The Arabic- English translation of the cultural references
In the two works from a cultural perspective

Mona Mohsen Abdo Elshemy[*]
monaelshemy007@gmail.com

Abstract

This research tackles Language and Culture in the light of Context of situation and Context of culture. Also, cultural references of cultural familiar expressions and cultural specific expressions are shown. Moreover, it sheds light on the suggested strategies used in the process of cultural translation embodied in domestication, foreignisation, adaptation and cross reference. The research aims at showing the cultural side in the process of translation as well as its significance. As well, it presents how effective the context of culture and context of situation are in narrowing the cultural gap involved in translating cultural references. Moreover, how effective the strategies adopted in cultural translation to get the full meaning clearly.

Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols. A language, then, is used for communication. Thus, we can only assume that language affects and is affected by culture. Translation is a means of cross-cultural communication between people of different communities. Not only does it serve to transmit knowledge from one language to another, but it also enhances cultural exchange,

---

[*] Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Fayoum University.

bridges cultural gaps, and serves to promote cultural awareness and understanding. In practice, translation requires cultural skills to decode the meaning.

Furthermore, another issue which is related to crossing cultural barriers in cultural translation is the debate between domestication and foreignization as two approaches or strategies used when the translator renders a text. Domestication is used to minimize the strangeness of the foreign text for the target language readers whereas foreignization indicates faithfulness to the original text that is, maintaining the alien nature of the original text. In order to obtain a perfect translation, one must go beyond the superficial meaning of the words, and that is embodied in adaptation. Cross reference is used to connect the relevant sections throughout the text.

Finally, this research reached the conclusion that cultural side in translation is not ignored. As well, text and its context whether it is a context of situation or a context of culture cannot be separated.

Key Words : Translation , Culture , Strategies

4.1. Language and Culture: Context of situation and Context of culture.

Although there is no certain answer to the question posed by Damen, "Which came first language or culture?" (1987, p.120), what is certain is that the connection between language and culture cannot be ignored. As defined by Sapir (1921, p. 8) "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols."

These ideas, emotions and desires are greatly influenced by our culture, since according to most social scientists, "The essence of a culture is not its artifacts, tools, or other tangible cultural elements but how the members of the group interpret, use, and perceive them. It is the values, symbols, interpretations, and perspectives that distinguish one people from another in modernized societies…People within a culture usually interpret the meaning of symbols, artifacts, and behaviors in the same or in similar ways.." (Banks, Banks and McGee, 1989).

A language, then, is primarily used for communication, as it is used by members of societies to send meaningful messages and culture defines what is or is not meaningful. Thus, we can only assume that language affects and is affected by culture, in other words as Kleinjans (1972) states, language and culture are analogous. They are certainly bound together as cultures are learned largely through languages rather than inherited biologically or genetically. Hence, the process of learning a new language inevitably accompanies cultural learning. This brings us to the relationship between the triangle of language, culture and communication. As mentioned above, language is used for communication between members of the same society who think, believe, speak and act the way they do because the messages they send to each other bear the stamp of culture. Therefore, it can be said that since culture and communication are directly linked, and since language is used to transmit culture, then language, culture and communication are inseparable. On the other hand, when a cultural dimension is added

to communication between people from different language communities, interaction becomes more complex as their cultural perceptions are distinct enough to alter the intended message.

This is highlighted by the fact that there can exist great variation even between the same languages depending on where the speaker is from. For example, both British English and American English contain culturally bound expressions and phrases that are unique to their cultures. For instance, doing porridge is a British slang for serving a prison sentence as porridge was once the traditional breakfast served in UK prisons. Without any cultural or factual pre-knowledge, it would be impossible for translators to make logical sense of the sentence "He's doing porridge." Likewise, Thanksgiving Day is a national holiday in the United States whose origin is commonly traced to 1621 when the Plymouth colonists and Wampanoag Indians shared an autumn harvest feast. Such factors play an important role in translation, as ignorance of the target language culture may cause problems in translation. Therefore, recognizing the importance of the cultural functions of a language is crucial for successful translation.

Translation is a means of cross-cultural communication between people belonging to different communities. Not only does it serve to transmit knowledge and learning from one language to another, but it also enhances cultural exchange, bridges cultural gaps, and serves to promote cultural awareness and understanding. This fact highlights the paramount importance of translators' roles as interlingual and cross-cultural mediators. A proper and adequate

translation goes beyond the linguistic elements and seeks to reflect in the target language, as much as possible, all the cultural specificities and social nuances of meaning being displayed in the source text. This late maxim has become a widely accepted idea in the field of translation studies, bearing in mind that language and culture are absolutely inseparable and are as closely related to each other as the two sides of a coin. In this respect, Mehrach (2003) asserts that "if language is mainly culture, translating not only reproduces a message in another language, but describes the world view of the target language. Hence translating is not a grammatical transposition, but a cultural transfer" (p.17).

The mutual relationship between language and culture has become a major concern for linguists, cultural theorists, and translators, especially when the text to be translated is of a literary genre. In addition to their literary style and creatively aesthetic language use, literary texts are often laden with cultural content and culture-specific elements ranging from customs, values, traditions, religion to life style, modes of address, world view, idioms and proverbs, etc. Nida (1982) refers to the fact that "differences between cultures may cause more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure" (p.30). Therefore, a literary translator's task is quite challenging since s/he has to faithfully transmit and preserve the cultural values and aspects of the source text while simultaneously manage to produce an aesthetically beautiful text that appeals to the target reader.

This role of the translator as a cultural mediator subsumes, in addition to bilingualism, that he or she should be knowledgeable of and familiar with both SL and TL cultures. In other words, translating literary works requires the translator to possess enough skill and expertise in using his/her own linguistic, stylistic and even ethical choices when transferring a SL message and the cultural aspects explicitly or implicitly embedded within that message. Hermans (2004) stresses the fact that translators have to identify culture-specific elements in a text, decide what needs to be translated, what techniques and procedures to apply, and what effects these techniques are supposed to produce on the target reader. However, attaining such a high level of equivalence at the levels of language, culture and effect is extremely difficult, if not impossible, because the slightest variation from the SL cultural term may be regarded as an act of subversion. In this vein, Levine (1991) affirms that the literary translator is usually a kind of subversive scribe, meaning that subversion is at the heart of the translation enterprise.

An understanding of the relationship between language and culture is important for translation. Such insights open the door for a consideration of how both culture and language influence people's life perceptions in general, and assist translators and translation theorists, in particular, in grasping the workings of the profession, and increase their awareness of the translation processes, problems and strategies employed for cultural equivalence.

Wardhaugh (2002) defines language as "a knowledge of rules and principles and the ways of saying and doing things with sounds, words and sentences" (p.2). This means that knowing a language consists of more than mastering its vocabulary, syntax and phonology. It rather entails being sufficiently aware of how this language is being used to effectively communicate the intended messages of the interlocutors within a certain social and cultural context. Though Wardhaugh does not mention culture per se, our speech acts are inevitably connected to the environment they are performed in. Edward Sapir (1970) is more explicit about this social and cultural aspect of the relationship when he says that "language does not exist apart from culture that is from the socially inherited assemblage of practices and beliefs that determines the texture of our lives" (p.207).

He also affirms that "language is a guide to social reality" (Sapir, 1970, p.30), meaning that no culture can exist without having a language as its core. So, there is a mutual dependency and reciprocal effect between the two. The preceding aspects of language mentioned above are succinctly phrased in the following comprehensive definition given by Robert Henry Robins and David Crystal: Language, a system of conventional spoken, manual or written symbols by means of   which human beings, as members of a social group   and participants in its culture, express themselves. The functions of language include communication, the expression of identity, play, imaginative expression and emotional release. (Encyclopedia Britannica, June, 2019)

In the early stages of translation theory, translation was mainly considered as replacing a text in one language by another in a different language. The emphasis was mainly on the linguistic and semantic aspects of translation, whether in the process or in the product. There was much concern about meaning in translation: What meaning is intended? The literal, semantic, pragmatic, or social? Eventually all these types of meaning were reconsidered under 'cultural aspects of translation'.

In the present time, it is so unlikely that anyone can envisage translation without taking into full account both the source culture and the target culture. Now, every scholar recognizes that a text cannot be translated in isolation of its culture. The two are closely interwoven that it is almost impossible to pull them apart. Translation is a lingual enterprise whose main goal is to allow people of differing cultural backgrounds, and who speak different languages, to communicate their feelings, experiences, knowledge, etc. It is not just an interlingual activity, but also an intercultural one, bearing in mind that languages are deeply immersed in their cultures.

In this regard, Gideon Toury (1980) defines translation as "a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions" (p.96). He means that understanding the cultural aspects of meaning is a central task for the translator, who is supposed to know the cultural implications in the source text and transfer them to the target reader. In this vein, Mehrach (2003) clearly states this relationship as follows: Indeed, when you are

communicating with somebody from your own culture, you can convey your message and express yourself much easier because you share the same cultural background, but the process becomes much more troublesome and challenging when it is between people from different cultures. Because language often expresses cultural reality, its words are usually tinged with attitudes, beliefs and worldviews, etc. Nida (1964) gives equal importance to both linguistic and cultural differences between the SL and TL. He concludes that "differences between cultures may cause more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure" (p.130). So, cultural transmission is as important as linguistic equivalence, like the two sides of the same coin.

When translating, it is necessary to be concerned not only with the linguistic impact on the target language reader, but also with the way the cultural aspects may be perceived and received, and have to make decisions accordingly. Bassnett (1993) points out that "the translator must tackle the SL text in such a way that the TL version will correspond to the SL version […] To attempt to impose the value system of the SL culture on the target language reader is dangerous ground" (p.43). A good translation, then, is the one that acknowledges the cultural differences and seeks to preserve them, because there is no point in neglecting the true identity of a text which is its culture.

Venuti (1995) believes that "translation is a process that involves looking for similarities between language and culture - particularly similar messages and formal techniques - but it does this

because it is constantly confronting dissimilarities. It can never, and should never, aim to remove these dissimilarities entirely" (p.102). A translated text should reflect a different culture and allow the target reader to know a cultural other. Ideally, a good translation, for him, is the one that enables the target reader to get the same cultural conceptions as the source text reader. Edward Sapir (1956) expresses a similar point of view as he argues that no two languages are similar enough to represent the same social reality. Each society lives in a distinct world, not the same world with different labels. Consequently, and as there is no one-to-one correspondence between one culture and another, much attention must be paid to culture-bound words, idiomatic expressions and proverbs lest they should get lost during the translation process. Translation is not just an imitation of a text from a linguistic point of view, but rather an effective form of cross cultural communication.

This intimate relationship between language and culture is also referred to by Nida and Taber (1969), who define cultural translation as "translation in which the content of the message is changed to conform to the receptor culture in some way, and/or in which information, which is not linguistically explicit in the original, is introduced" (p.199). Similarly, Ivir (1987, p.35) says that translation does not mean translating languages, but rather translating cultures. Therefore, a literary translator's job goes beyond the linguistic differences, and seeks to maintain and preserve, as much as possible, all the cultural components the writer has used in the source text to address a particular social group. As

each region or community has its unique cultural features, the translator's mandate is not only to convey the same meanings, but also to account for the dissimilarities between two different cultures and cultural perspectives.

Translation theories proceed from classifying the languages in which translation is carried out into two basic types: the source language, which is the language from which the transfer is made to the other language, which is called the target language, and sometimes the word language is replaced by the text word, so we have the original target text (Snell-Hornby , 2006, p. 132). Despite the target text is the obviousness of this division; it did not escape from being a subject of dispute among researchers in translation theories. In 1818, Friedrich Schleiermacher distinguished between the following two methodologies: "Either the translator leaves the writer alone as possible and makes the reader go to meet him, or he leaves the reader is alone as much as possible and makes him go to meet the writer." On the basis of this, the description of the language is determined if it is a source or target language. But where the strangeness appears for itself, and even obscures even the stranger, the translator suggests that it is not at the level of the original text. What we have in our hands now are theories that are formulated according to linguistic foundations, or knowledge content, and many approaches have emerged that dealt with the differences and approaches between these two aspects, including the linguistic, scientific, textual, cultural, psychological approach, and despite the differences of theorists who dealt with translation theory according

to their visions and opinions, but there is agreement that any theory of translation deals with the ways of changing the original text, the semantic and stylistic characteristics it contains, determining the goal of translation, and the means of understanding achieved for the occurrence of communication, and that these questions are made within a holistic framework of the phrase and not the singular pronunciation (p. 133).

In Katan's Translating Cultures, An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators , he shows that there is no doubt that the presentation of culture as a "system for orienting experience" and the description of ways of framing cultural perception, especially the examples provided in Translating Cultures, could be very useful in helping students develop awareness and expertise in translating culture at the beginning of this new millennium. The reader interested in current theories of culture will find Katan's overview of the various approaches informative, detailed and exhaustive. Models for culture and perception of reality are systematically placed in their intellectual context (1999 , p. 271).

Ever since "the cultural turn", over 30 years ago, and the rise of the functional school, belief in the importance of the translator as much more than a faithful copier has taken hold. Edwin Gentzler (2001: 71), for example, talks of a revolution which has broken "the two thousand year old chain of theory revolving around the faithful vs. free axis" and has empowered the translator. Today, translators "cross boundaries" (Bassnett 1997: 11) and are "nomads-by-obligation" (Cronin 2003: 126). This idea of freedom has allowed

interpreters and translators to be hailed as active participants in (re)creating meaning. Many have triumphantly suggested that they are (or should become) mediators (Hatim/Mason 1990), "cultural mediators" (Katan [1999] 2004); "cross-cultural specialists" (SnellHornby 1992) "information brokers" (Obenaus 1995), or "cultural interpreters" (Gonzalez/Tolron 2006), particularly interpreters (e.g. Harris 2000, Mesa 2000), and "experts in intercultural communication" (Holz-Mäntäri 1984).

Katan (1999, 2004) argues that one of the skills of translation is to have cultural references. This means that a translator should be a lingual mediator to unpack what culture-specific words have. Admittedly, Newmark (1995) states that translation mediates cultures. Likewise, Baker (2011) warns translators that words are very much like traditional costumes because words are uniquely the production of individual cultures. This goes in line with Hall's theory of language and culture; culture by time creates a deeper layer of word-level meanings that require skills beyond the lingual skills. This theory sounds true for many translation pundits. Vermeer describes a translator as "bi-cultural" (Vermeer, 1978). By the same token, Snell-Hornby states that a translator is such a cross-cultural specialist (Snell-Hornby, 1992). Interestingly, Robinson (1988) classifies cultural reference at word-level into four approaches: behaviorist, functionalist, cognitive, and dynamic. Venuti (2000) suggests foreignization and domestication as strategies to translating cultural references.

Mona Baker (2008: 22) paints an ever brighter Brave New World: **"…highly professional translators who belong to the same 'world' as their clients, who are focused on professionalism and making a good living, and who are highly trained, confident young men and women. These professional translators and interpreters go about their work in**

a conflict-free environment and live happily ever after."

In all cases, the academics are awarding translators creative, managerial and specialist roles, which almost automatically results in calls for the end of the invisibility of the translator. Anthony Pym (2000: 191-192) suggests that this change is already happening at the upper end of the market. For some scholars, translators have always 'created' rather than 'transferred'. Jose Santaemilia (2005: 14), for example, introduces his edited volume as follows: "The idea of 'manipulation' is inherent into the phenomenon of 'translation'".

More recently, scholars have turned their interest to the translator's "specific political commitment" and to the even more committed "inevitability of political engagement" (Brownlie 2007: 136). As Christina Schaffner (2000: 9) notes "The new impetus which has come to Translation Studies is the focus on culture as being linked to notions of power, asymmetries, difference and identity". The shift now is not so much "creating understanding" through disassociated mediation (e.g. Katan 2004), but on redressing the imbalances and becoming an "agent of social change" (Tymoczko 2003: 181), or "an activist" involved in re-narrating the world (Baker 2006, 2008; c.f Scarpa 2008). Global politics, now

seen as immanent in every translation decision, means that translation is "a process of power" (Wolf 1995). Maria Tymoczko (2007) concludes, exhorting: **"…the ability of a translator to be empowered – to be heard, to be seen, to be able to make engaged choices, to exercise a full range of translation options, to improvise, to invent, to construct meaning, to convey cultural difference, to make interventions, to exert activist agency".**

There are, however, some detractors. Carol Maier (2007: 254), for example, who takes increased visibility as a given, suggests that professionals are not ready to face the conflicts that increased visibility can involve. Also, as some are beginning to mention, it is a very academic force that is driving the idea of empowerment.

According to Halliday et al, the context of situation consists of three components:

1- Field: The total event, what՚s happening, the nature of the social interaction taking place.

2- Tenor : The role interaction, who is taking part, the social role of participants.

3- Mode : The function of a text in the event including channel (spoken, written–monologue, dialogue–telephone, computer mediated communication) and its genre (symbolic organization of text: Rhetorical mode / persuasive/ didactic, …etc.).

Consider the Examples below:

- Finals of soccer/football world cup   ⟵   filed

- Friend to friend   ⟵   tenor

- Written to be read (a letter)   ⟵ mode

If we know these, we can predict the grammatical structure with a great deal of certainty, and conversely we can go from the grammatical structures to the context of situation. The knowledge of context of situation is supplemented by context of culture, both of which will tell us significant information about how language will be used. Analysis of grammar, on the other hand, will tell us about the context. In addition to grammatical forms and patterns, one needs also to consider the field, tenor and mode of the context, for language is used in what is called the context of situation, which is part of what is called the context of culture.

In the context of situation the reader must identify:

• The field (What is being spoken about? The field of human activity? Is it at the beach? Going to school? Or what?)

• The tenor (What are the relationships? father to son? friend to friend? Judge to jury? Or what?)

• The mode (what are the circumstances in which the language communication takes place? Conversation? Reflection? Description? Or what?) (Collerson, 1994)

One should note that circumstances dictate the level of language used, such as: the formal, the informal, the colloquial and slang (Collerson). An example of context of situation could take place in a shop. The field could be the price of a certain item; the tenor would be a slight deference on the shop assistant part towards the customer because of a potential sale; the mode would be that of spoken inquiry: question, answer, response.

As mentioned above, context of situation forms part of context of culture. By context of culture is meant the meanings and assumptions we share as a community of people. It also incorporates "the culturally evolved expectations of ways of behaving" and getting things done (Hammond et al, 1992, p.2). For example, the buying and selling of goods will vary from culture to culture. In some cultures bartering is always acceptable but in Australia selling goods at fixed prices is the usual expectation. We must keep in mind, however, that a society like Australia has a multi-cultural strand in which different cultural assumptions interact but that in some Australian settings, it is possible for a common set of meanings and assumptions to operate.

Literature can sometimes tend to present context and culture almost as synonyms. This creates ambiguity, which can complicate the consideration of contextual and cultural variables in instructional design, learning, and teaching. From an ontological point of view, some clarification of these two concepts is essential as each may influence learning and teaching in different ways. Moreover, since context and culture are interconnected to a certain degree, one may influence the other. It is crucial to make a clear distinction between these two concepts in the knowledge models used in intelligent tutoring systems and distance education systems if we want to facilitate (1) their consideration in pedagogical scenarios, and (2) the accumulation of knowledge about different contexts and cultures. This article offers an interpretation of the difference between these two concepts, presenting context as a substrate of culture.

Contextual issues in the learning ecology are also discussed, based on this distinction.

Bazire and Brezillon (2005) noted that the word "context" is either not defined or is defined in multiple ways. They explained this by the fact that this word is either used assuming that everybody knows its meaning, or to delineate the particular meaning the author gives to this word. In the various definitions, two broad categories are often mentioned: definitions that see the context as internal to the individual and those that see it as being external. The first category views (internal) context as mental representations of an individual that could impact the learning process. The second interprets (external) context as environmental or circumstantial, and also having the potential to impact the learning process.

Brézillon (2002) stressed that the lack of an operational definition of context "explains several failures noted in knowledge-based systems use because (1) users and their contexts are not taken into account, (2) out of its context of validity, there is an incorrect use of the knowledge, (3) with the infinite number of contexts, it is not possible to endow a system prior to its use with all the needed knowledge, …" . This is to say that, without this operational definition, it is difficult to consider the contextual variables in instructional design and to facilitate the accumulation of knowledge about context. The consideration of those variables may improve learning. For example, according to Gilbert, Bulte, and Pilot (2011), "context-based courses" are increasingly used to address the major challenges that science education currently faces: lack of clear

purpose, content overload, incoherent learning by students, lack of relevance to students, and lack of transfer of learning to new contexts."

Savard (2014) highlighted the large number of definitions of culture. After an analysis, she formulated such a definition, inspired by that of Spencer-Oatey (2004). She sees culture as a set of schemes, shared by a given group. This definition has been adopted by Savard and Mizoguchi (2016) and reused in this project. It is presented in Section 2 below.

Inside a text exists context; there are two contexts that are realized in a text, they are context of culture genre and context of situation register. According to Eggins 1994:25, ―systemic functional approach describes how people use language to achieve culturally appropriate goals, through the concept of genre.‖ People use language in conveying meaning is based on the culture; different culture can make different meaning or interpretation.

Butt et al (1995 :11) stated that ―context of culture is the outer context around a text. When you think of the differences in forms of address, in ceremonies, in politeness and significant activities between one culture in shaping meanings.‖ In context of culture, we understand language from the information of cultural background. So, each people can make different interpretation in understanding the meaning of language based on the cultural background. Context of culture can be defined as genre. Genre in written text is a characteristic in composing a text. There are many genres in text, those are narrative, recount, descriptive, procedure,

etc. that can differentiate a text to each other.

Within context of culture, there is context of situation in language. Context of situation can be defined as the environment of the text; it is stated by Malinowski in Halliday and Hasan 1989:8. According to Butt et al 1995:11, ―within the context of culture, speakers and writers use language in many more specific contexts of situations. Context of situation that is organized can be specified through the use of the register variables; they are field, tenor, and mode.

According to Halliday in Eggins 1997:52, ―there are three aspects in any situations that have linguistic consequences, these can be briefly glossed as field: what the language is being used to talk about; mode: the role language is playing in the interaction; and tenor; the role relationship between the interactants. We can understand the meaning of language if we know the context of situation in a text. The combination between context of culture and context of situation in a text can make different interpretation of language. Halliday 1985:45 defined the three components of context of situations as follows: a Field of discourse: the "play''- the kind of activity, as recognized in the culture, within which the language is playing some part [predicts experiential meaning]; b Tenor of discourse: the "players'' – the actors, or rather the interacting roles, that are involved in the creation of the text [predicts interpersonal meanings]; and c Mode of discourse: the "parts'' – the particular functions that are assigned to language in this situation, and the rhetorical channel is therefore allotted to it [predict textual

meanings].

Finally, as was explained earlier about the focus entity, a context is determined by collecting entities relevant to a focus entity, since a context must be an entity for something. It cannot be independent of "something." For example, a singer sings songs in a concert event. The singing action is performed in the context of the concert, which consists of many actions performed by the audience and staff members who support the concert. If we do not focus on the singing action, the concert event is just an event and it is not a context. When students learn in a lesson event in a class, the learning action is accomplished in the context of the lesson, whereas if we do not focus on the learning action, the lesson is just an event. A context cannot be just anything on its own. A context emerges only when we focus on an entity. Gilbert et al. (2011) approach this idea and discuss context as being "formed around some focal event—an important or typical event—that draws the attention of the learners."

In practice, translation requires lingual and cultural skills to decode the meaning often simplified in certain words that vary in their meaning regionally and culturally both synchronically and diachronically. It is not surprising to find a word that connotes a different thing in one culture, and the same time it connotes another thing in another culture. This is due to certain reasons ascribed to ideology, attitude, association, pragmatics, or otherwise expressed. Hall (1976) suggests that culture is similar to an iceberg. He proposed that 10% of the culture (external or surface culture) is easily visible like the tip of the iceberg such as food, clothing, art,

dance... etc, while 90%, of culture (internal or deep culture) is hidden below the surface like idiom , collocation , proverbs , metaphor and other figurative speech.

Focusing on the importance of cultural reference in translation, Tosi (2003), Rubel and Rosman (2003), Moder and Martinovic-Zic (2004), recognizing the differences among cultures, and knowing how to find suitable equivalents for words especially those that have cultural references are very important to shed light on. Moreover, Arabic and English are genetically unrelated especially when it comes to the translation of formulaic language i.e idioms, collocations and fixed expressions that have cultural reference as Abu-Ssaydeh (2004) and Al Daqs (2011) clarify. Furthermore, the validity of investigating cultural references as they have been studied by many researches Ranzato (2016) and Olk (2013) reflect their importance of cultural references in translation.

With regard to cultural references, Leemets (1992: 475; cited in Ranzato (2016)) defines cultural references as: **Every language has words denoting concepts and things that another language has not considered worth mentioning, or that are absent from the life or consciousness of the other nation. The reasons are differences in the ways of life, traditions, beliefs, historical developments – in one word, the cultures of the nations.**

Also, differences can be observed on conceptual level. Different languages often nominate concepts from different viewpoints, and they also tend to classify them slightly differently. On the other

hand, Mailhac (1996, p. 133-134) describes cultural references as "any reference to a cultural entity which, due to its distance from the target culture, is characterised by a sufficient degree of opacity for the target reader to constitute a possible problem".

Cultural Reference Role means to decide whether it is a must to translate cultural references or not depending on its suggestive significance in both the ST and the TT (Ivir, 1987). For example, the word مخلوع (ousted) in الرئيس المخلوع (the ousted president) is socially derogatory. So, it must be translated and not left. Here it is the central word and cannot be dropped. However, المفدي (redeemer) in جلالة الملك المفدي (his Majesty redeemed king) is not central and therefore needs to be omitted as "His Majesty King …." which is more honorific in the ST and the TT. Again, the word دولة in دولة فلسطينis more assertive than decorative or tautologous. Therefore, it must be translated to assert the Palestinians" statehood and their non-existence or diaspora. For many politicians in the west, it is more offensive and therefore it should be dropped.

In the modern era, interest in translation from Arabic began with the European colonialism of the Arab region in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The motive for this interest and translation was Orientalist interest rather than literary appreciation. Arabic literature was looked at as a documentary record of the social conditions without any real literary value. This continued in the twentieth century until 1988 when Naguib Mahfouz was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature (Büchler & Guthrie, 2011).

Altoma (2005) distinguishes three phases that cultural references in Arabic went through in the twentieth century. The first phase was between 1947 and 1967, and during which it was very difficult to find publishers willing to publish translated Arabic literature because of the very limited interest then. The second phase starts in 1968 and extends to 1988. During this period, Arabic fiction started to be appreciated, and more Arabic works were translated. The awarding of the Nobel Prize to Naguib Mahfouz marks the beginning of the third phase, which extends from 1988 to the present day. This period has witnessed an increasing demand for Arabic fiction with more publishers willing to invest in translating and promoting cultural references in Arabic literature.

Translation of cultural references in Arabic into English is now dependent on subsidies, which is an obstacle in the face of its dissemination in English as the selection of titles for translation, the translation strategies, and the marketing of translated works are dictated by the commercial aspects of the publishing industry. The leading translated genre is the novel, with short stories in the second position (Büchler & Guthrie, 2011).

4.2. Cultural references : Cultural familiar expressions and cultural specific expressions:

Translation cannot only be a literal type of code switch, but also a cross-cultural interchange. Any kind of language is embedded with cultural perspectives. Language is a reflection of culture and acts as the transmitter for culture. Expressions as a special form of language convey an abundance of cultural information. Society and

culture influence the words that we speak, and the words that we speak influence society and culture. Such a cyclical relationship can be difficult to understand, but many of the examples throughout this chapter and examples from our own lives help illustrate this point. One of the best ways to learn about society, culture, and language is to seek out opportunities to go beyond our typical comfort zones. Studying abroad, for example, brings many challenges that can turn into valuable lessons. Furthermore, Culture is not solely determined by a person's native language or nationality. It is true that languages vary by country and region and that the language we speak influences our realities, but even people who speak the same language experience cultural differences because of their various intersecting cultural identities and personal experiences. We have a tendency to view our language as a whole more favorably than other languages. Although people may make persuasive arguments regarding which languages are more pleasing to the ear or difficult or easy to learn than others, no one language enables speakers to communicate more effectively than another (McCornack, 2007, pp. 224–25).

First of all, it is a must to distinguish between cultural familiar expressions and cultural specific expressions to explain and clarify their meaning as well as difference. On the one hand, cultural familiar expressions have lexical equivalents in the target language. Although the term may be well known in all countries, the problem lies in that it is culturally different form one country to another. For example, a term like "مقهى" or café whether in Egypt or in the Arab

countries, as depicted by Naguib Mahfouz in his novels, it is shown that this term is different as to the number of working hours: it is open along the day or around the clock, as it were. But in London or the foreign countries, there are specific working hours. As well, there is a difference as for foods and drinks presented to guests. That is, "shishas" for example are not known or familiar in the Western cafes. Furthermore, the character of the "waiters" and their uniforms are completely different in the European countries from those in the Arab ones.

On the other hand, cultural specific expressions are not used in the target culture. Therefore, they represent cultural as well as linguistic challenges in translation and the main challenge lies in the idea that they are culturally different. Thus, they represent a difficulty to the translator while rendering them. For example, expressions such as "ملاية لف" and "قله" , they are not in the Western culture and thus these words are not understood in the target culture. The translator as a mediator should simplify and clarify the meaning of such words. In the novels of Naguib Mahfouz translated by The American University in Cairo, those two terms were translated as "woman's coat " for "ملاية لف" and "water container" for " قله " , but this translation is not clear and a specific method of communicating cultural differences such as footnote or endnote should have been used and followed as depicted in the current research so as to get a clear meaning as well as cultural background of the term.

The actual language we speak plays an important role in shaping our reality. Comparing languages, we can see differences in how we are able to talk about the world. In English, we have the words grandfather and grandmother, but no single word that distinguishes between a maternal grandfather and a paternal grandfather (Crystal, 2005 , p. 155). In this example, we can see that the words available to us, based on the language we speak, influence how we talk about the world due to differences in and limitations of vocabulary. The notion that language shapes our view of reality and our cultural patterns is best represented by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Although some scholars argue that our reality is determined by our language, we will take a more qualified view and presume that language plays a central role in influencing our realities but doesn't determine them (Martin & Nakayama, 2010 , pp. 222-24).

Finally, social norms are culturally relative. The words used in politeness rituals in one culture can mean something completely different in another. For example, thank you in American English acknowledges receiving something (a gift, a favor, a compliment), in British English it can mean "yes" similar to American English's yes, please, and in French *merci* can mean "no" as in "no, thank you" (Crystal, 2005). Additionally, what is considered a powerful language style varies from culture to culture. Confrontational language, such as swearing, can be seen as powerful in Western cultures, even though it violates some language taboos, but would be seen as immature and weak in Japan (Wetzel, 1988).

4.3. Types of meaning: semantic, pragmatic, metaphoric, collocated, emotive and cultural.

"Word meanings are like stretchy pullovers, whose outline contour is visible, but whose detailed shape varies with use: 'The proper meaning of a word . . . is never something upon which the word sits like a gull on a stone; it is something over which the word hovers like a gull over a ship's stern,' noted one literary c ritic (Robin George Collingwood)."

"There can't be a single answer to the question 'Are meanings in the world or in the head?' because the division of labor between sense and reference is very different for different kinds of words. With a word like *this* or *that*, the sense by itself is useless in picking out the referent; it all depends on what is in the environs at the time and place that a person utters it. . . . Linguists call them deictic terms . . . Other examples are *here, there, you, me, now,* and *then*. "At the other extreme are words that refer to whatever we say they mean when we stipulate their meanings in a system of rules. At least in theory, you don't have to go out into the world with your eyes peeled to know what a *touchdown* is, or a *member of parliament*, or a *dollar*, or an *American citizen*, or *Go* in Monopoly, because their meaning is laid down exactly by the rules and regulations of a game or system. These are sometimes called nominal kinds--kinds of things that are picked out only by how we decide to name them." It has been generally assumed that we have to understand two types of meaning to understand what the speaker means by uttering a sentence. . . . A sentence expresses a

more or less complete propositional content, which is semantic meaning, and extra pragmatic meaning comes from a particular context in which the sentence is uttered.

Sinclair J. (1996) clarifies the task of explaining the main approaches to semantic meaning in contemporary philosophy of language might seem to face an in-principle stumbling block. Given that no two languages have the same semantics—no two languages are comprised of just the same words, with just the same meanings—it may seem hard to see how we can say anything about different views about semantics in general, as opposed to views about the semantics of this or that language. This problem has a relatively straightforward solution. While it is of course correct that the semantics for English is one thing and the semantics for French something else, most assume that the various natural languages should all have semantic theories of (in a sense to be explained) the same form.

The aim of what follows will, accordingly, be to introduce the reader to the main approaches to natural language semantics—the main views about the right form for a semantics for a natural language to take—rather than to provide a detailed examination of the various views about the semantics of some particular expression. (For an overview, see the entry on word meaning. For discussion of issues involving particular expression types, see the entries on names, quantifiers and quantification, descriptions, propositional attitude reports, and natural kinds.)

There are a wide variety of approaches to natural language semantics. Semantic meaning agrees that sentences are (typically) true or false, and that whether they are true or false depends on what information they encode or express. This "information" is often called "the proposition expressed by the sentence". The job of a semantic meaning, is at least in large part to explain how the meanings of the parts of the sentence, along with the context in which the sentence is used, combine to determine which proposition the sentence expresses in that context (and hence also the truth conditions of the sentence, as used in that context).

In Jacob L. Mey's Pragmatics: An Introduction (1993)   , pragmatics is a branch of linguistics concerned with the use of language in social contexts and the ways people produce and comprehend meanings through language. That is to say, the pragmatic meaning involves all the social cues that accompany language. The pragmatic meaning focuses not on what people say but how they say it and how others interpret their utterances in social contexts, the ability to use language for different purposes (e.g. to greet, inform people about things, demand, command, request) , says Geoffrey Finch in "Linguistic Terms and Concepts." For any specific language, natural speakers will inherently know the uses and the rules for many types of expressions.

These rules determine the interaction between people and between societies. In a sense, the pragmatic meaning is seen as an understanding between people to obey certain rules of interaction. In everyday language, the meanings of words and phrases are

constantly implied and not explicitly stated. In certain situations, words can have a certain meaning. You might think that words always have a specifically defined meaning, but that is not always the case. Pragmatics studies how words can be interpreted in different ways based on the situation. For example, once you are in line at a store to pay for your purchases. The cashier asks, 'How are you today?' Do you immediately go into an in-depth account of your health issues, varying mood, relationship status, and everything else going on in your life? Of course not! Usually, you respond with something similar to, 'Fine, how are you?' with the same expectation that the cashier will not go into full detail of how she truly is. This interaction perfectly shows pragmatics at work. It is understood that this question does not really ask you to explain everything going on in your life. The implication relies on the context and situation. It is good manners to ask strangers how they are, but it is not intended for a detailed response.

Sinclair J. (1996) explains that something metaphoric is figurative or symbolic — in other words, it's a metaphor. Your mom might use the metaphoric phrase "disaster area" when she talks about your bedroom. Metaphoric speech or writing emphasizes the similarities between two fundamentally different things, by having one stand for, or represent, the other. For example, the famous line in the play "As You Like It" by Shakespeare, "All the world's a stage," is metaphoric — "a stage" is a metaphor for "all the world." You can also use the adjective metaphorical to mean the same thing.

The Greek root of both is metaphora, "a transfer" or "a carrying over."

As stated in The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy, the emotional meaning of a word or expression that is used instead of one having a similar meaning but less affective quality, as the meaning of "murder" when used instead of "homicide" or "drunk" instead of "inebriated." Something described as emotive shows feeling. If you consider women more emotive than men, you think that women are more comfortable sharing their feelings than men. While the word "emotive" is similar to the word "emotional", it's important to note that the two aren't interchangeable. Emotive meaning is used with regard to something that makes you have intense feelings rather than just having intense feelings. For example, an emotive conversation will result in getting people's emotions riled up, while an emotional conversation is one in which people go into it with a lot of intense feelings already.

According to The Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy, the emotive meaning of a term is the attitude or other emotional state that is conventionally taken to be expressed by a straightforward use of it. Thus, a derogatory term conventionally expresses some kind of contempt or hostility to some class of people. Terms like 'firm', 'stubborn', and 'pig-headed' apply to more or less the same class of people for more or less the same reason, but convey different appreciations. Other terms like 'super!' or 'wow!' have nothing but an emotive function, but most terms with which we communicate approval or disapproval have descriptive aspects as well.

According to Halliday (1966) , a collocated meaning is a series of words or terms that co-occur more often than would be expected by chance. In phraseology, a collocated meaning is a type of compositional phraseme, meaning that it can be understood from the words that make it up. This contrasts with an idiom, where the meaning of the whole cannot be inferred from its parts, and may be completely unrelated. An example of a collocated meaning is the expression ***strong tea***. While the same meaning could be conveyed by the roughly equivalent ***powerful tea***, this expression is considered excessive and awkward by English speakers. Conversely, a corresponding expression in technology, powerful computer, is preferred over strong computer. There are about six main types of collocated meanings: adjective + noun, noun + noun (such as collective nouns), verb + noun, adverb + adjective, verbs + prepositional phrase (phrasal verbs), and verb + adverb.

Also , Smadja F. A & McKeown, K. R. (1990) state that collocated meanings are partly or fully fixed expressions that become established through repeated context-dependent use. Such terms as 'crystal clear', 'middle management', 'nuclear family', and 'cosmetic surgery' are examples of collocated pairs of words. Collocated meanings can be in a syntactic relation (such as verb–object: 'make' and 'decision'), lexical relation (such as antonymy), or they can be in no linguistically defined relation. Knowledge of collocations is vital for the competent use of a language: a grammatically correct sentence will stand out as awkward if

collocational preferences are violated. This makes collocated meanings an interesting area for language teaching.

Cultural meaning examines the extent to which cultural meaning presented in advertisements reflected national cultures of the target countries. Content analysis was applied to advertisements from four countries to investigate whether the use of advertising appeals presented in these advertisements mirrored variations in cultures as described by Globe Society Values. Results revealed that, in line with the hypotheses, there were similarities and differences in the use of appeals, and only some of them mirrored the cultural various meanings. Globe Society Values were more likely to predict the use of appeals than Globe Society Practices, but not for all appeals. Advertisers can draw on national cultures for cultural meanings to be used in advertisements only to a limited extent. It may be that advertisements mold rather than mirror societal values, or that only certain cultural traits are important for advertisers.

Susan Bassnett explains that cultural translation is the practice of translation while respecting and showing cultural differences. This kind of translation solves some issues linked to culture, such as dialects, food or architecture. The main issues that cultural translation must solve consist of translating a text as showing the cultural differences of that text while also respecting the source culture as well (2002 , p. 280)

Moreover, Katan in Translating Cultures, An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators states that cultural translation is studied through cultural anthropology, a field

of anthropology focused on cultural issues among humans. This discipline questions translation through cultural differences. Indeed, translation studies are not only based on language issues, but also on cultural contexts between people (1999, p.271) . An anthropological translator of cultures needs to deal with the issues between the source and the target language, that is to say he must respect at the same time the cultural source of point of view and the target culture.

Wilhelm von Humboldt shared this opinion of translation in a letter addressed to A. W. Schlegel, dated July 23, 1796: "All translation seems to me simply an attempt to solve an impossible task. Every translator is doomed to be done in by one of two stumbling blocks: he will either stay too close to the original, at the cost of taste and the language of his nation, or he will adhere too closely to the characteristics peculiar to his nation, at the cost of the original. The medium between the two is not only difficult, but downright impossible".

Cultural translation obviously implies the notion of culture, which needs here to be defined, in order to understand well the term. Culture offers two different meanings: the first one defines culture as a civilized society in a developed country, whereas the second one considers culture as a whole set of behaviors and ways of life that a people shares. As previously explained culture gets an important role and meaning in translation. According to Katan, culture is a shared model of   the   world,   a hierarchical model

of beliefs, values and strategies which can guide action and interaction of people.

In the same token, Munday, J. (2012) in Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications (3rd ed.) clarifies that the language of a people asserts and reflects the way they see the universe; a common sentence usually used in socio-linguistic studies to indicate how language is the carrier or communicator of the ideology, beliefs, value system … etc. of a certain community (p. 230) . This means that people express their ideas, beliefs, dreams … etc. through language. This language changes and develops to keep pace with the changes in people's life and ideas, scientific progress and technological advancement. The differences in human languages are clearly reflected in translation: there may be a word in Arabic, for example, which has no equivalent in other languages e.g. زكاة ، عمرة ، خُلع, … etc. This highlights that part of the difficulty of translation is attributed to the fact that no two languages are culturally or linguistically the same way. For example, in Arabic, there are two different, distinctive words for an old man and old woman, that is "شيخ" and "عجوز" and this does not exist in English which modifies 'man', 'woman' using 'old' to indicate the same fact.

Additionally , Munday confirms that the translator's role is not only a mediator between the source text and the target reader: s/he acts as a creator of new target-language structures that do not sound alien to the target reader and preserve the rhetorical effect and metaphorical content of the message of the source text. This is due

to the fact that the effectiveness and the communicativeness of the image depend largely on the shared knowledge of the hearer (or target reader) and the speaker (or source text). The problem occurs when there is a discrepancy between the cultural background of the source text and that of the target reader. For example, the common image "أثلج صدرى", which is part of daily usage, represents an example of culture-specific images. The cultural equivalent of this idiomatic expression is "it warmed my heart". Paradoxically "أثلج" in Arabic is rendered as "warm" in English due to cultural differences. To make this point clearer, the Arab who lives in hot atmosphere, believes that "الثلج" "أثلج صدرى" is something pleasing and this is why refers to something pleasing to the speaker. In contrast, the English man who lives in a cold atmosphere considers warmth one of the pleasures of life and this is why s/he says "it warmed my heart".

The concept of culture is essential in considering the implications for translation, even though there are different opinions whether language is part of culture or not, the two concepts of culture and language cannot be separated. In 1964, Nida discussed the problems of correspondence in translation, considering equal importance to both linguistic and cultural differences between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL). He concluded that differences between cultures may cause more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure. He further explained that parallels in culture often provide a common understanding despite there is significant formal shifts in the translation. According to him that cultural implications for

translation is very important as well as lexical concerns. Nida's definitions of formal and dynamic equivalence considers cultural implications for translation. For him, a gloss translation mostly typifies formal equivalence where form and content are reproduced as faithfully as possible and the TL reader is able to understand as much as the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression of the SL context.

Contrasting with this idea, dynamic equivalence tries to relate the receptor to modes behavior within the context of his own culture without insisting that he understands the cultural patterns of the source-language context. According to him, problems may vary in scope depending on the cultural and linguistic gap between the two (or more) languages concerned.

In 1988, Newmark defined culture as the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression, so that each language group has its own culturally specific features. He also introduced "Cultural word" which the readers are unlikely to understand and the translation strategies for this kind of concept depend on the particular text-type, requirements of the readership and importance of the cultural word in the text. He further clearly stated that operationally he does not regard language as a component or feature of culture in direct opposition to the view taken by Vermeer who stated that "language is part of a culture" (1989:222).

Works Cited

1-Al Timen, F. (2015, Feb). An analysis of translation methods for English proverbs: literal, literary or substitution". European Academic Research, 2(11), 14016-14026.

2-Bassnett, S. (1980). Translation Studies. London and New York: Routledge.

3-Bassnett, Susan Translation studies, Tailor and Francis, 2002.

4-Enani,Mohammed. The Translator's Guide, 2004. Anglo Bookshop, Cairo.

5-Enani, Mohammed. Literary Translation: Theory and Practice, 1997, 2002. Anglo Bookshop , Cairo.

6-Katan, David Translating Cultures, An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing, 1999, 271 p.

7- Munday, J. (2012). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications (3rd ed.) London and New York: Routledge.

8-Munday, J. (2016). Translation theory: Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications. 4th ed. New York, NY: Routledge.

9-Newmark, P. (1988a). A Textbook of Translation.   Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

10-Newmark, P. (1988b). Approaches to Translation. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

11-Newmark, P. (1991). About Translation: Multilingual Matters. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

12-Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of translation. New York and London: Prentice Hall.

13-Newmark, P. (1998). More paragraphs on translation. New Jersey University Press: Multilingual Matters.

14-Neubert: Text and Translation, Leipzig, 1985. 14S.

15-Neubert, Albrecht. Text and Translation. Leipzig: 1985.

16-Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence". The Translation Studies Reader. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004.

17-Nida,Eugene (1964). Towards a science of translation, Leiden: Brill.

18-Nida, Eugene and Charles R. Taber. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

19-Nida, E. (2000). Principles of correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.) The Translation Studies Reader. London: Routledge.

20-Venuti, L. (1995). The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference. London and New York: Routledge.

21-Venuti, L. (2008). The Translator's Invisibility. 2nd ed. New York,: Routledge.

22-Venutti, L. (Ed.). (2004). The translation studies reader. London and New York.

ملخص

يتناول هذا الفصل اللغة والثقافة في ضوء سياق الموقف وسياق الثقافة. أيضاً يتناول الفصل الأشارات الثقافية للتعبيرات الثقافية المألوفة والتعبيرات الثقافية الغير مألوفة. علاوة على ذلك ، فإنه يلقي الضوء على الاستراتيجيات المقترحة المستخدمة في عملية الترجمة الثقافية المتجسدة في التقريب والتغريب والأسناد المرجعي. أيضاً ، يتناول البحث توضيح أهمية الجانب الثقافي في عملية الترجمة . وتقوم أسئلة البحث علي مدي فاعلية سياق الموقف وسياق الثقافة في تقليل الفجوة الثقافية التي تظهر أثناء عملية الترجمة . وما مدي فاعلية الطرق المستخدمة في الترجمة الثقافية.

اللغة طريقة إنسانية بحتة لتوصيل الأفكار والعواطف والرغبات عن طريق الرموز. إذن ، تُستخدم اللغة للتواصل. وبالتالي ، لا يمكننا إلا أن نفترض أن اللغة تؤثر وتتأثر بالثقافة. الترجمة هي وسيلة للتواصل بين الثقافات وبين الشعوب من مختلف المجتمعات. فهي لا تعمل فقط على نقل المعرفة من لغة إلى أخرى ، ولكنها أيضًا تعزز التبادل الثقافي ، وتقلل الفجوات الثقافية ، وتعمل على تعزيز الوعي والتفاهم الثقافي. وتتطلب الترجمة مهارات ثقافية لنقل المعنى.

هناك موضوع أخر يتعلق باجتياز الحواجز الثقافية في الترجمة وهي المناظرة بين التقريب والتغريب كمقاربتين أو إستراتيجيتين تستخدمان عندما يقدم المترجم نصًا. يتم استخدام التقريب لتقليل غرابة النص الأجنبي بالنسبة لقراء اللغة الأخري بينما يشير التغريب إلى الألتزام بالنص الأصلي الذي يحافظ على الطبيعة الغريبة والأجنبية للنص الأصلي. من أجل الحصول على ترجمة صحيحة ومثالية ، يجب على المترجم أن يتجاوز المعنى السطحي

للكلمات . يلجأ المترجم أيضاً الي استخدام الإسناد المرجعي لربط الأقسام ذات الصلة في جميع أجزاء النص.

وأخيراً ، لا يمكن اغفال الجانب الثقافي أثناء عملية الترجمة . وأيضاً ، لا يمكن فصل النص عن سياقه سواء سياق النص أو سياق الثقافة عن بعضهما .

كلمات مفتاحية: الترجمة – الثقافة – استراتيجيات