



Ideology and Lexical Choices: An Analysis of the Urdu Translation of *Culture and Imperialism*

Aftab Akram¹, Prof. Dr. Jamil Asghar Jami²

Keywords:

Culture and Imperialism,

Ideology,

Lexical Items,

Politics,

Urdu Translation.

ABSTRACT

*The current study aims at identifying the ideological lacunae and tensions between Edward Said's book *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) and its Urdu translation *Saqafat aur Samraj* (2009) by Yasir Jawad with respect to the translator's lexical choices. In a text, according to Gayatri Spivak (1993/2000), the selection of vocabulary and textual items reflect ideology that is why the study of lexical choices in translation studies has become of the utmost importance to uncover the ideological dislocations in a text. Therefore, in this study, the lexical choices of *Saqafat aur Samraj*, the Urdu translation of *Culture and Imperialism* were analyzed to find out these ideological dislocations by applying Gayatri Spivak's three-tiered notion of language, i.e., rhetoric, logic and silence. She presented this notion in her renowned essay "The Politics of Translation" that highlights the role of language and ideology in the process of translation. In this qualitative study, textual analysis was carried out to find out the ideological dislocations and their sociocultural and power-oriented implications in translation. The result shows that the translator's selection of lexical items remarkably changes the ideology of the source text that may mislead the readers in their understanding of the text. This may potentially lead to a widening of the communication gap between the source and target cultures instead of minimizing it. The results of the present study hoped to benefit the translators in dealing with ideology faithfully in the process of translation and the translation evaluators to gauge the ideological differences effectively.*

¹PhD Scholar NUML Islamabad. Email: aftabakram58@yahoo.com

²Dean Faculty of Languages NUML Islamabad. Email: jamilasgharjami@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The world has become a global village because of the rapid expansion of science and technology. Hence, translation studies have become one of the most important subjects especially in the current era of globalization. In this context of global communication, the subject has become of paramount importance to convey the message across the globe as well as to minimize the communication gaps among the diversified cultures of the world. Ideology of the translator plays an important role in translation because the readers acquaint themselves with the new culture from the perspective of the translator. Thus, the translator introduces the culture in other community after a considerable ideological transformation. Whenever a translator translates, his or her ideology influences the source text and as a result a semantic and ideological gap creeps in. To produce balanced and reasonably exact translations, it is necessary to draw the attention of the translators and researchers to this problem. The current study deals with the ideological dislocations between *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) and its Urdu translation *Saqafst aur Samraj*(2009) with respect to vocabulary used by the translator.

There are two main reasons behind selecting “*Saqafst aur Samraj*” (2009) for the current study. The first is the reputation and popularity of the translator, Yasir Jawad. He is a renowned translator in Pakistan who has translated hundreds of English books into Urdu language. The second main reason to select “*Saqafst aur Samraj*” (2009) is the book is published by a very reliable and reputable publisher, Muqtadra Qaumi Zuban (National Language Authority) in Pakistan. Due to these two main reasons the particular translation was selected for the current study. The present study contributes to the existing body of Translation Studies literature by adding up understanding the phenomenon of translation. It indicates how the ideology can be uncoated in the target texts. It provides an insight into the nature of addition and loss of meaning while translating from one language to another. It presents the adopted deforming strategies by the translators to modify the ideology of the source text according to the ideology of the target readers. The study highlights the works of Pakistani translators on the world map. Due to all these reasons, the study was conducted to highlight the ideological slants in the canonical writers’ works in Pakistan.

The study deals with Edward Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) which points out the role of culture and literature in establishing and maintaining imperialism. Edward Wadie Said (1935-2003) was an American citizen but he was basically an Arab Palestinian Christian who was a public intellectual, cultural critic and the one of the founding theorists of postcolonial studies. His favorite topics are

ideology, European imperialism, identity crises, colonialism and postcolonialism (Bayoumi, 2000). *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) is his one of the most influential books apart from *Orientalism* (1978) and in this book, he discusses the asymmetrical and turbulent relationship between the East and the West in the context of colonialism by exploring the role of culture and literature in propping up the edifice of imperialism. It uncovers the multidimensional nature of relationship between the East and the West by while drawing upon extremely perceptive cultural criticism (Karpinski, 1993).

There are various factors that influence the process of translation and translator's ideology is one of them. Translators usually have a wide range of options and they tend to employ them according to their ideological or cultural persuasions which at times result in the loss of meaning. Spivak (1993) states that a translator should maintain the relationship between the original and its 'shadow' – a term she uses for translation. Hence, she considers translator responsible for transforming the ideology of the source text (henceforth ST) to the target text (henceforth TT) without changing it. Therefore, in order to satisfy the individual or collective ideology of the ST, the translator should be a good carrier of ideology between the cultures. That is why she advocates the practice of transforming the inconsistencies or differences of the ST into TT without any manipulation (Spivak 1993/2000, p. 370).

In order to convey ideology of the ST without changing it, Spivak (1993) presents three-tiered notion of language, i.e., rhetoric, logic and silence. Rhetoric is the persuasive act of communication and its negative aspects includes changing the ideology of the ST. Accordingly, Spivak's concept of rhetoric represents ideology of the ST and TT by highlighting the narrative of the translated work. Furthermore, logic deals with cohesion, i.e., the relationship between the words whereas silence represents the unseen ideological decisions of the translators to delete or add the lexical items of the ST in order to omit or change the ideology of the ST (Spivak 1993/2000, p. 370).

Consequently, in applied linguistics, textual analysis, as a research methodology, is used to analyze the language and discourse with respect to linguistic, social or cultural issues. It explores the effects of culture on language or vice versa and points out how cultural constrains or forces influence the discourse. Thus, the theories of ideology and language accord great importance to cultural aspects to address the problem of ideological dislocations in translation. Furthermore, Spivak's notion of 'The Politics of Translation' also significantly considers the crucial role of the cultural aspects in the process of translation, which consequently makes this notion suitable to explore ideological aspects in the translated work. That is why to explore the topics of ideological dislocation the theory of translation given by Spivak (2003) is applied in this present study.

Aims and objectives

- To find out how does the selection of lexical items entail ideological dislocations in the Urdu translation of *Culture and Imperialism*.
- To examine the implications of these ideological dislocations for the textual and cultural comprehension of the source text.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The importance of translation studies as a discipline is increasing day by day and it not only merely relates to the linguistics theories of translation but it also deals with the cultural aspects of the translation by highlighting the role of history, society, culture and ideology of the translator. The situation becomes more critical when we take into consideration the polysystem theory which posits translation as an overall polysystem constituted by various subsystems that continuously interact and evolve in a hierarchical way. As the polysystem is innately multi-layered and interactive, its subsystems are in a constant flux and movement. Therefore, different literary traditions keep shifting their positions from the centers to the peripheries and vice versa.

As Lefevere (2005) was the first person who talked about the ideological manipulation in the translated work, he goes one step further to polysystem and states that the ideology, patronage and poetics play an important role in the process of translation. As he considers translation a ‘rewriting’ and, to him, the whole procedure crucially hinges upon the ideology of the translator. According to him, linguistic theories are not enough while translating, rather one needs to consider the role of culture in the process of translation as well (2005).

He defines ideology as “a set of discourses which wrestle over interests which are in some way relevant to the maintenance or interrogation of power structures central to a whole form of social and historical life” (1989, p.59). Publishers also play an important role in accepting or rejecting the translations on account of their ideological beliefs and assumptions. Thus, they filter the work according to their individual or collective ideologies before publishing it, and if the work is not a threat to their dominant ideology, it will be published; otherwise it would have to be revised thoroughly. In that case, the

translators have to manipulate the source text by adding, deleting or modifying the TT. In this process ideology is the most important factor to influence the essence of source text (Shuttleworth,2004).

Here the conflict arises between the ideology and the professionalism; the translators have to shape the TT in such a way, which is also acceptable to the professionals. In this way, it becomes the duty of a translator to maintain the ideological constraints as well as to convince the professionals that their work is worth reading. Therefore, nobody can translate without ignoring his/her ideology; hence the claim of objectivity is considerably untenable (Gentzler, 2004).

Translation is not an isolated activity and it never takes place in some vantage vacuum. Many researchers of the manipulation school, so to speak, are of the view that the translation activity achieves personal and collective aims at the same time and each time it is affected by some extrinsic factors such as market pressures and power considerations (Asghar, 2015). At the intellectual level, translation studies enforces cultural ideologies, it is a matter of decision making among the different choices and even its aims and guidelines are also determined by the certain forces. Hence, translation studies deals with ‘rewriting’ and this activity faces different constraints and has multiple purposes. Therefore, the source text is selected by the translator after having a clear purpose and a predetermined procedure. Thus, to achieve the purpose, rewriting becomes integral part of the translation studies (Shuping, 2013).

Furthermore, the concept of ‘translation as rewriting’ was first introduced by Lefevere in translation studies. Theo Hermans (2004) traces out the historical evolution of Lefevere’s theory and explains that it took Lefevere fifteen years to develop his theory and it deals with various systems especially with the concept of rewriting which is the key idea of his theory and the collection of his essays can be found in *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (2016). Thus, he introduced the term “refracted text” in 1981 to highlight the role of manipulation and ideology (Gentzler, 2004, p. 137). Then in 1982, he broadens the meaning of refracted text by including the concept of adaptation of the text according to the different people for the purpose of influencing their ways of reading the text (Hermans, 2004).

In 1984, he included the concept of “*patronage*” to his theory in order to point out the role of ideological pressures (Gentzler, 2004, p. 137). Finally, in 1985, the term “refraction” turned into “rewriting” with the meaning of adapting other text to a certain ideology. In his theory, Lefevere (2004) introduces

different terms, e.g., patronage, ideology, poetics and “universe of discourse” (Hermans, 2004, p. 125). In the current study, the role of ideology is explored in the process of translation by highlighting that translation is not only a linguistics process but it also includes different social and historical factors as well.

In the 1790s Destutt de Tracy, for the first time, used the expression “ideology” in the sense of ‘object of ideas’. The concept was first favored and later dismissed by Napoleon because he faced criticism by the ideology theorists for establishing the monarchy. After that Marx gave the term different meaning as a system of ideas and representations that rules over the mind of people. Louis Althusser considers ideology as a relationship between people imaginary and real conditions of existence (Shuping,2013).

The term “lexical refractions” was first used by Lefevere (1991) to indicate the ideological dislocations in the process of Children’s literary books. He was the first person who talked about ideological dislocations in the TT (Khanjan, 2006). Lefevere (1981) started the discussion in such a persuasive way that the other translation scholars were also led to explore the role of ideology and other attendant factors in translation. Venuti (1997) came up with the conclusion that translators select one option out of many due to their ideological orientations and he also introduced the concepts of domestication and foreignization to highlight the vital role of ideology in translation (Khajeh, 2009).

The issue was further elaborated by Hatim and Mason (1997) who explored other influential factors such as “*politeness*” and “*power*” apart from ideology. Hatim and Mason (1997) are more comprehensive in pointing out the crucial role of ideology in translation accompany by politeness and power. Politeness and power mould translator’s ideology. Hatim and Mason explored the topic more comprehensively and they came up with different ideas like there is a reciprocal relationship between discourse and ideology. They state that ideology creates discourse and as a result discourse maintains ideology. They not only presented different ideas about ideological dislocations, they also studied and analyzed different works by pointing out the consequences of ideological dislocations in translation. Karoubi (2005) mentions various reasons for this ideological dislocations but here it would be important to states that he is of the view that the linguistic approaches due to their scientific and empirical nature have failed to address this issue. To support his view, he quotes Venuti (1997) and states that these theorists have been reluctant to take into account the social aspects in the process or study of translation (Karoubi, 2005).

Sertkan (2007) investigated the ideological dislocations between *Oliver Twist* and its five Turkish translations and he pointed out how ideology affects the lexical choices in translation. He concludes that ideology plays an important role in translation and can distort the meaning of source text. He not only includes translators in the process of ideological dislocations but also the publishers as they are involved in the process of publication and distribution, which may involve a very high degree of inclusions and exclusions in translation. Along these lines, the role of ideology has become of vital importance to determine the meaning of the TT. Most of the researches done in linguistics, regarding translation, deal with the linguistic features of both the languages ignoring the vocabulary used by the translators. Therefore, the current study aims at finding out the role of lexical items in creating ideological dislocations in translation by applying Spivak's notion of translation.

In order to translate the source text accurately, Spivak (1993) states that a translator needs to understand the rhetoricity of the text and its culture. If a translator does not understand the rhetoricity of the text he will promote neocolonialism. Therefore the first and foremost duty of a translator is to know the rhetoricity of the source text and culture. Her three-tiered notion of language presents rhetoric, silence and logic. Rhetoricity indicates specific cultural norms or features hence, they are only present in that specific culture. Therefore, due to its specific cultural nature, rhetoricity shapes the identity of its language and culture. In this way, the loss of rhetoric is the loss of language. Thus, rhetoricity points out the unique world view, history, cultural norms and traditions different from other cultures. Therefore, if a translator does not pay attention to rhetoricity of source text s/he may mislead the target readers by creating the communication gaps instead of minimizing them (Evans & Fernandez, 2018).

METHODOLOGY

The current study deals with Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) and its Urdu translation *Saqafat aur Samraj* by Yasir Jawad.

Textual analysis is carried out in this ongoing qualitative research. Spivak (1993/2000) considers lexical, grammatical and textual items responsible for any change in the ideology of TT. In the present research, her approach is used to investigate the ideological dislocations between the source and TT due to the selection of vocabulary. Hence, the lexical part of the approach is used to investigate the lexical ideological differences of source and TT. The study presents analysis of source and TT and the analysis

of lexical choices by the translator.

Many researchers have also used CDA approaches to study Ideological dislocations in translation. For example, Khajeh and Khanmohammad (2009) investigated Noam Chomsky's *Media Control* (2002) and its Persian translation and pointed out the ideologies of both source and the TT. They came up with the conclusion that there is a strong relationship between the socio-cultural and ideological preferences of the translators and their selected translation strategies while translating (Khaje & Khanmohammad, 2009).

Roland Barthes (2013) highlights the nature of text and states that it is a flexible set of discursive approaches and it can never be a fixed identity. The nature of these discursive approaches is cultural, historical, political and ideological. Therefore, one text can be examined and interpret from different perspectives. This multidimensional interpretive nature is called as polysemy. The main focus is not merely on the interpretation of truth values of the text rather to state and examine the hidden meaning of the text. Therefore, textual analysis is considered as a comprehensive and collective term to highlight textual, interpretive, qualitative and critical analyses (Fürsich, 2018).

Schaffner (2003) is of the view that the ideology of a text can be examined and explored from two perspectives, i.e., lexical and grammatical choices. The other factors that reflect ideology are genre, topic and communicative aims. Hatim and Mason (1997) also point out the key role of lexical choices in the production and modification of ideology. They analyzed the history of Mexicans and concluded that the English translation presented the source text in negative connotations. Therefore, Alvarez and Vidal (1996) are of the view that translators deliberately choose words, make lexical preferences, rearrange the word order and delete the lexical items. They further explain that translators adopt such approaches due to their ideology, culture, socio-political aspects and their history.

Fairclough (1989) states that the lexical, grammatical and textual features of a text indicate its ideology and a change in these categories may create another ideology different from the ST. He further claims that the selection of these values in the process of translation shows ideological manipulation in translation. For this reason, he presents different types of values which change the ideology of the source text. These are experiential, relational and expressive values. Experiential value is further divided into four sub parts, i.e., Classification scheme, Ideological contested words, Overwording, and meaning relations (Mansourabadi, 2013).

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In *Teaching and Researching Translation*, Basil Hatim (2001; 83-84) explains ‘the ideology of translation’ which is one of the most important contemporary issues in translation studies. He highlights the crucial role of lexical choices in the process of translation and points out that this decision of selecting lexical items depends on either what should be valued or what should be excluded. The selection of lexical items also depends on what should be omitted or deleted and what should be added or altered. To filter the text, translators select specific lexical items so that the ST may be appropriate for the target culture ideology. This selection indicates either individual or collective ideology of the translators. Therefore, the lexical items play a decisive role in creating ideological dislocation in translation.

To find out these ideological dislocations in translation, it is necessary to investigate the lexical choices in translation. Therefore, the following section deals with the analysis of source and target texts based on Spivak’s three-tiered notion of language. Rhetoric represents the ideology of a culture and logic indicates cohesion, whereas silence indicates the ideological motives behind changing or deleting the lexical items in translation. In order to analyze the relationship between lexical choices and ideology, this section is divided into two parts, i.e., analysis of lexical choices and analysis of ideology.

Lexical Choices

This subsection presents the analysis of the lexical choices made by the translator in *Saqafat aur Samraj* (2009), the Urdu translation of *Culture and Imperialism* (1993).

Although *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) also deals with “Orientals” and “Orientalism” yet the term “Orientalism” is not translated in the whole book by the translator and he has written it as it is in the English language. This selection of writing lexical items indicates ideological dislocation in the sense that in order to avoid any discriminatory term in the TT, the translator prefers not to translate it at all. He does not use any term in the TT which may show discrimination between the Orientals and the Occidentals. Throughout the book, the translator tries to soften the text for the target readers in order to make it ideologically and culturally more palatable to them. He does so by maintaining equal power relation between them. The other possible reason is to make the translation authentic similar to the ST.

The translator does not translate the term “illusion perdues” (p. 20) which also changes the meaning and ideology of the ST. The deleted term means the compelling relationship between culture and imperialism. This omission is again not by chance or cannot be ignored because the translator does not present the role of culture in establishing and maintaining imperialism as forcibly as the author does. This selection of lexical item is an example of Spivak’s notion of ‘Silence’ which points to the ideological reasons behind omitting any lexical item. It also changes the logic of the ST and ultimately changes its rhetoricity and aesthetics.

Edward Said (1993) points out that despite leaving Asia and Africa after decolonization, the Europeans hold control ideologically over these former colonies through trade or international markets. In this way, he further states that, Europeans keep the locals as their subject and they are still ruling over them successfully even after colonialism. Here the notion of silence plays an important role in translation by changing the ideology of the source text as well as changes the logic of the ST. The reason is that the translator does not translate the word “locals”(p. 33) and retain it as it is because it could have been translated in the sense of subordinate or “ماتحت”. Therefore, in order to avoid this humiliating characterization the Orientals, he does not translate it. This selection of lexical item remarkably changes the meaning and ideology of the source text. By doing so, the translation not only avoids the discourse of subordination but also seems to downplay the effects of postcolonialism.

Another example of ideological dislocation due to lexical items is the term “subaltern studies” which was not translated by the translator. Arguably, he generally avoids this translation (p. 39, 195,228, 232, 288,289) due to its inappropriate meaning in the target language. Thus, in order to make the text less offensive to the readers, the translator simple leaves it untranslated which indicates the crucial role of lexical choices and ideology in translation. This is another clear indication of ideological dislocation by means of lexical choices. This again shows the role of silence and logic in changing the rhetoric of the text. This is one of the main important notions in *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) as well as for Spivak, (1993) despite this the translator does not convey the meanings of the term in a true sense.

Moreover, Said (1993) also claims that if a nation was colonized by any power in the past that nation has maximum chances of having deep impact of imperialism on its character and its people even after colonialism. Their personality image is based on this theme of imperialism and the translator has omitted this word “theme” (p.57) to avoid the humiliated situation for the readers. In this example, the logic of the TT is changed and the silence has played its role in modifying the ideology of the ST.

In order to euphemize meaning, the translator also changes the logic of the TT by writing the phrase “America strikes back” (p. 302/397) in English language. Thus, the role of silence and logic becomes vital in this case as it changes the rhetoric or ideology of the ST. This type of translation does not convey the true meanings of the ST to the target culture readers or scholars. This selection of phrase minimizes the effects of ST because the phrase may offend or challenge the position the target culture readers. Therefore, he filters the text to make it less offensive and acceptable for the target readers but this style of translation is not an example of, as Spivak (1993) indicates, shadow of its original.

Furthermore, he does not translate another offensive term “Nigger” (p.4). The term is highly offensive for the black people or people of color. Due to its controversial and provoking meaning, the translator has avoided its translation which is another example of disturbing the logic of ST and changing the rhetoric and ideology of the text in translation. This filtered translation may present the ST in a euphemized way, in an acceptable way but the essence of the ST is not conveyed to the readers. Therefore, such type of translation cannot be regarded as the true representation of the author. Moreover, in this example, Said (1993) mentions the Western attitude towards the people of sub-continent and the colored people where as his remarks are not conveyed in translation as they should have been.

Another example of ideological dislocation due to the selection of lexical items is the subjective role of media which is highlighted by Said in his book *Culture and Imperialism* (1993). In the context of the Gulf War 1992, he writes that this was the most “covered and least reported” war in the human history and American watched this war on their televisions eagerly (p. 279/366). So, Said (1993) highlights American interest and censures the complicitous role of media bordering upon systematic mendacity. Now the translator not only translates the terms but also writes “cover” in English to emphasize the criticism on media. This selection of lexical item changes the logic of the text and modifies the meaning by putting emphasis on meaning. The role of silence is again prominent, in this example, and leads to the selection of ideological loaded terms. So, the translator highlights that the war was not reported truly and this stance indicates the ideology of the TT readers.

In addition, Said (1993) also brings into limelight the role of ideology in literature or among the literary figures as well as in determining political, professional, cultural and class-based commitments (p. 296/389). He presents the motives for falling into the trap of ideology and points out the reasons why the scholars or the authors act according to their ideologies. Throughout the translation, the translator seems to defend the authors or writers, therefore, he does not translate “Commitments” to ideologies. This lexical item indicates translator’s personal ideology which changes the meanings of the text

remarkably. Due to the silence, the logic of the text is changed which ultimately changes the ideology of the ST.

The translator translates the word “stereotypical” as “یکسانیت” (p.1/xi) instead of “ثقافتانوسی” because the term is used for the people of sub-continent. He translates the term by minimizing its negative meanings that shows another ideological dislocation. While in other context he translates the same term as “روایتی” (p. 115/163). The same term is being translated in different ways which is an indicator of silence and logic in translation. Therefore, Hatim (2001) states that in determining the ideology of the text, lexical items play a crucial role.

Instead of translating the word “strange,” “عجیب علاقے” (p. 2/xiii) the translator selects the word “اجنبی” for the colonized lands. He prefers the phrase “علاقے اجنبی” to “عجیب علاقے” which also shows ideological dislocation as he does not want to bring in the implied notion of *weird lands* for the *native lands*. He domesticates the text by selecting a softer expression for the natives and their lands. He does not consider native culture, history or land as weird; therefore, he prefers the word ‘unknown’ to make the text less offensive to the readers. The same example also indicates another ideological dislocation by avoiding the discourse of enlightening the locals by the white people. In this way, he avoids the discussion that the colonized areas were very weird and the white people came and civilized them. Therefore, the decision of selecting lexical items has a great impact on ideology of the text. The unseen factor called silence by Spivak (1993) changes the logic of the text and ultimately changes the ideology of the text.

This is another example of ideological dislocation due to the selection of lexical items. Throughout translation, the translator usually does not translate phrases other than English language but here he translates to highlight the horrible aspects of imperialism. Since the context is against imperialism therefore, he translates “Ultima ratio” as “خوفناک چہرا” (p.150) which means horrible aspects of imperialism. Unlike his general pattern of translation, the translator includes non-English phrases to put stress on the negative aspects of imperialism which is a clear indicator of ideological dislocation due to the selection of lexical items.

The similar example of ideological dislocation, in translation, due to the selection of lexical items is the word “Mischievous” translated as “خبیثانہ” which is an offensive word in Urdu language (p. 274/359). The reason of this selection is the context of the ST where the author is criticizing imperialism. This shows the individual as well as collective ideology of the target culture readers. Since, they have experienced colonization in the past therefore, they have got negative association with imperialism or colonialism. Whereas, when the author talks about post effects of imperialism on the personality images

of the natives the translator does not adopt the same approach as the author does. In both ways, the translator maintains the face value of the readers and tries his best not to offend them by making the text acceptable as much as he could.

Therefore, he translates the term as “*حبیثانه*” an abusive term in target language to show the anger or ideology of the readers. This is another clear example of ideological dislocation due to the selection of lexical item. Here again the decision was made due to the ‘silence’ element. As Spivak (1993) states that rhetoric works in silence which means silence is a theoretical manifestation of ideology whereas rhetoric is its practical manifestation. Silence directs the translators to select a lexical item which suites the ideology of the target culture. Therefore, this triangle given by Spivak (1993) determines the ideology of the ST.

Moreover, the translator translates a single term in different meanings depending on the context of the text. For instance, he translates “Decolonisation” as “*نوآبادیاتی*” (p. 176, 239) when the context is general, whereas he translates the same term as “*آزادییافته*” when the term is directly linked with the people of the Subcontinent. This style of translation is another example of how the three-tiered notion of language introduced by Spivak (1993) works in translation. The rhetoric of the ST is changed due to the modification of logic and this logic is changed because of unseen ideological tilted force, i.e., silence. Hence, the translator prefers a freedom oriented term “*آزادی یافته*” for the natives instead of “*نوآبادیاتی*”. Thus, the translator appears as a co-author who not only modifies the ST but also associates different ideological meanings even to a single term. To satisfy the ideology of the target culture the translators usually go by these options that’s why it is necessary to explore the field in order to minimize the cultural or communication gaps between the source and target cultures’ readers.

In addition, the translator has given negative meaning to the term “relentlessly” in the context of continuous and comprehensive European invasion in the non-European world. He could have translated the same term in positive terms showing the meaning of ‘courageous efforts’ of European people. Since, the context is against the natives therefore, he associates negative meanings to the term to show the barbarianism of these peoples. Therefore, he translates “relentlessly” as “*اندها دهند*” (p. 200/268) which could mean “madly” or “without wisdom” in the given context. Said (1993) states that the European observed the non-European countries continuously and comprehensively that only few spots or cultures of these lands were remained untouched. Therefore, to present this aspect of Europe, he prefers this meaning instead of “continuous efforts”. Thus, this selection of lexical item is another example of ideological dislocation guided by rhetoric and silence.

Another example of associating different meanings to a single term is the word “vision” which is translated differently on different pages as “تصور”, “وژن”, “خیالات” and “خیالی” (p. 112,113,123). The translator does not translate the term especially when he wants to take the word in the sense of “ideology” or “lofty ideas” (p. 5,57,65) and writes the term in roman Urdu in translation. Whereas, when he wants to criticize imperialism or colonialism, he prefers to translate it in the sense of ‘imaginary’ or even ‘ideas’. This selection of different meanings of a single term is another clear example of ideological dislocation where the rhetoric of the text is changed based upon the silence. Therefore, Spivak (1993) explains that rhetoric works in silence because it is an unseen force that compels the translators to select an appropriate term for translation. But this selection of different meanings changes the meanings or ideology of the ST and it seems that it is another text parallel to its original. For this reason, Spivak (1993) claims that translators should develop intimacy or love for the source culture, language and text in order to produce a true shadow of original. This style of translation also makes the translator a co-author who not only translates the ST but also adds a lot on his or her part.

Furthermore, whenever the translator idealizes the situation and presents it in a positive way he does not translate the word ‘vision’ and writes it in roman Urdu to give the meaning of “visionary”. On the other hand, when he wants to criticize the situation he translates it in the sense of imagination and superficial ideas. Sometimes, he undermines the situation and translates the term as “خیالی” means “fictitious”. Consequently, he decides when to give visionary as well as superficial effects to the ST. This is how he modifies the text by selecting appropriate terms in different situations. In this way, the selection of lexical items determines the ideology of the text in translation. But this way of translation may exaggerate or undermine the TT and may mislead the readers in their comprehension of the ST.

In *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), Said talks about the USA attack on Iraq and expresses the intention of the USA to prove “Saddam Hussein a clear loser” (Said, p. 354/270). Now, in order to ensure face saving of the Muslim ruler, the translator prefers to translate ‘clear loser’ as (سبق سکھانا). He does not humiliate the Muslim ruler or leader by using a colloquial term rather he changes it with a soft term. This selection of lexical choices indicates ideological dislocation in the TT.

Said (1993) is of the view that infect America did not officially favour any human rights or democracy but in order to promote wars and selling arms, it uses clients (Said, p.363/ 277). In the context of American official efforts and democracy, the translator selects the word of “پٹھو” for the English word ‘client’. The translator selects the Urdu word ‘پٹھو’ to criticize the American policies of selling arms and wars.

Ideology

This subsection presents the analysis of ideology created by the selection of lexical items by the translator in *Saqafat aur Samraj* (2009), the Urdu translation of *Culture and Imperialism* (1993).

The analysis shows that in order to make the ST suitable for the target culture readers' ideology the translator changes the lexical items and logic of the ST. To make the ST less offensive and acceptable for the natives, the translator changes the meanings of the terms to nullify the humiliated meanings used for the target readers. That is why, he frequently omits or changes the humiliated ideas used for the target readers to make the ST acceptable for them. On the contrary, he also adds to and exaggerates the situation if and when it is in favor of the natives. In this context, he selects the best possible meanings for the terms to promote the ideology of the target culture. All these examples illustrate how the translator modifies the text to ward off any possible cultural or ideological clashes between the source and target cultures. Moreover, he also changes the meanings or the stress patterns of the ST which may affect the actual intent of the author and keep it unsaid in the text. Then what is the purpose of translating a text if its essence, stress pattern or ideology is not passed onto the target readers?

The translator does not translate the humiliated terms used for the Muslim rulers. He euphemizes the terms in order to make them acceptable for the target readers. This shows his individual as well as collective ideology of the target culture. However, this selection of vocabulary modifies the text ideologically and creates cultural and academic comprehension issues for the target readers.

That is why, this approach of translation makes the text domesticated and makes sure that the ST is not a threat to the prevailing ideology of the target readers. Thus, ideology plays a crucial role in selecting lexical items and associating specific meanings to the ST. This highlights the vital role of translator in global intercultural communication and in order to avoid miscommunication and outright mistranslations it is equally important to have an informed understanding of such issues and a heightened sense of sense of responsiveness to the ST. That is why Spivak (1993) states that a translator should surrender to the text before translating it. He or she should develop intimacy and an intellectual empathy for the source culture, language and text in order to convey its ideology without much modifying it, as a certain amount of modification is in any case inevitable.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the translator has selected many lexical items on account of his

ideological orientations which has led to a change/dislocation in the meaning of the ST. There can be possibly various factors such as psychological, behavioral, cultural, etc., which seem to have resulted in an ideological baggage for the translator. This modification of ST may lead to miscommunication and miscomprehension of the intents and purposes of the writer. It seems that the translator gratuitously appropriates is the role of a co-writer or in Lefeverean parlance “rewriter” who not only decides what to include or exclude but also recasts the ST ideology into the image of the TT assumptions and beliefs. Therefore, the selection of lexical items remarkably affects the process of translation by changing the meaning and ideology of the text. These ideologically loaded words replace the original words with the ones which convey something different from the ideology of ST. This ideological dislocation creates multiple problems for the readers in their cultural comprehension of the text. Instead of bridging the gaps between the cultures, it further widens them which may ultimately lead to a still greater deepening of a longstanding intercultural divide. It can create illusions or delusions which may result in cultural clashes, exclusions and, at worst, an outright dismissal of coexistential notions.

REFERENCES

- Álvarez, R. & Vidal, M. Carmen-África .(1996). Translating: A Political Act. In Álvarez, R. and Vidal, M. Carmen-África, (eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 1-10.
- Asghar, J. (2015). The Power Politics of Translation: A Study of Translation-Ideology Nexus. *NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry*. National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad. 13(2), 32-49.
- Bassnett, Susan. (2004). *Translation Studies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Bassnett, Susan & André, Lefevere. (Eds). (2001). *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Bayoumi, Mustafa, Andrew Rubin, ed.(2000) *The Edward Said Reader*. New York: Vintage.
- Evans, J. & Fernandez, F. (2018) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics*, Routledge, 2

Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon.

Fürsich, E. (2018), *Textual Analysis and Communication*, Retrieved from <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199756841/obo9780199756841-0216.xml#firstMatch>, on April 3rd, 2019. DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199756841-0216S.

Gentzler, Edwin (2004). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Hatim, Basil. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Pearson Education Limited: Harlow, UK and New York.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hermans, Theo. (2004). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Karoubi, B. (2005). Ideology and translation with a concluding point on translation teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.translationdirectory.com/article233.htm>.

Karpinski, Eva C. (1993). Culture and Imperialism, Edward W. Said. *College Quarterly*, winter 1993 - Volume 1 Number 2, New York.

Khajeh, Z., & Khanmohammad, H. (2009). Transmission of ideology through translation: A critical discourse analysis of Chomsky's "media control" and its Persian translation. *Iranian journal of applied language studies*, 1, 24-42.

Lefevere, André. (2005). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literature Fame*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Lefevere, André. (2004a). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

- Lefevere, A. (1992b). *Translation. Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Lefevere, André. (1988-9). System thinking and cultural relativism. *Jadavpur Journal of Comparative Literature* 26 (7): 55-68.
- Mansourabadi, F.& Karimnia, A. (2013). The Impact of Ideology on Lexical Choices in Literary Translation: A Case Study of A Thousand Splendid Suns. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 70 (2013) 777-786
- Mirza, Z., &Khanjan, A. (2006). Representation of ideology and power in translation. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies*, 3, 5-28.
- Schäffner, C. (2003). “Third ways and new centres: Ideological unity or difference?”. In. Calzada-Pérez, M. (ed.), *Apropos of ideology*. Manchester: St. Jerome, pp. 23-42.
- Sertkan, K. (2007). *The Ideology of Lexical Choices in the Turkish Translations of Oliver*. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Turkey.
- Shuping, R. (2013). Translation as Rewriting. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(18), 56-
- Shuttleworth, Mark & Cowie, Moira. (2004). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Spivak, G. Ch. (2000). “The Politics of Translation”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London. New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G.C. (1993) The politics of translation. In G.C. Spivak *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. London: Routledge. (Reprinted in L. Venuti (ed.) (2000) *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 369–388). London: Routledge.