TRANSLATION STUDIES AND INTERCULTURALITY. SHORT INSIGHT INTO CONTEMPORARY THEORIES AMONG TRANSITIONS, CONFLICTS, NEW PARADIGMS

Teodora Nicoleta Pascu

PhD Student, „1 Decembrie 1918" University of Alba Iulia

Abstract:The 21st century brought to the fore cultural tensions and increasing ethnic intransigence all over the world, especially after September 11th, 2001. In this context, the more translation across cultures seemed to have (partially) failed, the more was the call for a discipline combining culture and translation with rigor and coherence, avoiding a merely and "dangerously fashionable" use of the cultural perspective. Multidisciplinary approach has enriched the Translation Studies research lines opening new paradigms but has also generated a fragmentation that is one of the potential sources of conflict in the discipline. Added to this, the lasting discrepancy between theory and practice, with the partially unsolved "translator's invisibility", the related issues pertaining to the sociology and ethics of translation and the preservation of the otherness, of the difference within the foreignization approach.

Since the prescriptivism left great place to descriptivism, and beyond the various schools, contemporary debate seems to be still particularly conflictual as regards essentialists and empiricists. Within the framework of the epistemological humanistic and social sciences crisis, there are also scholars arguing the "death" of Translation Studies, invoking thus the necessity of a multiple, transdisciplinary, mobile, and open-ended new paradigm, named post-translation studies. However, it is quite evident that Translation Studies is now a discipline in a transition moment. The literature investigating the connections between culture and translation has increased significantly. That leads the young researcher in Translation Studies to a certain difficulty in choosing a single fixed general line/school, since all appear valuable and present fascinating and challenging aspects, beyond being complementary. The present paper should hopefully provide some orientation headings through a critical outlook on the most debated relevant contemporary trends and developments in the field.

Keywords: Translation Studies, Interculturality, Conflicts, Essentialist, Empiricist, Post-translation Studies

Introduction

The continuously evolving and the labile boundaries of contemporary Translation Studies (TS) have led to a certain difficulty in finding univocal methodological approaches. Moreover, the "cultural turn" in the discipline has furtherly enriched, diversified, and "internationalized" its investigation domain. Within this framework, choosing a single fixed general line/school could become an arduous task for the young researcher in TS, since all appear valuable and present fascinating and challenging aspects, beyond being complementary. The present paper should hopefully provide some orientation headings through a critical outlook on the most debated relevant contemporary trends and developments in the field, with a focus on literary translation. And obviously that cannot be done without a look back to the tradition as an illuminating other than useful tool. A tool not to be considered as a mere repetition or summing up of taken for granted TS historical

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

notions. If not approached from a fixed, rigid position, the history of translation becomes an indispensable, integrant, and methodologically relevant part of TS.

Pre-scientific reflections

The problem of translation has generated debates and reflections in all historical epochs. However, the literature on the subject is relatively young, and we speak about a real autonomous discipline only for six-seven decades. There were great difficulties in establishing the methodologies and criteria for the statute of an autonomous scientific field of Translation Studies. Among all, the difficulty in defining the very concept of translation and certain categories with which a theorist of translation must operate (e. g. translatability, equivalence, fidelity, etc.).

Pre-scientific reflections are often contradictory precisely because translation has almost always occupied throughout history a subordinate, marginal role compared to other types of writing/rewriting, especially with respect to the literary text, whose untranslatability, as "original" and "unique", has been repeatedly proclaimed. Yet translation itself has played a fundamental role in the cultural sphere, if we consider only the assimilation of Greek literature in the Latin world, the translation of the Bible for Christianity, the translations during the period of formation of national languages, to remain in the Western context.

From this perspective, translation occupied a privileged place to bring together languages, literatures, cultures, to unite past and present, far and near, to "constitute a tradition" (Nergaard 1993: 7). Before briefly summarizing the most significant moments, it is necessary to make some observations: a) the pre-scientific reflections cover a period of about two thousand years and are not entirely lacking in scientific criteria; however, they do not fit into a systematic and organized theoretical panorama like the current one; b) the theories that emerge from these reflections are largely born from the personal experiences of authors who were not professional translators in the modern sense, but poets, writers and above all philosophers; c) almost all the reflections are presented as paratextual (prefaces, introductions, translator's notes, letters, etc.); d) all deal exclusively with the artistic translation of literary texts; e) all are mainly concerned with the problems of translating method.

The first testimony that has come down to our days dates back to around the year 250 BC. It is a translation of the Odyssey into Latin. The way consisted in a very free elaboration of the original text, fidelity in the modern sense being entirely "betrayed". With this vision, Cicero writes the oldest text we are aware of, De Optimo Genus Oratorum, exposing reflections on translating and professing free artistic translation. And it is precisely to Cicero that we owe the distinction between **ad verbum** and **ad sensum** translation. The approaches that will take their cue from this opposition introduced by Latin scholars re-emerge from time to time with different degrees of intensity according to the different concepts of language and communication. So much to induce Steiner to provocatively argue that by Cicero and Quintilian up to now the ideas on translating have always been the same. (Steiner 1998). Modern theories on translation would define this approach a "target-oriented" one, where fidelity to the original text is less important than the stylistic and formal result in the target text.

An important starting point for theoretical debates comes with **the translation of the Bible** in the Christian world. Discussions on how to translate the Bible began as early as 384 AD. C. (the year in which the famous and controversial version of the New Testament of St. Jerome was produced, who claims to have followed Cicerone's ideas), continues until the advent of national cultures and intensify with the Reformation. As for the medieval period, unfortunately there are no theoretical documents of great importance, but the activity of translating is intense, given the new linguistic contacts (Arabic expansion) and the birth of the European vernacular. Basically, the **medieval translation** can be described in the sense

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

of both a **vertical** development, from a SL with greater prestige to a vulgar one, and **horizontal**, when SL and TL have the same value.

The theoretical-philosophical debate will then move, starting from the sixteenth century also in non-Italian contexts, and the greatest contribution comes with Luther's translation of the Bible into German (1534). This is carried out by Luther based on linguistic-philological principles for which translating means to "Germanize" the text. This perspective presupposes a method that is placed between letteral and meaning, depending on the case, and has had enormous effects on the German language, as well as on German culture and identity in general. It marks the beginning of a tradition that will see the activity of translating as a significant moment in the **cultural existence** of a nation and will have repercussions as a model not only for German romanticism but also for other European cultural realities. The middle of the seventeenth century and a good part of the whole eighteenth century sees France as the protagonist in the literary and cultural field. It is the period of the "**beautiful infidels**", translations that must be adapted to the stylistic criteria of the time, considerably transforming the original according to Ciceronian models once again. The French trend is also followed in England.[1]

A real **novelty** of approach will come with **German Romanticism**; in this period of great cultural ferment (early 19th century), translation is treated as a hermeneutic and philosophical-linguistic problem. Translation is not just a transposition of words or phrases, but of cultures, of world views (a position shared by Goethe, von Humboldt, Schleiermacher). It becomes inevitable to talk about **translatability**, since for the romantic philosophers, language and thought influence each other as different languages mean different worldviews, ideas that will later match those of linguistic relativists such as Sapir and Whorf.

Starting from the birth of **industrial capitalism**, up to the two World Wars, the most interesting contributions come from England, the center of the new colonial expansionism. The main **trends in translation** in this period lie between literal translation, free translation, and translation containing many archaic forms and expressions. The last of these is the most followed, to render the space-time distance, according to a vision far removed from that of Cicero and Horace. The concept of linguistic diversity emphasized by the German romantics will still be present in the following reflections on translation, up to the mid-twentieth century and beyond, and will be seen by some scholars as a value, a necessary condition for the translation itself, while for others this Babelic condition will represent a condemnation that takes away the ability to understand us each other. (Steiner 1998)

From these brief hints appears that it is up to cultural history to explain how different concepts on translation are affirmed at different times and the continuous change in the role and function of the translator.

Modern and contemporary theories

During the second half of the twentieth century there is a turning point in reflection on translating. The methodological criteria are becoming more and more rigorous, and, through "the name that has been gradually given to it" (Nergaard 2002: 4), it is possible to glimpse the evolution of the formation of the discipline: a) **science of translation** (1950s - 60s), which investigates in the field of the word, of the non-literary text; b) **theory of translation** (1970s), with an anti-language and anti-prescriptive approach that once again favors literary texts; c) **Translation Studies** (1980s-1990s), a field of study with a predominantly

[1] For example, John Dryden outlines in his afterword to the *Epistles of Ovid* (1680), three basic types of translation: metaphrase (word for word), paraphrase (meaning translation) and imitation (free translation, which does not respect the word or the sense). *Among these, Dryden prefers the "middle way"*, the paraphrase because it is the most balanced.

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

descriptive, **interdisciplinary** nature, which does not want to provide strict models and instructions on how to translate, which looks at cultures rather than languages and sees translation as intercultural communication.

This classification cannot of course include all the various points of view with which translation has been studied in the last seventy years, given the multiplicity of theoretical approaches that change in the very definition of the disciplinary object. Describing the situation from a phenomenological point of view, G. Steiner had already noted: "What, then, is translation? how does the human mind move from one language to another? [...] Translation theory and analysis have proceeded to this day as if we knew the answers, or as if the knowledge required to make the matter non-trivial was predictable, given a reasonable amount of time and the current pace of progress psychology, linguistics or some other consecrated 'science'. On the contrary, I believe that we do not know with great precision and certainty what we are asking and, in parallel, what the meaningful answers should really be." (Steiner 1998: 269).

As for the first period, the **1950s-1960s**, the approach is strongly conditioned by the development of computer science and the research is conducted in a mechanistic manner. The first attempts at automatic translation through computers are made thinking that the phenomenon can be described, schematized, and formalized in logical terms. Linguists too seize this potential to confer a more marked scientific status on their discipline. Chomsky's **generative grammar** also offers a model for translation theorists since the universality of deep structures is interpreted as a guarantee of the existence of a coherent and unique entity underlying every linguistic act. Consequently, we speak of translation at the level of very small units, of the word, at the maximum of the sentence, and the texts are exclusively non-literary. O. Paz defines this trend as "the imperialism of linguistics which tends to minimize the eminently literary nature of translation".[2] The function of these theories was **normative** and sought to establish fixed criteria on how to make "a translation equivalent to the original" (Nergaard 2002: 7); the translation was seen only in function of the source text.[3] Among the reasons why this prescriptive and scientific approach will prove inadequate is the fact that while structuralist linguistics investigates the nature and structure of langue as a system in synchrony (in the Saussurian sense), translation is more about words, i.e. a transposition from text to text which is a dynamic fact that occurs in diachrony. Nevertheless, the most representative exponents of this first generation made an important contribution to the development of the discipline, and still today there are positions that support the priority of linguistics in outlining the theories on translation.

In the **mid-seventies and early eighties**, the linguistic approach is progressively incorporated into a broader vision that considers the multiple extra-linguistic and extra-textual aspects involved in the translation process. Literary and comparative literatures scholars reintroduce the literary text as a privileged place for studying the problems of translation. The new theories aim at understanding the phenomenon itself: "Instead of taking existing theories about literature and linguistics and applying them to translation, the way of thinking is reversed, suggesting that the research field first considers what is specific to translation and then apply that knowledge to literary or linguistic theory." (Gentzler 1998: 77). In the field of translation there is a shift from interlingual to intertextual, as Toury mentions. (Toury 1980: 1995).

The first impulses come from scholars from the Netherlands (J. Holmes, J. Lambert, Van der Broek 1978), but also from other European countries[4], and are strongly influenced by

[2] *Paz, O. (2002). Translation: literature and literality. (In Nergaard 2002: 283-298).*
[3] For further information, see Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press.
[4] *F*or example, we can mention the Leipzig German school including Kade (1964, 1968), Koller (1978), Wilss (1977); for some aspects, Nida with his volume *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964) although he mainly

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

Russian formalists. Important contributions to define the discipline and to establish what its main aims are come also from the "school of Tel Aviv", represented by I. Evan-Zohar and G. Toury, who, starting from the systemic conception of literature introduced by the Russian formalists, develop the **polysystem theory**. The literary system is seen as part of the systems of a culture, being itself a complex structure, that is, a polysystem in a continuous state of evolution and transformation. As a result, translation as a form of **rewriting** plays a primary role in the historical evolution of the various literatures, both when it introduces literary innovations into the receiving culture, and when it helps to consolidate the current canon. The translator's role becomes that of **cultural mediator**. Following the direction indicated by Holmes in 1972, A. Lefevere, one of the leading scholars of the discipline, proposed in 1978 to adopt the term **Translation Studies (TS)**. The main objectives of the TS are to describe the phenomenon of translating as a process and a product, as they manifest themselves in experience, and to establish general principles through which these phenomena can be explained.

In the seminal 1999 Translation Studies, Susan Bassnett proposes TS can be divided into **four main sectors**: two oriented towards the product and the other two oriented towards the process: "The first includes the history of translation and is a component of literary history […]. The second sector (includes) translation into the target culture [...]. The third, translation and linguistics, conducts a comparative study on the arrangement of linguistic elements at the phonemic, morphemic, lexical, syntagmatic, and syntactic level between the source and target texts […]. The fourth, translation and poetics, includes all literary, theoretical and practical translation [...]." (Bassnett 1999: 21-22). From this perspective, the delicate problem of evaluation/assessment also arises either by looking at the close correspondence with the source text, which requires the critic's bilingualism, or by treating the translated work as belonging to the literary system of arrival.

TS tends to favour the second trend, considering that there is no universal or ahistorical criterion to evaluate the absolute quality of a translation. It is necessary to take into account the whole set of contingent factors that become part of the translation act: who commissioned the work, for what purpose, in what socio-cultural context, at what historical moment for the receiving culture. The attention focuses on the target text, which is the result of a manipulation linked not only to the subjective interpretation of the translator and to the change in the linguistic code, but also to the socio-cultural and historical factors mentioned above.

The next goal of the TS was to strengthen the new paradigms for the study of literary translation as **intercultural communication**. The unit of analysis widens from the text to the culture, in a **cultural turn**. A central role in the evolution of theory was occupied by **post-structuralist** studies, influenced by **deconstructionist** works (especially Derrida), through questioning concepts such as text, language, nationality, originality.

At the end of '90s, with the increasing participation in the debate of non-Western scholars, TS has dramatically evolved and the **new lines of research** have been deepened: the translation between dominant and dominated cultures, the relationships between translation and gender, translation and postcolonialism, translation and ideology, translation and subjectivity, translation ethics. Thus, translation as the most widespread form of cultural mediation underlines its multidisciplinary approach, with an important role both in intercultural communication and in the concrete formation of culture. Besides linguistics, literature (narrative theory, critical discourse analysis) and intercultural studies, TS key concepts overlap with other neighboring fields such as anthropology, history, sociology,

deals with biblical translation, Mounin (1963, 1965), who tackles the problem from a structuralist perspective, and Catford (1965) with his application of Firth's and Halliday's linguistics.

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

religious studies, to better explore the various connections between translation and culture. This target-oriented non-normative position is exposed in the works of Evan-Zohar, Toury and Lefevere, already cited.

The **21st century** brought to the fore cultural tensions and increasing ethnic intransigence all over the world, especially after September 11th, 2001. In this context, the more **translation across cultures** seemed to have (partially) failed, the more was the call for a discipline combining culture and translation with rigor and coherence, avoiding a merely and "dangerously fashionable" use of the cultural perspective. (Baker 1996:17). **Multidisciplinary approach** has enriched the TS research lines opening new paradigms but has also generated a fragmentation that is one of the potential sources of conflict in the discipline. Added to this, the lasting **discrepancy** between **theory and practice**, with the partially unsolved "**translator's invisibility**", the related issues pertaining to the sociology and ethics of translation and the preservation of the otherness, of the difference within the foreignization approach. (Venuti 1995).

Since the prescriptivism left great place to descriptivism, and beyond the various schools, contemporary debate seems to be still particularly **conflictual** as regards essentialists and empiricists. One of the most famous articles in this sense is probably Anthony Pym's "spirited defense" of empiricism as an answer to Mona Baker's and Lawrence Venuti's influential studies Translation and Conflict and respectively Translation changes everything.[5] Even if there are scholars that have long been advocating a meeting point between the two approaches (e.g. Andrew Chesterman, Rosemarie Arrojo, Jenny Williams, etc.), the discussion is ongoing.

There are also scholars arguing the "death" of TS, underlying its involvement in the epistemological humanistic and social sciences crisis, with the repetition of the theories and a consequent stagnation and lack in innovation. They have invoked thus the necessity of a multiple, transdisciplinary, mobile, and open-ended new paradigm, named **post-translation** studies. (Arduini and Nergaard 2011). However, it is quite evident that besides these epistemological crises the ever-growing field of TS is now in a transition moment. The literature investigating the connections between culture and translation has increased significantly and this tendency will probably continue, enlarging and further developing especially the semiotic direction traced by Roman Jakobson.[6]

Still, various conceptual problems seem to persist, starting from the very definition of the key notions of culture and translation. In the introduction to The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture, the editors Sue-Ann Harding and Ovidi Carbonell Cortés notice the peril of cross-cut studies overlapping between cultural translation and general translation theory: "Isn't translation always cultural? […] Is culture a factor? Is culture a dimension of translation proper?". (Harding and Carbonell Cortés 2018: 3). Their answer sounds rather tautological and not innovative: "… in this [volume] approach, culture is created through translation at the same time that translation is determined by cultural factors." (Harding and Carbonell Cortés 2018: 4). That could appear obvious and even banal, but the contributions in the book demonstrate it is not. On the contrary, the complexity of cultural translation issues becomes even clearer through the book critical questioning of some TS main concepts, such

[5] Pym, A. (2016). A spirited defence of certain empiricism in Translation Studies (and in anything else concerning the study of cultures). *Culture and Society [Translation spaces]*. 5 (2). 289-313. https://doi.org/10.1075/ts.5.2.07pym. Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and Conflict. A Narrative Account.* Routledge. Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation Changes Everything. Theory and Practice.* Routledge.

[6] See among others the integrated approach proposal in Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: new paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* John Benjamins Publishing Company; and the category of power in Gentlzler, E. (2008). *Translation and Identity in the Americas. New Directions in Translation Theory*. Routledge.

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

as equivalence and fidelity. In the first chapter, for example, David Katan discuss the concept of translation as "creative rewriting" or "transcreation", overcoming the equivalence crisis and offering some interesting theoretical and methodological hints.[7]

Literary translation. Translatability, equivalence & other theoretical aspects

In the influential study Linguistic aspects of translation, **Jakobson** considers that "both for the linguist and for the common speaker, the meaning of a word is nothing but the transposition of it into another sign that can be substituted for that word." (Jakobson 1959: 56). Three **types of translation** derive from this semiotic perspective: a) **endolinguistic** translation or reformulation, which consists in the interpretation of linguistic signs by means of other signs of the same language; b) the **interlingual translation** or translation proper, which consists in the interpretation of linguistic signs by means of another language; c) **intersemiotic translation** or transmutation, which consists in the interpretation of linguistic signs by means of non-linguistic sign systems. The central problem for a translator immediately appears: while in the case in which the linguistic system is shared by the speaker and the listener, the message must simply be reformulated to be interpreted, in interlingual translation there is almost never a complete equivalence, since each element contains within itself a set of associations and connotations that are not totally transferable.

This means for Jakobson that the poetic text, and in some respects the literary text in general, is technically untranslatable, an unacceptable position for the modern theorist and above all for the translator. Jakobson's theory is taken up, among others, by George Mounin for whom translation is a series of operations whose starting point and final product are significations and functions within a given culture (Mounin 1963, 1976). In the context of TS, the problem of **equivalence** has always had to confront some of the most discussed concepts of linguistics itself, especially with that of linguistic sign in its structuralist sense of unity between signifier and signified. However, the translator must consider the possible distinction between both the referents of the two departure and arrival terms, and between the function and the value they assume in the relative cultural context. The problem of equivalence, in this case, involves the use and perception of the object in a given context. Furthermore, it must be taken into account whether in TL the paradigmatic relationship can be preserved, or the translated term is placed differently in the target linguistic structure. Firth reminds us that meaning can also be defined as "a set of relationships of various kinds between the terms that compound a situational context" (Firth, in Bassnett 1999: 37). In this case the words mean what they "do" and in the translation the focus should be on the function, not on the words themselves.

Popovič (1975) identifies four types of **translation equivalence**: 1) linguistic equivalence (word-for-word translation); 2) paradigmatic equivalence (equivalence of the elements of grammar that the author considers of a higher category than the lexical equivalence); 3) stylistic-translational equivalence (functional equivalence of the elements to possibly obtain an expressive identity with an invariant of identical meaning); 4) textual-syntagmatic equivalence (equivalence at the level of syntagmatic structure, that is, of form and configuration). Nida also distinguishes between **formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence**. The first focuses both on the form and on the content of the message itself, giving prevalence to correspondences of the type poem-poem, phrase-phrase, concept-concept. Dynamic equivalence, on the other hand, is based on the concept of equivalent effect, whereby the relationship between the receiver and the message in TL must tend to be

[7] Katan, D. (2018). Defining culture, defining translation. In Harding, S.A. and Carbonell Cortés, O. (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture. Routledge*. 17-47. See also Katan, D. (2014). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. 3rd ed. Routledge.

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

equal to the same relationship in the starting context. Nida attributes a main value to the sense communicative, to the possibility of creating a clear and intelligible message in any language. (Nida 1964). The text must function in the context in which it is translated, and therefore the most appropriate approach is of sociolinguistic nature and would depend on anthropological semiotics. Although Nida had an enormous influence as a theorist[8], one cannot fail to note the exegetical, non-hermeneutic task that Nida assigns to the translator, a position undoubtedly conditioned by his experience in the translation of the Bible, operation which rather presupposes ad verbum criteria.

Aside from this direction in addressing equivalence problems, which places emphasis on particular themes of semantics and the transfer of semantic content from SL to TL, there is also another trend that examines the equivalence of literary texts and the its application to their translation, fruit of the work of the Russian formalists and of the Prague linguists. Many scholars think that the use of the term equivalence must be made more explicit. Thus, Neubert believes that, from the point of view of a theory of texts, equivalence in translation must be considered a semiotic category, which includes a syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic component. These components are ordered according to a hierarchical relationship, the semantic one being a priority over the syntactic one and both being in turn conditioned and modified by the pragmatic one (Neubert, in Bassnett 1999: 44-45). This seems to be an approach still followed by **contemporary scholars**, that is to consider equivalence as a dialectical relationship between the signs and the internal and external structures of the texts in SL and TL. Since there may not be equality between languages, it will rather be a matter of **losses** and **acquisitions** and compensation acts in the translation process.

If the translator will have to deal with difficulties linked above all to language as vision of the world, but not only, then the problem of translatability of the text arises again. Catford distinguishes between **linguistic untranslatability** and **cultural untranslatability**. (Catford 1975). The first one occurs when in the TL there are no lexical or syntactic substitutes for an element of the SL and is due to differences between the two languages. The second is due to the lack in the TL culture of pertinent situational traits that could reflect the text in SL. But, considering the dynamic nature of language, to the extent that language is the primary modeling system[9] within a culture, **cultural untranslatability** is, in fact, inherent in any translation process. Popovič also tries to define untranslatability without making a clear distinction between linguistics and culture, speaking of two types of untranslatability. In the first case, the linguistic elements of the original cannot be replaced appropriately in structural, functional, or semantic terms, due to a lack of denotation or connotation. In the second case, the relationship of the expression of meaning, that is, the relationship between the creative object and its linguistic expression in the SL, does not find within the translation an adequate linguistic expression. (Popovič 1975).

However, many theorists believe that too much attention has been paid to the problem of translatability, to the expense of the real, yet unsolved problems that translators face. Basically, the translator must find and choose a solution to even the most difficult and apparently unsolvable problems. This choice of what constitutes the **invariant** information with respect to a given reference system is in itself a **creative act** and often depends on the intuition of the individual translator, an aspect fully grasped by J. Levý, with whom I completely agree: "As in all semiotic processes, translation has its own pragmatic dimension. Translation theory tends to be normative, to teach translators the optimal translation; however, the translator's real work is pragmatic: the translator opts for the solution, among

[8] Apel considers him "the true founder of translatology as an autonomous discipline". (Apel 1993: 33).

[9] This is the model proposed by Lotman (1985) and taken up by Toury, that is every cultural system is subjected to a **primary modeling system** which is the linguistic code (natural languages), alongside **secondary modeling systems**, such as religious, political, literary etc.

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

those possible, which promises the maximum result with the minimum effort, that is, he intuitively chooses the so-called **minimax strategy**." (Levý, in Bassnett 1999: 56-57) In this regard, G. Mounin considers translation a dialectical process that can be carried out with relative success: "communication through translation is never quite finished, which means, at the same time, that translation is never entirely impossible." (Mounin 1976: 279).

To conclude, as Salman Rushdie famously asserts, "having been born across the world, we are translated men".[10] It appears then quite evident that translation has always been "intercultural" or even "multicultural". Therefore, TS contemporary young researcher's/scholar's constant undertaking should be to shape their methodology in an inspired attempt to balance the paradigms, also depending to great extent on the texts under analysis, with intellectual honesty, coherence, and rigor. Since, as Arduini and Nergaard have argued in their calling for a new transdisciplinary post-translation field, "it is not the disciplines that decide how to analyze their objects of research, but the objects themselves that ask for certain instruments." (Arduini and Nergaard, 2011: 9). At this point, we still only can say in the wake of Pym: "I don't know; let us find out."[11]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arduini, S. and Nergaard, S. (2011). Translation: a new paradigm. *Translation*. Inaugural Issue.

Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. (Eds.) (1990). *Translation, History and Culture*. Pinter Publishers.

Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. (1998) *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary translation*. Multilingual Matters.

Bassnet, S. (1999/2013). *Translation Studies*. Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge.

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and Conflict. A Narrative Account*. Routledge.

Benjamin, W. (1968). *The Task of the Translator* [first printed as introduction to a Baudelaire translation, 1923]. In Arendt, H. (Ed. & Introd.). Zohn, H. (trans.) *Illuminations*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 69-82.

Braidotti, R. (2006). *Transpositions. On Nomadic Ethics*. Polity Press.

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford UP.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference.* Princeton UP.

Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of Translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*. *Revised edition.* John Benjamins**.**

Chesterman, A. (2017). *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected papers 1993 – 2014*. John Benjamins.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press.

Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes. Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Harvard UP.

Crisafulli, E. (1999). The Translator as a Textual Critic and the Potential of Transparent Discourse. *The Translator*. 5. 83-107.

Cushner, K. & Brislin, R. W. (1986). *Intercultural interactions: A practical guide*. Vol. 9. Sage Publications. doi: 10.4135/9781452204970.

Derrida, Jacques (1998). *Monolingualism of the Other; or, the Prosthesis of Origin*. Stanford UP.

[10] Rushdie, S. (1991). *Imaginary Homelands.* Granta Books, p. 16.

[11] I clearly refer here to Anthony Pym's article *A spirited defense of certain empiricism in Translation Studies (and in anything else concerning the study of cultures)*. (Pym 2016: 313).

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

Eco, U. (2003). *Dire quasi la stessa cosa. Esperienze di traduzione*. Bompiani.

Ferreira Duarte, J., Assis, A.R. and Seruya, T. (Eds.) (2006). *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*. John Benjamins.

Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in linguistics 1934-1951*. Oxford UP.

Folena, G. (1991). *Volgarizzare e tradurre*. Einaudi.

Gentzler, E. (2001) *Translation, hypertext, and creativity: Contemporary Translation Theories*. Multilingual Matters.

Gentzler, E. (2008). *Translation and Identity in the Americas. New Directions in Translation Theory*. Routledge.

Jakobson, R. (1959). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In Brower, R. (Ed.). *On Translation*. Harvard UP.

Lotman, Y. M. (2000). *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Indiana UP.

Hall, S. (1996). *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Routledge.

Harding, S. A. and Carbonell Cortés, O. (2018) (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture.* Routledge.

Hatim, B. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Longman.

Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained.* St Jerome.

Holmes, J. (1988). *Translated! Papers on Literary and Translation Studies*. Van den Broek, R. (Intr.). Rodopi.

Katan, D. (2014). *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. 3rd ed. Routledge.

Levý, J. (1963/2011). *The Art of Translation*. John Benjamins.

Maranhão, T. and Streck, B. (Eds.) (2003*). Translation and Ethnography. The Anthropological Challenge of Intercultural Understanding*. U of Arizona P.

Martin, J. N. and Nakayam, T. K. (2010). *Intercultural Communication in Contexts*. McGraw-Hill. 5th ed.

Morini, M. (2013). *The Pragmatic Translator. An Integral Theory of Translation*. Bloomsbury.

Mounin, G. (1963) *Les Problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Gallimard.

Mounin, G. (1976) *Linguistique et traduction*. Dessart et Mardaga.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies - Theories and Applications*. Routledge.

Nergaard, S. (2002). *Teorie contemporanee della traduzione*. Bompiani.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating.* Brill Archive.

Nida, E. and Taber, C. R. (1969/1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Brill.

Nida, E. (1975). *Language Structure and Translation: Essays*. Stanford UP.

Newmark, P. (1991). *About Translation*. Multilingual Matters.

Nord, C. (1991). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation Oriented Text Analysis.* Rodopi.

Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. St. Jerome Publishing.

Popovic, A. (1975). *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Dept. of Comparative Literature, U of Alberta.

Pym, A. (2008). *On Toury's Laws on How Translators Translate*. In Pym, A., Shlesinger, M. and Simeoni, D. (Eds.). *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations on Homage to Gideon Toury*. 311- 329. John Benjamins.

Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring Translation Theories*. Routledge.

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)

Pym, A. (2016). A spirited defense of certain empiricism in Translation Studies (and in anything else concerning the study of cultures). *Culture and Society. [Translated Spaces]*. 5 (2). 289-313.

Rubel, P. and Rosman, A. G. (Eds.) (2003). *Translating Cultures: Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology*. Berg Oxford.

Rushdie, S. (1991*). Imaginary Homelands. Granta Books* Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: new paradigms or shifting viewpoints*? John Benjamins.

Saussure, F. de, (1916/1971) *Cours de linguistique Générale*. Bally, C., Sechehaye, A. and Riedlinger, A. (Eds). Payot. [(2011). *Course in General Linguistics*. Baskin, W. (trans.). Meisel, P. and Saussy, H. (Eds.). Columbia UP.]

Spivak, G. C. (2003). *Death of a Discipline*. Columbia UP.

Steiner, G. (1998). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. 3rd ed. Oxford UP.

Toury, G. (1995/2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond.* John Benjamins.

Van Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. (1989). Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, I. *Target* 1 (2). 151–181.

Van Leuven-Zwart, Kitty M. (1990). Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities, II. *Target* 2 (1). 69-95.

Venuti, L. (Ed.) (1992). *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. Routledge. Venuti, L. (1995*). The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation Changes Everything. Theory and Practice.* Routledge.

Washbourne, K. and Van Wyke, B. (Eds.) (2018). *The Routledge Handbook of Literary Translation.* Routledge.

Webster, J. (Ed.) (2002/2013). *The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday*. Continuum.

Williams, J. and Chesterman, A. (Eds.) (2001). *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. St. Jerome Publishing.

Williams, J. (2013). *Theories of Translation*. Palgrave Macmillian.

BDD-A32439 © 2020 "Petru Maior" University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:57:21 UTC)