

**“OVIDIUS” UNIVERSITY OF CONSTANȚA
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES**

DOCTORAL THESIS

**LITERARY ROMANIAN
LANGUAGE IN THE SUCCESSIVE
TRANSLATIONS OF JULES
VERNE**

SUMMARY

**SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR:
Univ. prof. Dr. Petre Gheorghe BÂRLEA**

**DOCTORAL CANDIDATE
Gabriela Aurelia PANAIT (CHIRAN)**

**CONSTANȚA
2019**

CONTENTS

LOGOS AND ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1 SHORT HISTORY OF TRANSLATIONS OF JULES VERNE WORKS

- 1.1. Jules Verne in universal literature
- 1.2. Nantes – Paris – Amiens: Jules Verne’s road to becoming who he was
- 1.3. An extraordinary journey through life and through literature
- 1.4. Perception of Jules Verne in the Romanian literary space
- 1.5. Partial conclusions

CHAPTER 2 BETWEEN TRADUCTOLOGY AND CONTRASTIVE-TYPOLOGICAL GRAMMAR

- 2.1. The concept of “translation”: definitions, translation unit
- 2.2. Short history of translation
- 2.3. Types of translation
- 2.4. Translation methods
 - 2.4.1. Direct translation methods
 - 2.4.2. Indirect translation methods
- 2.5. Translation theories
 - 2.5.1. Linguistic theories regarding translation
 - 2.5.2. Translation theories and literary aesthetic
 - 2.5.3. Semiotic or “interpretative” theories
 - 2.5.4. Theories based on contrastivity
- 2.6. Around the meaning of a word
 - 2.6.1. Referential theory of the meaning of the word
 - 2.6.2. Componential analysis of the meaning
 - 2.6.3. Meaning postulates
- 2.7. Contrastive-typological grammar issues from the perspective of traductology
 - 2.7.1. Ambiguity
 - 2.7.2. Lexical organization of the structures of the two languages in contact

- 2.7.2.1 Split and focalization
- 2.7.2.2. Lexical gaps
- 2.7.2.3. Oblique trans-coding
- 2.7.2.4. False friends
- 2.7.3. Transposition
- 2.8. Partial conclusions

CHAPTER 3

THE CONTRASTIVE-TYPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT *LE CHÂTEAU DES CARPATHES/ CASTELUL DIN CARPAȚI*, BY JULES VERNE

- 3.1. A provocative novel for Romanian translators
- 3.2. Between traductology and the history of the literary Romanian language
- 3.3. Work instruments
- 3.4. The contrastive-typological analysis of the text *Le Château des Carpathes/ Castelul din Carpați*
 - 3.4.1. The contrastive-typological analysis of the text *Le Château des Carpathes/ Castelul din Carpați* from the perspective of communicative interactions
 - 3.4.2. Contrastive-typological approaches to the verb class in the novel *Le Château des Carpathes/ Castelul din Carpați*
- 3.5. Partial conclusions

INSTEAD OF CONCLUSIONS: ASPECTS OF THE LITERARY ROMANIAN LANGUAGE MANIFESTED THROUGHOUT THE HISTORY OF CERTAIN TRANSLATIONS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

KEY-WORDS

Literary Romanian language, historic evolution, successive translations, general traductology, applied traductology, translation strategies, direct translation, indirect translation, translation limitations, contrastive-typological grammar, contrastive-typological analysis, lexicology, pragmatics of the literary discourse, diachronic markers.

THESIS SUMMARY

“LITERARY ROMANIAN LANGUAGE IN THE SUCCESSIVE TRANSLATIONS OF JULES VERNE”

0. Our paper focuses on the literary Romanian language, analysed diachronically, for the modern and contemporary period, from a certain perspective, that of traductology.

1. This undertaking begins from the *premises* that the maturity of a literary language is proved not only through original creations, but through translations of creations in other languages, as well. In fact, the historic reality shows us that, within any written culture, translations (usually, those with religious character) have preceded their own productions, in accordance with P. Gh. Bârlea, 2016, *Traduceri și traducători. Pagini din istoria culturii române*, pp. 7-11. Of course, a language's ability to render the most profound ideas and the highest of sentiments is verified through the confrontation of humanity's greatest works, such as biblical texts, Homeric poems, Greek-Latin classics' creations, Shakespearian dramaturgy and others. Aside from these, writings that represent only the mentalities, taste and interests of a certain era in the evolution of human spirituality, that is a certain literary species, with a certain theme, style and a specific language, gain international fame, circulating among cultural-linguistic spaces with the same success, at least a temporary one, as fundamental works, such as those mentioned above. An eloquent example in this respect, beyond a doubt, is that of Jules Verne's works. Coming to be a short while after the European industrial revolution, it reflects the taste of entire generations for geographical discoveries, for scientific-technic innovations, grafted on the older taste for mysteries and on the interest toward the exotic world, full of unpredictability. Evidently, such writings bring to actuality an adequate vocabulary, marked by various terminologies, by loans for new concepts and by internal, daring creations, often with unexpected effects on the morphosyntactic and stylistic-pragmatic structures.

2. In general, Jules Verne's works were well accepted by the Romanian written culture. From 1870 and until today, approximatively 200 editions came to be in the Romanian language, which cover almost all that was significant for the French writer in the original: between 1870 - 1918, 20 titles were printed in Romanian, between 1919 and 1946 -57, between 1948 and 1989 - 91, and after 1990 - over 25, according to P. Gh. Bârlea, R.-M. Bârlea, „Traduceri din Jules Verne în limba română”, in: P. Gh. Bârlea, 2016, pp. 398-428. The first of the two novels, *Le Château des Carpathes* (1892) and *Le Beau Danube jaune* (1901), which Jules Verne places, entirely or partially, on Romanian soil, enjoyed significant attention from the Romanian translators. Between 1897-2017, no less than eight Romanian versions of *Le Château des Carpathes* were created! We include among these the revised edition by Vladimir Colin, as it effectively represents a sample of professional re-adaptation to a new generation of Romanian language speakers, in a qualitative manner rather than a quantitative one. We have excluded, however, various pirate-editions, that affect the aspect of an original version, but which, in reality, repeat older versions - that they sometimes even mutilate through severe collection mistakes and through a poor-quality graphic presentation.

3. The eight versions reflect the evolution of the literary Romanian language throughout 120 years (1897-2017). At a historic scale, such an interval isn't too great, yet, in concrete circumstances of the Romanian historical-cultural evolution, the respective era is as significant as it can be. The first Jules Verne Romanian translations came to be a little while after the massive elimination of old words phenomenon, of those of different origins - Slavic, Greek, Turkish, Hungarian etc. - in favour of the Latin-Romanic equivalents; after replacing the Cyrillic alphabet with the Latin one; in the middle of the standardization process of the standard literary Romanian language; in a supra-dialectal form, according to the possibilities of the age; and finally, during a period of openness towards Western literature and culture and the entire world.

4. The successive translations of the same French base-text, which was also within a linguistic-literary context marked by the material and spiritual circumstances of the end of the European and national French XIX century, constitute a chance of tracing the searches, hesitations, solutions given by competent people for the most different aspects of the Romanian language's evolution: phonetical particularities, morphosyntactic structures, lexical-semantic dynamics, stylistic-pragmatic stereotypes and, last but not least, the ample and slow process of levelling the principles of Romanian orthography, orthoepy and punctuation. In other words, these translations represent a mirror, a seismograph of the efforts made to modernize the literary Romanian language, in the most vivid, dynamic part of its history.

5. *The work methods* were imposed exactly through the nature of the premise from which we started and the proposed objectives. As there are two languages coming into contact, we have mandatorily used the work principles, methods and instruments of *contrastive-typological grammar* and when we say "grammar", we understand even the lexical-semantic phenomena that comprise the substance of the sentences that we have considered morphologically, syntactically and stylistically. Starting from the same reality of confronting the original French version with the Romanian transpositions, we have called upon the clarifications imposed by the modern theories of *traductology*. On the other hand, given the purpose of our paper, we have used the work system of *historical grammar*, with punctual applications in the Romanian language diachrony, from its literary aspect, mainly, however, with inevitable comments regarding the popular-dialectal levels and registers, with archaic, usual or, on the contrary, neological elements.

6. *The structure of the paper* reflects the attempt of harmonizing the work corpus with the most adequate interpretation methods. In the chapters that make up the infrastructure of the present research, we have granted sufficient space, we believe, for the information that would remind of the place that Jules Verne has in European and universal literature, through the scientific-fictional literature that appealed so much in the second half of the XIX century, with extensions visible to this day.

Then, we attempted to create a synthesis of the theories that configure the two associated domains of the word sciences: contrastive-typological grammar and traductology. The results of this undertaking were the concepts, analysis methods and the metalanguage with which we operated in the second part of the paper, that of the *contrastive-typological analysis* of the 1+8 sets of texts selected by us as representative for the linguistic description

we intended to perform.

7. The *conclusions* generated by this manner of approaching our research have confirmed, to a good extent, the premises from which we began: the successive translations into Romanian of the novel *Le Château des Carpathes*, by Jules Verne, shed light, from a significant point of view, on the evolution of certain important phenomena for the process of modernizing and constituting a linguistic code encrypted afterwards by grammarians in a relatively unitary, supra-dialectal, normative and flexible structure. A few examples can synthesize, we believe, the ample material that these versions offer to Romanian language historians.

7.1. *At the level of the orthography*, as to begin with the written aspect, the exterior one, the most visible of the Romanian language, we can observe the passing from the first norms encrypted by the Romanian Academy in 1884, as “etymologism tempered by the phonological principle”, to those from 1904-1936, of the phonologism with concessions to the etymologism, and from here, to the generalization of the phonetic principle, accompanied by the known “complementary principles”, among which, all that is left of the etymological one is what we call today the “traditional-historic principle”. As such, in the VO version (1897), we stumble upon the so-called etymological forms - in fact, intermediary forms of the latter, as in any writing declared “etymological”, as to reflect the Latinism supported by Cihac-Candrea and strongly defended within the Academy by N. Quintescu:

- *însě, mě, sělbatici* etc.

Of course, non-accentuated *e* in intermediate or final position had closed for many centuries to *ă*, but the promoters of the etymologism, from the most aggressive time of their activity (1870-1930), wanted to illustrate the Latin origin of those words through graphic artifices, cf. lat. *mē*, lat. *pavimentum* and others. It was no longer important that, throughout approximatively two millennia of evolution from Popular Latin to Premodern and Modern Romanian, the respective words had passed through many other phono-morphological and lexical-semantic changes, such as the syncope in *pavimentum*, the lexicalization and reorganization of *însă* etc.

- final *ă* – etymologic in the case of certain nouns, we underline “certain”, is maintained at VO, but disappears in the case of the others: *maiу, podereiu, gunoiu* and others. It is the same for the verbs: *voiu*.

7.2. In the *phonological field*, tightly linked, of course, to the orthographic aspect, we see the persistence of an old pronunciation, doubled by the most recent parallelisms of this type found in free variation, being reflected accordingly in the Romanian versions of the Jules Verne text created up to the partial reform performed by Sextil Pușcariu, in 1936:

- the closed vowel *â* is marked through the special graphic sign proposed in the final version of the orthography encoded by the Romanian Academy, through the norms imposed with difficulty by the collective led by T. Maiorescu: *pământurile* (from Ion Pas, 1929) vs. *păměnturile* (Victor Onișor, 1897).

- final accentuated *e* marks a diphthong in real pronunciation and it is written as such in Ion Pas (1929): *am putea* (față de *am putě*, la Victor Onișor).

- the same diphthong *-ea*, except originating from the tough pronunciation after *ș*, is marked accordingly in the versions of the XX century: *greșeală*.

- „etymological” ě is pronounced and written as ă in the modern Romanian versions: *călătorie, să, sălbatici, față de sălbatici* etc., compared to the XIX century.

- the reduction situations, those of apheresis, syllable conjunct words, from usual pronunciation, including in standard literary Romanian, are still stencilled differently in the translations from the first half of the XX century, a sign that, sometimes, the translators felt the pressure of certain popular-archaic forms; at the level of the graphic representation, these hesitations are marked by the alternation of the apostrophe with the unification line, in situations difficult to reduce to a certain model:

dar and *dar'* (cf. *dară*); *n'au* and *n-au* etc.

7.3. At morphological level, we observe the alternance between the desinence of certain nominal and verbal subclasses, until late, at the half of the XX century.

7.3.1. • In case of neutral nouns, the desinence *-ure* and *-uri*, that is the feminine plural form, normal for the neutral gender category and the specialized form of the neutral plural for names of objects or abstract concepts, is in free variation:

conture/contururi;

• The neological nouns, originating from the Latin forms ending in *-tio* (feminine of third declination imparisyllabic, usually – names of abstractions, most of them deverbatives at origin) also appear in free variation:

evocare/evocătune; nație/națiune; creație/creațiune

7.3.2. • For verbs in the first conjugations, subtypes in *-ø/-ez* (Cf. GALR, I, pp. 544 sqq.), we see the same phenomenon of free occurrence, non-encoded, in the same stage of evolution of the Romanian language:

dominează/domină

• The composed forms of certain moods and tenses appear to yet be fixed in stable forms, up to the translations of the modern era. Especially in the sentences which are pragmatically marked by sentence nuances or in interrogatives, the first translations use the old structure of changing the order of the auxiliary against the conjugated verb, with the corresponding displacement of the pronouns or of the nouns implicated in the respective verbal groups:

veni-va; ave-vom timp; asiguratu-te-ai?; nebunit-ai?

7.3.3. However, once with the registration of the context in which such inversions appear, we have already passed into the *syntactic field*.

Among other phenomena specific to the respective period during which the literary Romanian language was being standardized - in the standard and belletrist styles and registers - the passing from infinitive constructions to subordinates with conjunctive after various verbs (except for modal verbs) also draw attention:

...(nu) se va gândi a le pune

vs

...(nu) se va gândi să le pună

The phenomenon of passing from infinitive constructions (also supported by the Latin model and the massive influences of Slavic and Slavonic texts, in general) is older, certified by the Pre-Romantics and the Romantics (Gr. Alexandrescu replaced *îmi place a mă plimbă*, from the 1834 edition of his poems, with *îmi place să mă plimb*, in the 1852 edition, cf. P. Gh. Bâlea, 1998, *Gr. Alexandrescu...*, p. 103) and even in earlier texts. The fact that the infinitive

structures which are detectable in the first Romanian versions of the Jules Verne texts appear especially at Victor Onișor is definitely due, of course, to the archaic-regional mark of his writing, but also to the model offered by the base-text:

fr. *on veut éviter*

vs

rom. *se vrea a evita*

rom. *vrei să ocolești* etc.

7.4. At *lexical-semantic level*, the phenomena that could be brought into discussion are far more numerous, due to the nature of things. We have emphasized them throughout our analyses, and certain aspects shall be presented once again in the following pages, when we refer to the traductological particularities that mark the eight Romanian versions. Here, we observe only general order facts, such as the incongruence between the historic stage and the option for neologisms, in the case of equivalences for certain nouns, adjectives, verbs etc. More precise, sometimes an archaism appears in the first translations (potentially, a regionalism), and afterwards, neologisms are used (resulting from direct borrowing):

fr. *plateau*

rom. *podereiu* (VO, 1897)

rom. *platou* (GM, 2017).

But it is a quite frequent occurrence that terms definitively installed in the standard literary Romanian language be used in earlier ages (cf. *podiş*, at VC_{1/2}, 1980/1992 or DO, 2010, while at IP, 1929, it will be *platou*).

In other cases, the evolution is smoother and clearer:

fr. *reposer*

rom. *se basează* (VO, 1897; the etymologizing graphic is also observed, with inter-vowel *-s-* kept as is)

rom. *se reazimă* (IP, 1929, still archaic and popular)

rom. *se bizuie* (TF, 2004, also archaic and popular)

rom. *pornește* (DO, 2010)

rom. *se bazează* (GM, 2017) etc.

7.5. As such, the evolution of linguistic phenomena takes place at a level of the language, the phonetical facts being strongly tied to those of the morphological, syntactical and lexical-semantical particularities - all reflected in the graphic representation solutions offered by the orthographic code of the age.

8. From the point of view of the *translation strategies*, the image of the Romanian literary language can be completed with numerous observations useful to our aim of following the particularities of the literary Romanian language at the time of the eight translations.

8.1. In most situations, Victor Onișor, Ion Pas, Vladimir Colin, Traian Fintescu and Dorina Oprea tend to go towards fidelity in relation to the one for whom the translation is intended and, in some cases, towards the fidelity to the period during which the text was written, succeeding in transferring a clear, concise message into their own versions, one that is in agreement with the French author's intent. Therefore, we are speaking about a translation that is less loyal to the source-text, but closer to the level of understanding of the Romanian readers. The GM and MR versions take the form of fidelity towards the source-text, most times the lexemes and sentence structures being placed in the same order as the original

French text.

At the end of the contrastive-typological analysis, within which the traductological strategies have constituted an important part of our study regarding the transposition of the Jules Verne text into Romanian, we can state that the Romanian translators have used both direct translation methods, such as *borrowing* – the direct transfer of a lexeme, *calque* – the direct translation of a complex structure, *literal paraphrase* – a heteronymic translation of a phrase, as well as indirect translation procedures, such as *transposition*, *modulation*, *equivalence and adaptation*. As to apply the latter, the translators, avoiding the “*verbum a verbo*” translations, have proven that they have a complex knowledge of the Romanian language, as well as of the French language; here, we refer to the transfer operated at lexical-grammatical level, but also to the transfer specific to the socio-cultural specific existing the source-text.

8.2. *Direct translation methods*

With regards to these, the following are significant:

8.2.1. *Heteronymic translation (direct)*

In phrase (5), the adverbial phrase *au déclin de* from the source-text has as correspondent prepositional or adverbial phrases in the Romanian language:

la sfârșitul, in VO, DO, GM, MR;

în amurgul, in IP;

la capătul, in VC_{1/2}.

Therefore, in six out of the eight versions, we see a *literal paraphrasing*: as the mentioned adverbial phrase has a perfect semantic correspondent in Romanian, this could have been directly translated through the synonymous terms *(la) sfârșitul*, *(în) amurgul* in IP, respectively *(la) capătul*, in VO, DO, GM and MR. However, in the TF version, by choosing the metaphoric term *(la) adăpostul*, out of the translator’s desire to transpose the meaning of the French phrase in an exact manner, a modulation that is stylistic-pragmatically marked is used for the described moment.

There are cases in which lexical selection is very different from one translator to the next, and the causes are multiple. It can be a matter of ambiguity of the term in the source-text, more precise, of its polysemanism, with at least two-three meanings, which can be used just as adequately in the respective context. In other cases, on the contrary, it’s an issue of a technical term of the strictest specialty, for which the translators do not find the exact equivalent as they do not know the specialized terminology of the respective field of activity. As such, in phrase (11), the verb *raser* from French is either rendered directly, with the meaning *a rade*, in VO and IP, or through the metaphorical meaning, this being the meaning, in this case, from the source-text. Of course, there is also a change in voice, so that *les vents... le rasent* becomes:

îl rad, in VO;

e ras, in IP;

trec peste, in VC_{1/2};

rod (a roade), in TF;

este ros, in DO;

este măturat, in GM;

este bântuit, in MR.

The series of examples that illustrate the diachronic interference in the field of the

terminology can continue with the options used to render the mono-member verbal phrase *reposer*, at the end of sentence (7): fr. *reposer*, cf. *supra*, 7.4.

In phrase (15), *crapaudière* in French has the following correspondents in Romanian: *staul*, in VO; *cocioabă*, in IP; *înjghebare*, in VC_{1/2}; *cloacă*, in TF and DO; *groapă*, in GM; *mocirlă*, in MR.

In fact, the generic term would have been *stână*, which also incorporates *staul*, *cocioabă* etc. Given that it was in fact a matter of a filthy sheep yard, both Jules Verne and the Romanian translators recurred to the synonyms or periphrases which reflect the specific of the rustic life, but, rather, the sad state of the place.

8.2.2 Direct literal paraphrase through permutation

In phrase (7), we are faced with redistributions of the semantic information in the IP, VC_{1/2} and DO, due to the inversion of terms, which also incur the reorganization of the phrase:

fr. *Ces provinces de l'extrême Europe, M. Gérando les a décrites...*

rom. *D. Gerando a descris aceste provincii ale extremei Europe* (IP)

rom. *Dl. de Gérando a descris aceste provincii ale extremei Europe* (VC_{1/2})

rom. *Domnul de Gérando* a descris toate aceste provincii de la marginea Europei* (DO).

The most important difference compared to the original text is that Victor Onișor decides to transfer the plural *ces provinces* from the nominal group *ces provinces de l'extrême Europe*, through *această provincie*. The translation recurs to modifying the category number, as the extension of this lexeme would have seemed sufficiently great as to cover the plural of the French heteronym. With regards to this, we are right to believe that the French author used the plural *ces provinces* intentionally, referring, in this context, not only to Transylvania, but to Bucovina and Banat as well, Romanian provinces which, back then, were part of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire.

8.2.3. The direct borrowing

Also in phrase (5), as to give an equivalent for *les ases*, the authors of the VO, VC_{1/2}, TF, DO and MR version borrowed the word directly from French, adapting it only to the phono-morphological specific of the Romanian tongue, *asii*. In GM, one syntagma is introduced which explains the term in the original text through paraphrasing: *Zeii Aesir*.

The words *brownies*, *gnomes*, *elfes*, *sylphes*, *korrigans*, *valkyries*, which represent, let's say, "subspecies" of supernatural beings in the northern legend production, have also been *directly borrowed* in the Romanian versions, out of the translators' desire to conserve the spirit of the original work.

However, our attention is drawn to the treatment of the noun *des elfes* from the syntagma *la patrie des ases, des elfes [...]*. In the Romanian translation, this noun corresponds to the masculine *elf*, which symbolises, as is mentioned within the notes of translators Ion Pas and Traian Fintescu, a supernatural being from German mythology, represented by a dwarf, symbolizing various elements of the universe (water, fire, earth).

At the time of the translation, in 1897, Victor Onișor, as to aid his readers, chooses

adaptation, by selecting the metaphoric meaning *zână* for this noun, which envisages a feminine character with supernatural powers from the Romanian folk mythology, the picture of kindness and beauty. As such, as a result of the translation, the term *elfes* was neutralised, the translator trying, by introducing the heteronym *zână* in his own version, to give an approximative equivalent of the general concept, and not of the actual term.

In phrase (25), the Fr. *donjon* was transferred into $VC_{1/2}$, TF, DO and MR, by means of *complete borrowing* - Rom. *donjon*, term with a powerful semantic charge in the present context. The impossibility of finding an autochthonous equivalent for the toponym *Orgall* from phrase (26) determined Traian Fințescu, translator of the recent generation, to take the name of the plateau directly, maintaining even the German-Hungaria graphic representation from the original text. The other translators, with innovative spirit, as well as poetic boldness, chose to resolve this transfer by means of various *adaptations*. Here, we mention once again the proposed situations. As such, Vladimir Colin, Dorina Oprea and Mariana Riza translated the toponym through *Gorgan*, and Ion Pas and Gabriel Mălăescu adapted it to the phonologic specific of the Romanian language, that is *Orgal*. The VC_2 version offers a different equivalence solution for it as opposed to the previous translation, *Orgal*. Therefore, here is a form which stood the test of time, from Victor Onișor to Gabriel Mălăescu, proof of an inspired choice.

Another example that can illustrate the method we are referring to here, is that of the noun *lornetă*, the translation of the French term *lorgnette*, from phrase (26):

fr. *lorgnette*
 rom. *lorneta*, in VO;
 rom. *ochianul*, in IP;
 rom. *luneta*, in $VC_{1/2}$, TF;
 rom. *lornionul*, in DO;
 rom. *oceanul*, in GM;
 rom. *luneta*, in MR.

It is easily observed that the transfer of this term has greatly weighed on the specialized knowledge that the translators had about the two languages.

The action of designating an instrument used with the purpose of observing relatively far objects is performed by means of direct borrowing in Victor Onișor's version. Dorina Oprea opts for the term *lornionul* (eyeglasses used in spectacles, especially by women), an inadequate choice, in our opinion, as this only approximates the original meaning, while the other translators proposed equivalents which transfer the meaning from the source-text: *lunetă*, in $VC_{1/2}$, TF and MR, respectively *ocean*, in IP and GM.

8.3. *Indirect translation methods*

8.3.1. *Adaptation*

Another proof of the fact that the translation of the novel *Castelul din Carpați* was not easily performed is that of translating anthroponyms and toponyms. Below, we will show a comparative table in which we have included, in the first column, original lexemes, and in the following - the solutions proposed by the seven translators:

TT	VO	IP	$VC_{1/2}$	TF	DO	GM	MR
Frick	Bucur	Fric	Frig	Frik	Frik	Fric	Frig

Franz	Emil	Fanz	Frâncul/ Frâncu	Francisc	Franz	Franz	Frâncu
Koltz	Colțu	Colț	Colț	Colț	Colț	Colț	Colț
Werst	Mătești	Werst	Verești	Werst	Verești	Werst	Verești
Orgall	Orgal	Orgal	Gorgan	Orgall	Orgal	Orgal	Gorgan

We observe that the authors of the Romanian versions have allowed themselves a relative liberty in translating the anthroponyms and the toponyms, Victor Onișor being the one that offered Romanian solutions adequate to the described space, transferring the cultural information vehiculated in the target-text through Romanian terms.

The nominal *Werst* is rendered by means of the same strategy in the source-text, in *VC_{1/2}*, DO and MR. For the anthroponym *Franz*, Victor Onișor gives the form *Emil*, Vladimir Colin – *Frâncul*, in the 1980 version, following that the 1992 version receive the re-established onomastic form by means of eliminating the article *-l*, *Frâncu*, solution also adopted by Mariana Riza.

8.3.2. *Transposition*

From the indirect translation techniques, the Romanian versions include a rather significant amount of transpositions used by the translators either mandatorily, due to the structural differences between the two languages, or due to personal considerations. In the following, we will select several units which have underwent a change of grammatical class when passing from French into Romanian as a result of this technique.

8.3.2.1. *Simple punctual/exact transpositions*

In phrase (18), the transposition into Romanian of the gerund adjective *montant* implies lexical structure differences due to the property of the French lexeme of being expressed through a minimal verbal unit (deverbative monolexeme with adjective participle value), while in the target-language, its semantic traits are rendered through a phrase (adverbial or prepositional): *în sus*, in IP, TF and DO; *în susul*, in GM, after a verb at a personal mood, in both versions. Vladimir Colin and Mariana Riza render the participial adjective by means of the corresponding verb, with a developed construction in the attributive subordinate *ce sua*.

In DO, we remark the facultative transposition performed by replacing the nominal group *à sa voix* with a temporal sentence with finite verb, introduced through the relative adverb *când*, that has connector value: *când striga*.

8.3.2.2. *Simple transpositions through expansion / reduction*

We were able to observe the translators' tendency to appeal to informational redistributions meant to render the message less ambiguous in the target-language. In order to emphasize this, we have selected the nominal group used metaphorically *de gros socques de bois*, from phrase (14). This was rendered through one lexeme in VO, *opinci*, a term close to the sphere of comprehension of the readers from the end of the XIX century and the immediate following period of time.

On the other hand, by means of interlingual paraphrasing, Ion Pas, Traian Fințescu, Dorina Oprea and Gabriel Mălăescu reduce the personified expression (*se) faire la barbe* in phrase (12), to a single unit, the verb *a se bărbieri*.

8.3.3. *Modulation*

Also in phrase (7), the grammatical reorganizations in *VC_{1/2}*, DO and MR lead to a

phrasal modulation, which affects the type of the sentences. In the analysed phrase, the negation is marked by means of the adverbs *ne...point*, which delimit the verb *murmurer*. In the versions we are discussing, we see a metalinguistic negation, as the accent falls on the noun that has an attribute function, *Lignonul*. As such, *Le Lignon ne murmurait point* becomes *Nu râul Lignon îi șoptea/susura*, reorganization which allows the correct transfer of the information from the source-text.

In phrase (22), as to render the idea expressed in the original French text by means of *préten dre*, Ion Pas, searching for an expressive synonymous term, opt for a facultative modulation and uses the adverb *adevărat*, visibly simplifying the phrase.

The lexical differences with regards to equating certain specialized terms from French into Romanian, to which we can add the lack of knowing the meaning of some of them, has led to modalized translations: the French word *psychagogiques*, in phrase (5), which has as correspondent in DO the subordinate sentence *ce țin de plăsmuire*, and in VO, the term is directly borrowed, in a context in which the “verbum a verbo” principle is applied, the correspondent *psicagogice* being rendered in accordance with the writing from the end of the XIX century.

As we observed throughout our study, the traductological issues that the Romanian translators had to resolve resulted from the absence or, to a certain extent, from the impossibility of finding certain lexical equivalents or mophosyntactic constructions through which a link may have been established between the source-text and the correspondent / corresponding structure in the target language. That explains certain lexemes such as: *Tityre*, from phrase (13), in VO; lat. *immanior ipse*, the nominal group refers to the nature of the shepherd, from the phrase (16), in VC₂ and MR; lat. *immanum pecus*¹, from the same phrase, in VC₂, DO and MR; *les bœufs*, from the phrase (24), in IP etc. That is also the manner in which the adaptations through conversion which cancel the connotation of the original text are also justified: *știmă* for fr. *lamies*, from the phrase (24), in VC_{1/2}, TF and MR; *zână*, for fr. *elfes*, from phrase (5), in VO etc.

Creativity and ingenuity in translation are imposed by the search for certain equivalents which are adequate for the nuances of the original text, pleasant and harmonious, so that the message sent in Romanian may have effects among Romanian readers which are similar to those had upon the readers of the original French text. Terms such as *plăsmuire* for the fr. *récit*, from phrase (4), in TF; *lirism necăutat* for the nominal group *poésie instinctive*, from phrase (8), in TF; *cocioabă infectă* pentru *révoltante prouacrerie*, from phrase (15), in IP; *drăcie*, used as to render the fr. *machine*, in phrase (23), in IP, and not to mention *nechemații*, in Ion Pas; *nepoftiții*, in Vladimir Colin; *aciuiații*, in Traian Fințescu, from phrase (24), for the fr. *intrus*, are solutions which bring value to the aesthetic nuances of the Romanian language, but which prove, in equal measure, the talent and intellectual skills of the authors of the Romanian versions.

The option used for a certain lexeme is often decided by the translators’ desire to render local particularities into the Romanian versions. We enumerate several such situations found in these versions:

¹ The Latin expressions, also used by V. Hugo, for Quasimodo’s characterization, as „păstor mai sălbatic decât turma sa sălbatică”, also appear in J. Verne and the novel from 1864, *O călătorie spre centrul Pământului*, where there was a volcano as well.

- popular and archaic terms: *podereiu*, in phrase (11); *asta*, in phrase (3), in GM; *se reazimă* for *se reposer*, in phrase (7), in Ion Pas;
- the terms that nuance the atmosphere, bringing to life a traditional world: *unei vremi* for the fr. *un temps*, in phrase (3), in Vladimir Colin; *sămănături*, in phrase (10), in Victor Onișor, for the fr. *cultures*; *concitat* for fr. *comitat*, in phrase (15), in Mariana Riza;
- regionalisms: *a-și potrivi barba*, for the expression *faire la barbe*, in phrase (12), in Mariana Riza; *păcurar*, at Traian Fințescu and *tăran*, in the version created by Victor Onișor for the fr. *pâtour*, in phrase (15);
- expressions with a powerful national-identity charge: *a da binețe*, in VC_{1/2} and TF; *a da ziua bună*, in DO for the transfer of the construction *donner bonjour*, in phrase (20); *a da crezare* for *ajouter la fois*, in phrase (8), in Gabriel Mălăescu.

The situations in which the translators chose to use structural and grammatical reorganizations, reducing or, on the contrary, augmenting the number of the words in the original, are numerous. Such situations, seen especially in VO and IP, prove the translators' courage to intervene upon the text, with the purpose of facilitating the message for the Romanian readers.

Equating certain grammatical classes have implied both creativity and temerity in the translation act. Very frequent are the situations in which, as to render the meaning of the phrases in the target-language, but also in order to adapt the content to the specific of the Romanian language, the authors of the Romanian versions have deviated from the original and chose to use syntactic reorganizations by means of paraphrasing and modulations.

Even though the transfer of *nouns* did not cause significant issues, we can affirm that, compared to the original text, the Romanian versions have counted more nominal lexemes, this situation being due to the structure differences used by the translators. In the following, we will offer several convincing examples in this respect, in which the Romanian noun completes the verb in the target-text:

- As to render the infinitive *conclure*, in phrase (2), Traian Fințescu uses a facultative transposition and builds the phrase with the aid of the verbal group which contains a conjunctive verb and a noun: *să tragem concluzia* or the verbal group *c'est regrettable*, in phrase (9), was transposed through the nominal group *lucru regretabil*, in MR;
- However, there were situations in which the information was rendered in Romanian by means of lexical-morphological contraction of the source-unit. In phrase (6), Victor Onișor and Gabriel Mălăescu reduced the nominal group *le pays transylvain* to the unit *Transilvania*;
- As to make the meaning of certain lexemes more concrete, the translators have opted to augment the information in the French text, this being performed by introducing certain new nouns in their versions: fr. *Lignon*, in phrase (14), was rendered through *apele Lignonului*, in VO; *râul Lignon*, in VC_{1/2}, DO and MR or the fr. *les méandres*, in the same phrase, became *cotiturile pline de vărtejuri*, in VO etc.
- In Vladimir Colin, the fr. *Daphnis*, which pertains to the subclass of proper nouns, becomes *un Dafnis*, modulated translation which willingly contributes to the appreciative emphasis of the mythological character and that of the idea of uniqueness;

We have to mention the fact, throughout the analysis, numerous differences were observed with regards to the nouns' gender, number and case, which is absolutely normal in the case of contact between two languages with different grammatical systems. For example, in

VC_{1/2}, GM and MR, the nominal *dans un temps*, in phrase (3), was rendered through *unei vremi*, a complement in Dative, requested by the syntactic-semantic regime of the predicate *aparținem*, equivalent for the fr. (*nous*) *sommes*. Nominal structures introduced through calque from French were identified. As such, in phrase (25), the nominal *le courant* from the construction *aura lancé le courant*, was transferred through *la curent* in VC_{1/2}, DO and MR, the complement in Dative for the Romanian language being equated through a complement in the Accusative.

The category of the verb also subjected translators to tries of inspiration and professionalism. In order to express the rich flexion of this grammatical class, the translators were forced to often use contextual synonymous equivalents, some of them modifying the transitivity regime of the verbs, to mandatory or facultative transpositions which implied the syntactic reorganization of the verbal groups and of the entire sentence. There were also situations in which the translators, due to the impossibility of finding a concise and clear correspondent for the French term, simply ignored it: fr. *déboucher*, from phrase (25), is ignored in IP and GM. We believe that this strategy contributes to avoiding a far too complex syntax in the Romanian version. In the following, we will list several examples as to emphasize the differences in translating the class of the verb:

- the gerund/finite verb sentence opposition: *en se promenant*, in phrase (26), becomes *se plimbă*, in VO, and *levant*, from *le soleil levant*, is translated through *care tocmai răsărea*, in DO;

- the equivalence of a verb with a prefix is performed through paraphrasing (verb + adverb construction):

- *il retrouva*, in phrase (27), becomes *găsi earăști*, in VO; *ajunge iar*, in TF and DO; *a ajuns din nou*, in GM;

- the pronominal voice / active voice opposition:

- [...] *comme il s'était porté*, in the same sentence (27) becomes [...] *cum o apucase*, in VC_{1/2}; *cum o luase*, in TF, DO; *cum mersese*, in GM, MR;

- the passive - active voice opposition:

- [...] *sont empreintes*, in phrase (8), is translated through *caracterizează*, in VO;

- changing the verbal category of the verb number, determined by modifications at the level of the nominal group:

- [...] *la poussière se rabattait*, in phrase (18), becomes *nori de praf care se amestecau*, in TF or [...] *l'éclat s'accroissait*, from phrase (27), is equated through *licării creșteau*, in IP.

The pronouns, very frequent in the original text, are the subject of certain clarifications which pertain to the differences between the two systems found in opposition. The lack of subject personal pronoun in the Romanian versions (*Ar fi o greșeală* for *Ce serait une erreur*, in phrase (7)) or the mandatory repetition of the direct object in the relative clause through personal pronoun with a direct object function (*Această provincie dela extremul Europei a descris-o De Gérando, și a visitat-o Élisée Reclus*, in phrase (7), in Victor Onișor) are limitations which have led to syntactic reorganization of the sentences in the Romanian editions.

9. *The perspective of the exposure manners* that we have chosen as a sub-criterion of selection of the corpus of texts has once more shed light on the translation options, in close

relation to the evolution of the literary Romanian language.

a) In the *descriptive fragments*, the agglomeration of nouns (common and proper), adjectives, adverbs, nominal syntagma, in general, is justified by the details that establish the place, time and other circumstances associated to the unfolding events. In such fragments, fine selections of terms used in translation are seen, there where even Jules Verne himself seems to have searched for the most appropriate word (*bon à loger/foarte bine...; bun să; tocmai potrivit; care se potrivea*. Also cf. *colporteur/negustor; marchitan; negustor ambulant* etc.).

b) In the *dialog fragments*, the challenges were mainly constituted, evidently, by the valuation of *dicendi verbs*, especially in exclamative and interrogative structures (fr. *dit-il/rom. întreabă primarul; zise el; întrebă el; a întrebat el*; the item being ignored in TF). However, such structures are interesting on their own, as they render different possibilities of organizing the verbal interactions (offer / counteroffer / re-offer): *Et pour quoi faire?/Şi ce ţie bună? (1892)/Şi ce să fac cu ea?/Şi de ce?/Şi ce face?/Şi la ce-i bună? (2016)*. We can observe the passing from impersonal to personal, in search of a formula that is loyal to the source-language and it fits the spirit of the target-language, at the same time, as can be seen, and the road to modernizing the literary Romanian language.

c) Examples of verbs, of which we have presented only a sample above, return with the entire complexity of the inflected system of the respective grammar class within the contrastive-typological analyses of the narrative-dynamic passages. This time, the relation with the adverbial determinants or that with the circumstantial groups (modals, temporals, locatives, causals etc.) provoke massive changes in the morphosyntactic organization of the phrases. In the renderings of French into Romanian, the grammatical mood, tense change, the voice, personal/impersonal values change, often with significant semantic modifications: *avait quitté/ieşi; ieşise; e părăsit etc.; examinait/examina (1892); urmărea; lumina; cerceta (2017)* and others. This is the reason why we have dedicated an entire subchapter to the verb. The verbal group renders entire structures dynamic, eliciting massive reorganizations in the Romanian texts, more natural, as we look towards the end of the twentieth century. (Still, we should also add that the most recent version is not, in fact, the most adequate to the current use of the literary Romanian language.).

However, from our point of view, the changes in register corresponding to the different exposure manners have justified the changes in translation strategies within the Romanian versions of the novel in question. This is the place of origin of all of these grammatical and lexical-semantic differences which are so interesting for the evolution of the literary Romanian language.

10. We have to mention that, throughout the analysis, we also noted certain misfortunes regarding the quality of the message sent in Romanian. In this respect, we mention the expression *se faire la barbe*, whose meaning is *a se rade* in phrase (11) translated by Victor Onișor through *i se face prea mare*. Gabriel Mălăescu also introduces a semantically ambiguous construction in his version, and that is *şi aşa fac aproape*.

10. The present undertaking has helped us create a larger perspective upon the originality of the Romanian versions. As such, with regards to Mariana Riza's translation, one that is not dated, yet recent in accordance with the elements considered by us, we can say that it, in fact, is a take over of an older version. Our presumption is supported by the numerous

similarities observed between MR and VC_{1/2}, of which we mention the translation of the anthroponym *Franz* in the source text through *Frâncu*, in both target texts, and then the transfer of the toponym *Orgall* through *Gorgan*, the transposition of the participial adjective *montant* through the attributive subordinate *ce sua* and many others.

11. We can thus affirm that the premises according to which the analysis of the Jules Verne translations, as any translation from that period of time, can offer an additional perspective upon the evolution of the literary Romanian language between 1880 - 2017, has proven to be substantiated. As we have shown throughout our paper, the successive translations from Jules Verne reflect the passing from one decisive stage in fixating the supra-dialectal, normative literary Romanian language, to the stage of enriching, diversifying and emphasizing it in diachronic and diastratic versions adequate to the evolution of the Romanian society in the modern and contemporary era.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

I. Surse

Jules Verne, *Le Chateau des Carpathes*, 1892, Paris: Bibliothèque d'éducation et de récréation, J. Hetzel et Cie.

Jules Verne, *Le Chateau des Carpathes*, Oeuvre du domaine public. En lecture libre sur Atramenta.net.

Jules Verne, *Castelul din Carpați. Roman din viața poporului românesc din Ardeal*. Traducere autorizată de Victor Onișor, 1897. Cu o prefață despre Jules Verne – scriitor și scrieri, de Dr. E. Dăianu, Sibiu: "Tipografia", societate pe acțiuni, (VO).

Jules Verne, *Castelul din Carpați*. Traducere de Ion Pas, 1929, București: Editura „Cugetarea” P. C. Georgescu-Delafras, (IP).

Jules Verne, *Castelul din Carpați. Întâmplări neobișnuite. Castelul din Carpați* în traducere de Vladimir Colin. *Întâmplări neobișnuite* în românește de Anghel Chițulescu, 1980. București: Editura „Ion Creangă”, Proiectul RI – Jules Verne 2010, (VC₁).

Jules Verne, *Castelul din Carpați*. În românește de Vladimir Colin, 1992, București: Editura „Universitas”, (VC₂).

Jules Verne, *Castelul din Carpați*. Traducere de Traian Fințescu, 2004, București: Editura Corint, (TF).

Jules Verne, *Castelul din Carpați*. Traducere de Dorina Oprea, 2010, București: Editura Adevărul Holding, (DO).

Jules Verne, *Castelul din Carpați*. Traducere de Gabriel Mălăescu, 2017, București: Editura MondoRo, (GM).

Jules Verne, *Castelul din Carpați*. Traducere de Mariana Riza, s.a., Cluj-Napoca: Editura Tipografia Europontic, (MR).

II. Referințe

ARISTOTEL, *Categorii*. Traducere de Mircea Florian în Aristotel, Organon, vol. I, traducere, studiu introductiv, introduceri și note de Mircea Florian, 1997, București: Editura IRI.

ARISTOTEL, *Topica*. Traducere de Mircea Florian în Aristotel, Organon, vol.II, traducere, studiu introductiv, introduceri și note de Mircea Florian, 1998, București: Editura IRI.

BADEA LUNGU, Georgiana, 2005, *Tendințe în cercetarea traductologică*, Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest.

BADEA LUNGU, Georgiana, 2012, *Mic dicționar de termeni utilizați în teoria și practica traducerii*, Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest.

BARNA, Andrei Petru, 2004, *Receptarea poeziei Lamartiniene în literatura română din secolul al XIX-lea*, Chișinău.

BÂRLEA, Petre Gheorghe, 1998, *Grigore Alexandrescu – un clasic printre romântici*, București: Editura „Stolnicul Cantacuzino”.

BÂRLEA, Petre Gheorghe, 1999, *Contraria Latina – Contraria Romanica*, București: Editura ALL Educațional.

BÂRLEA, Petre Gheorghe; BÂRLEA, Roxana Magdalena, 2000, *Lexicul românesc de origine franceză*, Târgoviște: Editura „Biblioteca”.

BÂRLEA, Petre Gheorghe, 2016, *Traduceri și traducători - Pagini din istoria culturii române*, Iași: Editura Universității ”Alexandru Ioan Cuza”.

BÂRLEA, Petre Gheorghe, „Romanian Language in 1918”, în: *DICE*, 15-2, 2018, pp. 121-130.

BELL, Roger T., 2000, *Teoria și practica traducerii*: Traducere de Cătălina Gazi, București: Editura Polirom.

BOIA, Lucian, 2005, *Jules Verne: Paradoxurile unui mit*, București: Editura Humanitas.

BROWN, Penelope; LEVINSON Stephen C., *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CLERGEAU, Béatrice, *La conquête de l'espace selon Jules Verne, à travers ses deux œuvres: De la Terre à la Lune et Autour de la Lune*, Paris: Bibliothèque d'éducation et de récréation.

CODLEANU, Mioara, 2004, *Implications socio-culturelles dans l'acte traductif: l'adaptation*, Constanța: Editura Ovidius University Press.

CODLEANU, Mioara, 2017, *Interaction verbales et traduction, Domaine roumain-français/ français-roumain*, București: Editura Universitară.

COMPÈRE, Daniel, 2005, *Jules Verne. Parcours d'un oeuvre*, Amiens: Editura Encrage.

CORNEA, Paul, 1966, „Traduceri și traducători în prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea”, în: *De la Alexandrescu la Eminescu*, București: Editura pentru Literatură, pp. 48 sqq.

CRISTEA, Teodora, 1977, *Éléments de grammaire contrastive. Domain français-roumain*, București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

CRISTEA, Teodora, 1982, *Contrastivité et traduction*, București: Editura Universității din București.

CRISTEA, Teodora, 2007, *Stratégies de la traduction*, București: Editura Fundației „România de Mâine”.

DASCĂLU JINGA, Laurenția; POP Liliana (coord.), 2003, *Dialogul în româna vorbită*, București: Editura Oscar Print.

DIMISIANU, Gabriel, „Cronică literară: Jules Verne și românii”, în *România literară*, Anul 2005, Nr.19, 18.05.2005.

DOMINTE, Constantin, 2003, *Introducere în teoria lingvistică. Antologie pentru seminarul de Teorie a limbii*, București: Editura Universității din București.

DUBOIS, Jean, 1969, *Langue française. La syntaxe*, Paris: Larousse.

EVSEEV, Ivan, 1974, *Semantica verbului, Categoriile de acțiune, devenire și stare*, Timișoara: Editura Facla.

GAFTON, Alexandru, 2012, *De la traducere la norma literară*, Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”.

GHERMAN, Alin Mihai, „Pe marginea primelor traduceri din Jules Verne în limba română”, în: *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica*, 2007, Alba Iulia, publicat de Universitatea «1 Decembrie».

GHEȚIE, Ion, 1978, *Istoria limbii române literare*, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

GHITĂ, Elena, 1983, „Pentru o definiție a traductemului (II)”, în: *Analele Universității din Timișoara. Seria Științe Filologice*. Volumul 21, pp. 61-67.

GRICE, Herbert Paul, 1989, *Studies in the Way of Words*, London: Harvard University Press Cambridge.

HARPOLD Terry; COMPÈRE Daniel; DEHS Volker, 2015, *Collectionner l'extraordinaire, sonder l'ailleurs. Essais sur Jules Verne en hommage à Jean Michel Margot*, Amiens: Editura Encrage.

HOBANA, Ion, 1995, *Jules Verne în România*, București: Editura Fundației Culturale Române.

HOBANA, Ion, 2004, *Jules Verne – Chipuri, obiceiuri și peisaje românești*, București: Editura PRO.

HOBANA, Ion, 2005, *Jules Verne – chipuri, obiceiuri și peisaje românești*, București: Editura Pro.

IONESCU-RUXĂNDIU, Liliana, 1999, *Conversația. Structuri și strategii*, București: Editura All Educațional.

IONESCU-RUXĂNDIU, Liliana, 1991, *Narațiune și dialog în proza românească – Elemente de pragmatică a textului literar*, București: Editura Academiei Române.

IORGA, Nicolae, 1971, *Istoria învățământului românesc*, București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

JAKOBSON, Roman, 1963, *Essais de linguistique générale*, Paris: Minuit.

LEVINSON, Stephen C., 1983, *Pragmatics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MANOLESCU, Florin, 1980, *Literatura S.F.*, București: Editura UNIVERS.

MĂGUREANU, Anca, 2008, *La sémantique lexicale*, București TUB.

MEILLET, Antoine, 1925, *La Méthode comparative en linguistique historique*, Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.

MOROIANU, Dinu, 1962, *Jules Verne. Oameni de seamă*, București: Editura Tineretului.

MOUNIN, Georges, 1963, *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*, Paris: Maison d'Éditions Gallimard.

MOUNIN, Georges, 1999, *Istoria lingvisticii*. Traducere și postfață Constantin Dominte. București: Editura Peiada.

MUNTEANU, Ștefan; ȚĂRA, Vasile, 1978, *Istoria limbii române literare, Privire generală*, București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

NEGOITĂ, C. N., „Jules Verne și știința. Cu prilejul centenarului său”, în: *Adevărul literar și artistic*, Anul IX, Nr. 389, Duminică 21 Februarie 1932.

NEGRICI, Eugen, 2003, *Literatura română sub comunism*, București: Editura Fundației Pro.

NEWMARK, Peter, 1981, *Approaches to Translation*, New York: Pergamon Press.

PANĂ DINDELEGAN, Gabriela (coord.), 2009, *Dinamica limbii române actuale – Aspecte gramaticale și discursivee*, București: Editura Academiei Române.

PANĂ DINDELEGAN, Gabriela (coord.), 2016, *Gramatica de bază a limbii române, (GBLR)* București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold.

PEIRCE, Charles Sanders, 1932, *Collected Papers*, vol. II, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

POLET, Jean Claude, 1999, *Patrimoine littéraire européen: Vol. 11B – Renaissances nationales et conscience universelle* (Anthologie en langue française), Paris, Bruxelles: De Book Université.

POTTIER, Bernard, 1964, „Vers une semantique moderne”, în: *Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature de Strasbourg*, II.

RIEGEL, Martin; PELLAT, Jean-Christophe; RIOUL, René, 1994, *Grammaire méthodique du français*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de, 1967, *Cours de linguistique générale*, Paris: Editura Payot & Rivages.

Cf. și SAUSSURE, Ferdinand de, 1998, *Curs de lingvistică generală*. Traducere și cuvânt înainte de Irina Izverna Tarabac, Iași: Editura Polirom.

SĂVEANU, Simion, 1980, *Pe urmele lui Jules Verne în România*, București: Editura Albatros.

ŞERBĂNESCU, Anca, „Construcții scindate”, în: *LR*, XXXV, 1986, nr. 1, pp. 3-10.

STEINER, George, 1983, *După Babel. Aspecte ale limbii și traducerii*. Traducere de Valentin Negoită și Stefan Avădanei, București: Editura Univers.

TODI, Aida, 2001, *Elemente de sintaxă românească veche*, Pitești: Editura Paralela 45.

TOURATIER, Christian, 2000, *La sémantique*, Paris: Armand Colin.

UNGUREANU, Victoria, 2013, *Teoria traducerii*, Universitatea de Stat „Alecu Russo”, Bălți.

VASILESCU, Andra, 2007, *Cum vorbesc românii: studii de comunicare (inter)culturală*, București: Editura Universității din București.

VINAY, Jean-Paul; DARBELNET, Jean, 1972, *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*, Paris: Éditions Didier.

VINAY, Jean-Paul, DARBELNET, Jean, 1995, *Comparative Stylistics of French and English. A methodology for translation*. Tradusă și editată din limba franceză în limba engleză de Juan C. Sager și M. J. Hamel, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. (Descărcată de pe <https://books.google.ro> (18.01.2018, ora: 19:00).

Limba română contemporană. Semiotica discursului specializat (Note de curs și texte bibliografice selectate de prof. univ. dr. Adriana Stoichițoiu-Ichim), 2006, București: EUB.

Limba franceză contemporană. Semantică lexicală (Note de curs de conf. univ. dr. Anca Cosăceanu), 2004, București: EUB.

Teoria limbii. Structuralismul lingvistic. Texte bibliografice selectate de conf. univ. dr. Andra Vasilescu, 2003, București: EUB.

III. *Dicționare*

Dicționar explicativ al limbii române (DEX), 2016, Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, București: Univers Enciclopedic.

Dicționar ortografic, ortoepic și morfologic al limbii române (DOOM²), ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită, 2010, Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan-Al. Rosetti”, București: Univers Enciclopedic.

CRISTEA, Teodora, CUNIȚĂ, Alexandra (coord.), VIȘAN, Viorel (coord.), 1992, *Dictionnaire roumain-français/ Dicționar român-francez*, București: Editura Babel.

GORUNESCU, Elena, 2006, *Dicționar francez-român*, București: Editura Teora.

GORUNESCU, Elena, 2007, *Dicționar român-francez*, București: Editura Teora.

KERNBACH, Victor, 1983, *Dicționar de mitologie generală*, București: Editura „Albatros”.

NEGREANU, Aristița, 1996, *Franceza de astăzi/ Le français branché - Dicționar francez-român*, București: Editura Humanitas.

Larousse, <http://www.larousse.fr/dictionnaires/francais>, ultima consultare: 23.07.2019, ora 16:00.

ȘÂINEANU, Lazăr, 1908, *Dicționar universal al limbii române*, a opta ediție, revăzut și adaogit la Ediția VI-a, Editura „Scrisul românesc”, www.dacoromanica.ro (Iunie, 2019).

IV. Webgrafie

<http://www.agerpres.ro>, ultima consultare: 15.11.2016, ora: 17:35.

<http://books.openedition.org/>, ultima consultare: 22.11.2016, ora: 21:00.

<http://carte.superfit.ro/html/editura.html>, ultima consultare: 21.07.2017, ora 9:30.

Société Jules Verne. Bulletin de la Société Jules Verne (05/1936) – Sursa: gallica.bnf.fr /Bibliothèque nationale de France.

https://www.cairn.info/article_p.php?ID_ARTICLE=RFLA_082_07

http://cle.ens-lyon.fr/fichiers/grammairegenerative_1220433181896.pdf?lang=fr, „La Grammaire Générative” în: *La grammaire générative et transformationnelle: bref historique*, ultima consultare: 26.06.2019, ora 18:00.

<http://juniors.chez-alice.fr/dossiers/verne/verne.htm>, ultima consultare: 21.11.2016, ora: 20:00.

<https://la-conjugaison.nouvelobs.com>, ultima consultare: 20.07.2019, ora 16:00.

<http://www.lexpress.fr>, ultima consultare 10.07.2017, ora 23:30.

<http://montaiguvendee.fr>, ultima modificare: 7.07.2017, ora: 20:00.

www.orizonturiculturne.ro/ro_studii_Alberto_Bramati.html, „Cele patru probleme ale «traducătorului literiei»: lexicală, gramaticală, retorică și ritmică”, Alberto Bramati, în: *Orizonturi culturale italo-române*, revistă interculturală bilingvă, ISSN 2240-9645, ultima consultare: 7.03.2018, ora: 20:00.

http://www.persee.fr/doc/roman_0048-8593_1997_num_27_96_3230, ultima consultare: 2.12.2016, ora 23:00.

www.rador.ro/2015/03/24/portret-jules-verne-calatorie-extraordinară-prin-viata, ultima consultare: 7.07.2017, ora: 19:00.

<https://www.scribd.com/doc/294645570/Teoria-traducerii>, *Teoria traducerii. Théoriser la traduction*, 12.01.2018, ora 7:00.

<https://universulcărtiilor.wordpress.com/anti-babel/constantin-frosin-„traducerea-ca-dar”/>, Constantin Frosin, ”Traducerea ca dar”, în revista *Universul cărtiilor. Scriitori despre cărțile lor*.

<https://uvadoc.uva.es/bitstream/10324/23216/1/TFM-O%2020.pdf> (Michel Ballard),
29.01.2018, ora 16:00.

<https://ro.wikipedia.org>, (Enciclopedie liberă), *Listă de traduceri în limba română ale operelor lui Jules Verne*, ultima consultare: 7.06.2017, ora 19:00.

https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bibliografia_lui_Jules_Verne, ultima consultare: 17.07.2017, ora 16:00.

https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jacques_Arago#cite_ref-vppo_1-0, ultima consultare: 8.07.2017, ora: 17:30).

https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jules_Verne, (Enciclopedie liberă), ultima consultare: 7.11.2016, ora 22:00.

https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/List%C4%83_de_traduceri_%C3%AEn_limba_rom%C3%A2n%C4%83_ale_operelor_lui_Jules_Verne#cite_ref-1, ultima consultare: 5.07.2019, ora: 19:00.

<http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roman-negru>, ultima consultare: 4.07.2017, ora: 17:00.