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Abstract

Translation of culture and cultural translation have been proportionately given some agitations among translators to deal with. This is owing to the reason that culture is an indispensable part in translation. Having treated cultural translation, the translator must take the mediatory position between source and target language in order to decipher the points of similarities and differences across cultures (Akbari & Shahnazari, 2014). Of many theories and models proposed, the translator's challenge is to opt for the right theories and cultural models to be applied in cultural translation so as to produce a faithful translation. The aim of the present study is to juxtapose two models and theories in culture namely Iceberg Theory and Spider-Web Lattice of HomoKult to see which one would be more salutary to be operated in cultural translation and to behold which of them would satiate the needs of the target audience.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Culture and Translation (The Two Must-do Constituents)

Culture is an indispensable section of people's lives. Everyone is born with peculiar and archetypical culture. Therefore, there exist infinite subcultures constituting an exhaustive or mother culture in one society. In this vein, connecting cultures with one another requires devising one robust instrument to get them familiarized thoroughly. Of many instruments, translation and interpretation have gained their reputation compared with other studies in order to the fact that they work directly upon people's lives and standard of living. Generally, translation is regarded as the multidisciplinary (Munday 2012, p.25) field in which concentration is placed on the ranges of subject areas and is not exclusively pertained to one special field.

Alfred Louis Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn (1952) 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 a product of action, one the other hand, as conditioning elements of future action (p.181).

As implied, the word 'transmit' requires much heed attention in this quotation since it rightly works upon the transfer of stage-a dynamic process of reconfiguration in the target language of set of source language semantic and structural components (Hatim & Munday, 200, p.46)-proposed by Nida (1969, p.33). How would be possible to do so? Moreover, how is it possible to transfer symbols, patterns either explicitly or implicitly, and behaviors into the target and receptive culture so that people can be familiarized with one another and wholly build up the stable and durable frameworks of cultures in their minds? Of many queries posed, these two questions often preoccupy the mind of audience. However, in this connection, one agent or in better sense, one player acts out as the powerful reconciliator in this circumstance.

Let us face it, a translator or an interpreter, as the mediator (Akbari & Shahnazari, 2014, p.6) is responsible for linking cultures, concepts, symbols, patterns, and values of one society to the receptive and target culture in order to constitutionalize and institutionalize the real and exact translation of source culture. Taft (1981, p.53) argues on cultural mediator as:

The person who facilitates communication, understandings, and actions between persons or groups who differ with respect to a language and culture. The role of the mediator is performed by interpreting the expressions, intentions, perceptions, and expectations of each cultural group to the other that is by establishing and balancing the communication between them. In order to serve as a link in this sense, the mediator must be able to participate to some extent in both cultures. Thus, a mediator must be to a certain extent bi-cultural.

Needless to say, cultures are equipped with some peculiar and special items which cannot be found in other cultures. It signifies that they are exclusively pertained to special regions in this regard. How can the translator or interpreter render such items into the target culture in order to make them more palpable for the target audience? In addition, how can the interpreter prepare the pliable situation of such cultural items in his/her interpretation? Do
some new and innovative ways exist to reconcile cultures and then amalgamate them with one another? Does one new model of translation exist in culture to prepare the ground for this action? To what extent can the translator or interpreter approximate and connect a Source Culture (SC) to a Target Culture (TC)? To verify these questions, Pym (2014, p.139) argues that the prime cause of cultural translation and translation of culture might be due to movement of 'people' as 'subjects' rather than movement of the 'texts' as 'objects'.

To learn more about cultural studies and cultural translation, this article seeks to inspect one of the theories of cultures named 'Iceberg Theory' proposed by Edward. T. Hall in 1990. In addition, this article is pining for checking off the intended theory in cultural translation to see whether Iceberg Theory saturates the real and exact needs of the translator/interpreter or whether the translator should resort to the other theories or models in order to render a piece of text indelibly so as to meet the real criteria of the target audience in this direction. On the flipside, the present study is going to propose one peculiar scheme in cultural translation or translation of culture known as Spider-Web Lattice (SWL) through the lens of the latest model of cultural translation as HomoKult (Capital K) in order to substantiate the homogeneity and interconnectivity of cultures via the intended scheme in cultural translation. This study opens up the new window upon the futurity of cultural studies and cultural translation via Spider-Web Lattice of HomoKult model to approximate source audience to the target audience owing to the fact that people can easily understand and perceive other cultures through the act of proper and practical cultural translation in this regard.

2. Literature Reviewed

2.1. General Definition of Culture

Generally, people ascertain the real and exact meaning of culture and also they know to which culture they belong. It denotes the fact that culture covers the vast range of topics. Before going on to the main and primary definition of 'culture', it is better to inspect the etymology of this term. Culture emanates from the Latin term as 'Cultus', 'Cultivation', and 'Colore' (Katan 1999, p.17). Biologically speaking, the intended term alludes to absorption of elements in the environment. This is also true for anthropology. People in one society, so to speak, can absorb various elements yet unaware from their surrounding environments. In this direction, the term 'absorption' would be regarded as a sine non qua as it shows the sense of assimilation yet inevitably of something by someone.

Gail Robinson (1988, pp.7-13) categorizes diverse definitions of 'culture' into two rudimental levels namely: (1) External Level and (2) Internal Level. External Level besieges behaviors such as language, gestures, customs, habits and products as literature, folklore, art, music, and artifacts. On the other side of the coin, there exists Internal Level referring to ideas such as beliefs, values, and institutions.

Some of the authors attributes culture to computer programming since it can expounds habitual patterns of thought (Katan, 1999, p.20). To do so, Geert Hofstede (1991, p.5) argues,

"Culture is the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the member of one group or category of people from another..... Using the analogy of the way computers are programmed....we will call such patterns of thinking, feeling, and acting mental programs, or....... software of the mind."
Ned Seeleye (1984, p.13) delineates 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”. Tellingly, culture must be clarified both theoretically and practically since theoretical facets of culture cause practical facets to be created. However, there does not exist a stable and fix indenture amongst anthropologist to define and depict 'culture' absolutely (Asher, 1994, p.2001). Therefore, preparing the ground for absolute definition of culture would be of high significance.

### 2.2. Models of Culture

#### 2.2.1. Trompenaars' Layer

Fons Trompenaars (1993, pp.22-23) interprets culture in three layers namely: (1) the outer layer (e.g. artifacts and products), (2) the middle layer (e.g. norms and values), and (3) the core (e.g. basic assumptions). The outer layer of this model of culture is the visible one called explicit. The second layer (middle one) differentiates among norms, values, behaviors, and idiosyncrasies in the society. And eventually, the last and the inner layer (core) acts as the primary and vital layer in this direction. This layer is called implicit one since it is completely invisible in society covering assumption toward something. Trompenaars calls this layer as the 'heart of culture' which in essence is completely unattainable.
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**Fig 1: Trompenaars' Layer**

#### 2.2.2. Hofstede's Onion

Trompenaars (1993, p.xi) quotes about Hofstede in which:

Thanks also to Geert Hofstede who introduced me to the subject of intercultural management. We do not always agree, but he has made a major contribution to the field, and was responsible for opening management's eyes to the importance of the subjects.
De novo, Hofstede delineates culture as 'skin of the onion' (1991, p.7) as onion is made of some layers viz. surface and deep layers. These two layers are contributed to 'practice' and 'value' of culture of which the former covers norms, values, and products compared with Trompenaars' explicit layer and the latter alludes to originality of culture compared with Trompenaars' implicit or core layer.

![Hofstede's Onion](image)

2.2.3. Cognitive Culture

Emergence of new and different perceptions of culture prepares the situation to peruse culture as a set of cognitive system. In this respect, culture would be considered not as the 'pattern of life' but as the 'pattern of mind'. Ward Goodenough (1963, p.167) expresses,

“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 thing, people, behavior, 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) upholds that cultures and languages epistemologically correspond to the same sphere in that both of them are visible products of abstract ideational codes within a community. Henceforth, the linguistic analysis might open a crevice to those concealed ideational codes governing the individuals’ behavior in a society. For instance, Componential Analysis (CA) can divulge 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.

2.2.4. Iceberg Theory

The Iceberg Theory has long been operated to describe cultures. The intended theory came to be seen through the work of Hall in 1950s. This theory expounds that the most important parts of culture are invisible and concealed and what can be seen is as the catch phrase 'just the tip of the iceberg' such as music, art, food and drink, greetings, dress, and rituals (Katan, 1999, p.29). Hall is regarded as the most influential vanguard in anthropology and a highly prosperous business consultant, and skillful writer. Perhaps, he is the first person finding the way to link the meaning in language to the meaning in culture. In 1995, the most
novel amelioration of Iceberg theory was put forwarded by Brake et al. (1995, pp.34-39) in that

“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.”

The terms 'value orientation' in Iceberg Theory covers three facts of culture as action, communication, and environment. In discussion section, this paper seeks to inspect all the ins and outs whether the intended theory would be apropos in translation of culture and cultural translation and to see to what extent it would be prosperous upon conveying the cultural terms from source language (SL) to the target language (TL).

Fig.3: Iceberg Theory

2.3. Theories of Culture in Translation Studies (TS)

2.3.1. Non-Substantive Translation of Culture

The notion of 'cultural translation' first came to be seen by the work of the Indian cultural theorist Homi K. Bhabha. Cultural translation, in general, would be considered as the process without regarding source and target languages. Mostly, the main concentration is upon the process of translation rather than the product. However, some questions should be posed to clarify the very essence of cultural translation: (1) should the cultural translation keep and maintain the form of the source text altogether or should it be operated on the side of target language? (2) Should be cultural translation and translation of culture situated between source text and target text? And (3) what is the role of the translator in such situations? Bhabha (2004) adduces that cultural translation beleagueres 'a sense of new as an insurgent act of cultural translation', 'the borderline condition of cultural translation', 'the process of cultural translation, showing up the hybridity of any genealogical or systematic filiations', and 'cultural translation, hybrid side of meaning'. Bhabha takes the notion of...
untranslatability found in Walter Benjamin's 'The Task of the Translator' (1923/1977, p.61) dusting off that 'translations themselves are untranslatable'. However, Bhabha takes this notion due to corroborating 'translation resistance', 'a negation of complete integration', and 'a will to survive' (Pym, 2014, p.140). In this connection, Bhabha (1994/2004) maintains that translation theorization has been vested 'a will to survive' in newly and fresh context in that

“If hybridity is heresy, then to blaspheme is to dream. To dream not of the past or present, nor the continuous present; it not the nostalgic dream of tradition, nor the Utopian dream of modern progress; it is the dream of translation as survival as Derrida translates the 'time' of Benjamin's concept of the after-life of translation, as sur-vivre, the act of living on borderline. Rushdie translates this into the migrant's dream of survival, an initiatory [sic]; an empowering condition of hybridity; an emergence that turns 'return' into reinscription or re-description; an iteration that is not belated, but ironic and insurgent (p.324).”

In Bhabha's reading, generally, there does not exist any special Source Text (ST), Target Text (TT), no resistance accomplishment (Pym, 2014). Tellingly, through the act of negating and repudiating of such reading, the aim and the goal of cultural translation would be considered as 'non-substantive' translation.

2.3.2. Call for Transfer Theory in Cultural Translation

Even-Zohar proposes 'transfer theory' to limn the heterogeneity and dynamicity of all systems and movements of 'textual models' from Source Language to the Target language. However, amongst various movements, translation is mere sort of such movements. Even-Zohar (1990) anatomizes all kinds of transfer in such a way as,

“Some people would take this as a proposal to liquidate translation studies. I think the implication is quite the opposite: through a larger context, it will become even clearer that 'translation' is not a marginal procedure of cultural systems. Secondly, the larger context will help us identify the really particular in translation. Thirdly, it will change our conception of the translated text in such a way that we may perhaps be liberated from certain postulated criteria. And fourthly, it may help us isolate what translational procedures consist of (p.74).”

As inferred, the term 'transfer' would not be treated in isolation rather it will be integrated into the relation of the host-receptive-system in order to yield modification. It is worth mentioning that, amongst the intended movements scrutinized within system, only some of the movements occur as translations so as to behold transfer and transformation as a sine qua non for cultural survival.

2.3.3. HomoKult: A Gateway in Cultural Translation and Translation of Culture

HomoKult was first proposed by Akbari and Shahnazari (2014) due to the fact that culture reconciliation and culture homogenization play a major role in Translation Studies to approximate Source Culture (SC) to the Target Culture (TC). HomoKult shows the homogeneity and reconciliation of culture especially in the field of translation studies and is regarded as the multidisciplinary field. HomoKult is made of two terms: (1) 'Homo-'is the prefix signifies 'one and the same' utilized fraughtly in Latin Language and (2) '-Kult' is the clipping form of the word as 'Die Kultur' in the German language. The reason behind opting such terms would be reconciliating and amalgamating the cultural patterns of two diverse
languages and then depicting culture homogenization in translation. The main and sole objective of HomoKult is to show and corroborate points of similarities in cultural translation and then to build up the stable and durable framework of culture paradigm which never existed in Translation Studies. Notable to say, HomoKult model of cultural translation pays much heed to the deep layer of culture in particular and language in general to peruse the points of similarities among cultures. In the circle of HomoKult, one agent or one player, so as to speak, plays as an indispensable part. Translator as a mediator (Akbari & Shahnazari, 2014, p.6) or in better sense as 'Sprachmittler' seeks earnestly to connect and reconcile both deep layer of language and surface one thoroughly in order to produce an eternal/indelible cultural translation. The ins and outs of the newly intended cultural model of translation will be explained in discussion section.

3. Discussion

3.1. HomoKult Opens up the Horizon in Cultural Translation

Before going on to the main study, HomoKult model should be clarified in details to see the main and major functions of the intended cultural model in Translation Studies. As expatiated before, HomoKult is made of two various terms to inspect and peruse the homogeneity of cultures in translation. Does culture homogenization really exist in translation? How would it be possible to transfer and identify the deep structure of translational items between Source Text and Target Text in order to produce the eternal translation? How can the translator act as the mediator or 'Sprachmittler' to convey translational and translatorial elements in the texts? HomoKult as the cultural model of translation pays much heed to both deep and surface structure of language. Tellingly, firstly; this model scrutinizes deep structure of language in accord with translational rules and then hankers after perusing the surface structure of the language. In general, this model states that differences are emerged from similarities since similarities and differences are somehow the same; however, one element of differences differs from the whole elements in this regard.

HomoKult as a translation model in general and as a cultural homogenization model in particular consists of four main subcategories namely: (1) Purposive Culture (PC), (2) Ameliorated Culture (AC), (3) Circulated Culture (CC), and (4) Diglossic Culture (DC) (Akbari & Shahnazari 2014, 1-13).

Purposive culture is the foundation of this model since it inspects 'norms, values, behaviors, creeds, perception, conception, and conventions' in one's society. The intended items constitute the basement of one's society. Akbari and Shahnazari (2014) define Purposive Culture as “any kind of rudimental culture scrutinized deeply in order to convey gogetherness and then amalgamates deep layer of culture to those of the others.” For instance, the manners and ways of apologizing in different language proportionately shape the body of one's society since it works well with people's behaviors and creeds toward excusing. 'Excuse me' in English, 'EnchuldigenSie' in German, 'Scusi' in Italian, and 'Excusez-moi' in French all cover and besiege the same foundation-deep structure-of language. Therefore, transcreating the same deep structure along with various format of an item would be mandatory and is regarded as the sole and mere objective of Purposive Culture. In Spider-web lattice or
scheme, Purposive Culture is situated in the vertex of it due to the fact that PC shapes the deep structure of cultural translation.

Akbari and Shahnazari (2014) clarify Ameliorated Culture as “any sort of culture which works on the superficial layer of culture”. Ameliorated Culture as its identity demystified, substantiates the rate of cultural transferability in surface layer of language. It somehow acts as the role of decorator among other subcategories of HomoKult model of translation. AC investigates such terms as types of dancing, food, music, art, architecture, beverages, and so forth. For instance, ‘Tagliatelle ai porcini’ as an Italian dish is rendered in Persian, English, and German as ‘Supe Qarch’, ‘Mushroom Stew’, and ‘Die Pilzuppe’ respectively. The mentioned translations show that the decoration or the surface layer of language would be different yet the deep structure of the intended translation is the same. The ingredients of such dishes are the same; however, the manner of cooking or adding some more condiments are different. Generally, firstly, the translator as the mediator identifies and reconstructs the deep structure of a source item, and then he/she can decorate the surface structure of language through adding, omitting, or compensating the translational items. Worth mentioning, Ameliorated Culture is progressive in nature since it constitutes the superficial layer of translation and culture and this layer is prone to be changed through the time.

Peripherality and fleetingness of cultural elements in one's society would be regarded as Circulated culture in that it pays fully attention to the rate of progression of one element in the community to depict and delineate the temporal and spatial alternations in various fields such as technology, cutting edge devises, and products across cultures. How can a translator deal with these situations? How can she/he transfer the main essence of such cultural translational items in the target language? To clarify the main vantage point, so as to speak, notice to the term as ‘iPad’ and ‘iPod’. The best and appropriate equivalence of the intended terms in the Persian language is ‘Rajanake Malesi’. The appropriate Persian equivalent accords with firstly considering the deep structure of ‘iPad’ as Purposive Culture and secondly observing the technological environment in both languages (Source and Target). The other point in the Persian equivalent is the rate of delivery of the intended English term since it pays fully-fledged heed to the progression of this term in the receptive language; therefore, ‘Rajanake Malesi’ would be the best and relevant equivalent in this regard.

On the flipside, Diglossic Culture observes cultural translational items in both sides. One side refers to the High Culture in that it hankers after regarding the particular and special cohort of people such as professors, literati, elitist and statements. This group of people equips with particular and resplendent expressions and that is due to the fact that the run of the mill people would not understand them directly. On the other hand, Low Culture alludes to illiterates, countrymen, and young generation of people. It is important to accept such a truism that translation for these two cultures (either High or Low) differ greatly. Noticingly, translator as ‘Sprachmittler’ must consider and observe the role of decoding ability in his/her renderings. Decoding ability involves four main principles:

First: the capacity of children whose vocabulary and cultural experience are limited. Second: the double standard of capacity of new literates, who can decode oral message with facility but whose ability to decode written message is limited. Third: the capacity of average literate adult, who can handle both oral and written message with relative ease, and Fourth: the unusually
high capacity of specialists (doctors, theologians, philosophers, scientists, etc.) when they are decoding message within their own areas of specialization (Nida, 1964, pp.156-171).

Therefore, prior to the act of translating, the translator as the mediator should consider the addressee and the addressee of the target text. Naturally, the range of renderings differ greatly in accord with the type of the text and the genre of the target text such as medical, political, and economic texts.

To put high Culture into practice, the excerpts of Gerard Nolst Trenité is opted for to see the particularity of audience:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sword and sward, retain and Britain} \\
(Mind the latter how it's written). \\
\text{Made has not the sound of bade,} \\
\text{Say-said, pay-paid, laid but plaid.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Now I surely will not plague you} \\
\text{With such words as vague and ague,} \\
\text{But be careful how you speak,} \\
\text{Say: gush, bush, steak, streak, break, bleak,} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Previous, precious, fuchsia, via} \\
\text{Recipe, pipe, studding-sail, choir;} \\
\text{Woven, oven, how and low,} \\
\text{Script, receipt, shoe, poem, toe.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Say, expecting fraud and trickery:} \\
\text{Daughter, laughter and Terpsichore,} \\
\text{Branch, ranch, measles, topsails, aisles,} \\
\text{Missiles, similes, reviles.} \\
\text{Wholly, holly, signal, signing,} \\
\text{Same, examining, but mining,} \\
\text{Scholar, vicar, and cigar,} \\
\text{Solar, mica, war and far.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

As implied, Trenité draws upon diverse maze of phonetic disorders in order to put out the virtuoso feat of composition, a mammoth catalog of the sleaziest irregularities in English version. Utilizing such alliterations and phonetic disorders are due to absorbing special and particular audience. Therefore, rendering these items in any language requires considering the taste and skill of people of any language altogether and using directional equivalents to transfer the main taste and message of the source language is of high significance. Directional equivalence or one-to-two correspondence besieges various possible equivalents in the target language yet directionally. In this respect, the translator cannot reverse the intended equivalent into the source language due to uni-directionality of equivalents. Therefore, A in the Source language has the corresponding equivalents as B, C, and D into the Target language.
To corroborate the achievability and viability of Low Culture in translation studies, Giacomo Leopardi’s opus (L’infinito) is chosen to behold the sense of Natural equivalence or one-to-one correspondence in English translation:

Semprecaro mi fu quest’ermocolle,
E questasiepe, che da tanta parte
Dell'ultimoorizzonte il guardoesclude.
Ma sedendo e mirando, interminati
Spazi di là da quella, e sovrumanì
Silenzi, e profondissimaquiete
Io nelpensier mi fingo; ove per poco
Il cor non sispaura. E come il vento
Odostormitiraquestepianti, io quello
Infinitosilenzio a questa voce
Vo comparando: e mi sovviennel'eterno,
E le mortestagioni, e la presente
E viva, e il suon di lei. Cositraquesta
Immensitas'annega il pensiermio:
E il naufragar m'è dolce in questo mare.

The subsequent English translation made by Mark Towler (1998) of the intended poem would be as follow:

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, Mark Towler, the translator, particularly considers the addressee of this Italian and likewise English translation and utilizes Natural equivalence throughout the Italian poem. One-to-one correspondence refers to bi-directionality of the equivalents in both Source language and Target Language. Understanding and perceiving natural equivalence in translation is the easiest way to convey the main essence of the source text. However, the mentioned equivalence would not be considered as the sole and mere aim of translation in all situations. Whether the audience is willing to grasp the main gist of the source language, the translator as Sprachmittler adheres to natural equivalence to convey the superficial yet unusual sense of the source text.
3.2. Spider-Web-Lattice (SWL) of HomoKult Model of Translation

As expressed, the sole purpose of HomoKult model of cultural translation is to put entire concentration on homogenization of source culture to that of the target one. It purports that through deep structure of both Source and Target language, the translator as the robust mediator is able to reconstruct the surface structure of language. Deep structure is somehow the clearance to surface language. To be true, translation as the intermediaiy between deep/surface or Source/target aims at simulating source culture into the target one so as to convince the audience upon the workability and speakibility of cultural homogenization in practical translation. To put this notion into practice, HomoKult model of cultural translation sees culture as the spider web lattice. The reason behind opting such scheme is that all cultures from the very beginning are feeding from the mother culture or an exhaustive culture in this vein. As noticed, web of spider connects all the webs to one resource which is the center of web. Significantly, should one of web of spider cut out from the others for whatever purpose, this causes to threat the identity of other webs or to destroy others. Culture in accord with HomoKult model of cultural translation acts like this since cultural translation is the sole agent of one nation to show and depict the potentials of one's culture. For any purpose, if cultural items in the source language be falsified in the target language, so to speak, it makes target translation the mere superficial and no one can legitimately accept the originality and eternity of that translation. So far so good, the rate of absorbing audience either in source or target language would be lessened to a high degree. Therefore, for the first step, the translator should consider the center-hub-of web of spider completely in order to the fact that he/she must simulate the similar situation in the target language due to satiating the real need of the audience.

Notes:
PC: Purposive Culture
AC: Ameliorated Culture
CC: Circulated Culture
DC: Diglossic Culture

Fig.4: Spider-Web Lattice of HomoKult Model
As seen, the hub of the web would be the foundation of the web constituting Purposive Culture since it pays fully-grown attention to the deep structure of cultural items in translation. It is like the powerful and enriched resource feeding other webs to construct the surface of the culture in both Source and Target Language. As advanced, Purposive Culture turns out feeding Ameliorated Culture in that it inspects the surface of culture in translation. The nexus between Ameliorated Culture to that of Purposive one is mutually exclusive and well-connected. Progressivity of Ameliorated Culture causes translation to be inferred as beautiful and original translation since the translator first constitutes and institutionalizes Purposive Culture completely and then prepares the ground for Ameliorated Culture to be considered as the decoration of cultural translation in this regard. Should the translator observe such cultural items more fully-fledged in practical translation, then it makes the intended rendering more stable and durable through the time without any falsifications. Circulated Culture is the enhancement and development of Ameliorated Culture since the former is a little bit more exhaustive in nature. It covers the vast range of field such as technology, products, values, and cultural traits from one place to another. Noticingly, Circulated culture is the exhaustive and fully-grown one observing Purposive and Ameliorated culture simultaneously. In this situation, the task of the translator is somehow drudgery due to lacking some pieces of information in technical fields. However, he/she can simulate the approximate situation in the target language to satisfy the exact needs of the audience. Examples to clarify this sort of culture would be expounded in next section. And eventually, Diglossic Culture (HC and LC) constitutes the last web of this spider lattice to show diverse techniques of translation either naturally or directionally to corroborate either deeply or superficially. HC is well-equipped to directional equivalence since first the translator should depict and simulate the similar situation in the target language, then, she/he must assess the rate of progressivity of cultural translational items into the target language, and on the flipside, he/she should regard the role of decoding ability in translation in order to the fact that the mere target and aim of DC is to meet the needs of the audience upon the feasibility and practicality of the intended translation. Importantly, the translator at this stage can claim his/her true mediation between Source and Target Culture since to achieve this level in practical cultural translation requires rehabilitating PC, AC, and CC out and out so as to produce and generate eternal, original, and silver-tongue rendering.

3.3. Spider-web Lattice vs. Iceberg Theory in Cultural Translation: Which one Yields the Persuasive Rendering?

In translation studies, translator requires considering every facet of practical translation. It means that the translator should regard not only the hidden-concealed-structure but surface level of language to express and delineate every aspect of language through the lens of translation either in Source language or Target one. However, prior to the act of translating, he/she must take some models and theories into account. The translator has to rely upon some theories and models which put him/her forward to satiate the real and sheer needs of the audience or reader, since the reader is the sole criteria in judging translation goodness. Among various theories and models, the present study hankers after juxtaposing two of them viz. Spider-web Lattice (SWL) and Iceberg Theory to see which of them is more beneficial and appropriate for a translator to rely upon in cultural translation. As indicated earlier, every translation is made of deep and surface structure to show the real sense of the intended original text. Let’s face it, which of these schemes actually is more fully-grown utilizable in
cultural translation? Which one can depict deep and surface structure of the original text in practical cultural translation? And which of these can be honored by the audience in general and reader in particular? Both Spider-web Lattice and Iceberg Theory orient culture and language to a fuzzy area. However which one is fuzzier? These are some queries left answered but this study seeks to answer them altogether and seeks to opt for the best and appropriate scheme in cultural translation.

As mentioned, every good and pure translation is profoundly institutionalized in the deep layer of language since it contains some vital and important information correspondingly transferred into the target language. However, the translator should consider both source language and target one altogether and see translation through the prism of bi-polarism. To evince the real identity of cultural translation, Spider-Web Lattice and Iceberg Theory are juxtaposed to see which of them is more appropriate to be operated in cultural translation.

As observed, Iceberg Theory is made of two parts namely: (1) 'awareness part' that is directly observable and (2) 'out of awareness part' which directly invisible. Likewise, Spider-web Lattice consists of PC, AC, CC, and DC to show deep and surface structure of culture in various fields. Perhaps, the big difference is upon the way of treating deep structure by these two schemes. Iceberg Theory of culture mostly pays attention to the awareness or visible part of culture such as dress, literature, popular music, cooking, dancing, and games. To what extend can the translator convey the real and concealed essence of the intended items in cultural translation? To what extent can the renderer approximate to the deep layer of language in Iceberg Theory? Does any deep structure exist in Iceberg Theory? To answer these queries, notice to the word of 'Kimono', as an example, in Japan. Should the translator be willing to render such item into the target language, he/she should adhere to natural translation or one-to-one correspondent translation which is somehow unacceptabale in cultural translation and modern translation. This is due to the fact that natural translation causes cultural translation to be regarded as superficial one and consequently makes the audience not be fully-fledged inferred by the real content of the source texts. The audience or the reader is willing to read the smooth yet faithful translation so as to understand the main and hidden gist of the source text. Nevertheless, relying upon Iceberg Theory in cultural translation would not be a good choice for the translator procuring an eternal rendering in this regard. On the other hand, the exact translation of the intended term (Kimono) in accord with Spider Web Lattice
SWL is completely different since SWL considers first the exact deep structure of the intended item. Should the translator seek to simulate such item into the Persian language, he/she exploits the similar and deep term as 'Rasuxi' worn by the people in the north of Iran. In this situation, the renderer depicts the profundity-depth-of this term into the target language and correspondingly the target reader easily can delineate the real essence of this term in his/her language. Importantly, the translator utilizes both natural and directional translation into the TL. More often than not, cultural translation requires paying much heed to the potential of equivalents adopted by the translator. The renderer puts the audience and reader either in clear and shine outcome or into the passive and murky area. As another example, the name of food would be another case in cultural translation. De novo, convergent similarity (Chesterman 2006) would be an appropriate case in Iceberg Theory since it takes notice to the faithful yet superficial translation into the target language. Clearly, one cannot expect on translation's persuasiveness and dulcetness made in accord with Iceberg Theory. However, besides adopting purposive culture, SWL conjectures Diglossic Culture in this circumstance as it inspects the role of decoding ability in final and definitive translation. As beheld, the final and sheer aim of cultural translation or translation in general is to quench readers' needs and criteria. Source-Target Amalgamation and Deep-Surface Reconciliation in language play an active and main axis in SWL. As another point, how would it be possible for the translator to render 'out of awareness part' in Iceberg Theory? This invisible part cannot directly convince the reader and audience upon its feasibility and workability into the target language. Noticingly, the audience is willing to peruse and inspect such cultural translation transferring denotatively and connotatively at the same time. It signifies the fact that both deep and surface structures of language in translation have to be conveyed directly and simultaneously into the target language. For instance, 'martes y 13' in the Spanish language traces the unlucky day in some varieties. If the translator as the mediator seeks to find the relevant equivalent of the intended term in accord with Iceberg Theory, he/she must adhere to the one-to-one correspondence or faithful translation into the target language and renders such terms as 'Tuesday 13th'. In this vein, the translator cannot expect the reader to understand the real and exact sense of the intended translation in another language since he/she just transfers the superficial content of that phrase. As previously noted, the sheer target of translation is to meet the needs of the audience and consider the role of decoding ability as a whole. However, should the renderer translate such phrase in accord with SWL, he/she first regards the deep layer of that phrase and its relatedness to the norm and value of one's society. Number thirteen in most of the countries such as Iran, and Spain is considered as the ominous or unlucky number causing bad and deplorable outcomes. How can the translator render such term in the target language containing both denotation and connotation meaning? Purposive Culture suggests that the intended term contains unlucky and ominous connotation in the source language. Notice that the addressee of this phrase would be English-speaking countries. In this respect, the translator renders 'martes y 13' as 'Friday the 13th'. This is due to the fact that 'Friday' in English-speaking countries contain negative connotation. This translation is also true in Persian-speaking countries as the term 'Jome'e Nahs' conveying negative connotation. The task of the translator in this condition is to find and decipher the points of similarities between two unrelated languages (Spanish and English) and then amalgamates the deep layer of language to the surface one in order to produce the homogenized cultural translation in accord with Purposive, Ameliorated, Circulated, and Diglossic Cultures.
Last but not least, durability and stability of cultural translation are other important facets in translation studies. Prominently, all renderers are seeking to achieve the eternal and imperishable translation. Translation or translation of culture is the mirror of culture itself. Tellingly, producing and procuring the genuine/original translation is the utmost goal in this field. Conjecture, translation made by the Iceberg Theory and consequently by SWL into the target language, which one is more durable in nature? This might be considered as a joke, but, what will happen if the 'awareness part' of Iceberg Theory is melted through the time? If the 'awareness part' is attributing to cultural translation and translation of culture, the final outcome-rendering will be shattered and no one can legitimately rely on translation's feasibility and speakibility in cultural translation diachronically. Therefore, prior to the act of rendering, the translator as a powerful mediator should regard the speed of translation's delivery across cultures and secondly consider the type of the audience being addressed-decoding ability-in this direction. For instance, 'Canocchie'-Italian dish-would be rendered first through the lens of Purposive Culture as 'Shrimp', then it would be substituted by the Ameliorated Culture as 'Mantis Shrimp' to trace the whole picture of the intended dish in English version. To be true, in the Persian language, first the renderer adopted the mediatory position and significantly adheres to the term as 'Meygu' through PC and appropriately selects the directional equivalent as 'Meyguye Mantisi' in the target language. Henceforth, the audience in such circumstance can perceive the very nature of the intended translation as opposed to 'Canocchie'-borrowed-itself adopted in the TL. Should the renderer be willing to translate in accord with Iceberg Theory, he/she should utilize the original term along with natural or one-to-one equivalence into the TL which is completely unacceptable in Translation Studies.

4. Conclusion

Cultural translation and translation of culture have been always regarded as the drudgery task of the translator taking the position of mediation between Source Language and Target Language. Points of similarities and differences constitute the deep and surface layers of culture. Henceforth, observing such items in translation or practical translation requires scrutinizing every facet of culture. In the circle of practical translation, no one can legitimately repudiate the presence of translator. Generally, translator as the mediator seeks to conglomerate and reconcile both deep/surface and Source Language to Target Language to figure out the points of similarities and differences across cultures.

To put cultural translation and translation of culture in practical sideway, of many proposed theories and models, this study hankers after considering and perusing the two intended model and theory in culture and then inspects their relatedness and beneficiary to cultural translation namely: Iceberg Theory of Culture and Spider-web Lattice (SWL) of HomoKult model. The former is divided by two parts: 'awareness part' or visible part and 'out of awareness' part. Translator in the circle of Iceberg Theory often adheres and resorts to natural equivalence or one-to-one correspondence since he/she cannot directly reach up to the 'out of awareness' part simultaneously. The translator as the powerful mediator is unable to link deep layer of culture to the surface one so as to produce the indelible yet smooth cultural translation. However, the intended model is fully usable in word-for-word or literal translation. The latter-SWL-is appropriately suitable to be utilized in cultural translation as it divides culture into four parts namely: Purposive Culture, Ameliorated Culture, Circulated
Culture, and Diglossic Culture. SWL operates the intended four cultures at the same time to find out first the deep layer of culture in cultural translation to institutionalize the foundation of translation into the target language and then decorates and trims the translation to satisfy the taste of the audience. The main task of SWL of HomoKult model is to conglomerate the Source language similarities (deep layer of language) to the Target one. Should the translator yearn for producing literal, natural, and one-to-one translation, Iceberg Theory would be an option; However, with the advent of cutting-edge devises and progressions in every field, natural equivalence-superficial facets only-would be doomed to shunned away and the translators resort to directional or one-to-two equivalence to figure out both deep layer and surface layer of language in either cultural or practical translation. Therefore, applying SWL of HomoKult in practical cultural translation would be the good option to see and to reach the similarities, deep layer of languages, and cultural homogenization across cultures in cultural translation.
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