Cultural Approach to Literary Translation

Dr. Mohamed Sidi Mohamed Sidi Mahmoud

Faculty of Arts | Nouakchott University | Mauritania

Abstract: The cultural turn elaborated by Susan Bassnett, Andre Lefevere and Laurence Venuti is useful in the analysis of literary translation. It turns translation from the word level to the text level, with a consideration of the social, historical, cultural and religious contexts within which the process of translation is framed. In fact, their approach is a paradigmatic shift in translation studies because it recognizes the central position of culture in the process and analysis of translation. However, their framework remains unpractical, for it does not offer tangible methods that can solve translation problems resulting from linguistic and cultural divergences between SL and TL. Thus, the article examines the theoretical models elaborated by pioneers of the cultural turn of translation studies, such as those of the Manipulation School [1] and Postcolonial Theory. In addition, this article discusses Venuti's foreignization of translation and its role in cultural representation and translation analysis.

Keywords: culture, domestication, foreignization, manipulation, rewriting.

<div dir="rtl">

مقاربة ثقافية حول الترجمة الأدبية

الدكتور / محمد سيد محمد سيد محمود

كلية الآداب | جامعة نواكشوط | موريتانيا

المستخلص: التحول الثقافي الذي صاغته سوزان باسنيت وأندريه لوفيفر ولورنس فينوتي مفيد في تحليل الترجمة الأدبية. إنه يحول الترجمة من مستوى الكلمة إلى مستوى النص، مع مراعاة السياقات الاجتماعية والتاريخية والثقافية والدينية التي يتم فيها تأطير عملية الترجمة. في الواقع، نهجهم هو تحول نموذجي في دراسات الترجمة لأنه يعترف بالمكانة المركزية للثقافة في عملية الترجمة وتحليلها. ومع ذلك يظل إطار عملهم غير عملي؛ لأنه لا يقدم طرقًا ملموسة يمكن أن تحل مشاكل الترجمة الناتجة عن الاختلافات اللغوية والثقافية بين اللغة المصدر واللغة الهدف. وهكذا، تبحث المقالة في النماذج النظرية التي وضعها رواد التحول الثقافي لدراسات الترجمة، مثل تلك الخاصة بمدرسة التلاعب / الاستغلال ونظرية ما بعد الاستعمار. بالإضافة إلى ذلك تناقش هذه المقالة تغريب فينوتي للترجمة ودورها في التمثيل الثقافي وتحليل الترجمة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التغريب، التدجين، التلاعب، الثقافة، إعادة الكتابة.

</div>

---

(1) The manipulation school in translation studies pioneered by Lefevere and Basnet is highly concerned with ideological manipulation of the ST. It recognizes the ideological and poetical factors that affect the whole translation process.

1.1 Introduction

The emergence of the cultural turn - in the last two decades of the twentieth century- marked a turning point in the evolution of translation theory as it moved translation from concern with the translation of the word to the translation of the text. (Munday, 2008, p. 124-25) Cultural turn, as it is called in the field cultural studies turned attention to the historical, social and cultural contexts of the literary text. (Lui, 2010, p., 94). It was first proposed by Snell Hornby in her influential book Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach and later on developed and pioneered by Andre Lefevere and Susan Bassnett. (Munday, 2008, p. 125)

This article is an attempt to examine the translation models elaborated by exponents of the cultural turn of translation studies. In this regard, the article surveys some contributions of scholars such as Susan Bassnett, Andre Lefevere and Laurence Venuti, in addition to some other postcolonial writers who find the cultural approach to translation useful for reading the colonial discourse.

1.2 Bassnett and Andre Lefevere's Manipulation Theory

The cultural studies scholars Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere are, perhaps, the most important figures in the field of translation studies in the last two/three decades of the last century. They wrote extensively on the question of translation from a cultural perspective. They are considered by many scholars as the pioneers of the cultural approach to literary translation. Their main contributions to translation studies lie in their concern with translation as rewriting. In this regard, Bassnett and Lefevere introduce the concepts of "power,""ideology,""institution" and 'manipulation' as the conditions that frame the process of translating. (Munday, 2008, p. 125). Hence, this section is devoted to exploring these concepts.

Bassnett and Lefevere deconstruct the theory of equivalence advocated by the linguistically oriented approach and theorize translation as rewriting, which is a kind of manipulation of the ST. Lefevere describes rewriting as "potentially most influential because it is able to project the image of an author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin" (Lefevere, 2017, p. 7). In this sense, he turns attention to the importance of rewriting instead of authenticity in translation, which is an impossible task.

Working from within the frame of literary studies, Bassnett and Lefevere investigate the ideological and poetological constraints that inform the literary translation. In Lefevere's view, "rewritings are produced in the service, or under the constraints, of certain ideological and/or poetological currents" (Lefevere, 2017, p. 7). The translator is, thus, a rewriter whose production is governed by his/her own ideology and the dominant poetics of his/her time. Bassnett and Lefevere, therefore, acknowledge the inevitable visibility of the translator as a rewriter. In this sense, translation is a decisive factor in the literary evolution because it bridges the gap between two different cultures by introducing new concepts, philosophies, and even literary genres. (Lefevere & Bassnet, 1992, P. xiii) In their preface to Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame, Andre Lefevere and Susan Bassnett assert that

All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society. (Lefevere & Bassnet, 1992. P, xi)

Therefore, rewriting is a manipulation of the original texts "to make them fit in with the dominant, or one of the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time" (Lefevere, 1992, p. 6). The rewriter's task becomes the adaptation of the originals' poetics and ideology to their counterparts in the TC. Manipulation theory is very important for deconstructing the trope of originality that prevailed in the colonial translations as a means of canonizing the Western cultural representation of the Other. That is to say, Bassnett and Lefevere draw attention to the fact that any translation is a Re-reading offered by the translator to the original text. For example, in his discussion of cultural homogenization, Lefevere observes that some cultures assume the homogeneity of their cultural concepts. Thus, when they translate the Other, they naturalize cultural differences. He gives two extreme examples: the Greece and the Chinese languages. He argues:

Cultures that do not pay much attention to the Other are not just cultures that consider themselves central in the great scheme of things; they are also cultures that are relatively homogeneous, as is borne out in the case of both classical Greek and Chinese cultures. Cultures that are relatively homogeneous tend to see their own way of doing things as 'naturally', the only way, which just as naturally becomes the 'best' way when confronted with other ways. When such cultures themselves take over elements from outside, they will, once again, naturalise them without too many qualms and too many restrictions. (Lefevere, 1998, p. 14).

Obviously, Lefevere calls for cultural awareness through introducing a new version of translation that transcends such simplistic assumptions as the naturalization of other cultures. This assumption is inherited from colonial discourse, which views other cultures as barbaric and in need of 'Westernization'. Hence, translation is a rewriting of the original from target text-oriented perspective so as to broaden and grow the scope of literature and hence achieve intercultural communication.

As a cultural representation project, translation must avoid such methodological problems as homogenization of the cultural other. For Bassnett and Lefevere, the homogenization that prevailed in the colonial era destabilized the main principle of translation-achieving cultural

interaction. (Bassnet & Lefevere, 1998). For instance, in his article, "Composing the Other", Lefevere insists that translation should represent the Other instead of constructing him. He says:

When Chinese translates texts produced by Others outside its boundaries, it translates these texts in order to replace them, pure and simple. The translations take the place of the originals. They function as the originals in the culture to the extent that the originals disappear behind the translations. (Lefevere, 1998, p. 14).

Lefevere warns against the danger of the cultural effacement of the other through domesticating the ST. For Bassnett and Lefevere, this type of rewriting is very ridiculous as it distorts the ST, preventing the cultural interaction, which is the main purpose of translation; hence, it suppresses literary innovation. Interestingly, Basnett and Lefevere allow the translator to recreate and reconstruct the ST to allow for innovative translation to take place, but they do not set out clear principles to differentiate between distortion and innovation in translation. Nevertheless, they develop some analytical tools for dealing with the multiple constraints of literary translation. More importantly, they distinguish a significant function of literary translation, which is the cultural representation of the Other.

Moreover, Bassnett and Lefevere give cultural and ideological factors priority over the linguistic ones. Lefevere states that "on every level of the translation process, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or poetological nature, the latter tend to win out." (Lefevere, 1992, p. 30). Clearly, then, Lefevere shifts the attention from language to culture and ideology. Hence, he considers power relations a key tool in both constructing and analyzing literary systems, and this is one of the distinguishing traits of Lefevere's-and Bassnett's-discourse: both Lefevere and Bassnett draw the attention to the role of ideology and poetics in the process of translation. As Jeremy Munday observes, for Lefevere, the

most important consideration is the ideological one, which in this case refers to the translator's ideology, or the ideology imposed upon the translator by patronage. The poetological consideration refers to the dominant poetics in the TL culture. Together these dictate the translation strategy and the solution to specific problems. (Munday, 2008, p. 127)

Hence, literary translation is controlled by two major factors: (1) the ideology which governs the production and reception of the translation and (2) the poetics which determines translation strategies. Lisheng Liu points out that "André Lefevere's theory of "patronage, poetics and ideology" investigates translation by putting the literary system in the larger "social and cultural context to analyze the constraints on the translation mechanism and norms." (Liu, 2010, p. 94). The translator is, thus, a rewriter whose translation is culturally and ideologically constrained. Here, Bassnett and Lefevere bring translation studies closer to cultural studies by focusing on the power relations that frame Western literary systems. (Munday, 2008, p. 139)

The translation studies school pioneered by Bassnett and Lefevere oversteps the bounds of the concepts of equivalence, faithfulness and adequacy and focus on the TT as an autonomous text and on the translator as a writer. This new vision comes from the use of the cultural studies approach in the cultural turn of translation studies, for both approaches rely on, and give rise to, counter-hegemonic discourses. In her famous essay "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies," Bassnett speaks of this new trend of translation studies. She says,

[T]translation always takes place in a continuum, never in void, and there are all kinds of textual and extra textual constraints upon the translator. These constraints, or manipulatory processes involved in the transfer of texts have become the primary focus of work in translation studies, and in order to study those processes, translation studies has changed its course and has become both broader and deeper. (Bassnett, 1998, p.123).

Bassnett and Lefevere's theory represents a paradigmatic shift from word level to text level, focusing on the cultural and ideological constraints on translation. Jeremy Munday observes: "Bassnett and Lefevere go beyond language and focus on the interaction between translation and culture, on the way in which culture impacts and constrains translation." (Munday, 2008, p. 125) Culture is thus a crucial determinant of the translation process. In this sense, the translator has to understand both the SC and the TC. Hence, Bassnett and Lefevere's approach functions as a tool for analyzing translation in different cultures. According to Genzler, "[r]ather than suggesting that one theory of translation is valid across cultures and time, Bassnett's and Lefevere's multiple models are helpful for studying translations in different cultures during different periods." (Genzler, 1998, p. xiii).

Basnet and Lefevere's manipulation theory is one of the most productive translation theories made within the literary studies, simply because it raises many pertinent questions at once. It considers translation as a process that operates under different poetological and ideological constraints. For Bassnett,

a study of the processes of translation combined with the praxis of translating could offer a way of understanding how complex manipulative textual processes take place: how a text is selected for translation, for example, what role the translator plays in that selection, what role an editor, publisher or patron plays, what criteria determine the strategies that will be employed by the translator, how a text might be received in the target system. (Bassnet, 1998, p.123).

The manipulation process , then, is very complex, for it takes into consideration all the poetic and ideological factors that constrain the translation process—besides the cultural requirements of the target language. In this way, Bassnett draws the attention to the importance of the target culture in determining the translation process. In Bassnett and Lefevere's view, the focus on the TT is very important because it broadens and

deepens the target literary and cultural systems. In this sense, the translator is an author, and translation is his/her own work inspired by the original. This recognition of the central role of the translator goes beyond the classical conventions of source-oriented theories, which present translation as an authentic copy of the original. Such centrality of the ST is strongly rejected by thinkers in the fields of the cultural turn and post-colonialism, for it is a simplistic trope by which Orientalists in the colonial era propagated Eurocentric values through manipulating source texts and making them serve their own ideologies. That is, translation was used as a tool to construct the other in a way that serves a particular ideological end. For Bassnet and Lefevere, however, translation becomes a means of literary evolution. Thus, the task of the translator is not to convey the original but, rather, to recreate and reconstruct the source message "so as to achieve the goal of transmitting and constructing cultures, enabling different cultures to interact." (Zhang, 2013). Hence, Bassnett and Lefevere take translation studies beyond the theories that glorify the original and valorize such principles as fidelity and transparency.

Therefore, Bassnett and Lefevere introduce some new dimensions to the practice of literary translation, such as cultural difference and cultural interaction, and this approach is significant: it recognizes the cultural 'other' instead of obliterating him or of naturalizing his discourse to make it fit Western norms of civilization. (Lefevere & Bassnet, 1998, p. 6). For this reason, Bassnett and Lefevere's cultural turn is taken up by postcolonial thinkers and drawn on in arguing against the hegemonic discourse of colonialism. More significantly, Bassnett and Lefevere go beyond the linguistically oriented approach to the cultural approach, which views translation as a primary tool for the transmission of culture. In fact, their manipulation theory provides translators with interesting insights that motivate them to change their focus and to view translation as creativity.

In spite of their significance, Basnet and Lefevere's models appears insufficient in literary translation because they do not provide practical strategies for dealing with linguistic problems encountered in this field, especially in the case of widely divergent languages such as English and Arabic. Therefore, the following section attempts to fill the gaps in Basnet and Lefevere's cultural approach by incorporating the relevant ideas elaborated by Laurence Venuti.

1.3   Venuti's Concept of Foreignization

Laurence Venuti adopts a cultural approach to literary translation, just as Bassnett and Lefevere do. In his landmark books   The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation and The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference, he advocates foreignizing translation and calls for challenging the violently ethnocentric models of translation that are prevailing in the contemporary English-speaking world and that are leading to the muffling and suppression of the 'voice' of the original. In his view, translators must flaunt the otherness of the ST, so as to achieve the exchange of information and cultural values.

Venuti addresses in particular the foreignization strategy, 'a term' which he traces back to the German Romanist Scheilmacher. In his view, foreignizing translation is a sort of resistance against the global hegemony of the English language:

I want to suggest that insofar as foreignizing translation seeks to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation, it is highly desirable today, a strategic cultural intervention in the current state of world affairs, pitched against the hegemonic English-language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their global others. Foreignising translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations. (Venuti, 1995, p. 20).

Foreignization, or 'resistant translation', is, thus, a discursive strategy that counters contemporary American and English hegemony by disrupting the domestic canons of the target language, replacing them by those of the source culture. (Venuti, 1995, p. 148). In my discussion of Venuti, I shall refer to the importance of foreignization strategy in transmitting cultural values from the ST to the TT.

Like Lefevere, Venuti rejects lowering the status of the translator and upgrades him to the position of a writer. However, if literary evolution requires innovation in Lefevere's model, it contrarily demands, in Venuti's model, the preservation of the foreign aspects of the ST in order to enrich the literary and cultural systems of the target culture. (Munday, 2008, p. 145)In this regard, Venuti argues that translation theory and practice should recognize cultural differences. For this reason, he sharply criticizes the domestication strategy adopted by Eugene Nida and other translation scholars. (Venuti, 1995, p. 21).For Venuti, in contrast to foreignization, which means recognizing difference, domestication means leaving differences out. As he says, "Foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language." (Ibid, p. 20). He warns against the use of the domestication strategy, for it conceals the source culture and, thus, breaks the cross-cultural exchange, which is the most important tasks of the translator. In Venuti's view, the main scandal of translation is "putting the translated in the service of the translating culture." (Venitu, 1998, p. 4). The translator has to maintain a sense of the otherness of a ST so as to achieve cross-cultural exchange. Therefore, domestication is a kind of "ethnocentric violence." (Venuti, 1995, p. 20). Here Venuti is in line with postcolonial thinkers, who consider translation as an instrument used by colonizers to legitimize colonialism. (Bassnet & Trividi, 1999).

The main ethical problem of domestication lies in its violent exclusion of the foreign features of the ST. In this regard, Venuti points out that fluency is an illusion if it leads to justifying a domestication that rests on Orientalist assumptions, rendering Western civilization superior vis-à-vis other civilizations, and thus precluding cross-cultural exchange. For him,

Fluency can be seen as a discursive strategy ideally suited to domesticating translation, capable not only of executing the ethnocentric violence of domestication, but also of concealing this violence by producing the effect of transparency, the illusion that this is not a translation, but the foreign text, in fact, the living thoughts of the foreign author. (Venuti, 1995, p. 61).

Here, Venuti criticizes transparency as a trope for hiding the ethnocentric violence of domestication. Venuti's work has particular relevance to literary translation, where cultural exchange requires foreignization in order to enrich the target language with cultural and literary elements from the ST.

Venuti's notion of foreignizing translation has gained support and popularity among translation scholars and researchers, especially postcolonial theorists. Elaborating on the domestication and foreignization strategies, Ahmed Al Hassan says:

Too much movement towards the new reader deforms the original text and destroys the main aim of translation: enriching he target culture. No one will approve turning Hamlet, through familiarization, from a prince of Denmark to a prince of Arabia. The main foreign elements of the source text should be preserved; Hamlet should speak and behave as a Danish prince; the society portrayed by the original author must remain essentially the same." (Al-Hassan, 2013, p. 98)

Venuti, however, brings to the fore very important questions: How could the translator deal with the source text /target text dilemma? How will he/she find a way to stress the foreignness of the ST and at the same time achieve the translation readability without concealing the cultural other? It can be argued therefore that Venuti's model is a paradigm shift in translation studies. This is because it fills a gap in the cultural approach by drawing attention to the necessity of retaining the otherness of the ST as a strategy to counter the hegemony of English language translations and to consider the significant function of translation in cultural representation and the literary evolution.

1.4   Postcolonial Theory and Literary Translation

Postcolonial theorists center their criticism on how power relations in the colonial context influence translation theory and practice. In this sense, translation functions as a form of cultural appropriation aimed at legitimizing colonialism. Viewed from this angle, translations in the colonial context are always likely to adhere to the domestication strategy, which is, according to Venuti, grounded on some humanist assumptions that are in opposition to foreignization, which supposes human subjectivity. (Venuti, 1995, p. 24).

Thus, translation in the colonial context was a part of the rhetoric and politics of the time, and it was aimed at Westernizing and dominate the Other. In this respect, Edward Said foregrounds his theory of Orientalism that views the Orient as a Western production. As he puts it, "Every writer on the Orient, from Renan to Marx (ideologically speaking), or from the most rigorous scholars (Lane and Sacy) to most powerful imaginations (Flaubert and Nervel), saw the Orient a locale requiring attention, reconstruction, even redemption." (Said, 1978, p. 206). Therefore, Western scholarship during the imperial period has been part of the colonial enterprise. In this sense, colonizers have manipulated Western ideology and used it to serve their colonial goals. Following Said, Robert Yong goes further to assert that "European thought since the Renaissance is unthinkable without the impact of colonialism." (Young, 2004, p. 158). Hence, any theorization of Western translation theory has to take into account the imperial assumptions embedded in it. In a similar vein, Bassnett and Trivedi go further to suggest a radical view of the relationship between colonialism and translation. For them, "colonialism and translation went hand in hand." (Bassnet&Trividi, 1999, p. 3).

Along with Harish Trivedi, Susan Bassnett extends the cultural approach to encompass postcolonial interests. In tune with Laurence Venuti's thinking, Trivedi and Bassnett focus on the history of translation and how it has been used to serve the colonial agendas, and they reformulate a theory of translation that can restrain the cultural violence of colonial discourse. For them, translation in the colonial era was a form of 'ethnocentric violence'. For that reason, the main objective of translation in postcolonial theory should be, according to them, the deconstruction of colonial hegemony by recognizing 'Cultural difference'. (Venuti, 1995, p. 304-06). Bassnett and Trivedi argue that translation has always been determined and directed by Western norms of production and consumption, but

[at] this point in time, post-colonial theorists are increasingly turning to translation and both reappropriating and reassessing the term itself. The close relationship between colonization and translation has come under scrutiny; we can now perceive the extent to which translation was for centuries a one-way process, with texts being translated *into* European languages for European consumption, rather than as part of a reciprocal process of exchange. European norms have dominated literary production, and those norms have ensured that only certain kinds of text, those that will not prove alien to the receiving culture, come to be translated. (Bassnett &Lefevere, 1999,5)

Obviously then, translation theory and practice has been, to a great extent, subjected to a manipulative process that shifted it from the arena of literary evolution and cultural exchange to a strategy that have been aimed at serving ideological and political ends. It is therefore the mission of postcolonial translators to free literary translation theory from Eurocentric models.

In his article "*Composing the Other,*" Lefevere observes that Western writers in the colonial age construct the Other in a way that meets the expectations of the Western reader. He contends:

I shall try to show, in sum, how three different Dutch texts dealing with what the Dutch called 'India' ('their' India, as opposed to the one that 'belonged' to the British), and which is now called Indonesia, construct, or rather 'compose', that 'India' for the Dutch reader. (Lefevere, 1998, p.78)

Thus, translation is a means for constructing the 'other' and for consolidating particular stereotypes about other peoples and cultures—stereotypes that can serve the colonial discourse. In Lefevere's view, this is the most negative side of translation as this leads to the suppressing of the voice of the other, and thus target readers are not given the chance to enrich their culture. In this sense, translation loses its main function: enriching the target culture by the concepts and thoughts of the source culture. In addition, Lefevere discusses another example for Jan de Marre, who wrote an account describing India. Lefevere observes that for colonial translators, "if reality does not fit the textual grid, they change reality until it fits the grid." (Lefevere, 1998, p. 80) This shows the extent to which colonial writers were dominated by the ideology of their time.

Furthermore, the postcolonial thinker Homi Bhabha calls for a new cultural politics that goes beyond the dichotomy of the Self and the Other. For Bhabha, by adopting a third space "we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves." (Bhabha, 2004, p.39). He offers this hybridized notion of identity to encourage a shift beyond the sterile dichotomy of the Self and the Other. Bhabaha's notion is a sort of resistance against the hegemony of the colonial discourse, which informed and shaped knowledge production in the colonial era. Bhabha, however, overlooks the gaps encountered in the literary translation.

Additionally, postcolonial translation theorists have rethought the premises upon which translation has been set out in the colonial context. In postcolonial literature, translation is regarded as a form of resistance against Eurocentric and humanist assumptions that make translation a tool of reinforcing Western supremacy vis-à-vis the colonized societies. That is to say, translation, in the colonial era was not aimed at exchanging cultural and innovative literary values. Gnzler observes:

Rather than using translation as a tool to support and extend a conceptual system based upon Western philosophy and religion, postcolonial translators are seeking to reclaim translation and use it as a strategy of resistance, one that disturbs and displaces the construction of images of non-Western cultures rather than reinterpret them using traditional, normalized concepts and language. (Genzler, 2001, p. 176).

Clearly, then, translation has become a sign of resistance against the hegemony of Eurocentric assumptions that shaped the translation models that prevailed in the colonial times. In this sense, the postcolonial theorists criticize the illusion of the original-translation dichotomy in which the original resembles Europe and the translation resembles the colonies. "The role played by translation in facilitating colonization is also now in evidence. And the metaphor of the colony *as* a translation, a copy of an original located elsewhere on the map, has been recognized." (Bassnett & Trividi, 1999, p.5) .In this sense, translation legitimizes colonial discourse. That is why postcolonial scholars have been concerned with the study of translation as a form of 'cultural colonialism' by which indigenous cultures were subjected to ideological manipulation that confirmed the already constructed stereotypes about non-Western peoples.

Therefore, postcolonial thought of translation studies is advantageous for literary translation as it frees translation from the Eurocentric and Humanist paradigms. Unlike those Western thinkers who call for subjecting other cultures to Western measures and requirements of translation, for particular ideological ends, postcolonial translators endeavor to observe cultural and show it in translation.

1.5 Conclusion

What has been said proves that the cultural approach to translation has played a significant role in the evolution of literary translation studies in the twentieth century and the beginning of the new millennium. Exponents of the cultural approach have produced different theories of translation: cultural turn theory, the postcolonial translation theory, and Laurence Venuti's foreignization theory, amongst others. For these thinkers and theorists, translation means the rendition of not only lexical and syntactic components of the text, but also the ideological and cultural implications behind these elements so as to transfer the obscure and invisible meanings. (Al-Hassan, 2013, p. 96). Thus, the cultural approach shifts the emphasis in translation studies from the linguistic features of ST to the cultural dimensions that govern the process of translation.

Bassnett and Lefevere put forth a significant theory of translation based on a cultural analysis of the translation process. They show the extent to which a translation can be autonomous and not necessarily related to the original but rather reshaped and informed by the poetological and ideological constraints of the target culture. (Munday, 1995, p. 127).What differentiates their model from previous translation theories is that they recognize the translator's crucial role in manipulating the ST for particular poetological and ideological ends instead of claiming an ideal faithfulness to the original. For them, the translator's subjectivity is the warranty for innovative and communicative translation, for this warranty reduces the epistemological violence in the translation process by not concealing the manipulation undertaken in the translation process.

The cultural turn has later been expanded and developed by Laurence Venuti and postcolonial theorists, which has helped fill the gaps left by Bassnett and Lefevere and rectify the pitfalls in their model. For instance, while Bassnett and Lefevere subscribe to the analysis of the ideological manipulation of the ST, postcolonial theorists, along with Laurence Venuti, have projected translation as a tool for resisting hegemony of colonial discourse; they have rethought and redefined the translation process in order to challenge the Eurocentric assumptions prevailing in the contemporary English literary translation. The main advantage of postcolonial thought in translation studies is, therefore, the consideration of translation as a discursive formation determined by power relations. (Munday, 1995, p. 139).

Thus, all the trends discussed in this article consider the cultural factors key determinants by which the translator can achieve cultural interaction between people of different communities and backgrounds. The focus of translation in the cultural approach, as this investigation shows, has shifted away from linguistic equivalence to the cultural aspects of the ST.

Bibliography

- Al-Hassan, A. (2013). The Importance of Culture in Translation: Should Culture be Translated? International Journal for Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 2, (2), 96-100. https//DOI:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.2p.96

- Bhabha, H. (2004). The Location of Culture, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

- Bassnett, S. (1998). "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies." In S. Bassnett & Andre. L (Ed.), Constructing Cultures: Essays On Literary Translation Topics in Translation(pp 123-140). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Bassnett, S. & Harish. T. (1999). "Introduction: of Colonies, Cannibals and Vernaculars." In S. Bassnett & H. Trivedi (Ed.), Post Colonial Translation Theory and Practice (1-18). London: Routledge.

- Genzler, E. (2001). Contemporary Translation Theories. 2nd ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Genzler, E. (1998.) Foreword. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere. Constructing Cultures: Essays On Literary Translation Topics in Translation (pp. ix-xxii). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Lefevere, A. (1999). "Composing the Other". In S . Bassnett & H. Trividi. (Ed.), Post Colonial Translation Theory and Practice (75-94). London: Routledge.

- Lefevere, A. (1998). "Chinese and Western Thinking on Translation." In S. Bassnett& A. Lefever. (Ed.), Constructing Cultures: Essays On Literary Translation (12-24). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Lefevere, A. (1992). Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame, London: Routledge.

- Lefevere, A & Bassnett, S. (1998). "Introduction: Where Are We in Translation Studies?" In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere. (Ed.) Constructing Cultures: Essays On Literary Translation, (pp. 1-11). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Lefevere, A & Bassnett. S. (1992). Preface. In A. Lefevere, Translation, History Culture, (pp. xi-xii). London and New York: Routledge.

- Liu, L. (2010). Cultural Turn of Translation Studies and Its Future Development. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1, (1), 94-96. http//doi:10.4304/jltr.1.1.94-96

- Munday, J. (2008). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications, London & New York: Routledge.

- Said, E. (1978). Orientalism. London: Routledge.

- Venuti, L. (2000) .ed., The Translation Studies Reader, London: Routledge.

- Venuti, L. (1998). The Scandals of the Translator: Towards an Ethics of Difference, London & New York: Routledge.

- Venuti, L. (1995). The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation, London and New York: Rutledge.

- Young, R. (2004). White mythologies: Writing, History and The West, London and New York: Rutledge.

- Zhang, B. (2013). Innovative Thinking in Translation Studies: The Paradigm of Bassnett's and Lefevere's Cultural Turn. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3(10), 1919-1924. http// doi:10.4304/tpls.3.10.1919-1924