

ΙΟΝΙΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ
ΣΧΟΛΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ & ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗΣ - ΔΙΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ
ΤΜΗΜΑ ΞΕΝΩΝ ΓΛΩΣΣΩΝ ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ



"Critical perspectives on Translator's Invisibility."

ΠΤΥΧΙΑΚΗ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΑ

Της

ΣΟΦΙΑ ΚΑΤΣΙΓΙΑΝΝΗ
Αριθμός μητρώου: Ξ2017021

Επιτροπή Κρίσης

Επιβλέπων Καθηγητής: Ιωάννης Καρράς

Συνεπιβλέπουσα Καθηγήτρια: Σύλβια Καραστάθη

Κέρκυρα, Φεβρουάριος 2022



ΙΟΝΙΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ
ΣΧΟΛΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ & ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗΣ - ΔΙΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ
Τμήμα Ξένων Γλωσσών Μετάφρασης Και Διερμηνείας



ΙΟΝΙΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ
ΣΧΟΛΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ & ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗΣ - ΔΙΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ
Τμήμα Ξένων Γλωσσών Μετάφρασης Και Διερμηνείας

"Critical perspectives on Translator's Invisibility."

Της

Σοφία Κατσίγιαννη

Περίληψη

Η εμφάνιση της μετάφρασης αποτέλεσε το μέσο για την διαπολιτισμική επικοινωνία και την ανταλλαγή ιδεών. Για να επιτευχθεί ο στόχος της μετάφρασης, αναπτύχθηκαν πολλές και διάφορες Μεταφραστικές Θεωρίες, οι οποίες διαφέρουν ως προς τα βασικά τους στοιχεία, ανάλογα με τον στόχο που θέλει να πετύχει ο εκάστοτε μεταφραστής. Ο πολυσύνθετος χαρακτήρας της μετάφρασης, δυσκολεύει το έργο του μεταφραστή, αλλά με την εξέλιξη των Ανθρωπιστικών, Πολιτισμικών και Κοινωνιολογικών Σπουδών, μέσω των έργων διάφορων θεωρητικών και μεταφραστών, όπως οι Friedrich Schleiermacher, Antoine Berman, Lawrence Venuti, απέκτησε εφόδια που καθόρισαν την εξέλιξη του τομέα. Η ανάπτυξη των Ανθρωπιστικών Σπουδών και η συνεχής εδραίωση της Αγγλο-Αμερικανικής κουλτούρας ώθησαν τον Lawrence Venuti στην συγγραφή του έργου του *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Ένα έργο που πραγματεύεται την «αφάνεια του μεταφραστή» (“Invisibility”), την ιστορική εξέλιξη του όρου, τα θετικά και τα αρνητικά του. Ο Venuti κάνει αναφορά και στους όρους “domestication” και “foreignization” για τους οποίους έχει κάνει λόγο λίγο νωρίτερα και ο Antoine Berman, και που διαδραματίζουν σημαντικό ρόλο στο έργο του και στη σκέψη του γύρω από τη μετάφραση. Το δοκίμιο αυτό στοχεύει στην εξήγηση και την ανάλυση της σημασίας και της αξίας των όρων, “invisibility”, “domestication”, “foreignization” και “visibility”, στο τομέα της μετάφρασης και πώς μπορούν να επηρεάσουν την οπτική του μεταφραστή πάνω στο πρωτότυπο κείμενο.

Λέξεις Κλειδιά: «Μετάφραση, Μεταφραστικές θεωρίες, Ανθρωπιστικές και Πολιτισμικές Σπουδές, Lawrence Venuti, αφάνεια μεταφραστή, Antoine Berman»

Abstract

The appearance of the translation served as a medium for intercultural communication and exchange of ideas. In order for the translation to be achieved, many translation theories came to the surface, which differ in their basic elements, depending on what the translator wants to achieve. The complex nature of translation makes translator's work difficult, but with the development of Cultural and Sociological Studies, due to theorist and translators' works, such as Friedreich Schleiermacher, Antoine Berman, Lawrence Venuti, acquired skills that determined the evolution of the field. The development of Cultural Studies and the continuous consolidation of Anglo-American culture prompted Lawrence Venuti to write his book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. This book deals with the "Invisibility", the historical development of the term, its advantages, and its disadvantages. Venuti, also, refers to the terms "domestication" and "foreignization" that Berman had spoken about a little earlier, and which played an important role in his work and in his perception about translation. This essay targets in explaining and analyzing the mean and the value of the terms, "invisibility", "domestication", "foreignization" and "visibility" in the translation and how they can affect the translator's perspective on the original text.

Keywords: "Translation, Cultural and Translation Studies, Venuti, Translator's invisibility, Berman, domestication, and foreignization"



ΙΟΝΙΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ
ΣΧΟΛΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ & ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗΣ - ΔΙΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ
Τμήμα Ξένων Γλωσσών Μετάφρασης Και Διερμηνείας

Contents

Introduction.....	8
Different theories of translation and their formal approaches	8
Cultural Studies and Cultural Translation	11
How cultural and social translation is connected to invisibility	13
MAIN PART.....	14
Domestication-Foreignization.....	14
Berman's work <i>Translation and The Trials of The Foreign</i>	14
Analysis of the terms "Domestication" and "Foreignization" and Their role in translation	16
<i>The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation-Venuti</i>	17
Venuti's thesis on invisibility, analysis of his work's main points	17
His works influence and reference to works inspired by Venuti's thesis	24
CONCLUSION	25
BIBLIOGRAPHY	27

Introduction

Translation's importance is growing over time. Decisive role on translation's evolution played the appearance of Cultural Studies and the understanding of various social characteristics, which influenced the existing theories and led to the creation of new ones. Many theorists-translators, such as Friedrich Schleiermacher, Antoine Berman, and Lawrence Venuti, develop works and translation techniques, to introduce the cultural aspect in the translation field. The common denominator of these three is their thesis on "domestication" and "foreignization" and that their works were in favor of the "foreign" feature. Schleiermacher gave the stimulus for these theories, Berman with his work *Translation and The Trials of The Foreign* (2000), an analysis of the foreign feature in translation, inspired Venuti to write his most famous and influential book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2004).

The reference and the explanation of translation theories, and their evolution until the appearance and the influence of cultural and sociological studies in the translation field, are intending in highlighting some translators-theorists thesis, whose work brought to the fore the importance of cultural studies, within the context of the translation process. Such examples are Schleiermacher, Berman, and Venuti, who introduced terms such as "domestication", "foreignization", "invisibility" and "visibility", which were meant to determine the perception around translation. To examine these terms, based on their meaning and value, it was essential to start the research from the very foundations of translation.

Different theories of translation and their formal approaches

One of the reasons for the great diversity in translation theories and sub-theories is the fact that translation processes can be viewed from many difficult perspectives, such as

style, authors intent, diversity of languages, differences in corresponding cultures, changes in literature and problems of interpersonal communication (Nida, 1991:20). A translation theory must consist of a set of sentences that have the role of the rule-principles that translators must follow, to create an adequate translation. As Anton Popovic (1987) states translation theory is a science which studies the systemic examination of translation, and its task is to structure the translation process and the task. Also, a "successful" theory should help the translator discover new facts about his profession and be able to assess his success and impact on the public.

The intensive research into the existence and development of translation theories, or as it is commonly called "translatology", began in the 1940s. Translation strategies and perceptions started coming to the surface, apart from the standard divisions, such as "word vs sense" or "literal vs free translation", that existed since Cicero's time. Eugene Nida was the one who in general research on the subject classified the theories and sub theories into three general categories: philological theories, linguistic theories, and socio-linguistic theories, based on the translation principles and the different optics of each translator (1976: 66-79).

The philological theories rely upon "philology", and they refer to the comparison of structures in the native and foreign languages. As Nida states, these theories are concerned with all kinds of stylistic features and the rhetorical devices (1976:67-68). Moving forward to the philosophical theories, which according to George Steiner – writer of *After Babel* (1975) - are based on the psychological and intellectual functioning of translator's mind. Part of these methods is "Hermeneutic Motion", whose purpose is to explain the process of a literary translation. It depends on understanding the source text and its culture, "bringing home" the original meaning, finding the "appropriate use" of the translation, introducing new cultural and linguistic elements and last, finding "between the original and the translated text" (As-Safi, p.31).

The next category is the linguistic theories of translation and as Nida (1976:69) states are based on the comparison between the structures of the STs and TTs and not based

on literary genres and stylistic features. The linguistic evolution, the scientific study of anthropology, semiotics, the teaching of translation/interpreting skills and the excessive use of machine translation (MT), helped on the description of SL and TL (Nida, 1976:70). The Linguistic approach to translation is an approach that depends on replacing linguistic units of the ST with equivalent units in TL. According to Nida and Taber, due to the above only a linguistic translation can be “faithful”. A part of linguistic theories is Newmark’s (1981) binary classification of translation into semantic and communicative, that resembles Nida’s formal and dynamic equivalence.

Around 1970s and 1980s, in Germany, there has been a change from the linguistic typologies of translation to a functionalist and communicative approach. The functional theories, as they are called, subsume the theory of translation action, the text-type theory, the skopos theory and the text-analysis theory (Baker, 2005: 235-238 adapted). The translation action theory is a purpose-driven and product-oriented theory, where translator’s role is to transfer or choose successfully the linguistic and the cultural features, the form, and the genre of TT. As Nord states (2007:18) this type is a form of intercultural communication. The text-type theory is based on the idea of equivalence “Reiss links the functional characteristics of text types to translation methods” (As-Safi, 2011:34) and their main characteristics which are, informative, expressive, operative, and audiomedial¹. Moving on to the skopos theory its purpose is to stress the association practical viewpoints of translation, contending that the shape of the TT ought to be decided by the function or skopos² that is planning to fulfill within the target context, in this theory the translator should have the capability to choose the translation strategy, which is the most appropriate to achieve the wanted TT purpose. According to Newmark (1991 in Baker, 2005:237) skopos theory is linguistically in favor of simplification, but at the same time works against the linguistic richness and authority of the SL and as Baker (237) says a translated text, may have completed its skopos perfectly, but may lack accuracy on a syntactical, lexical or stylistic level.

¹ It refers to films and visual or spoken advertisements which supplement the other three functions with visual images, music, etc. (As-Safi, 2011:35).

² The Greek word for “aim” or “purpose”.

Another important theory is sociolinguistic, which depends on connecting translation with communicative theory and information theory, emphasizing on receptor's view. A characteristic feature of these theory is the use of many figures of speech, such as metaphors, irony. Part of the sociolinguistic theories is the interpretative theory, which was a reaction towards the restricted views of linguistics and as Lavault states translation should be based also on the cognitive context of the SL, not only on the linguistic meaning (1996:97). Systems Theories and more specific the polysystem theory, which has its roots solidly laid in Russian Formalism in the 1920s (Even-Zohar 1990), but it made its appearance more evident in 1969 and 1970. In the Dictionary of Translation Studies polysystem theory is defined as a theory to account the behavior and evolution of literary system, as a part of social, cultural, literary, and historical framework. There are two more parts of the system theories the Manipulation theory and the Aesthetic Communication theory. According to the first one, translation suggests a degree of control of the ST for a certain reason since the interpretation handle brings the TT into line with a specific model that ought to secure social acknowledgment within the target culture. The second one is spotted mostly in literary translation and its purpose is to create an aesthetic communication between the translator and the target reader (As-Safi, 1994:96). The last subtheory is the relevance theory that is connected to pragmatics, whose purpose was to show the interpretive use of language as distinct from the descriptive one.

Cultural Studies and Cultural Translation

The issue of cultural differences and the “untranslatable” cultural-bound words and phrases have impeded translators' work since ancient Rome. The existence of Cultural studies has set the pillar for the conflict resolution between different cultures and civilizations. This interdisciplinary field was developed by British Marxist academics during the late 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. The purpose of this field is to make evident how cultural practices are related to social phenomena and power systems, such as, ideology, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and class structures. Because of the

non-static nature of the term “culture” this field is constantly renewed. In order to explain the constant changes and the diversity of the cultures, cultural studies are closely associated with feminist theory, social and political theory, literary theory, philosophy, translation studies, history and many more.

Due to all the above and the influence of cultural studies, two new terms- the “cultural turn” and the “cultural translation”- appeared in the field of translation, which facilitated translators’ work and changed the course of translation. The first term was proposed by Snell-Hornby (1990) and came into being thanks to Lefevere and Bassnett (1990). For Snell-Hornby the “translation unit” (unit for analysis) should move from the text to the culture. Because of the important work on the cultural approach in translation studies, Bassnett and Lefevere managed to reveal the importance and the influence of the cultural characteristics, the social background, and the cultural tradition in translation. Study methods based on the cultural aspect expanded the scope of translation studies from strictly linguistic to cultural also. This “turn” played crucial role in Lawrence Venuti’s vision on translation. Moving on to the term “cultural translation” it seems that it was initially introduced by the cultural theorist Homi K. Bhabha in his work *The Location of Culture* (1994/2004). His perspective on cultural translation is based on his general beliefs that “Translation is the performative nature of cultural communication” (1994/2004:326) and that the term culture refers not only to migration factors, but also to all minority cultures (e.g., feminism, gay and lesbian writing). In general, “cultural translation” focuses on cultural processes and is based on the cultural hybridity, the social anthropology (describes the foreign culture), the actor-network theory (“translation sociology”) and the sociologies that analyses communication between cultural groups, such as immigrants.

How social features affect translation-Social Translation

With the appearance of the “cultural translation” in the translation field was brought to the spotlight the “social translation”. This “social turn” showed that translation is

not all about language, but also social features that affect the creation of the original and translated text. Some of the most influential factors are age, sex, race, education, social class, and peer-group identification. In that context are, also, included the social dialects a feature that usually is difficult to be handled by a translator. The gender as a social feature has played an important role during the history of translation and that is because they share the trait of inferiority (John Florio, 1603). In other words, translators and women have historically been the weaker figures in their respective hierarchies: translators are handmaidens to authors, women inferior to men (Simon, 2005:2). Feminist translation theory has as its purpose to identify the reasons why both translation and women were at the bottom of the social and literal scale and to explain the meaning of the term “fidelity”. For women, in the past, translation has been their lifeline and a means of expressing their political, social, or religious opinion. Around eighteenth century the term “feminist translation” makes its first appearance. (Simon, 2005:110). Due to the feminist feature these translations were criticized for lack of fidelity, but because of the cultural turn, the stereotypes against women and translation were challenged. It is worth mentioning that social translation is closely connected to sociology of translation, which refers to translators’ social features and how the combination of all these can affect the way they perceive the ST. Therefore, the social aspect refers both to the original text’s various socio-cultural features and the translator’s social background and his critical view on the ST.

How cultural and social translation is connected to invisibility

As it was previously mentioned the existence of cultural and social translation has helped translators to create more accurate and equivalent translated texts by dealing with linguistic and cultural problems. This kind of change gave them the chance to become “invisible”, i.e., the ability to “overcome” any cultural obstacle they may face during the translation process. In other words, translators now can use many techniques and strategies that help them create texts that look like originals by domesticating the source text’s cultural features. This condition was called “Translator’s Invisibility” many translators stand for this, but there are others, who

believe that invisibility can lead to the gradual disappearance of diversity and different culture, as the reader does not get familiar with the “foreign” that can open his horizons and offer him knowledge. The first one that officially supported the “foreign” feature in the concept of translation, was Antoine Berman with his work *Translation and The Trials of The Foreign* (2000), which inspired Lawrence Venuti, who opposed to the invisibility and domestication and supported his thesis through his work *Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2004).

MAIN PART

Domestication-Foreignization

Berman's work *Translation and The Trials of The Foreign*

Antoine Berman was a French translator, philosopher, historian, and theorist in the field of translation that studied philosophy at the University of Paris and in 1984 published his major theoretical work *L'Epreuve de l'étranger*, in English translated as *The experience of the foreign*. In this part, however, we will deal with his work *Translation and the trials of the foreign* and his contribution to the TS as a defender of *the foreign* in translation and his influence on other scholars, like Lawrence Venuti who translated his previously referred essay. Berman's theory of "Twelve deforming tendencies" in translation is inspired or otherwise influenced by German Romanticism and specifically by Friedrich Schleiermacher

Berman's work begins with the analysis of the phrase “The trial of the foreign” in the context of literary translation, as in this genre cultural characteristics play a greater role in the translation process and make the translator's work difficult, in how he will approach the text to be translated. For him, translation is both the ‘trial of the foreign’ and ‘the trial for the foreign’, since it is both ‘aiming to open up the foreign

work to us in its utter foreignness' and uprooting the foreign work 'from its own language-ground', in a way forcing it to exile (Berman, 1985:284). As far as non-literary works are concerned, the writer distinguishes them from the above, as in these the element of culture it is limited, since many times the "foreign" feature adapts to the requirements of the target language. In his essay, Berman refers to the strategy of "naturalization", -an existent technique to neglect the foreign from the translation-, that later will be equivalent to Venuti's "domestication". Translation's purpose is, as Berman states (p.227), "receiving the foreign as foreign", an idea that inspired Venuti develop the term "foreignization". Venuti's term will be analysed in the next parts. The writer explains that a translator should act within the limits of free intervention, respecting the text to be translated as well as its cultural elements, this process, as Berman called it, is characterized as "analytic of translation", which is based on "negative analytic". The negative analytic is primarily concerned with ethnocentric, annexationist translations and hypertextual translations (Pastiche, imitation, adaptation, free writing), where the play of deforming forces is freely exercised. (Berman, 1985b/2004:278). An important part of his work is the creation of subsections of the twelve deforming forces or tendencies, the value of which he supports by citing examples from translations of well-known literary works. More specifically these tendencies are:

Berman's "Twelve deforming tendencies".

1. rationalization
2. clarification
3. expansion
4. ennoblement and popularization
5. qualitative impoverishment
6. quantitative impoverishment
7. destruction of rhythms
8. destruction of underlying networks of signification
9. destruction of linguistic patterns
10. destruction of vernacular networks and their eroticization
11. destruction of expressions an idioms
12. effacement of the superimposition of languages

Source: Berman, A., *Translation and the Trials of the Foreign, The Translation Studies Reader* (2000).

Having described the deforming forces, Berman concludes his work by emphasizing that his theory is directly related to literary translation, because in this genre it is important to achieve both the transmission of the message of the original and the assimilation of various cultural characteristics. In general, Berman writes a book based on his theory about the "foreign" feature and analyzes why its existence is necessary in literary translations.

Analysis of the terms "Domestication" and "Foreignization" and Their role in translation

Berman's theoretical work was a source of inspiration for Laurence Venuti to introduce the terms "domestication" and "foreignization", to familiarize the "foreignizing" strategy in mainstream translation and to compose the book *The Translator's Invisibility*. Before analyzing the terms "foreignization" and "domestication", it is worth noting that the German Schleiermacher had spoken about these two types of strategy in 1813, but it was Laurence Venuti who gave them these names. His thesis on these two terms will be furtherly analyzed in the next part of this essay. More specific, foreignization is a source-culture-oriented translation which strives to translate the source language and culture into the target one, to keep a kind of exotic flavor (Feng, Jianwen, 1993). While domestication is the translation process in which, all special or unusual expressive means are transferred to the translation in a way that is understood by the readers of the target language. The purpose of this method is "a term adopted by Venuti to describe the translation strategy in which a lucid, fluent style is used in order to minimize the foreignness of the foreign text for TL readers (Shuttleworth & Cowies 1997)".

At this point it should be mentioned that Venuti was a supporter of foreignization because he believed that between the source text and translation must exist a distance, aiming at highlighting different cultures, but also at enriching the target language. On the contrary, other theorists such as Nida (1964) argued that a translation is

considered successful only when the translator can assimilate into the target language the foreign language elements. More specific, Nida's "dynamic" or "functional equivalence" in translation "aims at complete naturalness of expression," (Nida 1964:159), which signals the technique of fluent translation in his works that involves domestication. However, there are those who believe that emphasis should be given on the unity of opposition and compatibility of the two methods (Zhu, Jianping, 2002), and the combination of these should be done depending on the textual type and translation requirements. The textual genre directly affects the translation method, that will be used, as for example in scientific articles the method of foreignization is preferred, while in novels domestication is usually used (Venuti, 2004: 1,4,6,41,116). The translator is the one who, based on his experience, judgment, style, purpose, but also the ethical characteristics he wants to represent through his work, will choose which of the two strategies he wants to implement.

The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation-Venuti

Venuti's thesis on invisibility, analysis of his work's main points

Lawrence Venuti is Professor of English at Temple University, an expert on translation theory, history and practice, a translator from Italian, French and Catalan, a researcher of early modern literature and foreign-language poetic traditions and a member of the editorial and advisory board of several journals, including *Target*, *International Journal of Translation Studies* and many more. He is famous for his theoretical works, such as *The Translator's Invisibility* (2nd ed., 2008), *The Scandals of Translation* (1999) and *Translation Changes Everything* (2013).

Venuti's work "The Translator's Invisibility" is a book that marked the evolution of translation and affected many theorists' opinion on translation studies. The purpose of the book was the critical analysis and the evaluation of translation from the 17th century until today. Venuti's research showed that the method of "fluency" was the

most preferable compared to others, establishing a single rule for foreign language literature in English, which at the same time helped to “cover” cultural and imperialist characteristics and foreign values that existed in foreign texts. Exploring the history of translation, the author found translation theories and techniques that combine accuracy, fluency, but also the transmission of different linguistic and cultural elements in the final text. He, also, introduces in his book the previously mentioned terms, “domestication” and “foreignization”, and build their connection to the “invisibility” feature, by analyzing and explaining them.

As the title of the book suggests, the term "Invisibility" plays an important and primary role.

“Invisibility” is the term I will use to describe the translator’s situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American culture. It refers to two mutually determining phenomena: one is an illusionistic effect of discourse, of the translator’s own manipulation of English; the other is the practice of reading and evaluating translations that has long prevailed in the United Kingdom and the United States, among other cultures, both English and foreign language (Venuti 2004:14).

Goes on to state that translations, regardless of their textual form, should only be judged positively if they have the invisibility element. The only way for a translated text to be accepted is if it easily readable, does not include foreign features that will be difficult for the target audience to understand them and must follow strictly the syntactical rules of the target language (2004:2-6). This illusion effect that translators try to achieve comes from their need to make their work likeable both to the readers and critics. Even though the criticism on translation, mostly on English-language translated texts, is based on fluency and transparency, during the last years, and according to Venuti, there seems to be a tendency for more careful criticism that will not focus so much on these factors alone. A fluent translation, based on that time’s beliefs, consisted of the following elements; it must be written in modern English, be

free of foreign words and slang elements, follow the grammatical and syntactical rules of the TL, and have the proper rhythm definition.

According to the writer the economic and political power gained by scientific research, the development of the media, the advertising, the increased commercialization during the 20th century, as the need for purely instrumental use of language, affect every type of communication, are responsible for the extensive use and establishment of the transparency technique in translation. The same view was held by Bernstein (1986), whose experience has shown that the dominance of transparency was entrenched due to his economic value. This tendency for invisibility, or otherwise domestication as Venuti characterizes the method of smoothing out the differences of the source text, brings the translator to the individualistic conception of authorship, a perception that may devalue the translation, but indicates the purpose of the translation. The aim is to create the illusion that this is an original text through transparency. Translators, then, are called upon to create as writers. For this reason, they do not accept the recognition they deserve.

Having stated his opinion about invisibility, in order to explain the extend use of the “transparency”, he refers to the previously mentioned terms, "domestication" and "foreignization". Venuti creates these terms and gives translator the option to choose a method that is based either on invisibility method or a method that emphasizes on different linguistic and cultural characteristics of the ST. Eugene Nida is an exponent of the domesticating method ,and as it was referred to the previous part of this essay Nida supported that fluent strategy and "dynamic equivalence" are important for translation, so is domestication. For Nida accuracy in translation depends on generating an equivalent effect in the target-language culture and the dynamic equivalent translation is the mean for “intercultural communication. Also, his support for domesticating translation is explicitly based on a transcendental view of humanity, as a timeless essence, as he does in his *Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions* (1954). On the other hand, for Venuti “foreignization” is the mean to battle the ethnocentric violence against translation.

Venuti tries to highlight the right action that a modern translator should have, through a series of genealogies, during an era where the influence of the Anglo–American culture is growing. Genealogy is a form of historical representation that depicts, not a continuous progression from a unified origin, an inevitable development in which the past fixes the meaning of the present, but a discontinuous succession of division and hierarchy, domination, and exclusion, which destabilize the seeming unity of the present by constituting a past with plural, heterogeneous meanings. (Venuti, 2004:39). Venuti’s aim is to find the source of fluent translating, but also to analyze other translation techniques that were used since translation made its appearance. Venuti’s purpose is to draw the translators’ and audience attention on the “ethnocentric violence” that translation must deal with and impel the first ones to use translation techniques that make evident the foreign feature.

Venuti through genealogies tries to explain how the canonization of the English language translation is connected to fluency, transparency, and domestication. It is pointed out that the dominance of this method, since the modern period, has led to the ignorance and the opposition to anything foreign and different such as, foreign cultural values, even to domestic elements, like dialects. The translation strategies that were against transparency, were rejected immediately. The appearance of the fluent translation is more evident since the 17th century and a characteristic example is Sir John Denham and his work *The destruction of Troy, An Essay upon the second book of Virgilis Aeneis. Written in the year 1636*. Denham uses in his works the method of “free translation”, especially in poems, because this text type demands linear syntax, univocal meaning and varied meter that produce and illusionist effect. Denham’s example shows that the view on the translated text and the use of the domesticating translation were affected by the social background of the translator and the target audience. In other words, the translations of that time should be fluent and be understandable by the elite.

During the 18th and 19th century transparency is closing connected to stylistic elegant, whose extensive use can create a ridiculous result. In general, there was a belief that

the existing domesticating method helps on the persistence of the equivocal relationship between the source text and the translation, by replacing or excluding some of the cultural-textual features of the ST. At the end of the century, Alexander Fraser Tytler with his work *Essay on The Principles of Translation* (1791), laid the foundations and created principles, laws, and presets for the canonization of fluency in translation. Every decision made by the translator should be guided by the sense of “correct taste” based on “exquisite feeling”, even if it means breaking the laws of effective translations. By the 19th century the translation strategy that elides the linguistic and the cultural differences of the ST had become a canon in English-language translation. Domesticating translation’s canonicity was so undeniable that it survived the collapse of the bourgeois public sphere. At the same period, Frere (1820:481) stated that the base for the history of fluent translation was the liberal humanism, in which subjectivity is considered as both self-determining and dictated by human nature, individualistic but generic transcending cultural differences and social conflict to embody “every side of the human character” (Frere, 1820:481).

During the early modern period, the sanctification of fluency in English-language translation circumscribed the translator's alternatives and established their cultural and political stakes. A translator could use either the now-traditional domesticating method, which involves reducing the foreign text to dominant cultural values in English, or a foreignizing method, which involves applying ethnodeviant pressure to those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text. At this period, through the translations of Catullus poems it seemed that the transparent poetic discourse and the transparent translation were established. The translators that deviated from the bourgeois values and adopted the foreignizing method were negatively criticized. The two alternatives offered to translators, at a certain point in the development of fluency, were represented by Nott and Lamb. They demonstrate that in foreignizing translation the distinction between the foreign text and the translated text can only be made by domestic values that differ from those in dominance.

Venuti in his effort to analyze the term “foreign” in the context of the foreignization, connects it with the term “nation”. Firstly, even though this translating method was not popular in English language, it was popular in German. Friedrich Schleiermacher was its exponent, who believed that translation was a means to enrich the German language, to create an elite literature and elevate the German culture. In other words, Schleiermacher connected the concept of foreignization to the concept of nation and how the second one can be exalted by the entrance of foreign features. This kind of high culture that Schleiermacher desired to create was only directed to the elite of that time. Newman (1860) had expressed a similar opinion with some differences. He was one of the first Victorian translators that adopted foreignizing strategies opposing to English fluent domestication. Furthermore, he was a supporter of this method because he believed that it was the only way that liberal education and familiarity with different cultures would become a reality. What differentiated him from Schleiermacher was that his works were aimed to a wider audience and not just to the elite class. Their translation work was negatively criticized mostly from Arnold because the literature tendencies of that time prescribed the existence of fluency and transparency through the translated text. Similar method to Newman had followed and the Victorian translator William Morris who created an archaic lexicon full of literary forms (cf. Chandler 1970:209-230).

The foreignization’s ability on highlighting the different linguistic and cultural feature of a foreign language text in the translated one, is connected according to Venuti, to the term “dissidence”. The supporters of the dissidence feature had as a purpose the discovery of alternative translating methods to the domesticating tradition. The most important supporter of this tendency was the Italian writer Iginio Ugo Tarcetti (1839-1969), who inspired many other authors to use foreignizing methods. More specific he was a member of a closed group of authors-poets that with their works were standing against bourgeois values and the prudence of the time (scapigliatura). Tarcetti was also the first one that introduced in the Italian fiction the fantastic element, a foreign discourse opposed to bourgeois values, and he was the first practitioner of the Gothic tale in Italy. The reference of this author by Venuti was not made by chance, because Tarcetti demonstrates that foreignizing translation takes the shape of foreign text that

departs from prevailing literary canons in the target-language culture as well as divined translation practices.

The term “margin” plays a crucial role in *Translator’s Invisibility* as it refers to the attitude some modernists adopted, towards domestication, to differentiate themselves from the tradition that existed in Anglo-American culture and highlight other cultures. Venuti brings as example modernists, who were against hegemony of Anglo-American culture and brought to the surface values and foreign linguistic and cultural features that reveal the importance of the diversity in the literature. Characteristic example is the differences between the translations of Cavalcanti’s work *Sonnets and Ballate of Guido Cavalcanti* by Pound and Rosseti. The first one was a supporter of foreignization and used an archaic lexicon and style like Cavalcanti’s and his discourses were described as “Pre-Elizabethan English” (Ibid:250), while the second one’s translation was based in fluency by simplifying the syntax and the language. Pound inspired Zukofskys, who demonstrate the foreignizing process through translating Catullus creations. Pound’s work, also, affected Paul Blackburn’s (1926-1971) work, as he was one of the few post-war modernists that were against transparency.

Venuti explains that he “met” “domestication” through “Simpatico”, a term that describes the mental connection between the translator and the writer of the original text. This connection can be succeeded only if they meet in the beginning of their careers. Venuti came really close to the term “Simpatico”, due to his Italian friend, De Angelis, but he early realized that “simpatico” and “domestication” means the readers’ deception by creating an illusion of transparency. That was the time Venuti started supporting foreignization. He stood against domestication, by following the resistance strategy, embodying the authors’ thinking in the translated text, approaching the text using the concept of human agency, following the rhythm of the ST, using language like the original and giving a sense of ambiguity in his translations. As Venuti states translation must be approached as a procedure that its purpose is to transmit the meaning of the source text to the translated, making evident the similarity and the differences between the languages and the cultures, giving the chance to the reader to

experience the different. In this period new translating strategies are developed, such as “abusive fidelity”, which is a mode of translation that “values experimentation, tampers with usage, seeks to match the polyvalencies and plurivocities or expressive stresses of the original by producing its own”, by Philip E. Lewis (1985: 43). *The translator’s invisibility: A History of Translation*, as Venuti argues, is his way of encouraging other translators to mobilize against domestication and to incorporate the foreign feature into their translations without covering it up.

His works influence and reference to works inspired by Venuti's thesis

It should be mentioned here that Venuti shook the translation community with his innovative ideas and influenced many modern and later translators. An example is Anthony Pym, who is an admirer of Venuti and his work, but does not hesitate to judge his views and, perhaps, to question some points in Venuti’s book, in his work *Venuti’s Visibility*³. He was, also, criticized by the professor-writer-translator, Anne Coldiron, through her work, *Visibility now: Historizing foreign presences in Translation* where she reviews and judges the issues that Venuti deals within his book, while doing a historical search about Visibility, in the context of the translation. Through her research Coldiron finds out that Venuti’s research and analysis on “invisibility” and “visibility” was lacking information. It is worth mentioning that according to Coldiron, visibility during the medieval and early modern translation had a different meaning, than it had during 18th, 19th and 20 centuries. Medieval visibility was linked to the moral and intellectual authority of the translated text. Specifically, she mentions that Venuti’s historical analysis was emphasizing only on invisibility and its supporters and made little reference to those who were supporting foreignization, even before modernism period. Characteristic example is the medieval translators, who were trying their best to make their presence visible throughout their texts, and as Coldiron states “visibility was the fetiched thing” (2012:191). Coldiron’s thesis on medieval translators’ “visibility” is inspired by Rita Copeland and scholars’ work *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics*,

and Translation in the Middle Ages, in which medieval translation is furtherly examined. “Visibility” during the early modern translations, was related to “imitatio” and the Italian “sprezzatura”, two values that “obligated” translators to make themselves visible in their text, the most important supporter was Thomas Watson. Overall, Coldiron presents the information and the visibility aspect that Venuti “forgot” to mention during his research on “translator’s invisibility”. The truth is that Venuti’s work emphasizes mostly on the historical evolution of the terms “invisibility” and “domestication” and their dominance in translation, but he does not make any reference to the historical presence of the term “visibility”, even though it had a dynamic effect on translation field. A deeper research on “visibility”, can help appraise Venuti’s Invisibility better.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of translation theories, the emergence of cultural studies, the works of well-known translators, such as Freidrich Schleiermacher, Antoine and Lawrence Ventuti, whose aim is to emphasize on the cultural features and especially the feature of the “foreign” but also the contradictions that arise between theorists on translation methods, aim at understanding the basic terms-points of the text, such as “invisibility”, “domestication”, “foreignization” and “visibility”. During the translation process everything must be considered, and translator has to make the right decisions to achieve his previous referred goals.

Translation is the art of choosing. The translator must be able to “weigh” the data he has and the changes that his profession is facing, and understand the linguistic, cultural, and semantical aspects of the ST, so that he can choose between many theories and strategies, such as choosing domestication or foreignization. Foreignization, in 21st century, is considered the keynote in literature translation, as it is a method that satisfies the target audience and fulfils the ST’s purpose. As Berman and Venuti state the tolerance and the acceptance of “foreign features” in translation can be succeeded, through foreignization. When foreignization cannot express fluently the contents of the ST, domestication is the strategy that can easily pass the spirit of the original text.

ΙΟΝΙΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ
ΣΧΟΛΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ & ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΗΣ - ΔΙΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ
Τμήμα Ξένων Γλωσσών Μετάφρασης Και Διερμηνείας

Therefore, it would be best for translators to adopt foreignization and do not hesitate using domestication, when it is necessary. Only when translators properly choose foreignization and domestication and combine them appropriately, can they bring satisfactory translations to readers, and at the same time fulfill the duty of intercultural communication (Xu, Chongxin, 1991).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AS-SAFI, A. B. (2011) *Translation Theories, Strategies and Basic Theoretical Issues* (pp. 12-45). Jordan, Petra University.
- BASIL, H. (2013). *Teaching and Researching Translation* (2nd ed., pp. 3-139). London and New York: Routledge, Taylor& Francis Group.
- BASIL H., & Munday, J. (2003). *Translation: An advanced resource book* (1st ed., pp. 3-120). London and New York: Routledge, Taylor&Francis Group.
- BHABHA, H. (1994). *The location of culture* (1st ed.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- BERMAN, A. (2000), *Translation and the Trials of the Foreign, The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, Taylor& Francis Group.
- BERNEKING, S. (2016). *A Sociology of Translation and the Central Role of the Translator*. (V:67(3), pp.265 -281). The Bible Translator.
- BERNSTEIN, C. (1986) *Content's Dream: Essays 1975–1984*, Los Angeles: Sun & Moon.
- [Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia \(2015, July 26\). cultural studies. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/cultural-studies .](https://www.britannica.com/topic/cultural-studies)
- [Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia \(2008, December 19\). sociolinguistics. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/science/sociolinguistics .](https://www.britannica.com/science/sociolinguistics)
- COLDIRON A.E.B. (2012): *Visibility now: Historicizing foreign presences in translation*, Translation Studies, (5:2, pp.189-200).
- CONWAY, K. (2013). *Cultural Translation: Two Modes*. TTR, (26(1), pp.15-36). doi: 10.7202/1036948ar.

- ELNAILI, S. (2014). *Domestication and Foreignization Strategies in Translating Sinbad of The Arabian Nights* (pp. 49-63). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 3013. https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/3013.
- FIRDAUS, S. (2012). *Evolution of Translation Theories & Practice*. Lahore: Dept. of Islamia University Bahawalpur
- GARCIA, J. A. (2019). *Invisible Translations* (pp. 9-18). Amsterdam: Sandberg Instituut.
- GONZALEZ, M., & TOLRON, F. (2006). *Translating Identity and the Identity of Translation*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- NEWMARK, P. (1981) *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- NIDA, EUGENE A. 1976. *A Framework for the Analysis and Evaluation of Theories of Translation*. In R.W. Brislin. (ed), (pp. 47-79) *Translation: Applications and Research*. New York: Gardner Press.
- NIDA EUGENE A. (1991). *Theories of Translation*. *TTR*, (4(1), 19–32). <https://doi.org/10.7202/037079ar>
- NORD CH. (2007). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approafches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing
- ØDEMARK J. (2019) *What is Cultural Translation?* *The Translator*, (25:3, pp. 293-297).
- O'SULLIVAN C. (2012) *Introduction: Rethinking methods in translation history*, *Translation Studies*, (5:2, pp.131-138).
- PALOPOSKI, O. (2011). *Domestication and foreignization*.
- PEREZ FERNADEZ, J. (2017). *TRANSLATION, LITERATURE AND CULTURAL STUDIES*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- PYM, A. (1996). *Venuti's Visibility. Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, (8(1), 165-177). doi: 10.1075/target.8.1.12pym.

- PYM, A., SHLESINGER, M., & JETTMAROVA, Z. (2006). *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. [doi: 10.1075/btl.67](https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.67).
- SIMON, S. (2005). *Gender in Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- VENUTI, L. (2004). *The Translator's Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor& Francis Group.
- VENUTI, L. (2012). *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed.). Abingdon & New York: Routledge, Taylor& Francis Group.
- WANG, F. (2014). *An Approach to Domestication and Foreignization from the Angle of Cultural Factors Translation* (4th ed.). Finland: ACADEMY PUBLISHER.
- XU, CH. (1991). *Cultural Communication and Translation*. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, (2, 29-34).
- YANG, W. (2010). *Brief Study on Domestication and Foreignization in Translation* (1st ed.). Finland: ACADEMY PUBLISHER.
- YAN, C. and HUANG, J. (2014) *The Culture Turn in Translation Studies*. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, (4, 487-494). doi:[10.4236/ojml.2014.44041](https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.44041).
- ZAKHIR, M. (2009). *The Theories of Translation*. Morocco: University of Soultan Moulay Slimane.
- ZAMBRANA, J. *Cultural Factors and translation*. Málaga : Universidad de Málaga.
- ZHENG, J. (2017). *An Overview of Sociology of Translation: Past, Present and Future* (7th ed.). Canada: Canadian Center of Science and Education. [doi:10.5539/ijel.v7n4p28](https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n4p28).