

Translation difficulties in the Romanian version of Arthur Schopenhauer's *Aphorisms*. A contrastive and diachronic analysis (I)

Cecilia-Iuliana Vârlan*

Faculty of Letters, "Ovidius" University, Aleea Universității 1, 900472 Constanța, Romania

Article info

History:

Received November 9, 2015

Accepted November 19, 2015

Published February 12, 2016

Key words:

translation

diachrony

comparative analysis

Abstract

The present paper concentrates on a late work of the German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer, *Aphorisms on the Wisdom of Life*, and on its only Romanian version, delivered at the end of the 19th century by Titu Maiorescu. The existence of five editions of this Romanian version, that have been published by the translator himself during a period of 40 years, represents a clear proof of the fact that transposing a German philosophical text into Romanian involved a series of translating difficulties. Observing the way Titu Maiorescu tried to overcome these difficulties by adopting specific translation solutions produced an analysis which was conducted from the linguistic perspective and which followed two directions: the contrastive one (as a result of direct comparison between source-text and target-text) and the diachronic one (which considered the interventions made by the same translator on his own text at different points in time). The linguistic analysis of a philosophical text was considered to be the most appropriate and useful approach not only for the present research, but also for future translators of the *Aphorisms*, who would aim at adapting the discourse of Titu Maiorescu's version to the contemporary Romanian language, by taking into consideration its obvious evolution, especially in terms of its philosophical vocabulary.

1. Introducere

1.0. Premise

The first Romanian version—and the only one so far—of Arthur Schopenhauer's *Aphorisms on the Wisdom of Life*¹ was delivered towards the end of the 19th century by the Romanian writer and critic Titu Maiorescu. At present, Romanian publishing houses are still printing a text which is considered by scholars to be the final form of Maiorescu's translation, but which was nevertheless written a century ago. The only adaptations they made to the text were with regard to its orthography. The fact that the Romanian version exists in a few printed editions which Titu Maiorescu published during his lifetime, is due not only to his perfectionist nature, but especially to the many translation difficulties which this German philosophical text implied and which the Romanian translator tried to overcome each time he revised his text. The present paper provides an analysis that discusses these difficulties with the aim of emphasizing the way they were solved in Romanian language. The focus is set on how the target-language resources were employed to compensate for the shortages generated by the impossible equivalence of the two idioms involved in translation (German and Romanian).

1.1. Working material

The present research was based on a contrastive analysis of a source-text and of three successive editions of a target-text. The working material for the source-text consisted of the original text of the *Aphorisms*,

*Email address: varlan_c@yahoo.com.

¹Hereinafter referred to as *Aphorisms*.

written in German language, and included in an edition of complete works of Arthur Schopenhauer, delivered by Julius Frauenstädt (Frauenstädt, 1891, p. 331–530), the personal editor and literary executor of the German philosopher. This text has been corroborated with an academic edition issued by German National Library, which—according to the imprint—reproduced the original text as it has been authorised by the author himself (Haack & Haack, 2013). For the target-texts, the analysis was based—as previously mentioned—on three successive editions of the *Aphorisms* translated into Romanian, all made by Titu Maiorescu, as well as on modern re-prints which benefited from academic editing and annotations (Schopenhauer, 1872, 1876–1877, 1890, 1969, 1997).

1.2. Working method

The present research has a dual character determined by the coalescence of two kinds of investigation: the contrastive analysis of two texts, original and translation, on one hand, and the study of the different printed editions of the Romanian translation, delivered by the same translator at different moments in time, on the other hand. Consequently, the main working methods for analysing the Romanian translation of the *Aphorisms* are description and contrastive-typological analysis, in accordance with the two directions the present research followed. Starting from the original text, the existent printed editions of the Romanian translation have been investigated from the point of view of methods and strategies the translator employed in order to achieve an adequate target-text. More exactly, similarities and differences between various translation options have been examined, and then translation methods and strategies have been identified and verified in terms of their validity and applicability. Thus, the degree in which the respective translation reached its goal, i.e. its success in transferring into the target-text the meanings and the logical and emotional structures from the source-text was determined. The result was a contrastive and diachronic analysis conducted on a text which has been modified by its author in various moments over a certain period of time. In some places where the message of the source-text seemed distorted by transferring it into the target-text, new translation solutions were suggested, based on the fact that Romanian language evolved considerably from the time the translation was made, especially as far as its philosophical terminology is concerned.

The contrastive and diachronic analysis was set on the level of macro-text (Ungureanu, 2011) and it implied the examining of lexical, syntactic, stylistic, and pragmatic structures of each sentence within a chosen text excerpt. The goal was to notice how semantic and stylistic mechanisms functioned on the respective level within the source-text and if they had been adequately transferred into the target-text. The text passage chosen for this kind of analysis is the first chapter of the *Aphorisms*, called *Introduction*. Here, Arthur Schopenhauer defined the object of study and the method of his philosophical investigation, by setting a limit between them and his previous interests in the field.

2. The cultural context of Schopenhauer's *Aphorisms* translated into Romanian

The exegetes of Arthur Schopenhauer's work described the two volumes of *Parerga und Paralipomena*², in which the *Aphorisms* are integrated, as a "collection of fragments, sketches and essays, some of which only having an indirect relation to his philosophy" (Ribot, 1993, p. 13). The author himself considered them as mere "stray yet systematically arranged thoughts" (*apud* Safranski, 1998, p. 348). Ironically, those 'thoughts' were exactly what promoted Arthur Schopenhauer as a personality of the philosophical world of his time, while his main work, *The World as Will and Representation*, published in Leipzig, in 1819, was ignored, even if the German philosopher had exposed there his entire philosophical system. The second volume of this *opus magnum*, published in 1844, along all his other works, are only considered explanatory extensions of the philosophical doctrine presented in that first volume (Ribot, 1993, p. 13).

As already mentioned, Schopenhauer's fame as a universally renowned philosopher came towards the end of his life, and only after having published the two volumes of *Parerga und Paralipomena*. Considered

²The two-volume book *Parerga und Paralipomena* was first published in 1851 in Berlin.

as a genuine “philosophy for society” (Schopenhauer, 1978, p. 244; *apud* Safranski, 1998, p. 348), this work unquestionably resonated with his readers. Included in the second volume of this work, the *Aphorisms* were precisely those which became rapidly famous. Their success, as researched by the Schopenhauer's exegetes, was considered to derive from the wise attitude the German philosopher adopted and on his ‘relative’ abdication from the fundamental pessimism of his doctrine, as it had been asserted in all his previous works and especially in his main piece of writing. Arthur Schopenhauer's abdication from pessimism was only ‘relative’, as said, because he did not suddenly started to have faith in a ‘heaven’ watching over us or in the ability of people, no matter how intelligent, to master their own lives. In fact, the *Aphorisms* merely exhibit a higher degree of acceptance of life and of its limits—an idea of Buddhist origin. This change in Schopenhauer's attitude was determined by his entire life experience and by his willing to share it while offering his readers some advice for reaching a mental and spiritual comfort as close to the concept of ‘happiness’ as possible. The ethos within the pages of the *Aphorisms* could be summarized—a little far-fetched, of course, but extremely suggestive—by the oxymoronic piece of advice: “You have no chance, but use it!” (Safranski, 1998, p. 353).

Schopenhauer's *Aphorisms* are not written in an aphoristic style; instead, the German philosopher offered here a regular treatise of eudemonology, a concept explained by the author himself in the first lines of his text:

In these pages I shall speak of *The Wisdom of Life* in the common meaning of the term, as the art, namely, of ordering our lives so as to obtain the greatest possible amount of pleasure and success; an art the theory of which may be called ‘Eudæmonology’, for it teaches us how to lead a happy existence. (Schopenhauer, 1891, 1).

According to A. Schopenhauer, eudemonic happiness, as apposed to the hedonistic one, is obtained not from pleasures and delights, but from a prudent and even pessimistic attitude towards life, thus avoiding its inherent disappointments. Arthur Schopenhauer defended this assumption by writing his *Aphorisms* in the form of a small treatise with six chapters, in which various aspects of human life are discussed. Although short and apodictic assertions are present within the text³, the style of the *Aphorisms* is characterized by complex and elaborated sentences indicating a philosopher with a vocation of a writer.

Towards the end of the 19th century, Titu Maiorescu decided to introduce Arthur Schopenhauer to Romanian readers by translating his most successful work, *Aphorismen zur Lebensweisheit* [Aphorisms on the Wisdom of life]. Maiorescu's constant interest for philosophy, which already became visible from his times as a student in Vienna, descended on a continuous interest among the intellectuals in Romanian Principalities for such matters. Various concerns with philosophy, especially with translations from philosophical texts, are detected as early as in the times of the cultural movement *Școala Ardeleană*, whose prominent members contributed to the national awakening of the Romanian people at the end of the 18th century. Their scientific writings on history, linguistics, and theology were completed by translations from Western European philosophical texts (Including German texts), most of them being mere handbooks of philosophy or works of popular science that included practical advice for improving people's everyday life. A more general interest of Romanian intellectuals in Transylvania manifested in the same direction may be derived from the fact that a philosophical society (*Societatea filosofească a neamului rumânesc în mare principatul Ardealului*) was founded here in 1795. Its initiators established connections with scholars living across the Carpathians (in Wallachia and Moldavia) acknowledging the necessity for cooperation and possibly a future unity of the whole nation (Blaga, 1996, p. 207–210).

³Here are just a few excerpts from Haack & Haack (2013): Ein guter, gemäßigter, sanfter Charakter kann unter dürftigen Umständen zufrieden seyn; während ein begehrllicher, neidischer und böser es bei allem Reichthum nicht ist. (p. 16); Schönheit ist ein offener Empfehlungsbrief, der die Herzen zum Voraus für uns gewinnt. (p. 26); Denn je mehr Einer an sich selbst hat, desto weniger bedarf er von außen und desto weniger auch können die Uebrigen ihm seyn. (p. 28); Was Einer dem Andern seyn kann, hat seine sehr engen Grenzen: am Ende bleibt doch Jeder allein, und da kommt es darauf an, wer jetzt allein sei. (p. 30).

Translations from German philosophical texts were also made in 1830–1860, a period of time immediately prior to the cultural movement of *Junimea*. Though they were relatively few in number, these translations have been extremely important in terms of building and establishing the modern philosophical terminology in Romanian language. A remarkable role in this respect was played by German philosophical handbooks whose Romanian versions have been published by A. T. Laurian, S. Bărnuțiu, T. Cipariu, and Ghenadie Ienăceanu.

Returning to Titu Maiorescu, it is worth mentioning that as a student in Berlin (1858–1859) he started reading Arthur Schopenhauer with the overt intention to deeply comprehend Immanuel Kant, who was the centre of all German philosophy interest of the time⁴. He was also reading Spinoza, Voltaire, and Feuerbach, and obtained his doctoral degree in Giessen, after defending his work on Herbart's philosophy.

It seemed that Arthur Schopenhauer drew Maiorescu's particular attention, since in 1870 he published an adapted translation from his *On Philosophy at the Universities*, and then a fragment of *Parerga and Paralipomena*, under the title *Aforisme asupra înțelepciunii de viață* [Aphorisms on the Wisdom of Life], which were published in "Convorbiri literare", the monthly literary magazine of the *Junimea* society, no later than two decades after their emergence on the German cultural stage. The Romanian readers had thus the opportunity of getting acquainted with Arthur Schopenhauer's writings almost at the same time as German and universal public. In addition, the great German philosopher was increasingly becoming interesting among Romanian readers because of his influence on Mihai Eminescu's work, which Maiorescu promoted in the same period of time in the magazine of *Junimea*.

The Romanian translation of the Aphorisms was published in "Convorbiri literare" in Iași, from April 1876 through March 1877. Professor Liviu Rusu stated that the *Aphorisms* have been published between 1872 and 1877 (Rusu, 1969, p. XIV), which is not untrue. Indeed, on November 1, 1872 Titu Maiorescu began publishing his translation in volume VI, issue 8 of the previously mentioned literary magazine, but for unknown reasons he did not continue it in the next issues. The translation was resumed no sooner than 1876 in the same publication and the readers were this time offered a complete version. The fragment which had been previously published in 1872 (and which consisted in *Introduction* and *Chapter I*) was reproduced in 1876 with only minor formal changes that were due to the instability of the Romanian orthography of that time. For further details in this respect, see Bârlea (2013, p. 9–32). Thus, the translation published in 1872 exhibited word variants such as: "aci", "espunerea", "adecă", etc., which in the 1876 version became "aici", "expunerea", "adică", etc. From the lexical point of view, there are extremely few changes, one of them being the replacement of an adjective ("presente") with an adjectival phrase ("de față").

In 1890, T. Maiorescu revised his own translation and published it in a volume, at a publishing house (Editura Librăriei Socec) in Bucharest. The next editions of the translation were published at the same publishing house in 1891, 1902, and 1912 (Filimon-Stoicescu, 1969, p. XLIII). The 1890 revision implied bestowing greater attention to stylistic particularities of Romanian language, which he initially neglected in favour of fidelity to the German text, as the translator himself admitted in the preface of his published volume (Maiorescu, 1890, p. VIII–IX). It seems though that the real reason for this thorough revision was a remark made by Romanian writer Al. Odobescu who addressed the poor quality of the translation (Vârgolici, 1997). In the next year (1891), almost immediately after the first publication in a volume, T. Maiorescu issued another revised edition of his translation. The 1891 revision was followed by another one in 1902, which was considered by scholars to be a definitive text which the translator re-published without changes in 1912 (Filimon-Stoicescu, 1969, p. XLIV).

⁴Titu Maiorescu will later translate from Immanuel Kant as well, for his students at the University in Bucharest who attended his lectures on History of philosophy in the 19th century, between 1884 and 1907 (cf. Maiorescu, 1980, p. 7).

3. A contrastive-diachronic analysis of the Romanian version of *Aphorisms*

3.1. Some specifications about the various editions of the Romanian translation of *Aphorisms*

It is worth mentioning that according to the particularity of the topic, and since our research bears a double aspect, two approaches have permanently merged: the synchronic one (by confronting a source-text with its translation) and the diachronic one (by confronting various editions of translation, published by the same translator at different moments in time).

As mentioned above (Sec. 1.2), one of the two aspects of the present research was the diachronic investigation of the translated text and involved taking into consideration the various editions of the translation, as follows: the two editions that were published in “Convorbiri literare”, i.e. those of 1872 and of 1876–1877, which were assimilated to one another since they are almost identical, and two of the subsequent editions, i.e. that of 1890 (the first one which was published in a volume) and that of 1912 (which was the last edition published during the author's life, and which is considered to be a definitive text). In other words, our discussion revolved around three editions of the Romanian translation, which were synthetically noted by partially using the year of publication:

*A*_{72/76} : *Aforisme pentru înțelepciunea în viață*

*A*₉₀ : *Aforisme asupra înțelepciunii în viață*

*A*₁₂ : *Aforisme asupra înțelepciunii în viață*

The differences resulted from comparing the above-mentioned editions drew attention to semantic ambiguities that the source-text revealed, while their analysis helped us in determining the various translation options which Romanian translator had to deal with at the end of the 19th century, a period of time when the modern Romanian language underwent a series of intense changes. We were thus able to induce the translator's reasoning while selecting one of the possible options and how these selections influenced the comprehension of the respective philosophical text by Romanian readers.

Arthur Schopenhauer's original work consisted of an *Introduction (Einleitung)*, followed by six chapters: Chapter I – *Division of the Subject (Kapitel I – Grundeinteilung)*, Chapter II – *Personality, or What a Man Is (Kapitel II – Von dem, was einer ist)*, Chapter III – *Property, or What a Man Has (Kapitel III – Von dem, was einer hat)*, Chapter IV – *Position, or a Man's Place in the Estimation of Others (Kapitel IV – Von dem, was einer vorstellt)*, Chapter V – *Exhortations and Precepts (Kapitel V – Paränesen und Maximen)* and Chapter VI – *On the Differences Between Ages (Kapitel VI – Vom Unterschiede der Lebensalter)*^{*}. With a few orthographic exceptions, the translation of these chapter titles into Romanian remained unchanged in all editions published by Titu Maiorescu, which proves that no semantic ambiguities existed with regard to them. Therefore, we did not insist on that aspect, but we proceed to discussing the translation of the work title.

3.2. Discussing a title

In 1872, when the first edition of the translation of Schopenhauer's *Aphorisms* was published in “Convorbiri literare”, Titu Maiorescu decided that the equivalent of the original German title, *Aphorismen zur Lebensweisheit*, was “Aforisme pentru înțelepciunea în viață”. He also kept the same title when the translation was resumed in 1876. Later, in 1890, he slightly changed the title by using another preposition: “Aforisme asupra înțelepciunii în viață”. The latter version remains as yet definitive (including in the 1912 edition).

When comparing the two editions—on the one hand *A*_{72/76}, on the other, *A*₉₀ and *A*₁₂—one can easily notice that the transposition into Romanian language of the original German title raised a series of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic questions that we shall further discuss.

^{*} All English counterparts of the chapter titles are taken from Schopenhauer, 1891. Exceptions were made for chapters V and VI, where the translation is ours, since the English version did not cover the respective chapters.

The Romanian translation, in both its editions discussed here, followed the syntactic structure of the original title, i.e. a nominal group with a prepositional group included. The centre of the nominal group is the plural noun *aforisme*, an exact correspondent of the German *Aphorismen* in the original title. Both nouns came in their respective languages from Lat. (*aphorismus*), and here from Old Greek (*aphorismos*). In German, this word was borrowed as a direct loan from Latin (cf. **DUDEN**, *s.v.* *Aphorism*), whereas in Romanian the noun was phonetically adapted via French (cf. **DEX**, *s.v.* *aforism*)

The original German title includes two nouns, one of them being a compound (*Lebensweisheit*). Both Romanian editions use three nouns each, with two of them (*înțelepciunea / înțelepciuni*” and *viață*) accounting for the German compound. The ratio 2:3 in terms of number of nouns in the original title and in its Romanian translation reflects the impossibility of finding an equivalent—in most languages, Romanian included—of a compound word which reflects the most important means of internal enriching for German vocabulary: the compounding by juxtaposition, here realised by two nouns (*das Leben + die Weisheit*) put together and united by a linking *s*. The total transposition of the German compound is impossible in Romanian language, yet it is usually solved by decomposing it into its constituents and recomposing them into a nominal group² (Engel *et al.*, 1993, p. 463).

In both versions, i.e., **A**_{72/76} on the one hand, and **A**₉₀ and **A**₁₂ on the other, Titu Maiorescu chose to translate *Lebensweisheit* using the included prepositional group and selected the preposition *în* (Engl. *in*) as its regent. Yet, the very first words of the text published in 1890 surprisingly reveal that the translator turned to decomposing the German compound by using the genitive and began his translation of the chapter entitled *Introduction* as follows:

Înțelepciunea vieții o iau aici în înțelesul obicinuît al cuvântului fără vre o metafisică transcendentă. (Schopenhauer, 1890, 3).

In both cases, the subordinate element (be it a genitive or a prepositional phrase) functions syntactically as an attribute of the nominal phrase centre, thus semantically limiting the set of objects designated by it. Yet, the genitive assigns the theta role possessor to the noun *vieții*.

What seems here to be an inconstancy in translation is, in fact, determined by the stylistics of Romanian language. The translator was probably compelled to resort to genitival subordination in order to avoid repetition, since the preposition *în* occurs once again in the sentence at a very short distance.

The relative instability of the subordinate element (which may occur as a genitive or as a prepositional group) is due to the fact that there is no unique principle in Romanian language for translating German compounds and much less some prescribed preposition to be used for the recomposing into a prepositional group. The only requirement, linguistically speaking, is for the last noun of the German compound - the ‘determiner’ - to become the centre of the Romanian nominal group. Hence, the Romanian equivalent of a German compound is not equal to the sum of its translated constituents, but it demands a far more complex syntactic structure than the mere juxtaposition of the nouns which build the respective compound in the source-language. When translators choose a prepositional group and select a specific preposition as its centre, they should activate both their linguistic competence and their creativity in the target-language, since the preposition itself is absent from the source-language correspondent. A preposition defines the relation between the two nouns, and thus bears a decisive role in the correct understanding of the text

²In Romanian, a decomposition of a German compound results in a nominal group with two nouns. For example:

- (1) Germ. *der Zimmerschlüssel* – Rom. *cheia camerei* (Engl. *room key*)
- (2) Germ. *das Hotelzimmer* – Rom. *cameră de hotel* (Engl. *hotel room*)

The first noun is the group centre, though it semantically corresponds to the second noun of the German compound, whereas the second—corresponding to the first German noun—is the subordinate element within the nominal group. The subordination may be realized by means of genitive, as in example (1) above, or by including it in a prepositional group, as in example (2). Sometimes, the two nouns may occur as coordinated (see, for instance, Rom. *copil-minune* (Engl: *wonder child, prodigy*) for the German compound *das Wunderkind*), but these situations are not very relevant to our discussion. For further details, see Engel *et al.* (1993, p. 463–471).

meaning. In this respect, choosing the right preposition within a translation is only possible if both the respective context and text as a whole were thoroughly comprehended.

Another focal point that concentrates more than one meaning is the German lexical unit *zur*, which is placed between the two nouns of the original title and which represents a contraction of a preposition (*zu*) and an article (*der*)³. In order to translate the lexeme *zur*, Titu Maiorescu chose the Romanian preposition *pentru* in A_{72/76}, while in A₉₀ he replaced it with *asupra*. This very fact proves, on one hand, that the German preposition *zu* is polysemic and, on the other hand, that prepositions in general are highly difficult to translate.

Before discussing the semantic differences between the two titles, differences that were determined by the prepositions used, it is worth noticing that T. Maiorescu translated the German compound *Lebensweisheit* with the nominal phrase “înțelepciune în viață”. When choosing the preposition “în”, the translator discarded other possibilities of translation such as “înțelepciune *de* viață”, “înțelepciune *pentru* viață”, or “înțelepciune *despre* viață”. In our opinion, the translator's decision was the most appropriate with regard to the whole meaning of Schopenhauer's work, since the German author referred—throughout his text—to achieving happiness and comfort along a human existence, in other words, the wisdom of life (Rom. “înțelepciunea *în* viață”).

Returning to our discussion on the lexeme *zur*, it should be here mentioned that the German preposition *zu* may be spatial, temporal, or causative; yet, the context it occurs here in excludes both spatial and temporal aspects. Semantically speaking, *zu* belongs to the same paradigm as the German preposition *für* (Rom. *pentru*, Engl. *for*) and is being used when causality is expressed through abstract nouns (Engel et al., 1993, p. 850–851), in our case, the feminine noun *Lebensweisheit*.

The connector *pentru*, used in A_{72/76}, is a lexical preposition, which requires the accusative case for the articulated noun *înțelepciunea* (Engl. *wisdom*) and assigns the thematic role of Beneficiary to it. One can accordingly infer that the respective aphorisms might have a purpose, in other words that one becomes wiser through or by reading them. In A₉₀ and A₁₂, T. Maiorescu reformulated the title while maintaining its syntactic structure. The reformulation refers in fact to the replacement of the preposition *pentru* [for] with another word from the same category, *asupra* [on, about]. This seemingly minor change determines not only the case change for the subordinate element of the preposition (which now becomes a dative: *înțelepciunii*), but also the meaning of the text. The use of the Romanian preposition *asupra* implies that the reader shall discover some dicta about wisdom in life, some memorable and concise sayings on the respective topic. Yet, the style of Schopenhauer's writing is nowise sententious and concise, but elaborate, with long sentences which are sometimes even difficult to understand. In addition, the author's intention—as resulted from the text in its entirety—is not to merely present a series of reflections on a given topic, but rather to guide the reader towards a superior understanding of life.

Therefore, although A₉₀ is the edition that remained as yet definitive as far as the work title is concerned, the translation in A_{72/76} seems to be more adequate in our opinion, since the original author intended to offer his reader advice on how to live wisely, which, according to the German philosopher, would lead to happiness and contentment in life. Our opinion is also endorsed by the fact that Schopenhauer's *Aphorisms* are rather an explanatory philosophical handbook that combines—in a relatively accessible style—theory (the axiology of the most important aspects of human life) and practice (A. Schopenhauer very practically illustrated his philosophical thoughts with examples available to anyone) and has an explicit purpose (living wisely and becoming as happy and as content as possible), which has been often expressed throughout the text by the author himself.

³ According to German syntax, *zu* requires the dative case for its complement, *Lebensweisheit*. The realization of the dative in this specific situation is marked by the proclitic feminine article, *der*. The contraction of this article with the preposition *zu* resulted in the derived word *zur*.

3.3. *A pragmatolinguistic analysis of the aphoristic units*

In the following chapter a diachronic pragmatolinguistic analysis is conducted on the Romanian translation of the chapter called “Introduction” (*Einleitung*) of Arthur Schopenhauer’s *Aphorisms*. The source-text in German language has been decomposed into 14 elements, which correspond to its 14 complete sentences⁴. The analysis started by positioning each complete sentence of the source-text in parallel with its three Romanian equivalents, according to the three previously mentioned editions of translation (§3.1). The aim of this positioning was to rapidly determine the differences, both contrastively and diachronically, from multiple points of view: lexical, semantic, morphologic, syntactic, and stylistic-pragmatic.

The main objective of the present analysis was to reveal the way in which the original author organised his text—starting with his lexical and semantic choices, over to the phrase and sentence structure and further to capitalizing the resources of language—in order to obtain a certain effect on the cognitive level, as well as on the æsthetic one, on one hand, and the degree to which these pragmatic intentions have been well understood and rightfully restored by the translator in the target-text.

Both languages have been naturally discussed considering both their resources at the time they have been employed and the cultural context when each text was published. Moreover, another aspect is here worth mentioning: at the time Titu Maiorescu wrote his Romanian translation of the *Aphorisms*, the translator possessed almost no specific working instrument, i.e. there were no German–Romanian bilingual dictionaries (whilst a Romanian–German one, written by H. Tiktin, was just about to be issued, in 1895), not to forget about the famous *Lexicon de la Buda* (1825), written by Petru Maior, containing a series of Romanian words and their equivalents in Latin, Hungarian, and German.

As a practical working method, the text was divided into sentences which were numbered from (1) to (14) respectively, while the corresponding Romanian editions *A*_{72/76}, *A*₉₀, and *A*₁₂ have been successively positioned under each of them.

As expected, the first sentence of the text offered a short introduction with regard to the main philosophical concept that A. Schopenhauer wished to discuss in his work. By revealing his vision upon that concept, the author tried, in fact, to produce a definition of it.

- (1) *Ich nehme den Begriff der Lebensweisheit hier gänzlich im immanenten Sinne, nämlich in dem der Kunst, das Leben möglichst angenehm und glücklich durchzuführen, die Anleitung zu welcher auch Eudämonologie genannt werden könnte: sie wäre demnach die Anweisung zu einem glücklichen Daseyn.*

*A*_{72/76} Înțelepciunea în viață o iau aici numai în înțeles imanent, cuprinzând arta de a duce o viață pe cât se poate de plăcută și fericită, a cărei teorie s’ar pute numi și *Eudemonologie*; ea ar fi dar învățătura existenței fericite.

*A*₉₀ Înțelepciunea vieții o iau aici în înțelesul obicinuit al cuvântului fără vre o metafizică transcendentă. Vreau să vorbesc despre arta de a duce o viață pe cât se poate de plăcută și de fericită, a cărei teorie s’ar pute numi *Eudemonologie*: ea ar fi așa dar călăuză existenței fericite.

*A*₁₂ Înțelepciunea vieții o iau aici în înțelesul obișnuit al cuvântului fără vreo metafizică transcendentă. Vreau să vorbesc despre arta de a duce o viață pe cât se poate de plăcută și de fericită, a cărei teorie s-ar putea numi *eudemonologie*: ea ar fi așadar călăuză existenței fericite.

A rapid examination of the three Romanian editions of sentence (1) results in acknowledging that *A*₉₀

⁴The phrase “complete sentence” is being used here with the meaning of ‘fragment of text comprised between two full-stop signs’, which does not perfectly equate to that of ‘complex sentence’ (Rom. *frază*, cf. *GBLR*), often used here as a synonym, but which semantically corresponds to the concept of ‘Periode’ from the German grammar (cf. *Admoni*, 1987, p. 23).

and A₁₂ are identical, with the exception of a few minor changes due to the fact that linguists of the time were still in searching for a unanimously accepted orthographic system of the Romanian language. Easily detectable is also the orthographic instability of the noun *Eudæmonologie*. Initially, in A_{72/76}, Titu Maiorescu simply transferred the word into Romanian, without even changing the spelling (which is of Latin origin). In the following editions of his translation, he obviously wished to adapt the neologism to Romanian language, at least formally, and he successively noted the word variants *Eudemonomie* (in A₉₀) and *eudemonomie* (in A₁₂).

The A_{72/76} translation followed the syntax of the source-text exactly: a finite main clause (with *nehme* as its finite verb), a relative clause (with the predicate *genannt werden könnte*), and a further main clause (built with the subjunctive *wäre*), which was separated from the previous one through a specific punctuation mark (colon). The Romanian equivalents for the finite verbs and predicates of the above-mentioned clauses are, as follows: [*o*] *iau*, *s'ar pute numi*, and *ar fi* respectively.

In subsequent editions of his translation (A₉₀ and A₁₂), the text underwent a syntactical rearrangement because the translator abandoned the literal translation of the German adjective *immanent*, in the phrase *im immanenten Sinne*. In fact, Titu Maiorescu replaced the Romanian neologism *immanent* with the following paraphrase:

[înțelesul] obișnuit [al cuvîntului] fără vreo metafizică transcendentă.

Paraphrasing the neologism implied a syntactical rearrangement of the text, by fragmenting the first main clause, since otherwise the comprehension of the sentence would have been hindered. The next fragment of text—which starts with the adverb *nämlich* in the source-text—is translated into Romanian by starting a new sentence which begins with the phrase “vreau sa vorbesc despre [...]” [I wish to talk about (...)]. The collocation verb + preposition “a vorbi despre” preserved the semantic content of the German adverb *nämlich*, which is usually employed to introduce an explanatory assertion and which may be equivalent in Romanian with *adică*, or “mai exact (spus)”. Titu Maiorescu originally chose a gerund (*cuprinzënd*) as its equivalent—a rather unfortunate choice, in our opinion. He was thus trying to follow the original syntax, but disrespected the clarity of message rendered in the target-language. In our opinion, a more adequate translation option that would remain true to both form and content in the source-language would be the one using the appositive Romanian adverb *adică*, with the exact same intention as in the source-text, i.e. to anaphorically explicate the phrase “în înțeles imanent” (*im immanenten Sinne*), as follows:

[Înțelepciunea în viață o iau aici numai] în înțeles imanent, *adică* în acela al artei de a duce o viață [...].

From a lexical point of view, the first option of translation (A_{72/76}) is the one that complied with the structure of the source-text. Yet, there are a few exceptions, the most important one being the option not to translate the German noun *Begriff* (Rom. *noțiune, idee, termen, concept*). This option has been preserved in all subsequent editions of the translation. In the source-text, the above-mentioned noun was a centre of a nominal group (*den Begriff der Lebensweisheit* → Rom. *conceptul de înțelepciune în viață*). After eliminating the centre, the translator began his texts directly with the Romanian equivalent of the term *Lebensweisheit* (“Înțelepciunea în viață”), awarding it the same syntactic function—that of direct object—as in the original text. The decision not to translate the word *Begriff* resulted in intensifying the importance of the compound noun *Lebensweisheit*, which initially was just a modifier within the nominal group. In the Romanian translation this concept became not only independent, but also the theme of the sentence, which bestowed it the relevance implied by the very title of the original work.

A further difference—as far as the lexical structure is concerned—between the original and the target-text in all its editions discussed here, is the option not to translate the personal pronoun *ich*, which opened Arthur Schopenhauer's text. It was the translator's decision of making from a direct object *Lebensweisheit* (“înțelepciunea în viață”, “înțelepciunea vieții”) the theme of his first sentence that resulted in omitting the translation of the pronoun and in modifying the natural word order in a Romanian sentence (which

requires for a direct object to immediately follow the verb). Another reason for omitting the pronoun resides in the fact that Romanian syntax allows for a subject expressed by the personal pronoun *eu* to be omitted, since its semantics can be totally recovered from the verb inflection. From pragmatic and semantic points of view, using the natural word order of German language served A. Schopenhauer to emphasise the importance given by the author himself to his own way of thinking and of operating with philosophical concepts. Consequently, the source-text placed the focus on the author's individuality, while the target-text (in all its editions) placed it on the phrase which represents the central topic of the respective philosophical writing (also included in the work title). The preservation in the Romanian translation of the natural German word order would have resulted in starting this first sentence with the personal pronoun *eu*, which would further resulted in placing an emphasis upon it. But that was not the case in the source-text where the focus was naturally placed there and the pronoun was not emphasized by the original author. Therefore, in our opinion, Maiorescu's translating option, although not totally true to the source-text, did comply with both the pragmatic intentions of the original author and the Romanian syntax and stylistics of the times when the translation was written and of today, as well.

Still concerned with the lexical structure, one can notice that the translation of the German noun *Anweisung* deserves also a short discussion. Maiorescu's effort to find the most adequate Romanian equivalent is noticeable when he used in [A_{72/76}](#) a word of Latin origin, *invățătura*, and then changed it to *călăuza* (of Turkish origin) in the subsequent editions, [A₉₀](#) and [A₁₂](#). The decision to re-translate the German noun may have derived from the fact that *invățătura* would have been seemed more general, or vague, than *călăuza*, which—at its turn—indicates the idea of 'leading towards a concept', or 'towards a goal'.

Titu Maiorescu was confronted, like many other translators, with the problem of definitions. Any definition is difficult in itself, but the defining task becomes most difficult when abstract, philosophical concepts are involved. Indeed, the sentence (2) below is just the beginning of a philosophical text, where the author is compelled to clarify his working concepts.

- (2) *Dieses nun wieder ließe sich allenfalls definiren als ein solches, welches, rein objektiv betrachtet, oder vielmehr (da es hier auf ein subjektives Urtheil ankommt) bei kalter und reiflicher Ueberlegung, dem Nichtseyn entschieden vorzuziehn wäre.*

[A_{72/76}](#) Aceasta înseamnă s'ar putea earăși defini ca o existență, care privită în sine însăși, sau mai bine privită în noi (căci aici judecata subiectivă trebuie să hotărească) cu reflecție rece și matură, ar fi de sigur preferabilă neexistenței.

[A₉₀](#) Aceasta înseamnă s'ar putea earăși defini ca o existență, care privită în sine însăși sau mai bine privită în noi (căci aici judecata noastră personală trebuie să hotărească) cu mintea rece și matură, ar fi de sigur preferabilă neexistenței.

[A₁₂](#) Aceasta însă s-ar putea iarăși defini ca o existență, care privită în sine însăși, sau mai bine privită în noi (căci aici judecata noastră personală trebuie să hotărească) cu mintea rece și matură, ar fi de sigur preferabilă neexistenței.

The versions [A₉₀](#) and [A₁₂](#) are, again, relatively identical (with a few inherent changes in orthography) and the syntactic structure of the translation in all its editions is true to the original.

In the previous sentence (1), the German passive *genannt werden könnte* was translated with „s-ar putea numi”, using thus a passive form built with the reflexive pronoun *se*. This is an adequate translating option, since this form of building passive is preferred in technical and scientific texts ([Engel et al., 1993](#), p. 397).

Sentence (2) displays the same form with reflexive pronoun *se* as in (1), though it is used as an equivalent for another German passive form, i. e. the one built with the impersonal reflexive verb *lassen*⁵.

⁵In Romanian, the normative equivalent for such German constructs as passivization with the impersonal reflexive verb *lassen* is a structure built by combining an active verb with the reflexive pronoun *se* ([Engel et al., 1993](#), p. 411), which is exactly

The verb *lassen* is a subjunctive within the original text (*ließe*). Its semantics has been transferred into Romanian with the help of the modal verb *a putea*. In fact, the message within the source-text did not refer to the idea of 'potentiality', but the one of 'possibility': how it is / would be possible to define the concept in question. Therefore, T. Maiorescu's option to insert an additional modal verb in his translation in order to transfer the correct and full meaning of the German verbal construct seems perfectly adequate.

As far as the pair of words *objektiv / subjektiv* is concerned, it is obvious that the translator found it very difficult to decide how to adequately transfer the two concepts into Romanian. For the adverb *objektiv*, which occurs in the phrase "*(rein) objektiv (betrachtet)*", the translator avoided literal translation and decided to adapt the term. Thus, the equivalent of the above mentioned phrase is "(privită) în sine însăși" in all editions of the translation. The second term of the pair, the adjective *subjektiv*, was translated literally in the first edition (A_{72/76}) as *subjectivă*, but Titu Maiorescu was not satisfied with it since he resorted to an over-translation in the form of an explanatory addition. In this respect, he inserted the phrase „privită în noi” which has no equivalent in the original text, but which formally match with the phrase used for translating the adverb *objektiv*. The two terms are thus correlated within the target-text. Synthesizing, in A_{72/76}, the Romanian equivalents for the German pair of words are, as follows:

- *objektiv* → (privită) în sine însăși
- *subjektiv* → (privită) în noi + (judecata) subiectivă

The subsequent editions of the translation (A₉₀ and A₁₂) eliminated the word *subjectivă* and used instead two adjectives (*noastră* and *personală*). Consequently, the respective phrase became: "(judecata) noastră personală”.

This translation strategy by avoiding literal transposition of a word although such an equivalent was available in the target-language was applied by Titu Maiorescu especially when neologisms of Latin origin were involved. He considered that inserting them in a text as direct equivalents was not absolutely necessary as long as other vernacular variants of the respective word existed. Yet, in our opinion, the relinquishment of using neologisms hindered the text comprehension and the correct rendering of the message from the original into the target-text, although the translator's intent obviously was to facilitate the understanding of his translation by Romanian speakers at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century.

In the same respect of finding ways to make the message clearer within the target-text, T. Maiorescu decided to eliminate a demonstrative pronoun and chose to use the noun it referred to. Thus, the German noun *Daseyn*, which was firstly mentioned in sentence (1) of the original text, was substituted in sentence (2) by the demonstrative phrase *ein solches*, which—in turn—was in a direct relationship with the demonstrative pronoun *dieses* at the beginning of the sentence. The correlation between those two demonstratives on one hand and the above mentioned noun on the other is evident in the source-text, since both demonstratives are marked for the neuter gender with the ending *-(e)s*. Therefore, the only previous noun which they could refer to was the neuter *Daseyn*. Its Romanian equivalent in the target-text is the feminine noun "existență”. Had the translator followed the lexical structure of the original sentence (2), the phrase would have appeared as follows:

Aceasta s-ar putea iarăși defini ca una, care [...]

Consequently, the reader of the target-text would now have to try deciphering the anaphoric mechanism by searching in the preceding text fragment for the correlate of the feminine pronoun *una*. Here, he would have found no less than six feminine nouns (*existenței, călăuza, eudemonologie, teorie, viață, and arta*), which is at least confusing if not misleading. Therefore, in our opinion, inserting the noun as such in the discourse instead of using a pronoun is not an inadequate option for the Romanian translation, because ambiguity is thus avoided and the noun repetition is not disturbing.

what Titu Maiorescu used for his translation.

A further translation difficulty was discovered with regard to the postverbal noun *Ueberlegung* and its equivalents in Romanian. Bilingual dictionaries list a series of equivalents such as *reflecție*, *reflectare*, *cugetare*, or *chibzuială* (cf. DGR, s.v. *Überlegung*). The first term on this list (*reflecție*) was exactly the one T. Maiorescu used in his first edition of translation (A_{72/76}). The subsequent editions exhibit another equivalent, *minte*, which does not belong to the above mentioned series of equivalents. The translator must have been unhappy with his first option and that led to the decision to re-translate the word. On one hand, the dissatisfaction might have resided in the similar semantic connotation of the verb “a privi ceva”, here with the meaning ‘a reflecta la ceva’, and the noun *reflecție*. On the other hand, the context of such a phrase, “(a privi ceva) cu mintea rece și matură”, which the translator inserted in his A₉₀ edition, implies ‘to consider something’ (or, in other words, ‘to reflect upon something’) with objectivity and based on a certain life experience, which corresponds exactly to the message in the source-text.

The following sentences are, in fact, a series of explanatory assertions that are usual when additional clarification of the operational concepts is needed. The next sentence offers the reader the opportunity of observing how philosophical discourse commutes from the abstract to the concrete.

(3) *Aus diesem Begriffe desselben folgt, daß wir daran hiengen seiner selbst wegen, nicht aber bloß aus Furcht vor dem Tode; und hieraus wieder, daß wir es von endloser Dauer sehn möchten.*

A_{72/76} Din acest înțeles al ei urmează, că am iubi-o pentru ea însăși, nu numai de frica morții; și din aceasta earăși, că am dori să o vedem de o durată nesfârșită.

A₉₀ Din acest înțeles al ei urmează, că am iubi-o pentru ea însăși, nu numai de frica morții; și din aceasta iarăș, că am dori să o vedem nesfârșit de lungă.

A₁₂ Din acest înțeles al ei urmează, că am iubi-o pentru ea însăși, nu numai de frica morții; și din aceasta iarăș, că am dori să o vedem nesfârșit de lungă.

The Romanian translation, in all its editions discussed here, followed exactly the lexical and syntactic structure of the original, though the phrase at the beginning of sentence (3)—*Aus diesem Begriff desselben*—challenged once again Maiorescu’s abilities as a translator. It should be here reminded that when sentence (1) was being translated into Romanian, the equivalent for the noun *Begriff* was completely removed from the target-text. This time it could not be avoided anymore and the German noun was translated as *înțeles*. The equivalence between the two nouns is noted by no bilingual dictionary, yet they both are included in the semantic area of understanding concepts, which becomes visible in phrases such as:

Germ. *schwer/langsam vom Begriff sein* – Rom. *a fi încet/repede la minte, a pricepe cu greutate/cu ușurință*.

Moreover, a synonym for the German verb *begreifen*, from which the noun *Begriff* was derived, is the verb *verstehen* (Rom. *a înțelege*, Engl. *to understand*), which validates again the translator’s option.

As already mentioned, Titu Maiorescu resorted significantly to literal translation, especially in his first edition of the Aphorisms A_{72/76}. This is also the case of two phrases within sentence (2): *und hieraus wieder* (“din aceasta iarăși”) and *von endloser Dauer* (“de o durată nesfârșită”). Starting with A₉₀, some of his literal translations benefited from stylistic refinement as far the language employed was concerned. Thus, the second phrase mentioned here became „nesfârșit de lungă”, which used an adjectival adverb (*lungă*) along an adverbial modifier to express the superlative (*nesfârșit de*). That is a more adequate option of translation for a complement of the predicate *să o vedem*. Anyway, the final result is not an explanation that became more concrete, but a mere paraphrasing of the definition, which is more accessible in terms of language used.

The phrase *wir hiengen daran* included the subjunctive of the verb *anhängen*, for which Titu Maiorescu chose to use the equivalent *am iubi-o*. The conditional-optative mood of the verb in Romanian

edition represents, in our opinion, a legitimate option, since there are only a few possibilities of rendering the German mood *Konjunktiv* into Romanian. What is here interesting is the choice of the verb *a iubi* as an equivalent for the German *anhängen*. Bilingual dictionaries list equivalents for the latter, such as: 'a atârna', 'a suspenda', 'a agăța', 'a atașa', and also a metaphorical usage in sentences like *Ich hänge an dir* (Rom. *te iubesc, țin la tine, sînt dependent de tine*, etc.) (cf. DGR, s.v. *anhängen*). Titu Maiorescu naturally detected the metaphorical value the original author had attached to the verb *anhängen* and selected 'a atașa' as an equivalent with the same metaphoric meaning which implies a sentimental attachment to something more or less concrete.

In some of his explanatory assertions, Arthur Schopenhauer questioned part of the aspects of his philosophical system, but he only did it rhetorically, since he had always returned to his previous convictions. The translation had to solve this conflict between (apparent, rhetorical only) doubt and (real) conviction.

(4) *Ob nun das menschliche Leben dem Begriff eines solchen Daseyns entspreche, oder auch nur entsprechen könne, ist eine Frage, welche bekanntlich meine Philosophie verneint; während die Eudämonologie die Bejahung derselben voraussetzt.*

A_{72/76} De corespunde viața omenească unei asemenea existenți sau de ar pute vre-odată să-i corespundă, este o întrebare, la care filosofia mea, după cum se știe, răspunde negativ; pe când Eudämonologia presupune un răspuns afirmativ.

A₉₀ De se potrivește viața omenească cu o asemenea existență sau de ar pute vre-o dată să se potrivească, este o întrebare, la care filosofia mea, după cum se știe, răspunde negativ; pe cînd Eudemologia presupune un răspuns afirmativ.

A₁₂ De se potrivește viața omenească cu o asemenea existență sau de ar putea să se potrivească vreodată, este o întrebare, la care filozofia mea, precum se știe, răspunde negativ; pe cînd eudemologia presupune un răspuns afirmativ.

For the German verb *entsprechen*, Titu Maiorescu chose in A_{72/76} the equivalent *a corespunde*, which is a loan-word from French (*correspondre*), where it came from medieval Latin (cf. LAROUSSE, s.v. *correspondre*). This option of translation may be considered a rapid and a natural one, since both verbs have the same syntactic valence, restricting the nouns they collocate with to dative. In the next editions of his translation, T. Maiorescu reconsidered the Romanian equivalent for *entsprechen* and changed it with the reflexive verb *a se potrivi*, of Slavic origin, which is a word already known by readers at the end of the 19th century. In both cases, the Romanian equivalent was not able to cover the characteristics of a mood which is specific to German language: *Konjunktiv I* (with no equivalent in Romanian). When it does not signalize indirect speech, this mood is used to indicate the unreality of a state of facts—as is the case here in sentence (4). The philosopher's attitude is indeed one of distrustfulness of the true quality of a certain state of facts, since Schopenhauer himself stated that his philosophy denied the hypothesis expressed by an *ob... + Konjunktiv I* clause. The solution T. Maiorescu found, starting from the very first edition of his translation, was the insertion of the Romanian adverb *vreodată* [ever], which semantically suggests an indefinite time reference and thus covers to a certain degree the doubt which was originally indicated by the mood of the verb:

A_{72/76}: De corespunde viața omenească unei asemenea existenți sau de ar pute vre-odată să-i corespundă ...

A₉₀: De se potrivește viața omenească cu o asemenea existență sau de ar pute vre-o dată să se potrivească ...

A₁₂: De se potrivește viața omenească cu o asemenea existență sau de ar putea să se potrivească vreodată.

After setting the three editions in parallel, we noticed that the adverb *vreodată* was initially placed between the modal verb *ar putea* and the subjunctives *să corespundă* and *să se potrivească*, respectively (see A_{72/76} and A₉₀, respectively). This is a natural word order not for Romanian language, but for German, where the main verb is necessarily placed at the end of a clause in which a modal verb is used. In the definitive edition of the translation (A₁₂), the adverb was moved immediately after the modal verb *ar putea*, in accordance with the natural word order of the Romanian language.

In his perseverance to facilitate the text comprehension, the translator avoided once again the insertion of an equivalent for the term *Begriff*. Consequently, the phrase *dem Begriff eines solchen Daseyns* became in A₉₀ an indirect object expressed by a nominal group in dative (“unei asemenea existenți”), and in A₁₂ a prepositional object with an included nominal group in accusative (“cu o asemenea existență”). Thus, by eliminating the centre of the nominal group (*Begriff*), the translator assimilated, in fact, the ‘concept of being’ to the ‘being’ itself, which practically is somehow a distortion of the original message. Yet, if a literal translation would have been employed here, the target-text would have included more than two nouns, or nominal groups, which were involved in the one-to-one relationship of correspondence required by the verb. That fact would have led to a hindered comprehension of the message in the target-text.

In the source-text, the German adverb *bekanntlich*, placed by Arthur Schopenhauer in front of the nominal group *meine Philosophie*, implies that the readers of his *Aphorisms* would have already been familiarised with his previous philosophical writings, which was not necessarily true. As mentioned above (§2), literary historians and Arthur Schopenhauer’s biographers noted that readers of the time turned their attention to his philosophical work only after the *Aphorisms* became publicly appreciated. Therefore, one could say that this is a sample of Schopenhauer’s faith in his own philosophical system and even a touch of presumption from the part of an author who assumed his readers had already been acquainted with his previous work, at least in its essence. The adverb here discussed (*bekanntlich*) became an adverbial phrase in all the three editions of the translation analysed here: in A_{72/76}, T. Maiorescu chose as equivalent the phrase „după cum se știe“, functioning as a metadiscursive pragmatic connector, and did not change it when he revised his translation for the first time (A₉₀). The final edition A₁₂, though, recorded another form of this adverbial phrase: „precum se știe“. This is one of the very few instances when differences between A₉₀ and A₁₂ are noticeable.

Sentence (4) is the first one from a series of specifications covering the rest of the introductory chapter, specifications which helped Arthur Schopenhauer operate a clear distinction between eudemonology—the topic of his writing—and the philosophical system he had previously established and developed. The author also set in opposition the two corresponding types of philosophical approaches, establishing thus a balanced conflict which he linguistically mirrored in the opposition between two antonymic verbal groups: (*die Frage*) *verneinen* and *die Bejahung voraussetzen*.

For translating the German transitive verb *verneinen*, Titu Maiorescu avoided a direct equivalent in the form of a neologism of Latin origin (*a nega*) and resorted to a verbal phrase, *a răspunde negativ*. This decision probably resided in the fact that the direct equivalent of *verneinen* in this context (‘a nega o întrebare’) would have changed to a certain degree the message of the original text, and might have led to the (false) idea of contesting the utility or the legitimacy of the respective question. In German, the direct antonym of the verb *verneinen* would be the transitive *bejahen*, yet the author of the source-text resorted in turn to a verbal phrase, which included the noun derived from the respective transitive verb: *die Bejahung voraussetzen*. In the target-text, the verb *voraussetzen* was literally translated with the equivalent *a presupune*, whereas the direct object, i.e. the nominal group *die Bejahung derselben*, was also translated with a nominal group („un răspuns afirmativ”). Again, T. Maiorescu avoided the translating of the pronoun *derselben*, whose referent is the noun *die Frage*. He proceeded in such manner not out of carelessness, but with the express intention not to burden the syntax of the Romanian sentence by adding a useless and redundant message: “un răspuns afirmativ (*la aceasta)”.

After rhetorically setting in opposition eudemonology and his own philosophical system, as previously mentioned, Arthur Schopenhauer did not forget to succinctly justify his action in the next sentence:

(5) *Diese nämlich beruht auf dem angeborenen Irrthum, dessen Rüge das 49. Kapitel im 2. Bande meines Hauptwerks eröffnet.*

A_{72/76} Căci aceasta se întemeiază tocmai pe eroarea innăscută, cu a cărei critică incede capitolul 49 în volumul al 2-lea al operei mele principale^{*)}

[^{*)} Opul principal, în care se cuprinde filosofia lui Schopenhauer e *die Welt als Wile und Vorstellung* (lumea ca voința și idee). T.]

A₉₀ Căci aceasta se întemeiază tocmai pe eroarea innăscută, cu a cărei critică incede capitolul 49 din volumul al 2-lea al operei mele principale^{*)}

[^{*)} Opul principal, care cuprinde doctrina lui Schopenhauer e *die Welt als Wile und Vorstellung* (lumea ca voința și ca reprezentare). Traducere franceză de d. I.A. Cantacuzin (*Le monde comme volonté et comme représentation*. 2 vol. Bucurest, Socec, 1886). Trad.]

A₁₂ Căci aceasta se întemeiază tocmai pe eroarea înăscută, cu a cărei critică incede capitolul 49 din volumul al 2-lea al operei mele principale^{*)}

[^{*)} Opera principală care cuprinde doctrina lui Schopenhauer, e *die Welt als Wile und Vorstellung* (*Lumea ca voință și reprezentare*). Traducere franceză de d. I.A. Cantacuzin (*Le monde comme volonté et comme représentation*. 2 vol. Bucurest, Socec, 1886). (Nota trad.)]

By using the adverb *nämlich*, Arthur Schopenhauer indicated that sentence (5) pragmatically belongs to the series of specifications mentioned above. In the context of the sentence, that adverb has the conjunction *denn* ('căci', 'pentru că' [because]) as an equivalent (cf. **DUDE**, *s.v. denn*). As expected, Titu Maiorescu started his sentence with "căci", which he placed—in accordance with the rules of the Romanian language—at the beginning of the explanatory statement, in order to formulate "the justification of an assertion" (Șăineanu, 1908, p. 88).

The source-text started with the demonstrative pronoun *diese*, whose referent should be a feminine singular noun. The plural is not to be discussed here because of the enclitic mark for singular of the predicative verb. Stabilizing the meaning of this pronoun is not an easy task, since the context before it includes many feminine nouns, which are listed here in reversed order of occurrence within the previous sentence, i. e. in logical order of searching for the referent: (*die*) *Bejahung*, (*die*) *Eudämonologie*, (*meine*) *Philosophie*, (*eine*) *Frage*. Taking into account the rules of pragma-textuality on one hand, it seems that the referent should be the noun which is most close to it, i.e. the first one in the list above: (*die*) *Bejahung*. It must not be forgotten though that its equivalent in the target-text is a masculine noun „un răspuns”, which would correspond to a masculine pronoun (such as *acesta*) and not *aceasta*, as in Maiorescu's translation. On the other hand, if we considered the fact that this noun actually represents a direct object included in a verbal group (*die Bejahung derselben voraussetzt*), it resulted then that the referent of the demonstrative pronoun should be the next feminine noun in the list above, i.e. (*die*) *Eudämonologie*, which is in accordance with both textual logic (in Romanian, the equivalent of the noun in question is the feminine noun "eudemonologie", which means that the corresponding pronoun for it is *aceasta*), and the situational one (we deal here with a text fragment which handles eudemonology as a topic, so it is only natural that most referents in nominative should be correlated with this specific noun).

Sentence (5) includes a key-word, *Irrthum* ('greșeală', 'eroare' [error, mistake, misapprehension]), which Titu Maiorescu translated with *eroare* in all editions of his translation. Thematically, this word belongs to the criticism A. Schopenhauer levelled against the theory of eudemonology and signals the caducity of the foundation its philosophical concepts are built on and which the author shall operate with in his writing. The nominal group whose centre *Irrthum* is also includes the adjective *angeboren*, which was translated in all editions with the adjective *innăscută*. At the end of the 19th century, *innăscut* meant 'adus odată cu nașterea' [≈ given by birth] (Șăineanu, 1908, p. 329). Nowadays, a synonym mentioned by all contemporary bilingual dictionaries is *congenital*, which no longer agrees with the original message of the source-text. Today's reader would correctly understand the text and the message of the original author if another adjective were employed, for example *inerent* [inherent].

The three versions of the Romanian translation of sentence (5) are almost identical, with the exception of the word *opul*, which became *opera* no sooner than the definitive edition in 1912, in accordance with the evolution of Romanian philosophical language. The same noun is mentioned in the footnote which is an explanatory translator's note regarding A. Schopenhauer's main work. In his text, the German philosopher referred to it as *mein Hauptwerk* without mentioning any title. Knowing that the version he was writing was the first translation from Schopenhauer's *Aphorisms* into Romanian, Titu Maiorescu felt the need to mention the title of the philosopher's main work and to also give—starting with version A₉₀—all coordinates of the French edition⁶, which at the time was the only version available to Romanian readers besides the original work.

After analyzing the footnote, one can notice that the only existent differences between the three versions were the result of language evolution over the period of time between the first and the definitive version. Thus, the phrase “in care se cuprinde” from A_{72/76} used the verb in its reflexive form. In A₉₀, it was changed to “care cuprinde”, with the same verb used in its active and transitive form, which obviously eased the syntax of the whole sentence. A certain evolution of the philosophical meta-language is also noticeable when Titu Maiorescu, mentioning Schopenhauer's philosophical system, initially referred to it as *filosofia* (A_{72/76}), whereas in the subsequent versions he changed it to *doctrina*. His reasons to retranslate the respective word probably resided in the desire to restrict the meanings of the term *filozofie* to only one: ‘sistemă particulară a unui filozof’ [a philosopher's particular system] while discarding all other, more general meanings: ‘știință [...] care interpretează și reflectă realitatea’ [a science (...) that interprets and reflects reality] or ‘concepție generală despre lume și viață’ [a general concept about world and life] (cf. Șăineanu, 1908, p. 251). Even the title of Schopenhauer's main work underwent a series of changes: it was initially translated as “lumea ca voință și idee” (A_{72/76}), then modified to „lumea ca voință și ca reprezentare” (A₉₀), and appeared lastly, in the definitive version (A₁₂) as „Lumea ca voință și reprezentare”, a title that has since remained valid. In addition, there are differences with regard to signing the explanatory addendum as a translator's note: in A_{72/76} the note was signed “T.”, in A₉₀ T. Maiorescu signed it “Trad.”, and only the final A₁₂ version registered the typical phrase still in use at present: “(Nota trad.)”.

*

The second part of the present paper shall continue the pragma-linguistic analysis of the fragment discussed here, and shall also present the conclusions of this research.

Bibliography

- Admoni, W. G. (1987). *Die Entwicklung des Satzbaus der deutschen Literatursprache im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Berlin.
- Bârlea, P. Gh. (2013). *Titu Maiorescu și sistemul ortografic al limbii române*, în: Cap-Bun, M. & Nicolae F. (eds.). *Junimea și impactul ei după 150 de ani*, Editura Universitară, București, p. 9–32.
- Blaa, Lucian. (1996). *Gândirea românească în Transilvania în sec. al XVIII-lea*, Editura Științifică, București.
- DEX = *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*, Academia Română, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, București, 2012.
- DGR = *Dicționar german-român*, Institutul de lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” al Academiei Române, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, București, 2010.
- DUDEN = *Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*, 3., neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, Dudenverlag, Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich, 1996.
- Engel, U., Isbășescu, M., Stănescu, S. & Nicolae, O. (1993). *Kontrastive Grammatik Deutsch–Rumänisch*, Julius Groos Verlag, Heidelberg.
- Filimon-Stoicescu, D. (1969). *Notă asupra ediției*, în: Schopenhauer, 1969, p. XLIII–XLVI.
- Frauenstädt, J. (Hrsg.) (1891). *Arthur Schopenhauer's Sämmtliche Werke*, 2. Aufl. Neue Ausg., Fünfter Band. F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, p. 331–530.
- GBLR = Pană Dindelegan, G. (coord.) (2010). *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, București.
- Haack, H.-P. & Haack, C. (eds.) (2013). *Schopenhauer: Aphorismen zur Lebensweisheit*, Antiquariat und Verlag Dr. Haack, Leipzig.

⁶Titu Maiorescu contributed to this French edition of the *Aphorisms*, by supporting—especially morally—the translator Jean Alexandre Cantacuzène. See Maiorescu (1939, p. 345–346) and Rădulescu-Pogoneanu (1939, p. IX).

- LAROUSSE = *Dictionnaire de français* (Larousse), [online].
- Maiorescu, T. (1890). *Prefața traducătorului*, în *Schopenhauer, 1890*, p. VIII–IX.
- Maiorescu, T. (1939). *Insemnări zilnice*, publicate cu o introducere, note, facsimile și portrete de I. Rădulescu-Pogoneanu, vol. II (1881–1886), Editura Librăriei Socec & Co. S.A., București.
- Maiorescu, T. (1980). *Prelegeri de filozofie*, ediție îngrijită, note și comentarii de Grigore Traian Pop și Alexandru Surdu, cuvânt înainte de G. T. Pop, Editura Scrisul Românesc, Craiova.
- Rădulescu-Pogoneanu, I. (1939). *Introducere la Maiorescu, 1939*.
- Ribot, Th. (1993). *Filosofia lui Schopenhauer*, traducere din limba franceză de Cornel Sterian, Editura Tehnică, București.
- Rusu, L. (1969). *Studiu introductiv*, în *Schopenhauer, 1969*.
- Safranski, R. (1998). *Schopenhauer și anii sălbatici ai filozofiei. O Biografie*, traducere din germană de Daniel Necșa, Editura Humanitas, București.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1872). *Aforisme pentru înțelepciunea în viață*, Traducere de T. Maiorescu, în „Convorbiri Literare”, anul VI, nr. 8, Tipografia Societății Junimea, Iași.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1876–1877). *Aforisme pentru înțelepciunea în viață*, traducere de T. Maiorescu, în „Convorbiri Literare”, anul X, nr. 1–12, Tipografia Societății Junimea, Iași.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1890). *Aforisme asupra înțelepciunii în viață*, traducere de Titu Maiorescu, Editura Librăriei Socecu & Comp., București.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1891). *The Wisdom of Life*, translated by T. Bailey Saunders, 3rd Edition, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1912). *Aforisme asupra înțelepciunii în viață*, traducere de Titu Maiorescu, Editura Librăriei Socecu & Comp., București.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1969). *Aforisme asupra înțelepciunii în viață*, traducere de Titu Maiorescu, text stabilit de Domnica Filimon-Stoicescu, studiu introductiv de prof. univ. Liviu Rusu, Editura pentru Literatură Universală, București.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1978). *Gesammelte Briefe*, A. Hübscher Verlag, Bonn.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1997). *Aforisme asupra înțelepciunii în viață*, traducere de Titu Maiorescu, ediție îngrijită și postfață de Teodor Vărgolici, Editura Saeculum, Editura Vestala, București.
- Șăineanu, L. (1908). *Dicționar universal al limbei române*, a opta edițiune, revăzut și adăogit la Ediția VI-a, Editura „Scrisul românesc” S. A., [online].
- Ungureanu, E. (2011). *Textul și –textele*, în: Parpală, E. & Popescu, C. (eds.). *Comunicare și identitate. Perspective lingvistice și culturale*, Editura Universitaria, Craiova, p. 197–223, [online].
- Vărgolici, T. (1997). *Postfață la Schopenhauer, 1997*.