



LEXICAL AND PRAGMATIC DISCREPANCIES IN RETRANSLATING *PRIDE AND PREJUDICE* INTO ROMANIAN. CASE STUDY

Constantin Dănuț BAICU

University of Pitești

Abstract

The main line of comparative analysis within this study is to identify and explain (to the highest extent possible), some of the most scholarly relevant lexical and pragmatic discrepancies between three subsequent translations of Jane Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice* into Romanian. The focal points of inquiry are systematically centered on determining the level of efficiency and accuracy of each (re)translation in relation to specific Romanian linguistic principles and norms, as well as to universal knowledge of the source text. Additionally, by means of employing the terminological frame of reference and categorizing functions of the so-called *Translation Modalities Method*, each translation is placed onto either end of the translating continuum, that is, more onto the domesticating or the foreignizing end. Ultimately, a global conclusion is drawn as to whether the (re)translations of *Pride and Prejudice* can indeed contribute to a better understanding of Jane Austen's literary complexity and artistic subtleties in this particular case.

Keywords: *retranslation, discrepancy, translation modalities, domestication, foreignization, accuracy*

INTRODUCTION

To a certain degree, Austen's literary work has been successfully assimilated by numerous cultures and aesthetic orientations across the world, and its reception

has consistently and systematically advanced world literature to higher grounds of sociocultural expression. Propagating Jane Austen's work across nations has been dependent on multiple factors and agents that range from ideological readiness, geopolitical influences, academic reviewers, translators and, resultingly, readerships. Although the influencing elements mentioned above are indispensable for a complete and organic reception of a writer's work, the most researched and possibly the most insightful one would be the translating medium.

Translation has played a crucial role in successfully receiving and understanding Jane Austen's literary expression across the globe and a large number of translators have consistently worked towards this outcome from the incipient stages of Austen's decision to make her talent visible to the public eye. Jane Austen marked her literary era with an excellent portrayal of human affairs and social class. The nature of the human component was carefully and elegantly unveiled in a series of novelistic exposures of moral deficiencies such as prejudice, pride, hypocrisy and ignorance. Consequently, the translations of Austen's novels have been indexed to the temporal progression and intellectual effort of three centuries, each marked by its own intellectual and linguistic limitations in receiving the complexity of Austen's literary depiction of human behaviour in a restrictive pre-Victorian society.

Studies show that Austen's "European presence was relatively restricted" (Mandal 425) during the nineteenth century, with her work translated only into four languages (French, German, Danish and Swedish) that framed an incipient translative panorama "characterized by gaps and absences" (Valerie 169). Apart from a relatively large number of conspicuous cuts and omissions, Austen's work was being massively adapted to meet the cultural needs of a society that would have otherwise rejected the impetuous literary incursions of a woman author such as Austen. In other words, her intense depiction of sentimentalism and social interaction was perceived as 'exotic', so "continental translators had to make them relevant to local traditions of novel writing and readers' habits" (Valerie 170).

In stark contrast, the reception of Austen during the twentieth century expanded greatly with more than three hundred new translations being issued at a rapid pace with or without care for faithfulness to the source text. Such a galloping process of making Austen as accessible as possible internationally was

to some extent motivated by “a general postwar drift towards a pan-Europeanism resulted in an increased interest in British culture and literature – particularly in the case of France, which sought a closer acquaintance with the literature of its former allies” (Mandal 427). Moreover, the feminist movement of the 1960s and 70s most likely contributed to a sort of universal drive to gain more insight into the psychological and cultural conditions of feminine emergence.

In order to provide a brief, but careful look into how Austen’s work has been (re)translated over the centuries, a couple of studies by certain scholars will be furthered and briefly explicated in order to better frame the cultural implications and consequences that the notion of *reception* involves.

INTERNATIONAL RECEPTION OF PRIDE AND PREJUDICE

Li Xiu-li directs her study towards identifying and explaining the mistranslation of the word *pride* from Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* into Chinese. She samples seven Chinese (re)translations of Austen’s novel and discusses the consequences of the incorrect rendition of *pride* for Chinese readerships. More specifically, she claims that Austen’s key word *pride* is being systematically repeated for the purpose of reinforcing the overarching theme of her book and that its translation into a different language, particularly in Chinese, must be conducted as faithfully as possible in order to avoid altering Austen’s original intention of coherently and cohesively describing Darcy’s moral traits. Consequently, by mistranslating such vital lexical unit, the Chinese readers might incorrectly believe that Austen’s characters “are either talking about different things or constantly correcting themselves or one another” (4).

Xiu-li’s findings clearly show how all the seven Chinese translators altered the original meaning of *pride* due to their lack of semantic insight and also due to their unawareness of the “coherent and narrative functions of the repetition of *pride*” (7). Consequently, such errors produce unintended shifts from commendatory connotations to neutral or slightly derogatory ones and vice versa, which of course derails Austen’s original directionality.

Vitana Kostadinova, an English lecturer at the University of Plovdiv, is able to pinpoint and discuss a couple of important pragmatic implications of two (re)translations of *Pride and Prejudice* into Bulgarian, namely Zheni Bozhilova’s (1980) and Snezhana Mileva’s (2007) (re)translations that conjugate a highly

fertile basis for a thorough analysis of the effects that the domestication and foreignization approaches have on certain readers. According to Kostadinova, neither translator applied a consistent translating direction and instead opted for the best possible translating decision that a certain situation called for. To various extents, both translators were guided and informed by the same translating principles, but the large number of factors that determined the instantiation of a compatible lexical transfer in terms of cultural and lexical alignment with the source intentions were too diverse to be reduced to an interconnected and stable sense of translating progression.

All the examples given to support her study converge towards condemning to a certain degree the Bulgarian translators' inability to faithfully render Austen's nineteenth century literary tonality as well as her embodiment of thoughts on patriarchal and matriarchal relations. Consequently, Mr. and Mrs. Bennet's roles are more or less consciously altered and polarized in a different semantic dimension that generates a new cultural perspective for more linguistically aware target readers. Specifically, the phrase "my dear Mr. Bennet" proves to be exceedingly challenging when linguistically translated into Bulgarian. Kostadinova claims that Zheni Bozhilova's first translation of the phrase (Мистър Бенит, драги) [Mr. Bennet, dear] "implies a condescending attitude coming as a result of the speaker's superiority over the addressee" (2) and, as a result, creates the false impression that Mrs. Bennet has become the hierarchically dominant element in her marital relation with Mr. Bennet within a sort of "matriarchal re-distribution of power within the family" (3). Alternatively, the second translator, Snezhana Mileva, tries to recalibrate Zheni Bozhilova's negligence at the expense of the original intimacy between the couple. Therefore, even though her new translation (Dear, Mr. Bennet) restores the original polarity, it unfortunately neutralizes the soft domestic inscription of Jane Austen's carefully embedded formality.

Yvette van Diggele's study on *A Modern Reception of Pride and Prejudice in Dutch* focuses on comparing two Dutch (re)translations of Austen's novel to determine the approach the two translators employed in their transfer. Particularly, the aim was to analyze the first 1980 translation *Waan en Eigenwaan* and the most recent 2009 retranslation *Trots en Vooroordeel* to discover, statistically and as objectively as possible, the underlying translating trajectory of both translators' efforts. By selecting five excerpts from both Dutch

translations of the novel, the author conducted a brief survey in which he asked three renowned professors to share their honest critical opinion on the lexical differences between a set number of words and phrases that the author collected. Specifically, based on their own academic experience, the professors had to say which words were more modern or contemporary, thus more target-oriented, and which ones were more archaic, therefore more source-oriented.

Secondly, in order to reinforce the rigor and objectivity of the study, van Diggele also looked up all the selected lexical units in the *Corpus Hedendaags Nederlands*, an online corpus of contemporary Dutch language that offers researchers the options of looking up words by word form, lemma and part of speech. At its simplest, the corpus provided the exact number of occurrences (hits) for each word or phrase van Diggele selected for analysis so that she could accurately determine the level of popularity of each lexical unit. The results of this second test confirmed once more that the first translator did in fact use more archaic language, therefore getting closer to the source text, and that the second translator, that is, the author of the retranslation, was more concerned with domesticating the translation and “bringing it home”.

In her study on how Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* was received in France, Isabelle Bour stylistically analyses the (re)translations of the novel’s renowned opening statement (“It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune, must be in want of a wife.”), aiming to demonstrate that even the slightest alteration of the original semantic structure within the translating process moves the target readers away from Austen’s true world-view on nineteenth century societies. Specifically, Bour correctly indicates the fact that the modal auxiliary *must*, in the completive clause “must be in want of a wife”, neutralizes the aphoristic universality of the first statement to some extent, in that *must* expresses both obligation and probability at the same time, which in essence inscribes a sense of decisional uncertainty on behalf of Austen as to whether she truly believes in her initial declaration of universal acceptance.

On the other hand, the French translators Bour selected for scrutiny unfortunately neglected Austen’s subtleties and altered the original satire and paradoxical nature of the incipit.

The first French translation of the novel in 1813 is blatantly accused of having omitted the word “universally”.

C'est une vérité reconnue, qu'un jeune homme qui a de la fortune doit chercher à se marier.

[‘It is a known truth, that a rich young man must seek to marry’].

However insignificant such omission might seem at a pure semantic level, from a thorough stylistic point of view, the alteration cuts out the “pseudo-portentous tone of the original” (Bour 3).

Another translation from 1822 “waters down” Austen’s assertiveness to such an extent that her declaration becomes a somewhat feeble condition:

S’il est une idée généralement reçue, c’est qu’un homme fort riche doit penser à se marier.

[‘If one thing is certain, it is that a very rich man must think of getting married.’]

The force of Austen’s irony lies within her oxymoronic layout. By conditioning and questioning the axiomatic value of her universal enunciation of truth, the translator unfairly and irreversibly damages the very core of Austen’s literary principles. Moreover, the conditional *si* “selects an idea among many other received ideas, this idea becoming part of the *doxa* rather than being (supposedly, of course) a truth admitted by all human beings” (Bour 3). Consequently, the original *man* who *must* be in want of a wife must now act upon his own judgement and decide whether his bachelor status should be changed or not. Austen’s marital beliefs and universal pressure are now absent and cannot interfere with the process of a man’s selection of his spouse.

In 1946, Jean Privat adds even more *doubt* to Austen’s ironically and universally embraced concept of marital pursuit:

Qui songe à en douter? Un célibataire nanti d’une belle fortune doit être nécessairement à la recherche d’une femme.

[‘Who would doubt it? A bachelor provided with a good fortune must necessarily be in search of a wife.’]

The use of the adverb “necessarily” exerts a stronger obligation on the unmarried man’s mission to *search* for and not *want* a wife. Such alteration might give a reader the false impression that Austen was aiming to illustrate a particular model of a desperate man who was proactively looking for the right woman to consume his fortune with. Consequently, Jean Privat failed to preserve

the original portentous tone and the ingenious sense of irony and instead created a colloquial air pervaded by artificial approximation.

The beginning of the twenty-first century brings about other eloquent examples of what it means to alter authentic semantic mechanisms. In 2000, Jean-Paul Pichardie decided to remove the emphatic corroboration of truthfulness and reduce the emblematic nature of Austen's mannerism to a mere colloquial enunciation:

Il est universellement admis qu'un célibataire nanti d'une belle fortune a forcément besoin d'une épouse.

['It is universally accepted that a bachelor provided with a good fortune necessarily needs a wife'.]

In 2007, Pierre Goubert neutralizes the "hyperbolic universality" of Austen's passive voice by introducing an active and more tangible agent into the referential equation.

Chacun se trouvera d'accord pour reconnaître qu'un célibataire en possession d'une belle fortune doit éprouver le besoin de prendre femme.

['Everybody will agree that a bachelor in possession of a good fortune must be in want of a wife'.]

Last, but not least, in 2009 and 2011, Laurent Bury and Sophie Chiari illustrate a young man who is actively *looking for* a wife, instead of *hoping* or *wishing* to get married with one of the Bennet sisters.

Nedregotten Sørbø samples 150 years of Norwegian translations of Jane Austen's work and underscores the pervasive lack of precision in (re)translating Austen's brilliantly tuned irony and her satirical force. According to Sørbø, most of the Norwegian translators involved in translating Jane Austen had to face the often painstaking process of rendering the so-finely-tuned English irony into the Norwegian language without losing the pragmatic intentionality of Austen's ingeniously integration of what many Norwegian translators thought of as ordinary lexical units. In fact, the main point that Sørbø aimed to make was essentially informed by determining the extent to which the original irony was transferred into Norwegian and identifying the exact source words that proved to be rather challenging in terms of translatability. The study abounds in brief examples that confirm how omission, or abridgment, and faulty adaptation

frequently lead to the mistranslation of Austen's words, and to a larger extent to a certain level of reduction in emblematic irony.

The first Norwegian translator of Austen's work was unfortunately motivated by a more practical, if not domestic approach to translating the English novel and so decided to cut out vital aspects from Elizabeth's emotional life as well as her clear irony directed towards men which, at one point in the books, is uttered quite blatantly, "sick of them all". In other cases, Austen's irony is lost by means of unfaithful adaptation and plain omission with Austen's ironic hints being completely absent. The description of the Musgrove daughters in Jane Austen's *Persuasion* clearly illustrates the semantic discrepancy in Merete Alfsen's 1998 translation.

But the only two grown up, excepting Charles, were Henrietta and Louisa, young ladies of nineteen and twenty, who had brought from a school at Exeter all the usual stock of accomplishments, and were now, like thousands of other young ladies, living to be fashionable, happy and merry. Their dress had every advantage, their faces were rather pretty (Austen 2019, 32).

The ironic implication according to which a large number of girls would usually settle for a superficial education and a supposedly happy marriage is lost when Merete Alfsen opts for a mere not-so-inspired augmentation of size by seeing fit to only mention that the school was a "big girls' school" as if the "main point of the thousands were the number of girls attending the school" (Sørbø 5). Moreover, the translator somehow deems it appropriate to eliminate the use of the adverbial determiner "rather" in "rather pretty" which again neutralizes Austen's true underlying view on the nature of beauty which makes her seem as if she was actually considering such physical trait as a vital deterministic element of moral evolution.

METHOD

The following textual analysis employs the so-called *comparative method* that involves systematic sampling of specific linguistic data from three key (re)translations of *Pride and Prejudice* into Romanian, *i.e.* Ana Almăgeanu's first translation (the 1991 edition), Anca Florea's 2004 retranslation and the most recent retranslation from 2019 by Florența Simion. The collected data will be compared against specific pragmatic and lexical principles in order to determine

any possible discrepancies or translational disequilibria between the (re)translations and the source text that could ultimately affect the overall reception of Jane Austen's work into the receiving culture.

Particularly, the terminology and filtering capabilities of a submethod of the comparative method will be used, that is the *Translation Modalities Method* (TMM), in order to better frame the overarching approach and provide a more organized trajectory of inquiry. The incipient stage of this method came under the name of *Translation Modalities Model* and was made relevant by Francis Aubert who claimed it to be a highly efficient tool that could help researchers "generate quantifiable data suitable for statistical analysis" (Widman 150) and that was used to determine the level of linguistic differentiation between translations and the source text. The effectiveness of the method was to a certain extent enhanced by Julieta Widman who chose to analyze the first English translation and retranslation of Clarice Lispector's *The Passion According to G.H.* based on specific translation modalities that the method includes, such as *omission, transcription, loan, decal, word-for-word, transposition, explicit, implicit, modulation, error, intersemiotic translation, addition, adaptation and correction*. Five hundred forty-two words made up Widman's list, which proved sufficient enough for the Applied Statistics Center/USP to declare that the first translation was more domesticating than the retranslation. It would be safe to assume that Widman's approach to studying a retranslation's orientation could be extended to the analysis of even thousands of other randomly selected words so that one might fully, or at least to a greater extent, comprehend a translator's underlying motivation.

ROMANIAN RECEPTION - TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

The opening statement of the first chapter acts as a subtle indicator of what Austen hopes to achieve throughout her novel. Instead of blatantly accusing her protagonists of petty grandiosity, social snobbism and pathetic delusions, she resorts to a finely-tuned concealment of her characters' morality through humor, that is, by employing irony and free indirect speech. These literary techniques mirror to some extent the attitudes of her characters who do not directly reveal their true nature and intentions in their interaction with other people. Apart from many other translation prerequisites, when someone decides to translate

Jane Austen's work, he/she must be closely aware of precisely rendering her carefully embedded connotations and the challenges that come with it.

Translating the opening aphorism of *Pride and Prejudice* seems to have been challenging not only for French translators but for Romanian translators as well. The *universally acknowledged truth* clearly implies that "a single man in possession of a good fortune *must be* in want of a wife". In this case, the semantic force of the modal verb 'must' exerts a considerable social pressure on the universal wealthy bachelor suggesting that, according to current "laws" of social realization, he has a sort of moral obligation to complement his life with a feminine partner that would somehow contribute to his wellbeing and render him as an accomplished human being.

T1¹ provides an acceptable alternative to "must be in want of" by rendering it as *...are nevoie de...* (needs a...), which is successfully aligned with the original connotation of external pressure. The young man does indeed *need* a wife for his social, moral and romantic completion, but, however, unlike the original *in want* which precisely shows the source of the seeking force, it is not very clear if T1's *need* is external or internal, that is, if this particular desire has been urged upon him from the marital ideologies of the time or it comes from his own inner self. Thus, T1 is able to partly meet the bidirectional semantic dimension of Austen's universal truth that she expresses through the modulation of *must* and the desiderative internalization of the verb *want*.

Conversely, T2 provides an intransitive construction by using a contemplative verb (*se gândește la...* 'he thinks of') and successfully meets the internal criterion of *want*. However, while it has now become clear who the exertive agent is, the external pressure has been completely neutralized and the young man's initial strong intention of finding a wife has died down to a mere unreliable thinking matter.

On the third hand, T3 finds it easier to opt for a word-for-word translation of *must be* (*trebuie să fie*) and link that to a successful and precise translation of *in want* (*în căutarea*). In doing so, T3 is able to accurately satisfy Austen's bidimensional context; the external force of *trebuie să fie* and the young man's internal desire have been successfully conveyed, while also successfully

¹ For reasons of economy, throughout the study all the three translators involved will be noted as T1 (Ana Almăgeanu - 1992), T2 (Anca Florea - 2004) and T3 (Florența Simion - 2019).

preserving the source text's underlying sense of irony that Austen always sought to instil.

An apparent benign translational act with insignificant semantic consequences on the receiving end of the spectrum is traced to the moment when Mrs. Bennet is arguing with her husband as to whether he should pay the suitor Mr. Bingley a visit and let him know of his daughters' intentions to change their marital status:

“My dear Mr. Bennet”, replied his wife, “how can you be so tiresome! You must know that I am thinking of his marrying one of them” (Austen 6).

The acid reply comes as a reaction to Mr. Bennet's teasing rhetoric that clearly demonstrates his superior attitude and level of indifference over trivial social affairs while at the same time enhancing the domestic divergence and inequalities between men and women at that time in a relatively casual display of familial exchange of opinions:

What is his name? / Bingley. / Is he married or single? / Oh! single, my dear, to be sure! A single man of large fortune; four or five thousand a year. What a fine thing for our girls! / How so? how can it affect them? (Austen 6).

At its simplest, *tiresome* means *annoying* and a correct literal Romanian translation of it would have to be rendered as simply *enervant*. Regardless of an apparently seamless transfer of meaning, only T1 was able to provide the right equivalent by rendering it as *sâcâitor*, that is, a complete synonym for the above suggested *enervant*:

Dragul meu Bennet, îi răspunse soția, cum poți fi atât de *sâcâitor*? Știi, desigur, că mă gândesc c-o să se însoare cu una dintre ele” (T1, 5).

On the other hand, T2 finds it more appropriate to use *exasperant* ('exasperating') to describe Mrs. Bennet's sudden act of disapproval of her husband's Socratic intentions:

Dragul meu Bennet, îi răspunse soția, nu înțeleg cum poți fi atât de *exasperant*? Ar trebui să-ți imaginezi că mă gândesc la posibilitatea s-o ia în căsătorie pe una dintre fiicele noastre” (T2, 18).

The emotional rage contained in *exasperant* far exceeds that of *sâcâitor* and it would thus be unfair to use it as a quantifier for Mrs. Bennet's particular

moment of desperation at the starting point of the novel when the accumulation of frustration had just begun. The original English context clearly shows that Mr. Bennet is merely teasing his wife in a very elegant and respectful way. By knowing how desperate she is to prove her daughters' worthiness and adhere to a higher social class, Mr. Bennet would never cross the red line and risk his wife's sanity and emotional stability. As a result, his wife responds appropriately along the same lines of playful reproach and mutual respect by simply calling him *tiresome*. T3 expands the gap between the opposing lexical units and moves even further away from the original meaning with *plictisitor* (boring):

Dragă domnule Bennet, replică soția lui, cum poți să fii așa de *plictisitor*!
Doar știi prea bine că mă gândesc că o să se însoare cu una dintre ele (T3, 6).

While it is absolutely true that within the semantic spectrum of *tiresome*, *boring* is also indexed as a synonym, a faithful rendition of Mrs. Bennet's attributive state of mind should not consider this particular transfer as just another alternative to *sâcâitor* or *enervant*, which might run the risk of precluding unexperienced readers from grasping the right authentic emotional, and to a certain extent, physical display of conjugal interaction. From a twenty-first century Romanian perspective, Mr. Bennet is by no means a *boring* spouse, but rather a cautious observer of social mannerisms who is always ready to interfere whenever his carefully collected data informs him that someone might step out of bounds and jeopardize the workings of his precious domestic universe. Therefore, T1's use of *sâcâitor* becomes a more precise rendering of Mrs. Bennet's emotional reaction to her husband's supposedly ignorant and interrogative nature while also reaffirming Mr. Bennet's patriarchal (maybe dominant) figure within his family.

Along the same lines of emotional exertions, Mrs. Bennet releases yet another surge of discontent against her husband's so-called 'delight' in teasing her and accuses him of an irreverent action of *vexation*:

Mr. Bennet, how can you abuse your own children in such a way? You take delight in *vexing* me. You have no compassion for my poor nerves (Austen 7).

It becomes evident that, from a narrative point of view, Austen is highly attentive to key terminology and makes no mistake in choosing the most appropriate terms to describe the mental and emotional evolution of her

characters at particular moments throughout the novel. If *tiresome* was the prevailing benchmark for incipient build-up of annoyance, *vexation* frames the development of a higher level of stress reactions and impudent assertions that illustrate an even more volatile line of argument and, by extension, an even more distressed matriarchal figure.

In close agreement with the original meaning, only T2 succeeds in transferring to a relatively high degree the true meaning of *vexing* by rendering it as *necăjești* (*a necăji*):

Domnule Bennet, cum poți vorbi așa despre fetele dumitale? Se pare că-ți face mare plăcere să mă *necăjești*. Nu ai pic de înțelegere față de nervii mei (T2, 19).

Aside from its semantic compatibility to *vexing*, the verb *a necăji* also stands out as a proper lexical link to a more distant stylistic tone which also slightly taps into the preferred translatorial approach of T2. Other acceptable variants of *necăji* were more than likely available in 2006 for T2, such as *a tachina*, *a enerva*, or *a sâcâi*, but none of them would have matched the archaic and semantic value of *a necăji* which dates back to as early as 1688 (Biblia 1688).

Unlike T2, T1 and T3 saw it fit to make use of a relatively harsh term to illustrate Mrs. Bennet's spiraling emotional state by opting for *jignești* (*a jigni*):

Domnule Bennet, cum poți să-ți nedreptățești într-atât copiii? Îți place tare mult să mă *jignești*. Pic de milă nu ai pentru nervii mei (T3, 7).

Domnule Bennet, cum poți vorbi așa de urât de copiii dumitale? Îți face plăcere să mă *jignești*. N-ai nici un pic de milă de bieții mei nervi (T1, 6).

Chronologically, the first attestations of the verb *a jigni* can be traced back to the early nineteenth century (Bolintineanu, *Legende istorice*) which would mean that the stylistic register was successfully established. However, from a pure semantic point of view, the word feels distant and might even give someone the false impression that Mrs. Bennet was overreacting by accusing her husband of offending her when he was, in fact, only stressing her „nerves” a bit harder than before. *A jigni* means *to insult* and it is quite obvious that Mr. Bennet is quite far from such action at this point in the novel. Moreover, his often nonchalant manner, his seemingly superior intellect and witty remarks would have never

failed him into becoming a feeble-minded offender that would get irritated with trivial matters of marital issues.

The intellectual complexity of Austen's characters is being progressively unveiled based on their interactions. As a primary narrative technique, Austen's employment of what is commonly known as *free indirect speech* is able to provide a detailed and impartial description of human affairs. The indirect involvement of the author's voice into her characters' decisional apparatus empowers her to apply the most rigorous evaluative criteria to the oftentimes pandemonic interactions and consequences of her characters without having to take full responsibility for them.

Within the process of (re)translation, either of the characters' intellectual, moral or sentimental evolution must be carefully and faithfully transferred to the receiving culture so as to be well in line with Austen's progressive depicting mechanisms. Whereas an *adaptation* modality of translating would not completely alter the logical development of moral or intellectual characteristics, other modalities such as *omission*, *word-for-word*, *addition* or *error* would more than likely interfere with the internal mechanisms of the novel's infrastructure and therefore prevent target readers from grasping an authentic and complete sequence of human interaction and evolution.

Chapter II of the novel is concluded by Austen with a closer and insightful look into Mr. Bennet's persona after an intensive exchange of replies:

Mr. Bennet was so odd a mixture of *quick parts*, sarcastic humour, reserve, and caprice, that the experience of three and twenty years had been insufficient to make his wife understand his character. (Austen 8)

His wife's excessive and tireless implorations to determine Mr. Bennet to meet Mr. Bingley and go through the formalities of introducing his daughters enhanced Mr. Bennet's rhetorical skills and, to a certain extent, surfaced his dominant profile within his role as a highly educated husband and father. The magnitude of Mr. Bennet's complexity does not seem to know a particular limit. It is obvious that from a pure conjugal point of view the relationship between Mr. Bennet and his wife aims to showcase a static social component between them and, at the same time, some sort of romantic frigidity that coalesce into a dysfunctional and hypocritical pre-Victorian marriage. On the other hand, from a relatively elevated anthropological perspective, Austen may have also wished to

subtly touch on the out-standing human capacity to evolve and transgress pre-established norms and set moral, intellectual and spiritual limitations. Mr. Bennet becomes in this respect a symbol of multilateral evolution and a dynamic avatar of cultural liberation.

Translation-wise, the idiom *quick parts* is clearly a matter of adaptation, a pure translation with a *word-for-word* rendering making absolutely no sense on the receiving end in this situation. Therefore, T1 and T2 correctly deliberate in choosing to *modulate* the idiomatic originality of *quick parts* and mould it into single lexical units such as *agerime* (Almăgeanu) and *vioiciune* (Florea):

Domnul Bennet era un amestec atât de ciudat de *agerime*, sarcasm, rezervă și capriciu, încât douăzeci și trei de ani de viață conjugală au fost prea puțini pentru soția sa ca să-i înțeleagă firea (T1, 6).

Domnul Bennet era un amestec tare ciudat de *vioiciune*, umor sarcastic, reținere și capricii, iar în douăzeci și trei de ani de căsnicie soția lui nu reușise să pătrundă în totalitate tainele comportamentului său (T2, 20).

These preferred terms are able to frame more accurately Austen's depiction of Mr. Bennet's witty nature and superior rhetorical skills and so retain a sufficient amount of source meaning.

On the other hand, intriguingly, T3 does not subscribe to the same lines of thought as T1 and T2, and considers optimal to select the word *ironie* 'irony' to translate *quick parts*.

Domnul Bennet era un amestec atât de ciudat de *ironie*, umor sarcastic, rezervă și toane, că douăzeci și trei de ani de căsătorie nu fuseseră nicidecum de ajute pe soția lui să-i priceapă caracterul (T3, 8).

Before completely dismissing T3's rendition as *error*, a closer analysis is required that might help this study gain more insight into such hasty selection. According to Moby Thesaurus II, the expression *quick parts* is indexed primarily as a synonym for *sharpness*, and secondarily as *intelligence, capacity, comprehension, understanding, discernment, good judgement, acuteness, grasp of intellect* etc. Comparatively, the Romanian word *ironie* is partnered up in meaning with *persiflaj, persiflare, pișcătură, zeflemea, înțepătură, sfichiuitură* etc., all of which denote a particular kind of more or less subtle mockery of someone's behaviour, attitude or intellectual capabilities. It would actually be safe to infer that *ironie* (irony) derives from a person of *quick parts* as a visible and unique manifestation

of intelligence that has been directed towards a particular outcome. Regardless of the terms' obvious conjunctive parameters and Mr. Bennet's tendency to use irony as a dialogic mechanism, it is clear that Austen was in fact simply referencing a clear-cut mental capacity that is independent of other more obtrusive and offensive derivations.

On the other end of the spectrum, in contrast to the above more adapted and modulated translating layout, the rather popular literal translation can be used as a quick and successful translating tool for extracting the foreign essence onto the receiving target language without the fear of irreversibly damaging a particular network of references. However, despite its seemingly harmless nature, one must use it sensibly and cautiously in order to avoid depleting the target output of all its idiomatic referencing capabilities that might, as a result, risk reducing a potentially faithful translation to a mere inorganic lexical equivalence.

The „second-hand information from Lady Lucas” showed that Mr. Bingley's physical appearance, elegance and intentions were at a surprisingly good standard that Mrs. Bennet's girls were living up to. Mr. Bingley's sure intention of attending the acquaintance party added to the girls' enthusiasm and hopes of winning Mr. Bingley's heart through one of the most rhythmical and aesthetically romantic actions known as dancing:

Nothing could be more delightful! To be fond of dancing was a certain step towards falling in love; and very lively hopes of Mr. Bingley's heart were entertained (Austen 13).

The implicitly present gerundial term *winning* in “...lively hopes of (winning) Mr. Bingley's heart...”, seemed to have been accidentally omitted or simply ignored by all three translators involved in this study. Moreover, all three of them thought it appropriate to sort of emphasize the word *heart* and treat it as a unilateral point of referential interest that neutralizes its idiomatic properties within that specific *context*:

Nimic nu putea fi mai încântător! A iubi dansul însemna un prim pas către a te îndrăgosti; și *inima* domnului Bingley stârnea foarte vii speranțe” (T1, 10).

Nimic nu putea fi mai încântător. A iubi dansul era un semn sigur că te afli la un pas de a te îndrăgosti. Era firesc, așadar, să se nască speranțe puternice în privința *inimii* domnului Bingley (T2, 23).

Nimic nu putea fi mai încântător! Faptul că îi plăcea să danseze era un pas sigur spre a se îndrăgosti; și astfel, speranțele privind *inima* domnul Bingley atinseră înălțimi amețitoare (T3, 13).

Although it is obvious that such literal translation does not fail to preserve the original meaning and that the intended reference is still easily retrievable by a mere act of connotational inference, the rendering preference in this case exposes to a certain extent a kind of facile translation shortcut. The phraseological flexibility of the English language allows for a partly visible expression, as it is easily deductible from a quick contextual analysis and so the materialization of the implicit *winning* would have had no semantic effect on the reader whatsoever. In Romanian, analogically, if the translators did in fact employ a complete literal translation of the source phrase, the logical implicit collocater would have to be *a câștiga* (to win) in its specific conjugated form and so the equivalent expression would be represented by *a câștiga inima cuiva*, which has not yet been officially attested by Romanian dictionaries or studies as a correct collocation, even if a quick research does to some degree illustrate that it has slowly started to become a loan translation in its full right² or perhaps a metonymic reconstruction of *a câștiga simpatia/dragostea cuiva* that will probably be adopted by a large number of Romanian speakers eventually. In other words, the translators might have aimed a bit too close to the source language disregarding the idiomatic or collocative nature of their translatorial product.

At the assembly ball, Mr. Bingley's friend, Mr. Darcy, had been disappointingly reluctant to consider any form of acquaintance with the young ladies and, as a result, made a very bad first impression to say the least. Apparently, the most visibly irritated with Mr. Darcy's behaviour at that time was Mrs. Bennet who confessed these specific disdainful thoughts to her seemingly sympathetic husband:

“But I can assure you”, she added, “that Lizzy does not lose much by not suiting his fancy; (...) I wish you had been there, my dear, to have given him one of your set downs. *I quite detest* the man” (Austen 18).

² <https://minikar.ru/ro/money/kak-zavoevat-serdce-lyubimoi-kak-zavoevat-serdce-devushki/>
<https://familist.ro/principalele-reguli-pentru-castiga-inima-unei-femei>
<https://22iunie.wordpress.com/>

By adding the degree adverb *quite* to her declarative enunciation, the tonality of Mrs. Bennet's voice is successfully held in submission of Austen's literary parameters and so a relatively violent expression of negative feelings towards someone is elegantly toned down.

Regardless of the obvious importance attributed by Austen to such small but holistically relevant literary building blocks, T₁ did not seem to consider such a minor addition relevant to the whole and so omitted the stylistic term in her rendition:

Dar te pot asigura, adaugă ea, că Lizzy n-are prea mult de pierdut dacă nu corespunde gustului său; Tare aş mai fi vrut să fi fost dumneata acolo, dragul meu, să-i fi spus una cum ştii dumneata. *Eu îl detest* (T₁, 14-15).

Similarly, in terms of omission, T₃ does not directly translate *quite*, but instead resorts to a rather intriguing addition to the original declaration that recreates to a certain extent Austen's desired effect:

Dar pot să te asigur, încheie ea, că Lizzy nu pierde mare lucru că nu-i este lui pe plac; aş fi vrut să fii şi dumneata acolo, ca să-l pui la punct așa cum ştii mai bine. *Cât despre mine*, eu îl urăsc. (T₃, 16-17)

T₃'s decision to use an additional rhetorical clause of emphasis, instead of bluntly stating Mrs. Bennet's feelings of hatred, is a clear indicator of a deeper understanding of the original context.

On the other hand, T₂ goes even further by replacing the original *quite* with an adverbial phrase of degree *din tot sufletul* and so unfairly intensifies Mrs. Bennet's declaration of disgust towards Mr. Darcy:

Te asigur, adăugă ea, că Lizzy nu e cu nimic în dezavantaj, dacă nu se potriveşte fanteziilor lui (...) Aş fi vrut să fii de faţă, dragul meu, şi să-i arunci una dintre vorbele dumitale de duh. *Îl detest din tot sufletul* pe omul acesta (T₂, 27).

Linked to the verb *detest*, the Romanian expression *din tot sufletul* 'from the bottom of the heart' would basically suggest that Mrs. Bennet has somehow gone beyond detesting Mr. Darcy and that her feelings of disgust and disappointment have now turned into absolute irreversible hatred instead. Moreover, by *detesting someone from the bottom of your heart* the elegance is neutralized and turned into a rather rageful manifestation of emotions, an

emotional state that Mrs. Bennet was clearly not defined by at that particular moment in the novel.

A rather frequent mistake in translation is represented by what linguists call *false friends*, i.e., separate lexical units from different languages which are spelled almost the same but have completely different meanings. Therefore, it is relatively easy to fall under the false impression that the English word *sensible* is the direct equivalent of the Romanian *sensibil*:

They had several children. The eldest of them, a *sensible*, intelligent young woman, about twenty-seven, was Elizabeth's intimate friend" (Austen 5).

However, no matter how semantically convenient and syntactically facile such rendition might turn out to be, in reality, the terms reference distinct moral and emotional features. On the one hand, *sensible* is used to describe a person that "acts on good judgment and practical ideas" (Cambridge online)³; he/she is rational and morally inclined to react to surrounding events and actions in a reasonable way. On the other hand, the Romanian *sensibil* describes a sort of emotional predisposition that enhances a person's feelings in various situations. Ironically, this person is acutely more aware of their emotional state, but is at the same time unable to keep it under control and so loses grip of various strong external stimuli that eventually trigger an intensive sensitive reaction within.

T1 and T3 follow the same line of thought and so correctly render the term without crippling the moral profile of Elizabeth's intimate friend. However, the correct translation of the term does not exonerate T1 from flagrantly disregarding the pleonastic nature of her translation of *young woman as tânără fată*.

Aveau mai mulți copii. Cel mai mare, o tânără fată cam de douăzeci și șapte de ani, inteligentă și cu mult bun simț, era prietena intimă a Elizabethei (T1, 20).

Cea mai mare dintre ei, o fată cu mult bun-simț și inteligentă, în vârstă de douăzeci și șapte de ani, era prietena intimă a lui Elizabeth (T3, 22).

³ "sensible", adjective (good judgement), <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>

T2 mistakenly takes the straightforward path and renders *sensible* as *sensibil*, which deters target readers from fully understanding the moral depths of Elizabeth's dear friend:

Aveau mai mulți copii, cel mai mare dintre ei fiind o tânără sensibilă și inteligentă, în vârstă de aproape douăzeci și șapte de ani, bună prietenă cu Elizabeth (T2, 31).

Moreover, as Elizabeth had been already identified as a person who “had a lively, playful disposition, which delighted in anything ridiculous” (Austen 3) and was therefore guided mainly by reason and not by sensitivity, it is relatively logical for her good friend to live up to similar intellectual and moral standards that sensibility describes.

CONCLUSIONS

The reasons behind a translator's motivation to (re)translate a literary text have proven to be manifold, academically intriguing, and, at other times, to a certain extent, downright unproductive. Systematic studies of the particular linguistic elements of a translation and its subsequent counterparts have steadily brought to light a quite large number of clear resolutions to otherwise redundant translational products, such as translating for “economic capital,”⁴ editorial advertisement, political or professional promotion/advancement and, less frequently occurring, personal endeavours to legitimize one's linguistic and cultural capacity.

The data collected and explained in this study indicates that, at least from a lexical and pragmatic perspective, the three translators of Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* were in fact motivated by relatively different translating principles and that their knowledge of the source culture and language was heterogenous and not completely consistent along the way.

Throughout the study, five main translating modalities were used to organize the lexical and pragmatic discrepancies registered between the three

⁴ Sharon Deane-Cox describes what many researchers have agreed to name the “symbolic capital”, that is, a form of intellectual, cultural or artistic appreciation derived from the artist's out-standing literary (artistic) contributions. On the other hand, there is the notion of “economic capital” which is to a large extent a purely financial gain provided by masses for the artist's culturally or intellectually entertaining art form.

translations, that is, *modulation*, *adaptation*, *error*, *word-for-word* and *omission*. Each category unveils both specific types of discrepancies and the convenient or the appropriate modality to operate a lexical or pragmatic transfer.

	Modulation	Adaptation	Error	Word-for-word	Omission
T1	3	1	0	1	1
T2	1	1	2	1	0
T3	2	0	1	1	0

Table 1. Translating modalities in the works analysed

By far the most frequently encountered modality that the study surfaced is *modulation*, which, in the sense registered by Widman (2019), determines the level of domestication within a (re)translation. Table 1 clearly shows that T1 is the leading user of the modulation modality and, therefore, proves that, in the sense of translating principles, the domesticating approach governed her decisions more frequently, with T3 and T2 remaining closely behind. In this case, the data collected also confirm, to a relatively small degree, Antoine Berman's renowned *retranslation hypothesis*. On the other hand, in terms of foreignizing ways to translate, all translators registered the same number of *word-for-word* renderings and thus neutralizing any foreignizing tendencies, at least within the textual passages that were used for the study.

Additionally, from the point of view of accuracy, the adaptation and error modalities of translating also shed some light on the underlying approach the translators made use of. Particularly, T2 seems to have gone the farthest away from the exact meaning of the source text with 2 errors and 1 adaptation, followed by T3 with 1 error and, lastly, by T1 with only 1 adaptation.

Finally, considering all the above, it would be safe to state that, at a microlevel, based on the data collected and explained, T1 went a step further in/on "bringing the source text home", while also differentiating herself in terms of language competence and cultural knowledge of the source context. Nevertheless, despite such differences, a global complementary conclusion may as well be advanced, by the grace of which this study can also affirm that each translator effectively contributed to the understanding of the original text by providing at least one alternative to an otherwise faulty preceding translation.

Works Cited

- Austen, Jane. *Persuasion*. Global Grey eBooks, 2019.
<https://www.globalgreyebooks.com/persuasion-ebook.html>
- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice* (vol. 1 & 2). București, Prietenii Cărții, 1995.
- . *Mîndrie și prejudecată*, translated by Ana Almăgeanu, preface by Anda Teodorescu, București, Garamond, 1992.
- . *Mîndrie și prejudecată*, translated by Anca Florea, preface by Dan Grigorescu, București, Leda, 2004.
- . *Mîndrie și prejudecată*. translated by Florența Simion, București, Litera, 2019.
- Biblia de la București. translated by Radu and Șerban Greceanu, 1688.
<https://archive.org/details/Biblia1688/mode/2up?q=nec%C4%83ji>
- Bolintineanu, Dimitrie. *Legende istorice*. Pitești, Herra, 2009.
- Bour, Isabelle. "What Happened to the Truth Universally Acknowledged. Translation as Reception of Jane Austen in France." *MDPI – Humanities*, vol. 11, no. 4, 2022.
- Cossy, Valerie. & Sagliam Diego. 2005: "Translations." *Jane Austen in Context*, edited by Janet Todd, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 169-181.
- Deane-Cox, Sharon. "Retranslation. Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation." Bloomsbury *Advances in Translation*, 2014.
- Diggele, Yvette van Diggele. "A Modern Reception of *Pride and Prejudice* in Dutch." *MA Linguistics: Translation in Theory and Practice*. 2015.
https://studenttheses.universiteitleiden.nl/handle/1887/32715?solr_nav%5Bid%5D=9a923a1edc92cf158f28&solr_nav%5Bpage%5D=0&solr_nav%5Boffset%5D=0
- Kostadinova, Vitana. "Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* in Bulgarian Translation." *Institute for Bulgarian Language*. 2013
http://bglit.org/media/Statii/V_Kostadinova_JANE_AUSTEN_S_PRIDE_AND_PREJUDICE_IN_BULGARIAN_TRANSLATION.pdf
- Mandal, Anthony. "Austen's European Reception." *A Companion to Jane Austen*, edited by Claudia L. Johnson and Clara Tuite, Blackwell Publishing, vol. 172, 2009, pp. 422-433.
- Sørbo, Marie Nedregotten, "The Challenges of Translating Jane Austen's Irony: Samples from 150 Years of Norwegian Versions of the Novels." *MDPI – Humanities*. Vol. 11, no. 4, 2022.
- Widman, Julieta. "Translation Modalities Method in Retranslation." *Perspectives on Retranslation – Ideology, Paratexts, Methods*, edited by Özlem Berk Albachten and Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, New York, Routledge, 2019.
- Xiu-li, LI. 2016: "On the Translation of pride in *Pride and Prejudice*." *US-China Foreign Language*. David Publishing Company, vol. 14, no. 2, 2016. pp. 149-156.

BIONOTE

Constantin Dănuș BAICU is an English teacher and a PhD student under the coordination of Professor Constantin Manea at the University of Pitesti. Ever since he

graduated from the University of Pitești in 2013 he became interested in teaching English and translation studies. The PhD programme he signed up for started in 2021 and it is centred around the retranslation phenomenon. Over the last three years of research, he has been able to successfully complete two major relevant studies for his thesis. The first study, “Observations on (Re)translating *Pride and Prejudice* into Romanian”, was published in 2022 in the first edition of *Re-configuring Romanian Culture on its Way towards Modernity. Romanian Translation Practice in the Age of Enlightenment (1770-1830)*, Hartung-Gorre Publishers, Konstanz. The second study, “Creating Value in the Retranslation of Shakespeare’s Sonnets into Romanian”, was published in *Philologica Jassyensia* in the same year.

E-mail: danutconstantinbaicu@gmail.com