

**The Jazz Age Through Arabic Lenses: A Comparative Analysis of Two Arabic Translations of The Great Gatsby Based On Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization Theory of Translation**

عصر الجاز من خلال العدسات العربية: تحليل مقارن لترجمتين عربيتين لـ: غاتسبي العظيم استنادًا إلى نظرية التوطين والتغريب في الترجمة لفينوتي

عبد الرؤوف شويط Abderraouf CHOUIT

*Fr ères Mentouri University, Constantine 01, Algeria*

*ch.raouf91@gmail.com*

**DOI: 10.46314/1704-021-001-016**

Received date: 12/06/2021

Revised date: 22/06/2021

Publication date: 20/07/2021

**Abstract:**

The present paper aims to examine the use of domestication and foreignization strategies in the translation of Western literary fiction into Arabic. By reflecting on a comparative textual analysis of a corpus consisting of the novel *The Great Gatsby*, written by prominent American writer F. Scott Fitzgerald (1925), and two Arabic translations by Najeeb el Manie' (1961) and Hani Yared & Muhammed Hittini (2008), this study assesses the validity of the so-called Retranslation Hypothesis (RH), mainly the underlying assumption that the initial translation of a literary work tends to be domesticated while the later subsequent retranslation tends to be foreignized. After investigating the procedures applied in rendering the cultural references in the two translations, the findings revealed the predominance of foreignization and adherence to source-oriented norms in both translations, which is indicative that the RH does not have a general validity as it does not hold true against empirical data.

**Keywords:** Domestication; Foreignization; Retranslation Hypothesis; Culture; Literary Translation.

ملخص:

تهدف هذه الورقة إلى دراسة توظيف إستراتيجيتي التوطين والتغريب في ترجمة الأعمال الأدبية الغربية إلى اللغة العربية. تقيّم هذه الدراسة صحة ما يسمى بفرضية إعادة الترجمة من خلال تحليل نصي مقارن لمدونة تتشكل من رواية *غانسي العظيم* للكاتب الأمريكي الشهير ف.سكوت فيتزجيرالد (1925)، وترجمتين عربيتين لنجيب المانع (1961) وهاني يارد ومحمد حطيني (2008). تذهب هذه الفرضية الأساسية إلى القول بأن الترجمة الأولية للعمل الأدبي تميل إلى التوطين، بينما تميل إعادة الترجمة اللاحقة إلى التغريب. بعد دراسة الإجراءات التي تم تطبيقها لاسترداد المرجعيات الثقافية في الترجمتين، كشفت النتائج عن هيمنة التغريب والالتزام بمعايير النص المصدر في كل من الترجمتين، مما يؤكد أن فرضية إعادة الترجمة ليست في كل الأحوال صحيحة ولا يمكن تطبيقها على البيانات التجريبية.

الكلمات المفاتيح: توطين؛ تغريب؛ فرضية إعادة الترجمة؛ ثقافة؛ الترجمة الأدبية.

## 1 - Introduction

Fiction has always been a mirror that reflects different cultures. Translating this genre of literature needs to be clearly recognized not only as a linguistic transfer from one language into another but also as an encounter between different cultures. Therefore, it needs to be carefully and sensibly rendered into different languages.

This study aims to investigate literary translation from English into Arabic. It mainly seeks to unravel the ins and outs of cultural understanding between the Western and Arab worlds. More specifically, it examines the use of domestication and foreignization strategies in the direct translation of Western literary fiction into Arabic. Despite being a subject of great controversy, domestication and foreignization strategies provide both linguistic and cultural guidance for translators. Indeed, choosing to adopt one of these two strategies is by no means an easy choice. In fact, it largely depends on many factors related to the purpose of the translation, the power relations between the source language (SL) and target language (TL), the translator's own interpretation of the culture-specific references (CSRs)

in the source text (ST), the publisher's power to dictate the translation, and many other variables related to the social, cultural, historical, and political setting in which the translation takes place.

Without a doubt, domestication and foreignization strategies are mainly concerned with culture. The former means the reduction of the ST cultural aspects to what conforms with the target language and target culture (TC) values and norms. The latter means breaking the conventions of the TL and TC by deliberately retaining the foreign cultural aspects represented in the ST. Therefore, these strategies are only used in translation when there is a major difference between the source and target cultures.

By reflecting on a comparative textual analysis of a corpus consisting of the novel *The Great Gatsby*, written by prominent American writer F. Scott Fitzgerald (1925), and two Arabic translations by Najeeb el Manie' (1961) and Hani Yared & Muhammed Hittini (2008), this research identifies the use of domestication and foreignization strategies through investigating the procedures applied in rendering the cultural references in the two translations. The overall aim is to assess the validity of the so-called Retranslation Hypothesis (RH), mainly the underlying assumption that the initial translation of a literary work tends to be domesticated while later subsequent retranslation tends to be foreignized.

Despite the recent heated debates and controversy regarding retranslations and the RH, this hypothesis has only been investigated by a handful of scholars. Research conducted by scholars, such as Paloposki and Koskinen (2004), Deane (2011), Susam-Sarajeva (2003), and Desmidt (2009) seems to waver between confirming and rejecting the underlying assumptions of the RH. Therefore, the present study aims to review the existing literature on retranslation and contribute to enriching the existing body of knowledge to help fathom the ins and outs of this significant intercultural activity.

### 1.1 Domestication and Foreignization: Two Key Concepts in Translation Studies

Domestication and foreignization are two key concepts in translation studies that have been widely used to address cultural issues in translation. They were coined by the American scholar Lawrence Venuti to describe two discordant translation tendencies and expand on the ideas of the German philosopher and theorist, Friedrich Schleiermacher.

In his famous lecture titled *On the Different Methods of Translating*, which took place at Berlin's Royal Academy of Science in 1813, Schleiermacher states that there are only two methods used in translation: either the translator moves the reader to the author, or the translator moves the author to the reader. This rationale seems to have laid the foundation for Venuti's domestication and foreignization theory of translation. In 1995, Venuti introduced the concepts of domestication and foreignization in his book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* to comment on the relevance of cultural identity and difference to translation. In his opinion, Venuti (2008) states that translators may opt for either a domesticating or foreignizing strategy when they encounter foreign cultural elements in literary texts. He claims that translation can never be completely adequate to the foreign text; thus, translators are required to choose between a target-oriented domesticating strategy or a source-oriented foreignizing strategy.

On the one hand, according to Venuti (2008), domestication is the kind of strategy that aims at translating in a fluent, transparent, and idiomatic way to reduce the foreignness of the ST and conform with the TL and TC norms and values. Venuti (2008) describes this strategy as an "ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to the receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home" (p. 15). Foreignization, on the other hand, is the kind of strategy that seeks to preserve the linguistic and cultural values of the ST and highlight its otherness and foreignness. According to Venuti (2008), foreignization is used to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation. In his opinion, this strategy highlights the differences of foreign texts by eliminating the cultural codes that prevail in the TL. Thus, Venuti

(2008) considers foreignization as a “form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interest of democratic geopolitical relations” (p. 16).

## 1.2 The Retranslation Hypothesis

The phenomenon of retranslation is very common in practice. However, research into the subject is scarce and almost nonexistent. According to Susam-Sarajeva (2003), “although the practice itself is common, theoretical discussions on the subject are rather rare [...] currently, there is no detailed or systematic study on re-translations per se” (p. 02). In fact, it was not until the 1990s when serious research and theoretical discussions on retranslations started to take shape. In a special edited issue of the journal *Palimpsestes*, French scholars Antoine Berman and Paul Bensimon first discussed significant research topics of what was later coined the retranslation theory.

The RH was introduced and formulated by translation scholars Berman (1990), Bensimon (1990), Gambier (1994), and Chesterman (2000). It was founded on their consensus view that the initial translations of a literary work tend to be domesticated as opposed to later subsequent retranslations, which tend to be foreignized and source-culture biased.

Berman (1990) claims that initial translations have lots of deficiencies and are marked with inherent failure. Therefore, retranslations set out to fix and correct the deficiencies of first translations. He believes that great and complete translations can only be accomplished in the aftermath of blind and hesitant first translations. As the hypothesis suggests, a retranslation is presumed to succeed in bringing forth a more source-oriented and faithful translation. This is because the first translation, as Bensimon (1990) claims, serves as an introduction and naturalization of the foreign work and mainly seeks to ensure positive reception of the translated work in the target literary polysystem. Therefore, the translator tends to favor the target audience and culture by reducing the foreignness and exoticism of the ST to ensure easy readability and acceptance in the TC.

Gambier (1994) seems to share the same rationale; he claims that first translations tend to be assimilative and domesticated to eliminate the foreignness of the ST. Retranslations, on the other hand, mark a return to the ST and emerge in an effort to get close to the soul of the source culture (SC).

The core of the RH, as it is known today in translation studies, was formulated by Chesterman (2000). He notes that first translations tend to be target-oriented (domesticated) while later retranslations tend to be source-oriented (foreignized). Chesterman (2000) believes that retranslations express the cultural and linguistic peculiarities of the original text, which have most likely been ignored or even obliterated in initial translations.

The lack of inquiry about the validity of the RH may very well be due to the predominant assumption that initial translations are always lacking and flawed and that later retranslations are more accurate and closer to the original. According to Paloposki and Koskinen (2004), several studies have been undertaken to explore retranslations at different levels. However, the RH, in particular, has not yet been tested extensively. They claim that some of the conducted research does, indeed, fit into the RH schema. However, there also exist some counterexamples in which the RH was disproven. This means that the underlying assumption about domesticated first translations and foreignized subsequent retranslations does not always seem to hold true against empirical data. Therefore, the need to systematically test the RH in empirical settings has become of great importance. The results of such analyses will allow the investigation of the development and change of the sociocultural evolution of different translation activities carried out across different points in history and will, therefore, offer rich and significant contributions to translation studies.

## **2 - Methodology**

This research falls within the scope of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS). It seeks to describe the translation as a product and explore the translators' tendencies in using domestication and foreignization strategies when it comes to translating CSRs in literary fiction. Identifying

these tendencies will give us the required data to objectively assess the validity of the RH.

In order to obtain accurate and solid results, a mixed-method approach was adopted in this study. This means that both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed to collect and analyze the research data. The data for analysis were collected from a corpus that consists of the novel *The Great Gatsby*, written by American author F. Scott Fitzgerald in 1925, and its two Arabic translations by Nadjib El Manie (1961) and Hani Yared & Mohammed Hittini (2008). The time of publication has been taken as a crucial factor in our choice. In other words, there is roughly a five-decade time period between the first translation and the subsequent retranslation. Therefore, the time span will allow us to properly investigate the validity of the RH and challenge its underlying assumptions.

The chosen novel, which was written and set in the United States in the first quarter of the 20th century, perfectly depicts what is known as the ‘Jazz Age.’ This era is full of cultural references that are likely to pose countless obstacles for translators.

The original text was analyzed, 62 culture-specific references were extracted, and the analysis of their Arabic equivalents was performed. The culture-specific items were chosen based on what we named the Hybrid Taxonomy; a typology based on the mixture of two taxonomies proposed by Pavlović and Poslek (2003) and Kolebáčová (2007). The reason we chose to mix these taxonomies is to create a more extensive, comprehensive, well-arranged, and detailed classification of CSRs to help us best serve the purpose of this research and attain better, more precise, and less skewed results. The taxonomy that we proposed consists of the following categories:

1. Icons: this category includes names of characters, either real or fictitious.
2. Material Culture: this category includes names of objects, tools, clothes, and food.
3. Geographical Items: include names of geographical locations and places.

4. Infrastructure: includes names of institutions, means of transportations, services, and trademarks.
5. Ideological Items: include names of feasts, celebrations, and traditions.
6. Religious Items: include expressions and concepts related to religion.
7. Economy: includes concepts related to the economic system.
8. Measures: include references related to measures, such as inch, meter, ounce, etc.
9. Arts and Literature: include names of books, paintings, plays, and songs.
10. Social Items: include references related to forms of address, social status, and titles.
11. Activities: include names of jobs, crafts, and games.
12. History: includes references related to history, such as wars and historical events.
13. Nature: includes references related to plants and animals.
14. Army: includes names of uniforms, formations, and weapons.
15. Education: includes references related to grades, school subjects, and degrees.
16. Code: this category includes particular ways of expression, such as idioms, puns, similes, metaphors, and allusions.

The procedures that were adopted in analyzing the CSRs in the selected corpus were proposed by Pederson (2011) and consist of the following local strategies and their subcategories: Retention, Specification, Direct Translation, Generalization, Substitution, and Omission. The first three procedures are source-oriented, and the last three are target-oriented. This aligns with Venuti's domestication and foreignization theory. Hence, after we unraveled the procedures used by each translator in rendering each cultural instance, we were able to identify the translators' overall tendency in using domestication and foreignization strategies in the two translations of the novel.

### **3 - Results and Discussion:**

In order to unravel the overall tendency in using domestication and foreignization strategies in the two Arabic translations of the novel *The*



*Great Gatsby*, a total of 62 CSRs were analyzed and the procedures used to translate each cultural instance were identified. Table 1 below shows the frequency of using each procedure in the two translations.

**Table 1.***The frequency of using foreignizing and domesticating procedures in the two Arabic translations*

Strategies	Procedures	TT1	TT2
Foreignization	Retention	16.92%	09.85%
	Specification	24.61%	46.47%
	Direct Translation	18.46%	12.67%
Domestication	Generalization	10.76%	08.45%
	Substitution	15.38%	08.45%
	Omission	03.07%	02.81%
Neutral	Official Equivalent	10.76%	11.26%

As it can be seen from the aforementioned table, foreignizing and domesticating procedures were variably used in each translation. In TT1, the translator used foreignization mainly through the use of the Specification procedure (24.61%), Direct Translation (18.46%), and Retention (16.92%), respectively. On the other hand, the most prevailing procedure used in domesticating the CSRs in TT1 is Substitution (15.38%), followed by Generalization (10.76%), and then Omission (3.07%). The Official Equivalent procedure, which takes a neutral position, was used in the translation of (10.76%) of the overall cases. In TT2, foreignization was predominantly achieved through the use of the Specification procedure (46.47%), followed by the Direct Translation (12.67%), and then Retention (09.85%). On the other hand, domestication was achieved through the equal use of Generalization and Substitution (08.45%), followed by Omission (02.81%). The Official Equivalent was employed in the translation of

(11.26%) of the analyzed examples. A detailed overview of the frequency of using each procedure in both Arabic translations will be discussed in what follows.

### 3.1 The Use of Foreignizing Procedures

#### 3.1.1 Retention

Retention is the most foreignizing procedure because it allows foreign elements from the SC to be implemented in the TT. Pederson (2011) claims that the Retention procedure displays the most fidelity towards the ST because “it leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him” (p. 78). He argues that Retention is the most commonly used translation procedure to solve a translation problem that involves rendering mono-cultural references. However, our analysis shows that this has not been the case; Retention was not the most commonly used translation procedure in both translations. In fact, the data analysis reveals that both translators seemed to be less keen on using Retention; it was the least used foreignizing procedure in both translations. This procedure was mainly used to render examples from the categories of Icons, Material Culture, and Geographical Items. Percentagewise, Retention was employed in TT1 to translate 16.92% of the selected examples, while it was used to translate 09.85% of the CSRs in TT2. The analysis shows that Retention was used exclusively to render the category of ‘Icons’ in both translations. Some examples of that would include the translation of character names, such as ‘Gatsby’; rendered in both TT1 and TT2 as (غاتسي), ‘Klipspringer’ (TT1: كليبسبرينغر, TT2: كليبسبرنغر), ‘Tom Buchanan’ (TT1: طوم بوكانان, TT2: توم بوكان), and ‘Daisy’ (TT1 and TT2: ديزي). Because this category of CSRs is related to the name of characters, it is not surprising that both translators employed this procedure to keep the literary flavor of the ST intact.

Retention was also employed variably in the two translations to render CSRs from other categories, such as Material Culture and Geographical Items. A good example of that would include the translation

of fabric names in TT1, such as ‘crepe-de-chine’ (كريب دي شين), and names of beverages, such as ‘sauterne’ (سوترن). In TT2, Retention was mainly used to render names of geographical places and locations, such as ‘West Egg’ (وست ايغ), ‘East Egg’ (ايبست ايغ), and ‘Lake Superior’ (ليك سوبيير). Such fluctuations in using the Retention procedure reflect the translators’ different approaches in using foreignization in their translations of the different cultural references in the ST.

### 3.1.2 Specification

Specification involves keeping the CSR unchanged but adding additional details not originally present in the ST. The Specification procedure seeks to make the TT more specific, with the aim of guiding the target readers towards a better understanding of the ST. This procedure, Pederson (2011) claims, can be done in one of two ways: Completion (also known as Explicitation) or Addition. The former technique involves expanding the text in a rather restricted way, such as spelling out acronyms or abbreviations, adding someone's first name to the TT, or completing an official name. The aim is to disambiguate the CSR for the TC audience. The latter is considered interventional; the translator intervenes to give guidance to the TC audience. Thus, Addition is much broader in use than Completion because it involves adding anything to the TT that is pertinent to the CSR in the ST.

In both translations, the analysis shows that the use of the Specification procedure was predominant in rendering the CSRs in the novel. This procedure was used in the translation of at least one example from each category except Icons, Measures, and Education. In TT1, Specification receives the highest percentage of 24.61%. However, it was employed significantly higher in TT2; it was used in the translation of 33 examples and, thus, gets an overall percentage of 46.47%. The data analysis also reveals the use of the two subcategories of Specification (Completion and Addition) in the two Arabic translations.

The use of Specification can mainly be observed in the translation of CSRs related to Infrastructure, Arts and Literature, and Social Items. Some examples of that would include the translation of vehicle names, such as an ‘old Dodge’ (TT1: سيارة عتيقة من طراز دودج, TT2: سيارة قديمة من طراز دودج), names of hotels, such as ‘the Plaza’ (rendered in both translations as فندق بلازا), names of magazines such as ‘Town Tattle’ (TT2: مجلة تاون تتل), name of newspapers, such as ‘The Tribune’ (TT1: جريدة تريبيون, TT2: صحيفة تريبيون), spelling out abbreviations, such as ‘Mr. Gatsby’ (TT1: المستر غاتسبي) and ‘Mrs. Wilson’ (rendered in both translations as مسز ويلسون), and translating similes, such as ‘I stared at it, like Kant at his church steeple’ (TT1: فحدقت فيه لمدة نصف ساعة كأنني الفيلسوف "كانت" وهو ينظر إلى برج كنيسة).

Moreover, the data analysis reveals that both translators used a similar approach in using the Specification procedure in their translations of CSRs. The tendency towards using Addition instead of Completion could be due to the nature of the analyzed CSRs themselves; most of the analyzed examples need additional details in the TT that go beyond simple and restricted completion. What is noteworthy, though, is the way the translators used Specification through Addition to expand the text and give the target readers additional information about the ST. In TT1, it is shown that Addition was achieved mainly through adding pertinent lexical items to the TT to specify and disambiguate the CSRs for the target readers. In TT2, besides adding lexical items to the TT, the translator sometimes opted for paratextual items, mainly through the use of explanatory footnotes, to assist the target readers in their understanding of the translation. The added footnotes are characterized by a strong supply of information related to the cultural, social, historical, and even linguistic aspects of the ST.

### 3.1.3 Direct Translation

Direct Translation refers to the literal translation from one language into another without adding or omitting any semantic content. Pederson

(2011) divides the Direct Translation procedure into two subcategories: Calque and Shifted. Calque is the output of stringent literal translation that may very well appear exotic to the TT readers. The only shifts produced when Calque is used are mandatory ones, which are required by the differences between the SL and the TL. In Shifted Direct Translation, the same literal translation is adopted. However, unlike Calque, some optional shifts may take place to produce more idiomatic or, at least, less obstructive results.

The analysis of the examples reveals that Direct Translation was the second most used procedure in both translations. In TT1, it was used to render 12 examples, receiving an overall percentage of 18.46%. In TT2, it was employed in translating 9 examples and takes a percentage of 12.67%. In addition, the results of the analysis show that both translators employed the two subcategories in their translations.

Regarding the use of this procedure in rendering the analyzed categories, the results show a somehow similar approach in the translation of various examples from the categories of Geographical Items, Religious Items, Activities, and History. Moreover, it is worth noting that the Direct Translation procedure was sometimes combined with Specification to render some examples. The translators opted for such a combination to reduce the exoticism of the TT and mitigate the target readers' confusion by adding relevant details through Specification.

Examples of using the Direct Translation procedure can be observed in rendering CSRs related to Geographical Items, such as 'The Valley of Ashes' (rendered literally in both translations as وادي الرماد), religious songs, such as 'The Rosary' (TT1: أغنية المسبحة, TT2: السبحة + footnote), religious principles, such as 'The Cardinal Virtues' (TT1: الفضائل الأساسية, TT2: الفضائل الأربعة الأصيلة الأربعة), name of games, such as 'sardines-in- the-box' (TT2:

(لعبة السردين في الصندوق TT1: (الحرب الكبرى).

In both translations, the translators used the Direct Translation procedure through Calque almost exclusively. Such tendency indicates that both translators opted only for mandatory shifts caused by the differences between the SL and TL.

### 3.2 The Use of Domesticating Procedures

#### 3.2.1 Generalization

Generalization is a domesticating procedure that involves replacing specific CSRs with something more general. Pederson (2011) states that this procedure could be achieved by either making use of a Superordinate Term or Paraphrase. The former involves exploiting the sense of hyponymy or, to a less extent, meronymy. The latter involves removing the CSR in the ST while retaining the connotations associated with it. The output is, thus, longer and less specific.

The analysis reveals that Generalization was the second most used domesticating procedure in TT1. However, both Generalization and Substitution were equally employed to render CSRs in TT2. This procedure was used to translate 7 examples in TT1, yielding an overall percentage of 10.76%. In TT2, it was used relatively less; Generalization was used to translate a total of 6 examples, accounting for an overall percentage of 08.45%. It is noted that this procedure was used in both translations to render CSRs from the categories of Material Culture, Infrastructure, and Activities. Some examples of that would include the translation of names of alcoholic beverages, such as ‘claret’ (TT1: الخمرة الفرنسية, TT2: نبيذ بوردو), ‘mint julep’ (TT2: كأس من الشراب), name of clothes, such as ‘knickerbockers’ (TT2: سروال قصير), sports equipment, such as ‘aluminum putter’ (TT2: مضرب الألومنيوم), name of parks, such as ‘Central Park’ (TT1: الحديقة

العامة), and name of sports and activities, such as ‘dumbbell exercise’ and ‘wall-scaling’ (both translated in TT1 as تمارين رياضية).

Pederson (2011) considers Generalization an interventional procedure; the translator intervenes to give guidance to the target readers and facilitate the comprehension of the TT. It is noted that the translators opted for this procedure to render CSRs that are not well known in the TC. The analysis also reveals that the use of Superordinate Terms was mainly achieved by using hyponymy in both translations. Without a doubt, the use of Generalization in translating the CSRs in the ST resulted, in most cases, in the fluency and intelligibility of the TT at the expense of losing the cultural specificity of the ST. This is because the output in the TT was not culture-specific and, thus, the uniqueness of the ST reference was often lost in translation.

### 3.2.2 Substitution

Substitution involves removing the ST CSR and replacing it with something else, either from the TC or TL (Cultural Substitution) or with something else completely different (Situational Substitution). In Cultural Substitution, the ST CSR is domesticated and, hence, removed and replaced with another reference from the TC or with a better-known transcultural equivalent from the SC or a third culture. This equivalent, Pederson (2011) suggests, should be known in both the SC and TC. Situational Substitution, on the other hand, involves removing every sense of the ST CSR and replacing it with something else that fits the situation, regardless of the original sense expressed in the ST. The output resulting from using Situational Substitution is unlikely to be culture-specific because there is no connection whatsoever between the ST CSR and the TT item.

The analysis reveals the predominance of Substitution as the most domesticating procedure used to render CSRs in TT1. With an overall percentage of 15.38%, the translator used Substitution to render a total of 10 examples. In TT2, both Substitution and Generalization were equally

employed to render 6 examples each, thus yielding an equal overall percentage of 08.45%.

The analysis also shows the use of this procedure in both translations to render CSRs related to Material Culture, Infrastructure, Ideological Items, Religious Items, Measures, and Social Items. Moreover, both subcategories (Cultural Substitution and Situational Substitution) were employed to render the selected examples. Instances of using Substitution include the translation of alcoholic beverages, such as ‘mint julep’ (translated in TT1 as شراب النعناع) and clothes, such as ‘knickerbockers’ (translated in TT1 as جوارب). More examples of using this procedure include the translation of religious announcements, such as ‘the banns’ (translated in TT1 as أبواب القيل والقال), religious objects, such as ‘the grail’ (translated in TT2 as ضالته المنشودة), and units of measurements, such as ‘quart’ (translated in TT1 as ربع قنينة and in TT2 as ربع لتر). Substitution was also used to euphemistically render derogatory and racial terms, such as ‘little kyke’ (translated in TT1 as غمر صغير and in TT2 as خسيس صغير).

The use of Substitution in translating the aforementioned examples seems to be more or less successful because the prepositional meaning of the ST was often delivered. By using Substitution, the translators sought to achieve the equivalence of effect rather than the equivalence of information. Such effect, as Pederson (2011) claims, is rather centripetal; it removes the exotic and peripheral and replaces it with common and central CSRs from the TC, SC, or even a third culture with the aim of making the TT more accessible to the target readers. However, the use of Substitution resulted in the creation of credibility gaps, which led to the loss of the cultural connotations associated with the CSRs embedded in the ST.



### 3.2.3 Omission

Omission is the most domesticating translation procedure because it stops problematic foreign items from entering the TT. This procedure simply involves the deliberate complete removal of CSRs from the TT. Pederson (2011) claims that the translator may opt for the Omission procedure responsibly, after rejecting all the alternative procedures, or irresponsibly, out of sheer laziness to save him/herself the trouble of looking something up.

Omission was equally employed in both translations; each translator used this procedure to render 2 examples. Therefore, Omission was the least employed procedure in both translations. With an overall percentage of 03.07%, Omission was used in TT1 to render 2 examples from the categories of Activities and Code. In TT2, this procedure was also used twice to render examples from the categories of Religious and Social Items, receiving an overall percentage of 02.81%. Not providing any kind of equivalents for CSRs, such as ‘sardines-in- the-box’ in TT1 and ‘the banns’ in TT2 would be considered a good example of using Omission.

The analysis shows that Omission was, in some cases, used due to the lack of a good alternative. However, it also reveals that this procedure was employed to avoid unnecessary repetition or because the CSR in the ST is peripheral. Unlike the previous procedures, Omission involves doing nothing to tackle the cultural hindrances in the ST. It is, therefore, considered the most domesticating procedure because it completely removes the cultural aspects of the ST without presenting any alternatives or offering any kind of compensation for the cultural loss in the TT.

### 3.3 The Use of the Official Equivalent

The Official Equivalent holds a neutral position because it is different from all the previously-mentioned procedures. Pederson (2011) states that the process of using this procedure is administrative rather than linguistic because it involves using prefabricated solutions that may vary

well help the translator deal with translation crisis points resulting from the cultural discrepancy between the SC and TC. The Official Equivalent is created through some sort of official decisions and can be based on just about any of the aforementioned translation procedures, except Omission. Such equivalents are often found in standard bilingual dictionaries. Therefore, in our analysis, the Official Equivalent was determined when an X CSR was invariably translated as Y in the TL.

The Official Equivalent was employed almost similarly in both translations. With an overall percentage of 10.76%, the translator in TT1 used this procedure to render 7 examples from the categories of Religious Items, Measures, Social Items, and Activities. In TT2, the Official Equivalent was employed slightly higher; with an overall percentage of 11.26%, this procedure was employed to render a total of 8 examples from the categories of Measures and Social Items. Some examples of that would include the translation of units of measurements, such as ‘foot’ (translated in both TTs as قدم), ‘yard’ (TT1 and TT2: ياردة), titles, such as ‘Duke’ (TT1 and TT2: الدوق), ‘Earl’ (TT1 and TT2: ايرل), religious objects, such as ‘the grail’ (TT1: الكأس المقدسة), and games, such as ‘hide and seek’ (TT1: لعبة الاختباء and TT2: لعبة الغُمِيضَة).

Indeed, both translators used this procedure to translate examples from almost the same categories. This indicates that the CSRs found in such categories are less problematic to translate because they tend to have official equivalents in the TL.

### 3.4 The Overall Use of Foreignization and Domestication Strategies

The overall results show the translators’ tendency to use foreignization in translating the CSRs in both Arabic translations of the novel. In TT1, from the 62 examples that were examined and analyzed, the translator used foreignizing procedures to translate 36 of them. By contrast, domesticating procedures were used in 19 examples, and the Official

Equivalent, which is a neutral strategy, was used to translate 7 examples. In TT2, the translator used foreignization to translate more examples than the one in TT1. Statistically speaking, foreignization was used in TT2 to translate a total of 40 examples. Domestication, on the other hand, was used to translate 14 examples, while the official equivalent was used to render 8 examples. Hence, these results indicate that foreignization was the most used translation strategy in the two translations of the novel *The Great Gatsby* into Arabic. The overall results as to how the translators used these strategies are summarized in the following table.

**Table 2.***The overall degree of the strategies used in translating the CSRs in the two Arabic translations*

Strategy	TT1		TT2	
	Examples	Percentage	Examples	Percentage
Foreignization	36	58.06%	40	64.51%
Domestication	19	30.64%	14	22.58%
Neutral	07	11.29%	08	12.90%
Total	62	100%	62	100%

The preceding table illustrates the overall degree of the strategies used in rendering the CSRs in the two Arabic translations. Percentagewise, in TT1, the translator used foreignization to translate 58.06% of the analyzed examples, followed by domestication 30.64% and then the neutral Official Equivalent 11.29%. In TT2, the translator used foreignization to render 64.51% of the selected examples, followed by domestication 22.58% and then the Official Equivalent 12.90%. Such results indicate that both translators adopted a relatively similar approach in their translations. In other words, both of them adhered to the ST and employed source-oriented procedures in their overall translations of the cultural references in the ST. That is, in most cases, both translators favored retaining the cultural

specificity of the ST and sticking to solutions that were in line with the prevailing norms of the SL and SC.

### 3.5 Assessing the Validity of the Retranslation Hypothesis

Based on the RH implying that the first translation of a given literary work tends to be domesticated while later subsequent retranslation tends to be foreignized, it is evident that the findings of this study are not exactly in line with this claim and, thus, this hypothesis does not seem to hold entirely true against empirical data.

Indeed, the overall level of domestication in the first translation is actually higher than the subsequent retranslation. However, the overall degree of foreignization in both translations is much higher than domestication. Therefore, both translations are foreignized and are, more or less, close to the ST. While it is true that the level of foreignization of the retranslated version is higher than the first translation, it does not seem to be more faithful or truthful to the original than the first one. In fact, the results of the analysis show no significant differences between the two translations in terms of their tendency towards the SC. Despite some differences regarding the ways the translators dealt with CSRs in their translations, the general tendency exhibits the same translational behavior and shows adherence to the same source-oriented norms.

Undoubtedly, if we compared the degree of domestication in the first translation to the second translation, and the level of foreignization in the first translation to the one in the second translation, the RH would certainly be valid to some extent. However, it certainly does not have general validity if it is formulated in absolute terms.

## 4 - Conclusion:

This paper was dedicated to the analysis of the novel *The Great Gatsby* and its two Arabic translations. The comparative analysis was carried out to account for the translators' overall tendencies in using domestication and foreignization strategies in rendering the CSRs in the ST.

The examination of the data was achieved by comparing the ST's cultural instances to their corresponding equivalents in the TT to reveal the procedures applied in rendering each CSR in each translation. The results of the analysis revealed the tendency to use foreignization in both translations. That is, in TT1, foreignization was employed 58.06% of the time, as opposed to 30.64% for domestication. In TT2, the level of foreignization was even higher; the translator applied this strategy to render 64.51% of the selected examples, as opposed to domestication, which was used 22.58% of the time. The Official Equivalent, which takes a neutral stand, was applied almost similarly in both translations; it was utilized 11.29% in TT1 and 12.90% in TT2. These results indicate that foreignization was the most prevalent strategy used in both translations. Both translators chose to adhere to the same source-oriented norms and tended to employ the same source-oriented procedures in their translations of the cultural instances in the ST. Therefore, it is evident that the findings of this study are not exactly in line with the general assumptions of the RH and, thus, they do not support its gist. This indicates that the RH does not have general validity, as it does not hold entirely true against empirical data. However, it should be noted that this hypothesis would certainly be partly valid only if it was not formulated in absolute terms, as the findings of this study suggest. Nevertheless, it is also crucial to bear in mind that the findings of this study cannot be generalized and, thus, the RH still has not been absolutely proven or refuted. Therefore, further research needs to be carried out and more case studies need to be analyzed to reassess the validity of the RH using the same of different methodologies.

## 5 - References

1. Bensimon, P. (1990). Pr sentation. *Palimpsestes*, 4, IX-XIII. Retrieved from <http://palimpsestes.revues.org/598>
2. Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction. *Palimpsestes*, 4, 1-7. doi:10.4000/palimpsestes.596
3. Chesterman, A. (2000). A causal model for translation studies. In M. Olohan (Ed.), *Intercultural faultlines: Research models in translation studies I:*

- Textual and cognitive aspects* (pp. 15-27). Manchester, United Kingdom: St. Jerome Publishing.
4. Deane, S. (2011). *Confronting the retranslation hypothesis: Flaubert and Sand in the British literary system* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
  5. Desmidt, I. (2009). (Re)translation revisited. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, 54(4), 669-683. doi:10.7202/038898ar
  6. Fitzgerald, F. S. (1925). *The great Gatsby*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
  7. Fitzgerald, F. S. (1961). *The great Gatsby* (N. El Manie', Trans.). Baghdad, Iraq: by El Jawadi Library.
  8. Fitzgerald, F. S. (2008). *The great Gatsby* (H. Yared, & M. Hittini, Trans.). Irbid, Jordan: Modern Book's World.
  9. Gambier, Y. (1994). La retraduction, retour et d'écour. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, 39(3), 413-417. doi:10.7202/002799ar
  10. Kolečáčová, R. (2007). *Culture-specifics in subtitling: A comparative study of films for adult vs. young audiences* (Master's thesis, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic). Retrieved from [https://is.muni.cz/th/53124/ff\\_m/](https://is.muni.cz/th/53124/ff_m/)
  11. Paloposki, O., & Koskinen, K. (2004). A thousand and one translations: Revisiting retranslation. In G. Hansen, K. Malmkjær, & D. Gile (Eds.), *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies: Selected contributions from the EST congress, Copenhagen 2001* (pp. 27-38). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
  12. Pavlović, N., & Poslek, D. (2003). British and Croatian culture-specific concepts in translation. *British Cultural Studies: Cross-Cultural Challenges*, 157-168.
  13. Pedersen, J. (2011). Subtitling norms for television: An exploration focusing on extralinguistic cultural references. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
  14. Susam-Sarajeva, S. (2003). Multiple-entry visa to traveling theory: Retranslations of literary and cultural theories. *Target International Journal of Translation Studies*, 15(1), 1-36. doi: 10.1075/target.15.1.02sus

15. Venuti, L. (2008). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.