Research Article

Mihaela Cozma*

Equivalence and (un)translatability: Instances of the transfer between Romanian and English

Abstract: In very broad terms, translatability means that the translator is able to establish a relation of equivalence between a certain source text and its target variant. The notion of equivalence has a very complicated status in translation studies, because, on the one hand, this discipline does not provide a generally accepted definition of the concept, and, on the other, because it has a very complex nature, involving a variety of levels. The present article is based on the assumption that, even if there are situations when the source-language lexico-semantic items, grammatical structures or whole texts are so problematic that they seem almost impossible to be transferred into another language. The term "untranslatability" is not appropriately used with reference to such situations, because a certain type of equivalence can be always achieved. The article will approach the notions of equivalence and (un)translatability in both theoretical and practical terms, offering relevant examples specific to the transfer between Romanian and English.

Keywords: culture, equivalence, translatability, translation studies, untranslatable

1 Introduction

By its very nature, translation involves two languages, each of them having its own grammatical and lexical particularities and its specific manner of expressing various experiences and of reflecting the material and the spiritual culture. Considering the differences between the two languages in contact, it is natural that any translated text should be characterized by a certain degree of distortion or loss in comparison to its original. There have been translation theorists, such as Friedrich Schleiermacher, Jose Ortega y Gasset, or George Steiner (cf. Dimitriu 2006, 36–8), who consider that texts which involve too much loss are actually "untranslatable." Rejecting this idea, the present article brings theoretical and practical evidence in favour of the hypothesis that, even if it is impossible to achieve absolute identity between a certain text and its translated variant, this does not mean that it is impossible to establish a relation of equivalence between them. More exactly, translatability is always possible, but the translator has to decide in each particular case on the type of equivalence relation that he/she intends to establish between the source and the target texts. In line with the functionalist and the descriptive theorists, I consider that the translator's decisions in this respect should not be guided only by the linguistic format of the original text, but also by a series of constraints imposed by the target context, such as the rules of the target-language system, the norms valid in the target culture in the case of each particular genre or type of texts, the purpose of translation, and the specific features of the translation audience. The main objective of this article is to argue for the usefulness of

---

* Corresponding author: Mihaela Cozma, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, West University of Timișoara, Timisoara, 300223, Romania, e-mail: mihaela.cozma@e-uvt.ro

adopting a target-oriented concept of equivalence, considering that such a concept excludes the idea of untranslatability. To achieve this objective, I will present, first of all, the evolution of the notion of equivalence in the translation theory, then I will discuss some means by which equivalence can be achieved in practice, and, in the end, I will illustrate some situations that are considered to raise difficulties in the translation from Romanian into English.

2 On equivalence and other notions of correctness in the translation theory

Ever since the earliest attempts at reflecting on their activity, translators have been interested in the factors that contribute to the realization of a good or well-formed translation (cf. Schäffner 1997, 2–3, Venuti 2000, 5, Imre 2013, 85). Even if this interest has been constant throughout the years, the terms in which the notion of accuracy or correctness has been discussed in the theory of translation vary to a great extent, as they depend on what was understood by translation at a particular time or within a particular approach. Commenting on this aspect, Hermans (1996, 25) notes that the concept of "fidelity," which initially played a central part, was later replaced by "equivalence" as a theoretical and methodological concept in the approaches to translation. Starting with the 1980s, "equivalence" too has been progressively questioned and even rejected, largely in favour of the concept of "norms." A brief presentation of the evolution undergone by the notions denoting correctness in translation will be offered below.

For centuries on end, the accuracy of the translated text was approached in terms of the relation of fidelity or faithfulness existing between a translation and its source. This relation represented a matter of dispute between the supporters of a literal translation, who considered that translators should be consistent with the actual wording of the original text, and those of a free translation, who claimed that the most important element is the content of the source text and the message that it conveys (cf. Venuti 2000, 122, Bassnett 2002, 47, Dimitriu 2006, 41). Initially, this dispute resulted into a vast body of theoretical contributions on the subject of translation, which were not based on any elaborate theoretical perspective. Such contributions were mainly represented by comments made by translators on their own work, as it was the case of the ancient Rome writers, like Cicero and Quintilian, who advocated free translation, or the Bible's first translators, who recommended the word-for-word type of translation (cf. Dimitriu 2006, 42); additionally, there were philosophical reflections on the question of translatability, a relevant example in this respect being Schleiermacher, who, according to Bassnett (2002, 72–3) made, in 1813, a serious attempt at discussing translation on a more theoretical basis.

Starting with the second half of the twentieth century, when translation studies emerged as an academic discipline, translation research and theory started acquiring a more systematic character. As Malmkjœr (2018, 15) notes, at that time, many theorists interested in translation or interpreting looked to linguistics for theoretical input, because linguistics was perceived as the most appropriate discipline to inform the study of translation. In this context, translation was considered to be a linguistic phenomenon, a process of transcoding between the two languages in contact, and, consequently, the standards of accuracy and correctness were set in terms of sameness of meaning at the level of the translation units, which was the level of the word or the phrase in the case of the linguistic approaches, and the level of the text, in the case of the textlinguistic approaches. Halverson (1997) points out that the theorists with linguistic orientation addressed various aspects specific to the equivalence relation: some of them aimed at defining the units between which equivalence could be achieved (e.g. Catford 1965, Reiss 1989), while others focused on the qualities which define the nature of the equivalence (e.g. Nida 1964, Koller 1989).

The concept of equivalence started to lose ground once the theorists of the field embraced the idea that translators always deal with a text in a situation and in a culture. This idea was developed, with special focus on the purpose of the text, by the functionalist approaches. The representatives of these approaches (e.g. Vermeer 1989, Nord 1997) consider that the starting point for any translation is not the linguistic

structure of the original text, but the purpose (skopos) that the translated text is meant to achieve in the target culture. This is the reason why their view of a correct, adequate translation is related to a somewhat less strictly defined set of criteria than the traditional linguistic ones. The functionalists' target orientation does not imply that the source text has little relevance. On the contrary, Nord argues that the construction of the target text is based on a thorough source-text analysis. The role of this analysis is to guide the translation process by providing "the basis for decisions about (a) the feasibility of the translation assignment, (b) which source-text units are relevant to a functional translation, and (c) which translation strategy will lead to a target-text meeting the requirements of the translation brief." (Nord 1997, 62). This means that the source-text elements must be adapted to the target-language conventions according to the target-text skopos.

If in the linguistic, textlinguistic, and to a certain extent, the functionalist approaches the production of an appropriate translation was generally discussed in close connection to factors such as linguistic correctness and textual conventions, the descriptive translation studies focus on the socio-cultural dimension of the act of translating. The major effect of this focus was that the concept of norms became the new standard of accuracy and correctness.

The concept of translational norms as it is understood in the theory of translation today has been greatly influenced by the contributions made by Toury (1980, 1995) and Hermans (1996). In Toury's (1995, 55) definition, norms represent "the translation of general values or ideas shared by a certain community – as to what is right and wrong, adequate and inadequate – into performance-instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations." Translation, which is viewed as a norm-governed type of behaviour, has its own norms, and the role of these norms is to help the translator deal with the differing constraints exerted by the source text and language on the one hand, and by the target language and culture, on the other. It can be stated that, according to the descriptive translation studies theorists, the decisions made during the translation process are mainly determined by the translational norms and not only by the two language systems in contact. As Toury (1995, 57) explains, even the various shifts that occur as result of the translation process may be regarded as a type of equivalence that reflects target norms at a certain historical moment. In Halverson's (1997, 216) view, the adoption of a norm-based theory of translation focused the scholars' attention on "regularities of translation behaviour (norms) and the situational/cultural features which may account for these regularities." This fact has proved extremely beneficial especially in the case of translation research, for which it has opened up a series of new possibilities.

As illustrated in the present section, the discussion of the notions denoting translation correctness and well-formedness indicates that, in translation studies, "the focus of conceptual debate is the quality in terms of which the sameness is defined" (Halverson 1997, 209–10). In time, "sameness" evolved from a relation existing between the linguistic formats of the original and its translation to a complex notion that involves linguistic, pragmatic, and cultural factors on both the source and the target sides. But how can equivalence be actually achieved in the practice of translation? Section 3 will try to offer some answers in this respect.

3 Means of achieving translation equivalence

In the discussion of the means by which equivalence can be achieved, I must mention, first of all, the significant contribution made by Venuti (1995), who introduced the key concepts of domestication and foreignization, concepts which denote two opposed translation methods. In Venuti's view, domestication reveals the translators' orientation towards the target culture, entailing the reduction of the foreign text to the target-language cultural values, while foreignization involves their concern for the preservation of the source-culture specificity, resulting in a target variant which registers the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text (Venuti 1995, 20). These two concepts represent essential elements in the practical part of this study, as they set the extremes between which equivalence is discussed in the case of the examples offered there.

Trying to help translators deal with the problems with which they may be faced as part of their work, several theorists have proposed taxonomies of procedures, strategies, or techniques that can be used to this end. Maybe the best-known example in this respect is represented by the seven procedures of translation suggested by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000) on the basis of a comparison of the lexical and syntactic structures of English and French. The procedures in question are: borrowing (which is the simplest translation method and is used mostly for the creation of a stylistic effect), calque (when each of the elements in a borrowed expression are translated literally), literal translation (the word-for-word translation), transposition (the replacement of one word class with another word class), modulation (a variation in the form of the message, due to a change in the point of view), equivalence (or total syntagmatic change, like in the case of idioms, cliches, proverbs, etc.), and adaptation (when the situation referred to by the original message is unknown in the target culture, and therefore, the translator must create an equivalent situation).

The important fact is that the terminology used by Vinay and Darbelnet in the case of these translation procedures has proved to be very influential and has been frequently mentioned in the later literature of the field (for example by Newmark 1981, 1988 or by Chesterman 1997). Thus, Newmark (1988, 45–7) considers that translation methods range across a continuum between the emphasis on source language at one end, and the emphasis on target language at the other, and proposes eight such methods: word-for-word translation (with the strongest emphasis on the source language), literal translation, faithful translation, semantic translation, communicative translation, idiomatic translation, free translation, and adaptation (with the strongest emphasis on the target language). Similarly, Chesterman (1997, 88) claims that strategies are used as solutions for a translation problem related either to the text as a whole or to some segment in it, and consequently, they represent means of conforming to norms. Chesterman (1997, 92) makes a basic distinction between comprehension strategies, on the one hand, which have to do with the whole nature of the translation commission, and production strategies, on the other, which concern the manner in which the translator manipulates the linguistic material to produce an appropriate target text. Focusing on the latter category, Chesterman (1997, 94–112) offers a comprehensive classification of the possible changes to which translators might resort when they are not satisfied with the target variant that immediately comes to their mind. More specifically, he discusses 30 translation strategies that are divided into syntactic strategies (which primarily manipulate form), semantic strategies (which have to do with lexical semantics and with aspects of clause meaning), and pragmatic strategies (which regard the selection of information in the target text).

There have also been theorists who devise classifications related specifically to the treatment of the culture-specific items. Olk (2013, 348–51), for instance, suggests seven categories of procedures, ranking from a foreignizing to a domesticating scale: transference, transference + explicitation, transference + explanation, target-language expression referring to the source culture, neutral explanation, omission, and the substitution of a source-text cultural element by one specific to the target culture. Following the same line which involves maximal distance from the target reader at one end and minimal distance at the opposite end, there is Marco's (2018, 3–4) classification of translation techniques for culture-specific items, including borrowing, which may be pure or naturalized, literal translation, neutralization (under the form of description or generalization/particularization), amplification/compression, intracultural adaptation (the original culture-related item is replaced by another source-culture item which is more familiar to target readers), intercultural adaptation (a target culture item is substituted for the source-text item), and omission.

As we can see, the ways in which the translator can conform to notions of correctness are variously labelled as "procedure," "method," "strategy," and "technique." A thorough attempt to delimit the reference of these terms was made Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002), and, in line with their terminology, I will use the term "techniques" in the sense of operations materializing solutions for certain problematic translation units. More specifically, in my study, techniques represent the analytical tools that allow me to study the manner in which the result of the translation process functions in relation to its corresponding source-text unit. As for the typology of translation techniques used in the process of analysis, it is the one proposed by Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002, 509–5011): adaptation, amplification, borrowing, calque, compensation, description, discursive creation, established equivalent, generalization, linguistic amplification,

linguistic compression, literal translation, modulation, particularization, reduction, substitution, transposition, and variation.

4 Translating the "untranslatable": A few examples specific to the transfer from Romanian to English

4.1 Methodology

4.1.1 Object of study and sources

As repeatedly stressed in this article, I strongly believe in the concept of translatability and in the possibility of achieving translation equivalence. However, what I also want to stress is that equivalence and, implicitly, translatability cannot be approached and discussed in terms that are generally valid and universally applicable in any type of translation situation, as they depend a lot on a variety of factors imposed not only by the source context, but also by the target one. In an attempt to offer evidence of practical nature, in addition to the theoretical one, in the present section, I will discuss three situations that are considered problematic in the case of the transfer from English into Romanian, and I will illustrate some of the means used by translators to realize this transfer. The three situations refer to the translation of literary texts, of culture-specific items and of idioms, the examples offered here being taken either from research studies that I have previously conducted or from scientific articles written by other researchers interested in such aspects.

4.1.2 Results

4.1.2.1 Literary texts

A first example is that of translating literature, which, undoubtedly, represents a very challenging task for any translator. In fact, it is very likely that the most difficult translation decisions are generally made by the translators working in the field of literature. This happens because, on the one hand, translation represents the main means by which people get to know the work of a foreign writer, and, on the other, the texts produced by such translators will be integrated within the target culture and will inevitably exert a certain influence on it. As a mediator between two literary systems, the translator has to decide in each case on the right balance between the use of the foreignizing techniques, which bring the source culture closer to the target one, and the domesticating techniques, which make the translation sound as if it had been originally written in the target language. In spite of such difficulties, several translators have taken on the chore of dealing with literary texts produced by Romanian writers whose works are considered to be almost untranslatable because of the linguistic features they display, and I will refer here to only two such writers: Ion Luca Caragiale and Ion Creangă.

According to Momescu (2004), the literature created by Caragiale is one of an "internal-use only" type, because it is full of puns, allusions to local events and behaviours that are very difficult to translate. Moreover, in Caragiale's works, language represents an essential means of portraying the characters, because it attests the region from which they come, their social category, and their profession. Consequently, the texts abound in neologisms and dialectal peculiarities that often create a humorous effect. An influential English variant of eleven of Caragiale's sketches and stories was offered, in 1979, by the British Professor Eric Ditmar Tappe, who was specialized in Romanian studies and was very familiar with the Romanian literature and culture. According to Pioariu (2002), the British professor produced a very good translation of Caragiale's works, one which reflects not only the ideas conveyed by the original but also the type of lexical items typically displayed by it. In spite of some losses which are inherent in such an

endeavour (for instance, the scarcity of the English variants in comparison to the variety of Romanian lexical items with the same semantic value: *gogoși*, *baliverne*, *absurdități* paralleled only by "nonsense," or *parol*, *nene*, *frate* rendered simply as "really," "old chap," or "old man"), Pioariu (2002) stresses the important contribution made by Tappe in making a great Romanian writer known outside the borders of our country.

As far as Ion Creangă's works are concerned, they reflect the language of the nineteenth century peasantry, being characterized by colloquial speech, regional phonetics, and popular expressions. Pointing to the difficulties raised by the translation of Creangă's (1978) masterpiece *Memories of My Boyhood*, Cenac (2014, 158–159) makes special reference to the author's "use of numerous terms related to rural life and system (such as names of tools belonging to a primitive agricultural system), to coinage, weights and measures, to church service, religious rites, superstitious or social standing." Cenac (2014) notes that, when rendering this multitude of culture-specific items into English, the two translators, Ana Cartianu and R.C. Johnston, resort to techniques that help the target audience understand the original message, preserving, at the same time, the cultural specificity of the source text. Thus, when possible, the Romanian cultural elements are rendered by means of their target language established equivalents, which, for more clarity, are followed by an explanation. Such examples are *Săptămâna Luminată* ("The Enlightened Week" – the week before Easter), *Cârneleagă sau săptămâna hârții* ("the Carnival Week" – the week between Christmas and Epiphany when meat is allowed even on the fast days, Wednesdays and Fridays), *a se duce cu plugușorul* ("to take the New Year's plough" – a peasant custom which can be described as follows: a group of children goes from house to house and offers good wishes for the new year), *colivă* ("cornmeal cake" – a dish of boiled grain, honey, and walnuts carried at the head of the funeral procession and later divided among the mourners) (cf. Cenac 2014, 159–60). However, there are numerous culture-loaded terms for which the translators use the foreignizing technique of borrowing, often accompanied by the technique of description. This is the case of words such as *husași*, *sorocovăț*, *mocani*, *mămăligă*, *Moși*, *șezătoare*, *doină*, or *irmilic*, which the translators employ as such in the English variant and add some further explanatory notes (cf. Cenac 2014, 160).

These examples suggest that, in the case of literary texts, any translation technique is appropriate as long as the result is a target variant which reflects its original, but, at the same time, acts as a literary text in its own right. If this sometimes involves preserving the original form of certain words or structures, it does not mean that those lexical elements cannot be translated. As the translator Dana Crăciun explains in an interview conducted by the journalist Carmen Neamțu, translators should not erase any sign of foreignness in a literary translation, because "foreignness, a whiff of otherness does not necessarily mean a bad translation" (Neamțu 2017).

4.1.2.2 Culture-specific items

As pointed out above, among the difficulties pertaining to the translation of literature, an important position is occupied by the culture-related terms. But the use of such terms is certainly not restricted to literary contexts, and consequently, translators of various types of texts are very likely to be faced with the challenge of rendering them into a foreign language. The cultural lexical items present a great diversity and include, among others, terms related to fields such as geography, art, religion, social culture, gastronomy, word denoting types of clothing, objects, and actions specific to a particular cultural context. Irrespective of the translator's level of linguistic knowledge, the culture-loaded lexical items raise problems in the process of transfer into a foreign language, problems which are not determined by the words themselves, but by the realities they denote, that is by the notions, the objects, or the situations which are not part of the target audience's everyday life (Petrehuș 2016, 239).

As a result of globalization, a category of culture-related lexical items which are frequently translated is that of the terms which refer to foods, ingredients, and methods of cooking. This is the reason why I will illustrate the manner in which some terms denoting traditional Romanian dishes are dealt with in the process of transfer from Romanian to English. The examples that I will use are taken from twenty menus offered by restaurants in the Banat region, in the South-West of Romania. Most of these restaurants (eighteen) provide a mixture of dishes from both the Romanian and the international cuisine, and the other two

offer exclusively Romanian food. I must mention that the terms discussed below were collected in the context of a larger research study meant to identify the linguistic elements which contribute to the multicultural nature of the menus used in the Romanian restaurants in the Banat region (cf. Cozma, in press).

My analysis revealed that the translators made use of a variety of techniques for achieving equivalence in these texts. Thus, there are relatively few cases in which the translator uses the domesticating technique of the established equivalent. One such example is *mămăligă/bulz*, frequently paralleled by the target variant "polenta," which is actually a term of Italian origin. Even if the descriptive English term "boiled cornmeal" could have been used, this solution does not occur in any of the menus under analysis. What sometimes occurs, however, is the variant "maize," which is a generalization, and is not an appropriate translation choice. At the opposite end, the foreignizing technique of borrowing is used for dishes like *mici/ mititei*, *zacuscă*, *sarmale*, and *Pomana porcului*, which are often preserved as such in the English variants of the menus. Sometimes, the terms denoting such dishes are rendered by combining borrowing with the technique of description: "mici (grilled ground meat rolls)," "zacuscă (traditional Romanian vegetable spread)," "Pomana porcului (traditional Romanian dish)." There are also cases when these traditional dishes are paralleled by English variants based exclusively on the technique of description. Thus, *mici/ mititei* sometimes occurs only as "minced meat rolls" or as "grilled minced meat rolls." For *sarmale*, we find several variants, such as "stuffed cabbage," "meat rolled in cabbage," or "stuffed cabbage rolls," but I consider that none of these is entirely accurate, and I would suggest "minced meat rolled in cabbage leaves" as a more suitable descriptive equivalent in this case. Similarly, the translation of *Pomana porcului* as "Romanian traditional winter cold platter" does not capture the specific character of this dish, which would be better reflected by the variant "freshly slaughtered pig dish/plate." Far from being restricted to the cases mentioned above, the neutralizing technique of description is quite frequently used for the food names specific to the Romanian cuisine, even if the target variants do not always represent very felicitous translation solutions. A good example in this respect is *papanași*, which registers various English translations in my corpus, ranging from relatively appropriate – e.g. "sweet cheese dumplings" – to rather inaccurate descriptions of this dish: "jam and sour cream doughnuts," "fried dumplings," or "doughnuts with cheese."

I consider that the manner in which the traditional Romanian dishes are rendered into English in the restaurant menus needs more interest and attention from the field of translation research. As already mentioned, food is closely connected to culture, and this does not mean that the food terminology is untranslatable, but that the foreign terms used as equivalents for the Romanian traditional dishes should be carefully selected and should be used consistently in the menus all over the country.

4.1.2.3 Idioms

The third situation that is often associated with the idea that translation equivalence is difficult, if not even impossible, to achieve is the one in which translators are supposed to offer appropriate equivalents for the idioms contained by the source texts. Just like the categories discussed above, these lexical items are also part of the culture-bound linguistic elements, but they are usually dealt with separately due to the particularities that they present. Idioms represent combinations of words whose meanings differ from the literal meanings of the individual words making it up. More exactly, these combinations of words have new semantic values that can be understood only in relation to information and experiences shared by the members of a specific cultural space. Due to the close connection between idioms and the context in which they are used, the idiomatic expressions are often problematic in the process of translation, which means that the translator has to find appropriate techniques to render them into a foreign language. In what follows, I will give some examples of Romanian idioms, which are presented as difficult to understand, and at the same time, as funny, on various websites meant for English-speaking people who either visit Romania or want to learn Romanian (cf. Lektor, Tour in Romania).

In very general terms, the analysis of the manner in which the "problematic" Romanian idioms are rendered into English reveals that, quite frequently, the translator can resort to the domesticating technique of the established equivalent, that is they have the opportunity of using idioms which, even if dissimilar in

form, express a similar meaning. A few examples are *a vinde castraveți grădinarului* (literally "to sell cucumbers to the gardener"), which refers to telling someone something that they already know, can be rendered by the English "to preach to the choir"; *la Paștele cailor* (literally "at the horses" Easter), which basically means that something will never happen, can be paralleled by the English "when pigs fly"; *a fi prins cu mâța-n sac* (literally "to be caught with the cat in the bag"), which is used when someone is caught cheating or lying, has the English equivalent "to be caught red handed." In other cases, however, English does not provide idiomatic expressions with a similar semantic value, which does not mean that the Romanian idioms in question are untranslatable, but that other translation techniques must be used. Thus, idioms like the ones illustrated next are rendered by means of lexical structures which describe their meaning: *a o căuta cu lumânarea* (literally "to look for something with a lit candle") is well paralleled by "to be looking for trouble"; *a umbla cu cioara vopsită* (literally "to walk around with the painted crow") can be translated by "to try to fool somebody" or "to try to lie to someone"; *a freca menta* (literally "to rub the mint") basically means "to waste time," "to do something fruitless." or "to be lazy." These examples show that, even if certain particularities of the original idiomatic expression are inevitably lost, their general meaning can be rendered by the use of appropriate translation techniques.

4.2 Interpretation of results

The results presented so far confirm my initial hypothesis, namely that translatability is always possible as long as translators try to establish a relation of equivalence based not only on the linguistic format of the original text but also on a series of factors that have to do with the target context. Such factors might impose the use of domesticating techniques, which adapt the source text to the target-language cultural values and aim at making the translation sound as if it had been originally produced in the target language. My analysis has revealed a preference for such techniques in the case of the Romanian idiomatic expressions, which were rendered, whenever possible, by the English established equivalents. In other cases, the target context might impose the use of foreignizing techniques, especially when the translation was meant to give the target audience "a taste" of the source culture. This has frequently happened in the case of the transfer of various culture-specific items used in literary texts or in restaurant menus originally written in Romanian, which were often preserved as such in the English variant of the text. Moreover, in any of the situations illustrated above, the translator resorted, whenever necessary, to a neutralizing technique like description or generalization, which either accompanied a domesticating/foreignizing technique or replaced it completely.

   All these findings point once more to the essential role played by cultural factors in the process of translation. The cultural context in which the translation is produced, on the one hand, and the cultural background of the translator, the cultural specificity of the target audience, as well the intended effect that the translation is meant to create are all elements which influence the translator's choices, and, which inevitably determine the particular linguistic make up of a translated text.

5 Conclusions

The evidence of theoretical and practical nature presented in this article supports the idea that translation equivalence is a relative concept, because not all theorists and practitioners of this field use the same criteria in judging or in applying it. For some of them, it is crucial to render the source-text information with exactness, others aim at preserving the style of the original author, while others take into account the socio-cultural context of the target language. What translators must be aware of is that the type of equivalence relation that they are supposed to achieve is very much dependent on the specific features of each transla-tion situation. The identification of the potential translation problems in correlation with the features of the

translation situation is essential for the subsequent selection of the appropriate techniques, and for their effective application during the translation process.

References

Bassnett, Susan. 2002. *Translation studies*, 3rd ed., London and New York: Routledge.

Caragiale, Ion Luca. 1979. *Sketches and stories*, translated by Tappe Eric Ditmar. Cluj Napoca: Dacia.

Catford, John Cunnison. 1965. *A linguistic theory of translation. An essay in applied linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.

Cenac, Oana. 2014. "Translating cultural and historical coordinates in ion Creangă's memories of my boyhood." *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences* 137, 158–64. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.269 (15.04.2022).

Chesterman, Andrew. 1997. *Memes of translation, the spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Cozma, Mihaela. In press. "On the multicultural character of the restaurant menus: A translational perspective." *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Onomastics "Name and Naming", Baia Mare, September 3–5, 2019*. Multiculturalism in Onomastics.

Creangă, Ion. 1978. *Memories of my boyhood*, translated by Ana Cartianu and R.C. Johnston. Bucureşti: Minerva.

Dimitriu, Rodica. 2006. *The cultural turn in translation studies*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Halverson, Sandra. 1997. "The concept of equivalence in translation studies: Much ado about something." *Target* 9(2), 207–33.

Hermans, Theo. 1996. "Norms and the determination of translation: A theoretical framework." In *Translation, power, subversion*, edited by Román Álvarez and M. Carmen-África Vidal, p. 25–51. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Imre, Attila. 2013. *Traps of translation*. Braşov: Editura Universităţii Transilvania.

Koller, Werner. 1989. "Equivalence in translation theory." In *Readings in translation theory*, edited by Andrew Chesterman, p. 99–104. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura.

Lektor. https://www.lektor.ro/2020/10/08/five-romanian-idioms-to-have-fun-with/(28.04.2022).

Malmkjœr, Kirsten. 2018. "Theories of linguistics and of translation and interpreting." In *The Routledge handbook of translation studies and linguistics* edited by Kirsten Malmkjœr, p. 15–30. London and New York: Routledge.

Marco, Josep. 2018. "The translation of food-related culture-specific items in the Valencian Corpus of Translated Literature (COVALT) Corpus: A study of techniques and factors." *Perspectives* 27(1), 1–22. doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2018.1449228 (15.04.2022).

Molina, Lucía and Amparo Hurtado Albir. 2002. "Translation techniques revisited: a dynamic and functionalist approach." *Meta* 47(4), 498–512.

Momescu, Mona. 2004. "The local vs. the others: I. L. Caragiale's work as an internal use identity marker." *Respiro* 14. http://www.respiro.org/Issue14/Non_fiction/nonfiction_momescu.html (20.04.2022).

Neamţu, Carmen. 2017. "Coşmar cu traducător." *Levure Litteraire* 14. http://levurelitteraire.com/traducatoarea-si-universitara-dana-craciun/ (29.04.2022).

Newmark, Peter. 1981. *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A textbook of translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Nida, Eugene. 1964. *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a purposeful activity: functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Olk, Harald Martin. 2013. "Cultural references in translation: a framework for quantitative translation analysis." *Perspectives* 21(3). 344–357. doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2011.646279 (20.04.2022).

Petrehuş, Denisa Elena. 2016. "Specialized text pitfalls and how to avoid them." In *Globalization and national identity. Studies on the strategies of intercultural dialogue* edited by Iulian Boldea, p. 233–44. Târgu-Mureş: Arhipelag XXI Press.

Pioariu, Rodica. 2002. "Despre traducerea lui Caragiale în engleză." *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica* 3, 247–54.

Reiss, Katharina. 1989. "Text types, translation types and translation assessment." In *Readings in translation theory*, edited by Andrew Chesterman, p. 106–15. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura.

Schäffner, Christina. 1997. "Translation studies." In *Handbook of pragmatics*, edited by Jef Verschueren, Jan-Ola Ostman, Jan Blommaert, and Chris Bulcaen, p. 1–17. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Tour in Romania. https://tourinromania.com/reasons-to-visit-romania/common-romanian-idioms-sayings-and-expressions/ (29.04.2022).

Toury, Gideon. 1980. *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetic and Semiotics.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The translator's invisibility*. London: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence. (ed.). 2000. *The translation studies reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, Hans Josef. 1989. "Skopos and commission in translational action." In *Readings in translation theory*, edited by Andrew Chesterman, p. 173–87. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura.

Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. 1958/2000. "Comparative stylistics of French and English. A methodology for translation." In *The translation studies reader*, translated into English by Juan C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel and edited by Lawrence Venuti, p. 84–93. London and New York: Routledge.