

PERITEXTUAL HYBRIDITY ELEMENTS IN TRANSLATIONS OF THE *BALTAGUL* NOVEL BY MIHAIL SADOVEANU¹

ȘTEFAN GENCĂRĂU², EMA ILEANA ADAM³

ABSTRACT. *Peritextual Hybridity Elements in Translations of the Baltagul Novel by Mihail Sadoveanu.* Within this stage of our research, we focus our attention on several of the elements rarely taken into consideration while debating translation analysis, in our case, the translations of *Baltagul* novel [*The Hatchet*] into French and English. We subscribe to the method proposed by Danielle Risterucci-Roudnicky because it offers the analyst the parameters of a complex approach to the translated work. The distinction the method proposes concentrates the analyst's attention upon the translator's *footprints* as well as on the elements outside the text itself, but strictly connected to it, insuring its position within the cultural space into which it is inserted, facilitating its selection for reading and implicitly, its decoding. Consequently, the translated work bears the marks of a hybridity with benefic, even protective effects. Peritextually, hybridity has its sources in the references to the *printing house, support, collection, illustration, cover, in metatexts as the title, preface, afterword, and the footnotes*, as well as in *the history of the external interest for such a work*. Although we mention that textual hybridity diversifies with respect to the register in which the resistance of the original is felt within the translated work, advancing, in agreement with the accepted model, a typology which includes the *auctorial hybridity, referential hybridity, and poetic hybridity*, we approach, in the limits of the present article, only a few of the peritextual hybridity elements especially because the three versions of the *Baltagul* novel, two of which in French, chronologically due to Al. Duiliu Zamfirescu and Profira Sadoveanu and one in English owed to Eugenia Farca, should be discussed within the larger context implying the totality of the factors capable of contributing to the reception and thus to the circulation of the translated text.

Keywords: *Sadoveanu, Baltagul [The Hatchet], peritextual hybridity, metatext, title.*

¹ *The study is dedicated to the anniversary of 100 years from the Great Romanian Union of 1918.*

² Ștefan GENCĂRĂU is Assoc. Prof., Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca /CAER EA 854 Aix-Marseille Univ. E-mail: stefan.gencarau@univ-amu.fr.

³ **Emilia Ileana ADAM** is lecturer, at the Technical University of Cluj-Napoca. E-mail : adam@lang.utcluj.ro

REZUMAT. Elemente de hibriditate peritextuală în traducerea romanului *Baltagul* de Mihail Sadoveanu. Ne îndreptăm în această etapă a cercetării noastre atenția asupra unora dintre elementele rar luate în discuție în analiza traducerii, în cazul nostru: a romanului *Baltagul*, în franceză și în engleză. Subscriem unei metode propuse de Danielle Risterucci-Roudnicky, pentru că aceasta oferă analistului parametrii abordării complexe a operei în traducere. Distincția pe care metoda o propune centrează atenția analistului asupra *urmelor* traducătorului, precum și a elementelor din afara textului propriu-zis, dar în legătură strictă cu acesta, care îi asigură poziția în spațiul cultural în care se inserează, îi facilitează selecția spre lectură și, implicit, decodarea. Opera tradusă poartă în consecință însemnele unei hibridități cu efecte benefice, chiar protectoare. Peritextual, hibriditatea își are sursele în referințele la *editură, suport, colecție, ilustrație, copertă*, în *metatexte* ca *titlul, prefața, postfața și notele de subsol*, precum și în *istoria interesului extern pentru o astfel de operă*. Deși amintim că hibriditatea textuală se diversifică în funcție de registrul în care se resimte rezistența originalului în opera tradusă, avansând, în acord cu modelul acceptat, o tipologie ce include hibriditatea *auctorială*, hibriditatea *referențială* și hibriditatea *poetică*, abordăm în limitele acestui articol doar unele dintre elementele de hibriditate peritextuală tocmai pentru că cele trei versiuni ale romanului *Baltagul*, dintre care două în franceză datorate în ordine lui Al. Duiliu Zamfirescu și Profirei Sadoveanu și una în engleză datorată Eugeniei Farca, trebuie puse în discuție în contextul mai larg ce implică ansamblul factorilor în măsură să asigure receptarea și astfel circulația textului tradus.

Cuvinte cheie: *Sadoveanu, Baltagul, hibriditate peritextuală, metatext, titlu.*

1. Focusing, especially, upon three versions of the *Baltagul* novel written by Mihail Sadoveanu, two in French, one in English, we situate ourselves, in analysing the translations, in the position of the reader who has to find in the work owed to such an enterprise, the solutions meant to surpass the *linguistic, editorial, and cultural obstacles* (Anne-Rachel Hermetet in Risterucci-Roudnicky, 2008: 13), as well as, in the case of the literatures considered *minor ones*, the reserves, let us call them so, concerning mentality. These difficulties are inherent to picking up a message resulting at the same time from a *linguistic transposition, a cultural transfer, and a reapproach* (Risterucci-Roudnicky, 2008: 13) beyond the frontiers of the language in which the original has been imagined. The references already advanced in our referral acknowledge the source of the interest and the method we assume.

Such an approach of a translated literary work was inspired to us by Danielle Risterucci-Roudnicky, a traductologist for whom the version of a

work in the target language constitutes the indissociable derivate of the text of origin, the coherent, maieutic variant which is incomplete in relation to that.

Starting from Gérard Genette's (1982) considerations regarding the significance of the palimpsest, it is believed that a translated foreign work presents itself on the one hand (a) as a peritextual hybrid and on the other hand (b) as a textual hybrid.

Peritextual hybridity makes reference to those elements outside the text itself, but strictly connected to it, which make its circulation, reading possible and facilitates its decoding. Within that inventory, according to Risterucci-Roudnisky there are situated the *publishing house, the support, the collection, the illustration, the cover, especially the final one and the metatexts such as the title, the preface, the afterword, and the footnotes*, to which, in our opinion, *the history of the external interest in a certain work* should be added, since an analysis of a translation must lead, within the textual dimension, to a comparison of the variants.

Textual hybridity, more importantly in our acceptance, does not make reference only to the text proper, but includes the references to the *author, translator, the relationship of the author with the translator*, as well as *those signals certifying interculturality factors, such as the quotations from the target culture or from the cultural idiomaticity components* on which the work of origin is based. According to the register where the resistance of the original is felt in the translated work, from that point of view one distinguishes among *an auctorial hybridity*, a *referential one*, and not least important: *a poetic hybridity*. The first one concerns the relationships between the author and the translator; the second one sums up cultural indexes which demand reading and translating strategies in order for the origin world to open towards the one of destination; and finally, poetic hybridity highlights the meeting of the efforts of the author of contextualisation or social contextualization through language variants with those of the translator forced to recontextualize, and when the linguistic variation marks are eluded in the translation, to decontextualize to the benefit of the addressee of their enterprise.

Thus, instead of engaging in the irreconcilable dispute referring to the quality of translation with respect to faithfulness (Mounin, 1963; Oustinoff, 2003 a.o.) to the original or to annotations with regard to the untranslatable, or the virtues of the translator who forces, for example, the vernacular to open towards the territory of a foreign culture, Danielle Risterucci-Roudnicky prefers to identify within the analytic approach focusing upon the committed/fulfilled translation, those components which show *how books, authors, literature in general change when stepping over borders of countries or cultures*⁴. We

⁴ <http://www.literaturport.de/wab/Danielle.Risterucci-Roudnicky/en/>

understand from that why such an endeavour seems preferable to us in approaching the Sadovenian translations.

2. On this occasion, we will consider only some of the peritextual hybridity elements capable of highlighting the prestige of the work to be translated.

2.1. We will start by referring to *collections*. In agreement with Risterucci-Roudnicky (2008: 19):

«La vocation étrangère des éditeurs s'incarne dans des défis divers: représentativité, exhaustivité, nouveauté, interculturalité, etc., que reflètent le profil et le nom des collections »

The French foreign literature collections and publishing houses aimed either at publishing *all the major writers of the contemporary world* – it is the case of *Du monde entier* of Gallimard Publishing House – or to *carry their readers around the Globe by means of books*, in the case of Gaïa Publishing House, founded in 1991, or to *render visible the asymmetry of the literary fields* as is the case of Noir et blanc Publishing House, opened in 1986 in Paris. *Baltagul*, though the references regarding Sadoveanu were already eulogistic in the French world, did not catch the attention of these publishing houses. The reader inclined to choose according to prestige can be offered arguments by other connotations from the schedule of the collections.

First of all, through its integration in the collection *Bücherei Südost-Europa* [Library Southeast Europe]; the first of the translations, the German one, connects the novel to a certain mental space, the South-Eastern European one. The subsequent German editions present the novel as a public circulation book by integrating it into the *Goldmanns gelbe Taschenbücher* [Goldmann's yellow paperbacks] collection, a connotation which will be preserved in the case of the collections including the Hungarian translation: first in *Európa zsebkönyvek* [Europe's pocketbooks], later in *Milliók könyve* [Millions of Books for everybody].

On the first cover of the French edition of 1965 we find the specifications: *Mihail Sadoveanu, Le Hachereau, Le Roman Mondial «Alcyon», «Collection Unesco d'œuvres représentatives»,* which shifts, on the title page, to *Le Roman Mondial «Alcyon Collection Unesco d'auteurs contemporains»*. In subsequent editions, the French versions are registered in catalogues under the «*Publication gouvernementale internationale*» specification. Similarly, in presenting the English editions, beginning with 1955, we find *Mihail Sadoveanu, The Hatchet, (Unesco Collection of representative works: European series)*. Its being situated within the series of European representative works may be due to the fact that

the Finnish translation considered it as such as early as 1944 already, by means of the *Eurooppa-sarja* [Europe series] collection. The translation into English keeps to the framework of such collections as *Classics of Romanian literature* and *Eastern European monographs*.

2.2. *The support*, as it is perceived by Danielle Risterucci-Roudnicky (2008: 17), regards the *form* in which the translated work reaches the reader. The volume, the anthology, or the periodical, and later on contemporary forms of presentation, subsequent to the impressed work, such as the *audio books* or the *screenings*, certify varied textual combinative possibilities or a communicational syncretism as much more convincing than the printed version. The most frequent support for the *Baltagul* novel in the author's language as well as for its translations, is the impressed one. As an intersemiotic translation (Oustinoff, 2012: 105), to the printed support, a cinematographic transposition is added, circulating on a DVD support, a Romanian-Italian co-production directed by Mircea Mureșan (1969) with foreign actors who impersonate important characters of the work exemplarily, with relatively faithful English subtitles. Two of the translated editions appear as *livre electronique*, one of which, in English, is registered in the databases as *distributed by Columbia University Press, 1991*, another one in Swedish, under the title *Yxan*, issued by Enskede: TPB, 2005.

2.3. *The history of translations*, as an element of peritextual hybridity, creates the premises for comparison. Contrary to the fact that the language of Sadoveanu's work presents particularities which make it **not** easily translatable, the author of *Baltagul* novel seems not to have been avoided by translators. The Romanian critic has already signalled that:

"Romanian novelist Mihail Sadoveanu's *The Hatchet* is the most widely translated Romanian novel except perhaps for Mircea Eliade's works, though the latter's audience was tremendously increased by the author spending most of his life in the Western world and by his outstanding career as a historian of religion." (Borbély: 2008: 345)

The bibliographic guide regarding Romanian writers translated to foreign languages (Costache and Podgoreanu, 2014: 278-306) confirms the fact that since 1936, that is six years after the issue of the novel in Romanian, until 1997, would mark 19 European language editions, to which there are added (Borbély, 2008: 345) the editorial issues from *Shanghai (1957)*, *Tehran (1958)* and *Damascus (1964)*.

Finnish, similarly to Italian, holds the fourth position in the chronology of the translations we are concerned with (1944), after the novel had already appeared in 1936 in German, in 1938 in Czech⁵ (Borbely: 2008, Mareș: 2013) and in 1943 in Slovak. According to the same guide, German, the language in which the circulation of the novel is connected to that of the translator Harald Krasse, sums up eight editions in München, Hamburg, and Berlin, and three reprints in Bucharest.

It is possible that the inclusion on the UNESCO list of works to be translated with financial support on behalf of the states of origin, in our case, Romania, may have favoured the circulation of the book around the 60s, a period when *Baltagul* appears in Czech (1957), Swedish (1959), Polish (1960), Greek and Portuguese (1962), Danish (1963), Serbian (1964), Spanish (1964, and also in 1981), Slovenian (1966, as well as in 1983). According to the guide we have evoked, Norwegian, as well as Russian discover the *Baltagul* novel rather late (1997, respectively in 1983).

2.4. As far as those who have translated the novel are concerned, important names are connected to its circulation beyond the frontiers of the language of origin, such as the linguist Hilkkka Koskuluoma for Finnish, the Italian Romanist Mariano Baffi, the translator and literary historian Gino Lupi for Italian, the writer María Teresa León for Spanish, the writer Helfrid Ingegerd Granlund for Swedish, along which translators, writers, university faculty for Czech, Polish, Slovak, Bulgarian, Russian, and not only.

2.5. Some of the elements of textual hybridity demand to be approached with an anticipation for the relationships they entertain with the elements of peritextual hybridity. The competences of the translator, their relationship

⁵ The guide we have referred to for the assembly of languages mentions for Czech only the edition of the volume *Čakan. Po řece připlul mlýn. Mitrea Cocor*, SNKLHU, Prague, 1957, translated by Otakar Jirouš and Marie Karásková-Kojecká, while for the French one, only the editions of 1955 and 1963 of Bucharest, the republishing of Paris of 1965, and the new translation published in Bucharest in 1973. Ștefan Borbély notes, in the contribution mentioned above: "The Hatchet's international fame started as early as 1936 in France and Germany, continuing with the Czech version two years later ..." In the issue of October 18, 1935, in «L'Européen : hebdomadaire économique, artistique et littéraire» the article of Al. Philippide had already appeared under the title: «Un Grand Romancier Roumain: Mihail Sadoveanu», an article consecrating a great part of its texts economy to the novel, its sources, its connections to Romanian mythology. In «Lettres roumaines» which is published in the supplement of the Sunday issue of *Figaro*, on June 27, 1937, a supplement bearing the title *La Roumanie*, one can read about Sadoveanu: «Son roman *Baltagul*, récemment traduit en français (s.n. StG, EIA), exprime puissamment l'âme du paysan roumain dans ce qu'elle a de plus élevé et de plus spécifique.» With regard to the number of languages in which *Baltagul* has been translated, the data bases registering the editions of the novel seem to confirm the existence of translations into Catalan, Arabic, as well as other recent Italian versions, among which, the one owed to Marco Cugno.

with the author, the chance of the translator of penetrating into the intimacy of the creation process, generate, in their turn, elements of *textual hybridity*. In French and English *Baltagul* knows translations achieved by Al. Duiliu Zamfirescu, Profira Sadoveanu, and Eugenia Farca. The first one of the translators into French is the son of the writer Duiliu Zamfirescu, born in Rome, educated in Paris, with competences of French acquired through his Parisian academic studies. Profira Sadoveanu is the author's daughter, connoisseur of the Sadovenian writings, a writer in her turn and a translator from Russian and French, from Romanian into French, respectively, in the case of the novel *Baltagul*. Eugenia Farca is a specialized translator, with an interest in transposing into English numerous Romanian novels belonging to Mihail Sadoveanu, Ionel Teodoreanu, Camil Petrescu, Francisc Păcurariu, and others.

2.6. Peritextually, the *metatexts* of the translated works are auxiliaries necessary for the preparation of the reader. As Risterucci-Roudnicky (2008: 48) observes, the *preface*, *introductions*, and the *afterword* try to introduce the reader *into a universe that is distant from their own*, into its cultural specificity, by means of information of a linguistic or literary nature and of mentality which the translator can provide as an initiated person in the world over whose threshold they invite their reader to step.

The French editions in the translation of Duiliu Zamfirescu enjoy a *forward* signed by Pierre Abraham and an *afterword* belonging to Profira Sadoveanu.

2.6.1. *Un patriarche des lettres*, Pierre Abraham's *introduction*, summarizes the historical conditions under which the Romanian state is shaped, the evolution of the Romanian language and society during the 19th and 20th centuries, and, especially the importance of *folk lyricism*, of the folklore for the Romanian writers, from where the topic of many of Sadoveanu's works is inspired, from among which Pierre Abraham enumerates titles from French translations:

« Ce sera le theme de la Forêt magique en 1926, de l'Auberge d'Ancoutza en 1928 et surtout du chef-d'œuvre de cette lignée : le Hachereau en 1930 ». (Abraham, 1965: 15)

Beyond the references of the work, Abraham is preoccupied by the psychology of the world from which the characters of the novel are detached, invoking a similitude with that of a possible reader:

« [...] une psychologie délicate, une subtilité très proche de ce que nous connaissons chez nous, une intelligence qui s'exprime mieux par des actes que par des paroles. » (Abraham, 1965: 18)

2.6.2. In order to facilitate the reader's enterprise preoccupied to decode the title, to identify the pretext and the connections of the novel to a certain geographical and mental space, Profira Sadoveanu evokes in the *preface*, one and the same for the French editions of 1965 and 1973, an event which might have triggered the Romanian imaginary, including the significant interrogation for the denouement of the novel:

« Le hachereau était l'outil et l'arme préférée du paysan des Carpates : C'est avec lui qu'il coupait son bois de chauffage, se frayait un chemin à travers buissons et sous-bois, se défendait la nuit contre les voleurs [...] C'est un hachereau de ce genre - survivance du Moyen-Age barbare - que Mihail Sadoveanu reçut en cadeau voici bien des années [...] Qui sait quelles aventures écrites en lettres de sang avait pu connaître au long des sentiers de montagne, ces sentiers que Sadoveanu connaissait par cœur, comme les avait connus chacun de ses ancêtres. » (Profira Sadoveanu, 1965: 23)

2.6.3. For the English editions⁶, we register among the metatexts the *preface* proposed by Ion Dodu Bălan, in fact a translation itself of a text accompanying reprints of the novel in Romanian either as fore or afterwords. For the Romanian or foreign reader, this metatext brings about highlights regarding the mentality of the Romanian people, the proze writer's source of inspiration, claiming that *Baltagul* is a *reinterpretation of the mioritic myth*, and that a real fact, the writer learns about accidentally, determines him to combine similar mythological sources. The author of the preface invokes, as a factor of authority and veridicity, a particular closeness to the novelist. The writer himself seems to have specified the multiple mythological sources integrated in his novel. Passing towards the universe of the text of origin might force the foreign reader, with respect to the cultural references to be found in the preface, to acquaint themselves with other elements of Romanian folk culture as well:

"I had the good fortune to hear the author himself revealing the actual fact which inspired the book. Finding himself on one of his frequent rambling tours of the country one day of scorching heat, with a sky of spotless blue overhead and peace overall, Sadoveanu had stopped, all dusty and exhausted, at an inn for a rest and a bite. At a neighbouring table, two gendarmes were speaking of the death of a shepherd they were investigating, making guesses at who the murderers might be. The incident brought to Sadoveanu's mind

⁶ In accord with Costache and Podgoreanu (2014, 278-306): The first English edition in 1955: "The Book" Pub. House: Bucharest, reedited in London in 1965 and in New York in 1991. Numerous reprints in Romania, from among which the one of 1983, from which we quote for the English version.

the facts set forth by our anonymous poets in the ballads of Miorița, Dolga, and Salga.” (Bălan, apud Farca, 1983: 10 et seq.)

A small error might induce the reader a difficulty of a historical and literary pinpointing nature; probably a typing mistake leads to the idea that in that particular preface it is asserted that the novel appears in the language of origin in 1933. In spite of some excerpts in accord with the ideology of the days, the preface claims descents of the reader towards mythology and not only towards the Romanian one, inclusively towards bibliographical sources capable of preparing the reader for the specialised interpretations which the Romanian critique proposed later on (see Borbély, 2008: 347; Mincu, 2002: 346), these leading towards another hermeneutics of the folk textual source and the one depicted as a novel by Mihail Sadoveanu.

2.6.4. Among the metatexts, the **footnotes** are the object of controversy between the English traductology and the French one. An addition included in the series of annotations according to Risterucci-Roudnisky (2008: 24), *pretexts* or pre-texts in other acceptance, these interventions of the translator within the text, less pleasant for the editor, are considered *indispensable* to the translation of those *works coming from countries with habits, with a way of life and a culture* which differ from that of the *French reader* (Cachin, 2007: 122). In what concerns their usefulness, a consensus is expressed when it is discovered that there are no necessary lexical equivalents in the target language, or, among others, means for explaining the untranslatable puns, the auctorial hints to historical deeds, the references to mythological characters, architecture or clothing (Cachin, 2007: 123). In the English perspective, if we take into account Richard C. Blight:

”Some translators have reacted by not providing the needed background information at all. *They want their translation to appear much the same as the national-language version* (authors’ note: St. G., E.I.A.). However, this leaves the readers with a serious problem. Where the biblical authors planned for their readers to process the text based on a knowledge of what was left unsaid, present-day readers without that knowledge will often miss the point. They may consider the text to be so obscure that they will just give up the struggle to understand it. In fact, getting the translation accepted by the target audience is a challenge in either case — whether background material is added to the text or left out of it!” (Blight, 2005: 7)

The two French translations seem to rather take into consideration the English practice since the number of footnotes is extremely small. Although the translators are different, in the footnotes of their editions the same lexical units are explained, most often in the same manner:

Mohor (Zamfirescu, 1965: 35): *panic ou millet des oiseaux*.

Mohor (Profira Sadoveanu, 1973: 13): *Mohor- de-hongrie, sorte de graminée*.

Opinci (Zamfirescu, 1965: 41) and (Profira Sadoveanu, 1973: 16): *Sandales des paysans roumains*.

Prispa (Zamfirescu, 1965: 44) and (Profira Sadoveanu, 1973: 18): *Terrasse étroite et recouverte qui entoure les maisons paysannes roumaines*.

Topor (Zamfirescu, 1965: 46) and (Profira Sadoveanu, 1973: 20): *Topor en roumain signifie cognée*.

Dokia (Zamfirescu, 1965: 130) and (Profira Sadoveanu, 1973: 77): *Personnage légendaire portant neuf pelisses, symbolisant les neuf jours qui précèdent l'équinoxe de printemps*.

Iepure (Zamfirescu, 1965: 163) and (Profira Sadoveanu, 1973: 100): *lièvre*.

2.6.5. The English translation resorts to that practice of mediating between worlds in just one instance where the Romanian term is polysemantic and its polysemantism is, in fact, given by registers, we would add: regional ones, of language. Similarly to the way the translators have proceeded for French, Eugenia Farca also preserved in her version, the Romanian term, but added in the footnote:

Moș (Farca, 1983: 76): *Courtesy title given to old people*.

In other instances, where, as we have seen, for French it was preferred to maintain the untranslatable term in the text and the adding of a translator note, for English, the **adaptations** were preferred.

Zamfirescu kept *mohor* in his text explained in a note the possible choice from among the equivalent gramineous grass plants. Profira Sadoveanu had proceeded similarly in her text, but she preferred to recuperate in the note a regional connotation of the word: *mohor* used by the Romanian version, perhaps, as well, a specificity of that plant with regard to the family from which Zamfirescu chose *panic* or *millet*. Fr. Damé (1894: 3: 64), known for the faithfulness with which he defined in French words that were difficult to translate from Romanian, had proposed two synonyms for *mohor*: *1^o panic à grappes (bot.) 2^o mohor de Hongrie (bot.)*

For the term in Sadoveanu's text, *mohor*, of Hungarian provenance in Romanian, Eugenia Farca (1983: 19) prefers the English *sycamore*, a term of Greek origin in English, signifying: *A large Eurasian maple with winged fruits, native to central and southern Europe* (with a similar lexicographic definition, according to *DON*, in Romanian, *sicomór*: *Arbore exotic gigant cu lemn tare și cu fructe comestibile, asemănătoare cu smochinele [A giant, exotic hardwood tree, with edible fruit, similar to figs] (Ficus sycomorus)*. – From fr. **Sycamore**. The substitution with another botanical term may find its explanation in the rhyme constraints imposed by the translation of the verses in the oral structure.

On the same path of adaptation, the reader of the English version (Farca, 1983: 23) is prepared to perceive *prispa* as *verandah*: *A roofed platform along the outside of a house, level with the ground floor* (OED s.v. *verandah*), almost in the same way as the French reader for whom the footnote ensures the equalization with *terrasse étroite et recouverte qui entoure la maison*; however, the dictionary definitions do not support the French reader who might follow looking up explanations for *terrasse*; in the French dictionaries the closest definition being *Ouvrage de maçonnerie en forme de balcon, de galerie, au-devant d'une habitation* (Littré, s.v. *terrasse*). A comparison of translations might facilitate both the endeavours of the reader as well as of a future translator's. French lexicography, similarly to the English one registers the archaic form of *verandah* for which, *TLFi* proposes: *galerie couverte établie sur la façade d'une maison* while *MW*: *a covered structure adjoining an entrance to a building*. Fr.Damé (1894: 3: 282) had already proposed for *prispa*: *sorte de verandah ouverte établie le long de la façade d'une maison paysanne*.

And still just through adaptation Eugenia Farca (1983: 22) transposes *opinci* by means of *moccasin* while the French translation proposes to perceive the specific Romanian object by *sandale*. Semic units in the definitions to be found in *Littré's* dictionary, that is the fact that this type of footwear has *latchets on its upper part*, respectively in *TLFi* where the peculiarity of this type of footwear resides in the *way it is tied/attached to the foot* by means of *woollen latches* favour its decoding in the target language. It is, besides, what Fr. Damé also proposes in order to translate *opinci* by referring to the way they are tied, laced onto the foot: *opinci îmbăerate pe glezne, des sandales attachées avec des cordons au-dessus de la cheville [mocassins laced onto the ankles]* (Damé, 1894: 2: 124 and 1894: 3: 156).

To the same extent, Eugenia Farca's proposal evokes, according to what *moccasin* is described like in the main dictionaries, especially in *OED* and in *MW*, the shape of this type of footwear *its sole brought up on its sides and over the toes, with a seam/tying on the upper part of the foot*. On consulting these dictionaries, the reader may disregard other notes which localize that type of footwear, as in *OED*: *originating among North American Indians*, as well as the reader may, in case of the term *sandale* (*dont on se servait dans l'antiquité*), consulted in *Littré*, emit suppositions regarding the age of such practice.

We believe that the mythological proper name *Dochia* does not request in the act of translation, în Eugenia Farca's vision, neither a footnote, nor an adaptation because the conversational involvement of the characters in the novel is capable of bringing about clarifications. He who initiates the exchange of remarks and the one who plays the role of the naive vexed by the lack of precision of his interlocutor's statement generates the context for summarizing

the myth of Dochia and for explaining the fact that the mythological name is at the same time an antroponym in use, hence the necessary distinction between *Dochia de pe munte* [*Dochia on the mountain*] and *Dochia din casă* [*Dochia in the house*]. The annotation in the footnote in the French versions finds its justification in the complexity of the myth, in what the Romanian mentality circulates regarding the succession of the seasons. Fr. Damé (1894: 1: 110) created a lexicographic entry in order to explain Dochia's myth within the assembly of the myth of the Old Women/Babe and its relationship with other mentality elements within the novel's framework.

Likewise, for the English version, *topor* does not claim annotation because the phrases in which it appears establish its belonging to the inventory of *nicknames* while the comparison included in the text explains the semantic modification of the appellation on its way towards a surname. The translator into English proceeds in the same way regarding *iepure* [*hare*], respectively *Iepure*, as well as with the other antroponyms holding a nickname status, moreover with the totality of the onomastic lexis within which it would not be lacking equal interest, both for the Romanian and foreign reader, the significance of the first name Vitoria (Borbély, 2008) or of other proper names, especially antroponymic ones, designating *Sadoveanu's humanity* in *Baltagul* (Paleologu, 1978; Marcea, 1977).

2.6.6. Included in the series of the metatexts proving, in its turn, the peritextual hybridity of the translated work, the *title is a type of a text which has its concrete meaning and, similarly to other types of texts, it should evoke the intended effect* (Awedyk, 1992: 61). By its position as an element placed emblematically outside the text proper and still, inside, the title (Risterucci-Roudnicky, 2008: 30-37) *concentrates in a distinctive manner the problems inherent to translations*. In relation to the translator, the title is *a clue* of the type of text on which their activity will focus. Related to the editor and the audience to whom the work is dedicated through translation, the title is *its first signal beyond the frontiers of the culture in which it was written*. Its role is that of *catching the interest of the foreign reader*, the first participant in the *intercultural transaction* on which the fate of the work within the space of the new culture where it is disseminated through translation depends. The title as an equivalent of the work is the first reading indication which the translator offers the addressee of their work.

Function of the decision of rendering through the original title, of modifying it partially or replacing it with another title, the translations of Sadoveanu's novel open diverse reading or rereading perspectives. The majority of the translators prefer to look for the equivalent of the original title in the

target language. For *Baltagul* it is the case of the German translation (*Die Axt*), the one into Czech (*Čakan*), Italian (*La scure*), Hungarian (*A balta*), Bulgarian (*Bradva*), Swedish (*Yxan*), Greek (*To peleki*), Danish (*Øksen*), Spanish (*El hacha*), and Norwegian (*Øksa*). The Portuguese translation equates the title to a term (*A machadinha*) which privileges from the significance of the original title the meaning of *weapon*, to the detriment of instrument/ (tool). The translator for German makes amendments in the following editions and proposes the reader a track of reading which shifts the significance of the novel from the instrument with symbolic relevance to the character with a role (*Nechifor Lipans Weib*) and a name relevant to the novel's mythology (Borbély, 2008: 347). The same procedure is applied in the Slovenian transposition (*Nechiforjeva žena*) and in Slovak (*Horalka*), with the specification that in Slovak the title also acquires a localizing function (*Horalka: the mountain-woman*).

How do those who modify the title substantially proceed? The reading is orientated by means of the title (*Etsin miestäni: I Am Looking for My Husband*) towards the motive of the search, a central constituent of the novel and towards its folk source, that is the ballad of *Miorița [Little Ewe]*. The perusal proposal supported by the Polish translator through the title (*Zaginiony = Disappeared*) focuses one's attention on the absent character, a pretext for the search and for the entire initiatic journey. The proposal of the Serbian translator (*Osveta = The Revenge*) produces as well a modification of the reading code, valorizing the end and considering that the justitiary sequence conditions the reading of the novel.

What has determined such an attitude of the translators if not the very *hidden face of the words* (Ricoeur, 2004: 17) with the cultural references preserved by their regional and archaic registers (Boase-Beier & Holman: 47)? The contexts in which the word *baltag* is distributed within the economy of the novel, do not offer too many indices regarding the shape and the use of that object. To the reader who might look it up in the Romanian dictionaries, DLRLC proposes an association with the universe of the novel: *baltag* being defined here as *Topor mic și ușor, cu coadă lungă de lemn, întrebuițat de ciobani și de săteni ca armă [A small light axe, with a long wooden handle, used by shepherds and villagers as a weapon]*. Regarding its shape, DLRLC inventories a *dated and archaic sense; an axe with two edges and with a long handle*. The Romanian *baltag* originates from Turkish *balta* for which French, according to *DTF* indicates first *hache*, then *hachette*. Fr. Damé (1893: 1: 116) had already proposed the Romanian equivalence *baltag* with the French *1° massue, 2° hachette, hallebarde, hache d'armes, 3° baton, gourdin*. The synonymic series proposed by Damé relates to the semic trait which establishes what the object is used for [servant d'arme, servant à frapper]. *Hallebarde* which was preferred by Al. Philippide when he announced to the French press the appearance of the

Baltagul novel, is not convenient due to the traits which regard *the use* and *shape* of the object, according to French dictionaries:

« Arme d'hast à longue hampe, munie d'un fer tranchant et pointu et de deux fers latéraux ou ailes [...] » (PR, 2014, s.v. Hallebarde)

« Arme d'infanterie en usage du XIVe au XVIIe siècle et, de nos jours, arme d'apparat pour certains hommes assurant une garde d'honneur (marins, suisses, garde vaticane, etc.), comportant une longue hampe terminée par un fer pointu et tranchant, muni de deux ailes, l'une en pointe, l'autre en croissant de hache. » (TLFi, s.v. Hallebarde)

In defining *hachette*, the same lexicographical source adds the determinations *de bois, d'acier; hachette à bois, à fendre le bois*. *Le Petit Robert* makes reference, within the space of the definition of *hachette*, to *hachereau*, considered *hachette à bois* or it is explained in other dictionaries as a diminutive of *hachette*. Hence, probably the option of the translators to French. It becomes the title of the novel the name of an object which refers us to a certain way of life designating both the *weapon* as well as the *instrument* (tool) destined to the uses the synonym of *hachereau* inventorizes. The differences in readings depending on the title, are, in their turn, supported by the dictionaries which can be consulted. *Hachereau* needs to cover in translation a term which in Romanian points at the life of the uplanders, the shepards, while in the French dictionaries *hachereau* is un *petit outil de charpentier* (= *Celui qui fait des travaux de charpente - carpenter*) *tranchant d'un côté et formant marteau*, respectively *Petite cognée de bûcheron* (= *Personne dont le métier est d'abattre du bois*).

The translator from Romanian into English chooses for the title a term with a possible French origin. For Weekley (1921, 693), as well as for *OETD*:

"Hatchet: c. 1300 (mid-12c. in surnames), "small axe with a short handle," designed to be used by one hand, from Old French *hachete* "small combat-axe, hatchet," diminutive of *hache* "axe, battle-axe, pickaxe," possibly from Frankish **happja* or some other Germanic source [...]" (*OETD*, s.v. Hatchet)

The main characteristics evoked in the definition, important for the reading of the title, regard the *form*, *use*, and *the size* of the two parts of the *instrument*. In what concerns the form, just as in the case of the French *hachette*, the English *hatchet*, according to *WR*, has: **one end of the head as a blade and the other in the shape of a hammer**. And still as with the French *hachette*, the instrument designated by the English term, serves, according to *WR*, **for hewing, chopping, splitting**, etc and, most importantly, according to

CER: used for cutting wood. The size of the designated object by *hatchet* is a recurrent trait in the different dictionaries and it is rendered in *WR* by properties like: *small, short-handled* and *made to be used with one hand* or, in *COER*, by *you can hold [it] in one hand*.

Since some of the English explanatory dictionaries also offer the possibility of checking by means of retranslating to Romanian or to French, we learn that to the instrument described based on these features, in Romanian there should correspond, according to *WR*: *baltac, baltag, toporaș, toporișcă, bardă, băltăcel, băltăgel, bărdiță, secure*. Consistently, depending on the retranslation to French offered by *WR*, the English *hatchet* would enter into a synonymic relationship with the French *cognée, hache, gratte, fermer, hachette, laie, laye, merlin, panne, piolet*.

As can be seen from the lexicographical endeavour, the English title, although synonymous to the French *hachette*, does not refer to a certain profession, nor to a geographical localization, and neither to a social positioning of those using such an instrument. The synonyms the English lexicography indicates for *hatchet*, namely: *axe, machete, tomahawk, cleaver, mattock, chopper* include the name of the instrument in a lexical field which neutralises the feature *short*, in the absence of benefits to the reading of the title, and thus of the translated work by associations to a certain profession, especially through *cleaver* (= *A tool with a heavy, broad blade, used by butchers for chopping meat.*). Obviously, the reader will ignore the synonymy with a term, that is with *tomahawk* (= *A light axe used as a tool or weapon by North American Indians*) which would erroneously locate the universe of the novel.

The English title, judged in the extension of its own lexicographical definition has the advantage of designing an *instrument* corresponding to the different narrative sequences of the novel, sequences which register the Romanian *baltag* occurrence and it is updated through clothing or gesture determinations (Farca, 1983: 60: "Gheorghită carried the hatchet *looped to his belt over his right hip*"; Farca, 1983: 138: "the man who walked let go of his horse's reins and drew *the hatchet from under his left arm*") connotations necessary for the repetition of the object which nourished the imagination of the Romanian author.

3. In conclusion, accepting Eco's consideration (2003: 62), according to which, *in a verbal text the strictly linguistic substance is fundamental, but it is not always the most important one*, we have privileged in our demarche the display of the peritextual elements of hybridity, since, in accord with the model proposed by Risterucci-Roudnisky, in these, there are to be found the footprints of the translator and all those who intervene for ensuring the

existence of a work beyond the frontiers of the language in which it was meant to be born. To our interest for the elements of textual hybridity we opposed in the present instance the pleasure of acknowledging the role fulfilled - within this continuous landscape - by the *collections* in which the work has been integrated, the entire *history of its transposition into other languages*, the support on which they circulate, the *metatexts* accompanying it and the sequential adaptations it has been subjected to. These are aspects seldom taken into consideration by those proposing to observe the way in which the translation ensures the equivalence between the worlds which do not clip out reality in the same way. Within the limits of the method that has inspired our endeavour, we have highlighted, we hope, the translator's efforts towards accompanying their reader inside the universe of Sadoveanu's novel subjected to translation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAHAM, Pierre, *Introduction*, in Mihail Sadoveanu (1965), *Le hachereau (Baltagul)*, Roman, Traduit du roumain par Al. Duiliu Zamfiresco, *Introduction* de Pierre Abraham, delDuca Paris, Éditions Mondiales, Paris.
- AWEDYK, Sława (1992), 'On the Translating Titles of Literary Works', in *Folia Scandinavica*, vol. 1, Poznan, pp. 59-63.
- BĂLAN, Ion Dodu, *Preface* in Mihail Sadoveanu (1983), *The Hatchet*, Translated by Eugenia Farca, Preface by Ion Dodu Bălan, Minerva Publishing House, Bucharest.
- BLIGHT, Richard C. (2005), 'Footnotes for Meaningful Translations of the New Testament', in *Journal of Translation*, Volume 1, Number 1, pp.7-46.
- Consultat: <https://www.sil.org/resources/publications/entry/40266> [16 Oct. 2017]
- BOASE-BEIER, Jean; Michael Holman (2014), *The Practice of Literary Translation*, Routledge, London and New York..
- BORBÉLY, Ștefan, in Michael D. Soolers (2008), *The Fact on the File Companion to the World Novel, 1900 to the Present*, Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication-Data, Printed in the United States of America, pp. 345-347.
- Consultat: <https://books.google.ro/books?id=SXkVKq86YIkC&pg=PA345&dq=Baltagul&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwibianLqrfYAhWkAJokHe35DrE4MhDoAQg5MAQ#v=onepage&q=The%20hache&f=false> [12 Nov. 2017]
- CACHIN, Marie Françoise (2007), *La traduction*, Éditions du Cercle de la Librairie, Paris.
- COSTACHE, Geta; Anca PODGOREANU (eds.) (2014), *Scriitori români în limbi străine: ghid bibliografic de literatură română*, vol. 2: I-Z, Biblioteca Centrală Universitară „Carol I”, București, pp. 278-306.
- ECO, Umberto (2003), *Dire presque la même chose. Expérience de traduction*, traduit de l'italien par Myriem Bouzaher, Éd. Bernard Grasset, Paris.

- GENETTE, Gérard (1982), *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*, Éd. du Seuil, DL, Paris.
- MAREȘ, Gabriel (2013), *Literatura română în spațiul ceh sub regim communist*, Editura All Educational, București.
- MARCEA, Pompiliu (1977), *Umanitatea sadoveniană de la A la Z*, Editura Eminescu, București.
- MINCU, Ștefania (2002), *Miorița – o hermeneutică ontologică*, Editura Pontica, Constanța.
- MOUNIN, George (1963), *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*, Éditions Gallimard, Paris.
- OUSTINOFF, Michael (2012), *La traduction*, 4^e édition mise à jour, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- PALEOLOGU, Alexandru (1978), *Treptele lumii sau calea către sine a lui Mihail Sadoveanu*. Editura Cartea Românească, București.
- RICOEUR, Paul (2004), *Sur la traduction*, Ed. Bayard, [Montrouge].
- RISTERUCCI-ROUDNISKY (2008), Danielle, *Introduction à l'analyse des oeuvres traduites*, Ed. Arnmand Collin, Paris.
- SADOVEANU, Profira, *Préface* in Mihail Sadoveanu (1973), *Le hachereau*, Manuscris pour consultation, [Traduit du roumain par Profira Sadoveanu], Editura Minerva, Bucarest.

Dictionaries:

- DAMÉ, Frédéric (1893), *Nouveau dictionnaire roumain-français*, Premier volume, A-E, Imprimerie de l'État, Bucarest.
- DAMÉ, Frédéric (1894), *Nouveau dictionnaire roumain-français*, Deuxième volume, F-L, Imprimerie de l'État, Bucarest.
- DAMÉ, Frédéric, *Nouveau dictionnaire roumain-français*, Troisième volume, M-R, Bucarest, Imprimerie de l'État, 1894.
- DLRLC: *Dicționarul limbii române literare contemporane*, tom I, coord. Dimitrie Macrea, Emil Petrovici, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, București, 1955.
- DLRM: *Dicționarul limbii române moderne*, coord. Dimitrie Macrea, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, București, 1958.
- PR: *Le Petit Robert de la langue française*, version numérique du Petit Robert, Dictionnaires Le Robert, 2014.
- TLFi : *Trésor de la langue Française informatisé*, <http://www.atilf.fr/tlfi>, ATILF - CNRS & Université de Lorraine.
- Litré: *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, par É. Littré : <https://www.littre.org/definition/terrasse>
- DTF : *Dict.com : Dictionnaire turc – français* : <https://www.dict.com/turc-francais/balta>
- CED: *Cambridge Dictionary*: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/fr/dictionnaire/anglais/axe?a=british>
- COED: *Collins English Dictionary*: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english>
- DON: *Dexonline. Dicționare ale limbii române*: <https://dexonline.ro>
- OED: *Oxford English Dictionaries ED*: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com>
- OETD: *Online Etymology Dictionary, Classic Edition, 2001-2018 Douglas Harper*: https://www.etymonline.com/classic?ref=etymonline_footer

MW: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/verandah>
WR: WordReference: *WordReference Random House Learner's Dictionary of American English and Collins Concise English Dictionary*: <http://www.wordreference.com>
WEEKLEY M.A., Ernest (1921), *An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, John Murray Albemarle Street, W., London.

Sitography:

Literaturport, consultabil: <http://www.literaturport.de/wab/Danielle.Risterucci-Roudnicky/en/> [10 decembrie 2017].
Gallica: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k5513358n/f12.item.r=SADOVEANU.zoom>
www.worldcat.org [= referință pentru *Livre electroniquei*]: https://www.worldcat.org/title/hatchet-the-life-of-stephen-the-great/oclc/605972499&referer=brief_results
www.worldcat.org [= referință pentru *Baltagul* în sudeză]: https://www.worldcat.org/title/yxan/oclc/940067699&referer=brief_results
www.worldcat.org [= referință pentru *Baltagul* DVD și ecranizare]: https://www.worldcat.org/search?qt=worldcat_org_dvv&q=Baltagul&fq=fm%3Adv
www.worldcat.org [= referință pentru *Baltagul* cu precizarea în *catalană*]: https://www.worldcat.org/title/hacha-baltagul/oclc/802439645&referer=brief_results
www.worldcat.org [= referință pentru *Baltagul* cu precizarea în *kazach*]: https://www.worldcat.org/title/ogni-balkhasha-stikhi/oclc/80338336&referer=brief_results

Quoted editions:

Sadoveanu, Mihail (1965), *Le hachereau (Baltagul)*, Roman, Traduit du roumain par Al. Duiliu Zamfiresco, *Introduction* de Pierre Abraham, delDuca Paris, Éditions Mondiales, Paris.
Sadoveanu, Mihail (1973), *Le hachereau*, Manuscris pour consultation, [Traduit du roumain par Profira Sadoveanu], Editura Minerva, Bucarest.
Sadoveanu, Mihail (1983), *The Hatchet*, Translated by Eugenia Farca, Preface by Ion Dodu Bălan, Minerva Publishing House, Bucharest.