

Mapping a Translation Field: A Statistical Analysis of English Translations of Iranian Women's Fiction (1989–2025)¹

Mina Zandrahimi² & Farzaneh Farahzad³

Abstract

For more than thirty years, Anglophone readers have encountered Iranian women's fiction through translation; yet no research has mapped this literature as a structural field. This gap is significant because it determines whether Iranian women's voices gain international recognition, depending on who chooses, publishes, and presents these works to English readers. This study examines how publisher type, author's exile status, and peritextual attribution shape the field's positions and position-takings, drawing on Bourdieu's sociology of cultural production and Batchelor's theory of paratext as a negotiated threshold. It uses non-parametric inferential tests, cross-tabulation, and descriptive statistics to analyse three linked bibliographic datasets. According to the data, only 7 of 56 books were published by university presses, and publisher type does not predict peritext quantity, author's exile status, or print status in Iran. Rather, the source field proves crucial, since 97.9% of self-exiled authors' works are either out of print or prohibited in Iran. Exile status is associated with lower Persian award receipts at the book level but not at the author level and prestige in Persian and English functions independently of one another. In the target field, agency is allocated through peritext rather than credentials: translators currently lead in the most recent phase (48.2%, 2016-2025), while publishers control 44.6% of peritextual elements and 91.4% of biographies. The study concludes that peripheral literatures under state control are gatekept primarily in the source field rather than the Anglophone target field.

Keywords: Agency; Bourdieu; Iranian women's fiction; Literary translation; Paratext; Peritext; Sociology of translation; Translation field

1. This paper was received on 22.01.2026 and approved on 18.04.2026.

2. Corresponding Author: Ph.D. candidate, Department of English Translation Studies, Faculty of Persian Literature & Foreign Languages, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran; email: mina_zandrahimi@uk.ac.ir

3. Professor, Department of English Translation Studies, Faculty of Persian Literature & Foreign Languages, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran; email: farahzad@atu.ac.ir

1. Introduction

Over the past few decades, a community of translators and publishers has helped grow Iranian women's fiction for English readers. However, Iranian women writers remain marginalised within Anglophone literature, a marginalisation exacerbated by political tensions between Iran and Anglo-American countries that have restricted Iranian writers' visibility. Iranian texts struggle to move from the periphery to the centre of global literary attention because of "colonialist" presumptions about literature from "the Global South" in the hyper-politicised reception environment faced by female Persian authors (Quay, 2022, p. 202). According to Heilbron and Sapiro (2007), a sociological explanation of translation needs to consider cross-cultural exchange, its political and economic limitations, and the intermediaries who oversee importation and reception in the host country. Despite increasing scholarly attention to individual translated texts, no study has yet systematically applied this framework to Iranian women's fiction translated into English, using a comprehensive bibliographic dataset.

This article addresses that gap by empirically mapping the structural field of English translations of Iranian women's fiction published between 1989 and 2025. The study pursues three objectives: (1) creating a comprehensive bibliographic database of translated novels, novellas, and short story collections; (2) identifying publisher types in the field and testing their relationship to peritext quantity, author placement, and print status; and (3) investigating the effects of domestic literary consecration and state censorship on the selection of authors for translation. This study contributes in three ways: it broadens the scope of Bourdieusian sociology of translation by demonstrating that, under state censorship, a peripheral literature can be decisively gatekept in the source field rather than the target field, thereby challenging assumptions based primarily on Western European contexts. To the researcher's knowledge, it generates the first validated and comprehensive bibliography of this translation field, correcting earlier counts. Additionally, it shows that non-parametric inferential testing can support claims about a field's structure, in contrast to previous studies that relied on qualitative description.

2. Literature Review

Most studies of this work have used textual and thematic methods and have so far concentrated on individual texts or small collections. Bolouri (2018) analysed the translator's agency through footnotes and notes authored by modern Iranian literary translators. Hosseinzadeh (2018) investigated the role of translatorial prefaces in mediating among books, authors, and readers. Yalsharzeh et al. (2019) examine the

paratextual mediation and discursive presence of various agents in Persian translations of political texts by Western writers on the Iran-Iraq war. Gharehgozlou (2018) presented a digital bibliography cataloguing English translations of Persian literature, detailing translators, publication locations, and publication dates. It examined how these translations were presented to Anglophone readers across three historical periods. Zanzanbar et al. (2022) examined the presentation of Persian translations of American literary works published in Iran from 1953 to 2004, showing how paratranslations can alter the prevailing discourse in the source language of the original text. Bolouri and Rezvani (2023) investigated the impact of political relationships on intercultural transfer between Iran and the United States. Moslehi (2024) examined translators' agency by analysing the prefaces written by specific Anglo-American translators for their English translations of Persian poetry anthologies.

3. Theoretical Framework

The analysis draws on two complementary frameworks: Bourdieu's sociology of cultural production and Batchelor's (2018) theory of the paratext as a threshold.

Pierre Bourdieu's sociology of cultural production has been applied to translation studies. Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field, and capital have made a valuable contribution to the theoretical understanding of agency and structure in translation and interpreting research, particularly regarding the actions of the individual and the structures that restrict or enable them (Inghilleri, 2005). As Bourdieu (1993) stated, "the literary field is a force-field as well as a field of struggles that aim at transforming or maintaining the established relation of forces" (p. 143). Bourdieu defines capital as "a force inscribed in objective or subjective structures" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 241). Habitus is "systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures" (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 53).

This analysis draws on Batchelor's (2018) translation paratext theory, in which the paratext is "a consciously crafted threshold for a text that has the potential to influence the ways in which the text is received" (p. 143). No research has quantitatively analysed the entire bibliographic dataset and peritextual elements of English translations of Iranian women's fiction. However, without understanding who produces this literature, under what conditions, and how the peritextual items are framed, the mediation or constraining of Iranian women's voices in Anglophone reception cannot be evaluated.

4. Methodology

To map the field of Persian women-authored fiction in English translation, this study adopts a bibliographic and quantitative design. The combined database "can help users select relevant subcorpora" and is intended to serve as a reference in its own right (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2014, p. 77). Section 4.1 clarifies the study's scope, section 4.2 describes the variables coded for each record, and section 4.3 explains the statistical procedures applied.

4.1 Data and scope

The study uses three datasets from a systematic bibliographic investigation: a book-level dataset (ET) with 56 complete English translations of works, a short-story dataset (SS) with 213 translated short stories from anthologies and collections, and a peritext dataset (PT) with 148 peritextual elements extracted from the books. These datasets contain 417 authenticated records. Some variables, such as the print status of the book, the exile status of the authors, and literary awards, are attributes of individual authors or stories rather than of the whole volumes that collect them, so that a book-level dataset alone could not present these relationships. Short stories are analysed for authorial, translatorial, and circulation patterns. Of the 54 translators, twenty-eight overlapped between ET and SS. The book-level dataset includes adult fiction (novels, novellas, short-story collections) written by Iranian women writers, for an adult audience, and published in English translation from 1989 to 2025. The period opened with Daneshvar's *Playhouse*, the first contemporary Iranian collection of short stories to be translated into English by a famous woman writer, intended for an adult audience, and published in English translation between 1989 and 2025. To maintain gender distinction, multi-author anthologies were included only if every story was written by an Iranian woman.

The 56 records of the ET dataset are listed in Table 1 with the original Persian title of each book. Wherever an English title is given with no information about the Persian work, it means either that the volume compiles works by several Iranian women authors from different original sources, or that it collects a single author's works from multiple original Persian short-story collections.

Table 1: ET dataset

No.	English Title	Persian Title	No.	English Title	Persian Title
1	Daneshvar's Playhouse	—	29	Savushun: A Novel About Modern Iran	سووشون

No.	English Title	Persian Title	No.	English Title	Persian Title
2	A Persian Requiem	سووشون	30	Stories by Iranian Women Since the Revolution	—
3	A Walnut Sapling on Masih's Grave	—	31	Sutra & other stories	—
4	Winter Sleep	خواب زمستانی	32	Satan's Stones	سنگ‌های شیطان
5	In a Voice of Their Own	—	33	Women Without Men (1)	زنان بدون مردان
6	A Feast in the Mirror	مهمانی آینه	34	Suri & Co.: Tales of a Persian Teenage Girl	سوری و شرکا
7	A Mansion in the Sky: And Other Short Stories	خاطرات پراکنده	35	Women Without Men (2)	زنان بدون مردان
8	Kanizu	کنیزو	36	Afsaneh: Short stories by Iranian women	—
9	Touba and the Meaning of Night	طوبی و معنای شب	37	My Bird	پرندۀ من
10	Things We Left Unsaid	چراغ‌ها را من خاموش می‌کنم	38	Kimya Khatun	کیمیا خاتون
11	The Book of Fate	سهم من	39	The Pomegranate Lady and Her Sons	جایی دیگر
12	The Last Chapter	فصل آخر	40	The space between us	یک روز مانده به عید پاک
13	Afsaneh: A Novel from Iran	دل فولاد	41	The Shipwrecked	—
14	I Hid My Voice	پدر آن دیگری	42	Year of the Tree	سال درخت
15	There's No One in the Mirror: A Collection of Short Stories	هیچ کس توی آینه نیست	43	The Enlightenment of the Greengage Tree	اشراق درخت گوجه سبز

No.	English Title	Persian Title	No.	English Title	Persian Title
16	VIS & I	من و ویس	44	Being forty	چهل سالگی
17	From the Devil, Learned and Burned	از شیطان آموخت و سوزاند	45	Alive and Kicking: Short Story Collection	—
18	An Eastern Dream	—	46	The mailman	پستیچی
19	Dog and the Long Winter	سگ و زمستان بلند	47	The Drowned	اهل غرق
20	These Crazy Nights	شب های شورانیگز	48	That Stranger Within Me	بیگانه‌ای در من
21	The House of Edrisis (2)	خانه ادریسی- ها	49	Blue Logos	عقل آبی
22	Doran	دوران	50	The Last Dream	آخرین رویا
23	Lovemaking in Footnote	عاشقیت در پاورقی	51	I'll Be Strong for You	پاییز فصل آخر سال است
24	In Case of Emergency	نگران نباش	52	The Nights of Tehran	شب‌های تهران
25	Morning After	بامداد خمار	53	Two Visions and the Trial	دو منظره/دادرسی
26	The Veil of Tears	بگشای لب	54	The Second Cabinet	قفسه‌ی دوم
27	Island of Bewilderment	جزیره سرگردانی	55	The Bewildered Cameleer: A Novel of Modern Iran	ساربان سرگردان
28	The House of the Edrisis (1)	خانه ادریسی- ها	56	The Gowkaran Tree in the Middle of Our Kitchen	درخت گوکرن وسط آشپزخانه ما

4.2 Variables and coding

In this study, academic publishers are university presses such as University of Texas Press and Syracuse University Press, while independent publishers include trade, scholarly-independent, and activist presses such as Mazda Publishers, as well as self-published works. This definition of “academic” deliberately includes only

university press institutions. Genre was coded as novel/novella or short story collection. Authorial exile status was divided into four categories: never-in-exile, self-imposed, diaspora (non-political), and political refugee. Print status in Iran was classified as in print or banned. Translator credentials are classified by the highest academic degree held. Peritext attribution is by the publisher, translator, author, third party, or editor. Only peritexts, paratextual elements attached to the book itself, are analysed as the major part of the paratextual materials, while epitexts, such as reviews and interviews, are excluded. The translation gap was calculated as the English publication year minus the Persian publication year.

4.3 Statistical procedure

Analyses were conducted in R version 4.6.0 (R Core Team, 2026). Mann-Whitney U tests were used to compare peritext volume between two groups when counts were skewed and t-test assumptions would fail, and Fisher's exact test was used for two-by-two contingency tables. The level of significance was set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

5. The structure of the publishing field

This section addresses the research goal of identifying the dominant publisher types in the target field and whether publisher type is associated with peritext quantity, author placement, or print status in Iran. Section 5.1 presents the overall distribution of publisher types; 5.2 examines how this distribution varies across three historical phases; and 5.3 assesses the alignment of this distribution with a credential hierarchy.

5.1 An independent-publishing field

Independent publishing dominates this study's structure. Out of 56 works, 7 (12.5%) were from academic presses, 48 (85.7%) from independent publishers, and 1 was not retrieved. Only Syracuse University Press and University of Texas Press produced the academic books. This matters because with only seven academic books, the field isn't organized by academic authority. Most translations into English come from independent publishers outside the university system.

5.2 The boom decade and the displacement of academic presses

The English translation has gone through three distinct structural phases, classified by structure (type distribution, attribution, placement) rather than content. During Phase 1 (1989–2000; 11 books, 50 peritexts), the highest average peritext density was recorded at 4.6 peritexts per book, with publisher dominance at 52.0%. In Phase 2 (2001–2015; 15 books, 42 peritexts, 2.8 peritexts per book), publisher influence declined, with publishers accounting for 40.5% and translators 35.7%. Phase 3 (2016–2025; 30 books, 56 peritexts, 1.9 peritexts per book) is characterized by translator attribution (48.2%) surpassing publisher attribution (41.1%) for the first time and a decline in third-party scholarly content to 3.6%. Additionally, 22 of 56

books (39.3%) were published between 2010 and 2019, surpassing publication totals from the 1990s and 2000s. The decade of the 2020s, with 16 books over five years, continues this increasing trend.

Academic presses were a minority and declined when cross-tabulated with publisher type. In the 1990s, university presses published 3 of 9 novels; in the 2000s, 3 of 8; in the 2010s, 0 of 22; and in the 2020s, 1 of 16. The 2010s boom was driven by independent presses; university presses played a small role. Overall, independent publishing increased while academic presses declined.

The 2010s boom coincided with a ‘wave of forced migration linked to politics’ after Iran’s 2009 Green Movement (Nanquette, 2021, p. 14). This could raise international attention on Iranian civil society and help Western publishers understand Iranian voices. The rise of “world literature” as a publishing category was notable. Damrosch (2003) pointed out that authors with small domestic readership or government censorship may have their primary audience elsewhere, and Jiang (2020, p. 38) observed that translated literature by women can be a minority within a minority in the Anglophone market, a visibility that may have increased this decade.

5.3 Publisher type does not gate by credential

Though often assumed, these data show no credential hierarchy between academics and independents. Six of the seven academic-press books have PhD translators, and one has a master’s translator. For instance, *Stories by Iranian Women Since the Revolution* was translated by Soraya Paknazar Sullivan, who holds an M.A., while the remaining six academic-press books were translated by PhD holders, including Knorzer (*Suri & Co.*) and Faridoun Farrokh (*A Mansion in the Sky*). Academic-press translators (6 of 7, 85.7%) have a slightly higher PhD rate than independent-press translators (35 of 45, 77.8%), but This moderate difference doesn’t indicate a credential gate, as university-press publishing requires no specific credentials from translators. While 79% of translators hold PhDs, this reflects the credentialed diaspora community, not publication type.

6. The source field as the locus of selection

Having revealed that publisher type does not organise the target field as anticipated, this section turns to the source field and asks whether the authors’ exile status and Persian-language literary recognition help select the authors for translation.

6.1 Exile and censorship

The key finding is the link between author exile and work accessibility in Iran. 97.9% of stories by authors in self-imposed exile (47 of 48) are banned or out of print. Of 130 stories by non-exiled authors, 109 are in print; the rest are not

retrievable. 83.8% of works by political refugees are banned. This alignment shows that state cultural regulations regularly extend into the literary field. The Persian literary field is not entirely independent of the state; the state's political stance directly impacts a work's circulation within Iran. An author's exile status influences the legal accessibility of her texts, affecting their visibility to diaspora translators and Anglophone publishers, who mainly work with legally accessible Iranian literature. Gatekeeping is thus rooted in the source field. The translation of Iranian women's literature into English is more influenced by the Iranian state's regulations on permissible works than by Anglophone publishers' credential preferences. The target field typically draws from a work previously filtered by the source field. Mahshid Amirshahi, an author in self-imposed exile, has her story *Peyton Place Tehran* (in *A Walnut Sapling on Masih's Grave*) marked as out of print and banned in Iran; similarly, the story *Mrs Ahmadi's Husband* in *Stories by Iranian Women Since the Revolution*, written by Fereshteh Kuhi, a political refugee, is recorded as out of print in Iran.

6.2 Exile and Persian consecration

The award data show similar source-field logic, but less clearly. At the book level, exile status links to receiving Persian awards (Fisher's exact test, $N=49$, excluding multi-author anthologies, $p=0.038$). Authors never exiled most often get Persian awards, while self-imposed exiles and diaspora authors do so less often. Daneshvar, never in exile, received the Mehregan-e-Adab award for *Savushun*, and Vafi, also never in exile, won multiple prizes for *My Bird*, showing domestic awards are more common for non-exiled authors.

This link is suggestive rather than conclusive. Repeating the test with 59 unique authors from the dataset shows a non-significant result ($p\approx 0.33$), partly due to the small award-winning subgroup. The pattern suggests that exile has a dual impact in the Persian context: it removes texts from circulation and reduces their recognition within the country. Yet the main argument rests on the near-absolute alignment between exile/print status in Section 4.1 and the award connection.

6.3 Two independent prestige systems

Persian and English literary prestige do not align, with awards in each system being statistically independent (Fisher's exact test, $p=0.190$). Recognition in one does not predict recognition in the other. This independence is significant, suggesting that exile or political salience, which can hinder Persian recognition, might attract Anglophone attention. It suggests that Persian and Anglophone literary fields are governed by different standards and institutions, forming two separate, partly opposing value systems. This statistical independence doesn't prevent individual

overlap. *Lovemaking in Footnotes*, a collection by Mahsa Mohebbi, won both the Loose Translations Award in English translation and the Golshiri Award for Best Short Story Collection in Iran (2005). This shows that a single work can sometimes be recognized by both prestige systems, even if they are not consistently linked.

6.4 Publisher type, exile, and print status are not linked in the target field

The academic/independent distinction does not significantly influence author placement, print status, or publisher type, consistent with Section 3. Exile status is not strongly linked to publisher type ($p=0.232$); exiled authors mostly publish independently, with 64.6% of works appearing through independent publishers. Print status is also not significantly correlated with publisher type ($p=0.157$). The distinction does not systematically separate political or banned content, as seen in Shahrnush Parsipur's *Women Without Men*, which was published twice, once by Syracuse University Press (academic) and once by The Feminist Press (independent), showing that exile status doesn't determine publisher type.

7. Peritextual territories and the distribution of agency

Sections 5 and 6 demonstrate that this field is not organised by publication type or academic credentials. This section shifts the focus to the peritext itself as the site of agency, asking who controls peritextual production and how this distribution has evolved over time.

7.1 Who controls the threshold?

Agency in this field manifests in the peritext rather than through credential gates. Of 148 peritextual elements, publishers manage 44.6% (66 elements), translators 37.8% (56 elements), third parties 12.2% (18 elements), writers 4.1% (6 elements), and editors 1.4% (2 elements). The author of the translated work is rarely present in her own book in English, adding about one peritextual element for every twenty-five. A reader's entry into a translated novel by an Iranian woman is mainly influenced by the publisher and translator, with minimal input from the author. Daneshvar's *Playhouse* is an exception in which the author herself provides a peritextual element.

7.2 Biography as a publisher territory

The main peritext type is Biography, making up 23.6% of items (35 of 148), with 91.4% under publisher control. The portrayal of Iranian women's fiction in the Anglophone market is mostly shaped by publisher-controlled identity framing, especially through author or translator presentations. Book descriptions (17.6%) are mainly in publishers' domain. Introductions (12.8%), forewords (8.8%), and glossaries (8.1%) form a secondary layer, where translators and third parties are

more involved. For instance, the biographical notes for *Savushun* and *A Persian Requiem*, both English translations of the same Persian novel, were authored by their respective publishers.

7.3 The three phases and the rise of the translator

Peritextual attribution has evolved through three distinct temporal stages. Phase 1 (1989–2000; 11 books, 50 peritexts, mean 4.6 per book) shows the highest peritext density and a clear predominance of publishers (52.0% publisher, 28.0% translator, 18.0% third party). Phase 2 (2001–2015; 15 books, 42 peritexts, mean 2.8 per book) shows a decline in publisher dominance (40.5% publisher, 35.7% translator). Phase 3 (2016–2025; 30 books, 56 peritexts, mean 1.9 per book) is fundamentally unique: translator attribution (48.2%) surpasses publisher attribution (41.1%) for the first time, while third-party scholarly content declines to 3.6%.

Phase 3 shows increasing translator ownership of translations, with more interpretive framing from translators themselves via forewords and notes, instead of third-party scholars. In Phase 1, scholars like Spooner, Milani, and Fernea wrote introductions for works like *Savushun* and *Stories by Iranian Women*. By Phase 3, translators Kavani, Ghanoonparvar, and Javaheri assumed these roles for *Dog and the Long Winter*, *The Drowned*, and *The Mailman*.

8. Gender in the translation industry

This section investigates whether the agency from Section 7 is gender-balanced or whether male and female translators occupy different positions within the field.

8.1 Two translator profiles

Gender data reveal two distinct translator profiles in the same field. Female translators represent 41.1% of titles, surpassing the 35.7% of male translators, with the rest being mixed teams. Profiles differ across multiple dimensions. All Iran-based translators are women, with 21 from Iran, while male and mixed-team translators work from the diaspora. Female translators have a broader range of qualifications, including all MA/MFA-level translators, while male translators mainly hold PhDs. Sanam Kalantari, who translated *I hid my voice* in Iran, exemplifies the profile of Iran-based female translators, which differs from that of diaspora male translators like Ghanoonparvar.

8.2 Gender and political risk

Male and female translators show different patterns with politically sensitive content. Male-translated works are split evenly between in-print and banned texts (9 each), while female-translated works are mainly in print (17 in print, 3 banned). The only political refugee's work in the dataset has a male translator. This suggests male

translators often handle forbidden or sensitive texts, raising questions about gender and political risk in translation. For example, Ghanoonparvar, a male translator, translated banned titles by exiled or diaspora authors, while Roxana Zand, a female, translated Daneshvar's in-print work.

8.3 Mixed teams and Persian consecration

Mixed-gender co-translation teams rarely translate works by authors who have received Persian awards: only 1 of 57 short stories translated by such teams is by a Persian-award-winning author. Female solo translators account for the majority of Persian-award-winning source literature. Mixed teams are more efficient, with a median translation gap of 5 years, compared with 13 years for female solo translators and 11 years for male solo translators in the short-story dataset. Mohammad Mehdi Khorrami and Shouleh Vatanabadi's co-translation of *I Came to Have Tea with My Daughter* (in *A Feast in the Mirror*) exemplifies a mixed-gender team collaborating outside the Persian-award-winning subset of the dataset.

9. The short story anthology as a distinct circulation mechanism

The short-story collections are a distinct mode of circulation. They surpass book-length translations in speed (median gap of 10 years compared with around 16 years), include a higher proportion of Iran-based authors (60.1% of short-story authors are based in Iran), and exhibit greater gender diversity among their translators. For authors in Iran, they serve as the principal means of rapid worldwide dissemination, reaching Anglophone audiences significantly sooner than a complete book-length translation.

10. Discussion

Independent publishing accounts for 85.7% of books, challenging the idea that peripheral literatures entering the Anglophone market are mainly filtered through academic or credentialled institutions. Data shows academic presses are shrinking rather than shaping the market; they issued a third of books in the 1990s, barely a third in the 2000s, none in the 2010s, and one in the 2020s. Thus, independent presses haven't supplemented but replaced academic gatekeepers. One explanation is the transnational prestige of Iranian women writers through exile, awards, and diaspora networks, which may make academic validation unnecessary for market access.

The finding that 97.9% of stories by exiled authors are out of print or banned in Iran extends Bourdieu's field theory beyond his initial European case studies. The internal logic of consecration in the literary field operates through peer evaluation,

rewards, and critical recognition, not through political decree (Bourdieu, 1993, 1996). Johnson, cited in Bourdieu (1993), notes that in the cultural (e.g., literary) field, competition often concerns authority in recognition, consecration, and prestige. This is especially true in Bourdieu's sub-field of restricted production, which isn't aimed at a large-scale market. In Iran, the state's cultural organization acts as a primary gatekeeper, functioning mainly independently of Anglophone publishers and translators.

This result is consistent with Damrosch's (2003) observation that censored writers may find their main audience overseas, but it clarifies the precise mechanism: the decision to censor is the crucial structural event that determines which Iranian women's writing the international field can access at all, rather than merely that censored authors turn to foreign markets. Earlier research, especially Nanquette (2021), noted the political aspects of Iranian literary circulation. However, the current data's strong link between exile status and domestic unavailability was not quantified.

Peritextual findings from a non-Western, non-European context support Batchelor's (2018) model. Batchelor argues that paratexts in translated fiction constitute a contested threshold where the authority of the author, publisher, and translator is negotiated, not granted. The data show that this negotiation is asymmetrical and has changed over time: publisher dominance in Phase 1 (52.0%) shifted to translator dominance in Phase 3 (48.2%), with the original author never holding more than a small share of the peritext. This trajectory from publisher to translator aligns with broader trends in the sociology of translation (Wolf & Fukari, 2007), emphasizing translator visibility and agency. Its timing, mainly post-2015, indicates a field-specific shift: translators have gained interpretive authority as independent presses dominate and scholarly framing declines. Yet 91.4% of biographies controlled by publishers shows that identity framing remains largely a commercial choice.

11. Conclusion

This article makes three main contributions. First, 85.7% of works are independently published, and publisher type doesn't significantly influence peritext quantity, author positioning, or print status, challenging the Bourdieusian view that academic consecration organizes the field. Second, the source field is the key for selection, with strong alignment between self-imposed exile and banned/out-of-print status in Iran (97.9%) and a book-level link between exile and not receiving Persian awards ($p = 0.038$). Persian and English prestige are statistically independent ($p = 0.190$), showing they are valued differently. Third, peritextual territory is used for

agency: publishers control 44.6% of peritext and 91.4% of biographies; in recent years (2016-2025), translators exceed publishers (48.2%), while the author remains largely silent (4.1%).

The consequences of these structural results extend beyond this particular study. They contend that evaluations of peripheral literatures under state censorship cannot assume that the institutional logic of the target field is the primary organising factor; rather, the political logic of the source field may be more important to the sociology of translation as a whole. The information offers a standard by which future changes in publisher type, translator profile, or peritextual agency can be evaluated by academics studying Iranian literature and translation. The author's near-complete exclusion from her own peritextual means raises concerns for publishers and translation professionals about whose voice defines Iranian women's fiction for its Anglophone readership.

References

- Batchelor, K. (2018). *Translation and paratexts*. Routledge.
- Bolouri, M. (2018). Translators' agency in footnotes and notes of contemporary Iranian literary translators. *Language Related Research*, 8(6).
<http://lrr.modares.ac.ir/article-14-6415-en.html>
- Bolouri, M., & Rezvani, E. (2023). The politics of translation: Investigating paratexts of persian translations of American literary works in two ishtorical contexts. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies*, 21(82), 61–78.
<https://journal.translationstudies.ir/ts/article/view/1099>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *In other words: Essays toward a reflexive sociology*. Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature* (R. Johnson, Ed.). Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The rules of art: Genesis and structure of the literary field* (S. Emanuel, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Damrosch, D. (2003). *What is world literature?* Princeton University Press.
- Gharehgozlou, F. (2018). *Paratextual analysis of English translations of contemporary Iranian women's fiction* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Tehran.
- Heilbron, J., & Sapiro, G. (2007). Outline for a sociology of translation. In M. Wolf & A. Fukari (Eds.), *Constructing a sociology of translation* (pp. 93–107). John Benjamins.

- Hosseinzadeh, M. (2018). A Narrative account on the translatorial prefaces to the fictions translated into Persian. *Language and Translation Studies (LTS)*, 50(4), 140–167. <https://doi.org/10.22067/LTS.V50I4.67972>
- Inghilleri, M. (2005). Mediating zones of uncertainty: Interpreter agency, the interpreting habitus and political asylum adjudication. *The Translator*, 11(1), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2005.10799190>
- Jiang, B. (2020). Women in translation: Gender and (in)visibility in the Anglophone literary market. *Perspectives*, 28(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2019.1614144>
- Moslehi, Z. (2024). Thematic analysis of paratextual materials in English translations of Iranian women's fiction. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 22(85), 45–63.
- Nanquette, L. (2021). *Iranian literature after the Islamic Revolution: Production and circulation in Iran and the world*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Quay, M. (2022). Gender and canonization in contemporary Persian short story anthologies, 1980 to 2020. In P. Shabani-Jadidi, P. J. Higgins (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Persian literary translation* (pp. 200–228). Routledge.
- R Core Team. (2026). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2014). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. Routledge.
- Wolf, M., & Fukari, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Constructing a sociology of translation*. John Benjamins.
- Yalsharzeh, R., Barati, H., & Hesabi, A. (2019). Dissenting voices: When paratexts clash with texts. paratextual intervention in persian translations of texts relating to the iran-iraq war. *Meta (Canada)*, 64(1), 103–124. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1065330AR>
- Zanjanbar, A. H., Moradi, A., & Ameri Feleghi, N. (2022). A Comparison Between the Persian Translations of the Children's Story. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 12(3), 308–327.