(FEMINIST) TRANSLATORS: VOICELESS AND IN THRALL TO THE AUTHORS?

Alexandra-Maria Vrînceanu

PhD Student, „Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iași

Abstract: This article aims to provide an overview of several key developments in the field of Translation Studies, with respect to feminism. The concept of ideology and the ethics of translation and of translating are tackled as well, as they deal with notions related to faithfulness, be it to the author or to the target readership. Therefore, as certain scholars have pointed out, staying true to the message is paramount, especially when it comes to feminist texts that are experimental and playful in nature. In all fairness, any 'skewing' is not necessarily due to the translators' deliberate intention, rather other factors may be at play, notably the involvement of third parties (editors, reviewers etc.). The second section heads into the realm of voice and (in)visibility, as it deals with the status of the translator and the ideal situation versus the reality of the actual translation market. As such, I also attempt to connect several notions put forth by Translation Studies scholars with actual opinions of literary translators, as collected from online interviews, wherein they were asked about their approach to faithfulness and visibility.

Keywords: ethics, voice, (in)visibility, ideology, fidelity

Feminism and Gender Matters in Translation Studies: Fidelity, Ethics, Ideology

One of the key concepts that feminist translation undertook to redefine was that of "fidelity". A subject that has been thoroughly exhausted throughout the entire history of Translation Studies, from the well-known age of the "belles infidelles" of the 17th century, when translators went to great lengths and took many liberties with the source texts in order to 'beautify' the translations and make then appealing to the general public. Not unlike the feminist translators who appeared much later, these translators even went so far as to take out entire excerpts or terms from the text, depending on the *zeitgeist*, the audiences' preferences and what was deemed to be scandalous.

As such, feminist translators sought to make their presence known for other reasons, more ideological in nature, not merely esthetic. Thus, in her 1992 article titled "Writing in No Man's Land: Questions of Gender and Translations", Susan Bassnett writes of the many scholars attempting to incorporate the concept of 'cultural difference', forsaking the binary notion of masculine-feminine, father-mother (64). After the recognition of this concept, feminist thinkers began to worry about its nature and "[…] whether its use led to an androcentric or imperialistic 'othering'" (Olesen 276). That being said, feminist translation veers away from Schleiermacher's notions of either bringing the reader toward the writer or, vice-versa, of bringing the writer toward the reader, and focuses instead on the writing project, the participants of which are the translator and the writer alike (Simon 2).

In spite of the rise and groundbreaking developments of feminist translation theory and practices, numerous translation scholars still refuse "[…] to accept feminist translation as anything more than an extreme form of manipulation" (Wallmach 285). In view of the abundance of adjectives used for describing their undertakings, such as 'extreme' or 'radical', feminist theorists such as Canadian professor and translator Barbara Godard wore them like a badge of honor, stating that the feminist translator "[…] flaunts the signs of her manipulation

of the text" (Godard 50). Therefore, the translator 'womanhandles' (a clever pun meant to flip 'manhandling' on its head and give it a positive connotation) the source text, abandoning the 'invisible' mantle of the mousy translator and becoming "[…] an active participant in the creation of meaning" (50).

With the emergence of the Cultural Turn in the field of Translation Studies, the scholars turned their gaze toward the manner in which translations are shaped not only by the culture itself, but also by ideology or politics, gender identity etc. (Dimitriu, *Cultural Turn* 15). If we are to consider the hotly-debated topic of the use of the term 'gender', some scholars have come to the conclusion that translation concerns the "[…] differences of attributed meaning within, as well as across cultural boundaries" (von Flotow and Scott 358).

Looking at the tandem of gender and translation, another "tired" trope is that of women seen as secondary to men, therefore in need of transposing, or rather, 'translating' their own experiences and language "[…] into some form of the dominant patriarchal discourse" (von Flotow, *Translation and Gender* 12). As Lori Chamberlain best expresses it in her 1988 article "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation", feminist translation theory and practice sought to challenge such dichotomies the likes of the source text perceived as the 'original' (masculine) and the translation seen as 'derivative' (feminine) (455). Scholars reject these binary oppositions, and claim that translation and writing are intertwined, therefore one cannot come into being without the other (Bassnett 65). However, the consensus is that the translator should be seen as neither here, nor there, rather as an 'in-betweener', not just a filter that expels the text through the side, but a creative presence (70). Therefore, that creative energy may manifest itself in various ways 'immodestly' as Godard puts it, be it through the use of italics, translator's comments or in the preface (Godard 50). Granted, one must point out the fact that Godard's translator is more radical in nature (Bassnett 68).

"Text is the and between reader and the writer", writes Kathy Mezei (24), and this is precisely where the translator makes their presence known, as they are "[…] both a reader (and interpreter of the source text) and a writer (of the target text) (25). This idea ties in nicely with Myriam Diaz-Diocaretz' stance when it comes to rendering feminist discourse (and ideology) in translation, as the translator must be aware of the means in which the author challenges certain "[…] already established and received ideological structures, and the preexistent norms and values" (Diaz Diocaretz 153). This brings to mind Venuti's (*The Scandals* 1) famous words about flouting "[…] the authority of dominant cultural values and institutions", even though he is referring to translation in general.

Thus, especially when it comes to feminist texts, where the (often experimental) style and message are paramount, there must be an unspoken 'understanding' between writer and translator, so as not to "betray the message" (Diaz Diocaretz 156). As translators, we should be painfully aware of the fact that any changes, no matter how insignificant they may seem (even a simple modulation or distribution change) bear impact on both the form and the message that comes with it. It follows that such texts require that the translator do the message justice. Naturally, this begs the question: What happens when it is the other way around? What options does the feminist translator have when faced with the text that is either outright misogynistic or one that exhibits sexist undertones? It must be said, however, that this does not mean that, as translators, it is mandatory that we adhere to the authors' ideologies, just that it is our duty to recognize said ideologies, be they subtle or overtly challenging norms and structures, and to render them in translation, so that the readers may judge for themselves. Granted, if we are to veer into the realm of interventionist strategies, that is another discussion altogether.

This matter ties into the ethics of the translator, namely the 'moral' or 'ethical' code each translator adheres to. This brings the discussion around to the notions of faithfulness and

accuracy. But Henri Meschonnic (35) asks: "faithful to what?" and bids that the translator beware the difference between 'langue' and 'language'. It is important to note that ethics in this context is not thought of in its social dimension, rather "[…] as the pursuit of a subject striving to contribute itself through its activity, but where the activity of the subject is the activity by which another subject constitutes itself" (35). It therefore stands to reason that the feminist translator must be aware of the fact that he/she is translating not just the meaning itself, but also the power behind the author's words (Meschonnic 36).

Naturally, sometimes the translator may be met with somewhat of a resistance from the target language and culture, "to the ultimate logic of denaturalization", namely that notion as old as time that even the meaning of man and woman is socially determined (von Flotow and Scott 360). When it comes to an ethics of translating, particularly in ideologically-charged cases such as feminist texts, the element of thinking, of reason on the part of the translator comes into play, and one thinks of Meschonnic's notion that "[…] thinking means acting on society or it is nothing" (56). Seeing as feminist discourse is often experimental in nature, even ludic in the way in which it flouts the patriarchal norms and seeks to take back terms that were given negative connotations, feminist translators have to resort to ingenious strategies, provided that they have grasped the message behind the words, in order to render that same action.

It must be said, however, that potential altering, changes due to various translation strategies, be they syntactic, semantic or pragmatic, do not necessarily stem from deliverable intentions on the part of the translator; this is what Ian Mason calls "[…] a deliberate skewing" (33). Instead, other factors may be at play, namely the norms imposed by the publishing house depending on the target culture and the readers' tastes and anticipated reactions. For instance, in the case of feminist writings, these may be "taboo" topics for the more "conservative" societies. Such is the case of Romania since the 1990s, where there has been an openness toward literary works that are perceived as more 'extreme', 'shocking' or 'experimental' in nature. This was the case after the fall of Communism, thus an end to cultural and artistic oppression and censorship. Still, the road ahead is long in this respect, and feminist discourse in Romania has not managed to break through into the mainstream save for a few exceptions. The attempts made by writers such as author and translator Magda Cârneci translating Canadian feminist author Nicole Brossard's *Installations* (a collection of poems) into Romanian as *Instalări* for Paralela 45 publishing house serve to showcase this. The translator/writer herself explains this, stating how she was inspired to produce a Romanian translation of the works from the mind of an iconic feminist writer (Brossard) in order to bring these *niche* writings to the target audience in Romania. Those 'taboo' topics which include sexual pleasure, women's bodies and identities, the sense of self in a male-dominated world are still deemed to be somewhat 'shocking' for the readers. Paradoxically, when it comes to literary works by male authors (the case of famous writers like Charles Bukowski or Saul Bellow), whose works have been translated into Romanian, the translators (regardless of their gender) sometimes resort to strategies of over-attenuation or over-explicitation when it comes to vulgar terms. Such strategies may have an impact on the disparaging tone employed by the narrator, sometimes distorting what was said, even to a comedic effect. That being said, this brings the debate in somewhat "muddy" waters with respect to the translator's 'freedom'.

Translators: Invisible and Voiceless?

The following section will deal with the ever-present notion that translators are perceived as being 'in thrall' or secondary to the authors, forever catering to their every need and forsaking their own voice in the process. As such, I will briefly discuss some derogatory notions with respect to the translator's position that were popular belief for a long time, as well as a 'double standard' in this respect emphasized by scholars such as Lori Chamberlain.

The matter of the visibility and voice of the (woman) translator will also be explored in depth, by means of comparing and contrasting the opinions expressed by various scholars, while also touching upon ethics and ideology, and how these factors tie into the grand scheme of things. I will attempt to draw parallels between more theoretical notions and the reality of the translation market by means of several interviews wherein Romanian literary translators make their stances known as regards the translator's position and visibility (or lack thereof) in the translated text.

It seems as though translators are destined to be perceived as acting in service of the author, forever putting him/her first; as translator Vali Florescu said in an interview: "[…] your ultimate ego will be to become invisible, and let only the author come through" [my own translation from the Romanian article] (Camelia, "Interviu cu Vali Florescu"). Therefore, it seems that the translation market (publishing houses and the editors, the target readership and their perceived tastes and preferences) has the power to shape views in this respect.

The matter revolving around the status of the (female) translator is also a prevalent one, in terms of two major factors, namely visibility and voice. For instance, in the case of several feminist short stories by Denise Desautels, Louise Desjardins or Anne-Marie Alonzo (*Ritual*, *Shattering Realities*, *The Archeologist*) in French, which appeared in Canadian feminist journal *Tessera*, the English translations penned by feminist translator and author Susanne de Lotbiniere-Harwood are a perfect example that serves to showcase just that: the voice of the feminist translator is almost palpable. Such texts carrying feminist ideology and translated by feminist translators are often the product of a '*collaboration in the feminine',* as pointed out by Barbara Godard, as there is a close connection and cooperation between author and translator; as such, they sometimes even entail liberties and interventions on the part of the translator. It is worth mentioning that feminist-oriented criticism was acutely aware of this 'invisibility' imposed on feminist (and female) translators, and sought to respond by means of making their presence known through strategies such as interventions, additions, explicitations and others. In her essay titled *The Visibility of the Woman Translator,* Eleonora Federici uses an excellent analogy, stating that translators are considered to 'echo' the author's words, but given the fact that they are echoes, "[…] they work as refraction and sound different; in this way, they are visible" (Federici 80). This ties in nicely with Susan Bassnett's definition of otherness, "[…] as the translator has to take into account not only the foreigness of the culture in which the source text is embedded, but other issues, more properly described as ideological" (*Translation, Gender and Otherness* 83). When pondering the idea of the feminist translator making her voice heard, one thinks back to the Canadian pioneers of feminist translation, who proudly flaunted their 'womanhandling' of the text (as Godard put it). With respect to such interventions on the part of feminist translators it must be stressed that they are not simply gratuitous, rather "solicited and oriented by the text itself" (Federici 85).

The concept of the "cultural mind" (Simeoni 2) is brought into focus when it comes to the translators' ideologies and beliefs (as well as their training and experience). This corresponds to a great extent to Antoine Berman's model of translation criticism, namely "the translator's horizon" (Berman 63), in reference to the parameters (be they cultural, historical, etc. in nature) that determine one's manner of thinking and, thus, of translating.

For instance, one cannot help but wonder, in keeping with the realities on the translation market, whether if, should the translator take some liberties in terms of how he/she reacts to certain parts of a text which may be sexist or misogynistic in nature that the editor would not approve of, the translator in question would amend his/her strategies according to the norms imposed by the publishing house, forsaking his/her belief system. Therefore, it stands to reason that, more often than not, apart from those cases where the translator sets out

'to make a splash' or to make his/her voice known through a statement of sorts[1], translators must observe certain aspects that are more mundane in nature, and attempt to keep their personal ideology "out of it". However, that does not mean that more subtle or 'covert' strategies cannot make their way into a translation, far from it. As put by Simeoni, sometimes at least, "Norms have the upper hand" (6).

The conventions adhered to in the target culture must also be borne in mind: the topic, the type of publication, the text type; it is worth mentioning that these may lead to a change in register (Dimitriu, "I am coming back" 5). As such, for instance, when it comes to the Romanian translations of several works by Charles Bukowski and Saul Bellow, the publishing house (Polirom, for the most part) may sometimes enforce a higher/laxer degree of formality, depending on the perceived taste and expectations of the Romanian reader.

In an interview given in 2014, Romanian translator Vali Florescu (who translated *Henderson, the Rain King* by Saul Bellow – *Henderson, regele ploii*, 2007, Polirom) was asked about how difficult she finds it to stay true to the author's style, rhythm and 'essence'. She replied that it is all about finding the right balance between translator's own style and 'craftsmanship' and avoiding the risk that unwittingly, you may "rewrite" the text, embellishing it. "When I start to translate, it's as if someone gave me their most prized possession" [my translation from Romanian]. Moreover, in this translator's view, "[…] the writer is vulnerable, you must make him/her the best Romanian version they can be" (Camelia, "Interviu cu Vali Florescu"). Therefore, this can be taken to mean that she adheres to the notion that the translator is "in service" to the author, working tirelessly to bring their voice to a target audience. A common belief, to be sure, as stated before, seldom can a translator afford to take a more ideologically motivated stance and make drastic changes. Florescu also makes a more dramatic assertion, in that she believes that "[…] your ultimate ego will be to become invisible, and let only the author come through" [my translation from Romanian]. It can therefore be inferred that this translator adheres to Schleiermacher's view of bringing the reader to the writer, leaving the latter unperturbed.

As such, it is clear that some translators believe that they must be ever faithful to the author's voice, forsaking their own: "The writer is a vulnerable being, and the way his/her work is presented depends on you, as you are the alpha and the omega [….]. You must become invisible. […]. It is very likely that, for all your efforts, few readers will even remember your name" [my translation from Romanian] (Camelia, "Interviu cu Vali Florescu"). However, scholars like Theo Hermans do warn translators to bear in mind that there is an established rule or balance when it comes to how translations are perceived: "[…] to let in plural voices means destabilizing and decentring the speaking subject" (Hermans 44). Thus, a preliminary conclusion can be inferred, namely that, even if it is not perceived by an uninitiated target reader, the translator's voice is there, just beyond the limelight, and certain ideological stances and preferred strategies can almost always be identified.

Naturally, there is no right or wrong course of action insofar as this matter is concerned, as a translator cannot (nor should he/she) be faulted for staying true to the author's intended tone and imagery (sexist or misogynistic though it may be), irrespective of his/her ideology and beliefs. This doesn't necessarily mean that the translator should completely forsake his/her own voice in favor of the author's (as Vali Florescu stated), nor that he/she should take unjustified liberties just for the sake of it, merely that, as far as he/she is able to, given certain restraints imposed by the editor/publishing house, perhaps find a middle ground between ideology and the actual imagery and tone present in the text.

[1] An eye-opening example is Emily Wilson, the first woman who re-translated The *Odyssey* into English and made some changes by means of which she sought to prove the gender bias existing at the time when the translations were produced (by male translators).

In "The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative" (1996), Theo Hermans tackles this notion as an analogy involving former Soviet leader Boris Yeltsin: we are reading the translator's voice and words, but we really wish to find out what the author says, therefore the translator "[…] is as no more than a minor distraction" (23). At the other end of the spectrum, there are, of course, those feminist and often experimental writings wherein translators are actually strongly encouraged to take as many liberties as they wish and resort to various strategies, more or less "extreme", in order to fully convey the message that the author intended and achieve the "similarity of effect" Eugene Nida spoke of.

Moreover, the "[…] translation never coincides with its source, it is not identical or equivalent" (Hermans 24). Of course, it is somewhat more clear-cut as far as specialized translations are concerned, where the focus is on the content, but as far as literary texts and translations go, the matter becomes more complex, as we veer in the realm of the 'subjective'. In such cases, the concepts of 'voice' and 'visibility', namely the presence of the translator in the TT, subjectivize translation, as opposed to the norms that seek to generalize and uniformize it (Dimitriu, "I am coming back" 11).

As such, I have ascertained that it is only in certain cases that the translator's 'voice' makes itself known (that "presence" Hermans was referencing). Therefore, the "surfacing" of the translator's own voice and visible presence can be attributed to certain ideological factors having to do with feminist notions or reactions to misogynistic or sexist imagery. Thus, when adopting a comparative perspective over the source and target text, the analyst must determine: Have the translators been "good" in the sense that they have made themselves scarce, their sole purpose being only to make the author's words and nothing but come through? Or, perhaps, they have diverged from the text in certain ways, via specific strategies and for identifiable, or at least guessable – based on evidence – reasons?

The discussion revolving around the concept of 'voice' also brings us to the matter of 'authorship'/'ownership' of the text, and the longstanding prejudices against literary translators. More precisely, over the years, translators' skills have been subjected to scrutiny and doubt: "Shouldn't they be artists/writers/poets themselves in order to accurately render the imagery?" There are plenty of examples of authors translating other authors in their target language; for example, Radu Paraschivescu, a Romanian writer in his own right, translated works by Salman Rushdie, Kazuo Ishiguro, Jonathan Coe, David Lodge, Nick Hornby, among others.

Any which way we choose to analyze the matter, the fact remains that the margin of creativity assumed by the translator is narrow (with varying degrees). Lest we should forget, the work is still the intellectual brain-child of a certain author and the matter of ethics comes into play here. As such, the translator has no right over the source text, "[…] the most they can do is represent the source text and make authenticity claims about their representational work" (Flynn 14). Moreover, from a realistic standpoint, it is well worth mentioning that most contracts translators sign with publishing houses (at least in Romania) have them waive their rights over the translation. Their rights mostly have to do with their right to get paid, to have their name featured on the title page, as well as other such aspects once they hand it over to the editor.

In reference to the notion of ideology in translation, this seems to be intertwined with concepts such as the 'stance' and 'position' adopted by the translator. Moreover, one of the most important aspects pointed out by scholars, as far as the overlap between Translation Studies and gender matters, is that "of ideology and the struggle to control meaning" (von Flotow and Scott 368). As such, in some cases, "[…] translation is manipulated by the ideology of the socio-cultural context" (Munday 150). Similar to Sherry Simon's view that the translator is more than a filter that expels the message through to the other side, rather a creative presence that intervenes on the text to a certain extent (Simon 37), professor Maria

Tymoczko states that "[…] the ideology of a translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in its relevance to the receiving audience" (Tymoczko 183). That is to say, the 'voicing and stance' she refers to are reflected in the translation strategies and methods adopted, in interviews and prefaces. Moreover, the 'relevance' could refer to the publishing house catering to the readership's tastes: more vulgar language or, on the contrary, attenuation or even rendering the imagery more humorous. For instance, in a Romanian translation of Charles Bukowski's 1975 novel *Factotum* ("Factotum", translated by Domnica Drumea for Polirom 2004), the narrator describes a woman's morning ritual, and 'poop' is rendered in Romanian by translator Dominica Drumea as "trase cîteva pîrțuri" (p. 107). Therefore, if the source text adopts a realistic style, the translation comes across as humorous and somewhat ridicules the female character; it is important to note that this nuance is not present in the source text.

There is another aspect worthy of mentioning with respect to Venuti's notions, and that is his call on translators to resort to "marginalized" methods of translating (could be referring to feminist translation strategies) by choosing certain "[…] texts that are marginal in their own home cultures" (Emmerich 200). Such is the case of feminist texts in particular, for instance Florica Courriol and Sean Cotter translating Magda Cârneci's Romanian feminist novel *FEM* into French and English, respectively; as mentioned beforehand, feminist writing still has a hard time breaking through into the mainstream in Romania, therefore it is definitely perceived as a *niche*.

Researchers seem to have reached a consensus with respect to the fact that the notion of 'voice' is interspersed with concepts such as 'style', 'visibility/invisibility', the translator's 'presence in the text' and others (Alvstad 207). Other scholars view the translator's presence as the voice that permeates through and speaks to the target readership, rather than that of the author, for the translator renders the author's voice, or rather "[…] re-utters the previous speech act" (Alvstad 207). This is similar to the view expressed by Sherry Simon, that the translator can be seen as a 'mediator', leaving his/her own work, a 'creative filter' through which the text passes. At times, this 'illusion' that we, as readers, are hearing the author's voice directly, is shattered by devices such as translator's notes or footnotes.

When discussing Venuti's (1995) concept of the translator's invisibility, two equally important concepts are brought to the fore: 'domestication' and 'foreignization'. As such, parallels may be drawn between these notions and Schleiermacher's famous two pronged approach: a fluent and natural text that does not read like a translation and brings the writer to the reader, so that the latter is undisturbed, as opposed to a text that 'flaunts' its 'foreignness' protecting it from the ideological dominance of the target culture (Munday 144-145). In this sense, the Romanian translation market favors a 'domesticating' style, attempting not to disturb the readership as much as possible, and providing them with a 'covert' translation for the most part, save for the odd footnote or place names that signal to the reader that he/she is "not in Kansas anymore". At the other end of the spectrum, feminist translations are almost akin to Bible translations, in that the translator sticks incredibly close to the style and message of the author.

There seems to exist a consensus among Romanian translators (men and women alike), namely that the translator must remain invisible at all costs. For instance, when interviewed for "Revista de Traduceri Literare" (*The Literary Translation Magazine of the Romanian Writers' Union*), Luana Schidu, a Romanian literary translator who brings both English and Russian works to Romanian audiences, had this to say about staying true to the source text: "The original has a certain tone, one that I certainly strive to render as such. […] I believe that it is a matter of flair (being in tune with the language itself, the context, the text, the author's voice, etc.)" [my own translation from Romanian] (Schidu, "Traducerea a devenit pentru mine un mod de a fi"). Moreover, the same translator expresses an opinion

that I believe echoes and resonates with most Romanian literary translators (myself included). Thus, when asked how she manages to 'adopt' a certain style in order for the translation to be successful, she answers that "What I attempt to render in Romanian is exactly what the original text sounds like in my head. At times, I am tempted to force a comparison to the manner in which an Oracle speaks, as I feel like I turn into a mere transmission channel. Of course that there is more to it than that. It involves knowledge of the culture, of the author, etc." The same translator urges that translators "[…] be faithful to the text as much as possible, to never give into the temptation to embellish it, to translate it as is, faulty though it may be" [my own translation from Romanian]. The self-referential nature of this paragraph has not escaped my notice, as I have attempted to render this translator's opinions on faithfulness to the source text and the author's voice as faithfully as possible.

I believe that this is, in a nutshell, the creed that Romanian translators on the market adhere to. As mentioned before, realistically speaking, a (Romanian) translator is under contract and is held to certain obligations. Moreover, the editor and/or the other agents from the publishing house have the last say in regard to the final draft that goes to print. The adjective 'faulty' that the translator quoted above uses carries weight, as it may refer to many aspects with the potential to prove problematic: sexist and misogynistic undertones and a disparaging and derogatory language and imagery with respect to women.

Coming back to the other literary agents working on the translation after the translator submits it for review, the translators themselves admit that the editors intervene without their knowledge. In a 2019 interview given to the same *Romanian Magazine of Literary Translations*, experienced Romanian translator and Professor Liviu Cotrău, whose life's work revolves around translating E.A. Poe's works (and not only) into Romanian, states that "[…] generally, I requested that the versions reviewed by the editors from the publishing house be sent back to me for revision, but such interventions have sometimes made their way into my translations" [my own translation from Romanian] (Borgovan, "Eu cred că"). Naturally, it is the translator's prerogative to ask that the publishing house send him/her the text for revision in order to see whether changes have been made but, in the end, it all depends on the publishing house, which has the final say if a consensus cannot be reached.

Another aspect of vital importance when it comes to the translator's presence in the text comes in the form of the "deforming tendencies" identified by translation scholar Antoine Berman ("Translation and the Trials of the Foreign" in Munday 147). Among these tendencies, she most pervasive ones would be: clarification and expansion, that seek to over-explicitate and 'feed' the readers additional information, ennoblement (that tendency that certain translators are aware of and try to overcome, an urge to embellish the text), thus affecting the orality of the text, the destruction of underlying networks of signification (words that, together, bear significance), the destruction of vernacular networks (speech and language patterns that get 'lost in translation' or are replaced with a target language equivalent in slang or vernacular) or the destruction of expressions and idioms (Berman advocates against using target language equivalents).

The translator's reliability (Dimitriu, "I am coming back" 3) ties into the matter as well, as some choices may not stem from a conscious or ideological choice, rather a linguistic one, perhaps, or they may have to do with more prosaic reasons: taste of the *zeitgeist*, norms of the publishing house, etc. A 'thorny' matter could be the fact that the translator is sometimes faced with a conundrum: staying true to the author's voice and style, while also making sure that the target readership will respond to the text. This is where shifts of emphasis, slight changes in register or a more humorous language may come in and play a part. An antithesis is apparent here, in that translators can often caught between a rock and a hard place: to change or to adhere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alvstad, Cecilia. "Voices in translation." *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, J. Benjamins, 2013, pp. 207-211.

Bassnett, Susan. "Writing in no man's Land: Questions of Gender and Translation." *Ilha do Desterro*, No. 28, 1992, pp. 63-73. PDF file.

--- "TRANSLATION, GENDER AND OTHERNESS" *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, Vol. 13, No.2, 2005.

Berman, Antoine. *Toward a Translation Criticism: John Donne*, trans. Françoise Massardier-Kenney, The Kent State University Press. Kent. Ohio, 2009.Print.

Bukowski, Charles. *Factotum*. Polirom, Iași, transl. by Domnica Drumea, 2004.

Chamberlain, Lori. "Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation" *Signs*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Spring, 1988), pp. 454-472, The University of Chicago Press.

Diaz-Diocaretz, Myriam.*Translating Poetic Discourse: Questions on Feminist Strategies in Adrienne Rich*, John Benjamins, 1985. Print.

Dimitriu, Rodica. *The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies*. Institutul European.Iași, 2006.Print.

----- "'I am coming back to where I started. I am sure you won't believe it!' On Translating E. A. Nida's Voice." *Translating the Voices of Theory*, edited by Isabelle Génin and Ida Klitgård, Montréal: Editions québécoises de l'oeuvre, 2015, pp. 63-88. PDF file.

Emmerich, Karen R. "Visibility (and invisibility)."*Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, J. Benjamins, 2013, pp. 200-207.

Federici, Eleonora. "The Visibility of the Woman Translator." *Translating Gender*, edited by Eleonora Federici, Peter Lang Publishers, University of Ottawa Libraries, 2011.

Flotow, Luise von. *Translation and gender - Translation in the Era of Feminism*. St. Jerome Publishing.Ottawa, 1997. Print.

Flotow, Luise von and Joan W. Scott. "Gender studies and translation studies: Entre braguette – connecting the transdisciplines." *Border Crossings Translation studies and other disciplines*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, vol. 126, 2016, John Benjamins. Print.

Flynn, Peter. "Author and translator." *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, J. Benjamins, 2013, pp. 12-20.

Godard, Barbara. "Theorizing Feminist Discourse / Translation". *Tessera*, Apr. 1989. ISSN 1923-9408.PDF file.

Hermans, Theo. "The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative." *Target*, 8:1 (1996), 23-48. DOI 10.1075/target.8.1, John Benjamins Publishing Company. PDF file.

Mason, Ian. "Discourse, Ideology and Translation." *Language, Discourse and Translation in the West and Middle-Eas*t, edited by de Beaugrande Robert, et al., Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1994, pp. 23-34.

Meschonnic, Henri. *Ethics and Politics of Translating*. Translated and edited by Pier-Pascale Boulanger, John Benjamins, Concordia University, 2011. Print.

Mezei, Kathy. *Reading as Writing /Writing as Reading the reader and the decline of the writer / or the rise and fall of the slash*. Translated by Christine Dufresne, *Tessera*, Vol. 2, 1985.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies, Theories and Applications*, 2008, Routledge, second edition. Print.

Olesen, Virginia. "Feminist Qualitative Research in the Millennium's First Decade: Developments, Challenges, Prospects". *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Sage, 2018. Print.

Simeoni, Daniel. "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus." *Target*, 10:1 (1998), 1-39, York University (Toronto), DOI 10.1075/target.l0.1.02sim ISSN 0924-1884 / E-ISSN 1569-9986 © John Benjamins Publishing Company. PDF file.

Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation*.Routledge, 1996. Print.

Tymoczko, Maria. "Ideology and the Position of the Translator In What Sense is a Translator 'In Between'?." *Apropos of Ideology Translation Studies on Ideology – Ideologies in Translation Studies*, edited by María Calzada Pérez, Routledge, 2003, pp. 181- 203. Print.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation, Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.

--- *The Translator's Invisibility*. Routledge, 1995. Print.

Wallmach, Kim. "Feminist Translation: A First Exploration" *Language Matters*, 27:1, 284-311, 1996.

Electronic sources

Borgovan, Doina. "Liviu Cotrău: Eu cred că traducătorul trebuie să rămână invizibil." *Filiala București – Traduceri Literare (FITRALIT)* – Uniunea Scriitorilor Din România, Nr. 45-46 iulie-august 2019, 8 Sept. 2019, www.fitralit.ro/31-08-2019-liviu-cotrau-eu-cred-ca-traducatorul-trebuie-sa-ramana-invizibil/. Date accessed June 14 2022.

Camelia."Interviu cu Vali Florescu."*Cărți cu suflet*. January 9 2014.https://www.carticusuflet.ro/interviu-cu-vali-florescu/ . Date accessed June 19 2022.

Schidu, Luana. "Luana Schidu: „Traducerea a Devenit Pentru Mine Un Mod De a Fi."." *Filiala București – Traduceri Literare (FITRALIT) – Uniunea Scriitorilor Din România*, 4 Apr. 2019, www.fitralit.ro/31-03-2019-luana-schidu-traducerea-a-devenit-pentru-mine-un-mod-de-a-fi/. Date accessed June 19 2022.