

A Less Than Accidental Translation by Petru Maior Fénelon's *Les Aventures de Télémaque* (1818)

ALIN-MIHAI
GHERMAN



Alin-Mihai Gherman

Former professor at 1 Decembrie 1918 University of Alba Iulia, literary historian and author of several critical editions (Grigore Maior, Samuil Micu, Ioan Zoba, Teodor Corbea, N. Iorga, D. Prodan, etc.).

WITH THE exception of Ioan Budai-Deleanu, fiction did not occupy a privileged place among the concerns of the Transylvanian School (the Transylvanian Romanian cultural movement from the 18th century). This was the result of two seemingly disjointed reasons. As supporters of a clerical mentality of a traditional conservative background, they considered, on the one hand, that any artistic manifestation by which the individual was deprived of their fulfillment as a religious being must be, if not vehemently amended, at least considered with reservation. On the other hand, viewed from the perspective of the social and political program of the representatives of the Romanian Enlightenment in Transylvania, fiction was a frivolous and pointless manifestation, which neither

The Romanian version of the study appeared in the volume *Petru Maior și prietenii: Lucrările Simpozionului Național desfășurat la Reghin în perioada 7–8 septembrie 2018*, edited by Laura Stanciu (Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2020), 111–120.

supported nor argued this program. The period of Romanticism would later bring—at another level and with other means—a synthesis between fiction and the national program of the moment. Only peripherally, from the point of view of these centers of church authority—Blaj (Blasendorf, Balázsfalva), and later Sibiu (Hermannstadt, Nagyszeben)—but associated with urban centers of Romanian culture, through writers such as Dimitrie Țichindeal in Banat or Vasile Aaron and Ioan Barac from Sibiu and Braşov (Kronstadt, Brassó), it promoted a greater interest in fiction. An exception, which does not refute what has been mentioned above, was Ioan Budai-Deleanu, because he composed major writings for Romanian literature, *Țiganiada* (The Gypsyiad) and *Trei viteji* (Three brave men) away from Transylvania, in a major cultural center of the empire, Lemberg (Lviv, Ukraine).

The translation activity was differentiated as well. An important translator was Samuil Micu-Klein, but his activity was limited (except for the short story by Lucian of Samosata) to the presentation, in Romanian, of a wide selection of patristic texts (but also to a new translation of the Bible), seen as a completion of the theological discourse and as an annex to his *Church History*.¹

Gheorghe Şincai was also a diligent translator, but mainly of textbooks and scientific texts were meant to increase the level of his compatriots' knowledge and, implicitly, their economic emancipation. Located in Lemberg at a great distance from the authority of the bishop of Blaj, Ioan Budai-Deleanu also translated, but not completely, texts from Metastasio. An apparent exception is the translation activity of Ştefan Crişan (Körössi), who translated from Florian's work not with the purpose of presenting to his compatriots a narrative text with special literary virtues, but in order to exemplify (in a language difficult to equate for the modern listener) his etymological spelling system for writing the Romanian language using Latin characters (until then it had been commonly written in Cyrillic characters) and the purist Latinist lexical program. In conclusion, compared to the frantic activity of the Moldavian Alecu (Alexandru) Beldiman, a real machine when it came to translating some memorable texts of ancient or modern Western literature (doubled by a rich cluster of Moldavian and Wallachian boyars or clerics), the activity of translating fiction was fragile among the Romanians from Transylvania and, from the point of view of the major centers of culture (usually the two dioceses of Blaj and Sibiu), it was also peripheral.

Petru Maior was not a translator, unlike, as we have said, Samuil Micu-Klein, who excelled at interpreting the texts of the Holy Scripture and of patristic writers, at translating and processing philosophical texts such as those by Friedrich Christian Baumeister or those related to universal church history, such as Claude Fleury's or Gheorghe Şincai's. We can also mention Ioan Piuariu-Molnar, whose

Rhetoric proved to be a free translation of scholarly textbooks used in the empire. There was, however, one exception: Maior not only translated but also printed Fénelon's *The Adventures of Telemachus, Son of Ulysses*.² The exception must have had, however, its meanings, and we intend to clarify at least some of them in the present study.

Had it not been for the publication in 1699 of the novel *Les Aventures du Télémaque*, which made Fénelon's personality a point of reference for French and implicitly European culture, the figure of the French clergyman would have been limited in the modern era only to footnotes to a minor history of the ecclesiastical life of the France of his time, as he was a central character of a minor "scandal" (which French culture does not lack at all), the dispute about Quietism, which divided the society of the time, making necessary the intervention (as a result of the insistent intercession of the king himself) before the Holy See to obtain a firm condemnation of this movement also from the pontifical authority. Amid the lack of details concerning that time, the problem of Quietism looks not only minor, but also difficult to explain.³

Fénelon was deeply involved in the cultural debates of his time; even when far from the capital and the Court, exiled to Cambrai, he was considered one of the intellectual and reference authorities of the time, often asked to come in person at the residence of the archbishopric: from a philosophical point of view, he was a notable opponent of Jansenism, which he combated in several of his writings, asked by the very institution of which he had been a member since 1693, the French Academy, to rule on a question of esthetics, namely the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, on which he formulated a pertinent point of view etc.

Written by Fénelon while he was the preceptor of the king of France's grandson, the novel *The Adventures of Telemachus* was primarily intended to train the Dauphin in matters pertaining to the culture of Hellenic antiquity (see in this regard, the large number of characters taken from the two Homeric epics, *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*, as well as the large number of characters from Greek mythology, but also an entire geographical universe of Hellenic antiquity). Under the pretext of a narrative that arouses the interest of his young student, Fénelon inserted in his novel a broad discussion about the forms of government, so much debated at the time by thinkers like Hugo Grotius or Justus Lipsius.

Led by Mentor (in the novel, an alter ego of the goddess of wisdom, Minerva, but expressing in fact Fénelon's own opinions), Telemachus encounters different forms of government, drawing conclusions and lessons from the knowledge of each Mentor (but sometimes of Telemachus himself). Mentor's assertion that few arrangements were well organized and fair to all members of society was one that was circulated in the Age of Enlightenment by other writ-

ers as well. Starting with Montesquieu's *Persian Letters*, through Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, and Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, and ending with several tragedies and prose texts by Voltaire, or Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Julie, or the New Heloise* and *Émile*—to mention only the most important writers—an impressive number of writings debated this issue.⁴

Lacking a proper plot, Fénelon's novel enjoyed a tremendous reception at the time from two seemingly different but complementary points of view: it was received as a good piece of fiction piecing together the universe of Hellenic culture (which is why it enjoyed a huge reception in neo-Greek culture at the time of national revival in the second half of the eighteenth century and, by reflex, in Moldavia and Wallachia in the Phanariot period) but especially as a political novel open to many personal interpretations.⁵ In this respect he was certainly not very favorably received by the absolute monarchy of Louis XIV.⁶

Les Aventures de Télémaque was a remarkable success, seeing an impressive number of editions throughout the eighteenth century, to which we must add the many translations in most mention European languages. In our country, in addition to the circulation of the novel in French, we must also the success enjoyed by the Greek translation.

Until Petru Maior, others had tried to translate Fénelon's novel into Romanian: we know of five manuscripts from the second half of the 18th century, all from Moldavia,⁷ comprising only some sections from the first part of the novel. By mentioning that the translation was made after the French original, the first complete translation and printing—*Întâmplările lui Telemah fiul lui Ulises acum întâi tradusă din franțozește de G. Pleșoianul*, 2 vols. (Craiova, 1831)—suggested that it was a complete version of the novel and that Pleșoianu was aware of the existence of Maior's translation. Both the anonymous translators of the Moldavian manuscripts and G. Pleșoianu were attracted by the political character of Fénelon's writing, coinciding with the debates on social and political reforms that took place in the Moldavian space in the second half of the 18th century, while Pleșoianu's translation coincided with the moment of the debates around the first modern constitution of Romania, the Organic Regulation.⁸

From the point of view of Petru Maior's conception, expressed in his *Protopopadichia* (The power of archpriests) and *Istoria Besearicei românilor* (The history of the Romanian Church), but also in his other writings, the translation of Fénelon's novel is far from accidental, being coherent with the whole socio-political thinking of the learned archpriest of Reghin (Szászrégen, Sächsisch-Regen), and actually complementing it. Passages such as

Sumeții tiriani trăsesse asupra lor mânia împăratului Săsostere, care domnea preste Eghipetu și multe alte țări câștigase cu armatele sale. Avuțiile cele cumplite

ce le adunase ei cu neguștorii și tăria cetatei lor celei nebiriuită ce era pre mare, îngâmfasă inima acestor popoare. Pentru aceea, la darea ce pusesse pre dânșii Săsostere la întoarcerea sa de la războaiele cele cu biruință purtate, nu vrură a se supune, ba, ce e mai multu, dăduse mulți ostai fratelui său, carele îmblase să-lucidă la întoarcerea sa în mijlocul publice (de obște) veselii a unui ospăț mare.

(The arrogant tyrants had drawn upon them the wrath of the Sesostris emperor, who ruled over Egypt and many other countries he had conquered with his armies. The terrible riches which they had amassed through trade and with the strength of their invincible citadel, which was too large, made the heart of these peoples arrogant. For this reason, he did not want to submit to the gift he had given to Sesostris upon his return from the victorious wars he had fought, and, moreover, he had given many soldiers to his brother, who tried to kill him upon his return in the middle of the public (community) merriment of a big feast.)

could only incite Petru Maior to find out the underlying social mechanisms.

We don't know whether Petru Maior translated the whole novel, since only half of it (the first ten chapters) was printed in 1818.⁹ The existence of a full translation would also be supported by a note at the end of the volume: "Capăt tomului I" (The end of volume one). If our assumption is valid, in a future research it will be necessary to clarify both the reason why the second part was not printed and the choice of the manuscript.

Petru Maior definitely translated Fénelon's novel not directly from French, but, as the title page itself confesses—"de pre limba italienească pre limba românească prefăcute" (changed from the Italian language into the Romanian language)—through an as yet unidentified Italian translation.¹⁰ This hypothesis is supported by several Italianisms that we encounter in the text, often accompanied in parentheses by synonyms used in everyday language by Petru Maior himself, such as: cavern [cavern] (gaură [hole]), colună [column] (stâlp [pole]), corieru [carrier] (cociș [coachman]), fâretru (tulbă [quiver]), grația [grace] (har [talent]), isolă [isle] (ostrov [islet]), insinua [to insinuate] (vârî [to insert]), liliu [lily] (crin), navarcu [ship master] (căpitan de corabie [ship captain]), năvega [to navigate] (corăbia, a merge cu corabia [to sail]), prigionier [prisoner] (prins [caught]), prigionerie [imprisonment] (prinsoare), răminge [oar] (vâslă [paddle]), sobrietate [sobriety] (trezvie [innocence]), sobriu [sober] (treazv [innocent]), sovranu [sovereign] (stăpânitoriu [ruler]), stătuarî [sculptor] (cioplitor de chipuri [effigy carver]), etc. Moreover, Maior borrowed from Italian the interjection "va!" (go!), inventing an equivalent in Romanian, "vă!" instead of "du-te!" or "mergi!"

This process of doubling neologisms with synonyms from everyday language is also found in other cases, such as that of neologisms from Latin, and not only in the case of words obviously taken from Italian: gravitate [gravity] (bărbătească

cuviință, bărbătească purtare [manly behavior]), ispert [expert] (ispitit [lured]), liber [free] (volnic [autonomous]), libertate [freedom] (slobozire, volnicie [autonomy]), maestate [majesty] (mărire), maestos [majestic] (cu mărire), modest [modest] (de omenie [humble]), modestie [modesty] (bună-cuviință, omenie [humility]), monstru [monster] (arățătură [apparition]), naufragiu [wreck] (sfârmare sau frângere de corabie [shipwreck]), navigație [navigation] (îmblare cu corabia pre mare [sailing]), neregulat [irregular] (nendreptat [uneven]), obelisc, pl. obeliști [obelisk(s)] (niște stâlpi minunați [impressive poles]), ocașie [occasion] (prilegiu [occasion]), opune [to oppose] (împrotivi [to balk]), etc.

At that time Petru Maior was putting together the *Lesicon românesc-latinesc-unguresc-nemțesc, care de mai mulți autori, în cursul a trideci, și mai multor ani s-au lucrat*—known as *Lexiconul de la Buda* (The lexicon of Buda)—printed in 1825, his opinions tending orthographically toward an etymological spelling of Romanian with Latin letters, and lexically toward linguistic purism, respectively towards the elimination of words of other origins than the ones inherited from Latin and the borrowing of neologisms from Latin or Romance languages. Thus, in his *Prediche* (Sermons) he insistently used words inherited from Latin, even if they were dialectal. This is what he did in the case of “mai” (mallet), a word with a regional circulation, but which could be easily identified as being of Latin origin (also thanks to the Italian “maglio”) which he doubled in parentheses with the much better known “ciocan” (hammer). His linguistic purism went so far as to propose verbal forms remade after the Latin language, but non-existent in the Romanian language. This is what he did in the case of “sămu” (after the Latin “sumus”), which he accompanied in parentheses with “sântem” (we are) (which was actually of Latin origin, but this became known only in the twentieth century, when linguistics also factored in the Latin vernacular, unlike Petru Maior and his contemporaries, who only drew on classical Latin). Also significant is the reconstruction—as a sign of the consciousness of the Latin nature of the Romanian language—of the form “românesc” instead of the etymological “rumânesc,” indicating how the word developed into Dacian-Romanian dialects: “acum întâiu de pre limba italienească pre limba românească prefăcute” (first changed from the Italian language into the Romanian language).

Maior’s Romanian version of *The Adventures of Telemachus* became, along with his *Sermons*, a textbook in which the scholar applied his linguistic principles, being also coherent with his entire linguistic thinking, through the implicit support of his purist program.

FOR A long time, *Les Aventures de Télémaque* was considered and admired as a model of refined fictional style, being part of the canonic texts of the school curriculum. On a closer reading, Fénelon’s text fully meets the demands of literary classicism. However, the novel as such, and implicitly

Les Aventures de Télémaque, had not been codified by the poetic arts of classicism, either by Boileau, or by other authors of such works, because by the very combination of narrative bits with descriptions and dialogues, it contravened classicist purism. The mixture of literary genres also ensured the survival of this novel, which had several reading keys: political novel, textbook for education, pilgrimage novel, which bordered on the much more lively popular genre of the picaresque novel. Without excluding any of those sides of Fénelon's novel, Petru Maior was attracted first of all by the political dimension of the novel, making its translation an action coherent with his other works (*Protopopadichia* in particular, a work inspired by the reading of French Gallican writings, pleading for autonomy from the authority of the bishop).¹¹

The action of interpreting a literary text is at the same time one of rendering a text in another language, respecting the literary canon in which it was composed, but also of recreating it in the language in which it is transposed taking into account its expressive possibilities, the author being conditioned, on the one hand, by the fidelity to the model and, on the other hand, by the expressive possibilities of the language in which they translate. Compared to the translations from the old Romanian literature prior to Petru Maior (most of the times free translations or even a remaking of the original text) he showed fidelity to the original text, respecting its structure and even the order of words:

Aceste zicându, se duse către Vinere cu o grațioasă (drăgălașă) și maiestosă zâmbire, o scânteitoare lumină asemenea celor mai pătrunzătoare fulgere scâpără din ochii săi și cu dragoste sărutând pre Vinere răsufă un miros de dulce ambrosie, de care tot Olimpul rămase mireșmit. Dumnezeuoia nu se putu conțeni să nu fie simțitoare spre arătarea dragostei, de care cel mai mare întră dumnezăi le-au fost împărțășit. Bucuria care simți ea fu atâta, cât, cu toate lacrămile sale și durerea sa, isbucni pre fața ei. Slobozi în jos învălitoarea sa pentru ca să ascunză rușinea feței sale și încurcătura în care să afla. Toată dulceața dumnezăilor să bucură de cuvintele lui Joe și Vinere, fără amânare, să duse la Neptunu ca să se sfătuiască cu dânsul despre mijlocirile cu care să isbândească asupra lui Telemah.¹²

(That said, he went towards Venus smiling graciously and majestically, a bolt of light like fiercest lightning shot from his eyes, and when he lovingly kissed Venus a scent of ambrosia pervaded the whole of Olympus. The goddess was powerless to resist this display of love, coming from the greatest of the gods. Despite her tears and her pain, the joy she felt was so compelling that her face could no longer hide it. She dropped her veil to conceal the shame of her countenance and the awkwardness of her stance. All the gods rejoiced on hearing Jupiter's words, and Venus quickly went to Neptune to seek his counsel on how she could overcome Telemachus.)

Obviously, Fénelon was driven in his novel by the mentality of his contemporary rationalism: all actions find a logical and rational explanation. However, the feelings of the individuals appear in the novel, foreshadowing a feature of many pre-Romantic novels that followed. However, sentiment is seen as an irrational manifestation of the individual. One such moment is the passionate outburst of the goddess Calypso, abandoned by Telemachus on Mentor's advice:

Calipso, mai tare mâniindu-se decât o leoaie, ai cui fură puii ei cei micuți răpiți, alerga prin pădure fără de cărare și neștiind unde merge, pre urmă, fără de a se pricepe, se află la intrarea groapei sale, unde Mentor aștepta:

—*Duceți-vă de la isola mea, zice, o, străinilor, carii nu pentru alta aveți venit aici, fără ca să-mi turburați răpaosul meu! Departe, departe de la mine acest tinăr nesâmțitu! Și, dacă tu, bătrâne fără înțelepție nu-l vei îndepărta de aici, vei simți asprimea unei zină întăritată! Nu vreu mai mult să-l văzși mai puțin voi răbda ca pre o nimfă de ale mele să corvească cu el și să se uite la el! Mă juru pre apele Stigie, jurământu care și dumnezeilor iaste înfricoșatu! Ci să știi, Telemache, că necasurile tale nu sânt sfârșite, nemulțemitoriule și om fără de lege, nu te vei duce de la isola mea fără ca să cazi în nenorociri noao! Vă! Du-te! Voi ști eu să-mi isbândesc! Vei plânge că ai pierdut pre Calipso, ci în deșertu! Neptunu încă și acum fiind întăritat asupra tatălui tău pentru că batjocori în Sicilia și așțat de Vinere, de care tu ți-ai bătut joc în isola Ciprului îți gătește vifore noao! Vei mai vedea pe tatăl tău în viață, ci fără de a-l cunoaște!*¹³

(Angrier than a lioness deprived of her cubs, Calypso was running through the woods without following a path and without knowing where she was headed. Eventually, she reached the entrance to her cave, where Mentor was waiting for her:

—*Leave my island, she said, you foreigners who came here only to disturb my peace; take this young man, incapable of feeling, away from me! And you, old fool, will experience the anger of a furious goddess unless you take him away forthwith! I do not wish to see him anymore, and I shall not allow any of my nymphs to lay with him or glance at him! This I swear on the waters of the Styx, an oath that can shake the gods themselves! But know this, Telemachus, you ungrateful wretch: your troubles are far from over; you leave my island only to experience more misfortune! Go! Leave! I shall find my vengeance! In vain will you pine for Calypso! Neptune, still mad at your father, who offended him in Sicily, and stirred by assist Venus, whom you disparaged on the island of Cyprus, has more storms in store for you. You will see your father, who is still alive, but you will fail to recognize him!*)

At a closer look, Petru Maior's translation of the novel is consistent both with his political thought and with his own conception of the creation of a modern

standard Romanian language, being a text worthy of consideration in the reconstruction of his whole work and conception. That is why we believe that republishing this translation is mandatory for the reconstruction of the whole work of this important representative of the Enlightenment among the Romanians in Transylvania.



Notes

1. This also applies to the translation—lost today—of a popular book like *Barlaam and Josaphat*, which, according to tradition, was made in the name of the author to Saint John of Damascus.
2. *Întâmplările lui Telemah, fiului lui Ulise (Odiseos), întocmite de Fenelon arhiepiscopul Cambrei, acum întâiu de pre limba italiană pre limba românească prefăcute de Petru Maior de Dicio Sântmărtin, protopop și crăiescul revizor al cărților*, vol. 1 (Buda: Crăiasca Tipografie a Universității din Pesta, 1818).
3. Promoted by Madame Guyon, a controversial figure of the time, the Quietists advocated the withdrawal of the individual in prayer. This passive attitude was blatantly contradicted by the Catholic militancy promoted by royalty as a means of unifying France (the Edict of Nantes, which allowed the existence of the Reformed Church in the kingdom, was revoked in 1685 and there began a very aggressive policy of converting the Reformed to Catholicism, in spite of their frequent resistance). The “architect” of the anti-Quietist reaction was Cardinal Bossuet himself, a very influential figure in the political, religious and cultural life of his time.
4. We also find a consistent debate on the forms of government in Budai-Deleanu’s *Gypsiad*, in which Mitru Perea (Petru Maior’s alter ego) was also involved. Knowing the close friendship between Budai-Deleanu and Petru Maior, the analysis of the interventions of the commentator Mitru Perea in the dispute over the forms of government leads us to Maior’s opinions on the debated issue.
5. The echo of Fénelon’s novel is incomparably greater when compared to his other writings. Although he was also a fabulist (the best after La Fontaine) and an author of dialogues of the dead inspired by Lucian of Samosata, his other writings aroused to a much lesser extent echoes among contemporaries, having an incomparably smaller number of editions than *Les Aventures de Télémaque*. In the modern era, due to the importance given to the novel, other writings of the French clergy were republished, be they literary, philosophical, or theological.
6. The famous statement of the king “L’État c’est moi” deserves, however, a footnote. The king did not refer to the institution of the French state in general, but used the word in the sense given to it at that time, “les États” being the Estates (orders of the realm) that tried to preserve their medieval privileges. The king’s reply could be paraphrased as “I am the privileged one!,” the statement being consistent with the characteristics of the absolutist monarchy of the time.

7. The oldest is from 1780 (Library of the Romanian Academy, 311).
8. Another translation, *Eventurile lui Telemacu, fiul lui Ulise, urmate de eventurile lui Aristonu* (The adventures of Telemachus, son of Odysseus, followed by the adventures of Ariston), printed by A. I. Crețulescu in Bucharest in 1852, also coincides with a significant political moment, respectively with the political debates that followed the Revolution of 1848. A political dimension must be given to the printing—in 1973—of the book *Peripețiile lui Telemah* (The adventures of Telemachus), translated by Sanda Mihăescu-Boroianu, with a foreword and chronological table by Al. Călinescu, 2 vols. (Bucharest: Minerva, 1975), which coincided with the ostentatious beginning of Nicolae Ceaușescu's cult of personality.
9. For a complete translation, lost today, he would argue that another work, *Istoria Beseareicei românilor* (The history of the Romanian Church), was incompletely printed in 1813. In this case we know precisely that its printing was suspended due to the express intervention of Bishop Ioan Bob, disturbed by the criticisms addressed to him. In the case of *Întâmplările lui Telemah*, the suspension of printing could have been influenced by the period of restitution of the old medieval institutions that took place throughout the empire, the political substratum of the novel obviously contradicting it.
10. Until we find the Italian version, we cannot establish with precision whether the lack of abstracts at the beginning of each chapter (present in the French original) was the initiative of the Italian translation or is due only to Petru Maior.
11. Significant is the fact that Ioan Budai-Deleanu attributes to his good friend Petru Maior (Mitru Perea) most of the comments on the Gypsies' dispute over the choice of the ideal form of government (chapters X and XI) for the Gypsies. We quote only one of these comments: "Acum vine Jamalău la thema sa. Deci (zice) unul care va să așeze vreo stăpânire în norod, trebuie mai întâi de toate să aducă întru norodul acela obiceiuri bune (adecă, precum să vede a fi scoposul lui Jamalău), să înceapă de la creșterea tinerilor, să orânduiască școale și învățături de norod, care să îndrepteze spre fapte îmbunătățite, pe oameni din pruncie. Acest temeiu pus, poate el apoi să așeze măcarce stăpânire, luând sama pururea și la firea norodului, firea locului și, după acest obicei, să așeze legile" (Now Jamalău comes to his point. So (he says) one who wants to dominate the people must first of all bring good habits to that people, that is (as seems to be the aim of Jamalău), start by bringing up young people, organizing schools and teaching for the people, directing the people to improved deeds since their infancy. Once this foundation has been laid, he can then establish his dominance, always taking into account the nature of the people, the nature of the place and, according to this custom, establish the laws). It would be interesting to study the voice of Mitru Perea in *The Gypsies*, which is an obvious echo of the close relationship of friendship and communication between the two great writers.
12. Fenelon, *Întâmplările lui Telemah* (1818), 241.
13. As a comparison and as a confirmation of the fidelity of Petru Maior's translation, we also present Sanda Mihăescu-Boroianu's modern translation of Fénelon, *Peripețiile lui Telemah*, 1: 134–135: "Calipso, mai furioasă decât o leoaică lipsită de puii

ei, alerga prin pădure fără să urmeze un drum anume și fără să știe încotro merge. În cele din urmă se trezi la intrarea peșterii ei, unde Mentor o aștepta.—Plecați din insula mea, spuse, o, voi străini, care ați venit să-mi turburați liniștea; departe de mine acest tânăr fără simțire! Și tu, bătrâne nesăbuit, o să simți de ce este în stare mânia unei zeițe, dacă nu-l smulgi pe dată de aici! Nu mai vreau să-l văd, nu voi îngădui ca vreuna din nimfele mele să-i vorbească sau să-l privească! O, jur pe jurământ ce-i face să tremure chiar și pre zei! Dar află, Telemah, că nenorocirile tale nu s-au sfârșit, nerecunoscătorule; nu vei pleca din insula mea decât spre a cădea pradă unor noi nenorociri! Voi fi răsbunată. Îți va părea rău după Calipso, dar în zadar. Neptun, mânios și acuma pe tatăl tău, care l-a jignit în Sicilia și chemat în ajutor de Venus, căreia i-ai arătat dispreț în insula Cipru îți pregătește alte furtuni. Vei vedea pe tatăl tău, care n-a murit, dar o să-l vezi fără a-l cunoaște!”

Abstract

A Less Than Accidental Translation by Petru Maior:
Fénelon's *Les Aventures de Télémaque* (1818)

The study aims to analyze the importance of the search for the echoes of Fénelon's novel *The Adventures of Telemachus* (1699) in Romanian culture, as well as the importance of the translation printed by Petru Maior in 1818. The language of translation is also researched in relation to his linguistic conception and the language of the Italian intermediate source.

Keywords

Petru Maior, Fénelon, Transylvanian School, Enlightenment, novel, translation