Rethinking Invisibility in Translation

Rethinking Invisibility in Translation

Edited by

Daria Protopopescu, Nadina Vișan,
Mihaela Zamfirescu and Eliana Ionoaia

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Rethinking Invisibility in Translation

Edited by Daria Protopopescu, Nadina Vișan, Mihaela Zamfirescu
and Eliana Ionoaia

This book first published 2026

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-0364-6788-3
ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-6789-0

CONTENTS

Part II - (Un)desirable (In)visibility

Part III - Extreme Invisibility

CHAPTER ONE

RETHINKING (IN)VISIBILITY IN TRANSLATION

NADINA VIȘAN, DARIA PROTOPOPESCU, MIHAELA ZAMFIRESCU

The present volume represents the proceedings of a workshop on invisibility in translation and terminology held at the University of Bucharest as part of the annual Conference of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures. The selection of the fourteen contributions presented here reflects a broad range of topics and languages that made the object of debate during this workshop. The articles have been arranged into three main sections (Part 1: Clines of Invisibility; Part 2: (Un)desirable (In)visibility; Part 3: Extreme Invisibility), within which they gravitate around focal themes, from the translation of fiction to its retranslation, from translating terminology to lexicography and labelling in bilingual dictionaries. The common thread which runs through these sections is the concept of invisibility proposed thirty years ago by Lawrence Venuti in his seminal work, *The Translator's Invisibility*. By zooming in on various translated texts with the aid of a contemporary critical lens, the volume re-evaluates the notion of invisibility as it endeavours to illuminate the process of translating from languages that are "central" into a "peripheral" language such as Romanian. In lifting the veil off the process of translation, the footprints left by the translator (Baker 2000) become visible and thus the face of the translator becomes less shadowy.

To a literary translator, producing a metatext about a collection of metatexts that have as main objective decomposing the mechanism of translation might seem as an arduous task. Translating a text into one's native language is a natural thing, even if the first essay in the present volume would argue otherwise. To Daniela Ionescu, the author of the first essay in this volume, translation is a matter of conscious choice and translators seem to find themselves in a never-ending dilemma, the solving of which results into their remaining a shadowy figure behind the target text or assuming a more prominent position, thus becoming more "visible". Ionescu's essay invites thought about translating both fiction and non-fiction with the aid of an "acceptability grid" that appears to be instrumental in both endeavours. In writing her essay, Professor Ionescu resorts to her considerable experience of teaching translation techniques to many generations of students, reminding all of us about the responsibility that lies on the shoulders of a dedicated translator.

The first section of this volume has found an appropriate name in "Clines of Invisibility", borrowing the term "cline" from historical linguistics: instead of retaining the "snappy dichotomy" (Leal 2025) *invisible-visible*, according to which invisibility in translation goes hand in hand with domestication and fluency, while visibility is associated with foreignization and disrupted fluency, we take a more fluid view on the process of translation. In our view, both domestication and foreignization are tendencies that can co-exist in the same target text (see also Cotter 2025), to a higher or a lower degree. This view is shared by most of the articles in this volume. Lorena Mihăeș' essay, for instance, focuses on the voice of the Translator as a sophisticated mediator between a diegetic Narrator and an implied Target Reader. Her essay raises the question of myth retelling in the translation of Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant* and reinforces this idea of a need for mediation between ancient cultures and languages (whether in this case it is Old Greek, or Old English, or Old Gaelic).An interesting point that the author of this essay makes is the fact that a translator specialized in the work of a particular author, as is the case of Vali Florescu, who translated most of Ishiguro's work into Romanian, leaves their own unmistakable translational footprints in the target text. In this way, the resulting translation becomes enriched by the experience of the "expert" translator, who manages to better "impersonate" the Author and, paradoxically, becomes more "visible" to an informed reader.

In Liana Oprea's essay on the translation of David Lodge's *Campus Trilogy* into Romanian, the question of invisibility seems to be posed from two perspectives: on the one hand the translator strives to stay "invisible" as function, by domesticating culturemes, but they become "visible" by the use of extratextual explicitation (footnotes); on the other hand, the translator is already "visible" as person (Schahadat 2016), as the name of the Romanian translator, Virgil Stanciu, is well-known to both academics and to most Romanian readers, and his name on the cover of the target text enhances the value of that particular target text.

A nuanced outlook on visibility in translation is provided by Nicoleta Bleiu's observations regarding multiple translatorial voices in the Romanian rendition of George R.R. Martin's *Game of Thrones* series.

Since the Romanian target texts are an instance of “collaborative translation”, an important part of the process of translation should revolve in this case around “harmonizing” voices in translation. Bearing in mind that the translators involved in this project are all reputed “Sci-Fi translators” (Protopopescu & Vișan 2022), the resulting target text should read as a cohesive unit, but, as pointed out by Bleiu, there are discordant notes that count as “marks of visibility”, albeit undesirable ones.

The first section of the volume ends with Ana Magdalena Petraru and Brîndușa Speranța Doboș’ essay on the Romanian translation of Herge’s comic series, *The Adventures of Tintin*. The authors compare the Romanian target text with the English one, raising the question of foreignization and domestication from the perspective of the nature of the target cultures. While the Romanian culture is “minor” and foreignizes the French source text, the English culture is “major” and domesticates it. It therefore turns out that the translator is more visible in the Romanian rendition. In making this intriguing point, the authors of the essay pave the way to the second section of the volume, which focuses on retranslation (Koskinen 2018) and on the ways in which this notion can be linked to the notion of (in)visibility.

We have chosen the name “(Un)desirable (In)visibility” for the second section of this volume in order to reopen the debate proposed decades ago by Venuti in regard to invisibility in translation. Should the voice of the translator be silenced, their presence forgotten, which means creating no disruption in the reading protocols of the target readership? Should the Target Reader be aware that the Translator lurks behind their Target Text and that the Target Text is not, can never be, identical with the Source Text? Wouldn’t a Target Reader prefer to be a non-naïve, unprovincial reader (Coldiron 2025) and take the target text’s marks of visibility in their stride?

The essay that opens this discussion is signed by Oana Balaș, who investigates the translation of a medieval Valencian poem into Romanian, pitting this version against English, Italian and Hungarian target texts. The essay draws attention upon the fact that translating poetry with a fixed form has the consequence of what Balas chooses to dub “illusive transparency”, an evasion of invisibility. The author illustrates this point by providing an analysis of their own rhymed translation into Romanian, which presupposes a commendable effort on their part: the translator has to distance herself from her own work and leave room to the academic to critically decompose the target text and asses translational choices.

The translation of fixed-form poetry is also the object of the essay produced by Teodora Boboc, who analyses M.I. Lermontov’s poem *The*

Sail in as many as twenty published English versions, one of which belongs to Vladimir Nabokov. The author of the essay approaches this impressive translational series by resorting to Berman's (1984) analytic of translation, tracing "deforming tendencies" that disrupt the network of signification present in the source text and identifying degrees of domestication and of foreignization that coexist in the target texts.

This view is adopted by Daria Protopopescu and Nadina Vișan, in their essay on J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Hobbit*. The essay focuses on the study of "Trollese" and its rendition into Romanian. More precisely, the article investigates the translation of varieties into Romanian and in what way translational strategies such as standardization and vernacularization can be matched with domestication and foreignization, and ultimately with invisibility and visibility. The appropriation of a variety is a technique used by Tolkien to create the language of fantastic beings (Trolls), which is replicated in an unpublished target text in the translational series. The result is a text that stays "faithful" to the original but allows for the translator to remain "visible". Does in this case visibility go hand in hand with "faithfulness"? In this case, is visibility more desirable than invisibility? These are questions that the essay attempts to answer.

Analysing the "language of murderers" in her essay, Alexandra Etelca Nechita takes a close look at two published Romanian translations of Thomas Harris' *The Silence of the Lambs*, reappraising Bensimon's (1990) proposal regarding domestication in retranslation. The first target texts adopts a more domesticating stance, keeping the translator's voice in the shadow, whereas the second, more recent, target text appears as more foreignizing, with a more "visible" translator. Given that both target texts were produced after 1989, therefore in the "post-communist period" of Romanian translation (Constantinescu 2021), when foreignization seemed to be more frequently used as a strategy in literary translation, these findings come as valuable support to the proposal known as the "retranslation hypothesis" (due to Chesterman 2000, who borrows from Berman 1990) in the literature.

The second section of this volume ends with Radu Iacob's analysis of the two Romanian translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. Iacob discusses two tendencies in translation, namely explicitation and normalization (Vinay & Darbelnet 1995), starting from the premise that they are "universals" and that they are both "marks of visibility". His approach to visibility is that it is a strategy by means of which the translator brings the reader close to the target text, while in the case of invisibility, the translator brings the target text closer to the reader. While this idea is by no means a new one, what transpires from Iacob's analysis is that, contrary to expectations, the foreignized text, where the translator is more "visible", appears more fluent than the domesticated one. Venuti's pairing of disrupted fluency with foreignization and visibility seems to be in need of reformulation, raising new questions regarding the intricacies of the process of translation.

The third section of this volume is dedicated to the translation of terminology, which is why it bears the name of "extreme invisibility". Translators of terminology are normally barred from being creative, they must efface themselves, strategically become invisible by resorting to an "approved" fixed lexical baggage (whether it is in the form of a glossary or a simple list of terms). As pointed out by Hawkins (2018), the general rule is to treat the translation of specialized language uniformly. Translators "have to" be consistent and utilize a fixed set of established terms as equivalents for the terminology in the source text. This consistency is, however, something that needs to be taught in a coherent programme, as demonstrated by the article signed by Cosmin Băduleţeanu and Mihaela Zamfirescu. A similar point is made by Mihai Robert Rusu in his essay that illustrates the vagaries of translating medical terminology. Rusu goes on to explain that the extensive use of metaphors and metonymies in medical terminology might give rise to undesirable consequences, such as literal translation, which may count as a mark of visibility.

Lastly, Andreea Moruzan proposes a debate regarding the task of the lexicographer as a mediator between two cultures, by looking at dictionary labelling in bilingual dictionaries. In analysing a corpus of English-Romanian dictionaries, she traces the use of the label "slang" in these lexicographic instruments and draws conclusions with respect to language ideology, lexicographic policies and their consequences on translation guidance. Drawing attention on lack of contextual information and on more fine-grained labelling in English-Romanian bilingual dictionaries, Moruzan underlines the necessity of balancing precision and cultural sensitivity in lexicographic entries, which may be construed as a plea for more visibility for Romanian lexicographers cum translators.

The research conducted in the articles of the present volume leaves room for further investigation regarding "marks of visibility", as listed by Coldiron 2025, and regarding visibility as a potential key that might open the door to developing critical, informed reading. Other, possible lines of interpretation might point to research into retranslations of the same source text produced by the same translator and to degrees of (in)visibility that become apparent when translating for academic purposes (namely fragmentary, contrived translations produced for the purposes of serving as "informed" samples in a corpus).

References

Baker, Mona. 2000. “Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator”. Target 12 (2): 241–266.

Bensimon, Paul.1990. «Présentation», in Palimpsestes, no. 4, pp. ix-xiii.

Berman, Antoine. 1984/2000. “Translation and the Trials of the Foreign”, in: The Translation Studies Reader. Venuti, Lawrence and Mona Baker (eds.). New York: Routledge, pp. 284-289.

Berman, Antoine. 1990. «La retraduction comme espace de la traduction», in: Palimpsestes, no. 4: 1-7.

Chesterman, Andrew. 2000. A causal model for translation studies. In: M. Olohan (Ed.), Intercultural faultlines: Research models in translation studies I: Textual and cognitive aspects (pp. 15-28). St. Jerome.

Coldiron, A.E.B. 2025. “Visibility: Contingency, Ruptures, Kinds.” Eds. Larisa Cercel, Alice Leal. *The Translator's Visibility. New Debates and Epistemologies.* New York and London: Routledge. 39-54.

Constantinescu, Muguraș. „Explozia pieței editoriale post-comuniste”. Eds. Muguraș Constantinescu, Daniel Dejica, Titela Vîlceanu, *O istorie a traducerilor în limba română*, vol. I, București: Editura Academiei Române. 363-368.

Cotter, Sean. 2025. “Modernism, Foreignization, and Form: “Translationmourning” in Anne Carson's *NOX*”. Eds. Larisa Cercel, Alice Leal. *The Translator's Visibility. New Debates and Epistemologies.* New York and London: Routledge. 113-130.

Schahadat, Schamma. 2016. “Sichtbare Übersetzer – transkulturelle Biographien. Am

Beispiel von Karl Dedecius und Ilma Rakusa.” In Übersetzungslandschaften. Themen und Akteure der Literaturübersetzung in Ost- und Mitteleuropa, edited by Schamma Schahadat and Štěpán Zbytovský , 19–40. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Spencer Hawkins.2018. “Invisible terminology, visible translations: the new penguin Freud translations and the case against standardized terminology”, The Translator, DOI:10.1080/13556509.2018.1503525

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2018. “Revising and Retranslating.” The Routledge Handbook of Literary Translation. Ed. Kelly Washbourne and Ben Van Wyke. London and New York: Routledge. 315-324.

Leal, Alice. 2025. “Introduction: Plural Voices and Epistemologies around the Translator's Visibility”. Eds. Larisa Cercel, Alice Leal. *The Translator's Visibility. New Debates and Epistemologies.* New York and London: Routledge. 1-36.

Protopopescu, Daria, Nadina Vișan. 2022. „Literatura alternativă”. Eds. Muguraș Constantinescu, Daniel Dejica, Titela Vîlceanu, *O istorie a traducerilor în limba română*, vol. II, București: Editura Academiei Române. 1860-1867.
Venuti, Lawrence. 1995/2008. The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation. London and New York: Routledge.
Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. 1958/1995. Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation, translation of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) by Juan C. Sager and Marie-Josée Hamel. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

PART I –

CLINES OF INVISIBILITY

Chapter Two

The Translator's Dilemma or the Inner Nature of the Profession

Daniela Corina Ionescu

This contribution is going to be some food for further thoughts about translation, not a real 'recipe' about what and how to translate. It is a short overview of Derrida's central idea about relevance in translation and the dilemmatic position of the translator when having to decide which version would be the best option for a translation so that it should comply with the criteria of relevance, acceptability, economy, fidelity, and appropriateness. The discussion regards both literary and non-literary texts, as they are subject to the same set of translational criteria. These are put together in an acceptability grid which may prove useful in the assessment of the validity of a translation. The translated text is a result of a linguistic, cultural, and contextual transformation, according to J. Derrida's (2004) opinion described in his essay, *What is a 'Relevant' Translation?*. Several illustrations of this view (both in literary and non-literary texts) are shown and commented upon in the present paper.

Keywords: acceptability grid, economy, equivalence, fidelity, literariness, relevance

The Translator's Dilemma

The dichotomic nature of the translator has always been rooted in the dilemma of choice; which term, which phrase is better in transferring the meaning of the source text? The translator may find themselves 'stuck' between the legendary Scylla and Charybdis 'monsters' that must both be avoided so as to pass in the safe realm of the resulting target text; this must be the final solution to the translation act of word and/or phrase choice.

However, a sort of rewarding content lies in the heuristic nature of translation. This is the reason why a translator will always take refuge in the intellectual effort of searching for the right, appropriate word, or phrase, to replace in the TL what has been expressed in the SL. Hence, *the (in)visibility* feature outlined repeatedly by Venuti (1995) with respect to the translator's effort to fulfill their defining task of transfer of meaning the best they can, until the TT becomes a perfect 'copy' of the ST. Therefore, the translator will be happy to discover in this endeavor the newly acquired senses based on the SL text. These senses must be rendered gradually and progressively into the TL text, which is created by the translator, who is a sort of ghostwriter of the SL author of the original text.

In what follows, I intend to argue that translation, as a dilemmatic act *per se*, will always be judged or evaluated from a dual perspective: the perspective of its relevance for the target readership, on the one hand, and the perspective of the translation critic, on the other. The translation critic, maybe a translator himself, will look into the level of 'absorbtion' of the ST into the TT, all through the way of the translation process.

W. Benjamin (1969), S. Bassnett (1980), and others consider this effort to be one of absorbing the original text by its total replacement with the new TL text, in a "cannibalistic" manner.

In his essay, *The Translator: From Piety to Cannibalism*, Serge Gavronsky (1977, 53–62) posits two self-exclusive metaphors to explain the role of the translator unhappily caught between original and translation. Gavronsky's analysis relies heavily on Freudian psychoanalysis, in particular on the Oedipus complex and Freud's description of primitive culture in *Totem und Tabu* (2004/1913), a text that was also of primary importance to Andrade's (1928) *Manifesto Antropófago*, which established a steady Brazilian tradition of a cross-cultural dimension of the metaphor. Gavronsky, however, seems to ignore the Brazilian tradition. The use of the term cannibalism, for Gavronsky, 'emphasizes the disappearance of the slightest trace' of the original, creating a 'perfect' (Gavronsky 1977, 59), that is, self-sufficient text. Through cannibalistic translation the new text becomes a primary one, that is, a new original text, and the translator a creator in his/her own right, negating in the creative act any debt s/he might have towards the first act of creation.

Personally, I would consider this to be a mere effort for the *continuation of thought* (and aesthetic awareness, in the case of literary translation), from the SL text *via* translator – to the TL text. The TL text becomes the new, recreated text, a copy or a parallel of the original, source language text, a perfect match that shares the same stylistic, genre, and register features, but transcoded in a different language and culture.

Derrida's view on the nature and purpose of Translation (Relevance)

In Derrida's terms (2004), relevance in translation relates to its economy, the economy of the word as a unit of translation, if we are to understand a word as a notional or conceptual idea-loaded unit by means of which readers, translators and writers/authors of some literary piece represent the world cognitively and emotionally.

In translational terms**,** relevance means appropriateness of translation, a feature that merges quantity and quality, in that the right quantity gives us the right quality or adequacy, i.e. relevance or significance of the resulting translated text.

However, philosophically, and not only philosophically, practically, and especially culturally too, lack of appropriateness in translation is usually coupled with the insertion of the translator's glosses which are a sign of the translator's impotence or failure to prompt the right word or the right equivalence to the original phrase or phrasing.

Relevance, in other words, gives us the ethical dimension of translation, in case it is attained by way of the translator's gift and good inspiration.

To quote Derrida at this point, "a relevant translation would, therefore, be, quite simply, a "good" translation, a translation that does what one expects of it, in short, a version that performs its mission, honors its debt and does its job or its duty while inscribing in the receiving language the most *relevant* equivalent for an original, the language that is the *most* right, appropriate, pertinent, adequate, opportune, pointed, univocal, idiomatic, and so on. The most possible and this superlative puts us on the trail of an "economy" with which we shall have to reckon" (J. Derrida 2004, 4).

This type of relevance in translation differs from E. Gutt's (1989) view on translation, but in this study, I rely on Derrida's theory only. However, the idea of 'economy' as a parameter of quantity in translation is not far from Gutt's own view, based on the theory of relevance described by Sperber and Wilson (1985). Economy of expression, hence of the translated text as well implies the fact that human communication crucially creates an expectation of 'optimal relevance' (cf. E. Gutt 1989, 50), that is an expectation on the part of the hearer that his attempt at interpretation will produce an adequate effect with a minimal processing effort of comprehension.

It must be stressed, however, that though this theory is also focused on economy of expression when it comes to relevance or comprehension of the message translated from one language into another, the communicative success of a translation is not determined by conformity to any stipulations of translation theory, but by the causal interaction between stimulus, context and interpretation rooted in the relevance-orientation of human cognition. This is the reason why E. Gutt's theory of relevance applied in translation is not only useful, but it also serves the translation critics to draw justifiable conclusions about the degree of adequacy and 'economy' of the target text, when subject to self-evaluation or critical assessment by the translator who will ultimately decide on the final option of the end-product of their translation work.

Economy–parameter of quality and quantity in translation

Economy as a parameter of [appropriate] quantity (if we are to abide by the word as a measurement unit of translation) conducive to quality, i.e. to relevant translation could be considered the ultimate desideratum of a good translation, freed from the age-old concept of word-for-word rendition of a SL meaning in a text.

But we all know that this is quite hard to attain because the translator will always struggle to override the ethical dilemma of choice: what 'unit' to choose for adequacy to be fulfilled in a TL text? What word should be the best, the most appropriate, the most relevant, etc.? As I mentioned above, economy of expression must go hand in hand with relevance, with the minimal/optimal effort of interpretation from the part of target language readership. Therefore, economy will not, shall not abide by brevity only, but by that expression that most readily or most 'optimally' fits the immediate [and correct!] comprehension of the message. Again, the translator will be held responsible for this 'economy' of expression in the target language since it is their choice to use or [not to use] it.

Along with the criteria of equivalence, economy, relevance, and adequacy, we may infer that a translated text should finally comply with the criterion of acceptability so that it should be finally 'authorized' in a publishable version for the potential target language readers. A sort of acceptability grid can thus be outlined, as a sum of all the above-mentioned conditions or criteria, i.e. equivalence, economy, faithfulness to the source text or adequacy, and relevance. This grid is applicable to each translation unit (TU) as part of the entire corpus of the source language text.

Acceptability grid as a test for evaluating quality of translation

The acceptability 'grid' of the Translation Unit (AGTU) may function as a tool for checking or 'measuring' the appropriateness (and relevance) of the target text as against its counterpart, the source or ‘departure’ text. It comprises a set of parameters as shown below:

- The cultural background;
- The lexical-semantic description and illustration/contextualization to be found in dictionaries (mono- and bilingual); use and usage (dictionary definitions and illustrations in context). The right equivalence is thus built on the basis of this type of description which relies on the use of the phrases or words in highly contextualized frames to be defined and described in dictionaries.
- The readers’ ‘acceptability’ grid (within a synonymic scale within the frequency-of-use scale/overlapping–yes or no); at this level, the effect of correct communication holds if readers can interpret the translated text with a ‘minimal’ effort, i.e. they perceive its semantic relevance in a most appropriate way and the relation between the translator and the readership is highly accepted and acceptable.
- The author’s reach, if possible; indeed, it is desirable that a translator should be able to communicate with the author of the source text, though this happens quite rarely especially in the case of literary texts. In these rare cases, a sort of negotiation process may occur between the two text writers (author-translator ‘negotiation’), which in all cases may prove highly beneficial for the readers of the target language text.
- Finally, the translator–TT readership relationship may (or may not) confirm *relevance* in translation, in J. Derrida’s terms.

According to Derrida’s philosophical essay *What is Relevant Translation?* on his own, rather ‘impossible’ task of translating Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice* into French, “all translation implies an insolvent indebtedness and an *oath of fidelity* to a given original…”; then there is the *theme of economy*, a certain economy of the law of translation”, in terms of choice of words, phrase-for word or free/‘oblique’ against word-for-word or ‘close’ translation.

Thirdly, Derrida considers that there is also a concept of *equivalence* that is omni-present when it comes to translation, a sort of ‘alleged correspondence’ that should operate both intra- and inter-linguistically, so as to enable the translator to find the right corresponding wording into the target language.

Finally, the fourth ‘law’ of translation is the utter *denial of its possibility to replace the original*! (cf. Derrida in L. Venuti’s version in English, *What is Relevant Translation?, apud Translation Studies Reader, 2004: 365-388*).

We must underlie the fact that reference is being made to the literary texts, and from this perspective, maybe Derrida is right, in that several other theorists of translation studies have concluded that the act of translating a literary text is in fact an act of recreating or rewriting a text into a language different from that of the original. Therefore, the literary translator should be a writer and an author in their own rights (G. Toury 1978; A. Lefevere 1992).

In sum, the acceptability grid would comprise a set of 'translation laws', which also constitute a sort of analytic view of the essence of what has been called the 'authorized translation' (D. Ionescu 2003, 244).

Acceptability grid applied to literary and non-literary texts

The present proposal, however, is to forward a grid that should be applicable both to literary and non-literary translation. Indeed, when it comes to the evaluation of the notional word, the conceptual unit meant to render the meaning from SL to TL text, the acceptability grid seems to prove valid. It could be 'checked' by applying it to lexical-conceptual terms; what translators do, in this particular case, is to have to opt for a certain word, a notion-loaded lexical item in translation, or else, for a certain syntagm or phrase, whether idiomatic or non-idiomatic, on the basis of some collocational characteristic/s of the corresponding word or phrase in the TL; obviously, the TL phrase must be an equivalent or a notational pair to the SL notional word/phrase.

However, the grid should be submitted to *different assessment criteria* when it comes to the translation of a literary vs. a non-literary text.

Translation of literary texts: literariness criterion for translation evaluation

Literary translation must reflect the features of the original text, the so-called forms of *literariness* that are signs indicating the genre of the respective text, implicitly leading to the style used in the original text and that must be rendered appropriately in the target text by the translator. The question is what could this feature of literariness do in translation or when a certain literary text is translated into another language?

From the perspective of translation, we have to make the right distinction between literary and non-literary texts. Obviously, literariness is central to literature, so, when a translator proceeds to translating that text, they cannot ignore it. In a broad sense, it is the form of a text that suggests or presupposes something, an implicature that goes beyond the content *ad litteram*. A non-literary text, on the other hand, has no such suggestive meaning, it only denotes or describes what it plainly states.

Style and topic presuppose a genre. No literary translation can ever be successful unless it finds equivalences for the literary-inducing presuppositions (Riffaterre 1992, 205). Besides form (literariness) and cogency of meaning (i.e. relevance), a literary translation must also comply with the relationship between the background situation or context of the ST on the one hand and the function of the translation, that is of the target text – on the other (cf. Riffaterre 1992). It becomes thus obvious that for a translator it would be crucial to understand and then transfer into the TL the exact suggested meaning or presupposition of the SL. The dilemma of choice is justified by way of the feature of literariness when we discuss literary translation and Derrida's quotes above are meant to confirm this view.

Given this preliminary conclusion, we would be tempted to infer that translation of the non-literary texts would not pose too many problems since the content of these texts is fully denotative, i.e. what is written is exactly what the author means and no hidden or presupposed sense is bound to be triggered when transferring that meaning into the TL. However, there may occur as many confusions or dilemmas with respect to the choice of words in translation if a certain notion has no equivalent in the terminology of the TL in the respective area or if (in some rare cases) the SL word or phrase is polysemantic or homophonic and the context fails to disambiguate the exact meaning of the respective lexical item.

Illustrations: notional words in common language, literary and non-literary texts

As regards use of common language employed either in literary or non-literary texts, there is a certain class of words that bear no stylistic significance, instead, they are highly notional or conceptual and because of their specific lexical-cognitive nature, may cause a problem in their rendition into a different language, by translation.

For instance, there are plenty of proper names in various languages that bear a certain meaning and can be symbolically chosen to nominate a newborn, according to the parents' will. Also, there are names of certain religious ceremonies, typical of the religious holy books and rituals, or even cultural types of words, designating periodical customary events, traditions, etc., for which the notion itself must be rendered into a TL by way of translation. The recommended strategy in this respect is to 'borrow' the term from the SL and transfer it straight into the TL, under the 'foreignization' vs. 'domestication' technique. A different strategy would be to resort to equivalence, but this translational technique may fail to render the exact meaning of the respective SL term or phrase, despite the common language register.

Another very thorny domain in translation is the area of the gastronomical 'idiosyncratic' terms or notional words in different languages, peoples, and cultures. For instance, the Romanian words *cozonac*, *turtă*, and plenty of other words designating a certain food item typical of the place where it is regularly cooked, or the Italian Pizza, etc. may be prone to penetrating other cultures and languages, just because of lack of lexical and conceptual, cultural equivalence in the TL.

Below are a few examples of literary texts, triggered from two different literary works, *The Happy Prince* by O. Wilde, in a very old translation into Romanian, *Prințul fericit*, dated 1945 (by Igena Floru), and the novel *The Winter of our Discontent* by J. Steinbeck, translated by Tatiana Malita and Mihu Dragomir, in 1967.

(1) **Weathercock – cocoș de tablă (brezaie)** – The Happy Prince (O. Wilde):
"He is as beautiful as a weathercock," remarked one of the Town Councillors who wished to gain a reputation for having artistic tastes; "only not quite so useful," he added, fearing lest people should think him unpractical, which he really was not."

The translation for *weathercock* in the Romanian version of O. Wilde's tale is: "*...Era frumoasă* (about the statue of the Happy Prince) *ca un cocoș de tablă...*" (I. Floru, translation published in 1945).

Against all odds, this equivalent seems to be quite felicitous, even if it sounds too 'close' to the original. Otherwise, it could have been translated as *giruetă*, but in that case, the Romanian equivalent word would miss the ironical touch. The word-for-word translation *cocoș de tablă* is meant to render the source language intended author's subtle irony on the councillor's doubtful artistic taste, by use of this *terre-à-terre* simile (as beautiful as a weathercock).

(2) The year's at the day. The day's at the morn." "I guess you did. Do you remember it's **Good Friday**?" He said **hollowly**, "**The dirty** Romans [are forming up for] **Calvary.**" (The Winter of Our Discontent, J. Steinbeck)

- Anul bun se cunoaște după prima lui zi, iar ziua bună, de dimineață. Mi se pare că, într-adevăr, te-ai trezit. Știi că azi e **Vinerea Mare**?
El spuse cu **o voce cavernoasă**:
- **Scîrbele de** romani [încep să-și concentreze soldații] **la poalele Golgotei.**
(Iarna vrajbei noastre, EPL, 1967, trad. Tatiana Malita, Mihu Dragomir)

In example (2), we should note the cultural (religious) type of equivalence for *Good Friday* (Vinerea Mare) as well as a euphonic type of lexical equivalence between the SL and TL adverbs respectively, i.e. *hollowly//cavernos*. The exact meaning of *hollow/ly* refers to the quality of sound (devoid of echo), while the translator opted for the Romanian adjectival phrase *voce cavernoas*ă, which is reminiscent of some rough, smothered, base-sort of sound, as if coming from the bottom of some hollow barrel. A felicitous lexical equivalence was found for dirty in *the dirty Romans* in the Romanian phrasing: *scîrbele de Romani* or a cultural equivalence between *Calvary* and *poalele Golgotei*.

As regards translation criticism, in the present analysis and tentative application of the accessibility grid briefly outlined above, I depart from the idea quoted by Snell-Hornby (1988), following H. Vermeer (1986, 35) that we can remove the rigid division between literary and other 'types' of source language texts when it comes to their translation into a target language.

This is the reason why in what follows, a short overview of a set of non-literary texts is presented, with notes on their translatability and result of applying the accessibility grid in both cases, literary and non-literary translations. What is still differentiating one from the other is the criterion of literariness which is proper to the literary texts and implicitly of their TL versions in translations. But apart from this distinctive feature, all the other criteria regarding the accessibility grid hold in both types, whether literary or non-literary.

In this respect, H. Vermeer and M. Snell-Hornby concur in tackling translation as a unit of critical analysis, irrespective of the typology of the text. This view is justified by the nature of the process, act, and production of the 'new' text, the translated version of the original, whether literary or non-literary, as we are aware of the fact that the same linguistic 'instruments' are used to communicate the message to readership, artistic or non-artistic, literary or merely 'technical'.

Non-literary units (terms) and their translation in an encyclopedic framework

Below is an illustrative example originating in an ample translation project on the Encyclopedia of Public Relations (EPR), Second Edition, authored by Robert L. Heath and commissioned to a team of professional translators under the management of the National University of Political Studies and Public Administration (SNSPA) editorial board (2018-2020). The term *sampling* is quoted, including the terminological and technical information existing in the encyclopedic format which was translated into Romanian for editorial purposes.

> *Sampling* refers to the process of selecting the people or the objects to be used in an analysis. Although sampling is most commonly associated with surveys, sampling also can be used to select messages for analysis. For example, a practitioner may be interested in examining a subset of the news stories that appeared about a product recall, a lawsuit, or a plant opening. Although this discussion will focus on sampling people, similar principles can be applied to sampling messages. Researchers use sampling when they cannot survey everyone from the population of interest. A population refers to a group of people of interest. A census is when researchers are able to survey everyone from the population. However, typically this is not feasible. Researchers determine a sampling frame—a complete list of the membership of the population from which they will select their sample. The sampling frame is composed of the set of people that have a chance to be sampled. Researchers use a sampling method to obtain a sample, a subset of the population that is used to represent the population. (Vol. 2, p. 815, EPR)
>
> *Eșantionarea* se referă la procesul de selecție a oamenilor sau obiectelor care se folosesc într-o analiză. Deși eșantionarea este de cele mai multe ori asociată cu analizele, eșantionarea poate fi folosită și pentru a selecta mesajele în vederea unei analize. De exemplu, un practician ar putea fi interesat de analiza unei submulțimi de relatări ale unor știri care au apărut despre un produs, un proces în instanță sau despre deschiderea vreunei fabrici. Deși această discuție se va axa pe eșantionarea indivizilor, se pot aplica principii asemănătoare celor de eșantionare a mesajelor.
> Cercetătorii folosesc eșantionările când nu pot să studieze fiecare individ din populația cercetată. O populație înseamnă un grup de oameni cercetați. Un recensământ se face atunci când cercetătorii sunt capabili să întreprindă un studiu asupra fiecărui membru al unei populații.
> Cu toate acestea, acest fapt caracteristic nu este fezabil. Cercetătorii determină un cadru de eșantionare–o listă completă a membrilor populației din care vor selecta eșantionul. Cadrul eșantionar se compune dintr-o mulțime de oameni care sunt selectabili din punct de vedere al eșantionării. Cercetătorii folosesc o metodă de eșantionare pentru a obține un eșantion, o submulțime de populație care se folosește pentru a reprezenta populația. Un scop primar este acela de a asigura ca eșantionul să se potrivească foarte bine cu populația astfel încât să se poată emite o genealizare pe baza eșantionului ales din populația cercetată.
>
> *Sandbagging* is a term used to describe the efforts of an organization or an individual to avoid answering questions asked by reporters or key publics. Sometimes the response is as simple as "No comment." At the extreme, the response is couched in more complex terms, such as "We are establishing a commission to investigate. When we have found the facts, we will report

them." The term has military roots. For example, in the late 19th century it meant "to strike unexpectedly; to take by surprise." In the early 20th century, it meant "to intimidate, coerce, bully as by threats." This slang term further shows up as a verb in cooperation with "ghosting" and "goldbricking" when referenced as a Vietnam War slang term to mean "hiding out in the rear as if not seen."
This slang term also appears as part of mainstream gambling terminology—"to downplay or misrepresent one's ability in a game or activity in order to deceive (someone), especially in gambling." Further, various online dictionaries describe this term (verb) as follows: "to treat harshly or unfairly; to misinform, mislead—to give false or misleading information" and "to conceal or misrepresent one's true position, potential, or intent, especially in order to take advantage of." A person who carries out such behaviors is a sandbagger (noun). This term appears to also be framed as a propaganda technique when used in a political context.

Sandbagging/Eludare/Trişare este un termen care se folosește pentru a descrie eforturile unei organizații sau ale unui individ de a evita să răspundă la întrebările puse de reporteri sau de publicul-cheie. Uneori răspunsul este un simplu „Fără comentarii". În mod extrem, răspunsul se ascunde în spatele unor termeni mai complecși, precum „Se va stabili o comisie de anchetă. Când vom fi aflat faptele, le vom anunța".
Termenul are origini militare. De exemplu, la sfârșitul secolului însemna „să lovești pe neașteptate"; „a lua prin surprindere". La începutul secolului 20, însemna „a intimida, a obliga, a abuza prin amenințări". Acest termen argotic apare apoi ca verb în cooperare cu „ghosting" (urmărire de stafii) și „goldbricking" (aur stivuit) cu referire la un termen argotic din războiul din Vietnam care însemna „să te ascunzi în spate ca să nu fii văzut, să te camuflezi". Acest termen argotic mai apare și ca parte din terminologia jocurilor de noroc - „a subestima sau reprezenta eronat abilitatea cuiva la un joc sau într-o activitate de pariere pentru a înșela (pe cineva), a-l fenta, în special la jocurile de noroc".
În continuare, diversele dicționare online descriu acest termen (verb) în următorul mod: „a se purta grosolan sau nedrept; a informa greșit, a deruta – a crea o informație falsă sau derutantă" și „a ascunde sau reprezenta greșit poziția reală a cuiva, potențialul sau intenția, în special pentru a profita de pe urma acestei minciuni". O persoană care are un asemenea comportament este un trișor, „a sandbagger" (substantiv). Acest termen apare și ca o tehnică de propagandă când este folosit în context politic.

Lexicographic, semantic, and cultural notes

The two terms, *sampling* and *sandbagging*, are explained in the Encyclopedia of Public Relations according to very strict socio-economic or even military and statistical analyses, including lexicographic information that is quoted from a variety of dictionaries, etymological or simply glossary-type of dictionaries. References to slang terms are also present in these minute descriptions.

In translating the dictionary entries of the Encyclopedia, the translator must take into account what is existent and what is not, conceptually and semantically in the TL. In this particular case, the translation into Romanian raised several problems, I would call them dilemmatic problems in that for the first term, sampling, the phrasing *eșantionarea oamenilor* sounds very uncommon, degrading, although the purpose of such an operation could be sociologically justified and largely accepted.

This is the reason why, in a few cases, according to context, the translator chose the term *indivizi* instead of *oameni* to denote the process of sampling among a certain population group. On the other hand, if we try to apply the acceptability grid in this case, the criterion of use and usage would be fulfilled because it is a term commonly used in sociology, in connection with the method of classifying or grouping a certain population, for some specific sociological purposes.

Further on, the criterion of cultural background as well as the criterion of author's opinion are also fulfilled, in the sense that both terms (*sampling* and *sandbagging*) belong to the Anglo-American special language terminology (social sciences, military domain, slang usage, etc.). Lastly, the relevance parameter is also observed in translation as both terms are rendered into Romanian by way of appropriate equivalence, economy, and fidelity to the source language meaning according to the given context.

Conclusions on the dichotomy of translation

Apart from the philosophical views on translation according to which it is both possible and necessary but, at the same time, impossible, therefore, it may prove to be a failure, we should take Derrida's stand in assuming that translation is rather *a transformation* of the ST into a text related to a different readership, belonging to a different culture and language, the TL readership which does need the translated version of a SL text for communication, comprehension, and possibly – some response to the author's previous piece of writing. As such, as an act of transformation, a translated text will always prove relevant and acceptable, irrespective of the time when it is perceived by its readership and irrespective of the historical or social significance that the SL text may have had for its own (contemporary) readership. The transformation and coming-into-being of the 'recreated' text as a result of translation are the natural result of the professional translator's choices of the 'right', most 'economic', reliable, and relevant wording as well as the most appropriate rendition into the TL style and register. This means that every translation will become relevant by its own vocation because it would guarantee the survival of the original text (J. Derrida 2004). What is also interesting is that equivalence of terms is dependent both on the author of the original and the producer of the TL text, i.e. the translator, since both writers have to resort to a certain choice of words when they proceed to manipulate their own writing in the linguistic systems in question (M. Baker 1991, 17).

However, the translated text will be in a state of co-existence with the original. The TL text does not 'absorb' the original by an act of annulment, on the contrary. Both original, source-language and translated, target-language texts will continue performing their communicative function on account of the norms of textuality and authorship. Moreover, the translator will find themselves in the privileged position of 'witnessing' the source language text by simply rendering it 'transparent' to the target language readers, by way of foreignization rather than by domestication (E. Nida and L. Venuti, among others). Obviously, for the translator to be transparent to the TL readership, the translator's notes and footnotes should always be added to the translated text, according to Venuti. In fact, this would be the only 'visible' facet of the translator's work, in that footnotes and translator's cultural explanations or comments related to a certain phrase or paraphrase in the target language as an equivalent form of the source language concept and syntagm play the role of getting the text transparent to the TL readership.

Concluding, I would venture to support Derrida's dichotomic idea that *a translated text is the result of the translator's choices from a set of dilemmatic versions* of the same 'unit' that corresponds to the source language entity. Unless such correspondence or equivalence, or else – acceptable translation unit is found in the re-created TT, the transfer of meaning, i.e. transformation of the ST into the TT, fails to be accomplished; hence translation will be invalid as long as it fails to pass *the acceptability grid.* The test that can be conducted by application of the acceptability grid to the translated version of a certain text can prove very useful in the assessment of the quality and validity of the respective translation and it may serve as a best practice approach to any kind of assessment in translation industry.