



The Impact of Ideologies on the Translator's Work: A Conceptual Reflection and Application

El impacto de las ideologías en trabajo del traductor: una reflexión conceptual y su aplicación

HENRIETA KUZDEROVÁ

University of Presov / Prešovská univerzita v Prešove. Ul. 17. Novembra 1. 08078
Prešov. Slovensko / Slovakia.

Dirección de correo electrónico: henrieta.kuzder@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1109-7090>

KLAUDIA BEDNÁROVÁ-GIBOVÁ

University of Presov / Prešovská univerzita v Prešove. Ul. 17. Novembra 1. 08078
Prešov. Slovensko / Slovakia.

Dirección de correo electrónico: klaudia.gibova@unipo.sk

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6555-4464>

Recibido: 19/3/2021. Aceptado: 9/11/2021.

Cómo citar: Kuzderová, Henrieta and Klaudia Bednárová-Gibová, «The Impact of Ideologies on the Translator's Work: A Conceptual Reflection and Application», *Hermēneus. Revista de Traducción e Interpretación*, 23 (2021): 31-67.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24197/her.23.2021.31-67>

Abstract: This paper addresses the translator's role from an ideological standpoint and seeks to show that the actions of translators are not completely arbitrary and may be influenced by a wide array of factors and especially ideologies. The basic assumption is that translators can detach texts neither from the ideologies of the source nor the target culture. This study results from qualitative research, namely a critical conceptual analysis of the selected theories of translation studies (Baker, 2006; Lefevere, 1992; Venuti, 1995). The conceptual reflection implies that translations serve as an infinite source of culture and history, serving the target but not the source culture. The critical discourse analysis of English translations of two selected novels that contain the ideologies of socialist and post-socialist era, and the Nazi ideology, suggests that the tendencies in translation strategies vary depending on diffusion of the languages, and awareness of the target culture and history.

Keywords: Ideology, literary translation, translator, translation strategies, neutralization, foreignization, *The Tin Drum*, *Rivers of Babylon*.

Resumen: El artículo profundiza en el rol del traductor desde un punto de vista ideológico y pretende mostrar que las acciones de los traductores no están completamente en sus manos y que se ven influenciadas por una amplia gama de factores, especialmente ideológicos. La suposición básica es que los traductores no pueden separar los textos ni de las ideologías de origen ni de la cultura de destino. Este estudio es el resultado de una investigación cualitativa, concretamente, un análisis conceptual crítico de las teorías seleccionadas de los estudios de traducción (Baker, 2006; Lefevere, 1992; Venuti, 1995). La reflexión conceptual insinúa que las traducciones sirven como una fuente infinita de cultura e historia, que sirve a la cultura del

destino y no a la cultura de origen. El análisis crítico del discurso de las traducciones al inglés de dos novelas que llevan las ideologías de la era socialista y postsocialista, y la ideología nazi, sugiere que las tendencias en las estrategias de traducción varían según la difusión de los idiomas y la conciencia de la cultura y la historia de destino.

Palabras clave: Ideología, traducción literaria, traductor, estrategias de traducción, neutralización, extranjerización, *The Tin Drum*, *Rivers of Babylon*.

Summary: Introduction; 1. The concept of ideology: definitions and features; 2. Ideology in translation and translation studies, 2.1. Critical discourse analysis, 2.1.1. Selected insights into critical discourse analysis, 2.2. Translation theories concerning ideology, 2.2.1. The ideological turn, 2.2.2. Mona Baker's narrative theory; 2.2.3. André Lefevere's rewriting; 2.2.4. The translator's invisibility and ethnocentric violence by Lawrence Venuti), 2.3. The translator's ideological standing; 3. Translating ideology in *The Tin Drum* and *Rivers of Babylon*, 3.1. Translation strategies, 3.2. Research design, 3.2.1. Research question and hypotheses, 3.2.2. Methodology, 3.2.3. Corpus, 3.3. Analysis of translation strategies in *The Tin Drum* and *Rivers of Babylon*, 3.3.1. Economy, 3.3.2. Politics, 3.3.3. Power over people; Final thoughts; References.

Sumario: Introducción; 1. El concepto de ideología: definiciones y características; 2. Ideología en traducción y traductología, 2.1. Análisis crítico del discurso, 2.1.1. Perspectivas seleccionadas sobre el análisis crítico del discurso, 2.2. Teorías de la traducción sobre ideología, 2.2.1. El giro ideológico, 2.2.2. La teoría narrativa de Mona Baker, 2.2.3. La reescritura de André Lefevere, 2.2.4. La invisibilidad del traductor y la violencia etnocéntrica de Lawrence Venuti, 2.3. Posición ideológica de traductor; 3. Traducir ideología en *The Tin Drum* y *Rivers of Babylon*, 3.1. Estrategias de traducción, 3.2. Diseño de la investigación, 3.2.1. Pregunta e hipótesis de investigación, 3.2.2. Metodología, 3.2.3. Corpus, 3.3. Análisis de las estrategias de traducción utilizadas en *The Tin Drum* y *Rivers of Babylon*, 3.3.1. Economía, 3.3.2. Política, 3.3.3. Poder sobre las personas; Reflexiones finales; Referencias bibliográficas.

INTRODUCTION

The translator's role and the apparent objectivity of their work have been the subject of scholarly debates since time immemorial. In particular, discussions of this kind seem to have intensified even more in the wake of Wing-Kwong Leung's ideological turn (2006). The present study focuses on the role of the translator from an ideological angle, and tackles the issue whether translators are responsible mediators between cultures, capable of an objective reception and production of a text, only deformed by the bounds of language, thus overcoming an essentially romantic view of their translational activity. Building upon a premise that translators not only translate, but also consume ideologies and inject them into their *translatums*, the underlying assumption of this paper is that translators can detach texts neither from the ideologies of the source, nor the target culture.

In general, this study seeks to pinpoint ideologies, which can be inferred from the semioscape of Anglophone translation studies and

thereby determine the layers of its ideological substratum. In its application part, the study aims to identify translation solutions and strategies that capture ideological phenomena in the English translations of two selected novels, namely *The Tin Drum* by Nobel-prize winning German writer Günter Grass and *Rivers of Babylon* by Slovak author Peter Pišťanek, epitomizing two different ideologies.

The choice of the former novel has been motivated by our keen interest in the representation of the Nazi ideology in the English translation while the selection of the latter novel has been partly influenced by the cultural background of the authors of this study, providing us with an inspiring point of contrast for translational analyses and reflections.

Seen through critical-conceptual lenses, ideologically-minded processes can be interpreted as an essentially inherent part of a text-centric approach to translation. It should be emphasized at the outset of our critical-conceptual quest that in the theoretical part we use the term “ideology” devoid of its possible negative connotations, which are often linked to socio-political systems, control or coercive manipulation, as typical of Communist societies. Instead, we draw attention to a more neutral understanding of the term at hand to feature certain beliefs, norms and values that typify a cogent interpretational point of departure of a text-based world.

In order to accomplish the overriding aim in terms of methodology, qualitative research will be performed, more concretely a critical conceptual analysis of selected theories of translation studies in the theoretical part. The ensuing empirical part of the study shall centre on the application of the method of critical discourse analysis in identifying translation strategies in selected ideological thematic areas.

Ideology and literature have always been closely intertwined. As literary texts are preserved on the basis of language, which in turn carries a culture, *i.e.* an ideology, we maintain that texts carry ideologies. It appears virtually impossible to mark off literary texts from their spatial and cultural context. A text, whether it is a translation or an original, always results from a certain environment, a cultural space, thus taking on the elements of an ideology or even multiple ideologies. According to Zhang “no one can escape his own ideology, so that the absolute “faithful translation” is a utopia to be thought as the only translational strategy possible or allowable, because translation always takes place within a certain ideology and poetics” (2012: p. 758). A similar stance is taken by

Laš (2017) when he asserts that it is the selection of a piece of literature to be translated that already demonstrates the impossible neutrality of literature. This implies that translation is always ideological in one way or another.

1. THE CONCEPT OF IDEOLOGY: DEFINITIONS AND FEATURES

The lexeme *ideology* is reported to have entered the English language in the eighteenth century as a translation of its French counterpart *idéologue* to designate “the science of ideas” (Downing and Bazargan, 1991). The lexeme was used for the first time in 1796 during the times of the French Revolution by the French philosopher and politician André Destutt de Tracy (Heywood, 2008; Freedon, 2003). Intriguingly enough, there were attempts to treat ideology as science, since the lexeme *ideology* comprises the suffix *-logy*, which typically refers to a science, such as in words like psychology, biology. However, this meaning of the lexeme is now perceived as rather obsolete and ideology nowadays tends to be understood more as a worldview or a set of beliefs. One way or another, *ideology* is a term which undoubtedly escapes a straightforward definition. A possible semantic clarification may be found, for example, in political science as ideologies are mostly related to politics. Surprisingly, in political science, the main problem with this phenomenon is apparently the fact that there is no stable definition which could be generally accepted to denote ideology (Heywood, 2008), and several meanings are listed e.g. in Heywood’s flagship book *Political Ideologies*.

These semantic readings of the concept under discussion are now worthy of being explored further. Thus, ideology can be interpreted as “a system of political opinions, ideas of the ruling class, world-view of a certain class, group, or society, an abstract collection of political ideals” (Heywood, 2008: p. 23) (own translation from Slovak). As can be inferred from the definition, it stresses the presence of political undercurrents and different groups of society, which are differentiated from each other also by ideologies they incline to. Before a concise conceptualisation by Andrew Heywood is introduced, typical features of ideologies should be given in order to gain a deeper understanding of ideology. Hence, the three salient features of ideologies are as follows: “(a) they come with a certain evaluation of the current order, usually in a form of some ‘world-view’, (b) they propose a model of a desired future,

some vision of a 'good society', and (c) they clarify how the political change could and should come *i.e.* how to get from (a) to (b)." (Heywood, 2008: p. 30) (own translation).

Heywood (*ibid.*) draws upon the definitions by other theorists of political science, by Seliger, for instance, when trying to come up with a suitable explication for this elusive term. Martin Seliger (1976) understands ideology as "a certain set of ideas, by which people determine, clarify and reason aims and means of organized political actions to themselves, regardless of whether these political actions try to preserve, change, destroy or recreate the organization of society" (in Heywood, 2008: 29) (own translation). As can be inferred from the aforementioned, Seliger's interpretation lays emphasis on the importance of action and negotiation. This intimates that ideologies are neither positive nor negative (Heywood, 2008), thus being devoid of simplified black-and-white binary oppositions. However, this neutral approach is in contrast with the more common negative connotation associated with the lexeme ideology (Freeden, 2003). It stands to reason that people are not very keen on having their mindset associated with an ideology. As van Dijk states, "few of 'us' (in the West or elsewhere) describe our own belief systems or convictions as "ideologies". On the contrary, ours is the truth, theirs is the ideology" (van Dijk, 1998: p. 2). Regardless of this, every person experiences the impact of ideologies throughout their lives. People are influenced and affected by ideologies, often unconsciously, or rather subconsciously, and they tend to picture two worlds in themselves, the way they expect them to be, in marked contrast to the way they really are. People are only human beings and thus, they can never be fully objective. Each of us is a political thinker. Whenever people try to express their opinions or stances, words related to ideologies are used to formulate these standpoints of ours (Heywood, 2008). It could be assumed that being "ideological" does not necessarily have to equate with being "negative". As already explained, the original meaning of the lexeme ideology was "the science of ideas." Nevertheless, words may undergo semantic changes and alter connotations over time. This is also the case of the lexeme *ideology*. It has several collocations, which can be viewed as positive (*e.g.* ideology of progress), but they may also be subject to a rather negative perception, or may be related to politics and history (*e.g.* Nazi or socialist ideology). Ideologies are described as "opinions and doctrines which have a nature of either unquestionable dogmata or of a coat covering individual and group interests" (Heywood,

2008: p. 16) (own translation). This implies a rather negative connotation of political ideologies. Freedden confirms this in his own words by stating that ideology is “a word that evokes strong emotional responses” (2003: p. 1) and that not many people would like to be called ideologists. They seem to associate the word ideology with infamous “-isms” such as Communism and so forth (*ibid.*)

Finally, Andrew Heywood formulates a concise definition of ideology as follows: “Ideology is a more or less interconnected set of ideas, which become the basis of an organized political procedure, and it does not matter whether this procedure should preserve, change or destroy the current order” (2008: p. 29) (own translation). It is evident that the scholar grounded his definition on the clarification by Seliger (1976) and it can also be felt that his interpretation seems rather objective, and he is not hinting at a negative or positive side of political ideologies. A similar and quite neutral general definition of ideology can be found elsewhere. As briefly defined, for instance, by Freedden, a political ideology is “a set of ideas, beliefs, opinions, and values” (2003: p. 32). As can be seen, the most salient meaning of the term seems to always be closely connected to politics, nevertheless, *ideology* represents a broader term used in various areas of life.

Hence, the concept of ideology should be narrowed down and defined from the standpoint which is relevant for the purpose of this study. The term *ideology* was aptly defined by Hatim and Mason in *The Translator as Communicator* (1997). The scholars base their conceptualisation of ideology on the definition provided by Simpson (1993: p. 5) and view ideology as “tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups” (Hatim and Mason 1997: p. 120). In sum, all definitions provided so far emphasize the social aspect of the issue under discussion. It follows that ideology always emerges and only functions in a certain society, not as an isolated entity. In the realm of translation studies (henceforth TS), the notion of ideology and its aspects have been discussed from various points of view by many theorists such as André Lefevere (1992), Lawrence Venuti (1995), and Mona Baker (2006), to mention just a few. They look at ideology through several lenses such as pragmatic, cultural, socio-cultural and political, as well as from an interdisciplinary point of view. The selected theories are dissected in greater detail in section 2.2 of this study.

2. IDEOLOGY IN TRANSLATION AND TRANSLATION STUDIES

This section draws attention to diverse theories of TS which tackle the role of ideology in the translator's work. As for the methods and research strategies which are used for analyses of the impact of ideologies on language, one of the most suitable approaches seems that of the so-called *critical discourse analysis*. Its principles and major insights shall therefore be discussed below.

2. 1. Critical discourse analysis

Ideology and its influence on language, communication and discourse has been debated for a long time. These phenomena, vast and varied, have been explored within several fields of study focusing on the interplay between language, society and power. Prime examples of such fields are *sociolinguistics* and *critical linguistics*, to mention just a few. This perspective can also be applied when analysing translated texts and retrospectively the process of translation which led to the final product. As Barnes states, "translated texts can be read on different levels" (2014: p. 4). It is not only the level of a story and the plot that constitute a translated text. Readers can also look at the psychological characteristics of protagonists, for instance, to understand their deeds and motivation. Another level of reading consists in identifying the underlying ideology or even multiple ideologies. Critical discourse analysis is a research method which takes into consideration the relation of language, translation, and ideology. In many cases, however, language is studied "in a vacuum" *i.e.* with only a narrow-minded looking at a text and its words. It is a micro-analysis which is performed in this way. Although this is not how texts exist in a real world, it is the parole, as introduced by de Saussure (1916 / 1986), the actual manifestation of the language, that actually exists. Nothing is ideal, neither the production, nor the reception or interpretation of the text. It is a multifaceted phenomenon and process which ought to be viewed from several interlaced points of view.

Now, *critical discourse analysis* (hereafter CDA) as a method should be elucidated. CDA draws upon theories and approaches that emphasize the interaction and the unavoidable and undeniable connection among discourse, language, society and power. It sees language as "a form of social practice" (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997: p. 285). CDA "equips the reader and the analyst with the tools necessary to identify and demystify

texts in which discourse is engendered” (Barnes, 2014: p. 9). Fairclough (2001) explains that ideologies come to life through the practice of writing, editing, translating etc., as their agents form the discourse. A similar idea was expressed earlier by Lefevere (1992) who states that all these actions have the consequence of creating *rewritings*, which carry and spread ideologies. Language is where social practice comes to light. Janks cogently sums up the nature of CDA (1997: p. 1) as follows:

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) stems from a critical theory of language which sees the use of language as a form of social practice. All social practices are tied to specific historical contexts and are the means by which existing social relations are reproduced or contested and different interests are served. It is the questions pertaining to interests – How is the text positioned or positioning? Whose interests are served by this positioning? Whose interests are negated? What are the consequences of this positioning? – that relate discourse to relations of power. Where analysis seeks to understand how discourse is implicated in relations of power, it is called critical discourse analysis.

As implied above, CDA is an interdisciplinary field where several connections and parallels can be established between the fields focusing on similar issues (power, discourse, society). Some parallels can also be observed when linking the theories presented by Lefevere and Bourdieu and the CDA approach. The theory of *rewriting* and *patronage* by André Lefevere (1992) as well as the insights within the *sociology of translation* as provided by Pierre Bourdieu (1984) both focus on the notion of power and how the ones who hold the power within a society construct the canon, how they manipulate the discourse and what an important role in this respect is played by the ideology prevailing in a given society or culture.

2. 1. 1. Selected insights into critical discourse analysis

Many theorists concerned with CDA focus on the issue of translation and its connections to power, ideology, and language in their theories. In this section, the insights of selected theorists engaged in CDA are briefly discussed. As will be seen, they all view the issue of ideology and its impact on translation processes from a slightly different perspective.

In his book entitled *Language and Power* (1989), Norman Fairclough highlights the connections between three dimensions, which shall be all taken into consideration when analysing a text, and he aims for their integration. The three dimensions comprise (a) analysis of text, (b) analysis of the process of text production, consumption and distribution and (c) a sociocultural analysis of the discursive event as a whole (*ibid.*)

All these three elements are crucial in any analyses that are concerned with translations. It is never only a bare text that is examined. The whole process of its creation, reception, use, and function needs to be taken into account. What is also very important is the culture and society within which the texts are produced and perform their function. As Fairclough argues, CDA wants to, among other aims, “investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power” (Fairclough, 1995: p. 132).

In Fairclough's view, ideology is represented in the discourse and the language of the discourse embodies the ideology. He states that “ideologies reside in texts” and it is “impossible to read off ideologies from texts” (1995: p. 71). The reason for this is the fact that “meanings are produced through interpretations” (*ibid.*) and interpretations are highly, if not completely, dependent on the native culture of the person interpreting the text. This may bring about obstacles in the interpretation of translations. The ideology of the source text could easily be overlooked by the source culture reader as it is perceived as something “normal” because it is embedded in the source culture. Nevertheless, the ideology of the source text may easily remain misunderstood or overlooked by the target reader because of the fact that the target reader is not familiar with the source culture and ideology.

Another approach to CDA is taken by Teun van Dijk, who represents its key figure. He reiterates an idea that when performing a CDA, there is a typical “jargon” used such as *e.g. ideology, class, power, institutions, interests*. Van Dijk also lists discourse examples which can be of help when doing a CDA, *e.g. metaphors, pronouns, presuppositions, passive sentence structures etc.* (van Dijk, 2015). Before starting an analysis, one should be aware of the features of CDA. Van Dijk (*ibid.*) sums up the basic features of CDA as follows: (a) focusing on social problems and political issues, (b) performing a multidisciplinary analysis and (c) explaining discourse structures. The scholar also holds the view that

ideology consists of multiple layers. Therefore, he proposes his multidisciplinary theory of ideology (1998), stating that ideology is formed by three main elements. The first element is that of cognition which covers “thought and belief which go together to create ideas”. The second element is that of society which means “group interests, power and dominance”. The third element is that of discourse which stands for “language use which expresses ideologies in society, often involving concealment and manipulation” (in Munday, 2007: p. 196).

Michael Foucault, along with other theorists of *sociolinguistics* and social theory like Pierre Bourdieu or Antonio Gramsci, set the basis for the methodology of CDA. With hindsight, Foucault brought a new perspective on *power* by viewing it as “a relation of force that only exists in action” (Daldal, 2014: p. 1). Van Dijk argues that power is always present everywhere, *i.e.* also in texts and translations, and paraphrases Foucault’s (1980) ideas that “power may be enacted in the myriad taken-for-granted actions of everyday life” (van Dijk 2015: p. 469).

In addition, Lesley Jeffries is also concerned with *critical stylistics*, understood as a sub-branch of CDA. She is critical of a vague approach of some theorists towards CDA stating that they take a keener interest in the features of context, and not in the tools that texts use to attract and persuade the reader (Jeffries, 2010). She reflects on where the ideology is within a text, or rather, what the text is doing in order to present ideology and make it work for the reader. Not only does Jeffries focus on the fact that ideologies are embedded in texts and how they affect the reader, but she offers concrete strategies to search for when doing a CDA. The scholar introduces ten specific tools which are used by texts, or more precisely by their authors. These can be helpful to researchers when setting the categories of examples to be searched for in a text and subsequently further analysed.¹

A translational perspective on CDA is offered by Basil Hatim and Ian Mason. According to the Anglophone researchers, translation of a text that incorporates, and by doing so also presents, a certain ideology is certainly an onerous task for a translator. Although each and every text is more or less marked by ideology of the source culture, some texts may be

¹ Jeffries’ CDA tools comprise the following: “(a) naming and describing, (b) representing actions/events/states, (c) equating and contrasting, (d) exemplifying and enumerating, (e) prioritizing, (f) assuming and implying, (g) negating, (h) hypothesizing, (i) presenting the speech and thoughts of other participants, (j) representing time, space and society” (2010: p. 15).

suffused with ideology related to politics or other areas. Hatim and Mason (1997) discuss the way the translator handles the task of translating a text that is “marked” by ideology. They refer to it as *mediation* which they view as “the extent to which translators intervene in transfer process, feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into processing the text” (Hatim and Mason, 1997: p. 145). It should be stressed that translators need to balance this mediation and thoroughly analyse the source in the phase of interpretation of the source text in order to produce an adequate target text which shall function in the target culture.

Finally, Terry Locke (2004) points out the great importance of taking into consideration phenomena such as *ideology* and *power* when carrying out a CDA. Along with the analysis of the specific tools which the texts use to achieve certain goals, as suggested by Jeffries (2010), by applying Locke's partial tasks of CDA (2004), one can perform a reliable critical discourse analysis of a text, too. Locke breaks down the requirement of a complex analysis, as already called for by Fairclough (1989), into more detailed points and finally summarizes seven rules or tasks of CDA. These concern historically located and dynamic social order, pervasiveness of constrictions of social order, ideologically-coloured discourse, power in society as a consequence of particular discursive configurations, discursive construction of human subjectivity, textual and intertextual mediation of reality, discursive consolidation of power and colonization of human subjects (for more detail, see Locke, 2004: pp. 1-2).

As part of the hermeneutic process of translation, within the interpretation of the source text, translators shall perform a certain form of CDA in order to take stock of, among other things, the issues of *power* and *ideology*, the importance of which has been stressed by all theorists whose insights have so far been introduced. Texts are comprised of multiple “layers” and should therefore be approached in this way. To do a CDA, the “manuals” by Locke (2004), Jeffries (2010), and also van Dijk (2015) may be used, as they draw attention to many issues and examples which should be considered and searched for in a text, in order to perform a comprehensive CDA.

2.2. Translation theories concerning ideology

The notion of ideology can be viewed from multiple perspectives, and that of TS is no exception. This study's section centres, first and foremost, on the *ideological turn* in TS, the *narrative theory* by Mona Baker (2006), *the theory of rewriting* by André Lefevere (1992) as well as the theory of the *translator's invisibility* and *ethnocentric violence* by Lawrence Venuti (1995). All selected approaches treat the issue of ideology and its impact on translation processes from a considerably different perspective worth discussing.

2. 2. 1. *The ideological turn*

Although one of the first mentions and analyses of the “ideological turn” goes back to Wing-Kwong Leung (2006), Mary Snell-Hornby's (2006) merits should not be underestimated, either. According to the Vienna-based English scholar, the ideological “shifting viewpoint” followed the previous turns of TS such as the *linguistic turn* or the *cultural turn* (Snell-Hornby, 2006). In the 1960s, the theorists of translation focused mainly on the language as a system, hence the *linguistic turn*. Later, culture became the central issue when discussing the problems of translation and it was emphasized that it was culture that was transferred in the process of translation, not just the mere text, hence the *cultural turn* in TS. Subsequently, translation came to be perceived as a “cross-cultural event”, not just a sole exchange of words, but an exchange of culture, as propounded by Mary Snell-Hornby (1995). TS theorists have for quite some time turned their attention to discussing the interplay of translation, society, and ideologies within the study of translation, as ideologies play a key role in the process of translation as well as in reading *translatums*. Thus, the so-called *ideological turn* of TS has dominated the streams of scholarly discussions for a long time.

2. 2. 2. *Mona Baker's narrative theory*

In Baker's view (2006), ideologies contribute to the creation of the so-called *narratives*. This means that they are impacting and forming the narratives of people's lives. By this, *meta-narratives* or the so-called *master narratives* are meant, the ideas having a great impact, which sometimes influences the whole world (e.g. the idea of progress; the newer, the better etc.). However, individual or personal narratives all

individuals live by, the “smaller” narratives, are also influenced by ideologies as well as by the grand narratives.

According to Baker (*ibid.*), *conflict* is something that is always present in life. Conflict provides space for presenting *power*. The scholar sees the conflict as part and parcel of everyday life, not as something exceptional or unusual, nor as something negative, as the connotations might perfunctorily suggest. Translation plays an important role in this tension, because it spreads *narratives*. Baker explains the term narrative as “the everyday stories we live by” (2006: p. 3). She distinguishes four types of narratives, namely ontological narratives, public narratives, conceptual narratives, and meta-narratives. The *ontological narratives* are the smallest ones, understood as personal or individual narratives. Bigger than the ontological narratives are the *public narratives* which are formed in larger units such as family or nation. The third type of narratives, bigger than the previous ones, are the *conceptual narratives* which are related to a certain profession or a field of study. The greatest narratives are called *meta-narratives*, containing significant ideologies. The “size” of these narrative types is an attribute based on how large a group of people carrying a narrative is.

All of the four above-mentioned types of narratives are influenced by ideologies, and at the same time they create ideologies. No single person, let alone translators, who work with texts and transfer those among cultures, can “escape” these narratives, because they are embedded in our life. Hence, it is impossible to separate the work of translators and the results of their work, *i.e.* translations, from ideology. Baker states that “every time a version of the narrative is retold or translated into another language, it is injected with elements from other, broader narratives circulating within the new setting or from the personal narratives of the retellers” (Baker, 2006: p. 22). In one of her inspiring lectures (2013), she further advocates the use of a *narrative approach to TS*.² She maintains that TS should be taken a look at from a slightly different perspective. The traditional concern with *equivalence* and the assumption of *neutrality*, as symptomatic for descriptive TS and its by-gone linguistic stage, should be replaced with different viewpoints, such as perceiving translated texts as parts of both source culture and target culture, and also as parts of other texts. A narrative approach should,

² Online lecture available at <https://www.methods.manchester.ac.uk/themes/qualitative-methods/narrative-analysis/>.

besides other pros, intertextually link separate texts to other texts and events.

2. 2. 3. *André Lefevere's rewriting*

The recurrent questions such as who a translator is or what the tasks of a translator are have not been fully answered to this day despite their constant conjugation. Taking into consideration how many tasks a translator does – (reflexive) interpretation, analysis, transformation, reformulation, to name just a few – this is understandable. Some theorists, however, seem to concur with a simplified interpretation of the translator's mission, and see him / her as a *mediator* (Katan, 1999) between the two cultures. This stance might suggest that this mediation is purely objective and non-problematic, that the translator is able to grasp the message of the source text and smoothly transfer it into the target language, and by doing so ensures a successful cultural mediation. However, this mediation is not as straightforward as it may seem at first glance. The production of literature is governed by many controllers. Lefevere in his now classic work *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992) claims that literature, including translations, is governed and controlled. His theories, going back to the tendencies of systems theories, build bridges to the *cultural turn* and interdisciplinary TS theories which emphasize the role of culture in translation practice.

Lefevere (1992) maintains that literature is controlled by three main “forces” or factors. The first force is represented by respected authors and *professionals* working in the field of literature *i.e.* critics, translators. They hold the power to decide, whether a work is of sufficient quality to be published and contribute to literature. The second force, which Lefevere dubs as *patronage*, is represented by institutions and agents such as publishers, political parties, media etc. deciding on the issues of literature, such as which works will be translated. The third force is represented by *dominant poetics*. The produced text needs to fit into the canon, *e.g.* be of a genre which is common in the field of literature or culture where it is supposed to be published. These factors are influenced by ideologies and at the same time they partake in creating ideology.

In Lefevere's opinion, the translator functions as a *rewriter*. This also concerns editors, critics, and even writers themselves, all being rewriters. However, he considers translation the most influential action of

all (1992). He perceives translation as the most visible form of *rewriting*, too. He goes on to explain the concept of *rewriting* as “manipulation, undertaken in the service of power” (Lefevere, 1992: p. 11). The motivations for rewriting may vary in detail, but essentially, the reasons behind them are either conformity or rebellion. *Rewriters* either aim to fit the ideology or poetics, or they rebel against it by their own rewriting (*ibid.*). Translators, as rewriters, transform the texts which they translate under the influence of ideology, culture and authorities. Hence, they are inevitably under the influence of these forces. Another of Lefevere's conviction is that when translators face dilemmas when deciding which translation solution to apply in a translation, where a dispute between language and ideology occurs, the latter tends to win (*ibid.*). This supports the theory of the controlling factors and that they matter more than language accuracy and language *per se*.

With regard to the post-TS era that has already set in, Edwin Gentzler (2017) takes up the theory of Lefevere and in the same way sees translators as rewriters, as mediators who contribute to cultural circulation. According to Gentzler, “post-translation studies” should follow the *cultural turn* and *sociological turn* in TS. His theory offers a new perspective on the notions of translation, original and rewriting. The contemporary age and its tendencies make one re-think the character, function, features, and goals of translation (Liu and Wen, 2018). In the postmodern world we live in, the borders between writings and rewritings are becoming less clear, and as Gentzler suggests, “all writing is rewriting, or a rewriting of a rewriting and translation – intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic” (2017: p. 10).

2. 2. 4. *The translator's invisibility and ethnocentric violence by Lawrence Venuti*

Lawrence Venuti (1995) has authored the famous catchphrase *translator's invisibility* which has gained currency in TS over the years. He speaks of one of the most popular trends in the practice of translation in the context of Anglo-American literature and the translation industry in general that has been prevailing for some years.

We could pose a perennial question by what we judge the quality of translation. In our response, we could argue, and thus resorting to some sort of cliché and oversimplification, that the translation is considered adequate when it is smooth, fluent and does not even feel like a

translation upon reading it. The translator is trying to “impersonate” the author and transfer his thoughts into the target language. In this vein, Venuti speaks of the so-called *illusionistic effect of discourse* where the illusion of fluent and smooth discourse is created by translators. The translation is then “not in fact a translation, but the ‘original’” (Venuti, 1995: p. 14). This claim articulated by Venuti appears to be a kind of an antidote to Gentzler’s idea (2017) that every writing is a rewriting. With respect to the “demand” for *naturalness* in the Anglo-American translation reception space, Venuti (1995) also gives thought to the so-called *ethnocentric violence* which he sees immanently present in this culture. Therein, *domestication* prevails as a translation strategy, thus adding to the *illusionistic effect of discourse*. Venuti expresses that idea that the Anglo-American culture

has long been dominated by domesticating theories that recommend fluent translating. By producing the illusion of transparency, a fluent translation masquerades as true semantic equivalence when it in fact inscribes the foreign text with a partial interpretation, partial to English-language values, reducing if not simply excluding the very difference that translation is called on to convey (Venuti, 1995: p. 21).

However, promoting such a culture or rather tradition might deprive the Anglo-American readership of learning more about other cultures and languages, to which translation should primarily contribute. As a consequence, Venuti calls for *foreignization*, in order to ease the perpetrated ethnocentric violence (*ibid.*). By using foreignization, the translator makes readers of the target text realize that they are reading a text originally written for a different culture and in a different language.

The translators seem not to have much of a choice when it comes to the style of language or translating. They are governed by society and they know beforehand how they should translate so that their translation is accepted by the audience and critics, considered smooth and sounding natural. This manipulative approach of the society can also be understood as a certain form of *ideology*, an ideology concerning the language of translations. There is an uneasy battle between the basic principles of translation. As is known, the translator should not alter the character or style of the text already determined by the author. The translation is required to be faithful. On the other hand, translations are at the same time required to read fluently, to be easily understood in the target

culture, to blend in with the canons of the target language literature, *i.e.* the translator has to adapt the text to the presuppositions, cultural norms and ideologies of the target audience. This makes Venuti call translation “a cultural political practice, constructing or critiquing ideology-stamped identities for foreign cultures, affirming or transgressing discursive values and institutional limits in the target-language culture” (1995: p. 19).

In his later work, Venuti (1997) boldly advocates *foreignization* as a strategy which translators should use to “fight” against the translator’s invisibility. This strategy in a way “sends the reader abroad,” whenever the translator, working on a literary translation, decides to preserve a word, mostly a culture-specific word, from the source language in its original form in the target language without explaining it using a footnote. Upon doing so, translators make readers aware that they are reading a translation and the translator no longer remains invisible. Of course, it depends on what type of audience the translator is translating for and how they cope with this demand. For example, Tymoczko (2006: p. 454) considers this translation strategy rather “elitist”, as it makes the translation unsuitable for a broad readership since she assumes that, depending on their “horizon of expectation”, not every reader is keen on learning while reading.

2. 3. The translator’s ideological standing

Ontologically, translators fulfil important tasks and their work is far from being easy, although some might argue that it is considered best when it goes unnoticed. This was tacitly implied *e.g.* by Etgar Keret at the Edinburgh International Book Festival in 2015 when he remarked jokingly: “Translators are like ninjas. If you notice them, they’re no good.”³ Indeed, it might seem easy to imagine what a translator does, just like in any occupation, but one can be easily deceived by both the final result and that which is only visible on the surface. What lies beneath all their hard work often remains submerged, just like in the iceberg theory.

The most rudimentary interpretation of translation, although significantly outdated from a synchronic point of view, would involve taking a text written in one language and transforming it into another language. However, there is much more than this linguistic labour,

³ Online interview available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t3zN_erN-M.

however complicated it may be, on the part of translators. Aside from their other roles, translators act as *mediators* and *ideological gatekeepers* (Cheung, 2014). This means that they build imaginary bridges between cultures. In addition, they ensure that a text which is rendered into another language adequately fulfils its purpose, in compliance with the skopos theory, and make sure that the text *communicates* and works perfectly in the target culture.

Shedding more light on the figure of the translator, and more precisely on what features or characteristics he / she should possess, it has to be stressed that a personality of the professional translator consists in an interplay of multiple traits. What is even more vitally important for translators than being bilingual, is being *bicultural* (Hatim and Mason, 1990). Translators need to understand and intimately know the source, as well as target culture, in order to be able to transfer the ideational load successfully. Besides biculturality, translators should possess another important quality: they bear a great deal of responsibility and make final decisions in their equivalence quest. That is why they need to be very objective, rather than subjective (Khalaf, 2014). However, being objective, when it comes to cultures, might turn out to be a strenuous task. The translator has to decide, especially when translating culture-specific items, which strategy and solution to use. Venuti speaks in this connection of *foreignization* and *domestication* (1995). The opposition of *domesticating vs. foreignizing strategy* is also acknowledged by Newmark (Baker and Malmkjær, 2005: p. 240). Domestication or domesticating strategy means that the translation strategy is target-oriented, the translator chooses an equivalent which is well-known within the target culture. Searching for parallels, this is in some typologies called *naturalization* (Popovič 1971, 1975; Newmark, 1988). *Foreignization* or *foreignizing strategy*, on the other hand, is the strategy that is source-oriented, the translator keeps the wordlore in its original source language form and in this vein tries to incorporate it into the target culture, and consequently educate the target audience and enrich their lexis and cultural awareness. This strategy may be also seen as *borrowing*, a strategy introduced by e.g. Ivir (1987) in his typology. If the words of the source culture are transferred into target culture without a change, this is by Levý referred to as *noetic subjectivism*⁴ (Jettmarová, p. 2011).

⁴ In Popovič's theory (1971, 1975), this strategy is known as *exoticization*.

Despite the possibility of the choice of the two end points in this ideological treatment of cultures, translators are always prone to incline to one language and one culture (Tymoczko, 2003). However, this approach may change with each individual translation solution, although there is an undeniable tendency towards the source language or the target in general. Moreover, the “size” of a culture or language *i.e.* how influential and widely spoken in the world a language is, how large its translation market with its recipients is as well as how well known is the culture to the readership and so forth, also play a role of supreme importance.

3. TRANSLATING IDEOLOGY IN *THE TIN DRUM* AND *RIVERS OF BABYLON*

The presented empirical research zooms in on translation solutions and strategies used in translating ideological phenomena in the English translations of two novels, namely *The Tin Drum* by Günter Grass and *Rivers of Babylon* by Peter Pišťánek. The aim of the application stage of the research was to uncover tendencies in opting for certain translation strategies by the translators since both examined novels carry ideologies in themselves. While *Rivers of Babylon* presents socialist and post-socialist ideology, *The Tin Drum* depicts the Nazi ideology.

3. 1. Translation strategies

Despite terminological differences in TS literature related to designating the translator's text-based operations in their interlingual transfer (Gibová, 2012), translation strategies are understood here as a tool of textual analysis when comparing the source and target texts, which enables translators to cope with translation-oriented ideological problems. Upon performing a qualitative analysis of the two novels under examination, several translation strategies were observed. The range of the identified strategies is based on Pym's (2016) typology of translation solutions, in combination with the two opposing strategies by Newmark (1988), Nida (1969), and Venuti (1997). In particular, Venuti's *foreignization* and *domestication* (1997), Nida's *dynamic* and *functional equivalence* (1969), and Newmark's *semantic* and *communicative translation* (1988) form the basis for our understanding of achieving adequacy in literary translation. With respect to Pym's approach, his three major categories of “translation solution types” feature *Copying* (of

which *Copying Sounds* seems the most relevant for our case study), *Expression Change* involving *Perspective Change*, *Density Change*, *Compensation* and *Cultural Correspondence* (of which *Changing Voice*, *Generalization / Specification*, and *Multiple Translation* seem relevant to our translational analyses) and *Content Change* where *Text Tailoring* may involve *Addition*, *Omission*, *Correction / Censorship / Updating* (Pym, 2016, p. 220).

It should be underscored that Venuti's *foreignization* and *domestication* could be added to Pym's category of *Expression Change* in order to arrive at an even more all-inclusive portrayal of the translation strategies. Concurrently, for the strategy of *Correction / Censorship / Updating*, *Neutralization* was used in the analysis as an alternative since we think that it tends to describe the strategy in a more hyperonymous manner. In addition, frequent occurrences of one more strategy, which seemingly led to no change in register or meaning, were observed. When this strategy was used, some ideological hints could be harder to understand or even noticed by the target reader. As the essence of the strategy rests on *foreignization* applied to larger parts of the text, and not only to certain words, we suggest that it should be approached as a "macro-foreignization" in the unfolding analysis.

3. 2. Research design

3. 2. 1. Research question and hypotheses

The research addresses the following research question: *Are the two reflected political ideologies in the studied novels approached in any way differently by their translators?*

The research question is followed by two interlaced hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: *The size of a culture, or diffusion of a language, as well as the readership's awareness of the ideology impacts the choice of translation strategies.*

Hypothesis 2: *Translating from a language with higher diffusion allows for a wider use of foreignizing strategies in the translation of ideologically-marked language.*

Apart from the authors' experiential observation, the hypotheses are based on Venuti's theory of the translator's invisibility and ethnocentric violence (1997). Likewise, they are inspired by the principles of *foreignization* and *domestication / naturalization* by Popovič (1971, 1975), Newmark (1988), and Venuti (1995, 1997).

3. 2. 2. Methodology

The method of CDA applied to translation is used, as it is a method that emphasizes the links and connections between society and language as well as between language and power, which is, beyond doubt, manifested by ideology.

In the analysis, selected translation solutions and strategies used for translating *ideology* in the two studied novels are commented on. The aim of the research is not to perform an extensive and exhaustive quantitative analysis. If we consider the subjective nature of CDA, it has to be admitted that there are certainly examples of ideologies in the novels under investigation which might have been easily overlooked. However, our desideratum is to provide an insight into the possible effects of translation strategies on the target reader.

3. 2. 3. Corpus

The novel *Rivers of Babylon* by Peter Pišťanek was originally written in Slovak. The book was first published in 1991 and was translated into English in 2007 by a Slovak translator, Peter Petro, who is also a writer and a university professor in Canada. Pišťanek's book tells a story of the lives of people in Bratislava's criminal underworld, the capital of Slovakia, around the times of the Velvet Revolution. It depicts a transition from the era of socialism to democracy, with a whole lot of changes in society incurred by the transition, which include the birth of mafia. The novel garnered critical acclaim across the Slovak cultural space.

The Nobel-prize winning novel *The Tin Drum (Die Blechtrommel)* by Günter Grass was originally written in German. The story revolves around the life of a boy Oskar Matzerath rebelling against society. His behaviour reflects various problems caused by the Nazi regime. The book was published in 1958 and first translated into English by Ralph Manheim in 1961. For the sake of this research, the 2009 English

translation of *The Tin Drum* by Breon Mitchel, a translator and professor in the U.S., was used (Joosten and Parry, 2016: p. 1).

3. 3. Analysis of translation strategies in *The Tin Drum* and *Rivers of Babylon*

The following section of the study shall discuss three selected thematic areas related to the translation of ideology in the analysed novels: economy, politics, and power over people.

3. 3. 1. Economy

Socialist economic systems are generally very ineffective due to their nature and principles, which was also portrayed in *Rivers of Babylon*. Since in socialism, the economy is planned ahead and is not regulated by a natural demand, there is a lack of competition among companies and sellers. The author depicts an illogical nature of planned economy in the novel, for instance, as follows: “Na celý rok by museli zastaviť prevádzku a **hotel by nesplnil plán.**” This text passage illustrates that hotels, in the same way as factories, were obliged to have economic plans which were expected to be followed and fulfilled. However, this reference to a socialist economic system was *neutralized* in its English translation in the following manner: “They’d have to stop all operations and **the hotel wouldn’t meet its targets.**” Here, the lexeme “target”, in its plural form, is associated with rather neutral connotations when compared to a set “plan” of incomes. Another selected example which illustrates the translation strategies when dealing with ideologically-marked issues pertaining to economy may be found in table 1.

Table 1. Source: own elaboration.

Slovak source text	English translation	strategy
Páni hore, v kancelárii, to dodnes rozpisujú tak, akoby v kotolni i naďalej robili všetci. Dva platy a všetky kolektívneprémie poberá on, Donáth. Aj za	The gentlemen upstairs in the administration are still fiddling the books to make it look as if four men still worked in the boiler-room. Two salaries and all collective	macro-foreignization

<p>socialistickú súťaž. Sám so sebou súťaží. Sám si je kolektívom. Dva platy ostanú hore, v kancelárii. Páni si podelia (p. 11).</p>	<p>bonuses go to Donáth. Even the bonuses for socialist competition go to him. This means he's competing against himself. He's a one-man collective. Two salaries stay upstairs in the office. The gentlemen will share them (p. 10).</p>	
<p>Na celý rok by museli zastaviť prevádzku hotel by nesplnil plán (p. 26).</p>	<p>They'd have to stop all operations and the hotel wouldn't meet its targets (p. 22).</p>	neutralization

With regard to *The Tin Drum* novel and its economic ideological undercurrents, it is vital to highlight that the Nazi party gained power, among other reasons, due to unfavourable economic conditions in the country.

Table 2. Source: own elaboration.

German source text	English translation	strategy
<p>Als Alfred Matzerath im Jahre dreiundzwanzig, da man für den Gegenwert einer Streichholzschachtel ein Schlafzimmer tapezieren, also mit Nullen mustern konnte, meine Mama heiratete (p. 49).</p>	<p>When Alfred Matzerath married my mama in nineteen twenty-three, a year when you could paper your bedroom with zeroes for the price of a box of matches (p. 33).</p>	macro-foreignization
<p>Allerlei wohlbestallte Kritiker des Wirtschaftswunders behaupten heute, und je weniger sie sich der damaligen Situation erinnern können, um so begeisterter: Das war noch</p>	<p>All sorts of well-placed critics of the German Economic Miracle are waxing nostalgic these days, and the less they remember what things were really like back then, the more enthusiastic they</p>	addition

<p>eine tolle Zeit vor der Währungsreform! Da war noch was los! Die Leute hatten nischt im Magen und stellten sich trotzdem nach Theaterkarten an (p. 570).</p>	<p>are: Ah, those were the days, before the currency reform! There was always something happening. People's stomachs were empty, but they still lined up for theatre tickets... (p. 415).</p>	
--	--	--

This economic situation in Germany is depicted only perfunctorily against the background of the plot of the novel. The hyperinflation crisis of 1923 after the WW1 defeat, for instance, is only briefly mentioned between the lines when describing the year when Oskar's parents got married: “When Alfred Matzerath married my mama **in nineteen twenty-three, a year when you could paper your bedroom with zeroes for the price of a box of matches...**”

On the other hand, a slight *addition* can be detected in the text passage reacting to the post-war currency reform (see table 2). Therein, the “German Economic Miracle” was adjusted for the target reader in comparison to the original “Wirtschaftswunder”, meaning “economic miracle”, yet, leaving the reader to find out, in case they are not familiar with the historical realia, what the economic miracle actually was.

3. 3. 2. Politics

Nazism and its ideas were promoted and spread by the political party of NSDAP, led by Adolf Hitler. Joining the Party required a lot of faith and conformity, but it could be beneficial for those who obeyed the rules of the political party. In *The Tin Drum*, Oskar's father Alfred epitomizes conformity and the exaggerated loyalty to the Party: “...**refusing to carry an umbrella when in uniform**, and repeating time and again what was soon to become a stock phrase. “**Duty is duty...**” (see table 3). Another fine example of how the translator approached the translation of political ideology may be found in the following text passage: “Matzerath, who recognized the forces of law and order relatively early on and **joined the Party** in thirty-four...” Therein, “Party” may be interpreted as a form of *macro-foreignization* since no specification such as e.g. “the Nazi Party” is made by the translator.

Moreover, propaganda represents a crucial topic in any discussion about the Nazi ideology. This involves the means and the ways of spreading and promoting Nazism, and this was faithfully captured in the analysed novel. For illustration, Bebra, the dwarf with whom Oskar later staged a performance, defended the actions and ideas of the Nazi Propaganda and aimed to persuade Oskar to join his shows: "Bebra explained the **nature and purpose of the Propaganda Corps**. Roswitha related **little anecdotes from the daily life of the corps**."

In contrast to *The Tin Drum* novel, other manifestations of political relationships and conformity are depicted in *Rivers of Babylon*. Here, the relationships between the mafia members and politicians are crucial, since they are marked by the *quid pro quo* mentality and both parties can benefit from each other's help to cover up their dishonest actions. Rác, the main protagonist, is given freedom and helped with protection of his illegal business, and politicians are, in return, helped with their popularity among people. However, such a kind of political relationship is also fake and profit-seeking: "Yes, he decides: from now on, **politics and hotelier Rác will be inseparable partners!**".

Table 3. Source: own elaboration.

German source text	English translation	strategy
Matzerath... trat im Jahre vierunddreißig, also verhältnismäßig früh die Kräfte der Ordnung erkennend, in die Partei ein ... (p. 145).	Matzerath, who recognized the forces of law and order relatively early on and joined the Party in thirty-four... (p. 103).	macro-foreignization
... lehnte auch ab, einen Regenschirm zur Uniform zu tragen , und wir hörten oft genüge eine Redewendung, die bald zur stehenden Redensart wurde. „ Dienst ist Dienst “ (p. 146).	... refusing to carry an umbrella when in uniform , and repeating time and again what was soon to become a stock phrase. " Duty is duty ". (p. 103).	macro-foreignization

<p>Bebra erklärte mir Sinn und Zweck der Propagandakompanie. Roswitha erzähltemir Anekdotchen aus dem Alltag der Propagandakompanie (p. 420).</p>	<p>Bebra explained the nature and purpose of the Propaganda Corps. Roswitha related little anecdotes from the daily life of the corps (p. 302).</p>	<p>macro-foreignization</p>
--	---	------------------------------------

Other text passages serve to highlight the importance of political connections and having the right acquaintances as it might be useful to install someone from the boss's people into politics in order to be able to pull the ropes, e.g. "Even the lawyer isn't left unrewarded by politics. **Using generous financial contributions, Rác pushes him into the other political party.**"

The main character demonstrates that in a country where the police and the government do not work responsibly and honestly, anything can be achieved if a person has enough money. Rác "buys" the police, politicians and also other officials, as exemplified by the following: "...no problem... **Each important official will leave with a thick envelope, a financial gift, in his pocket.**"

Overall, the novel depicts the atmosphere of the corrupted environment in Slovakia in a rather rough way. No extra explanation of the practice of corruption or cruel deeds is provided in the English translation, which matches the atmosphere of the Slovak source text. The translator uses the strategy of *macro-foreignization*. The novel reads as a story and if the readers become interested in more detail which would help them grasp the political situation or historical events better, they are left to read up on the cultural background at their discretion. An overview of selected examples of the phenomena under discussion is given in table 4.

Table 4. Source: own elaboration.

Slovak source text	English translation	strategy
<p>Mám bývalého švagra na Fonde národného majetku. Je to skorumpovaná sviňa. Pokúsím sa uňho</p>	<p>My ex-wife's father works at the National Property Fund. He's a corrupt swine. I'll try and lobby him to transfer the hotel to minor</p>	<p>macro-foreignization</p>

lobbovať, aby dali hotel už domalej privatizácie (p. 291).	privatization by auction” (p. 237).	
Áno, rozhodne sa: od dnešného dňa bude politika a on, hotelier Rácz, patríť nerozlučne k sebe! (p. 308).	Yes, he decides: from now on, politics and hotelier Rácz will be inseparable partners! (p. 250).	macro-foreignization
...nie je... problém: každý z dôležitých úradníkov odchádza domov s hrubou obálkou - finančným darčekom vo vrecku (s. 310).	...no problem... Each important official will leave with a thick envelope, a financial gift, in his pocket (p. 251).	macro-foreignization
Politika neobíde ani právnika. Rácz ho pretlačí do druhej politickej strany a tiež nešetří finančnými prostriedkami. Čoskoro sa fiškál dostane do Slovenskej národnej rady... (p. 317).	Even the lawyer isn't left unrewarded by politics. Using generous financial contributions, Rácz pushes him into the other political party. Soon the lawyer gets into the Slovak National Assembly... (p. 257).	macro-foreignization

3. 3. 3. Power over people

The Holocaust and power over races are not the prevailing themes within *The Tin Drum* novel. Just like any other historical events and elements of the Nazi ideology, they are shown only in the background of the storyline, and this makes the readers both think for themselves and identify the allusions to these. The character that represents the Jews and their WW2 destiny in the novel is Sigismund Markus. Markus is an owner of a toy shop, and thus is very important to Oskar as his source of tin drums. This character is mentioned a couple of times throughout the novel and the most important event is the Kristallnacht when his store becomes raided and destroyed by the Nazis. The text passage which contains these ideological hints in the English translation⁵ reads as

⁵ A methodological manual for the analysis of culture-bound items in literary translation, which reflect ideology, may also be found in Bednárová-Gibová (2017). Building upon Pym's model of translation solutions (2016), the study explores to what

follows: “Once upon a time there was a toy merchant named Sigismund Markus, and he sold, among other things, white and red lacquered tin drums. Oskar, ... found him in a state that **made it impossible for him ever to sell tin drums again** in this world. ...The same ordinance specialists I, Oskar, thought I’d run away from had visited Markus before I got there, **had dipped a brush in paint and written the words Jewish Swine across his shop window in Sütterlin script...**” (see table 5).

Furthermore, the idea of being different, and how it was not accepted by the party and the public, comes to expression in recurrent situations throughout the novel. The Nazi Party, for example, promoted a perfect symmetry and an ideal look of everything and everyone: “No matter for whom and by whom a grandstand is erected, **it must always be symmetrical**. ...From top to bottom: Six swastika banners side by side. Then flags, pennants, and standards.”

In this connection, a character called Greff is an example of the person who was different. Although he used to be a Scout Leader, and he sometimes presented signs of conformity, he was a homosexual. As illustrated by a text passage, “Greff was **hanging in a scoutmaster’s uniform...** Framed and glazed on the right front post, **the photo of an expressively handsome lad of around sixteen**. An early photo of his favourite, Horst Donath, who fell as a lieutenant on the Donets.” His fear of an upcoming court trial, along with the loss of his true love, made him commit suicide. This is because Nazi ideology considered homosexuality as inherently unacceptable (apart from his being a vegetarian, too).

Table 5. Source: own elaboration

German source text	English translation	strategy
<p>Ganz gleich für wen und vor wem eine Tribüne errichtet wird, in jedem Falle muß sie symmetrisch sein. ... Von oben nach unten: sechs Hakenkreuzbanner nebeneinander. Dann</p>	<p>No matter for whom and by whom a grandstand is erected, it must always be symmetrical. ...From top to bottom: Six swastika</p>	<p>macro-foreignization</p>

extent the local ideological colour of the Slovak ‘start text’ has been kept in the English literary translation.

<p>Fahnen, Wimpel und Standarten (p. 148).</p>	<p>banners side by side. Then flags, pennants, and standards (p. 105).</p>	
<p>Es war einmal ein Spielzeughändler, der hieß Sigismund Markus und verkaufte unter anderem auch weißbrot gelackte Blechtrommeln. Oskar, ... fand ihn in einem Zustand vor, der ihm das Verkaufen von Blechtrommeln fortan oder auf dieser Welt unmöglich machte. ...Sie, dieselben Feuerwerker, denen ich, Oskar, davongelaufen zu sein glaubte, hatten schon vor mir den Markus besucht, hatten Pinsel in Farbe getaucht und ihm quer übers Schauenfenster in Sütterlinschrift das Wort Judensau geschrieben... Markus aber war ihrem Zorn ausgewichen. Als sie ihn in seinem Büro sprechen wollten, klopfen sie nicht etwa an, brachen die Tür auf, obgleich die nicht verschlossen war (p. 259).</p>	<p>Once upon a time there was a toy merchant named Sigismund Markus, and he sold, among other things, white and red lacquered tin drums. Oskar, ... found him in a state that made it impossible for him ever to sell tin drums again in this world. ...The same ordinance specialists I, Oskar, thought I'd run away from had visited Markus before I got there, had dipped a brush in paint and written the words Jewish Swine across his shop window in Sütterlin script... But Markus had escaped their rage. When they wished to speak with him in his office, they didn't bother to knock at the door but broke it down instead, although it wasn't locked (p. 186).</p>	<p>macro-foreignization</p>

With a view to *Rivers of Babylon*, the hierarchy of a corrupt country might well have a mafia boss on its top. In the end, the character of Rác is the one who rules all: “He has the entire hotel and surroundings in his hand. **Everybody is scared of him.**” The passage implies that everybody knows him, and whether his allies or foes, all want to have a good relationship with him. Everyone calls him “boss”, even the police, as they depend on him: “You know, **boss**,” says the policeman, “how can I put it? ... “You promised to keep us in mind. Christmas is coming... **the bonus ..., the Christmas bonus**” (see table 6). In this sentence, *neutralization* may be observed, since the English lexeme “bonus” seems more neutral than the original Slovak “prilepšenie” as the connotational potential of the two lexemes differs considerably. It is made evident in the English translation that money gives power to the mafia boss and he is able to control anything. Further examples of the ideological phenomena related to power over people and their translation strategies may be found in table 6.

Table 6. Source: own elaboration.

Slovak source text	English translation	strategy
„Viete, šéfe ,“ ozve sa policajt. “Ako by som vám”... „Sľúbili ste že na nás budetemysliet'. Niečo na Vianoce. Na prilepšenie... ” (p. 159).	“You know, boss ,” says the policeman, “how can I put it?” ... “You promised to keep us in mind. Christmas is coming... the bonus ..., the Christmas bonus ” (p. 131).	neutralization
Vedia, že Rác je mocný. Platí si policajtov, celé hotelové osadenstvo je mupo ruke. Oni, Šiptári , by nemali šancu (p. 160).	They know that Rác is powerful. The cops are in his pocket, and the hotel staff do as he says. The Albanians wouldn't stand a chance (p. 133).	neutralization

Celý hotel i okolie drží v rukách. Všetci saho boja! (p. 203).	He has the entire hotel and surroundings in his hand. Everybody is scared of him (p. 167).	macro-foreignization
---	---	-----------------------------

FINAL THOUGHTS

To conclude, the aim of this study was to show that the actions of translators are not completely in their hands and that they may be impacted by a great many factors and, in particular, by ideologies. This fact should not be underestimated and translations deserve to be perceived from a broader perspective when functioning as subjects of research or analysis. More layers of texts should be taken into account, not only their language aspects. Although the focus of this study was inevitably selective and thus far from being exhaustive, its merits lie in drawing attention to the most prominent theories of ideology which deserve a deeper scholarly reflection.

A conceptual-reflexive analysis of the selected TS theories disclosed that all of them emphasized the embeddedness of ideologies in language and texts, including translations. It stands to reason that we learn the most about culture and history from translations where they serve the target, not the source culture. Their content is meant to be understood, discussed and passed on by the target audience. However, translations are shaped and moulded by ideologies, beliefs and culture of the desired audience. This implies that the target audience consumes textual products designed to fit them and hence lacks objectivity. Indeed, the objective perception of reality seems to be an impossible task. Nevertheless, one can at least be aware of the fact that there is a “moving force” which is shaping language in translations. And that powerful force is ideology.

The empirical analysis of the selected translation strategies and solutions in the two novels under examination cast more light on the issues of ideology in translation. Various translation strategies on the part of their translators were ascertained. In the English translation of the Slovak novel *Rivers of Babylon*, neutralization was observed in some cases of the translation of ideological phenomena related to economy and the practice of mafia. This could be caused by a different level of diffusion of the two languages and their cultures as English target readers can be expected not to be so deeply familiar with a smaller Slovak source

culture and its connotations. In the *The Tin Drum* translation, foreignizing strategies were identified as commonly opted for when translating ideologically-loaded parts of the text. The reason for this can be sought in the diffusion of the German culture and the Nazi ideology which is known to many people and cultures thanks to the influence of literature, films or documentaries. It is also true that the theme of WW2 affected many other countries, which may be in the position of target recipients, in a significant way.

Moreover, the empirical analysis implies that translation strategies and solutions when translating ideologically-marked texts can vary. Many factors may influence these choices such as the diffusion of the language, knowledge of the history and culture, and so forth. Overall, the stated research hypotheses were borne out as the two examined ideologies, due to the above-mentioned reasons, seemed to be approached by the translators in a different way. Overall, our mission was to provide a deeper insight into the real practice of translating ideology that underlies the selected texts of fiction. We humbly believe that it was a successful one.

REFERENCES

- Baker, Mona (2006), *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*, London, Routledge.
- Baker, Mona (2013), “Narrative Analysis: Translation as Renarration”, at <https://www.methods.manchester.ac.uk/themes/qualitative-methods/narrative-analysis/> (accessed: 5/2/2021).
- Baker, Mona and Malmkjær, Kirsten (2005), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York, Taylor and Francis e-Library.
- Barnes, Nathan (2014), *Ideology in Translation: CS Lewis: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, Johannesburg, University of the Witwatersrand, at <http://hdl.handle.net/10539/16983> (accessed: 13/12 /2020).

- Bednárová-Gibová, Klaudia (2017), "Minority in English Literary Translation: the Case of Slovak Culture-bound Items", *XLinguae: European Scientific Language Journal*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 202-217, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2017.10.03.16>.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984), *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Cheung, Martha P. Y. (2014), "Translation as Intercultural Communication: Views from the Chinese Discourse on Translation", in Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter (eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Chichester, UK, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 179-190, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118613504.ch13>.
- Daldal, Asli (2014), "Power and Ideology in Michael Foucault and Antonio Gramsci: A Comparative Analysis", *Review of History and Political Science*, 2, pp. 149-167.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand (1986 [1916]), *Course in General Linguistics*, LaSalle, IL, Open Court.
- Downing, David B. and Susan Bazargan (1991) *Image and Ideology in Modern / postmodern Discourse*, New York, State University of New York Press.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995), *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, London, Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman (1989), *Language and Power*, London, Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman (2001), "The dialectics of discourse", *Textus*, 14, pp. 231-242.
- Fairclough, Norman and Wodak, Ruth (1997), "Critical Discourse Analysis", in Teun A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London, Sage, pp. 258-284.

- Freeden, Michael (2003), *Ideology. A Very Short Introduction*, New York, Oxford University Press, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780192802811.001.0001>.
- Gentzler, Edwin (2017), *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies*, New York, Routledge, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619194>.
- Gibová, Klaudia (2012), *Translation Procedures in the Non-literary and Literary Text Compared*, Norderstedt, Germany, BOD Gmbh.
- Grass, Günter (2007), *Die Blechtrommel*, Göttingen, Steidl.
- Grass, Günter (2009), *The Tin Drum*, London, Vintage Classics.
- Hatim, Basil and Mason, Ian (1990), *Discourse and the translator, language in social life series*, London, Longman.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason (1997), *The Translator as Communicator*, London, Routledge.
- Heywood, Andrew (2008), *Politické ideologie*, Plzeň, Czech Republic, Aleš Čeněk.
- Ivir, Vladimir (1987), “Procedures and strategies for the translation of culture”, *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13, pp. 35-46.
- Janks, Hilary (1997), “Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool”, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 18, pp. 329-342, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630970180302>.
- Jeffries, Lesley (2010), *Critical Stylistics: The Power of English*. Basingstoke, UK, Palgrave Macmillan, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-04516-4>.
- Jettmarová, Zuzana (2011), “Editor’s Introduction to the English Edition”, in Jiří Levý, *The Art of Translation*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. XV-XXV.

- Joosten, Jos and Christoph Parry (2016), *The Echo of Die Blechtrommel in Europe: Studies on the Reception of Günter Grass's The Tin Drum*, Leiden, Brill, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004291898>.
- Katan, David (1999), *Translating Cultures. An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*, Manchester, St. Jerome.
- Khalaf, Bilal Khalid (2014), "Why and How the Translator Constantly Makes Decisions about Cultural Meaning", *American Journal of Linguistics*, 3, pp. 1-8.
- Laš, Matej (2017), "Súčasná tendencie americkej translatológie: Návrat k Schleiermacherovej dichotómii?", *Prekladateľské listy*, 6, pp. 41-53.
- Lefevere, André (1992), *Translation. Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London, Routledge.
- Liu, Jinhui and Jun Wen (2018), "Review of Gentzler, Edwin (2017): *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge", *Meta*, 63, pp. 267-269, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1050530ar>.
- Locke, Terry (2004), *Critical Discourse Analysis*, New York, Continuum.
- Munday, Jeremy (2007), "Translation and Ideology", *The Translator*, 13, pp. 195-217, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2007.10799238>.
- Newmark, Peter (1988), *A Textbook of Translation*, London, Prentice Hall.
- Nida, Eugene (1969), *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden, Brill, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/411434>.
- n. a. (2015) "Etgar Keret and Alain Mabanckou Interview at the Edinburgh International Book Festival", at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t3zN_erN-M (accessed: 15/2/2021).

- n. a. (2019) “How Culture is Important in Language Learning”, at <https://www.translatemedia.com/translation-blog/culture-important-language-learning/> (accessed: 6/1/2021).
- Pišťanek, Peter (2008), *Rivers of Babylon*, Bratislava, Slovart.
- Pišťanek, Peter (2007), *Rivers of Babylon*, London, Garnett Press.
- Popovič, Anton (1971), *Poetika umeleckého prekladu*, Bratislava, Tatran.
- Popovič, Anton (1975), *Teória umeleckého prekladu*, Bratislava, Tatran.
- Pym, Anthony (2016), *Translation Solutions for Many Languages: Histories of a Flawed Dream*, London, Bloomsbury.
- Reiss, Katarina and Hans J. Vermeer (2011), “Übersetzen als interkultureller Transfer”, in Radegundis Stolze (ed.), *Übersetzungstheorien. Eine Einführung*, Tübingen, Narr Verlag, pp. 185-194.
- Seliger, Martin (1976), *Politics and Ideology*, London, Allen and Unwin.
- Simpson, Paul (1993), *Language, Ideology and Point of View*, London, Routledge, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203312612>.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary (1995), *Translation Studies – An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.2>.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary (2006), *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.66>.
- Tymoczko, Maria (2003), “Ideology and the Position of the Translator: In What Sense Is a Translator ‘In Between’?”, in María Calzada Pérez (ed.), *Apropos of Ideology: Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies*, Manchester, St. Jerome.

- Tymoczko, Maria (2006), "Translation: Ethics, Ideology, Action", *The Massachusetts Review*, 47, pp. 442-461.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1998), *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, London, Sage.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (2015), "Critical Discourse Analysis", in Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, pp. 352-371, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch22>.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995), *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London, Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1997), "The American Tradition", in Mona Baker, Gabriela Saldanha (eds.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, pp. 320-328.
- Wing-Kwong Leung, Matthew (2006), "The ideological turn in translation studies", in João Ferreira Duarte, Alexandra Assis Rosa and Teresa Seruya (eds.), *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 129-144, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.68.12leu>.
- Zhang, Mei (2012), "Translation Manipulated by Ideology and Poetics – A Case Study of the Jade Mountain", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2, pp. 754-758, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.4.754-758>.