



Islamic Azad University-Central Tehran Branch

Faculty of Foreign Languages- Department of English

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Translation Studies**

**CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE MOVIES
SARA (1993) AND PARI (1995): A SEMIOTIC APPROACH**

Adviser:

Dr. Farzan Sojoodi

Reader:

Dr. Farhad Sasani

Researcher:

Maryam Ghahremani

November 2012

In the Name of God

The Compassionate the Merciful

TO MY BROTHER'S LOVELY BONES

ABSTRACT

The present study was an attempt to focus on synchronic examination of the traces of power and ideology manifested in two Iranian cinematic meta-texts *Sara* (1993) and *Pari* (1995), made by Darush Mehrjui, in relation to their corresponding proto-texts *A Doll's House* ([1879]1943), *A Perfect Day for Banana-fish* ([1948]1981) and *Franny and Zooey* ([1961] 1964) based on the framework generated through the study at two levels of Macro and Micro. Macro level deals with the conditions and circumstances of textual production and its reception while Micro level focuses on analyzing the textual codes embedded within the texts. The core idea of this study is based on the theory of intertextuality in its Kristevaian sense and the school of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). At its Macro level the present investigation attempted to analyze the role personal and impersonal legitimate authorities play in reception of the meta-texts along with the impact of the dominant and prevailed ideology on the meta-textual productions; at Micro level the focus was on the examination of the ideological considerations involved in transforming the proto-textual characters into their corresponding meta-textual ones. Findings and results of the present study were categorized, systematized and discussed under three main headings of Power Relations Involved in Reception of The Meta-Texts, Dominant Ideology Imposed upon the Production Stage; and From The Proto-Textual Characters To The Meta-Textual Ones.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Significance of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
Limitations and Delimitations	7
Definition of Key Terms	9
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	15
Section I: Translation Studies	15
Historical Development	15
Translation as Rewriting	18
Section II: Critical Discourse Analysis	21
Cornerstones of CDA	23
Discourse	23
Ideology	26
Power	27
Critical Discourse Analysis and Translation Studies	30
Methodologies for Critical Discourse Analysis	33
Farahzad's CDA Model of Translation Criticism	33
Van Leuwen's Semiotic Tool-Kit	33
Transformations	34
The discursive construction of legitimation	36
The framework for visual representation of social actors	37
Section III: Semiotics	39
Modern Semiotics	39
Ferdinand de Saussure	40

Saussurean Model of Sign	40
Sign Value	41
Charles Sanders Peirce	41
Peircean Model of Sign	41
Peirce's typology of signs	43
Codes	43
Types of Codes	44
Kress and Van Leeuwen	44
Sojoodi's linguistic and non-linguistic codes	45
Ahmadi's Cinematic Codes	46
Denotation and Connotation	47
Metaphor	50
Conceptual or Cognitive Approach to Metaphor Studies	53
Central Assumptions	53
Metaphor as linking two mental [conceptual] domains	53
Metaphor as hiding and highlighting	54
Metaphor as structuring ideas	55
Nonlinguistic realizations of conceptual metaphors	56
Metonymy	57
Types of metonymy	58
Non linguistic realization of metonymies	59
Ideological dimension of metonymy	59
Intertextuality	60
The origins of the term	61
Intertextuality and translation studies	63
Semi-translation	65
Criticism of Farahzad's Model	68
Criticism of Farahzad's View of Intertextuality	68
Criticism of Farahzad's View of CDA	74
Introducing the Authors	76

Jerome David Salinger	76
Henrik Ibsen	78
Darush Mehrjui	79
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	81
Design of the Study	81
Corpus of the Study	81
The Meta-Texts	82
The Proto-Texts	82
Theoretical Framework	82
Procedure	99
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND RESULTS	103
Mehrjui's Authorial Codes	104
Mehrjui's Tips In Making His Texts Acceptable	107
From A Doll's House to Sara	109
Introducing the Inter-Texts	109
The Proto-Text A Doll's House	109
The Meta-Text Sara	111
Findings and Results	113
Macro Analysis	113
Power Relations Involved in Reception of the Meta-Text	113
Dominant Ideology Imposed Upon the Production Stage	117
Micro Analysis	124
From the Proto-Textual Characters to the Meta-Textual Ones	124
Final Consideration	150
From A Perfect day for Banana-fish & Franny and Zooey to Pari	151
Introducing the Inter-Texts	151
The Proto-Text A Perfect day for Banana-fish	151
The Proto-Text Franny and Zooey	152
The Meta-Text Pari	154
Findings and Results	155

Macro Analysis	155
Power Relations Involved in Reception of the Meta-Text	155
Dominant Ideology Imposed Upon the Production Stage	159
Micro Analysis	166
From the Proto-Textual Characters to the Meta-Textual Ones	166
Final Consideration	190
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	192
Summing Up	192
Pedagogical Implications	199
Suggestion for Further Studies	200
REFERENCES	203

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

This study consists of five chapters. The present chapter includes the background of the problem, statement of the problem, purpose of the study; its importance; limitations and delimitations; and definition of key terms. The following chapters will be focused on reviewing the literature of the study; outlining its methodology; analyzing its data and closing its discussion with the final conclusion.

Background of the Problem

Critical Discourse Analysis often abbreviated to CDA with a network of leading scholars with very different backgrounds is a new developed approach in socio-linguistics which deals with the representations and relations of power and ideology in language use; it is fundamentally concerned with analyzing structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control manifested in discourse and critically investigating the social inequality expressed, constituted, and legitimized through language use (Blommaert, 2005; Weiss and Wodak, 2003; Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002; Wodak and Chilton, 2005). However, there is no agreement among CDA scholars upon the definitions of power, ideology and discourse; also there is no unified body of theory or a single methodological approach in CDA studies (Wodak and Meyer, 2001; Wodak and Chilton, 2005; Wodak, 2005; and Locke, 2004); despite the

various tendencies towards variety of approaches, however, CDA's main concern is to provide demystifying and emancipatory effects (See Chilton, 2007).

Related to the commonalities between CDA and TS (Translation Studies) it is worth to mention that, dealing with the notions of ideology and power and exploring their impact on the process and product of translation is not new. From the time of so-called cultural turn forward Translation Studies has many answers to the range of questions raised around the issues of power and ideology. (Munday, 2001; Bassnett, 2002; Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990; Bassnett, 1998, 1996; Venuti, 1992, 1993, 1995 and 1998; Alvarez and Vidal, 1996; Lefevere, 1992; Hatim and Mason, 2005; Tymosko, 1992 and 2003; Perez, 2003; Vidal, 2003)

However, dealing with the subject from a CDA perspective is new. Christiana Schaffner (2004), a German translation scholar, was the one who invited the CDA discussions into the TS, drawing attention to the idea that CDA and TS have a lot in common. Since then, translation scholars with a joint interest have focused on the ideological implications of translation product; the issue around the ideological position of a translator also has continued to be central in translation writings. Some of the most searching discussions of translation in the last years have focused on the issues of establishment or reinforcement of power relations through translation practice and product, regarding texts as vehicles of power. (Bielsa and Bassnett, 2009)

As a result of growing interest in investigating the impact of power and ideology on the process and product of translation; a number of recent studies have been conducted in our country mainly focusing on the role of a translator who serves as a mediator in introducing new ideas into the receptor society; this study also emerged out of this recent concern attempting to shed a new light on the issue.

Statement of the Problem

The present study was mainly concerned with the role ideology and power play through the meta-textual circulation and the impact they encode within its (in process) product. CDA is the school of thought from which the present study drew its inspiration; the other guiding idea behind this research is the idea of seeing translation as a dynamic operation of negotiating meaning between and within multi-semiotic-discursive constructions not as a static decoding-encoding activity of rendering meaning across natural languages; this idea which is mainly inspired by the theory of intertextuality in its Kristevaian sense (See Allen, 2000; Schmitz, 2007; Culler, 2001 and McAfee, 2005) formed a necessary part in the present study and received a considerable amount of attention. From this new perspective translation as an intertextual (intercultural, interdiscursive, etc.) transaction makes a significant contribution in keeping the texts in a state of production and becoming. The texts involved in the process of intertextual transaction, also, here, are not considered as the static linguistic finished products traditionally labeled as source text and target text rather they are seen as the semiotic entities in process relabeled as proto-text and meta-text (See Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997); both are regarded as intertextual and interdiscursive constructions. Here, also, the so-called film adaptation is redefined to be considered as a kind of translation [transformation] and relabeled as inter-[text-cultural] semiotic exchange.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study was twofold; the first and the most significant concern of the present study was to investigate the impact of ideology and power on the meta-textual circulation and its [in action] product; for this purpose two Iranian

cinematic texts, Sara (1993) and Pari (1995) were selected to be surveyed in relation to their corresponding proto-texts *A Doll's House* ([1879]1943), *A Perfect Day for Banana-fish* ([1948]1981) and *Franny and Zooey* ([1961] 1964). Both meta-texts were made by Darush Mehrjui who is renowned in turning towards local and foreign literature to transform them into cinematic texts [the kind of practice which in traditional discourse was labeled as film adaptation]; and that is why in choosing the corpus of the present study the researcher tended towards his texts. The main reason behind the selection of the aforesaid multi-semiotic texts among all Mehrjui's adapted texts was the fact that both are the only texts transformed from foreign literature into the local cinema; and due to the considerable differences existing between the proto-textual environments [Norway and the US] and the meta-textual environment [Post-Revolutionary Iran] the selected meta-texts in relation to their corresponding proto-texts were regarded to be more helpful in surveying the ideological and power relational considerations involved in the process of textual transformation.

At its second level the present study faced with the lack of comprehensive theoretical framework in dealing with the traces of ideology and power manifested in multi-semiotic discursive constructions; the only available framework for conducting a CDA-TS research was Farhazad's (2009) model of Translation Criticism based on CDA and it was clear from the first that her model was greatly inadequate to meet the requirements of the present study and many other similar investigations (See pages 68-76); and it could not give satisfactory answers to the burning recent questions around the issue. So, the second purpose of this study was to provide a relatively comprehensive model to discuss the issues of power and ideology in discursive constructions embedded within multi-semiotic texts, to do so the present study aimed to

redefine Farahzad's model of Translation Criticism, and actually, to generate its own theoretical framework.

Significance of the Study

Reintroducing the theory of intertextuality in its Kristevaian sense (See Allen, 2000; Schmitz, 2007; Culler, 2001 and McAfee, 2005) into TS from a different perspective could be regarded as the most notable significance of the present study; the new perspective introduced in this study could change the whole nature of TS widening its scope to a great degree. In this view translation as an inter-[intra]-semiotic practice is at work in any kind of text-o- socio-cultural exchange; also, all texts, here, are seen in a free play of intertextual interactions ongoingly open to each other.

Another notable significance of the present study is proposing a relatively comprehensive model of translation criticism based on CDA, widening the realm of translation investigations; the model which could be used as a framework in similar investigations by other students for critical analyzing the multi-semiotic-discursive constructions [meta-texts] in relation to or independent from their corresponding proto-texts at two levels of Macro and Micro focusing on the underlying meaning the inter-texts bear.

Applying this proposed framework to the cinematic discourse could be considered as the other notable significance of the present investigation. Since cinema has a high rate of interest among the people all over the world and it is highly impressive in introducing new ideas and challenging the preexisting values and beliefs of the textual environment within which it is introduced. So, it is largely effective in exchanging ideas among the people of the world as Ahmadi (1389) believes the cinematic texts transfer the established concepts and ideas from one place to another; and they can be

used as 'cultural education tools' for introducing a particular culture to others; and, that is why the cinematic texts were targeted for fulfilling the purposes of the present study and among all sorts of cinematic texts the researcher turned towards the kinds of texts which were traditionally called as 'adapted films'.

The present study was by no means the first to deal with the subject of Critical Discourse Analysis in cinematic discourse but it aimed to take a comprehensive perspective towards investigating the role of ideology and power in it by largely emphasis on its non-verbal ideological and power-relational considerations; so it may be helpful for the scholars and the students interested in cultural studies in cinema, or any other relevant field of investigations.

Research Questions

To fulfill the aforesaid purposes the researcher attempted to answer the following questions throughout the study:

- What ideologically significant elements were involved in transforming the proto-textual characters into their corresponding meta-textual ones?
- What ideologies were at work to govern the meta-textual productions?
- What goals were those ideologies aiming to achieve?
- What relations were at work in reception of the meta-texts?
- What traces have those relations left on the meta-texts?
- What traces has the preferred ideology left on the meta-texts?
- What traces has the translator (filmmaker) left on the meta-texts?

Limitations and Delimitations

One of the limitations of the present study in dealing with the proto-text A DOLL'S HOUSE was the researcher's lack of knowledge of Norwegian language, the actual language the proto-text was written in; to solve this problem the English translation of the proto-text was used instead; it is worth to add that in this study the translated text is considered as the meta-text of the Norwegian proto-text and as the transposed and transformed version of that in a different sign[(at least)linguistic] system; however, in relation to its corresponding cinematic text SARA the translated text A DOLL'S HOUSE was considered as the proto-text and served as a mediator between the Norwegian proto-text ET DUKKEHJEM and the cinematic meta-text SARA.

Another significant limitation the present study dealt with was the lack of information about the power relations involved in distributing the meta-texts; the relations who actually determined in which cinema and for how long the meta-texts could be remained released; the issue which is highly influential in the reception of a cinematic text; the kind of information which is not accessible for an ordinary college student. The only accessible information around the relations involved in reception of the meta-texts was the notes, comments, judgments, reviews and interviews released in film magazines and newspapers of the time.

However, the present researcher attempted to focus only on the role celebrities and film stars as personal legitimate authorities along with impersonal legitimate entities played in highly reception of the meta-texts and to leave the investigating the impact of the aforesaid journalistic documents to the subsequent researchers interested in the issue.

Related to the issue of the preferred ideology also the researcher's information was only restricted to the inferable textual codes embedded within the meta-texts in considering their relation to their corresponding proto-texts; since there was no access to the actual information existing in Iranian Ministry of Culture And Islamic Guidance around the ideological and power relational limitations, prohibitions, forbiddens and prescriptions exerted upon the textual production; and Mehrjui, himself, is always reluctant to speak about difficulties he faces with through his textual productions. (See Gharesheikhlou and Vafaei, 1385; Zera'ati, 1384 and 1389)

Therefore, at the level of Macro analysis investigation was limited and [somehow] delimited to the surveying the impact of personal and impersonal authorities involved in reception of the meta-text; as well as the impact of the preferred ideology on the meta-textual production.

At the level of Micro analysis the investigation was delimited to the surveying the ideological considerations involved in transforming the characters from proto-textual environments into the meta-textual one; another relevant delimitation was concerned with analyzing the characters; at this stage, the focus was on the chief characters of the meta-texts in relation to their corresponding proto-texts; among these characters also the main focus was on the protagonists of the texts [Sara-Nora in Sara-A Doll's House and Pari-Franny in Pari-Franny and Zooey] due to the significant role they play in the inter-texts and due to the fact that the main situations and events of the inter-texts were set in association with them; other characters also were discussed mainly in relation to these protagonists, if needed.

Definition of Key Terms

Critical discourse analysis

Baker and Ellece (2011) define CDA as an approach to discourse analysis which sees language as a social practice and deals with the ways ideologies and power relations are expressed through language. This could be considered as a general definition of the school of CDA which only relies on the linguistic aspect of human communication disregarding the role of Multimedia texts which are a large part of contemporary life. The definition of CDA in the present study was mainly in the line with Van Leeuwen's (2008) concerns. He has a semiotic approach to CDA focusing on the visual representation and manifestations of power and ideology in multi-semiotic constructions.

Ideology

'Ideology' has been viewed as a significant aspect of establishing and maintaining unequal power relations in CDA (See Wodak and Meyer 2001; Perez, 2003; Fairclough, 1995; Schaffner, 1996 and Van Dijk, 1996); the definition of ideology, but, has been the first area of controversy among CDA scholars; there have been numerous view points towards the term 'ideology' since its coinage. The term ideology for the first time was used by Count Destutt de Tracy to refer to the science of ideas (Baker, 1998). Bressler (1998) writes this term was used by Tracy as opposed to metaphysics; however, Engles and Marx borrowed this term from Tracy and used it emphasizing the negative sense of the term to refer to the upper class's ruling ideas, customs and practices in creating a false consciousness on lower classes.

In the present study the general definition of the term ideology was considered which is actually in the line with Lefevre (1992), Hatim and Mason's (2005:120) definitions; it is the tacit and abstract assumptions, beliefs, and value systems shared collectively by a social community. The ideology here refers to the translator's (filmmaker's) ideology or the ideology imposed upon a translator (filmmaker) by controlling (leading/governing) factors through the process of textual circulation.

Power

Power is central to CDA and the purpose of CDA is analyzing opaque or transparent structural relationships between dominance, power and control manifested in language (See Wodak and Meyer 2001). The definition of power also is the third area of controversy among CDA practitioners. However they agreed upon the fact that discourse is structured by power and dominance. For Fairclough (1989: 17) "language is centrally involved in power, and struggles for power".

In the present study power is seen as an inseparable element of social relations and of one's life; the definition which is inspired by Foucault; Power is central to Foucault, for him (1978) power is not something imposed upon another, rather it is a net of relations circulating through society. It is something that is performed; it is "employed and exercised through a net-like organization" and individuals are the vehicles of that, "not its points of application". (Foucault, 1980:98) he (Cited in Mills, 2003:35) does not see power as something "dominating and imposing its rationality upon the totality of the social body" rather "there are power relations, they are multiple, they have different forms, they can be in play in family relations, or within an institution or an administration". The interesting point here is that unlike mainstream view of power, it

is not understood by Foucault (1980:119) as oppressive and negative but productive and positive:

"What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than as a negative instance whose function is repression."

Discourse

The definition of the term discourse has been a subject of ceaseless controversy among thinkers, social theorists, critical linguists and critical discourse analysts; however, it has been generally defined as "language above the sentence" Mayr (2008:7).

The present study is mainly inspired by Foucaultian definition of discourse. Foucault does not see a discourse as an equivalent of language or "a text"; it is not "an extended stretch of connected speech or writing", it is, what Van Leeuwen (2008:6) states, "the socially specific ways of knowing social practices"; in Mills' words (2003), for Foucault discourse is a system which structures the way that people perceive reality. He (1981) sees discourse as a practice which people impose upon reality; as a way of speaking about the world and as a means of producing and organizing meaning.

Intertextuality

In a general definition, Intertextuality "refers to the ways that texts refer to or incorporate aspects of other texts within them" in the form of parody, retelling, sampling, quotation, direct reference or allusion. (Baker and Ellece, 2011:64)

The term was first used by Julia Kristeva in 1966, referring to the Bakhtinian notions of dialogism and polyphony (See Bakhtin, 1981 and Allen, 2000). By using 'intertextuality', Kristeva tries to explain the idea of "any text is an absorption and transformation of other texts." (Cited in Allen, 2000:39), disrupting "the notions of stable meaning and objective interpretation." (Allen, 2000, p.3)

A text, in Kristeva's view, lacks in any kind of independent meaning; it operates within a system of meaning; it is a space in which a vast number of texts coalesce. So, the act of interpreting Kristevaian text plunges the interpreter into a network of textual relations. (See Allen, 2000; Schmitz, 2007; Culler, 2001 and McAfee, 2005)

Kristeva does not consider a text as "an individual, isolated object but, rather, a compilation of cultural textuality." (Allen, 2000,p.36) a text, in this vision, is made up of the cultural and social texts, of all the different discourses, intertextually related to them, in an ongoing interaction with them; it is always in process. It has no unity or unified meaning on its own; it is thoroughly connected to on-going cultural and social processes. A text and its socio-cultural text are made from the same textual material and cannot be separated from each other.

The present study is highly inspired by Kristeva's definition and view of intertextuality; in fact her approach to textual studies is a building block of this investigation.

Proto-text and Meta-text

The terms 'Proto-text' and 'Meta-text' are Popovic's (Cited in Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997:105,134) appropriate coined labels for the traditional source/target binaries of translation. Proto-text and Meta-text for Popovic are the texts which serve as the objects of intertextual continuity. Any meta-text also can serve as a proto-text for another meta-text in a chain of intertextual relations and any proto-text also in this chain