



Finnish
Journal for :
Romanian
Studies

Nº 3 • 2017

Published by
School of Languages and Translation Studies
University of Turku
Finland



Turun yliopisto
University of Turku



www.fjrs.eu

Editor in chief

Paul Nanu (University of Turku, Finland)

Associate Editors

Emilia Ivancu (Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań, Poland)

Tomasz Klimkowski (Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań, Poland)

Georgeta Orian (University of Alba Iulia, Romania)



Advisory Board

Maria Bucur-Deckard, University of Indiana, USA

Aurelian Craiutu, University of Indiana, USA

Dennis Deletant, University College London, UK

Jukka Havu, University of Tampere, Finland

Zdzisław Hryhorowicz, Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań, Poland

Sabine Krause, University of Leipzig, Germany

Vincent Liotta, University of Indiana, USA

Isabela Mares, Columbia University, New York, USA

Roberto Merlo, University of Turin, Italy

Lavinia Stan, St. Francis Xavier University, Canada

Maria Ștefănescu, Babeș-Bolyai University, Romania

Eija Suomela-Salmi, University of Turku, Finland

© Romanian Language and Culture (2017)
School of Languages and Translation Studies
University of Turku



ISSN 2343-3442 (Print)

ISSN 2343-3450 (Online)

www.fjrs.eu

Printed in Finland

Finnish
Journal
for
Romanian
Studies

*T*ranslations – *On the Borderline*
Nº 3 • 2017

University of Turku
Finland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword • 7

TRANSLATIONS – ON THE BORDERLINE

CĂTĂLIN CONSTANTINESCU ('Alexandru Ioan Cuza' University of Iași)
The Role of Translations in Comparative Literature. Conjectures and Solutions • 11

ALINA RESCEANU (University of Craiova)
Resolving Ambiguities in Translation. Amount Relative Clauses in Romanian • 25

DIANA PAINCA (Free University of Brussels)
Characteristics of Orality in Translation: Repetitions in Oral History Interviews on Romanian Communism • 41

FLORIN CIOBAN (ELTE University of Budapest)
IOANA JIEANU (University of Ljubljana)
Romanian Prints and Romanian Literature Translations in Hungary in the 18th and 19th Centuries • 57

CONSTANTIN-IOAN MLADIN ('Ss. Cyril and Methodius' University in Skopje)
Some Observations on Literary Translations from Romanian to Macedonian and Vice Versa • 63

BOOK REVIEWS

LARISA CERCEL (University of Saarland)
Sean Cotter, *Literary Translation and the Idea of a Minor Romania - A Review*
• 75

EMILIA IVANCU (Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań)
Justice, Memory and Redress in Romania. New Insights – A Review • 81

FOREWORD

The Finnish Journal for Romanian Studies (FJRS) focuses on different aspects of Romanian culture, mainly as reflected outside Romania, while researchers from around the world are invited to publish, the interdisciplinary dialogue between researchers in the field being heartily encouraged.

This third issue of *The Finnish Journal for Romanian Studies* aims at bringing together research articles which would focus on the topic of translation studies, either theoretical or applied, with direct reference to Romanian texts, whether we speak of literature, language, culture or specialised texts from economy, medicine, marketing, history, etc. The definition and understanding of the translating process are in continuous transformation as well as the role of the translator. Sometimes both the text, the process and the translator find themselves on the borderline. How do all these three relate to translating texts from and into the Romanian language? This is the question we would like to address through the present issue dedicated to the process of translation of different texts from and into Romanian. Our third issue sees itself as an invitation to revisit old concepts and paradigms regarding translations and the translating process as well as the role of the translator, and to offer the possibility for discussing all these concepts in the light of the Romanian language.

We thus express our sincerest thanks to the contributors of the current issue for their novel perspectives brought to the field of Romanian studies as well as to the reviewers of the articles.

The Editors

REVIEWERS FOR THIS ISSUE

Mirjana ĆORKOVIĆ

Diarmuid JOHNSON

Iwona KASPERSKA

Anna OCZKO

Ivana OLUJIĆ

Petar RADOSAVLJEVIĆ

Elena SANDU



TANSLATIONS – ON THE BORDERLINE

THE ROLE OF TRANSLATIONS IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE. CONJECTURES AND SOLUTIONS

Cătălin Constantinescu

'Alexandru Ioan Cuza' University of Iași

Romania

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to demonstrate that the general theory of literature is not possible if we avoid the conclusions offered by the comparative literary studies that take into consideration the important role that translations play in the broader literary phenomenon. The insertion of the national literatures into a polysystem cannot be imagined without literary translations (Itamar Even-Zohar developed his theory in parallel and simultaneously with the descriptive paradigm in translations). The polysystem theory favoured the issue of translations in the field of literary studies, since it was conceived – when literary studies were ignoring the translations – as a theory that describes how literatures evolve. This theory legitimated the literary translations as part of the literary study (Susan Bassnett strongly advocated this idea). It is stated that systems (literatures national are perfect examples) exist only in systems theory, without an ontological status; the decision to consider literature, art or translation as a system is based on the assumption that such an approach clarifies the internal structure and the evolution of literature, and also its connections with the outside world. We may observe that all modern national literatures participate more or less in a literary polysystem, influencing writers, giving them models to imitate or influences to which they are opposing. 'Peripheral literatures' are highly shaped by translations. In recent years, many theorists (such as Emily Apter, Pascale Casanova, Rita Felski, Theo Hermans or David Damrosch) advocated the idea of defining world literature as a way of circulation of texts and readings made possible due to the translations and not as canonical literary texts. We anticipate that the current definition of (world) literature – the essential object of the general theory of literature – involves the description of it as a space between the source and receiving cultures, as a result of the translations.

KEYWORDS

translation, national literature, polysystem, comparative literary studies, general theory of literature.

One of the most consistent part of the literary comparativism and of the comparative literary theory is the quest of answering some harrowing questions: ‘What literary works should read one in order to understand what is World Literature?’ or ‘How many books can read one in his or her lifetime and in how many languages?’. Answering may indicate the role of the translations in the general theory of literature. Literary comparativism, throughout its history, is deeply connected with the phenomenon of translations, a necessary part in understanding the influences, the intersections between literatures written in vernacular languages or the intersections between different arts.

Commonly, translation means several ways of transfer: translation of content in different linguistic codes, in different artistic codes, etc. Translation studies are interested in resolving problems which may be expressed as questions: ‘How can we speak about a ‘single language’ and how may we distinguish and analyse historical and cultural stratifications from the texts we read and translate?'; ‘How do we study oral and written translations, and the cultural and linguistic functions of them?'; ‘What is the role of translations in the religious, ethical or political structures of the past?'; ‘How were translations used to undermine the power structures?'; ‘What was precisely the role of translations in colonial and postcolonial societies?'; ‘What is the meaning of translations in identity's construction?’

The comparative study of literature must observe the special role of the translations; the term *translation* is increasingly used as *transformation*, through the literary texts that make translation as their main theme or through the work of translators, as they rewrite the sources and may alter the horizon of expectations. Moreover, the comparatist may have special and refined answers, as he or she is concerned with problems such as: for the representation of the Other, in the globalized world, translations are very important; how severe the inequalities between various languages are, as some of them are more important than others; the current meaning of the ethics of translation. The main gain of studying the role of translation is that we may observe that ‘national’ literary histories are actually ‘transnational’ literary histories. This idea may be better understood in the context of the polysystem theory.

Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere were interested in translation studies since they were interested in linguistic and cultural differences. The theory of translations would be incomplete if it had no practical starting point, and if the accessibility of ideas is not regarded as a bridge between those who define themselves as theoreticians of translations and those who define themselves as simple translators. Bassnett and Lefevere considered the study of intimate translations related to comparative literature and inseparable connected to history. The conjecture is revolutionary: the study of translations should be the field within which comparative literature is located, not the other way around. (Bassnett, Lefevere, 1998: p. viii)

Bassnett and Lefevere somehow shift the emphasis from the practice of translation to cultural studies, showing that there are cultural manipulations generated by those in power (an idea borrowed from Edwin Gentzler). The study of translations would be the study of cultural interaction; we can study mediation between cultures through words, forms, cultural nuances and the meanings existing in the cultures in contact.

We must mention that Lefevere challenged the study of translations in the field of comparative literature or linguistics in 1976, regarding it as a particular discipline. Later, Susan Bassnett chose in the volume *Translation Studies* to develop an entire theoretical apparatus which supports the idea that translation studies represent an independent field that focuses on cultural contexts. Hence, a careful concern for understanding the complexity of manipulating texts and the factors that have influenced translators' translation strategies (Bassnett, 2004: 32).

The idea of 'translation as rewriting' struck Lefevere in 1981, when he introduced the concept of 'refracted text' – a text that was processed for a particular audience or adapted to a certain poetics or ideology. 'Refraction' meant for Lefevere the adaptation of a literary work to a different audience, in order to influence the way audience reads the work. In 1984, Lefevere imposed a new term: 'refraction' became 're-writing'. And 'rewriting' meant any text produced on the basis of another, intended as adaptation of the other text to a certain ideology or certain poetics, or both at times. Consequently, according to Lefevere and Bassnett (2004), 'rewriting' reflects a certain ideology and aesthetics, and directs literature to a certain function in a particular society. Rewriting is a manipulation in the service of power, but it is a manipulation that can develop new concepts, genres, literary innovations. Translation is not just a linguistic matter, but involves factors like power, ideology, aesthetics, and patronage.

In the early 1980s, Lefevere approached Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, which he later criticized, proposing new terms and categories, such as patronage, ideology, poetics, and the 'universe of discourse'. All these

categories are related to the complex phenomenon of translation, which is directly influenced by authority, legitimacy and power. Therefore, the study of translations should take into account the power, patronage, ideology and poetics, placing a special emphasis on attempts to undermine an ideology or poetics.

Following the suggestion of Richard Johnson, in the 1970s and 1980s, Itamar Even-Zohar developed a very complex theory of polysystems, under the influence of Russian formalism (Tinianov, Eichenbaum and Zhirmunskij). And, after Bahtin and Lotman, Even-Zohar insists on the fact that a special interest must be taken in the mechanisms of the relationship between what we call the 'high' literature and the 'low' literature. The above distinction was one of the main targets of cultural studies. Any literary study that ignores works condemned to have no artistic value will only give an inaccurate image of the process of production and reception of literature.

Just as Itamar Even-Zohar has been theorized since 1973, all modern national literatures are more or less involved in a literary 'polysystem', which influences the writers by offering models imitated or not, or influences to which they are opposing. Peripheral literature is modelled in a great deal by translations.

Even-Zohar proposed that any study of literary history be at the same time a study of the history of translation. The number of translations produced at a given time varies according to the stage of development of the respective culture; therefore, the cultures in transition tend to translate several texts as they consolidate, while those who consider themselves self-sufficient tend to translate less.

In 1976, Even-Zohar proposed the approach of translation through his notion of systematic literary study, attempting to open a new opening for translations. It also raised the issue of the correlations between the translated work and the target system (target culture); also, the problem of choosing certain texts to be translated at a given time, and the way in which translations can adopt specific behaviours and rules. It is not always the aesthetic factor that is decisive, emphasized Even-Zohar. Even-Zohar was interested in some other aspects: what could be the dynamics – within a literary system – between innovation and conservatism, and what role could the translated literature play in this regard? Could translation be a major force in evolution, producing transformations? Such a notion of translation as a tool of literary renewal proved to be radical at that time, one that traditional literary historians tried to minimize. Even-Zohar has identified such a trend in Renaissance: with the rise of vernacular languages to an equal status to classical languages, there has been an increasing activity in the field of

translation (without being a marginal concern). The translations must be seen as the basis of the process of transformation of the literary forms related to the emergence of vernacular cultures. For this reason, Even-Zohar proposed a systematic study of the conditions that made possible for translations to take place in a particular culture. Although in controversial terms, his proposal enumerated several concrete situations: 1) when the literature is ‘young’, in the process of edification, when the polysystem is not shaped; 2) when the literature is ‘peripheral’, ‘weak’; 3) in moments of crisis.

The main criticism to the polysystem theory was the idea of shifting the attention from the source text and context to the target system (target language). This mutation is explained by Susan Bassnett by the intent that underpinned the theory of the polysystem: to move away from the notion of a dominant literary canon and to emphasize the uncontrollable variables of a text in the target context. It is a theme that it shares with cultural studies, which have challenged the idea of studying canonical texts, proposing the widening of the spectrum of the study by including what is popular among the masses. Another point of criticism regarding the polysystem theory: the study of translations in Canada, India, or Latin America did not adopt the polysystem, but rather analyzed the texts translated from the perspective of relations between colonized and colonizers.

For Even-Zohar, the challenge was to find the answer to questions such as: ‘What is the function of the translated literature in the context of literature as a whole?'; ‘Can we think translated literature as a system?'; ‘Are the cultural or verbal relationships – within an arbitrary set of translated – texts of the same type as those in the original literature?'; ‘What kind of relationships can exist between the translated works, presented as definitive ‘products', imported from other literature and detached from their contexts and consequently neutralized from the point of view of the centre-periphery axis?’

The translated works can correlate in two ways:

- 1) depending on how the source texts are selected by the target literature, the principles of selection being impossible to correlate with the host co-systems of the target literature;
- 2) depending on how they adopt specific rules, behaviours and policies, that is, how they are used by the literary repertoire. (Even-Zohar, 1990: 46)

Translated literature may have its own repertoire, which up to a certain level may be exclusive.

According to Even-Zohar, translations are not only an integral part of a literary polysystem, but they are also the most active inner system. It remains to be determined what the position of the translations within the polysystem

is, and how this position is related to the general repertoire. We would be tempted, at first glance, to deduce it from the peripheral position of translations in literary studies (with the amendment that today the situation improved).

Asserting that translations remain central to polysystem theory is to say that they actively participate in shaping the centre of a polysystem. In this case, they are a part of the innovative forces; when new literary models are born, translations are probably among the means of developing a new repertoire, introducing foreign works and models into a literature. The translations produce not only new models of reality that replace the old ones, but also a new poetic language or techniques and patterns of composition. It seems clear that the underlying principles in the process of the selection of the works to be translated are determined by the situation that governs the host polysystem: the texts are chosen in accordance with their compatibility with the new approaches and the supposed innovative role they can assume in target literature.

But not all polysystems are structured in the same way, and the cultures differ significantly. French literature would be an example of a more rigid system compared to others. Combined with the traditional central position of French literature in the European context (or within the European macro-polysystem), it would lead to a peripheral position of translations from French literature. At least for some periods, the observation is not valid: Romanian literature, for example, admits translations from French as having a central position in the first part of the 20th century.

The answer to the question ‘What do we translate?’ cannot be located outside a historical and ideal context: it is determined by the basis of the operations that govern the polysystem. Seen from this point of view, the translation is no longer a phenomenon with fixed nature and boundaries, but an activity dependent on relations within a particular cultural system. So the recent definitions of translation as a related phenomenon formulated by Pascale Casanova or David Damrosch are highly influenced by the structuralist perspective of Itamar Even-Zohar.

The polysystem theory has the advantage of capturing the dynamic nature of literature, thanks to the practice of continuous repositioning of the genres related to each other. It illustrates that canonical literature is good to be subject to competition.

Translated literature does not occupy a fixed position in a literary system because the system itself is in a continuous state of alteration, so Even-Zohar considers that this state is the normal position of the translation. The polysystem theory is important because it has moved the literary research

from the linguistic approach of translating to a broader approach, in a cultural, social and historical context. The main counter-argument to the theory of the polysystem remains the far too abstract nature of the theory elaborated by Itamar Even-Zohar.

It is, however, mandatory to mention the answer that Itamar Even-Zohar formulated in 2005 in the article ‘Polysystem Theory (Revised)’ in defending the theory of the polysystem. The original term ‘polysystem’ refers to phenomena existing at different levels, so that the polysystem of a particular national literature is considered to be part of a wider socio-cultural polysystem which itself may contain several other polysystems (beyond the literary), such as artistic, religious or political. In this context, literature is a term that can designate not only a series, a multitude, a collection of texts, but a wider phenomenon such as a set of factors governing the production, promotion and reception of these texts. In this way, Even-Zohar redefines the polysystem: a multiple system, a system with different systems that interfere with each other and partially overlap, and still function as a structured whole. (Even-Zohar, 2005: 40)

As far as the literary polysystem is concerned, there is a tension between the centre and the periphery, where different literary genres struggle to occupy the dominant position of the centre. The implication is that translated literature also exists as part of the polysystem of a national literature, since translation is no longer a phenomenon whose nature and boundaries are definitive, fixed, but an activity dependent on the relationship in a particular cultural system. (Even-Zohar, 1990: 51)

It has to be said that AILC/ICLA had in 1976, 1978 and 1980 conferences and meetings that debated the subject of translation of literature. We even recall the volume in Theo Hermans’ co-ordination, *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, where the results of many of these debates are found.

Also, in 1985, José Lambert and Hendrik van Gorp (in the chapter *On Describing Translation*, pp. 42-53) proposed a scheme to compare the theory of the system and the theory of translation and the relations between the author, the text and the reader, as follows:

- 1) *Preliminary data*, which includes information about the title, preface and other paratextual information (about translation);
- 2) *The macro level*, with reference to the way the text, chapters, title are structured;
- 3) *The micro level*, investigating linguistic transfers or linguistic deviations;

4) *The systemic context*, which involves a comparison of micro and macro levels, of text and theory, leading to the identification of the norms.

In the past, the study of translations was conducted in the context of the study of influences, genetic relations between literatures and writers, while the emphasis was always put on the original work. Even in studying the migration of themes and motives (the study of themes is a consistent chapter of comparative literature), the translators were considered intermediaries who transmit messages from one national literature to another.

The new paradigm for the study of literary translations was to be based on a comprehensive theory and practical research. The theorists who have engaged in the foundation of this new direction shared in the first place the common ground, as they shared a common vision of literature: as a dynamic and complex system. And the belief that there should be an interplay between theoretical models and case studies. They also approached the literary translation from a descriptive point of view (and this is an essential, obligatory praxis in any theory), pragmatic, functional and systematic. An interest was noticed in the rules and the constraints governing the production and reception of translations, the relationship between translation and other types of word processing, and the place and the role of translations both in literature and in the interaction of the literatures. The line of influences in this new direction begins with the Russian formalists (Tinianov, Jakobson), the Czech structuralists (Mukarovsky, Vodicka), then with Iuri Lotman, Claudio Guillén, Siegfried Schmidt, Itamar Even-Zohar. As David Damrosch observed, the translations played a formative role in creating national literature. Not even one of the individual literatures was created from zero, but was born in a wider, transnational context.

With the rise of nation-states in recent centuries, national traditions have developed in an international context, in a context in which the respective nation's writers defined themselves in terms of translations assimilated by literatures with whom they came into contact or of which they were part.

In modern times – the term ‘national literatures’ is used in the true sense of the word – translations played a vital role, not necessarily as external sources of inspiration, but as constituent, if not all, of most parts of the national literature. David Damrosch analysed the circuits through which authors such as Bartolome de las Casas, Nguyen Du or Marguerite Yourcenar and translations of their writings have marked other national literatures. We can therefore speak of an international character that is regularly found in national literary cultures. Such cases illustrate that ‘national’ and ‘international’ are no longer opposing categories. The ‘national language’ itself is the environment through which original works and translated works

circulate together and form our national literatures that are ineluctably inertial. For Damrosch, translation can improve the original text, allowing readers to access several cultural worlds. The idea of world literature takes into account those forms of literature that gain in translation, having in mind that other works lose power or influence in another language.

Emily Apter adopts Alain Badiou's idea of untranslatability, recognizing the limits of the cultural translation: 'nothing is translatable'. Though, the translation zone is established on the basis of the philological relation. Not surprisingly, as the singularity is the reason for a poetic masterpiece to become the paradigm-shift agent or a carrier of universal value. Apter insists that 'the challenge of the comparative literature is to balance the singularity of untranslatable alterity against the need to translate *quand même*'. (Apter, 2006: 91)

The implications of a planetary criticism, for the future of comparative literature, as suggested by Gayatri Spivak, Edward Said and then by Emily Apter, for the future of comparative literature are based on the emphasis 'on a unidimensional formalism – univocity, singularity, irreducibility, holism, quantum cosmology, the Event – while remaining constant to an earthly politics of translation and nontranslability'. (Apter, 2006: 93)

Making a step further, Apter affirms that the field of the translation studies explores the possibility that everything is translatable, having in mind that it should expand to include the relationship between natural language and code (informatics is integrated in interdisciplinary humanities. (Apter, 2006: 227). Also, the shifts in the world canon and literary markets may determine the repositioning of the translation as the fulcrum of the comparative literature. Apter reiterate the idea of 'neighbouring' from Kenneth Reinhard: comparative literature is not only comparison, but a mode of reading texts that are grouped not in 'families' (similarity and difference), but into 'neighbourhoods' (accidental contiguity, genealogical isolation and ethical encounter). (Apter, 2006: 247)

For Emily Apter, translation functions as a form of social homogenization that flattens out the cultural and linguistic differences, backed by the socio-economic logic of globalization. As incentive for comparative literary studies, Apter proposes the concept of untranslatability, in order to resist false equivalence, emphasizing the critical force of 'incomparability and untranslatability'. This description of the phenomenon is based on the idea that comparison and the perception of inequality are intrinsically connected, and that comparative thinking could be used to impose pre-existing categories or to impose one's view over the world (the label could be 'colonialism').

Rita Felski proposes a return to actor-network theory (ANT) in discussing the role of the translation in contemporary literary comparativism and its new angles for the explorations of translation and comparison. ANT, as theorized by Bruno Latour, is a form of relational thinking, centred around the idea of actor – that is anything that makes a difference, related to agency, not to performance or presence. ANT is not so much interested in the linguistic turn (as the most of the translation studies), but in making things more real rather than less real, in terms of Latour and Felski. What ANT brings to literary studies are the new ways of thinking about connectivity, seeing the relation as co-creation. ANT and comparative literature are interested in translation, ANT being described as a ‘sociology of translation’.

Translation is rather a metaphor for ‘thinking about relations’ (Felski), as ANT implies that ‘meanings are mediated, altered, and sometimes enriched’, when they move from one culture to other culture. Comparative literary studies may benefit from new modes of comparison: ‘ones that can attend to cross-fertilizations between minor literatures that are not scripted by the centre; that are alive to the contingencies of cross-cultural interaction and lateral networks; that do not assume that translation is equivalent to homogenization’. (Felski, 2016: 753) ANT reveals that the translability is a reality, as it is an ongoing basis of mediation and communication between actors.

For Rita Felski, ‘tracing hybrid and heterogeneous constellations of text, persons and things’ becomes more challenging in the new context of comparative literature, where texts and contexts are no more the only points of interests: ‘This openness to the kinds of actors that make literature matter is, in my view, one of the most exciting contributions of ANT to literary studies’ (Felski, 2016: 762).

Comparison is thought to defamiliarize what one takes as given in a certain culture, and also plays the main role in decontextualization and recontextualization. The relativization of the force of belonging characterizes also the comparison.

The work of Pascale Casanova *The World Republic of Letters* (1999, 2004) also deals with the importance of works on the periphery in the revitalization of French urban literature (metropolitan French literature). Casanova’s perspective is influenced by that of Goethe, who in 1820 identified the importance of international circulation, made possible through translations: the key to rebirth of any national culture. And in 1836, Goethe stated that he preferred to read his own Faust in French translation, not in German (in *Kunst und Alterthum*, 1836, 1984: 276, *apud* Damrosch, 350). It follows that a translation implies a new, fresh language.

According to Pascale Casanova translation is one of the most special ways of consecration in the literary world, as it is the main vehicle to enter the literary world for all authors located on the periphery of a center. (Casanova, 2004: 133)

Translation is an instrument whose purposes and uses vary according to the position of the translator to the translated text (the old source language axis – target language). Therefore, any theoretical analysis or attempt must take into account two factors: the intention of the translator or the author and the relationship between the languages involved.

For a poorer, peripheral target language, the import of major literary works seems particularly important, and the translation is a way of gathering literary resources, acquiring universal texts, and thus represents a very consistent way of enriching an expanding literature. Casanova offers as an example the case of the German romantics, who have made remarkable efforts to translate the classics into the 19th century. Another direction of enriching a language is the translation of subversive works by authors who themselves are polyglots and enjoy recognition international: Nabokov translates Lewis Carroll into Russian, Borges translates Hart Crane, e e cummings, Robert Penn Warren and so on (Casanova, 2004: 134).

This way, instead of turning the periphery into a centre to consecrate it, they made the centre known in the periphery by translating its major works. The translation also allows the international distribution of literary capital by expanding the power and prestige of literatures of long tradition.

From the point of view of the target language, the import of literary texts written in ‘small’ or neglected languages functions as a means of annexing or misappropriating peripheral texts. For a minor language, it is equivalent to obtaining a validation certificate, and comparatists should be interested in this form of consecration.

Translation is not just a form of naturalization (in the sense of changing one’s nationality in exchange for another) or a simple passage from one language to another: translation is *littérisation*. Casanova believes that Latin American authors began to exist in international literature only after their translation into French and their recognition by French critics. For this reason, it is stated that Jorge Luis Borges is an invention of France. Danilo Kis’ international recognition coincided with his consecration in French. And Rabindranath Tagore, once translated into English. (Casanova, 2004: 135)

The definition of the translation as *littérisation*, a change in literary existence, makes it possible to find a solution for a whole series of problems generated by faith in equality (or better said in symmetry) of different types of translation, conceived as simple transfers of meaning from one language to

another. In fact, we are dealing with a transformation into a literary language (in the sense of the language of literature, C.C.). For Casanova, *littérisation* is an operation like any other – self-translation, translation, transcription, direct composition in a dominant language, by some means by which a country with underdeveloped literature can obtain literary recognition from legitimate authorities. Transmutation and translation of literary texts are strategies to help literature to become visible for all.

In ‘Introduction’ of *Translating Others*, Theo Hermans insists and asserts that the translation negotiates the difference. The bigger the difference, the harder the translation is. And the difference has many masks, which is the reason why the study of translations follows the same logic. From a historical point of view, the study of translations in the West owes its categories to the particular concepts of language and culture, in combination with a limited set of canonical written texts. Such alliances explain the traditional concern for identity and preservation. This history, however, gave to the translation studies a limited basis for confronting the complexities and inequities of a globalizing world.

According to Hermans, ‘translating others’ is a phrase that refers not only to alterity and how it affects translation, but also to the many ‘Others’ who translate in their own way, for various and specific purposes.

The intake of the local and its specificity is not possible through a single model of investigation. Rather we can accept that we are dealing with a perspective of a disparate future of discipline, de-centred and ex-central, which has to learn several languages. The methods of the future will be rather dialogical than dialectical. The commitment in order to exploit the contextual details of the difference confines the researcher to pay close attention to his discourse. The future methods certainly involve critical self-reflection. Beyond the (im)precision of the proposed models and the elaborated theories, it is certain that the study of translations from a literary perspective still remains a territory of speculation. Some are more or less convincing.

REFERENCES

- Apter, E. (2006), *The Translation Zone. A New Comparative Literature*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Apter, E. (2013), *Against World Literature. On the Politics of Untranslatability*, Verso Books, London, New York.
- Bassnett, S. (1993), *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*, Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.

- Bassnett, S.; Lefevere, A. (1998), *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation Topics in Translation*, Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon.
- Bermann, S.; Porter, C. (eds.). (2014), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Wiley Blackwell, Oxford.
- Damrosch, D. (2003), *What is World Literature?*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1990), ‘The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem’. *Poetics Today* 11:1, pp. 45-51.
- Felski, R. (2016), ‘Comparison and Translation: A Perspective from Actor-Network Theory’, *Comparative Literary Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 747-765.
- Gile, D.; Hansen, G.; Pokorn, N.K. (eds.). (2010), *Why Translation Studies Matter*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Hermans, T. (1999), *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-oriented Approaches Explained*, St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester.
- Hermans, T. (2014), *Translating Others*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group London & New York.
- Hermans, T. (ed.). (1985/2014), *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, Routledge, Oxon/New York.
- Kuhiwczak, P.; Littau, K. (eds.). (2007), *The Companion to Translation Studies*, Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto.
- Saussy, H. (2006), ‘Exquisite Corpses from Fresh Nightmares: Of Memes, Hives and Selfish Genes’. In Saussy, H., (ed.), *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*, Johns Hopkins University Press Baltimore, pp. 12-54.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, St.; Mukherjee, T. (eds.). (2013) *Companion to Comparative Literature, World Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*, Cambridge University Press India, New Delhi.

RESOLVING AMBIGUITIES IN TRANSLATION: AMOUNT RELATIVE CLAUSES IN ROMANIAN

Alina Resceanu

University of Craiova

Romania

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we discuss potentially ambiguous relative clauses (RCs) in English. The ambiguity refers to the fact that these RCs may be interpreted either as restrictive relatives (RRs) or as amount relatives (AR) (identity of substance vs. identity of quantity, cf. Carlson, 1977; Heim, 1987 a.o.). We compare the English RCs used in such contexts with their Romanian equivalents and we observe that this ambiguity does not exist in Romanian. The interpretation of the RCs in Romanian depends on the type of the relative determiner used to introduce the RC. Thus, the use of the degree relative determiner *cât* ('how-much' and its variants *căia* 'how much_{Fsg}', *căi* 'how much_{Mpl}', *căte* 'how much_{Fpl}', *cătora* 'how much_{Gmpl}') signals a context of amount or a reference to cardinalities (being an operator abstracting over degrees), whereas the RC with *care* ('which') is mostly restrictive. Therefore, it is the use of a certain relativizer that helps us get the meaning and the interpretation right. This paper is structured in three parts. In the first part, we define what an amount relative clause is in English and demonstrate how it differs from a restrictive relative (RR). We point to the descriptive characteristics of English amount relatives in comparison with restrictive relative clauses, focusing on their structural similarity, but their different interpretation. In the second part, we bring into discussion the RCs in English with 'identity of substance' vs 'identity of quantity' interpretation and discuss the analyses proposed in the literature (cf. Heim, 1987). The third part is aimed at discussing the Romanian *cât* 'how much/many' vs. *care* relative clauses with an amount interpretation, concluding that the (syntactic/semantic) properties that these have are determined by the relativizer used in the construction.

KEYWORDS

amount relative clauses, restrictive relative clauses, semantic ambiguity, degree words, cardinality.

1. AMOUNT RELATIVE CLAUSES IN ENGLISH: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The term ‘amount’ relative clause (AR) was first proposed by Greg Carlson (1977) to refer to a third class of headed relative clauses (actually included in the class of restrictive relative clauses) or to a non-canonical construction which is different from the more traditional distinction between restrictive (RR) and non-restrictive or appositive relatives (NRR).

One context in which ARs are distinct from RRs is illustrated in (1):

- (1) a. *Some man there was t on the life-raft died. (RR)
b. Every man there was on t the life-raft died. (AR)

In (1a) the RR cannot relativize the logical subject of a context where *there*-insertion has applied, whereas in (1b), where the quantifier has been changed from *some* to *every*, the sentence is grammatical.

This means that the RC in (1b) is compatible with certain quantifiers and determiners that allow relativization in *there*-contexts, like definite or universals (this property of AR is known as determiner restriction, cf. Carlson, 1977). Despite its similarity to the ordinary restrictive in (1a), the relative clause under (1b) is quite different, which led Carlson to claim that it is an AR.

One important difference between RR and AR is that amount relatives are relativizations over degrees, rather than over individuals (like restrictive).

There-relatives are difficult to account for, since they seem not to automatically provide a true amount reading. Instead, they can only have the identity of individuals reading. In other words, the example in (1b) does not mean ‘the same number of men as there were on the life-raft died.’ Rather it can only mean ‘all the men who were actually on the life-raft died.’

Other contexts labelled as ‘amount relatives’ by Carlson (1977: 525, 530) are given in (2 a-d):

- (2) a. Any beer (that/*which) there may be t left in the cooler is all mine.
b. That’s all (that/*which) there is t.

- c. Marv put everything (that/*which) he could t in his pockets.
- d. Every hour (that/*which) this movie lasts beyond my bedtime means more aggravation for me.

By examining these examples, all RCs above involve contexts in which abstraction over amounts or degrees rather than on individuals applies (see the ungrammatical use of the relative pronoun ‘which’, a definite relative pronoun ruled out in existential contexts and in the contexts where abstraction over degree, not individuals applies) and all are ARs.

In (3a-c), we exemplify the types of ARs identified in (Heim, 1987) and in (Grosu and Landman, 1998 and 2013):

- (3) a. It will take us the rest of our lives to drink the champagne that they spilled that evening. (Heim, 1987)
- b. We will never be able to recruit the soldiers that the Chinese paraded last May Day.(Grosu and Landman, 1998)
- c. The money it cost could have fed 1,000 hungry children. (Grosu and Landman, 2013)

Despite the initial consideration that in degree relativization abstraction on a set of degrees denotes only an identity of quantity reading (quantity /degree denoting ARs), the evidence in (3) indicate that abstraction over degrees within ARs is also compatible with an individual denotation of the complex noun phrase containing the AR (substance/entity denoting ARs).

To solve the puzzle raised by the degree/entity interpretations of this category of ARs (Carlson, 1977 and Heim, 1987), a new concept of degree was proposed by Grosu and Landman (1998), in fact a richer notion of degree, which keeps track of what it is a degree of (based on the idea that degrees always measure something). In their opinion, the expression of degree for a given sortal predicate is a triplet consisting of the cardinality of a plural index, the sortal (or something that functions as a measure domain), and the plural index itself (which is equal to the classical notion of degree). This contrasts with the classical degree notation which consists only of the cardinality. This set of degrees undergoes the operation of Maximalization, which essentially picks the unique maximal degree from the set created by degree relativization. Finally, the amount relative clause may undergo an optional operation of SUBSTANCE. This operation is used to provide the individual denotation from the complex degree notation. This is an interesting notion of degree, but the details of the analysis are beyond the scope of this paper. For the complete description of how such a richer notion of degree is a suitable analysis for ARs in English, we refer the interested reader to Grosu and Landman (1998).

Despite the fact that ‘amount’ relatives are structurally heterogeneous, the presence of degree quantification is one of the shared properties. In the following section, we will take a look at the original motivation for postulating a degree variable in ARs.

ARs have offered a rich ground for investigation, both syntactically and semantically. The questions linguists have been trying to answer for the last 30 years is why they are called ‘amount’ relatives and how they are different from ordinary (restrictive/non-restrictive) relatives.

As mentioned in the introductory part above, ARs are relativizations over degrees, rather than over individuals (like restrictive), and despite their apparent unitary interpretation, there is a lot of variation with regard to naming such a category (Carlson (1977) called these constructions ‘amount relatives’, Heim (1987) identified them as ‘degree relatives’, Grosu and Landman (1998) as ‘maximalizing relatives’ and later on, refining the typology, Grosu (2009) and Kotek (2009) deal with the singleton definite/indefinite relative clauses¹).

2. DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH AMOUNT RELATIVES

We discuss in this section the descriptive characteristics of amount relatives as initially proposed in Carlson (1977) and Heim (1987).² Let us examine the relative clauses exemplified in (4 a-b):

(4) a. I took with me the books that/Ø there were t on the table.

b.*I took with me the books which there were t on the table.

The example under (4a) has an amount reading and lacks the ordinary restrictive relative reading since the gap in the relative clause refers to a degree measuring the cardinality of the objects, which are in our case the books.

As far as the relative in (4b) is concerned, Carlson draws attention to the following facts concerning the interaction between relativization and *there*-insertion contexts. If the relative clause contains a *there*-insertion context and

¹ The justification for calling the relative clauses of this type singleton definite/indefinite RCs is that an operation of maximalization takes place in the semantic derivation of these relatives, turning the predicate denoted by the relative clause into a singleton predicate (ARs necessarily denote a set with exactly one member, which may be either an atom or a plurality, cf. Grosu, 2013: 609).

² These analyses were subsequently refined in Grosu and Landman (1998, 2013) and McNally (2008). For instance, McNally (2008) argues that there are problems with this analysis and that, despite the superficial similarities between amount relatives and relativization in *there*-insertion contexts, it cannot be concluded that the latter is necessarily amount relativization.

the relativization gap is in the position which is open to the definiteness effect, the relative clause is fine with the relativizer *that* or with the empty relativizer \emptyset as in (4a), but not with the relativizer *which* as in (4b).

The explanation Carlson gives for the infelicity of the example in (4b) is based on the syntactic structure that he adopts in deriving relative clauses in English, and thus (4a) is interpreted as in (5):

- (5). I took with me the books that there were [THAT AMOUNT books] on the table

Another interesting explanation is offered by Heim (1987): since ARs denote sets of degrees, an operation of degree abstraction takes place in the sense that the gap in (4a) contains a null degree expression, *d many books*, as illustrated in (6) in which only the variable *d* is bound by the relativizer.

- (6) I took with me the books that there were *d many books* on the table.

This analysis brings forth the first case of ambiguous interpretation that a context such as that in (4a) creates in which the question is if we have an identity of substance or an identity of quantity reading. We give an answer to this question in the next sections.

2.1 ARs IN AMBIGUOUS CONTEXTS (IDENTITY OF SUBSTANCE VS. IDENTITY OF QUANTITY INTERPRETATION): EXAMPLE 1

If we go back to example (4a) and analyse it based on Heim's proposal, we would have an identity of quantity reading and not an identity of substance reading, due to the presence of the *d many books* variable. We repeat below the two examples in (4 a-b), this time with Heim's (1987) interpretation:

- (7) a. I took with me the books that/ \emptyset there were *d many books* on the table.

b.*I took with me the books which there were *d many books* on the table.

However, the facts are exactly the opposite: (7a) cannot mean that I took with me from the library as many books as there were books on the table in the kitchen; it only means that I took those actual books on the table. That is, (7a) only has an identity of substance reading.

Carlson (1977) points out that relatives can be interpreted as denoting degrees even if they are headed by entity denoting nouns. The explanation he offers is that amount relatives interact with the rest of the sentence in the same way as comparatives do, so the AR in (7a) is given the same interpretation as the comparative in (8):

- (7) a. the books that there were *d many books* on the table

(8). as many books as there were on the table

In Romanian, the interpretation of such RCs is less problematic since a specialized relative determiner *cât/câți* (how much/many) can be used to introduce the RC in order to obtain an amount/degree reading.³

For example, in (9) the relative clause contains a degree expression *d many books*, in which only the variable d is bound by *cât*:

(9) Am luat cu mine (atăea) cărți câte erau *d many books* pe masă.

Have taken with me that-many books how-many_{FemPl} were on table

'I took with me the books that there were on the table'.

Thus, (9) is interpreted as referring to the (maximum) number of books, rather than to the actual objects (due to the semantic interpretation of *cât* which acts as a maximalising operator, binding the degree variable inside the AR *d many books* and selecting the maximum number of books in the example above).

2.2 ARs IN AMBIGUOUS CONTEXTS (IDENTITY OF SUBSTANCE VS. IDENTITY OF QUANTITY INTERPRETATION): EXAMPLE 2

There is a second example of ambiguity between 'identity of substance vs. identity of quantity' reading, as far as ARs in English are concerned. Heim (1987) adopts Carlson's view (the similarity with comparatives mentioned above) and further points out that there are other contexts in which the similarity is not only visible, but it also plays an important role in differentiating an amount relative from a restrictive one. Let us take a look at the examples in (10 a-b) and (11 a-b):

(10) a. It will take us the rest of our lives to drink the champagne that they spilled that evening.

b. It will take us the rest of our lives to drink as much champagne as they spilled that evening.

(11) a. We will never be able to recruit the soldiers that the Chinese paraded last May Day.

b. We will never be able to recruit as many soldiers as the Chinese paraded last May Day.

³ *Cât* is a wh-operator that binds the degree variable and also acts as a maximalizing operator (for a more detailed analysis of *cât* in Romanian ARs, see Kotek, 2009; Resceanu, 2015).

We notice that (10a) allows a reading which requires only identity of quantity, not identity of substance, thus having the same interpretation as the comparative in (10b). (11a) and (11b) make the same point with a count noun.

Now, let us suppose that the relative in (10a) can be either a restrictive or an amount relative. If it were a restrictive, it would receive an identity of substance reading (cf. Heim, 1987), and thus it would illogically refer to the actual champagne that was spilled that evening.

The most natural reading of the sentence in (10a) has to do with the amount of champagne spilled, since it will take us a long time to drink as much champagne as they spilled: it does not refer to how long it would take us to slurp the champagne they spilled off the ground. The interpretation referring to the amount of champagne also justifies its similarity with the comparative in (10b).

When it is given this interpretation, we get the identity of quantity reading and the sentence is an amount relative. It also gets a maximal interpretation, since it refers to the total amount of champagne. The same explanation is valid for (11) as well.

Once more, Romanian resorts to the use of *cât* to clarify the interpretation in translating the English examples:

- (12) a. Nu vom putea niciodata să bem (atâta) şampanie câtă au vărsat ei ieri seară.

Not will be able never to drink (that much) champagne how-much have spilled they yesterday evening

We will never be able to drink as much champagne as they spilled that evening.

- b. Nu vom putea niciodata să bem la fel de multă şampanie câtă au vărsat ei ieri seară.

Not will be able never to drink the same of much champagne how-much have spilled they yesterday evening

We will never be able to drink as much champagne as they spilled that evening.

- c. Nu vom putea niciodată să bem şampania pe care au vărsat-o ei ieri seară.

Not will be able never to drink the champagne PE which have spilled-CL_{Fem.sg.Acc} they yesterday evening

'We will never be able to drink the champagne which they spilled that evening.'

By examining the examples above, we observe that the use of *cât* ('how-many' with its inflected form *câtă/câți/câte*) only allows for an amount interpretation (i.e. identity of quantity reading) and disambiguates the interpretation. The use of *care* 'which' might give a rather nonsensical interpretation of drinking the actual champagne that was spilled that evening (just like the RR in English analysed above). However, this nonsensical interpretation is never adopted by the speakers.

As shown in these two sections of the second part, the existence of degree-denoting (quantity) and entity-denoting (substance) ARs has been a field of debate starting with Carlson (1977) and Heim (1987). The recent contributions made by Grosu (2002, 2005), Grosu and Landman (1998, 2013), Heim (2000) and Kotek (2009) offer detailed explanation, new empirical data and complex formalized analyses in order to clear up the ambiguity. Others, like McNally (1998), objected to the idea that entity-denoting ARs involve abstraction over degrees (she considers these cases as illustrating restrictive relatives).

3. CÂT VS. CARE ROMANIAN ARS

In this part, we discuss ARs in Romanian, which are types of relative clause constructions (headed or headless (free) relative clauses) that have an 'amount' reading and denote properties of amounts/cardinalities. They are mainly introduced by the specific relative word *cât* used as either a degree word or as a relative determiner with φ features (its inflected forms for number and gender are *câtă* 'how much_{Fsg}', *câți* 'how much_{Mpl}', *câte* 'how much_{Fpl}'), which is semantically interpreted as a maximalizing operator abstracting on a set of degrees. It has no counterpart in English relative clauses and it secures the amount reading in all the contexts in which it is used.

It is interesting to note that the complex DPs which are modified by RCs headed by *cât/câți* may denote amounts/cardinalities or individual entities.⁴ Due to the presence of *cât/câți*, abstraction over degrees is possible even when the DPs denote entities.

We illustrate Romanian AR in the example below:

- (13). Am luat cu mine atâtea cărți câte erau pe masă.

⁴ This distinction between degree denoting ARs and entity denoting ARs was discussed in details in Kotek (2009) and Grosu and Landman (2013).

Have taken with me that-many books how-many were on table
'I took me as many books as there were on the table'.

By examining the example under (13), we notice that the use of *câte* confers an amount interpretation to the relative clause headed by the indefinite DP. The relative clause denotes not only the maximal number of books that I took with me, but also the maximum number of books that were on the table. The interpretation is based on the fact that the two sets are equated: the number of books I took with me is equal to the number of books that there were on the table (representing also the total number of books). This equivalence is reflected in the correlative-like structure of this construction due to the presence of the correlative terms *atâtea...câte*. In this case, the indefinite AR has only an amount reading (referring to the number of books), not a substance reading (referring to the fact that I took with me the actual books that were on the table).

Let us compare the AR in (13) with the RCs in (14), in which *câte* 'how many_{FemPl}' was replaced with *care* 'which'.

(14). Am luat cu mine atâtea cărți care erau pe masă.

Have taken with me that-many books which were on table

'I took me so many books that were on the table'.

The interpretation of (14) is different, in the sense that the relative clause introduced by *care* is interpreted as a restrictive relative clause, based on co-reference, i.e. an identity of substance interpretation (I took with me the many books that were on the table) and not as denoting amount (I took with me as many books as there were on the table).

Another example of Romanian AR is given in (15):

(15) Am luat cu mine cărțile câte/care erau pe masă.

Have taken with me books-the how-many/which were on table

'I took me the books that there were on the table'

In this example, the (entity denoting) DP modified by the relative clause is definite and so the definite relative can have both an amount reading, where it denotes properties of amounts/degrees, and a substance reading, where it denotes properties of entities (the books on the table). Thus, both *câte* 'how-many_{FemPl}' and *care* 'which' are possible with a maximal interpretation (mainly due to the presence of the definite article).

Moreover, alongside ARs with *cât*, there are also relative clauses with *care* and *ce* that have only an amount interpretation, and this interpretation is obtained due to additional mechanisms external to the RC (such as the use of the

universal *tot* in (16) or of a definite quantitative nominal head, i.e. *vinul* ‘wine-the’ in (17)). If we take, for example, the relative clauses in (17), we consider them genuine ARs since they could only refer to the same quantity of wine (identity of quantity), excluding the nonsensical interpretation of drinking the exact same wine (identity of substance) in both *care* (17a) and *cât* (17b) constructions. These ARs are similar to the English ARs discussed in the previous part.

- (16). La petrecere o să beau tot ce mi se dă.

At party will drink_{ISg} all what me_{DAT} SE give

‘At the party, I will drink all that I am given’.

- (17) a. Îmi ia o lună să beau vinul *pe care-l* bei tu într-o oră.

To me takes a month to drink wine-the PE which/what CL_{III sg} drink you in an hour

‘It takes me a month to drink the wine that you drink in an hour’.

- b. Îmi ia o lună să beau atâta vin *cât* bei tu într-o oră.

To me takes a month to drink wine how-much drink you in an hour

‘It takes me a month to drink the wine that you drink in an hour’.

- (18). La Paște, o să beau și eu vinul *pe care-l* bea toată lumea.

At Easter will drink and me wine-the PE which-CL drink all people

‘At Easter, I will drink the wine that everybody drinks’.

The same interpretation is given to the example in (18). On the one hand, the restrictive reading, according to which ‘At Easter, I will drink the same wine that everybody drinks’, is ruled out, whereas the amount reading (drinking the same amount of wine) is acceptable.

Another interesting case are the Romanian ARs of the form illustrated in (19a-f). These are ARs in which the external material contains a (modified) numeral or a numeral phrase.

- (19) a. Zece *câți* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.

ten *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the

‘The ten that there are in the classroom now will pass the exam’.

- b. Zece studenți *câți* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.

ten students *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the

‘The 10 students that there are in the classroom now will pass the exam’.

- c. Exact zece studenți *câți* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.
exactly ten students *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the
'The exactly 10 students that are in the classroom now will pass the exam'
- d. Nu mai mult de zece studenți *câți* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.
Not much more than ten students *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the
'Not more than 10 students that are in the classroom now will pass the exam'
- e. Doar zece studenți *câți* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.
Not much more than ten students *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the
'Not more than 10 students that are in the classroom now will pass the exam'
- f. Unsprezece jucători buni *cât* formează o echipă de fotbal sunt greu de găsit.
Eleven players good how-much form a team of football are hard to find
'Eleven good players that form a football team are hard to find'.
We point out that the use of *care* in these examples indicates coreference and infers a substance reading, which is a more preferred reading if we want to emphasize the identity of substance or reference to individuals. Hence the optimal acceptability of RCs with *care* as illustrated in (20):
(20). Zece studenți *care* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.
ten students *who* are now in classroom will pass exam-the
'The 10 students that there are in the classroom now will pass the exam'.
However, the case in (20) is interesting, since its acceptability is conditioned by a partitive interpretation where [zece studenți *care...*] ('ten students *who...*') should be interpreted as [zece dintre studenții *care...*] ('ten of the students who').
On the contrary, the ARs with *cât* could not receive a partitive interpretation (zece dintre studenții *câți* sunt acum în clasă). The presence of *cât* confers a maximal interpretation (the total number of students is ten and there are no other students in the classroom except those ten) and as a consequence it would be impossible to continue with a sentence such as the one in (21):
(21) Zece studenți *câți/cât* sunt acum în clasă ne ajută să promovăm examenul. *Restul care sunt în clasă nu vor promova.

ten students *how-many* are now in classroom usCL_{pl} help to pass exam-the

‘The 10 students that there are in the classroom now will help us pass the exam’.

Moreover, the AR above is also a pure degree denoting AR, in which the alternation between *cât/câți* is possible. The degree word *cât/câți* is semantically used as an anaphoric quantifier and in all the cases illustrated above it refers to the cardinality of the antecedent. The amount denotation is even more obvious if we consider examples like (22).

(22). Din cauza a cinci studenți câți au lipsit am pierdut examenul.

Because of five students how-many have missed have lost exam-the

‘Because of the 5 students that had not come we lost the exam’.

The same explanation could also be used to account for the constructions discussed in two recent papers by Grosu (2009a, 2013). These constructions, which are called the ‘Romanian Unexpected Relative constructions’ (RUR), are similar to the ones above, except that the RURs illustrate the possibility of abstraction over degrees when the gap is in a ‘nominal’ position that is the complement of verbs such as *weigh, measure or last* (Grosu 2013: 615).

According to Grosu, RURs are of the type illustrated below:

(23) a. Patru ore cât durează filmul depășesc durata medie a unui film.

‘Four hours that this movie lasts exceed/exceeds the average duration of a movie’.

b. Cele patru ore cât durează filmul depășesc durata medie a unui film.

‘The four hours that this movie lasts exceed/exceeds the average duration of a movie’.

(24) a. Nouă kilograme cât cântărește bagajul tău de mâna te pot împiedica să te urci în avion.

‘Nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs may prevent you from boarding the plane.’

b. Cele nouă kilograme cât cântărește bagajul tău de mâna te pot împiedica să te urci în avion.

‘The nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs may prevent you from boarding the plane.’

(25) a. Zece kilometri cât se întinde soseaua dincolo de peşteră sunt o distanţă mai mare decât mă aşteptam.

“Ten kilometres that the road runs on far beyond the cave are a greater distance than I expected”.

b. Cei zece kilometri cât se întinde şoseaua dincolo de peşteră sunt o distanţă mai mare decât mă aşteptam.

“Ten kilometres that the road runs on far beyond the cave are a greater distance than I expected”.

Unlike their deviant English counterparts illustrated in (26a-c), the indefinite constructions in Romanian are grammatical.

(26) a. *Nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs may prevent you from boarding the plane.

b. *Four hours that this movie lasts exceed/exceeds the average duration of a movie.

c. *Ten kilometres that the road runs on far beyond the cave are a greater distance than I expected.

Based on the analysis of these examples proposed in Grosu (2013), these constructions are called non-intersective singleton relatives, since the relative clause and nominal constituent cannot be combined by intersection. Additionally, it is clear though that the ARs in (23-25) do not have a partitive interpretation. Rather, they denote the total weight of the luggage at issue, the total duration of the movie and the total length of the road, respectively.

The only possible explanation is the presence of the degree word *cât*, and not necessarily the presence of the numeral or of the definite article like in English. The definite counterparts of the English examples provided in (23-25) are grammatical ARs:

(27) a. The nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs may prevent you from boarding the plane.

b. The four hours that this movie lasts exceed/exceeds the average duration of a movie.

c. The ten kilometres that the road runs on far beyond the cave are a greater distance than I expected.

As demonstrated above, both a definite (23-25a) and an indefinite version (23-25b) are made available in Romanian due to the presence of the degree determiner *cât* and of the numeral (the definite article indicates only the discourse referent here) with different properties: the definite relative can have both an *amount reading*, where it denotes properties of amounts or

degrees, and a *substance reading*, where it denotes properties of entities. The indefinite relative can only have an amount reading (cf. Kotek, 2009).

CONCLUSIONS

Firstly, we conclude by stating that the relative determiner *cât* is the key word for obtaining the correct interpretation in all the examples of ARs in Romanian analysed here. *Cât/căți* ('how much/many') is a specialized item that is used in order to obtain an amount/degree/cardinality reading (it is a wh- (degree) operator that binds the degree variable inside the RC).

Secondly, besides this specialized relativizer that introduces degree/amount relatives, other wh-forms, such as *care* 'which' and *ce* 'what' introduce ARs. However, in this case, we need additional mechanisms external to RC to obtain the amount/cardinality reading (i.e. the presence of a maximalizing marker outside the RC, such as the definite quantitative nominal head, i.e. *vinul* 'wine-the' in (17) above, for example).

Thirdly, taking into consideration our initial aim and the facts analysed in this paper, the ARs in Romanian are semantically similar to the amount relatives in English, but morpho-syntactically different. It is this difference in the use of relativizers that disambiguates the meaning and the interpretation in Romanian.

REFERENCES

- Butler, A. (2001), 'Relatives and There-Insertion' in *Proceedings of CONSOLE IX*. 28-40.
- Carlson, G. (1977), 'Amount Relatives'. In *Language*, 53:520-542.
- Cornilescu, A. (1980/1996), *Montague Grammar and the Analysis of Relative Clauses*. Editura Universitatii din Bucureşti, Bucureşti.
- Grosu, A. (2013), 'Relative Clause Constructions and unbounded dependencies'. In Sorin, C., Giurgea I. (eds.), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, vol. 1: The Noun Phrase. John Benjamins.
- Grosu, A. (2009a), 'Two kinds of degree-denoting relatives: Hebrew versus Romanian'. *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics*, vol. 1, available at http://www.tau.ac.il/~grosua/papers/Grosu_2009b.pdf [August 10th 2017]
- Grosu, A. (2009b), 'Romanian 'unexpected' relatives', *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, vol. LIV, No 1, January-March 2009.

- Grosu, A. (2005), ‘Unbounded dependencies’ (ms). In *The Essential Grammar of the Romanian Language*, available at: <http://www.linguist.univ-paris-diderot.fr/~essromgram/> [March 15th 2015]
- Grosu, A. (2002), ‘Strange relatives at the interface of two millennia. State-of-the-Article’, *GLOT International* 6,6, 145-167.
- Grosu, A., Landman, F. (2013), *Amount relatives. Natural Language Semantics*.
- Grosu, A.; Kotek, H. (2009), *Degrees/Intervals as restricted entities*. Handout of talk given at NELS 40, held at MIT, on November 13, 2009. Available at http://www.tau.ac.il/~grosua/papers/Grosu_2009g.pdf [August 10th 2017]
- Grosu, A.; Landman, F. (1998), ‘Strange Relatives of the Third Kind’. *Natural Language Semantics*, 6, 125-170.
- Heim, I. (2000), *Degree operators and scope*. ms. MIT, available at http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/heim/Heim_Degree_Operators_and_Scope.pdf [July 10th 2017].
- Heim, I. (1987), ‘Where does the definiteness restriction apply? Evidence from the definiteness of variables’, in *The representation of (in)definiteness*, eds. E. Reuland and A. ter Meulen, 21-42. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Herdan, S. (2008), *Degree and amounts in Relative Clauses*, PhD thesis, University of Connecticut, ProQuest LLC.
- Kotek, H. (2009), ‘Degree Relatives, Definiteness and shifted Reference’, *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society (NELS) 40*. MIT, 13 November 2009.
- McNally, L. (2008), ‘DP-internal only, amount relatives, and relatives out of existentials’, *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 161-169.
- Resceanu, A. (2015), *Amount Relative Clauses in English and Romanian: a Minimalist Approach*. Craiova: Universitaria.
- Szczegielniac, A. (2005), ‘Relativization that you did...’, *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 24. (PhD dissertation defended at Harvard in 2004 under the title Relativization and Ellipsis), available at https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/26517269/relativization_that_you_did.pdf?sequence=4 [June 12th 2017]

CHARACTERISTICS OF ORALITY IN TRANSLATION: REPETITIONS IN ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEWS ON ROMANIAN COMMUNISM

Diana Painca

Free University of Brussels

Belgium

ABSTRACT

The issue of orality in translation has recently come under close scrutiny. Scholars have pointed out the distinctive features of orality and drawn attention to their intricate translation process. Orality can roughly be defined as a primary modelling system (spoken language) as opposed to writing or literacy. To instantiate the issue of orality in translation, I rely on oral history interviews that I briefly describe in both linguistic and historical terms. I also touch upon Paul Bandia's authoritative book *Orality and Translation* (2016), explaining the difference between a pragmatic and a metaphoric conceptualization of translation. In addition to this theoretical framework, I develop a more practical part relying on Walter Ong's work of reference *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (1982, 2002). Therefore, the scholar classifies oral thoughts and expressions into nine categories. However, the aim of this article is to address only one of them, namely redundancy, and examine the difficulties it poses in translation. To accomplish this objective, I first translate several oral history interviews on Romanian communism from Romanian into English. Secondly, I map the peculiarities and complexities of such a process and, just as importantly, I illustrate the function of redundancy in these particular interviews.

KEYWORDS

orality, translation, oral history interview, redundancy/repetition, communism.

1. ORALITY AND TRANSLATION - SOME THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Before addressing the relation between orality and translation, it is incumbent upon me to state the purpose of the translations used here. Hence, to be more explicit, the oral history interviews selected for this paper were translated as part of the corpus for my PhD thesis¹. The primary objective of the dissertation is to investigate the linguistic difficulties posed by the translation of oral history interviews on communism from Romanian into English. Secondly, the thesis aims to see how these translated historical texts articulate the communist experience in Romania.

The issue of **orality** has preoccupied a cohort of researchers, and their work has yielded important results. It should be noted though that studies in orality were pre-eminently carried out in societies or languages where literacy played but a minimal role, oral referring thus to pre-literate (Alant, 2010).

In his seminal paper *Towards a Linguistic Definition of Orality* (2010), Jaco Alant calls for a linguistic definition of orality that could dislodge the term from the anthropological and literary realms. He emphasizes the distinctive feature of orality, namely sound, which he defines in rather poetic terms as something *essentially evanescent* (Alant, 2010: 45) that *exists only as it vanishes* (*ibid*). Alant draws attention to Saussure's claim that not all sounds represent speech. Speech can only be accomplished when 'the sound, a complex acoustical-vocal unit, combines...with an idea to form a complex physiological-psychological unit' (Saussure, 1959: 8, quoted in Alant, 2010: 47). It is only in speech that the sound turns into a sign that reflects the connection between the signifier and the signified. Finally, as Alant points out, the peculiarities of sound can also be evidenced by yet another Saussurian notion: the arbitrariness of the linguistic sign. According to the French linguist, this can be explained by the fact that different sound-images are employed in different languages for basically the same signified (Alant, 2010: 47).

¹ Diana Painca is a PhD student within the Doctoral School 'Languages, Letters and Translation' (Université Libre de Bruxelles). The innovative interdisciplinary approach of her research extends the boundaries of Translation Studies illustrating the connection between this discipline and oral history on the subject of Romanian communism. The thesis draws upon sources like historical interviews with a wide range of people (survivors of Communist prisons, members of the anti-Communist resistance in the mountains, King Michael of Romania) all taken from three main Romanian books on the era that she translates into English. The goal of her work is to present the translator's difficulties pertaining not only to linguistics, terminology and background historical knowledge, but also to the distinctive features of the oral history interview, like repetitions and vividness of languages (obtained through rich imagery).

In Walter Ong's influential book *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (1982, 2002), the dichotomy orality-literacy gains salience. Also relying on Saussure's postulates, he acknowledges the importance of oral speech that supports all verbal communication.

Ong sees language as *an oral phenomenon* (Ong, 2002: 6), and analysing the interplay between orality and literacy (or writing), is keen to show that writing can never do away with orality, the former being a *secondary modeling system* inextricably linked to a primary system, that is, spoken language (Ong, 2002: 8). In much the same vein, Grant Lovejo in his article *The Extent of Orality* (2008) contends that a great number of dictionaries define orality as 'a reliance on spoken, rather than written, language for communication' (Lovejoy, 2008: 2). However, Lovejoy believes that an extended definition should consider the communicational, relational and cognitive features of oral cultures (Lovejoy, 2008: 2).

Let me now return to Ong, who identifies nine characteristics of oral thoughts and expressions. Therefore, they can be additive (rather than subordinative), aggregative (rather than analytic), redundant, conservative or traditionalist, close to the human lifeworld, agnostically toned, empathetic and participatory, homeostatic, situational (rather than abstract). However fascinating as it might have been, my paper does not attend to all these features of orality but to only one, namely redundancy – repetition. As Lovejoy (2008) and Ong show, this feature helps both the speaker and the audience keep track of the argument and not lose the sequence of events. How the translator deals with redundancy and repetitions is something that I will be looking at in subchapter 2.

1.1. THE INTERVIEW

Let me now shift my attention to the **interview**, and the way it is defined by two different fields of research: (a) oral history and (b) linguistics. First, it should be noted that (a) oral history as a discipline is a method of 'collecting memories and personal commentaries of historical significance through recorded interviews' (Donald Ritchie, *Doing Oral History*, 2003: 19). It would not be then wrong to state that oral history is predicated on the use of the interview, seen as an exchange between a professional interviewer and an interviewee and recorded in audio or video format. Recordings are then transcribed, placed in an archive and used for further research. Ritchie calls attention to the historical objective of the interview. It seeks information and knowledge about the past and should be distinguished from that used by sociologists, political scientists, etc. Last but not least, the interview is understood as a well thought-out investigation that should yield a thorough and intelligible historical account.

On the other hand, the interview has but recently gained a purchase on (b) linguistic research. It has been amply exploited by fields like sociology, anthropology or discursive psychology. In his authoritative paper *A critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics* (2010), Steve Mann charts the roles assigned to interviews by various disciplines. Therefore, social scientific research highlights the active - interactive nature of the interview (Mann, 2010: 8) that enables spontaneity and improvisation. Mann also insists on the fact that the interview is a co-construction between an interviewer and an interviewee, a dynamic process seeking to create meaning (Mann, 2010: 8).

Moreover, Conversation Analysis has focused on the interview interaction and linguistic research has used interviews as a method of data collection in order to examine different language phenomena. Block justifies the use of interviews in linguistic research by a need to ‘take research participants ‘at their word’ ...[that is] to offer presentation of data plus content analysis, but no problematization of the data themselves or the respective roles of interviewers and interviewees’ (2000:757, quoted in Mann 2010: 12).

1.2. TRANSLATION

After fathoming orality and interview it is incumbent upon me to explain how these two notions are approached by Translation Studies scholars. Paul Bandia’s compelling work *Orality and Translation* (2015) discusses the complexity of orality in translation. Consequently, according to Bandia, translation is an essential tool for the ‘recording, textualization, representation or appraisal of orality’ (Bandia, 2015:125).

There are primarily two avenues of inquiry when tackling orality in translation. The first one departs from a pragmatic conceptualization of translation, and proposes a study of the intra- and interlinguistic or intersemiotic translation practice (*ibid*). This approach has galvanized interdisciplinary research in areas like gender studies, intercultural communication studies or film and media studies. The second one offers a metaphorical approach that addresses issues like otherness and alterity, minority languages and cultures, etc. As Bandia aptly explains, this second axis of investigation enables a close analysis on the connection between orality and translation in numerous fields pertaining to humanities and social sciences, including history (where my paper actually situates itself), anthropology, theology, classics or fine arts (*ibid*).

1.3. REDUNDANCY

As I have previously shown, one of the features of orality, according to Walter Ong (1982, 2002) is redundancy. This concept has also been studied

from a linguistic perspective, and a plethora of definitions have been framed. In their lucid and concise article *What is Linguistic Redundancy?* (1999)², Ernst-Jan Wit and Marie Gillette have charted the various meanings attributed to this concept by different scholars. Therefore, they show how overdetermination and high predictability demonstrate that repetition of information lies at the core of redundancy (Wit and Gillette, 1999: 3)³.

One more definition worth noting is that provided by Hunnicut, who views redundancy as ‘the systemacity in one’s language (and speech). This refers to the information in a complete sentence over and above that which is essential’ (Hunnicut 1985: 53, quoted in Wit and Gillette 1999:3)⁴. Following their rigorous and in-depth analysis of the concept, the two authors distinguish between grammatical and contextual redundancy. If grammatical redundancy is intrinsic to the language system, being systematically necessary, the contextual one is optional (Wit and Gillette, 1999: 3)⁵. My paper is concerned with the latter, which broadly refers to the repetition of identical or apparently identical components. In their attempt to clarify the concept, Wit and Gillette advance four kinds of contextual redundancies: (a) identical or synonymous repetition, (b) isolating, salient repetition, (c) contrasting repetition, (d) distinguishing, differentiating repetition. In what follows I will incorporate both this classification and also that proposed by the Georgian scholars Kemertelidze and Manjavidze which dovetails with the first one mentioned, albeit with some differences. Consequently, they distinguish between the following categories: anaphora, epiphora, anadiplosis, framing, root repetition, chain repetition and synonymous repetition (Kemertelidze; Manjavidze, 2013: 4-7).

2. REDUNDANCY IN TRANSLATED ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEWS ON ROMANIAN COMMUNISM

This second part of the paper attends to the peculiarities of redundancy in **my translation** of oral history interviews on communism from Romanian into English. The data is extracted from the following books: *Memorialul Durerii: Întuneric și Lumină* (2013) by Iulia Hossu Longin, *Supraviețitorii. Mărturii din temnițele comuniste ale României* (2014, Humanitas), by Raul Ștef and Anca Ștef, and *Con vorbiri cu Regele Mihai I al României*, the third edition published in 2008 by Humanitas.

² Gillette, E.J.; Wit M. (1999), ‘What is linguistic redundancy’, available at <http://www.math.rug.nl/~ernst/linguistics/redundancy3.pdf>

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

Let me now begin the analysis proper, by illustrating redundancy in a series of examples selected from the data mentioned hereinabove.

When the interviewer asks Marioara Horescu Blănaru whether she heard anything about her husband who was on trial for his anti-communist activities, she replies: ‘And such a rumour emerged from time to time, that someone either ran away, or that he left somewhere, or someone took him out of prison, so that for seven years I believed that he either hid somewhere or was somewhere, across the border’ (‘Şi a mai apărut din când în când câte un zvon de acest gen, ba că a fugit căutare, ba că a plecat în căutare loc, ba că l-a scos căutare din închisoare, aşa încât şapte ani am avut convingerea că ori e undeva ascuns, ori e undeva, peste graniţă’; Hossu Longin, 2013: 58). The repetition of ‘căutare’ (an indefinite pronoun, with an adjectival function in ‘căutare loc’) poses some translation challenges, as it remains unaltered in Romanian, yet changes need to be applied in English. Hence, I was compelled to use two different words, *someone* and *somewhere*, for basically the same Romanian word. In addition, the translation of ‘undeva’ by ‘somewhere’ (just like ‘căutare’) leads to an extra repetition not intended in the original text. Needless to say, the role of ‘ba’ as a disjunctive conjunction used three times by the interviewee must be clearly signposted.

Another telling example that demonstrates how repetition amplifies emotions is also provided by the same interviewee. Recounting the moment her husband saw their child for the last time before his execution, she says: ‘He took the child in his arms, with tears falling down and the only thing he could say was: ‘Corneliu, Corneliu’, over and over again. We didn’t talk about anything else. Just that: with the child in his arms and with tears falling down. ‘Corneliu, Corneliu’, over and over again’ (‘El a luat copilul în braţe, şi curgeau lacrimile şi singurul lucru pe care putea să-l spună era: ‘Corneliu, Corneliu’, la nesfârşit. Altceva n-am vorbit împreună. Doar atât: cu copilul în braţe şi-i curgeau lacrimile. ‘Corneliu, Corneliu’, la nesfârşit’; Hossu Longin, 2013: 59). As a translator, I found it appropriate to slightly recast the structure ‘îi curgeau lacrimile’ (tears were falling down), adding the preposition *with* to reinforce the poetic nuance embedded in the source text. I would also like to draw attention to the contrasting repetition ‘*We didn’t talk about anything else. Just that*’, where the words that semantically form a contrast are repeated or redundantly coded, as Wit and Gillette explain (1999: 10). What is more, the double repetition of ‘*over and over again*’ and also of the child’s name (‘Corneliu’) points out emphatically the grief caused by the separation between father and son.

The story of the resistance groups in the mountains is retraced by survivors and also by those who lent them a hand and who subsequently faced

repression by the communist regime. Prominent leaders of such a group were Doctors Alexandru Dejeu and Iosif Capotă who, in their valiant effort to keep hope alive in the country's fight against communism, proclaimed the necessity of resistance.

Teofil Crețu, a member of the group Capotă-Dejeu, was sentenced to hard labour for life. He testifies: 'I knew they were determined people, resolute people, who did not flinch from fighting against communism, on the contrary, on all occasions and in all circumstances I talked to them, we spoke only about this and we discussed only this, the way in which we could fight and how we could take action against communism in our country' ('Ştiam că sunt oameni hotărâți, oameni fermi, care nu dădeau în lături de la lupta împotriva comunismului, din contră, în toate ocaziile și împrejurările când aveam discuții cu dânsii, numai despre asta vorbeam și numai despre asta discutam, despre felul în care putem lupta, cum putem activa contra comunismului la noi în țară'; Hossu Longin, 2013:100). Apart from the repetitions of the words 'people' and 'only' which call attention pointedly to the high moral stature of the fighters, there is also a contrasting repetition. Therefore, the idea that '*we spoke only about this and we discussed only this*' increases the implicit contrast expressed by the fact that they '*did not flinch from fighting against communism*'.

To continue, when interviewed about his brother's refusal to renege on his convictions even when standing trial, Gavril Dejeu says: '...I think he knew that, whether he was sentenced to death or not, in reality death awaited him, because the way in which the organs of the Securitate treated him was beyond description' ('...cred că a știut că, indifferent dacă este condamnat la moarte sau nu, în realitate moartea îl așteaptă, fiindcă modul în care s-au comportat cu el organele de Securitate a fost incalificabil'; Hossu Longin, 2013:108). As this short sentence suggests, death (or the fear of death) was ubiquitous, becoming a mute and cold companion of an oppressive life.

The ideas of suffering, resistance or death that emerge in these interviews about the fighters in the mountains point to the Romanians' struggle to preserve their dignity and liberty. However, despite its significance, this chapter in history has almost been consigned to oblivion. Octavian Paler, a renowned writer and journalist, born in a mountain village involved in the resistance movement, makes some vituperative comments on this matter:

It looks as if we are the only ones cursed. The only ones who let foreigners believe that we were a nation of cowards, that we didn't stand up to Soviet colonisation for many, many, many years and that we bore with it. We are the only ones who allow foreigners to talk about Romanian passivity [...] forgetting that some of our countrymen actually rebutted the philosophy of submission from

Miorița for seventeen years, I repeat, for seventeen years. (Numai noi parcă suntem blestemați. Numai noi îi lăsăm pe străini să credă că am fost un popor de lași, că nu ne-am ridicat împotriva colonizării sovietice mulți ani, mulți ani, mulți ani și că am răbdat. Numai noi le permitem străinilor să vorbescă despre pasivitatea românească [...] uitând că niște compatrioți ai noștri au contrazis, de fapt, filozofia resemnării din Miorița timp de șaptesprezece ani, repet, timp de șaptesprezece ani (Hossu Longin, 2013: 233).

With regard the first sentences, I felt compelled to use the structure ‘*it looks as if*’ that expresses the interviewee’s search for an explanation of Romanian apathy. On the other hand, in the case of the repetition ‘mulți ani, mulți ani, mulți ani’, I translated ‘ani’ (years) only once, since the repetition of ‘many’ three times helps the whole sentence achieve the same effect in English as it does in Romanian.

A sense of outrage and revolt at contemporary Romania’s rampant apathy runs through Paler’s interview. His answers are replete with repetitions meant to add emphasis to his ideas and preserved as such in the Target Language. He says conclusively:

[...] why do we forget what should not be forgotten? Why do we forget that in the 1950s, Romania was the first country in Eastern Europe – I repeat, the first country in Eastern Europe – before the Hungarian Revolution, before the ‘Prague Spring’, before the Polish workers’ uprising in Gdansk. I do not undermine these revolts in any way. I just want to say that we also have the right to dignity, we also have the right to pride. Because there were in Romania our own fellow countrymen – I repeat, the first in Eastern Europe – who had the courage to place liberty above their own lives. (De ce uităm că, în anii 1950, România a fost prima țară din estul Europei – prima țară din estul Europei, repet -, înaintea Revoluției Maghiare, înaintea ‘Primăverii de la Praga’, înaintea revoltei muncitorilor polonezi de la Gdańsk. Nu minimalizez deloc aceste revolte, în nici un fel. Vreau să spun numai că și noi avem dreptul la demnitate, și noi avem dreptul la mândrie. Că au existat în România compatrioți ai noștri – primii, repet, în estul Europei – care au avut curajul să pună libertatea deasupra vieții lor. (Hossu Longin, 2013: 242).

The repetition of ‘first’ appears obviously in the translation, being also introduced by the interviewee’s emphatic use of ‘I repeat’. What is more, the structure *first country* coupled with *before the Hungarian Revolution, before the Prague Spring* forms a contrasting repetition where the double use of the preposition ‘before’ adds even more weight to the expressed message. It goes

without saying that the translation was not problematic, yet the translator should not address this string of repetitions superficially, and render them in a condensed version in the target text. This approach would only mangle the original and provide a translation bereft of the power and emotion of the source text.

As I have shown so far, the oral history interviews are interspersed with repetitive words that also illustrate non grammatical circumstances, such as sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic elements (Wit; Gillette, 1999: 9). An interviewee can sometimes wax lyrical and repetitions can turn a subdued account into a more personal, poignant one.

When talking about her brother who was part of the resistance movement in the mountains, Victoria Haşu-Trâmbiţaş laments the absence of a burial place for him. She touchingly shares her feelings: ‘I look at all the mountains and I wonder: ‘Were they also here, I wonder?’ Because they didn’t stay put, Madam. They walked up and down for a long time, they didn’t stay put. And I think to myself: ‘Were they also here, I wonder?’ Whenever I see the mountains and every single minute, Madam, I think about them, every single minute’ (*La toţi munţii mă uit şi zic: ‘Oare or fi fost ei şi pe-aici? Oare?’ Că ei n-au stat numai într-un loc, doamnă. Ei au umblat mult, n-au stat numai într-un loc. Şi mă gândesc aşa : ‘Oare si pe-aici au fost ?’ Eu, când văd munţii şi în tot ceasul, doamnă, mă gândesc la ei, în tot ceasul*; Hossu Longin, 2013: 267). Repetitions are profusely employed in this paragraph and the translator has to map them all. Unarguably, the most striking example is the use of ‘oare’ no less than three times. This is an interrogative adverb that naturally requires a question mark at the end of the sentence that it introduces. However, I avoided the literal translation and I chose instead a pronoun (I) and a verb (wonder) to obtain a similar effect in English and to make it sound as natural as possible. These are, after all, oral history interviews, and when reading them, one should have the impression of actually listening to the interviewees’ stories. By the same token, the translator should pay heed to all the characteristics of orality.

Let me now return to the example previously mentioned. The peculiar syntax of the Romanian sentence ‘*Eu, când văd munţii şi în tot ceasul, doamnă, mă gândesc la ei, în tot ceasul*’ that contains the repetition of *every single minute* had to be closely studied. I finally opted for a literal translation that could better render the emotion embedded in the source text tinged with sadness and regret.

This first set of examples presented hereinabove has been primarily concerned with the resistance fighters in the mountains, being excerpted from the book *Memorialul Durerii: Intuneric si Lumina* (2013) by Iulia Hossu Longin. In what follows, I will look at the repetitions that appear in political

prisoners' accounts (*Supraviețuitorii. Mărturii din temnițele comuniste ale României*, 2014, by Raul Ștef and Anca Ștef).

Let me now analyse an example selected from Inocențiu Glodeanu's interview. When describing his first impressions upon arrival at the prison, he confesses: 'It was dead quiet, we couldn't hear anything in the prison, silence struck you' ('Era o liniște desăvârșită, nu auzeam nimic în închisoare, tacerea te izbea'; Ștef, 2014:59). The synonymous repetition is obtained through the use of the word 'quiet' reinforced by the noun 'silence' that conveys the same meaning. Therefore, translating also meant searching for new words that could intensify and rightly portray the auditory image underlying the source text.

For historical information purposes, it is worth mentioning that many people were tortured, arrested and sentenced to many years in prison for the simple reason of helping a member of the resistance groups or expressing their disagreement about the communist regime.

The examples pertaining to the first category abound, one of them being that of Otilia Răduleț. She is the one being interviewed, yet she begins her story by using a rhetorical question herself: 'Wasn't it the right thing to do, when my friends came and asked for my help, or they went to my father and asked for his help, wasn't it right to help them?' ('Nu era normal, când prieteni de-a mei vin și îmi cer ajutorul, sau se duc la tatăl meu și-i cer ajutorul, nu era normal să-i ajutăm?'; Ștef, 2014: 69). The position of '*wasn't it right?*' at the beginning of the sentence and its repetition at the end illustrates the concept of framing (Kemertelidze; Manjavidze, 2013: 5). The translator's task is to identify its presence in the original text and not remove it in translation, because the interviewee's choice of framing, as a type of repetition, reveals her strong belief in the justice of her actions. In much the same vein, she adds: 'I do not regret, no, helping the partisans, no, knowing them, no!' ('Nu am nici un regret, nu, pentru că i-am ajutat pe partizani, nu, pentru că i-am cunoscut, nu!'; Ștef, 2014:75). The emphatic use of 'no' three times, and rendered as such in English, also draws attention to the orality of the interview, steeped in subjectivity and strong personal involvement.

Another element that transpires in these interviews is the acute sense of hunger, described at length by many interviewees. Nistor Man's account is quite revealing in this respect, illustrating the torment inflicted on people by the lack of food: 'We suffered from hunger like jackals, like any other famished animal. We were starving animals. And it's not the stomach that is starving, it's the cell that is starving, even the bone cells, even the hair is starving, everything is starving in our body' ('Noi am suferit de foame ca săcalii, ca orice animal înflămânzit. Noi eram animale flămânde. Și nu e

flămând stomacul, e flămândă celula, chiar și celula osoasă, chiar și părul este flămând, totul e flămând în corpul nostru'; Ștef, 2014: 79). The four-time repetition of the word ‘starving’ might account for the speaker’s intention to hammer his message into his listeners. Needless to say that the translator has to pay attention not only to the identical repetition but also to the synonymous repetition between the words ‘starving’ (flămând) and ‘famished’ (înflămânsit). The translation demands thus an accurate semantic analysis and careful reading so that this *microscopic* description of hunger could be successfully transferred into the target language. In his strenuous effort to capture in words the otherwise indescribable suffering wreaked by hunger, Nistor Man resorts to a powerful visual image that cuts deep into the readers’ minds, being twice repeated. The comparison with *jackals* or with *starving animals* and *famished animals* requires attention and a loose translation drifting from the original would be ill-advised. What is more, as the focus of Man’s description shifts from particular to general (to a universally valid observation) towards the end of the paragraph, the present tense simple of the original is maintained in the Target Text.

Nistor Man’s account leaves an indelible impression on readers/listeners, being wrapped in a powerful and reflective language that poses a challenge to any translator. Yet another telling example that I have gleaned from his interview:

Do you know what I think is the secret of survival? Forgiveness brings you inner balance. Inner balance means health, inner balance means resistance, inner harmony, even that of internal organs – you can control your stomach, your liver, intestines, you can control your gallbladder, viscera, everything you’ve got can be under your control if you have forgiven everything. (Știți care cred eu că este secretul supraviețuirii? Iertarea îți aduce echilibrul intern. Echilibrul intern însemnează sănătate, echilibrul intern însemnează rezistență, armonie internă, până și a organelor interne – îți poți stăpâni stomacul, ficatul, intestinele, îți poți stăpâni fiera, viscerele, tot ce ai poate fi sub controlul tău dacă ai iertat totul. (Ștef, 2014: 83).

The repeated structure ‘inner balance’ (used three times in this paragraph) is first introduced as an answer to a question, being later defined. Its use at the end of a sentence (*Forgiveness brings you inner balance*) and the beginning of a new one (*Inner balance means health, inner balance means resistance*) forms a type of repetition called anadiplosis (Kemertelidze; Manjavidze, 2013: 5). This figure of speech adds a special effect to the source text and its translation, notwithstanding its apparent lack of difficulty, should bear the stylistic mark of the original.

The repetitions I have put under scrutiny depict in sharp terms the brutal and repressive world of communism. They are sometimes paired with auditory images for a more marked effect. Galina Răduleanu's confession brings into stark relief the psychological terror carefully orchestrated from the very first moments of the investigation. 'At the Securitate, everything was conceived in such a way as to make you feel harassed, starting with the bolts that clanged shut eerily, starting with the clanging of the chains of those going to the investigation room' ('În Securitate, totul era făcut în aşa fel încât să te simți agresat, începând cu zăvoarele, care se închideau cu un zgomot sinistru, începând cu zgomotul lanțurilor celor care mergeau la anchetă'; Ștef, 2014: 296). The repetition of the word 'starting' has a twofold purpose: it introduces an enumeration, and it also attracts attention, if only for a minute, to the dismal backdrop where the action was unfolding. Things or sounds that seem too unimportant to be noticed serve here a significant function, enhancing the incremental psychological destruction they were meant to inflict on victims. As far as the translation is concerned, it should be stated that a literal rendering has been applied in the case of 'începând cu'; however, I chose to translate the word 'zgomot' (noise), repeated twice in the paragraph, by 'clang/clanging'. The English verb and noun depict more effectively the specificity of prison sounds (chains of prisoners, doors that are shut) and contribute to a more potent auditory image.

Last but not least, the inner force of those who survived inhumane treatment and conditions in communist prisons, but also of those who perished in their fight, is captured by Octav Bjoza's words: 'Say to yourself, if you are in the cell and you disturb them: 'I am a winner! Say it ten times, a thousand times, tens of thousands of times! I'm not afraid, I'm not hungry, I'm not in pain', and so it will be, my son!' ('Spune în gând, dacă ești în celulă și-i deranjezi: 'Sunt un învingător!' Spune de zeci, de sute, de mii de ori, de zeci de mii de ori! 'Nu mi-e frică, nu mi-e foame, nu mă doare', și așa va fi, fiule!'; Ștef, 2014:262). The imperative form of the verb 'to say' ('a spune', repeated twice) is translated as such into English, for it accentuates the instruction/advice received by Octav Bjoza from older people (hence the use of 'son' at the end of the paragraph). What is more, the string of nouns making reference to numbers ('zeci, de sute, de mii de ori, de zeci de mii de ori') is not problematic in translation, and I chose to render it as such in English, instead of opting for a shorter and more compressed version.

Repetitions are also present in the interviews taken to King Michael of Romania by Mircea Ciobanu (*Con vorbiri cu Regele Mihai I al României*, 2008). As befits a more formal language style implied by the high status of the interviewee, objective descriptions are less frequently punctuated by personal involvement and subjectivity. When talking about the invasion of

Czechoslovakia by Soviet troops and the possibility of Romania being also targeted, King Michael concludes: ‘Betraying one man’s good faith is a crime. Betraying a people’s good faith is something indescribable’ (Înşelarea bunei-credinţe a unui singur om este o infracţiune. Înşelarea bunei-credinţe a unui popor este incalificabilă; Ciobanu, 2008: 17). The Romanian noun ‘înşelare’ (betrayal), used twice by the King, can be more effectively translated in English by the gerund ‘betraying’. Applying this translation technique called transposition helps the text fit better into the target language. What is more, from a stylistic point of view, an anaphoric repetition emerges, which is translated accordingly, as I have already shown.

King Michael employs repetition more consistently when trying to express an idea as clearly as possible. What is interesting to observe is that he includes repetitions in a telegraphic speaking style. Asked by the interviewer about his watchword, he tersely, yet self-assuredly, replies: ‘Truth. Only truth can set us free’ (‘Adevărul. Doar adevărul ne poate elibera’; Ciobanu, 2008: 190). Translation is hardly problematic in this case, so a word-for-word transfer can also convey in English the conciseness and the didactic tone of the sentences.

Before rounding off my analysis, I would like to dwell on one more example. When defining a communist historian, the King contends: ‘He uses only the facts and events that can be incorporated into his demonstration. When he has them, fine. When he does not have them, he makes them up’ (‘El apelează doar la fapte și evenimente care intră în demonstrația lui. Când le are, e bine. Când nu le are, le inventează’; Ciobanu, 2008: 18). The double occurrence of the Romanian direct object *le* (referring to facts) preceded by the verb *a avea* can easily find their corresponding forms in English (them and have respectively).

3. CONCLUSION

Repetitions, as a feature of orality, can pose numerous problems in the translation or oral history interviews from Romanian into English. The translator must successfully address all these challenges and seek to preserve the oral characteristics of the original into the target language. The source text, just like the original, should give readers the impression that they are listening to the interviewees’ stories, not reading them. For this reason, repetitions - pervasive in these interviews on communism - should not be easily disposed of.

The repetition of a word in Romanian that has an identical form both as an adjective and as a pronoun cannot be preserved in English where different forms for an adjective and pronoun are used. Moreover, when confronted with an emotional description provided in the original, the translator can

avoid literal rendering and choose instead to recast the repetition in such a way as to make sure it has the same effect on the target audience.

As I have shown, contrasting repetitions permeate the whole ensemble of interviews. They are assigned a significant importance by all speakers who use them as a method to reinforce a point or to delineate psychological traits of the fighters against communism.

In order for repetitions and contextual meaning to be effectively rendered in English, syntactic and semantic changes have to be applied. Synonymous repetition is apparently the most problematic as the translator is forced to widen his/her search for words and mark out those suitable to the context. Moreover, transposition as a translation technique can also be used for a more natural effect in the target language. It is also worth noting that literal translation has appeared to be reliable, especially in curt, telegraphic-style paragraphs.

Last but not least, these repetitions acquire an important role in these oral history interviews dealing with communism. They manage to bring into sharp relief personal stories about communism in Romania, emphasizing not only what people said, but also how they said it, how they felt about their experiences and how they analysed them in retrospect. The repetitions depict realistically and in an unadorned style people's ordeal and suffering during communism. Even more importantly, they cast light on Romanians' resistance and struggle to extricate themselves from the powerful jaws of a destructive regime and fight for dignity, liberty and the survival of their very nation.

REFERENCES

- Alant, J. (1994), 'Towards a linguistic definition of orality', *Alternation*, vol. 1, nr. 1, pp. 42-51.
- Bandia, P. (2015), *Orality and Translation*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Ciobanu, M. (2008), *Con vorbiri cu Mihai I al României*, Humanitas, Bucureşti.
- Gillette, M.; Wit E. J. (1999), 'What is linguistic redundancy', available at
<http://www.math.rug.nl/~ernst/linguistics/redundancy3.pdf>
- Hossu Longin, I. (2013), *Memorialul Durerii: Intuneric si lumina*, Humanitas, Bucureşti.
- Kemertelidze, N.; Manjavidze T. (2013), 'Stylistic repetition, its peculiarities and types in modern English', *European Scientific Journal*, July Special Edition.

- Mann, S. (2011), ‘A critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics’, *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 32, nr. 1, pp. 6-24.
- Ong, W. (2002), *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Ritchie, D. (2003), *Doing Oral History*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Ştef, A.; Ştef R. (2014), *Supraviețuirea. Mărturii din temnițele comuniste ale României*, Bucuresti, Humanitas.

ROMANIAN PRINTS AND ROMANIAN LITERATURE TRANSLATIONS IN HUNGARY IN THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES

Florin Cioban | ELTE University of Budapest | Hungary

Ioana Jieanu | University of Ljubljana | Slovenia

ABSTRACT

The paper proposes a general presentation of the translations from Romanian literature into Hungarian, and it reflects the evolution of Romanian literature reception in the Hungarian space, connected with the political and historical tensions between the two people. The Romanian fundamental works, lexicons and encyclopedias, Mihai Eminescu's first works, the first anthologies of Romanian folk literature, the publishing activity of the representatives of the Transylvanian School are presented in the paper, in order to highlight their role in the scientific foundations of the idea of Romanian national unity.

KEYWORDS

translations, Romanian literature, Transylvanian School, Romanian folk literature, Romanian Enlightenment.

A brief presentation of the rich history of translations from Romanian literature into Hungarian is almost impossible, as it is necessary to examine several thousands of translations and an impressive number of translators. However, the paper tries to provide the reader with a general picture, which reflects the evolution of Romanian literature reception in the Hungarian space, as well as the social and political conditions of this reception. Thus, there are some fundamental works such as those of Veress Endre: *Romanian-Hungarian Bibliography*, 1.-3. k., 1931; Bitay Árpád: *A román irodalomtörténet összefoglaló áttekintése*, (A Brief Look on the History of Romanian Literature, Scurtă privire asupra literaturii române, 1922); Pálffy Endre: *A román irodalom története*, (The History of Romanian Literature, Istoria literaturii române, 1961); Kemény G. Gábor: *A szomszéd népekkel való kapcsolataink történetéből*,

(From the History of our Relations with Neighbouring Peoples, *Din istoria relațiilor cu vecinii*, 1962); Domokos Sámuel: *A román irodalom magyar bibliográfiája*, (The Hungarian Bibliography of Romanian Literature, *Bibliografia maghiară a literaturii române*, vol. I-II., 1966, 1978). Of all the important encyclopaedias containing several references to the Romanian civilisation, the following can be mentioned: *Pallas Nagy Lexikona* (The Great Pallas Encyclopaedia) made up of 18 volumes published between 1884 and 1897, respectively in 1900 and *Révai Nagy Lexikona* (Révai's Great Encyclopaedia) in 21 volumes (between 1911-1927, 1935). The 19 volumes of *Világirodalmi Lexikon* (The Encyclopaedia of World Literature) appeared between 1970 and 1996 and it includes more than 500 articles on Romanian literature.

It should be noted from the beginning that the reception of Romanian literature in the Hungarian space is closely connected with the political and historical tensions between the two peoples.

Throughout the 19th century Buda and Pesta, then Budapest, were, paradoxically, important centers of Romanian culture. Between 1777-1840 the printing house of the University functioned in Buda, and it published two hundred papers in Romanian, including Greek-Catholic religious books, sermons, Orthodox religious books containing the saints' services, important works of language history, in Latin and Romanian, school textbooks, foreign language textbooks, translations, and science books. The fundamental works of the Transylvanian School were published here, these representing the main works of the Romanian Enlightenment.

Mihai Eminescu started publishing his works at Pesta in 1866, in *Familia* magazine, which belonged to Iosif Vulcan, the one who changed the poet's name from Eminovici into Eminescu. The young poet also debuted here as a journalist in the journal of Transylvanian Romanians, *Albina* (1870), with an article about theatre. Then, he published his first political studies in Alexandru Roman's *Federațiunea* (1870). Numerous Romanian magazines and newspapers were published in Pesta and in Buda, but they did not have either a too long or too easy life: *Biblioteca românească*, 1821-1834; *Albina*, 1869-1876; *Aurora română*, 1863-1865; *Concordia*, 1861-1870; *Familia*, 1865-1880; *Federațiunea*, 1868-1876; *Gura satului*, 1867-1871, *Muză română*, 1872; *Priculicinl*, 1872; *Speranța*, 1863; *Umoristul*, 1863-1866. In the new formed Budapest were published: *Adevărul*, 1903-1917; *Cucu*, 1910, 1918; *Foaia ilustrată*, 1907-1919; *Luceafărul*, 1902-1906; *Lupta* 1906-1910; *Poporul român*, 1901-1914; *Sezătoarea*, 1875-1880; *Viitorul*, 1883-1885. Most of these magazines were definitely read in the Romanian provinces.

There were also some common magazines that wanted to support the rapprochement between the two peoples. We only mention Grigore Moldovan (Moldován Gergely)'s Cluj magazines *Ungaria* (1892) and *Román-Magyar Szemle* (1895).

At the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century, the most elevated representatives of the Romanian culture worked together with Hungarian scholars, as censors, proofreaders or editors at the University of Buda's Printing House and this contributed to the spread of Enlightenment ideas among Romanians everywhere. The scientific foundations of the idea of Romanian national unity were laid in this 'workshop' by personalities such as Samuil Micu, Petru Maior, Gheorghe Șincai, Ion Budai Deleanu. More than 200 books were published in Romanian in this printing house in Buda between 1777 and 1848 and spread in Hungary, Transylvania, Moldova and Wallachia. According to Nicolae Iorga, the most beautiful Romanian books – from a typographical point of view - appeared here. For example, Petru Maior, in parallel with his 12 original works and translations, wrote and published almost one hundred Romanian books, out of which 44 textbooks, 22 religious works, 10 history books, 12 papers related to economy and 16 of a different kind (Galdi, 1942). Besides these, he also published five works in Latin, some being bilingual and multilingual. Romanian authors wrote the first Romanian grammars for Hungarians, and they also tried to translate the writings of the Hungarian writers into Romanian (Bota, 1836; 1847). It can be stated that one of the starting points of the Romanian scientific life was the Printing House of the University of Buda and the Romanian books were elaborated, drafted and edited by outstanding personalities of the Romanian culture who are known as representatives of the Transylvanian School.

The first Romanian grammar in Latin (*Elementa linguae Daco-Romanæ sive Valachicæ*, 1780) was published in Vienna in 1870, but the second edition (1805) was published in Buda, signed by Samuil Micu and Gheorghe Șincai. Its publication also meant the outline Latin trend of Blaj. Șincai himself, teacher of rhetoric at the Greco-Catholic high school in Blaj, became in 1804 proofreader of the Printing House of the University of Buda. The works in Latin and Romanian of linguistic and historical character, published here, contributed to the foundation of the Latin origin concept of the Romanian language and people and the emancipation idea of the Romanians. (Veress, 1982) Șincai published two papers at the Printing House of the University of Buda, but all of Petru Maior's works in Romanian and Latin saw the light of the printing house in Buda. Important Romanian literary works, such as Dinicu Golescu's travel journal (*Writing about My Travel*, 1826), the Romanian translations of Nicolae Beldiman (*Arel's Death*, by Salomon Gessner, 1818; *Numa Pompilie's History* by Jean Pierre Florian, 1820; *Orest's Tragedy* by Voltaire, 1820). Eufrosin Poteca published the translation of Dimitrie

Darvar's work, *The First Reading to the Knowledge of God* (1818) and *The Philosophy of Word and Vices* (1829), and Petru Maior translated some of Fénelon's writings. *The Lexicon of Buda* (with the title *Romanian-Latin-Hungarian-German Lexicon, on Which Many Authors Have Worked for Over Thirty Years*) was published in 1825, being the first dictionary of the Romanian culture in four languages. Vasile Colosse, Ioan Molnar-Piuariu, Petru Maior, Ioan Teodorovici and Alexandru Teodori worked on this dictionary. It is worth mentioning that the Orthodox Church published its famous 12 volumes of *Minei* (religious writings), between 1804 and 1807, in Buda, with Ioan Molnar-Piuariu's collaboration.

It should also be mentioned Zaharia Carcalechi's activity, a merchant of books of Greek origin from Bucharest, who published in 1821 the first Romanian literary journal, entitled *The Romanian Library (made up of 12 parts according to the 12 months, printed for the first time for the Romanian nation, 1821-1829)* in the Printing House of Buda. The magazine for readers from Moldova and Muntenia published articles of national history, literature, translations and politics. Since 1829, the magazine had a new title, which clearly explains its editor's intention: *The Romanian Library or Gatherings of Many Useful Things, Made up of 12 Parts, Firstly Interpreted by Overly Taught Men and Printed for the Romanian People, 1829-1834*. This magazine substantially contributed to the development of Romanian national consciousness.

An important stage in the reception of Romanian literature, in the spirit of Herder's ideas, was the publication of the first anthologies of Romanian folk literature. Such publications are: *Virágok a román (oláh) népköltészet mezejéről* (*Special Flowers Chosen from the Romanian Folk Poetry*, *Flori alese din folclorul românesc*), Translator: Ács Károly, 1858, Pesta); in 1872 the volume *Román népdalok és balladák* (*Romanian Folk Songs and Ballads*, *Cântece și balade românești*) translated by Grigore Moldovan, and in 1877 *Román népdalok* (*Romanian Folk Songs*, *Cântece populare românești*) translated by de Ember György, Iulian Grozescu, Iosif Vulcan. Then, two volumes signed by the same Grigore Moldovan were published: *Román közmondások* (*Romanian Sayings*, *Proverbe românești*) in 1882 and *Koszorú a román népköltészet virágaiiból* (*Garland of the Romanian Folk Poems*, *Cununa de cântece populare românești*) in 1884, and in 1912 *Román népmesék* (*Romanian Folk Fairytales*, *Basmele românilor*) were published, translated into Hungarian by Gheorghe Alexici.

Eminescu's first poem translated into Hungarian was published in 1885 in the Christmas issue of the magazine *Kolozsvári Közlöny*. The first volume of Romanian short stories and stories was published in Oradea in 1881 (*Bihari román írók – Romanian Writers from Bihar*, *Scriitori români din Bihar*, translated by Márki Sándor); in Révai Károly's poetry books of 1907 (*Delelő*) there are

some good translations of poems written by Eminescu and other poets. The first important anthology of Romanian poetry was published in 1910 in Baia Mare and translated by Révay Károly, Brán Lőrinc (Laurentiu Bran) and Simon Aurél (Aurel Simon). In 1895 Miron Cristea, the future Patriarch of Romania (starting from 1925) defended his bachelor's thesis on Eminescu (Cristea, 1895).

In the reception of the Romanian culture and literature, lexicons and encyclopaedias, as the ones mentioned above (*Pallas* and *Rérai*), played an essential part. Besides them, some fundamental historical works of Hungarian specialists such as Hunfalvy Pál, Grigorie Moldovan, and Jancsó Benedek, are strongly connected with the process of reception of the Romanian culture by the Hungarian space. It should also be noticed the publication of some Romanian language textbooks for Hungarians in the second half of the 19th century. The most famous are those of Fekete (Negruțiu) János (1852), Grigore Moldovan (1872), Gheorghe Alexici (1892). In the same period, two very important volumes were translated into Hungarian: one by Ioan Slavici: *A szerencsemalom* (The Lucky Mill, translated by Kovács János, 1898), and the other by George Coșbuc: *Költemények* (Poems, translated by Révai Károly, 1905). Queen Elisabeth, Charles' I wife, also known as Carmen Sylva as a writer, had some kind of success in Hungary with her novels written in German but about Romanian themes. She was awarded *Doctor honoris causa* by the University of Budapest. It should be recalled with curiosity that the female writer Harmath Lujza (1846-1910) published a paper entitled *Egy királyné női eszményei Carmen Sylva regényeiben* (The Feminine Ideals of a Queen in Carmen Sylva's Novels, 1891).

Even from the 18th to the 19th centuries, of course, a whole series of titles or events could have been introduced, but we tried to make a representative selection, which will continue anyway in the 20th century to the present day. The intention of the presentation was to emphasize the existence of these numerous bridges between the two cultures and literatures that although many remain, most of them, unknown. In conclusion, we can say that the two cultures: Romanian and Hungarian have built systems to reflect the achievements of each one, systems that exist until today and, despite the oscillations generated by history and times, they will exist in the future, too.

REFERENCES

- Bota, Moisi (1836), *Grainul român în linba domnito're, sau Modu'l mai ușor d'a învăța Românu' linba Ungurească de Moisi Bota Românescul învățătoriu din Girok lucrat. Oláh szó, az Uralkodó Honni Nyelvben*, Pesta.
- Bota, Mózes (1847), *Română-ungurească sau Convorbirí a acestora dona linbi prin îndeletniciri mai ușoră învățare de Moisi Bota naționalul învățătoriu lucrată –*

Oláh-magyar Nyelv Együttbeszélgetések E két nyelvnek gyakorlatilag legkönyebben megtanulására, szerkesztette Bota Mózes, nemzeti oláh tanító, Pesta.

Cristea, Miron (1895), *Eminescu élete és művei. Tanulmány az újabb román irodalom köréből*, Szamosújvártt.

Gáldi, László (1942), *Magyar-román szellemi kapcsolatok*, Budapest.

Hunfalvy, Pál (1894), *Az oláhok története*, Budapest.

Jancsó, Benedek (1899), *A román nemzetiségi törekvések története és jelenlegi állapota*, Budapest.

Moldován, Gergely (1895), *A románság*, Cluj Napoca.

Veress, Endre (1982), *A Budapesti Egyetemi Nyomda román kiadványainak dokumentumai 1780-1848*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON LITERARY TRANSLATIONS FROM ROMANIAN INTO MACEDONIAN AND VICE VERSA

 Constantin-Ioan Mladin
 ‘Ss. Cyril and Methodius’ University in Skopje
 Republic of Macedonia

ABSTRACT

This study pursues the objectives listed below in a consecutively logical order: 1) to list the Romanian literary translations into Macedonian (and vice versa) completed in the last decade and a half; 2) to critically judge the volume, representativeness, and quality of the translations; 3) to present a few perspectives and proposals regarding the desirable improvement of the subject area's status quo, in the near future.

KEYWORDS

Macedonian literature, Romanian literature, translation

1. THE METHODOLOGY USED OF THE RESEARCH.

The translations were grouped into two sections: 1) *Translations of Romanian literature into Macedonian* and 2) *Translations of Macedonian literature into Romanian*. The number of editorial entities for each section is indicated in brackets. In fact, this data may prove to be misleading because: 1) some of the listed titles are anthological collections of fragments from the work of a single author or of different authors, of varying length and more or less eloquent for the portrait of a certain writer or for a particular section in one of the two literatures (generically, they have been called anthologies here), so the number of listed authors is greater; 2) several authors appear in different positions with different works, so the number of these authors is lower, in this case.

The translations were arranged in the following order: ascending chronological order, followed by the alphabetical order of the authors, by family name and by following the succession of the letters in the two alphabets (Latin and Cyrillic).

Several exceptions to this general principle were necessary: 1) the collective works (florilegium) were arranged as if their title were the name of the author; 2) works with insufficient or unclear chronological information were placed either at the end of the list or in a footnote.

The main part of the research is actually made up of a corpus of bibliographic references of literary translations from Romanian into Macedonian and vice versa, completed in the last decade and a half. This information has been arranged according to the following general principle: the author's name – the bio-note of the author – only for the Macedonian authors (in a footnote, once, at its first occurrence in the text) – title of the work – original title, place, and year of publication – only for Macedonian works (in another footnote) – a schematic indication of the literary genre of the work – the name of the translator / translators, followed (in a footnote, only for the first occurrence) by their bio-note (for Macedonian translators only). Sometimes, due to lack of bibliographic information, some of these data may be missing. If the title of a volume, a selection from an artist's lyrical work, for example, was given by one of the works contained in that volume, the indication of the source was no longer possible. The names of writers and translators have been written in both alphabets so as to easily overcome some of the difficulties that may arise in the transliteration process. Instead of the purely value profile of those personalities (the intrinsic value of the work, from an aesthetic point of view, the contribution of the author to the development of literature, etc.), the notes rather aim to provide an image of the administrative status of the writers, in a possible hierarchy of the guild. This aspect demonstrates that the selection of authors whose work was translated from one language into another, as in other cultural spaces and as in all times, has been strongly influenced by such a tragically conjectural criterion.

Since there is no bibliography specifically devoted to this very specific theme and since the corpus of the article is built out of bibliographic references, placing a list of works at the end of the text would not have been meaningful and would have given a repulsive aspect to the whole presentation¹.

2. THE CORPUS OF ROMANIAN LITERATURE TRANSLATIONS INTO MACEDONIAN AND VICE VERSA.

Inevitably, the following lines bring together Macedonian translations of well-known Romanian authors with translations of the works of minor writers in the relative value hierarchy of Romanian literature, as well as important authors in

¹ Abbreviations: MASA – Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts (Maced. Македонска Академија на Науките и Уметностите), PEN (PEN Club International – with the branch corresponding to each of the two countries), WAM – Writers' Association of Macedonia (Maced. Друштво на писателите на Македонија).

the Macedonian literary landscape with Macedonian authors less well-known in national literature and whose works have been translated into Romanian. This axiologically questionable mix remains outside of the objectives pursued by the present study, and ultimately reflects the actual situation in the literature of the two countries, not inconsistent with the situation in other cultural spaces.

2. 1. TRANSLATIONS OF ROMANIAN LITERATURE INTO MACEDONIAN:

- 1) Мирча Чобану [Mircea Ciobanu (lyrics; anthology), in Ефтим Клетников², *Хоризонти на зборот*. Скопје: Менора, 2000.]
- 2) Каролина Илика [Carolina Ilica, *Беседа за Прличев / Discurs despre Prlichev* (lyrics; bilingual Romanian-Macedonian text; edition supervised by Dumitru M. Ion). Охрид: Национална установа – Завод за заштита на спомениците на културата и Музей, 2008.]
- 3) Звукот на зборот. *Тројца романски поети* (Николае Григоре Марашану [Nicolae Grigore Mărăşanu], Константин Гергинау [Constantin Gherghinoiu], Стере Буковала [Stere Bucovală]) – (lyrics; anthology; translation: Dimo Dimcev³). Смедерево: Арка, 2009.]
- 4) Стере Буковала, *Попладнињата на едно пијано* [*După-amiezile unui pian*] (translation: Dina Cuvata și Gane Todorovski⁴). Скопје: Матица Македонска, 2009;
- 5) Еugen Урикару [Eugen Uricaru], *Клада и пламен* [*Rug și flacără*] (novel; translation: Dimo Dimcev). Скопје: Макавеј, 2010.
- 6) Деветмина романски поети [*Nouă poeți români*] (Гелу Наум [Gellu Naum], Марин Сореску [Marin Sorescu], Илеана Маланчоју [Ileana Mălăncioiu], Јоан Ес. Поп [Ioan Es. Pop], Андреј Бодиу [Andrei Bodiu], Василе Багиу [Vasile Bagiu], Аугустин Јоан [Augustin Ioan], Кайус Добреску [Caius Dobrescu], Сорин Гергут [Sorin Gherguț]) – (lyrics; anthology; translation: Lidija Dimkovska⁵), in the *Ак* literature and art magazine, n° 40 / 41, 2011, p. 48-53.

² Eftim Kletnikov (Ефтим Клетников; 1946-), poet, literary critic, essayist and Macedonian translator.

³ Dina Cuvata (alias Dimo Dimcev, the Macedonian name: Димо Наун Димчев; 1952-), economist, writer and Macedonian translator of Aromanian origin, member of WAM.

⁴ Gane Todorovski (Гане Тодоровски; 1929-2010), professor, writer, essayist, critic and literary historian, publicist and Macedonian translator.

⁵ Lidija Dimkovska (Лидија Димковска; 1971-), poet, essayist, Macedonian prose writer, currently based in Slovenia, PhD student (2000) and a Macedonian lecturer at the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literature of the University of Bucharest, editor of the *Блесок* electronic journal of culture and art, member of WAM and PEN.

- 7) Константин Абалуца [Constantin Abăluță, *Имагинарни случки од букурешките улици* [*Întâmplări imaginare pe străzile Bucureștiului*] (novel; in eBook format; translation: Lidija Dimkovska). Скопје: Блесок, 2011).
- 8) Мирчеа Картареску [Mircea Cărtărescu], *Носталгија* [Nostalgia] (novel / short prose; translation: Ermis Lafazanovski⁶). Скопје: Икона, 2011.
- 9) Каролина Илика [Carolina Ilică], *Малку повеќе* [Puțin mai mult] (lyrics; preface: Mateja Matevski⁷; postface: Rade Silian⁸; translation: Mihail Rengiov⁹, Vesna Ačevska¹⁰, Dimo Dimcev). Скопје: Матица Македонска, 2011.
- 10) Думитру М. Јон [Dumitru M. Ion, *Јован Метафора / John Metaphor* [Ioan Metaforă] (lyrics; bilingual English-Macedonian edition; translation: Dimo Dimcev). Скопје: Макавеј, 2012.
- 11) Лучијан Дан Тодоровиќ [Lucian Dan Teodorovici], *Аргумент љубовни приказни* [Celealte povești de dragoste] (novel; translation: Ermis Lafazanovski). Скопје: Икона, 2013.
- 12) Мирчеа Картареску [Mircea Cărtărescu], *Заслепување – Лево крило* [Orbitor. Aripa stângă] (novel; translation: Ermis Lafazanovski). Скопје: Икона, 2014.
- 13) Дојна Рушти [Doina Ruști], *Елиза на единаесет години* [Elizanca la 11 ani] (novel; translation: Александра Кайтозис¹¹). Скопје: Издава Антолог, 2015.

⁶ Ermis Lafazanovski (Ермис Лафазановски; 1961-; born in Romania), a researcher at the 'Марко Цепенков' Folklore Institute (Skopje), Macedonian prose writer and translator, member of WAM and current president of PEN.

⁷ Mateja Matevski (Матеја Матевски; 1929-), Mateja Matevski (Матеја Матевски, 1929-), poet, essayist, literary and dramatic critic, Macedonian translator, journalist and editor and director of Macedonian Radio, former MASA president.

⁸ Раде Силјан (1950-), a Macedonian poet, essayist, critic and translator, a former journalist at 'Студентски збор', 'Наш свет', 'Железничке новине', director of the 'Македонска книга' Publishing House and the 'Матица македонска' Publishing House, Macedonian, former president of WAM, member of the Association of Macedonian Translators, PEN, of the 'Mihai Eminescu' International Academy in Craiova. Ten years earlier, Rade Silian had already been translated and published in Romanian: *Zidirea Umbrei* (Зацедување на скакама, Скопје: Култура, 1990) – (translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilinca). Bucharest: Orient-Occident Publishing House, 1993.

⁹ Mihail Rengiov (Михаил Ренцов; 1936-), lawyer, poet, prose writer and Macedonian translator, member of WAM and PEN. Mihail Rengiov was himself translated into Romanian: *Poezia și fluturele* (lyrics; translation: Dumitru M. Ion). Bucharest: Cartea Românească Publishing House, 1981; *Intrarea în Ierusalim* (Влезување во Ерусалим, 1993; translation by Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilinca). Bucharest: Orient-Occident Publishing House, 1995.

¹⁰ Vesna Ačevska (Весна Ачевска; 1952-), poet, narrator and Macedonian translator. Vesna Ačevska was translated into Romanian: *Causa Sum* (translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilinca). Bucharest: Orient-Occident Publishing House, 1995.

¹¹ Alexandra Kaitozis (maced. Александра Кайтозис; 1985-), Macedonian-Romanian translator, graduate of the Faculty of Letters of 'Alexandru Ioan Cuza' University of Iasi.

- 14) Лучијан Блага [Lucian Blaga], *Метафизичка тага* [Tristețe metafizică] (poetry). Скопје: Макавеј (onwards 2000);
- 15) *Антологија на балканскиот афоризам* [Antologia aforismului balcanic] (Валериу Бутулеску [Valeriu Butulescu], Василе Гика [Vasile Ghica], Јонуц Карада [Ionuț Caragea], Иоан Ромошан [Ioan Romoșan]). (aphorisms; in online format: <http://www.vasiltolevski.mk>; translation: Vasil Tolevski¹²).
- 16) Симона Грација-Дима [Simona-Grazia Dima], *Антологија на современската романска книжевност во превод на македонски* [Antologia literaturii române contemporane în traducere macedoneană] (Василе Багиу [Vasile Baghiu], Думитру Кироару [Dumitru Chioaru], Ауреа Кристи [Aura Christi], Симона-Грација Дима [Simona-Grazia Dima], Гелу Дориан [Gellu Dorian], Николае Прелипчеану [Nicolae Prelipceanu], Константин Абалуца [Constantin Abăluță], Габриел Кифу [Gabriel Chifu], Никита Данилов [Nichita Danilov], Раду Павел Гео [Radu Pavel Gheo], Георге Шварц [Gheorghe Schwartz], Раду Ф. Александру [Radu F. Alexandru], Моника Спиридон [Monica Spiridon], Корин Брага [Corin Braga]) – (poetry, prose, dramaturgy; in electronic format: <http://diversity.org.mk/>; translation: Simona-Grația Dima). Меѓународно списание за книжевност у уметност, Колекција за поезија, фикција и есеј на Меѓународниот – Diversity – Diversité – Diversidad – Разноликост (under the aegis of PEN; onwards 2007).
- 17) Адријан Алуй Георге [Adrian Alui Gheorghe], *Лајка* [Laika] (novel; translation: Ирина Кроткова¹³). Скопје: Македоника литера, 2017.
- 18) Филип Флоријан [Filip Florian], *Малите прсти* [Degete mici] (novel, but published in a collection of essays; translation: Ирина Кроткова). Скопје: Или-или, 2017.

2. 2. TRANSLATIONS OF MACEDONIAN LITERATURE INTO ROMANIAN:

- 1) Lidija Dimkovska, *Meta-spânzurare de meta-tei* (lyrics; anthology; translation: Constantin Abăluță). București: Vinea, 2001.
- 2) Savo Kostadinovski¹⁴, *Poezie despre poezie / Пoesija za poesijama* (lyrics; bilingual Macedonian-Romanian text; translation: Dumitru M. Ion). București: Editura Academiei Internaționale Orient-Occident, 2002.

¹² Vasil Tolevski (Васил Толевски; 1956-), professional athlete, humorist and Macedonian satirical writer.

¹³ Irina Krotkova (Ирина Кроткова), ministerial civil servant, poet, prose writer, translator and Macedonian journalist, former Macedonian lecturer at the University of Craiova (1987-1991) and Istanbul, former WAM president.

¹⁴ Savo Kostadinovski (Саво Костадиновски; 1950-), Macedonian poet.

- 3) Katița Kiulavkova¹⁵, *Dorințe*¹⁶ (lyrics; also available in eBook format; translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilinca). București: Editura Academiei Internaționale Orient-Occident, 2003.
- 4) Rade Silian, *Amarul Vilaet*¹⁷ (lyrics; translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilică). București: Editura Academiei Internaționale Orient-Occident, 2007.
- 5) Milovan Stefanovski¹⁸, poems in ‘Ramuri’, n° 5, 2007 (<http://revistaramuri.ro/articole.php>).
- 6) Dejan Dukovski¹⁹, *Butoiul cu pulbere*²⁰. In *Dramaturgie contemporană din Balcani*, in ‘Teatrul azi’ – supplement. (dramaturgy). București, 2008.
- 7) Bojin Pavlovski²¹, *Frumoasa și profanatorul*²². (novel; translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilică), București: Editura Academiei Internaționale Orient-Occident, 2008.
- 8) Bojin Pavlovski, *Iarnă în plină vară*²³. (novel; translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilică). București: Editura Academiei Internaționale Orient-Occident, 2008.
- 9) Bojin Pavlovski, *Ipocritul roșu*²⁴. (novel; translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilică). București: Editura Academiei Internaționale Orient-Occident, 2008.
- 10) Bojin Pavlovski, *Western Australia*²⁵. (novel; translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilică). București: Editura Academiei Internaționale Orient-Occident, 2008.

¹⁵ Catița Kiulakova (Катица Кулакова; 1951-), former Macedonian language lecturer in Paris, professor of literature theory at the Faculty of Philology of the ‘St. Kiril and Metodiu’ University (Skopje), former president of PEN, WAM, MASA.

¹⁶ *Дива мисла*. Скопје: Мисла, 1989.

¹⁷ *Горчлив вилает*. Скопје: Матица Македонска 2006.

¹⁸ Milovan Stefanovski (Милован Стефановски; 1952-), ministerial civil servant, poet, prose writer, translator and Macedonian journalist, former Macedonian lecturer at the University of Craiova (1987-1991) and Istanbul, former WAM president.

¹⁹ Dejan Dukovski (Дејан Дуковски; 1969-), contemporary Macedonian playwright, former playwright at Macedonian Radio, currently a teacher at the Faculty of Dramatic Arts at the ‘St. Kiril and Metodiu’ University (Skopje), member of PEN.

²⁰ *Буре барут*. 1994.

²¹ Bojin Pavlovski (Божин Павловски; 1942-), Macedonian writer, member of MASA. Bojin Pavlovski had already been published in Romanian, in the translation of the same translators, with the novel: *Ipocritul roșu* (Извениот хипокрит. Скопје: Мисла, 1985). Bucharest: Cartea Românească Publishing House, 1986.

²² *Убавицата и Мародером*. Мелбурн: АЕА, 2006.

²³ *Зима во лето*. Скопје: Матица и Мисла, 2007.

²⁴ *Извениот хипокрит*. Скопје: Македонска Книга, 1984.

²⁵ *Вест Авуст*. Скопје: Мисла, 1977.

- 11) Bojin Pavlovski, *Visătoarea egipteană*²⁶. (novel; translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilica). Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Internaţionale Orient-Occident, 2010.
- 12) Goran Stefanovski²⁷, *Poveşti din Estul Sălbatic* (*Fundul dublu*, *Gaura neagră*, *Ex-Yu*, *Bacchanalia*²⁸, *Demonul din Debarmaalo*²⁹, *Poveşti din Estul Sălbatic*³⁰, *Monologul lui Zoran*) – (dramaturgy; anthology; translation and preface: Ioana Ieronim). Bucureşti: Editura Cheiron, 2010.
- 13) Dina Cuvata, *Învăţările mamei*; *Ca o suflare*; *Deşteptarea aromânilor*; *Nu vă atingeţi de poezia mea*; *În cine să se-ncreadă omul?* (lyrics; translation: Dimo Dimcev, alias Dina Cuvata). In Irina Lucia Mihalca, *Poezie macedoneană*, in *Casa Gândului – Cleopatra*, 2012 (Reţeaua Literară in electronic format: <http://reteaualiterara.ning.com>).
- 14) Lidiya Dimkovska, *Diferență* (lyrics; Constantin Abăluță³¹, Ioana Ieronim³², Dagmar Maria Anoca in Dagmar Maria Anoca). Bucureşti: Tracus Arte, 2012.
- 15) Ivan Geparovski³³, *Sedimente ale istoriei* (lyrics; translation: Dumitru M. Ion, Carolina Ilica). Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Internaţionale Orient-Occident 2012.
- 16) Goce Smilevski³⁴, *Sora lui Freud*³⁵ (novel; translation: Octavian Blenchea). Iaşi: Polirom, 2013.
- 17) Rade Silian, *Umbrele Clipelor. Versuri*³⁶ (lyrics; translation: Dina Cuvata). Chişinău: Editura Literatura şi Arta, 2014.

²⁶ Египетска сонувалка. Скопје: Мисла, 2001.

²⁷ Goran Stefanovski (Горан Стефановски; 1952-), Macedonian playwright (established in London), former drama editor at Macedonian Television and teacher at the Faculty of Philology at the ‘St. Kiril and Methodiu’ University (Skopje), thereafter a dramaturgy professor at the drama faculty at the same university, member of WAM, PEN and MASA.

²⁸ Баханалии. 1996.

²⁹ Демонот од Дебар Маало. 2006.

³⁰ Приказни од Давиот исток. Скопје: Табернаку, 2004.

³¹ The lyrics of Lidiya Dimovska in the translation of Constantina Abalutza were also published in the cultural journals: *Viaţa românească* (Bucharest, 2009), *Contrafort* (Chisinau, 2011), *Ara* (Arad, 2012).

³² Ioana Ieronim also translated Lidiya Dimovska's lyrics into the *Luceafărul* magazine (Bucharest, 2012).

³³ Ivan Geparovski (Иван Гепаровски), professor at the Institute of Philosophy at the ‘St. Kiril and Methodiu’ University (Skopje), Macedonian poet.

³⁴ Goce Smilevski (Гоце Смилевски; 1975-), Macedonian writer, one of the best-known contemporary prose writers.

³⁵ Сестрата на Зигмунд Фројд. Скопје: Дијалог, 2011.

³⁶ Сенка на векот. Скопје: Матица Македонска, 2013.

- 18) Igor Isakovski³⁷, *Tu dormi aici...; Însetat și bland* (poetry). In *România Literară*, 2015).

3. CONCLUSIONS

At first glance, the volume of the authors who have been indexed and of the works listed here, also taking into account the impressive volume of translations preceding the period of time that was the subject of this study, seems to confirm Dimo Dimcev's assertion that currently there are countless translations into Macedonian ('Има многу преоди од романски на македонски'³⁸). Similarly, it can be argued that Macedonian literature is well represented through translations in the Romanian cultural space.

A closer look of the inventory of translations of the two literatures, completed in the last decade and a half, in conjunction with the examination of the translations preceding this period, also highlights other observations. Therefore, other conclusions that can be formulated at this stage of the research would be:

1) The selection of Romanian and Macedonian literary works proposed to be known to the readers of the two spiritual areas is not governed by a common, coherent and fundamentally axiologically solid cultural and editorial policy, being rather the result of very personal, therefore subjective and arbitrary choices. Oftentimes, the selections are less focused on the hierarchies put forward by literary history and critique, however controversial and contradictory these milestones may seem in the light of recent revisions and re-evaluations. Sometimes, these choices appear to be governed by personal and somewhat petty interests, or by the translators' need to satisfy their vanity, often writers themselves. Hence, the large number of self or mutual translations, a phenomenon that could lead a foreign reader to have the distorted image that they and not others would be the emblematic writers of the literature at a given point in time (the contemporary period, in the present case). In support of the above, it is also noteworthy that the most translated authors are, apart from translators-writers, well-known writers who are or were at the time when their translations were published in high public positions or at the top of the hierarchy of administrative structures in the cultural life of the two countries. Fortunately, the value of their artistic creation often confirms the public recognition of the authors in question. Often, not always... This explains why so many niche authors, who are unrepresentative even for a barely acceptable understanding of the true values of the two literatures have been translated from one language into the other. The overall impression, therefore, remains that of an amalgam that is hard to define and quite monotonous.

³⁷ Igor Isakovski (Игор Исаковски; 1970-2014), poet, prose writer, Macedonian translator and editor (radio-tv and several publications).

³⁸ In *Дневник* online, 26.04.2012 (<http://www.dnevnik.mk>).

- 2) For the time being, public access to the true masterpieces of foreign literature through translation remains impossible. Until now, and especially in the period under review, it turns out that the translators have made many but yet small steps. It is noteworthy in this discussion that even when important and very important writers of one literature or the other were translated into another language, they were not illustrated with their most representative works.
- 3) Many of the translated titles have a very limited circulation, appearing in a confidential circulation and in niche publishing houses, making them difficult to reach both the general public and the specialists. However, the distribution of translated literature begins to show some signs of adaptation to the current specificity of the editorial market and to resonate with trends in the behaviour of readers of the new generation. Thus, a new and unexpected element for the research period is the emergence of translations in digital format (translations in online publications and in eBook format).
- 4) With some exceptions, which is absolutely notable, translations of literary works from Romanian into Macedonian and vice versa are the work of self-employed and freelance translators. Very attached to the two cultures, more or less well-versed in both languages, they have trained themselves over time in this field through the force of circumstance. Permanent collaboration with specialists from the other cultural (and linguistic) space is a definite constant of translation in all cases, as is natural. The product of professional or amateur translators, the overwhelming majority of the works outlined here are distinguished by a remarkably good quality.
- 5) The fundamental recommendation that is almost imperative at the end of this research comes naturally from the partial satisfaction of the general conclusion that translations, in both directions, are not at present capable of reflecting both literatures to their true value.



BOOK REVIEWS

SEAN COTTER, *LITERARY TRANSLATION AND THE IDEA OF A MINOR ROMANIA*¹ - A REVIEW

 Larisa Cercel
 University of Saarland
 Germany

This book is a thought-provoking reflection on translation, based on sustained research and the observation of translational discourses and practices in what the author calls ‘minor’ Romania – a country whose language and literary culture are rather unfamiliar to scholars working in Translation Studies. Sean Cotter, an associate professor of literature and literary translation at the University of Texas and an esteemed translator of Romanian literature, valuably directs our attention to a country that has an intense investment in translation – there is much to learn from Romania’s example, and the facts can often be surprising. In Romania, the publication of a translation can become a real event: the 25,000 copies of Lucian Blaga’s translation of *Faust*, for example, sold out in 3 days; an eyewitness reports that when Blaga delivered a talk on the translation, he spoke ‘to a room so crowded that chairs were torn from the floor and crushed against the walls’. Romania provides a cultural space in which canonical writers could envisage an extraordinarily extensive translation program: they envisaged translating the major works of world literature into Romanian as a vital cultural strategy, but also, perhaps, as a response to the presence of a foreign army in their own country. In Romania, translation enjoys high status and translators are prominent figures in public culture, and this is still the case today. What could such a culture teach scholars working in contemporary Translation Studies?

Sean Cotter focuses his research on Romania’s Communist period, *i.e.* on the discourses and practices of post-World War II Romanian translation. The key concept, and the red thread running through this volume, is ‘the minor’. Cotter challenges the common understanding of the minor as an effect of diminished cultural importance or as a term that implies a certain inferiority complex. Instead, he presents it as ‘an active mode of imagining the nation’ (p. 7), and as

¹ Sean Cotter, *Literary Translation and the Idea of a Minor Romania*, University of Rochester Press, 2014, ISBN 978-1-58046-436-9, 174 p.

an interactive model for international cultural exchange and encounter. He also ‘troubles’ some current theoretical models in Translation Studies as they relate to matters of nationhood and power, particularly insofar as they are ‘designed for major nations’ (p. 4). Cotter attempts instead ‘to reimagine transcultural interaction from the perspective of the smaller culture’ (p. 25) and to articulate a discourse ‘beyond the terms set by the more powerful’ (p. 25).

The most convincing arguments for this thesis are delivered in the analysis of the role of translation during the beginnings of Communist regime (chap. 1). With the presence of Soviet troops on Romanian territory immediately after the end of the Second World War (1944 to 1958) a deep process of linguistic-ideological transformation begins. The Soviet Union assigned a key role to the language, regarding it as a ‘means of production’ of the new Communist person. The Soviet Union also deemed literary authors to be ‘engineers of the soul’ (Stalin). Accordingly, the new Communist regime in Romania initiated a massive project of material and ideological importation – translation was to aid in that undertaking. The immense quantity of translations from Soviet socialist realist texts that emerged in this period led to a double foreignization of the Romanian culture and language: the intention was ‘to move the Romanian reader from his domestic subjectivity to a foreign one, in line with the ideology of the Soviet Union’ (p. 28). Part of that exercise involved transforming the Romanian language, such that Latinate vocabulary became Slavicized, and Romanian grammar was modified to resemble Russian constructions. The result was ‘a broad foreignization of Romanian itself, the creation of what is commonly called ‘the wooden language’ (p. 29). This Russified Romanian became the language of original works, and consequently such works sounded like translations.

This is the point where Sean Cotter enters into a critical dialogue with Lawrence Venuti’s universal claims for foreignization as exposed in his classic book *The Translator’s Invisibility* (2nd edition, 2008). Consider some of Venuti’s postulates: ‘The concept of foreignizing can be productively applied to translating in any language and culture’ (Venuti 2008, p. 19). Or ‘Foreignizing translation can be useful in enriching the minority language and culture while submitting them to ongoing interrogation’ (Venuti 2008, p. 20). Or indeed ‘No culture should be considered immune to self-criticism, whether hegemonic or subordinate, colonizer or colonized’ (Venuti 2008, p. 20). But for Cotter, such claims, when inspected with due regard to the case of 1950s Romania, are not only inadequate, they are also ‘ironic’ and ‘disastrous’ (p. 32). In Cotter’s view, the theoretical binaries of foreignization/domestication or hegemony/resistance are ‘tools developed to show the minor how to act like the major’ (p. 33); they translate the minor ‘into something intelligible to readers in major cultures in Europe and the United States’ (p. 33).

The strategies imagined by Romanian translators during the Communist period stand in marked contrast to what one might call ‘major-minded’ discourses on translation. These strategies show that there are other possibilities in respect to ‘the minor’, and indeed that they can mount real resistance to political power. Sean Cotter illustrates these other options and facets of the minor by discussing the translational activity of three key figures in Romanian culture: the poet and philosopher Lucian Blaga (chap. 2), the philosopher Constantin Noica (chap. 3), and the essayist Emil Cioran (chap. 4). They present and represent different ways in which translation became essential to the national imagination.

Lucian Blaga was one of the most prominent translators during the first decade of the Communist regime in Romania and reflected deeply on the topics of translation and national culture. Blaga’s strategy, when confronted with Soviet political and cultural hegemony, is a surprising and unexpected one: he neither stands against it, nor capitulates in the face of power, but interconnects Romanian culture with other cultures through translation and constructs a network of relations with writers from Western European countries. Thanks to this subtle chess move, he creates a force-field in which the Soviet influence is just one influence (powerful nonetheless) among many others. Blaga’s translation projects (realised in an anthology of translations that draws upon very different authors and languages) demonstrate ‘a conscious eclectism’ that links Romania to a variety of other countries and ‘recontextualizes the Soviets as one of many foreign interferences that have constituted Romanian culture’ (p. 53). Thus, Blaga tries to turn Romania’s political and cultural vulnerability into cultural flexibility. Via translation, he expands the capacity of the minor culture to incorporate multiple influences: ‘Romanian culture cannot assume a major position, an autochthonous cultural independence, but it can embrace the possibilites of minor status’ (p. 71).

Blaga’s translational work literally puts into practice his project to connect ‘minor’ Romanian literature with a variety of foreign influences. He was deeply familiar with the work of other prominent translators (e.g. Ezra Pound and Rainer Maria Rilke) and used their versions in his own translations. He intended to create a community of translators thereby, a translatological-poetic network braiding their work with his own Romanian versions, with the result that he developed a complex zone of linguistic and hermeneutic interference. Cotter illustrates this particular kind of translation (“free translations”) by way of Blaga’s translation of Valéry’s poem *Les Pas* read through Rilke’s translation. Traces of the German version are visible in the Romanian translation, but in Blaga’s text there are also passages where ‘the Romanian does something neither Rilke nor the original author do, and this performance gives the Romanian text a particularity’ (p. 71). And this is ‘because it appears only in Romanian, it is a Romanian creature, a new creation, something beyond simple interference’ (p. 71). Blaga’s version of *Les Pas* is intended to demonstrate ‘the capacity of both

the Romanian language and Romanian culture to find its strength, its heartbeat, in multiculturalism' (p. 71). A culture connected to the community of great Western artists was Blaga's well-reasoned aesthetic and political strategy, his dynamic model of, and for minor Romania.

Constantin Noica is the second case presented in Cotter's book. A first-class philosopher, placed under house arrest for ten years and imprisoned for six years, Noica refused to become a dissident voice, however (defying the expectations of the Romanian community exiled in Paris - among them his friends Mircea Eliade and Emil Cioran), preferring to frame his cultural activity 'as a kind of collaboration with the state' (p. 92). Cotter sees in Noica's cultural-political choices a 'detachment from political power' and an 'identification with translation' (p. 89). This detachment, and this identification, Cotter argues, can be interpreted as alternative possibilities of the minor.

If we want to understand Noica's position, the key text in this regard is his *Memo to the One Above* (1973). For here he defines Romania's role as 'Europe's translator'. In this text, Noica offers a stark image of Romania as a minor nation: it is 'a country without original, particular contributions to the culture of the world'; Romanian intellectuals prefer 'dilettantish improvisation in many fields over rigorous specialization in one'; Romanian culture itself has 'as its best creation only an adaptable, expressive language' (p. 95). But these negative characteristics, even if they do account for Romania's lack of major status, are actually productive in a translational sense: dilettantism also describes the capability to achieve competence in different fields (this, after all, is a key translational competence). The flexible Romanian language provides Romanians with 'the ability to translate anything from any language' (Noica, cited by Cotter, p. 96). Noica turns Romania's apparent weakness into its strength, demonstrating that it is best suited for the role of translation in Europe.

Noica's intense and heterogeneous translational practice focused on major philosophical works (by Descartes, Augustine, and Kant, among others) and also literary translations. His practice gives us deeper insights into how we might understand the activity of translation in respect of the minor. Surprisingly, Cotter outlines Noica's translational thinking not by way of his philosophical translational work, however, but by discussing his translation of Cecil Day Lewis's *Sagittarius Rising* – a book about aviation. The critical voice Noica articulates in his translation becomes, for Cotter, emblematic of Noica's understanding of the role of translation and the translator: 'Noica sees the translator as an explainer, one who shows the moral shortcomings of the original author and text' (p. 115). Noica's version of the minor enacts a politics of translation, working alongside the oppressions of power, and endows translation with a critical function, suggesting thereby that translation can be an alternative type of cultural production.

Emil Cioran is the third and last case Sean Cotter presents in this volume. Born in Romania, where he is appreciated as one of the most prominent Romanian intellectuals after World War II, Cioran left the country in the 1940s (as did his lifelong Romanian friends Mircea Eliade and Eugène Ionesco). He settled in Paris and adapted to French culture, and indeed, he was hailed as ‘the greatest French writer to honour our language since the death of Paul Valéry’ (Saint-John Perse). In the chapter dedicated to Cioran, Cotter focuses on two translation stories, each of which reveal variously different perceptions and perspectives on the minor.

The first story is one that Cioran recounted many times: after moving to France, he went on a bike tour, and along the way he undertook to translate Mallarmé into Romanian. But he fully understood ‘the absurdity and the uselessness’ of his effort. This was the moment in which he perceptively grasped the unimportance of the Romanian language and indeed the Romanian nation, and hence turned away from both. In Cotter’s view, however, Cioran actually ‘never abandoned Romanian or Romania’ (p. 117). He continued to correspond with his family and friends in Romania, he kept up-to-date with the culture and politics of the country, and he persisted in speaking fluent Romanian until his death. Cioran was actually trying to explore ways to re-imagine Romania. So, rather than reading Cioran’s story as a rejection, Cotter in fact considers this to be the starting point of Cioran’s ‘turn from a major-minded version of Romania to a minor one’ (p. 117f.). This turn, and the undertaking it implies, was one which occupied Cioran even as he was also working in the French language during the time he lived in France.

During his youth, Cioran cherished emphatic (albeit disappointed) hopes for ‘a Romania with China’s population and France’s destiny’ (Cioran cited in Cotter, p. 118). Such hopes concerned the possibility of a radical transformation that would find its expression – once again – in a translational act. The second story narrates the translation process of *Lacrimi și sfinti* (*Tears and Saints*), the first of Cioran’s books written in Romanian to be made accessible in French. It was published in 1986. The translation – officially ascribed to Sanda Stolojan, in fact – was the occasion for Cioran to express his changed vision of Romania. He was intensively involved in the translational work – cutting, removing or rewriting entire ‘fanatic’ phrases and passages of the original, an original he initially regarded as ‘a major-national text’ (p. 135). The translation presents the readers with ‘a radically changed national imagination, from the anxieties of the ‘minor’ to the minor’s possibilities’ (p. 136). ‘You can become something just as well through the minuscule as through the grandiose’, Cioran writes in a letter to his friend Constantin Noica in 1973. The adapted French translation of *Lacrimi și sfinti* reveals ‘a non-grandiose version’ of Romania, one presented ‘on a human scale, rather than the all-or-nothing scale of the saint’ (p. 141). No longer caught ‘between a dream of greatness and a life of obscurity’ (p. 141), Romania and the

minor could accordingly occupy a more relaxed position, in terms of its cultural prominence, and its relative size. For Cotter, then, ‘Cioran’s revision gives us the major as a metaphysical nation, while the minor nation has the advantage to actually existing’ (p. 142).

To summarize: Sean Cotter’s book shows how the category of the ‘minor’ can help us to understand translation, and to grasp how translation nuances what we mean by the ‘minor’. It is clear that this nexus can open up a conceptual space by means of which we can better explore the deep questions of linguistic and cultural identity. The minor can be flexible and dynamic (Blaga), critical (Noica), or realistic (Cioran), but in all cases, it is a notion that does not have to be trapped in its negativity. It can be hugely productive, and Sean Cotter shows this in his analysis of these three Romanian examples. His research on translation and the role of translators in the ‘minor’ Romania, a ‘smaller nation, one born of a hyperengagement with translation; one modelled on, developed within, and expressed through translation’ (p. 145), provides Translation Studies with new lines of enquiry. This refreshing perspective on the minor tends to suggest, moreover, that ‘going East’ would be a promising journey for Translation Studies to undertake – a move towards a space and a context for thinking that Translation Studies scholars have barely begun to discover.

JUSTICE, MEMORY AND REDRESS IN ROMANIA. NEW INSIGHTS – A REVIEW



Emilia Ivancu

Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań

Poland

‘There is no natural ‘end’ to understanding the recent past; there is no ultimate story.’ – is one of the very many ideas on which the collection of academic essays *Justice, Memory and Redress in Romania. New Insights*, edited by Lavinia Stan and Lucian Turcescu (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017). As one of the main topics approached in the various articles in the book is memory, the idea above represents a safe and reasonable path to approaching the past and thus memory itself as well as its ways into the present. Memory can be and is multifaceted, the past is not a fixed line of events, but rather a sum of stories, which can all lead to a deep understanding of the past. In this configuration, the term ‘transitional justice’ is a reflection of how people can manage to deal with their past, with the stories of the past – either theirs or others’, and how all this can finally lead to healing, which is something post-Communist Romania definitely needs. The articles represent different approaches to what this idea actually means in the Romanian context.

The collection is made up of an *Introduction*, written by Lavinia Stan, three parts, and a *Conclusion* signed by both editors. The three different parts of the book contain different articles signed by researchers from Romania, the UK, France, the United States or Canada, and offer different perspectives upon the relation between memory, past, justice, victims and collaborators, in the Romanian context but also with references to other former communist countries in Eastern Europe.

The first part of the book, entitled *Memory, Reckoning, Legitimacy, and Justice: Theoretical Considerations*, as the title shows, gives a rather theoretical approach via the four articles it encompasses. They clarify and establish the possible definitions of social/collective memory in a Communist context, resistance and collaboration under dictatorial regimes, starting with what ‘collaborationists’ meant in the Nazi regime in France, the resistance through culture in Romania and the various situations of resistance – some controversial in their acceptance in Romania, and even refuted. An interesting and very useful article makes the

one signed by Cynthia M. Horne – *Evaluating Measures and Their Outcome* – in which the term transitional subject is analysed in a larger Central, Eastern European and Balkan context. Romanian transitional justice measures or the lack of them is placed in this context. The chapter contains also an article on transitional justice with a more accurate description in the Romanian context. The conclusion thus drawn by Alexandru Gussi is as relevant as it could be: ‘The Romanian case illustrates the vicious case of deligitimization caused by transitional justice expectations that grow faster than the elites’ political and the state’s ability to fulfil such expectations. The issue of timing is fundamental, as some transitional justice programs came too late to boost trust in the government and rather showed the country’s ambiguous position toward its undemocratic communist past.’(p. 98)

The second part is named *Transitional Justice in Practice: Successes, Failures, and Challenges*, and contains four articles. The first article, *Retrospective Justice and Legal Culture*, authored by Raluca Grosescu and Agata Fijalkowski, deals with the idea of legal culture in Romania, and how it gradually changed after 1990 from a rather Soviet influence to a more independent judiciary and a separation of powers. That also meant the introduction of crimes against humanity in the Criminal Code, which was adopted only in 2014; yet this was a crucial moment for the debates regarding retrospective justice in Romania. Probably one of the most interesting articles in the collection is *Memory, Commemorative Landscapes and Transitional Justice* by Duncan Light and Craig Young. It focuses on how commemoration and memorialization play an important role ‘in healing the wounds of the communist past’. Moreover, as the authors declare, ‘memorialization is a means of giving recognition to those who suffered hardship, repression, exile, or death under communist regimes.’ (p.145) The article, on the other hand, shows the dangers which public memory can face, especially under political pressure or changes, underlining how public memory started to be erased at the moment when the communists took over in 1946. However, one of the concluding recommendations of the articles is that ‘a focus on the popular reception, negotiation and contestation of memorialisation intended to right the wrongs of the communist era is an important research agenda for the scholars of transitional justice.’ (165) The role of art in revisiting the communist past in Romania is presented in the next article signed by Caterina Preda. She discusses the main cinema productions dedicated to communism, emphasising the major role that the Romanian cinema has played in dealing with the Romanian amnesia/remembering, to this adding the role of theatre, painting or performance arts. Yet the author fails to notice that even though Romanian cinema has proved to be very successful in both approaching the hard themes of the communist regime as well as its aftermath, the Romanian public is not amongst the great fans of Romanian cinema of that kind. Romanian cinema has not found yet a place in its own country, the reasons for

this possibly being many, one of which probably even the resurrection of a past that Romanians either want to run from or simply want forgotten.

The third part of the book is dedicated to *Victims and Collaborators*, and represents a deeper cut into what Romanian communism meant from the point of view of abuses against human rights in all layers of society. The article *Nostalgia, Identity and Self-Irony in Remembering Communism*, by Cristina Petrescu, touches a problem specific especially for the communist countries in Eastern Europe *i.e.* the feeling of nostalgia towards the past, in spite of the atrocities it represented for the Romanians, for example. On the other hand, the article dedicated to the religious representations and practices in the Gulag such as recollections of imprisonment in the communist prisons analyses, beyond the cases of exceptional personal accounts in prisons such as that of Nicolae Steinhardt, for example, also analyses the role of the Orthodox church both during communism and after 1989. The article entitled *Coming to Terms with the Controversial Past of the Orthodox Church* underlines the extent to which Communism affected one of the most important institutions of the society, the Orthodox Church, seen also in comparison with the Greek Catholic Church or with the Roman Catholic one. However, in the subchapter dedicated to Valeriu Anania's memoirs, the author does not offer an academic perspective, but rather attempts to make presumptions and suppositions about the time Valeriu Anania spent in Hawaii as well as the personal history Anania offers, which is quite 'unorthodox' from the point of view of research practices and discourse and also from the way memoirs and autobiographical texts are usually seen and analysed.

The *Conclusions* signed by Lavinia Stan and Lucian Turcescu are relevant not only for the book itself, but also for the situation in which Romania finds itself today, with a transitional process in development, interrupted, with a past not dealt with nor assumed, and represent an invitation for further research and interpretation for the unique case Romania embodies especially from the point of view of exit from communism as well as of transitional justice.