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Abstract

In literary translation, cultural adaptation or transplantation is a method that offers the readers of the target-text linguistical and cultural ease in their interaction with the text. Still, it could also prevent them from absorbing foreign cultural elements. (Re)translation could change the status of a text in that it could offer fresh perspectives that have never been offered before. In this study, we will analyse two Romanian (re)translations of T. S. Eliot’s poem “The Naming of Cats”, focusing on the translation of proper names and on the differences in register and style that arise from different translation choices, to argue in favour of the idea that the transplantation of cultural elements can be just as valuable for the readers as preserving the foreign elements.
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INTRODUCTION

This study aims to show that cultural transplantation in translation is a practice that appeals to twenty-first-century readers, especially in terms of proper names and register. To exemplify, we will discuss the first poem in T. S. Eliot’s Old
**Possum’s Book of Practical Cats, i.e., “The Naming of Cats”, and two of its Romanian (re)translations which are very different in their approach. They are also proof that “more than one translation of the same source text may come about within a very short time span” (Susam-Sarajevo 5), as Viorel Ştefanescu and Tudor Cristian Roșca’s translation of the poem, “Numele pisicilor”, was produced in 2009 and Florin Bican’s retranslation, “Cum pui nume la pisică”, was published in 2015¹.

Firstly, to discuss literary (re)translation, we must establish why and for whom we translate. Translating a book might be justified by a wide variety of reasons, most of which fall into one of the following categories:

(a) making the book available to a wider audience;
(b) offering the readers a glimpse into another culture (Yamazaki).

So, the two factors involved in (re)translation are culture and readership, both influencing each other involuntarily. Why and for whom we translate are the two main questions that the public and their culture can answer depending on the timeframe and the ongoing literary and cultural movements that the readers experience as part of their daily lives. All of these factors influence the feedback that a (re)translation receives after it is published, but they are not the only ones dictating how the target text is seen and enjoyed by the public. We must also consider the translator, who (like all the creators of a text) is supposedly free to choose what to change and how. From this perspective, a translation can be described as the product of a translator who happens to follow the instructions left by the author within and outside the text that is being translated.

Secondly, from the perspective of the source-text, (re)translation can be direct (from the source-text itself) or indirect (from another translation of the source-text) (Jianzhong). If a translator chooses the indirect approach, many of the foreign elements intended by the author will be lost in translation. The end product would be a reproduction of another reproduction of a source-text. However, can we always tell when a retranslation is done after the original work? In some cases, because an indirect translation might stray quite a lot from the

---

¹ The original poem, as well as the two translated versions, can be consulted in the Appendix. Besides these two versions, we did not manage to find any other translations of this poetry volume in any online catalogues from the largest public libraries in Romania.
original, one might assume that the translator has never read the source-text. The only way to answer this question is by asking the translator, who can add a preface or footnotes to the text, explaining their thought process.

On the other hand, the reasons for the emergence of a retranslation are numerous. Berman lists two possibilities: the first translation ages, or it is consistently an incomplete act that needs to be perfected. The latter is also called ‘the retranslation hypothesis’, which states that the translated text can evolve into future retranslations. The source-text will always have the same value, while the only element that might change is its translation, the interpretation given by the translator. Besides these reasons theorised by Berman, there are also the following:

(a) a new edition or a new interpretation of the source-text emerged (Vanderschelnden; Robinson);
(b) there are deficiencies in the previous translation (Monti);
(c) the text had to undergo indirect translation, so a new and stronger link between the target-text and the source-text needs to be established (Tegelberg);
(d) norms in translation changed, and previous translations have become less readable (Tahir Gürçağlar);
(e) there has been a shift in ideology within the culture of the source-text (Palopouloski & Koskinen).

Eliot’s *Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats* has sometimes been discussed in terms of personal comic relief. Murphy writes that it “was not as much of an aberration for Eliot as it might otherwise seem” but a “comic relief while composing his new verse drama” (23). He describes it as “refreshingly lighthearted and devil-may-care in the sheer energy of its play of both language and imagination” (348). Should (re)translations take into account these traits, or should they change them according to the (new) culture they enter?

The primary objective of this study is to delve into the topic of transplantation in the context of these two (re)translations. Specifically, we will focus on the proper names and register used in each version. Additionally, we will present the findings of an opinion survey conducted among a group of fifty-five university students. The purpose of this survey was to determine the respondents’ preference for one of the two Romanian versions. Ultimately, our
aim is to ascertain whether a retranslation that prioritizes the receiving culture is as valuable to modern-day readers as one that adheres closely to the original text.

**TRANSPLANTATION IN (RE)TRANSLATION**

Transplantation has acquired many names in the last century: localisation or cultural context adaptation (Klingberg), tradaptation (Panetto; Knutson), cultural alteration or adaptation (Milton), and cross-cultural translation (Hermans, D’hulst, Schäffner). In *Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies*, Milton argues that transplantation happens in some particular areas, such as:

(a) websites—where information has to be directed to the culture of the consumer;
(b) children’s literature—where the target culture does not allow elements considered inappropriate for children, such as guns or swear words that some other culture might have no problem with;
(c) theatre texts—where omissions and additions can be made;
(d) advertising texts—which appeal to different consumers depending on the culture of that specific country;
(e) visual texts—which are usually modified for the hard-of-hearing or for people that have trouble reading the written text.

On the one hand, the practice of transplantation/localisation can be seen as beneficial, especially for younger readers, because it allows them to focus on what happens in the text and not on what seems to be foreign and unknown to them (Weinreich; Bell). On the other hand, transplantation might prevent them from interacting with the Other, and it might disrespect not only the reading comprehension level of the readers but also the cultures that are involved in the translation process (Yamazaki 2002). Nonetheless, there are cases when transplantation offers a new and fresh perspective on the source-text, as we can see from the analysis below.

**THE TRANSLATION OF PROPER NAMES IN ELIOT’S “THE NAMING OF CATS”**

In Europe, it is a common practice to make changes in translation with regard to names (Yamazaki 2002). Göte Klingberg (1986) places these changes under
“cultural context adaptation” (12). He also discusses one of its two extremes and calls it “localisation (12), which means that the names and the location are completely changed so that they can be set in a place which is familiar to the reader. Weinreich (1978) argues that this practice is beneficial and “can give the audience an opportunity to concentrate on the performers as well as possible” (157). This is especially true when it comes to young readers, who might also be a target audience for The Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats. In the case of children’s literature, there is the idea that foreign elements are an obstacle for the reader, whose desire is to appreciate the translated book (Bell).

Yamazaki argues that “almost everything is foreign or new for a very young child” (58), no matter the culture of the translated text. He exemplifies this by reminding us that Disney characters and cartoons, such as Thomas the Tank Engine, have already been adopted by Japanese children as their own, just as Pokémon has been in Europe and America. So, “it seems more probable that children do not make cultural distinctions but just accept what they find attractive from the things promoted” (58). Moreover, some researchers believe that transplantation or cultural context adaptation shows a lack of respect for the children’s comprehension capacity. Stolt states that the change of proper names is a result of “the preconceived opinion of adults about what children want to read, value and understand”, so it is “an underestimation of the child reader” (134). Yamazaki builds upon this argument and takes it even further, stating that it is not only a lack of respect for children but also for other cultures, as transplantation reinforces the target culture, “the inculcation of its values, and the obliteration of its taboos through alteration of the original text” (59). While the change of names creates a “false impression of a homogenous world” (60), we cannot argue that they are not appreciated by the readers, who rejoice in this familiarity that offers the text a certain fluidity.

Vermes writes that there are four translation operations that a translator can choose from when a proper name is involved:

(a) transference (incorporating the source-language name into the target-language text without changing it);
(b) substitution (choosing a target-language correspondent for the name in the source-language);
(c) translation (rendering the meaning of the source-language name by
using one that expresses almost the same thing in the target-language); (d) modification (choosing a name in the target-language that is unrelated or just partly related to the original).

The following table shows the presence of these four operations in the two (re)translations of Eliot’s poem “The Naming of Cats”. However, we must also take into account the presence of deletion and addition because it appears that both the 2009 and the 2015 versions used these strategies for reasons of rhyme and rhythm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cases of transference</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases of substitution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases of translation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases of modification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases of deletion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases of addition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Cases of transference, substitution, translation, modification, deletion, and addition in the case of proper names in Eliot’s poem “The Naming of Cats”

The source-text contains seventeen proper names. In the 2009 target-text there is a case of deletion, while in the 2015 target-text there are two cases of addition and none of transference, not even of substitution or translation. The translator has fully modified all seventeen names.

Some scholars argue that proper names have no meaning (Vendler; Sciarone), and they do not necessarily need to be translated into a different language. They are seen as labels attached to characters and places, so the translator’s task is to carry them across the border of language and present them to the reader as intact as possible. However, even if proper names can be seen as carrying no meaning, they can carry sense (Searle; Strawson), such as nicknames, made-up names, or names which clearly designate a trait of that character, implied as such by the author of the text. When we speak or write, we rely on words and phrases to convey our intended meaning to others. However, it is essential to understand that the meaning of a word or phrase can be different from the sense that others interpret from it. In linguistic terms, the meaning of a word or phrase refers to its definition as established by a dictionary or other agreed-upon language resource. On the other hand, the sense of a word
or phrase refers to the interpretation that the listener or reader infers from the context in which it is used. It is essential to remember this distinction when communicating with others to ensure that our intended sense is accurately conveyed. In our case, names such as Peter, George, Bill, Jonathan, and James are primarily associated with the source language, and not all of them have a counterpart in the target language. Other cases of names are those that have a counterpart in the target language because of their widespread use and familiarity. For instance, Plato and Demeter become Platon and Demetra in Romanian. However, to better grasp the differences between the two retranslations in terms of proper names, let us see the following lines, which will show us the 2009 version, marked with TT1 (target-text 1), and the 2015 version, marked with TT2 (target-text 2). The original text will be marked with ST (source-text).

**ST:**
First of all, there’s the name that the family use daily,
Such as Peter, Augustus, Alonzo or James,
Such as Victor or Jonathan, George or Bill Bailey—
All of them sensible everyday names.

[...]
There are fancier names if you think they sound sweeter,
Some for the gentlemen, some for the dames:
Such as Plato, Admetus, Electra, Demeter—
But all of them sensible everyday names.

[...]
Of names of this kind, I can give you a quorum,
Such as Munkustrap, Quaxo, or Coricopat,
Such as Bombalurina, or else Jellylorum—
Names that never belong to more than one cat. (11)

**TT1:**
Primul, pentru uzul familiei, potrivit rânduielii,
Precum Peter, Augustus, Alonzo sau cum e
Victor sau Jonathan, George sau Bill Bailey;
Toși și-ar dori—de purtat—așa nume.

[...]
Sunt și nume ceva mai bizarre, cu son de șerbet,
De bărbați și de dame de lume:
Precum Platon, Electra, Demetra, Admet,
Căci toți și-ar dori—de purtat—așa nume.
[...]
Ei, nume dintr-astea pot să vă dau cu duzina,
Ca Munkustrap, Quajo sau Coricopat,
Precum Jellylorum sau chiar Bombalurina—
Nume doar de-o anume pisică purtat. (1-2)

**TT2:**
Mai întâi are un nume pentru uz cotidian,
Ca s-o strige toți ai casei: Mițo, Mișule, Tomițe,
Aurele, Geto, Fane, Bombonico, Marian—
Nume pentru toată ziua, practice și fără fițe.
[...]
Sunt și nume mai fudule, care sună mai stilat,
Unele pentru bâieți, altele pentru fetițe—
Cleopatra, Leonora, Aristide, Calistrat—
Nume pentru toată ziua, practice și fără fițe.
[...]
Știu la nume dintr-astea, vă spui drept, berechet...
De exemplu Marcel, Dominic, Arpagic,
Dana, Felix, Terente și, desigur, Musette—
Nume care le poartă decât un pisic. (15-17)

In the 2009 version, we can notice an interesting case of substitution by changing one letter of a name that is actually made up by the author. In TT1, the translators choose to substitute *Quaxo* with *Quajo*, although the former is not a real name at all, so it is not supposed to have any substitution. The names *Munkustrap, Quaxo, Coricopat, Bombalurina, and Jellylorum* are inventions of Eliot, although it is speculated that *Coricopat* is derived from *calico cat* (Robbins 2013). *Bill Bailey* is inspired by the 1902 song “Won’t You Come Home Bill Bailey”. The author also uses names derived from mythology or ancient figures, such as *Plato, Admetus, Electra, and Demeter*. In TT1, the translators preserve the names, but in TT2, Bican only keeps the historical/mythological category, using *Cleopatra, Leonora* (deriving from the Greek name Helena), *Aristide* (deriving from the Greek
name Aristaeus, who was the son of Apollo), and Calistrat (deriving from the Greek name Kalistratos of Aphidnae, a famous Athenian orator in the fourth century BCE). The Greek element is there, although the names are different, so we might say that the author’s intention to present the category of names has been adopted by the translator as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Mița</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Mișu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonzo</td>
<td>Alonzo</td>
<td>Tomița</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Aurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Geta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Fane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Bombonica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bailey</td>
<td>Bill Bailey</td>
<td>Marian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>Platon</td>
<td>Cleopatra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admetus</td>
<td>Admet</td>
<td>Leonora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electra</td>
<td>Electra</td>
<td>Aristide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demeter</td>
<td>Demetra</td>
<td>Calistrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkustrap</td>
<td>Munkustrap</td>
<td>Marcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaxo</td>
<td>Quajo</td>
<td>Dominic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coricopat</td>
<td>Coricopat</td>
<td>Arpagic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolmalurina</td>
<td>Bombalurina</td>
<td>Dana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellylornum</td>
<td>Jellylornum</td>
<td>Felix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Musette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Proper names in the source-text and their translation or transplantation in the two retranslations

As far as we know, Eliot intended the names to have meaning. In his *Critical Companion to T. S. Eliot*, Murphy argues that “a cat’s name is in and of itself significant” and “such delicious sounds as Coricopat and Jellylornum meet the eye and fill the ear” (349). The only question one might have here is: whose eye and whose ear? The reader of the English version is, in most cases, English, and the names (their sound, their spelling) might stir curiosity. But for a foreign reader—for a Romanian one—is this still the case? We should say it is not. Names
such as Terente, Arpagić, Mița, and Geta will never cease to have a specific meaning for the Romanian reader (and, more importantly, a comic effect). They are not invented names, and this is the difference between TT2 and the original, and yet they still “fill” the ear, as Murphy argued, and this is significant proof that the author’s intention was kept intact by Bican.

Due to the transplantation of names, the 2015 retranslation has some light-heartedness about it. And this will be more clearly seen in the next section, where we discuss the translation of register and style and the translators’ choices. We will primarily focus on idioms, expressions and sayings that do not necessarily have an immediate equivalent in Romanian and on the discrepancy between formality and informality in our two (re)translations.

THE IMPORTANCE OF REGISTER IN POETRY (RE)TRANSLATION

In the case of literature, the register or the style of a translation is a confrontation of both linguistic and literary systems. The changes that we see in a translation take place between the two languages and the two “authors” (the author of the original and the translator who acts as the author of the translation). The differences between the author and the translator are determined by different literary, social, and personal situations (Popović). Next to the three components of the register: field, tenor, and mode—sometimes called style (Halliday)—we must also consider the inner and the outer context of the situation (Leech; Marco), that is, the internal or the external constraints that are imposed onto the literary text.

In the case of poetry, Leech argues that it is “virtually free from the contextual constraints which determine other uses of language” (187), so we might as well believe that Bican made use of this lack of constraints and created his own parameters which shape the literary universe of the text, different from that of the source-text. The register is also dictated by keeping or by changing foreign elements, such as proper names (discussed above) or phrases like idioms, expressions, and sayings. We have many names for the two paths a translator could follow in this case: foreignisation and domestication (Venuti 1995, 2013), semantic translation and communicative translation (Newmark 1988), or

\[ \text{2} \text{ Probably an allusion to Ana Blandiana's poem “Arpagic”}. \]
author-oriented and reader-oriented translation (as Schleiermacher proposed). More than once, when the exotic element is preserved, the text will move closer to the formal end of the register spectrum (Quirk et al.): very formal ➔ formal ➔ neutral ➔ informal ➔ very informal.

The Oxford Thesaurus of English (2006) offers us the following classification of register labels: informal, vulgar slang, formal, technical, literary, dated, historical, humorous, archaic, and rare. By comparing the two translations, we may argue that each of them belongs to different categories or combinations of categories. If the 2009 translation is rather formal and literary, the 2015 version is humorous and slightly informal, which are—as we will see in the following section—the two components that guided our group of respondents towards preferring one of the two (re)translations.

Fortunately, the translator of the 2015 version shared with the readers his motivation for transplantation in the form of a preface to the entire text. He explains that the translation of the whole poetry book took thirty years. Nevertheless, all the versions he had managed to produce were not loyal to the playful rhythm of the original poems. He argues that he wanted Eliot to be compatible with the Romanian language and culture, so one day, he started working on the translation again, altering the style, and trying to break the code of the original. He realised that the poems would never feel at home in Romania because they describe foreign scenes. And thus, he transplanted the characters from an English train station to a Romanian one (for instance, he replaced Eliot’s luxury coaches with second-class passenger cars for commuters). However, he says that he would not even think of doing this should he translate The Waste Land or Four Quartets. He describes the transplantation process as taking the seeds planted by Eliot in foreign soil and replanting them in Romania, watching them sprout and grow into a localised version of the poems (Bican 7-11).

Now, let us have a look at some lines from the original poem and their (re)translations. There are five examples, each containing the ST, TT1, and TT2.

(A)
ST: The naming of cats is a difficult matter...
TT1: Să daie nume Pisicii e treabă grea, và spun...
TT2: Să-i pui nume la pisică, băie nenică, e un chin...
(B)
ST: You may think at first I’m as mad as a hatter...
TT1: Mă veți crede mai întâi pălărierul nebun...
TT2: O să ziceți că-s cu capu’, că sunt dus—da’ stai puțin...

(C)
ST: Else how can he keep up his tail perpendicular...
TT1: Altfel, cum să-și țină coada perpendicular...
TT2: Ca să umble cu coada la nooj’ de grade...

(D)
ST: Names that never belong to more than one cat.
TT1: Nume doar de-o anume pisică purtat.
TT2: Nume care le poartă decât un pisic...

(E)
ST: And that is the name that you never will guess...
TT1: Iar numele acesta în veci nu-l veți ghici...
TT2: Și nu i-l ghicești nici în ghioc, nici în cărți...

It is obvious that TT2 uses argotic language. In (A), (B), (C), and (E), there is proof that the translator’s register is informal and humorous: the use of idioms such as a da în ghioc (BT: to give in shells), a da în cărți (BT: to give in cards)\(^3\), a fi dus cu capul (BT: to be gone with the head)\(^4\), the fact that the the reader is addressed in an extremely informal manner with băi, nenică (similar to the English forms man, dude, or chief).

In (D), we notice an intentional grammatical mistake in TT2: the correct choice would be pe care instead of care (we use pe before the relative pronoun care when the noun referred to is a direct object) and doar instead of decât (which is a negative polarity item). These are humorous choices made with the intent to produce laughter. In this respect, TT2 is quite different from TT1, whose translators choose to stay as close as possible to the original text. For example, in (B), the phrase to be as mad as a hatter\(^5\) was translated literally in TT1, although this

\(^3\) Both are methods for telling the future (one involving shells and the other cards).

\(^4\) To be crazy.

\(^5\) Also an allusion to the Mad Hatter from Alice in Wonderland.
is not a common idiom in Romanian, whilst, in TT2, we have a rather informal, playful style, found in the expression *a fi dus cu capul* (the informal equivalent of *to be crazy or to be out of your mind*). A similar example is (C), where TT1 preserves *keep his tail perpendicular* and translates it literally, whilst TT2 finds a more informal style exemplified by the spelling of *nouăzeci* (ninety) using the extremely informal *nooij*, which is also a proof of orality in the register of the second version.

We can clearly see that the two translations are quite different in terms of register and style. While Bican uses orality, informality, and humour, Ştefănescu and Roșca do not appear to share his view of the original text. Bican sees it as playful and mostly humorous, and his opinion is reflected quite well in the translation. But the translators of the 2009 version seem to be of a different opinion—that we can extract from the translation itself—and that is: the original poem is formal, even sober at times, deserving a translation that would match the tone (register and style) of the ST.

**OPINION SURVEY SHOWING PREFERENCE FOR TRANSPLANTATION**

To find whether the transplanted text is more appealing to (young) readers nowadays, we asked 55 of our university students to read the original poem and the two (re)translations and to complete a survey which was built on the idea that transplantation might prove to be a method that pleases the (young) readers of the twenty-first century. Naturally, our survey is meant to show the general lines of opinion regarding such translations rather than to give a definitive answer to the question. Of the 55 respondents, 53 were aged 18 to 24, and only two belonged to the 25-34 age bracket. The following table illustrates their responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3. Preference percentages that resulted from the survey*

As we can notice from Table 3, most respondents expressed their preference for Bican’s retranslation. In terms of disliking the two versions, the
results are again quite different, with a total of 11% (not at all + not really) for TT1 and 5.4% for TT2. The total scores for liking go up to 69.1% for TT2 and 56.3% for TT1, showing us that Bican’s style does receive positive feedback in comparison to what we might call a “traditional” translation.

Moreover, we asked the respondents which of the two poetry books they would like to continue reading, taking into consideration their experience with the first poem, “The Naming of Cats”. Of the 55 respondents, 42 answered that they would like to read the 2015 version, while 13 said they would rather enjoy the 2009 version more than the 2015 one. While some of the students admitted to liking the use of Romanian colloquial expressions, others manifested their appreciation for the translation that followed the same register as the original poem.

And so, retranslation can be a powerful tool in poetry translation, as it has the potential to increase reader motivation and stimulate further reading. However, it should be used with caution and not become a widespread technique, as the goal is to create a unique and refreshing literary world where the original text can take on new and unexpected dimensions. By embracing the possibilities of retranslation, we can unlock new levels of creativity and bring renewed energy to the art of poetry translation.

CONCLUSIONS

Just like (re)translations, readers also differ from one another in terms of preference. We cannot predict with certainty whether transplantation will be a translation trend for the twenty-first century. However, pleasure is an excellent decision factor when it comes to what we read nowadays. Mikulecky and Jeffries (1996) write that regular reading for pleasure can improve reading speed, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing.

Major shifts in reading habits have begun to unfold at the beginning of the century, from the digitalisation of libraries to the change in motivation, from a necessity-oriented reading experience to a pleasure-oriented one (Ng & Graham; Rueda). Studies have shown that young readers who have already developed an interest in reading or who are intrinsically motivated by pure enjoyment are more willing to read challenging texts and have reading behaviours related to performance (Baker & Wigfield; Unrau & Schlackman).
Could we use this technique of transplantation to create motivation and pleasure in readers? Definitely, and we could also use it to explore the mind of the translators, who, most of the time, do not have a chance to express their reasoning and thought process involved in the making of the translation. It is essential to ask them and to find out the “why” and the “for whom” because their answers will lead to a better understanding of the translated text, not just in terms of literary value but also for the sake of the translation practice and process.

We could not say whether one (re)translation is more valuable or “better” than the other because it all comes down to the translator’s voice and interpretation. No matter how much we struggle to make ourselves believe that the translator is invisible, this could only be true for machine translation. As we have seen in this study, what the translator thinks, his first step towards the translation, and his interpretation of a single word, can change the way an entire readership understands and sees a text. Transplantation should not be seen as a technique that erases the Other to make us believe that only our culture is valuable but as a method of reinforcing familiarity and the sense of belonging to a home-culture. After all, we have the possibility of also reading other retranslations, of deciding for ourselves whether one or the other is better for us. This is what the twenty-first century brings in terms of retranslation: a supernova of versions, each offering us something else and an unprecedented freedom of choice for the readers.
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**APPENDIX**

**ST:** “The Naming of Cats”, from *Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats* by T. S. Eliot, 1974, pp. 11-12:

The Naming of Cats is a difficult matter,
It isn’t just one of your holiday games;
You may think at first I’m as mad as a hatter
When I tell you, a cat must have THREE DIFFERENT NAMES.
First of all, there’s the name that the family use daily,
Such as Peter, Augustus, Alonzo or James,
Such as Victor or Jonathan, George or Bill Bailey—
All of them sensible everyday names.
There are fancier names if you think they sound sweeter,
Some for the gentlemen, some for the dames:
Such as Plato, Admetus, Electra, Demeter—
But all of them sensible everyday names.
But I tell you, a cat needs a name that’s particular,
A name that’s peculiar, and more dignified,
Else how can he keep up his tail perpendicular,
Or spread out his whiskers, or cherish his pride?
Of names of this kind, I can give you a quorum,
Such as Munkustrap, Quaxo, or Coricopat,
Such as Bombalurina, or else Jellylorum—
Names that never belong to more than one cat.
But above and beyond there's still one name left over,
And that is the name that you never will guess;
The name that no human research can discover—
But THE CAT HIMSELF KNOWS, and will never confess.
When you notice a cat in profound meditation,
The reason, I tell you, is always the same:
His mind is engaged in a rapt contemplation
Of the thought, of the thought, of the thought of his name:
His ineffable effable
Effanineffable
Deep and inscrutable singular Name.

**TT1**: “Numele piscilor”, from *Cartea lui Moș Oposum Despre Piscicile Poznașe*, translated by Viorel Ștefănescu and Tudor Cristian Roșca, 2009, pp. 1-3:

Să dai nume Piscicii e trebă grea, vă spun,
Nu-i vreun joc de vacanță, ca leapșa pe ghicite—
Mă veți crede mai întâi pălăriierul nebun,
De zic că-i trebuie trei nume diferite.
Primul, pentru uzul familiei, potrivit rânduielii,
Precum Peter, Augustus, Alonzo sau cum e
Victor sau Jonathan, George sau Bill Bailey;
Toți și-ar dori—de purtat—așa nume.
Sunt și nume ceva mai bizar, cu son de șerbet,
De bărbați și de dame de lume:
Precum Platon, Electra, Demetra, Admet,
Căci toți și-ar dori—de purtat—așa nume.
Dar pisicici îi trebuie un nume particular,
Dintre cele mai ciudate și fine,
Alfel, cum să-și țină coada perpendicular,
Sau să-și infoaie mustața, mândră de sine?
Ei, nume dintr-astea pot să vă dau cu duzina,
Ca Munkustrap, Quajo sau Coricopat,
Precum Jellylorum sau chiar Bombalurina—
Nume doar de-o anume piscică purtat.
Dar peste toate-i un nume lăsat la urmă abia,
Iar numele acesta în veci nu-l veți ghici:
Nici un studiu al omului nu-l va putea afla—
Doar pisica însăși îl știe și nu-l va dezvăluți.
Când zăriți vreo pisică adâncită-n meditație,
Motivul, vă zic, e același mereu—și anume:
Mintel ta e pierdută în sacra contemplație
A gândului la gândul la gândul la propriu-i nume:
Inefabilul efabil
Efaninefabil
Adâncul, de necercetat, singularul său nume.

**TT2**: “Cum pui nume la pisică”, from *Pisicoteca Practică a lui Moș Pârșu*, translated by Florin Bican, 2015, pp. 15-17:

Să-i pui nume la pisică, băi nenică, e un chin,
Nu-i, cum crede unii oameni, fo distracție, fun bal;
O să ziceți că-s cu capu’, că sunt dus—da’ stai puțin:
Pisica care-i pisică are TREI NUME-N TOTAL.
Mai întâi are un nume pentru uz cotidian,
Ca s-o strige toți ai casei: Mițo, Mișule, Tomițe,
Aurele, Geto, Fane, Bombonico, Marian—
Număr pentru toată ziua, practice și fără fițe.
Sunt și nume mai fușule, care sună mai stilat,
Unele pentru băieți, altele pentru fete—
Cleopatra, Leonora, Aristide, Calistrat—
Număr pentru toată ziua, practice și fără fițe.
Da’-n afară de asta, vă spui eu că se cade
Ca pisica să aibă și-un nume de cod,
Ca să umble cu coada la nooj’ de grade
Și mustețile-n vânt când se dă jos din pod.
Știu la număr dintr-astea, vă spui drept, berechet...
De exemplu Marcel, Dominic, Arpagic,
Dana, Felix, Terente și, desigur, Musette—
Număr care le poartă decât un pisic.
Da’ pisica mai are înc-un nume-n dotare
Și nu l ghicești nici în ghioc, nici în cărți.
Nu-l găsești nicăieri—nici măcar în dosare...
Doar PISICA ȘI ȘTIE și ți-l spune din părți.
Deci când vezi o pisică prăvălită-n visare,
Lucru’ ăsta se-ntâmplă taman atunci când
Se gândește de-a-n proasta la numele care
E ascuns într-un gând dintr-un gând dintr-un gând:
La numele-prenumele—
Gata cu glumele—
Inefabil și unic, insondabil, profund.