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When translators are faced with a text that contains culturally sensitive elements, there are different strategies that they can use in translating the text. The strategy being chosen depends on a host of factors that include, among others, the purpose of the translation, the publisher’s power to dictate the translation, the translator’s own ‘power’ and mandate endowed to him/her, as well as his/her own interpretation of the cultural elements that are represented in the text for translation. This article examines how cultural translation is interrelated with the notions of domestication, foreignization and power. At the end of the article, translation cases involving Indonesian-English languages are examined in the light of this interrelation. The findings show that the translation strategies employed by the translator reflects his/her interpretation that dictates the translation process. When the cultural elements are considered as foreign the translator tends to use the domestication strategy. On the other hand, when the ‘foreign’ element is related to a known genre such as the Ramayana, the translator has chosen to use the foreignization strategy. Both strategies reflect the translator’s power or mandate to interpret the original text and realize it in the translation; this is a power that may have been granted to him/her by the publisher. By way of comparison, another case of foreignization is also presented, one that indicates the publisher’s power instead of the translator’s. These major findings are important for translator training in that the texts selected for exercises need to include those containing culture-sensitive items.
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INTRODUCTION

There are various strategies that a translator can use in translating a source language text (SLT) into the target language text (TLT). In a recent research, Bahrami (2012) examines the translation of allusions in Hafiz Shirazi’s poetry. She focuses on the translations allusions containing proper nouns and for translating allusions of key phrase (not containing proper nouns). The strategies for the translation of proper nouns are: retention of the name; replacement of the name by another (beyond the changes required by convention), that is, by replacing the name with another Source language (SL) name or by a target language (TL) name; omission of the name. In terms of the strategies for the translation of key phrase, there are 8 strategies: use standard translation; literal translation (minimum change); add extra-allusive guidance to the text; provide additional information via footnotes, endnotes; introduce textual features that indicate the presence of borrowed words; replace with a performed TL item; rephrase the allusion with an overt expression of its meaning; re-create the allusion by creatively constructing a passage that reproduces its effects; omit the allusion.

In this research on the translation of English idioms into Indonesian (Machali, 2004), some of the aforementioned strategies were also used by the translators, that is, using an idiom of similar meaning and form; using similar idiom
but dissimilar in form; paraphrasing and omission. There seem to be similarities in the strategies used in these two studies. However, Bahrami’s study was more extensive because it involves quantitative analysis in addition to the qualitative.

The above studies are both linguistic in nature, without involving cultural consideration in addition to the linguistic inquiry. Therefore, this paper is an attempt to examine other strategies in translation studies, particularly those that are concerned with the translation of culture. In recent years, there has been a discussion over the translation of culture, that is, how can culture be translated. Of the main strategies that have been proposed and debated over are: domestication and foreignization. Of course there are other terms that have been used instead of these, for example ‘acculturation’ instead of domestication (Bassnett, 2005). For purposes of contrast, the terms ‘domestication’ is used here rather than acculturation, for purposes of contrasting it with foreignization.

**Translation as a form of cultural communication: To domesticate or to foreignize?**

Discussion in this paper will be focused on strategies and views that emphasise cultural translation. The process of cultural translation is not different from the translation process in general, in the sense that it should consider the target reader, aim of translation and power relations between the source and target languages. These considerations also play an important role in cultural translation and with differing levels of significance. Therefore, the question “can culture be translated?” should really be rephrased into “how is culture translated”, which will be discussed later in the light of translations cases that have been published, involving Indonesian-English language pair.

In general terms, cultural translation is often considered as a notion that is often used as an alternative against linguistic translation. This has been a long debate in the translation world, but we are not going to enter into this in this paper. Instead, the focus here will be on cultural translation and the strategies that can be used in such translation. Among the strategies discussed here are: domestication and foreignization.

The metaphor ‘translation’ in cultural studies indicates that all communication acts that are carried out through language are essentially translation acts, involving two cultures. This is in line with what Bhabha (1994) says, that is, translation is essentially cultural communication. To him, language is a form of intercultural communication, which always has to deal with ‘foreignness’, in the sense that there are always elements that are untranslatable. In line with Bhabha, Venuti also asserts that translation practice is cultural communication, but the culture itself has been recast in a way that is different from its original. This is what has been referred to as domestication, which means that the foreign elements in the text have been recast into elements that are familiar to the target readers, as Venuti says:

“…foreign text is rewritten in domestic dialects and discourses, registers and styles, which results in the production of textual effects that signify only in the history of the domestic language and culture” (Venuti, 2000:471)

In other words, the translated version is only a ‘domesticated understanding of the foreign text’ (p. 469). Therefore, Venuti further says that the domestication process has limited and redirected communicative aim of translation. But in doing so, adds Venuti, the different cultures should not cause the exclusion of foreign elements. Rather, the translation process should foster communication, not simply domesticating foreign elements. In the translation cases that are discussed, it can be seen at the end of the paper differing from Venuti, the exclusion of foreign elements are for both reasons: domesticating the elements as well as for fostering communication.

In the interest of fostering communication, domestication is also often understood as a process where the message in the foreign text maybe reduced and replaced with a target text (that is, domestic text) that contains “foreign” nuances. Venuti (1995:469) views domestication as the domination of ‘Anglo-Americans translation culture’. To him:

... It involves ‘an ethno-centric reduction of the foreign text to Anglo-American cultural values’. This entails translating in a transparent, fluent, ‘invisible’ style in order to minimize the foreignness of the target text (bold face added)

The notion ‘reduction’ here needs to be explained further. In the translation cases discussed later at the end this article, there are cases that can be considered as some sort of reduction of meaning. However, in view of translation as cultural communication, the so-called reduction may not be necessarily seen as ‘ethno-centric reduction’, since it seems to be more an act of minimizing foreignness. For want of a better term, the word ‘reduction' will still be used in this paper mainly to mean ‘minimization of foreignness’.

In the context of cultural translation, Venuti also uses the terms “domestic remainder” to refer to aspects of the target text that have significance only in the context of the target text. On the technical level, the degree of the “domestic remainder” of a translation cannot be separated from the text coherence. Baker (1992:221) argues that text coherence is not something that is intrinsic in a text; instead it is concerned with reader’s...
ability to relate the text to aspects outside the text (that is, the aspects of context). Obviously, the context aspect is related to reader’s experience, either personal or cultural. The extent of coherence of the translated version to the cultural perception of the readers determines the “domestic remainder”. Therefore, the extent to which the target text can reflect source culture constitutes the attempts for maintaining the “internal coherence” of the source text, as well as reflecting the ability of the target culture in embracing the “foreign” element (that is the target culture element) into the translation.

Apart from Venuti (2000) also discusses aspects of domestication in the translation of idioms from Nigerian language into English. Appiah is of the opinion that translation is aimed at producing a new text that is understood by the (new) target readers in the same way it has been understood by the source readers. Appiah suggests that domestication is necessary in the production of the new text (that is, the target text). So he suggests that translators do more than mere translation proper. For example he suggests that the translator replaces “Nigerian view” with “English view”, and he also suggests that the translator “expands” English cultural system by including foreign elements from Nigerian idioms into English culture, and this in our terminology would be a case similar to foreignization, for example when words such as ‘yum cha’ that has entered English vocabulary. On checking the Macmillan dictionary, ‘yum cha’ is put under ‘noun’ to mean ‘a Chinese lunch in the Cantonese style where people go to a restaurant to have China tea and Cantonese snacks (dimsum), which are usually served from trolleys pushed around the restaurant by waiters’ (http://www.macmillandictionary.com)

When faced with a Chinese original text, for example, that contains this foreign concept, a translator that translates the text into English can choose to keep the original term, namely to use the strategy of foreignization but probably by providing a context for it, depending on what the text is about and what the purpose of the translation is. For example if the text is about an occasion of business lunch and the purpose of the translation is for informing readers about the content of the text, then the translation can be ‘business yum cha lunch’. Since ‘yum cha’ is a popular concept, ‘foreignization’ seems to be an appropriate strategy. In fact, such strategy has also been employed by the translator (see the discussion on translation cases).

These processes require more than just inter-cultural communication, because translation is inseparable from why and how we try to make “other” culture understood. In the cause of this study, we shall examine how domestication has occurred and also examine what ‘power’ a translator has over such domestication. On the opposite, we shall examine how a translation is also a manifestation of another power, that is, the translation takes the form of foreignization rather than domestication. However, before discussing these cases, a brief discus-

On the notions of culture, language and power

The attempts to understand the “other” culture in the form of “Cultural translation” as explained above is meshed in the power relations that exist in the source and target contexts of the text. As a concept borrowed from Foucault (1982), power relations indicate a way for modifying actions, not simply implementing the power itself. According to Foucault, power relations are a mode of action that has direct impacts. In other words, the existence of power (for example, as manifested in a particular text) limits the scope of an action.

Both domestication and foreignization involve power relations. In the context of translation, power relations that exist between the source and the target contexts constitute relations between language and culture, that is, something that reflects representations in the culture. Representations of self identity in the two cultures have both created impacts and can cause a clash of representations. Power relations between the source and target contexts are unequal, for example while English is an international language, Indonesian is not. So, a translator working from Indonesian to English or from English to Indonesian has to consider this unequal relation when he/she translates and has to be aware of how this may affect the translation process and product.

An example of this interrelation can be seen in the decision of books or novels to be translated and the purpose of the translation. In Indonesian context, the decision about which book to translate and from which language, is almost entirely dependent on the publisher with its monetary considerations. From a discussion in the mailing list of Indonesian translators (called Baghera), it is clear that publishers tend to choose books or novels that are popular in the English world. The greatest percentage would be to translate from English into Indonesian (rather than the opposite). The first and foremost important basis of decision would be whether or not the (English) book or novel is popular. The expectation is: if the original book or novel is popular, the translation would sell well. The economic aspect of the decision goes hand-in-hand with aspects of representation in the translation. The publisher has the power to determine how the original source (English) culture should be represented in the Indonesian version.

There can be a clash of representation in the translation between that of the publishers and that of the translators. A very clear example would be the translation of the novel Harry Potter into Indonesian. Indonesian readers find the Indonesian version to be full of cases of foreignization, which is, retaining the English words and phrases. Even in cases where formal correspondence can be found between English and Indonesian for
particular words, the publisher insists that the English version is used instead. For examples, for the words ‘Mr’ and ‘Mrs’, the closest translation would be ‘Tuan’ (Mr) and ‘Nyonya’ (Mrs). However, Mr and Mrs are used instead, and on reading the translated version, readers may feel like riding through a very bumpy road. So, publisher’s power becomes the overriding principle in the choice of translation strategy by the translator.

While (literary) fame can also be used as reason for the translation of Indonesian work into English, the basis for choice decision is usually not for monetary value. An example of this would be the translation of novels by the dissident writer Pramoedya Ananta Toer into English, which was undertaken by a publisher in Malaysia when the novels were banned in Indonesia. However political solidarity such as this is not the only reason for translating Indonesian work into English. Another reason would be for fostering cultural communication, as is the case with the translation of work presented and discussed below. In this kind of translation, the translator can often exercise his power more freely than when the purpose of translation is for monetary value.

CASES IN THE TRANSLATION OF INDONESIAN INTO ENGLISH AND VICE VERSA

Procedure

The texts being examined here are Indonesian poems that have been translated into English. They have been translated by professional translators (McGlynn and Kratz, 1990) and have been published in the form of an anthology titled Walking Westward in the Morning: Seven Contemporary Indonesian Poets, published by The Lontar Foundation, Jakarta (1990:68-110). The purpose of the translation and publication is mainly to introduce to the world the work of Indonesian writers “that these writers saw themselves as part of a bigger world and thus shared the cultures of that world” (p. xii of the anthology).

The book contains 98 poems written by seven poets, ranging from short poems (four lines) to a two-page long poem. Of the seven poets, one is a woman poet, who has written 15 poems in the book. Only the poems that contain Javanese words Sanskrit names are selected and presented here for discussion. The reason for this selection is because the Javanese words and Sanskrit names carry cultural meaning. Of the seven poets, only two have used Javanese words and concepts in their poems, namely Linus G Suryadi and Toeti Heraty. In Indonesia, Suryadi “....is known for his heavy use of his native Javanese” (page 15 of the anthology). Heraty is also a Javanese and probably that is why she uses Javanese in her poems.

Research questions

How are domestication and foreignization used as strategies in the translation of cultural notions in the poems? How do the translations reflect or not reflect the ‘power’ that the translators have over how the translation has been done.

The Data selection (SLTs and their corresponding TLTs)

The most helpful thing of the book is that the poems are presented side by side, with the SL poem on the right side and the translated version on the left. So, they are presented as comparative corpora that make them easier to contrast. As stated earlier, only poems containing Javanese cultural markers are selected. Of the 15 poems that Heraty has written, only one contains extensive use of Javanese cultural concepts, so the focus will be in this poem “Surat dari Oslo” (a letter from Oslo) which was written while she was there.

Suryadi’s poems, however, have no such extensive use of Javanese in any one poem, but he uses Javanese and words from the Ramayana epic freely in some poems. Also, on scanning the translated versions, these words from the Ramayana epic have been foreignized and no domestication strategy has been used. Probably, this is due to the fact that Western readers or other readers are familiar with such epics. So, for these reasons, Heraty’s poem is discussed under domestication while Suryadi’s under foreignization. For comparative purposes in cases of foreignization, some examples are also taken from a study by Zulfadli (2004) on the translation of Harry Potter’s the Sorcerer’s Stone, for the purpose of making a point regarding publisher’s power.

Presentation

Cases of domestication

As stated earlier, the following is a fragment of a poem written by an Indonesian Woman poet, Toeti Heraty, “A Letter from Oslo”. Here only the fragments containing cultural components are presented, leaving out the rest. Cultural components in texts are normally very closely related to the writer’s experience and perception of the world (world views), for example, concerning how she views social relations, gender relations, etc. Therefore, when such components are translated into another language with very different cultural backgrounds, changes of meaning and domestication are bound to occur.

SL Poem: Surat dari Oslo (“A Letter from Oslo”)

Fragment 1 set the scene of what the poem is about. Before discussing what is expressed in the poem it is probably best to discuss further the writer’s background, so as to understand her poems better. Heraty is one of the Indonesian prominent women poets whose writings often centre on her personal experience, particularly those concerned with women and their world (Heraty, 1982:6). “She often touches upon the topics of love and marriage in a subtle way” (Heraty, op cit).

Her poems, apart from showing this aspect of her life, they also reflect her other self, that is, being Javanese. This is shown by her frequent reference and use of Javanese (words), apparently to show this aspect of identity and her attachment to the Javanese culture (for example, the words printed in italics in the aforementioned fragment). Therefore, this should be given special consideration in translation, mainly because of its ‘foreignness’ that is not understood by non-Javanese readers.

As can probably be roughly understood from the translated version, the poem is an expression of Heraty’s feeling of the marriage of her friend’s child. In many parts of the poem she uses Javanese words to refer to certain cultural concepts in the Javanese marriage ceremony, which would otherwise have been hard to express in Indonesian language with equivalent effect. In Javanese, as is reflected in the poem, marriage has two aspects: the personal and family aspect, and the social. In Fragment 1, the underlined phrase ‘jejer-jejer ngagem sinjang’ is about the family aspect and togetherness, and the literal rendering of the phrase is ‘(standing) side-by-side wearing the Javanese traditional clothes’.

The Javanese family togetherness expressed in the Javanese phrase has been translated into ‘flanking the bride and groom– the
**Fragment 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT 1</th>
<th>TLT 1 (Fragment 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sudah kuterima surat undangan</td>
<td>(1) I received the invitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Terima kasih, jadi anakmu akan menikah?</td>
<td>(2) Thank you. So, your daughter is getting married?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Baru ini kali terima berita, ah, ternyata,</td>
<td>(3) This is the first word of it I’ve had. Well, it seems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) anak-anak kita telah merasa cukup dewasa.</td>
<td>(4) Our children feel themselves sufficiently grown-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Katakkan saja sebagian tugasmu selesai sudah</td>
<td>(5) Just consider that a part of your duty is done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) dan tentu selamat saya ucapkan,</td>
<td>(6) and, of course give my regards, I can see you all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) terbayang, kalian mendampingi penganten jejer-jejer ngagem sinjang</td>
<td>(7) Flanking the bride and groom - the tintinnabulation of gongs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) tak sempat terharu barangkali, terlalu sibuk</td>
<td>(8) behind you - no chance even for emotion, perhaps,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) semua harus berlangsung sesuai rancangan</td>
<td>(9) being too busy making sure everything proceeds as planned (underlining added)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Numbering is just for ease of reference in the discussion
2. The words printed in italics in the poem are the writer’s (Javanese words)-- underlining added.

**Fragment 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLT 2- Fragment 2</th>
<th>TLT2 - Fragment 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) Lalu kini, siraman air kembang dahulu, <em>midodareni</em></td>
<td>(10) And now, the sprinkle of the blessed water - rose petals fall with the water from an earthen jug-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) sebelum esok menghadap penghulu -Tarub, janur, gamelan dan gending kebo giro</td>
<td>(11) before facing God and his servant tomorrow the nuptial awnings, woven palm leaves, the orchestra and wedding songs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) penganten bertemu, berlempar sirih, <em>wijidadi</em></td>
<td>(12) the bridal couple meets, betel leaves thrown in exchange.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. *midodareni* = the eve of the wedding day, when the bride is accompanied by her (girl)friends.
2. *wijidadi* = a meeting between a bachelor and a girl in a wedding ceremony.
3. *kebogiro* = A gamelan orchestral tone played to accompany the meeting procession between the bride and the groom and their respective companies (usually members of the extended family).

sound of the gongs’ (underlined) in English. This underlined phrase has been added, apparently to provide a context for the foreign phrase. However, there is a side effect to this. What is perceived as something essentially concerned with ‘subjects’ (that is, family) has been ‘translated’ into objects in the English version (underlined), which is probably due to the sound of the Javanese musical instruments played during (parts of) the ceremony. This, in a way, seems to imply that the ceremony is merely an object to see than something social or familial. With due respect to the translator(s), they seem to domesticate meaning in this case, in accordance with the perspective of the Westerner(s). Dingwaney and Carol have objected to this kind of representation, because it is:

‘...entail[ing] varying degrees of violence...[in which] alien cultural forms or concepts or indigenous practices are recuperated (translated) via a process of familiarization... whereby they are denuded of their ‘foreignness.’” (1995:24)

So, according to the above opinion, the TLT version has shown a degree of ‘violence’ to the original text. In a similar way, to refer to Venuti’s (1995:469) views and terms quoted earlier in this article; this domestication indicates a *reduction*, that is, that an aspect of culture (representing togetherness) has been ‘reduced’ into a mere entertainment. I disagree with Venuti for referring to this occurrence as ‘ethno-centric’. In view of fostering communication in cultural translation, the translator has merely provided a context to create coherence with the world outside of the text. However, it is unfortunate that the English version focuses on ‘things’ rather than ‘people’.

A similar (mis)representation is also found in another fragment of the poem (Fragment 2).
It can be seen from the second fragment, that, unlike Western wedding ceremonies that are usually held in the church, Javanese weddings can be held at home, and the religious functionary ‘penghulu’ in (11) can usually come to the bride’s house to legalise the marriage, in the presence of invited guests and witnesses. Here, what is emphasised is the social meaning of the occasion, rather than the sacred or ritual meaning; it is a social announcement that a man and a woman can live together legally after the marriage. It is a very important aspect in the culture that a man and a woman can only live together after marriage and consensual living together without marriage constitutes a cultural anomaly. For this reason, the social meaning is important.

On observing the SL for this Fragment 2, an explanation needs to be provided here: On the eve of the wedding day [sentence (10)], there are two important events, that is, siraman and midodareni. While the first is concerned with blessings from the elders and older family members by sprinkling the bride with blessed water, the second is concerned with social gathering, that is, when the bride’s girlfriends accompany her for the night.

Then the wedding day itself is held [sentence (11)], when the bride and the groom face the penghulu ‘the religious functionary’. The day is described as one accompanied with the traditional Javanese music (gamelan, gending, etc.) and ornaments (tarub, janur). And then, the bride and the groom meet by throwing betel leaves at each other [sentence (12)].

At any stage, the ceremony is an indication of social and family gathering, a social pronouncement that the two are legally married, not a mere consensual living together. Although the presence of the religious functionary may indicate that the ceremony is religious, the whole event is in fact more for purposes of legality.

Having examined the second fragment of the poem, we now examine the English version (TLT 2). Once again, there is a difference of representation here. In (10), while the blessing and the social gathering together are two important events in the eve of the wedding day in the SL poem, it is the blessing (rather than the social gathering) that is emphasised in the English version. In (11), it’s the legalisation aspect that is important in the SL poem, but in the English version it’s the social aspect. Again, a case of domestication occurs here: in the Western (that is, English) wedding ceremony, it is this aspect of sacredness that is often emphasised, as well as the fact that it is usually held in church. In addition, it is a fact that in the English version there are ‘wedding songs’ accompanying the wedding ceremony, while in the SL poem it is the orchestra, that is, the sound of the Javanese traditional musical instruments, with no lyrics, often said to carry a mystical force, one strongly believed by the Javanese and forms a part of the culture.

It can be said that in order for the translation to be understood by the target readers and for these readers to be able to ‘relate’ to their own world experience, the translator has chosen to domesticate meaning. As such, the publisher (and the original writer) apparently has given such power to the translator. This will be discussed further below, after discussing the opposite notion to domestication, that is, foreignization.

Presentation

Cases of foreignization, accompanied by addition or omission

As an opposite to cases of domestication above, there are also cases of foreignization in the translation. Some very obvious cases and examples are found in the translation of Suryadi’s poems. The strategies used in the translation of Suryadi’s Javanese words are basically of two kinds, which are the strategies that are said to occur in Bahrami’s data (Bahrami, at the beginning of this paper): they are (1) omission; (2) retaining the foreign words plus explicitation or just retaining them.

Omission and addition

In Fragment 3, ‘bunga’ (flower) is translated but the word ‘Nirwana’ is omitted, probably because the translator does not see it as necessary, since the omission does not affect general meaning. However, the word ‘Bali’ is added to the name ‘Besakih’, apparently to make it explicit that the temple is in Bali.

Retention and sometimes accompanied by an explicitation

For titles (SLT 4 and 5) (Fragments 4 and 5), apparently, the
translator(s), being Indonesian speaking foreigners, must have considered that English readers would be familiar with it as a scene from the Ramayana where ‘Setiowati’ appears as a prominent character for this scene. Therefore, they are retained. Interestingly, the place ‘Prambanan’ in (SLT4) is made explicit that it is a place and ‘Ramayana’ has also been explicit that it is ‘Ramayana relief’ rather than the drama/show. In contrasting these translations with those involving domestication, no particular perspectives and views are involved in this foreignization. The translator’s choice to delete or add words has apparently been for purposes of clarifying meaning.

FINDINGS AND COMPARATIVE DATA

To domesticate or to foreignize?

There are two main findings that can be drawn from the above comparative presentation. The first finding is that when the translator chooses to domesticate meaning, the translation is smooth and becomes highly readable, because the foreign words have been translated. The translator has the power to put his/her own interpretation into the foreign words. This has been made possible because the publisher does not interfere in the process. In fact, one of the translators himself is a member of the publication team. Therefore, the translator’s power is extensive in the sense that he can include what he perceives as his readers’ expectations when they read his translation. This is clearly a case of cultural translation, where the emphasis is in fostering communication. It has been found here that in fostering such communication, there may be a reduction of meaning to an extent that target readers are prioritized over ‘correct’ rendering of meaning.

The same power is also mandated to the translator in the foreignization cases above, where he can choose to use the foreign words and retain them in the translation, and he sometimes also added words, apparently for providing context in understanding the foreign words. However, there are clear cases where foreignization is not dictated by the translator’s choice but by the publisher. For comparison, a different kind of translation is presented below, which are cases in the direction of English→Indonesian translation of one of the Harry Potter novels (Zulfadli, 2004, p. 21).

Back-translated from Indonesian into English

Uncle Vernon, who has already been very pale, mumbles something that sounds like ‘mimbelwimbel’ (Fragment 6).

The word ‘mimbelwimbel’ has been retained in the Indonesian version, thus making it visible that it is translation as well as making it sound foreign to Indonesian readers. It is possible to translate it using a word that is almost homophonous when uttered, such as ‘grundel-grundel’ [pronounced (grooondle-groondle)] in Indonesian that means to complain in murmuring unclear sound. However, the translator has chosen to foreignize it as such.

Although it does not hamper readers’ understanding of the text, it raises questions as to why the translator does it for such a simple word where it is easy to find a word with equivalent value. As it turns out, the translator has a list from the publisher of the original text that contains words and phrases that should not be translated (Zulfadli, op cit). This clearly indicates how the publisher has power over cultural representations in text and over translation strategy. Even for simple words such as Mr and Mrs in English should be retained, although formal correspondences are readily available in the target language (that is, Indonesian).

Back-translated from Indonesian into English

Mr. and Mrs. Dursley who lives in Privet Drive number four is proudly declaring that they are normal people, fortunately (Fragment 7).
As is obvious from the translation (the back-translation, the English expression has been used as the norm.

There is no reason why the terms ‘Mr,’ And ‘Mrs,’ should be retained. Clearly, there are perfect equivalents for ‘Mr,’ and ‘Mrs.’ in Indonesian, such as ‘Tuan’ and ‘Nyonya’ or borrowed from kinship words ‘Bapak’ and ‘Ibu’ (that is, kinship words used as honorics). The fact that the English version is retained once again indicates that it fosters an English-language version of the world, thus eliding cultural differences.

Upon contacts with the translator, apparently, it is the publishers’ decision in this case whether or not to retain the English form. As it was stated somewhere in this paper, the issue is not whether or not culture can be translated but how it is translated. In view of cultural translation for fostering communication, the translator should have been given a mandate (that is, power) to decide which translation strategy is better. This brings us back to the question: how much or how little power does a translator have in translation?

**DISCUSSION**

The translator’s ‘power’ and its extent, as well as the ways of presenting interpretation

In view of how publishers dictate meaning as shown above, we are still faced with the notion of choice: whether translators can show his/her ‘colour’ in the translation. How much ‘power’ does s/he have in this case? In Venuti’s terminology, it is about how visible or invisible can a translator be in the translation. However, the concept of power itself can have a far-reaching effect, particularly when double translation is involved. On referring to the domesticated meaning of ‘togetherness’ in SL1 Fragment 1 into ‘entertainment’ in TLT 1 Fragment 1, we can imagine how the cultural reduction entailed in the translated text can become a ‘permanent identity’. When the English version was given to a group of upper level student translators to translate into Indonesian, they retain the meaning represented in the poem, that is, that the wedding is a part of an entertainment. Of course these translators were not told of the fact that they were doing ‘double translation’.

As far as translator training is concerned, it is certainly not a good idea for providing students with a text that result in double translation. However, I did this just to make a point, that is, that domestication may cause chain reaction (as is the case with Western perspective of the word ‘jihad’ mentioned elsewhere in this paper).

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

As mentioned in the abstract, this article examines how cultural translation is interrelated with the notions of domestication, foreignization and power. To do this, the article discusses the translation of texts that contain cultural elements in literary genre, which have been translated by professional translators. Many studies have been carried out in the area of translating cultural aspects in Indonesian translation, but most have been analysed using the linguistic or discourse framework. In this study a different conceptual framework has been used, that is, that concerned with domestication and foreignization. This conceptual framework has been used both as translation strategies as well as analytical strategies for a number of years, particularly since Bassnett and Andre (1990) published an anthology Translation, History and Culture. They made a kind of manifesto, where they say that there is a need to shift emphasis on translation studies, which they call “cultural turn” where cultural studies are combined with translation studies.

However, not much has been written in the area of cultural translation that involves English-Indonesian language pair. In this article, a preliminary work has been done as a critical inquiry into the possibility of using the notions domestication and foreignization as analytical tool in examining Indonesian-English translations and vice versa. It has been found in this preliminary inquiry that:

1. Confirming Venuti and Bhabba that translation is essentially cultural communication, and the foreign elements have been recast into expressions that are familiar to the target readers. In addition to confirming this occurrence, the translation cases have also shown a case of ‘ethno-centric reduction’ of cultural values, which Venuti asserts as occurring in domestication vis-à-vis the domination of ‘Anglo-American translation culture’. In fact, the Indonesian cases of foreignization also have indicated this ‘English domination’ in the texts involving particular honorifics in the translation of Harry Potter. The English domination is indicated by the publisher’s instruction to retain the English original words in the translation, even when the Indonesian versions are readily available.

2. It also has confirmed that domestication is a way of fostering communication; unless the foreign elements are ‘domesticated’, they would not be as accessible to the target readers. However, as Venuti has indicated as occurring in the Anglo-American translation culture, domestication in the Indonesian-English translation has also entailed ‘reduction’ of meaning in the interest of ‘invisible’ style of translation and minimizing the foreignness.

3. This kind of ‘reduction’ of meaning is heavily criticized by Dingwaney and Carol who refer to this phenomenon as ‘violence’, in the sense that in the interest of familiarization, the original forms or concepts have been ‘denuded’ of their foreignness.

4. The article has also shown that there is a Western perspective in the translation of Fragment 2 of the poem, and so we can say that domestication entails westernization, at least in this preliminary data. It is important to note here that it does not mean that the
translator intentionally produces such discourse. With due respect to the translator(s), the aim of the translation is for informing global readers about Indonesian poets and their work.

5. Both domestication and foreignization are interrelated with 'power'. As mentioned elsewhere in this article, power relation is unequal, and the inequality is shown by the fact that English is an international language while Indonesian is a language that does not have such a wide readership. It has been shown in this article that even when there are formal correspondences (as in the use of honorifics) between English and Indonesian, the forms being used are English (as in the case of Harry Potter’s translation). It has been found that this is due to the publisher’s power to dictate the translation process.

However, a translator also has used the foreignization strategy in the translation involving the Ramayana epic in Suryadi’s poems (for example cases of SLTs 4 and 5). The translator has exercised his/her power to choose foreignization when the SLT contains names or places that known to readers. Apparently, the translator thinks that readers can predict meaning from context and content of the text.

6. It has been found that the translator’s power (or mandate) has a lot to do with domestication. This has raised the issue of the extent of his/her power to reduce or add meaning in translation, and how much s/he can add and/or reduce it.

It is recommended, on the basis of the aforementioned conclusions and findings that cultural translation is taught as a part of the general curriculum of translator training. While subjects such as text analysis using socio-semiotic linguistic framework remains an important aspect of the curriculum, it is good to add aspects of ‘cultural translation’ in the upper-level or postgraduate level, not just for purposes of analysis and studies but also in translation workshops, mainly to see what further impacts it may have outside of the translation realm, eg in publication of translation.

The general curriculum here means that in addition to the general training of producing ‘good’ translation, trainees can also exercise their power of producing translation that involves his/her interpretation which may result in ‘domestication’ of meaning. Such domestication does not necessarily involve ‘Western’ perspective.
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