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ABSTRACT

The recent arguments in Translation Studies for the adoption of a foreignising strategy in (literary) translation have come mainly from Anglo-American culture, most notably Lawrence Venuti. He argues persuasively for cultural enrichment via foreignisation. However, a different picture emerges when one looks at the issue from the point of view of small languages/cultures. Indeed, the definition of what constitutes foreignisation depends on the cultural context. We will illustrate our point by discussing the notion of translation strategy and its influence on translators’ decision-making. We will also discuss examples from the history of translation in Finland as well as a recent translation project of heavy rock lyrics from Finnish into German.
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RESUMEN

Dentro de los Estudios de Traducción, las recientes manifestaciones a favor del uso de la estrategia de extranjerización en la traducción (literaria) surgen principalmente en el ámbito de la cultura angloamericana. Uno de los defensores más destacados es Lawrence Venuti, quien argumenta el enriquecimiento cultural que conlleva este procedimiento. Sin embargo, desde la perspectiva de las culturas/lenguas minoritarias el panorama no es el mismo. De hecho, la definición de lo que constituye “extranjerización” depende del contexto cultural. Ilustraremos nuestra postura examinando la noción de estrategia de traducción y cómo influye en el proceso de toma de decisiones del traductor. Asimismo ofreceremos ejemplos de la historia de la traducción en Finlandia y de un reciente proyecto de traducción de letras de un grupo de rock duro finés al alemán.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Our aim in this paper is to take up —yet again— a couple of old hats in Translation Studies: the old dichotomies of translation in their various forms (free
vs. faithful etc.) and the notion of translation strategy. We wish to offer some new contents to the old hats by examining examples from research in progress. We will begin by a short overview of some of the old dichotomies. Then we will proceed to the issue of defining “translation strategy” —a term which seems to be used to refer to a variety of different phenomena in translation. We will narrow down our discussion to the resurfaced dichotomy “foreignising vs. domesticating” and discuss the cultural constraints which underlie translators’ strategy choices in the light of the evidence gathered in the project of writing up a history of translations of literature into Finnish as well as the first-hand experiences of one of the co-authors when translating Finnish heavy rock lyrics into German.

2. OVERVIEW OF DICHOTOMIES

Translation Studies has typically polarised the two poles of the translation continuum. For the sake of convenience, we call this the free vs. faithful dichotomy, which is one of the formulations used for centuries by translators and translation scholars. However, other formulations have been used as well—and they do not necessarily mean exactly the same thing.

The debate whether free or faithful translation should be the ideal has its roots in antiquity (see e.g. Robinson; Kelly). Friedrich Schleiermacher (1813/1997) introduced a dichotomy known as foreignising vs. domesticating translation. Schleiermacher’s point of departure is emphatically source text (ST) driven —it is the genius of the ST author and the intellectual or artistic tools offered by the source language (SL) which determine the way in which a text should be translated— and based on assumed functional constancy of texts in translation. Texts dealing with business or diplomacy can be subjected to “interpretation” (meaning a fairly mechanical operation between languages). In contrast, works of art and scholarship are the realm of “translation proper” and with them, the translator can decide either to move the target text (TT) reader towards the ST author (foreignising) or to move the ST author towards the TT reader (domesticating).

More recently, similar (but not quite identical) dichotomies have been proposed by various translation scholars. These include, for example:

– dynamic and formal equivalence (Nida)
– overt and covert translation (House)
– adequacy and acceptability (Toury)
– communicative and semantic translation (Newmark)
– instrumental vs. documentary translation (Nord)

These dichotomies are easily understood as synonymous variations of one and the same free vs. faithful theme. However, this is not always the case. For example, Nida’s “dynamic” and “formal equivalence” stem from Bible translation and focus on the effect of translation solutions on the prospective audience response. Newmark’s “communicative” and “semantic translation” seem to deal with
the same chunk of translated discourse as Schleiermacher’s “translation proper,”
while Toury’s “adequacy” and “acceptability” refer to translations adhering to the
source language and source cultural norms or to the target language and target
cultural norms respectively, thus coming close to Schleiermacher’s foreignising vs.
domesticating. House’s and Nord’s dichotomies, in turn, seem to be closer to
Schleiermacher’s distinction between “interpretation” (House’s “covert” and Nord’s
“instrumental translation”) and “translation proper” (House’s “overt” and Nord’s
documentary translation”).

In the 1990s, Venuti revived the notions of foreignising vs. domesticating
(see Venuti, Scandals; “Strategies”), but his dichotomy is not identical with Schleier-
macher’s original either. Schleiermacher recommends foreignisation for linguistic,
artistic, and intellectual reasons: its aim is to reveal and appreciate the author’s mas-
tery of the linguistic potential of his native language. In contrast, Venuti’s main
motivations are political and ideological: he recommends foreignisation as a means of
fighting cultural imperialism and of raising awareness of the “Other.” Approaching
translation from the Anglo-American perspective, Venuti sees foreignisation as a strategy
which points out linguistic and cultural differences of a foreign text and challenges
the dominant aesthetics of the translating culture. Venuti presents convincing argu-
ments for adopting a foreignising strategy in translation by quoting examples of mis-
representation of, say, the Japanese culture in the U.S., based on the domesticating
strategies adopted in translating (very rare pieces of) Japanese fiction (Venuti, Scan-
dals 71ff.). However, Venuti also draws attention to reverse cultural contexts and
translating situations in which the translating culture is the one with less power (e.g.
Venuti, Scandals 158-189). This seems to have been occasionally overlooked when
Venuti’s contributions are discussed; we will return to this point in the conclusion.

On the whole, it is fairly tempting to embrace Venuti’s arguments for
foreignising translations in order to promote multiculturalism — Finnish students
of translation are a good example; once they come across Venuti’s ideas, they whole-
heartedly agree. However, when we look at the situation from a Finnish perspec-
tive, the picture seems a little different.

In Finland, the share of translated fiction out of all published fiction has
been steadily rising after the 1930s and 1940s when translated literature reached its
lowest number partly due to the introduction of copyright fees. In 2000, 58 per
cent of published fiction was translations. Moreover, statistics show that in 1999,
79 per cent of translations had English as their source language (Sevänen, “Suomen-
noskirjallisuuden”). Even though some books written in English represent non-Anglo-
American cultures, these figures show that adopting foreignisation as “the” strategy
in translations “into” Finnish would hardly serve to promote multiculturalism or to
fight cultural imperialism.

3. DEFINITIONS OF TRANSLATION STRATEGY

“Translation strategy” is another notion in translation studies, which is used
by virtually everyone and more often than not to mean at least slightly different
things. In what follows we will briefly discuss the different meanings of “strategy” to make clear what we are referring to when we talk about strategies. We will then illustrate our points by examples in sections 4 and 5.

With regard to strategies, a distinction is often made between products and processes. For example, Englund Dimitrova mentions that translation strategies relate, on the one hand, to things that happen to texts, such as domestication or foreignisation, and to things that take place in the translation process on the other.

To begin with things that happen to texts, in the following quotation Venuti focuses on higher level text-related phenomena:

Strategies of translation involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it. Both of these tasks are determined by various factors: cultural, economic, political. Yet the many different strategies that have emerged since antiquity can perhaps be divided into two large categories. A translation project may conform to values currently dominating the target-language culture —Alternatively, a translation project may resist and aim to revise the dominant— (Venuti, “Strategies” 240)

The choice of texts to be translated also depends on the dominant translation policy, while “a method to translate it” would refer the overall approach taken in the process (see below).

On a lower level, translation strategies refer to the changes or shifts in the TT, as compared to its ST (Englund Dimitrova; see also Chesterman). These would include things like transposition, explicitation, addition, omission, etc. (see e.g. Chesterman; Leppihalme; Vinay & Darbelnet) and are also known as “translation methods” or “procedures.” Thus the adoption of a domesticating strategy could show up in the translated text as a super-ordinate term “newspaper” for a culture-specific ST reference to The Times.

In process-oriented translation research, a distinction is often made between “global” vs. “local strategies” (Séguinot; Jääskeläinen, “Investigating”) or “macro-” and “microstrategies” (Hönig). Global strategies refer to the translator's overall approach or work-plan which is based on the translation brief. With professional translators, global strategies govern and guide the subsequent choices and decisions which relate to individual (lexical, syntactic, stylistic, etc.) problems —that is, local strategies. For example, with a commission to translate an English children's book for Finnish child readers, the translator’s (and publisher's) decision to choose a domesticating global strategy for the book would have an effect on the whole process. The local lexical problems, like “What shall I do with this reference to The Times?” would in all likelihood be solved with the help of the global strategy and result in choosing either a super-ordinate term “newspaper” or a cultural adaptation The Helsingin Sanomat. Other kinds of strategy comments also appear in process data (e.g. think-aloud protocols). They, too, tend to materialise in target texts as, for example, coherence or consistency; however, for the purposes of this paper these are less relevant (for more details see e.g. Jääskeläinen, “Investigating”; Tapping).

As the above discussion shows, there is not necessarily a clear-cut distinction between what happens to texts and what takes place in the process; after all,
the decisions based on the aims and cultural context of a translation project which are taken before the actual translation process are reflected in the choice of a global strategy for the process, while the local decisions taken during the process materialise in the target text. These strategy concepts appear to be inextricably linked and, in many cases, simply different sides of the same coin: what happens in the process shows in the product. The large cultural, economic, and political decisions taken before a translation project is started are reflected in the choice of a global strategy which then governs local strategy decisions relating to the appropriate changes or shifts in the TT. We will provide examples of how these phenomena work in practice in section 4 below. The issues related to the relevance of the distinction between text-related vs. process-related strategies will be discussed in more detail in Jääskeläinen ("Translation").

4. STRATEGIES AND CULTURE

We will illustrate our view of translation strategies and their realizations by discussing the cultural, political and economic factors (Venuti, "Strategies") which influence them in the light of a few examples of translation practice and policy in Finland. In addition, our aim is to show that the implications of adopting a foreignising strategy in translation look rather different when we look at it from the point of view of a small language/culture.

First, we will give a short introduction to Finnish history and culture to provide background for our examples to follow. For some six hundred years, Finland was under the Swedish rule. In 1809, Finland became an autonomous Grand Duchy of the Russian empire. After the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, Finland gained its independence from the newly formed Soviet Union in 1917.

To begin with, the Finnish language was the people’s language, while the ruling (“civilised”) classes used Swedish. One of the extraordinary features in the history of the Finnish language is the fact that some members of the Swedish-speaking ruling class actively participated in the creation of Finnish, instead of Swedish, as a national language. After the annexation to Russia, the role of the Finnish language became increasingly important. According to Paloposki:

The Finnish language was now hailed as a means of—and a basis for—developing the nation’s identity. Translation into Finnish first served the aim of producing useful and educational literature for the masses, but also aimed at founding a national literature, polishing the Finnish language for literary use, and finally making Finnish the language of the educated elite. It was ultimately seen as a means of elevating the Finnish language to the ranks of “civilised languages.” (87)

4.1. CULTURAL FACTORS

Up until the mid 19th century, there was a heightened awareness of the role of own national language and literature in the creation of cultural identity in
Finland. As a consequence, the functions of translations into Finnish were to refine the Finnish language for future purposes, to create the foundation as well as models for a future Finnish literature, and — last but not least — to educate and instruct the people. These general cultural aims determined the choice of texts for translation, as well as the way in which they were translated (Paloposki; Paloposki & Oittinen).

For the above reasons, domestication occupied a special position as a global strategy. It aimed at strengthening the Finnish cultural identity at a time when Finnish literary tradition was non-existent. One example discussed by Paloposki, and Paloposki & Oittinen, is Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, which was domesticated into Finnish in 1834 by a retired army officer, Major Lagervall, as *Ruunulinna* (“Crown Castle”), located in Eastern Karelia in Finland. In addition to the changed location, some of the protagonists were named after Finnish war heroes and the three sisters were Finnish mythological creatures. Expressed in Finnish runic verse, the text made use of repetition and other poetic devices typical of Finnish oral tradition. This domestication project reflects the cultural aims of improving the Finnish language, enriching Finnish literature, and creating “a history worthy of admiration on a national scale” (Paloposki 108).

4.2. Economic Factors

Gradually, with the assistance of translations, Finnish literature became more versatile and self-sufficient, creating its own literary system, and the Finnish national and cultural identity grew stronger. However, the educational project continued throughout the process of Finland gaining its independence in 1917 until the II World War, but with slightly different emphases. For example, the translations of classics aimed at joining Finland and the Finnish people with the Western cultural heritage (Sevän, *Vapauden; Kirjallisuus*).

Finnish publishing houses became established as commercial enterprises in the late 19th and early 20th century, which added business interests to the earlier educational goals of publishing policy. This contributed to the rise of literary genres focusing on entertainment, which was even then sometimes in conflict with the cultural aims of the time. One of the economic factors linked to the choice of texts and to the rise of entertainment was the Bern copyright agreement which Finland signed in 1928. The agreement made publishers pay for translation rights. In some cases the copyright payments were regarded as too high, which resulted in a decrease in the total number of translations into Finnish and tipped the balance in favour of entertainment, as old entertainment literature, which was outside copyright, grew more attractive to publishers (Sevän, *Suomenmoskirjallisuuden*).

The commercial demands have resulted in the dominance of entertainment in the publishing industry. The same applies to other media, such as film and television, where imported Anglo-American entertainment industry prevails. In the field of audiovisual translation the problems are particularly acute. The large mul-
national film and video distributors (and consequently local translation agencies as well) wish to mass-produce subtitled and dubbed versions of films and television programmes. When emphasis is placed on fast and cheap translation, quality in the traditional sense might suffer. Alternatively, quality may have to be redefined to mean “fast and cheap” in some cases, even at the expense of the conventional “good,” meaning linguistic and textual quality (Abdallah).

On the other hand, the demand for fast and cheap translation affects the written media as well. Valkonen complains that the publishers’ economic interests are over-emphasised: for example, there’s a rush to get books published in time for the Christmas market, which results in poor quality (facts are not checked, language not revised). In fact, it appears that a draft translation is sufficient for publication. This applies to English as a source language in particular: as “everybody knows English,” there is no need to hire a professional translator or a language reviser, a subject specialist or an eager enthusiast will suffice. The draft translations tend to retain the “Foreign” in the form of half-translated idioms and syntax, for instance, and when the bulk of translations come from English, it means that the “Foreign” is increasingly Anglo-American.

4.3. POLITICAL FACTORS

After Finland gained its independence from the Soviet Union in 1917, there was a short civil war in which German soldiers participated to help (successfully) the Finnish “white” troops (against the “reds”). The new nation used this special relationship and the related culture-political boom for its own nationalistic purposes. Consequently, there was a marked increase in the publication of German translations of Finnish literature, supported by Finns themselves through the Funds for the Promotion of Finnish Literature (Kujamäki, “Finnish”).

The political relationship between Finland and Germany played a major role in the various translations into German of the Finnish novel Seitsemän veljestä (“The Seven Brothers”) by Aleksis Kivi. The first translation by Gustav Schmidt from 1921 could be characterised as “anthropological”; following from the above aim to make Finnish culture and literature known in Europe, it was fairly faithful containing a large number of explanatory footnotes. The footnotes also served another higher goal: establishing Finland as a member of Western civilisation, as the “northern outpost” of Western society (Kujamäki, “Finnish”).

Heidi Hahm-Bläfield’s later translation of “The Seven Brothers,” done at the time of increasing cooperation between Finland and Germany in the 1930s, wishes to promote the ideas of the racial political “Nordic thought” and reinforce the image of Finland as a land of a thousand lakes, with wild and mythical landscape, and with the Finns as the hunting, heroic and muscled representatives of the “healthy” Nordic race. As a result, Hahm-Bläfield’s translation is careful not to introduce anything that would question the Nordic virtues or throw an unfavourable light on the Nordic people: the translator has left out the brothers’ excessive drinking and their typical discourse containing a great deal of quarrelling and swear-
ing (Kujamäki, “Finnish”). Other translation projects with Finnish authors from that time had a similar fate; for example, Finland’s only Nobel laureate in literature, Frans Emil Sillanpää, was “purified” in German translation by leaving out scenes depicting drunkenness or sexual promiscuity, examples of which were already in oversupply within German literature itself. This reveals one of the aims of these translation projects, which was to offer a “model” literature which would help remove the “unnatural” and “degenerate” works of German modernism (Kujamäki, “Of Course”).

In the case of the first Seven Brothers translation by Gustav Schmidt, it was very much in the interest of the source culture to present a certain kind of image. The translation with its stylistic faithfulness and informative footnotes could be regarded as a foreignising translation consciously advancing the cultural interests of the source culture. Hahm-Bläfield’s translation with its omissions and adherence to the model of German “Blut und Boden” literature is clearly a domesticating translation, which was commissioned and controlled by the translating culture.

5. THE NISKALAUWAUS CASE

Our final example comes from a translation project of one of the co-authors of this article, Pekka Kujamäki. With the help of this example we wish to illustrate the interplay of the aims and cultural context of a translation project, the subsequent choice of a global translation strategy, and how that affects the translator’s local strategic choices, and, eventually, the reception of the translation in the target culture. This example also relates to a translating situation in which the cultural context is that of translating from a minor language and (sub)culture (Finnish heavy rock lyrics) into a more dominant one (the German heavy rock scene), and as such offers a case in point of the principles of foreignisation at work.

5.1. BACKGROUND

The translation project deals with exporting Finnish heavy rock music—by Timo Rautiainen & Trio Niskalaukaus; henceforth abbreviated to TR & TN—to the German market. This was by no means the first or in any way foolhardy attempt, as several Finnish heavy rock bands have already made their name in the German market (e.g. HIM, The Rasmus, and Nightwish). In fact, TR & TN had released an album in German earlier, but its reception had been controversial with the bulk of criticism focusing on the unacceptability of the lyrics translated into German and the lead singer’s exotic accent. Nevertheless, TR & TN wanted to release yet another album in Germany, where there is a demand for Finnish heavy rock.

The decision to make the album in the German language, instead of English, was motivated by several factors; using English could have easily been misconstrued as an attempt to conquer the global market. Also, the lead singer’s express
aim was to export “Finnishness to Germans.” This aim was coupled with the wish to underline the lyrics of TR&TN which are, even in the Finnish rock scene, quite different from the typical clichés of the heavy rock genre. The latter abounds with imagery related to death, decadence, ancient myths, and Gothic romance. In contrast, TR&TN tell stories about Finns and Finland, particularly Finnish men. Yet the stories have wider implications related to the weaknesses and vulnerabilities of the human condition.

5.2. GLOBAL AND LOCAL STRATEGIES

The main aims of the translation project were to keep the stories intact and try to provide at least glimpses into “Otherness,” i.e. the Finnish cultural context. Changes on the surface level were considered permissible to make the lyrics to some extent more understandable to the German audience and to make the lyrics fit the melody and rhythm (which is always a constraint in song translation).

The aim of exporting something very Finnish to a German audience clearly called for a foreignising global strategy. In fact, it could be argued that the decision to translate the lyrics into German was in itself a foreignising strategy, as most of the lyrics in the heavy rock genre are in English. As TR&TN write their lyrics in Finnish, they stand out from the Finnish heavy rock scene as well. The global strategy guided both the selection of texts for translation (songs with a good story and best views to “Finnishness” were preferred) as well as the subsequent local strategies, which shared the aim of maintaining the cultural setting of the texts. For this purpose even direct transfer of Finnish expressions was used. Another local strategy was to use archaic expressions to force the (young) audience to pay attention to the lyrics, perhaps even to read the lyrics printed on the CD cover sheet.

5.3. RECEPTION

The album Hartes Land was released in Germany in January 2004, and since then it has been reviewed extensively in German printed and on-line publications in the field. It is interesting to note that the reviews comment on phenomena which relate directly to the translation strategic decisions in the project: choosing to make translations into German, emphasis on the stories in the texts, and the translator’s lexical choices.

On the basis of the comments in the reviews, it could be speculated that the reception in Germany hinges upon the recipient’s willingness to embrace the “Foreign” and to invest mental effort to decipher its significance in the texts. The reception could be characterised as controversial, but on the whole fairly sympathetic; at the same time the reviewers seem to be overwhelmed by the whole idea of making the album in German. This can be seen in the comments below (translated excerpts of the German reviews by RJ):
You hear the first beats, begin to nod your head. Then the singer starts, you hear the German words and think: “What’s this?” Finns singing in German?¹

It is precisely the accent which makes the music, together with the melancholic lyrics, so special.²

The intended emphasis on the stories told in the lyrics is the focus of the following comments:

While German heavy bands wring out lyrics with meaning-laden psychoanalyses, —[TR&TN] simply tell stories.³

[TR&TN] tackle “big” themes like the refugee problem —and also illustrate the difficulties of everyday life.⁴

Although the reviewers do not give any specific examples, comments like “unusual word choices” probably refer to the translator’s lexical choices. On the other hand, the translator’s conscious decision to use archaic expressions seems to find appreciation in the following comments:

—charmingly old-fashioned choice of words and expressions.⁵

The lyrics on the CD appear successful, even though some of them have been translated a little strangely; however, they possess a deeper meaning.⁶

Many expressions are such that are used by older people, which gives the text a special atmosphere.⁷


To sum up, several reviews seem to indicate that the foreignising global strategy chosen for the translation project from a minority language/culture into a more dominant language/culture has reached the goals which are postulated by Venuti as well: the translated lyrics challenge the dominant aesthetics of the heavy rock genre, they signal the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, and generally draw attention to the “Otherness” expressed in the texts and their stories. Still, as the target culture reception ultimately depends on the recipients’ willingness to accept the otherness in the text, the foreignising solutions which affect the understandability of the translations can also stand in the way of gaining a wider acceptance.

6. CONCLUSION

In this article we wanted to take up several central notions in TS for a re-examination. We took a quick look at the basic dichotomy between domestication and foreignisation and then a closer look at the notion of translation strategy. Translation strategies are divided here into global strategies, which govern the process of translation, and local strategies, which are used to solve lexical, syntactic, etc. problems during the translation process. We have discussed examples taken from the history of translated literature in Finland to illustrate the interaction of translation policy and global strategy choices. We also discussed a more recent case of translating Finnish heavy rock lyrics into German, which gives a glimpse into the interaction of global and local strategies, and their effect on the reception of the TT in the target culture. These examples aim at bringing cultural relativism into the discussion on domestication vs. foreignisation. Indeed, according to Venuti, the very definition of “foreignisation” vs. “domestication” depends on taking into account “the changing hierarchy of values in the target-language culture” (Venuti, “Strategies” 243).

The means of combatting cultural hegemonies may vary depending on the status of the source and target cultures. Foreignising works when translating into the dominant English-language cultural domain from more marginal, less powerful cultures. Domesticating, in turn, may be more effective from the point of view of small, marginal cultures, in some historical contexts, and with translations from hegemonic cultures. As Venuti puts it (albeit in relation to translation in developing countries):

—translation can revise hegemonic values even when it seems to employ the most conservatively domesticating strategies— strategies, in other words, that are designed to reinforce the dominant indigenous traditions in the translating culture. (Venuti, Scandals 189)
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