

УДК 811.111: 81'26: 347.78.034

TRANSLATING CULTURE: FOREIGNIZATION VS DOMESTICATION

Tkachuck T. I.

*Vinnitsia Institute of Trade and Economics
of Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics*

The article discusses the concept of foreignization and domestication strategies in translation as a mechanism of rendering cultural issues and realities of the source text in the target text. The main attention is focused on the analysis of the role of foreignization and domestication strategies as the means of adequate translation of extralinguistic elements of the source text into target text as seen by theorists and practitioners of modern translatology.

Key words: translation, source text, target text, culture, cultural realities, translation strategies, foreignization, domestication.

Ткачук Т. І. Переклад культури: стратегії фореїзації та доместикації. У статті розглянуто поняття перекладацьких стратегій фореїзації та доместикації як механізму трансляції культурних особливостей і реалій вихідного тексту в цільовий текст. Увагу сфокусовано на аналізі бачення ролі й потенціалу стратегій фореїзації та доместикації як способів адекватного перекладу екстралінгвальних елементів вихідного тексту теоретиками і практиками сучасних транслятологічних студій.

Ключові слова: переклад, вихідний текст, цільовий текст, культура, культурні реалії, перекладацькі стратегії, фореїзація, доместикація.

Ткачук Т. И. Перевод культуры: стратегии фореизации и доместикации. В статье рассматривается понятие переводческих стратегий фореизации и доместикации в качестве механизма трансляции культурных особенностей и реалий исходного текста в целевой текст. Внимание сконцентрировано на анализе видения роли и потенциала стратегий фореизации и доместикации как способов адекватного перевода экстралингвальных элементов исходного текста теоретиками и практиками современного переводоведения.

Ключевые слова: перевод, исходный текст, целевой текст, культура, культурные реалии, переводческие стратегии, фореизация, доместикация.

Problem statement and substantiation of relevance of its consideration. Adequate translation strategies chosen for the conveyance of cultural elements have long been a point at issue in modern translation studies, the two major being foreignization and domestication. Nonetheless, both of them have given ground for discussion since their emergence in translation studies. As for a truly successful translation, **biculturalism** is even more important than **bilingualism**, since words only have meanings in terms of cultures in which they function [7, 27].

Translation is aimed at transferring the information represented in one language into another one [2, 574]. And while the transfer of language symbols is the primary tool of translation, the communication between cultures via giving the insight into one culture to the speakers of another language, hence the representatives of another culture, is no less the task of translation.

Analysis of the last researchers and publications. Therefore, it is not a mere change from one language into another, but also the introduction of one culture into another, which undoubtedly makes translation a creative work. In the past decade both theorists and practitioners of translation have conducted a series of research on various aspects of foreignization and domestication in literary translation (G. M. Anderman, M. Baker, M. Cowie, M. Cronin, M. F. Esposito, L. Hickey, T. I. Kovalevska, O. A. Matsera, E. A. Nida, M. Rogers, G. Saldanha, M. Shuttleworth, Ch. R. Taber, H. Tonkin, L. Venuti).

Therefore, the **aim** of this paper is to explore these two strategies, summarizing and analyzing the scholars' views on the potential of domestication and foreignization for translating cultural connotations and realities.

The **topicality** of the article is determined by the penetration of globalization processes in all spheres of human activities making multiculturalism and multilingualism the new reality of human communication and interaction, which in the field of translation is, on the one hand, mirrored in the demand of the readers to receive high-quality comprehensive translation, embracing all the aspects of the original language and culture the text has been created in, and on the other – the willingness and preparedness of the translators to use all available resources to provide the readers with such a translation.

Presentation of the main research material. Adequate translation should aim at the comprehension of the message of the original which is defined as the total meaning of a discourse, the concept and feeling, which the author intends the reader to understand and perceive [1, 19]. Whereas culture can be defined as a complex of beliefs, attitudes, values, and rules which a group of people share. It is the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression [4, 39].

The concept that language influences perception of the world goes back to the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt, whose ideas about the close connection of language and thought (or using his term, mind), the active role of language in thought construction and the reflection in language of the world outlook of nations were

interpreted by his followers as the existence of a particular linguistic world standing between consciousness and the real world, reaching its peak with the formulation of Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, known also as the linguistic relativity theory [9, 56].

The notion of culture is crucial to considering the implications for translation and, disregarding the differences in opinion as to whether a language presents a part of culture or not, the two notions seem to be inseparable. Researching the issue of correspondence in translation, E. A. Nida confers equal importance to both linguistic and cultural differences between the SL and the TL and concludes that differences between cultures may cause more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure [7, 130]. Cultural parallels often provide a common understanding despite significant formal shifts in the translation.

The beliefs, attitudes, values, and the rules of the source language audience need to be mirrored in the target discourse in order to be properly understood by the people sharing a different set of beliefs, attitudes, values, and rules. On the other hand, as the language people use reflects the culture, to be more specific, their community culture is revealed by its social conventions, norms and social appropriateness, the culture both emancipates and constrains people's activities socially, historically and metaphorically [4, 83]. It can be put in the following way: language is the transmitter for culture and culture is the fertile ground on which language evolves and develops. To understand a language, one must know well about its culture and vice versa.

In recent years, strong emphasis has been made on cultural factors in translation as an activity of intercultural communication. Through the prism of communication theory, translation is a way of conveying messages and exchanging information. To be more precise, it is intercultural communication between the author and the translator, and between the translator and the readers of the target language [3, 97].

Each language group has its own culturally specific features, that don't have equivalents in other languages, thus presenting a challenge for the translator. One way to resolve this challenge is to employ domestication and foreignization strategies presenting the two sides of the same method.

The best distinguished difference between the two main translation strategies was made by an American scholar Lawrence Venuti, who put it in the following way "you can bring the author back home" or just "send the reader abroad" [10, 46]. Roughly explained, **foreignization** is based on retaining the **culture-specific** items of the original: **personal names, national cuisine, historical figures, streets** or **local institutions** whereas **domestication** focuses on **minimizing the strangeness** of the foreign text for the target readers by introducing the **common** words used in the target language instead of providing readers with foreign terms [10, 28].

Foreignization is a source-culture-oriented translation which is aimed at translating the source language and culture into the target one in order to keep a kind of exotic flavor [5, 80]. Foreignization as a term used by Venuti can also be defined to represent the type of translation in which a TT is produced deliberately departing

from target conventions by preserving some foreignness of the original [10, 27]. Whereas domestication refers to the translation oriented to the target culture in which unusual or unfamiliar to the target culture expressions are transmuted and replaced by familiar ones so as to make the translated text easy for understanding for the target readers. Schuttleworth and Cowie define domestication as a term adopted by Venuti to describe the translation strategy employing a lucid, fluent style in order to minimize the foreignness of the foreign text for TL readers [8, 144].

The debate on free and literal translation is mirrored in the duality of foreignization and domestication. While literal translation focuses mainly on how to keep the form of the source language without distorting its meaning, free translation holds that different languages have different cultural connotations and forms of expression, and when the form hinders translation, free translation should be applied. Free translation method pursues elegance and intelligibility of the version at the expense of the form of the source language [2, 370].

Translator's employing literal translation method are basically ignoring the formal elements of the target language at times sacrificing the comprehensibility of the target language text in the pursuit to keep the similarity of form of the source text. Nonetheless, literal translation is not to be confused with mechanical or dead translation, while at times keeping the form of the original text is crucial to convey the author's connotations, intentions and implications.

It is fair to say, that the two methods and the two strategies correlate: literal translation emphasizes linguistic and stylistic features of the original text, while at times giving up clarity and coherency of the language, thus complicating understanding of the content for the target readers [3, 160]. The readers may find such a translation a bit unusual if not to say uncomfortable for reading, while free translation and domestication focus on the target audience, presenting smooth coherent sentences, familiar expressions and cultural phenomena rendered, which contributes to the fact that the target readers hardly realize that they are dealing with a translated from another culture text [3, 146]. Thus, foreignization and domestication present a pair of new translation strategies more intricate and inclusive than literal and free translation methods focusing primarily on cultural factors in translation.

A language reflects the culture of a society, not only in its choice of vocabulary, but also in its syntax and way of organizing ideas. In single context world, the author communicates with the source text readers who share the same cultural background knowledge with him/her [8, 54]. Therefore, they can co-operate with each other in the process of communication quite harmoniously. But the process of translation often breaks this harmony. Translation is displaced and disjointed communication [6, 68]. In translation, the original text is deprived of its context and the information it carries is encoded in an entirely different language with an entirely different context. The reader may not be able to meet the expectation of the author, thus there comes information gap [5, 24]. The translator's job is to fill this gap and harmonize the communication.

The translator needs to understand beliefs, attitudes, values, and the rules of the SL audience in order to adequately understand the ST and faithfully translate it for people who have a different set of beliefs, attitudes, values, and rules. And since each language group has its own culturally specific features, that don't have equivalents in other languages the interpreter or translator should rely on the ways to create occasional equivalents and to render equivalent-lacking units. That's when the translator has to decide, which strategy – domestication or foreignization – to apply. The most common ways within the two strategies seem to be the following:

1) using long words – imitating in target language the forms of the SL word or word combinations. By this technique using transcription of transliteration exclusively is understood;

2) transcription of transliteration and explication of their genuine nationally specific meaning;

3) using a descriptive explanation to convey the meaning of the ST unit;

4) translating componential parts and additional explanation of units of the nationally-bound lexicon;

5) using appropriate substitutes or semantic analogy, i.e. words with similar meaning, which is extended to convey information;

6) by ways of word for word translation;

7) using all kinds of lexical transformation modifying the meaning of a SL word [6, 69].

Conclusion from this research and prospect. To conclude, it should be stated that successful translating of the source text into the target text is crucial to rendering its full and comprehensive meaning. This can be accomplished via employing a number of translation strategies and techniques, among which the most productive as well as controversial seem to be foreignization and domestication, presenting the two extremes in ways of rendering the source text into a target language: the former focusing on preserving the cultural authenticity of the ST in the TL, while the latter reshaping the TT in the following way as to make it sound natural in the SL.

This, however, doesn't mean that domestication obstructs the penetration of a foreign culture into the native one, nor does it mean that foreignization always translates the culture of a SL in the TT more successfully. It just means that in accordance with the readers' needs and capacities as well as the communicative needs and intentions of the author translator has two different options of rendering cultural realities at his hand. Further investigations into the topic seem fruitful in the aspect of researching the best suitable strategy of rendering specific cultural realities and equivalent-lacking units in various languages.

REFERENCES

1. Anderman G. Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives / G. Anderman, M. Rogers. – Multilingual Matters, 2003. – 232 p.
2. Baker M. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies / M. Baker, G. Saldanha. – Routledge, 2009. – 704 p.
3. Cronin M. Translation and Globalization / M. Cronin. – Routledge, 2012. – 190 p.
4. Faulstich K. Culture and translation / K. Faulstich. – Bucknell University Press, 2004. – 171 p.
5. Hickey L. The Pragmatics of Translation / L. Hickey. – Multilingual Matters, 1998. – 24 p.
6. Kovalevska T. Translation equivalency through the prism of linguistic picture of the world / T. Kovalevska, O. Matsera // Науковий вісник Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія «Філологічні науки (мовознавство)»: [зб. наук. праць]. – Дрогобич, 2016. – № 6. – С. 67–70.
7. Nida E. The Theory and Practice of Translation / E. Nida, Ch. Taber. – BRILL, 2003. – 218 p.
8. Shuttleworth M. Dictionary of Translation Studies / M. Shuttleworth, M. Cowie. – Routledge, 2014. – 252 p.
9. Tonkin H. The Translator as Mediator of Cultures / H. Tonkin, M. Esposito. – John Benjamins Publishing, 2010. – 201 p.
10. Venuti L. Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice / L. Venuti. – Routledge, 2013. – 271 p.