A Comparison between the Translation Dichotomies Suggested by Juliane House and Lawrence Venuti

Seyyed Yahya Barkhordar (Corresponding author)
Allameh Tabataba'i University, Iran
Email: syabr.2006@gmail.com

Reza Fatemi
Imam Reza International University, Iran

Abstract

Juliane House has split translation into "overt" and "covert" types. Translation has been classified by Lawrence Venuti into "domestication" and "foreignization". This research attempted to compare the translation typologies rendered by House and Venuti. House' and Venuti's translation typologies are similar in 8 points and differ in 4 ones. Overt translation corresponds to foreignization and covert translation to domestication. Dichotomy is neither superior nor inferior to the others.

Keywords: Overt Translation, Covert Translation, Foreignization, Domestication, Cultural Filter, Translator's Invisibility

1. Introduction

Communication is a complex and dynamic process. It has a message sender and a message receiver. The former encodes the meaning into a form that the latter recognizes. The receiver decodes the form back into meaningful messages. Translation is an inseparable part of human's life. The translator lends his voice to an author and allows him to reach an audience speaking a different language (Ryndová, 2008). Translation Studies, the discipline of investigating various dimensions of translation, involves a large number of theories.

Translation Studies is a discipline established to define translation and examine it from several points of view. It defines translation in many ways and from different angles. Most of them describe an aim being sought by translation. Others are instructions or a list of factors that should be considered when translating (Aissi, 1987). Gambier and van Doorslaer (2016) define translation as a process of textual replacement. The history of Translation Studies contains a large number of theorists, each suggesting different translation classifications and dichotomies.

Juliane House is a translation scholar who has divided translation into two types of "overt" and "covert". An overt translation is required whenever ST is heavily dependent on the source culture and has independent status within it. A covert

translation is required whenever ST is not source culture specific. Functional equivalence is only possible in covert translation. It is more difficult than overt type since differences in the cultural presuppositions of the SL and TL communities may require the translator to apply a cultural filter, a set of cross-cultural dimensions along which members of the two cultures differ in socio-cultural predispositions and communicative preferences (Baker & Saldanha, 2009).

Another significant dichotomy in the area of translation has been that suggested by Lawrence Venuti, namely "domestication" and "foreignization". By domestication, ST becomes more accessible for the TL reader and reads more fluently. The translator remains (invisible) and offers the reader the impression as if it were written in the TL. Foreignization involves using translation strategies that retain the foreign flavor of the original. Translators act as agents who deliberately become visible and emphasize the text's otherness from the target culture's perspective (Ajtony, 2017).

"Cultural filter" and "invisibility" are the concepts closely associated with the theories rendered by House and Venuti respectively. They are discussed as inseparable parts of their translation dichotomies. The cultural filter is a construct with which one captures, describes and explains similarities and differences in communicative styles in the source and target cultures. It is the means by which the translator compensates for cultural specificity (Gambier & van Doorslaer, 2016). Invisibility is a term used to refer to the translator's role in the translation process. It is employed in relation to the translation strategy of domestication, through which the translator adopts a fluent and natural style to reduce the sense of the foreign text's "otherness" for the TL audience and thus make it more easily assimilated (Munday, 2009).

Foreignized translation is described as overt and domesticated translation as covert (Abu Hatab, 2017). Such a quotation indicates the capacity of comparison between these two translation dichotomies. Comparing the translation dichotomies suggested by House and Venuti and looking for their similar and distinct points are parts of the problem examined in this paper.

1.1. Research Significance

This research can lead to numerous corresponding research projects. House and Venuti are two of many figures in the field of Translation Studies. This discipline is full of many further theories and their comparisons can result in a large number of research projects.

Translation theories are created to be used by practical translators. Any comparison between them can help translators select the best translation strategy in their projects. There may be a translator who hesitates whether overtly/covertly translating or domesticating/foreignizing the source text helps him accomplish in his task. This research and its findings will be extremely helpful for such a person.

1.2. Research Questions

Q1: What are the similar points between the translation dichotomies suggested by Juliane House and Lawrence Venuti?

Q2: What are the distinct points between the translation dichotomies suggested by Juliane House and Lawrence Venuti?

1.3. Research Hypotheses

H1: The similar points between House' and Venuti's translation dichotomies include the receptor's awareness of reading a translated text, following SL rules and principles, degree of difficulty, the distinction between form and content in the ST, attention to the notion of culture in the TT, self-explanatory terms for the typologies, being not mutually exclusive, and being classified as receptor-oriented.

H2: The distinct points between House' and Venuti's translation dichotomies include the criterion of TT's evaluation, scholars' focus points regarding the terms associated with the typologies, the classification of theories as either process-based or product-based, and higher practicality of the latter.

1.4. Research Limitations

Translators should make good use of different translation strategies in various cultural settings between diverse languages and cultures (Sharifabad, Yaqubi, & Mahadi, 2013). The translation theories studied here may be applied differently for each language pair. They may also lead to different conclusions on the basis of different text types and cultural settings. It is beyond the scope of this research to consider such factors in its analysis.

House' and Venuti's theories are not restricted to these translation dichotomies. Juliane House has provided a great model for translation quality assessment and Lawrence Venuti has discussed a large number of other points in his works. Time and space limitations, however, do not allow the current research to take them into account as well and force it to restrict its scope only to the translation typologies already mentioned.

2. Literature Review

The world today is no longer what it was before. It is more open and colorful. Different nations learn from and influence one another. It is commonly agreed that translation is one of the most controversial styles of events in the world. Translation plays a crucial role in the international communication. It gives a great impetus to the exchange of the cultures and the development of the mankind. The translator is considered as the intermediary between ST and TT. His task is to decode the original semantic signs and recode them in the target language (Suo, 2015).

2.1. Juliane House

Juliane House, born in 1942, is a German linguist and Translation Studies scholar. She earned her PhD in Applied Linguistics at the University of Toronto. She is a senior member of the German Science Foundation's Research Center on

multilingualism at the University of Hamburg, where she has directed several projects on translation and interpreting. Her research interests include translation theory and practice, contrastive pragmatics, discourse analysis, politeness theory, English as lingua franca, intercultural communication, and global business communication. She is the president of IATIS ("Juliane House").

2.1.1. Overt and Covert Translation

Translation is the result of a linguistic-textual operation in which a text in a language is re-contextualized in another language. Translation is both a cognitive procedure which occurs in the translator's head, and a social, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural practice. Any valid translation theory must embrace these two dimensions. Translation is both a linguistic act and an act of intercultural communication. In translation, not only two languages but also two cultures come into contact (House, 2015).

Translation is of two types: overt and covert. In overt translation, ST as a piece of work with a certain status in the SL community must remain as intact as possible, given the necessary transfer and recoding in another language. Cases of overt translation present difficulties precisely because their status in the socio-cultural context of the SL community necessitates major changes. Such a dialectical relationship between preservation and alteration makes the finding of translation equivalents difficult in overt translation. A covert translation, on the other hand, is a translation which enjoys the status of an original text in the target culture. It is thus a translation whose ST is not specifically addressed to a particular source culture audience (House, 1997).

The production of a covert translation includes an attempt to conceal the translated nature of a TT by producing a text functionally equivalent to ST. Such an approach is appropriate for STs which are not inextricably associated with the language, traditions, history or any other aspect of the source culture. Some STs have independent status in the source culture. Their translation necessitates producing an overt translation. Such a task is generally a matter of relatively straightforward linguistic recoding, usually with no need to carry out any subtle cultural realignment (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014).

Overt and covert translations are cases of 'language mention' and 'language use' respectively. They differ regarding register and the demands of equivalence of the communicative values of the linguistic units in the two texts (House, 1997). What sets this distinction apart from corresponding distinctions is the fact that it is integrated into a coherent theory of translation criticism, inside which their origin and function are consistently described and explained (House, 2015). this distinction is a cline rather than a pair of binary opposites (Munday, 2016). They are interrelated strategies which are not independently employed on the translated texts.

2.1.2. Cultural Filter

The concept of "cultural filter" is a means of capturing socio-cultural differences in expectation norms and stylistic conventions between the two linguistic-cultural communities. In a covert translation, the translator should make allowances for underlying cultural differences by placing "cultural filter" between the two texts. He should view the source text through the eyes of a target culture member (House, 2015).

A covert translation includes a translation in which the function the original text has in its discourse world is maintained through a "cultural filter" with which culture-specific SL norms are adapted to the norms holding in the receiving language community (House, 2006). Cultural filter is a procedure used in covert translation in order to make the translation compatible with target culture discourse norms and preferences (House, 2017).

2.2. Lawrence Venuti

Lawrence Venuti, born in 1953, is an American translation theorist, translation historian, and a translator from several languages. Venuti graduated from Temple University and he has long lived in New York City. He completed his PhD in English at Columbia University in 1980. Venuti is currently professor of English at Temple University. He has also taught at the University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, Columbia University, University of Trento, University of Mainz, Barnard College, and Queen's University Belfast ("Lawrence Venuti,").

2.2.1. Domestication and Foreignization

Translation means the replacement of the foreign text's linguistic and cultural difference with a text intelligible to the TL reader (Venuti, 2004a). Translations are produced for many reasons. Translators participate in the institutional exploitation of foreign texts and cultures. Some other translators act just as dubiously on their own (Venuti, 1999). Translation never communicates in an untroubled fashion because translators negotiate the linguistic and cultural differences by reducing them and supplying another set of differences (Venuti, 2004b).

Domestication and foreignization are two strategies regarding the extent to which translators make a text conform to the target culture. The former means making text closely conform to the culture of the language being translated to. It may involve the loss of information from ST. The latter means retaining information from ST. It involves deliberately breaking the TL conventions to preserve its meaning. The first person formulating these strategies in their modern sense was Lawrence Venuti. His innovation to the field was the view that the dichotomy was an ideological one ("Domestication and foreignization,").

Domestication and foreignization have long been the focus of debates in translation circle. Opinions of various translation theorists diverge in the choice between the two translation strategies in translation practice. However, it is easy to find out that both of them are deeply rooted in specific social and cultural circumstances. In other words, the choice of either

domestication or foreignization is not only made by the translator, but more importantly, by the specific social situation (Wang, 2013).

A significant part of domestication is transparency. A transparent translation is linguistically and stylistically regular and appears to be the foreign author's original text. All signs of a translator are hidden. Cultural acceptance is one of the most significant parts of domestication. When the aim is to produce TTs which can be integrated into the target culture as unnoticeably as possible, STs are sometimes altered to such an extent that the translator becomes the author. Faithfulness to the ST becomes less significant, when the target reader expects his reading experience to be as smooth as possible (Tapanainen, 2008).

A foreignized translation tends to give the reader more information than a domesticated translation. The translator makes no attempt to conceal himself from the reader. The reader is aware that what he is reading is not the author's original work, but the translator's interpretation of it. Loyalty to the original text is more significant than re-writing it to be more familiar to the target audience and its culture. If this strategy is used in a case where ST is completely bound up in the SL culture, the message of the original may be entirely lost to a reader unfamiliar with the source culture (Tapanainen, 2008).

Domestication and foreignization are not binary opposites, but part of a continuum. They relate to ethical choices made by the translator in order to expand the receiving culture's range (Munday, 2016). If no differences in cultural connotations exist, every translation is simultaneously domesticating and foreignizing. It is domesticating because the TT is rendered in the target culture's domestic language. It is foreignizing because what is being translated and presented to the target culture is a text originating in a foreign language and culture. Maintaining the dichotomy in cases without a change of cultural connotations is therefore not productive (Schmidt, 2013).

2.2.2. Invisibility

Translation is an invisible practice, everywhere around us, inescapably present, but rarely acknowledged. Being a leading translator means producing translations highly accomplished, favorably reviewed, and award-winning. It also means shere quantity, executing many projects, practicing translation as a steady source of income, gaining an economic advantage over other translators in the competition for foreign texts and the negotiation of fees. Many translators aim to work from contract to contract and move from one foreign text to another, focusing on the delivery of the manuscript and therefore devoting little time to sustained methodological reflection (Venuti, 1992).

Venuti indicates that the translator has two options. He can make himself invisible in the translation, i.e. his translation reads fluently as a target text. This is domestication. On the other hand, translator can make himself visible and make it obvious that it is a translation, the linguistic traces of the alien thought movement that SL is showing up. This is foreignization (Suo, 2015). Invisibility has been prevalent in the Anglo-American translation tradition, not only in the translation strategy preferred, but in the selection and scarcity of books translated and in the absence of recognition of the translator (Munday, 2009).

Invisibility is the term used to describe the translator's situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American culture. A translated text is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers, and readers when it reads fluently and the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text. This illusory effect conceals the numerous conditions under which the translation is made, starting with the translator's crucial intervention in the foreign text. The more fluent the translation, the more invisible the translator, and presumably, the more visible the writer or meaning of the foreign text (Venuti, 2004a).

3. Methodology

This paper involves a comparative research. The translation theories suggested by Juliane House and Lawrence Venuti are compared against each other in this project. In the first step, a brief literature of the translation typologies rendered by the two scholars is provided. The second step involves two parts; the first part to examine the similarities between their theories and the second to look for their different points. The final step provides concluding points based on the previous sections' findings with the aim of answering the research questions and either supporting or rejecting its hypotheses.

4. Data Analysis

Comparing Juliane House and Lawrence Venuti, the first point which comes to the researcher's mind is that the former is a linguist and translation scholar, while the latter is just a translation theorist. This means that House pays more attention to linguistics and linguistic concepts in her translation theories. The researcher thus concludes that, in comparison with Venuti's translation typology, House' dichotomy is of a higher linguistic nature. Lawrence Venuti, on the other hand, is a practical translator from a number of languages. It is therefore logical to conclude that his theory and translation dichotomy is, more than that of Juliane House, related to the practice of translation.

House' overt/covert and Venuti's domestication/foreignization strategies are two prominent translation theories in the discipline of Translation Studies. Comparing their theories and looking for their similarities and differences is of a very high research value. It is attempted to find their similar and different points and not determine which one is better or superior to

the other. Both are translation theories, with their corresponding opponents and proponents. They are neither superior nor inferior to each other. Their comparison indicates which one is appropriate to be adapted in specific translation contexts.

Some similarities and differences can be seen in the definitions of translation given by the two theorists. They consider the linguistic and cultural nature of translation, while House takes also its cognitive nature into account. House considers only the process of "recontextualization" in her definition, whereas Venuti adds the criterion of "intelligibility" for a translated text. Such a characteristic as "forceable" is another term used by Venuti for the process of textual and cultural replacement done in the translation; the term which is absent in House' definition.

4.1. Similar Points

The first and most obvious similarity found by the researcher between overt-covert and domestication-foreignization dichotomies is the notion of receptor's awareness of whether he is reading a translated or an original text. The text translated in both overt and foreignized way allows the reader to know his connection to a text produced in a different language. Both covert and domesticated translation involve changes in the text with the aim of producing a text not sounding to be a translated text. The former moves the reader beyond the restriction of a single text and makes a link to a further language and culture, while the latter holds the reader in a monolingual territory.

The second similarity between the translation dichotomies is in following source-target language rules and principles. Overt translation and foreignization pay less attention to the target language's lexical and grammatical rules. They follow the way in which language is used in the SL. Covert translation and domestication, on the other hand, create the text in a way acceptable and well-formed on the basis of receptor language. They ignore SL form and transfer its meaning in the form grammatical in the TL. Overt translation and foreignization are SL-oriented, while covert translation and domestication are TL-oriented.

The third similarity between the translation typologies refers to their degree of difficulty. Covert translation is obviously more difficult than overt translation. The application of cultural filter is a good reason to verify such a fact. This is true for Venuti's dichotomy as well. It is easy to recognize that domestication is more difficult than foreignization. Following TL linguistic and extra-linguistic rules, making changes in the source text to produce a well-formed and natural TT and attempting to remain invisible in the target text, all are among the tasks a domesticating translator is expected to perform, the duties which a foreignizing translator does not have to take into consideration.

The fourth similarity is based on the distinction made between form and content in the source text. A source text involves a form and a meaning (content). Translation may include the transfer of form, meaning, or both of them. Foreignization and overt translation can be said to be form-oriented. They produce a text in the TL which mostly follows ST's form and therefore overtly foreign to the receptor. Domestication and covert translation, on the other hand, sound to be content-oriented. They maintain ST's main content and re-create it in a form on the basis of TL rules and principles. They attempt to render the meaning in the TL in a way not seeming to be a translated text.

The fifth similarity is the degree of attention to the notion of culture in the target text. Each language involves a culture. Translation may involve removing or at least decreasing cultural differences across languages. This sounds to be a duty upon the translator working on the basis of whether domestication or covert translation. These two translation types pay a closer attention to the TL culture and their purpose is to produce a text acceptable and natural in the receptor language's culture. Such a fact is true in the case of foreignization and overt translation in an opposite direction. They produce a text foreign and overtly translated in the TL, even if the original text encompasses some facts and notions unknown for or even opposing to the target culture.

The sixth similarity between House' and Venuti's translation theories is the selection of self-explanatory terms for their typologies. A translation is overt because the receptor is overtly aware of reading a translated text. It is covert since its translated nature remains covert. Domestication means translating on the basis of rules and principles domestic in the receptor language, while foreignization refers to the adaptation of particular strategies to make the text foreign to its reader. The terms chosen for the translation types in these theories provide enough information about them.

The seventh similarity between House' and Venuti's theories is with regard to the fact that the two translation types suggested by each scholar are not mutually exclusive. Both scholars point out that a single translation may belong more or less to each of the translation types rendered by them. House states that a translated text may be more or less overt and covert. Venuti indicates that domestication and foreignization are not binary opposites, but parts of a continuum. This is a crucial similar point.

Finally, it is obvious that these two theories are among receptor-oriented theories in the field of Translation Studies. A translation theory may be text-based, purpose-based, receptor-based, philosophical, etc. Both House and Venuti consider the TL receiver's idea about the target text as the basis of their theories. House considers translation to be either overt or covert in the view of its receiver. Venuti also sees whether translation is domestic or foreign to the TT user. Both theories are oriented towards the target language audience.

4.2. Distinct Points

The first distinction between the translation typologies discussed is the criterion upon which target text is evaluated. In House' terms, the main criterion is reader's awareness of reading a translated text. A text may be translated well, however the reader, looking at the names of characters, cities, dates, currencies, etc. learns to be reading a translated text. Such a criterion

in Venuti's theory is correspondence to domestic values and principles in the target language. Using TL rules and principles or following the SL closely determines the translation to be domesticated or foreignized.

The second distinction is the scholars' different focus points in the concepts they introduce in a closed association with their translation dichotomies. Introducing the term "cultural filter", House indicates her focus to be on the cultural distance existing across the two languages which should be taken into account and decreased as much as possible. Such a focus is different in Venuti's theory, where he uses the term "invisibility". This term reveals that Venuti focuses in his theory on the role of translator in the process of translation and his manifestation in the final product.

The third distinction is based on the theories to be either process-based or product-based. House' theory is considered to be product-based. It attempts to investigate the final product and to see how the text produced is viewed by its receptor. Venuti's theory, on the other hand, is a process-based theory. The terms "domestication" and "foreignization" refer to the strategies utilized by the translator during the process of translating the original text.

Last but not least, Venuti's theory enjoys a higher degree of practicality, i.e. it is more than House' theory relevant to the practice of translation. Two reasons are provided by the researcher for this point. First, comparing House' and Venuti's biographies shows that House is a translation theorist, while Venuti is both a theorist and a practical translator. This reveals a higher amount of practical translation, on the basis of which his theory is created. Furthermore, the focus of Venuti's theory is on using linguistic and extra-linguistic rules, while House mainly seeks to see if the target text sounds to be a translated text or an original work. Once again, the researcher believes that the former is more practical than the latter and is more applicable in the practice of translation.

5. Conclusion

The researcher has no doubt that the translation theories suggested by House and Venuti are highly influential in the discipline of Translation Studies. However, he believes that dividing translation into two types and restricting its criteria to such notions as "invisibility" and "cultural filter" is too general. Translation can be classified into numerous categories, from oral to written, from audiovisual to legal and religious, from literary to non-literary, etc. The criteria for translation is also capable of including numerous notions, from translation purpose to its text-type, from translation circumstances to translator's social, financial and religious conditions, and so on. The researcher therefore considers these theories to be too generic, although he does not ignore their prominent role in the field of translation.

Juliane House and Lawrence Venuti are two translation scholars whose theories correspond to more than differ from each other. This is obvious both qualitatively and quantitatively. Qualitatively, the definitions provided by them for their translation typologies are similar to each other and have a large number of points in common. With regard to quantity, the researcher provides 8 similar points and 4 distinct ones. Such a higher number of similarities indicates their correspondence.

The translation dichotomies discussed are two pairs of lines where one line of each pair is parallel with only one line of the other. Overt translation corresponds to foreignization and covert translation is parallel with domestication. All the similar points mentioned do exist in this way. Overt translation corresponds in all the eight similar points to foreignization and covert translation in all of them to domestication. This is also true for the concepts associated with each translation typology. Cultural filter is used for covert translation and the translator's invisibility takes place in domestication.

Another conclusion made by the researcher on the basis of his findings is that neither Venuti's typology nor House' dichotomy is superior or inferior to the other. They are two translation theories moving along each other. They correspond to each other in several dimensions. The first three differences between the two dichotomies mentioned by the researcher also verify no superiority or priority among them. The last distinction indicates a very little superiority of Venuti's theory, however it is not too prominent to be considered and to lead to ignoring the significance of House' theory.

At the end, the researcher indicates a significant point which should be taken into account by any scholar investigating these theories or any translator using them in his translation. As all languages are prone to a variety of changes, the texts translated between languages may also change in the course of time. A translated text which is considered to be an overt translation in a period of time may be considered as covert at another time and vice versa. This is true for the domestication/foreignization dichotomy as well. A word or structure which is transferred via translation from language A into language B and makes its reader aware of the fact that he is reading a translated text, for instance, may be used in that language over a long period of time so frequently that, after several years or decades, become an item of the lexicon of that language. As a consequence, another individual who encounters it in a different text will not consider it as a foreign word and supposed to be reading an original text, even if that text is a translated one. In such circumstances, that word or structure is a domestic concept in that language and no longer regarded as foreign.

References

Abu Hatab, W. (2017). *Translation across Time and Space*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Aissi, L. (1987). *An analytical study of the process of translation: with special reference to English/Arabic.* University of Salford.

Ajtony, Z. (2017). Taming the Stranger: Domestication vs Foreignization in Literary Translation. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica, 9*(2), 93-105.

Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Domestication and foreignization.   Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Domestication_and_foreignization

Gambier, Y., & van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Border crossings. Translation studies and other disciplines* (Vol. 126). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

House, J. (1997). *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited* (Vol. 410): Gunter Narr Verlag.

House, J. (2006). Covert translation, language contact, variation and change.

House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. New York: Routledge.

House, J. (2017). *Translation: The Basics*: Routledge.

Juliane House.   Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Juliane_House

Lawrence Venuti.   Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lawrence_Venuti

Munday, J. (2009). *The Routledge companion to translation studies*: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*: Routledge.

Ryndová, E. (2008). *In/Visibility of the Translator and Questions of Copyright (Synchronic & Diachronic View)*. (BA Bachelor's Diploma Thesis), Masaryk University, Czech Republic.

Schmidt, G. (2013). Foreignization and domestication in the Croatian translations of Oscar Wilde's The Picture of Dorian Gray. *Jezikoslovlje, 14*(2-3), 537-548.

Sharifabad, E. D., Yaqubi, M., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2013). The Application of Domestication and Foreignization Translation Strategies in English-Persian Translations of News Phrasal Verbs. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 3*(1).

Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (2014). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Suo, X. (2015). A new perspective on literary translation strategies based on skopos theory. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5*(1), 176-183.

Tapanainen, U. (2008). Translating Music and Sound–Foreignization and Domestication in the Translated Articles in Soundi Magazine.

Venuti, L. (1992). *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology*: Taylor & Francis.

Venuti, L. (1999). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2004a). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (Ed.) (2004b). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wang, L. (2013). A Survey on Domestication and Foreinization Theories in Translation. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 3*(1).