

Domestication and Foreignization in Translating Cultural Terms from English into Kurdish in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

Kazi Hassan Saleh, Huner Abdullah Mohammed

Department of English, College of Education, University of Charmo, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

Abstract— Translation of culturally specific terms is considered a challenging activity. The current study explores the Kurdish translations of cultural terms found in the novel *Animal farm* written by George Orwell in 1945 and translated by three different translators. The study particularly attempts to identify the type of cultural terms according to Newmark's (1988) taxonomy. In addition, the study uses Venuti's (1995) strategies of domestication and foreignization to identify the three translator's choices, and uses Newmark's (1988) translation procedures to operationalize those two strategies. The results of the study reveal that all the five main categories of cultural terms were discovered including ecology, material culture (artefact), social culture (work and leisure), social organizations as well as gestures and habits. Material culture was the most frequent category of cultural terms found in the data. The translators employed various procedures, with cultural equivalent being the most common and deletion being the least. Furthermore, the translators' tendencies towards domestication and foreignization vary. Translator 1 demonstrates a greater inclination towards foreignization, while Translators 2 and 3 lean more towards domestication, with a notable similarity in their preferences. This study will be a contribution to the field of literary translation by offering insights concerning domestication and foreignization in translating CTs from English into Kurdish.

Index Terms— Cultural terms, translation procedures, foreignization, domestication, cultural equivalent.

I. INTRODUCTION

The central point of translation is to convey a message from one language to another. For this purpose, throughout translation theory, translation scholars have proposed various translation strategies and procedures in order to be used in the translation process to achieve an accurate translation in the target language (TL). El-Dali (2011), Zhang (2012), Braçaj (2014), and House (2016) note that in the past few decades, there has been a substantial change in translation studies away from text- and linguistically focused approaches toward culturally oriented ones. Thus, investigating culture in translation studies has received great attention recently.

During a translation process, translators need to tackle

different aspects of the text to be translated accurately. One of those aspects is the translation of cultural terms (CTs) that is considered one of the primary concerns for translators while translating between two languages, particularly when translating literary materials. This goes in line with Hatim and Mason's (1990) perspective regarding the role of the translator contending that it is undoubtedly true that in the past few decades, the translator has progressively appeared to be viewed as a mediator between cultures instead of merely a linguistic intermediary (pp. 223-4). Moreover, Davies (2003) points out that debates regarding the way of dealing with CTs frequently initiate the differentiation between the two fundamental objectives of translation; firstly, retaining the properties of the original text as much as possible, even if this results in an exotic or odd impact, and secondly, adjusting it to generate a text which appears natural, acquainted, and approachable to the readership of the TL (p.69). Translation is influenced by both the source language (SL) and TL cultures. Concerning this, Sun (2011) states that it is now commonly accepted that translation is necessarily affected by both the SL and TL cultures, and how to cope with the cultural norms concerned has become one of the key challenges in practical translating. A translator should choose which cultural norms to prioritize: the original language community's cultural norms, the targeted language community's cultural norms, or a hybrid of the two (pp.160-61). In this respect, a recent model that has received great attention in translation theories from the cultural viewpoint was introduced by Venuti (1995, 1998) in which he presents the strategies of domestication and foreignization.

Domestication focuses on creating a translation that familiarizes the target readers with the source culture (SC), whereas foreignization aims to bring the foreign culture closer to the target readership. As such, there are two orientations for the translator to take, either prioritizing the source text (ST) and taking SL culture into account or prioritizing the target text (TT) and taking the target culture (TC) into account. Besides these two orientations, some scholars such as Newmark (1988, p. 83) and Dickins (2012, p. 55) claim that there is also a neutral translation which stands between the two poles of

domestication and foreignization. This study focuses on the usage of domestication and foreignization in the novel *Animal Farm* and provides the following research questions:

- What type of cultural terms are found in the novel *Animal Farm*?
- Which of Venuti's two strategies, namely domestication, and foreignization, is employed by each of the three Kurdish translators of *Animal Farm*?
- Which strategy is predominantly used by the translators in translating CTs in *Animal Farm* from English into Kurdish?
- Which procedures are used by translators to domesticate or foreignize CTs

II. METHODOLOGY AND MATERIAL

This study is a descriptive quantitative analysis that examines the implementation of Venuti's (1995,1998) strategies of domestication and foreignization in the translation of cultural terms within three Kurdish translations of the novel *Animal Farm*. To carry out this, Newmark's (1988) categorization of cultural terms, along with his suggested procedures for translating them, are employed as the operational framework.

As for the material, the materials collected for the current study comprise the English novel *Animal Farm* written by George Orwell as the ST and its three Kurdish translations by, namely, Adib Nadr (2008) (TT1), Sirwan Mahmood (2018) (TT2) and Isa Osman (2020) (TT3) as the TTs. The novel was first published on August 17, 1945, in England. The researchers intentionally chose this piece of literature since it is one of the most famous novels around the world and it has been translated into seventy languages. The novel recounts the story of a group of farm animals that rise up against their human farmer in an effort to establish an animal-friendly society in which every animal can live in equality, freedom and happiness together. Literary texts can portray different forms of CTs which are not necessarily found in the same way within the TL system. Therefore, the translator can either domesticate or foreignize them or generate a neutral translation between the two poles of domestication and foreignization. In the present study, the units of the data consist of words and phrases that belong to cultural terms. Furthermore, the scope of this study is restricted as it solely focused on the quantitative analysis of cultural term (CT) translations in the three Kurdish versions of *Animal Farm*. The study did not delve into a qualitative examination of the translators' choices and decision-making processes.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Culture, Language, and Translation

The term culture has been defined by different scholars in the field of translation. For example, Larson defines it as "a complex set of beliefs, attitudes, values, and rules which a group of people share" (1984, p. 431). Newmark (1988, p. 94) also defines 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". The strong relationship between culture and language is evident in their deep interconnection. It is noteworthy that the literal meaning of a word, phrase, or sentence in one culture may not necessarily convey the same

meaning in another culture. Yan and Huang (2014, p. 490) contend that every nation does not only possess a language of its own, but a culture, too. This robust connection between culture and language has been affirmed by Lotman (1978, p. 211) that "no language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its center, the structure of natural language".

Translating cultural materials has drawn translators' and researchers' attention considerably. The cultural aspect is also seen as one of the key and problematic elements in the translation process between two languages or more. In this respect, many translation scholars and researchers point to this reality such as Nida (1964) Catford (1965), Lefevre (1975), Toury (1978), Baker (1992), Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997), Nord (2001), Robinson (2012), and Basnett (2014) among many others. Nida (1964, p. 161) states that "for truly a successful translation, biculturalism is even more important than bilingualism, since words only have meanings in terms of cultures in which they function". He goes on to state that cultural discrepancies lead to more severe complexities for translators than dissimilarities in language structure (Ibid, p. 130)). Hence, translators should be aware of the disparities which exist between the source and target cultures to render the CTs in the best way possible for the target readership. In the meantime, Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997, p. 35) assert that the translation of culture means "any translation which is sensitive to cultural as well as linguistic factors". Furthermore, Nord (2001, p. 34) points out that translating refers to drawing comparisons between cultures. Not far from this notion, Toury (1978, p. 200) also emphasizes that translation is viewed as a sort of activity that certainly encompasses a minimum of two languages as well as two cultural traditions. Therefore, while translating a text, two cultures should be taken into consideration.

Braçaj (2014, p. 335) claims that translating CTs appears to be among the most difficult tasks a translator should undertake. Simply stated, culture and intercultural competence are much more complicated than the translator might perceive.

Thus, culture plays a crucial role in the translation process, as translators are faced with the task of navigating the cultural aspects of both languages involved. This proves the fact that translators need not only linguistic proficiency in the languages they work with, but also a deep understanding of the respective cultures.

Among translation scholars, Newmark is widely recognized for his significant contributions to the classification of cultural words. In his comprehensive framework, Newmark (1998, pp. 98-103) categorizes cultural words into five distinct categories, shedding light on the diverse aspects of culture that translators must consider. These categories encompass "ecology (animals, plants, mountains), material culture (food, clothes, housing, transport, and communications), social culture (work and leisure), organizations, customs, ideas (political, social, legal, religious, artistic), and gestures and habits (often described in 'no-cultural' language)". The researchers of the current study chose to adopt Newmark's categorization of cultural words because of its comprehensive nature, which provides valuable guidance for analyzing and translating cultural terms. By employing this framework, the researchers are able to thoroughly explore the cultural terms present in the translations

of *Animal Farm* and contribute to a deeper understanding of the interplay between culture and translation.

For long, there have been discussions in the translation field as to which translation strategy should be used while translating cultural materials between two languages. It is either the selection of the strategy which is TL culture focused and target reader-oriented or the one which is SL culture focused and SL receptor oriented. According to Hu Cui'e (2000, pp. 45-8), foreignization and domestication have been the focal point of that debate since their emergence. This stance distributed translators and scholars into two classes: those who backed foreignization (taking the SL cultural values into account) and those who opted for domestication (considering the TL cultural values). These are important poles for this study as mentioned in the study aims above.

B. The Domestication and Foreignization Strategies

For long, scholars of translation and translators have explored the notion of translation strategies. According to the online Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2023), *strategy* means "a long-range plan for achieving something or reaching a goal, or the skill of making such plans". Besides the dictionary meaning, the concept *strategy* also possesses a conceptual meaning in the field of translation. Lorsch (1991, p. 8) defines translation strategy as "a potentially conscious procedure for solving a problem faced in translating a text, or any segment of it". For Venuti, translation strategies "involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it" (1998, p. 240). He uses the notions of domesticating and foreignizing to denote translation strategies.

At the end of the 1990s, there was a boom in Translation Studies that divided translations across the dichotomy of domesticating and foreignizing. The most notable figure, and the one most frequently mentioned in this regard, was Lawrence Venuti (Kemppanen et al., 2012, p. 51). Venuti (1995) brought the concepts of foreignization and domestication into modern Translation Studies. Schmidt (2013, p. 537) notes that even though promptly connected with Venuti, these two terms do not speak for new concepts. Baker and Saldanha argues that Venuti originates the two concepts from his reading of Schleiermacher's popular debate over the translator's option between shifting the reader towards the writer or the writer towards the reader (2009, p. 285).

The combination of domestication and foreignization strategies, introduced by Venuti (1995, 1998), has become one of the most frequently used dichotomies in the last fifteen years. His translation perspectives can be viewed as a continuation of the academic debate over free vs literal translation if the theoretical nuances in the two strategies are overlooked depending on the binary oppositions (Kemppanen et al., 2012, p. 50). In his book, Venuti describes a translator's condition in modern Anglo-American culture and criticizes the translations into English as being too domesticated. He further contends that through domestication, translators force the Anglo-American values on the texts being translated.

It is interesting to note that the dichotomy of domestication and foreignization has drawn the researchers' attention considerably. In this regard, Yang (2012, p. 2674) states that

domestication and foreignization are two basic translation strategies that offer linguistic as well as cultural guidance. The foreignization - domestication model, according to Ramière, has been hailed as an effective instrument for conceptualizing the border between the original culture viewed as the 'Self' and the destination culture viewed as the 'Other' (2006, p. 153). In addition, Wang (2013, p. 175) argues that domestication, as well as foreignization, are the two strategies that are firmly embedded in certain social and cultural contexts. Therefore, the selection of domestication and foreignization strategies is influenced not only by the translators but more significantly by particular social circumstances.

Venuti (1998, p. 102) casts light on the strategies of domestication and foreignization and he states that "domestication and foreignization deal with 'the question of how much a translation assimilates a foreign text to the translating language and culture, and how much it rather signals the differences of that text'". In Venuti's view, domestication indicates a translation that is tailored toward the destination culture to make the translated text comprehensible to the target audience (1995, pp. 20-24). He further defines the domestication strategy as "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bring the author back home" and by using this strategy, a type of translation is produced which includes a 'transparent' and 'visible style' to lessen the strangeness of the TT (Venuti, 2008, p. 15). Thus, when a translated text is transparent and straightforward to understand, it is possible that it has been domesticated. Domesticated translations, according to Venuti (1995), are devalued versions of the original texts.

Munday notes that domestication is connected with Schleiermacher's translation type in which the translator "leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him" (2012, p. 219). Similarly, Feng (2016) claims that a translation adopting the domestication strategy, according to Venuti, seems more like a text written in the recipient language than a translation from a foreign language. This is due to the reason that the original language's cultural values are violently eliminated, and foreign cultural norms are replaced with those of the target audience. This implies that domestication keeps readers inside their own country by producing a translation that is fluent and transparent for the TL receptors. In Venuti's perspective, it is the domestication strategy which is predominant in the Anglo-American culture that goes in line with the asymmetrical literary connections that arise between this and other cultures in general. Furthermore, he asserts that because domestication provides wider domestic agendas, it is required to confront its dominance by consciously employing other translation strategies (Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997, p. 44).

It is also worth stating, on the contrary, that Nida advocates the domestication strategy which can be clearly seen in his concept of "dynamic" or "functional equivalence" formulated first in 1964. Nida states that "a translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture" (1964, p. 159). The concept of "naturalness of expression" exposes the significance of a fluent strategy in this translation theory, and it is clear from Nida's work that fluency entails domestication (Venuti, 1998, p.16).

Nida (1964) also adds that the translator is required to be someone who can remove the linguistic and cultural variations so that people may perceive vividly the relevance of the message of the original (p. 36). As per Nida, the receivers of a translated text ought to understand the translation in the same manner as the original receivers must have grasped the meaning of the original text (Ibid).

In contrast to domestication, foreignization is "an ethnodeviant pressure on those (cultural) values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad" (Venuti, 1995, p. 20). In other words, foreignization helps to preserve something of the foreignness of the original text in the TL. Foreignization involves selecting a foreign piece of text as well as advancing a method of translation side by side with the lines that are not included in the dominant cultural values of the receptor language (Venuti, 1998b, p. 242). Nevertheless, according to Venuti, a foreignizing strategy should not pose issues for the readership; instead, a translator should search for new ways of introducing foreign cultures while maintaining fluency. He (1998) contends that while it is impossible to evade domestication, a translator can widen domestication's boundaries and allow foreignization to reach the TL. He also claims that there is no clear distinction between foreignization and domestication. A wholly foreignized or thoroughly domesticated translation is impossible to achieve (Venuti, 2002, 2008, 2013).

Foreignization is the preferable strategy for Schleiermacher, in which the translator "leaves the writer in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader toward [the writer]" (Schleiermacher, 1813/2004, p. 49 cited in Munday, 2012, p. 219). Elnaili (2014, p. 56) states that Schleiermacher supported and promoted a foreignization strategy and also proposed that a translator should try his hardest so as to retain the peculiarity of the original text and take the target reader to the SL's linguistic and cultural otherness. The translation method, in other words, should be ST-oriented. Schleiermacher assumed that the strategy of foreignization would serve to reinforce German as a TL that could then become a main SL (Ibid).

In the same way, Venuti is also regarded as the representative of foreignization and it is regarded, by him, as a 'highly desirable' strategy in which the translator takes the reader abroad by making the recipient culture cognizant of the cultural and linguistic disparities in the foreign text (Venuti, 2008, pp. 15-16). This will be accomplished by using a 'non-fluent, estranging, or heterogeneous translation' style that is outlined to expose the translator's appearance while also emphasizing the ST's foreign identity (Munday, 2012, p. 219). In this manner, the role of the translator will be visible. Venuti's advocacy towards foreignization is reflected even in his definition of translation in which he states that "translation is a process that involves looking for similarities between languages and cultures" (1995, p. 306). He further contends that a translated text ought to be the location where cultural diversity appears, where the audience experiences a cultural other through 'resistancy' which Venuti uses instead of foreignization; it can retain those dissimilarities and otherness by informing the reader of the losses and gains in the translation process as well as the unbridgeable gaps existing between cultures (Ibid).

The dichotomy of domestication and foreignization is closely related to this study for several reasons. In the context of

translation, domestication and foreignization represent two contrasting translation strategies that deal with the treatment of cultural elements in the TL. Firstly, this study focuses on the translation of cultural terms found in the Kurdish translations of *Animal Farm*. CTs are inherently tied to specific cultural contexts and often pose challenges for translators. The dichotomy of domestication and foreignization provides a relevant framework to analyze how these translations approach the rendering of CTs.

Domestication, as a strategy, involves adapting the ST to make it more familiar and accessible to the target readership. This approach aims to bring the target readers closer to the source culture by minimizing the cultural gaps. In the context of this study, understanding how domestication is employed in the translation sheds light on how the translators aimed to bridge the cultural divide and make the text relatable to the Kurdish readership.

On the other hand, foreignization is a strategy that deliberately retains foreign elements in the translation, embracing the uniqueness and distinctiveness of the source culture. By incorporating foreign cultural elements into the TT, foreignization seeks to expose the target readers to the foreign culture. In the context of this study, examining instances of foreignization in the translations provides insights into how the translators aimed to preserve the cultural authenticity of the ST.

Analyzing the interplay between domestication and foreignization in the translations allows for a comprehensive understanding of how the translators navigated the cultural challenges presented by the novel. It provides valuable insights into the translation choices made regarding CTs and how these choices might impact the reception of the text by the target readers.

In summary, the dichotomy of domestication and foreignization is relevant to this study as it provides a theoretical framework to analyze the translation strategies employed in dealing with CTs. Exploring the interplay between these strategies offers valuable insights into how the translators balanced the need for cultural adaptation and cultural preservation in the Kurdish translations of *Animal Farm*.

IV. TRANSLATION PROCEDURES IN RENDERING CULTURAL TERMS

A variety of terms can be seen in defining the way of translation among translation scholars and specialists. For instance, Molina and Albir (2002, p. 499) refer to it as a translation technique that caused differences in opinion among experts regarding "translation techniques". Baker (2011, p. 20) refers to them as strategies, while Newmark (1988, p. 81) terms them as procedures. The definition of procedure according to the online Meriam Webster's Dictionary, "is a series of steps followed in a regular definite order." Pinchuck also defines translation procedures as "the technical devices used to transfer the meaning of a text in one language into a text in another language" (1977, p. 188). In the current study, translation procedures are employed highlighting that they are applied in the translation process for rendering sentences and the smaller components of language (Newmark, 1988).

Several scholars suggest different procedures for translating CTs such as Newmark (1988), Baker (1992), Hervey and Higgins (1992), Aixela (1996), Pedersen (2011), Fernandez Guerra (2012) among many others. The researchers use the translation procedures proposed by Newmark (1988) for translating CTs who proposes various procedures such as transference, naturalization, cultural equivalent, descriptive equivalent, functional equivalent, literal translation, synonymy, through translation, shift and transposition, modulation, recognized translation, compensation, reduction and expansion, paraphrase, addition, glossary, and notes.

V. THE DIVISION OF THE PROCEDURES APPLIED IN THE DATA

The translation procedures Newmark proposes are ranked on a scale according to their orientation toward SC and TC or a position between them (i.e., neutralizing translation). This way, they are analyzed under the two overall strategies of foreignization and domestication in light of Venuti's model (1995, 1998) as follows: literal translation, transference, through translation, naturalization, translation label, addition, and notes fall under the foreignization strategy, while cultural equivalent, synonymy, and paraphrase fall under domestication strategy. It is worth noting here that according to Newmark (1988) and Dickins (2012), functional equivalent and descriptive equivalent are neutralizing procedures. So, they neither create domestication nor foreignization and they produce a neutralizing translation between the two poles of domestication and foreignization. In addition to these, in this study, deletion (omission) is also dealt with as a neutral procedure.

1) Foreignizing procedures

A. Transference (borrowing)

Newmark (1988) defines it as the use of loan words or transcriptions to transfer a SL word directly into the TL text. In this procedure, the SL word is retained in its original form or transcribed phonetically into the TL, without undergoing translation. This involves transliteration that is concerned with converting distinct alphabets and the spelling of the word remains unchanged. This procedure is sometimes used by translators to add local colour (p. 81). Newmark also asserts that cultural terms are frequently transferred in order to add local flavor, draw the reader's attention, and establish a feeling of closeness between the reader and the text (ibid, p. 82). In the data, some examples of translation by transference (borrowing) are presented for the three translators as follows:

Table 1.
Examples of transference found in the data

ST	TT	Translator
harrow	هارزو	Translator1
van	فان	Translator1
pipe	پایپ	Translator2
dynamo	دینامو	Translator2
veterinary	فیتیرنری	Translator3
cheque	چیک	Translator3

B. Naturalization

This procedure "succeeds transference" and adjusts the SL word initially to the typical pronunciation, then to the typical morphology (word forms) of the TL (Newmark 1988, p. 82). Rasul (2015, p. 46) notes that the difference between transference (borrowing) and naturalization is only applicable in a kind of translation which occurs between two languages sharing the same "alphabetical systems". He further claims that when a translation is performed between two languages of distinct alphabets, for example, English and Kurdish, a borrowed term can be simultaneously an instance of naturalization since both situations entail a shift from one alphabetical system to another. For instance, see Table 2 below.

Table 2.
Examples of naturalization found in the data

ST	TT	Translator
apartment	نەپارتمان	Translator1
debate	دەبیات	Translator1
committee	کۆمیتە	Translator2
maneuver	مانۆر	Translator2
Bushel	بووشل	Translator3
candidate	کاندید	Translator3

C. Through translation

Through translation is a kind of procedure which is utilized in rendering names of organizations, common collocations, the components of compounds, and possibly phrases in a literal way. Calque or loan translation is also used to describe this procedure (Newmark, 1988, p. 84). Examples are shown in Table 3.

Table 3.
Examples of through translation found in the data

ST	TT	Translator
wooden crate	سندوقێکی تەختە	Translator1
solemn funeral	ماتەمیکی پیرۆز	Translator1
cart-track	ریژگی گالیسکە	Translator2
harvest moon	مانگی دروینە	Translator2
memorial banquet	کۆرێکی ماتەمی	Translator3
feather mattresses	دۆشەمکی پەر	Translator3

D. Literal translation

According to Newmark (1988), literal translation is the initial stage in the process of translation, which is then accompanied by other processes. Additionally, he contends that literal translation frequently misses the true intent or implication, necessitating the addition of a remark to clarify. This procedure requires more effort from the translator in order to produce a text that is smooth and comprehensible. He explains that "literal translation ranges from one word to one word, through group to group, collocation to collocation, clause to clause, sentence to sentence. The longer the unit, the rarer the one-to-one" (ibid, p. 69). Table 4 shows examples from the data.

Table 4.
Examples of literal translation found in the data

ST	TT	Translator
blackbirds	بەلندە رەشەکان	Translator1
a game of cards	بازی کاغەز	Translator2
Comrades	هاورێیان	Translator3

E. Notes, Additions, Glosses

The extra information a translator might need to include in his version are typically cultural due to the variety of the SL and TL cultures. The translation could involve additional information in a variety of ways:

- Within the text

Wherever applicable, the extra information should be incorporated into the text itself, as this does not divert the reader's focus. Unfortunately, translators frequently overlook this procedure. Its drawback, moreover, is that it makes it difficult to distinguish between the text and the translator's voice (Newmark, 1988, pp. 91-92).

- Notes at the bottom of the page (footnote).
- Notes at the end of the chapter.
- Notes or glossary at the end of the book.

Newmark believes that when the translator inserts long and multiple notes (foot-notes) at the bottom of the page, they will be annoying. Similarly, he asserts that adding notes at the end of the chapters are frequently bothering because it is time-consuming to find them (Ibid).

2) Domesticating procedures

A. Cultural equivalent

This is a translation procedure in which an SL cultural term is replaced by a TL cultural term. Newmark (1988) points out that it is an approximate translation and it is inaccurate. The primary goal of this procedure is to assist another procedure in a couplet (Newmark, 1988, p. 82). Examples are shown in Table 5.

Table 5.
Examples of cultural equivalent found in the data.

ST	TT	Translator
foal	جوانوو	Translator1
ram	بیران	Translator1
blinkers	چاویستهکان	Translator2
foxhound	تانجی	Translator2
sleet	شلنیه	Translator3
halters	ره شمه	Translator3

B. Synonymy

According to Newmark (1988, p. 84), synonymy is a close TL counterpart to the SL term. This type of translation procedure is employed by translators when an accurate equivalent in the TL might or might not be available. This procedure is also applied when there is no obvious one-to-one equivalent for an SL term. Newmark further argues that a translator cannot avoid synonymy in translation. However, excessive use of synonyms is a sign of many inaccurate translations (ibid).

Table 6.
Examples of synonymy found in the data

ST	TT	Translator
beech	سوره چنار	Translator1
gaiters	پروت	Translator2
cockerel	کلمه شیر	Translator3

C. Paraphrase

This strategy clarifies or explains the sense of a segment of a text and it is applied in an "anonymous" text which is poorly

written or contains significant omissions and implications (Newmark, 1988, p. 90). It is used to translate a cultural word in few words in order to accomplish clarity in the TT.

Table 7.
Examples of paraphrase found in the data.

ST	TT	Translator
stormy weather	کمشو همای تووش و رشمه باوی	Translator1
solemn funeral	مهر اسپه کی شایسته ی به خاک سپاردن	Translator1
Young Black Minorca	باروکه له جوری ماینورکای رمش	Translator2
Brussels carpet	مافوروی تووک دریژو نمخندار	Translator2
lawsuit	کیشمه کی دادگایی و یاسایی	Translator3
snowdrift	کلمه که بغورنکی هموار اداو	Translator3

3) Neutralizing procedures

A. Functional equivalent

This procedure is common in translation and when it is adapted to cultural terms, it needs the usage of a culture-free word, often along with a new specific term. It frequently goes together with transference when it is used in rendering cultural terms from the SL into the TL. In addition, the functional equivalent procedure is utilized to render SL terms by neutralizing and generalizing them, as explained by Newmark (1988, p. 83). He further asserts that functional equivalent is considered the most accurate way of translating, as it involves deculturizing a cultural word. He further explains that functional equivalent is "the most accurate way of translating i.e., deculturizing a cultural word" (ibid).

Table 8.
Examples of functional equivalent found in the data

ST	TT	Translator
the magistrates	دادور مکان	Translator1
dining room	ژوور	Translator2
market days	بازار	Translator3

B. Descriptive equivalent

Newmark defines descriptive equivalent as a translation procedure in which an SL cultural term is translated into the TL by giving explanations. He further states that description sometimes needs to take precedence over function when transferring the message (Newmark, 1988, p. 83). Description and function are two crucial parts of clarification, and hence within translation.

Table 9.
Examples of descriptive equivalent found in the data

ST	TT	Translator
weeds	گژوگیای زیان به خش	Translator1
frost	شمه ختمه کی سمخت	Translator1
breeches	پانتولی نمه سپواری	Translator2
hearse	گالیسکه ی گواسته مه ی ناسم	Translator2
horse rake	دهز گای دروینه و کوکر دنه مه	Translator3
van	نوتومینانکی بار	Translator3

C. Deletion (Omission)

The term "deletion", according to Newmark (1988, p. 90), describes situations in which specific components or words from the ST are deleted in the translation process. According to Dickins *et al.*, omission (deletion) is a type of 'translation loss' in which portions of the ST are merely left out in the TT (2017, p. 20). Omission can be the last option for translators to use while translating 'unacceptable' CTs. This is possibly because of stylistic, religious, or ideological constraints in the TL culture (Mansour, 2014, p.28).

Table 10. Examples of deletion found in the data

ST	TT	Translator
shelter	omitted	Translator1
pet	omitted	Translator2
cock-a-doodle-doo'	omitted	Translator3

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results

To determine the frequency of the type of the cultural terms (as shown in Table 11) as well as the distribution of the translation procedures (as demonstrated in Table 12) along with the overall strategies used in the data to render the CTs (see Table 13), descriptive statistics were utilized as presented below along with a discussion of the results gained.

Table 11.

The frequencies and percentages of the cultural terms' categories found in Animal Farm.

Type of cultural word	Frequency	Percentage
Ecology	56	35.22%
Material Culture	65	40.37%
Social Culture: work and leisure	10	6.29%
Social Organization	12	7.54%
Gestures and habits	1	0.63%

Table 12.

The distribution of the procedures and their frequencies used in the Kurdish translations of Animal Farm based on foreignization, domestication and neutralizing translation.

Strategy	Procedure	Frequency (Freq)& percentage (Pct)	TT1	TT2	TT3
Domestication	Cultural equivalent	Freq.	54	66	74
		Pct.	24.66 %	39.76 %	41.34 %
	Synonymy	Freq.	3	19	19
		Pct.	1.37 %	11.45 %	10.61 %
	Paraphrase	Freq.	3	3	5
		Pct.	1.37 %	1.81 %	2.79 %

Neutralizing translation	Descriptive equivalent	Pct.				
		Freq.	20	28	25	
Functional equivalent	Deletion (omission)	Pct.	9.13 %	16.87 %	13.97 %	
		Freq.	4	7	8	
Foreignization	Transference (borrowing)	Pct.	1.83 %	4.22 %	4.47 %	
		Freq.	1	1	1	
Foreignization	Naturalization	Pct.	0.46 %	0.60 %	0.56 %	
		Freq.	45	7	9	
	Through translation	Pct.	20.55 %	4.22 %	5.03 %	
		Freq.	9	5	7	
	Literal translation	Pct.	4.11 %	3.01 %	3.91 %	
		Freq.	23	23	18	
	Notes (footnote)	Notes (footnote)	Pct.	10.5 %	13.87 %	10.06 %
			Freq.	8	7	2
		Notes (footnote)	Pct.	3.65 %	4.22 %	1.12 %
			Freq.	49	-	11
	Notes (footnote)	Notes (footnote)	Pct.	22.37 %	-	6.15 %
			Freq.			

Table 13.

Frequency and percentage of the overall strategies adopted by the three translators identified in the three translations.

Strategy	Frequency & Percentage	TT1	TT2	TT3
Domestication	Frequency	60	88	98
	Percentage	27.4 %	53.02 %	54.74 %
Foreignization	Frequency	134	42	47
	Percentage	61.18 %	25.32 %	26.26 %
Neutral translation	Frequency	25	36	34
	Percentage	11.42 %	21.69 %	19

B. Discussion

The current study aimed to find and identify the types of CTs in the novel *Animal Farm* which is the first question of the study. As seen in the data presented above (see table 11), all the five basic categories of CTs based on Newmark's taxonomy have been identified in the novel including ecology, material culture, social culture, social organization and gestures and habits. There are 159 CTs identified in the novel. Of all the CTs, material culture (all the sub-categories included) is the most common type with 65 occurrences which account for 40.37% of the total CTs in the novel. The second common type of CTs is categorized into ecology with 56 occurrences accounting for 35.22% of the total CTs in the novel. Religious terms and

gestures and habits come as the least common types of CTs which both occur once accounting for 0.63% for each of the identified CTs in the novel.

As it shown in Table 12, all the three translators used various procedures from Newmark's (1988) proposed procedures for translating CTs. As for translator 1, he utilized 11 procedures in translating the CTs in the novel. Of which, cultural equivalent, synonymy and paraphrase were used to domesticate the CTs in the TT. The foreignizing procedures include transference, literal translation, through translation, naturalization, and notes (footnotes). The neutralizing procedures are descriptive equivalent, functional equivalent and deletion. Out of all the procedures, cultural equivalent was employed 54 times which is the most frequently used one, accounting for 24.66% of the total cases, while deletion (omission) is the least common procedure utilized by translator 1 only once. The translator, through cultural equivalent, tried to find equivalents in the TL so as to make the ST cultural terms appear as domestic cultural values as possible for the TT readership. Newmark (1988, p. 220) states that while translating CTs, the use of cultural equivalent procedure is considered best applicable for the "uninformed readers". Similarly, the translator adopted synonymy and paraphrase procedures in rendering the CTs and a target version of the ST was produced which sounds natural for the TT receptors.

The results also indicate that translator 1 used foreignization strategy by using some procedures mentioned above. Using the procedures which have tendency towards foreignization allows the foreign cultural elements to be introduced to the literary and cultural system of the TL. What is important to be noted here is that translator 1 employed transference 45 times to borrow the SL cultural terms into the TL. It can be clearly seen that the translator tried to foreignize the CTs and open the door for the ST cultural terms enter the TL and make the TT readers familiar with them. This helps the reader to realize what they are reading is a distinct culture reflected within the TL. This also offers the target audience a chance to feel cultural otherness. In addition, transferring or borrowing CTs may indicate that the translator tends to facilitate the establishment of new terms within the TL.

Transference seems easy to be used by translators, in the meantime, it may have an impact on the TL readers. Thus, the translators should take the type of readership into account before applying this procedure as Newmark (1988, 220) classifies readership into three kinds, including "expert, educated, and uninformed" ones. Naturalization also resembles transference in a way or another. While the naturalization of a CT is not exactly the same as transference in foreignizing the CTs, it still maintains the SL cultural term's foreignness since the TL readers can easily identify the alienating nature of the SL cultural term in question.

It is worth noting that translator 1 utilized notes in the form of footnotes 49 times, accounting for 22.27% of the total identified cases. The use of footnotes can help the TT readers form more accurate opinions about the ST cultural terms. Besides, some stylists think that a translation that is heavily peppered with footnotes is terrible in terms of appearance. According to Nida (1964, 237–239), footnotes should serve at least two of the following purposes: firstly, to provide additional information, and secondly, to draw attention to any inconsistencies in the original. Even if a translator provides

explanations for the CTs in the form of footnotes, their foreignness will still be easily apparent. Further to what has been discussed about the two poles of foreignization and domestication in translating the CTs by translator 1, he used the neutralizing translation as well through which a translation is made neither that domesticates the CTs nor foreignizes them.

With regard to translator 2 and translator 3, the results illustrate that they adopted 10 and 11 procedures respectively in rendering the CTs found in the novel. The use of the procedures by translator 2 and translator 3 is different in terms of occurrences in comparison with translator 1. Cultural equivalent was used 66 times by translator 2 and 74 times by translator 3 to render the CTs which is the most commonly applied procedure to domesticate the CTs for both of them. Likewise, the least commonly used procedure is deletion (omission) which was applied only once by the three translators. It should be noted here that, unlike translator 1 and translator 3, translator 2 did not employ footnotes at all in rendering the CTs in his TT.

It is interesting to note that the SL oriented procedures of transference and naturalization were almost identical in their number of occurrences which were utilized only in a few cases in rendering the CTs by translator 2 and 3. In contrast, among the SL-oriented procedures, the "through translation" procedure was adopted more frequently by both translator 2 (23 times) and translator 3 (18 times) to foreignize the CTs.

The results demonstrate that translator 2 and 3, in contrast to translator 1, have the preference towards domestication strategy. They both attempted to minimize the foreignness of the CTs in the TL. Venuti (1995) claims that the domesticating strategy "violently" eliminates cultural values, resulting in a text that reads as though it were written in the TL and adheres to the cultural norms of the target audience. Interestingly, Venuti (ibid) provides extensive documentation of how foreign texts would be disregarded if they did not pass the "fluency" test, in other words, if they were resistant towards "easy readability" (Hatim, 2001, 51). Thus, when a text or a type of writing is translated into the TL by using foreignizing strategy, it is unlikely to be preferred by any mass market readership because it will not appear natural in the TL due to breaking a lot of TL conventions and norms.

Taking the numbers and the above-mentioned results into consideration, it can be apparently seen that, as for translator 1, foreignization strategy is predominant compared to domestication. Foreignization was adopted 134 times which accounts for 61.18 % of the used strategies, while domestication was employed 60 times accounting for 27.4% and neutral translation occurred 25 times which accounts for 11.42% of the identified strategies. This illustrates the fact that translator 1 tends to move the readers towards the writer and the SL cultural values. This can be achieved through foreignizing the CTs during the translation process of the novel by breaking some of the TL conventions and norms. It can also be said that translators 2 and 3, unlike translator 1, employed domestication more predominantly than foreignization. With regard to translator 2, domestication was applied 88 times (53.02%), while foreignization was implemented 42 times (25.32 %) and neutral translation 36 times (21.69%). Again, regarding translator 3, domestication is the predominant strategy with 98 occurrences (54.74%), while foreignization occurred 47 times

(26.26%) and neutral translation was utilized 34 times (19%). This illustrates that both translators have the tendency towards foreignization and domestication strategies as well as neutralizing translation with varying percentages as explained above.

The present study is parallel to Al-Rikaby, *et al* (2018) study titled *Domestication and Foreignization Strategies in Two Arabic Translations of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus: Culture-Bound Terms and Proper Names*. Both the current study and their article examine the frequency of foreignization and domestication strategies in light of Venuti's (1995) model. Al-Rikaby, *et al.* applied the procedures suggested by Newmark (1988) and Coillie (2006) to operationalize the theory while the current study used only Newmark's procedures. The results of their article indicate that although the translators employed various strategies, they both favored foreignization over domestication and foreignization is more pervasive.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and findings of the study, the researchers conclude that the total number of CTs found in the novel were 159 terms and all the five basic cultural categories proposed by Newmark (1988) were identified in the three translated versions of the novel into Kurdish. When translation occurs between two different languages and cultures such as English and Kurdish, cultural complications arise for translators and may make translators use different procedures to translate the cultural bound terms. The translators used a number of translation procedures from Newmark's (1988) suggested procedures. Among the different types of CTs identified, material culture accounted for the highest proportion (40.37%) in the target texts (TTs). As for the translators' choices, footnote and transference were two preferred procedures for translator 1 to translate the CTs, whereas the other two translators used transference only occasionally to foreignize the CTs. The translators shared almost the same tendency in using cultural equivalent which was the most commonly used one and also deletion (omission) which was the least common procedure for all the three translators. Furthermore, all the translators employed domestication, foreignization and neutral translation differently in translating the CTs. Translator 2 and 3 implemented domestication nearly equally which was more dominant than foreignization. This means that they both had the tendency to domesticate the CTs so that they would sound familiar to the target readership. They both also applied neutral translation almost similarly. On the other hand, translator 1 utilized foreignization more predominantly than domestication and neutral translation. In other words, he tended to foreignize the CTs in order to appear foreign and preserve the culture of the ST. This study's scope is limited because it only considered the translation of CTs in the three Kurdish versions of *Animal Farm* quantitatively, i.e., it did not approach it qualitatively. Therefore, future studies and investigations can focus on the translators' choices and decisions qualitatively in order to reveal any potential underlying factors that triggered their choices in handling CTs in Kurdish translations.

REFERENCES

- Aixela, J. F. (1997). Culture-Specific Items in Translation. In Translation, Power, Subversion. Ed. Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal. Claverdon: Multilingual Matters, 52-78.
- Albakry, M. (2018). *Translation and the intersection of texts, contexts and politics: Historical and socio-cultural perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Al-Rikaby, A.B.M., Mahadi, T.S.T. and Ai Lin, D.T. (2018). Domestication and Foreignization Strategies in Two Arabic Translations of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus: Culture-Bound Terms and Proper Names. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 26(2).
- Baker, M. & Saldanha, G., (2009). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, Second edition*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (1998). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (2011). In other words: A Coursebook on translation. 2nd ed. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation studies*. 4th ed. London: Routledge.
- Bračaj, M. (2014). Reflection on language, culture and translation and culture as a challenge for translation process. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(4), 332-337. <https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2014.v4n4p332>
- Dickins, J. (2012). Procedures for Translating Culturally Specific Terms. in: Littlejohn, A. and Roa Metha, S. (eds.) *Language Studies: Stretching the Boundaries*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 43-60.
- Dickins, J., J. Herveý Sándor G and Higgins, I. (2017). *Thinking Arabic translation: Arabic to English*. 2nd eds. London England: Routledge.
- Dictionary definition & meaning (no date) Merriam-Webster. Merriam-Webster. Available at: Merriam Webster Dictionary <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/procedure> (Accessed: February 15, 2023).
- El-dali, H. M. (2011). Towards an understanding of the distinctive nature of translation studies. *Journal of King Saud University - Languages and Translation*, 23(1), 29-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksult.2010.01.001>
- Feng, X., (2016). On aesthetic and cultural issues in pragmatic translation: *Based on the translation of brand names and brand slogans*. Routledge.
- Fernández Guerra, A. (2012). Translating culture: Problems, strategies and practical realities. *[sic] Journal of Literature, Culture and Literary Translation*, (1.3). doi:10.15291/sic/1.3.lt.1
- Gambier, Y. (2007). Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman: Longman Group Limited.
- Hatim. (2001). *Teaching and researching translation*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Hedger, M., (2006). *Tension between Domestication and Foreignization in English-Language*.
- Herveý, S., & Higgins, I. (1992). *Thinking translation: Teachers' handbook. French to English. A course in translation method*. Routledge.
- House, J. (2016). *Translation as communication across languages and cultures*. Routledge.
- Hu, Cui'e. (2000). Rethinking on Domestication and Foreignization. *Foreign Language and Translation*, 1,45-48.
- Kemppanen, H., Jänis, M. & Belikova, A. eds., (2012). *Domestication and foreignization in translation studies* (Vol. 46). Frank & Timme GmbH.
- Larson, M.L. (1984) *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Lotman, J. (1978). *On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture*. New Work History, p.211
- Lorscher, W. (1991). *Translation performance, translation process, and translation strategies: A psycholinguistic investigation*. Tübingen: Gunter Nar
- Mansour, M.H., (2014). Domestication and Foreignization in Translating Culture-Specific References of an English Text into Arabic. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, pp.23-36. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16184>

- Matielo, R. & Espindola, E.B., (2011). Domestication and foreignization: An analysis of culture-specific items in official and non-official subtitles of the tv series heroes. *Cadernos de Tradução, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brasil*, 1(27). <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-7968.2011v1n27p71>
- Munday, J. (2001/2012). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and applications*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Harlow, Essex: Prentice Hall.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Nord, C. (2001) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. Toronto, Ontario: The Penguin Group.
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. Translated by Mahmood, S. (2018). Suleimani: Endeshe publishing.
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. Translated by Nadir, A. (2008). Suleimani: Sardam publishing.
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. Translated by Osman, I. (2020). Suleimani: Adiban Publishing.
- Pedersen, J. (2011) *Subtitling Norms for Television: An exploration focusing on extralinguistic cultural references*. Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pinchuck, I. (1977) *Scientific and Technical Translation*. London: A. Deutsch Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ramière, N. (2006). Reaching a foreign audience: Cultural transfers in audiovisual translation. *caleidoscópio: Literatura E tradução*, 3(1), 07–20. <https://doi.org/10.26512/caleidoscopio.v3i1.25323>
- Rasul, S. H. (2015). *Procedures and Strategies in English-Kurdish Translation of Written Media Discourse*, unpublished PhD thesis offered to the University of Leeds.
- Robinson, D. (1997). *Becoming a Translator: An Accelerated Course*. London: Routledge
- Schmidt, G. (2013). Foreignization and domestication in the Croatian translations of Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. *Jeziškoslovlje*, Issue 2, pp. 537-548.
- Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (1997) *Dictionary of translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sun, H. (2011). On cultural differences and translation methods. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 2(1), 160–163. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.1.160-163>.
- Toury, G. (1978). The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation, in Venuti, L. (ed.). *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 205-218.
- Translations Of Anna Karenina*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Edinburgh.
- Venuti, L. (1995/2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. (2nd ed.) London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (2013) *Translation changes everything: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.11.2423-2427>
- Wang, L. (2013). A Survey on Domestication and Foreignization Theories in Translation. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 3(1), 175-79 <https://doi.org/10.4304/TPLS.3.1.175-179>
- Yan, C. and Huang, J. (2014) "The culture turn in translation studies," *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 04(04), pp. 487–494. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.44041>.
- Yang, W. (2010). Brief study on domestication and foreignization in translation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 77–80. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.1.77-80>
- Yang, W., (2012). Factors influencing domestication or foreignization on the macro and micro levels. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(12), pp. 2674–2679. [doi:10.4304/tpls.2.12.2674-2679](https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.12.2674-2679)
- Zhang, M. (2012). Translation manipulated by ideology and poetics—a case study of the jade mountain. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(4), 754–758. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.4.754-758>.