

Domestication and Foreignization in Literary Translation: The Case of Paul Bowles' Translation of *For Bread Alone*

* Lina Roumaissa Feraguena¹, Abdelkader Belguernine²

¹Kasdi Merbah University (Algeria)

²Tlemcen University (Algeria)

Lab-LEFEU¹

linaasia11@yahoo.com¹ / belguernine.abdelkader@gmail.com²

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Dep. Day : 22/1/2024 | Acc. day: 26/6/2024 | Pub. day: 2/9/2024 |
|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|

Abstract:

The translation process is seen as an act of communication. In other words, the translator takes the role of a mediator between the author of the source text and the reader of the target text. This article deals with two essential techniques: domestication and foreignization. It also spotlights the challenges the translator faces when translating a literary work which belongs to a different culture. Translating from a language such as Arabic is a challenge, especially when attempting to translate into language such as English, not only because of the different script, but because the English text would lack details related to Arabic culture which oftentimes is a mysterious unknown to the non-Arabic reader. *For Bread Alone*, the English version of Mohamed Choukri's *Al Khubz Al Hafi* will be analyzed according to Venuti's domestication and foreignization taking extracts from the novel. We concluded that transposition, adaptation, omission and addition are used within domestication. While, in foreignization, the translator used literal translation, transliteration and borrowing. Additionally, certain losses have been noticed when the translator opted for domesticating strategy. Hence, the target reader is deprived of knowing the culture of the original.

Keywords: Culture, Domestication, Foreignization, Literary Translation, Mediator, Techniques.



* corresponding author. Full non. Email. author@gmail.com

e of a mediator between the author of the source text and the reader of the target text. This article deals with two essential techniques: domestication and foreignization. It also spotlights the challenges the translator faces when translating a literary work which belongs to a different culture. Translating from a language such as Arabic is a challenge, especially when attempting to translate into language such as English, not only because of the different script, but because the English text would lack details related to Arabic culture which oftentimes is a mysterious unknown to the non-Arabic reader. *For Bread Alone*, the English version of Mohamed Choukri's *Al Khubz Al Hafi* will be analyzed according to Venuti's domestication and foreignization taking extracts from the novel. We concluded that transposition, adaptation, omission and addition are used within domestication. While, in foreignization, the translator used literal translation, transliteration and borrowing. Additionally, certain losses have been noticed when the translator opted for domesticating strategy. Hence, the target reader is deprived of knowing the culture of the original.

Keywords: Culture, Domestication, Foreignization, Literary Translation, Mediator, Techniques.



1. Introduction

Translation has been approached for a long time as a linguistic phenomenon and its definition varies depending on the scholar. For example, Venuti (1995) defines translation as “a process by which the chain of signifiers that constitutes the source-language text is replaced by a chain of signifiers in the target language which the translator provides on the strength of an interpretation” (p. 17). To clarify, it is the rewriting of an original work from its source language to the target one. Accordingly, translation is produced to help those who do not know the original language and would like to understand and appreciate what is written in it. The translator should be familiar with as many fields as he or she might be translating or attempting to gain as much knowledge as possible related to the subject which in itself is a substantial challenge. A good case in point is literary translation which is especially challenging due to the difficulty the translator encounters while dealing with culture. Zahrawi (2018) states that “translation of literary texts

requires, more importantly cross-cultural dexterity, in order to transfer the nuances of cultural identity” (p. 3). On that account, different strategies are used to transfer the message and complete the translation knowing that is not simply replacing one language with another from a linguistic point of view, but rather the task has to do with knowing the cultural aspects of the target language so as to reach an “original”. This paper discusses namely domestication and foreignization suggested in Venuti’s book *The Translator Invisibility*.

2. Statement of the Problem

The concern of translating a literary work is cultural comprehension because there is interaction between cultures. Moreover, the aim of every translation is to satisfy the target readers and convey the message adequately. This paper intends to investigate the use of domestication and foreignization in the English translation of Bowles’ *For Bread Alone*. Simply put, the goal is to examine whether the translator preserves the characteristics of the source text as far as possible (foreignization) or chooses to produce a target text which seems more accessible to the target audience (domestication).

3. Research Questions

The current study intends through a descriptive comparative analysis to answer the following questions:

To what extent has the translator used domestication and foreignization in translating *For Bread Alone*?

What is the general tendency of the translator: Is the translator more oriented towards domestication or foreignization?

4. Literature Review

In their research titled “A Diachronic Study of Domestication and Foreignization Strategies of Culture-Specific Items in English-Persian Translation of Six of Hemingway’s Works”, Zare-Behtash & Firoozkoobi (2009) conducted a significant study on the use of domestication and foreignization strategies in translation. Their paper aimed to determine which of these strategies was predominantly employed in the translation of six of Hemingway’s books from the 1950s to the 2000s. The findings revealed that while both domestication and foreignization strategies have been used over the past six decades, domestication emerged as the most prevalent cultural translation strategy from the 1950s through 2000s.

Machali (2012) in her paper “Cases of Domestication and Foreignization in the Translation of Indonesian Poetry into English: A Preliminary Inquiry”

in which she aims to examine how cultural translation is connected to the concepts of domestication, foreignization and power. The researcher used the comparative corpora method to provide contrast between two works which are the original text and its translation. Her research concluded that when the cultural elements are considered as foreign, the translator tends to use the domestication strategy. On the hand, when the foreign element is related to a known genre such as the Ramayana, the translator has chosen to use the foreignization strategy.

Shahabi and Shams Abad (2016) have conducted a study in which they analyze *The Old Man and the Sea* and its two Persian translations, examining the use of domestication and foreignization. They focused on specific techniques including preservation, addition, omission, globalization, localization, transformation, and creation. Their findings indicated that preservation was the most frequently employed strategy, leading to the conclusion that the foreignization approach predominates over the domestication approach in both Persian translations.

5. Brief overview of Literary Translation

Generally speaking, literary translation can be defined as a translation dealing with prose or poetry. It is significantly different from the other types because literature has to do with the aesthetic part of the language. Hence, it forms a separate category in the world of texts. This is what Hermans (2007) pointed out: “the standard view is that literary translation represents a distinctive kind of text” (p. 77). That being the case, the literary translator should take into consideration the features of the text and should be skillful in advanced language knowledge as well as in-depth cultural knowledge. The linguistic and cultural differences of translated literature and their source texts are a good example of how shades of meaning can shift. This is true for linguistic, cultural, and textual meanings. Sometimes it also shows how difficult --almost impossible-- it is to define the task of the translator as pertains to preserving the original meaning or creating a text which has the same meaning (Tymoczko, 2014).

Toury (1981) regards translation as “the product of an act of translating, i.e., the replacement of ST, a text encoded in one natural language, SL, by TT, a text encoded in another natural language, TL, providing that a certain relationship exists between the two texts” (p. 10). Toury’s statement means that the translator's task is to try to find the equivalent of the ST in the other translated language which is the TL. He also gives another definition to

literary translation in which he considers it as “every literary text in the target literary system (and in TL) which is equivalent to another text in SL” (p. 11). Therefore, every literary text in translation has the linguistic significance of translation in general. It is useful to mention that a literary text is not similar to literary translation. For the literary text, it is worth mentioning that it is the direct product of the author, and its quality is noticed with relation to its literary translation and the language it is translated to. However, literary translation is not that direct of a product and its quality is not assessed by its linguistic system.

Wills (1982) argues that when we consider a literary text, we see that the linguistic form serves to not only keep the text nicely together, but also has a beautifying or aesthetic effect. He adds that it conveys the artist's creativity and, in essence, gives the literary text a very special quality that cannot be duplicated and, therefore, can be perceived in the target language only as a resemblance or likeness of the original.

In light of that, translating a literary work, the translator attempts to produce a text which is expected to be both aesthetically and linguistically similar to the SL version. Though it is possible to master the linguistic barrier, it is not as easy to overcome the literary traditions of either culture which can lead to stylistic problems. Furthermore, it might be nearly impossible to produce an adequate rendition because there is a transfer of the text from one culture to another, an aspect known as interculturality. Owing to that, translating literature can be classified as an intercultural activity. We see this stated by Radetič (2019) as “literary translation is the most usual form of intercultural transfer of literature in intercultural position” (p. 583). On that account, cultural meanings cannot be ignored and for that reason the translator must understand language differences and cultural nuances in order to transfer them to the target reader in a suitable way that evokes similar emotions and images as they would if read in the original.

6. The Cultural Turn

Linguistics is defined as the study of language, and more specifically applying rules that help people understand each other. Each cultural group might have different perspectives about life and the world because their language has been formed by the society in which they live. Therefore, over time knowledge and the meaning given to words are gained through the language habits of their community. Linguistic communication can be

defined as “a systematic means of communicating by the use of sounds or conventional symbols”.

At first, translation studies concentrated on a linguistic method. As mentioned above, linguistic communication is a means of communicating with sounds and conventional symbols. However, to understand other languages, and correspondingly understand the people who speak that language, we often recognize the necessity to rely on a translation from the source language to the target language. Snell-Hornby (1988) explains in her book *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* the changes in the study of language translation which includes a growing interest in specific realization of facts which led to the emergence of the linguistically-oriented theory of translation.

Catford (1965) defines translation as “an operation performed on languages” or “a process of substituting a text in one language with a text in another” (p. 1). Furthermore, he contended that “clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language—a general linguistic theory” (p. 1). Considering that the process of translation is the action of converting a text from one language into another, linguistics has much to offer to the field of translation. This is evident when Fawcett (1997) stated, “a translator who lacks at least a basic knowledge of linguistics is somebody who is working with an incomplete toolkit” (in the foreword). Without a doubt, the tools available in the linguistics toolbox have a great deal to offer in the realm of translation studies.

The Russian linguist, Roman Jakobson, divided translation into three categories: intralingual, interlingual, and inter-semiotic translation, and defined them as follows:

1. Intralingual translation, or rewording, is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.
2. Interlingual translation or translation proper is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language.
3. Inter-semiotic translation is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems. (Jakobson, 1959, p. 233).

A literal translation is basically useless in most circumstances if we want it to be a successful translation. For that reason, the idea of equivalence plays a significant role in the field of translation because we are searching for the meaning behind the words. Due to this, renowned translators and scholars such as Vinay and Darbenlet (1995), Jakobson (1959), Nida and Taber

(1969), Catford (1965), Newmark (1981) and Baker (1992) have written studies on the subject. Nida (1964), for instance, claims that there are two types of equivalence: formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. If we take the word “formal”, it is derived from “form”. He believes that in formal equivalence, both form and content in the target text is closely similar to the source one. On the other hand, he added that dynamic equivalence, tries to transfer the message in the source text as naturally as possible.

Translation studies took another approach in the 1970's. This shift was towards a cultural turn in which the emphasis was not merely linguistic but focused on the cultural aspects of the meaning of language. Prevalent currents in the cultural turn included: Descriptive Translation Studies: The “Manipulation” School; the Skopos Theory and its Functional Approach; the Model of Translation Action and the Deconstruction or the “Cannibalistic” Approach (Snell-Hornby, 2006). The challenging task of the translator is not only finding the equivalents of words, sentences, or texts in the target language, but also gaining a good knowledge about the target culture to which he or she is translating because from one culture to another, cultural connotations --those emotions and ideologies that can be conjured up by certain words and phrases---are crucial to know in order to capture the most accurate, deeper meanings.

The cultural approach emphasizes the importance that culture plays when translating and the cultural influence on translation in the receptor-language region, this is why treating translation as independent literature, and not the mere copy of the original text. We can understand that the translator may face difficulties about how to treat the cultural aspects of the source text as well as the culture of the target text. Consequently, the translator must do his or her best to find the most suitable technique for conveying the closest and most accurate meaning. These cultural aspects take many forms. It is also interesting to note that the meaning of culture can differ from one scholar to another. McCarthy & Carter (1994), for example, stated that “culture can be generally defined as the set of values and beliefs which are prevalent within a given society or section of a society” (p. 150). Likewise, ideologies and ways of life have been tackled by Newmark (1988) when he gives the definition of culture. He states that “the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression” (p. 94). For him, language has its specific cultural characteristics.

As previously mentioned, when a text is being translated, both the source language and the target language are taken into consideration. Cultural clues in both languages take the translator beyond just the linguistic approach which was used extensively in the past. This has been acknowledged by Bassnett & Lefevere (1990, as cited in Wang, 2020) in this way:

Now the questions have changed, the object of study has been redefined: what is studied is the text embedded in its network of both source and target cultural signs and in this way Translation Studies has been able both to utilize the linguistic approach and move out beyond it. (p. 17)

A conscientious translator strives to understand the culture of the original text and the target audience because the texts are fixed firmly and deeply in a culture. Within a culture, we find that community's common knowledge: political, historical, educational, and even the most current of events (Simon, 1996).

Significant cultural critics, theorists and philosophers emerged during the cultural turn period, among them Jacques Derrida, Itamar Even-Zohar, and others. So, the cultural turn did not just happen in a random style. For example, a crucial theory called "polysystem theory" was introduced by Even-Zohar. He offered a theoretical framework for the study of literature as well as language in their cultural contexts. The theory has had a great influence on translation studies. Even-Zohar strived to present culture as "polysystems". This term is known for being "a heterogeneous, hierarchized conglomerate of systems which interact to bring about an ongoing, dynamic process of evolution within the polysystem as a whole" (Shuttleworth, 2009, p. 197). It is further argued that:

Polysystems can be postulated to account for phenomena existing on various levels, so that the polysystem of a given national literature is viewed as one element making up the larger socio-cultural polysystem, which itself comprises other polysystems besides the literary, such as, for example, the artistic, the religious or the political. (p. 197)

7. Domestication and Foreignization

Domestication and foreignization are strongly connected to the target-oriented and source-oriented approaches. Since translation is a rewriting of an original text, it is natural to expect a certain ideology. Hence, the translator adopts either the author's ideology or applies his or her own ideology to the translation. The choice of the translator determines the strategy that he or she

will use during the translation process, whether it be domestication or foreignization.

These strategies were first discussed by the German Friedrich Schleiermacher in which he claimed that there are only two “either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him” (Lefevere, 1977, p. 74). In other words, moving the reader towards the author means that we are respecting the foreignness of the ST. However, if we move the writer toward the reader, it means transparency. This latter is a crucial part in domestication because “a transparent translation is linguistically and stylistically regular and appears to be the foreign author’s original text” (Barkhordar & Fatemi, 2020, p. 12). According to Venuti (1995), transparency is “an effect of fluent discourse” (p. 1). That is, the more fluent the translation is, the more transparent it is.

According to Venuti (1995) foreignization is “an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad” (p. 20). Specifically, the translator keeps foreign elements of the source text as they are. This can either be done deliberately or occurs due to the lack of equivalence of those specific terms in both the target language and target culture. This mode of translation is referred to as a source-culture oriented translation. On the other hand, domestication is “an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home” (Venuti, 1995, p. 20). In other words, domestication usually results in a translation that is fluent, natural and understandable because the target reader is familiar with the terms and expressions used.

Venuti (1995), prefers the principle of foreignization as a strategy of translation because he claimed that: “it is highly desirable today, a strategic cultural intervention in the current state of world affairs” (p. 20), and he added that: “foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations” (p. 20).

Baker (2010) contends that describing entire texts in terms of foreignization or domestication amounts to oversimplifying the techniques and approaches that might be used in a single translation by lumping a variety

of potential translators' attitudes together under one heading. She adds that domestication and foreignization can coexist in a single text and proposes that, rather than comprehensive translations of particular written work, the contrast between these two methodologies might be observed in the examination of particular instances as opposed to analyzing the entire translation as a whole.

Scholars have categorized four important techniques under domestication, starting with transposition which is "a change of one part of speech for another (e.g. noun for verb) without changing the sense" (Munday, 2016, p. 90). Sometimes changes must be made to the text in order to make it more understandable in the new language due to the structural and syntactic differences and this shows the creativity of the translator. The second technique is omission. When confronting cultural differences between the source and target languages, it is difficult to locate precise counterparts or grasp particular concepts, requiring the translator to leave out key components rather than provide a misleading or erroneous translation. Moreover, Baker (1992) claims that omission is to be chosen "only as a last resort, when the advantages of producing a smooth, readable translation clearly outweigh the value of rendering a particular meaning accurately in a given context" (p. 42). The third technique is addition in which the ST translators tend to add some words to replace phrases, idioms and calques to the target-language translation to make it clearer. Dickins et al. (2002) define it as "translation in which something is added to the TT that is not present in the ST" (p. 24). Finally, adaptation is a kind of oblique translation. The adaptation technique is used when the translator has no other choice than to change the words given by an author. The task of the translator is formed in line with the purpose of the translator. The message given in the TT is organized serving the purpose of the translation.

As for the techniques used with foreignization, we have literal translation which is author-oriented translation because all words are rendered without adding the translator's ideas to the target language text. Under the umbrella of foreignization, there is also the transliteration technique. As its name implies, transliteration is writing words or letters using letters of a different alphabet or language. The last technique is borrowing. Translators resort to this procedure because the concept discussed in the ST is unknown to the target audience.

To conclude, if the translator chooses domestication, the translation will be more fluent and transparent. Accordingly, the translation reads like the original because of the translator's invisibility. However, if foreignization is the option, the translation will be more subjective because of the translator's visibility.

8. Analysis

For Bread Alone is the English translation of *Al khubz al Hafi* written by the Moroccan writer Mohamed Choukri, and translated by the American literary translator Paul Bowles. It was written in Arabic in 1972. At first, it was forbidden since it contains a lot of taboo situations and this is not considered prudent in the Arab culture. Consequently, it was not published in Arabic until 1982 because it was deemed to have too many inappropriate expressions which are not widely accepted in Arabic countries, especially in Muslim society.

The book is an autobiographical narrative of a young man, Choukri himself, who struggles to overcome not only extreme poverty, but also endure living with a cruel father who beat his wife, abused his children, and even killed his own ill son, Choukri's younger brother, in a fit of madness.

For Bread Alone was written in classical Arabic; Paul Bowles assures us that the translation was far from literal because he does not know the classical language. Choukri and Bowles communicated by using colloquial Maghrebi, as well as Spanish and French to succeed in reaching the meaning and the essential character of the story.

In the following paragraphs, we cite instances from Choukri's work as examples of how and why the translator chose the method used to convey meaning to the target reader in light of Venuti's dichotomy of domestication and foreignization.

8.1. Domestication

8.1.1. Transposition

As it was mentioned earlier, transposition is a structural change and sometimes it is a must to make the TT comprehensive to the target audience. The following examples show the transposition technique, "الجوع يولمني" (p. 9) which was translated as "I was hungry" (p. 10). Here, the noun "الجوع" became an adjective "hungry". Another illustration, "لم يكن الجوع قاتلا" (p. 10)

which was transformed to “it was not a hunger that killed” (p. 10); the change is from an adjective to verb. Another instance of transposition is shown in “يتكلم وحده” (p. 12) which was transformed to “talking to himself” (p. 12), in that example the verb is changed to an adverbial phrase.

8.1.2. Adaptation

The title in Arabic is *Al Khubz Al hafî*. When we first read the title الخبز الحاف the first idea that comes to mind is that there is only bread to eat and nothing more. This shows how miserable life is and to what extent poverty exists at the lowest level. In the translation, with the intended target reader in mind, the title has become transformed. If it were a word for word translation, it would be only bread or just bread, but since the translator belongs to another culture, he is a mediator between two cultures. He gave a religious translation to the title which is *For Bread Alone* that is taken from the Christian Bible in the book of Matthew, “Man shall not live by bread alone...” As a result, if we compare the original title with its translation, it seems like a radical change and that proves his statement when Bowles mentioned in the introduction of the book that the translation is far from literal.

ST: “نعم، أبي. أضفت: إنه يستحق أكثر مما فعلتما له. إنه كلب.” (p. 12)

TT: “Yes, my father. But you should have hit him harder. He’s a pig.” (p. 72)

The scene shows the hatred Choukri felt toward his father since he is the reason of his suffering and more importantly, he killed his brother in front of him and hit him with his mother. Bowles changed “كلب” to “pig” because it is more insulting in the English culture than the word “dog”

8.1.3. Omission

ST: “ثم أعطها سلسلة ذهبية يتدلى منها صليب. فحصت الصليب وقالت: هذا سأخلعه لأرميه وأذوبه.” (p.n77) “عند الصانع لأجعل منه خميسة”

This sentence has not been translated into English because the target reader who may be Christian may not be pleased with the fact that the cross which represents his or her religion is going to be thrown away by the woman or she will take it to the jeweler to make of it خميسة which is a symbol of the

hand and is used to protect people from the evil eye, which is believed by many people in the Arab culture. The word خميسة is derived from the number five and it has been mentioned before that it represents the hand and a hand has five fingers. Even a newborn baby will be given one as a gift خميسة so that nothing harmful will be done to him. Here, when omission is used there is a cultural loss and cultural equivalence is not achieved.

ST: "ماذا تفعل؟ هل أنت أحمق؟ ليس حسنا غسل الثياب في الليل. إنه فال سيء." (p. 114)

TT: "Are you crazy, washing your clothes at night?" (p. 106)

The Arabic version contains a superstitious idea which is that washing clothes at night is something negative. However, the translator did not depict this concept in his translation. He opted for omission while he should have mentioned that to make the target reader familiar with those beliefs.

ST: "ستأكل قلب أمك يا ابن الزنا." (p. 9)

TT: "If you're hungry, eat your mother's heart." (p. 10)

In the phrase "If you're hungry, eat your mother's heart", the translator omitted "ابن الزنا" because it is an abusive word, and does not seem to be appropriate. Even though the translator, who lived in Morocco for many years, is not himself a Muslim, he respects Islam and knows that certain words and expressions are considered inappropriate and harsh to the readers' moral conscience. Because the translation might be read by different types of people and some of them may be ultra-conservative and not accept such an expression, it is more cautious and perhaps more respectful, too.

ST: "زبل النصارى أحسن من زبل المسلمين." (p. 10)

TT: "Nazarene garbage is the best." (p. 11)

Choukri's friend announces that "Nazarene garbage is the best". In the ST, he makes a comparison between Muslim garbage and the trash tossed out by the Europeans. It is mentioned in the footnotes that النصارى stands for Europeans that lived in the city during that time period, and more specifically most of those Europeans were Christians. Nazarene was one title for Jesus, as he was from Nazareth. The translator removed المسلمين and only kept النصارى and he used the superlative.

ST: "يسب العالم دائما ويجدف على الله أحيانا ثم يستغفره." (p. 12)

TT: “He abuses everyone with his words, sometimes even Allah.” (p. 12)

If we look at both the original and the translated version, we notice that (ثم (يستغفره) is omitted. Here the translator used the technique of omission since الاستغفار does not exist in the target culture, for that reason, a suitable equivalence for that expression is not found. In the Muslim community, whenever someone commits a sin, he asks forgiveness from Allah saying (استغفر الله).

8.1.4. Addition

ST: “وجدت طفلا يقات من المزابل مثلي في رأسه وأطرافه بثور حافي القدمين وثيابه متقوية.” (p. 10)

TT: “I found another boy there before me. He was barefoot and his clothes were in shreds. His scalp was covered with ringworm, his arms and legs scarred with sores.” (p. 11)

The passage here describes the extreme poverty and misery. There is an addition “his arms and legs scarred with sores” to provide a more vivid and descriptive picture of the boy’s condition emphasizing the extent of his suffering.

ST: “عثرت على دجاجة ميتة ضممتها إلى صدري وركضت إلى بيتنا.” (p. 10)

TT: “One day I found a dead hen. I seized it and hugged it close, for fear someone would snatch it away.” (p. 11)

The addition here serves to highlight the harsh reality of the author’s living conditions. It suggests that resources are limited and one should protect what little he has. Thus, it is a struggle for survival where even a dead hen becomes something valuable.

ST: “أخذ يقرأ.” (p. 228)

TT: “He intoned: *Ya sin oual Qoran el Hakim ...*” (p. 215) (Italics in the original).

Yassine surah is usually read for the dead or dying. Here, the translator added the first words of the Surah which were not present in the ST. He does not only make an addition, but he combines it with intertextuality.

Foreignization

8.2.1. Literal Translation

في الريف رايتهم يذبحون كيشا. لا ادري في أي مناسبة، وضعوا طاسا تحت عنق الكبش الفائر بالدم، “امتلاً الطاس وأعطوه لامي المريضة” (p. 11)

TT: “In the Rif I had watched them kill a sheep. They put a bowl under its throat to catch the blood. When the bowl was full they gave it to my mother.” (p. 11)

The translator applied the technique of literal translation to preserve the Moroccan custom which is offering blood to a newly delivered mother or to people who are said to be haunted by “djinn”.

ST: “لا حركة لكلمة إلا بإذنه كما هو كل شيء لا يحدث إلا بإذن الله.” (p. 12)

TT: “Not a movement, not a word, save at his command, just as nothing can happen unless it is decreed by Allah.” (p. 11)

The scene is described as it was in the ST to show that Choukri’s father is cruel and everything is done according to his approval.

8.2.2. Transliteration

ST: “الله اكبر، بسم الله.” (p. 11)

TT: “I said: *Bismillah. Allahou akbar.*” (p. 11, italics in original)

Here, the translator kept the expression as it is in Arabic which in accordance with Venuti is foreignization. The reason for keeping the phrase as it is written in the source text is to shed light on the fact that “bismillah” is an omnipresent utterance in the Muslim culture, thus making the target reader familiar with this custom. Every Muslim remembers Allah before undertaking any activity such as eating, drinking, or beginning a task. In this way, the believer starts any action in the name of Allah and asking for his blessing. The translator could have decided to translate the phrase as “In the Name of God”, but he preferred to keep the expression since he lived in Moroccan society for 52 years and was aware of its importance in Muslim beliefs. Consequently, he tried to make the target reader aware of those traditions by keeping the Arabic wording.

ST: “اللعة عليك.” (p. 23)

TT: “*Allah inaalik.*” (p. 23, italics in original)

In this example, while Choukri and his mother were walking; a man harasses his mother. Thereby, Choukri curses him by telling him “*Allah innalik*” which means “May the curse of God fall on you”.

8.2.3. Borrowing

ST: “الجهاد! الجهاد يا عباد الله!” (p. 121)

TT: “*El Jihad! El Jihad ya ibad Allah!*” (p. 112, italics in the original).

The Arabic word al jihad is a religious duty in Islam. Here, the translator used borrowing for the sake of not losing the cultural aspects of the word.

ST: “السوق الكبير.” (p. 14)

TT: “the Zoco de Fuera.” (p. 14)

The translator wrote in another language which is Spanish. It is mentioned in the introduction that Bowles is not familiar with classical Arabic. For that reason, the writer used both French and Spanish to arrive at the English meaning. He might describe the Zoco de Fuera as a market or whatever it is.

9. Conclusion

Translation is undeniably a very challenging task. It requires an intense mental effort as well as background information about different cultures in an attempt to bridge the gap between different civilizations. Though linguistics is important, it is not enough for the best literary translation. Culture plays a significant part in producing a faithful translation of the original. Translation enables communication between the people of the world and is also the message-bearer of a culture's knowledge and the protector of its heritage. When a text reads flowingly, it is more acceptable to readers as well as to publishers and reviewers.

Domestication and foreignization are significant in the translation process and the extent to which each one is selected depends on the translator's intention, audience, text and context. On the basis of the analysis set forth in this paper, domestication has consistently been applied, unlike foreignization which is less utilized. As a result, certain losses were experienced. For

instance, different passages and expressions were left untranslated which might keep the target audience questioning.

The debate concerning which strategy is the most appropriate continues to the present day. If we could measure which readers possess the curiosity to research unknown words and phrases, we can certainly opt for foreignization and add that desired “color” to the translation. On the other hand, for the less curious, domestication offers ease of reading which could create more pleasurable reading and keep the attention of a certain type of reader who prefers not to be bogged down by a profusion of foreign words and expressions. However, it distorts the original and only maintains cultural values of the target language, bringing to an end the sharing of culture.

A translator is not able to determine exactly who will make up the reading audience. Further research on the impact that the different translations make, whether using foreignization or domestication, may seem like an impossible endeavor, but some study in this area could prove to be exciting and useful.

References

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge.
- Baker, M. (2010). Reframing Conflict in Translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Critical Readings in Translation Studies* (pp. 113-129). Routledge.
- Bakhordar, S. Y., & Fatemi, R. (2020). A Comparison between the Translation Dichotomies Suggested by Juliane House and Lawrence Venuti. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, 1(2), 9-15. <https://doi.org/10.46809/jpse.v1i2.13>
- Bowles. P. (2006). *For Bread Alone*. Telegram.
محمد شكري، الخبز الحافي، (1982)، دار الساقى .
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Dickins, J., Herve, S., & Higgins, I. (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Arabic to English*. Routledge.

- Fawcett, P. (1997). *Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained*. ST. Jerome.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. *On Translation*, 232-239. Harvard University Press.
- Hermans, T. (2007). Literary Translation. In P. Kuhiwzak & K. Littau (Eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 77-91). Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Lefevere, A. (1977). *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Van Gorcum.
- Machali, R. (2012). Cases of Domestication and Foreignization in the Translation of Indonesian Poetry into English: A Preliminary Inquiry. *Journal of Language and Culture*, 3(4), 74-82.
- McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. Longman.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (4th Ed.). Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translation: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Brill.
- Radetič, A. (2019). Literary Translation and Interculturality. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*, 4(3), 583-586. [https://dx. doi. org/10.22161/ijels.4.3.7](https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.4.3.7)
- Simon, S. (1996). *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. Routledge.
- Shahabi, H., & Rezaiei Shams Abad, R. (2016). A Study of Domestication and Foreignization of Culture-Specific Items In Two Persian Translations of *The Old Man and the Sea*. *Journal of Language Sciences & Linguistics*, 4(3), 191–198.
- Shuttleworth, M. (2009). Polysystem. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd Ed., pp. 197-200).

Routledge.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Toury, G. (1981). Translated Literature: System, Norm, Performance: Toward a TT-Oriented Approach to Literary Translation. *Poetics Today*, 2(4), 9–27. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1772482>

Tymoczko, M. (2014). Why Literary Translation is a Good Model For Translation. In J. Boase-Beier, A. Fawcett, & P. Wilson (Eds.), *Literary Translation: Redrawing the Boundaries*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge.

Wang, Y. (2020). *A Comparative Study on the Translation of Detective Stories from a Systemic Functional Perspective*. Springer.

Wills, W. (1982). *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.

Zahrawi, S. (2018). Maintaining Cultural Identity in Translated Literary Texts: Strategies of Translating Culture-Specific Items in Two Arabic Plays. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 2(2), 2-16. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol2no2.1>

Zare-Behtash, E., & Firoozhookhi, S. (2009). A Diachronic Study of Domestication and Foreignization Strategies of Culture-Specific Items: In English-Persian Translations of Six of Hemingway's Works. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 7(12), 1576–1582.