

Received: October 2023 Accepted: December 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58262/ks.v12i1.179>

Death of the Truth in Translation Revisited “Accuracy or Excess of Limits”

Prof. Dr. Djamel Goui¹

Abstract

Translation at large is known initially and traditionally by rendering telling the truth of a content provided in another language and serves at communicating with faithfulness, this meaning, however, should be revisited given the actual nowadays practices that are leading to the death of the truth. Traditionally, as agreed by those in the field or as expected by the beneficiaries, translation seeks reexpressing the facts contained in the source text minding carefully telling the truth to be qualified faithful accurate translation. With the big increase of translation load, diversification of needs and multiplication of natures of texts and discourses lately, new phenomena have started to emerge leading the observer to proceed to investigating the truth/ lie and conformance of the translations comparing the original input with the final refined product of translating; most of the time, mainly recently, more than one single reading of the output is possible and surprisingly it finds to be sometimes thoroughly divergent reading and interpretations. This has led to putting the translator in his/her capacity of doer and likely the interpreter in a doubt zone, being suspicious or even convict of not transferring telling the truth and accordingly undermining the whole process of rendition by turning it less trustworthy, to be dealt with at the end with high attention and even vigilance. This chapter comes then to question whether or not the translator or translation nowadays is trustworthy rendering truth, and shall begin with accounting for translation practices in the past and nowadays, attempt to compare and analyze the reasons of the dramatically witnessed change, and revisit the meaning of translation compared to the practice since translation started in the actual modern routine practice contributing tremendously to setting frames, instead of limiting its self to mere reexpressing realities defined in the source. The chapter shall as well highlight the ideology and power being factors introduced in translation and leading to more vigilance by the receptor and shall primarily investigate the limits of permission allowed by translation as a process aiming a priori at communicating.

Keywords: translation, truth, ideology, power, frames.

Introduction

Translation linguistically speaking embodies a change in the initial form or format. If for instance metaphorically speaking *someone is translated before the judge*, it means that his status changed from being fully free to becoming convict or suspect if not a guilty. This confirms that, a priori, translation meaning involves change at several levels. At another level, if someone uses “*so and so translated his words into actions*”, it means that he changed the form of the initial first mentioned “words” into another form “actions”. Nevertheless, this change in the form or likely format is not at all part of acting unfaithful to the initial form, but changing the form to

¹ Laboratory of English Language, literature, translation and production of knowledge.
University of Kasdi Merbah Ouargla Algeria.

illustrate the first in another way. Technically speaking, on the other hand, translation means briefly expressing a language content in another language.

1. Translation Functions

Since the antiquity, translation as practice mainly as fully technically defined by scholars in the fields aims at rendering with precision the content of a source text in another target one. This rule does not give, a priori, rendition process any right to text/discourse change, distortion, falsification or any cunning intervention. Translation, for ages, was safely practiced aiming merely and exclusively to achieve communication success between different peoples or communities. This is accordingly to acknowledge translation function at first was just purely communicative and limited to communication. Translation intervenes accordingly to fix language communication problems (Basil Hatim & Ian Mason, 1993).

Recently, translation turns from a mere means to understand the other, to a means to build and turns into sometimes an objective as well. The multitude of targets, intentions and objectives have created a new atmosphere to translation routine practice, and this helped tremendously in diversifying the functions of translation; some of them are commonly known such as the communicative function, and some others are non-classical and not widely known. These functions are not limited to:

1.2 Production of Knowledge

Production of knowledge is lately claimed to be one of the functions of translation among others. By this is meant, translation should not remain merely a device to resort to when failing to communicate with the other but a means to contribute to producing a new knowledge (Robert Young, 2011). To illustrate, on one hand, one can think of a same information and likely conclusion that exists in a language he/she ignores and might assume he/she is producing an innovation, and without translation, plagiarism trap might be the final destination of this research, as it will be just a repetition of a research already made elsewhere. With the numerous world major languages and minority languages, one cannot guarantee he/she is innovative in research for instance, unless translation does its role of a world knowledge checker. Not only checking plagiarism, but forming new perspectives of innovative practices basing upon the really found inclusive literature review, with the successful avoidance of innocent repetition that might be judged plagiarism (see, Jenny Williams & Andrew Chesterman, 2011, p 128) according the actual views, visions and definition in research and research methodology.

On the other hand, translation can serve as a means to gather information and data of the other from all parts of this globe, in connection with a particular field to fill in a real need gap in research. Gathering information and data shall constitute accordingly a good database for producing new knowledge by researchers; generating knowledge from the accumulation of translations from the other (Djamel Goui, 2015, p 61). This, I bet, helps the entire world tremendously achieving progress ahead in research and likely all life sectors, since solid development is, theoretically and practically, founded on reliable research and knowledge generation, thanks to translation and data collected through it.

1.3 Power and Domination

A common person and even a well taught might get surprised to hear translation might play a role in power achievement and domination. Seemingly, translation is, par excellence, a linguistic activity that has theoretically nothing to do with power and domination. (Mathew Reynolds, 2016, p65).

Nevertheless, translation particularly and language at comprise semantic loads, transmit and eventually influence and affect the receiver mind, mind-set, actions, reactions and likely whole behavior and attitudes. It is clearly noticed in this operation that the starting point is just a language and the arrival point is influence, this means that language is loaded with influence. In translation, which undoubtedly and naturally uses language as a means, the involvement and possible intervention of a second touch via a mediator namely the translator is ineluctable most of the time; some other times the author is the translator therefore the second touch is not there, however, in all cases, the second operation is there i-e when translating. This second touch or second operation has the ability to launch wars. (جمال قوي، 2017)

Discourse is a field that investigated and investigates very interesting phenomenon in relation with the impact of loads in language practice including translational practices. Through discourse, discourse analysis and especially critical discourse analysis, studies have confirmed that translation could be a strong weapon of war, or precisely a soft weapon of war; as it does not lead to deaths or injuries, but rather a war of ideas namely ideology war where translation would act satisfactorily as a tool or a device of extending areas of domination on the other, embodying safely a soft expansion that controls the superstructure instead of the infrastructure only as in classical military wars. Translation then might help drawing the ideological maps of the existing world, which are thoroughly different from the political maps known by almost every ordinary person and recognized by all world states and organisms.

Indeed, soft wars (wars of ideologies) are stronger and harsher in consequences than military frank classical wars. Soft wars are soft in name but very hard and harsh in their outcomes. Soft wars launched via translation in particular being area of this research and language at large might undermine the ideological belonging of some nations, countries or communities on a side and can cater hatred between large and small communities. This can accordingly lead to worse situations including the military confrontations.

Translation uses many strategies to insure soft war is taking place and power is embodied. It is first to highlight that in this context differences is made between strategy and technique in translation as scholars have different views in this regard and some of them see absolutely no difference between them such as Andrew Chesterman (1997, p88). In addition to the much known strategies defined in translation studies books and major references of the discipline, translation resorts to containment and incitement strategies to show soft war waging and power illustrated.

1.3.1 Containment

By containment in translation is meant the selection of a series of a glossary that contains the others and change their ideological belonging. The consequence of this containment is whether changing the attitudes of a certain community, a group or a person, render them softly convinced, and believe in causes that their community sees them from another angle such as the Palestinian cause, which is controversial and very sensitive between groups in the world among others. Containment becomes then a sort of mind programming by sweeping ideas judged generally negative or harmful by a community and adopting instead relatively neutralized idea. The containment that is performed via neutralization process is based essentially on words and terms selection. The selection gives strength and forms the needed influence on the targeted receiver.

1.3.2 Incitement

The second strategy is incitement, which means in this context “Urging someone to do something via encouraging and prioritizing all sorts of hatred expressions and glossary”. This

strategy is founded on teasing feelings to push to dealing according to them. Incitement is indeed another aspect of programming the targeted receiver to act full of anger and fury towards another community or a group.

The sin is clearly seen in this strategy more than in the containment strategy. Actually, it is because the context is simply involving war making (see: Nataly Kelly & Jost Zetsche, 2012). Therefore, regardless of being a soft hidden or a hard clear military war, sin is always present in all types of war including the one led linguistically via translation and discourse contained or directed and deemed soft theoretically but, in fact, very powerful on the ground.

Incitement is consequently adopted by translators mostly and interpreters when necessary, in order to have control and power over the targeted receiver. This is to understand how dangerous could be the selection of words blindly or innocently sometimes, as failing to select adequately particularly might lead to calamities at many levels. Worse than that, the simple naïve translator might find himself/herself playing surprisingly the role of the enemy of his/her self and community or group at large by acting carelessly willingly or unwillingly.

Since power and domination have lately become of the roles of translation, one should start investigating if any translation is safe to receive and more significantly, to examine whether the rendition is truly telling or transmitting the truth as exactly contained in the source language. Traditionally and routinely, peoples used to rely on translation blindly and innocently as deemed a safe device of understanding the other with accuracy and in total faithfulness harmony. Nevertheless, investigating this should be made to know what is happening and to what extent one could rely on translations.

2. Accuracy in Translation

Accuracy: the correct transfer of information and evidence of complete comprehension (Munday, 2008, p 31). Initially, accuracy in translation investigates the exactness of rendition of the source text in the target language. The Exactness most of the time is linked to the achievement of sameness in sense and words between the input and output of translating operation, and generating a harmony that gives at the end an equivalent faithful text or discourse to the source text or discourse. Accuracy concept in humanities at large as acknowledged by everyone is relatively different from accuracy in scientific fields such as physics or mainly mathematics, and from this point, accuracy in translation for instance should seek achieving the closest possible rendition that enables conveying the contained message in the source, with faithfulness as much as possible. It is hence to understand that there are always, in the way to generate equivalence, some lost units or loads for a reason or another, in the final refined translation; reasons range from, differences or divergences of languages that engender many difficulties, to untranslatability sometimes.

Sometimes to produce an equivalent with accuracy, you should change the original exactly with its opposite word or expression:

Table 01: Accuracy Via Opposition (Equivalence).

English (source)	Arabic (target)
This news has warmed my heart	هذا الخبر صدري أثلج
My students are hungry for knowledge	للمعرفة طلبتي متعطشون

This attempt to give a general idea on accuracy in translation might shed light on margins, which are not covered during the process leading the receiver/reader to doubt zones. By margins is meant, all occurrences taking place at the margin of the process, which the receiver

may not think they happened or might happen such as omission or opposition among others. The receiver in his/her position may start thinking of how trustworthy are the translations and if the translation are truly reliable for a successful communication and more surprisingly if the translation tells the truth or is leading to truth death.

Translation is supposed always to seek telling truth but with the recent practices, one should investigate this to confirm if any derailing in the process or in the outcome is taking place. Moreover, accuracy in humanities is not measurable with precision; it is then sometimes tied and conditioned with probabilities, sentiments and even tempers occasionally. Thus, it remains always relative and objectively subject to investigation, study and as well as logically led criticism.

The examples above, for instance, show how the details in the source text were expressed differently using fully opposite concepts to produce accurate equivalence. Should they be considered truth telling or truth killing?

3. Practices and Constraints

Because of many natural phenomena in languages such as polysemy, synonymy, vagueness among others, some recent practices raised inevitably in translation. Translators for a reason or another are taking willingly advantage of the phenomena to achieve certain objective or subjective objectives and others are innocently falling in those traps. For this cause, many recent studies, have highlighted the intervention of the translators in the translation output, and have examined as well its legitimacy in the context of achieving accuracy, and telling the truth. While others have examined the same issue from the angle of the limits of intervention of the translator while translating, to see to what extent this intervention is acceptable and shall not be qualified as distortion of the original, or in best cases rewriting.

Table 02 Polysemy in Context.

English (source)	Arabic (target)
You need to have advanced level to have admission in our university	تحتاج الى مستوى متقدم لتقبل في جامعتنا
She has an advanced cancer	تعاني سرطانا في مرحلة متأخرة

The table above shows how the same word in English “advanced” has given in two different contexts in English (source) two fully opposite words in Arabic. This is to confirm that context has rendered the word “advanced” into a polysemous word, that might mislead the translator, the interpreter or the mediator at large. Context then colors the meaning and might give and synonymy might turn into antonymy in the target language. “Context plays a key role in the process of translating because it is the signpost that guides the translator in choosing one type of equivalence rather than another” (Farghal & Shunnaq, 2011, p12)

3.1 Translator Intervention

Translators logically are not supposed to intervene in the text undergoing translating. As mentioned previously, translators should facilitate understanding the other and consequently they are not in any cases entitled to intervene in the original text by adding loads, overdoses, extra meanings or information that are not contained in the source. Translators are ethically to limit their mission to rendition with precision as much as possible and assisting the others to understand and likely respond if necessary. However, with the multitude of targets, natures and types of texts along with

the possibility to intervene in the translated texts, it becomes more or less needed to serve certain intentions via translation to have power even on the original source text.

Translators intervene taking advantage of the linguistic possibility and translation allowance do not intend to falsify truths but to serve agendas and strategic objectives in connection notably with power and domination. This was one of the substances of study of “source oriented strategy” and “target oriented strategy”. See (Jamal Mohamed Giaber, 2019, pp 109, 112)

Translators intervene mandatorily in discourse for several reasons, which are not limited to:

3.1.1 Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is always linked to feelings of supremacy, superiority and distinction of nation or a community culture. It can be as well described as cultural ignorance as individuals or groups see themselves the only correct in the way they live or behave. Ethnocentrism, on the ground, is a real enemy of cultural tolerance or coexistence; it embodies some hatred aspects and features. In language, at large, ethnocentric practices are found, and expressed via linguistic signs in literary works in particular. While in translation, they are generally neutralized (rendered neutral) in some cases if the translator is not from the same ethnocentric attitude, group or community. In some other cases, those signs disappear thoroughly as the translator tends to remove them from text at all, aiming probably at the avoidance of the cultural jamming (See Venutti, 2013, p145) or cultural shock of the receiver/reader ; this signifies practically to domesticate the loads and possibly the effect. In few other times, those ethnocentric linguistic signs are turned to express the opposite surprisingly; the translator might permit the use of antonym instead of merely translating literally the word used in the original in a certain context. In other cases, the translator might fully change the word of the original by another one that has nothing to do with the one used in the source text, and it is neither an antonym nor close; the translator in this case might qualify the translation being an adapted one. Actually, in the four (04) mentioned cases namely; neutralization, omission, opposition or full change, the translator intervention is acknowledged, confirmed and cannot be denied whether by the translator or by the observer who might be most of the time the reader. Hence, those undertaken positions and expressed actions by the translator, who is acting, *à priori*, as a mediator, are not part of truth telling and do not represent it in any case; as the contrast between the source and the target is very clear. Whereas the reader is, on the other side, relying fully trustfully and confidently on the translator to enable him/her understanding with precision first, and give him/her access to all the realities and details expressed in the source text second at least. Here, the investigation of the role of the translator is highly required and recommended, as it is in this case, undermining strongly the function of translation in general.

The four stated cases take place more clearly in audiovisual translation. In audiovisual translation, whether dubbing or subtitling is concerned, the margin of intervention of the translator is a bit wider, as the original text or audiovisual material is rich of scenes, attitudes, positions, scenarios and so on that might need to convey message unwanted by a community of a cultural group. This opens the way to the translator for more intervention or manipulation because of the increasing chances and multitude of scenes in movies and documentaries among others. This does not mean that intervention of the translator in other types of translation is not acknowledged but this is simply to say that chances to notice the intervention in audiovisual translation is more likely to occur than other types of translation.

Consequently, one might tolerate the question of whether the avoidance of cultural shock of the reader is a valid reason to legitimate such an intervention of the translator visibly seen in the

translation or it is a mere pretext. Indeed, the cultural shock might be always there, if, for instance, culture ONE reader is not shocked, culture TWO reader is shocked; there is always a victim of cultural shock somewhere if two divergent cultures are subject to expression, a first via source language and a second via translation. It is, therefore, to confirm that cultural shock sometimes is a mere pretext to have recourse to ethnocentric renditions, which if applied or adopted by the translator shall embody real paradoxical illustration of telling truth in translation. Translation accordingly will not apparently be a reliable source of information to know the other as it may mislead the one relying exclusively on it, due to the mentioned details in this regard.

Ethnocentrism illustrates a reason behind intervention, nevertheless, it is not the only one pushing the translator to intervene in the source text, and puts his/her touch on it, by neutralization, omission, opposition or full change, but there are still other reasons such as ideology among others that might whet the appetite of the translation to feel more freedom towards the text between hands.

3.1.2 Ideology

One of the major reasons behind the translator intervention is ideology. Ideology and ethnocentrism meaning overlap relatively but they are different from each other from several perspectives. Ideology means much more beliefs that are related to political and economic theory along with other beliefs including religious and cultural backgrounds. Ideology is a fertile arena of real and clear conflicts between nations and groups, as it is expressed often in issues in connection mainly with causes, such as the Palestinian cause, Algeria and France colonialism, Western imperialism, Islam and other religions among others. These topics are very strongly sensitive to each and every one subjected to a text or a translation dealing with his/her cause; response to discourse will certainly be rapid and the effect shall be too high. The sensitivity of those topics is indeed the reason leading a translator to intervene strategically attempting to mitigate the negative effect on his/her community, nation or group via neutralization sometimes, omission some other times, change or opposition if possible. The translators tend to opt for one of these choices to enable their community or group of belonging standing in the position of winners and right-holders, and putting the others in the position of loser or non-right-holders. It is then a question of winning or losing a position to put oneself or the others in a certain frame or another.

In the war led by translation, ideology makes conflicts clearer being a soft weapon in the game. Again, just like ethnocentrism represented in ethnocentric linguistic practices, ideological attitudes in language or in translation, which are qualified as interventions in translation, would provoke the message receiver/reader sentiment, and incite him/her to act accordingly; most of the time showing hatred or anger at least, and might lead also to undertaking reactions which might, in turn, be categorized as war soft silent signs, that nobody can guarantee will not develop to a military one in a later stage, or in some cases interpreted in physical violence acts or attacks. This means that killing truth in translation is per se a sort of war, from effect and truth death perspective and from translatorial and translational perspective as well; undertaken by translators and permitted by translation.

Is the translator obliged then to kill the truth, which is not part of his/her job? Leading accordingly to the death of the truth in translation and turning the translator into a liar instead of good mediator.

In some cases the objectives behind translating undertaking differs and those objectives might correctly and naturally tolerate killing truth in translation.

4. Objectives of Translation and the Death of the Truth

Nations translate simply to exist. Needles to go back to the very beginning to highlight the role of translation in enabling communication or successful communication between nations. Translation is, now converted, as indicated previously in this paper, to non-classical roles; not limited of course to production of knowledge and power only. Nations translate to get updated and consequently be able to exist in nowadays world growing and developing too fast and turning into a small room instead of a small village. In these circumstances, the objectives of translation differ from a translator to another one and from a group, community or a nation to other ones too.

Objectives of translation are generally set beforehand, whether in literary translation or other, and initially none of those objectives plans from the beginning to achieve the death of the truth in the target text.

4.1 Translate to Introduce the Other

The actions undertaken by translators mainly in literary translation are most of the time justified by the planned objective. In many cases, the translator objective may be to introduce the culture of the other and in this case, he/she will not neutralize or hide the signs, which might frankly lead to the culture shock of the receiver/reader due to the divergence in worldview between the source culture and the culture of the addressee/reader. The translate here does not change anything and leaves willingly all exotic units and signs to enable the reader to know and discover them and discover hence the other through the provided translation.

Translator then does not kill the truth contained in the original. No truth death is acknowledged in this case. However, does this frame achieves real equivalence as the process looks to be having adopted literal translation as a technique of rendition. In all cases, one cannot judge the process correct or not unless having investigated the relevant or irrelevant use of literal translation through which truth was kept and told.

Translating to introduce the other may help tremendously giving the other the chance or possibility to generate a response. Sometimes, the other has to know with high accuracy what was said or written about them, in order to enable them responding correctly, via the resulting translation. This happens mainly in cultures and civilizations dialog and even religions debating where some religions, civilizations accuse the other one of being in a wrong position, the addresses have to know the naked truth contained to enable responding a dialoging successfully; all details have then to appear.

Translating to introduce the other, most of the time requires literal translation, which is not always possible for good equivalence. Using literal translation claiming keeping the truth is an irrelevant action that may result in translationese and linguistic interference (see: Djamel Goui, 2015, pp 82, 83)

4.2 Translate To Influence the Other

In this second objective, the translator intends to generate the same impact left by the source text. Therefore, the translator might change opting for natural equivalence according to Anthony Pym where he/she can change the form maintaining the content and select carefully an expression that keeps the same effect and will be clearly more understand by the receiver/reader. Thus, literal translation is avoided in purpose and formal truth telling is investigated too; as seemingly the observer might consider the process a kind of falsifying truths that leads in his/her mind to the death of truth. Again, one might be back to the very early debates of form and content in achieving the equivalence as explained mainly by Eugene Nida (1964) or J.C Catford (1965) and many other translation studies prominent scholars.

What happened here is a kind of adaptation to the objective, which was producing the same effect that many translators feel fully free to resort to it in literary translation and believe it is an excellent method to creatively convey the meaning and keep the same effect, which is the essence of equivalence philosophy in translation.

Nevertheless, this much talked about adaptation in translation may itself generate many frames in operation of translating since its meaning or concept is used in different contexts and give eventually different outcomes.

5. Translation, Adaptation and Death of Truth

“Adaptation has always been defined in relation to something else –a specific style, linguistic conventions or a communication model. Translation studies as an independent discipline now enables us to study adaptation on its own terms, as both a local and global procedure. It is imperative to acknowledge adaptation as a type of creative process which seeks to restore the balance of communication that is often disrupted by traditional forms of translation” (Mona Baker & Gabriela Saldanha, 2011, p 6)

Adaptation in translation differs from adaptation in literary works although they both have roughly the same principle and meet in a common group. Adaptation in translation consists of neutralizing loads to a particular receiver/reader, this practice is very common in child literature for instance, where translators tend to facilitate the reception of concepts by changing or domesticating some words, terms or idea and loads to meet with the child mind expectation and ability of both understanding and safely digesting the content. The child thinks absolutely differently from an adult and hence his/her ability of digesting adult concept is limited, in addition to the harm that some adult concepts might cause to the mind of an ordinary child, and this is really the main reason why translators may have recourse to adaptation; by adapting which might involve partial change in translation, translators see themselves saving situations, and their intervention is highly required.

Whereas, adaptation in literary works consists of taking the main idea of a literary work then writing another one that is inspired from the first with flagrant differences permitting qualifying the second as a new literary work.

The literary meaning and practice of adaptation is sometimes adopted in translated works as well, producing accordingly an adapted translation. Adapted translation hides tolerantly many realities and details from the source, and this is the reason why most scholars do not consider it a translation but rather a rewriting, as it differs a lot from its source literary work, and they highlight strongly that it is not part of the translational practice because of the major difference between the source and the final product or the target.

In adaptation in translation, truth is partially hidden but innocently made. If any unit, regardless of its nature, or a load is neutralized, or generally speaking domesticated, it is made simply to facilitate digestion of the ideas and concepts contained in the source by the receiver reader.

Death of truth if defined as disappearance of details contained in the source is thus confirmed in adaptation practices in translation. Nevertheless, it is worthy to keep examining if hiding truth or burying it in the target text does not produce an equivalent text according to most scholars of translation studies. Adaptation sometimes is needed as the literary works including literary translations depict imaginary, quasi-imaginary realities or realities inspired from real life, the lost details or hidden details then will not affect real life like in scientific texts for instance; if any details or information are hidden (buried), results will certainly be negative and realities

undoubtedly will change. This does not signify defending adaptation and modifying realities in literary translation and burying truth which I imagine faithful to the source and meets the requirements of equivalence generation (see: Guieppe Palumbo, 2009, pp42, 43) along with meeting the planned objectives.

6. Neutrality, Bias and Death of Truth in Translation

Neutrality is the avoidance of bias theoretically speaking while in fact neutrality is a failing attempt to avoid bias. Neutrality is trying to stand for or against cause, issue or a problem. ; standing for a cause claiming neutrality is indeed standing against the other one, therefore what one sees neutrality the other might see a full bias. This turns both neutrality and bias then into one thing or in other words “one concept”. Neutrality buries a part of the truth and bias buries a part of it too, being the same practice indeed, the only difference is the direction of the action and the beneficiary of the action as well. Both neutrality and bias embodiment attempt consists of hiding partially the truth. The part, which is hidden or buried regardless of the intention of the translator to opt for neutrality or bias, is considered a death of truth.

Moreover, both neutrality and bias are in a way or in another, directly or indirectly, represent clear signs of ethnocentric practices or ideological ones. This is acknowledged simply because both mentioned are willingly or unwillingly undertaken to show supremacy of one part on another one for belief or culture or any of those associated aspects and features.

7. Conclusion

Even though the concept of truth telling or death of the truth in translation is very sensitive and controversial, translation has to acknowledge its existence. Producing an equivalence, which is the ultimate aim of any translating process, may lead to some sacrifice, due to the divergences or differences between languages and worldviews. Changes then in form or content depending on the context are not always qualify as “Death of Truth”, as some changes in form, for numerous reasons, along with changes in content, also for multiple other reasons, are compulsory for meaning and message transmission “communicative function” of translation. Nevertheless, because of the changing circumstances and condition of nowadays world, translation acquired new non-classical functions such as production of knowledge along with power and domination and the translators started taking advantage of this upgrade in function and scope. Some of them do not limit the advantage to communicate successfully with the other but deploy effort to dominate the other through some minor deviations on the text that might lead to a change in the text orientation, vision and likely leading to the death of the truth contained in the source text or source discourse. Many will think that translators are turning into criminals via their attempt to hide the truth provided in the source partially or totally, however translators try to take advantage of the possibilities naturally existing in languages to dominate and exert power of containment on the other through language. Many see this as intervention from the translator and denounce this being out of his/her role; his/her role is limited to conveying messages and enabling successful communication, but the translators are seizing the opportunity of selecting one correct translation that serves more their interest, background and likely ideology, if for instance a words is polysemous, this will mean that the translator intentionally shall select the word in the target that serves more his/her intentionality. The translator hence does not feel changing the context or killing truth of the original text but using the available material that is possible claiming that choosing another

word might serve another attitude or other group of people who might be thoroughly different ideologically. The intervention of the translator in the text is not always possible, and the margin of intervention in the text frequently is not of a big amount in the ordinary cases, but the reader has always to pay attention, and should have the ability of critic and analysis to discover what is happening or what happened to the original text through translating and refinement process, in order not to accuse the translator of leading willingly to the death of the truth in the target text/discourse. Therefore, the death of the truth in translation should not be understood superficially as an intended falsification of the source text, but an intelligent use of power and domination within the linguistic possibilities; limits of the context, words meanings and the possible interpretations and most importantly readings. This means that the translators does not exceed the limits given by the text and context and go beyond to rewrite a fully different text or discourse. In this case, the translate turns into an author and not a mediator author. The death of the truth also is sometimes justified with the generation of a good natural equivalence. All in all, the label “death of the truth” is indeed more sophisticated and deceiving than it is reality or real translator practice.

References

- Baker, M. & Saldanha, G. (2011), Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies, second edition, Routledge
- Catford, J.C. (1965) A linguistic theory of translation, Oxford university press.
- Chesterman, A (1997) Memes of translation, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Eugene Nida (1964), Towards a science of translating, Leiden, E.J Brill
- Farghal, M. & Shunnaq, A. (2011), Translation with reference to English and Arabic, a practical guide, Dar Al-Hilal for Translation, Irbid, Jordan
- Giaber, J. M. (2019), Translation, theory, methodology and practice, Al-Falah books, Kuwait, UAE
- Goui, D. (2015), An overview on interference, Cahier de Traduction, issue 05, University of Algiers
- Goui, D. (2015), Translation and production of knowledge, Social consultancy and research Ltd, London, United Kingdom
- Hatim , B. & Mason, I. (1993), Discourse and the translator, Longman, London & New York.
- Kelly, N & Zetzsche, J. (2012) Found in Translation, Penguin books, England.
- Munday, J. (2008), Introducing translation studies, Theories and applications, Second edition, Routledge.
- Palumbo, G. (2009), Key terms in translation studies, Continuum, London and New York.
- Reynolds, M. (2016) Translation, a very short guide, Oxford university press.
- Venutti, L. (2013) Translation changes everything, Theory and practice, Routledge.
- Williams, J & Chesterman, A (2011), The map, a beginner’s guide to doing research in translation studies, Fifth Edition, Routledge
- Young, R. (2011), Some questions about translation and the production of knowledge, Translation journal, inaugural issue, St Jerome Publishing, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, Manchester & Rome.
- ج. قوي (2017) الترجمة وهندسة حرب السلم، مجلة العربية و الترجمة، العدد 29، المنظمة العربية للترجمة، بيروت، لبنان