

# **The Leverage of Cultural Homogenization in Futurity of Translation Studies: HomoKult Model as the Right Switch**

**Masoud Shahnazari**

Islamic Azad University, Kerman Branch, Iran

**Alireza Akbari**

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

## **1. Introduction**

Currently, the role of culture in societies is a robust backup in connecting people aiming that they become cognizant upon the dos and don'ts with one another. This is owing to the fact that cultures vary and conform considerably in diverse fields such as norms, conventions, thoughts, and language patternings.

Generally speaking, Alfred Louis Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn (1952:181) define culture as:

“Patterns, explicit and implicit of and for behavior required and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiment in artefacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached value. Culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as product of action, on the other hand, as conditioning elements of future action.”

To corroborate the identity of the term ‘culture’, it is noteworthy addressing the deep and surface traits of the culture. How is it possible to come through the deep and underlying facets of cultures? How would it be attainable to connect cultures with one another in a way that people can depict a stable framework upon the workability, similarities, and differences amongst their cultures? That said, the role of translation and particularly translator would be highly noticeable.

Before advancing forward to the main aspects of the present study, it is remarkable to mention the exact and real meaning of culture. Culture in particular is not the matter of external facets such as norms, rules, and conventions of one community (Akbari and Shahnazari 2014). Culture is made of special and pristine thoughts,

behaviors, and cognitive factors. Thus, it is worth expressing that culture acts as a significant role in shaping the inner and outer worlds of people. Perceptions and understandings of people toward various concepts such as poems, ethics, and so on shape their outer cultures. Deep layer of culture often proceeds from the surface culture. However, these points are significantly associated with the people of the same society. What about the other cultures? Are there new/innovative and fresh ways to reconcile two far-distant cultures? Are there some appellative techniques to amalgamate and muster them up with one another? In the envisioned situations, translation and the role of the translator as the mere asset is cost-regarding.

In the circle of translation, translators are considered mediators among cultures. Are there any ways to reconcile cultures in translation studies? Do any possibilities exist to build up cultures simultaneously so as to prepare a unique situation to proximate? Does culture diversification exist in translation? Are culture diversifications emerged from the culture homogenization or vice versa? And, should cultural homogenization be treated as globalization in translation?

Translating cultures and reconciling them is possibly the perpendicular purpose of the translators. To reconcile does not signify cultural overlaps. Reconciliation of cultures tends to be considered as culture homogenization (Akbari and Shahnazari 2014). Conversi (2010:719) outlines cultural homogenization as:

“A state-led policy aimed at cultural standardization and the overlap between state and culture. As the goal is frequently to impose the culture of dominant elites on the rest of the citizenry, it consists basically of a top-down process where the states seek to nationalize the masses.”

The present study aims at tracing the futurity of cultural homogenization in translation of poetical texts through ‘purposive culture’ and ‘diglossic culture’. This is due to the fact that the existence of cultural homogeneity in translation of poetical texts proximates the source and target audiences upon the accountability and feasibility of cultural translation in the intended texts.

## **2. State of the Art**

### **2.1. Definition of Culture**

People by nature know the real, hidden, and functional meaning of culture. However, defining culture would be a crucial and significant task to do. Griswold (1994:8) defines culture as “*that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.*” As indicated, culture is not curbed into the surface traits as arts and crafts, clothes, and so on. Let’s face it, culture in particular is

vehemently tied with the internal characters as beliefs, perceptions, understandings, and conceptions to bridge the gap and make a nexus to that of surface culture. In this respect, Gail Robinson (1988:7-13) compartmentalizes the various definitions into two rudimentary levels as external and internal. Externally, culture would be defined as 'behaviors' (e.g. language, gestures, customs, and habits) and 'products' (e.g. literature, folklore, art, music, and artefacts). Likewise, internal culture would be pegged as 'ideas' such as beliefs, values, and institutions.

Ned Seeley (1984:13) depicts culture as "*I know of no way to better ensure having nothing productive happen than for a language department to begin its approach to culture by theoretical concerns for defining the term*". Culture must be stated theoretically and practically at the same time, since theories cause practices to be formed. It signifies that defining culture in accord with deep layer of language and surface one would be considered as betterment in order to fill the gap between theory and practice. Tellingly, defining culture smoothly and dulcetly would be effortless in that there is not a fixed and stable indenture among anthropologists (Asher 1994:2001).

## **2. 2. Theories of Culture**

### *2.2.1. Trompenaars's Layers*

To interpret the culture, Fons Trompenaars (cited in Katan2004) suggested a model in which, the culture is split up into three concentric rings, namely the outer layer, the middle layer, and the core layer. The outer layer comprises artefacts and products such as the legal system and bureaucracy. The middle layer embraces norms and values. Norms dictate to individuals how to behave in their society, but values concerns with aspirations of those people. Finally, the innermost layer is the core layer which is made up of the basic assumptions about life in a given society.

### *2.2.2. Hofstede's Onion*

In Hofstede's Onion Model (cited in Katan2004) culture is also defined in terms of different layers. Hofstede has a bipartite view of culture and divides it into two main levels called values and practices. The values of the society make the invisible core of that culture. Starting from the outermost level respectively, symbols, heroes, and rituals are all different parts of the practices.

### *2.2.3. Ice-berg Theory*

Over the years, Ice-berg theory has been a widely held model on describing culture; however, this model disseminated mostly through the work of Hall in 1990. According to this model, culture is divided into two parts of unequal size. The smaller section is the "tip of the ice-berg" which can be seen plainly and contains music, art, food, drink, etc. The greater but also the concealed portion of

the culture lies beneath the waterline. It comprises the invisible deeply rooted ideas which manifest themselves in the portion above the waterline. In 1995, the most recent ameliorated Ice-berg theory was put forward by Brake et al. (1993:34-39) as follows:

“Laws, customs, rituals, gestures, ways of dressing, food and drink and method of greeting, and saying goodbye . . . These are all part of culture, but they are just the tip of the cultural iceberg. The most powerful elements of culture are those that lie beneath the surface of everyday interaction. We call these values orientation. Value orientations are preferences for certain outcomes over there.”

#### 2.2.4. *Cognitive Culture*

One exciting offshoot of new anthropology is the emergence of a new and different understanding of culture as a unique cognitive system. In this direction, culture is considered not as the "patterns of life" but as the "patterns of mind". Ward Goodenough (1963:167) maintains that:

“A society’s culture consists of whatever it is one has to know or believes in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its member. Culture is not the material phenomenon; it does not consist of things, people, behaviors, or emotions. It is rather an organization of these things. It is the form of things that people have in mind, their models for perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting them.”

Keesing (1974) believed that cultures and language epistemologically belong to the same realm in that both of them are visible products of abstract ideational codes within a community. Hence, the linguistic analysis might open an aperture to those hidden ideational codes which govern the individuals' behavior in a society. For instance, componential analysis can reveal underlying thoughts behind the words so once the translator succeeds in reaching the rationale behind the words, the conglomeration of source language to the target one would be reachable.

#### 2.2.5. *Symbolic Culture*

In this line of work, culture is regarded as systems of common symbols and meanings. One of the most eminent figures in this junta is Clifford Geertz (1964:89) who outlined culture as "*a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life*". Geertz avers that culture is not an abstract pattern locked inside people's head but a "*pattern of meaning embodied in symbols*" shared by particular people. He recommended an interpretive approach in studying culture and deemed that symbols should be examined not for their own sake but for the explanations they could provide about social processes. Geertz

takes critical stance toward mapping the culture with absolute integration and internal consistency and claims that in essence, only partial integration and often disconnectedness and internal contradiction exist. Geertz's (1964:66-67) famous metaphor may better clarify his viewpoint:

“The problem of cultural analysis is as much a matter of determining independencies as interconnection, gulfs as well as bridges. The appropriate image, if one must have images, of cultural organization, is neither the spider web nor the pile of sand. It is rather more the octopus, whose tentacles are in large part separately integrated, neutrally quite poorly connected with one another and with what in the octopus passes for a brain, and yet who nonetheless manages to get around and to preserve himself, for a while anyway, as a viable, if somewhat ungainly entity.”

### **2.3. The Role of Culture in Translation**

Translators are always rummaging to decipher some new techniques to deal with cultural translation. Translation of cultures is a sine qua non as mostly renderers are trying to come out of this challenge in order to approximate and reach the common indenture in this field. To do so, firstly translators should act as the robust mediators amongst cultures, and secondly, they must ascertain their borderlines and constraints in translation of culture. The former alludes to the influential role of the translator between source language (SL) and target language (TL), and correspondingly, the latter puts its emphasis on translators' dos and don'ts in translation of cultures. It is important to state such a truism since translation of cultures are always deemed as an 'affinity group' translation (Hatim and Munday 2004:139) and consequently is an arduous task to reconcile two various groups of thoughts, behaviors, creeds, perceptions, and understandings of two particularly different cultures. Hence, the need to build up the framework of translation of culture might be a functional task in translation studies.

#### *2.3.1. Cultural Diversification in Translation*

One cannot encounter fairly the challenges of translation without reckoning the leverage of cultural differences in any two cultures. Hongmei Sun (2011) argues that owing to the discrepancies and differences across two cultures, semantic equivalence is subjected to be modified and constrained. He then gives an example that the term 'dragon' alludes to the fortune and luck whereas in the western countries it is the symbol of fiendish and evil power regarded as a threatening animal. As another example, 'dog' has the ameliorated associative meaning in the west while it carries the pejorative meaning in eastern countries (Sun 2011:160). Noticingly, it is far worth mentioning that pragmatic differences direct cultures to be treated differently.

Munday (2012:154) goes over that ‘linguistic differences’ are the signs of cultural differences. Linguistic differences would behave cultures variously and eventually lead to build up multiple interpretations across cultures. In such a vein, translator must be aware of the fact that conveying and transferring such different translational items into the target language require observing and considering such constraints. For instance, Grice’s maxims (e.g. quality, quantity, manner, and relevance) would be rendered differently in English-speaking countries compared tonon-English speaking countries. According to Baker (2011:248) “Grice’s maxims seem to reflect directly notions which are known to be valued in the English-speaking world, for instance sincerity, brevity, and relevance.” Accordingly, Venuti (1998:21) avers that linguistic-oriented approaches as ‘*a conservative model of translation that would unduly restricts translation’s role in cultural innovation and change*’.

Translators must always make a fix decision on how to prioritize the norms in their translations. Whether source culture norms prevail or target one is the matter of discussion in translation. Adhering to the norms of source culture steers translation to be regarded as foreignization and to the norms of target culture as domestication (Venuti 1998).

In support of diversity in translation, Roman Jakobson (1959/2000:139) posits the triad types of translation in which the second type coats cultural differences due to ‘interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language’. This category might be juxtaposed with the first form of Umberto Eco (1977:70) in that it explicitly states “*an equivalent sign in another semiotic system (a drawing of a dog corresponds to the word dog)*”. As implied, ‘another semiotic system’ in Umberto Eco postulates two various interpretations whether to build up similar and homogenized situation or the dispersed one in the target language. Should the renderer consider ‘interpretation of verbal signs in another language’ and ‘an equivalent sign in another semiotic system’, she/he comes to this conclusion that translational items upon cultural differences are inevitable.

In doing so, Even-Zohar (2005:3) posits sociocultural differences as the ‘polysystem’ in that “a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent.” As inferred, Even-Zohar illuminates two facets of sociocultural translation namely: (1) overlapping system and (2) various system-different options. The former refers to partly culture homogenization and the latter sets its lens on cultural variabilities and differences between various systems such as source and target languages.

### 2.3.2. *HomoKult: A Surgical Model of Translation of Cultures*

HomoKult is made of two foreignized terms as “*homo-*” and “*Kult*” showing the homogenization of the Latin language and the Germanic one. The former prefix signifies ‘one and the same’ and latter is the clipping term of ‘Die Kulture’ which

means 'culture'. HomoKult model of translation was firstly proposed by Akbari and Shahnazaridue to the fact that cultural homogenization plays the major role in translation studies. The objectives of HomoKult are to substantiate the points of similarities in cultures and then to build up the deep-rooted framework in cultural translation. The intended model pays much attention firstly to the deep layer of language and then to the surface one.

HomoKult as a cultural homogenization model consists of four primary subcategories namely: (1) purposive culture, (2) ameliorated culture, (3) circulated culture, and (4) diglossiculture (Akbari and Shahnazari 2014:1-13).

Akbari and Shahnazari (2014:6) define purposive culture as 'any kind of rudimental culture inspected deeply to convey go-togetherness and then amalgamates deep layer of culture to those of the others.' Purposive culture is made of 'norms, conventions, values, creeds, understandings, perceptions, conceptions, and creeds' of one society. For instance, the ways of apology such as '*Scusi*', '*EntschuldigenSie*', '*Excusezmoi*', and '*Excuse me*' in various languages proportionately shape the foundation of purposive culture since they show the communal deep ground in culture. The utmost facet of purposive culture is to address people's thoughts, perceptions, and understandings toward something.

Ameliorated culture defines as 'any sort of culture working on the superficial layer of culture'. Ameliorated culture, as its name reveals, corroborates the rate of cultural transferability in surface layer of language and mostly pays much attention to the decoration of culture. For instance, translation of '*Taglitelleai porcini*' as an Italian dish in the Persian and English as '*SupeQarch*' and '*Mushroom Stew*' respectively. This is particularly owing to the fact that the general ingredients of the intended food are the same and the translator puts his/her effort to simulate the intended dish in the receptive languages to depict the superficial framework on the target languages. Coping with ameliorated culture in HomoKult model of translation requires much information on equivalence paradigm, since equivalence directly applies to the surface feature of the translational items.

Whenever a culture inspects the peripherality of one translatorial item, it is considered as circulated culture. This category of cultural translation scrutinizes temporal and spatial alternations in diverse fields such as technology, cutting-edge instruments, and products across languages. For instance, the notion of '*Americanism*' (Patton Jr 1980) is going to be spread out across languages and it shows the vastness of the culture overshadowing amongst others. As another example, '*iPad*', '*iPod*', '*iPhone*' are all cutting-edge devices in which the translator must resort to the technique of 'wafting' (Akbari 2013) to make translation palpable for the target audience.

And eventually, every culture is generally made of two different strata namely (1) high culture and (2) low culture. The former is pertained to the particular cohorts of

people such as elites, professors, statesmen, and the like and conversely the latter related to illiterates, countrymen, and young generations. These strata refer to diglossic culture in which it checks translation into two different parts.

### 3. Discussion

Purposive and diglossic cultures are two levels of extremes in that the former is exploited for the foundation of the culture and the latter is for decoration of culture. Tellingly, these two facets and categories are always in the circle of interaction with each other to form an acceptable translation. By and large, the stable element in this interaction is the role of the translator, since his/her *devoir* is to reconcile and amalgamate source language to target language.

Notably, prior to the act of translating, translators should thoroughly perceive the concealed message of the source text and correspondingly she/he frames up the chain of simulations between the languages. To put into practice, the present study opens up the insight of cultural translation through the lens of poetic texts in order to build up the resilient situation between ST and TT. To understand the real intention of purposive culture, one of the poems of Benjamin Franklin (1733) (*Death is the Fisherman*) is selected and consequently the Persian translation is presented in order to see the communal parts.

#### Death is the Fisherman

DEATH is a fisherman, the world we see  
 His fish-pond is, and we the fishes be;  
 His net some general sickness; howe'er he  
 Is not so kind as other fishers be;  
 For if they take one of the smaller fry,  
 They throw him in again, he shall not die:  
 But death is sure to kill all he can get,

And all is fish with him that comes to net

Tellingly, the Persian translation made by KambizManuchehrian (2013) has also addressed the hidden and concealed intention of what Benjamin Franklin thought.

مرگ یک ماهیگیر است

مرگ مانند ماهیگیر

هست و دریای او جهان باشد



ماهی او کسی چون من چون تو

خواه او پیر یا جوان باشد

تو را: ناخوشی، مرض، پیری

هست تا صیدمان کند شاید

ما همه ماهیان این برکه

تور گاهی به سمت ما آید

گرچه صیادهای دیگر هم

تور خود را به آب اندازند

گاهی اما که صیدشان کوچک

هست دیگر به آن نمینازند

صید را باز هم روانه کنند

سوی دریا که جان بگیرد باز

تا نمیرد به آب برگردد

زندگی را ز نو کند آغاز

مرگ اما همیشه بی رحم است

او فقط مرگ صید میخواهد

هرکه افتد به دام خواهد کشت

تا که از جمع ماهیان کاهد

Before going through the main theme of this poem, it is noteworthy inspecting the poet's policy and correspondingly beholding the relevant flow of thoughts of the Persian poet. 'Death is the Fisherman' by Franklin is the fictional poem in which 'death' or 'demise' is juxtaposed to a fisherman. Notably, 'Fish' is the simile of the HuMan (capital M) and the FisherMan (capital M) is the one who takes soul. The FisherMan in the poem does not seem to be the run of the mill fisherman, since he does not hand back the fish to the river and noticingly he would not forgive and spare any soul. Therefore, the poem depicts the unidirectionality of life continuum which encompasses on-way life's road.

All along the line, the purpose of the English poem has been kept in its counterpart, Persian translation. For instance, 'تور گاهی به سمت ما آید', 'ماهی او کسی چون من چون تو', 'هر که اقتدبه دام او خواهد کشت', etc.

In all these renderings, the Persian translator as the deep-surface reconciliator tries to project the aim of the poem in Persian to institutionalize and curve the speakable conjecture in the reader's mind. Therefore, the first step (deep-source amalgamation and deep-source reconciliation) is addressed by the Persian translator on the basis of HomoKult model of translation.

Another variable in purposive culture would be prosodic effects and the rhyme of the poem. Both English poem and Persian translation observe the rhythmic-metric-sound among the lines and this makes Persian translation more priceless as much as the original poem. This is due to the fact that the translator as a mediator could infringe the notion of 'Les Belles Infidèles' (Chamberlain 1998/2000:315), since the intended Persian rendering is faithful and also beautiful.

To corroborate the very nature of purposive culture in another languages, one poem is taken from Charles Baudelaire (1857) (*Causerie*) and consequently English translation is compared to see the deep-surface amalgamation.

### Causerie

Vousêtesun beau ciel d'automne, clair et rose!  
 Mais la tristesse en moi montecomme la mer,  
 Et laisse, en refluant, sur ma lèvre morose  
 Le souvenir cuisant de son limonamer.

— Ta main se glisse en vain surmonsein qui se pâme;  
 Cequ'ellecherche, amie, est un lieu saccagé  
 Par la griffe et la dent féroce de la femme.  
 Ne cherchez plus moncoeur; les bêtes l'ontmangé.

Mon coeur est un palais flétri par la cohue;  
 On s'y soûle, on s'y tue, on s'y prend aux cheveux!  
 — Un parfumnage autour de votre gorge nue!...

Ô Beauté, dur fléau des âmes, tu le veux!  
 Avec tes yeux de feu, brillants comme des fêtes,  
 Calcine ces lambeaux qu'ont épargnés les bêtes!

Accordingly, English translation made by Roy Campbell (1952) transcreates the same situation in his translation:

### Conversation

You're like an autumn sky, rose, clear, and placid.  
 But sorrow whelms me, like the tide's assault,  
 And ebbing, leaves upon my lips the acid  
 And muddy-bitter memory of its salt.

Your hand may stroke my breast, but not console.  
 What it seeks there is but a hole, deep caverned  
 By women's claws and fangs, and ransacked whole.  
 Seek not my heart, on which the beasts have ravened.

My heart's a palace plundered by the rabble:  
 They tope, they kill, in blood and guts they scabble:  
 — A perfume swims around your naked breast!

O Beauty, flail of spirits, you know best!  
 With your eyes' fire, lit up as for a spree,  
 Char the poor rags those beasts have left of me!

One of the significant techniques which the English translator uses, besides the main intention of the original poem in English translation, is considered as wafting. Akbari (2013) defines wafting as “*a direct and intense translation process, it has a connection with rendering or transferring as the original SL by inserting or absorbing the SL words or phrases form into the RL's in accordance with prestigious, frequency, and intensity of the intended words.*” Words such as ‘*autumn, rose, clear, perfume, and beauty*’ are considered as partial and total wafting, since they convey the main essence, frequency, and prestige as

those in the French poem. Exploiting such wafted words makes the target reader accept the nativized translation in his/her tongue.

In the French poem, the poet makes use of rhymes in lines such as '*rose and morose*', '*mer and amer*', and '*pâme and femme /fæm/*' in order to form an acceptable framework of his understanding. Accordingly, the English translator also utilizes such rhythmic lines in his translation such as '*placid and acid*', '*assault and salt*', '*console and whole*', and '*caverned and ravened*' to generate a faithful and beautiful rendering of the intended poem in the target language. Exploiting similar rhymes in English translation as those of the original French poem puts translation in a hybrid manner in which the sole purpose of purposive culture is to reach this apogee.

The other category of HomoKult model of translation addresses culture dichotomously so as to inspect the type and the sort of the audience encountered either in source or target languages to behold the sense of reaction upon perceiving the hidden and concealed resolution of the poem. Diglossic culture as its name connotes inspects the feasibility and speakability of one's culture into two halves: (1) low culture (one to one translation or natural translation) and (2) high culture (one to two, directional, and one to several translation). The former refers to literal, word for word, formal, and phonological translation. While the latter covers creative, primary, translocation, free-adaptation, and functional translation.

To put high culture into practice, the present study selects the excerpts of Gerard NolstTrenité (1922) (*The Chaos*) to show the particularity of audience in this respect:

Sword and sward, retain and Britain  
(Mind the latter how it's written).  
Made has not the sound of bade,  
Say-said, pay-paid, laid but plaid.

Now I surely will not plague you  
with such words as vague and ague,  
but be careful how you speak,  
Say: gush, bush, steak, streak, break, bleak,

Previous, precious, fuchsia, via  
Recipe, pipe, studding-sail, choir;  
Woven, oven, how and low,  
Script, receipt, shoe, poem, toe.

Say, expecting fraud and trickery:  
Daughter, laughter and Terpsichore,

Branch, ranch, measles, topsails, aisles,  
Missiles, similes, reviles.

Wholly, holly, signal, signing,  
Same, examining, but mining,  
Scholar, vicar, and cigar,  
Solar, mica, war and far.

As observed, Trenité draws upon various labyrinths of phonetic disorders or irregularities so as to put out the virtuoso feat of composition, a mammoth catalog of the sleaziest irregularities in English version. The bulk of the poem displays as valid an indictment of the Chaos in English spelling.

On the other side of the coin, there exists low culture regulating one-to-one correspondence or natural equivalence for the audience and the reader to become familiar with the sensitivity of the situation. In this condition, rendering tends to be simple and easy to comprehend by the people to get an overall picture of that implication.

To substantiate the viability of low culture in translation, Giacomo Leopardi's opus (L'infinito) will be overhauled to see the order and progression of equivalents in Italian Language and accordingly in English translation.

Sempre caro mi fu quest'ermocolle,  
E quest'asiepe, che da tanta parte  
Dell'ultimo orizzonte il guardo esclude.  
Ma sedendo e mirando, interminati  
Spazi di là da quella, e sovrumani  
Silenzi, e profondissima quiete  
Io nel pensier mi fingo; ove per poco  
Il cor non si spaura. E come il vento  
Odo stormir tra queste piante, io quello  
Infinito silenzio a questa voce  
Vo comparando: e mi sovvien l'eterno,  
E le morte stagioni, e la presente  
E viva, e il suon di lei. Così tra questa  
Immensità s'annega il pensier mio:  
E il naufragar m'è dolce in questo mare.

The English translation made by Mike Towler (1998) is also addressed the purpose of this poem:

Always dear to me was this lonely hill,  
And this hedge, which from me so great a part  
Of the farthest horizon excludes the gaze.

But as I sit and watch, I invent in my mind  
 endless spaces beyond, and superhuman  
 silences, and profoundest quiet;  
 wherefore my heart  
 almost loses itself in fear. And as I hear the wind  
 rustle through these plants, I compare  
 that infinite silence to this voice:  
 and I recall to mind eternity,  
 And the dead seasons, and the one present  
 And alive, and the sound of it. So in this  
 Immensity my thinking drowns:  
 And to shipwreck is sweet for me in this sea.

Noticingly, Mike Towler observes the special group of people and translates every chunk of poem naturally along with natural equivalents in order the reader understands the main gist of the poem. The English translation does not observe the prosodic effects of the original poem yet it regards the deep structure in the target language provided the fact that the audience does not lie close upon the real intention of the poem. The hidden purpose of this poem is expressed pricelessly by the tongue of Towler (1998):

“‘L’infinito’ exhibits one of the apexes not only of Leopardi's poetry but of all poetry. Scarcely has a poet been able to compress within one hundred words such depth of meaning with such simplicity of language and harmony of sounds. Leopardi called "L’infinito" an "idyll", a definition that perfectly fits the charm and suggestive power of this superb poem, which, to quote Renato Poggioli, makes familiar and almost dear to the heart of man the alien metaphysical vision of a universe ruled by laws other than those of life and death (<http://www.tcm.phy.cam.ac.uk>).”

To juxtapose and contrast the identity of HomoKult model, one needs to ascertain the foundations of ‘spider-web lattices of HomoKult model’ (Akbari and Shahnazari 2016). Moving forward from the least to the last steps of web lattice requires operating the true nature of some cultural/translational strategies which the aforementioned model pays attention at large. Moving from purposive culture to diglossic culture causes the end-product to be implied significantly, since these two extremes are responsible for pulling over the translator into the right sphere of creating translation. However; being in the zenith and nadir of this lattice (purposive and diglossic cultures), one can apply the in-depth knowledge of culture to homogenize in case of diversification.

#### 4. Conclusion

It is generally believed that cultural translation (CT) plays an indispensable part in translation. Most of the translators' concerns lie in this field in that they always give a shot to scrutinize various rites, customs, and perceptions. Some questions need to be supervised for building up the acceptable framework in CT. Among cultural theories, HomoKult model of translation gained its popularity for the amalgamation of source culture with target culture in order to decipher the communal parts between cultures. Of the four proposed categories of HomoKult model, purposive culture and diglossic one were evaluated for their workability in translation of poetical texts. The aim of purposive culture would be simultaneously to preserve both local color of source language and target one so as to saturate the needs of the audience. And also, diglossic culture inspects equivalence paradigm either natural or directional. Opting the appropriate yet fitting to type of the audience is the ultimate aim of diglossic culture.

#### 5. Implication

It will be such truism to accept the viewpoint that all suggested cultural models of translation per se are not exhaustive and address some special gamut of audience in translation studies. However, to this effect, HomoKult model peruses culture and the role of culture for the sake of deep-surface reconciliation. This model also addresses some strategies to deal with cultural facets which are of significance in cultural translation. To presuppose translator as the powerful sprachmittler for making a robust nexus between the source and target cultures requires applying some pivotal or even rudimental cutting-edge devices and methods in which HomoKult model heeds them in its own right.

#### References and notes:

- Akbari, Alireza. "Exploring into the New Model Procedure in Translation: Wafting as a Case in Point." *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies* 1.2, 2013: 18-26.
- Akbari, Alireza, and MohammadtaghiShahnazari. "HomoKult: A New Model in Translation" *SAGE Open* 4.3, 2014: 1-13.
- Akbari, Alireza, and MohammadtaghiShahnazari. "On the Other Side of Equivalence Paradigms in New Translation Studies: Equimediation Paradigm as a Case in Point." *Proceeding of SOCIOINT2014- International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities* .2014.: 215-220.
- Akbari, Alireza, and MohammadtaghiShahnazari. "Spider-Web Lattice vs. Iceberg Theory: Which One Holds Sway over in Cultural Translation?" *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies* 2.4 .2016.: 54-72.

- Asher, R. E., and J. M. Y. Simpson. *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1994. Print.
- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Course book on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2011. Print.
- Brake, Terence, Danielle Medina.Walker, and Thomas Walker. *Doing business internationally: the guide to cross-cultural success*. Burr Ridge: Irwin, 1993. Print.
- Chamberlain, Lori. *Gender and Metaphors of Translation*, Signs 13: 457-72, Reprinted in L. Venuti (ed.), 2000: 315.
- Conversi, Daniele. "Cultural Homogenization, Ethnic Cleansing and Genocide". In: Denmark, Robert A., (ed.) *The International Studies Encyclopedia*, 12 Volume Set. Wiley Blackwell, London, UK (2010): 719-742.
- Eco, Umberto. *A Theory of Semiotics*, London, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1977. Print.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 'Polysystem Theory Revised', in Itamar. Even-Zohar (ed.) *Papers in Culture Research*, (2005): 38-49, <http://www.tau.ac.il/itamarez/works/books/EZCR-2005.pdf>.
- Geertz, Clifford. "Ritual and Social Change: A Javanese Example." *American Anthropologist* 59.1 (1957): 32-54.
- Goodenough, Ward. *Cooperation in Change*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 1963. Print.
- Griswold, Wendy. *Cultures and Society in a Changing World*. London, England: Pine Forge Press, 1994. Print.
- Hall, Edward. T. *The Silent Language*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1990. Print.
- Hatim, Basil, and Munday, Jeremy. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Jacobson, Roman. *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation (Venuti L., Ed.)*. London, England: Routledge, 2000. Print.
- Katan, David. *Translating Culture: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters, and Mediator*. Great Britain, UK: St. Jerome Publishing, 2004. Print.
- Keesing, Roger. M. "Theories on Culture". *Annual Journal Review*, 3.1(1974): 73-97.
- Kroeber, Alfred L., and Clyde Kluckhohn. *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. New York: Vintage, 1952. Print.
- Munday, Jeremy. *The Routledge Companion to Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012. Print.
- Patton, Jr, C. R. *Americanism*, <http://hiwaay.net/~crpatton/pattons/prose/amerism.txt>, (1980). Print.
- Robinson, Gail. *Cross Cultural Understanding*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Prentice Hall International, 1988. Print.
- Seeleye, Ned. *Teaching Culture: Strategies for Foreign Language Educators*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company ACTFL, 1984. Print.
- Sun, Hongmei. "On Cultural Differences and Translation Methods." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 2.1 (2011): 160-163.
- Venuti, L. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards as Ethics of Differences*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.



## Summary

### **The Leverage of Cultural Homogenization in Futurity of Translation Studies: HomoKult Model as the Right Switch**

**Masoud Shahnazari**

Islamic Azad University, Kerman Branch, Iran

**Alireza Akbari**

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

Cultural Translation (CT) in general and translation of cultures in particular has come into the new horizon in a few years. Both diversity and homogeneity of cultures circle around translators' cynosure. Notwithstanding the fact that cultural diversification acts as the primary role in cultural translation, much attention has been paid to homogeneity and future of cultural translation in translation studies. In this direction, one of the latest movements in cultural translation is rooted in source-target culture reconciliation known as HomoKult (capital K) model. The core principle of HomoKult lies in four types of cultures namely: (1) purposive culture, (2) ameliorated culture, (3) circulated culture, and (4) diglossic culture. The present study opens up the new insight in cultural translation on the basis of purposive and diglossic cultures of HomoKult model for reconditioning off the futurity of intercultural translation between source and target languages.

**Key words:** Cultural Translation, Homogeneity, HomoKult, Purposive and Diglossic Cultures