

## TRANSLATION ACROSS FRAMEWORKS

DARIA PROTOPOPESCU\*

This volume is the result of part of the papers presented at the 2020 workshop *New Challenges in Lexicology, Terminology, Translation and Interpreting*. The articles selected for the current volume all focus on various aspects of literary translation. We hope that the different approaches to literary translation covered by the authors are both intriguing in their diversity as well as appealing to the readers of the volume.

Literary translation has a long-standing tradition in the field of translation studies. One can trace it back to antiquity where “the theories that emerge at the time are unsystematic remarks, mainly situated in the discipline of rhetoric” (Ghanooni 2012: 77). The pioneers in the field are considered to be Cicero and Quintilian, who “deem translation as a pedagogical exercise whose debate on translation practice pertains to word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation.” (Ghanooni 2012: 77).

During the 17<sup>th</sup> century, influential theories emerge; the most prominent being that of John Dryden (1631-1700) whose trichotomy on translation types (metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation) makes big strides in the development of the field. Dryden (1680/1992: 17), as quoted in Venuti (2004: 17-18), negates metaphrase (word-for-word) for lacking fluency or easy readability and imitation as well, that adapt the foreign text so as to serve the translator's own literary ambitions, instead he is in favour of paraphrase or translation with latitude, which seeks to convey meanings. At the outset of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Romanticism discusses the issue of translatability and untranslatability. In 1813, the German translator Friedrich Schleiermacher writes a seminal paper on

---

\* University of Bucharest, [daria.protopopescu@lts.unibuc.ro](mailto:daria.protopopescu@lts.unibuc.ro)

"The Different Methods of Translating." He moves beyond word-for-word, literal, sense-for-sense or free translation. He argues that the real question is how to bring the ST writer and the TT reader together: Either the translator leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader towards the writer or he leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer towards the reader (Schleiermacher, 1813/1992: 41-2, In Munday, 2001: 28).

In the 1940s to 1950s, the prevalent concept is "translatability". During this decade, the main issue to be tackled by linguists and literary critics is that whether the differences that separate the languages and culture can be brought back to friendship via translation or not. To achieve this, the impediments to translation are jotted down, to see whether they are surmountable or not, and translation methods are formulated. Ideas are formed by disciplinary trends and change to a great extent, ranging between the extremes of philosophical skepticism and practical optimism (in Venuti, 2004, p. 111).

When literary criticism considers the question of *translatability*, it accentuates the impossibility of reproducing a foreign literary text in another language which is sedimented with different literary styles, genres and traditions (in Venuti, 2004: 112). However, at the end of this spectrum lies "optimism," occupied by *linguistic analysis*. The question of *translatability* is taken into account by linguists. They analyze specific translation issues and then describe the methods that translators developed to solve them. This optimism emanates to a certain degree from a theory of language that is communicative of meaning, not constitutive of it, conceived along empiricist lines as referential (Venuti, 2004: 113). Chaim Rabin, in his essay "The Linguistics of Translation" affirms that translation involves two distinct factors, a "meaning," or reference to some slice of reality, and the difference between two languages in referring to that reality" (1958: 123).

Another pivotal scholar who theorizes about the problem of translating between different realities is Eugene Nida (1945). By working on the translation of the Bible, Nida comes to the conclusion that solutions to translation problems should be ethnological, contingent upon the translator's acquisition of sufficient "cultural information."

In the 1980's, Susan Bassnett's *Translation Studies* is published. Bassnett combines diverse branches of translation research in this book, marking the resurgence of translation studies as a separate field overlapping with linguistics, literary criticism and philosophy. At the same time, problems of cross-cultural communication are in focus. The approach she takes to theoretical concepts is historical and understands practical strategies in relation to specific cultural and social situations. However, her emphasis is mostly on the relative autonomy of the translated text (as quoted in Venuti, 2004: 221). In this period, translation is viewed as an independent form of writing, distinct from the source text and that texts originally written in the translating language (Venuti, 2004: 221)

Andre Lefevere is an important figure in the field of translation studies who follows the concept of literary system. Lefevere views translation as "refraction" or "rewriting." As he says (1992a), refractions carry a work of literature from one system into another. He sees translation as an act carried out under the influence of particular categories and norms constituent to systems in a society (p. 12). Lefevere (1992a), focuses on the examination of the very concrete factors that systematically govern the reception, acceptance or rejection of literary texts; that is, issues as power, ideology, institution and manipulation. Lefevere views such power positions as "rewriting" literature, who govern its consumption by the people (p. 2).

On the other hand, Antoine Berman in "Translation and the trials of the foreign" negates "ethnocentric translating". According to him, the clear sign of a bad translation is when it domesticates the foreign work and does not let in the foreignness of the foreign work, when the SL text is assimilated to TL reader and culture (Berman, 1984: 17). Instead, he argues that a good translation is the one in which the linguistic and cultural differences of the ST are registered in the TT. This foreignness cannot be achieved but by literalism. Thus, by developing a "correspondence" and "literalism", the TL is enriched and amplified (Berman, 1995: 94).

In the last decade of the twentieth century, translation research progresses with a fusion of theories and methodologies being prevalent in the previous decade, pursuing trends in such disciplines as (polysystem, skopos and poststructuralism) and also developments in linguistics (pragmatics, critical discourse analysis and computerized corpora) and

in literary and cultural theory (postcolonialism, sexuality, globalization (Venuti, 2004: 325).

This volume brings to the fore investigations in the domain of literary translation from a mostly linguistic perspective: **Ruxandra Drăgan**, **Daria Protopopescu** and **Nadina Vișan**'s articles starting from linguistic structures and their formal analyses and going into corpus explorations of their translations in literature.

The article proposed by **Eva-Nicoleta Burdușel** reports on literary translation as cultural and linguistic mediation. The author highlights the significance of the field and the role of professional translators and interpreters as cultural mediators enabled by linguistic competence. Emphasis is laid on the power that culture has in connecting individuals and communities, to ensure national survival, to preserve tangible and intangible heritage as the most valuable asset of continuity. **Burdușel** views literary translation as one of the most powerful and effective means of linguistic and cultural mediation, though equally challenging due to the complexity of a process often touched by "untranslatability".

**Ruxandra Drăgan**'s paper investigates the universal concept of motion. Her focus is on the expression of motion events in English and Romanian, as two languages representative of the S-framed *vs.* V-framed distinction made in Talmy (1985, 2000). Her article delves into the strategies Romanian translators employ to render directed motion structures, specifically, on the elaboration of the Path and Manner components in narratives. This is a case study on two translation samples of Chapter 35 – *Beyond the Veil* – from J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, translated by Ioana Iepureanu (*Harry Potter și Ordinul Phoenix*, vol. 5, Editura Egmont România, 2013), and by Tatiana Dragomir (*Harry Potter și Ordinul Phoenix*, vol. 5, Editura Arthur, București, 2017). In looking at the two versions of the ST, Ruxandra Drăgan also touches upon the older concept of retranslation without specifically pointing it out. However, her study looks at the two translations from a strictly linguistic point of view, by analyzing the already announced structures related to manner salience in the translation of motion events.

The article authored by **Eliana Ionoaia** addresses the issue of retranslation by looking into the different versions of the Romanian translations of *Hamlet's* soliloquy in Act 1, scene 3. The main issue

identified by Eliana Ionoaia is whether the translator should adapt or not. The article examines the Romanian tradition of using indirect translation and retranslation/revision, not only to improve the rendering of the text, but also to adapt it to the Romanian culture, as well as the tensions between domesticating versus foreignizing choices. The investigation is all the more intriguing since apart from being a fragment of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, dramatic texts cannot be treated as a whole unit like a prose or a poetic text and they were not extensively analyzed from a translational point of view, according to Bassnett (2002: 123)

**Daria Protopopescu's** article investigates the concept of retranslation, again from a linguistic point of view, focusing on attitude adverbs in two translations of C.S. Lewis's *The Magician's Nephew*. By analyzing the corpus provided by the two versions of the Romanian translation of C.S. Lewis's book, the author touches upon the matter of translating adverbs into Romanian which is always a problem given the parametric difference between English and Romanian with respect to the treatment of adverbs. This in turn can be further extended to explorations of what happens to the translation of adverbs in other Romance languages which all seem to favour a translation by means of PP-paraphrase rather than equivalence.

Last, but not least, in her article, **Nadina Vişan** explores the concept of translating violence by addressing the issue of whether to use taboo or non-taboo words. She investigates the translation of swear words. The starting point in her investigation is that most Romanian literary translations do not deal well with translating bad language since they tend to apply formal correspondence or resort to mild equivalence. The data employed in the analysis are taken from the corpus provided by Stephen King's novel *The Shining*.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bassnett, Susan (1980), *Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge; revisited edition, 1991.  
Bassnett, Susan (2002), *Translation Studies*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Routledge, London and New York.

- Berman, Antoine (1984), *L'Épreuve de l'étranger: Culture et la Traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Berman, Antoine (1995), *Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Dryden, John (1680), "Metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation". Extracts of "Preface to Ovid's Epistles" in R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds) (1992), pp. 17-31.
- Ghanooni, Ali Reza (2012), "A Review of the History of Translation Studies", in *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 77-85.
- Munday, Jeremy (2001), *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Nida, Eugene (1945), "Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation Problems," *Word* 1: 194-208.
- Rabin, Chaim (1958), "The Linguistics of Translation," in A.H. Smith (ed.) *Aspects of Translation: Studies in Communication* 2, London: Seeker and Warburg, pp. 123-45.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich (1813/1992), „On the different methods of translating“, in R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds) (1992), pp. 36-54.
- Talmy, Leonard (1985), "Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms.", in Timothy Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description 3: Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 57-149.
- Talmy, Leonard (2000), *Toward a cognitive semantics, Volume 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Venuti, Laurence (ed) (2004), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.