

A Review of the History of Translation Studies

Ali Reza Ghanooni

Romance and Germanic Philology, Yerevan State University, Yerevan, Armenia

Email: ghanoonialireza@yahoo.com

Abstract—This paper aims at a general review of the history of translation studies and the prevalent approaches from antiquity to the present in the west, in the form of a historical survey in which key theoretical developments are taken into account, focusing on approaches that have been developed during the twentieth century. Without a doubt, It is James Holme's seminal paper "the name and nature of translation studies" that draws up a disciplinary map for translation studies and serves as a springboard for researchers with its binary division of Translation Studies into two branches: "pure" and "applied." Its growth as a discipline goes back to the 1980s. As time elapses, translation studies, by achieving a certain institutional authority and coalescing with many a resurging disciplines and trends as cultural studies, linguistics, literary theory and criticism, brings a renewed aspect to translation theory.

Index Terms—history, approaches, trends, theories

I. INTRODUCTION

Behind the field of translation lies the names and theories emerging at diverse periods. There are changes taking place in the history of translation; however, such changes differ from one place into another. For example, those flourishments in the western world are far removed from the eastern part. Two of the pioneers of the field are Horace and Cicero (first century B.C) whose discussions of translation practice pertains to word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation. Subsequently, such basic trends affect later progressions and advances in the field, exerting a crucial influence up until the twentieth century.

II. A REVIEW OF THE DISCIPLINE: THEORIES IN ANTIQUITY

As it is conspicuous, translation theory is much sparse in antiquity, and the theories that emerge at the time are unsystematic remarks, mainly situated in the discipline of rhetoric. In fact, the very pioneers of the field are luminary Roman commentators, such as Cicero, Quintilian, who deem translation as a pedagogical exercise whose debate on translation practice pertains to word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation. Cicero (first century B.C), in composing Latin versions of speeches by the Greek orators, writes:

I did not translate as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the figures of thought, but in a language which conforms to our usage and in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word-for-word, but I expressed the general style and the force of language (Cicero 46 BCE/1960 CE, p. 364).

Another period is brought about by St. Jerome (fourth century B.C) whose approach to translating the Septuagint Bible into Latin would affect later translations of the Scriptures (Munday, 2001, p. 7). He negates the word-for-word approach, for by closely following the form of the original, the sense of the original is masked and an absurd translation is created. In vindicating his own strategy, St. Jerome (395 CE/ 1997, p. 25, in J. Munday, 2001, p. 20) writes:

Now, I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek- except in the case of the Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery- I render not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense.

In the seventeenth century, influential theories emerge; the most obvious is that of John Dryden (1631-1700) whose trichotomy on translation types (metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation) makes big strides. He (1680/1992, p.17), as quoted in Venuti (2004, p. 17-18), negates metaphrase (word-for-word) for lacking fluency or easy readability and imitation as well, that adapt the foreign text so as to serve the translator's own literary ambitions, instead he is in favour of paraphrase or translation with latitude, which seeks to render meanings.

At the outset of the nineteenth century, the Romanticism discusses the issue of translatability and untranslatability. In 1813, the German translator Friedrich Schleiermacher writes a seminal paper on "*The Different Methods of Translating*." He moves beyond word-for-word, literal, sense-for-sense or free translation. He argues the real question is how to bring the ST writer and the TT reader together, he writes:

Either the translator leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader towards the writer or he leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer towards the reader (Schleiermacher, 1813/1992, p. 41-2, In Munday, 2001, p. 28).

His preferred strategy is the first. To achieve this, the translator has to render in such a way so as to procure the same impression as the original reader would have. This cannot be done but by having recourse to an "alienating" rather than "naturalizing" method of translation, ensuring that the language and the content of the ST are in translating language (ibid: 43).

A. 1900-1930s

During the 1900s to 1930s, in translation theory the crucial trends are rooted in German literary and philosophical traditions and hermeneutics. It is considered that language is not communicative, but constitutive in its representations of thought and reality. For translation, taking this into account, it is viewed as an interpretation which necessarily reconstitutes and transforms the foreign text. For scholars as Schleiermacher and Bolt, translation is a creative force in which specific translation strategies serve a variety of cultural and social functions, paving the way for the construction of nations, literatures and languages (in Venuti, 2004, p. 74)

At the outset of the twentieth century, these ideas are rethought from the viewpoint of modernist movement. What is of significance in this movement is the "autonomy" of the translation, its "status" as a text in its own right, derivative but independent as a work of signification. Walter Benjamin in his 1923 essay, "*The Task of the Translator*" argues that the aim of a translation should not be to confer to the readers an understanding of the meaning or information content of the original. It is the hallmark of bad translations. Translation exists separably but in conjunction with the original, coming after it, giving the original 'continued life' (Benjamin, 1968/2000, p. 16). According to him, the hallmark of a good translation is that it should 'express the central reciprocal between languages' (ibid. 17). This reciprocal relation points toward the "kinship" of languages and that the task of the translator can be more significant than the writer of the original. He believes that the translator, through the decade barriers of his language releases the "pure language." For him, pure language is a force hidden within certain texts, a poetic potential, a kernel that is striving to beyond the immediate shell of words. It is the task of the translator to reach out to and release that potentiality. This pure language is released by the co-existence and complementation of the translation with the original (ibid. 22). For this pure language to shine through, the strategy of literalism should be exercised:

A real translation is transparent; it does not cover the original, does not block its light, but allows the pure language, as though reinforced by its own medium, to shine upon the original all the more fully. This may be achieved by a literal rendering of the syntax which proves words rather than sentences to be the primary elements of the translator (Benjamin, 1968/2000, p. 22).

Another theorist who is more in line with the German interest is Ezra Pound. In Pound's view, the "autonomy of translation" takes two forms. A translated text might be interpretive, written next to the foreign poem and composed of linguistic peculiarities that direct the reader across the page to foreign textual features, or a translation can be original writing in which the TT literary standards are an impetus to rewriting the ST poem so as to seem a new poem (1934: 55). This second stance is in line with the translation of Khayyam by Fitzgerald. Pound's standards are modernist; he adopts the first so as to recover foreign poetries to advance these values in the TT.

At the end of the 1930s, translation is viewed as a separate linguistic practice, a literary genre apart, with its own norms and ends (Ortega y Gasset, 1992, p. 109). Ortega, in his paper "*The Misery and the Splendor of Translation*" argues for the importance of the German translation tradition. By "Misery", Ortega means the impossibility of the task, for in the two intended languages, there are differences not only linguistically, but also culturally and mentally. On the other hand, what he means by "splendour" is the act of overcoming such differences and by so doing the TL reader is forced out of his/her linguistic habits and would move within the linguistic habits of the foreign author (Ortega y Gasset, 1992, p. 108).

B. 1940-1950s

In the 1940s to 1950s, the prevalent concept is "translatability". During this decade, the main issue to be tackled by linguists and literary critics is that whether the differences that separate the languages and culture can be brought back to friendship via translation or not. To achieve this, the impediments to translation are jotted down, to see whether they are surmountable or not, and translation methods are formulated. Ideas are formed by disciplinary trends and change to a great extent, ranging between the extremes of philosophical skepticism and practical optimism (in Venuti, 2004, p. 111).

The figure skeptical of translatability is Willard Quine. He develops the concepts of "radical translation," and "indeterminacy of translation" (Brower, 1959, p. 148; Quine, 1960). "Radical translation" describes the situation in which a linguist attempts to translate a completely unknown language, which is unrelated to his own, and is therefore forced to rely solely on the observed behavior of its speakers in relation to their environment. Any hypothesis of translation could be defended only by appeal to context: to seeing what other sentences a native would utter. But the same indeterminacy will appear there: any hypothesis can be defended if one adopts enough compensatory hypotheses regarding other parts of language (*Word and Object* 1960). He Questions the empirical foundations of translation by pointing to a semantic "indeterminacy" that cannot be resolved even in the presence of an environmental "stimulus" (ibid. 172). Quine (1960) tells a story to illustrate this indeterminacy, in which an explorer is trying to puzzle out the meaning of the word "gavagai". He observes that the word is used in the presence of rabbits, but is unable to determine whether it means 'undetached rabbit part', or 'fusion of all rabbits', or 'temporal stage of a rabbit', or 'the universal 'rabbithood'.

In contrast, Quine admits that translating in fact occurs on the basis of "analytical hypothesis," derived from segmentations of foreign utterances which are equated with words and phrases in the translating language (Brower 1969: 165), by means of which, linguists can create dictionaries, manuals and grammars by relying on them. Despite these

tools, he believes that between the intended stimuli and meaning there can be no out-and-out correlation (ibid: 154-155). Quine's work leads to a more pragmatic view of translation, in which meaning is viewed as conventional, socially circumscribed and the ST is reproduced in the receiving culture according to the terms and values embedded in the TL (ibid: 171).

However, Heidegger's approach to language is literary. Bringing back Schleiermacher's concept as "bringing the domestic reader as much as possible to the foreign text", Heidegger adopts a "poetizing" strategy that does violence to everyday language by relying on archaism, which submits to etymological interpretations (Heidegger 1975: 19).

When literary criticism considers the question of translatability, it accentuates the impossibility of reproducing a foreign literary text in another language which is sedimented with different literary styles, genres and traditions (in Venuti, 2004, p. 112).

On the other side of the extreme lies "optimism," occupied by linguistic analysis. The question of translatability is taken into account by linguists. They analyze specific translation problems and subsequently describe the methods that the translators have developed to solve them. This optimism emanates to a certain degree from a theory of language that is communicative of meaning, not constitutive of it, conceived along empiricist lines as referential (ibid: 113).

Chaim Robins, in his essay *The Linguistics of Translation* affirms that translation involves two distinct factors, a "meaning," or reference to some slice of reality, and the difference between two languages in referring to that reality" (1958, p. 123).

Another figure who theorizes about the problem of translating between different realities is Eugene Nida (1945). Nida by working on the translation of Bible comes to this conclusion that solutions to translation problems should be ethnological, contingent upon the translator's acquisition of sufficient "cultural information." He brings up a cultural word in the Bible like "desert" which should, according to him, be rendered as "abandoned place" so that the "cultural equivalent of the desert of Palestine" is established (1945: 197). By adopting such a procedure, though it is a paraphrase, the linguistic and cultural differences will boil down to a shared referent, causing the concept to be comprehensible in the translating language.

Roman Jakobson's study of translatability gives a new impetus to the theoretical analysis of translation since he introduced a semiotic reflection on translatability. On the basis of his semiotic approach to language and his aphorism 'there is no signatum without signum' (Jakobson, 1959, p. 232), he suggests three kinds of translation:

- Intralingual (within one language, i.e. rewording or paraphrase)
- Interlingual (between two languages)
- Intersemiotic (between sign systems)

Jakobson claims that, in the case of interlingual translation, the translator makes use of synonyms in order to get the ST message across. This means that in interlingual translation, there is no full equivalence between code units. He conceives of meaning not as a reference to reality, but as a relation to an endless chain of signs. According to his theory, 'translation is a process of recoding involving two equivalent messages in two different codes' (ibid.:233).

And finally, the concept of translatability is drawn on by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (1958). Unlike Jakobson who negates empiricist semantics, these two figures say that descriptions of translation methods involve some reduction of linguistic and cultural differences to empiricist semantics: according to them "Equivalence of message," ultimately relies upon an identity of situations, where the term "situations" indicate an undefined "reality." (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995, p. 42).

They provide six translation procedures. "Borrowing, calque and literal translation" are implemented in situations where the translation is "direct". By "direct" they mean "the possibility of transposing the SL message element by element into the TL. The other three are "transposition, modulation and equivalence." These three procedures are applied in situations where the translation is "oblique". These latter procedures are applied when certain stylistic effects cannot be transposed into the TL, because of structural or metalinguistic differences, without upsetting the syntactic order, or even the lexis (Vinay and Darbelnet in Venuti, 2004, p. 128).

C. 1960-1970s

In the 1960s to 1970s, the main prevailing concept in translation studies is "equivalence." When this concept is applied to translation, translation is viewed as a process of communicating the ST via the creation of a relationship of identity with the ST. George Mounin (1963) negates the concept of "relativity" that made translation not feasible, and instead draws on the concept of "equivalence", arguing that it hinges upon the "universals of language and culture (p. 38)." In this period, it is believed that there are identifiable units in a text which are stable and invariant, with defined units and categories of language which can be broken down. There are some scholars who theorize about this concept as Werner Koller and Eugene Nida.

koller (1979a, p. 185), in answering what this concept means, enunciates five types of equivalence (ibid: 99-104):

1. "Denotative equivalence" or equivalence of the extralinguistic content of a text. It is called "content invariance."
2. "Connotative equivalence," depending on the similarities of register and style. Koller refers to this as "Stylistic equivalence."
3. "Text-normative equivalence," relating to text types, with different kinds of texts behaving in different ways.
4. "Pragmatic equivalence," or "communicative equivalence," oriented towards the receiver of the text or message.

5. "Formal equivalence," relating to the aesthetics and the form of the text.

Nida argues that there are two different types of equivalence, namely *formal and dynamic equivalence*. Formal correspondence 'focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content', unlike dynamic equivalence which is based upon 'the principle of equivalent effect' (Nida, 1964, p. 159). Dynamic equivalence is defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original in such a way that the TL wording will trigger the same impact on the TL audience as the original wording did upon the ST audience (Nida and Taber, 1982, p. 200).

During this period, a distinction has to be made between pragmatic equivalence (a translation which considers the receptor language reader and hence comprehensibility) and formal equivalence (in which the linguistic and cultural aspects of the ST are transparent in translation). There are some figures that move along this line (in Venuti 2004: 147). One is Eugene Nida, as discussed above. In 1997, there is a similar opposition by Newmark, distinguishing between "semantic and communicative" translation, the former being source-oriented and the latter target-oriented (Newmark 1998a: 47) and Juliane House between "overt and covert" translation. An 'overt translation' is a TT that does not purport to be original. It is a translation in which the addressees of the TT are quite "overtly" not being addressed (House 1997: 66). However, a 'covert translation' is the one which enjoys the status of the ST in the TL culture. The ST is not linked particularly to the ST culture or audience; both ST and TT address their respective receivers directly (ibid. 69). The function of a covert translation is "to recreate, reproduce and represent in the TT the function the original has in its intralingual framework and discourse world." (ibid. 114). House's distinction considers how much the ST hinges upon its culture for comprehensibility. If the significance of the ST is indigenous, then an overt translation is needed by relying on supplementary information, whether expansions, insertions or footnotes (in Venuti, 2004, p. 148).

Inevitably, upon considering the concept of equivalence, the term "shift" comes to the fore. This concept is defined by Catford (1965). He (1965) defines it as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from SL to TL, departures that can occur at linguistic level as graphology, phonology, grammar and lexis (p. 73). Yet, he concludes that translation equivalence does not entirely match formal correspondence and such deviations occur (ibid. 82).

Ultimately, functionalists, in the case of literary texts, negate the concept of equivalence and instead draw on the TL reader. Etmar Even-Zohar and Guidon Toury (1978) argue that literary translations are facts of the target system. A literary work is not studied in isolation but as part of a literary system, which itself is defined as "a system of functions of the literary order which are in continual relationship with other orders (Tynjanov, 1927/71, p. 72). Literature is part of the social, cultural and historical framework, and the main notion is that of "system", in which there is an ongoing dynamic of mutation and struggle for the primary position in the literary canon (in Munday, 2001, p. 109).

Itamar Even-Zohar sees the position of translated literature in the literary polysystem of a society as a primary one when it actively participates in modeling the center of the polysystem. Hence, translated literature fulfills the needs of a young literature to put its renewed tongue in use in as many literary genres as possible in order to make it functional as a literary language and useful for its emerging public. When a SL Literary system is young and in the process of being established, a young literature cannot create major texts in all genres until its polysystem has crystallized, then it greatly benefits from the experience of other literatures, and translated literature becomes, in a way, one of its most important systems and translation, in this case occupies a primary position and as he says, to achieve this, the translation strategy should be to produce a TT that is a close match in terms of adequacy, reproducing the textual relations of the ST. In contrast, if the SL literary system is rich, then translation occupies a peripheral or secondary position and translation can be produced non-adequately by exploiting the existing target culture models for the TT (Even-Zohar 1978: 117, in Munday, 2001, p. 110).

During this decade, with the expansion of translation research, bringing this field into a new academic discipline was the main point. At the time, Nida (1964) called his theories a "science of translating," but the seminal paper "*The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*" by James Holmes (1972) paves the way for the development of the field as a distinct discipline. Not only does he define a name for the field, but also describes what translation studies cover. He distinguishes between "pure-research oriented areas of theory" and "applied areas" like training and criticism (Holmes, 1988b/2000, p.176).

In 1975, the key advance of hermeneutics of translation is George Steiner's influential *After Babel*. It opposes modern linguistics with a philosophical approach. Steiner, unlike linguistic-oriented theories that considered translation as functional communicative, goes back to German Romanticism and the hermeneutic tradition. He defines the hermeneutic approach as "the investigation of what it means to "understand a piece of oral or written speech, and the attempt to diagnose this process in terms of a general model of meaning" (Steiner, 1975/98, p. 249). For him, the aim of language should not be to communicate meaning, but it should be constitutive in reconstructing it (p. 205). He argues that "great translation must carry with it the most precise sense of the resistant, of the barriers intact at the heart of understanding (ibid. 375).

The hermeneutic motion consists of four parts: 1) initiative trust; 2) aggression; 3) incorporation (or embodiment); 4) compensation (or restitution).

D. 1980s

In this decade, Susan Bassnett's *Translation Studies* is published. In her book, diverse branches of translation research are combined, marking the resurgence of translation studies as a separate field overlapping with linguistics, literary

criticism and philosophy. At the same time, problems of cross-cultural communication are in focus. The approach she takes to theoretical concepts is historical and understands practical strategies in relation to specific cultural and social situations. However, what she accentuates most is the relative autonomy of the translated text (as quoted in Venuti, 2004, p. 221).

In this period, translation is viewed as an independent form of writing, distinct from the source text and that texts originally written in the translating language (ibid. 221)

The issue of equivalence, as it was prevalent in the previous decade, loses its significance. William Frawley negates the concept of equivalence and argues that translation is a form of communication, there is information only in difference, so that translation is a code in its own right, with its own rules and standards, though they are derivative of the matrix information and target parameters (1984, p. 168-169).

The autonomy of translation as "functional", is viewed by other scholars in consequence of the social factors involved in directing the translator's activity. Justa Holz-Mänttari (1984), instead of using the term "translation", uses the term "translational action" to encompass diverse forms of cross cultural communication, not only translating, paraphrasing and adapting but also editing and consulting (p. 43). In such cases, the TTs are produced in consultation with the client's needs to serve a particular purpose in the receiving culture. Here, the question of equivalence is out of question, and it is the translator who should decide how to produce the text so as to fulfill the client's needs.

The aspect of functionality bears great impact on Hans Vermeer's work. Vermeer (1989) accentuates on the "skopos" or aim of the translator as a crucial factor. Although this theory predates Holz-Mänttari's theory of translational action, it is part of that same theory, as it deals with a translational action which is ST-based, which has to be negotiated and performed, which has a purpose and result (Vermeer, 1989/2000, p. 221). Skopos theory concentrates mainly on the purpose of the translation, which determines the translation methods and strategies that are to be employed in order to produce a functionally adequate result. This result is TT, which Vermeer call *translatum*. Hence, two main points for the translator to keep in mind is knowing why an ST is to be translated and what the function of the TT will be (ibid. 222).

Vermeer's approach resembles the contemporary trends in literary history and criticism, i.e. reader-response theory, where the translations are prepared in accord with the TL audience needs (in Venuti 2004: 223).

Andre Lefevere is another figure who follows Zohar and Toury's concept of literary system. Lefevere views translation as "refraction" or "rewriting." As he says (1992a), refractions carry a work of literature from one system into another. He sees translation as an act carried out under the influence of particular categories and norms constituent to systems in a society (p. 12).

Lefevere (1992a), focuses on the examination of the very concrete factors that systematically govern the reception, acceptance or rejection of literary texts; that is, issues as power, ideology, institution and manipulation. Lefevere views such power positions as "rewriting" literature, who govern its consumption by the people (p. 2).

According to Lefevere, there are three main factors that control the literary system in which translation functions: 1) professionals within the literary system; 2) patronage outside the literary system; 3) the dominant poetics (Lefevere, 1992a, p. 13).

On the other hand, Antoine Berman in *Translation and the trials of the foreign* negates "ethnocentric translating". According to him, the hallmark of a bad translation is when it domesticates the foreign word and does not let in the foreignness of the foreign work, when the SL text is assimilated to TL reader and culture (Berman, 1984, p. 17). Instead, he argues that a good translation is the one in which the linguistic and cultural differences of the ST are registered in the TT. This foreignness cannot be achieved but by literalism. Thus, by developing a "correspondence" and "literalism", The TL is enriched and amplified (Berman, 1995, p. 94). He views translating as the "trial of the foreign," "trial" in two senses (ibid. 276):

- 1) A trial for the target culture in experiencing the strangeness of the foreign text and word;
- 2) A trial for the foreign text in being uprooted from its original language context.

However, Berman sees that in every translation there is a system of textual deformation in the TTs that hinders the foreign coming through. He calls this deformation as "negative analytic." (ibid. 278).

In this period, translation can never be an untroubled communication of the foreign text. It is rather manipulation. Manifold works on translation view language as communicative of a range of possible meanings and it is with the emergence of poststructuralism that language is a site of uncontrollable polysemy, therefore, translation is not transformative of the ST, but interrogative or as Jaque Derrida says, "deconstructive" (Derrida, 1979, p. 93).

This period witnesses the resurgence of a postcolonial reflection on translation in anthropology, area studies, literary theory and criticism as well.

E. 1990s and Beyond

The 1990s sees the incorporation of new schools and concepts, with Canadian-based translation and gender research, postcolonial translation theory, with the prominent figures as Spivak and in the US, the cultural studies oriented analysis of Lawrence Venuti, who champions the cause of the translator (Munday, 2001, p. 14).

Translation studies in the last decade of the twentieth century establishes itself as a purely separate discipline, thanks to the scholarly publications and a worldwide dissemination of translator training programs. A new kind of textbook appears as well: a book of theories presenting research methodologies to students (in Venuti, 2004, p. 326).

In this decade, translation research progresses with an amalgam of theories and methodologies being prevalent in the previous decade, pursuing trends in such disciplines as (polysystem, skopos and poststructuralism) and also developments in linguistics (pragmatics, critical discourse analysis and computerized corpora) and in literary and cultural theory (postcolonialism, sexuality, globalization (ibid: 325).

Varieties of linguistics remains part of the field, for it is considered that in training translators of commercial, technical and other sorts of nonfiction text, they are of avail and the findings of linguistics are used to solve translation problems (ibid. 326).

One of the varieties is that of pragmatics and discourse analysis, seeking to conceptualize translation on the model of Grecian conversation (in Mona Baker, 1998, p. 181).

In pragmatics, one of the basic assumptions is that, in conversation being sincere is a social obligation (Austin 1962, ibid. 181). However, language users can evoke and interpret implied meanings. Considering this potential for generating and retrieving meanings other than those that are stated explicitly, Grice (1975) seeks to account for where and why this smooth ongoingness is hindered, thus leading to implicature. He stipulates a Cooperative Principle, four conversational maxims that language users adhere to: "quantity" of information, "quality" or truthfulness, "relevance" or consistency of context and "manner" or clarity. The flouting of these maxims will be conducive to "implicature" (p. 181). Hence, translating is the communication of the ST by cooperating with the TL reader according to these four maxims and in pragmatics, a foreign message is conveyed with its "implicature" by having resort to the maxims of the TL community.

Gutt (1991, p. 101) tries to describe translation in terms of a general theory of human communication; therefore, he models translation via "relevance theory."

Gutt (1991), by basing translation upon relevance theory, writes:

If we ask in what respects the intended interpretation should resemble the original, the answer is: in respects that make it adequately relevant to the audience, that is, that offer adequate contextual effects; if we ask how the translation should be expressed, the answer is: it should be expressed in such a manner that it yields the intended interpretation without putting the audience to unnecessary processing effort, in this way, the result will be a "faithful" translation (1991, p. 101-102).

Thus, according to him, translation should be clear and natural in expression in the sense that it should not be difficult to understand (ibid. 102).

In 1990s, what provides translation studies with powerful analytical tools is corpus-linguistics. It is a branch of linguistics that studies language on the basis of corpora, i.e., "bodies of texts assembled in a principled way" (Johansson 1995: 19). It is the study of language through vast computer-stored collections of texts. One of its main goal is to separate the features of language used in translations, features that are not the result of interference from the SL.

Baker (1995) distinguishes between "parallel corpora" (consisting of texts originally written in language A alongside their translations into a language B) and "comparable corpora" (consisting of a collection of texts originally written in a language, say English, alongside a collection of texts translated (from one or more languages) into English (Baker, 1998, p. 51-2).

"process-oriented" research is also in focus, as Holmes termed it. In this research the mental activity of the translator is studied. In order to extract the empirical data, scholars exploit "think-aloud protocols" where translators are asked to verbalize their thinking during or after the translation process (in Baker, 1998, p. 266).

Another crucial advance in translation studies is the concept of "cultural turn," synthesizing fields as literary theory and criticism, film and anthropology that in 1978 is presaged by the work on Polysystems and translation norms by Even-Zohar and in 1980 by Toury. They dismiss the linguistic kinds of theories of translation and refer to them as having moved from word to text as a unit but not beyond. They themselves go beyond language and focus on the interaction between translation and culture, on the way culture impacts and constraints translation and on the larger issues of context, history and convention. Therefore, the move from translation as a text to translation as culture and politics is what they call it a Cultural Turn in translation studies and becomes the ground for a metaphor adopted by Bassnett and Lefevere in 1990. In fact Cultural Turn is the metaphor adopted by Cultural Studies oriented translation theories to refer to the analysis of translation in its cultural, political, and ideological context (Lefevere and Bassnett, 1990, p. 8)

This issue sheds new light on a renewed functionalism to translation theory, the social effects of translation and the political and ethical aftermaths involved (ibid. 325).

According to Bassnett, the translator who takes a text and transposes it into another culture has to consider carefully the ideological implications of that transposition (1980/1991, p. 15). Sherry Simon describes how she sees culture and language interacting at the point of translation:

Translators must constantly take decisions about the cultural meanings which language carries, and evaluate the degree to which the two different worlds they inhabit are "the same"....In fact, the process of meaning transfer has less to do with finding the cultural inscription of the term than in reconstructing its value (1996, p. 139).

Culturally-oriented researches suspect regularities and universals, accentuating the social and historical differences of translation. This approach stems partly from the influence of poststructuralism, the doubt it casts on abstract formalizations, timeless and universal essences. Poststructuralist translation theory, instead, calls attention to the exclusions and hierarchies that are masked by the realistic illusion of transparent language, the fluent translating that

seems untranslated. And this enables an interrogation of cultural and political effects, the role played by translation in the creation and functioning of social movements and institutions (Venuti, 2004, p. 328-9).

Post-colonialism is one of the most thriving points of contact between Cultural Studies and Translation Studies. Translation is here theorized as a cultural political practice that might be strategic in bringing about social change. In 1993, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak was the one who introduced postcolonialism, constituting a feminist intervention into postcolonial translation issues. It can be defined as a broad cultural approach to the study of power relations between different groups, cultures or peoples in which language, literature and translation may play a role (Hatim and Munday, 2004, p. 106). Spivak's work is indicative of how cultural studies and especially post-colonialism has over the past decade focused on issues of translation, the translational and colonization. The key concept used by Spivak is 'translatese'. This term refers to a lifeless form of TL that homogenizes the different ST authors. Spivak criticizes the lifeless translates that comes from a translator third-world feminist texts who is not fully at one with the rhetoricity of the language in question.

'Translatese' is viewed by Spivak as a 'species of neo-colonialist construction of the non-western scene' since the dominant but the characterless English that results (it is English that is the dominant TL) erases the speech patterns and differences of the huge range of 'third-world' feminist voices. This has its echo in Venuti's criticism of Anglo-American publishing practices that favour domesticating translation. Hence, to come up with this issue, the concept of 're-translation' in post-colonialism comes to the fore. This concept is a practice of 'resistance' by translating anew key texts to subvert colonialist discourse. The linking of colonization and translation is accompanied by the argument that translation has played an active role in the colonization process and in disseminating an ideologically motivated image of colonized people. The metaphor has been used of the colony as an imitative and inferior translational copy whose suppressed identity has been overwritten by the colonizer.

Cultural studies bring to translation an understanding of the complexities of *gender, culture and sexuality* as well. Simon (1996) approaches translation from a gender-studies angle (p. 1). She sees a language of sexism in translation studies, with its image of dominance, fidelity, faithfulness and betrayal. What marks the history of translation is how best to be "faithful and that fidelity in translation has been defined in terms of gender and sexuality. The feminist theorists see a parallel between the status of the translation, which is often considered to be derivative and inferior to original writing, and that of woman, so often repressed in society and literature. Hence, the feminists attempted to subvert this male-oriented discourse with what they termed 'translation project'. This term is an approach to literary translation in which feminist translators openly advocate and implement strategies (linguistic and otherwise) to foreground the feminist in the translated text. While theorists have implemented a variety of metaphors to explain the translator's work, those metaphors that pertains gender, divulge something of the politics of translation. They reveal an anxiety about origins and originality, and a power struggle over the meaning of difference (in Baker, 1998, p. 93). Translators have worried that the process of translation may violate the purity of the modern tongue and equally worry over that the virility of the original, that the ST has been emasculated (ibid. 94).

Sherry Simon (1996) mentions the seventeenth century image of "les belles infidels" (unfaithful beauties), translations into French that were artistically beautiful but unfaithful. She went further and investigated George Steiner's male-oriented image of translation as penetration (p. 27).

As the domain of "cultural studies" gains ground, the concept of "ideology" becomes a crucial area of study. Hatim and Mason (1997) state that "ideology encompasses the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups" (1997, p. 147). They make a distinction between the ideology of translating and the translation of ideology. Whereas the former refers to the basic orientation chosen by the translator operating within a social and cultural context, in the translation of ideology they examine the extent of mediation supplied by a translator of sensitive texts. Here "mediation" is defined as the extent to which translators intervene in the transfer process, feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into processing the text (ibid. 147).

And finally, Venuti's work typifies main trends in culturally oriented research during the 1990s. It theorizes translation according to poststructuralist concepts of language and discourse so as to explain their relations to cultural difference and social change (Venuti, 2004, p. 334).

Venuti (1995: 19-20) discusses invisibility hand in hand with two types of translating strategies: *domestication* and *foreignization*. He considers domestication as dominating Anglo-American (TL) translation culture. Just as the postcolonialists were alert to the cultural effects of the differential in power relation between colony and ex-colony, so Venuti (ibid. 20) bemoans the phenomenon of domestication since it involves reduction of the foreign text to the target language cultural values. This entails translating in a transparent, fluent, invisible style in order to minimize the foreignness of the TT. Domestication also covers adherence to domestic literary canons by carefully selecting the texts that are likely to lend themselves to such a translation strategy (Venuti, 1997, p. 241).

Foreignization, on the other hand, entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in target language (ibid. 242). Venuti considers the foreignizing method to be an ethnoveiant pressure on target language cultural values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad. According to him it is highly desirable in an effort to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation. The foreignizing method of translating, a strategy Venuti also termed 'resistancy' (1995: 305-6), is a non-fluent or estranging translation style designed to make visible the persistence of translator by

highlighting the foreign identity of ST and protecting it from the ideological dominance of the target culture.

In his later book *'The Scandals of Translation'* (1998), Venuti insisted on foreignizing or, as he also called it, *'minoritizing'* translation, to cultivate a varied and heterogeneous discourse (1998, p. 11). As far as language is concerned, the minoritizing or foreignizing method of Venuti's translation comes through in the deliberate inclusion of foreignizing elements in a bid to make the translator visible and to make the reader realize that he is reading a translation of the work from a foreign culture. Foreignization is close adherent to the ST structure and syntax.

Despite the fact that Venuti is in favour of "foreignization", he is aware of some of the contradictions and limitations the term carries and believes that a translation involves some domestication since it translates an ST for a target culture and depends on target culture values to become visible when it departs from them (Venuti, 1995, p. 29) and as he says, any communication through translating will involve the release of a domestic remainder (Venuti 2004: 485).

In his book *'The Translator Invisibility'*, (1995) Venuti carries out research on translation in the Anglo-American culture. He found out that most publishers advocate Domestication as it makes the translation reader-friendly. The trend is to choose texts from other cultures that appeal to the Anglo-American values. For Venuti, this method is making the translator 'invisible' on the one hand and implies 'an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values' (p. 20) on the other hand. By Domestication, the Anglo-American culture imposes its own 'hegemonic' power upon other minor cultures.

Foreignization revives Berman and Schleiermacher's line of thinking; however, as Venuti says (2004, p. 334), it goes beyond literalism to advocate experimentalism: innovative translating that samples the dialects and styles already in the translating language to create a discursive heterogeneity which is defamiliarizing, but intelligible in different ways to different constituencies in the translating culture.

III. CONCLUSION

The history of translation studies and the resurgence and genesis of the approaches to this emerging discipline was marked by the first century (BCE) commentator Cicero and then St. Jerome whose word-for-word and sense-for-sense approaches to translation was a springboard for other approaches and trends to thrive. From 1950s, each decade was marked by a dominant concept such as translatability, equivalence etc. Whilst before the twentieth century translation was an element of language learning, the study of the field developed into an academic discipline only in the second half of the twentieth century, when this field achieved a certain institutional authority and developed as a distinct discipline. As this discipline moved towards the present, the level of sophistication and inventiveness did in fact soared and new concepts, methods, and research projects were developed which interacted with this discipline. The brief review here, albeit incomplete, reflects the current fragmentation of the field into subspecialties, some empirically oriented, some hermeneutic and literary and some influenced by various forms of linguistics and cultural studies which have culminated in productive syntheses. In short, translation studies is now a field which brings together approaches from a wide language and cultural studies, that for its own use, modifies them and develops new models specific to its own requirements.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baker, M. (1998). *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge.
- [2] Bassnett, S. (1980). *Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge; revisited edition, 1991.
- [3] Bassnett, S. and A. Lefevere. (1990). *Translation, History and Culture*, London and New York: Printer.
- [4] Benjamin, W. (1968). *The Task of the Translator*, in *Illuminations*, ed. H. Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn, New York: Schocken, pp. 69-82.
- [5] Berman, A. (1984). *L'Epreuve de l'étranger: Culture et la Traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique*, Paris: Gallimard.
- [6] Berman, A. (1995). *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*, Paris: Gallimard.
- [7] Brower, R. (ed.) (1955). *On Translation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [8] Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- [9] Cicero, M. T. (1949). *De inventione, De optimo genere oratum, Topica*, trans. H. M. Hubell, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [10] Derrida, J. (1979). *Living on/Border Lines*, trans. J. Hullbert, in *Deconstruction and Criticism*, New York: Continuum, pp. 75-176.
- [11] Dryden, J. (1680). 'Metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation'. Extracts of 'Preface to Ovid's Epistles' in R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds) (1992), pp. 17-31.
- [12] Even-Zohar, I. (1975). "Decisions in Translating Poetry", *Hasifrut* 21: 32-45. [Hebrew].
- [13] Frawly, W. (ed.) (1984). *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical perspective*, Newark, London and Toronto: Associated University Press.
- [14] Gutt, E. A. (1991). *Translation and relevance: Cognition and Context*, Oxford: Blackwell; 2nd edition, Manchester: St Jerome 2000.
- [15] Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation," in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech acts*, New York: Academic Press.
- [16] Hatim, B. and I. Mason. (1997). *The translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [17] Heidegger, M. (1975). *Early Greek Thinking*, ed. and trans. D. F. Krell and F. A. Capuzzi, New York: Harper and Row.
- [18] Holz-M änt äri, J. (1984). *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

- [19] House, J. (1997). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- [20] Jakobson, R. (1959). 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', in R. A. Brower (ed.) *On Translation*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 232-39.
- [21] Jerome, E. H. (St Jerome) (395) CE/1997). 'De optime genere interpretandi' (Letter 101, to Pammachius), in *Epistolae D. Hieronymi Stridonensis*, Rome: Aldi F., (1565), pp. 285-91, translated by P. Carroll as 'On the best kind of translator', in D. Robinson (ed.) (1997b), pp. 22-30.
- [22] Koller, W. (1979a). *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*, Heidelberg-Wiesbaden: Quelle und Meyer.
- [23] Lefevere, A. (1992a). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London and New York: Routledge.
- [24] Mounin, G. (1963). *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*, Paris: Gallimard.
- [25] Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, London and New York: Routledge.
- [26] Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*, Hempel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- [27] Nida, E. (1945). "Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation Problems," *Word* 1: 194-208.
- [28] Nida, E. A and C. R. Taber (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- [29] Ortega y Gasset, J. (1992). "The Misery and the Splendor of Translation," trans. E. G. Miller, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- [30] Pound, E. (1934). *The ABC of Reading*, New York. New Directions.
- [31] Quine, W. V. O. (1960). *Word and Object*, Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.
- [32] Rabin, C. (1958) "The Linguistics of Translation," in A.H. Smith (ed.) *Aspects of Translation: Studies in Communication* 2, London: Seeker and Warburg, pp. 123-45
- [33] Schleiermacher, F. (1813/1992). 'On the different methods of translating', in R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds) (1992), pp. 36-54.
- [34] Simon, S. (1996). *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and The politics of Transmission*, London and New York: Routledge.
- [35] Spivak, G. (1992). "The Politics of Translation," in *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- [36] Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, London, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 3rd edition, 1998.
- [37] Tynjanov, J. N. (1927). *Arkhaisty I novatory*, Moscow: Akademia, translated (1978) by C. A. Luplow as 'On literary evolution', in Matejka and Pomorska (eds.), pp. 66-67.
- [38] Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.
- [39] Venuti, L. (1997). *The American tradition*, in M. Baker (ed.) (1997a), pp. 305-15.
- [40] Venuti, L. (ed) (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [41] Venuti, L. (ed) (2004). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [42] Vermeer, H. J. (1989). "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action," trans. A. Chesterman, in A. Chesterman (ed.) *Readings in Translation Theory*, Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab, pp. 173-87.
- [43] Vinay, J. & P. Darbelnet. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, trans. And ed. J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ali Reza Ghanooni was born in 1981. He got his B.A in English Translation from Sheikh Bahaei University, Iran and M.A in the same field from Isfahan University. He is currently a third-year Ph.D. student of translation studies at Yerevan State University. He is working on his dissertation titled "A Cross-Cultural Study of Imagery and Pun in Two of Shakespeare's Tragedies: *Macbeth* and *Romeo and Juliet*."