UNIVERSITATEA „DUNĂREA DE JOS" DIN GALAȚI
ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ DE ȘTIINȚE SOCIO-UMANE

TEZĂ DE DOCTORAT

NOT ONLY TABOO: TRANSLATING THE 'CONTROVERSIAL' BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER COMMUNISM

TRADUCEREA CUVINTELOR ȘI STRUCTURILOR CONTROVERSATE ÎN PERIOADELE PRE-COMUNISTĂ, COMUNISTĂ ȘI POST-COMUNISTĂ

Rezumat

Conducător științific:
Prof. univ. dr. Elena CROITORU

Candidat: Ana-Maria PÂCLEANU

GALAȚI
2016

CONTENTS

4.2.3. Operational norms before, during and after communism. Communist interventions under the lens

4.3. Conclusions

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS
LIST OF PUBLISHED PAPERS
BIBLIOGRAPHY
ANNEXES

KEY WORDS: Romanian communism; criteria for censoring; censored literature; translations; controversial elements; functional, cultural-turn and descriptivist approaches; the function(s) of translations; operational norms.

INTRODUCTION

Literature is a form of art that, due to its mimetic nature, can become a means of alluding to, mocking at or even criticising systems of authority and unravel the drawbacks of obeying them. Differently, it can promote and support views, doctrines or ideology or simply describe aspects referring to taboo subjects like politics, religion, social issues or eroticism.

Since any kind of authority needs to safeguard their power and to control the way and extent to which information reaches or is likely to reach the public, interventions from holders of power frequently take the form of censorship. In fact, this is one of the most common form of intervention practiced by holders of power.

Given the fact that the present study refers to censorship applied to translations of literature, the phenomenon acquires its relevance by being considered along with norms that functioned during communism for selecting literature to be accessed by the public as well as for translating controversial literature into Romanian.

The large number of titles on the lists of books censored during communism in Romania, amongst which two (of four) novels by Lawrence and eight (of eight) novels by W.S. Maugham were pre-communist translations into Romanian. This fact raises questions on the censorship criteria and the translation norms that functioned at the time.

Therefore, the main aim of the present research is to identify the (operational) norms that functioned during communism and regulated the censoring of the pre-communist translations and the existence of translations that conformed with the ideology at the time.

A secondary aim is to prove the need of a blending of translation theories that can be effectively applied in the analysis of translations provided in the above-mentioned historical periods. This entails the task of proving the importance of all the factors and elements involved in the translation process.

The corpus was selected by taking into account the fact that the pre-communist translations found on the lists of banned books have communist and post-communist variants. This facilitates the identification of norms at work during communism (as compared to the pre-communist and

post-communist periods), a period marked by censoring interventions in all fields.

Despite the fact that invariability of the content (as suggested by many theorists in the field) should be a dominant features of translations, texts are often marked by changes required by the initial norms (in this case acceptability) and preliminary norms as it can be acknowledged when analysing communist translations.

The texts in question are approached from the historical, cultural, literary and linguistic points of view, by starting with details related to censorship (and, most important, criteria for censoring), the historical context in which censorship manifested most in Romania, and continuing with special emphasis on the utility of certain translation theories and the importance of linguistics in the analysis of source texts and target texts. This analysis is aimed at identifying the functions of the texts and the norms considered when texts containing controversial elements were rendered into Romanian, for a *communist audience*.

Therefore, the theoretical framework consists of theoretical elements from fields such as History, Linguistics, Translation Studies and Literary Criticism. This integrative

approach is a complex means of assessing translations and drawing conclusions on translators' behavioural patterns specific to each of the three historical periods under scrutiny by starting in an inductive manner (the observation related to the works by Lawrence and Maugham that were censored during communism) and continuing in an deductive manner (i.e. applying functionalist, cultural-turn and descriptivist theories along with concepts and principles from Linguistics).

The thesis consists of four chapters of which the first two make up the theoretical part that, alongside definitions and theories, provides the terminology employed in the practical part.

The main contribution to the research in the field consists in an analysis of particularly interesting aspects of translations that have not been analysed from the point of view of communist Romanian censoring actions in the translation field despite Maugham's status as the most translated author during the pre-communist period and D.H. Lawrence's fame as one of the most censored writers. The communist censorship criteria are the key factors in

identifying these aspects that generally refer to **politics / ideology**, **social issues** and **religion**.

In addition, a secondary-importance contribution consists in a coherent and relevant synthesis of both theoretical and practical aspects.

Another important dimension of our contribution is the subchapter that encapsulates the detailed comparative analysis (4.2.3.) and that enhances a screening of the variation in translation patterns for each category of controversial elements during each of the three periods under scrutiny.

Consequently, by testing existing theories or methodologies like the functionalist and the descriptivist ones, blending and applying them in a logical algorithm, the effects of censorship on literary texts during communism in Romania become obvious.

The logical sequence presupposes applying the steps of translation criticism put forth by Margret Ammann. The steps have been re-ordered so as to fit the purpose of the present research. The conclusions drawn (even if following a model of translation critique) are not part of a strait-laced assessment of the quality of translations and are not meant

to question the value of the variants accepted or done before, after and under communism, but have a great importance in showing the effects of censorship on literary texts considered controversial during communism while also evaluating the potential (of each variant) to render the original meanings.

CHAPTER 1

An inquiry into the factors that brought about the censoring of the pre-communist translations into Romanian of D.H. Lawrence's and W.S. Maugham's novels would not be possible without a foregoing examination of the historical context in which the censoring took place. The existence of other variants and the translation mechanism that resulted in translations conforming with communist norms are also related to the historical context – communism in Romania between 1945 and 1989.

Still, apart from describing the historical circumstances, insights into the phenomenon of censorship are also necessary. Thus, subchapter 1.1. – **General Aspects of Censorship** – refers to censorship as a particularly complex

phenomenon that occurs worldwide and affects all fields. In this sense, the first section of the subchapter (**Censorship as a global phenomenon. Norms, rules and re-shaped canons**) deals with the relationship between power, resistance and censorship, one of the most sizeable practices of power (as pointed out by Foucault). This relationship and the manner in which censorship affects societies are analysed by looking into the extent to which two opposite ideological directions – totalitarian and democratic – have employed censorship throughout time. One of the most evident common features of censorship practised in totalitarian states and the one practised under democratic regimes is that behind the decision of censoring the reasons are mainly political and not the ones that mask the real intentions of authorities.

Therefore, it was acknowledged that limiting access to information and denying freedom of speech are measures often taken by authorities on the plea of **norms**, **rules** or **canons**, a consequence of the "will to power" (in Nietzsche's words). In this case, the main issue is to observe how different categories of norms and rules, when imposed,

could occur in the cultural environment, especially in the field of literary creations and at different levels or stages.

In order to emphasise the complexity of the relationship between power, norms and censorship, concepts from logic – such as von Wright's purposes of norms (permitting, prohibiting and ordering) –, psychology – Michel's behavioural uniformity (as a result of social norms) and La Pierre's homogenizing effect of norms on public behaviour – and philosophy (where norms are referred to by using the terms rule or standard) are considered. Ove Hanson's insights into the action-guiding nature of norms and the subjectivity of moral norms (that when employed by political regimes often become an artifice meant to mask or conceal other purposes) have been discussed.

Another element described as related to norms is the canon. Like norms, canons – that are, in fact selection of a "subset of the best and most important" elements from "a largest set of all possible choices" (Brown 2010: 13) are meant to improve, regulate, and normalize. Thus, both censorship and canons refer to norm preservation and compliance. However, canons are often "a yardstick against

which to measure cultural products" and "censorial judgments (often) reflect values transported through canons" (Müller 2004: 13), where censorial judgements could cause a re-shaping of canons so as to fit the purposes of the authority. The best example is the re-shaping of the aesthetic criteria in communist Romania in order to turn art and literature into means of communist education (Petcu 1999: 171).

The section called **Types of censorship and its propitious environments** provides definitions of censorship of which the simplest and clearest is Müller's – "discourse regulation which influences what can be said by whom, to whom, how, and in which context" (2004: 1).

Also, types of censorship are identified by taking into account the following elements: the authority or institution that practices it (governmental and cultural); the moment when it is applied (a priori, a posteriori or self-censorship – that recall Foucault's forms of interdiction); the factors / participants in the act of censorship (censorship affecting the literary field can address the author or the text), the affected levels along with the way in which the process of monitoring and banning takes place (constitutive and

regulatory censorship); the political regimes that impose norms (totalitarian or democratic censorship).

Yet, the most relevant classification of types of censorship for this study is the one that gathers all the other for establishing the factors or grounds on which products are censored, or more precisely art that refers or alludes to political, religious, social and sexual issues and that triggered partial or total censorship, enlarged upon in several series dedicated to censorship.

The second part of Chapter 1 – **Communist Censorship in Romania** – refers to the authority, the periods and the extent to which censors pursued their goals in the elimination of published matters as well as the criteria employed for censoring. The impact of the censorial measures is considered from the diachronic point of view, a method meant to prove that literary activity and the existence of texts (both as original texts and as translations) are often conditioned by the cultural and political context. What comes to the fore is that the purging and censoring in communist Romania did not have the same intensity and effects for the whole period. The three periods described by historians are: 1945-1948 when the worst censorial

measures were taken (with defascization as a main goal) and excessive purging took place by closely following the Soviet model and by eliminating all the Western elements (Corobca 2014: 29); 1949-1952/1954 – a 'softer' period with the main purpose destalinisation or condemnation of the previous period of the communist regime, when an apparently more careful censoring or purging was done despite the consistent fight against and condemnation of the decadent, "rotten" bourgeois culture that cultivated exploitation and cosmopolitanism (Corobca 2014: 30); and the 1954-1989 period, when an even more obvious oscillation between democratic and harsh measures occurred.

Nonetheless, the apparent freedom of speech was aimed at promoting, supporting and complying with the communist ideology and policy, a more democratic perspective meant to disguise the same tendency to control.

During these periods, inconstancy was a result of the Romanian leaders' decisions to either follow the Soviet model ad literam or then deviate from it to a certain extent for the implementation of a Romanian variant of socialism.

The "purging" actions during all these periods were based on the 1945, 1946 and 1948 lists (that later became

tomes) and the related instructions. The criteria for censoring mentioned in the brochures are synthesised in the second part of this subchapter and regard, in general, concepts and ideologies contrary to the communist ones.

Since many scholars argue that the understanding of the mechanisms and evolution of censorship and its criteria in Romania is very much related to the development of this phenomenon in the Soviet Union, the communist criteria for censoring are compared with the Soviet ones.

Furthermore, the intended function of communist translations is analysed by considering both the criteria for censoring and the studies in the field of translation done during communism inasmuch as the latter contain theoretical elements and remarks on what good translations should have consisted in at the time.

As a matter of fact, the historical details related to censorship (as an intervention on the published matters), the criteria for censoring provided in the brochures and in the instructions, along with the studies related to translation are the preliminary norms described by the descriptivist theorist Gideon Toury explained in Chapter 2.

By analysing the Romanian (communist) criteria for censoring, it becomes evident that there is a certain relation between the criteria and the linguistic elements and the subject matters literary works. The linguistic elements that caused the banning of the texts that make up the corpus of the present research (identified and analysed in Chapter 3) are, in fact, words and structures that refer to realia depicted in fiction and, therefore, to the concepts, ideas, mentalities that were condemned by communism according to the criteria for censoring.

CHAPTER 2

In this chapter, the theoretical framework for the analysis of the source texts and the target texts is provided. While opening the path for a translation-oriented type of analysis, subchapter 2.1. (**Functionalist, Cultural-turn and Descriptivist Approaches in the Analysis of Censored Texts – Relevance and Application**) is a presentation of the most significant functionalist (2.1.1.) and descriptivist theories (2.1.2), of both their negative and their positive features, and also a plea for a certain manner of combining

elements belonging to the two types of approaches to translation (2.1.3.). Cultural-turn theories were also considered in this personal approach.

By providing the advantage that they focus on the function of the target text in its cultural context and move equivalence from the area of debatable concepts into a more practical sphere that involves the cultural element, functionalist theories are particularly important for the present research. This fact offers more complex ground for the analysis of target literary texts in their historical and cultural contexts.

Some theories and models lay emphasis on all the elements that gravitate around the finite products (translations) – as Margret Ammann's model for translation critique – while others focus on the importance of one of the elements of the translations process – as in the case of the skopos theory.

Most issues related to functionalist theories refer to the typology of texts to which they apply or to the importance given to the target texts and to other elements in the translation process. In addition, debatable aspects are to be found, in particular, in some theories regarding the skopos

method, which seems too rigid for using it in the translation of literary texts or analyses of literary translation.

However, despite the drawbacks, as regards the literary texts under investigation, some ideas stated and the correspondent terminology in the framework of this theory (the importance of *the commissioner, the author* and the *form of the messages*) are of avail mostly when referring to translations published and distributed on the market during communism since the purpose of some of the texts produced under the regime was to replace the old translations that had been banned. This resulted in the use of certain methods and strategies in order to provide finite products that were functionally adequate, i.e. that conformed to the communist norms or criteria.

Other important functionalist perspectives applicable in the present research are: Christiane Nord's analysis of source texts (by considering the extratextual and intertextual factors) and the identification of translation problems as parts of the functional translation process; Reiss' linguistic components for translation evaluation; Margret Ammann's model for translation critique.

In fact, Ammann's model is the main theoretical aspect considered and it consists of the following steps: (1) the function of the translation in the target culture; (2) the intratextual coherence of the translation; (3) the function of the source text in the source culture; (4) the intratextual coherence of the source text; (5) the intertextual coherence between target and source texts.

A possible way of applying this model to the analysis of the texts in question here (the analysis of the source texts and that of the target texts) is reordering them as follows: (3), (4), (2), (5), and (1). The purpose of this re-ordering/re-thinking is to provide an algorithm for identifying the difficulties translators faced when translating during communism. The analyses in Chapter 3 and 4 are based on these steps.

The first stage proposed is the analysis of the source texts through a simulation of the stage in which translators decode the source texts (undertaken in Chapter 3). Accessing and decoding source texts, by also considering their functions and intratextual coherence enables us to formulate assumptions on the translation problems

translators had faced as regards the frames that could have evoked scenes not accepted by the regime.

During the second stage – the reconstruction of the process of translation (undertaken in Chapter 4) – steps (2), (5) and (1) are covered. This entails an investigation into the features of translations and a comparative analysis of the translations by considering the intertextual coherence between source texts and target texts in order to establish the function achieved by the communist translations as a consequence of the applying the communist criteria for censoring.

Consequently, this model is used in the present research by integrating the others when following the above-mentioned steps. The findings facilitate the formulation of generalization regarding translation universals (rules, norms or conventions) that governed, or better said beset, the translators during communism as opposed to the freedom of speech before and after the period in question.

As regards the cultural-turn approaches, Lefevere's view on the ideological factor in translation (patronage) is of avail due to its clear terminology and concepts and the features that shares with the skopos theory. The most

important elements are those regarding the four levels of translation: ideology, poetics, universe of discourse and language (1992: 87) and the factors of crucial importance in the control-mechanism – professionals within the literary system, the patronage outside the literary system and the dominant poetics.

In the same vein, various items in the descriptivist approaches are relevant given the obvious connections with the phenomenon of translations regulation as described by Lefevere. The common assumption is that "translation is always controlled by the target culture" (Robinson 2001: 179).

However, Toury starts from the translated text itself for identifying the norms at work in different historical and cultural contexts, whereas Lefevere looks at the relation between translations and cultures, a relation in which the latter is the starting point and constrains the former.

The most important detail related to the three approaches is that the notion of culture is the central concept as regards the ideological component but also the literary value, functions of the texts, participants in the *rewriting* process etc. Thus, functionalist and cultural-turn views

provide a valuable and consistent terminological ground if complemented by the descriptivist metalanguage and theories.

The norm-based theory is a result of the reasoning on the relations between the product, function and process of translation. Despite neglecting the importance of source texts or cultures, Toury's descriptivist approach – in which target texts (products) are perceived as a key factor in understanding the translation process – is a means of identifying the decisions made during the translation process.

Therefore, according to the theorist, the decision-making mechanism could be re-constructed by considering data coming from two sources: the analysis of the products of this norm-governed activity (translating) and the 'confessions' (statements) of the people involved in this activity (Toury 1995: 55, 65). The former provides more objective data because investigating into the translation methods (and the recurrent linguistic issues) is a more pragmatic way of identifying "regularities of behavior" (common patterns) in the attitude of translators translating during communism and the reasons for the censoring of the

variants produced before communism. It is also useful for comparing this phenomenon with its post-communist correspondent – the translation norms (if any) governing translation in a democratic context.

The categories of norms considered in the present study are the initial norms – whose use for fitting the source system or the target system results in characteristics of the target text like adequacy and acceptability also called TT-oriented and ST-oriented (Hermans 1999: 77), preliminary and operational norms. Operational norms are the most important for the reconstruction of the translation process in the practical section (Chapter 4).

The two subclasses of operational norms that also recall the importance of linguistic elements in translation studies are the matricial norms – removing, moving or adding pieces of text – and the textual-linguistic norms – the linguistic choices made by the translator for rendering concepts in the target text.

Certainly, the two manners in which norms might function are the most relevant details related to the role of norms – (a) subscribing to the norms of the source text, source language and culture and the effects (the law of

interference), or (b) complying with the norms of the target text and the consequences (the law of standardization**)**.

Thus, translators' attitude could be interpreted and described by identifying norms with a view to providing answers to the "leading descriptivist questions – who translates what, when, how, for whom, in what context, with what effect and why?" (Hermans in Kuhiwczak and Littau eds. 2007: 88).

The correspondence between the functionalist, cultural-turn concepts and Toury's norms is the following:

Preliminary norms (Translation policy)	Translation brief	Patronage
Operational norms	Translation strategies	Translation procedures
Text-linguistic norms	Text-type conventions	Universe of discourse/language

The essential conclusion of this part of the theoretical chapter is that terms such as *function of translations*, *decision-making process*, *translators' role* (and behaviour/attitude) and *source/target culture* are common to these approaches and that there is also a significant correspondence between concepts belonging to the three types of approaches.

The last subchapter (**Elements of Linguistics: Lexical, Semantic, Pragmatic and Syntactic Dimensions**) refers to the relevance of linguistics (with emphasis on the importance of each level of linguistic description) in analysing the type of literary texts in discussion. The aim of this section is to briefly recall some theoretical elements used in the analysis of the source texts and target texts, i.e. for covering the steps in the adopted model.

Thus, the linguistic component is perceived as a tool for analysing the features of original texts and translations. On the one hand, linguistic analysis is useful for establishing the way "frames" were used in order to refer to "scenes" (concepts explained in this subchapter within the scenes-and-frames theory) and, on the other hand, for detecting the degree to which the 'finite products' achieved the functions they were expected to achieve in the target system. The linguistic coordinate is also particularly important for identifying the features of the source texts by means of what was called *translation-oriented type of analysis* in the present research

Aside from their applicability to translation practice or criticism, aspects of linguistics should also be accounted for

when dealing with texts in general. Roger Fowler's *levels of description* – the semantic level of linguistic description, syntax (and its sub-part – morphology), the sounds of language (phonology and phonetics), text-grammar (the *linking* and *sequencing* of sentences in coherent discourse) and pragmatics (Fowler 1996: 5) are considered in the analysis of: linguistic problems like those identified by Nord (2.1.1); Reiss's linguistic components for translation evaluation; and the identification of operational norms (matricial and textual-linguistic) that prevailed in communist translations of the novels under discussion.

Therefore, it is worthy of note that despite a more and more obvious shift towards a culturally-oriented perspective in Translation Studies, all the translation analyses or assessments make use of elements from Linguistics.

Moreover, linguistic components such as *semantic equivalence*, *lexical adequacy*, *grammatical correctness* and *stylistic correspondence* play an important role (together with extra-linguistic determinants) in Reiss's model of translation assessment (Snell-Hornby 2006: 30).

Translation problems (as presented by Nord) are identified by taking into account the differences between the vocabulary, the syntax and the suprasegmental features of the source and target languages.

Consequently, this subchapter explains the utility of certain concepts and principles from Semantics (componential analysis, sense relationships, lexical and semantic fields, referential classes etc.), Pragmatics (presupposition, implicature, speech acts, modality and deixis), and Syntax, and of the translation methods that took shape or stemmed from this discipline – Vinay and Darbelnet's translation procedures and Catford's well known classification of shifts (valuable terminological and conceptual resources for dealing with translation at all levels).

In conclusion, in the present research, the succession of paradoxes in the history of translation study are not followed, but the diversity of the theories is turned to good account by focusing on some areas of convergence between the cultural and linguistic theories as well as their complementarity.

CHAPTER 3

Chapter 3 – **A TRANSLATION ORIENTED TYPE OF ANALYSIS** – is a simulation of the stage that precedes the act of translating, i.e. the decoding of the source texts after considering their function in the source system.

Thus, observing the features of the source texts (both as a product having a certain status in the source culture and as forms of discourse with certain linguistic features) implies covering two of the five steps of the functionalist model for translation analysis – steps 3 and 4 (i.e. the function of the source text in the source culture and the intratextual coherence of the source text).

Despite it not being an analysis for a further translation stage, it is meant to disclose the problems original texts posed because of their being incompatible with the communist criteria of what could be published.

One of the important hypotheses on which this study is based (and that takes into account literary critics' arguments) is that the two authors' novels are "mimetic reproductions of the world" created "to motivate personal insights about reality" and not to simply describe it (Nord

2005: 78) and that the facts and actions depicted by the writers are, to a certain extent, related to the reality they witnessed (the scenes), reality not tolerated in a communist system.

Thus, subchapter 3.1. is an exploration of the connection between the two authors' worlds and their fiction for a further attempt (3.2.) at analysing why linguistic items (words, complex structures and even paragraphs) referring to certain experiences, beliefs or reality (the subject matters of their works) were removed from the texts.

In this sense, as already mentioned, the main elements to be analysed are the function of the source texts in the source culture and their coherence. Therefore, the general characteristics of D.H. Lawrence's and W.S. Maugham's style as well as the features of each author's fiction are presented in order to establish if censoring measures were also taken in the source culture and to identify the linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of each author's works.

Furthermore, in Lawrence's case, the section dedicated to the eroticism in his prose (3.1.1.2) is meant to provide a clear delineation of the concepts taboo, vulgar, eroticism,

pornography and insights into the way sexuality was perceived at the time and into the implications of employing eroticism-related elements in literary works.

Literary criticism sources revealed the fact that the main characteristics of Maugham's fiction and language are simplicity, lucidity, fluency and readability, uncomplicated vocabulary and syntax. All these seem to illustrate his interest in "the obscure", "the ordinary", "the common run of men" (Maugham 1951: 4) and therefore, interest in reality, hence the variety of subject matters and the multitude of elements referring to politics / ideologies, religion and social aspects.

Conversely, despite the fact that his fiction reflects his personal odyssey and that his writings contain many elements from the events he witnessed and his life story, by inserting these elements into his fiction, Lawrence did not only write stories. He expressed ideas, implied and suggested through language that defies semantic and syntactic principles and often has particular pragmatic effects. Thus, his style strikes because of the obvious tendency to bring reality into fiction by going beyond what used to be defined as literature.

Moreover, the content and the themes in his works (especially those of novels challenged for references to eroticism) have been criticised by various types of audience.

As already mentioned, another key detail related to the two authors' fiction is that many events and characters were inspired by the reality they had witnessed. Evidence in this sense is provided by the libel actions against W.S. Maugham (in the case of the novel *The Painted Veil*), the incredible resemblance between Lawrence's characters and the people he knew, as well as between the events and state of affairs presented in novels like *The Plumed Serpent.*

Another element that stresses the existence of controversial elements (like frames referring to imperialism, colonialism, religion, social issues) in the fictional texts are the travels to remote places in search of a variety of subject matters, as admitted by the two in their correspondence and the essays about their own activity (Maugham's *The Summing Up* and Lawrence's essays and letters).

3.2 (**Translational-Relevant Levels of Analysis in Texts Containing the Controversial**) is the most important part of the translation-oriented type of analysis undertaken in the present research.

Since controversial meanings can occur even at the simplest level, each novel is examined at all levels of linguistic description as suggested by Fowler – lexis, sounds of language (where the case), semantic level, syntax and pragmatics. To this purpose, focus is laid on the four categories of controversial elements (identified by considering the criteria for censoring) – politics / ideologies, religion, social issues and eroticism – that are visible at all linguistic levels.

The main conclusion drawn is that the linguistic choices made by the two authors make up frames that evoke (in readers' minds) beliefs, experiences or elements belonging to a reality that was considered controversial between 1945 and 1989.

Consequently, this investigation has also a twofold purpose. First, it enables the compilation of an *inventory* of peculiar words, structures or larger pieces of texts that were prone to censorship for identifying potential translation problems. Second, it is a means of outlining the general characteristics of the texts with a view to evaluating the extent to which the target texts follow the original patterns (in Chapter 4).

These insights into the content and form of the original texts also allow a proper and thorough understanding of the correspondence between the frames and the scenes they evoke, a task facilitated by the understanding of the source text cultural system.

The features of the original texts prove particularly relevant in establishing why changes occurred during the translation process of fictional works during communism, more precisely in identifying the operational norms.

Consequently, it can be argued that the assumptions made in this translation-oriented type of analysis are an effective means of identifying the exact instances where the criteria for censoring functioned.

CHAPTER 4

In Chapter 4, other three steps of Margret Ammann's functionalist model for translation critique (reordered as previously described) are covered: (2) the intratextual coherence of the translation; (5) the intertextual coherence between target and source texts, and (1) the function of the translation in the target culture.

Since it is meant to be formulated as a conclusion to the findings of the analyses undertaken in the practical part, the first step in the functionalist model becomes the last. Nevertheless, the function of the translation in the target culture (step 1 that became the last in our view) is examined under a different form in this chapter.

In the first chapter, the intended function of the target texts in the Romanian communist context (as opposed to pre-communist tendencies) is described, whereas in the last chapter what comes to the fore is what we have called the achieved function (as resulting from the analysis of all the factors involved in the translation process). The examination of the communist political context as a factor for the regulation of art (especially published matters) reveals the preliminary measures that functioned during communism and thus, the prerequisites for understanding the context in which the censoring of the pre-communist translations of D.H. Lawrence's and W.S. Maugham's novels took place (Chapter 1). Furthermore, it justifies also the publication of other Romanian translations whose aim was to comply with the communist norms (the *aimed* function of the translations).

However, the identified preliminary norms do not entirely explain the censorial measures applied during communism. Thus, an analysis of the censored translations by comparing them with the communist and post-communist translations is meant to emphasise the operational norms (translation patterns) that functioned during the translation process under the totalitarian regime.

While attempting to shed light on the operational norms at work during communism, the present chapter deals also with the target texts, translators and their activity. Aside from the investigation into the intratextual coherence of the translations and the comparative analysis, aspects related to translators' activity acquire particular importance inasmuch as these provide some interesting clues or justify, to a certain extent, some choices and translation patterns that come to the fore in the analysis of the translations. An interesting detail related to this matter is **the invisibility of translators**. As regards the translators that translated during communism, this concept (coined by Lawrence Venuti) has a twofold dimension.

On the one hand, it applies with a positive meaning as in Venuti's definition. In this case, it refers to translator's

skills of creating the **illusion of transparency**, a result of their effort "to insure easy readability by adhering to current usage, maintaining continuous syntax, fixing a precise meaning", resulting in a translation that does not seem a translation (Venuti 1995: 1). Therefore, translators' importance is diminished by making the author more visible through a high level of fluency in translation, hence the reader is provided with highly coherent and easy to decode target texts.

On the other hand, during communism, this dimension of translators' invisibility could not have been entirely valid. In this case, the term invisibility could be employed to describe the undermining of translators' *authority* by means of a strict regulation of the translation mechanism like the communist one.

The overview of the activity of the translators as professionals in the literary field facilitates the understanding of some translation patterns as result of the experience with certain languages or of their status in the field (for instance, Lupan's role of editor or Ralian's ability to avoid censorship in certain cases due to her previous

experience as an employee of an institution where censorship was operated).

In the second part of this chapter (**Censored versus Uncensored Translations – A Comparative Analysis**), stress is laid on the elements that might have triggered the censoring of the translations done in the 1940s and the recurrence of certain translation patterns during communism.

The function of the translation brought up in this case is the one *achieved* by the communist target texts, with emphasis on the congeniality between the preliminary norms and the operational norms (as they become visible when examining the translations). This function becomes obvious when examining the very products, whereas the aimed function is the one previously established through norms that regulate the literary system the text is part of (the communist criteria) or the genre to which the text belongs.

By considering the communist cultural norms (as presented in Chapter 1) and the translation policy at the time, possible instances of what might be called self-censorship (on the part of translators that provided translated versions approved by the regime) are detected.

This entails comparing the 1945-1989 translations with the pre-communist and post-communist versions by considering the fact that communists banned the former and, that the latter were done in a democratic context.

However, even if the main goal is to establish how the aesthetic features and the meanings of the originals were preserved in the target texts provided during the three periods, the intratextual coherence of each translation is not overlooked.

As regards the translation patterns applied to words and structures referring to politics / ideologies, translating the novels in question during communism entailed interventions (in order to achieve acceptability in the target culture context) when politics-related elements occurred in contexts that compromised the Soviet-like communist regime.

Adequacy, i.e. the preservation of the original features, was often intentionally overlooked in the 1989 and the 1972 translation (the variants of *The Plumed Serpent* and *The Painted Veil* provided during communism) with the purpose of avoiding the controversial meanings. This resulted in a re-writing (as translation was often described), that implied

reading and thinking, but also re-thinking. This re-thinking is, to a certain extent, detrimental to the target text, especially if distortions are to be analysed and / or perceived by a double readership. We argue that these changes can be described as detrimental (almost exclusively) by a double readership because, overall, the textual-linguistic and the matricial norms were used so as to preserve, as much as possible, the intratextual coherence of the translations. The same holds valid for the structures referring to social issues.

When it comes to religion (another subject defined as controversial according to communist criteria), the tendency to replace or omit words and structures that directly refer to it is a recurrent pattern, especially when they occur in relation with of power.

Translators' intention to comply with the rules and conditions of the target culture are evident also in the translation shifts that are deliberate choices (in the communist variants), as opposed to the cases when shifts happen due to errors during the process of decoding the source texts (especially in pre-communist variants).

Differently, words and expressions (exclamations) that, throughout time, became devoid of their religious meaning,

were kept, a fact that proves the importance of the semantic and pragmatic coordinates.

Given the fact that target versions oscillate between deletion and substitution, and sometimes shifts of meaning occur, as far as eroticism is concerned, the translation patterns are not constant. Thus, it cannot be argued that the translations conform exclusively to the target or to the source culture norms.

Consequently, it can be admitted that the target texts provided during communism achieved the aimed function to a great extent, as stipulated by the translation policy at the time. However, the criteria for censorship do not seem to have functioned as norms in all the cases (as in the communist translation of *The Plumed Serpent* where most taboo nuances were preserved and the translation becomes adequate rather than acceptable under these circumstances). Nevertheless, it is worth admitting that, in the translations provided during communism, there was a clear tendency to avoid concepts belonging to certain frames that might have evoked controversial scenes.

It can be acknowledged that the reconstruction of the translation process (as we metaphorically called it) – in

which the intratextual coherence of the target texts, the intertextual coherence between the original texts and the translations and the function of the translation in the target culture are considered – provides enough support/evidence for reaching a conclusion on the operational norms that functioned between 1945 and 1989 in Romania.

Regarding translators, it is obvious that their status and the status of the publishing house might have had a certain importance (especially in the case of professionals translating during communism). Moreover, their working languages and their background in the field of translation proved that, in some cases, shifts in meanings and structure could be consequences of the lack of experience (as in Alexandru Dima's case) or the lack of practice of certain languages (Iulian Vesper translated mostly from Russian into Romanian).

In point of intratextual coherence of each translation and the intertextual coherence between source texts and target texts, it can be noticed that none of the variants of the three novels under examination display a perfectly systematic use of translation patterns, a fact acknowledged

by considering each of the categories of controversial frames identified.

Therefore, the existence of words and more complex structures belonging to frames related to politics / ideologies, religion and social issues in *The Plumed Serpent* and *The Painted Veil* triggered different translation strategies depending on the communist norms (in the case of translations done between 1945 and 1989) and translators' style and preferences (in the case of the pre-communist and post-communist translations).

Insofar as eroticism is concerned, translators' behaviour does not appear to be highly systematic either. There are various reasons for the variation regarding the linguistic choices made by translators during before communism. These might be triggered by the lack of experience in the field or with the English language, or by the intention to discard or diminish the effect of elements referring to eroticism, body functions and genital organs. 'Weighty' syntax and excessive use of repetition might account for the difficulties of rendering *Lawrence's meanings*.

Post-communist target versions convey most of the original elements, but the author's exaggerated insistence on sexual connotations (even when describing nature) might have triggered a reduction of the effect of these connotations in the target language in keeping with the translator's preferences

Yet, some regularities of behaviour can be noticed. For instance, the tendency to operate a reduction of the taboo features (perceptible even in the translations done after 2000) and to aim at a balance between acceptability and adequacy, between obeying the target culture norms and keeping the aesthetic value of the source text.

The shifts occurring in the communist variants reveal congeniality between the communist preliminary and operational norms. The purpose of discarding what we have identified as elements belonging to certain frames become evident in the examined instances of omission and substitution, where the censorship criteria listed and described in the first part of our study had a key role.

An important detail regarding this phenomenon is that cuts were often operated in translations despite one of the ideas stated in the proceedings of the 1980 National Colloquium

on Translation and World Literature ('Colocviul național de traduceri și literatură universală. Stenograma lucrărilor' published in *Viata Romaneasca* in 1981) according to which omission was strictly forbidden (1981: 54-55).

Nonetheless, the translations done in the communist years are coherent from the linguistic point of view and seem to have stricken a balance between norms that regulated the existence of the literary texts, the features of the source texts and the Romanian translators' preferences and style.

In conclusion, it can be argued that, overall, translations achieved the function set by the preliminary norms and the linguistic choices clearly reflect the tendency to avoid evoking controversial scenes in the mind of the readers. This was done by applying the two categories of operational norms with a view to complying with the communist criteria. What is essential is that translators achieved this without affecting the coherence and cohesion of the translations.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The removal/banning of a large number of works written by two English writers (as presented in the lists of books censored during communism) – D.H. Lawrence and W.S. Maugham – was the starting point of the present investigation. The aim of this research has been to inquire into the factors that brought about the censoring of translations from the English writers during communism, while also examining the translation mechanism (regulated by the publishing and translation policy between 1945 and 1989) that triggered the publication of other translations meant to replace the ideologically inappropriate ones.

In this respect, both the general effects of censorship on the literary products (Chapter 1) and the specific norms that directly affected the texts in question have been considered and analysed (Chapter 4).

Since most of the censored books are translations into Romanian, identifying the variety of factors and the manner in which these factors concurred to remove the texts and to provide other versions was done first at a macro level – the Romanian political and cultural system – and subsequently

46

at a microlevel – the literary field and the subfield of translations (1.2).

Focus was laid on the interwar translations of two works banned according to the 1940's and 1950's brochures and annexes – *The Plumed Serpent* by D.H. Lawrence and *The Painted Veil* by W.S. Maugham – as well as on the interwar translation of *Women in Love* by D. H. Lawrence. Other variants of these translations were provided in the communist years. Also, post-communist translations of all the novels in discussion are available.

Thus, the existence of alternative translations produced in other historical and political contexts enabled the identification and analysis of norms at work during communism by contrast to the other historical periods. This was done by means of a multidisciplinary approach in which historical, cultural, literary and linguistic concepts / theories were employed, a fact that allowed us to draw conclusions on translators' behavioural patterns specific to each of the three historical periods under scrutiny.

The regulation of the translation mechanism undertaken with the purpose to provide other target versions congenial with the cultural and political criteria at the time

was described in Chapter 1. Thus, a partial answer to the question about the reasons for censoring the pre-communist translations was provided by means of a thorough analysis of the historical context in which the censoring took place.

One of the most important details in this overview is the existence of the communist criteria for censorship provided in brochures issued under the totalitarian regime starting from 1945. These have been taken into account as related to *patronage* and its major importance component – *ideology*.

By looking into these criteria, very similar to the Soviet criteria for censorship (from which they derive), their action-guiding nature has become obvious inasmuch as they were meant to guide the activity of writers, censors and other professionals or institutions that distributed or employed published matters. In addition, these criteria prove that even the aesthetic and artistic canons had to adapt to the proletarian ideology based on the socio-political principles of Marxism that condemned other political ideologies, Western mentality (both at the social and political level) and disapproved of religion and everything that was not congenial with the communist ideas.

However, the investigation of the very products affected by censorship (in Chapter 4) has provided the most relevant evidence of the extent to which translational behaviour adjusted to communist standards. In this sense, the logical algorithm (consisting in a coherent blending of the functionalist, cultural-turn and descriptivist theories) did not only provide useful terminology but also outline clear strategies for the examination of all the components and participants involved in the translation process.

Thus, in establishing the theoretical framework for the analysis of literary products (translations), we have focused on the most significant views and the conclusion reached is that each provides useful insights into the main features of translation as a cultural act and that they are often adjacent, hence terminology and principles belonging to both directions are worth considering when endeavouring in an investigation like the present.

M. Ammann's functionalist model for translation critique acquires its importance due to the capacity to integrate the other theoretical elements. Consequently, it has been chosen as the main model to be drawn on when

analysing the importance of the source text, target text, their coherence and their functions in the culture they address.

Nonetheless, a reordering of these steps was suggested and utility of this reordering lies in the fact that it establishes the elements to focus on during the analysis of the source texts in Chapter 3 (steps 3 and 4) and the one of the translations in Chapter 4 (steps 2, 5 and 1).

By considering also other functionalist guidelines – Nord's model for the analysis of source texts in order to go through steps 3 and 4 in the aforementioned model, the relevance of linguistics has been recalled inasmuch as translation problems might be encountered at each of these levels.

Another essential tool for understanding the relation between the pure linguistic coordinate and the readers' perception and internalization of the source texts meanings (and the reality to which they refer) was the scenes-and-frames theory.

What became obvious was that the scenes evoked by the frames employed by the two authors are depictions of the political events, effects of certain ideologies and certain systems of power that they knew. Some of these were considered controversial according to the communist criteria

for censoring: imperialism, colonialism, elements related to the Western culture, bourgeoisie, those opposing the socialist / communist ideology, religion, mysticism, eroticism (lust-stirring elements or unhealthy love).

Foreseeing the translation problems encountered by communist translators due to the presence of certain controversial elements in the source texts has been the objective of **Chapter 3**, an objective pursued by undertaking a simulation of the decoding and interpretation stages that translators go through before rendering the text into the target culture language – a first stage of the analysis based on Ammann's model.

In the three novels – mimetic reproductions of the reality witnessed by their authors –, problems have been identified at all levels. These problems are not only related to the style of the writers but also to the fact that the identified frames might have evoked (in readers' minds) beliefs, experiences or elements belonging to a reality considered controversial during the 1945-1989 period.

As for the second stage of our analysis based on Ammann's model of translation-critique (Chapter 4), it has been confirmed that an analysis of the translations reveals

the clearest image of the direct effects of the communist censorship on the literary work concerned

Furthermore, by applying the norm-based theory as suggested by Toury, the investigation of the final products enabled the reconstruction of the process of translation and the identification of the operational norms that functioned during communism while also confirming the existence of the (communist) preliminary norms described in Chapter 1.

In this sense, alternative translations (produced before, during and after communism) of each novel have been compared in order to emphasise the operational norms (translation patterns) that functioned during the translation process under the totalitarian regime.

The main conclusion reached is that *ideology* can be traced in procedures like shifts, omissions or additions operated for removing what was ideologically unacceptable. In order to remove these elements, cuts of lexical items, complex structures or longer paragraphs were operated. Additionally, for the same purpose, a substitution of words and structures for other more general and / or more neutral terms / constructions was frequently practised. Where and if the contexts allowed it, equivalents were chosen from totally

different frames, bearing no resemblance with the original ones.

As for the target texts, despite the congeniality between the communist preliminary and operational norms, the instances of omission and substitution (where the censorship criteria listed and described in the first part of our study had a key role), did not affect the target texts to the extent that they lack coherence or suffer severe changes of segmentation.

Therefore, even in cases when important parts of the text were cut, an audience that has never read the original would not be aware of the losses because coherence is mostly achieved by means of an effective application of the textual-linguistic norms.

Furthermore, we have also noticed a tendency towards keeping the aesthetic features of the original when possible (even in constructions and paragraphs displaying a high incidence of elements referring to controversial subjects where the aforementioned textual-linguistic norms were applied). At times, this fact resulted in an oscillation between adequacy and acceptability.

Generally, the *authors* of these translations managed a balance between norms that regulated the existence of the literary texts, the features of the source texts and the Romanian translators' preferences and style. Also, translations done under the communist regime generally display coherence and cohesiveness.

In the pre-communist versions, some flaws were identified in the slight shifts in meaning, possibly due to interpretation issues, whereas the post-communist ones are faithful to the original with an occasional tendency to diminish (as in the case of frames referring to eroticism) or to provide more expressive equivalents.

In conclusion, we have acknowledged that translators are always subject to a double number of constraints. First, they have to take into consideration the structure and content of the original, as well as the need to achieve the effect of translator's invisibility.

Second, the importance of the target culture and its norms and rules cannot be denied or disregarded. In this case, there is the issue of rendering the text into the target language by conforming to the target culture norms. Consequently, when translating under repressive regimes, the censorship criteria

imposed on translators could imply a greater degree of constraint and achieving the illusion of transparency and the level of precision only to the extent required by the regime will always be a matter of compromise.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. **Primary sources**

Novels by D.H. Lawrence and W.S. Maugham

Lawrence, D.H. (1969) *Women in Love*. London: Penguin Books.

Lawrence, D.H. (1981) *The Plumed Serpent*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd.

Maugham, W.S. (1934) *The Painted Veil* (The Collected Edition of the Works of W.S.Maugham).   London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Maugham, W.S *(1947) The Painted Veil.* London and Paris: The Albatross Ltd.

Translations of D.H. Lawrence's and W.S. Maugham's Novels

Lawrence, D.H. (1943) *Șarpele cu pene* (translation by Iulian Vesper). București: Editura Cultura Românească. S.A.R.

Lawrence, D.H. (1989) *Șarpele cu pene* (translation by Antoaneta Ralian). București: Editura Cartea Românească.

Lawrence, D.H. (2003) *Șarpele cu pene* (translation by Antoaneta Ralian, republished). Iași:Polirom.

Lawrence, D.H. (1936) *Femei în dragoste* 2ⁿᵈ edition (translation by Zaharia Stancu). București: Editura Librăriei Universale Alcalay &Co.

Lawrence, D.H. (1978) *Femei îndrăgostite* (translation by Alexandru Dima). București: Univers.

Lawrence, D.H. (2004) *Femei îndrăgostite* (translation by Monica Taliu). București: Leda.

Maugham, W.S. (1943) *Fumul amăgirilor* 5th edition (translation by Jul Giurgea). București: Remus Cioflec.

Maugham, W.S. (1972) *Vălul pictat* (translation by Radu Lupan). București: Editura Eminescu.

Maugham, W.S. (2011) *Vălul pictat* 3rd edition (translation by Andrei Bantaș). București: Editura Polirom.

2. Secondary sources

Studies on Censorship and Norms, History, Culture

Bobel, C. and Kwan, S. (2011) *Embodied Resistance: Challenging the Norms, Breaking the Rules*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Brown, J.L. (2010) *Confronting our Canons: Spanish and Latin-American Studies in the 21st Century*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

Caravia, P. (2000) *Gândirea interzisă. Scrieri cenzurate. România 1945-1989*. București: Editura Enciclopedică.

Carmichael, C.M. (2010) *Sex and Religion in the Bible*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Corobca, L. (2011) *Epurarea cărților în România. Documente (1944-1964).* București: Editura Tritonic.

Corobca, L. (2014) *Controlul cărții. Cenzura literaturii în regimul comunist din România*. București: Editura Polirom.

Costea I., Kiraly I., Rodosav D. (1995) *Fond Secret. Fond „S" Special*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.

Decker, J.M. (2004) *Ideology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Deletant, D. (2008) 'Cheating the Censor: Romanian Writers Under Communism'. In *Central Europe* Vol. 2, p.126-175.

Dobre, C.F. (2015) *A Country Behind Barbed Wire. A Brief History of Communist Repression in Romania*.
București: Editura Fundației Culturale "Memoria".

Dwyer, J.D. ed. (1980) *Russia, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe: A Survey of Holdings at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace*.
Stanford: Leland Stanford Junior University.

Fairman, Ch.M. (2009) *Fuck. Word Taboo and Protecting our First Amendment Liberties*. Illinois: Sphinx Publishing.

Friedman, M. (2002) *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Green, J. and Karolides N. J ed. (2005) *Encyclopedia of Censorship*. New York: Facts On File.

Jones, D. ed. (2001) *Censorship: A World Encyclopaedia* Vol. 1-4. London and New York: Routledge.

Karolides N.J. (2005) *Literature Suppressed on Political Grounds*. New York: Facts On File.

Kiraly, I. (2001) *Fenomenologica existențială a secretului Încercare de filosofie aplicată*. Pitești/București/Brașov/Cluj-Napoca: Paralela 45.

Magnus, B. and Higgings, K.M. eds. (1996) *The Cambridge Companion to Nietzsche*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manea, N. (1992) *On Clowns. The Dictator and the Artists: Essays*. New York: Groove Press.

McHoul, A. and Grace, W. (1993) *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. London and New York: Routledge.

Mocanu, M.R. (2012) *Scriitorii și puterea*. București: Ideea Europeană.

Mocanu, M.R. (2008) *Cenzura a murit. Trăiască cenzorii*. București: Europress.

Müller, B. ed. (2004) *Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Nealon, J.T. (2008) *Foucault beyond Foucault. Power and Its Intensification Since 1984*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Negrici, E. (2003) *Literatura română sub communism*, Bucharest: Editura Fundației Pro.

Ossowska, M. (1980) *Moral Norms: A Tentative Systematization*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Ove Hanson, S. (2004) *The Structure of Values and Norms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grigorescu Pană, I. and Mihăilă, R. eds. (2000) *Transatlantic Connections: Essays in culturalrelocation*. Bucharest: Integral.

Paraschivescu, R. (2011) *Toamna decanei. Convorbiri cu Antoaneta Ralian*. București: Humanitas.

Petcu, M. (1999) *Puterea și cultura*. *O istorie a cenzurii*. Iași: Polirom.

Popescu, H.F. (1978) 'Cartea engleză în România după 23 august 1944'. In *Secolul XX*, 10-11 12, p. 260-263.

Rad, I. ed. (2011) *Cenzura în România*. Cluj-Napoca: Tribuna.

Railton, P. (2003) *Facts, Values, and Norms: Essays Toward a Morality of Consequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rimell, V. (2004) Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction. Cambridge: Cambridge University   Press.

Sova, D.B (2006) *Literature Suppressed on Sexual Grounds*. New York: Facts On File.

Terry, D.J. and Hogg, M.A. eds. (2000) *Attitudes, Behaviour and Social Context: The Role of   Norms   and Group Membership*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Thompson, W.C. (2013) *Nordic, Central, and Southeastern Europe 2013*. Maryland: Rowman&Littlefield.

Tilly, Ch. (2007) *Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Troncotă, T. (2006) *România comunistă: propagandă şi cenzură*. Bucureşti, Tritonic, 2006.

Țurcanu, I. (2007) *Istoria Românilor (cu o privire mai largă asupra culturii).* Brăila: Istros.

Vasile, C. (2011) *Politicile culturale comuniste în timpul regimului lui Gheorghe Gheorghiu   Dej*. București: Humanitas.

Verzea, I. (1978) 'Anglia văzută de români'. In *Secolul XX*, 10-II-12, 53-70.

Vianu, L. (1998) *Censorship in Romania*. Budapest: Central European University Press.

von Wright, G.H. (1963) *Norm and Action: A Logical Inquiry*. London: Routledge and Kegan   Paul.

Zub, A. (2000) *Orizont închis: istoriografia română sub dictatură*. Iași: Institutul European.

Literary theory and Criticism on D.H. Lawrence and W.S. Maugham

Bason, F.T. (1974) *A Bibliography of the Writings of W.S. Maugham*. New York: Haskell House Publishers Ltd.

Bassett, T.J. (1998) '*W. Somerset Maugham: An Annotated Bibliography of Criticism,1969   1977'.* In English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920, Volume 41, Number 2, 1998, pp.   133-184.

Becket, F. (2002) *The Complete Critical Guide to D. H. Lawrence*. London and New York: Routledge.

Brown, I. (1970) *William Somerset Maughaum,* London/ New Delhi/New York/Sydney: Bloomsbury Reader.

Brulotte, G. and Phillips, J. eds. (2006) *Encyclopaedia of Erotic Literature*. New York:Routledge.

Casey, S. (2003) *Naked Liberty and the World of Desire. Elements of Anarchism in the Works of D.H. Lawrence*. New York: Routledge.

Curtis, A. and Whitehead, J. (1987) *The Critical Heritage. William Somerset Maugham*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cornea, L. (2014) *Studii şi articole literare*. Brașov: Pastel.

Drabble, M. Ed. (2000) *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford   University Press.

Draper, R.P. ed. (2002) *D.H. Lawrence. The Critical Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ellis, D. (2006) *D.H. Lawrence's Women in Love: A Casebook*. Oxford: Oxford University   Press.

Eunyoung, O. (2007) *D.H. Lawrence's Border Crossing. Colonialism in His Trave Writings and "Leadership" Novels*. New York & London: Routledge.

Hamalian, L. (1996) *D.H. Lawrence and Nine Women Writers*. Cranbury.London.Ontario: Associated University Press

Humma, J.B. (1990) *Metaphor and Meaning in D.H. Lawrence's Later Novels*. Missouri: University of Missouri Press.

Ivory, Y. (2009) *The Homosexual Revival of Renaissance Style 1850-1930*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kinkead-Weekes, M. (1996) *D. H. Lawrence. Triumph to Exile*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kinsley, D.R. (1989) *The Goddesses' Mirror. Visions of the Divine from East and West.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lawrence, D.H. (2002) *The 'First Women in Love'* (Worthern, J. and Vasey, L. eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loth, D. (1994) *The Erotic in Literature. A historical survey of pornography as delightful as it is Indiscreet.* New York: Dorset Press.

Lodge, D. (1990) *After Baktin. Essays on fiction and Criticism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lupan, R. (1988) *Moderni și postmoderni. Text și context II.* București: Cartea Românească.

Maugham, W.S. (1951) *The Summing Up*. London: William Heinemann.

Meyers, J. (2004) *Somerset Maughaum: A Life*. New York: Vintage Books.

Meyers, J. ed. (2004) *The W. Somerset Maugham Reader: Novels, Stories, Travel Writing.* Lanham-New York Dallas-Boulder-Toronto-Oxford: Taylor Trade Publishing.

Montgomery, R.E. (1994) *The Visionary D.H. Lawrence. Beyond philosophy and art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moore H.T. ed. (1953) *Sex, Literature and Censorship*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Poplawski, P. (1996) *D.H. Lawrence: A Reference Companion*.Westport/Connecticut/London: Greenwood Press.

Roberts, N. (2004) *D.H. Lawrence, Travel and Cultural Difference*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rogal, J. S. (1997) *A William Somerset Maugham Encyclopaedia*. Connecticut/London: Greenwood Press.

Rogers, P. (1992) *An Outline of English Literature*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Scherr, B.J. (2004) *D.H. Lawrence Today: Literature, Culture, Politics*. New York: Peter Lang.

Scott-Kilvert, I. ed. (1984) *British Writers* vol. VI. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Scott-Kilvert, I. ed. (1984) *British Writers* vol. VII. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Stewart, J. (1999) *The Vital Art of D.H. Lawrence: Vision and Expression*. Illinois: Southern   Illinois University Press.

Linguistics and Translation Studies

Andraș C., Simeon E., Anton M., Apetroaie I. ed. (2005) *Dicționarul general al literaturii   române* Vol. 4. București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

Argintescu-Amza, N. (1965) 'Despre frumoasele credincioase'. In *Secolul XX* . 2/1965, 157-163.

Ariel, Mira (2010) *Defining Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Armstrong, N. (2005) *Translation, Linguistics, Culture: A French-English Handbook*, Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baer, B.J. (2011) *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts. Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Baker, P. and Ellece, S. (2011) *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis.* London and New York: Continuum.

Baker, M. and Saldanha, G. (2009) *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Baker, M. ed. (2010) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. eds. (1998) *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Basnett, S. (2002) *Translation Studies* 3rd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Biguenet, J. and Schulte, R. (1989) *The Craft of Translation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boase-Beier, J. and Holman, M. eds. (1999) *The practices of Literary Translation. Constraints and Creativit*y. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Chesterman, A. and Wagner, E. (2010) *Can Theory Help Translators?: A Dialogue between the Ivory Tour and the Wordface*. New York: Routledge.

Cotter, S. (2014) *Literary Translation and the Idea of Minor Romania*. New York: Rochester Press.

CREL 1983 = "Cahiers roumains d'études littéraires"*, n.1. Poïétique/Poetique de la traduction, București: Univers.

Croitoru, E. (2004) *English through Translation*. Galați: Editura Fundației Universitare "Dunărea de Jos".

Croitoru, E. (2010) 'Cultural Contextualizers in Translation*'. In *Challenges in Translation.* Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest, 21-38.

Croitoru (2013) 'Interaction through Translation with Humour'. In Bonta, E. ed. *Perspectives on*

Interaction. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambdridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 3-13.

Dimitriu, R. (2002) *Theories and Practice of Translation*. Iași: Institutul European.

Dobric, N. (2013) *Theory and Practice of Corpus-based Semantics*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Dodds, J.M. (1994) *Aspects of Literary Text Analysis and Translation Criticism*. Udine: Campanotto Editore Udine.

Doinaș, Ș. A. (1965) 'Dificil, riscant, dar nu imposibil'. In *Secolul XX*, nr. 2, 164-167.

Fowler, R. (1986) 'Power'. In Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Vol 4: Discourse Analysis in Society, Van Dijk,T., London, 61-82.

Fowler, R. (1989) *Linguistics and the Novel*. London and New York: Routledge.

Fowler, R. (1996) *Linguistic Criticism* 2nd edition. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Gentzler, E. (2001) *Contemporary Translation Theories* 2nd revised edition. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto/Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Graur, Al. (2009) *Mic tratat de ortografie*. București: Humanitas.

Hermans, T. (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature*. Croom Helm.

Hermans, T. (1999) *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Hoffman, E. (1991) *Lost in Translation*. London: Minerva.

Ionescu, A. (2010) 'Un-sexing Ulysses: The Romanian Translation Under Communism'. In *Scientia Traductionis* n. 8, p.237-258.

Ionescu, G. (1981) *Orizonturile traducerii*. București: Univers.

Jeanrenaud, M. (2006) *Universaliile traducerii*. Iași: Polirom.

Kohn, I. (1983) *Virtuțile compensatorii ale limbii române în traducere*. Timișoara: Facla.

Kuhiwczak, P. and Littau, K.eds. (2007) *A Companion to Translations Studies*. Clevedon Buffalo Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Lai, Ping-Yen (2013) *The Anatomy of Translation Problems*. Oxford: Chartridge Books.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (2008) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lambert, J. (2006) *Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Leech, G.N. and Short, M. (2007) *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* 2nd edition. Great Britain: Pearson Longman.

Lefevere, A. (1992a) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London/New York: Routledge.

Lefevere, A. (1992b) *Translating Literature. Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Lefevere, A. ed. (2003) *Translation, History, Culture*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Malmkjær, K. (2005) *Linguistics and the Language of Translation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Munday, J. (2008) *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Applications* 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2009) *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Neagu, M. and Pisoschi, C. (2015) *Fundamentals of Semantics and Pragmatics.* Craiova: Editura Universitară Craiova.

Newmeyer Frederic J. (1990) *Linguistic Theory: Extensions and Implications.* Vol 2. *Cambridge: University Press.*

Nida, E. (2001) *Contexts in Translating*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Nord, C. (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Nord, C. (2005) *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam New York: Rodopi.

Pâcleanu, A.M. (2014) 'Censorable Structures in W.S. Maugham's Novels. Linguistic and Cultural Elements', in Praisler, M. (ed.) *Cultural Intertexts*. 1-2/ 2014. Cluj Napoca: Casa Cărții de Știință, pp. 353-363.

Pacleanu, A.M. (2015) 'Translating W.S. Maugham's and D.H. Lawrence's Novels During Communism: Scenes, Frames and Translators' (In)visibility'. In

Boldea, I (2015) *Debates on Globalization. Approaching National Identity Through Intercultural Dialogue*. Tg. Mureș: Arhipelag XXI Press, p.636 647.

Picon, G. (1965) 'Traducerea, un eveniment al limbajului' (translated by Alexandru Baciu). In *Secolul XX*, nr. 2, 168-169.

Pym, A., Shlesinger M., and Simeoni, D. eds. (2008) *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Raffel, B. (1994) *The Art of Translating Prose*. Pennsylvania: Pensylvannia State University Press.

Renz, B. (2013) *Language Power: Dynamic Progression from Word to Message*. Bloomington: iUniverse.

Riemer, N. (2010) *Introducing Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, D. (2001) *Becoming a Translator. An accelerated Course*. New York: Routledge.

Schäffner, Ch. (2004) *Translation Research and Interpreting Research*. Clevedon-Buffalo-Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Snell-Hornby, M. (1988/1995) *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2006) *The Turns of Translation Studies. New paradigms or shifting view   points?*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John   Benjamins Publishing Company.

Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*.   Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ulrych, M. (1992) *Translating Texts. From Theory to Practice*. Genoa: Cideb Editrice.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993) 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis'. In Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 4: *Discourse and Society*, 249-283.

Venuti, L. ed. (1994) *The Translator's Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. ed. (2004) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Williams, J and Chesterman, A. (2014) *The Map. A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies.* New York: Routledge.

"Colocviul național de traduceri și literatură universală. Stenograma lucrărilor." (1981) *Viaţa Românească*, număr special, XXXIV.

Webliography

Andronescu, M. http://jurnalul.ro/cultura/arte vizuale/zaharia-stancu-s-a-facut-frate-cu-dracul-ca sa-treaca-puntea-537446.html

Croitoru, A. (2005) Am scris gândindu-mă numai la public, http://romanianjewish.org/db/pdf/nr235/pagina7.pdf

Lisvan, A.M and Chiruta, R. (2007) "Elena Ceaușescu afișa puritanismul unei femei urâte" http://www.romaniaculturala.ro/articol.php?cod=43.

Engels, F. *The Principles of Communism,* translated and published on https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847 11/prin-com.htm.

Simuț, I. (2008) Proletcultism sau realism socialist?, http://www.romlit.ro/proletcultism_sau_realism_soci alist_ii

Ștefănescu, Al. (2002) *La o nouă lectură Zaharia Stancu*, http://www.romlit.ro/zaharia_stancu.

Ungureanu, C. (2007) Zaharia Stancu în luptele cu înalta societate,

http://www.romlit.ro/zaharia_stancu_n_luptele_cu_nalta_so cietate.

http://www.businessdictionary.com/article/1086/communis m-vs-democracy-d1412/

Communists and the struggle against Imperialism, http://www.cpgbml.org/index.php?secName=proletarian&su bName=display&art=778

https://www.marxists.org/history/international/comintern/sections/britain/pamphlets/1969/comview.htm

http://www.cartearomaneasca.ro/despre-noi/.

http://www.edituraeminescu.ro/despre.php

http://www.britannica.com/topic/communism

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/prescriptive

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/canon

http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/canon

http://www.britishempire.co.uk/article/cmg.htm

http://www.acronymfinder.com/KCIE.html

http://www.eugeniavoda.ro/ro/emisiuni/diverse/antoaneta-ralian

https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/dec/14/antoaneta-ralian

http://www.observatorul.com/articles_main.asp?action=articleviewdetail&ID=6594.

http://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/play+upon

http://www.dictionar.1web.ro/dictionar-roman-roman/mesteca/

http://www.thefreedictionary.com/orgiastic

http://www.thefreedictionary.com/juice.