

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: 16th to 21st 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

translatological metalanguage. Alongside the foreword, the book includes a preface, six chapters, conclusions, an index including 19th century Romanian translators, and three appendixes.

The preface provides an accurate account of the objectives of the book, and displays the main theoretical and analytical background for the research. Thus, the fundamental objective presented in the foreword is reinforced by translatological objectives, such as the highlighting of an “explicit connection between, on the one hand, the inductive translation pre-theories of the 18th and 19th centuries, the borrowing of western theoretical (cultural, historical, etc) models and the deductive linguistic theories, and, on the other hand, between the various branches of translatology (history, historiography, theory, and philosophy of translation)” (p.13).

The author intends to reappraise the translations done within the boundaries of nowadays Romania in the 18th and the 19th centuries and to foreground a puzzling contradiction: even though the exceptional contribution of translation(s) to the linguistic and national self-determination and to the creation of a national literature and public taste is undisputed, an actual in-depth research into the various aspects of the translation process has never been carried out. The political implications of translation are insisted upon, since translations have had an important role in demonstrating the Latin origins of Romanian, thus legitimizing the right to administrative and linguistic autonomy and paving the road to national independence.

The beginnings of the Romanian translational activities are presented in the first chapter of the book, where three main periods are mentioned. The first period, from the 15th century up to 1640, is characterized by sporadic ecclesiastical translations which used two literary variants: a northern type and a southern type. The second period (1640-1780) is marked by an increased translational activity, but continues the lack of phonetic unity. The pre-modern or the transition period (1680-1840) implies the beginning of an influx of Romance and Latin lexical elements into Romanian; it boasts a series of secular translations which topple the supremacy of the religious translation, but also destroy the integrity of the literary language, thus accentuating the dialectal influences. The chapter clearly underlines the indissoluble connection between the history of Romanian translation and that of the Romanian language.

The second chapter is the most elaborate of the book. Its title, *Cine traduce?* [*Who translates?*], spotlights the author’s intention, which is carried out in five detailed sub-chapters. The extratranslational context and the translational reasons are provided first, with a focus on the historical, cultural and sociological context. The second subchapter offers proof for the existence of a real Romanian translation tradition and mentions several translation schools and directions from the 18th and early 19th centuries. The school of Paisie Velicickovski, an orthodox abbot from Mount Athos, was established at the northern monasteries

Dragomirna, Secu, and Neamț. Greek patristic texts were translated there into Romanian and Slavonic. A second school was founded in the same principality of Moldavia by the orthodox bishop Leon Gheuca and his associate Gherasim Putneanul. They translated both religious and secular texts, with an emphasis on certain moral and civic education texts, under the Enlightenment influence. A school which focused on the translation of non-religious writings was founded by Gheorghe Lazăr in Bucharest in 1818. Subchapter three succinctly presents the influence of the other Romance languages upon Romanian as far as the lexical level is concerned and the attitudes of the main cultural figures of the 19th century in that respect. The fourth subchapter deals with the reasons for and the finality of translation in the 19th century, with a focus on the direct and indirect translations. The most important Romanian pre-translatological approaches are provided in the last subchapter. The writings and opinions of non-translators such as Titu Maiorescu, Ion Heliade Rădulescu, or Mihail Kogălniceanu are highlighted first, followed by those of translators such as Matei Millo, Ion Brezoianu, or Gheorghe Asachi. The second half of the last subchapter concerns a series of contemporary translatological views on the 19th century translation. The conclusion of the chapter points out once more the essential contribution of the translation to the development of Romanian language and literature, as it was at the same time a linguistic and a cultural catalyst. An interesting feature of this chapter is an appendix which provides important information regarding the translation of several French works into Romanian. The original author and title are given alongside the number of translations, the name of the translator and the publication year as well as the alphabet in which the translation was published.

Mihail Kogălniceanu, the prominent Romanian political and cultural figure of the 19th century, is the topic of the third chapter. He is revealed in his adversity towards translations, which “kill our national spirit” (p. 81). Kogălniceanu doesn’t actually oppose the phenomenon of translation in general; he only advises against the rendering into Romanian of those poor quality works which are of “no interest to Romanians” (p.82), while encouraging the translation of valuable works, such as those of various classics. The author mentions that Kogălniceanu’s attitude must be considered within the frame of reference of historical determinism. Anyway, his attitude led to an increase in the number of translation, quite the opposite of what he had expected.

The fourth chapter is dedicated to the crucial role of dictionaries in translation and in the perfection of language, with a focus on the 19th century. Various personalities’ approaches and contributions to dictionaries and the way they should be compiled are provided together with a long list of actual dictionary writers and names. The footnotes which accompany this chapter are extensive, demonstrating a

surprising amount of lexicographic work on the part of the Romanian scholars from the 19th century.

Simeon Marcovici (1802-1877), on whom the fifth chapter is focused, was a Romanian translator and rhetoric professor from the 19th century who fully supported free translation. He was the one who provided in his rhetoric course the Romanian equivalents of various terms such as *metaphor*, *personification*, or *simile*. As far as the translational approach of Marcovici is concerned, the author mentions that he was convinced that his translations were useful for national literature and that they could shape the Romanian mentality and taste; he thought that Romanian should moderately borrow foreign words; he considered that a translation should express the spirit of the author, should be empathic and beautiful. The means to obtain such a translation was, in his opinion, the *ad litteram* method.

The final chapter of the book corresponds to the final stage of the diachronic presentation of Romanian translation. It provides an analysis of the contemporary Romanian approaches to translatology and comprises a general theoretical introduction regarding the typologies of translation theories followed by the description of various research approaches characteristic of Romanian translatology. Thus, there are five subchapters: Contrastive linguistic translation and didactics of translation; Translation theory, theoretical reflections on translation and the status of translators and translatology, translation criticism; Synchronic and diachronic translation; Translation theory and the influence of theory of literature; and Contemporary approaches.

The three appendixes are extremely helpful and illustrative. The first one offers a very concise presentation of the controversy about the precedence of the Latin alphabet over the Cyrillic alphabet in the first documents written in Romanian. The second appendix is an excerpt from the epilogue of Psalms, translated for the first time from Slavonic into Romanian by the orthodox deacon Coresi in 1570, while the third appendix is a collection of excerpts from several pre-translatological prefaces from the 18th and the 19th centuries, both in the original Slavonic alphabet and in their transliterated Latin counterparts.

Georgiana Lungu Badea's book is a successful endeavor. The fundamental objective in mind, one could easily say that it provides all the necessary materials for the building of a solid bridge between the incipient inductive pre-/proto-translatological works and the minutely organized contemporary research. A very important book on the national scene of research, *Idei și metaidei traductive românești (secolele XVI-XXI)* also integrates the history of Romanian translation and translatology into the international context.

Octavian COSTE