

Translation in Flux: Revisiting the Past, Envisioning the Future

KINJI ITO

Appalachian State University, USA

Abstract

Translation and translators are emerging as powerful catalysts for promoting vibrant cross-cultural interaction among individuals from different backgrounds. Commonly perceived as the process of converting content from one language to another, translation is a nuanced and multifaceted endeavor that transcends mere linguistic conversion. Translators act as adept mediators, deftly navigating the intricate web of diverse texts and cultures while shaping their uniquely insightful perspectives. This article explores the rich historical dimensions of translation, highlighting its deep connections to philosophical beliefs and socio-political dynamics. It also aims to enhance our understanding of the complex nature of this practice by dissecting various dichotomies in translation studies, including contrasting philosophical views of translation and divergent approaches to the art of translation. In today's interconnected world, the role of the translator has become increasingly indispensable, underscoring that translation goes beyond mere words; it serves as a mirror that reflects the ever-evolving globalized landscape. To chart a path forward, we must recognize the importance of revisiting the past, drawing wisdom from history, and gaining valuable insights for the future.

Keywords: domestication strategy, epistemological challenges, essentialist perspectives, foreignization strategy, non-essentialist

perspectives, political realities, post-Nietzschean thought, pragmatist perspectives, role of translators, translation approaches

Epistemology in Western Philosophy: From Plato to Nietzsche

Epistemology, a branch of Western philosophy, has been profoundly shaped by a number of influential thinkers throughout history. Among these luminaries, Plato and Friedrich Nietzsche are often seen as the opening and closing figures in a story that spans millennia. Plato, known for his theory of forms and contributions to political philosophy, marked the beginning of an epoch characterized by the pursuit of absolute truth and value. In contrast, Nietzsche, with his scathing critique of traditional values and morality, announced the collapse of that very epoch (Simpson 339).

Plato, often considered an essentialist philosopher, conceptualized truth within a vertical hierarchy. According to his structure of truth and value, God is at the top of the pyramid, followed by the king and the philosopher, with God's creations considered eternal. In his view, nothing changes over time, including linguistic meaning, because everything remains fixed and stable (Long 87-89). Consequently, Plato viewed translation as a significant departure from the original, considering it misleading and inherently inferior. In stark contrast, Nietzsche, a prominent non-essentialist thinker, took a horizontal perspective on truth. He not only posited that the search for truth is rooted in falsehoods, lies, and forgetfulness but also asserted that history, convention, and culture are subject to constant evolution (Nida and Taber 12). As a result, meaning is in a state of flux, with nothing remaining immutable. Nietzsche saw translation as a process of enriching the original, recognizing that words like 'house' can have different connotations depending on the language and culture (Ponzi xi-xii). This insight explains the diversity of languages, as each region and country produce unique linguistic meanings.

These opposing positions on truth deeply influence translation practice. Essentialists prioritize fidelity, aiming for a meticulous reproduction of the source text. Non-essentialists, aware of cultural and linguistic variations, seek to capture the essence and spirit of the original in a new form. To contextualize these philosophical perspectives, it is worth noting that Plato, from ancient Greece, laid the foundation for Western civilization with profound philosophical thought while Nietzsche lived in the 19th century, a period of significant intellectual and cultural change. Despite the vast time gap separating them, Plato's philosophical ideas have cast a long shadow over Western philosophical thought for centuries, and they both continue to shape our understanding of truth, meaning, and the dynamic nature of language in today's globalized world (Cutler 15).

The influence of philosophy on translation studies goes beyond the essentialism/non-essentialism dichotomy. In recent decades, translation studies has undergone transformative development, inspired by post-Nietzschean thought, which not only offers a critique of rationality but also directs our attention to sources of normativity (Peters et al. 25). These sources include theories such as deconstruction, postcolonial studies, and gender studies, which have played a significant role in reshaping the field (Wyke 17-18). For example, deconstruction has prompted scholars to reexamine the biases and power dynamics inherent in translation, while postcolonial studies has illuminated how translation can either perpetuate or challenge colonial structures and narratives. The following sections provide examples of historically distinct schools of thought in translation studies.

A Brief Overview of Different Schools of Thought

Essentialist vs. Non-Essentialist

Vladimir Nabokov's and Jorge Luis Borges's dichotomous conceptions of origins parallel the philosophical views of Plato and Nietzsche. Nabokov, an essentialist like Plato, firmly believes that

originals are frozen in time and should remain unaltered. He claims that these texts carry specific cultural and historical references, and that preserving fidelity to the original requires a literal approach (Shuttleworth and Cowie 96). Much like Plato's reverence for the Bible as the word of God, Nabokov treats works like Alexander Pushkin's *Onegin* as if they had a similarly sacred and untouchable aura. For him, translation is a loss and distortion of the original, an erosion of its essence, as though every translation were a brushstroke that obscures the masterpiece (Ronen 180).

Conversely, Borges, a non-essentialist aligned with Nietzsche, asserts that there is no ultimate original because texts are constantly in flux. This perspective is consistent with Nietzsche's view that no truth can transcend history (Radhakrishnan 66). Moreover, a faithful translation cannot transport one back in time in order to become the original author. Instead, history itself should be acknowledged and respected in its entirety. In his seminal work "*Pierre Menard, Author of Don Quixote*," Borges meticulously analyzes two verbally identical texts: one by Cervantes, published in the 17th century, and one by Menard, published in the 20th century. He suggests that Menard's text is almost infinitely richer, underscoring his belief that the original text is in a constant state of evolution because it cannot control how different people in different times perceive it (94).

The fundamental difference between essentialist and non-essentialist views of translation concerns the concept of equivalence (Baumgarten 61-63). Plato thought of equivalence as something pre-existing in the text, implying that words in different languages are inherently equivalent and have identical meanings. Nietzsche, on the other hand, astutely observed that while words in different languages may have equivalent counterparts, they do not necessarily have the same meanings. Equivalence, Nietzsche argued, is a construct shaped by culture, history, and external factors. This dichotomy in the notion of equivalence is also illuminated by postmodern theories of language. For essentialists like Eugene Nida, translation is about recovering the meaning of the original, which inevitably involves some loss. Thus, Nida seeks

to achieve perfect equivalence in order to seamlessly transfer meaning from the source text to the target text (Pym 31).

In contrast, based on the belief that meaning itself is not a stable entity that exists independently in the original but is actively shaped by language and context, non-essentialists such as Jean Jacques Derrida question the need for precise, one-to-one equivalence between source and target texts (Earlie 97). This perspective not only revolutionizes the concept of equivalence, but also redefines fidelity in translation. Additionally, while essentialists value the original and its author, non-essentialists recognize the significance of translation and translators (Chesterman 17). These conflicting philosophical notions could indirectly influence political and power dynamics in the context of how knowledge is conveyed and manipulated through language and translation.

Further Analysis of Non-Essentialist: Theory and Practice

Derrida's deconstruction and Stanley Fish's reader-response theory challenge traditional essentialist philosophy, which suggests that everything remains fixed and stable so that translation is a straightforward process of one-to-one correspondence between words and their meanings (Wilson 49). Both, however, argue that texts have neither fixed nor essential meanings and are open to multiple interpretations. What follows are their thought-provoking essays that show how non-essentialist philosophy differs from its opposing mode.

Derrida, a Nietzschean who follows the philosophical ideas of Nietzsche, has left an indelible mark on the world of philosophy and language (Schrift 87). In his terse yet profoundly illuminating essay "Letter to a Japanese Friend," he responds to a Japanese professor's request for translating the term *deconstruction* into Japanese. This seemingly simple linguistic challenge opens the door to a broader exploration of the complex relationship between translation and deconstruction, one of his seminal concepts. In the

essay, Derrida reveals his motivation for coining the term *deconstruction*. Faced with the task of translating Heideggerian words such as ‘destruction’ or ‘dismantling’ into French, he confronts the limitations of literal translation. Although the term seems appropriate, it carries negative connotations such as annihilation or even demolition, which are at odds with the nuanced essence of deconstruction (“Letter” 1). Consequently, Derrida ingeniously crafts the neologism *deconstruction*, a term born out of the very act of translation. This process underscores a fundamental aspect of his philosophy: language shapes meaning. The essay also addresses the complexities of translating the term into French or any other language. He warns against the naive assumption that the word has a clear and unambiguous meaning in French. Instead, he recognizes the inherent ambiguity and multiplicity of meanings that language carries. This perspective is consistent with his broader philosophical stance, which emphasizes that language is not a transparent medium, but a realm in which multiple interpretations and significations coexist.

At its core, Derrida’s essay “Letter to a Japanese Friend” exemplifies the complex interplay between language, translation, and the making of meaning. It highlights that language is not a static vessel for conveying meaning, but a dynamic arena in which interpretations proliferate. His legacy in philosophy and translation continues to expand horizons and challenge conventional boundaries, reminding us that language is a realm of endless exploration and reinterpretation. In the concluding part of the essay, Derrida conveys the final message to his Japanese friend, summarizing it with the utmost clarity: “I do not believe that translation is a secondary and derivative event in relation to an original language or text. And since, as I have just said, ‘deconstruction’ is a word that is essentially interchangeable in a chain of substitution, it can also be done from one language to another” (275). In essence, Derrida’s response to his friend’s inquiry is a profound assertion that it is your responsibility to find a suitable substitute for the term *deconstruction* within your own linguistic realm. This perspective underscores his belief that translation is not a simple

duplication but a creative process in which the original concept becomes a new linguistic and conceptual entity.

Translating a particular term into one's native language involves a complex interplay of personal thought and cultural conventions. Derrida eloquently writes, "deconstruction is inventive or it is nothing at all . . . it produces rules – other conventions – for new performatives" (Derrida et al. 23). This perspective emphasizes the creative aspect of translation, where rendering a concept into a different linguistic and cultural context gives rise to new linguistic and conceptual possibilities. His philosophy focuses on the intimate connection between language and thought, and how translation serves as a medium through which the original concept evolves and adapts to the nuances of another language and culture. This insight transcends mere linguistics, permeating the realm of philosophy and shaping discussions about the nature of language, meaning, and cultural context. As a result, Derrida's views on translation remain highly relevant and continue to inspire discourse in fields such as philosophy, linguistics, and translation studies, especially in a world characterized by multiculturalism and globalization, where the boundaries between languages and cultures are constantly tested and reshaped.

In his eye-opening essay "How to Recognize a Poem When You See One," Fish delves into the fascinating realm of literary conventions within particular communities based on his reader-response theory. This theory challenges the traditional emphasis on the author's intent and the text itself by asserting that the reader also plays a significant role in the interpretive process (Hirvela 128). Fish conducted a meticulous experiment in two of his college courses to examine the dynamics of recognition. The unifying element of these courses was a cryptic assignment posted on the blackboard, which included the names of distinguished linguists and a prominent literary critic:

Jacobs-Rosenbaum
Levin
Thorne

Hayes
Ohman (?) (323)

A remarkable phenomenon occurred in the first course, where the students were naturally interested in the interplay between linguistics and literary criticism. They readily recognized and identified the names on the blackboard. Fish remarks, "I am sure that many of you have already recognized the names on that list" (322). The plot thickens, however, when we turn to the second course, which focused on seventeenth-century English religious poetry. Here, Fish challenged his students to interpret the same list of names not as a mere collection of linguists and critics but as religious poetry. What emerges is an intriguing observation: the students in this course, operating within the contextual framework of religious poetry, instinctively interpreted the list as a poem until instructed otherwise.

The heart of Fish's experiment lies in his quest to "explain not only the meanings a poem might be said to have, but the fact that it is recognized as a poem at all" (322). Although the list was a simple compilation of names, the students in the second course, imbued with the aura of religious poetry, naturally perceived it as a poem. The experiment not only underscores the paramount importance of context, convention, and community in the process of recognizing and interpreting literary works, but also provokes reflection on how our preconceived notions and contextual frameworks influence our understanding of texts. In other words, this experiment serves as a testament to the power of context and community in shaping our perceptions of literary works, and it raises interesting questions about the role of convention and pre-existing knowledge in our engagement with language and literature. In essence, people perceive and attribute meaning to entities based on the conventions and expectations of their specific interpretive communities.

A poem is not merely the product of its intrinsic linguistic features; it is, in fact, a creation of interpretive conventions and expectations. A poetic or literary text emerges as a result of giving

it a certain kind of attention and bringing certain expectations to bear. The text is thus transformed into and functions as a poem (Bogel 31). Fish's argument challenges the notion that formal features alone define a poem, emphasizing the dynamic role of shared interpretation. He also offers a thought-provoking example from our everyday lives. Fish illustrates how something as seemingly simple as students raising their hands in a classroom carries layers of meaning that are only apparent to those familiar with the context. To those who have studied or participated in a classroom environment, the raised hand is an unspoken request for permission to speak. Without knowledge of the context, however, the gesture may appear to be nothing more than a casual extension of the arm. Fish's example demonstrates the central role of context and convention in giving meaning to actions and gestures. This perspective goes beyond the realm of poetry and gesture; it also highlights a fundamental aspect of human communication. Our shared understanding is deeply intertwined with context and convention, allowing us to decode and interpret the world around us, whether it be the intricacies of poetry or the subtleties of everyday interactions.

By exploring the interplay between context and convention, Fish's essay invites us to consider the multifaceted nature of meaning and recognition in our lives. He underlines that our shared conventions and communal contexts are the lenses through which we perceive and navigate the rich tapestry of language, poetry, and human interaction. Human beings are inextricably bound to social conventions that have evolved over time, shaped by the threads of history, culture, and community. As a result, we speak different languages depending on the geographic locations in which these intricate norms operate. These linguistic differences are not mere distinctions but signs of humanity. It is within these unique interpretive communities that we develop our distinctive lenses that change the way we perceive and interact with the world.

Consider the classroom, where feedback from a teacher plays a significant role in our intellectual growth. We naturally process and integrate these insights into our work as soon as we receive it.

This seamless transformation and interpretation of feedback is made possible by the conventions that govern our interactions within this educational community. It is so common that we understand and respond to feedback as a two-way street, thereby enriching our learning experience. Without the influence of post-Nietzschean thought, we might perceive feedback in a more rigid, Platonic way: as fixed and unchanging, where we receive it without responding, like a one-way street. However, the post-Nietzschean philosophical perspective broadens our horizons, allowing us to explore alternative forms of expression and interpretation.

A Spectrum of Diverse Perspectives on Translation

Translation is a complex art, with no universal consensus or definitive manual for its practice. While some advocate specific approaches to translation, others forge their own paths, resulting in a rich tapestry of techniques and perspectives. In recent decades, a prominent dichotomy in translation studies that has generated heated debates is the tension between domestication and foreignization strategies (Kemppanen 8). The former involves adapting the target text to the norms of the target culture, whereas the latter entails preserving the distinctive qualities of the source text. This lively discourse stems from the fundamental nature of translation, which engages the interplay between source and target texts, bridging the gap between two languages and cultures. This gives rise to several schools of thought, each with its own unique perception. In the following sections, the translation scholars selected for this study are divided into three groups based on their philosophical stance: essentialist, non-essentialist, and pragmatist. The aim is to contrast similarities and differences between the groups by exploring different perspectives on translation.

Essentialist Perspectives on Translation

Essentialism in translation revolves around the belief that the primary goal is to capture the essence of the source text and render

it faithfully in the target language. Nida addresses the complex relationship between essence and meaning in translation. He approaches translation as a scientific endeavor, confidently asserting that the meaning of each word in a translation can and should be “reasonably close to the meaning in the original” (*Science* 156). Similarly, Nabokov, a literary luminary known for his meticulous approach to translation, echoes this perspective. He passionately argues that a translator’s main task is to recover the textual essence of the source material and advocates reproducing the entire text with absolute accuracy, including nuance and subtlety (Boyd 332). Annie Brisset emphasizes the need for linguistic parity between source and target languages, considering it a *sine qua non* of the translative operation, underscoring the essentialist principle that the language used in translation should faithfully reproduce the source language (“Search” 343).

These scholars share the same dedication to preserving the essence and meaning of the source text in their translations, emphasizing the importance of linguistic precision and fidelity. However, their distinctive approaches to the practice of translation set them apart. Nida, a prominent advocate of the domestication school, focuses on the structural and grammatical aspects of translation. He extensively engages in grammatical and semantic analysis, syntactic structures, and other linguistic perspectives (153). His primary objective is to convey the message of the source language in the most linguistically appropriate manner for the intended target audience. To articulate this concept, Nida coined the term *dynamic equivalence*, highlighting the idea of reading a translated text as if it were an original composition.

In contrast, Nabokov, finding it relatively easy to translate *Alice in Wonderland* into Russian due to his lack of emotional connection to the story, chose to domesticate it for local children to ensure their complete understanding. However, when it came to Pushkin’s *Onegin*, a work he considered sacred because of his personal connection to it, he steadfastly adhered to fidelity to the original text (“Problems” 152). Meanwhile, in discussions of the translation of a play originally written in French, Brisset argues that

domestication suppresses the text, leading to a scenario in which it seems “as if the original play had never existed in any other form except its Québécois adaptation or re-creation” (“Search” 402). From a political standpoint, she emphasizes the suppression of the alterity of the foreign text, coining the term *Quebecization* to indicate that the foreign language itself has already undergone domestication.

Another distinction among these essentialist scholars lies in their different conceptions of the task and process of translation. Nida offers a defining perspective, framing translation as “reproducing in the receiving language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message” (Nida and Taber 12). His focus is squarely on the transfer of meaning. Nida contends that successful translation should prioritize the accurate conveyance of semantic components rather than rigid adherence to a word-for-word literal rendering. Known for his meticulous approach, Nabokov believes that “the clumsiest literal translation is a thousand times more useful than the most beautiful paraphrase” (qtd. in Stanislav 278). He sees literal translation as the true essence of the translator’s craft. This perspective arguably reflects his belief in the definitive and unchanging nature of the original text. Interestingly, Nabokov uses a chess analogy to illustrate the complexity of translation (*Poems* 15). He suggests that players can only use 32 given pieces in a game and no more, a metaphorical reflection of his strict view of translation fidelity. Brisset presents a unique perspective on the translation process. She understands translation as a form of conquest infused with politics and violence, a complex endeavor that actively shapes national identity (“Cultural Perspectives” 74-75). Her lens widens further when she explores the concept of cultural interface, which she sees as akin to translation – an operation between languages characterized by an inherently asymmetrical relationship.

It is critical to review how these perspectives shape their approaches to translation. Nida’s emphasis on the transmission of meaning is consistent with his linguistic and semantic approach to translation. Nabokov’s commitment to literal translation stems from

his conviction that the original text possesses an enduring essence. The chess analogy underscores Nabokov's view of translation as a strategic game with its rules and constraints (Parker 439). Brisset's unique perspective on translation as a form of conquest with political and identity-forming dimensions invites further exploration through specific examples or case studies. Her perspective on the cultural interface and how it operates within the realm of translation is evident. By considering these different perspectives together, a comparative analysis highlights the differences and the intersections in their approaches to translation. After all, their perspectives enrich translation studies and provide valuable insights into the complex interplay between philosophy, practice, and the ever-evolving art of translation.

Non-Essentialist Perspectives on Translation

Introduced by Hans J. Vermeer, a dominant concept that permeates discussions today is the *skopos* theory, which posits that every act of translation has a specific goal or purpose (Schjoldager et al. 151). Consequently, translators act as agents who strive to find optimal solutions within the parameters of existing contractual conditions, all of which depend on the target audience and the cultural milieu in which they reside. Vermeer further argues that translators must be well-versed experts with a deep understanding of the target cultural context and the nuances of the target audience. In this view, translators are not mere shadow figures behind the original authors, but translation emerges as a dynamic form of action, a deliberate 'doing' guided by a clear, defined goal (Vermeer 193). When Lawrence Venuti ventures into translation strategies with the seminal concept of domestication and foreignization at its core, he advocates the latter approach. His stance goes beyond the conventional view of translation as a simple act of communication. Venuti asserts that translation, by its very nature, tends to introduce biases that result in a conscious incorporation of the power of foreignness into the translation process ("Translation" 469). In doing so, translators not only facilitate communication, but also

actively contribute to the formation of a distinct translating community.

As noted earlier, Derrida faced a linguistic challenge when he attempted to translate the Heideggerian words destruction or dismantling into French. In response, he ingeniously coined the term *deconstruction*, a linguistic invention that has since reverberated throughout literature and philosophy (Jones 37). His claim is profound: translation, traditionally perceived as inferior to the original, could now be seen as “a kind of survival of the source text” (Laiho 115). This shift in perspective was not only linguistic but also philosophical. Central to Derrida’s deconstruction is the dismantling of traditional notions of translation, which challenges the conventional view of translation as a faithful reproduction of the source text and instead posits translation as a transformative act. It redefines the nature of translation itself, prompting scholars to explore the dynamic relationship between translated and source texts. This transformation is not merely linguistic; it extends to the very essence of the text, breathing new life into the translated work. As a result, translation ceases to be a mere derivative and becomes an original act of creation.

The interpretation of the conventional notion of equivalence varies from scholar to scholar. From a functionalist perspective, Vermeer emphasizes the intertextual ‘coherence’ between source and target texts. For him, equivalence means adequacy to a *skopos*, where the primary goal is to ensure that the target text performs the same communicative functions as the source text, maintaining a functional correspondence between the two texts (Nord 203). Vermeer suggests that translators must identify the function of the given source text and then tailor the translation to match that function, provided there is intertextual coherence. Venuti values ‘accuracy’ and sees equivalence as a dynamic and adaptable concept that depends on how the translation relates to the foreign text (“Translation” 487). He often uses the term *lexicographical equivalence* in his work. This concept emphasizes the importance of preserving the original linguistic form of the source text. Venuti argues strongly for the preservation of foreignness in translations

because it allows target readers to engage in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural communication (*Scandals* 115). In other words, translators have an ethical responsibility to reproduce lexicographic equivalence. Derrida's perspective on equivalence in translation is closely related to 'relevance.' He asserts that translation is not a mere word-for-word endeavor, yet it remains as close as possible to the equivalence of "one word for one word" ("Relevant" 370). In this endeavor, Derrida focuses on respecting the verbal set as a set of words. A translation must be quantitatively equivalent to the original text, thus positioning the translation as a derivative work of equal value to the original.

In practice, these differing views of equivalence in translation result in various approaches and choices that translators can make. According to Vermeer, who focuses on functional equivalence, this approach might involve adaptations to ensure the intended function is preserved in the target culture. On the other hand, according to Venuti, who emphasizes lexicographical equivalence, this approach might lead to a more literal rendering of linguistic forms, preserving the strangeness of the source text. Derrida's pursuit of quantitative equivalence underscores the importance of capturing not only meaning but also the linguistic texture of the original. In short, the various perspectives on the concept of equivalence in translation reveal the richness and complexity of the approach to translation.

Under the banner of non-essentialism, Vermeer, Venuti, and Derrida share a common thematic thread in their respective works. Vermeer's *skopos* theory emphasizes the centrality of purpose in translation, including political considerations due to the frequent presence of political meanings and ideologies in texts that translators must navigate (191). Venuti's discourse focuses on the politics inherent in translation, advocating foreignization over domestication to preserve cultural and political distinctions in translated texts (*Translator's Invisibility* 32). Derrida's philosophy challenges conventional notions of fidelity and authority in language and text, prompting a critical examination of how translations can reinforce or disrupt political power structures

(Derrida and Spivak 92). Collectively, these scholars highlight the political dimensions of translation, underscoring the importance of considering cultural and political contexts, power dynamics, and the translator's role as a mediator in the complex relationship between translation and politics.

Pragmatist Perspectives on Translation

Maira Inghilleri addresses the ethical responsibilities of translators in a social context by highlighting the challenges translators face on the battlefield, where they must make ethical decisions without clear guidelines. Their cultural and linguistic understanding of both sides becomes essential in navigating these complex situations (Inghilleri 207-209). Vicente Rafael shows how foreign language skills have transitioned from a means of comprehension to an indispensable asset in wartime. Translation now stands as a pivotal weapon system and a strategic tool in the political arena (2-3). Emily Apter focuses on the power of language in wartime, where a growing national linguistic concern leads to the politicization of language. Translators often find themselves under suspicion in such environments, and Apter, like Inghilleri, emphasizes the lack of established ethical guidelines in these contexts (199). These scholars discuss in depth the inherently political and practical nature of translation practice. They all point out that translation and language are not neutral entities in international politics, offering valuable insights into the contemporary landscape of translation studies and its central role in shaping our understanding of language, power, and politics. While they share a concern for the political dimensions of translation, their perspectives diverge on specific translation strategies, particularly the concepts of domestication and foreignization.

Inghilleri's analysis of translators in war zones highlights the ethical complexity of their role. She notes that they often work without a predetermined code of ethics and are forced to make decisions on the fly. In such high-stakes scenarios, the luxury of neutrality disappears, leaving them with the daunting task of

determining the most appropriate strategy for each situation (210). This implies that they cannot maintain neutrality when deciding on the most suitable approach in unpredictable circumstances. Rafael examines the political landscape of U.S. language policy, particularly during the Bush administration. His research reveals a dominant tendency toward domestication in American politics, where translation assumes a unidirectional role in transforming foreign content into a domestic context. This domestication process requires the invention of equivalence, a challenging endeavor given the inherent incommensurability of different cultures and languages (38-40). Citing a specific case, Apter mentions that errors found in translation can lead to catastrophic intelligence failures (195). Mohamed Yousry, an Egyptian graduate student studying in the United States and untrained as a translator, was hired to work for a lawyer representing the former leader of a terrorist organization. Instead of domesticating a document, he foreignized it, which was inappropriate in the context of a U.S. courtroom. Yousry was eventually charged with aiding and abetting terrorist activity, demonstrating his unfamiliarity with how translation works and what it entails (Apter 196-199). Apter does not advocate for any particular translation strategy but stresses the importance of translators understanding the consequences of their translation efforts.

These scholars offer diverse and thought-provoking political perspectives on the complicated field of translation. Inghilleri, for example, delves into the depths of the ethical dilemmas that often arise in dangerous contexts. She deftly navigates the treacherous terrain of translating in life-and-death situations, shedding light on the moral complexities that translators must confront in such high-stakes scenarios. Rafael closely examines the shifting dynamics within American politics in which translation takes a central position while exploring the idea of domestication, which involves tailoring translations to the cultural and political preferences of particular audiences. He also examines how this adaptation process can influence perceptions of foreign concepts in politics, potentially shaping public opinion and policy decisions. Apter highlights the

underestimated impact of mistranslation on political discourse. Her work illuminates how inaccuracies in translation can lead to misunderstandings, diplomatic tensions, and even international conflict. Apter's research is a powerful reminder of the critical importance of linguistic precision in international relations. Taken together, the contributions of these scholars enrich our understanding of the complex interplay between translation, politics, and ethics.

In recent years, technology has changed our lives in many ways. Overall, the smartphone stands out as a game changer. Its capabilities, including built-in translation tools, have revolutionized the way we communicate, breaking down language barriers and fostering cross-cultural interactions. However, it is important to acknowledge that there is a downside. In particular, mistranslation poses a significant risk. In our increasingly interconnected world, even the smallest mistranslation can quickly escalate into a politically explosive situation between countries. This underscores the importance of continued vigilance and refinement in our approach to translation technology to minimize potential pitfalls and ensure its positive impact on global communication and diplomacy.

Speaking of politics, the political dimension of translation has become a contentious and complex issue (Bielsa 116-119). For example, because English is considered universal, it often enjoys linguistic advantages over any other language, with elements of English grammar, vocabulary, and style easily incorporated into translations in the target language. Interestingly, the political climate between two countries can dramatically alter this dynamic. English elements in a text translated into another language may meet with resistance or even hostility from the intended audience. Translators must therefore navigate the complex web of factors and conditions inherent in the political relationship between two cultures. This may involve avoiding culturally sensitive language and issues to convey the intended meaning without causing offense or misrepresentation. The translator's ability to handle these

political intricacies and balance the tension between precision and impartiality is critical to the success of the translation.

Conclusion

The positive impact of post-Nietzschean thought on modern approaches to translation is undeniable. Translators have evolved from passive transcribers to active agents, shaping texts to resonate with different audiences and cultural contexts. Meanwhile, translation goes beyond mere linguistic conversion, actively promoting intercultural dialogue, bridging linguistic divides, and fostering a shared global experience. However, this evolving field remains inextricably linked to the realm of politics, where power dynamics, ethical considerations, cultural preservation, ideological adherence, and censorship influence translators' choices regarding expression, tone, and audience perception, to name a few. To navigate this terrain skillfully, translators must confront linguistic, cultural, and political challenges while ensuring that the essence of the source text reaches its intended audience.

Two contrasting translation strategies have been discussed and employed by scholars and translators. Domestication adapts the target text to the norms of the target culture, while foreignization preserves the distinctive qualities of the source text. The choice between these strategies depends on the translator's assessment of the purpose, context, and audience. Regardless, translators are responsible for faithfully conveying the core message of the source text without diluting its essence. In today's pluralistic societies, translators play a crucial role as facilitators of cross-cultural communication. They serve as cultural mediators, promoting intercultural exchange and mutual understanding. In order to carry out this role effectively, translators must be committed to aligning their practices with the ever-evolving landscape of language, culture, and technology. Future research in this area should delve deeper into specific cases and historical instances, providing nuanced insights into the complex relationship between politics and translation. Equally important, such research should address the

ethical dimensions that inevitably accompany translation in politically charged contexts. There is no doubt that translation is in flux as it continues to thrive at the intersection of linguistic artistry, cultural mediation, technological advancement, and political engagement. But we must not forget that it requires unwavering commitment, adaptability, and ethical awareness from those who engage in this noble endeavor.

Works Cited

- Apter, Emily. "Translation – 9/11: Terrorism, Immigration, Language Politics." *Globalization, Political Violence and Translation*, edited by Esperança Bielsa and Christopher Hughes. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, pp. 195-206.
- Baumgarten, Stefan. "Ideology and Translation." *Handbook of Translation Studies* 3, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer. Benjamins, 2012, pp. 59-65.
- Bielsa Esperanza. "Translation and Cosmopolitanism" *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics*, edited by Evans Jonathan and Fruela Fernandez. Routledge, 2018, pp. 110-124.
- Bogel, Fredric V. *New Formalist Criticism : Theory and Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. *Collected Fictions*. Penguin, 1999.
- Boyd, Brian. *Vladimir Nabokov: The American Years*. Princeton UP, 2019.
- Brisset, Annie. "The Search for a Native Language: Translation and Cultural Identity." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti. Routledge, 2000, pp. 343-375.
- . "Cultural Perspectives on Translation." *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 61, no. 199, 2010, pp. 69-81.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2451.2010.01748.x>.
- Chesterman, Andrew. *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected Papers 1993-2014*. John Benjamins Publishing, 2017.
- Cutler, Ian. *Cynicism from Diogenes to Dilbert*. Mcfarland, 2005.

- Derrida, Jacques. "Letter to a Japanese Friend." *Derrida and Differance*, edited by David Wood and Robert Bernasconi, Parousia Press, 1985, pp. 1-5.
- Derrida, Jacques, et al. *Psyche: Inventions of the Other*. Stanford UP, 2007.
- . "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?" *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2012, pp. 365-388.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Gayatri Spivak. *Of Grammatology*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1998.
- Earlie, Paul. *Derrida and the Legacy of Psychoanalysis*. Oxford UP, 2021.
- Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Harvard UP, 1980.
- Hirvela, Alan. "Reader-Response Theory and ELT." *ELT Journal*, vol. 50, no. 2, 1996, pp. 127-134.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.2.127>.
- Inghilleri, Moira. "Translation in War Zones: Ethics under Fire in Iraq." *Globalization, Political Violence and Translation*, edited by Esperanza Bielsa and Christopher Hughes, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, pp. 207-221.
- Jones, Campbell. "Jacques Derrida." *Organization Theory and Postmodern Thought*, edited by Stephen Linstead, Sage, 2004, pp. 34-63.
- Kemppanen, Hannu. "The Role of the Concepts Domestication and Foreignization in Russian Translation Studies." *Domestication and Foreignization in Translation Studies*, edited by Hannu Kemppanen, Marja Jänis and Alexandra Belikova, Frank and Timme, 2012, pp. 49-62.
- Laiho, Leena. "A Literary Work – Translation and Original: A Conceptual Analysis within the Philosophy of Art and Translation Studies." *The Metalanguage of Translation*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. John Benjamins, 2009, pp. 105-122.
- Long, A. G. *Immortality in Ancient Philosophy*. Cambridge UP, 2021.

- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Poems and Problems*. McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- . "Problems of Translation: Onegin in English." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2021, pp. 143-155.
- Nida, Eugene A. *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden, 1964.
- Nida, Eugene A., and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. E. J. Brill, 1982.
- Nord, Christiane. "Functionalism in Translation Studies." *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Carmen Millán and Francesca Bartrina, Routledge, 2013, pp. 201-212.
- Parker, Luke. "The Gambit: Chess and the Art of Competition in the Luzhin Defense." *The Russian Review*, vol. 76, no. 3, 2017, pp. 438-457. <https://doi.org/10.1111/russ.12138>.
- Peters, Michael A., et al. *Futures of Critical Theory*. Rowman and Littlefield, 2003.
- Ponzi, Mauro. *Nietzsche's Nihilism in Walter Benjamin*. Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- Pym, Anthony. *Exploring Translation Theories*. Routledge, 2009.
- Radhakrishnan, R. *History, the Human, and the World Between*. Duke UP, 2008.
- Rafael, Vicente L. "Translation, American English, and the National Insecurities of Empire." *Social Text*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2009, pp. 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-2009-052>.
- Ronen, Omry. "The Triple Anniversary of World Literature: Goethe, Pushkin, Nabokov." *Nabokov at Cornell*, edited by Gavriel Shapiro. Cornell UP, 2003, pp. 172-181.
- Schjoldager, Anne, et al. *Understanding Translation*. Academica, 2010.
- Schrift, Alan D. "Reading Derrida Reading Heidegger Reading Nietzsche." *Research in Phenomenology*, vol. 14, 1984, pp. 87-119.
- Shuttleworth, Mark, and Moira Cowie. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Taylor and Francis, 2014.

- Simpson, David I. "Truth, Truthfulness and Philosophy in Plato and Nietzsche." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2007, pp. 339-360.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09608780701255485>.
- Stanislav, Shvabrin. *Between Rhyme and Reason: Vladimir Nabokov, Translation, and Dialogue*. U of Toronto P, 2019.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. Routledge, 1998.
- . "Translation, Community, Utopia." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 468-488.
- . *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge, 2008.
- Vermeer, Hans J. "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2012, pp. 191-202.
- Wilson, Philip. *Translation after Wittgenstein*. Routledge, 2015.
- Wyke, Ben V. "Imitating Bodies, Clothes: Refashioning the Western Conception of Translation." *Thinking through Translation with Metaphors*, edited by James St. Andre, Routledge, 2010, pp. 17-46.