

In “Fragmentary worlds”, Judit Dobry provides an insight into the difficulties and dilemmas a translator faces when recreating the works of Veronika Šikulová in Hungarian. Dobry asks if a family narrative is conceivable solely from fragments as well as she explores the depths of how such a multifaceted linguistic world can be transferred in its totality into another language.

Tímea Péntzes also focuses on questions of translation and cultural mediation. Looking at Monika Kompaníková’s novel *The Fifth Boat*, Péntzes is particularly interested in how the metaphorical microcosm of the twelve-year-old protagonist Jarka is reproduced

in Hungarian, considering the difficulties that stem from the cultural and linguistic differences and suggesting solutions to these issues.

The eleven articles that comprise the publication open up a novel, multidimensional discourse about the reception of Slovak literature in Hungary after 1990. Consequently, *Neighbors on Showcase* may provide the foundation on which a larger intercultural dialogue could be premised, although whether this will be so remains to be seen.

ENIKÓ CZUCZ

Comenius University in Bratislava
Slovak Republic

MARIA SAAS – ȘTEFAN BAGHIU – VLAD POJOGA (eds.): The Culture of Translation in Romania/Übersetzungskultur und Literaturübersetzen in Rumänien

Berlin – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Warszawa – Wien: Peter Lang GmbH, 2018, 326 pp. ISBN 978-3-631-77205-8

In the foreword of the volume with the promising title *The Culture of Translation in Romania/Übersetzungskultur und Literaturübersetzen in Rumänien*, its editors emphasize the ambitious main motivation of its creation: “an attempt to signal the need for a shift in Romanian scholarly and public perspectives on translation”. The volume represents the results of a collaborative Romanian and German project “Writers and Translators” focusing on Romanian literature, in particular on the Romanian perspective on foreign literature, co-financed by the Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu and the Romanian National Cultural Fund Administration. It is divided into three thematic sections according to methodologies and the degree of distance taken in the analysis.

The first section, titled “General Analysis and Quantitative Studies”, has a broader, especially historical/chronological focus, and presents contemporary insights into translation. As Andrei Terian argues in his study “Translating the World, Building the Nation: Microtheories of Translation in Romanian

Cultural Criticism (1829–1948)”, translation studies as a standalone discipline in Romania are “of a fairly recent date”: before 2000, translations often fell into the field of interest of linguistics, comparative literature, and cultural studies. Moreover, the interest in the theoretical aspects of translation has so far focused on two crucial periods (from the 16th to mid-19th century and after World War II), thus leaving out the ideologically and theoretically varied period of the second half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century. Terian therefore tracks the period from the publication of the first Romanian literary periodical (1829) to the establishment of the communist regime (1948), focusing on the critical and ideological views of translation. Unlike other theorists who called this period “proto-“ or “pre-translation studies” (G. Lungu Badea), he speaks of microtheories and distinguishes three phases: the phase 1829–1866 focused on translating the classics with the aim to enrich the expressive potential of Romanian literature; the phase 1866–1918 of ample “directional criticism” focused on

translating Romanian literature for a foreign readership and translating the peripheral and world literatures; and the phase 1918–1948 of the increasing need of systematic editorial series (G. Călinescu) and the category of the “Untranslatable” (E. Lovinescu).

Previous analysis is particularly deepened by Cosmin Borza’s chapter “Translating Against Colonization. Romanian Populists’ Plea for Peripheral Literatures (1890–1916)”. Despite the fact that populist, ethnic-nationalist (*semănătorism*) or national-specific (*poporanism*) movements promoted the isolationism or protectionism of autochthonous values, the author shows that both their leaders and sympathizers were among the most active translators and reviewers of foreign literature. In contrast to the prevailing interest in “major” literatures, however, they favoured translations from “minor”, peripheral literatures (e. g. Czech, Hungarian, Scandinavian, Polish, Lithuanian, South Slavic). Translations from major literatures focused on social realism (Dickens, Gorky, etc.). Borza pleads for the political interpretation of this shift: not seeking a new model, nor establishing a relationship with “exotic” cultures, but resisting colonization by large cultures was its main reason.

There are three studies based on quantitative research methods. Emanuel Modoc’s “Travelling Avant-Gardes. The Case of Futurism in Romania” investigates the reception of Futurism in Romanian cultural space of the first half of the 20th century. The study is based on meticulous analysis of the existing vast bibliographies of relations between Romanian and foreign literatures in periodicals (1859–1944) (Beiu-Paladi, L., Brezuleanu, A.-M., Lupu, I., Ștefănescu, C., Preșu, C. 1980–1985. *Bibliografia relațiilor literaturii române cu literaturile străine în periodice (1859–1918)*, vol. I–III. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România; Brezuleanu, A.-M., Mihăilă, I., Nișcov, V., Șchiopu, M., Ștefănescu, C. 1997–2009. *Bibliografia relațiilor literaturii române cu literaturile străine în periodice (1919–1944)*, vol. I.–X. Bucharest: Editura Saeculum I. O.) and

reveals, on the methodological basis of Said’s concept of traveling theories and geographic dispersion and later Bal’s traveling concepts, the reception of the phenomenon of futurism in Romania. The author concludes that despite its strongest presence among modernist movements in the Romanian interwar press, futurism did not have a direct aesthetic impact on literature, but rather was a fact of intercultural exchange.

In his chapter “Strong Domination and Subtle Dispersion: A Distant Reading of Novel Translation in Communist Romania (1944–1989)”, Ștefan Baghiu uses quantitative methods (based on Franco Moretti’s concept) to generate three graphs that reflect the variations and dynamics of translation. In the author’s opinion, translated literature can serve as a barometer for world-system dynamics, even if the surveyed renditions are produced in and for peripheral cultures. Baghiu designates four main periods of translation dynamic in the communist era: the domination of Soviet literature between 1948–1955; the East-West Equalizer between 1955–1964; the domination of the West between 1964–1975; and the proportionate Equality and Sub-Production between 1975–1989. He notices the interesting fact that although “inconvenient texts” were translated, e.g., translations from Western European literatures, they were mostly accompanied by introductions, so-called interpretative instructions. It should be underlined that such research has been made possible by the existence of the *Chronological Dictionary of the Novels Translated in Romania (Dicționarul cronologic al romanului tradus în România (1793–1989))*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei române, 2005), that the author does not cite in his bibliography.

In the third study of quantitative analyses and literary geography, “A Survey of Poetry Translations in Romanian Periodicals (1990–2015)”, Vlad Pojoga offers thirteen graphs of poetry translations in five chosen Romanian literary magazines. The resulting database contains 1810 entries and is interpreted from the chronological (quantities over time,

poetry translation rates, and gender proportionality) and spatial perspective.

The central concern of Alex Goldiș's analysis "Literary Interferences in Subversive East-European Prose under Communism" is the construction of a pattern of the evolution of subversive narrative strategies, by considering the permanent tension between themes and means of expression. Using Even-Zohar's polysystem theory and his concept of repertoire, Goldiș illustrates the socialist realist literature with highly limited repertoire, and the literature in the Thaw period as one marked by the writers' initiative to expand this repertoire. These system constraints have led to the emergence of subversive literature; and "the notion of subversive prose can only be defined in context, because the limits of permissiveness have permanently changed from 1948 to 1990" (88). The repertoire was enriched with translations and the recovery of the modernist tradition. There were two modalities of realist subversion: the so called "distance effect" – starting in the mid-1960s and ending in the late 1970s – when fiction writers took refuge in remote times or in faraway places, or, after denunciation of Stalinism, when they described the "obsessive decade"; secondly, "the formalist subversion", partially caused by language artificiality, the rejection of reflecting poetics, and deconstruction of the truth-telling function of literature. This interactionist model of literature saw the relation between author-reader as one of coder-decoder, but reading became, in the words of Eugen Negrici, a "paranoid reading". As Goldiș concludes: "The complex of interpretation that included the writer, the censor and the reader created a specific form of literary production that transformed every written word into the object of complex negotiation" (94).

The second section of the book, "Close-ups of Literary Translation", contains more specific studies focusing on one author or genre, such as Stefan Sienerth's chapter (in German) about the German writer and translator from Romania, Wolf von Aichelburg; Maria Sass's contribution (in German) about George

Coșbuc, the Romanian writer from the turn of the 19th and 20th century, formed in the Transylvanian German environment, whose translation activities from English, Spanish, Chinese, and Sanskrit literature were based on German renditions; Ioana Constantin's chapter (in German) on Romanian translation of Goethe's *Faust* from the point of view of covert/overt translation theory and the theory of equivalence.

Anca-Maria Simina's chapter "Foreignizing Shakespeare's Bawdy Multilingual Puns in Communist and Post-Communist Romania" is a comparative study of Romanian translations of Shakespeare's bawdy wordplay with the aim of pointing out different approaches to the so-called foreignizing concept (L. Venuti). The subject of comparison are two Romanian translations – Mihnea Gheorghiu's editions from the communist era and George Volceanov's present-day editions.

Cătălina Stanislav in her chapter "Sexual Language in Translation. An Analysis Based on Male v. Female Authored Novel" analyses the differences in the portrayal of sexual acts, depending on the gender identity of the author and the translator. Based on Luise von Flotow's *Translation and Gender* there exist "interventionist feminist translations" that adapt texts and strive to separate female and male language. Stanislav shows, with a variety of examples, the ways translators handle sexual and erotic language. She describes the discrepancies in translation language realisations when sex scenes of a novel are translated by a heterogeneous author-translator pair: "more often than not, female translators are more attentive to gendered phrases, insults or appellatives than male translators, because they usually involve their own body parts" (195). Stanislav states that the explicit language of the novel causes offense to women, therefore woman translators often redact it by using euphemisms. And she concludes that "something in the female translator's brain always takes different types of precaution to distance herself when she feels in any kind of discomfort or anxiety" (201).

Andreea Coroian Goldiș builds her article “Editorial Fiction’: Local Issues and Global Relevance in French and Romanian Literature” on the postulate of the post-2000s declared crisis of national (in this case French) literature in the international dynamics of cultures. The solution to this crisis should be a kind of internationalization, universalization of culture and literature in particular, a concept of literature that reflects the global dimension of humanity (see also the French Writers’ manifesto “Pour une littérature-monde en française”). Coroian Goldiș rejects this postulate as surpassed already at the time as it was declared, proof of what is already known in European literature as “editorial fiction”: “Editorial fiction brings together autofiction, a narrative style focused on the construction of intimacy [...] and social or journalistic prose style, which draws on the rhetoric of engagé authors” (206). She describes both French (M. Houellebecq, Y. Haenel) and Romanian (D. Lungu, A. Șchiop) authors of editorial fiction or “literature/prose for export” (the Romanian designation and notional bridge between the topic of this study and the topic of the whole book).

Case and material studies on translation are represented by Iulia Elena Gâțăs “Chinese Literature in Romanian Translation: Fidelity v. Artistic Coherence in Yu Hua’s *Huózhe*”, Ovio Olaru’s quantitative comparison of German and Romanian markets and translations of Nordic noir bestsellers, and Alex Ciorogar’s axiological study on the current status of the translator/translation “Beyond Print and Invisibility: ‘Translation’ in the Age of Digital Globalization”, which I would have preferred to see included in the first section of the volume.

The third section, “A Translator’s Perspective: Language, Discourse and Meaning”, opens with Georg Aeschl’s axiological study (in German) on the status of the literary translator in the era of globalization and profit-oriented societies and his/her role in transporting Eastern European literature to the West. It continues with case studies:

translations of Paul Celan’s poetry (George State), translation concepts of Ezra Pound’s texts (Radu Vancu), translating poetry, tales, non-fiction and preservation of the Romany language heritage by the so-called “Roma Princess,” Luminița Mihai Cioabă (Sunhild Galter; in German), the humor and social criticism in the fiction of Romanian writer Radu Paraschivescu (Nora Căpățână, in German), and the presentation and German translations of Doina Ioanid’s poetry in prose (Doris Sava, in German).

The volume presents the latest Romanian thinking about translation, based on international methodological approaches. It introduces studies by scholars and PhD. students mainly from two university centres – Sibiu and Cluj – so it cannot be considered fully representative of Romanian translation studies. If I began this review by emphasizing the declared pioneering status of this study, I need to conclude with the caveat that Romanian translation studies had existed before (see e. g., the recent studies by Georgiana Lungu-Badea, Magda Jeanrenaud, Mihaela Ursa, but also the older volumes by Gelu Ionescu). However, *The Culture of Translation in Romania* opens Romanian translation studies to international audiences, which is of great benefit and merit.

EVA KENDERESSY
Institute of World Literature SAS
Slovak Republic