

**Text Analysis of Poetic Genre in Translation: A Contrastive  
Study of English & Persian Discourse**

**Dr. H. Vahid Dastjerdi**<sup>\*</sup>

Isfahan University

**M. Shekary**<sup>\*\*</sup>

**ABSTRACT**

This study aims at investigating some cross-linguistic properties of poetic genre. For this purpose, three Persian pieces of poetry by Jalal-addin-Rumi - Avaze Nei (the Reed Flute), Shah va Kanizak (the King and the Servant), Moosa va Shaban (Moses and the Shepherd) will be compared with their English translations. The study draws on the recent version of discourse analysis approach (Baker, 1995) propounding five hypotheses on the specific properties of translation; namely, simplification, normalization, explicitation, transitivity, and nominalization. The analysis of the data reveals significant cross-linguistic differences in SL and TL as related to these properties, which in turn suggest a shift of mind from mere linguistic to metalinguistic and ideational analysis of texts in translation process.

**Keywords:** 1. Simplification 2. Normalization 3. Explicitation 4. Transitivity 5. Nominalization 6. Discourse analysis.

**1. Introduction**

The present article is an analysis scenario in which instances of various linguistic features need to be extracted in more than one language. The main theoretical goal is the empirical testing of some hypotheses about the specific properties of translations using some standard techniques of text analysis. As an example, it has often been observed that translations tend to be longer than corresponding SL originals, on the one hand, and that they are simpler than their SL originals on the other hand. There has recently been an increased interest in more exact formulations of such general contentions in terms of explicit hypotheses and in providing empirical evidence to confirm or reject them. Such formulations can be found in Toury (1995), Baker (1995) and Kenny (1998).

The article will touch upon five hypotheses concerning the specific properties of translations, to show how we need to refer to multiple levels of linguistic organization, in order to be able to extract from the corpus, instances of linguistic features ranging from grammatical to semantic ones. It will then come up with concluding remarks for future studies.

Based on Baker's (1995) suggestions, three hypotheses to be tested in this study are as follows: simplification, normalization and explicitation. Two other hypotheses, namely, nominalization and transitivity will be discussed later.

**1.1. Simplification**

"Translations tend to use simpler language than original texts ... possibly to optimize the readability of the target language text" (Hansen & Teich, 2001). Possible measures for simplification are average sentence length, and lexical density. Taking

---

<sup>\*</sup> Assistant Professor

<sup>\*\*</sup> Instructor

lexical density as a possible measure providing evidence for simplification, the following more concrete hypothesis can be formulated (cf. Baker 1995):

H (1): In translations from Persian into English, one would expect the lexical density to be lower in English translations (ET) than in Persian original texts (POT).

### 1.2. Explicitation

Translations show a tendency to spell things out rather than leave them implicit. A possible measure for explicitation is text length; translations tending to be longer than their SL ... originals texts (Hansen & Teich).

Also, some language-specific tests have been proposed, e.g., for English, frequency counts of optional that have been suggested (cf. (Baker, 1996, 180)); translations tend to use that more frequently than comparable original texts. Also translations employ more explicit linguistic renderings of a given semantic content vs. less explicit ones, e.g., more conjunctions vs. prepositions.

Conjunctions indicate that semantic relations, such as temporal or causal ones, are made explicit, prepositions indicate less explicit lexico-grammatical relations (cf. (Halliday and Matthiessen, 1999).

Taking the number of occurrences of that complementizer and the number of occurrences of conjunctions vs. prepositions as indicators for explicitation, we can formulate the following two hypotheses:

H (2-1): In translations from Persian into English, one would expect to find more that complementizers in ET than in POT.

H (2-2): In translations from Persian into English, one would expect to find more conjunctions vs. Prepositions in ET.

### 1.3. Normalization

Translations have a tendency to conform to the typical patterns of the TL, exaggerating the typical features of the TL (Hansen & Teich, 2001).

Baker (1995) suggests comparing the use of punctuation as a test for normalization.

Translations tend to use punctuation less creatively. Taking the extensive use of punctuations to be 'normal' in English in the given register, we can formulate the following hypothesis:

H (3): In translations from Persian into English, one would expect that there will be a higher frequency of punctuations in ET than in POT.

While Baker's proposal is clearly a novel idea of how to approach the question of the specific properties of translations, there is one important shortcoming: the measures suggested for testing the hypotheses are quite shallow linguistic properties, essentially operating at word and graphological levels. One of the problems with 'superficial' quantification (i.e. taking account of formal linguistic categories rather than semantic ones) is that the counting procedures distance the analyst from the source text. Once a linguistic phenomenon has become a tick on a coding sheet, to be processed by quantitative approach, the co-text, so vital for interpretation, is lost (Fairclough 1992: 230).

In this study our approach to the question of the specific properties of translations (Fairclough, 1989) differs from Baker's approach in the following respect: we bring some more abstract linguistic features into the picture. The approach discussed in this study is intended to supplement, not replace, the methods normally used in DA. Qualitative and quantitative techniques need to be combined, not played off against each other. This allows us to formulate additional hypotheses about the specific properties of translations relating to nominalization and transitivity; such as H (4) and H (5).

#### 1.4. Nominalization

One of the features of poetic genre in Persian is the extensive use of nominalization. Taking the extensive use of nominalization to be 'normal' in Persian, we can formulate the fifth hypothesis.

H (4): In translations from Persian into English, one would expect a higher frequency of nominalization in source texts than in comparable ET.

This hypothesis is drawn on Badawi's hypothesis (1973) which first pointing to the major difference between Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic in that nominal clauses are more frequent in the latter, and verbal clauses are more frequent in the former. It will be interesting to extend Badawi's hypothesis to translated texts from Persian to English. The significance of this extension lies in the fact that no published study has yet compared the ratio of nominalization and frequency of different process types in Persian texts vs. their corresponding ET.

#### 1.5. Transitivity

As part of the ideational function in the Hallidayan paradigm, transitivity is a powerful semantic concept and an essential dimension of the discourse analysis (Fowler, 1991). Transitivity places agents, actions, and patients in various relations to each other (Stubbs, 1994) and has important ideological implications (Yaakoub, 1988).

The important difference between transitivity in traditional grammar and in Halliday's functional grammar is that in the former transitivity relates to whether a verb is transitive; while for Halliday (1985), transitivity has to do with the entire clause, not only with the verb, but with the relationships between the verb and the noun phrases in the clause. A clause, as Fowler (1991) puts it, is based on a semantic nucleus consisting of an obligatory verb or adjective called a predicate. In Halliday's model, the predicate is the process (1985). A process is typically realized by a verb group; It may be material (a process of doing), mental (a process of sensing), relational (a process of being) or verbal process. Material processes "express the notion that some entity 'does' something – which may be done 'to' some other entity" (p. 103). A mental process is a process of thinking, feeling, or perceiving. A mental process is not a process of doing. It cannot be substituted by "do". The third type of process is the relational. A relational process is a process of being. It has three subtypes:

1. X is a (intensive).
2. X is at a (circumstantial).
3. X has a (possessive).

Verbal processes are processes of saying, e.g., "say", "tell", "argue".

The other two processes by Halliday, i.e. behavioral and existential are not dealt with. A contrastive feature of the English and Persian grammatical systems is that English tends to use more material process whereas Persian shows more tendency toward relational process. This view is not yet attested in any published work. This study aims at providing evidence for this opinion. Thus, with regard to transitivity we can formulate another hypothesis concerning translation properties:

H (5) In translations from Persian into English, one would expect that there will be a higher number of relational processes in POT than in ET texts.

This reorientation towards the more abstract properties of source language texts and their translations has the following advantage for the methods of analysis: It adds the ideational function of nominalization and process types to the analysis. Considering these features helps us answer this question: does translation serve the same ideological function as the source language and therefore appear to use the same frequency of nominalization and transitivity (process types). (Thompson, 1990; and Van Leeuwen, 1995).

In the following section, the method of analyzing the corpus to elicit appropriate information on the hypotheses (H1)–(H5) will be described.

## 2. Methodology

This study adopts a text analysis approach in handling the data, following Baker's translation hypotheses (1995), Halliday's functional grammar (1985) and critical Discourse analysis explicated by Fairclough & Wodak (1997) in order to answer the following research question:

Is there any significant cross-linguistic difference between selected POT and ET as related to five hypotheses, namely, simplification, explicitation, normalization, nominalization and transitivity?

### 2.1. Materials

The texts to be analyzed in this study are:

- a) Three poems by Jalal-addin-Rumi (1373) as source texts:
  1. Aavaz-e Nei
  2. Shah va Kanizak
  3. Moosa va Shaban
- b) Three English translations, corresponding to each Persian poem:
  1. "The Reed Flute 1" and "the King and the Servant 1" by E.H. Whinfield (1898)
  2. "The Reed Flute 3" and "Moses and the Shepherd 1" by Shahriar Shahriari (1998 & 2000)
  3. "The Reed Flute 2" and "the King and the Servant 2" by Paul Smith & Omid Honari (2002)
  4. "Moses and the Shepherd 2" by Ibrahim Gamard (1999)
  5. "The King and the Servant 3" and "Moses and the Shepherd 3" by A. J. Arberry (1993)

### 2. 2. Procedure

Each text is first broken into its constituent clauses. The clauses of each text are then categorized, following Halliday (1985), into Relational, Material, Mental, or Verbal. Other linguistic features selected for hypothesis testing such as optional that, conjunctions vs. prepositions, lexical density, nominal phrase, punctuations, and number of words, are also extracted and inter-linguistic comparisons are made in order to empirically test H1-H5.

## 3. Analysis and Discussion

In the following, more precise formulations of the hypotheses stated above and at least one possible test for each of them will be provided. The empirical testing of each of the hypotheses places different requirements on the analysis techniques to be used. For the analysis of hypotheses, we need to refer to a range of linguistic features: Lexical density, "that" conjunctions, prepositions, nominalization which is a syntactic construction and the process types (transitivity) which refer to functional-grammatical classes reflecting a semantic distinction. The tests illustrate the extraction of these linguistic features on the basis of a raw text corpus.

### 3.1. Simplification

Possible measures for simplification are average sentence length and lexical density. As far as sentence length is concerned translations seem to be longer (Table 1 & 2). In fact, except "the Reed Flute 1 & 2", translations tend to have longer sentences than the source texts. This verifies baker's hypothesis.

**Table 1: Sentence length in SL texts.**

POT	Sentence length	Total number of words
Avaze Nei	20.41	430
Shah va Kanizak	15	2519
Moosa va Shaban	5.5	1235

**Table 2: Sentence length in TL texts.**

ET	Sentence length	Total number of words
Moses and the Shepherd 1	15	1463
Moses and the Shepherd 2	11.54	820
Moses and the Shepherd 3	15.2	1111
The Reed Flute 1	17.2	647
The Reed Flute 2	14	757
The Reed Flute 3	24.23	509
The King & the Servant 1	16.71	936
The King & the Servant 2	17.07	5187
The King & the Servant 3	19.44	2178

As to lexical density, the focus is on one lexical item in each text: "God" in "Moses and the Shepherd "; "Reed" in "the Reed Flute"; "sickness" in "the King & the Servant". Table 3 & 4 & 5 below indicate that lexical density is lower in the English translations, if only slightly, and we can thus interpret this as simplification.

**Table 3: Lexical density in "Moses and the Shepherd".**

ET1	ET2	ET3	POT
God	God	God	خدا
Your majesty	Divine	Your majesty	الله
The Judge Glorious		The Judge	محترم
The Almighty		The Almighty	آفتاب
The Lord		The Lord	حق تعالی
Glorious One		Allah	ذوالجلال
		Ruller	حادث
		You	خالق
		Holy	الله
		Creator	کردگار
			رب
			یزدان
			رب

**Table 4: Lexical density in "the Reed Flute".**

ET 1	ET 2	ET 3	POT
complaining	tale of separation	reed	شکایت کردن
lamenting	complaint	sigh	حکایت کردن از جداییها
Plaintive notesreed	ferment	grief	نالیدن
pangs	longing	fire	شرحہ شرحہ از فراق
longing	stain	sound	شرح درد اشتیاق
plaintive notes	yearning	passion	آتش

yearning	wailing	separation	بانگ نای
wailing	weep	grievence	جوشش عشق
weep	grief		حدیث راه پر خون
ferment of love	sorrow		قصه عشق مجنون
grief	sigh		غم
sorrow	cry		سوز
anguish	the sound		
sigh	pain		
fire of love	passion		
plaint of the flute			

Table 5: Lexical density in "the King and the Servant".

ET 1	ET 2	ET 3	POT
sick	sick	sick	بیمار
lovesick	sickness	illness	دردمند
treatment	drug	suffering	خسته
cure	ailment	affliction	مرض
diagnosis	illness	treatment	رنج
	torment	cure	رنجور
	illness		زاری
	torment		بیماری
	treatment		علت
	cure		نا خوش
	diagnosis		رخ زرد
	remedies		درمان
			علاج
			دوا

### 3.2. Explication

One possible measure for explication is text length; as it is evident from the number of words, in this study translated texts tend to be longer than their SL originals. Table 1 & 2 shows that there are four exception regarding text length (the total number of words). "The King & the Shepherd 1 and 3" and "Moses & the Shepherd 2 & 3" are shorter than their source texts.

Also, frequency counts of optional that have been suggested as another possible measure for explication. According to (H2), the translations show explication using the optional that more often than original texts do.

Table 6, below provides evidence for the rejection of the hypotheses regarding the excessive use of optional "that" in translations ("the King and the Servant 2" & "the Reed Flute 2" are exceptional).

The data show that there are significantly fewer that-clauses in English translations compared to their source language texts.

**Table 6: The number of "that" in POT & ET.**

ET	Number of "that"	Optional "that"
Moses and the Shepherd 1	15	7
Moses and the Shepherd 2	5	1
Moses and the Shepherd 3	6	10
The Reed Flute 1	7	1
The Reed Flute 2	26	8
The Reed Flute 3	4	0
The King & the Servant 1	11	3
The King & the Servant 2	145	27
The King & the Servant 3	33	7
POT		
"Moosa va Shaban"	21	10
"Avaze Nei"	17	5
"Shah va Kanizak"	48	7

The ratio of conjunctions vs. prepositions is another possible measure for explicitation. The results are displayed in table 7. Hypothesis (2-2) maintaining that there should be more conjunctions in the translations for explicitation to hold is confirmed, because the ratio of conjunctions to prepositions is more in translation than in original texts. The two exceptions are "Moses and Shepherd 2" and "the King and the Servant 3".

**Table 7: Conjunctions, vs. prepositions in SL and TL texts.**

ET	conjunction	preposition	ratio
Moses and the Shepherd 1	99	131	1.32
*Moses and the Shepherd 2	127	119	0.93
Moses and the Shepherd 3	35	63	1.8
The Reed Flute 1	52	67	1.28
The Reed Flute 2	65	93	1.43
The Reed Flute 3	61	72	1.18
The King & the Servant 1	70	127	1.81
The King & the Servant 2	408	595	1.45
*The King & the Servant 3	219	233	1.06
POT	—	—	
"Moosa va Shaban"	131	140	1.06
"Avaze Nei"	56	53	0.94
"Shah va Kanizak"	279	387	1.38

### 3.3. Normalization

The next hypothesis to be considered is related to normalization property. Translations have a tendency to conform to the typical patterns of the TL, exaggerating the typical features of the TL. As a test for normalization, Baker (1995) suggests comparing the use of punctuation; translations purportedly using punctuation less creatively than original texts.

Hypothesis (3) which claims that there should be more punctuation in the translations for normalization to hold, is rejected as far as question mark and colon are concerned since they are used more in source texts. On the other hand, with regard to semicolon and full stop, the hypothesis is confirmed, since they are used more in English translations. (Table 8)

**Table 8: Punctuation in SL and TL texts.**

ET	.	,	;	:	?
Moses and the Shepherd 1	86	110	1	0	8
Moses and the Shepherd 2	60	71	6	1	12
Moses and the Shepherd 3	37	42	16	5	5
The Reed Flute 1	25	46	6	1	6
The Reed Flute 2	32	47	1	9	9
The Reed Flute 3	14	32	1	0	6
The King & the Servant 1	44	85	7	0	5
The King & the Servant 2	218	138	33	76	17
The King & the Servant 3	80	124	13	11	8
POT	—	—	—	—	—
"Moosa va Shaban"	0	53	0	13	15
"Avaze Nei"	7	26	0	1	7
"Shah va Kanizak"	7	112	0	27	17

Question mark as opposed to Baker's hypotheses is used more in source texts.

Colon which introduces explanation, amplification, or a list or a comment is used more in source texts. Two exceptions are "The Reed Flute 2" and "The King and the Servant 2" in translated texts.

### 3.4. Nominalization

Nominalization, deletes agency, tense and modality. It reduces a whole clause into its nucleus, the verb, and then turns it into a noun, thus deleting agency and modality, facilitating relexicalization, clouding relational responsibilities and yielding a tone of formality and impersonality. This syntactic reduction also allows suppressing face-threatening details such as Agent and Patient and presenting a complex relation in a single lexical item (Fowler & Kress, 1979). A nominal clause is one where the thematic/subject position is occupied by a noun phrase; in a verbal clause this position is occupied by a verb. A nominal clause, compared to a verbal one, is rather static and does not indicate action or continuity (Yaakoub, 1988). Tables 9 & 10 below show the results of the analysis of nominalization. They indicate a significant difference in the use of nominalization in original texts compared to English translations. Persian texts use more nominalization than English translations, and so the extensive use of nominalization is more a register feature of Persian than of English. Thus, hypothesis (4) suggesting that in translations from Persian into English one would expect a higher frequency of nominalization in source texts than in comparable English translations, is strongly confirmed.

**Table 9: The ratio of nominalization in SL texts.**

POT	Verbal clauses	Nominalization	ratio
Moosa va Shaban	386	146	2.64
Avaze Nei	259	97	2.67
Shah va Kanizak	1650	724	2.27

**Table 10: The ratio of nominalization in TL texts.**

ET	Verbal clauses	Nominalization	ratio
The Reed Flute 1	284	93	3.05
The Reed Flute 2	332	108	3.07
The Reed Flute 3	247	75	3.29
Moses & the Shepherd 1	687	253	2.71
Moses & the Shepherd 2	713	122	3.38
Moses & the Shepherd 3	334	111	3.00



King & the Servant 1	386	106	3.58
King & the Servant 2	2153	626	3.43
King & the Servant 3	844	250	3.37

The first text analyzed here, was "Moses and Shepherd". This text is divided into 3 subheadings which may be further divided into 4 nominal clauses and 1 verbal clause. One example of nominal clauses in subheading is "enkaar kardane Moosa". Here, nominal clauses are more frequent in Persian, and verbal clauses are more frequent in English. The subheadings witness to this hypothesis. However, the tendency towards nominalization in titles and subtitles is not specific to Persian. Even in English subheadings are predominantly nominal. But the same tendency towards nominalizing is also noticeable within the text. It contains 146 instances of nominalization in 386 clauses. The ratio of nominalizations to clauses is approximately 1 to 2. That is, in every two clauses there is at least one instance of nominalization, e.g., "bi adab goftan"; (to tell impolitely) "vasl kardan" (to join). The same tendency is true in the two other source texts. "Avaze Nei" contains 97 instances nominalization in 259 clauses. Similarly, "Shah va Kanizak" contains 724 instances of nominalization in 1650 clauses; namely, in every two clauses there is at least one instance of nominalization in each text. So one significant difference between the source and the translated texts lies in the high density of nominalization (Table 9).

The tendency towards nominalizing, however, is less noticeable in translated texts. (see Table 10); it shows that except in "Moses and The Shepherd 1" the ratio of nominalization to all clauses is approximately 1 to 3, i.e. in every three clauses there is at least one instances of nominalization, while in source texts there is at least one instance of nominalization in every two clauses.

### 3.5. Transitivity

The analysis of transitivity choices in the data has been concerned with processes. Processes "carry the main responsibility for representing the events and situations to which the text refers" (Fowler & Kress, 1979, p. 198).

Table 11 & 12 show the results of the analysis of transitivity. There is a significant difference in the use of transitivity in ET compared to POT, i.e. Persian uses more relational process than English which uses in turn more material process.

**Table 11: Process categories in POT.**

Process	Relational		Material		Mental		Verbal	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
POT								
Moosa va Shaban	108	46	88	37	15	7	23	9
Avaze Nei	48	58	19	23	10	12	5	6
Shah va Kanizak	193	41	164	35	56	12	52	11

**Table 12: Process categories in ET.**

Process	Relational		Material		Mental		Verbal	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
ET								
Moses and the Shepherd 1	59	20	155	54	61	21	8	3
Moses and the Shepherd 2	64	47	55	41	4	2	11	8
Moses and the Shepherd 3	41	33	57	47	10	8	13	10
Reed Flute 1	31	31	37	38	27	27	2	2
Reed Flute 2	55	45	45	47	15	12	5	4
Reed Flute 3	18	20	56	62	9	10	3	3
King & Servant 1	50	34	78	53	10	6	7	4

King & Servant 2	208	24	449	53	115	13	67	7
King and Servant 3	73	23	167	54	40	12	29	9

Starting from the source texts, the 234 clauses of the "Moosa va Shaban" text may be categorized as follows: 108 Relational, 88 Material, 23 Verbal, and 15 Mental. The percentages of these processes are given in Table 11 (N = number).

Table 11 shows that the most frequent category is that of Relational processes, and the least frequent is that of Mental processes. The following are examples of the different process categories in this text:

1. "dastakat boosam..." (May I kiss your hand?) (Material)
2. "oo tanha nashod..." (He doesn't become alone ...) (Relational)
3. "goft Moosa: ba ki ast in folan?" (Moses said: "whom is he talking to?") (Verbal)
4. "did Moosa yek shabani ra be rah" (In his way Moses saw a shepherd) (Mental)

Table 11 also shows the same tendency towards relational processes in "Avaze Nei" and "Shah va Kanizak" respectively.

Table 12 shows that the most frequent category in ET is that of material process and the least is of verbal process. There are two exceptions in which relational process is the most frequent and the mental process is the least frequent category in ET. Thus, H(5) which claims that in translations from Persian into English one would expect a higher number of relational processes in source texts than in translated English texts, is strongly confirmed.

#### 4. Findings and Conclusions

This study illustrates the analysis of Persian poetic genre along with corresponding English translations for the purpose of testing some selected hypotheses about the specific properties of translation, using some standard text analysis techniques employed in translation assessment. The primary objective was to find how the translated texts differ from the source texts in terms of normalization, explicitation, simplification, transitivity, and nominalization. As to more abstract features such as nominalization and transitivity, the ultimate aim of the study was to find out how Persian and English vary in encoding ideology.

The only hypothesis strongly rejected was H (2-1) which claims that translations show explicitation, using more "optional that" compared to source texts. The study showed that there are significantly fewer that clauses in ET compared to POT. However, H (2-2) which concerns the ratio of conjunctions vs. prepositions as another possible measure for explicitation was confirmed, because with two exceptions, the ratio of conjunctions to prepositions came to be more in ET than in POT.

Hypothesis (1) was also verified with one exception. According to this hypothesis, the lexical density in translations should be lower than in source texts. The analysis showed that lexical density in ET was lower, a proof for simplification in translation. It is to be noted that here there is an important limitation as to the adopted method of analysis: that is in this study we have focused on only one lexical item in each text and thus, the result is not generalizable.

Hypothesis(3) which presents the ratio of punctuation as a possible measure for normalization was partly verified and partly rejected. This hypothesis which claims that there should be more punctuation in the ET for normalization was rejected as far as question mark and colon are concerned since they are used more in source texts. On the other hand, with regard to semicolon, comma, and full stop. H (3) was confirmed, since they are used more in ET.

The reason why question mark and colon are more frequent in POT needs to be

explored more by further studies, since the commonly hold view is that punctuation is always used less creatively in Persian texts than in English. For example, semicolon, as it is evident in this study, is almost absent in Persian poetic genre. In this study, the excessive use of question mark might indicate that the authors of POT are more interactive with the readers. This needs to be further researched.

Hypothesis (4), which is related to nominalization, was strongly confirmed in this study. The ratio of nominalization to verbal phrases is approximately 1 to 2 in POT, and 1 to 3 in ET; that is in POT in every two clauses, while in ET in every three clauses, there is at least one instance of nominalization. So one significant difference between POT and the ET is in the high density of nominalization.

Hypothesis (5) claiming that there is a higher number of relational processes in POT than in ET, was also strongly confirmed because there was a significant difference in the use of transitivity in ET compared to POT. In fact, Persian texts use more relational process, while in translations, with two exceptions, the most frequent category is that of material process.

The above-mentioned findings, derived from the English and Persian data reveal significant cross-linguistic differences related to simplification, explicitation, normalization, transitivity, and nominalization. A note has to be made that to substantiate the significant differences claimed, the results are subjected to statistical Chi-square test the outcome of which appears in Appendix No. 1. The significant difference in the use of transitivity and nominalization between POT and ET might be due to some other factors influencing translations. It might be an indication of an essential dichotomy between the two ideologies governing the two languages, i.e. one being subjective and the other objective (Brookes, 1995). This implies that we also need to add the ideational function of nominalization and process types to the findings.

It is, of course, very difficult to overlook the greater tendency towards subjectivity in source texts and towards its opposite in the translations, for the latter is predominated by reports of actions and things done through excessive use of material process, whereas the former is predominated by things speculated, stipulated or mandated through excessive use of relational, value- laden clauses (Brookes, 1995). The processes in the latter are thus more “measurable” (Brookes, 1995).

As to Relational processes, when they take precedence over Material processes, “the dynamic world of interhuman processes” is changed into “a static world of immutable precepts and interdicts” (Hastert & Weber, 1992, p. 169), and agency and action are “attenuated”, if not totally “omitted” (Brookes, 1995, p. 476). Processes are reified into states that should be taken for granted and duties that should be performed. This is the case in Persian texts to a much greater extent than in the translations of such texts.

Apart from formulating and testing additional hypotheses about the specific properties of translations, our longer-term goal is to work towards the specification of a translation corpus workbench that caters for the informational needs of researchers in translatology as well as teachers and students of translation.

Taken together, the techniques employed in this study support the kinds of analysis carried out, but there are a number of open issues that require more principled treatments. In fact, there is still a lot to do to establish discourse analysis (DA) in the Persian context and to cover other discourse genres in Persian. The list of unrehearsed, at least under-researched, Persian genres is too long, but such genres as news reports, opinion columns, cartoons advertisements, matrimonial columns, interviews, State documents and correspondences, courtroom discourse and legalese, religious sermons, folk tales and songs, can be good areas for further research.

What is at stake, however, is not the number of Persian discourse genres that should be explored; it is rather a reorientation of attention from linguistic choices and their meanings to linguistic and metalinguistic choices and their ideological meanings in a given context (Abrams, 1993).

### References

- Arberry, A. J. (1993). **Tales From Masnavi**, Jalal-din Rumi. London: Curtzon Press.
- Abrams, M.H. (1993). **A Glossary of Literary Terms**, (6th ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Badawi, E. M. (1973). **Levels of Contemporary Egyptian Arabic**, Cairo: Dar El-Maaref.
- Baker, M (1995). *Corpora in Translation Studies: An overview and some suggestions for further research*, **Target**, 7(2), 223-245.
- Brookes, H. J. (1995). "Suit, tie, and a touch of juju"- *The ideological construction of Africa: A critical discourse analysis of news on Africa in the British press*, **Discourse & Society**, 6, 461-494.
- Coulthard, M. (1977). **An Introduction to Discourse Analysis**, London: Longman.
- Kenny, D. (1998). *Creatures of Habit? What Translators Usually Do with Words*. **Meta**, XLIII (4): 515-524.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). **Language and Power**, London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). **Discourse and Social Change**, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). **Critical Discourse Analysis**, In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction*, 258-284.
- Fowler, R. (1985). **Power**, In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*, volume 4, *Discourse analysis in society*, Academic Press, London, 61-82.
- Fowler, R. (1991). **Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press**, London and New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. & Kress, G. (1979). **Critical Linguistics**, In R. Fowler, et al. (Ed.), *Language and Control*, 85-213.
- Gamard, I. (1999). "The Mathnawi-ye Ma'nawi " [Rhymed Couplets of Deep Spiritual Meaning] of Jalaluddin Rumi. Translated from the Persian by Ibrahim Gamard (with gratitude for R. A. Nicholson's 1926 British translation). Available online at: <http://www.dar-al-masnavi-org/n.a-11-1720.html>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). **An Introduction to Functional Grammar**, London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1990). **Construing Experience Through Meaning, A Language – Based Approach to Cognition**. London: Cassell
- Hansen, S. & Teich, E. (2001). **Multi-Layer Analysis of Translation Corpora: Methodological Issues and Practical Implications**, In D. Cristea, N. Ide, D. Marcu & Poesio, M. (Eds.) **Proceedings of EUROLAN 2001 Workshop on Multi-layer Corpus-based Analysis**. Iasi: 44-55.
- Jalal-addin-Rumi, M. (1373) **Masnavi Manavi Moalavi**, with Foroozanfar's preface, based on Nicholson transcription.
- Shahriari, S. (1998) *A Tribute to Molana Jalal-e-Din Mohammad Moalavi Rumi*, Available online at: [http://www.rumionfire.com/mathnavi/1\\_1.htm](http://www.rumionfire.com/mathnavi/1_1.htm)
- Shahriari, S. (2000) *A Tribute to Molana Jalal-e-Din Mohammad Moalavi Rumi*, Available online at: [http://www.rumionfire.com/mathnavi/2\\_1721.htm](http://www.rumionfire.com/mathnavi/2_1721.htm)
- Smith, P. & Honari, O. (2002) *Masnavi-prologue & first story*. Available online: <http://www.rumionfire.com/masnavi/>
- Stubbs, M. (1986). *Grammar, text, and ideology*, **Applied Linguistics**, 15, 201-223.

- Thompson, J. B. (1990). **Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication**, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Toury, G. (1995). **Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond**, Amsterdam: Benjamin
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1995). *Representing social action*, **Discourse & Society**, 6, 81-106.
- Whinfield, E. H. (1898). *Masnavi Manavi: the spiritual couplets of Maulana Jalau-d Din Muhammad I Rumi by Jalaludin Rumi translated by E.H. Whinfield*, Available online at: [http:// muslim-canada.org/sufi/book1rumi.htm](http://muslim-canada.org/sufi/book1rumi.htm)
- Wodak, R. (1984). **Determination of Guilt: Discourse in the Courtroom**, In C. Kramarae et al., (Eds.), *Language and Power*, 89-100.
- Wodak, R. (1985). **The Interaction Between Judge and Defendant**, In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Use of Language in Courtroom Interaction*, 181-192.
- Yaakoub, E. B. (1988). **Encyclopedia of Grammar, Morphology and Parsing (in Arabic)**, Beirut: Dar El-Elm Lil-Malaayiin.

**Appendix: Chi-square test applied to data**

Table No.	df	$\chi^2$	P
6	6	18.615	0.005
7	6	19.377	0.004
9-10	6	307.426	0.000
11.12 First 2 parameters	6	18.012	0.007
11-12 Second 2 parameters	6	9.6	0.144