

Problems of translating the sociocultural elements of the Sudanese novel – a comparative study of models translated from English into Arabic (The Translator) as a case

Younis Ismail Mohammed¹, Halima Al Cheikh²

¹University of Oran1, Email address, Mohammedkoka1@outlook.com

²University of Oran 1, Email address, cheikhhalima@yahoo.com

Received: 08/03/2023

Accepted: 04/11/2023

Published: 10/12/2023

Abstract:

Based on Lawrence Venuti's (1995) methods of domesticating and foreignizing the translation, this paper firstly studies the microstrategies employed by the translator in the translation of sociocultural elements of "The Translator" a novel written by the Sudanese novelist Leila Abouela. The paper aims to identify Venuti's most used method according to Anne Schjoldager's (2008) taxonomy of microstrategies as well revealing the possible reasons behind translator's choices. Then, a comparative analysis of our selected corpus composed of sociocultural elements and their translations will be conducted aiming to reveal the difficulties that faced the translator. The paper concludes that all domesticated cases were due to the existence of direct linguistic, idiomatic counterparts in the target language. The paper also shows that most of the expressions, sayings, and proverbs that well known worldwide have been foreignized. The results confirm that the cultural gap between two languages is proportional, the closer the distance the greater possibility of domestication.

Keywords: Translation, language, culture, domestication, foreignization

Corresponding author: Younis Ismail M, e-mail: Mohammedkoka1@outlook.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The translation in its classical and simplest definition can be defined as it has been stated by Catford (1965) in his book entitled “A Linguistic Theory of Translation”. In this book Catford considers the translation as: “The replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)”.(Catford, 1965:20). This orientation represents the linguistic model of translation and sees the central problem of translation in finding TL translation equivalents. However, this concept has been substituted since the late of 1970s, when the focus of attention in translation moved away from such narrowly linguistic-oriented approaches to the contemporary cultural ones that deal with translation as an integrated process.

The cultural based translation began with the concept of dynamic equivalence developed by Nida and Taber (1969). In this approach they described the process of translating as: “translating consist of reproducing in the receptor language the closet natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style”, (Nida, 1969:12). In spite of the fact that Nida and Taber did not address explicitly the matter of culture, it can be said that they paved the way for this new orientation in the translation through their explanation of their concept “closet natural equivalent”.

The real shift towards cultural approach of translation could be associated to works of influential translation scholars appeared in the early nineties such as Vermeer Hans, André Lefevere, Susan Bassnett, and later, Lawrence Venuti well known through his concept of invisibility.

This paper aims to demonstrate the implementation of domestication and foreignization methods in the translation of sociocultural references in the Arabic translation of the Translator (2007), a novel written in English by the Sudanese novelist Leila Abouela and translated into Arabic by Alkhatim Adlan. Based on Venuti’s (1995) methods and Schjoldager’s (2008) translation micro-strategies, this paper will firstly study the micro-strategies that have been used by the translator in the translation of sociocultural elements to identify the Venuti’s most used strategy according to Schjoldager’s microstrategies, as well revealing the possible reasons behind translator’s choices. The study will also attempt to shed the light on the impact of cultural gap between the two languages of work on the translator’s choices, In other words the geographical distance between work’s languages.

In this regard, we will present a comparative corpus in which our selected sociocultural elements will be comparatively analyzed with their translations, aiming to determine the difficulties faced the translator and to find out some integrated solutions hopefully will contribute in overcoming the obstacles that could face literary translation.

2- Language and culture:

Historically the relationship between language and culture has been seen as homologous because of their parallels, interdependence, and mutual influence. This sophisticated relationship or togetherness, has been clearly described by Strauss (1958) as he quoted:

“The relationship between language and culture is an exceedingly complicated one. In the first place, language can be said to be a result of culture: The language which is spoken by one population is a reflection of the total culture of the population. But one can also say that language is a part of culture. It is one of those many things which make up a culture” (Strauss, 1958:68).

The aim from citing Straus’s anthropological point of view here is not only to demonstrate the interdependence or the inextricably linked nature that exist between language and culture, but also to indicate that these two notions appear and develop together. The language as a system of communication is mainly composed of words, while the culture represents the environment in which these words have been produced, but what interests us most here is the importance of the role played by culture in the interpretation of the meaning and the impact of this relationship on translational process. In a linguistically based transference of meaning, the translation could be defined as it has been cited by Catford (1965) in his book entitled “A Linguistic Theory of Translation” in which he defines the translation as:

“Translation may be defined as follows: the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) [source language] by equivalent textual material in another language (TL) [target language]” (Catford, 1965:20).

The above mentioned definition represents the first impression about any translation, an impression that comes generally to one’s mind that the

translation simply a replacement of a written text or spoken speech from one language into another by a translator who masters two language. It is clear that this point of view deals with the translation only at semantic level of meaning, in other words it focuses only on textual structure of the text, however, this narrow vision has been broaden to some extent by Newmark (1988) who defines the translation as:

"What is translation? Often, though not by any means always, it is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text"
(Newmark, 1988:5).

By focusing on the meaning and the message intended by the author, it is possible to say here that Newmark was very precise in his definition, as he implicitly indicates a possible involvement of other factors as long as the meaning can't always be transferred in the way intended by the author. Newmark's view could be seen as one of the turning points that paved a way towards more comprehensive approaches particularly the cultural ones. The involvement of cultural factors alongside the linguistic process in the translation was very clear according to Vermeer's vision:

"Translation involves linguistic as well as cultural phenomena and processes and therefore is a cultural as well as linguistic procedure, and as language, now understood as a specific language, is part of a specific culture, translation is to be understood as a "cultural" phenomenon dealing with specific cultures: translation is a culture transcending process" (Vermeer, 1992: 40).

In this context, the meaning can't be limited to a singular textual space, rather an attention should be payed to the contextual dimension as long as the meaning can't always be expressed in an explicit manner especially to solve problems of cultural nature when the meaning goes beyond linguistic barriers, and that is what proposed by Vinay et Darbelnet.

3- Cultural approach of translation:

The long dominance of linguistic based translation vision which characterised the early translation approaches and theories that focused only in finding the textual equivalence of the source text items in the target language and dealt with translation concept as an interlinguistic activity

only takes place between languages however, this idea began to change because of remarkable advancement witnessed by the field.

Since early 1960th this linguistic based translation vision has been partially replaced by the concept of equivalence, a more broaden concept that constituted the defining factor of the act of translation for many translational theorists, a term that simply means transferring the same meaning as expressed in the source text with a completely different wording. Starting from Nida's (1964) two form of equivalence (formal and dynamic), then Jakobson's (1965) semiotic based notion of equivalence, as well Catford's linguistic based of equivalence. The term has been developed to include other phases of translation process, for example House (1977) established an equivalence theory that based on her concept of overt and covert translations within the framework of improving translations, but the more flexible and broaden one among the concepts of equivalence was that of Koller (1989) which depends on different factors such as extralinguistic content, the connotations of text, the norms of language.

Inspired by above mentioned developments, a new orientation focuses on positioning the translation into wide cultural environment had begun to challenge the old notion of equivalence that dominated the translational space since early 1960th. In 1990, Bassnett and Lefevere co-published their book entitled "Translation, History and Culture" through which they formally put forward the notion of "cultural turn" in translation. Different from traditional approaches, the cultural approach is mainly interested with the important status of culture in translation and the influence of cultural contexts on translation process.

4- Microstrategies:

Beside the advancement at theoretical level, the field of translation has also witnessed a similar progress at the level of translations techniques. Inspired by Delabastita's (1993) transformation categories and Vinay and Darbelnet's (1995) translation procedures, Schjoldager. (2008) established a taxonomy consisting of two models; marcostrategies and microstrategies. According to her, translation macrostrategies are determined by translator's choices at general level, in other words at macro-level decisions which are conventionally divided into two categories: (1) source-text oriented macrostrategy; (2) target-text oriented macrostrategy, but what matters us much in this study are the translation microstrategies. Schjoldager's presents a taxonomy of microstrategies as a guide to resort when translators confront with translation difficulties as well as a way of understanding and analyzing the translation process.

In contrast to the macrostrategies concerned with the general plan of the translator in translation process, the microstrategies are exclusively concerned with specific problems that face the translator at phrases, words, or sentences levels during the translation process:

“While conveying a message from one text to another, a translator has to make a number of specific choices considering the source text she/ he works on” (Schjoldager et al., 2008:89).

Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) in their book entitled “*Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais*” translated into English as *Comparative Stylistics of French and English*, identify two major translation strategies; direct and oblique translation: in direct translation they suggest three strategies (borrowing, literal translation, and *claque*), and four for indirect or oblique translation (*transposition*, *modulation*, *equivalence*, and *adaptation*). While Delabastita’s model of his book entitled “*There’s a Double Tongue: An Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare’s wordplay, with special reference to Hamlet* (1993) provided a model of five strategies with the aim of enabling translators to overcome meaning transfer related problems (*substitution*, *repetition*, *deletion*, *addition* and *permutation*).

Apart from her three new strategies (*paraphrase*, *condensation*, and *explicitation*), Schjoldager’s taxonomy which composed of twelve microstrategies is essentially based on two above-mentioned models as it has been mentioned before, these twelve microstrategies as they have been explained by Schjoldager on the table below are: *direct transfer*, *direct translation*, *oblique translation*, *claque*, *explicitation*, *condensation*, *paraphrase*, *adaptation*, *permutation*, *deletion*, *addition*, and *substitution*.

Schjoldager’s taxonomy of microstrategies:

Direct transfer:	Transfers something unchanged.
Claque:	Transfers the structure or makes a very close translation.
Direct translation:	Translates in a word-for-word procedure.
Oblique translation:	Translates in a sense-for-sense procedure.
Explicitation:	Makes implicit information explicit.
Paraphrase:	Translates rather freely.

Condensation:	Translates in a short way, which may involves implicitation (making explicit information implicit).
Adaptation:	Recreates the effect, entirely or partially.
Addition:	Adds a unit of meaning.
Substitution:	Changes the meaning.
Deletion:	Leaves out a unit of meaning.
Permutation:	Translates in a different place.

5- Venuti's notion of invisibility and his translation methods:

Invisibility is a term used by Venuti in his book entitled "The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation (1995) to describe the translator's situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American culture. Based on Anglo-American translator' orientation and experience, the status of invisibility according to him can manifests through two ways; the translator's attempts to create a fluent translation or through the way that translations are assessed and read. In this sense, according to Venuti, the translator tends to come up with target reader's expectations by providing fluent and easily readable translations as he cites bellow:

"a translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or nonfiction, is just judged by most publishers, reviewers, and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities, makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text-the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the original" (Venuti, 1995:1).

Venuti suggests that the notion of fluency in translation is likely to be based on theory of language that favours the easy intelligibility to polysemy, in this basis, Venuti describes the impact that the fluency has on translator's status according to the notion of invisibility as follows: "the more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and presumably, the more visible the writer or meaning of the foreign text" (Venuti, 1995:2). In contrast, Venuti opposes this illusionary effect made by fluency and insists the importance of manifesting the linguistically and culturally different nature of the source text and showing the crucial role played by the

translator in the production of translations therefor, the translations should be read and evaluated in this basis.

Venuti favours the presence of the foreign identity of the source text in the translation process whatever it takes, rather than creating a false impression through producing what is linguistically and culturally acceptable by the target reader at the expense of the source language and culture, but according to him, the transfer process does not necessarily have to be smooth but understandable as far as possible::

“Translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text with a text that will be intelligible to the target language reader” (Venuti, 1995:18)

Venuti is against any tendency that focuses to generate the naturalness of the target language or culture and insists that any translation process should necessarily evoke a certain degree of forced interaction, a relationship which he designates it as “violence”:

“This relationship points to the violence that resides in the very purpose and activity of translation: the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs, and representations that pre-exist it in the target language, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulation, and reception of texts. (Venuti, 1995:18)

Based on the concept of invisibility, Venuti (1995) presents two basic translation strategies: foreignization (ethnocentric) vs domestication (ethnodeviant). His definitions of these two strategies are essentially based on Schleiermacher’s argument that the translation of a text could only be conducted by two ways: either by leaving the author in peace as much as possible and moving the reader towards him in this case the translator employs a foreignizing strategy, or by leaving the reader in peace as much as possible and moving the author towards him as a way of domesticating the text. In this sense Venuti defines his two methods as follow:

“An ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to the target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home,

and a foreignizing method, and ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad” (Venuti, 1995:20).

In contrast with foreignization where the otherness is well manifested, the domestication strategy tries to eliminate anything may sound unnatural to the target-text audience by reducing the differences and giving a false impression that the work is not translation. Venuti favours the foreignization strategy instead of domesticating the source text through creating a false transparency that makes the translator invisible.

6- Analysis of examples:

Example 1:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
It was useless to catch a bus. The buses were elephants today. (The Translator, 1999: 116).	ليس من الممكن أن تجد باصاً فالباصات صارت أبطأ اليوم من السلاحف. (المتريجة، 2007: 180).

In this example, the translator has translated the expression “the buses were elephants today” into Arabic as “الباصات صارت أبطأ اليوم من السلاحف” (“slower than turtles”). This expression doesn’t involve a one-to-one translation of individual source text items. The translator has used here the **adaptation strategy** as he translated the text differently in the terms of the words to cover the contextual meaning that describes the slowness of the buses in a target oriented way.

The turtle is commonly used by Sudanese people in various contexts as a symbol of slowness. Applying the adaptation strategy and using expression within Sudanese cultural and contextual meaning in the target text instead of an unfamiliar saying, the translator has resorted to **domestication**. The use of this phrase increases the fluency of translation and decreases at the same time the feeling of foreignness that could have been raised through transferring foreign elements with a focus on individual elements rather than the contextual meaning intended by the author.

Example 2:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
I will get off my soap-box now,’ he said and laughed. His laugh turned into a cough. ‘I’m sorry to go on about this. Consider it though. (The Translator,	قال ضاحكاً: سأنزل الآن من منبر الخطيب..... أسف لدخولي في كل هذه التفاصيل، ولكن فكري في الأمر. (المتريجة، 2007: 47-48).

1999: 27).

In the example above, the translator has transferred the expression “I will get off my soap-box” into Arabic as “سأنزل الآن من منبر الخطيب” (“I will get off preacher’s platform now”), which represents a common idiomatic expression in Arabic culture. Here, by applying the **oblique strategy**, the translator has focused on the whole context’s meaning and used the contextual equivalent instead of the semantic equivalent of source-text elements and rendered the meaning within a target text oriented translation

“I will get off preacher’s platform” is a common idiomatic expression in the target language’s culture used with the reference to someone who is telling or giving unwanted advice or expressing his/ her opinions forcefully. Using the oblique strategy and inserting this commonly used idiomatic expression, the translator has resorted to **domestication**. By this way, the translator has provided an easy readability and reduced the foreignness of the text.

Example 3:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
When I started praying my knees hurt, and I also thought “old age”. (The Translator, 1999: 195).	عندما بدأت الصلاة، كانت ركبتي تؤولمانني. وقلت حينها إنه العمر قد دنا من خريفه. (المترجمة، 2007: 300).

In the extract above, the translator has translated the English expression “I also thought old age” into Arabic as "وقلت حينها إنه العمر قد دنا من خريفه" “approaches the autumn of life”. Here also the translator has not resorted to direct transfer strategy, but rather he has conveyed the source text expression by use of a counterpart which does not contain the exact meaning given by the individual elements of it. The translator has applied the **oblique translation** by adopting a target oriented translation with a particular focus on the context of the expression.

“The autumn of life” is often used among Sudanese people to reduce anxiety of old age. By adopting this common idiomatic expression instead of putting a foreign way to talk about the waning of youth, the translator has resorted to **domestication**.

By domesticating the expression, the translator has raised the fluency and lessened the feeling of foreignness leaving no way to the culturally different nature of the source text.

Example 4:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
-------------	-------------

<p>The time was not generous. They looked at their watches at the same time. (The Translator, 1999: 106).</p>	<p>مرّ الوقت سريعاً وهما يتحدثان. تمنيا لو أنه يطول أكثر. (المترجمة، 2007: 165).</p>
--	--

In this example, the translator has translated the English idiomatic expression “the time was not generous” into Arabic as “مرّ الوقت سريعاً” “the time passed quickly”. In this process, the translator has adopted **explicitation strategy** to make this implicit expression fully explicit in the target text by broadening its meaning and putting some extra linguistic elements “they wished the time was longer”.

By adopting a sense-for-sense procedure and conveying the source text elements to the target text in a different way, the translator has resorted to **domestication** rather than employing the meanings of individual linguistic units. However, this fluency of the translated text might prevent the target text reader from making a sense of translation.

Example 5:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
<p>She had a sheet of paper from the mosque with the times of prayer for each day. (The Translator, 1999:31).</p>	<p>لديها إمساكية من المسجد مدونة فيها المواعيد اليومية للإفطار والإمساك. (المترجمة، 2007: 53).</p>

In the example above, the translator has translated the foreign phrase “a sheet of paper” into Arabic language as “إمساكية”. Here, the English expression has been translated with an expression that relates to source text’s religious practices, in terms of the overall meaning intended in the context without any regard to individual words existing in the source text. The translator has employed the **adaptation** strategy to reproduce the meaning given in source text in a different way in the target culture by focusing on the contextual meaning the process that led to **domestication**.

The word “Imsakiah” is derived from Arabic word “imsak” that means beginning the daily fast (islamqa.info). Imsak is a period of time, about 10 minutes, before the dawn prayer begins and when people who have eaten suhoor (pre-dawn meal before the fast begins for the day) must stop eating

With inserting “Imsakiah” instead one-to-one translation, the translator has enhanced the fluency of translation and minimized the foreignness of the text. As a result, the readers are likely to experience a natural reading, however, the translation has not showed the culturally different nature of the source text.

Example 6:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
Looking into her eyes, you have no idea, do you? You're blank. (The Translator, 1999: 144).	قال لها وهو ينظر في عينيها: أنت لست لديك فكرة أي فكرة؟ ماسحة خالص. (المترجمة، 2007: 222).

In this example, the translator has translated the idiomatic English expression “you’re blank into Arabic as “ماسحة خالص” (“completely erased”). Here, to convey the contextual meaning of the source text, the translator has employed the **oblique translation** by turning to sense-for-sense procedure rather than word-to-word strategy.

This idiomatic expression “ماسحة خالص” or “ماسح خالص” according to the sex, is widely used in target language’s culture to express the unawareness or having no idea about something or someone. In this regard, by employing the oblique translation strategy and inserting this cultural idiomatic expression in the target text, the translator has resorted to **domestication**.

With this choice, the translator has provided a fluent translation and enhanced the naturalness of the target text rather than manifesting the cultural difference of the source text as the translated text does not contain any foreign or unnatural element that could violate the cultural conventions of the target text.

Example 7:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
Here though, it’s a different story. I would think that the consensus is “in Rome do as Romans do”. (The Translator, 1999: 19).	أما هنا، فالأمور تختلف، وأعتقد أن المفهوم العام هو: “عندما تكون في روما افعل ما يفعله أهل روما”. (المترجمة، 2007: 34).

In this extract above, the translator has translated the proverb “in Rome do as Romans do” into Arabic as “عندما تكون في روما افعل ما يفعله أهل روما”. In this part, we see that all the linguistic units of this proverb in the source text have been transferred to the target text according to their relevant linguistic equivalents through a word-for-word strategy without missing or modifying anything at linguistic level, so it is possible to state here that the translator has **foreignized** the translation by employing **direct translation** strategy.

This phrase which can be traced back to the 4th century A.D. During the Roman Empire (dictionary.cambridge.org), is used worldwide to mean to follow the traditions or customs of a place being visited.

By keeping the source text elements completely unchanged, the translator has preferred to preserve the taste of the original work instead of inserting

cultural items of target language to make the text sound familiar to the target readers. With this translation, the translator has made it clear that this work belongs to another culture and has been brought by the act of translation.

Example 8:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
They were the foot soldiers. The ones the spears got first, the spears of the dervishes and the Fuzzy-Wuzzies. (The Translator, 1999: 52).	كانوا هم المشاة والضحايا الأولى للسهام... سهام الدراويش "الفظي وطي." (المتريجة، 2007: 85).

In this example, the translator has translated the expression “the spears of dervishes and the Fuzzy-Wuzzies” in the target language as "سهام الدراويش والفظي وطي". As he has preserved the phrase mostly unchanged while transferring it into Arabic, it is possible to be stated here that the translator has used the **direct transfer** strategy.

The word “dervish” which means in Arabic, any member of a Sufi (Muslim mystic) fraternity, or tariqa (www.collinsdictionary.com), refers broadly in target culture to the followers of the Sudanese religious leader AL Mahdi who well known with his courageous wars against British armies during the colonial era, while the expression “Fuzzy-Wuzzies” firstly used in 19th century by British colonial soldiers as a derogatory term for a black person, especially one with fuzzy hair (merriam-webster.com). Today, the term is used in a nursery rhyme but it is no longer used in the context of its old meaning because of its offensive history as a racist slur.

By employing the direct transfer strategy, the translator has **foreignized** the expression and manifested the culturally different nature of the source text, and also he raised the consciousness of the target readers that the text they are reading has originally been written in another language and culture. We can say also that the translator by employing foreignization strategy has avoided to produce negative feeling because of the term’s offensive history.

Example 9:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
The saying went, ‘ Only the able, clever one falls. ’ (The Translator, 1999:113).	يقول المثل "لا يقع إلا الشاطر" (المتريجة، 2007: 175).

In this extract above, the translator has transferred the English saying “only the able clever one falls” into Arabic as "لا يقع إلا الشاطر". It is clear to

note here the direct employment of linguistic elements, almost all the linguistic units of the saying in the source text have been transferred to the target text by employing their relevant linguistic equivalents through a word-for-word translation without missing or modifying anything at linguistic or meaning level, so it is possible to state here that the translator has **foreignized** the translation by employing **direct translation** strategy.

We can say here, the translator has preferred to bring the expression within its own cultural template in order to manifest the culturally different nature of the source text instead of replacing it with its cultural counterpart that exist in the target language. By using this foreign expression, the translation has minimized the easy readability and enhanced the visibility of the translator.

Example 10:

SOURCE TEXT	TARGET TEXT
Of course he believes in God. He's not empty inside. (The Translator, 1999: 90).	طبعاً أنه يؤمن بالله، إنه ليس فارغاً من الداخل. (المتريجة، 2007: 141).

In this example, the translator has translated the linguistic units of the English idiomatic expression “he’s not empty inside” into the target language as "أنه ليس فارغاً من الداخل" (“he’s not empty inside”). In this example, as the translator has used the **direct translation** strategy, it is very clear that the structure of the source text has been translated exactly as it is by replacing its units with their direct linguistic equivalents in the target language through a word-for-word strategy without missing or modifying anything at any level.

In the source culture, “inside emptiness” which has been used here to mean “spiritual emptiness”, is an expression used in various contexts. As we see the meaning has been implicitly expressed instead of saying “he’s not atheist or unbeliever” maybe due to the sensitivity of the religious issues in the source culture, in contrast to the target culture which tends to be direct with such issues.

By employing the direct translation strategy to transfer the meaning of this idiomatic expression without any modification at all levels, the translator has resorted to **foreignization**. As a result, the translation has manifested by inserting this unfamiliar expression, the culturally different nature of the source culture and made the target readers conscious that what they are reading is actually a translated work.

6-Discussion:

This study involves a comparative analysis of “The Translator” and its Arabic Translation in terms of the translation of sociocultural elements. The study firstly examines the microstrategies used by the translator in the translation of sociocultural elements (individual words, idiomatic expressions, and proverbs) and the way in which Venuti’s two methods have been implemented. In the light of the findings and according to the study purposes, the results show that: Among 12 microstrategies proposed by Schjoldager. (2008), only five microstrategies have been used.

According to the findings, the oblique and direct translation are the most commonly used strategies (6) cases, an average of three cases for each strategy. The study revealed that most of the cases in which the translator employed the oblique translation strategy are related to idiomatic expressions and proverbs. According to the results the reason behind this choice was the effectiveness of this strategy and its reliance on meanings in addition to the existence of their equivalents in the target language and culture. The results also show that the translator used many proverbs and expressions that belong to target language and culture, and this made it easier for him to employ a domestication strategy to return the expressions to their original forms and to the culture to which they belong. Thus, the most likely reason behind translator’s reliance on this strategy according to our belief is the writer’s style and her cultural background, given that her roots go back to the culture and the language to which these elements have been transferred. We also noticed that the process of domestication of these elements by employing the oblique strategy contributed significantly to the fluency and readability of the translations, and made the expressions appear natural in the target language and culture, and also raised the value of some meanings and expressions by returning them to their origins by restoring their cultural and social charges that were lost when they were formulated in the foreign language.

Concerning the Direct translation strategy, it is obvious that the translator’s choice was due to the lack or nonexistence of equivalents in the target language and culture. Therefore, we noticed that the translator in most cases in which he foreignized the elements by direct strategy was not able to produce the same effect stated in the original.

The adaptation strategy ranked second in terms of the translator's choices of strategies (2) cases. We noticed that the reason behind his choice was either due to the existence of an image similar to the experience in the target culture or to remove ambiguity from the meaning, which is likely to happen if the sentences are literally transferred.

The direct transfer and explicitation strategies are considered the least employed among the five microstrategies that the translator used in the process of transferring these elements (2) cases an average of one case for each. The translator employed the direct transfer method to foreignize only one element because of the sensitivity of this expression in the target culture for its reliance to the colonization era. Thus, we can say the translator was not faithful to the meaning in this case as long as there is an equivalent to the expression. Regarding the case in which the translator used the explicitation strategy, we noticed that this idiomatic expression is used in a direct way in the target language and culture.

We can say in general and according to these results, the translator was able to fulfill the meaning almost in all cases. Beside the effectiveness of the strategies used by the translator and accuracy of translator's choices, the results also indicate the significance of the role played by cultural gap between the writer and translator in the quality of the translation.

Conclusion:

This comparative study tries to reveal the most used strategies in the translation of our novel's sociocultural elements according to Schjoldager's (2008) taxonomy of microstrategies in the light of Venuti's (1995) methods of domesticating and foreignizing the translation. It also tries to explore the possible reasons and motives behind translator's choices of strategies. Based on the findings and their discussions presented in the case study, the results show that the oblique and the direct translation are the most employed strategies among the microstrategies proposed by Schjoldager. All the domesticated cases were due to the existing idiomatic counterparts in the target language and culture. Therefore, the results indicate that 5 out of 6 domesticated cases have been domesticated because of their direct corresponding idiomatic counterparts that exist in the target language's culture.

Only one out of six domesticated cases has been domesticated by explicitation strategy through adding some extra parts in order to re-create the contextual meaning in a way that could suit the target readers' way of expression. The translator kept 4 cultural expressions completely unchanged in the translation process which represents the total number of foreignization cases. It has been noticed that, the translator has inevitably resorted to foreignization only to translate: the most popular expressions that well known worldwide, or due to lack of direct cultural equivalent of these expressions in the target language. Considering that the writer and the translator are from the same cultural background, the study confirm that the

cultural distance between the writer and the translator is directly proportional, the closer the distance, the greater possibility of domestication.

References:

- Cambridge dictionary, (n.d.) *Do*. Retrieved: 10 December 2022 from Cambridge dictionary: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/when-in-rome-do-as-the-romans-do>
- Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Claude, L.S. (1958). *Structural Anthropology*, New York, BASIC BOOKS, Inc., Publishers.
- Collins dictionary, (n.d.) *Sufi*. Retrieved: 21 December 2022 from Collins dictionary: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/sufi>
- Delabastita, D. (1993). *There's a Double Tongue: An Investigation into the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay, with Special Reference to Hamlet*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Islamqa.info, (n.d.) *Time*. Retrieved: 10 December 2022 from Islamqa.info: <https://islamqa.info/en/answers/12602/meaning-of-imsak-and-its-time>
- Lawrence Venuti. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility*. Routledge, 11 New Fetter, London EC4P 4EE.
- Merriam-Webster, (n.d.) *Fuzzy-Wuzzy*. Retrieved: 15 December 2022 from Merriam-Webster: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Fuzzy-Wuzzy>
- Nida, E. & Taber, C. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden, E.J. Brill.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice-Hall International.
- Schjoldager, A., Gottlieb, H., & Klitgård, I. (2008). *Understanding Translation*. Aarhus: Academic.
- Vinay, J. and Jean, D. (1995). *Comparative Stylistic of French and English*. (Trans. Juan C. Sager and M, J. Hamel). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vermeer, Hans. (1992). *Is Translation a Linguistic or a Cultural Process?* Ilha Do Desterro 28.

