

## The Politics of Translation: How Ideology and Culture Shape Meaning

**Abdelmounim Charaf**

PhD student at: Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences, Mohammedia/Hassan 2 University of Casablanca.

---

**ABSTRACT:** This paper looks critically at how translation studies changed over time. It moved away from dry, formal grammar rules to focus closely on social, cultural, and political settings. We look at this field's 'cultural turn' along with Hans Vermeer's goal-driven Skopos framework. This shows that translation is not a simple, automatic job of swapping words. Instead, it is an intentional act of political rewriting and power trading. Using ideas from postcolonial theory, cultural signs, and Pierre Bourdieu's sociology, we study the tension that happens when local realities cross unequal language borders. Examples include Arabic religious phrases, French working-class speech styles, and marginalized oral histories. We also look at the digital world, checking the tight space and time limits of video text matching. Ultimately, we argue that the translator is a vital gatekeeper. Their choices between blending in or staying foreign directly shift cultural power within global systems.

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

For decades, main translation theories stayed stuck within safe, traditional boundaries. They focused mostly on literal grammar matches. Early structural methods routinely reduced the whole field to a simple two-sided fight. It was always a match between 'word-for-word' literal translation and 'sense-for-sense' adaptation. Under this tight model, backed by mid-century language experts, people saw the original text as a holy, untouchable structure. The new translated text was judged as a naturally weak copy. Even when thinkers brought in dynamic matches to focus on how the audience reacts, they still fell into a trap. They wrongly assumed that languages are stable, neatly organized grids that could match up perfectly through simple structural moves.

They were wrong. Language is a socio-political minefield.

The late twentieth century fully broke this mechanical illusion. It brought the 'cultural turn' to translation studies. Thinkers like Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere finally stated the obvious fact that language is never an isolated or politically neutral thing. Instead, it works as a messy, living home for a society's past traumas, structural setups, hidden taboos, and basic myths. Moving a story across national borders means dealing with an entire socio-political world. This paper offers a close study of the deep link between translation and cultural politics. It checks how political agendas, historical gaps, and cultural differences meet during rewriting. This work changes the translator from a hidden courier into an active, responsible cultural helper.

### 2. THEORETICAL ORIENTATIONS: THE SEMIOSPHERE AND THE MECHANICS OF REWRITING

To view translation as a clear cultural act, we must look at the cultural models of Yuri Lotman. He created the idea of the 'semiosphere'. Lotman described this as the bounded, active mental space where a community's communication and signs take shape. A text never makes itself. It is an organic product of its unique environment. It depends completely on local cultural codes to have meaning. When a story is suddenly pulled up and dropped into a foreign space, a major cultural break happens. Meaning breaks apart and must be built again.

Bassnett and Lefevere built on this idea. They stated that translation is rarely an innocent move, but rather a deliberate act of rewriting. Lefevere pointed out three institutional forces that rule how this rewriting happens:

- **Ideology:** The political views, moral choices, and mental filters held by the translator and the target culture's top groups.
- **Poetics:** The ruling literary rules, genre expectations, and style standards dominant in the target book market.
- **Patronage:** The structural powers, including big publishing companies, state censors, schools, and rich sellers, that fund and hand out the translated work.

By focusing on these outside forces, the cultural turn permanently shifted the academic field. The main question changed forever. Scholars stopped asking how words match up on a basic grammar level. They started asking why people make specific text choices within particular historical and structural setups.

## **The Politics of Translation: How Ideology and Culture Shape Meaning**

### **3. TELEOLOGY AND PRAGMATICS: THE STRUCTURAL IMPACT OF SKOPOS THEORY**

The cultural turn exposed the political forces behind making text. Around the same time, the German functional school, led by Katharina Reiß and Hans Vermeer, brought in a highly practical, purpose-driven framework called Skopos Theory. Coming from the old Greek word for 'purpose' or 'goal', Skopos theory says that the top law ruling any translation work is the final goal of the translation itself. If that goal requires a major break from the original layout, the translator must make that change.

#### **De-centering the Source Text**

Skopos theory purposely takes away the original text's traditional status as the final measure of correctness. Instead, the goal of the project depends on the needs and expectations of the final reader. Vermeer argues that a translation is not a mirror image of an original statement. It is a completely new offer of facts made inside a target culture, reporting on an older offer of facts made within a source culture.

Because of this, the translator's main job is to read the specific 'Skopos guide' given by an employer or needed by the final audience. For example, take a 14th-century Arabic legal paper. If it is translated to serve as clear evidence in a modern UK court, the Skopos demands a highly literal, strict word-for-word copy. But if that same old paper is used to build background mood in a modern fantasy book, the Skopos shifts. It now needs smooth reading and local blending. Under this practical view, text loyalty is no longer a fixed language rule. It is a flexible match with the text's intended social role.

### **4. THE GEOPOLITICAL TENSIONS OF DOMESTICATION AND FOREIGNIZATION**

A translator makes tactical choices to meet a specific Skopos. These choices always cross the classic moral split made famous by Lawrence Venuti: the choice between blending in (domestication) or staying foreign (foreignization). This choice goes back to Friedrich Schleiermacher's philosophies and carries deep political meaning.

#### **Domestication as Cultural Erasure**

Domestication means cutting down a foreign text to match the cultural, stylistic, and political ideas of the target language. Here, the translator actively removes odd concepts, old words, and strange cultural references. They do this to create a smooth, highly readable text. Venuti strongly attacks this habit. He notes that smooth text creates a false sense of openness. This trick completely hides the translator's work. It wipes out the clear cultural differences of the original writer. In Anglo-American publishing, blending in has often worked as an imperial tool. It takes the creative work of smaller global cultures and reshapes it to fit the easy styles of Western capitalism.

#### **Foreignization as Radical Alterity**

On the other hand, foreignization tries to show and save the language and cultural differences of the source text. It purposely shakes up the style and political expectations of the target audience. The translator keeps foreign sentence setups, leaves local cultural words untranslated, and copies original idioms. This forces the reader to leave their comfortable home zone and face the real foreign culture. Venuti supports this plan. He sees it as a vital way to resist the flattening pressure of globalization. It clearly marks the text as a translation, saving the cultural freedom of the original group.

### **5. UNTRANSLATABILITY AND REGIONAL REALIA: CONTEXTUAL CASE STUDIES**

The clear limits of translation appear when facing realia. These are specific words, institutional names, and local idioms deeply tied to the history and mind of a particular community. They have no direct match in the target language. When we check real-world local texts, these empty conceptual gaps stop being abstract issues. They become immediate fights for meaning.

#### **Case Study 1: The Arabic Socio-Religious Semiosphere**

In old and modern Arabic books, stories are heavily filled with religious words and titles. These carry huge social weight far beyond their basic meanings. A great example is the phrase *Insha'Allah*. A simple grammar translation might turn this into 'if God wills'. But inside its real local setting, the phrase does many social jobs:

- It can show a real religious belief in holy choice.
- It can work as a polite, culturally understood dodge, a soft no, or a sign of social delay.
- It can serve as regular chat filler or a daily expression of hope.

If a translator working on a modern Egyptian book flattens this phrase into the English word 'hopefully', the whole social subtext is lost. Similarly, the concept of *Al-Ghayb* is often reduced in English books to 'the unseen' or 'the mystery'. But it actually refers to a massive, complex system of hidden holy knowledge. Translating it without extra explanation splits the word from the spiritual reality that gives it life.

#### **Case Study 2: French Sociolinguistic Registers and Class Hierarchies**

When turning modern French books into English, the main test often shifts from physical things to the sharp levels of social class and identity built into speech. French texts rely heavily on clear splits between formal literary French (*le français soutenu*), standard daily talk (*le français courant*), and street slang (*l'argot* or *le verlan*) born in poor urban neighborhoods.

## **The Politics of Translation: How Ideology and Culture Shape Meaning**

For instance, switching between the formal pronoun 'vous' and the friendly 'tu' changes personal links and shifts power balances. Standard modern English has lost this old distinction, so it cannot easily capture this change.

Also, look at texts dealing with the French working class or immigrant lives in poor suburbs. Authors use deep language swaps like *verlan*, which flips word parts (turning 'flic' to 'keuf' or 'femme' to 'meuf'). Trying to put this into standard English flattens the social map of the original story. If the translator replaces French city slang with American inner-city or British working-class talk, they risk mixing up distinct cultural spaces. This shows that French-to-English translation needs a careful balance where class politics and institutional realities match word choice directly.

### **6. CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS AND COGNITIVE ASYMMETRIES**

Beyond separate words, the mental framework of human thought changes a lot from one culture to another. Language science studies this closely. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson showed that metaphors are not just surface style decorations. They are core mental frameworks that humans use to understand daily life.

Because these basic metaphors depend on culture, translating them literally can cause total failure in meaning. For example, the English phrase 'to spill the beans' makes sense only because of an underlying cultural idea that treats secrets like physical objects locked in a box. Translating this word-for-word into a language without that mental setup causes pure confusion. The translator must look past the surface image. They need to check the real meaning of the idiom, choosing whether to keep the image itself or the underlying point. This work needs deep knowledge of the target culture to ensure the text's emotional weight lands correctly.

### **7. POSTCOLONIAL ASYMMETRIES: THE VIOLENCE OF SUBALTERN ASSIMILATION**

Translation never happens in a political vacuum. It is deeply tied up in past power rankings. Postcolonial translation thinkers like Tejaswini Niranjana, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, and Vicente Rafael have laid this bare.

#### **Case Study 3: The Colonization and Resistance of Subaltern Voices**

The political force of unequal translation shows clearly in the past handling of local oral traditions and postcolonial texts. Vicente Rafael's study of early Spanish papers in the Philippines shows how colonial priests used translation as a weapon. They translated Christian ideas into local languages like Tagalog. They did not do this to honor native speech, but to systematically replace local spiritual ideas with European rules of ranking and sin. This turned translation into a tool for control.

In modern books, this power fight shows in writers like Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. He famously chose to stop writing in English, switching to his native Gikuyu language as a radical act of political resistance. When a text written in Gikuyu—meant to fight Western literary setups—is later translated into English for global sale, a major puzzle occurs.

The translator must make a choice. They can use a smooth, standard European grammar that kills Ngũgĩ's political fight (domestication). Or they can purposely break up the English language to show the rhythmic, wise, and conceptual patterns of Gikuyu (foreignization). This choice shows what Spivak calls intense moral care. It is needed to make sure translation does not bring a second wave of control to the marginalized voice.

### **8. AUDIOVISUAL LOCALIZATION: SUBTITLING CONSTRAINTS AND SEMIOTIC POLYPHONY**

The shift in translation studies in the digital age shows best in the specialized field of media translation, especially subtitling. Literary translation works on a single, straight visual setup (the printed page). Subtitling works inside a multi-sided communication framework. The text must live next to three other live tracks: spoken words, audio sounds (music and effects), and the moving picture.

#### **The Spatial and Temporal Iron Cage**

Subtitling requires a unique way of cutting text due to strict physical limits. Translators must usually stick to standard rules. These allow a maximum of two lines of text per subtitle, with a total limit between 35 and 42 characters per line. Also, because the average audience reads slower than actors talk, subtitles must respect time limits. They usually stay on screen for at least one second and a maximum of six to seven seconds for two full lines. This math depends on standard reading speed, usually measured between 12 to 17 characters per second.

#### **Decimation, Omission, and Pragmatic Adaptation**

Because of these tight space and time walls, subtitlers cannot copy every spoken word. They have to cut text systematically, often dropping up to 30% to 40% of the spoken talk. This demands a sharp focus on core meaning over grammar identity. The subtitler must drop repeated words, shorten long lines, and shift data away from words to rely directly on the picture or sound. For example, a character might wave their arms wildly while shouting a highly local insult. The subtitler might shorten the line to a quick target match that fits the text limit. They rely on the actor's body moves and voice tone to show the angry mood. This setup turns subtitling into an intense test of Skopos theory, where keeping fast reading and timing matters far more than being fully loyal to the original script.

## The Politics of Translation: How Ideology and Culture Shape Meaning

### 9. THE SOCIOLOGY OF TRANSLATION: INSTITUTIONAL FIELDS AND SYMBOLIC CAPITAL

To map the institutional forces that police book movements, modern translation scholars rely heavily on Pierre Bourdieu's social models. We can view translation as a highly competitive field of cultural work where different players fight to gather both economic and symbolic wealth.

#### Habitus, Capital, and Global Textual Flows

Tracking a Bourdieusian view means checking several linked ideas:

- **The Translator's Habitus:** The built-in values, class roots, social history, and moral bents of the translator that quietly guide their intuitive choice of words.
- **Symbolic Capital:** The fame, critic praise, and cultural weight tied to a specific writer or national book. This affects whether a publisher will take the financial risk to translate a work.
- **The Asymmetry of the Global Market:** The highly unequal flow of translations between central and peripheral nations. Globally powerful languages, especially English, translate a very small share of foreign books (regularly tracked at under 3-4% of total prints). On the flip side, smaller language areas translate a massive volume of Western texts. This imbalance ensures that the cultural view of the global core is constantly exported, while its own borders stay largely safe from foreign ideas.

### 10. GENDERED DISCURSIVE FRAMEWORKS: SUBVERTING PATRIARCHAL FIDELITY

The meeting of gender studies and translation theory—led by feminist scholars like Sherry Simon, Luise von Flotow, and Lori Chamberlain—has unmasked the deep patriarchal metaphors that have historically ruled translation talk.

#### Les Belles Infidèles and the Politics of Ownership

Chamberlain's study of past translation reviews shows that the craft has consistently been viewed through a gendered, male-dominated lens. The famous 17th-century French saying 'les belles infidèles' suggests that translations, like women, can be beautiful or faithful, but never both. This highlights a deep cultural worry about truth, property ownership, and text fatherhood. Within this setup, the original source text is coded as the male, ruling master. The translated text is cast as the low, female copy, always suspected of stepping out on the original.

#### Feminist Translation Rhetoric and Intervention

Feminist translators actively fight this low status by showing their clear co-authorship of the text. Luise von Flotow listed three main actions used to break down male biases in literature:

1. Supplementing: Stepping directly into the body of the text to fix structural male biases or past gaps in the source language (like writing female presence back into pronouns and descriptions).
2. Prefacing and Footnoting: Using intro essays and critical notes to clearly state the translator's political views and specific choices.
3. Hijacking: Taking a historically neutral or openly sexist source text and intentionally rewriting it to highlight and critique its hidden gender setups.

### 11. THE DIGITAL SEMIOSPHERE: LOCALIZATION AND ALGORITHMIC REALITIES

In the modern era, the link between translation and culture has been reshaped by digital growth, product setup (localization), and the wide use of neural machine translation (NMT) models.

#### Localization as Cultural Redesign

Localization goes far beyond basic word-shifting. It fully changes digital items—like software apps, video games, company platforms, and web layouts—to match the specific language, law, tech, and cultural needs of a local market. This job requires rebuilding user screens to handle right-to-left writing, updating pay tools, changing date styles, and switching color setups (which hold totally different meanings across cultures). In the digital market, translation is mixed into the broader field of international user experience (UX) engineering.

#### The Inherent Deficits of Machine Systems

Modern AI and large language models can read massive text data very fast, but they stay structurally split from human life. Algorithms work entirely on math odds of word patterns. They do not live inside a culture, nor do they have a local history or emotional memory.

Because of this, automated tools routinely fail when facing light irony, multi-layered subtext, local humor, and changing social taboos. The human translator remains irreplaceable as a caring, culturally rooted expert who can guide texts through the unwritten rules of human feeling and identity.

### 12. CONCLUSION: THE CRITICAL IMPERATIVE OF THE INTERCULTURAL AGENT

As global societies grow more linked yet politically broken, the position of the translator as a practical cultural helper becomes uniquely vital. The move of translation studies from dry grammar rules to advanced cultural and Skopos models proves that words are never innocent or neutral. They work as political vessels, history stores, and the main areas where social fights happen.

Translating with an ethical mind means saying no to the easy path of total blending that wipes out the identity of the foreign culture. At the same time, it requires a clear commitment to the practical goal the text must achieve for its new audience, whether on a printed page or trapped within the tight limits of a digital screen.

Translators must own their role as active historical players, fully aware of the power dynamics, institutional blocks, and global gaps that sway their work. By viewing translation as an ongoing, necessarily imperfect act of cross-cultural trading, we can build global talk that truly respects difference, breaks down control, and feeds our shared cultural world.

### REFERENCES

- 1) Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (1990). *Translation, History and Culture*. Pinter Publishers.
- 2) Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. Columbia University Press.
- 3) Chamberlain, L. (1988). "Gender and the Metaphors of Translation." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 13(3), 454-472.
- 4) Díaz Cintas, J., & Remael, A. (2020). *Subtitling: Concepts and Practices*. Routledge.
- 5) Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
- 6) Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Routledge.
- 7) Lotman, Y. M. (1990). *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. I.B. Tauris.
- 8) Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. University of California Press.
- 9) Rafael, V. L. (1993). *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule*. Duke University Press.
- 10) Reiß, K., & Vermeer, H. J. (2014). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained*. Routledge.
- 11) Simon, S. (1996). *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. Routledge.
- 12) Spivak, G. C. (1993). "The Politics of Translation." In *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (pp. 179-200). Routledge.
- 13) Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.