BOOK REVIEW:
PUNGĂ, LOREDANA. APPROACHES TO ENGLISH AND ROMANIAN IN USE, SZEGED: JATE PRESS, 2017, ISBN 9789633153512. 210 P.

FELIX NICOLAU
Lund University, Sweden

Approaches to English and Romanian in Use, Loredana Pungă's book, is a matter-of-fact, specialized approach to a number of linguistic phenomena and realities. Chapter 1 represents the warm-up for a complex cross-linguistic approach, chapter 2 discusses the translation solutions in the case of one classic fairy tale and two politically correct fairy-tale collections, whereas the third focuses on instances of language usage from a cognitive linguistics point of view.

Not long ago, there used to be a great fuss about English borrowings into Romanian (remember, for example, George Pruteanu's interventions in the Parliament asking that all public messages delivered in a foreign language should be translated into Romanian). Without echoing this kind of fuss, but rather adopting a well-balanced stance as to the borrowing phenomenon, Loredana Pungă takes a keen look at some Romanian glossy magazines where she spots interesting facts connected to words of English origin imported into Romanian. Thus, she records that the boundaries between oral and written communication have been effaced, that teenagers and youngsters created their idiolect sprinkled with Anglicisms (this *teenspeak* involves code switching too), this Anglomania being an elitist rampart (among so many other elites). The hospitality of Romanian to English words resulted into the emergence of the hybrid *Romglish* ("romgleză", G. Pruteanu, Law 500/2004), which has become a jargon so well-developed that the researcher could identify its thematic fields.

Some Anglicisms, as Pungă explains following Onysko and Winter-Froemel (2011) proved to be "catachrestic" loanwords, that is, they are, or better said, were necessary as they introduced new concepts in the language (in order to talk about new realities) and later became the first-hand way of referring to those realities (e.g. *software, website, T-shirt, film, PC, pop*, etc). A number of these will remain non-assimilated and end up as "foreignisms" in the host language (e.g. *gloss, board games, shopping*, etc). Loans belong to various grammatical categories and they disclose the permeability of a language and its evolving destiny. Assimilation, instead, comes with a mixture of paradigms, the foreign one + the domestic one, which means, among other things, the use of Romanian inflections with English-origin words (e.g. *fanele, liderilor, un outfit*).

Gender, especially the neuter, is tackled in many ways. Among the numerous situations of assimilation of loans by gender assignment, an interesting one is the derivation of nouns of English origin with Romanian gender-specific suffixes (e.g. *coolgirliţă*).

Anglicisms are categorized on semantic grounds as well. Their meanings may be transparent or, on the contrary, opaque. One line of research that Pungă follows in her book concerns the role of the context in disambiguating the meanings of those words that remain inexplicit when taken in isolation. The way in which authors clarify themselves what Anglicisms they use mean is also of interest to the author: clarification is offered either directly, by a double-gloss, or indirectly, by various means. There are numerous possibilities of effectively integrating

loans in contexts and the researcher sprinkles her book with a wide range of judiciously selected examples of this.

As she notes, many Anglicisms, apart from those perfectly integrated and with zero semantic extension (mostly monosemantic terms like *catwalk, e-mail, online, trendy*), are prone to changes of meaning. Sometimes, polysemantic words suffer restrictions of meaning, contractions from more general to more specific senses. As opposed to these, semantic expansions also occur in the case of English borrowings now part of the Romanian language; they are responsible for loss of intensity in translation (see, in this respect, the examples of *sandwich* and *net* offered by the author).

On the other hand, semantic loans have had their imprint on the existent words in Romanian, which explains enlargement of meaning of some Romanian native words. Cross-linguistic interference generated semantic calques like *chimie, posturi, a complimenta* and so on. Speaking about calques, they may be total, partial, phraseological (e.g. *item de îmbrăcăminte, a ţine prima pagină, a avea fluturaşi în stomac, scheleţi în dulap*).

Pungă discusses, at some length, the uses and misuses of Anglicisms in Romanian. Mainly, loans are forced into domestication (by being placed in post-position to the head noun, for instance). The conclusion here is that there is "bidirectionality in the relationship between the oral and the written use of language" (p. 54). There is also a pragmatic recommendation: "lexical items should be adapted to context-specificity" (ibidem).

Contrastive and error analysis are applied in the area of morphology. Case studies refer to articles, prepositions, and adverbs, but also to grammatical aspect (which is absent in Romanian). When it comes to syntactic errors that native speakers of Romanian seem inclined to make, disobedience of English word order rules (Romanian being more permissive in this respect) comes first. Very interesting remarks are also made about the erroneous use of the subject (which is quite often "legally" omitted in Romanian and this negatively influences Romanians who write in English). When expressing themselves in English, many Romanians tend to omit the object or they fill its slot with a pronoun in a redundant manner. As far as the sequence of tenses is concerned, Romanian is more relaxed than English, which again holds sway on many Romanian natives when they use English.

Lexical-semantic errors are also detailed on. For instance, Romanian students sometimes create "hybrid lexical items with a Romanian-like base and an English derivational or inflectional affix" (p. 80) (e.g. *devorated, particulates*). Cognates in their turn often distract attention from false friends. Another mistake triggered by negative transfer from Romanian as the users' mother tongue is to resort to double negation, perfectly acceptable and even a must in some Romanian language contexts, but inacceptable in English. Calques produced based on English patterns – lexical, semantic or both – are also dedicated some attention by the author (e.g. *in loss, make part of*).

The second chapter of Pungă's book is devoted to *A Translation-oriented Approach* to the two languages, English and Romanian, in use. This is definitely the most spectacular chapter, as it studies loss and gain in the translation process in the case of the translations into Romanian of the Grimm Brothers' classical stories parodied in Garner's (1994) *Politically Correct Bedtime Stories* and in Fisher's *Legally Correct Fairy Tales* (1996). This is followed by a comparison of a translation into Romanian of Hartland's *Jack and the Beanstalk* published in the 80s and an online translated version of the story.

Preservation and translation of source text words and phrases, omission of words or larger portions of the source texts and addition of various lengths to the target texts are some of the aspects that loss and gain are discussed in connection with.

As most professionals know and as Pungă suggests in her analysis, irony is more often than not very difficult to translate. For instance, in Romanian, it is impossible to seize the sheer ludicrousness of such politically correct concoctions like *womyn/wommon*. Even terms like *queendom* or *fairy godperson* are difficult to be transposed. To cope with the translation

difficulties, the most characteristic intervention of the translator is to omit constructions (for instance "adverb+participial adjective") meant to ridicule or to intensify the message.

The sanitization of children's tales is called "protectionism" by Klinberg (1986). This approach destroys the whole stylistics of the text, its emotional impact, and, ultimately, the "childness" specific of children's literature, as Hollindale (1997) calls it. This disparaging effect is the result not only of omissions, but also of reformulations and additions. In many cases, translation-adaptation is simply a distortion of the source text.

In 1976, Dagut described metaphors as semantic novelties, which clearly did not make them prone to translatability. Instead, they had to be recreated in the target language. Of course, this could be a situation of gain, not necessarily of loss. But what Pungă analyzes in her book are cases of abuse and distortion of metaphors in translation.

This makes a smooth transition to the topic of the final chapter, related to metaphors collected from the business magazines *Capital* (published in Romanian) and *The Economist* (published in English), from the official activity of teaching mathematics, from wine tasting notes, and ecological discourses. Again, English and Romanian are studied in use, the approach being this time that specific of cognitive linguistics.

The study of the pretty large corpora of metaphors starts from the premise that they are not only surface linguistic manifestations of mind mappings but also contextually-determined constructions which both reflect and generate realities. There are frequent cases of unidirectionality (Kövecses 2002) when only the source domain is mapped on the target one. It is almost impossible to find completely mutual mappings.

The author discusses the metaphors identified in the sources indicated in terms of conventionality and universality and observes in this respect that, for instance, anthropomorphizing metaphors are characterized by a high level of conventionality, thus exemplifying "the embodied nature of the concepts they build on" (Kövecses 2015). These metaphors are on the brink of becoming clichés.

The context plays a leading role in activating mind mappings as metaphors relate to particular communicative situations. The metaphoric universe is a "web of shared knowledge and exceptions that activates a certain mind scheme" (p. 163). Other key factors in activating certain mind mappings are the surrounding discourse and previous discourses on the same topic. Intertextuality also contributes to the recycling of one dominant form of discourse in other discourses. Pungă remarks that novel metaphors are not fertile generators of intertextuality as they are still unstable and difficult to anticipate (p. 186).

Approaches to English and Romanian in Use explores the subtlest layers of Romanian and English when studied in comparison and generates most valuable conclusions for students of languages and for linguists working in the areas the book focuses on. Though kaleidoscopic in nature, it does not lack coherence at all – the three-angled approach to the two languages that the author takes manages to offer the readers insight into the complexity of languages, their resemblance and differences just to ultimately point out that all this is just a reflection of human thinking.

This homogeneous, logically structured and reader-friendly report on the author's research in comparative linguistics, translation studies and cognitive linguistics surely provides useful and thought provoking reading.

References
Dagut, M. 1976. "Can Metaphor Be Translated?" In *Babel*, XXII(1): 21-33. Available https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/. Accessed November 2018.
Fischer, D. 1996. *Legally Correct Fairy Tales*. New York: Warner Books.
Garner, F. 1994. *Politically Correct Bedtime Stories: Modern Tales of our Life and Times.* New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.
Hollindale, P. 1996. *Signs of Childness in Children's Books.* Stroud: Thimble Press.

Klinberg, G. 1986. *Children's Fiction in the Hands of the Translators*. Vol. 82 of *Studia psychologica et paedagogica*. Malmo: CWK Gleerup.

Kövecses, Z. 2002. *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z . 2015. *Where Metaphors Come from. Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Onysko, A. and E. Winter-Froemel. 2011. "Necessary Loans – Luxury Loans? Exploring the Pragmatic Dimension of Borrowing". In *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43/6: 1550-1567.