

*și pașapoartele, călăuză pentru trecerea frontierei, singuratic, nici cal nici măgar, importator, cercetător al valorilor culturale străine (pág. 253), un agent dublu al istoriei care nu poate fi scrisă fără el (pág. 255).*

Los intérpretes se han destacado, a su turno, como personas clave, embajadores muy eficaces de los colonizadores y comerciantes europeos y a veces han acumulado funciones de guías, exploradores, diplomáticos y negociantes (pág. 307). Los trujamanes militares, conocedores de la lengua del enemigo, eran apreciados desde los tiempos de las campañas de Alejandro Magno. Son evocados no solo intérpretes militares (unos de ellos oficiales con excepcionales competencias interpretativas) sino también sucesos de carácter anecdótico.

*Los traductores en la historia* es un libro de alto rigor científico y de marcada originalidad, que pone de relieve el multiculturalismo, el multilingüismo, con todos los aspectos y las perspectivas que derivan de este planteamiento pero que, sobre todo, arroja luz sobre el vasto terreno de la profesión de traductor. Su versión rumana, necesaria y útil, además de ser un interesante y laborioso ejercicio colectivo de traducción, convierte una vez más este libro tan original en una obra de referencia.

**Luminița VLEJA**

**Rarenko M.B., Oparina E.O., Trošina N.N. Osnovnyje poniatija perevodovedenija (Otečestvennyj opyt). Terminologičeskij slovari-spravočnik (Fundamental notions used in the theory of translation. National experience. Dictionary of terms).** 2010, Moscow: INION RAN, 260 p., ISBN 978-5-248-00512-3

During the last sixty years – a relatively short time span for a scientific discipline – the theory of translation has developed a quite extensive terminological body. The use of terms has been greatly influenced by different currents and schools appearing along the time, which is only natural as new approaches and objectives inevitably shaped the terminological systems. However, a certain need appeared in studying and systemizing the existing terminological apparatus, which led to several works dedicated entirely to the terminology of translation studies. Thus, in 2010 the Russian Academy of Sciences published the dictionary of terms under title *Fundamental notions used in the theory of translation (national experience)* by Rarenko M.B. (chief ed.), Oparina E.O. and Trošina N.N.

While compelling the edition, the authors aimed at presenting a full picture of the modern theory of translation in Russia, reflecting the

real situation of term usage, which could “help acknowledge the existing controversies, systemize and unify the terminological apparatus” (4). The main criterion for selecting the defined notions has been the frequency of their use in Russian literature dedicated to translation.

The authors accomplish the suggested objectives most thoroughly. The edition contains 184 articles, defining the fundamental notions in terms of linguistic, semantic, pragmatic and cultural aspects of translation, each one containing a list of suggestions for further reading in the end and the necessary references to the other entries in the body of the article. The dictionary presents a quite extensive bibliography of more than 380 works in the Russian language. A helpful move has been to mark out the existing terminological synonyms, for example *переводческое соответствие* (translation equivalent) – *межъязыковое соответствие* (interlingual equivalent) – *эквивалент* (equivalent) (131), in an attempt to link together the existing terms with identical meaning.

Aside from well-established notions as *контекст* (context), *исходный язык* (source language) and *переводящий язык* (target language), the authors touch on some more complex subjects, such as the problem of equivalence in translation (*эквивалентность*), types of possible equivalents (*соответствия*), realia in translation (*реалии*), the translation models (*модели перевода*) etc. Considering the general “linguistic” orientation of the translation studies in Russia, the dictionary could be distinguished especially due to the extensive analysis of the pragmatic aspects of translation. Thus, the pragmatic equivalence is included in notion of translation norms (*нормы перевода*) – “the totality of requirements for translation” (106), among which the authors also mention the semantic similarity, correspondence to the requirements of given genre and style and the language requirements. The pragmatic aspect of translation is considered as the capacity to single out, qualify and reconstitute in translation all the TS elements, which present, in one form or another, a relation between the text itself and the subjects of communication: the author and the target-reader (141). All the ST transformations, justified by pragmatic aspects of TT, are defined by the term pragmatic adaptation of translation (*прагматическая адаптация перевода*) standing for “the system of [...] procedures, aimed at adapting the ST for the target-reader – a representative of another culture” (142). Thus, from the pragmatic point of view the translation is viewed as intercultural communication, while the acceptability of ST is reached through correspondence with the target-culture.

The edition presents a detailed analysis of the models of translation (*модели перевода*) – a conventional description of the operation which constitute the process of translation (103), enumerating 16 models of translation, among which there are the hermeneutical model of translation (*герменевтическая модель*

перевода), including four main phases: the act of trust (the translator accepts the TS as a symbolical entity worth to discover, the act of aggressive intrusion – singling out the concrete sense, then follows the act of merging together the original complex with the fixed TL structure, and the final act is the accepted responsibility to localize the translation, to find it an appropriate place in the TC (27); the denotative model of translation (*денотативная модель перевода*) – the model which describes translation as the restitution of the same situation with the help TL units (31); semantic model of translation (*семантическая модель перевода*) which presents the process of translation as 1) reduction of the TT structures and lexical units to basic TL units. These are replaced with conceptual categories, which they represent. Conceptual categories are common for two languages, thus the transition itself to those categories represents an act of translation. On the final phase these categories are expressed by means of the TL system (171). By mean of the most detailed analysis of the translation models the authors managed to illustrate the particular interest towards translation as a mental, cognitive process, characteristic for the Russian translation studies. The models of translation help describe the common elements of the source and target texts, the reasons and the orientation of differences existing between them, study the factors which determine the choice of appropriate equivalents (172).

The categories of culture-specific and language specific elements in translation are presented with four main notions, namely *безэквивалентная лексика* (“no equivalent” words), *безэквивалентные грамматические единицы* (“no equivalent” grammar units), *реалии* (realia) and *лакуны* (lacunae). In the presented edition the term “realia” (*реалии*) is generic and refers to 1) extra linguistic objects and phenomena; 2) corresponding cultural concepts (mental units); and the linguistic units which denominate them (166). The term *безэквивалентная лексика* (no equivalents words) refers to the “SL lexical units which do not have a regular vocabulary equivalent (complete or partial) in the TL” (18). This category includes culture-specific words or realia, but it is my no means construed by those. According to the authors, the phenomenon itself takes place due to “the differences in denotative and connotative semantics” (19), in the “volume” of the signified. The no equivalent words and the lacunae (the absence of a word which would express a meaning which is expressed in other languages (77)) refer to the same situation, though the former designates, in the course of translation, the SL unit, while the latter the TL lack of an appropriate substitute. The terms *безэквивалентная грамматическая единица* (no equivalent grammar unit) refers to “the grammar forms are structures which do not have a common type equivalent in the TL” (20). All of these categories are identified for the given pair of languages (118).

As opposed to the notions described above, the terms “realia” is generic and refers to 1) extra linguistic objects or phenomena; 2) the

corresponding cultural concepts (units of the mental sphere) and 3) linguistic units (words/idioms) which represent them in language. The authors present an exhaustive comparative analysis of realia and other specific language units (no equivalent words, exoticisms, barbarisms, terms, connotative words etc.) and conclude the article with an ample perspective over the existing criteria for classifying realia (referring to type of the described object or phenomenon, referring to the grade of acceptability, depending on the origin etc.). The article represents a fairly complete picture of the modern trends in studying the cultural concepts in translation, using the material provided by the most acknowledged specialists in the sphere (V. N. Komissarov, I.I. Retsker, A. D. Šveitser, V. S. Vinogradov etc.).

The edition represents a rare, and thus more precious, attempt to create a common base for the further development and precision of the basic notion used in translation studies in Russia. The description of the existing terminological apparatus is exhaustive and most thorough. The notions are examined in a wide variety of perspectives, creating the necessary links between the theory of translation, lexicology, linguistics, cultural studies etc. and assuring the necessary amplitude of the analysis. Due to an extremely accessible style, the clarity and impeccable logic of narration, the edition would be of great interest for specialists in translation studies, students of philology, actual translators and any other person, who would like to learn more about the modern state of translation studies in Russia.

**Valentina SHIRYAEVA**

**Georgiana Lungu Badea, *Idei și metaidei traductive românești (secolele XVI-XXI)*, Timișoara, Editura Eurostampa, 228 p., ISBN 978-606-569-626-6**

-The fundamental objective of this book is to prove that there is an incipient inductive pre-translatological research which forms the basis of today's translational research, marked by the fields of interest and formation of every researcher. (p. 7) This is the statement which Georgiana Lungu Badea makes in the foreword of her latest book *Idei și metaidei traductive românești (secolele XVI-XXI)* [*Romanian translational ideas and metaideas: 16<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> centuries*]. The author also mentions that her book represents the synthesis of some previous approaches to Romanian translation and translatology developed within the ISTTRAROM-Translationes Research Center in Translation and the History of Romanian Translation. The approaches mentioned above are elaborated upon from the perspective of contemporary translation theories and are correlated with state-of-the-art