



ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
CENTRAL TEHRAN BRANCH

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of
Arts in Translation Studies**

SUBJECT:

**Application of Domestication & Foreignization Strategies in
the Translation of Food Recipes from English to Persian**

ADVISORE:

HAJAR KHANMOHAMMAD Ph.D.

CONSULTING ADVISOR:

KOUROSH AKEF Ph.D.

BY:

AFARIN ALIZAD ZIAEE

Winter 2013

In The Name Of God

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my deep gratitude and thankfulness to my dear professor, **Dr. Khanmohammad**, whose undivided attention and invaluable guidance helped me through this study. I am indebted to her for all the time and efforts she spent. I know I could not carry out this study if it had not been for her technical and moral support.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to my dear professor, **Dr. Akef**, imparted upon me his insightful comments which improved the quality of this study.

Then, I would like to appreciate **Dr. Kolahi** for her help and reading the thesis.

At last, this is to thank my beloved family, managers, colleagues and friends who supported me unconditionally.

Abstract

There are current trends for cultures to converge as the process of globalization takes place. An important function of translation is mediating between cultures and enabling intercultural comprehension. Translation, due to its communicative nature should be foreignized, to get the readers acquainted with the ST original culture. But getting acquainted with the ST culture is not always practical. When the reader's response is concerned, the ST ought to be, to a certain extent, domesticated or localized to become tangible. In this research, domestication and foreignization used in the translations of English recipes to Persian were investigated. To narrow down the job, the extent of the usage of domestication and foreignization in thirty English recipes in the website of www.bbc.co.uk/food/ and their Persian translation from the cookbook, "The Art of Cooking" by Montazemi (1968) and also the cooking magazine, "Positive Cooking" (2012) were compared. This comparison was done according to Venuti's model (1995) and a

categorization done by Epstein (2009). The categories were as follows: Ingredients, Name of the Dish, Measurement, Procedure and Implements. This study aimed to indicate the extent of the application of domestication and foreignization in the mentioned categories to solve the inter-cultural and inter-language problems while recipe translation.

The result of total frequency and percentage of the strategies adopted in these translations indicated that the most common strategy which is used by most of Persian translators in the translation of foreign (English) recipes to Persian is domestication. It can be deduced that Persian translators mostly prefer to domesticate the recipes especially in the translation of Ingredients to facilitate the cooking process. In addition, it can be figured out that most of the foreign dish names are not translated and they would enter in the receptor culture directly.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	II
Abstract	IV
Table of Contents	VI
List of Tables.....	X
List of Figures	VI

Chapter I: Background and Purpose

1.1.Introduction.....	1
1.2.Statement of the Problem.....	8
1.3.Research Questions.....	9
1.4.Definition of Key Terms.....	10
1.5.Limitations and Delimitations.....	11

1.6. Significance of the Study	12
--------------------------------------	----

Chapter II: Review of the Related Literature

2.1. Introduction	14
2.1.1. Language and Culture.....	15
2.1.2. Culture Studies.....	19
2.1.3. The Translatability of Culture.....	21
2.2. On the notions of culture and language power.....	33
2.3. Dynamic Equivalence.....	37
2.4. Domestication and Foreignization.....	39
2.5. Cookery Texts Translation.....	46
2.6. Other related studies	49

Chapter III: Methodology

3.1. Introduction.....	53
------------------------	----

3.2. Corpus.....54

3.3. Instrument.....55

3.4. Procedure.....57

Chapter IV: Results and Discussion

4.1. Introduction.....62

4.2. Restatement of the Research Questions.....63

4.3. Data Analysis.....64

4.4. Statistical Presentation of Results.....65

4.5. Discussion.....101

Chapter V: Conclusion, Implications, and Suggestions for Further Research

5.1. Introduction.....104

5.2. Conclusion.....105

5.3. Implications.....	108
5.4. Suggestions for Further Research.....	109
Reference.....	111
Appendix A.....	118

List of Tables

Table 3.1. Cheese and Ham Omelette.....	59
Table 4.1. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Cheese Omelets”	66
Table 4.2. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Beef Roll”	67
Table 4.3. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Borscht”	68
Table 4.4. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Cheese soufflé”	69
Table 4.5. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Chicken Liver Pate”	70
Table 4.6. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Crispy chicken salad”	71
Table 4.7. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Chicken Tikka masala”	72
Table 4.8. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Chocolate coffee cake”	73

Table 4.9. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Spider crab gratin”	74
Table 4.10. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Chicken jalfrezi”	75
Table 4. 11. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in“Pan-fried fish with green salad and sweet and sour dressing”	76
Table 4. 12. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Gigot of lamb with rosemary on raspberry beer and redcurrant gravy”	77
Table 4. 13. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Meatzza”	78
Table 4. 14. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “French Onion Soup”	79
Table 4. 15. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Pasta with tomato sauce, mozzarella and basil”	80
Table 4. 16. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Chocolate profiteroles”	80
Table 4. 17. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Pan-fried ratatouille”	82
Table 4. 18. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Russian potato and pink radish salad”	83

Table 4. 19. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “King Prawn salad”	84
Table 4. 20. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Tomato fondue”	85
Table 4. 21. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Tandoori-style chicken”	86
Table 4. 22. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Perfect Roast Turkey”	87
Table 4. 23. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “White gazpacho soup”	88
Table 4. 24. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Ravioli”	89
Table 4. 25. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Ravioli”	90
Table 4. 26. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Thai green rice”	91

Table 4. 27. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Lasagne”	92
Table 4. 28. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Beef stroganoff with matchstick potatoes”	93
Table 4. 29. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Breakfast fruit cocktail”	94
Table 4. 30. Frequencies and percentages of Foreignization and Domestication in “Béchamel sauce”	95
Table 4.31. Total Frequency of Domestication.....	96
Table 4.33. Total Frequency of Foreignization.....	98
Table 4.35. Ingredients Domesticated Distribution.....	100

List of Figures

Figure 4.32. Chart of Domesticated Elements in all data.....	97
Figure 4.34. Chart of Foreignized Elements in all data.....	99
Figure 4.36. Chart of Ingredients Domestication Distribution.....	101

CHAPTER I

Back ground and Purpose

1.1. Introduction

The growth of translation studies as a separate discipline is a success story of the 1980s (Bassnett 1998). The subject has developed in many parts of the world and is clearly destined to continue developing well into the twenty-first century. Translation studies brings together works in a wide variety of fields, including linguistics, literary studies, history, anthropology, psychology, and economics. This series of books will reflect the breadth of work in translation studies and will enable readers to share in the exciting new developments that are taking place at the present time (Bassnett 1998).

Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and manipulate

literature to function in the society in a given way. Rewritings can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices, and the history of translation is the history of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another (Lefevere, 1992).

The visibility of the translator has become a pervasive topic of discussion in translation studies ever since it was explicitly approached by Venuti (1995) in his well-known *The Translator's Invisibility*. Venuti (1995) discusses invisibility hand in hand with two types of translating strategy: domestication and foreignization. These strategies concern both the choice of text to translate and the translation method. Their roots are traced back by Venuti to Schleiermacher and his 1813 essay "On the Different Methods of Translating". Venuti (1995) sees domestication as dominating Anglo-American translation culture. Just as the post colonialists are alert to the differential cultural effects in power relations between colony and ex-colony, so Venuti (1995) bemoans the phenomenon of domestication since it involves an ethnocentric reduction

of the foreign text to [Anglo-American] target-language cultural values. This entails translating in a transparent, fluent, 'invisible' style in order to minimize the foreignness of the TT. According to Venuti (1995), the reader should be left in peace, as much as possible, and the author should be moved towards him. Domestication further covers adherence to domestic literary canons by carefully selecting the texts of cultural and political agenda that are likely to lend themselves to such a translation strategy (Venuti 1995).

Anglo-American translation theory has been dominated since the seventeenth century, mainly by the domesticated method which intends the translated text to conform to the norms of the target-language usage (Venuti 1995). In other words, the domesticated method means that the text should be transferred from source to target language in such a way as if it had been originally written in the target language. Translator should erase every shred of foreignness and create a fluent and idiomatic text. Typical characteristics of this type of translation are “fluency”,

“naturalness”, “transparency” and “readability”. Domestication also permits adjustments to “special literary forms”, “semantically exocentric expressions” or “intra-organismic meanings” (Nida1964).

Naturalness, as a key requirement in this type of translation should be raised to such a degree that it “bears no obvious trace of foreign origin” .

If the source text contains linguistic and cultural elements alien to the target language and culture, they are likely to be avoided in the translation

In contrast, a foreignized translation strategy is more oriented towards the source language and the source text. This type of translation strategies resists contemporary cultural, stylistic and idiomatic norms in order to convey the full aesthetic impact of the foreign poetic experience (Manfredi, 2010). As Venuti (1995) declares, it sends the target reader abroad instead of familiarizing the text in order to facilitate the comprehension. Using this method, the translator is expected to preserve the foreign identity of the source text, which means keeping linguistic and cultural differences in the translation. Foreignized translation gives readers

more information but tends to increase the difficulty of understanding (Yang, 2010).

Foreignization, “entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language” (Venuti 1997). It is the preferred choice of Schleiermacher, whose description is of a translation strategy where “the translator leaves the writer alone, as much as possible and moves the reader towards the writer” (Schleiermacher 1992: 42).

Foreignizing method is an ethno deviant pressure on target-language cultural values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad. It is 'highly desirable', Venuti says, in an effort 'to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation'. In other words, the foreignizing method can restrain the 'violently' domesticating cultural values of the English-language world. The foreignizing

method of translating, a strategy Venuti also terms 'resistance' (1995: 305-6), is a non-fluent or estranging translation style designed to make visible the presence of the translator by highlighting the foreign identity of the ST and protecting it from the ideological dominance of the target culture.

Classification into domesticated and foreignized translation enables the researcher to distinguish between the different levels of impression made on the reader by the text. Domesticated translation is more natural and easy for understanding because it is read as an original text. Foreignized translation presents foreign language and culture and for that reason requires certain details to be rationalized and clarified. In this case, the reader has to discover.

The methods elaborated above can also be used in the translation of cookbooks and food recipes from one language to another.

It seems that cookbooks are lately becoming ever more popular. So, it is easy to see that bookstores dedicate them more and more space on the