Revue de Traduction et Langues Volume 18 Numéro 01/2019, pp. 72-82
Journal of Translation and Languages **مجلة الترجمة واللغات**
ISSN (Print): 1112-3974 **EISSN (Online): 2600-6235**

A Critical Evaluation of Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization Theory of Translation

Chouit Abderraouf
University of Frères Mentouri Constantine 1- Algeria
ch.raouf91@gmail.com
0000-0001-9622-142X

To cite this paper:
Chouit, A. (2019). A Critical Evaluation of Venuti's Domestication and Foreignization Theory of Translation. *Revue Traduction et Langues 18(1),* 8-22.

Received: 23/08/2018; **Accepted**: 24/06/2019, **Published:** 31/08/2019

Abstract: *The primary objective of this paper is to introduce, examine, and critically evaluate Venuti's domestication and foreignization theory of translation in terms of power relations and cultural encounters. Domestication and foreignization are seen as two discordant translation tendencies in the sense that the first one involves adopting a fluent and transparent style in translation, by replacing all the unfamiliar elements with domestic variants in order to reduce the foreignness of the source text and help the target reader approach it with ease and familiarity, whereas the latter retains the foreign aspects of the original text and ignores the target reader's potential comprehension difficulties. The controversial issue over domestication and foreignization has been the crux of contention in the translation circle for a very long time. In fact, these two strategies are still creating theoretical discussions and springing up heated debates among translation scholars. This article comes to the conclusion that such controversy cannot possibly be resolved by considering which is better than the other or which one has the priority over the other. Rather, these two strategies should be regarded as a continuum that provides heuristic tools for translators to help them successfully overcome the various cultural hindrances in translation.*
Keywords: *Culture, domestication, foreignization, literary translation, Venuti.*
Résumé : *L'objectif principal de cet article, est de définir, examiner, et faire une évaluation critique sur la théorie de localisation et l'exotisation de la traduction de Venuti, en termes de rapports de force et de rencontres culturelles. La localisation et l'exotisation sont souvent considérées comme deux tendances opposées de la traduction, où la première s'efforce de remplacer tous les éléments étrangers du texte source par d'autres alternatifs familiers, dans le but d'atténuer son étrangeté et aider le lecteur cible à le pénétrer avec facilité et familiarité, tandis que le deuxième privilège de maintenir la saveur du texte originale, en ignorant tous les problèmes de la compréhension chez le lecteur cible. Le débat polémique de savoir si les traducteurs doivent localiser ou exotiser leurs traductions, était le nœud du problème depuis longtemps, et il continue de créer des discussions théoriques jaillissant des débats entre les théoriciens. Cet article vient de conclure que cette polémique ne pourrait pas être résolue en envisageant une stratégie meilleure que l'autre, ou l'une a la priorité sur l'autre. Au lieu de ça, ces deux stratégies doivent être observées comme un continuum, fournissant des outils heuristiques, afin d'aider les traducteurs à surmonter le handicape culturel de la traduction.*
Mots clés : *Culture, exotisation, localisation, traduction littéraire, Venuti.*

Corresponding author : Chouit Abderraouf

1. Introduction

Little by little, the scope of translation studies broadened and constituted myriads of corners and layers. One important development came to the fore after the cultural turn that took place in the second half of the twentieth century, when translation theorists and practitioners, such as Bassnett, Lefevere, and Venuti, became more interested in the notion of culture and in its role in translation. Consequently, the significance of the cultural aspects in translation became more and more prominent. Indeed, the differences between the source culture (SC) and the target culture (TC) may create some tough obstacles for translators.

Generally, there are two cardinal strategies employed by translators to deal with the cultural factors in translation, namely, domestication and foreignization. In other words, translators need to select and choose one of a number of possible solutions to tackle and overcome the difficulties of translating the various cultural aspects in the source text (ST). On the one hand, if the solutions chosen by the translator indicate a tendency towards the target language (TL), e.g. by omitting foreign or exotic references and replacing them with intelligible and common alternatives from the TL and the TC, this means that the translator has opted for a domesticating strategy governed by the TL and the TC norms. On the other hand, if the translator retains the foreign and exotic aspects of the ST, this is indicative of a foreignizing strategy governed by the prevailing norms in the SL and the SC. The controversial issue of whether translators should domesticate or foreignize their translations has been the crux of contention among translation scholars for a very long time. Indeed, these two translation tendencies are still creating heated theoretical debates in the translation circle.

2. Domestication and Foreignization: An Ethical Crossroads for Translators

Translation problems are nothing new for translators. Actually, linguistic and cultural differences among different languages and cultures continue to present some serious obstacles for translators. In an attempt to minimize such difficulties, different translation strategies have emerged and evolved throughout the history of translation studies.

Indeed, the essence of translation is to transfer the information presented in the text from one language into another. However, when it comes to literature, translation needs to be clearly recognized not only as a mere transfer from one linguistic register to another but as an encounter of two languages and cultures (Boukreris, 2011). This is due to the fact that culture distinguishes people of one group from another not only in terms of race, religion, or color but also in terms of behaviors, perceptions, and ways of thinking (Arabi, 2012). Therefore, literature translation is considered as important as literature creation since it contributes to the introduction and interaction among different cultures and societies (Wang, 2014).

The issues involved in the translation of culture specific references in literary texts constitute one of the most daunting and challenging areas of intercultural transfer. When translators encounter such references in literary works, they tend to make use of different strategies to deal with them. The use of each strategy depends on various factors, such as the purpose of translation, the publisher's power to dictate the translation, and the translator's own interpretation of the various cultural elements in the ST (Machali, 2012).

According to Benhabililes (2018), the translation process is by no means a dyadic relationship between the ST and TT. Rather, it is a central meeting point for various factors. This is the reason why translators need to be aware of the discrepancy between what is linguistically encoded in a particular text and what is meant to be communicated (Youcef, 2018).

According to Yakhlef (2017), translators need to be linguistically and culturally competent in both languages in order to achieve good contextualization of the SL and TL in their respective cultures. Doubtlessly, one of the most important decisions that translators need to make before embarking on rendering literary works is choosing the overall strategy to follow. Generally, there are two main strategies that are used to deal with the cultural factors in translation, namely, domestication and foreignization. According to Ramière (2006), the domestication and foreignization model is deemed a powerful tool to conceptualize the interference between the SC and the TC.

The terms domestication and foreignization were coined in the 1990s by the American translation theorist and historian Lawrence Venuti, who used them in his book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* to expand and add up to the ideas of the German theorist and philosopher, Friedrich Schleiermacher. In his lecture entitled *On the Different Methods of Translating*, which was held at Berlin's Royal Academy of Science in 1813, Schleiermacher claims that there are only two 'paths' of translation: either the translator moves the reader to the author or the translator moves the author to the reader. Schleiermacher's two methods of translation seem to lay the foundation of Lawrence Venuti's theory of domestication and foreignization. In his opinion, Venuti (2008) states that translators may opt for either a domesticating or foreignizing strategy when they encounter foreign elements in literary texts. He claims that translation can never be completely adequate to the foreign text; hence, translators need to choose between a domesticating strategy that serves to bring the author back home, or a foreignizing strategy that seeks to send the reader abroad (Venuti, 2008). Choosing between these two tendencies, therefore, indicate fundamentally ethical attitudes towards the ST and the SC.

3. Domestication

Domestication refers to "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to the receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home" (Venuti, 2008: 15). Domestication, therefore, describes the translation strategy whereby a transparent and fluent style is used to eliminate the foreignness and strangeness of the ST for the TL readers and help them approach it with ease and familiarity (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014). This can be realized by making the text conform closely to the linguistic and cultural norms of the TL. According to Venuti (1998), translators have used domesticating strategies since ancient Rome. During that time, translation was considered a form of conquest, which is why Latin translators used to not only delete culture specific references from their translations but also to add allusions to Roman culture and replace the names of Greek poets with their own names so that their translations would appear as texts originally written in Latin (Venuti, 1998).

3.1 The Translator's Invisibility and the Illusion of Transparency

Adopting a domesticating strategy during the translation process of literary texts results in what Venuti calls 'the translator's invisibility'. Invisibility, Venuti (2008) claims, describes the translator's role in preparing the TT in accordance with the TC norms. According to him, invisibility can either refer to the "illusionistic effect of translators' own manipulation of the translating language" or to "the practice of reading and evaluating translations that have prevailed in the United Kingdom and the United States for a very long period of time" (Venuti, 2008: 01). Venuti (2008) sees domestication as the predominant translation strategy in Anglo-American cultures and considers it the reason behind producing invisible and unreceptive cultures in the United States and the United Kingdom. Both of them are aggressively and assertively "monolingual, unreceptive to foreign literatures, accustomed to fluent translations that invisibly inscribe foreign texts with British and American values" (Venuti, 2008: 12).

Indeed, translated texts, either prose or poetry, have been judged by their fluency and transparency for a very long time; translated texts have been deemed acceptable by publishers, reviewers, and readers when they are fluent, comprehensible, and readable. Venuti (2008) calls this type of fluency 'the illusion of transparency' and considers it an effect of domesticating translation strategies that seek to ensure easy readability of translated texts by adhering to the linguistic and cultural norms of the TL. Such transparency, Venuti (2008) adds, conceals the various conditions under which translations are made. These results in two major disadvantageous implications: on the one hand, while foreign texts are viewed as originals and authentic, translations are regarded as second-hand representations, derivative, fake, and even false copies of originals. On the other hand, translations are required to efface and overcome their second-order status with the effect of transparency, which ultimately leads to the creation of the illusion of authorial presence whereby translations are regarded as originals (Venuti, 2008). He further criticizes the notion of invisibility claiming that translators should be regarded on par with foreign authors, since "translations are different in intention and effect from original compositions, and this generic distinction is worth preserving as a means of describing different sorts of writing practices" (Venuti, 2008:06).

In short, domestication for Venuti is seen as a strategy that translators use to reduce the strangeness of original foreign works for the convenience of the TL readers. This can be achieved though the conscious adoption of fluent, natural-sounding TL style and the replacement of all the ST's various foreign cultural aspects with familiar alternatives from the TL and the TC (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014). This indicates that domestication, as a target reader-oriented strategy, involves making the text recognizable as a TL text type and bringing the foreign culture closer to the target readers. The translator's invisibility, therefore, contributes to the marginality of translators and successfully conceals the foreign aspects of literary texts by rewriting them in a domesticated, fluent, and transparent way. Putting it differently, when translators adopt a domesticating strategy, the result, as Venuti (2013) describes it, would be the production of texts that can only and solely signify the history of the domestic language and culture.

4. Foreignization

A foreignizing strategy, according to Venuti (2008), refers to an ethnodevient pressure on the TL cultural values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the ST. This means that foreignization designates the type of translation which deliberately breaks the TL cultural norms and conventions and retains the foreign aspects of original texts. This strategy, therefore, entails not only freedom from absolute compliance with the target linguistic and textual constraints but also the selection of a non-fluent opaque style and the deliberate inclusion of foreign culture-specific references and archaisms. The aim is to provide the TL readers with an alien reading experience and to make the presence of the translator visible by highlighting the foreign identity of the ST (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014).

4.1. The Translator's Visibility and 'Resistancy'

According to Venuti (2008), foreignization signifies the differences of foreign texts by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the TL. In his opinion, Venuti (2008) considers foreignization a strategy that seeks to restrain the ethnocentric 'violence' of translation. Hence, he claims that foreignization is a "form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interest of democratic geopolitical relations" (Venuti, 2008: 16). Advocating a foreignizing strategy during the translation process of foreign works is not only a matter of dealing with the cultural political agendas but also a way to develop a theory and practice of translation that resist dominant values in the TC and signify the cultural and linguistic differences embedded in foreign texts. This results in what Venuti calls 'resistancy', which refers to the strategy that seeks to partly avoid fluency in translation and to challenge the dominant cultural norms and values of the TL even if it enacts its own ethnocentric violence on the foreign text (Venuti, 2008).

Resistancy, thus, involves freeing both the TL readers and the translators from cultural constraints that govern their reading and writing. In practice, resistancy involves the inclusion of foreign linguistic and cultural features in the translated text to produce the impression of foreignness. However, Venuti (2008) claims that adopting resistancy in translation does not necessarily result in increased faithfulness but establishes an 'abusive fidelity' in which some features of the ST are lost but others are added. Therefore, translation is seen in this regard as a process of looking for similarities and differences among languages and cultures through the act of confronting the dissimilarities that are represented in foreign texts with the aim of bridging the gaps between cultures (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014).

In his perspective, Venuti (2008) states that developing resistancy in translation results in the reinvention of fluency in innovative ways. To put it differently, the translator who adopts a foreignizing strategy seeks to expand the range of translation practices in order to create new conditions of readability (Venuti, 2008). For Venuti (2008), what constitutes fluent translations changes from one historical moment to another and from one cultural constituency to another. This indicates that the way that fluency is practiced and enforced today, which is restricted to the current standard dialects of the TL, results in mystified translations and limited translators' creativity (Venuti, 2008).

Venuti's call for adopting foreignization in translation, therefore, can be considered an ideological call to respect foreign texts and ethics of mutual globalized discourses. Venuti's use of the term 'resistancy' with the unusual spelling of 'y' instead of 'e' seems to be a way to express the translational trend that he advocates which resists transparent and fluent translational tradition that dominated the Anglo-American translations. According to Al-Omary (2011), Venuti's call for action stems from an ideological perspective after realizing the extent to which translation theorists and practitioners have gone in domesticating, excluding, and obliterating foreign texts. Venuti (2008) stresses the need to free foreign texts from such dominant practices and urges translators to apply ethics of respect in their translations to foreign texts in order to fend off extreme and narcissistic translation practices.

5. Scholar's Criticism of Venuti's Theory of Translation

There are many scholars who question Venuti's domestication and foreignization theory of translation and challenge its underlying assumptions. Some of them are: Pym (1996), Cronin (1998), Tymoczko (2000), and Shamma (2005).

In his article entitled *Venuti's Visibility,* Anthony Pym (1996) objects to Venuti's belief that adopting foreignization in translation can form resistance against ethnocentrism, racism, cultural narcissism, and imperialism. He asserts that "translational resistance has not brought more democracy, has not changed domestic values, and has not been banished to the fringes" (Pym, 1996:167).

Pym (1995) considers the rationale of adopting foreignization in translation, mainly the argument that translators should follow the ST as closely as possible so that the TL readers may get a sense of being faced with something foreign, as the easiest, most foolish and naïve method of achieving what he calls 'translationse', which refers to awkwardness and ungrammaticality in translation caused by the excessive literal approach used in the translation process. He claims that following the aforementioned rationale will lead translators to the risk of going too far and, hence, cause them to betray themselves and their own language (Pym, 1995). He further criticizes Venuti's choice of the word 'violence' to describe the act of domesticating foreign texts in accordance with the TC's norms and beliefs and considers it overly exaggerated (Pym, 1996). He states that the translation that is described in terms of 'violence' "does not leave me many words for the kind of violence where people bleed and die as a result of transcultural relationships" (Pym, 1995: 166). Moreover, Pym (1995) does not seem to agree with the idea behind domestication and foreignization as two opposed translation strategies and considers the binarism of these two tendencies as a way to suppress a hidden middle term: the translator.

Michael Cronin (1998) also criticizes Venuti's theory of domestication and foreignization. In his article entitled *The Cracked Looking Glass of Servants: Translation and Minority Languages in a Global Age,* Cronin (1998) questions the appropriateness of using foreignizing strategies in translations into marginal and threatened languages. He argues that advocating non-fluent and foreignizing strategies in translation can be seen as a bold act of cultural revolt in major languages, whereas for marginal languages, fluent strategies may represent the progressive key to their survival (Cronin, 1998). He claims that adopting foreignizing strategies in translation will lead minority and marginal languages that are under pressure from other dominant and major languages to succumb

to lexical and syntactic borrowing from these languages (Cronin, 1998). Because of that, marginal languages will eventually become mirror-images to dominant languages and, consequently, they will lose their own identity (Cronin, 1998).

Another scholar who questions Venuti's concepts of domestication and foreignization is Tymoczko (2000). In her opinion, Tymoczko (2000) claims that the concepts of domestication and foreignization have not been strictly defined; hence, no sufficient criteria for what the terms may constitute have been established. She explains that the reason behind Venuti's vague definitions is that the terms he uses are not his own. Consequently, this enables him to change the basis of his argument as it suits him without committing himself to the particularities and implications of any of his terms and concepts (Tymoczko, 2000). She thinks that this shift in Venuti's terminology is deployed in order to avoid defining his concepts with any sort of particularity or specificity of meaning, which permits him to evade accountability for logical difficulties and consequences associated with his terminology (Tymoczko, 2000). She further criticizes Venuti's concept of resistance and claims that it does not form a coherent category that enables us to replicate on his conclusions or extend his perceptions; therefore, she states that Venuti's definition of the term resistance poses more questions than it answers (Tymoczko, 2000). Furthermore, she claims that Venuti does not make it clear how much it would be sufficient to characterize a given translation as being resistant or foreignizing. Hence, it is unclear how many instances of foreignization should be there in a translated text to be counted resistant (Tymoczko, 2000).

For these reasons, she eventually concludes that Venuti's concept of resistance cannot possibly be used as a tool in translation research as it is neither identifiable nor applicable (Tymoczko, 2000). Topping it all off, Tymoczko (2000) questions the overall value of Venuti's concepts and methods in the development of translation studies. She argues that "Venuti's methods and concepts lead us backward rather than forward in the development of translation studies" (Tymoczko, 2000:39).

This is because Venuti's concepts are the "application of standards of political correctness that turn ultimately to individuals or to a party for arbitration of political appropriateness" (Tymoczko, 2000:39). This is why she holds the belief that Venuti's concepts and methods are not very specific or germane to the particular subject matter of translation as cultural phenomenon (Tymoczko, 2000).

Tarek Shamma (2005) is another scholar who criticizes Venuti's theory of domestication and foreignization in translation. After analyzing Burtan's translation of the *Arabian Nights* from Arabic into English in accordance with Venuti's domestication and foreignization theory, Shamma (2005) concludes that Burtan's foreignized translation did not challenge English people's ethnocentric preconceptions and racist ideas of the Arabic culture but reinforced them instead.

In his article entitled *The Exotic Dimension of Foreignizing Strategies*, Shamma (2005) claims that despite the foreignizing strategy that Burton adopted, his translation turned out more eccentricizing and exoticizing rather than foreignizing. He further asserts that Venuti's theory ignores the political context that governs the transfer between the two linguistic systems of translation and the history of representation between them; therefore, he states that "what holds true for Anglo-American culture, which is the subject of his [Venuti's] analysis, does not necessarily hold true for others, especially those with no

pretensions to cultural imperialism" (Shamma, 2005: 64). He claims that what readers of translated texts think of their own culture is a crucial factor in determining how they respond to its alterity (Shamma, 2005). For example, translations from Arabic, Persian, or Sanskrit into English cannot possibly disrupt or alter English readers embedded beliefs because such cultures have often been considered inferior and dissimilar to English readers' culture (Shamma, 2005). He maintains that challenging the fluency principle may be effective among European cultures that have equal power relations, but not necessarily in cultures that have less or weaker global political power (Shamma, 2005).

Hence, Shamma (2005) further criticizes Venuti's theory of domestication and foreignization and claims that the effect of a given translation cannot only be reduced to the translator's strategy. In other words, the major weakness in Venuti's theory lies in confusing the translation strategy (which is related to the textual level) with its effect (which is pertinent to the socio-political and intertextual dimension of the text) (Shamma, 2005). In addition to the previously mentioned arguments, we may add the following critical points:

The first noteworthy point is related to the nature of domestication and foreignization. As it has been previously mentioned, domestication is a translation strategy that tends to promote a transparent and fluent style to combat and conceal the foreignness and alienating effect of the ST. Domestication, hence, does not challenge or unsettle the target readers in any way. In other words, adopting domestication in translation does not only mean deleting the foreign elements of the ST or replacing them with clear local variants but also not challenging, provoking, or renewing the literary tradition of the TL and the TC in any way.

By contrast, foreignization refers to the translation strategy that deliberately challenges and breaks the TL and the TC norms and conventions by retaining the foreign aspects of the ST. This indicates that applying foreignization in translation means retaining only those elements that are considered foreign in the TL and the TC. Thus, a translated text that preserves all the foreign aspects of the ST cannot possibly be considered foreignized if the cultural aspects of the ST are not foreign for the TC readers. This implies that there is no straightforward way to measure the degree of foreignness of a given translated text since it entirely depends on the target readers' degree of familiarity with the foreign aspects embedded in the ST, which is likely to be varied and inconsistent. Moreover, adopting a foreignizing strategy in translation through retaining the cultural aspects of the ST will eventually result in the integration of such cultural elements in the TC and the TL.

Putting it differently, the repeated retention of such foreign aspects will eventually make the target readers familiar with them. This means that such foreign elements will soon lose their foreignness and, consequently, will no longer be considered alien to the target readers. Therefore, it seems only logical to assume that foreignization has an ephemeral rather than a permanent effect in translation, which means that what is considered a foreignized text today may be construed as domesticated later on. Furthermore, Venuti's concept of foreignization does not only mean retaining the foreign cultural aspects of the ST but also entails adopting a non-fluent and estranging translation style with the aim of highlighting the presence of the translator and maintaining the foreign identity of the ST. This can be achieved by making use of unfamiliar lexical items,

complex structures, anachronism, or anything else that can unsettle the fluency of reception and disturb the easy readability of the translated text. Then, when it comes to literary translation, one very important feature of foreignization that is often overlooked is that it resembles to a great extent the technique of defamiliarization, which is a literary device that is often used by writers, and translators too, to create an intentional alienation effect on their texts for artistic purposes. The issue, therefore, is that it would be very hard, or rather impossible, to determine with certainty whether a given translated text is foreignized in order to highlight the foreign aspects of the ST, or that it was made that way just for artistic purposes.

The second key issue of Venuti's theory is related to the operationalization of the concepts of domestication and foreignization. The problem takes place at two main levels: at the theoretical level, in which there is no definite conceptualization of these terms, and also at an empirical level, in which there are no definite or rigorous methods to quantitatively measure the level of domestication and foreignization in translated texts. That is to say, while it is possible to disclose the nature of given translated texts through a qualitative analysis, it is unlikely to make definite conclusions about the tendencies of such translations across time and space without making use of quantitative methods. For instance, we cannot possibly state with certainty that a given translated text is more foreignized or domesticated than another one, or that translated literary texts from English into Arabic are more domesticated than those from English into French, or that the translation tendency in the 1960s is more foreignizing than in the 1990s. Such lack hinders to a great extent the advancement and evolution of translation history research and makes it really challenging to uncover the sociocultural conditions and norms of translated literary texts undertaken at different points in history.

In light of the aforementioned points, we deduce the following: it is beyond doubt that Venuti's theory of domestication and foreignization is imprecise, adaptable and, thus, prone to misunderstanding and manipulation. Indeed, domestication and foreignization are relative concepts and are not mutually exclusive. They do not constitute a binary opposition because they cannot possibly be separated or isolated from each other; both strategies seem to stand as two poles in a linear continuum, along which there are varying degrees of each strategy. Therefore, they should not be viewed in a value-laden or normative manner since neither one can possibly and reasonably be labeled as positive or negative, or that one has the priority of use over the other. Rather, these two translation strategies should be seen as heuristic tools that help translators make the right decisions to overcome the cultural hindrances they encounter in the ST. In fact, the deployment of each one or the other should be viewed in relation to the context in which the translation is produced and received and the function it intends to have in a particular socio-cultural setting.

6. Conclusion

When translators encounter culture-specific references in literary texts, they tend to use different strategies to successfully render these cultural elements. In fact, translators are constantly involved in a decision-making process to decide which strategy is appropriate to use. Choosing the right strategy is by no means an easy task for translators. Hence, choosing to adopt a given strategy and not another depends on a whole host of

different factors that include, among others; the purpose of the translation (Skopos), the power relations between the source and target literary system, the status of the receiving literary system, the publisher's power to dictate the translation, the translator's interpretation of the cultural elements that are represented in the ST, and other variables related to the historical, social, and cultural setting in which the translation takes place.

Domestication and foreignization strategies have been used by translators to deal with the cultural differences between the SL and the TL for a very long period of time. Nevertheless, these two strategies have also been the crux of debate and controversy ever since their appearance in translation studies. Indeed, the wild variety of viewpoints to adopt domestication or foreignization in translation can be seen from different perspectives because both strategies have their advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, adopting domestication in translation helps overcome the linguistic and cultural barriers between the SL and the TL. Moreover, it makes it possible for readers to get a better understanding of the content of the ST. However, such naturalness and smoothness in the TT often entail a partial or complete loss of the stylistic messages embedded in the ST. On the other hand, adopting foreignization in translation helps expose the TL readers to foreign cultures. In addition, it enriches the TL culture with new expressions and notions by preserving and transplanting the SL culture in the TL text. However, alien cultural images and expressions may not be fully understood by the TL readers and, consequently, the translated text may lose its literary merit. In other words, both strategies entail inevitable loss because neither one can be followed in a pure and consistent way.

This means that the controversy over these two strategies cannot possibly be resolved by considering which is correct or incorrect and which is better or worse. Instead, they should be seen as a continuum that offers heuristic tools for translators to cope with the different cultural aspects in the translation process. Thus, translators should employ both strategies in their translations, considering the fact that a good translation should be both domesticated and foreignized.

References

[1] Al-Omary, R. H. (2011). The strategy of resistancy and the cultural hegemony of transparent discourse in English-language translation. *Stamford Journal of English, 6*, 219-229.

[2] Arabi, M. (2012). The inclusion of the filmed versions of literary works in teaching literature: an effective strategy to foreign cultures' familiarity. *Traduction et Langues, 12 (1),* 7-14.

[3] Benhabililes, B. (2018). The influence of publishing strategies on the process of translation: the case of Milan Kundera. *Traduction et Langues, 17 (1),* 157-165.

[4] Boukreris, L. (2011). Translation, language and globalization. *Traduction et Langues, 10(1),* 62-66.

[5] Cronin, M. (1998). The cracked looking glass of servants. The Translator, 4(2), 145-162.

[6] Machali, R. (2012). Cases of domestication and foreignization in the translation of Indonesian poetry into English: a preliminary inquiry. *Journal of Language and Culture, 3(4),* 74-82.

[7] Pym, A. (1995). Schleiermacher and the problem of blendlinge. *Translation and Literature, 4(1),* 5-30.

[8] Pym, A. (1996). Venuti's visibility. *Target, 8(1),* 165-177.

[9] Ramière, N. (2006). Reaching a foreign audience: cultural transfers in audiovisual translation. *The Journal of Specialised Translation, (6),* 152-166.

[10] Shamma, T. (2005). The exotic dimension of foreignizing strategies. *The Translator, 11(1),* 51-67.

[11] Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (2014). *Dictionary of Translation Studies.* United Kingdom: Routledge.

[12] Tymoczko, M. (2000). Translation and political engagement. *The Translator, 6(1),* 23-47.

[13] Venuti, L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference.* United Kingdom: Routledge.

[14] Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

[15] Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice.* London and New York: Routledge.

[16] Wang, F. (2014). An approach to domestication and foreignization from the angle of cultural factors translation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4 (11),* 2423-2427.

[17] Yakhlef, Z. (2017). The impact of academic training on beginner trainee translators. *Traduction et Langues, 16(1),* 56-68.

[18] Youcef, K. (2018). Exploiting relevance theory findings in translation. *Revue de Traduction et Langues, 17(2).*