

Additionally, Vermeer identifies the skopos of the TT as the main goal to determine the translation process. Unlike Reiss's model, which regards the ST as "the measure of all things in translation,"¹⁷ the ST, in skopos theory, is considered as "the offer of information."¹⁸ Vermeer comments on this new status of the ST, saying: "One practical consequence of the skopos theory is a new concept of the status of the source text for a translation."¹⁹ In her seminal work on functionalist theory, *Translation as Purposeful Action*, Christiane Nord observes that translation in Vermeer's model is "a form of translational action based on a source text, which may consist of verbal and/or non-verbal elements."²⁰ In this sense, the nonverbal elements will be verbalized to be an essential part of the communication message. Thus, Vermeer, as understood by Snell Hornby, views translation to be a kind of "complex form of action in which someone gives information about a text (source language material) under new functional, cultural and linguistic conditions and in a new situation."²¹ In this case, translation becomes a purposeful and situational human action, and it is consequently governed by the cultural assumptions of the TRs in general and the translator as a main TR in particular. Therefore, functionalists such as Vermeer and Nord insightfully analyze language as situational human activity, and thus it is part of culture.²² Hence, Vermeer, like other functionalists, recognizes the cultural dimension in formulating languages and translation. Since "language is part of culture,"²³ any analysis of the functional relations between ST and TT, for him, has to take into account the cultures that shape both of them and the purposes that determine their formulations: As its name implies, the source text is oriented towards, and is in any case bound to, the source culture. The target text, the *translatum*, is oriented towards the target culture, and it is this which ultimately defines its adequacy. It therefore follows that source and target texts may diverge from each other quite considerably, not only in the formulation and distribution of the content but also as regards the goals which are set for each, and in terms of which the arrangement of the content is in fact determined.²⁴ Seemingly, Vermeer believes that any text is set for a particular goal. This goal determines the arrangement of the content of the text. However, by associating the 'adequacy' of the TT or the *translatum* with the target culture, Vermeer adheres to the domestication strategy, which makes the source culture invisible for the sake of the target readers' comprehension. In his seminal paper entitled "Is Translation a Linguistic or a Cultural Process?" Vermeer discusses the importance of culture in translation. Unlike linguists of the equivalence-based approach who conceive translation as linguistic trans-coding process, he views translation as "a "cultural" phenomenon dealing with specific cultures: translation is a culture transcending process."²⁵ However, the gap in Vermeer's model lies in his focus on the TT culture at the expense of the source culture. As a major functionalist scholar, Vermeer claims the insufficiency of linguistics in the process of translating for two reasons: "First, because translating is not merely and not even primarily a linguistic process. Secondly, because linguistics has not yet formulated the right questions to tackle our problems. So let's look somewhere else."²⁶ Thus, translation embraces a paradigm shift from "linguistic considerations to also encompass cultural issues."²⁷ In Vermeer's framework, translation is freed from any restrictions. As he says, "Skopos theory does not restrict translation strategies to just one or a few; it does not introduce any restrictions."²⁸ In this sense, the main criterion for translation methods is determined by the famous functionalist principle: "the end justifies the means."²⁹ The significance of Vermeer's approach lies in his

recognition of culture in the translation process. His approach, however, is still inadequate for literary translation for two reasons. First, he denies the role that linguistics can play in providing solutions to the semantic and lexical problems encountered in literary translation. Second, he undermines the intercultural communication by giving primacy to TT ov