

## Translation studies

# THE EVOLUTION OF LITERARY TRANSLATIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE ROMANIAN TRANSLATION AND RETRANSLATION OF “A LITTLE CLOUD”

Andra-Iulia URSA

“1 Decembrie 1918” University of Alba-Iulia

e-mail: ursa\_andraiolia@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** *It goes without saying that literary translators participate actively in the creative process of authors. They read the original work and try to understand the author’s perspective, so that they are able to communicate the message to those readers who do not understand the source text language. Therefore, translators act as mediators, that constantly struggle to surmount linguistic, stylistic or cultural difficulties, by using effective strategies. With regard to the retranslation theory, subsequent translations of the same literary work are susceptible to supplement previous versions, and to capture more of the original work. However, some researchers blame translation practices used nowadays of ‘too much’ invisibility, up to the point that the role of mediation is nullified. Therefore, this paper seeks to understand how the strategies of translation evolve over time, and what the predisposition of translators’ attitudes is nowadays. In order to obtain some conclusive answers to our questions, this research is based on a quantitative and qualitative analysis of three Romanian renditions of one of the stories in James Joyce’s Dubliners— “A little cloud”. The advantage of this study is that even though there is a fifty-one-year gap between the first Romanian version and the second, the last two translators belong to the same period of time and have similar education backgrounds, knowledge and skill in the field of specialty.*

**Keywords:** mediation; globalization; invisibility; strategies.

### Introduction

The end of the twentieth century was marked by the emergence of a new type of revolution, which changed forever the propagation of information and still continues to this day. The Digital Revolution introduced the public to concepts that systematically sought to popularize the dissemination of knowledge, by using faster and more effective means. People are encouraged to communicate and to stay connected, both with one another and with what is being provided by mass industries. The world has never moved faster, and endless possibilities have never looked more reachable than today.

Rooted in the concept of globalization, the well-defined space of literature and territory no longer exists. National identities have turned into collective identities and geographical boundaries are real only for indicating the limit of the settled area of a country. In the modern world of the twenty-first century, the dynamics of a single world market and the growth to a worldwide scale have favoured the transcendence of traditionally territorial literatures. The concept of “otherness” is gradually being replaced by “togetherness” and we find ourselves living both inside and outside the borders of a single territory. This set of circumstances dictates instant communication across the globe and quick decisions in overcoming cultural and linguistic barriers.

In this accelerated context, this research aims to analyse the circumstances in which the work of Romanian re-translators occurs. Literary translation is an intellectual labour which requires, beyond a full command of languages, extreme care and a concern for details. Translation, as practice, expresses a need for communication and exchange that is not only interlinguistic, but also intercultural. Without doubt, translation raises issues that engage the translator beyond the strict linguistic level. A literary text presents particularities which differentiate it from other texts. Therefore, its translation, too, is distinguished by special characteristics. Literary translation is not only a question of rendering ideas, but also of reproducing creativity, from a philosophical and cognitive perspective as well as with an artistic and aesthetic sense.

The idea that literary texts pose problems in translation has been vehemently discussed over the course of time. These issues relate mainly to linguistic elements, stylistic turns, semantic structure and translational and interpretative strategies. As a result, the translator is called upon to show creativity which integrates the understanding of the original text and its rewriting in translation, so as to promote a fruitful dialogue between, on the one hand, the two languages and, on the other hand, between the two cultures. Various theories refer to translation as to a process that involves “technical procedures of translation” (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1958), “techniques of adjustment” (Nida, 1964) or “strategies” (Baker, 1992), meant to combine solutions for pragmatic, semantic or syntactic issues.

By using these strategies in handling cross-cultural or linguistic problems, a translator automatically becomes an intercultural mediator. However, the work of a translator is not static (Liddicoat, 2015: 4), but subject to interpretation and to the elucidation of meanings. Therefore, mediation can be explained as “an active engagement in diversity as a meaning making activity” (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013: 54), an activity in which the translator becomes first a mediator for the self, and then a mediator for the others.

For more than four decades, the role of mediation has not been distrusted, however, in the context of these days, where stress is placed on fast and efficient communication, there is a tendency for uniformity. The implications of the present stage of globalization require “human emancipation, in which universality is not threatened by cultural diversity” (Bielsa, 2005: 132). In this context, Bielsa claims that there is great emphasis placed on the translator’s invisibility, in such a way that “the nature of translation as a process which necessarily mediates between cultures is ignored” (Bielsa, 2005: 135).

It is common knowledge that a translation becomes “transparent” when the translator’s manipulation of the original language becomes invisible. This means that the text becomes more fluent, and “easy readability” is ensured by using a modern language, maintaining a syntax that abides by the rules of the target language, and opting for intelligible meanings. (Venuti, 2008: 1-5). Therefore, to some degree, in order to obtain a transparent text, a translator should employ, for the greatest part, domesticating strategies.

Although Venuti presents this tendency within the boundaries of English-language translation, Michael Cronin, in his book *Translation and globalization*, dedicates an entire chapter to the idea of “invisible minorities” and to the unfair treatment that languages which occupy a subordinate position in world culture receive. In his opinion, even in the context of globalization, when speaking of European languages, most people automatically think of English and French (Cronin, 2003: 140), leaving the non-imperial languages to sink into a state of obscurity. He believes that these languages with little power are gradually absorbed by the controlling languages, which are more frequently used and which dominate the field of communication. “Minority languages that are under pressure from powerful major languages can succumb at lexical and syntactic levels so that over time they become mirror images of the dominant language. Through imitation, they lack the specificity that invites imitation”. (Cronin, 2003: 141). In other words, we speak of a predisposition to homogenize minor languages, according to the rules of those languages that exercise more power.

With these hypotheses on board, this research is built on the presupposition that the newest foreign versions of the same source text would show little specificity and would dismiss the use of those strategies that call attention for peculiar expressions or specific linguistic units. In a quantitative analysis of the use of foreignization strategies in the first translation and the second Romanian version of *Dubliners*, indeed, it has been proven that the latter rendition shows a predisposition for domestication (Ursa, 2020), although referring to a minor language. However, as the author concludes, the study cannot be generalized and should be perceived “strictly from the

point of view of the foreignization technique, analysed in relation to the amount of foreignized words used” (Ursa, 2020: 234). In this respect, this study aims at expanding the research, focusing on more approaches of the same text and analysing them from different perspectives.

### **Theories of Retranslation**

Nowadays, the theory of translation puts forward for consideration another practice, meant to contribute to a more efficient rendering of foreign literary texts: the retranslation of of the same source text. As language continuously undergoes transformations and transitions, it is believed that, with the passing of time, new renditions of pieces of literature that express artistic quality are needed. Scholars have pointed out several reasons for retranslation. First of all, every act of translation is unique, but as Berman (1990: 1) states, it is an “incomplete” act, which can be expanded only through subsequent renditions. Second of all, some translations simply do not stand the test of time, either because of political intrusion in their freedom of speech, or because some linguistic choices have become outdated and the readers demand an increase in their creative quality. Any original piece of work is “timeless” (Robinson, 1999: 1), as opposed to the work of a translator which, as an act of interpretation, rarely remains unaffected by time. All in all, theorists have drawn on the additions brought to the forerunner translations in such a way as to obtain a more complete and accurate rendition of the original. In this respect, Robinson (1999: 2) speaks of three types of “supplementarity”, attributed to the completeness of first versions of translations: “temporal supplementarity”, which contains more authentic traits, which make the original ageless, “quantitative supplementarity”, which is meant to capture more semantic and syntactic features of the original, and “qualitative supplementarity”, when more of the authorial charm is rendered in the translated text.

Indeed, canonical literary works have always been translated and retranslated, mainly because they never cease to be highly valued and examined, especially in an academic environment. At the same time, translation scholars become pretentious in the endless search for the perfect translation, so, after a period of time from the first translation, they feel the need to provide for certain deficiencies. In the light of the retranslation hypothesis, classical literature never ceases to invite for further reflection and reconsideration and new approaches and the latest methodologies stand together with the intention of obtaining, every time, a more appropriate rendition of the source text.

The act of retranslating is exceptionally important in overcoming first translations errors and in adapting the text to current values and ideologies, especially in a country like Romania, where literature has been subordinated

to the subversive policies of the communist party for over forty years, and translators had to refine their speeches to suit the constraints of artistic creation. The communist movement placed such strong emphasis on ideological indoctrination, that the censorship of information and publishing lead to deep cultural scars. Nevertheless, the deficiencies revealed in translations that were rendered in those days cannot be blamed on the lack of skills or knowledge on the part of translators, but, for example, on the scarcity in critical reviews. Unfortunately, Romania is still trying to recover and to make up for the cultural loss of those hard years of censorship and we speak of a continuous nationwide struggle to catch up with the rate of progress that Western countries experience. Even Romanian retranslations lack in promptness and volume, due to the low pay and to the lack of consideration for the job (Paraschivescu, 2009; Moldovan, 2019).

It appears that the hypothesis of retranslation points at the achievement of a more faithful target text and at creating added value. However, this statement started to be questioned, as researchers have identified various inconsistencies in the quality of some subsequent translations. Koskinen and Paloposki (2004) present some examples which prove that, in some situations, the first literary translations are syntactically and semantically closer to the original than the retranslations. Therefore, the two researchers conclude that the retranslation hypothesis seems to be based on two tendencies: on the one hand, contemporary translations have abandoned the use of radical strategies and, on the other hand, modern days interpretation of a text is closely related to the views of the readers that live in this era, and for this reason, the text seems more faithful to the original (Koskinen & Paloposki, 2004: 33-34). Venuti (2013: 99-101) supports the idea that re-translators have the advantage of becoming aware of the different sets of value that a work encompasses, by taking into account previous versions and interpretations. In other words, retranslations are built upon the work of predecessors who had no choice than to take a leap of faith in their personal view of the artistic work. Moreover, every rendition is closely related to the values and the overall disposition and perception, dictated by a community.

### **“A little cloud” and its Romanian renditions**

*Dubliners* stands as a forerunner for the experimental style that the author will skilfully exploit in his later works. A conventional style, compared to the revolutionary techniques employed thereafter, makes this bundle of short stories, which share the central theme of paralysis, easier to be approached. When the stories first appeared in 1914, they were thought of as something fresh, as they did not fit the established literary patterns, but they were also misread and considered libellous or lacking a plot.

James Joyce felt a constant fascination for the life of simple people, characterized by the absence of economic and social distinctions, the streets, the cemetery, the public houses. The writer's perception of underworld is not only manifested in his vision of the city of Dublin at the beginning of the twentieth century, but also by the morally decayed minds of his characters. The writer employs the technique of presenting peculiar events which remain unexplained for the readers, offering just enough information to hint at something, but never revealing the full story. James Joyce is a master of language, a feature that he has been praised for more than once. His words may seem simplistic, but they carry a number of symbols and tropes that require effort to decipher. The city of Dublin is in a silent state, where people seem capable of uttering words, but sometimes this ability proves defective and they become unable to articulate.

"A little cloud" is a story that captures the encounter at a bar in Dublin between two friends who have not seen each other in eight years. Little Chandler is a man in his 30s, married with a child, having a clerical job and living a simple life in the capital of Ireland. Gallaher, on the other hand, has moved to London and has an impressive life. Gallaher is the one who leads the conversation and talks about his experience as a journalist that he had in some of the most prestigious capitals of Europe. Right from the beginning, Little Chandler seems driven by his admiration of his friend's personality and success, continuously comparing his humble life with the extravagant experiences Gallaher describes to have had. In the end, Little Chandler returns home, daydreaming about his possible career as a poet of the Celtic school, and picturing in his mind potential admiration of English critics. When his wife returns home, she scolds him for forgetting to do the shopping and reprimands him for not being able to calm their crying son. Like all the other stories in the collection, "A little cloud" is narrated in the third person singular, by an omniscient narrator who concentrates the attention to a single character that seems trapped in a life guided by undesirable circumstances, paralysed by fears and impossibilities. This simple style of writing, which presents various types of human behaviour, without expressing judgement or any reaction of some sort, has been acknowledged for determining readers to correlate these simple fatuities with various moments of their own lives.

The first Romanian translation of *Dubliners* appeared in 1961, fifty-one years later from the original publication of the text, and it was undertaken by Frida Papadache. The stories were featured in the literary magazine *Secolul XX*, which was highly esteemed for its monthly publications of translations and important pieces of work, despite the communist propaganda and intrusion of the Committee for prints and publications [*Comitetul pentru presă și tipărituri*]. Frida Papadache was a reputable Romanian translator,

who, in a similar way to other translators belonging to the same period of time, was a self-taught and was not granted an academic degree in foreign languages. Although praised for her skills, despite the political constraint men of letters were kept into, she was often accused of using rather poetic terms, ornamentations and of manifesting fondness for explicitness (Oțoiu, 2004, Ionescu, 2013, Filimon, 2017).

The second Romanian translation of the collection appeared in 2012 and belongs to Radu Paraschivescu, a skilful translator, who has had a successful experience with over sixty works of literature. In the case of *Dubliners*, some linguistic deviations have been removed from the previous version, but his style, rather colloquial, was blamed that it “tends to bulldoze Joyce’s subtle palette into some latter-day compositional mix” (Ionescu, 2013: 861).

Finally, the third Romanian translation was undertaken by Violeta Baroană and was published in 2015, together with other two stories in the collection, in a bilingual study about translatability. Baroană has a master’s degree within the field of translation of contemporary literary text, and a vast experience in editing translations. Her version, as Lidia Vianu states in the introduction of the study, tries to respect Joyce’s silence and his distinctive authorial feature, that offers simplicity and vagueness to the text.

The purpose of this study does not consist in highlighting the faults of these translations, as we believe the act of literary translation is a creative one, and each rendition is original and unique in its own way. We simply aim at correlating the original work with its interpretations over time, involving considerations susceptible of measurement and comparing the strategic choices and their linguistic changes.

### **A quantitative analysis of stylistic features**

The methodology of this study comprises both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the corpus consisting of the source text and its three Romanian translations. For the quantitative part, we were interested in showing the degree of similarity and discrepancy of the three Romanian translations of the story, and we have used the free corpus analysis toolkit *AntConc*. With the help of the basic features of the software, we were able to “measure” the different types of approach and to count the individual occurrences of some of the most frequently used linguistic units. The purpose of this type of examination is to map out the prominent stylistic features of the original text, as compared to its target texts. The style of an author has oftentimes been described as a “distinctive manner of expression” (Wales, 2014: 397) or as a personal preference for choosing and combining words. In order to highlight this stylistic rendition, we identified from the source text

the tokens with a high number of occurrences and we kept track of their Romanian translation.

The table below statistically displays the total number of word types and tokens generated from the selected story and its Romanian translations. According to Baker (2000: 250), “a high type/token ratio means the writer uses a wider range of vocabulary”, while “a low type/ token ratio means that a writer draws on a more restricted set of vocabulary items”. Word types are the different words that exist in a text. Tokens refer to the individual occurrences of a linguistic unit and counts the actual number of each word type instances. As the table shows, in comparison with the style of Joyce, the first Romanian translator shows a higher preference for using a wider range of vocabulary, although, all translators had difficulties maintaining the simplicity of the text. In general, Romanian language requires more words to express a concept or an idea, as it has not got the same flexibility of intention as English, but it looks like, as various critics have already stated, Papadache gives priority to clarifications. In opposition, Baroană’s translation uses a restricted number of vocabulary items.

Following the model of analysis applied by Dastjerdi and Mohammadi (2013) in their research on the Persian retranslations of *Pride and Prejudice*, the final rows of the table show the amount of punctuation marks. We have used this technique in an attempt of identifying the end of sentences. We can see that Paraschivescu has the largest number of full stops, which means that his preference was to break longer sentences into two, and to replace exclamative sentences with affirmative statements. Baroană’s translation has the lowest number of question marks, showing that she turned interrogative expressions into statements. The total number of punctuation marks (i.e., questions, full stops and exclamations) was used in determining the average sentence length, by calculating how many times it is contained in the total number of words. The results do not show a big difference between the Romanian versions and the original text. However, it looks like all translators opted for readability and fluency, as they kept the medium length sentences, but they reduced the number of words in these sentences. It should be noted that these results may be influenced by the different grammar rules of the two languages.

	<i>A little cloud</i> (Joyce)	<i>O mică înnorare</i> (Papadache)	<i>Un norișor</i> (Paraschivescu)	<i>Un norișor</i> (Baroană)
<b>word tokens</b>	5445	5320	5514	5207
<b>word types</b>	1363	1783	1769	1658
<b>question marks</b>	53	50	50	45
<b>full stops</b>	235	284	313	297

<b>exclamation marks</b>	45	47	27	41
<b>number of punctuation marks</b>	346	381	390	383
<b>number of words</b>	4933	4655	4886	4663
<b>average sentence length</b>	14.25	12.21	12.52	12.17

James Joyce wrote *Dubliners* with the intention to offer a ‘biography’ of Ireland’s capital, as he mentions extensive geographical details, and to portray the small lives of his people, completely sealed against change. Although the stories seem unimpressive, the text has not been created without a governing design. All the words and constructions are in fact indicators of the real turmoil of characters. In this respect, the software showed that the most used tense of the target text is the Past Perfect, which appears 58 times. The narrator tells the story in the Past Tense, and the main character often remembers moments of his past, in a state of a bittersweet longing. Thus, the use of this tense subtly shows his feelings of regret for the things that never happened. When rendered into Romanian, the predominant tense of the story is ‘the imperfect’, which in English refers to past progressive, a tense used for highlighting recurrent events or actions and conditions in progress, at some moment in the past.

Furthermore, to highlight the condition of lack of decision and firmness, the most frequent conjunction is “but”, included 26 times in the speech, for the greatest part associated with Little Chandler’s contrastive thoughts and doubting attitude towards his personal choices in life. As for the translators’ rendition, the conjunction appears either as „dar” or as „însă”, since in Romanian these two words are synonyms. In Papadache’s and Paraschivescu’s text, the two forms appear 29 times, whereas Baroană uses the contrastive conjunctions 26 times. It is a small difference, but it appears that the last re-translator tried to stay closer to the style of the author, whereas the other two translators have used the conjunctions as a strategy of addition.

The hesitant attitude of the character and his inner tumult is also portrayed by the use of “perhaps”, an adverb that Joyce employs 6 times, only when Little Chandler indulges in a fantasy about having done things differently or obtaining recognition for his poetry. Papadache uses the target language equivalent „poate” 8 times, as in addition, she translates two occurrences of the modal verb “may” in the same way. However, we believe that this changes the form and the meaning of the text, as the verb used to express possibility appears in Gallaher’s speech, and it has a different

purpose than the adverb used by his hesitant friend. Baroană follows the interpretation of her predecessor and employs the adverb „poate” 10 times. Besides translating the modal verb in Gallaher’s statement, she also uses the adverb as an equivalent for “might”, used by Little Chandler in his reverie. However, Parashivescu offers an exact number of equivalents, for the exact situations presented in the original work.

Another adverb used repetitively is “boldly”, employed by Joyce three times, every time in relation to the main character’s attempt at giving up his timidity. Baroană renders the word by using one equivalent two times, while the other translators use different words every time, as it is represented below. In the source text, the first time it refers to Little Chandler’s walk, while he struggles to show a brave attitude, right before he meets his intimidating friend. The second time, the adverb reflects Gallaher’s image, as perceived by the main character. Finally, it appears at the end of the two friends’ meeting, when Little Chandler feels that he has been treated condescendingly by his friend and wishes to exhibit some courage. We believe that the author uses the same form of the word as a reference point to stress the opposing feelings the character experiences in his strenuous effort to overcome his lack of self-confidence.

“he walked <u>boldly</u> ” (Joyce 2007: 75).	“He sipped a little of his drink while Ignatius Gallaher finished his <u>boldly</u> ” (Joyce 2007: 80).	“Little Chandler pushed one glass towards his friend and took up the other <u>boldly</u> .” (Joyce 2007: 88).
„[...] cu îndrăzneală” (lit.: “venturously/boldly”) Papadache	„[...] îl goli <u>hotărât</u> pe-al său” (lit.: “emptied his with determination”) Papadache	„[...]și-l luă <u>cutezător</u> pe celălalt” (lit.: “took up the other bold-heartedly”) Papadache
„pe măsură ce-și continua drumul” (lit.: “as he continued his way”) Paraschivescu	„[...] și-o termină <u>vitejește</u> pe-a lui” (lit.: “finished his with bravery”) Paraschivescu	„[...] și-l ridică pe celălalt <u>cu semetie</u> ”(lit.: “took up the other haughtily”) Paraschivescu
„[...] cu îndrăzneală” (lit.: “venturously/boldly”) Baroană	„[...] îl termină <u>hotărât</u> pe-al său” (lit.: “finished his with determination”) Baroană	„[...] apucându-l <u>hotărât</u> pe celălalt” (lit.: “grabbing the other with determination”) Baroană

By offering these examples, we may undoubtedly perceive the role of mediation that all three translators show, and which consists in favouring the different meanings that some English words may take in different contexts. Although the initial intention of the author changes in form when transferred to Romanian, the target texts are not affected in fluency.

### A qualitative analysis of the three Romanian renditions

Starting with the translation of the title, as it was presented in the first table, we can easily notice a difference in the attitude of the three Romanian translators. Papadache interprets the syntagm in a rather dignified manner, as in her rendition, she refers to the state of the sky when it is covered by clouds, whereas, Paraschivescu and Baroană offer a direct Romanian equivalent for the construction. This shows the different ways of mediating access to the text. Papadache wanted to portray the similar effect of the adjective “little”, as it is a key word throughout the text. Unfortunately, she changes the meaning of the noun. While on the contrary, the other two translators provide the meaning but fail in portraying the form.

This part of the study attempts to offer an overview of the most prominent strategies used by the three translators. In this way, we hope to determine the role of mediation, assumed in relation to the degree of invisibility. The methodology for this part of the study, consists in picking those paragraphs from the four texts that show distinctive linguistic features as support to the values of the three translators.

After an overall appreciation, we reached the conclusion that each translation shows a preference for a particular strategy. Papadache assumes the role of a ‘long-winded’ translator, as she shows a tendency for over-explaining words and for employing long phrases when rendering a simple idea. While her successors choose to provide idioms or a playful language, she has a more conservative attitude and she always seems to advocate for explanatory strategies, especially when the English term does not have a single-word equivalent in the target language. For example, she translates “unspoiled by such success” (Joyce, 2007: 71) with „neschimbați în rău de asemenea succes” (lit.: “unchanged in bad [unspoiled] by such success”).

Another visible trait of the first Romanian translation is related to the use of vocabulary. First of all, Papadache employs words belonging to the Moldavian dialect, such as the diminutive „nițeluș”/ „nițel”, which are not only used for “a bit”, but also turn into ornamental additions for the original style. Furthermore, her language encompasses words that were frequently used in Romania in the mid-twentieth century, such as the French borrowed word „șic”, used for describing the “style” of Parisiennes, or „prăvălie”, an old word for “the shop at the corner”.

Finally, in this first translation, simple words are frequently rendered by more „poetic” words. Thus, “tears of remorse started to his eyes” (Joyce, 2007: 96) becomes „lacrimi de căință îi scăldau ochii” (lit.: “tears of repentance bathed his eyes”). This is a technique that places emphasis on the assumed role as editor, which changes the authorial spark.

Paraschivescu’s retranslation comes as a very much needed updated Romanian version. The big time-gap between the two renditions left its mark

on the change of language. The strategies preferred by Paraschivescu contribute to the fluency and readability of the text and even adds a touch of humour, by the use of idioms and high-spirited language. In the speech of Gallaher, this technique comes in hand, as Gallagher talks fast and in a casual language. For example, “I put my head in the sack” (Joyce, 2007: 88) is rendered as „îmi vâr capu-n laț” (Lit.: “I force my head in the loop”), a funny saying that associates marriage with hanging. Yet, sometimes his linguistic choices produce changes in the authorial intended meaning. The source text narrator states that “Gallaher’s heart was in the right place” (Joyce, 2007: 71). In English, by using this expression to describe someone, “you mean that they are kind, considerate, and generous, although you may disapprove of other aspects of their character” (Collins English Dictionary). Paraschivescu translates it as „Gallaher era om de ispravă” (lit.: “Gallaher was a good sort”), dismissing the subtle implication of a negative character.

Another strategy that Paraschivescu is fond of is that of literal translation or mild paraphrasing. He does not seem to be afraid of using common English expressions in his mother tongue. Thus, the appellative “old hero” becomes „bătrâne erou” and “Where’s my considering cap?” (Joyce, 2007: 76) is rendered simply as „Unde mi-e tichia de om isteț?” (lit.: “where is my smart-man cap”). In this way, he hints at the enrichment of Romanian language, especially in the context of nowadays’ tendency of watching English-language movies, which are rich in colloquial expressions, determining these time’s generations to borrow the same linguistic easiness.

Finally, the latest Romanian translation, belonging to Baroană, comes as a perfect example of a clean work, that puts into practical use the modern-days theoretical approach that a translation should consider in order to show fidelity to the author’s intentions and not to proceed forcefully with domestic words and expressions. This re-translator is not afraid to change the order of clauses in a sentence and shows a preference for a compact language that is neither embellished, nor full of fun constructions. This is the version that shows the most transparency and technicality.

Baroană manages to find elegant arrangements for some difficult constructions. For instance, the vivid description of a glowing autumn sunset image - “It cast a shower of kindly golden dust on the untidy nurses and decrepit old men who drowsed on the benches” (Joyce, 2007: 72) - is rendered as „Doicile neîngrijite și bătrânii decrepiți care moțâiau pe bănci erau învăluiți într-o pulbere feerică, aurie” (lit.: “The untidy sitters and the decrepit old men who drowsed on the benches were wreathed in a fairy golden powder”). Yet, sometimes the language loses its spark. For example, the idiom “he was out at elbows and at his wits’ end [...]” (Joyce, 2007: 76) turns into a hollow expression: „era strâmtorat” (lit.: “he was short [of money]), and the funny language of a drunk man “I had a sore head and a fur

on my tongue.” (Joyce, 2007: 81) is rendered rather bluntly: „mă durea capul și eram mahmur” (lit.: “I had a headache and I was hung-over”).

### Conclusion

Indeed, translation is a matter of perception, and every act is unique and springs from the personal purposes set by the translator. One may choose to write for a specific type of audience, external factors may restrict the creative act, or the publishers may dictate a specific direction. Elite readers and the growing group of translation scholars inevitably contribute to a change in the approach of a literary source text. In this respect, one should not discredit the fact that knowledge is assimilated through education, and that the two re-translators, Baroană and Paraschivescu, share a common educational history, besides belonging to the same period of time.

The main advantage of the last two retranslations is that they make a considerable difference in updating the vocabulary and in conferring a more relaxed tone to the rendition. However, even though in the beginning it appeared that the latest translations are similar in approach, a more meticulous study proved that Baroană discredited a big part of the interpretation used by her immediate predecessor and, instead, employed some of the framework that the first Romanian translator produced. The explanation for this situation may consist of a difference in the personalities of the translators. While Paraschivescu appears to be more comfortable using a bold language, the other two female translators prefer simple and clean structures. Of course, this tendency cannot be generalized, as the roles assumed systematically inter-change.

In terms of invisibility and translation as mediation, this study concludes that the latest Romanian re-translation proves a point in applying strategies that are meant to obtain fluent and clean texts. Indeed, we begin to see signs in the practice of translators that show opposition against the intention of bulldozing ahead with strategies that make the target text too visible and difficult to follow. But, in the end, the personal contribution of a translator cannot be considered mechanical action, and whether the language is naturalized or neutralized is a matter of choice in mediating cross-cultural and linguistic conflicts. So even though the visibility of a third person contribution tends to be reduced, this can only be attained through the role of mediation, which can never be discredited.

## References:

- Baker, M. (2000). Towards a methodology for investigating the style of literary translator. In *Target*, 12, 241-266. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.12.2.04bak>
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation (3<sup>d</sup> ed.)*. London/ New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1992).
- Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de la traduction/ Retranslation as translation area. In *Palimpsestes*, 13, 1-7.
- Bielsa, E. (2005). Globalisation and translation: A theoretical approach. In *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5(2), 131-144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470508668889>
- Cronin, M. (2003). *Translation and globalization*. London and New-York: Routledge.
- Dastjerdi, H.V., & Mohammadi, A. (2013). Revisiting “Retranslation Hypothesis”: A comparative analysis of stylistic features in the Persian retranslations of *Pride and Prejudice*. In *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 3(3), 174-181. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2013.33024>
- Filimon, V. (2017). Aspecte ale traducerii experimentului modernist în operele lui James Joyce/ Aspects of the translation of the modernist experiment in the works of James Joyce. In *Études Interdisciplinaires en Sciences Humaines*, 4, 213-221.
- Ionescu, A. (2013). Oameni din Dublin (Dubliners) by James Joyce, and: Portret al Artistului la Tinerete (A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man) by James Joyce (review). In *James Joyce Quarterly*, 50(3), 860-864. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jjq.2013.0039>
- Joyce, J. (2007). *Dubliners*. New York: Signet Classics.
- Joyce, J. (2015). *Three stories from Dubliners* (V. Baroană, Trans., L. Vianu, Ed.). The University of Bucharest: Contemporary Literature Press.
- Joyce, J. (2018). *Oameni din Dublin* (F. Papadache, Trans.). București: Editura Litera.
- Joyce, J. (2018). *Oameni din Dublin* (R. Paraschivescu, Trans.). București: Humanitas. (Original work published 2012).
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural language teaching and learning*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2015). Intercultural mediation, intercultural communication, and translation. In *Perspectives Studies in Translatology*, 24(3), 1-10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2014.980279>
- Moldovan, R. (2019, February 28). Traducerea a devenit a doua mea natură/ Translating has grown upon me (D. Borgovan, interviewer). In *Revista de Traduceri Literare*. Retrieved May 28 2020 from <https://www.fitralit.ro/28-02-2019-rares-moldovan-traducerea-a-devenit-a-doua-mea-natura/>
- Nida, E.A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- Oțoiu, A. (2004). 'Le sens du pousser'. On the Spiral of Joyce's Reception in Romanian. In: *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe*. Vol. I. 198-213. New York: Thoemmes Continuum.
- Paloposki, O., & Koskinen, K. (2004). A thousand and one translations: Revisiting retranslation. In *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Copenhagen 2001*, 50(1). 27–38. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.50.04pal>
- Paraschivescu, Rad. (2009). Traducătorul român e antrenat pentru fachirism și supraviețuire în mediu ostil, [interview]/ The Romanian translator is trained for fakirism and survival in a hostile environment. In *Ziarul Financiar*. Retrieved December 29 2020 <https://www.zf.ro/ziarul-de-duminica>
- Robinson, D. (1999). *Retranslation and ideosomatic drift*. Retrieved December 29 2020 from [www.umass.edu/french/people/profiles/documents/Robinson.pdf](http://www.umass.edu/french/people/profiles/documents/Robinson.pdf)
- Strich, F. (1998). *Goethe and world literature*. London: Routledge.
- Ursa, A. (2020). On the borderland between fidelity and foreignization: A case study on the Romanian translation and retranslation of Dubliners. In *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica*, 21(1), 218-227.
- Venuti, L. (2008). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1995).
- Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation changes everything: Theory and practice*. London/ New York: Routledge.
- Vinay, J.P., & Darbelnet, J. (1972). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais: Méthode de traduction* (nouvelle édition revue et corrigée) / *Comparative stylistics of French and English: Translation method* (new revised and corrected edition). Paris: Didier. (Original work published 1957).
- (one's) heart is in the right place. (n.d.) Collins COBUILD Idioms Dictionary, 3rd ed. (2012). Retrieved December 29 2020 from [https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/\(one%27s\)+heart+is+in+the+right+place](https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/(one%27s)+heart+is+in+the+right+place)
- Wales, K. (2014). *A dictionary of stylistics* (3<sup>d</sup> ed.). London/ New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. (Original work published 1990).