

Translational Resistance and Constitutional Movement: The Case of *One-Word Treatise* in Constitutionalist Narrative Communities¹

Parvaneh Ma'azallahi²

Abstract

The relationship between translation and power is realized differently; some subservient translators produce submissive translations that conform to the norms set by power, while others choose to resist and produce resistant translations that bring about socio-political transformations. Concerning Baker's (in Tymoczko 2010) conceptualization of the link between resistant or activist translations and narrative communities, this study intends to examine *One-Word Treatise* as a resistant translation in the Naseri period. Hence, it attempts to examine what resistant strategies were employed by the translator and whether there was a link between this translation and the narrative communities such as Farāmoushkāneh and Jāme'-e Ādamīyat. The analysis of *One-Word Treatise* as the textual data showed that Mostashar al-Dowleh chose interventionist strategies such as addition, deletion and manipulation to adapt the original text to the Islamic Sharia. Moreover, he could introduce alternative metanarratives such as freedom and law into these narrative communities. It is concluded that *One-Word Treatise* as an adaptation of the French Declaration of Human Rights was a resistant translation which countered Naser al-Din Shah's repressive policies and created counter-discourses and paved the way for a political subversion, namely the declaration of constitutionalism under the rule of Mozaffar al-Din Shah despite the bitter fate that befell the translator.

Keywords: Resistance, *One-Word Treatise*, Naseri period, Constitutionalism, Farāmoushkāneh, Jāme'-e Ādamīyat

1. This paper was received on 04.05.2021 and approved on 30.08.2021.

2. Parvaneh Ma'azallahi, Assistant Professor, Department of Linguistics and Translation Studies, Dr. Tajaddod Faculty of Iranology, Vali-e-Asr University of Rafsanjan, Iran; email: maazallahie@vru.ac.ir

Introduction

The Naseri period (1848–1896) was marked by the reforms initiated by the intellectuals and royals, especially Naser al-Din Shah Qajar. In this context, Mohammad Hassan Khan Etemad al-Saltanah (1367/1981, pp.126–27) referred to some initiatives such as the establishment of new ministries and offices along with the development of railways and telegraph. However, many are skeptical of these reforms and criticize them for being highly selective. In other words, Naser al-Din Shah not only did not take steps to modernize the state apparatus according to the needs of the time, but also questioned the virtues of European political systems such as democracy and constitutionalism and believed that such structures were harmful to Iran (Ghargozlou, 1386/2001, p. 66). The founding of Dar al-Tarjomeh Naseri seems to be a good example of such a situation, for it occurred because of, among other things, “the king’s personal interest in reading translated fiction and history, the development of technical knowledge, the need for translated textbooks in Dar ul-Fonoun, and the entry of new thought into Iran” (Azarang, 1394/2015, pp. 245–247). However, it turned into a controlled gateway through which only the accepted subjects were translated into Persian and no new ideas related to freedom of speech, human rights, the struggle against absolute tyranny and separation of powers were allowed to be translated in this office. The strong disapproval of Naser al-Din Shah towards the Persian translation of Descartes’ *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One’s Reason*, which ended in the burning of this translation, can be considered as a proof of such a policy followed by this Qajar King to deny people access to knowledge and enlightenment (Delzende, 1398/2019, p. 195). In this line, a certain censorship department was also established to control “all writings imported into Iran and also all books published within the country” (Etemad al-Saltanah, 1367/1981, pp.161–2). Despite all these restrictive measures, a new wave of

thought aimed at political reform and the struggle against tyranny and regression emerged by some intellectuals including Mirza Aqa Khan Kermani, Mirza Malkam Khan, Mirza Yusef Khan Mostashar al-Dowleh, etc. They wrote or translated political and philosophical treatises in which they criticized the socio-political environment of Iran and introduced Western political thoughts and managed to put a lot of pressure on the Qajar government (Ghargozlou, 1386/2001, p. 70).

Concerning Tymoczko's (2010) definition of translational resistance, this study intends to examine the influence of *One-Word Treatise* as a case of resistant translation on some intellectual communities of the time, including Farāmoushkhāneh¹ and Jāme'-e Ādamīyat², within the framework of the relationship between resistant translations and narrative communities conceptualized by Baker (in Tymoczko, 2010, pp. 23–41). Three main questions are raised in this line: a) what were the mainstream translation institutions and practices during the Naseri period? b) in what sense was the *One-Word Treatise* a case of translational resistance and what resistance strategies did it involve, and finally c) did it exert any impacts on constitutionalist narrative communities such as Farāmoushkhāneh and Jāme'-e Ādamīyat? With this in mind, the present study is informed by a socio-historiographic approach (Buzelin, 2010, p. 8) and falls into the category of "context-oriented translation studies, which operationalized through case studies", as is the case *One Word Treatise* in this study (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2014, p. 205).

Translational Resistance and Narrative Communities

Translational activism and resistance were first developed by Tymocko (2010) to redefine dichotomous and absolutist views of the relationship between

1. Freemasonry

2. Humanity Community

translation and power. Alternatively, Tymoczko and Gentzler (2002) traced such views back to the 1950s and 1960s when translators began to recognize how translated texts could manipulate readers to achieve desired effects, and also to the 1990s, when the cultural turn produced significant works that addressed issues of power. Moreover, they criticized such early translation studies for an uncritical application of power dichotomies, through which an either/or situation was posited in relation to translation, i.e. "either the translator would collaborate with the status quo and produce a fluent, complacent translation, or resist a particular hegemony and employ foreignizing strategies to import new and unfamiliar terms into the receiving culture" (Tymoczko and Gentzler, 2002, p. 18). In such a reading, power is no longer a form of oppression, rather the relationship between discourse and power is highlighted to show where discourses meet and compete and power relations are negotiated (Tymoczko and Gentzler, 2002, p. 18). To further this discussion, Tymoczko (2010, pp. 8–9) placed emphasis on translators' choices and prioritization and the ideological implications embedded in them, claiming that translation choices serve as a context of affiliation for the translator and entail values, ethics and responsibilities; therefore, translations are always potentially subject to conflict and contestation, which is evident in translations with activist edge. Tymoczko added that resistance or activism are generally complex acts involving complex textual constructions and social positioning, and translators have to choose what to resist or do, so their strategies for achieving their social or ideological goals are diverse and highly time and space dependent. Regarding the question of what translation resistance is due to, Tymoczko (2010, p. 8) referred to variable opponents, including colonialism, imperialism, neo-imperialism, capitalism, Western domination, specific regimes such as that of the United States, oppressive social conditions, dominant discourses, religions, literary and linguistic norms. Based on such a conceptualization of translational resistance or activism, Baker (in Tymoczko, 2010, pp. 23–41) presented translation as

potentially capable of challenging the dominant narratives of the time through affiliating institutions that lie outside the mainstream institutions of the time. In this context, Baker referred to Fisher's narrative paradigm (1984) in which narrative is the primary and inescapable mode through which we experience the world, adding that there are very specific, detailed narratives that are fully articulated within the confines of a single text or group of texts. In terms of defining narratives, Baker drew on Somers and Gibson's (1994) categorization of narratives into ontological, public, conceptual, and finally meta-narratives, which seems to best fit the present study because it refers to "narratives in which we as contemporary actors are embedded in history ... Our sociological theories and concepts are encoded with aspects of these master narratives—progress, decadence, industrialization, enlightenment, and so on" (Fisher, 1984, p. 63).

In the case of the present study, constitutionalism or the rule of law over society instead of absolute power exercised by the king seems to be the meta-narrative that intellectuals like Mirza Yousef Khan Mostashar al-Dowleh (1823–1895) tried to promote in the Naseri period. In this line, he produced a Persian translation of the French Declaration of Human Rights entitled *One-Word Treatise* in 1287_{S.H.}/1908_{AD.} Focusing on differences between this translation and the mainstream translations produced under the auspices of Naser al-Din Shah, this study seeks to examine if *One-Word Treatise* can be termed a case of translational resistance and also whether it had any impact in the narrative communities such as Farāmoushkhāneh and Jāme'-e Ādamīyat as two communities that saddled on the meta-narrative of constitutionalism during the absolute kingdom of Naser al-Din Shah. In this process, the translation strategies applied by Mirza Yousef Khan in this treatise are also highlighted.

Naseri Translation Tradition: Patronage, Dissidence and Resistance

Translation in the Naseri period has been examined in many studies that approach this question from different perspectives. Some highlighted the role of Naser al-Din Shah's patronage, while others shed light on the role of translation

in the socio-political changes of this period. Among these, the studies of Bolouri and Mirkiaei (2019) and Farahzad and 'Adili (2019) are worth mentioning. Bolouri and Mirkiaei (2019) examined the works translated in the State Translation Bureau within the framework of Lefevere's Patronage Theory (1992) and concluded that due to the interests of the Shah and policies of the bureau's chairman, there was an increase in the translation of literature, politics, geography, science and military tactics during this time period, while Shah's unwillingness for reform left no room for the translation of modern Western thought. In relation to Tymoczko and Gentzler's (2002) description of early studies informed by the "cultural" or "power turn" in translation studies, it seems that this study takes a 'top-down' approach to the relationship between power and translation, where power is seen as a form of repression. Farahzad and 'Adili (2019) offered a broader framework for translation during the Naseri period by adopting a micro-historical approach to the study of the role of translation in modernization and enlightenment during the Qajar dynasty. In contrast to Bolouri and Mirkiaei (2019), their study addressed both the translations produced in *Dar al-Tarjomeh Naseri*¹ as the only mainstream translation institute of the period and the translations produced outside it as a form of declaration of dissidence against the ruling power. According to Farahzad and 'Adili (2019, pp. 8–13), such translations produced by dissident translators introduced Iranians to concepts such as liberalism, nationalism, and human rights, and played an important role in raising Iranians' consciousness, inspiring political campaigns, promoting ethical values and paving the way for the Declaration of the Iranian Constitutional Revolution in 1906. Although Farahzad and 'Adili (2019, p. 8) did not label dissident translators as resistant or activist, they offer a view of the role of translation in changing the political discourse of the time and the enormous socio-political changes such as constitutionalism under the rule of Mozaffar al-Din Shah.

1. Naseri Translation Bureau

As for translation resistance, Mollanazar and Ghaderi (2018) offered a view of translational resistance before the Islamic Revolution in translations published illegally as white-cover books. Adopting Baker's (2006) argument about text selection and framing methods, including pretexts, timing of publication and place of publication, Mollanazar and Ghaderi argued that various forms of translational resistance such as stirring, inspiring, witnessing, mobilizing, and inciting rebellion can be seen in the resistant translations that were directed against the state, the monarch, and capitalism that dominated society before the Islamic Revolution. Their study provided a large scale image of the non-mainstream translation practices as well as the resistant translation strategies at verbal and non-verbal levels that aimed at resisting censorship and promoting the working class of the society to oppose the dominant ideologies of the time. The present study shares some aspects with the above studies.

Like Farahzad and 'Adili's study (2019, p. 8), this study adopts a socio-historiographical approach to portray the mainstream translations as well as the dissident translators, especially Mirza Yousef Khan Mostashar al-Dowleh, and his role in the declaration of constitutionalism in Iran. Like Mollanazar and Ghaderi's (2018) study, it focuses on translational resistance and the translation strategies that constitute such resistance. Unlike Mollanazar and Ghaderi's (2018) study, this study focuses on a single text, *One-Word Treatise*, and the translation strategies used at the textual level.

Translation: an instrument to overthrow or strengthen the power structure?

By tracing the history of libertarian thought as an under-investigated prelude to the constitutionalism in Iran, Adamiyat (1340/1961, p. 33) concluded that events such as the subsequent failures of the Iranians in the wars with Russia awakened some authorities and paved the way for the adoption of means of modern civilization in Iran. In this line, some educators were sent abroad for further education and Iranians were initially exposed to various representations

of modernity such as democracy in Western countries (see Adamiat's account of Mirza Saleh and Mirza Malkam Khan sophistication). After returning home, these people tried to eliminate Iran's cultural and political backwardness mainly by introducing modern thoughts. Therefore, newspapers such as *Vaghay-e Etefaghieh* and translation institutes such as Dar al- Tarjomeh Naseri and Dar al- Fonoun were established. Although the role of court patronage in this process cannot be underestimated. Strictly speaking, *Vaghay-e Etefaghieh* and Dar al- Fonoun were introduced in line with the reformative policies taken by Amir Kabir as the prime minister of Naser al-Din Shah between 1227_{S.H.}/1848_{A.D.} and 1230_{S.H.}/1851_{A.D.} and Dar al- Tarjomeh Naseri seems to have been founded in 1288_{S.H.}/1909_{A.D.} on account of king's interest in reading and keeping himself informed of the events abroad. Under the superintendence of Naser al-Din Shah, the leadership of this translation institute had been assigned to 'Etemad al- Saltaneh and some Iranian and non-Iranian translators were recruited for translating in this institute. In newspapers or books published under the auspices of 'Etemad al-Saltaneh, the term *Khāseh Homāyouni*¹ was also included to indicate the affiliation of this institute (Delzendehrooy, 1398/2019, p.81) and for systematization of the working procedures Naser al-Din Shah commanded translators of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to join the translators of Dar al- Tarjomeh and give him a report on the translated books at regular intervals. A translation fee was also fixed for these translators. When the foreign minister, Mirza Saeed Khan Ansari, refused to send the translators to Dar al-Tarjomeh, the king strongly objected and dictated that these translators should work in Dar al-Tarjomeh ('Etemad al-Saltaneh 1345/1966, p. 345). Such interventions by Naser al-Din Shah indicate, on the one hand, the patronage aspect of power and, on the other hand, the interventionist policy of the power structure in relation to translation. This policy was later reinforced by the establishment of a censorship bureau called *Dayereye Cansour* which was founded in

1. Especially for the king

1320^{S.H.}/1941^{A.D.} at 'Etemad al-Saltaneh's suggestion primarily to control the content of newspapers and books imported into Iran, but in a next step all translations were also controlled before publication by this department ('Etemad al-Saltaneh, 1368/1989, p. 159). In relation to Alvarez and Vidal's (1996, p. 2) classification of various forms of constraints imposed on translators, it seems that those who translated in the Dar al-Tarjomeh were constrained both by the ruling power, i.e. Naser al-Din Shah, and Dayereye Cansour as a dominant institution established by it. In this context, it seems that power acted as a means of coercion and oppression and Naser al-Din Shah as the main promoter of the Dar al-Tarjomeh promoted translation "solely for political purposes and not for initiating any socio-cultural reforms" (Delzendehrooy, 1398/2019, p. 86). A glance at the subjects translated in this institute reveals the translation policy of Naser al-Din Shah. In this regard, Delzendehrooy reported that sixty-five travelogues, sixty-four historical books, eleven books on geography, twenty-two novels, and forty-eight books on various subjects made up the two hundred and nine books translated in this institute. However, a more comprehensive account of translation in the Naseri period is not possible unless one takes into account the marginalized groups and non-mainstream institutes or communities. In such groups, counter-discourses and metanarratives such as freedom and law were sought in translations produced by socio-political reformers such as Mirza Malkam Khan or Mirza Yousof Khan Mostashar al-Dowleh as two instances of resistant translators who sought to promote cultural and political renewal by compiling or translating books in subject areas very different from those translated in Dar al-Tarjomeh and who, in Tymoczko's (2010, p. 8) words, resisted "oppressive social conditions and dominant discourses". Against this background, as Raeen (1353/1974, p.125) reported, books such as *Humanity Principles and Benefits of Freedom* were adapted from Auguste Comte's "religion of humanity" and its positivist philosophy. Moreover, Stuart Mill's *Book of Freedom* was adapted by Mirza Malkam Khan. These adaptations were done

in the opposite direction to the translations produced in Dar al-Tarjomeh for the purpose of social reform, and were strongly pursued by the members of Farāmoushkhāneh and Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat. From Baker’s perspective (in Tymoczko, 2010, p. 23), it can be assumed that Farāmoushkhāneh and Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat served as two narrative communities which were set up outside the mainstream institutions with agendas that explicitly challenged the dominant narratives of the time and enabled the mobilization of numerous individuals around specific political, humanitarian or social issues. Similar to Stuart Mill’s *Book of Freedom* adapted by Malkam Khan, Mirza Yousef Khan’s adaptation of the French Declaration of Human Rights paved the way for the introduction of counter-discourses such as liberty and human rights and laid the foundation for constitutionalism, as will be shown in the next part. To put it in the words of Ādamīyat (1340/1961, pp. 200–201), eminent dissident intellectuals such as Mirza Malkam Khan and Mirza Yousof Khan Mostashar al-Dowleh were the first people to write books in Persian dealing with the philosophy of governance and human rights. These books were directly adapted from books produced by the French thinkers. As for Farāmoushkhāneh and Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat, Ādamīyat believes that Farāmoushkhāneh had no relationship with the Freemasonry organizations in Europe and Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat was founded by Malkam Khan’s supporters. These two communities functioned as unprecedented clandestine communities aimed at progressivism and liberality in Iran, attracting dissident intellectuals of the time and introducing new sociopolitical concepts. In such a situation, translation acted as a double-edged sword, used both in mainstream institutions such as Dar al-Tarjomeh and in non-mainstream institutions such as Farāmoushkhāneh and Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat for specific purposes that contradicted or opposed each other.

One-Word Treatise: Translational Resistance for the metanarrative of freedom

One-Word Treatise, published in 1287_{S.H.} /1908_{A.D.} by Mirza Yousof Khan Mostashar al-Dowleh, is the first to determine the will of the people as the

source of power and to separate rule from religion. This treatise was written in the period of highest political suffocation, when uttering the word of the law was an unpardonable sin for Naser al-Din Shah (Aryanpour, 1372/1993, pp. 282–3). This treatise was the result of Mostashar al-Dowleh's stay in Paris, his acquaintance with Malkam Khan and his presence in Saint Petersburg and Tbilisi, which brought him into contact with the thoughts of French revolutionary thinkers such as Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu (Hedayati, 1381/2002, p. 40). Mostashar al-Dowleh and the other Iranian intellectuals of the pre-Constitution period approached the concept of freedom from the perspective of their religious and mystical backgrounds and reached a certain sociological strategy which was different from that of the Western intellectuals who consider freedom as a concept related to the sociological contracts (Rafatipanah and Soleimani, 1395/2016, p.98). Based on this, Mostashar al-Dowleh takes an interventionist approach in translating French Human Rights Declaration to adapt it to the Islamic Sharia which was widely accepted in the Iranian society. In fact, strategies he applied in his interventionist approach can be enumerated as follows:

- According to Hassani and Pashazade (1388/2009, p.53), he compared the French codes with Islamic Sharia to select those principles of this Declaration that are adaptable to Islamic Sharia while he deleted or changed the incompatible ones. In this line, Mostashar al-Dowleh did not mention the principle of freedom as a fundamental principle of rule in the Western constitutional system, but he deleted this principle because it contradicted the actual Islamic principle which refers to the rule of Allah. Therefore, the first principle of the French Declaration, i.e., the freedom of the people to determine the governance, was completely deleted and equality before the court was substituted for it, which was supported by some Qur'anic verses referring to the equality of all human beings.
- Moreover, he added the principle of virtue to the Persian translation of the French text to address the problem of recruiting unqualified people

into high political ranks in the Naseri political system and mentioned the thirteenth verse of the *Al-Hojarat* Surah, to support this.

- Individual liberty as one of the other principles outlined in the French text was also manipulated and replaced with physical security on the basis of which no torture or corporal punishment is permissible.
- Freedom of assembly stated in company with a hadith from *Nahj al-Balaghah* was another principle added in the Mostashar al-Dowleh translation of French Declaration.

The same interventionist strategy including additions, deletions and manipulation was adopted for the rest of the translation “to escape strict political censorship on the one hand and to please open-minded clerics who were opposed to the tyrannical politics of power on the other”, according to Ajoudani (1382/2003, pp. 223–5). Such a strategy seems to culminate with the success of the *One-Word Treatise* as one of the most prominent instances of “constitutional literature used in the secret communities” such as Farāmoushkhāneh and Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat. In this context, one of the members of the Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat, namely Nazem al-Islam of Kerman (1376/1997, p. 177), reported that “the *One-Word Treatise* served as an adequate guideline and model of behavior for the members of Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat who intended to disseminate it for public reading as well”. Strictly speaking, “Farāmoushkhāneh as Mirza Malkam Khan’s souvenir from his European travels was planned to train a class of Iranian intellectuals ready for high-level posts in the government apparatus”, (Mohit-Tabatabaei, 1327/1948), and “it was recognized as a revolutionary institute aimed at fighting dictatorship and establishing democracy”, according to Ajoudani (1382/2003, p. 252).

Another community in the fashion of Farāmoushkhāneh was Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat which had been founded by one of Mostashar al-Dowleh’s advocates named Mirza Abbas Gholi Khan “after the assassination of Naser al-Din Shah, when the decline of the dictatorship provided an opportunity for liberal dissidents to expand their liberal ideals” (Ādamīyat, 1340/1961, p. 208). These

two communities can be seen as narrative communities in which values such as law, freedom and democracy were introduced as counter-narratives that challenged the dominant narratives of the time, on the basis of which Naser al-Din Shah was conceptualized as the shadow of God and obedience to him was obligatory. Such meta-narratives, which owed much to adaptations such as *One-Word Treatise*, *Humanity Principles* and *Benefits of Freedom* by Mostashar al-Dowleh and Mirza Malkam Khan respectively, acted “as a prelude to constitutionalism” (Ādamīyat, 1340/1961, p. 221) and when constitutionalism was realized under the reign of Mozaffar al-Din Shah, the minds of the constitutionalists were so influenced by the *One-Word Treatise* that, according to Momeni (1352/1973, p. 44), “some of the principles of the constitutional law, especially its amendments, were written in accordance with the principles introduced by Mostashar al-Dowleh”.

Conclusion

Translation in the Naseri period is endowed with such a multifaceted visage that it can be approached from different perspectives. On the one hand, it can be studied in terms of courtly patronage and its influences on mainstream translation institutions such as Dar al-Tarjomeh Naseri. On the other hand, it can be studied from the perspective of translations that did not conform to the translation norms set by power and were intended for non-mainstream institutions such as clandestine political communities. *One-Word Treatise* is a case of the latter which falls into the category of resistant rather than subservient translations, hence, includes many translation interventions like additions, deletions and manipulations as resistant strategies deliberately chosen by the translator. In other words, this translation was largely adapted to the Quranic interpretations of human rights due to the translator’s personal beliefs and also for escaping the state censorships. In this line, it could meet the needs of its time and challenge meta-narratives such as Naser al-Din Shah as the shadow of

God. Moreover, it could introduce values such as freedom and counter-narratives such as democratic origin of power, which resonated in narrative communities such as Farāmoushkhāneh and Jāme‘-e Ādamīyat, where the seeds of constitutionalism were first planted among dissident intellectuals. These efforts eventually culminated in constitutionalism under the rule of Mozaffar al-Din Shah.

Works cited

- Alvarez, R. & Vidal, C. (1996). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD.
- Baker, M. (2010). Translation and Activism: Emerging Patterns of Narrative Communities. In Maria Tymoczko. *Translation, Resistance, Activism*. (pp. 23–41). University of Massachusetts Press.
- Bolouri, M. & Mirkiaee, M. (2019) The Effects of the Court’s Patronage on the Selection of Books for Translation in the State Translation Bureau. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 17(65), 7–20.
- Buzelin, H. (2010). Agents of Translation. In Yves Gambier & Luc Van Doorslaer. (Eds.). *Handbook of Translation studies*. Pp. 3–8. John Benjamins.
- Farahzad, F., & Adili, S. (2019). Translation, Modernization and Enlightenment: The Qajar Translation Movement. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 17(66), 8–23.
- Fisher, W. (1984). Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Agreement. *Communication Monographs*. 51(1), 2 2.
- Mollanazar, H., & Ghaderi, R. (2018). Resistance in Translations Published as White-Cover Books. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 16(62), 41–62.
- Saldanha, S. O’Brien, G. (2013). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. New York: St. Jerome.
- Somers, M. R., & Gloria D. Gibson. (1994). “Reclaiming the Epistemological ‘Other’: Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity,” in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Pp. 37– 99. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tymoczko, M. & Gentzler, E. (2002). *Translation and Power*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Tymoczko, M. (2010). *Translation, Resistance, Activism*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

آجودانی، م. (۱۳۸۲). *مشروطه ایرانی*. تهران: اختران.

آدمیت، ف. (۱۳۴۰). *فکر آزادی و مقدمه نهضت مشروطیت*. تهران: انتشارات سخن.

- آذرنگ، ع. (۱۳۹۴). *تاریخ ترجمه در ایران: از دوران باستان تا پایان عصر قاجار*. تهران: ققنوس.
- آریان پور، ی. (۱۳۷۲). *از صبا تا نیما (تاریخ صد و پنجاه ساله ادبیات فارسی: بازگشت-بیداری)*. تهران: زوار.
- اعتمادالسلطنه، محمدحسن خان (۱۳۴۵). *روزنامه خاطرات اعتمادالسلطنه*. به کوشش ایرج افشار. تهران: امیرکبیر.
- اعتمادالسلطنه، م. (۱۳۶۷). *تاریخ منتظم ناصری*. تهران: دنیای کتاب.
- حسنی، ع. و پاشازاده، غ. (۱۳۸۸). *رویکرد مستشارالدوله به نظام مشروطه غرب*. *تاریخ ایران*. (۵) ۶۲-۴۸.
- دل‌زنده‌روی، س. (۱۳۹۸). *سیاست و عاملیت ترجمه: موردپژوهی دو نهاد دولتی و خصوصی ترجمه در عصر قاجار*. (پایان‌نامه دکترا چاپ‌نشده): دانشگاه فردوسی مشهد.
- رائین، ا. (۱۳۵۳). *میرزا ملکم خان*. تهران: بنگاه مطبوعاتی صفی‌علی شاه.
- رفعتی‌پناه، م. و سلیمانی، ک. (۱۳۹۵). *بازخوانی مفهوم آزادی در مطبوعات مشروطه (۱۳۲۴-۱۳۲۸)*. *مطالعات تاریخ فرهنگی*. ۸ (۳۰): ۹۷-۱۲۶.
- کرمانی، ن. (۱۳۷۶). *تاریخ بیداری ایرانیان*. به اهتمام سعیدی سیرجانی. تهران: پیکان.
- قرگزلو، ن. (۱۳۸۶). *اصلاحات و تجدد در عصر قاجار*. سانتاکاترینا: تیپوتیل.
- محیط طباطبایی، م. (۱۳۲۷). *مجموعه آثار میرزا ملکم خان*. تهران: انتشارات علمی.
- مؤمنی، ب. (۱۳۵۲). *ادبیات مشروطه: یک کلمه*. تهران: گلشائی.
- هدایتی، ع. (۱۳۸۱). *یوسف خان مستشارالدوله و رساله یک کلمه*. بهار. (۲): ۳۹-۴۰.

مقاومت ترجمانی و نهضت مشروطه: مطالعه موردی «رساله یک کلمه» و جمعیت‌های روایی مشروطه‌طلب^۱

پروانه معاذاللهی^۲

چکیده

رابطه بین ترجمه و ساختار قدرت به انحاء گوناگون نمود می‌یابد. برخی مترجمان تابع هنجارهای تعیین‌شده از جانب نهادهای قدرت بوده و ترجمه‌هایی هنجارمند عرضه می‌کنند، درحالی‌که، برخی دیگر مقاومت در برابر هنجارهای حاکم را برمی‌گزینند و با ارائه ترجمه‌هایی مقاومتی گاهی به تحولات سیاسی اجتماعی دامن می‌زنند. بر اساس دیدگاه بیکر (در تیموژکو، ۲۰۱۰) نسبت به رابطه بین جمعیت‌های روایی و ترجمه‌های مقاومتی یا عمل‌گرا، پژوهش حاضر قصد دارد تا رساله یک کلمه را به عنوان ترجمه‌ای مقاومتی در عصر ناصری بررسی کند. در این راستا، استراتژی‌های مقاومتی مترجم یعنی میرزا یوسف خان مستشارالدوله بررسی شده و ارتباط بین این ترجمه و جمعیت‌های روایی مانند فراموشخانه و جامع آدمیت تحلیل می‌شود. از مطالعه رساله یک کلمه به عنوان داده‌های متنی این پژوهش، چنین برمی‌آید که مستشارالدوله در جایگاه مترجمی دگراندیش از استراتژی‌هایی مانند حذف، اضافه و دستکاری متن اصلی برای سازگار کردن آن با شریعت اسلامی استفاده کرده و توانسته کلان‌روایت‌های جایگزینی مانند آزادی و قانون را به این جمعیت‌ها معرفی کند. این اقتباس از اعلامیه حقوق بشر فرانسه به عنوان نمونه‌ای از ترجمه‌های مقاومتی در برابر اختناق عصر ناصری قدهلم کرده و ضدگفتمان‌هایی معرفی کرده که راه را برای اعلام مشروطیت در عصر مظفرالدین شاه هموار کرده، اگرچه سرنوشتی تلخ برای مترجم خود رقم زده است.

واژه‌های راهنما: مقاومت، رساله یک کلمه، عصر ناصری، مشروطه، فراموشخانه، جامع آدمیت

۱. این مقاله در تاریخ ۱۴۰۰/۰۲/۱۴ دریافت شد و در تاریخ ۱۴۰۰/۰۶/۰۸ به تصویب رسید.

۲. استادیار، گروه زبان‌شناسی و مطالعات ترجمه، دانشکده ایران‌شناسی دکتر تجدد، دانشگاه ولی عصر (عج) رفسنجان، رفسنجان، ایران؛ پست الکترونیک: maazallahie@vru.ac.ir