
A Normative Analysis of Sadegh Hedayat's "The Blind Owl's" Target Text

Yalda Bartina¹

Ph.D. Candidate at Istanbul University

E-mail: yalda.bartina@ogr.iu.edu.tr; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9757-5630>**Prof. Arsun Uras²**

Department chair of Translation Studies and Head of School of Foreign Languages

E-mail: auras@istanbul.edu.tr; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8266-2822>

Article Received: 25/05/2025**Article Accepted:** 27/06/2025**Published Online:** 29/06/2025**DOI:**10.47311/IJOES.2025.18.06.578

Abstract: Norms in translation studies play a fundamental role to enlighten the path encountering the translator and as a spine for further surveys in the field. Due to the existing shift from classical to modernism in literature and regarding the tastes of the Iranian and Turk readers, this article attempts to indicate Gideon Toury's (1995) initial, preliminary and operational norms' significance on translation as a product and a process at the same time and enclose the hidden message of the author which lies within the lines of "Blind Owl" (بوف کور) [Bufo Kur]. The book is a masterpiece written by Iranian author Sadegh Hedayat who introduced modernism to Iran's literature. Scrutinizing the translated text as a final product (Necatigil, 1977) and the translation process according to the norms depicts the prominent role of translator's decisions of being adequate and source text oriented or acceptable and target text oriented on conveying the implicit messages and contributes to readers' understandings of the whole story. Furthermore, the descriptive explanation of some salient samples and symbols driven from the source text could alter the readers' perceptions and represent a new perspective to translation studies.

Keywords: initial norms, preliminary norms, operational norms, translation process and translator's decisions.

Introduction: Gideon Toury, a prominent scholar in translation studies, developed the idea of norms, which are the guidelines to lead translating in any specific cultural, social, and historical settings. In his seminal work, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995), Toury aimed to describe how translations operate within their new cultural environments, rather than prescribing a rigid method. Toury categorized these norms into three main types as follows:

Initial Norms determine the translator's overall approach: whether to prioritize faithfulness to the source text's characteristics (adequacy) or to adjust it to align with the target culture's conventions (acceptability) (p.64). Preliminary Norms cover decisions made before the translation process begins, such as the selection of texts for translation and the reasons behind those choices and directness of translation whether it translated directly from the original source text or not (p.65). Finally, Operational Norms guide the translator's decisions during the actual translation. These include Matricial Norms, which concern the structure and organization of the translated text (like adding or omitting parts), and Textual-Linguistic Norms, which involve specific linguistic choices in vocabulary, syntax, and style to match the target language (ps.65 and 66). Collectively, these norms highlight the complex relationship between the source and target cultures in shaping translation practices.

To obtain a clear understanding of the norm-guided process of translation, flourishing of 'Modernism', a shift from classical literary to modernity could be one of the critical eras which impacts the translators' decisions in a nonconventional way. "... modernism came into discussion as a domain which embodied various artistic currents such as symbolism, impressionism, expressionism, futurism, Dadaism, vorticism, imagism which appeared at the end of the nineteenth century" (Chifor, 2023 p.62). Modernity, according to Childs (2000) and broader academic understanding, marked a time of significant change. It is defined by sudden industrial growth, new technologies, and a surge in city populations, all of which drastically altered daily routines and societal organization. This period also saw groundbreaking developments in science and philosophy, like Einstein's (p.21) and Freud's (p.51) theories, which questioned established ideas about time, identity, and existence. At the same time, religious influence decreased as secular ideas gained ground. "Modernist art is, in most critical usage, reckoned to be the art of what Harold Rosenberg calls "the tradition of the new". It is experimental, formally complex, elliptical, contains elements of decreation as well as creation, and tends to associate notions of the artist's freedom from realism, materialism, traditional genre and form, with notions of cultural apocalypse and disaster" (Childs, 2000 p.2)

Yet, despite advancements, many felt a sense of disconnection and alienation, a feeling intensified by events like World War I. The emergence of mass culture and consumerism blurred the lines between different forms of art and entertainment. Artists faced with a 'crisis of representation', struggling to portray a world that felt increasingly complex and uncertain. In response, modernity advocated individualism and subjective experience, pushing writers to develop new literary approaches that prioritized personal perspectives over objective storytelling. Modernist authors such as James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, and Franz Kafka reacted to these profound shifts with a mix of enthusiasm and apprehension, using experimental methods to reflect the intricate and often disruptive nature of their contemporary world.

Another author who practiced modernist innovations in his works is Sadegh Hedayat. "It is impossible to write on Hedayat and not say something about the fantastic

world of his undeniable masterpiece” (Bidgoli 2020, p.7). (بوف کور) [Buf-e Kur], Blind Owl (1937), his masterpiece reflects modernist features as the priority of the individual on society, mixing images from the past with modern themes, creating a world which is becoming a more absurd place, use of symbols, and regarding literature more as a craft than a flowering of creativity. Another leading scholar who has extensively researched Sadeh Hedayat is Omid Azadibougar. His book, *World Literature and Hedayat's Poetics of Modernity* (2020), delves into Hedayat's works, analyzing his unique style and the themes he explored. He asserts that “Hedayat was literary pioneer, ... one of the pillars of modern Persian literature. ... he was a major force in literary modernization and his influence on the development of modern Persian poetics is undeniable.” (p. 10).”

After becoming interested in philosophy, Hedayat started to read and reexamine the works of Umar Khayyam, especially the philosophy that the poet had incorporated into his “*Ruba'iyat*”. The result of these investigations appeared in print in 1934-35 as a most concise, well-organized, and informative introduction in *Taraniha-i Khayyam* in 1923 (Khayyam's Quatrains). In the same study, Hedayat also examined Khayyam's link to Iran's Aryan past on the one hand and the philosophy of the Buddha on the other. “Hedayat's study of Khayyam led him to examine the philosophies of two other Aryans, Zoroaster and the Buddha. In 1924, he published his first impressions in a brief study entitled “*Ensan va Heyvan*,” (“Man and Animal”). Like Zoroaster's “Gatha of the Ox Soul,” “*Ensan va Heyvan*” is primarily a defense of the animal kingdom against the ravages of man.” (Bashiri, 2013 p.2)

Getting insights from Khayyam's poems, Hedayat decided to go to India in order to achieve a better understanding of Buddha. There, he found some old documents of Iran's history and investigated them. Furthermore, he hoped to publish some of his works in India which he couldn't publish in Iran because of censorship. After investigations, he finished his book known as “بوف کور” (The Blind Owl) first published in Bombay in 1936. Initially, the book received many critics' attention due to the belief that the author had developed the story under narcotic drug effects but in the later years as modernism started to flourish in literature and regarded as a highly notable work of art in Persian literature.

Due to its significance in literature, it has been translated to numerous languages such as Turkish, Arabic, Romanian, French, Russian, English, German, Swedish, Finnish, Danish, Italian, Greek, Hungarian and Czech, and so on. This article investigates the Turkish translation of the book particularly the hidden symbols, and some culture-bound vocabularies along with the footnotes presented by the translator to describe the effects of Toury's norms in the process, product and the translators' decisions to be source-oriented, target-oriented or maintaining a balanced approach.

Normative Analysis: The translators' decisions on being adequate or acceptable regarding the initial norm could be analyzed after scrutinizing both source and target texts under the whole three translation norms. Pertaining to this, Turkish version of the book namely as “Kör

Baykuş” translated by Behçet Necatigil in 1977 could be a rich corpus for obtaining the study’s aim. The reason of opting Necatigil’s translation as a target text lies on his interest toward Iranian literature. In his article, “*Türkiye’de Çağdaş İran Edebiyatı, Doğumunun 75. Yılında Sâdık Hidâyet*”, (1978) he asserts that:

[... I liked Sâdık Hidâyet with two stories in Turkish and one novel, *Kör Baykuş*. I wish his other works and stories would be translated. Because Hidayat has once again reminded me that literature is an independent and indestructible republic within the borders of states and regimes ...] (Necatigil, 1978; my translation).
As mentioned above, he even describes Iran’s political condition:

[...he begins to write war and post-war hopes and hopelessness, the problems that the Iranian society faced in this war, political tales in terms of criticism, and presents the only novel (or noveli) *The Blind Owl (Bûf-i Kûr)* and modern literature to Iranian readers. The book was first published in 1936. ..., which André Rousseaux praised as “the milestone of our literary history in the century”. ...] (Necatigil, 1978; my translation).

Thus, it could be assumed that the translator was aware of the political and social conditions of that time, and he was cognizant of the source text contextual framework and style. The first category of the preliminary norm, which is the reason for choosing the source text, could be explained by the translator’s specific article about the book and the author.

To analyze the second category of the preliminary norm as the directness of the translation, there is a special edition of “*Kör Baykuş*” which was published by the same publisher in 2017. In this edition it is noted the book has been translated from German language by Necatigil, “*Almancadan çeviren: Behçet Necatigil*” (p.4). Thus, it could be inferred that the translator did not directly translate from the original source text, and he translated from another language (German). Hence, the choice of particular vocabularies presented in the following sections, and the overall appearance of the target text could be explained by preliminary norm.

Furthermore, “Matricial” the first category of the operational norm encompasses the translator’s decisions about the text’s overall view, like whether to leave something out, add something in, or how to break the text into sections. Thus, they show features such as omissions, additions and text segmentation during the act of translation and depict the translation decisions. One of the most obvious matricial norm practiced by the translator could be noticed on the first page of the text, which starts with a long paragraph in the source text but in the target text it has been divided into two paragraphs. *Blind Owl* starts with a dim statement dealing with some sorrows in human life. Comas and full stops are almost used normally at their regular positions, i.e., at the end of the sentence in the case of full stops and among shorter units of the sentences in the case of comas. But one strange point is in using short dashes on nearly all pages. The number of such dashes on most pages increases by more than one e.g., on the first page there are four and on the second page six dashes. If

one replaces such dashes with commas and in more cases with full stops, no deficiency of meaning endangers the total meaning of the text.

Scrutinizing both source and target texts reveals that the translator opts to shorten the sentences of the original text. For example, the first part contains 431 sentences in the original book but in the translation, it reaches up to 577 sentences. *Blind Owl* is a 90-page novella which encompasses very long sentences divided with semicolons. Furthermore, in the whole text, the long sentences of the original book were shortened by the translator that this practice hasn't made a specific notion of differences over the meaning of it.

According to Toury (1995), "Textual-linguistic" as the second category of the operational norm is related to the language choices made in the target text (66). These norms can be universal or specific to certain types of texts or translation styles which directly govern the actual decisions translators make during the translation process. These decisions could be explained by analyzing the author's special word choices then scrutinizing the target text.

Identifying the translator's tendency to be adequate, acceptable or creating a balance between them relies on his textual-linguistic choices during the process of translation. Accordingly, Iraj Bashiri who is a prominent scholar and literary critic known for his extensive work on Persian literature, particularly on the works of Sadegh Hedayat, he says, "The *Blind Owl* is a difficult book. Language is one factor in its difficulty, but the main factor, so often played down by critics ..., is the impenetrable symbolism in the novella. This is why the translator of the novella often finds himself literally among islands of vague, seemingly unrelated concepts, and is forced to intuit some sense into them..." (2013, 79).

Therefore, translation is not simply a linguistic transfer, but a socio-cultural activity. In this context, footnotes in translated books can play a significant role in revealing and negotiating the norms. Thus, Necatigil might want to preserve culturally specific words in the main text (adequacy) and provide explanations of specific ones in footnotes (acceptability). Footnotes applied by Necatigil are totally 33 which encompass both cultural explanations about for instance the inherited wine, Rey city or linguistic clarifications added to explain the kind of one special flower. Thus, they can explain cultural references, idioms, or historical contexts that might be unfamiliar to the target audience. It could be concluded that the translator tries to be adequate and reflect the source text culture to target text readers. Apart from footnotes as indicators of translator's preferences, the choice of equivalence for culture-bound words could lead to mistaken conceptualization among target readers and mislead the target readers to reach the source text's message. While analyzing the target text according to the textual-linguistic category of the operational norm, one culture-bound word in the source text is (گزمه) [gazme] which translated to (*polis*) neglecting the historical discourse of the word which does not lead to the same effects of the text on target language readers. In fact, the equivalence of the word in that time of Turkey was (*emniye*) which reflects the same culture and same discourse used by Hedayat and has the same influence on the readers of both languages. Although Necatigil tried to preserve the original book's

modernity, it seems that he failed to convey the contextual and discursive meaning of the text.

Analyzing the textual linguistic choices of the translator could pave the way to decide on the initial norm of Toury, however, to obtain more clear understanding some symbolic linguistic choices of the author have been discussed in the article. It seems that Hedayat expresses numerous political and geographical changes occurred from very beginning of Iran by using various symbols. His craving for prosperous and pleasant days of Zoroastrian era competently knitted within the lines of the whole story waiting for the readers to discover the mystery behind them. The most notable symbol which could be seen more than ten times in the story is the numbers of “Two and four”.

Table 1. Two and four

(p, 5) “...سه ماه – نه – دو ماه و چهار روز بود که پی او را گم کرده بودم،”
“...It was three months, no, two months and four days ago that I lost her.” (p, 17)
“...üç aydan beri, hayır, iki ay dört gün var ki onun izini yitirdim,” (p, 16)

The narrator’s repetition of these numbers during the whole story could involve the modernist feature of the novel and at the same time could point to the fact that the exact date of Zarathustra and the era of Achaemenid empire not mentioned in the literature. The reason why Hedayat chose the special era could be because of that period’s specialty. The Achaemenid empire is the first Persian empires approximately 550-330 BC which “... stretched from Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean to the Indus River. It included the whole of modern Turkey and Europe to the Danube River....” (Brosius, 37). This assertion helps us date back to a time when Persia had one of the prestigious ruling powers reigning the nation; when Zoroastrianism was an important religion and stature which is the era has been bolded and admired by Hedayat. Blind Owl written in 1936 and according to these dates the period encompasses almost two thousand and four hundred years ago, so it could be inferred that the deliberate reoccurrence of the numbers “two and four” carries the significance of the Achaemenid empire for the author.

Figure 1:



The sequence and the exact translation of the numbers have been practiced in Turkish translation by Necatigil, also scrutinizing the English version of the book shows that the same decision has been made there as well. In Turkish version, these numbers (نو ماه و چهار روز) [do mah ve chahar ruz] translated to (İki ay ve dört gün) which conveys the same meaning in the source text and in English version the numbers translated to “two months and four days”. There is no clue about the historical value of these numbers within the lines of the story, so the author may leave the mystery to be found by the readers’ background knowledge and their level of curiosity. In the case of translation texts in both Turkish and English, there aren’t any footnotes to describe the numbers. Thus, you couldn’t speculate whether the translator could understand the historical background of the numbers or not. However, it could be inferred that the operational norm has been practiced by Necatigil without changing the originality of the source text would be an accurate decision.

Table 2. Ancient Wine Flask

	(p. 7) “یک بُغلی شراب کهنه که به من ارث رسیده بود”
“...an ancient wine flask that I had inherited ” (p.18)	
“...bir şişe eski şarap vardı...” (p.18)	

Necatigil adds more information in the footnote about the wine flask which the narrator has on his room’s shelf. However, the translator did not transfer the significant word of (ارث), [ers] which means “inherited” in English which has been saved in English translation of the book. The prominence of the word relates to the reference of the past time

and as Necatigil explains in the footnote that “When a baby was born, wine was made and a bottle of it wouldn’t be drunk and would be saved which is a tradition from Zarathustra time a religious prophet who lived in around 7th century” (Necatigil, 1977; my translation). According to the initial norms, the translator tries to make the target text acceptable by using the footnote but unfortunately it seems that he fails to transfer the considered goal of the author by practicing omitting technique. However, the omission of (ارث) [ers] (inherited) couldn’t be referred as adequate towards the target readers.

Table 3. Cypress Tree

(p, 6) “...همیشه یک درخت سرو میکشیدم که زیرش پیرمردی قوز کرده شبیه جوکیان هندوستان “عبا به خودش پیچیده،
“...I drew a cypress tree under which an old man, wrapped in a cloak, hunching his shoulders in the manner of the Indian <i>yogis</i> , sat in a squatting position.” (p, 17)
“...hep bir <i>servi</i> çiziyordum. Dibinde ihtiyar, kambur bir adam bağdaş kurmuş oturuyor, bir Hint fakirine benziyordu.” (p, 17)

Historic narratives testify that Zoroaster planted two amazingly large cypress trees as a good omen during his lifetime. A.V. Williams Jackson who was a prominent American scholar and a leading authority on Zoroastrianism and ancient Iranian culture, in his book namely, “The Prophet of Ancient Iran” asserts that “In telling the story of Zoroaster and of Vishtāspa’s embracing the new Faith, ... Zardusht planted a cypress-tree before the door of the fire-temple ... as a memento of Vistāspa’s conversion... (Jackson, 1899, 80)”. From the very beginning of the “Blind Owl”, the narrator explains his job as a painter who always draw one specific view, a cypress tree, (درخت سرو) /derakhte Sarv/ which is literally and correctly translated to (*servi*) in Turkish and “Cypress” in English, an old man and a girl. In the source text, the author used the adverb of (همیشه) [hamishe], which means “always” to explain that the narrator as a painter always paints the same cypress tree in his works. This adverb which is omitted in English but translated in Turkish to “hep” could be a sign of author’s attempt to highlight the significance of the cypress tree and illustrates his point of view towards the country where he was born to express his longing to his birthplace, a nostalgia which would never end.

M.J. Yahaghi’s *Encyclopedia of Mythology and Story in Persian Literature* is highly regarded for its comprehensive and insightful exploration of Persian myths and stories. In his book he asserts that “Just like myrtle, mirage and haoma, the tall cypress has been sacred and the special symbol of Iranians from the ancient times” (Alebrahim Dehkordi 2017, 106). Zoroastrian people planted cypress for health and happiness. In this example sentence, the author points out the tranquility gained by sitting under the cypress tree which refers to the Zarathustra era’s peaceful world by using the word (حتما) [hatman] which means “definitely”; hence, the writer illustrates his opinion about the old time and the acceptance of that. In Turkish translated text, Necatigil uses (*hiç şüphesiz*) which carries the same influence of the original text and successfully operates the operational norm by choosing the linguistically

appropriate vocabulary. However, in English translation the sentence changes to if conditionals type second which due to the impossibility of the source text it should have been translated to third type. By using this sample, it is worth noting that during the translation process the translator must be aware of the structure of the target language as well.

Table 6. Glazed Jar

(p, 27) "...مثلا امروز رفتم به قبر بکنم این گلدون از زیر خاک دراومد، میدونی گلدون راغه، مال شهر قدیم ری (p, 27) هان؟ اصلا قابلی نداره، من این کوزه رو به تو میدم بیادگار من داشته باش."
"...For instance, right today I went to dig a grave, and I uncovered this jar. Do you realize that this is a Raq jar , from the ancient city of Ray , huh? Let's assume it's a useless jar. I give it to you to keep as a souvenir from me, O.K.?" (p, 29)
"...Mesela bugün bir mezar kazdım, kazarken de şu testiyi buldum. Bir Rhages testisi , eski Rey yani, ya! Tamam, tamam! İşte sana veriyorum testiyi, benden sana yadigar!" (p, 32)

In this example sentence one of Iranian culture depicted by the author is the glazed jar to draw the attention to Zarathustra once more which holds significant cultural and religious importance in ancient Iran, particularly during the time of Zarathustra. According to the story, while the narrator and one old man are digging the ground to bury the corpse, the old man finds a glazed jar under the soil and covered that with a dirty cloth. Then in the next pages of the story, the old man gives that jar to the narrator. There is a painting of a girl on the jar which is exact copy of the narrator's painting of the girl who died in narrator's house, and he painted her face on a piece of paper.

From the story it could be inferred that the buried jar with the painting of the same girl who is assumed to be the Iran in its old time symbolizes the buried majestic culture and beauty of the country which was ruined after Zarathustra. The existence of the same painting on both pieces of paper drawn by the narrator and on the jar, is the sign of the written history of Iran which hid among the lines of this story.

In this example sentence extracted from the story, there is another important phrase which presents Iranian culture of "courtesy" by these words: (اصلا قابلی نداره) [aslan ghabeli nadare]. This phrase literally means "it doesn't have any value" however, according to Iranian culture this special phrase used to show the courtesy not the exact linguistic meaning of the word as invaluable and no need to be grateful. Because the one who compliments knows that it is very valuable but according to the cultural belief, he/she has to say the phrase to show humbleness. This part in Turkish translation translated to (*Tamam, tamam!*). The translator attempts to reflect the Turkish expression while giving a gift to somebody when the receiver hesitates to accept, the Turkish gift giver says: (*Tamam, tamam!*) which means "ok accept it". Thus, the extended meaning of courtesy has been erased by the translator and the contextual meaning has been lost. And in English version translated by adding a phrase of "Let's assume it's a useless jar" does not express the discourse of gratitude, courtesy and humbleness as well. By assuming to be 'a useless jar' the focus is on being invaluable than

the main reference of the source culture. Thus, scrutinizing the target texts under the initial, preliminary and operational norms both in Turkish and English as a mediating language could lighten the way of the target readers to figure out the true story and understand the main aim of the author.

Conclusion: Scrutinizing the Hedayat's book leads us to analysis the Turkish, and English (as a mediating language) translation texts, aims to demonstrate the significance of Toury's norms in understanding the translation process, the source text's discourse and its impact on the reader's experience. By examining the source text, we can gain a deeper comprehension of how cultural and linguistic factors could shape masterpieces which symbolize the values and beliefs of communities. Actually, the cruciality of the culture, time, and the taste of the readers had been emphasized in the literature, it is a well-known fact that culture and language are inseparably linked to one another. According to Kramsch, the President of the International Association of Applied Linguistics whose area of research emphasizes on social, cultural and stylistic approaches to language study and, language is "bound up with culture in multiple and complex ways ... Words reflect their authors' attitudes and beliefs, their point of view, that are also those of others... Language expresses cultural reality" (1998: 3).

Carefully analyzing the target text in Turkish (and English) based on Toury's "Initial norm", the study managed to evaluate to what extent the translator tries to be adequate or acceptable. By adding footnotes to some pages and further explanations of the translator it could be concluded that he tries to be acceptable and depicts the importance of the context and cultural values of the source text. Furthermore, investigating Hedayat's *Blind Owl* leads to uncovering the implicit references, and their appropriate transfer in target texts. Also, this analysis can help us to identify potential challenges as well as opportunities in the translation process and to develop more effective strategies for future translations.

Blind Owl is a multidimensional product which encompasses the Iran's history, Zarathustra's culture and the author's nationalistic ideology. Due to its richness in rhetoric norms, and implicit meanings with opaque communication, reaching its readers could be difficult. Thus, it seems there is a curtain between the readers and the book's message which is hard to draw aside. Thus, Necatigil attempts to draw the reader's attention to some special words and their significance by mentioning them in the footnotes.

Adopting Toury's framework, this research investigates the extent to which a target text can achieve comprehensive faithfulness to its source. Specifically, the study functions as a meta-analytical inquiry, examining the translator's mediation by scrutinizing the appropriateness and acceptability of sub-referential transfers. This approach establishes a critical space for questioning the translation adherence to the source text's semantic and cultural integrity. By analyzing the translator's strategic choices regarding cultural and historical references, this research moves beyond mere description to engage in evaluation of the translator's decision to convey the source text's relevance.

Works Cited:

- Alebrahim Dehkordi Saba. (2017). *Studying the Role and Symbolic Meanings of Cypress Tree (Sarv) in Miniatures of "Tahmasbi Shahnameh"*. 13 (45): 106
- Azadibougar, O. (2020). *World Literature and Hedayat's Poetics of Modernity*. Germany: Springer Nature Singapore. 9789811516917, 981151691X
- Bidgoli, M (2020). "Hedayat, Sadegh". The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Urban Literary Studies. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62592-8_169-1
- Brosius Maria. (2021). *A History of Ancient Persia: The Achaemenid Empire*. First Edition. Published 2021 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Chifor, M. (2023). *Modernism-context and Overlooked Literary Manifestations*. ISSN: 2455-6580 Vol. 8 & Issue 4, (August 2023). Perception Publishing.
- Child Peter. (2000). *Modernism*. 2nd edition. Routledge.
- Coulter Charles Russell and Turner Patricia. (2000). *Encyclopedia of Ancient Deities*. 1st Edition. Routledge.
- Gideon Toury. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins
- Hedayat, Sadeg. *Kör Baykuş (Resimli Özel Baskı)*. Translated by Behçet Necatigil. Illustrated by Hemad Javadzade. 1st ed. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, (2017).
- Hedayat, Sadeq, trans. (1977). *The Blind Owl*. By Behçet Necatigil. Yapı Kredi Publication Co.
- Hedayat, Sadeq. (2013). *The Blind Owl*. By Iraj Bashiri. Working Papers on Central Asia and Iran 1st edition 1974, 2nd revised edition 1984, 3rd revised edition 2013. The University of Minnesota. <https://www.thecreativelauncher.com/index.php/tcl>
- Jackson Williams A.V. (1899). *Zoroaster, The Prophet of Ancient Iran*. The Macmillan company London. <https://ia801207.us.archive.org/4/items/zoroasterprophet00jack/zoroasterprophet00jack.pdf>
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. (2007). *The Persian Empire: A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*. First published 2007. Routledge.