Research paper

Translation as a Confront of Languages and Cultures

Linguistics

Alba Teneqexhi | **International University of Tirana, Albania.**

Abstract

Translation remains the most complicated and unknown phenomenon. The process of translation is the subject of research of recent times, among other things, established the systematic analysis of the translation formulations created by interpreters and linguists in different eras and places. Necessarily translation is closely connected with the multiplicity of the ways of thinking and as a consequence I have treated this occurrence as a confront of cultures, in a confrontation that must reach a balance and a measurability of losses or supplements during the hard work of the translator: of this being that 'sits in the shade and makes light'.

Herein, different treatments and considerations on the problems of translation and cultural connotations that confront and interject best in the binomial culture – translation.

In this research are presented different approaches and considerations on the problem of translation and cultural connotations, which are faced and interlinked best in culture binomial - translation.

As a result of this research turns out that contacts between two languages define linguistic modifications to the systems that much so that translation can be best seen as a rewriting, as a manipulation that expresses the power of a culture over another.

The historical evolution of languages, cultures, literatures and societies, has brought as a necessity the connection of the concept of translation with the varieties of the ways of thinking and of saying. This view can be amplified by claiming that the translation does not reflect only the 'state of things' at a certain time, but can help in the spreading of new models on different lingual and cultural structures. This impact is so large that it can reach to the conversion or evolution to a particular culture.

The relationship between the cultural tradition and translation, to which refers G. Steiner, is retaken once again by Gianfranco Folena, who join in one thought: in the fact that every civilization is born from a translation and that "from the Latin the concept of translation takes a special importance in the creation of the new linguistic and cultural traditions".

Here Folena refers to Latin literature, which is built through translations from Greek, whereas the literary modern German language, especially the written language, owes more to the translation of Martin Luther that did to the Bible; he knew to adjust himself in syntoni with the soul of German nation, by opening the way to a national language and by strengthening the cultural identity of his nation. His thesis summarized in the concept "translation as a tradition" [92] [1], officiates in the impossibility of the elaboration of a theory beyond any historical experience and helps in making the discussion of the prevalence of theoretical formalisms and Linguistics.

The act of translation, in this aspect, relates closely to the language which goes beyond a mechanical process or a simple shift. This act brings not only confrontation between two different linguistic systems, but also different confontations between the two peoples and their respective cultures.

Research paper

During the process of making meaning of a text, with all its difficulties, data linking cultures and thus their cultural context are often translated into text which shows the presence of a culture that is completely unknown to the recipient.

Therefore, it is necessary that these conditions occur in an adaptation of what is communicated in the transition from one culture to another. Such a necessity is not the product of our times, but has been observed back then. According to Goethe, convinced that every culture has a vision of his own for himself, says that there are different forms of translation, corresponding to different attitudes toward a foreign culture.

Hence, his ideas he expresses with the argument: The first (form of translation) recognizes us with the externality of our perspective, a prosaic translation in a linear way in this case is the best. After him, follows an era in which we see the attempt to be displaced in a foreign country circumstances, but in fact the trend is only to appropriate the meaning that is unknown to us and for them refigures in the appropriate meaning.

Genre is defined by him as "the most supreme" is "one in which the translation of desire are made identical to the original, so that one translation should not be a surrogate of another, but to represent it in a way equivalent in value [93] [2] by appearing as an ideal fulfillment of a perfect balance between the initial text and the arrival text. In the individualism that he makes to different attitudes towards "another" culture, Goethe perceives almost invisibly the tendencies, some larger and some smaller of different historical epochs assimilated to an original one, for coping with and to be modeled on it, recognizing in this way to give up cultural identity that stems from a particular national origin.

The closest with the Goethe's vision which seems to be report-culture translation is expressed by Wilhelm von Humboldt. Humboldt sees translation as the opportunity to move from "an image of the world to another in order to characterize the different", since every language "expresses the special vision of its world, of the nation from which has the roots" [94] [3].

Related to the report between two cultures Jose Ortega y Gasset who comes out in defense of a diversity which is considered as a necessary element. He applies the concept of diversity, in a diachronic meaning, for the differences between the classic culture and the modern one. We should be aware from the temptations to flatten this diversity: "We need ancients" insists Ortega y Gasset, "exactly, because they are similar to us and translation should emphasize their exotic and distant character, making it readable as such [95] [4].

Translation and Modification of Linguistic Systems

Effects produced by translations are not noticed only in the cultural context. Contacts between two languages define real modifications in linguistic systems and give to it life, based on the thesis supported by Benjamin, an inversion from the traditional viewpoint. In the moment of translation Benjamin distinguishes the expression of "the closest relationship of the languages between them", because "they are not foreign between them, but are derived from any historical relationship, thus they are close to what they want to say" [98].

It can even be said that a superimposition of such affinities shows the maximum level and exactly then rises the cultural need of translation. Teaching climbing and falling, changing its trends, its continuous transformations, cause mutations not only to the text, but also to the native language of the translator.

As a result, "the best translation is destined to enter into the process of language increase." What unites languages in a prosperous return is not the entirety of their particular elements, but what is understood. All the elements of language, words, sentences, syntactic relation to different languages exclude each other, these languages are integrated in their own.

To clarify his concept that establishes the foundation of the philosophy of discourse, Benjamin makes the difference between the two sets of different concepts that echo each other and give a new dimension to the form and content of definitions, otherwise "ways of understanding" and "understanding ".

The image that is created from such terms as *brot* and *pain* (*bread*, respectively in German and French) does not seem to be identical; if that what Benjamin defines as "comprehension" is the same thing for French and German, that they both refer to a particular food, then the "way of comprehension" is different, because the words "interlock in themselves an affective nuance" at that point it is hard to call them interchangeable, connected as they are with accurate socio – cultural connotations.

The way of understanding of one for another is foreign, in the mind are created two different images even though the understanding is simplified to the minimal terms (as it is *bread*) is identical. Therefore, the translation appears as "a temporary way to clear accounts with the language." If we take the words of Rudolf Panneitz cited by Benjamin, the ideal one would be "to be widened and deepened the individual language through the foreign language", a hypothesis that reminds you to the concept expressed by Machiavelli in his theory of the "change" of "borrowed" or "immigrant" verbs [99] [6].

In the closed position, in terms of a language that absorbs and digests foreign word until it makes its own, Benjamin opposes the proposed vision of Panneitz, a linguistic system capable of "be shaken or moved from foreign language" [100] [7], opens externally and breaks the boundaries, by challenging itself to mutation. Such mutation seems even more radical in the position of Ortega y Gasset, for whom "the decisive point remains the one of the attempt that during translation moves away from our language and goes towards the others" [101] [8].

Translation and Rewriting

As stated above, there is a debate over translation which particular attention is given to aspects related to the context and cultural data. By interpreting the act of translation in cultural profile, Andrè Bassnet and Susan Lefevre define it as a manipulation of primordial text, rewriting by translators "reflects a defined ideology and poetry and in favor of this, manipulate the literature to act in a certain way in a certain society. Rewriting is manipulation, put into the service of government and taken from the positive side, can help literature and society to move forward [102] [9].

By rewriting, new ideas and genres in the process of transmission express power of culture over another, that power can even take the form of oppression and repression, where rewriting aims to slow down and drive towards genres and natural new forms.

This choice of manipulation is added another manipulation, the one that the translator himself exerts on the text voluntarily. Not only language prevents the interpreter, but mostly by the conditioning of historical circumstances, social, cultural.Close in the essence with this idea of the dominance of property is also Siri Nergaard expresses like this:

> *While the theory of "traditional" translation is inclined to*
> *distinguish the hardships of translation…, only of linguistic*
> *occurrences", the real hardships and definitions have*
> *extra – linguistic nature" [103] [10].*

According to her, extra – linguistic factors, literary ideologies, poetics, traditions are the centers of power and as such they have a conditioning role on a translation. Such a condition, may be distinct not only in choosing the aspects of a culture initials to enter the destination culture, but also a certain act of censorship on external data, the linguistic formulation. [104] [11].

Almost similar concepts are presented by Theo Hermans [105] [12]: he sees a certain closeness with translation and other forms of rewriting, for example, critical elaboration or revision, trying to find their common element in the process of manipulation of text.

For Eiden Gentzler [106 [13] the concept of rewriting has its own motivation in the need to fit with the literary taste of a given culture, with that comes the need to modulate styles, themes and references [107] [14] through text cutting, which he defines as "silences" of the text.

The only one who knows about these cutting is translator. However, it should be required cultural changes, detected by the typology and quality of transfer of text.

The theme of cultural transfer, in its linguistic aspect is brought by Lefevre in a very original way: texts are rewritten through linguistic boundaries and the rewriting happens in an accurate and fixed context. Transmission of texts through literature provide also refraction, because the crossing of language boundaries brings changes in linguistic perception, it is necessary to describe what happens when a text migrate from one culture to another.

This kind of analysis should put face – to – face the literary evolution in the initial culture and in that of arrival, because translation – according to Lefevre – is not an isolating activity, but is connected with a temporary continuum, constituent elements of which should be search exactly in the development of cultural context.

This type of analysis should be put in front of literary evolution and culture initials, because translation by Lefevre is not an isolated event, but is associated with a temporary continuum, whose constituent elements required to be precisely in the context of the cultural developments.

But the critics towards the position of Lefevre do not come from the real translation, but from the projection of the comparative literature. The evaluation of the impact of translation on the culture of arrival would become the detriment of the initial text, which can leave the "obscured".

The speed of contacts and exchanges that characterize the society in our days has facilitated the affinity of different cultures. The activity of the translator is not carried out in a gap, but it is a result of the confrontation of different cultures at a given time. Between two cultures is raised a kind of imaginary border. The overcoming of these linguistic and cultural barriers represents an aspect with much interest. Also, there are concentrated studies and researches of the group of Tel Avivi [08] [15], who in 1970 departed from the concept of litrary poly-system, by seeing the report between the tradition and culture in the prism: center – periphery.

A strong culture or central does feels no need for more translations, while the opposite is the attitude of peripheral cultures, marginalized, which trusts to the translations in order to benefit sustainability and to widen the range of knowledge. From this derives also the need to spread the field of studies towards the absorption process of a text translated by a given culture at a given age.

Bibliography and Notes

[1] Folena G, Volgarizzare e tradurre, Torino, Einaudi, 1991, f 7.

[2] Goethe J.W, Noten und Abhandlungen zu besserem Vertandnis des Westostlichen Divans, S.Nergaard,1819, Note e saggi sul Divan orientale-occidentale, f 120 (marre nga perkthimi ne italisht i Cusatelli G, Torino, Einaudi, 1990)

[3] Ferraris M, Storia dell'ermeneutica 1988, te S.Nergaard, La teoria della traduzione nella storia, Milano, Bompiani, 1993, f 43-44.

[4] Ortega J y Gasset, Miseria e splendore della traduzione, te S.Nergaard, La teoria della traduzione nella storia, Milano, Bompiani, 1993

[5] Per kete citim te S.Nergaard, La teoria della traduzione nella storia, Milano, Bompiani, 1993, f 225-235

[6] Ne Diskurs apo Dialog rreth gjuhes sone, Makiaveli mbeshtet parimin e terheqjes se foljeve te huaja, qe nuk ndikojne mbi sistemin gjuheor ne te cilin hyjne, por me se shumti perthithen.

[7] Benjamin W, Detyra e perkthyesit ne "Illuminacione", Tirane, Korbi, 1998, f 37-50

[8] Ortega J y Gasset, Miseria e splendore della traduzione, te S.Nergaard, La teoria della traduzione nella storia, Milano, Bompiani, 1993, f 205.

[9] Bassnet S- Lefevre A, Translation, History,Culture, London, 1992, f 21.

[10] S.Nergaard, La teoria della traduzione nella storia, Milano, Bompiani, 1993, f 20

[11] Ne praktike sipas gjykimit te Nergaard, kuhtezimi behet i dukshem sidomos ne zgjedhjen e teksteve qe do te perkthehen, si dhe ne "metoden, me te cilen perkthyesit duhet te punojne"

[12] Herman T, The manipulation of literature, London, Croom Helm, 1985

[13] Gentzler E, Contemporary translation theories, London, Routledge, 1993

[14] Me referent kuptohet elementi i realitetit jashtegjuhor, rrethana oe konteksti net e cilin jepet imazhi.

[15] Studimet teorike te grupit te Tel Avivit, me te cileve spikasin emrat e Itmar Even-Zoharit dhe Gideon Toury-se, jane dokumentuar ne revistat "Transs, International Newsletter of Translation Studies" Tel Aviv dhe "Target, International Journal of Translation Studies", Amsterdam.