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Abstract

The research attempted to discover the norms of translating taboo words and concepts after the Islamic Revolution in Iran using Toury’s (1995) framework for classification of norms. The corpus of the study composed of Coelho’s novels between 1990 and 2005 and their Persian translations which were prepared and analyzed manually to discover the norms. It was found that the norms were at work during both the selection of novels for translation and the process of translating by translators. It was also discovered that the translators of the novels complied with the target language norms, i.e. the translators had attempted to produce acceptable translations. Regarding preliminary norms, the research suggested that the translation policy was based on popularity of the author that could guarantee the salability of translations. The frequency of the norms suggested that euphemism with 37.87 percent was the dominant norm in translating taboo words and concept in Iran. The frequency of the norms in each of the books, as well as their frequency in the entire corpus was measured and presented in tables and discussed. Finally, it was found out that the dominant ideology in Iran was a determining factor in the process of decision making by the translators.
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هنگار های ترجمه وازگان و مفاهیم متنوعه از انگلیسی به فارسی بعد از انقلاب اسلامی ایران

چکیده
در این تحقیق تلاش بر این بوده است تا هنگارهای ترجمه وازگان و مفاهیم متنوعه از انگلیسی به فارسی بعد از انقلاب اسلامی مورد بررسی قرار گرفته. در این راستا از چارچوب نظری تواری (1995) برای طبقه‌بندی هنگارها استفاده شده است. پیکره تحقیق شامل رمان‌های پاتولوگی و ترجمه فارسی‌اش بوده است که به ترتیب هنگارها 2000 و 1995 منتشر شده است. این پیکره به شیوه دستی مورد بررسی و تحلیل قرار گرفته است. تا به بررسی هنگار‌ها پیردازید. نتیجه‌های حاصل داده که هنگارها چه در مرحله انتخاب رمان‌ها برای ترجمه و چه در مرحله ترجمه توسط مترجم موثر هستند. همچنین این نتیجه حاصل شد که مترجمین آثار ذکر شده در پیکره تحقیق پایبند به هنگارهای زیبان مفید بودند. این عبارت دیگر مترجمین تلاش کرده بودند تا ترجمه ای قابل قبول ارائه دهند. هنگارهای توپولوژی مقدماتی سیاست ترجمه بر مبنای شهرت مولف بوده است که به گونه‌ای فروش ترجمه را تضمین می‌کند. بسامد هنگارهای به کار رفته نشان داد که حسن تعیین با 177 درصد هنگار غالب در ترجمه وازگان و مفاهیم متنوعه در ایران می‌باشد. بسامد هنگارها در هر یک از کتاب‌ها و همچنین بسامد هنگارها در کل پیکره سنجیده و مقایسه در جدول‌های جداگانه قرار داده شد و مورد بررسی قرار گرفت. در نهایت نتایج حاکی از آن بود که ایدئولوژی حاکم در ایران عامل تعیین کننده ای در فرایند تصمیم گیری مترجمین بوده است.

زهره سادات اعتماد حسینی