Translating the (Meta)Language of Romanian Literary Criticism at the End of the Twentieth Century and the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century
Theoretical and Practical Aspects

OVIDIU MATIU

Translating the (Meta-)Language of Literary Criticism: Terminological Issues

ROUGHLY PUT, the translation of literary criticism from one language into another is specialized translation and should be performed accordingly, with more focus on terminology and the target audience, and less on the creative writing skills of the translator. From this point of view, it resembles—at least in terms of its purpose—technical translation, which produces manuals and guides to be used by professionals in a specific field. Beyond the superficiality of such definition, literary criticism may be counted among the other specialized fields of knowledge, listed under "humanities," and hence the translation of texts belonging to it is permanently connected to disciplines such as terminology management.

There are voices in the field of Translation Studies who argue that terminology should be regarded as a distinct discipline, or at least one that is soon going to be a discipline in its own right. It has undergone a process of development as a standalone discipline since the mid-twentieth century, and it has achieved a significant position among the disciplines under the umbrella of Translation Studies. According to Lynne Bowker, one of the contributors to the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, irrespective of what approach one might adopt, today "terminology clearly has very close ties to other areas of applied linguistics, including specialized translation, and while terminological investigations can certainly be carried out in a monolingual setting, one of its most widely practised applications is in the domain of translation."[1] The reciprocal is valid as well:

research in the field of translation must include terminological investigations, whether of the quantitative or the qualitative sort.

"Terminology is concerned with the naming of concepts in specialized domains of knowledge" and operates with concept-term units, composed of the notions of concept and term, interconnected through definitions; "behind each term there should be a clearly defined concept which is systematically related to the other concepts that make up the knowledge structure of the domain."[2] Bowker's definition of terminology leaves no room for interpretation: every specialized field must develop its own (electronic) multi-lingual terminology databanks containing the standardized terms to be used in that particular area of research, as upgraded versions of their hard-copy forefathers (bi-lingual dictionaries and glossaries of terms). Such databanks are already available for the more "technical" domains, but the humanities, literary studies included, for obvious reasons, display more resistance to change in this respect.

This "resistance" (which, truth be told, has decreased over the past few years with the advent and constant development of disciplines such as digital humanities, of computer-assisted research on literature, on literary criticism) seemed natural, for example in the late 1990s, especially because concepts such as "standardization," "(specialized) terminology," "database" belonged to domains which seemed to be and actually were ontologically distinct from the humanities, in general, and literary studies, in particular. The history of theoretical approaches to terminology starts with the General Theory of Terminology (GTT), based on the work of the Austrian engineer Eugen Wüster, the first enemy of ambiguity in specialized language. This theory operates with principles such as onomasiology, the clear-cut nature of concepts, univocity and synchrony. The GTT uses a strategy borrowed from industrial engineering and its main objective was terminological standardization *per se*. However, straightforward as it may seem, this approach failed to lay the foundation for the terminologist's/the translator's paradise and to become the absolute theory of terminology for obvious reasons (one of which being the fact that dogmatic standardization—regulated by standard institutes—cannot be used in all "specialized," i.e. less "technical", fields).

According to Bowker, this is what generated several other theories of terminology, which appeared to be less exclusive, such as: socioterminology, sociocognitive terminology or the Communicative Theory of Terminology (CTT).[3] Lacking the prescriptive dimension of the General Theory of Terminology, some of the newer theories have (arguably) become and remained mere "approaches" to terminology, used and promoted by small groups of researchers, confined to the linguistic and cultural boundaries terminology usually aims to cross.

For example, socioterminology has been, to use John Humbley's phrase, just "a useful excursion", failing to become at least "a branch of terminology in its own right", an excursion which started in Quebec in 1981 and was then imported to France by linguists such as Louis Guespin and François Gaudin, its influence being thus confined to a very limited area.[4] Humbley observes that the "official" ISO TR: 22134 (2007) definition of socioterminology links it to technolects or LSPs, thus referring to it as the "approach of terminology work based on the sociological, cultural and socio-linguistic characteristics of a linguistic community, aiming at the study and development of its tech-

nolects in accordance with those characteristics."[5] Within this context, the language of literary criticism may be understood as a technolect used to transfer specialized knowledge to professionals in a specialized field, which resists standardization mainly because it operates with dynamic concepts.

Therefore, the promoters of socioterminology aimed at a radical break from the GTT's main course of action and, implicitly, its main objective (i.e. standardization), by focusing on the analysis of terms used by researchers in a specific area and aiming at a *normaison*, a substitute to or even a better version of standardization. Humbley mentions Louis Guespin as the one who coined the term in French and adds that it reflects standardization (*normalisation*, in French, in the context of industrial standardization), but its meaning is closer to the English *in-house terminology*.[6] In other words, *normaison* is a process which targets the terminology used by a small group of researchers, both in spoken and written form, who set the norm based on the needs of their community, of which the most important is the need to deal with domain-specific communication issues. Hence, socioterminology may be able to provide the translators of literary criticism with a hands-on solution to the apparent terminological "crisis" in the field, a crisis which has more to do with the quantity, rather than the quality of the terms that need to be processed in the ever-expanding literary criticism jargon.

In her book on the experientialist sociocognitive theory of terminology, *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive-Approach*, Rita Temmerman calls for a new perspective on terminology that would provide an alternative for the objective approach of the Vienna school of terminology, whose authority in the field was probably derived from the activity of the International Information Centre for Terminology (Infoterm) based in the Austrian capital city and supported by UNESCO until the mid–1990s. After analyzing the previous criticism of what she calls "traditional Terminology" (discussing the various approaches by Juan C. Sager and John McNaught, Peter Weissenhofer, Britta Zawada and Piet Swanepoel, M. Teresa Cabré, Ingrid Meyer, Louis Guespin and François Gaudin, Kyo Kageura) she concludes that "the discipline of Terminology needs alternative principles and methods for the study and description of terminology," supporting the idea that Terminology is a discipline in its own right.[7] In brief, the alternative principles of the sociocognitive theory converge to the idea that "terms are more likely to represent fuzzy and dynamic categories, whose members may exhibit dittering degrees of prototypicality, rather than clear-cut concepts."[8]

Temmerman's "alternative" principles open the way for a new perspective upon terminology, in which the distinction between Terminology (i.e. the theory and practice of terminology), seen as a discipline, or seen as terminography (i.e. the terminology work, *per se*), does not seem so important anymore. This view opens the way to multiple possibilities regarding the application of terminology (capitalized, or not) in domains which traditionally reject the use of "clear-cut concepts", favoring more "dynamic" approaches to terms they operate with. Obviously, most of these domains are in the area of the humanities, and fields such as literary criticism/studies, philosophy, theology, are perfect candidates in this respect.

Theoretical Models for Translation Criticism

TRANSLATION CRITICISM or analysis has undergone multiple mutations since the second half of the twentieth century. Looking at translation as both a "linguistic product" and a "cognitive process," Jeremy Munday sees these transformations as attempts to construct a logical explanation of what the translation process involves on various levels. With a special focus on the linguistic level, Munday selects two of the most prominent of such attempts, namely Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet's taxonomy and Catford's "translation shifts," which emerged in the 1950s and the 1960s and have ever since exerted a strong influence in what is known today as the field of Translation Studies.[9]

The first one, the "classic" model, i.e. Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy in *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais/Comparative Stylistics of French and English* (1958/1995), involved a stylistic analysis of parallel texts in French and English, in search for "strategies" and "procedures." Beyond Munday's basic definitions of the two terms (he sees strategy as the translator's general approach to the process of translation, while procedure is the translation method employed),[10] we should also note that, besides being "an overall orientation," the translator's strategy also provides a framework which exerts a strong influence over the entire process of translation, with an even stronger tendency to control other translations in the same field and with great potential to become a distinct translation model. Moreover, it might involve one specific procedure or technique or several, which integrate into the framework binding together the component parts of the model.

This is what happened to the Vinay and Darbelnet model itself, as it spread widely in the late twentieth century, being applied in various shapes and contexts, and suffering its own specific "mutations", such as changes in the language pair (it generated analyses on French-German translation: Malblanc, 1944/1963; English-Spanish translation: Vázquez-Ayora's *Introducción a la traductología*, 1977, García Yebra's *Teoría y práctica de la traducción*, 1982) and two reiterations, which expanded its area of application and increased its influence (Chuquet and Paillard's work titled *Approche linguistique des problèmes de traduction*, published in 1987 and the translation into English of Vinay and Darbelnet's book, published as *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, as late as 1995).[11]

In the chapter titled "Methods of Translation," Vinay and Darbelnet describe a model which positions the translator on the same level as an impressionist painter who focuses on the essence, leaving out the details of the subject, and produces an *impasto* structure, which only hints at the original subject. The translator thus becomes a mediator between two linguistic systems, that of the source and that of the target language, his role being somehow reduced to that of a mediator who analyses the target text, reflects on it, then creates in his mind "an impression of the target", constructs the target language text and then adds all the missing details.[12] In practice, the process is more complex and seems to involve, to use Vinay and Darbelnet's word, "countless" methods or procedures.

Nevertheless, Vinay and Darbelnet count just two general methods (the direct/literal and oblique translation) and seven procedures, of which three are direct and four oblique (borrowing, calque, literal translation; transposition, modulation, *équivalence*/idiomatic translation, adaptation). The translator must test the first three procedures and if they are inappropriate (the meaning is different, there is no meaning, the register is different etc.), he should turn to oblique translation.[13] These procedures function on three different levels: the lexicon, syntactic structures, the message, supplemented with word order and thematic structure (*démarche*) and connectors (*charnières*): cohesive links, discourse markers, deixis, punctuation marks.[14]

According to Vinay and Darbelnet, the application of the methods and procedures above must be preceded by an initial analytical process, whose "fixed starting point" is the target-language text. This analysis of the target text follows four "initial steps": "to identify the units of translation" (the units of translation are the expressions that must be translated as a whole and not as individual words; "units of thought" and "lexicological units") , "to examine the SL text; this consists of evaluating the descriptive, affective, and intellectual content of the units of translation," "to reconstitute the situation which gave rise to the message" and "to weigh up and evaluate the stylistic effects, etc." These four steps of the holistic analysis performed on the source-language text must be followed by the production stage in which the translator produces the target-language text as a problem solver who constructs then evaluates the translation.[15] This is the stage in which the various translation methods and procedures must be applied.

The second linguistic model, which Munday counts among the most representative in the field of Translation Studies, is the one published by John Cunnison Catford in 1965, in his book, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. In the twelfth chapter of his book, "Translation Shifts," Catford is the first one to use the term (in fact adding the specialized terminology to Vinay and Darbelnet's approach) defining it as the set of linguistic changes identified in the process of translating "textual material"[16] from the source into the target language. Shifts are of two types, level shifts and category shifts (the latter are further divided into: structural, class, unit/rank, and intra-system shifts), and they are defined as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL".[17]

In the chapter dedicated to "Translation Equivalence," Catford analyses the differences between what he terms as formal correspondence and textual equivalence. He defines the formal correspondent as "TL category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the 'same' place in the 'economy' of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL." The other concept, that of textual equivalent, is understood as "any TL text or portion of text which is observed on a particular occasion, by methods described below, to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text."[18] In other words, the latter has a binary structure composed of two units: a source-language and a target-language text (or units of translation), while the former is a system-based binary structure in which the component items are the two languages (the source and the target).

Even though Catford's approach has been targeted by heavy criticism over time, on grounds of "its static contrastive linguistic basis" (Delisle), and of the lack of actual,

contextualized examples, being even dismissed as a work of mere "historical academic interest" (Henry),[19] there are, however, several strong points which have kept the book on the shelf of translation theorists and translators. Among these is his acknowledgment of the value of "function, relevance, situation and culture rather than just … formal linguistic criteria"[20] in translation, and also the role of the translator in this entire system, whose "opinion" is the one that actually counts more in establishing what is relevant from a functional point of view than the formal distinction between any criteria applied to the translation process: "A decision, in any particular case, as to what is functionally relevant in this sense must in our present state of knowledge remain to some extent a matter of opinion. The total co-text will supply information which the translator will use in coming to a decision, but it is difficult to define functional relevance in general terms."[21]

Catford's "error," that of not using real-life, actual examples of translated texts, was probably the result of his attempt to create a broad-spectrum model, a generic framework that could be applied to various contexts and types of translation, for example from translation in the more technical fields to literary translation. However, the first serious discussion of literary translation was actually very specific and emerged in the 1960s and 1970s in the Czech school of translation theory, whose most prominent representative, Jiří Levý, proposed a model which involved the use of methods typical of the exact sciences in the translation of poetry. To a certain extent, his work opened the way for the application of computer-science theories and tools to the process of translation.

Jiří Levý's theory emerged mainly from practice and it is based epistemologically and methodologically "on Czech 'functional' structuralism."[22] Levý is the one who introduces in the theory of translation the "expressive function" or style, by analyzing the "surface structure of the ST and TT with particular attention to poetry translation, and sees literary translation as both a reproductive and a creative labor with the goal of equivalent aesthetic effect."[23] As shown in Munday's ample and detailed overview of translation theories, "stylistic shifts" have survived in contemporary (theoretical) approaches to the process of translation especially because of the increased interest in the role of the translator and his "his/her relationship to the ST author as exemplified through linguistic choices", as well as "the development of more sophisticated computerized tools to assist analysis."[24]

However "theoretical" these linguistic models might seem, they may be used to improve the quality of translation in the humanities, in general, and in the subfield of literary criticism, in particular because some of their foundational principles are used today in the development of computer-assisted translation tools and that of electronic glossaries. The case study below is based on the Vinay and Darbelnet model and its main aim is to prove that the language of literary criticism can be analyzed and processed just as any other specialized language in order to produce the material for terminology databanks, glossaries and translation memories that could help improve the quality and the quantity of translations in the field.

Translating the (Meta-)Language of Romanian Literary Criticism in the Late Twentieth Century and the Early Twenty-first Century: A Case Study

THE CASE study uses the model of translation shifts developed by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, a model which, in spite of it being now sixty-years old, is still usable in analyzing translations involving pairs of European languages in general. In particular, the fact that is was originally designed for French and English make it the perfect candidate for analyzing Romanian into English translations and, since it was also published in English in 1995, it is still widely used in the (English-speaking) world. Moreover, the two strategies it proposes (direct translation and oblique translation, with their seven procedures) make it applicable to a wide range of translations, in various fields, including literary criticism. Therefore, the translation of Romanian literary criticism may be counted among the candidates for such analysis.

The main aim of the case study is to show that all texts analyzed share the same perspective upon the translation process and its end-product, with minimal variations of method and undeniable differences in quality. We have analyzed three pairs of parallel texts, all published between the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century as translations of Romanian literary criticism texts. Chronologically, using the year the translation was published as reference, the first one is G. Călinescu's *Istoria literaturii române de la origini pînă în present* (the second edition published in 1982) /*History of Romanian Literature* (1988), the second one is Eugen Simion's *Întoarcerea autorului: eseuri despre relația creator-operă* (1981)/*The Return of the Author* (1996), and the third one is the shorter and newer *Experimentul literar românesc postbelic*, by Monica Spiridon, Ion Bogdan Lefter, and Gheorghe Crăciun (1998)/*Experiment in Post-War Romanian Literature* (1999).

In the "Notes on the English Edition," the editors of the English version of Călinescu's *History of Romanian Literature* express their gratitude to professor Leon Levițchi, "who has shown real stylistic virtuosity in the translation and reshaping of the texts (old, poetical, philosophical) while preserving their originality and freshness."[25] Furthermore, in the "Letter to the Present Edition," Ernest H. Latham, Jr. praises the translator "who brings to the present work skills and sensitivities sharpened over the years."[26] In other words, Levițchi's translation is the result of his "stylistic virtuosity" and "sensitivity" as well as his "skills" acquired after many years of practice. Since, as we have seen above, the translation of literary criticism requires a considerable amount of both artistry and technique, the product of Levițchi's work may be counted among the great examples of such endeavor and a point of reference for other less experienced translators.

Vinay and Darbelnet's linguistic model has been applied to various sections of the two texts, i.e. the source and the target language texts, in an attempt to analyze the process of translation, focusing on its product. Because of the obvious limitations of space, we shall consider a few parallel texts selected as relevant samples for this case study. Table 1[27] below is a segmentation of a fragment from Călinescu's chapter on "The National Tendency. The 1901 Moment. The New Messianism. Analysis of the Ethnical Substratum.

Semănătorul (The Sower)" into units of translation (or segments) below sentence level:

TABLE 1

Segment number	Source language segment	Target language segment
1.	Critica "științifică" a lui Gherea	Gherea's "scientific" criticism
2.	avu,	had
3.	cum era de prevăzut,	as could be foreseen
4.	o consecință	a consequence
5.	pe care	which
6.	numai criticul însuși	the critic himself
7.	poate	perhaps
8.	nu o bănui.	did not anticipate.
9.	Gherea subordona arta	Gherea subordinated art
10.	scopului social	to a social aim
11.	și	and
12.	îndemna pe scriitor	urged writers
13.	să lupte	to struggle
14.	pentru societatea internațională	for international society
15.	și	and
16.	împotriva naționaliștilor xenofobi	against xenophobic nationalists
17.	ca Eminescu.	like Eminescu.

The target text in English reads, "Gherea's 'scientific' criticism as could be foreseen had a consequence which perhaps only the critic himself did not anticipate. Gherea subordinated art to a social aim and urged writers to struggle for international society and against xenophobic nationalists like Eminescu."[28] This fragment is an example of direct translation, each source segment having a "word-for-word" translation into the target language; there are also minor changes in syntax, which do not impact upon the general character of the translation product. The same applies to the poetry fragment (Vlahuță's versified commentary on the title of *Semănătorul*/The Sower), which the translator renders as if it were a fragment of blank verse focusing on the meaning, without any attention given to rhyme and rhythm. However, this text does not raise any doubt about the translator's skills (the very next page contains several examples of oblique translation as well as a beautifully rendered poem by Şt. O. Iosif), on the contrary, it shows that—as in most chapters of the analyzed text—the focus is laid predominantly on meaning. Hence, in the analyzed text as well as in Vinay and Darbelnet's model, direct translation is to be replaced with oblique translation only when the former is impossible or "'unacceptable' for what are grammatical, syntactic or pragmatic reasons."[29]

The second text sample is taken from Eugen Simion's *Întoarcerea autorului: eseuri despre relația creator-operă*, translated into English as *The Return of the Author* by James W. Newcomb and Lidia Vianu and published in 1996, fifteen years after the Romanian version. This explains, at least in part, the author's choice to leave out certain chapters in the original version in order to "remove what might be considered extraneous," especially the sections about "Romanian writers who would be unknown to an American audience."[30] On the other hand, there is also the wish to facilitate the integration of

the translated text into the target culture. The table below is an example of sentence-level segmentation, a method used today by computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools[31] to improve the translation process and to enable the translator to focus on sentence-level units of meaning, rather than on above-word units of translation.

Table 2

Segment number	Source language segment	Target language segment
1.	Este interesant de observat că orice critică începe, azi, prin a avea o teorie a criticii.	Interestingly, today all criticism begins by formulating its own theory of criticism.
2.	Orice metodă pune în discuție celelalte metode.	Every method questions all others.
3.	Puțini sunt criticii care mai acceptă să privească în curtea vecinului.	Few are the critics interested in the neighbours' affairs.
4.	Un sentiment de intoleranță marchează domeniul nostru în a doua jumătate a secolului pe care îl parcurgem.	This latter half of our century is an age of intolerance in the field of criticism.
5.	O intoleranță, aș zice, inaugurală, fondatoare.	I take it to be an inaugural, founding intolerance.
6.	*Sunt* în măsura în care mă delimitez de tot.	I *exist* insofar as I can differentiate myself from the rest.
7.	*Exist* numai în solitudinea metodei mele.	I *exist* in the solitude of my method alone.
8.	Asta sugerează faptul că nu mai sunt propriu-zis critici, ci numai metode.	The methods seem to have replaced critics.
9.	Biletul la control: ai *metodă*?	Tickets, please. Have you got a method?
10.	Te poți urca în trenul criticii.	If so, pass, get on the train of criticism.
11.	N-ai o metodă bine fixată, nu aparții unei confrerii metodologice?	No method, no methodological brotherhood owns you?
12.	Adio!	Farewell, then.
13.	Rămâi mult și bine pe peronul criticii tradiționale, hotărâta, posomorâta critică biografică, pozitivistă, psihologică, impresionistă...	You are stranded on the platform of traditional criticism, that dull and determined biographical, positivist, psychological, impressionistic criticism.

The two texts in the table above, the source text[32] and the target text,[33] have been aligned to form thirteen pairs of equal sentence-level translation segments, mirroring the segmentation process performed by computer-assisted translation tools. This type of segmentation turns any type of text into the perfect candidate for a translation performed by means of a CAT tool, which generates the context as well as the need for databanks of specialized terminology, which would accelerate process and improve the product of translation.

In the case above, as well as in other sections of the same text, the product has been obtained by applying the direct translation method in combination with a few oblique-translation strategies. For example, segments 2, 6, 7 were translated by using the direct method and the exact meaning was preserved in all the three cases. Segment 4 contains an example of optional transposition (a procedure of oblique translation), in which the structure "îl parcurgem" (personal pronoun-verb) is translated as "our" (possessive determiner). Another example of oblique-translation procedure is the idiomatic translation of the phrase "în curtea vecinului" as "neighbours' affairs" (segment 3).

Therefore, this second sample showcases a combination of the two strategies, direct and oblique translation, with the latter naturally replacing the first when required.

The third pair of parallel texts is Monica Spiridon, Ion Bogdan Lefter, and Gheorghe Crăciun's *Experimentul literar românesc postbelic*, published in Romanian in 1998, and as a translation into English, one year later, in 1999 (*Experiment in Post-War Romanian Literature*). According to Ion Bogdan Lefter, the English edition is a "concise," shorter version of the Romanian original.[34] The analysis of the target text in the English version by means of the same model developed Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet revealed several aspects which show that direct translation (with some innovations) is the norm in the translation of Romanian literary criticism in the late twentieth century as well. Table 3 below is a sentence-level segmentation of a short fragment in Monica Spiridon's essay "Experimentalismul bine temperat"[35] (Well-moderated experimentalism[36]).

Table 3

Segment number	Source language segment	Target language segment
1.	Ecuației continuitate/ruptură i se adaugă altele.	The equation continuity/break is followed by others.
2.	De pildă, un raport specific între poetic și politic.	For example, a specific rapport between the poetical and the political.
3.	Nonconformismul definitoriu al experimentalismului a fost, în literatura postbelică, practicat prin sine însuși ca un gest de frondă față de presiunea ordinii totalitare.	In post-war literature, the defining nonconformism of an experiment was practised as such, as a fronde against totalitarian pressure.
4.	Dincolo de camuflajul tehnicist, toate tentativele de înnoire programatică ale literaturii postbelice aveau caracter subversiv.	Beyond the technicist camouflage, any attempt to renew programmatically post-war literature had a subversive character.
5.	În toate ipotezele sale, refuzul de aliniere în plan tehnic al poeziei și prozei, într-o epocă obsedată de ideea monumentalului în civilizație și cultură, a fost un simplu fenomen.	In all its hypostases the refusal to observe "technical" command in poetry and prose, in an epoch obsessed by monumentalism in civilization and culture, was a mere epiphenomenon.

The two parallel texts in Table 3 above are an example of direct translation, as the dominant translation strategy employed by the translators of this book, impregnated with surprising (word-level or technical, in most cases) innovations that turn the entire target text into a genuine translation experiment. For example, the third segment contains the word "fronde" that is mainly used in English as a proper noun (Fronde, with reference to the mid-seventeenth century civil wars in France), or as a common noun (usually in inverted commas or italics, as it is a French borrowing). Since, the English "fronde" does not fill a semantic gap, the English word "rebellion" being an eligible equivalent in the target language, this borrowing may be labeled as unnecessary, unless the translator intended to preserve the "couleur locale" of the source text.

The target text also contains translations of Romanian sources (whole fragments as well as titles) which are rendered into English without references to the original and without stating whether the quotations have been taken from previous English translations

of those texts or they are the product of the current translation process. There is also terminology specific to Romanian literary criticism, such as "proletcult" (itself a borrowing from Russian into Romanian, meaning proletarian culture), which is transferred directly, and which belongs to a category that requires direct borrowing meant to fill a semantic gap in the English language.

Conclusions

THE RESEARCH results of the case study show that the (meta-)language of literary criticism qualifies as a perfect candidate for analyses using theoretical models that have been originally designed for more "technical" fields and thus it can be processed as any other "specialized" (meta-)language. The language models employed, and the research results they produced may be used as raw material in the process of developing specialized Romanian-English terminological databanks for the field of literary criticism, both in the process of translation and in that of translation analysis or criticism. Since the subfield of literary criticism, as many other subfields listed under the field of the humanities, is "resistant" to the standardization process, deemed more appropriate for the technical domains, its bilingual (Romanian-English) technolect must undergo a dynamic "harmonization" process, according to the principles of socioterminology and the sociocognitive theory.

❑

Notes

1. Lynne Bowker, "Terminology," in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, eds. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 2nd edition (London–New York: Routledge, 2009), 286.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 287.
4. John Humbley, "Socioterminology," in *Languages for Special Purposes: An International Handbook*, eds. John Humbley, Gerhard Budin, and Christer Laurén (Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2018), 469.
5. ISO TR: 22134 (2007), qtd. in Humbley, 469.
6. Humbley, 478.
7. Rita Temmerman, *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The sociocognitive approach* (Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2000), 34.
8. Bowker, "Terminology," 287.
9. Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, 4th edition (London–New York: Routledge, 2016), 87.
10. Ibid., 88.
11. Ibid.
12. Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, transl. Juan C. Sager and M. J. Hamel (Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1995), 31.
13. Ibid., 34–35.

14. See Munday, 93.

15. Vinay and Darbelnet, 30–31.

16. The term "textual material" is taken from Catford's "wide-not vague," to use his own words, definition of translation, as the uni-directional process involving "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)." J. C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, Fifth Impression (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 20.

17. Ibid., 73.

18. Ibid., 27.

19. Munday, 97.

20. Ibid.

21. Catford, 94.

22. Zuzana Jettmarová, "Editor's Introduction to the English Edition" to *The Art of Translation*, by Jirí Levý, transl. Patrick Corness, edited with a critical foreword by Zuzana Jettmarová (Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2011), xv.

23. Munday, 98.

24. Ibid.

25. "Notes on the English Edition," in G. Călinescu, *History of Romanian Literature*, transl. Leon Leviţchi, 4th edition (Milan: UNESCO; Nagard Publishers, 1988), 4.

26. Ernest H. Latham Jr., "Letter to the Present Edition," in ibid., 6.

27. The table follows Munday's structure, but the terminology has been updated to match today's metalanguage employed by Computer-Assisted Translation (CAT) tools; for example: the "unit of translation" was replaced with "segment". See Munday, 106.

28. Călinescu, 501.

29. Munday, 89.

30. James W. Necomb, "Introduction" to *The Return of the Author* by Eugen Simion, ed. James W. Newcomb, transl. James W. Newcomb and Lidia Vianu (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1996), 12.

31. Such as OmegaT, for example.

32. Eugen Simion, *Întoarcerea autorului: eseuri despre relaţia creator-operă* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1981), 89.

33. Simion, *The Return of the Author*, 92.

34. Lefter, "Preface" to *Experiment in Post-War Romanian Literature*, eds. Monica Spiridon, Ion Bogdan Lefter, and Gheorghe Crăciun, transl. Della Marcus, Ruxandra-Ioana Patrichi, and David Hill, Mediana Collection (Bucharest: Editura Paralela 45, 1999), 7.

35. Monica Spiridon, Ion Bogdan Lefter, and Gheorghe Crăciun, *Experimentul literar românesc postbelic* (Bucharest: Paralela 45, 1998), 11.

36. Spiridon, Lefter, and Crăciun, 20.

Abstract
Translating the (Meta)Language of Romanian Literary Criticism at the End of the Twentieth Century and the Beginning of the Twenty-first Century: Theoretical and Practical Aspects

This paper argues that the translation of Romanian literary criticism, as a field of its own, requires the development of terminological databanks meant to provide the terminological standard, not in the sense of a "standardized" glossary of terms, but in that of "harmonized" terminology, organized in community-specific technolects, as defined by the promoters of socioterminology and the sociocognitive theory. This argument is supported with evidence derived from the research results of a case study focused on several samples of Romanian literary criticism originally published in Romanian and subsequently translated into English in Romania in the late twentieth century and the early twenty-first century, before and in the wake of great social, political and cultural changes. The analysis of the research results shows that dynamic terminological "harmonization," as opposed to mere "standardization," is not only possible but also a *sine qua non* requirement, given its potential to trigger improvements in the quality as well as in the quantity of translations of Romanian literary criticism into the *lingua franca* of today's world.

Keywords