

“The Dinner Was as Well Dressed as Any I Ever Saw”: Intertextuality in Nine Romanian Versions of *Pride and Prejudice*

Nadina VIȘAN*

Abstract

*The present article investigates intertextuality in the retranslation of food-related culture-specific items employed in Jane Austen’s novel *Pride and Prejudice*. Such an investigation is important because, as shown in the literature, Jane Austen mentions food stuffs and food-related habits sparingly but meaningfully, in order to characterise her protagonists. The textual-based analysis in the article is couched in Zhang & Ma’s (2018) framework on intertextuality in retranslation and in Klaudy’s (2009) system of translational strategies. The investigation conducted in this article disproves my initial prediction that the second translation, published during communism, is the more influential target text, to the detriment of the first one, published in 1943, and that the subsequent target texts are in a relation of filiation with the second target text.*

Keywords: *culture-specific items, dissidence, filiation, intertextuality, retranslation*

Introduction

The present article aims at tracing instances of intertextuality in nine Romanian versions of Jane Austen’s novel, *Pride and Prejudice*. I will conduct this investigation in the framework proposed by Zhang & Ma (2018) with regard to intertextuality in retranslation (IR henceforth) and by Klaudy (2009) with respect to explication and implicitation as translational strategies. I am especially interested in looking at how the (re)translators of this classic deal with culture-specific items that have to do with food, cooking and table manners. Culture-loaded items (also known as culturemes or culture-specific items, Aixelá 1996) are known to provide important clues with respect to translational choices. Moreover, as pointed out by Mona Baker (1992: 230), any kind of reference to a type of food that the reader is not familiar with might come as disruptive to the textual continuity of the translated version, which makes the treatment of such items in translation subject to various specific strategies on the part of the (re)translator. Therefore, this article will rely on a textual-based analysis to identify the strategies employed by (re)translators and to establish to what degree they count as instances of IR.

* University of Bucharest, nadina.visan@lls.unibuc.ro

In Zhang & Ma's article, the definition of intertextuality is borrowed from Genette (1997: 1) as "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts". A rough taxonomy of intertextuality in translation studies evinces three main categories: intertextuality between the source text and the other texts in the source culture's polysystem [1], intertextuality between the various target texts that are available for a certain source text (what Zhang & Ma refer to as "intertextuality in retranslation", abbreviated as IR) and intertextuality between the target text(s) and the target culture's polysystem. While the first category has been extensively discussed in various literary and translation studies, the second has been only marginally tackled in the literature, and mainly from a "paratextual" perspective, whereas the third has not been documented at all. With respect to the second category, Zhang & Ma propose a shift from an analysis that involves "direct links between human agents" (2018: 580) to a textual analysis that relies on tracing intertextuality between various versions by looking at textual cues. In other words, they propose a shift from perusing (often poorly represented) paratexts to analysing the target texts themselves so as to trace instances of what they call "filiation" and "dissidence". In their study, filiation is defined as "textual similarities that reflect a filiation stance from one translation towards another" (580), while dissidence is seen as "textual differences that indicate one translation is made to distinguish from or even to compete against another" (581). These phenomena can be identified at various levels of analysis: lexical, semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, etc. One good way of identifying traces of IR is, for instance, to look at how much overlapping is present in two (or more) target texts. As shown in the literature (VanPoucke, 2020), overlapping is a phenomenon that characterizes retranslation. Zhang & Ma (2018) remark that overlapping can be coincidental, but that there are certain clues that might indicate whether the retranslator has consulted the previous version and borrowed or, on the contrary, refrained from using the same techniques. One of the most effective ways of identifying filiation or dissidence is, for instance, looking at the treatment of culture-loaded terms. I would venture to say, however, that, in my opinion, filiation seems much easier to prove than dissidence, a statement that I intend to check while analysing the corpus.

Culture-specific items are, therefore, seen as one of the important features of a source text that can reveal in translation whether a target text is indebted to another or whether it is in a relation of rivalry with it. If the source text is part of a literary canon, as is the case of Jane Austen's novel, chances are that the translator will refrain from intervening (mediating) and from working too much for a transparency of the element. This is because of an "anxiety of influence" (Koskinen & Paloposki 2015, borrowing from Bloom 1973) generated both by the original (as part of the literary canon) and, possibly, by one of the early versions that might count, itself, as a "pseudo-original" (Pym

2004). In retranslation theory, the first target text is often seen as introductory (it introduces the source text to the target readers, by “domesticating” the exotic, opaque elements), while the subsequent target texts might adopt a “foreignizing” strategy (by protecting the “alien” character of the culturemes and explaining them intra- or extra-textually rather than absorbing them into the target culture). I intend to check whether this is in fact the case with the target texts under analysis.

Romanian translations of the novel

Pride and Prejudice counts as a classic and it has been very influential culturally worldwide. One can trace, for instance, the subgenre of regency romances [2] as originating from Austen’s work (Kamlblé *et al.* 2020). This is why I expected to find at least three or four Romanian versions of *Pride and Prejudice* when I started to investigate the history of the Romanian translation of this book. Like many other English novels that were welcomed in the Romanian polysystem, the first translation into Romanian happened quite late (although the original was published in 1813, the first Romanian version was in 1943, as mentioned in Burlacu *et al.* 2005) and appeared under the title *Surorile Bennet* (“The Bennet Sisters”). All the subsequent target texts appeared under the title *Mândrie și prejudecată* (“Pride and Prejudice”). The second version was due to Ana Almăgeanu and was published twenty-five years later in the prestigious collection of *Clasicii literaturii universale* (“The classics of world literature”) by one of the most important publishing houses of the communist era. This version was the one that kept being republished even after 1989 (the post-communist period), as shown in Table 1 below. Its history is quite intricate, since not only did it undergo many republications, but also it was sold to the readers as a distinct version by at least three various publishing houses that had no qualms in either erasing the name of the translator or in placing this text under a different translator’s name (see Target Text 6 in Table 1). The third target text, published in 1992 is as yet unattested in the dictionaries, as no mention is made in Borza *et al.* 2017, and I believe it was a very obscure publication and had no impact on the subsequent translations. The fourth target text belongs to Anca Florea and appeared in 2004, twelve years later than the third version, only to be constantly republished by various publishing houses until recently (2022 is the year of its latest publication). This version must have constantly competed with TT2/6, the “communist” translation, as well as with TT8, i.e. Florența Simion’s version, which was first published in 2016 by Litera Publishing House and republished twice since. Since these three target texts (TT2, TT4 and TT8) were constantly republished, I expect that they will prove as the more “influential” versions in the lot, which is also confirmed by the fact that they have already been subject to analysis (Baicu 2023) in the literature. TT5 and TT7 were published at Cluj and Oradea, respectively, and

must have been less influential versions, probably because they were not as widely distributed. While TT5 is riddled with instances of mistranslation, TT7 is the only version whose source text is an American annotated version, with a taxonomy of colourful notes marked by emoticons that must have been created with a view to making the classic text palatable to the modern American reader. Finally, the last target text under discussion, TT9, was published in 2017 by RAO and its translator is not a “person” but a company (Graal Soft SRL), which makes one wonder whether this target text was the object of more than one translator.

From what I have noticed so far, working on the retranslation of literary works from English to Romanian for the past few years, there are three periods in the translation of English literature: the pre-communist, communist, and post-communist periods. So far, in most cases, the most influential version (many times republished) has been the “communist” one, which I expect to be the case here as well. Most of the “communist” target texts held the status of “pseudo-non-retranslations” (to adapt a notion proposed by Svahn 2023), in the sense that they were the only accessible versions and were many times republished, reigning supreme for a few decades and influencing the new generations of translators. Retranslations as such started to be commissioned only after 1989 and were dictated by the post-communist boom in the publishing business (Constantinescu *et al.* 2021: 134) as well as by other considerations. Consequently, I expect that TT2 (TT6) will count as the most influential version, as a “pseudo-original” (Pym 2004). My intuition is that IR is traceable, especially with respect to this particular target text.

Table 1: The Romanian Versions of *Pride and Prejudice*

The Pre-Communist Period	TT1 - <i>Surorile Bennet</i> 1943, translated by Gh. Nenişor, Socec & Co. S.A.R. publishing house (republished in 1993 under the name <i>Mândrie şi prejudecată</i> , Mengel Impex – S.R.L publishing house, Bucureşti).
The Communist Period (1947-1989)	TT2 - <i>Mândrie şi prejudecată</i> 1968, translated by Ana Almăgeanu , Editura pentru literatură universală in the collection <i>Clasicii literaturii universale</i> (republished in 1970 by Eminescu Publishing House in the collection <i>Romanul de dragoste</i> (“The Love Novel”). Republished after 1989: 1992, Garamond; 1998, RAO.
The Post-Communist Period	TT3 - <i>Mândrie şi prejudecată</i> 1992, translated by Al. Petrea, published by Valahia.
	TT4 - <i>Mândrie şi prejudecată</i> 2004, translated by Anca Florea, republished in 2006, 2008 by Leda Clasic; 2013, republished in 2014 and 2022 by Corint Books.
	TT5 - <i>Mândrie şi prejudecată</i> 2006, translated by Anamaria Alb, published by Maxim Bit (Cluj).

	TT6 - <i>Mândrie și prejudecată</i> 2011, translated (plagiarised?) by Corina Ungureanu, published by Adevărul Holding (also republished in 2008 by Aldo Press, in 2016 by Dexon). Also printed as a pirated version by Daffi's Books, where no year of publication or translator is mentioned. The text is almost identical to TT2!
	TT7 - <i>Mândrie și prejudecată</i> 2012, translated by Mariana Bront, published by Casa Cărții (Oradea) – source text: annotated American edition.
	TT8 - <i>Mândrie și prejudecată</i> 2016, translated by Florența Simion, published by Litera, republished in 2018, 2020 .
	TT9 - <i>Mândrie și prejudecată</i> 2017, translated by Graal Soft SRL, published by RAO.

Analysis

The investigation I propose seems meaningful the more so as it has been pointed out in the literature (Lane 2003, Pahlau 2019, Wei 2021) that Jane Austen mentions food stuffs only sparingly and makes use of food-related terminology to characterise the protagonists and provide insight into her dietary philosophy that has to do with good stewardship, decency and moderation. Also, some of the commonly used terms (*dinner, lunch, supper*) may count as culture-loaded items because the period in which Austen wrote was a transition period for eating habits (Lane 2003), which meant that the terminology itself was changing: see, for instance, the meaning of the noun *dinner*, which is not, in fact, the equivalent of the Romanian “cină”. In this case, the noun *cină* is more appropriate as a translation for the English term *supper*. At the time Austen was writing her novels, dinner, which had previously been an early meal, had been pushed later in the afternoon (according to Lane 2003 and Shapard 2007, the Bennets dined as late as 4 o'clock, while the richer families, such as the Bingleys, dined even later, i.e. around 6 o'clock). Suppers, on the other hand, were invariably provided later in the evening (at balls, such as the one organized by Bingley, or evening gatherings, such as the party thrown by Aunt Philips), and were falling out of fashion (Shapard 2007: 65).

Consider the following excerpt, where both *supper* and *dinner* are mentioned:

Mrs. Bennet had designed to keep the two Netherfield gentlemen to **supper**; but their carriage was unluckily ordered before any of the others, and she had no opportunity of detaining them. “Well girls,” said she, as soon as they were left to themselves, “What say you to the day? I think every thing has passed off uncommonly well, I assure you. The **dinner** was as well dressed as any I ever saw. The venison was roasted to a turn –and everybody said, they never saw so fat a haunch. (*Pride and Prejudice*, Volume III, Chapter 12, p. 359)

TT1 is the only one that renders *supper* as *supeu* (defined by The Dictionary of Romanian (DEX 2016: 1885) as “meal taken late in the evening, after coming out of the theatre/opera”), while all the other target texts, except for TT5, opt for *cină* (the equivalent of what passes for “dinner” today). TT5 goes for explicitation by division (*masa de seară* “the evening meal”). *Dinner*, on the other hand, is implicated by generalisation as *masa* “the meal” in TT1, omitted in TT2, translated as *prânzul* “the lunch” in TT3, TT4 and TT6, as *cina* “the dinner” in TT5, *masa* in TT7 and TT8, and as *meniul de la prânz* (“the menu for lunch”) in TT9. TT6, otherwise identical to TT2, repairs the omission by translating the missing sentence (*The dinner was as well dressed as any I ever saw.*), which indicates that the editor at least revised the text they appropriated. While the strategy employed in most target texts is to alternate between the terms *cină/prânz* for *supper/dinner*, or to use implicitation by generalisation, replacing the problematic noun *dinner* with *masă* “meal” or with a paraphrase, which counts as explicitation by division, TT5 manages to disrupt cohesion by referring first to keeping the gentlemen to an “evening meal” and then discussing their “dinner”, which is supposed to have already happened during the day. This counts as an instance of mistranslation.

Interestingly enough, the distinction *supper/dinner* is obliterated in many of the other instances where in the source text the noun *dinner* is mentioned in isolation (i.e. without being placed in opposition with *supper*). The source text mentions the word *dinner* on five different occasions. As suggested before, the word *dinner* is not translatable by the Romanian noun *cină* “dinner” because its semantics is not yet that of its modern counterpart. This was visible in the translation of the excerpt above, where most target texts, with the notable exception of TT5, attempted to distinguish the noun *dinner* from *supper*, either by translating *dinner* with “lunch”, or by using a vaguer term, *masă* (“meal”). What happens with the other five instances where the noun *dinner* is mentioned? TT1 renders it as *masă* “meal” (4 instances) or as *dineu* “dinner party”(1), TT2/TT6 opts for *masă* “meal”(2 instances), *prânz* “lunch”(1), *dejun* “lunch”(1), *cină* “dinner”(1), TT3 makes use of *masă* (2), *prânz* (3), *a prânzi* (“to take lunch”) (1), TT4 goes for *masă* (2), *cină* (3), TT5 and TT7 opt for *cină* (5), TT8 selects *masă* (2), *prânz* (1), *bucate* “victuals” (1), *cină* (1), while TT9 goes for *cină* (3), *masă* (2). In those instances where the word *cină* was employed by the target texts, the (re)translators were in fact inconsistent. A clear preference for this type of inconsistency can be identified in TT4, TT5, TT7 and TT9. This means that these particular target texts are characterized by overlapping, yet there is little indication that they borrowed from one another. A similar pattern of strategies can also be traced between TT2/6 and TT8, that only resort to the noun *cină* once. It seems that there is a similitude of strategies between these particular target texts.

Let us now look at the translation of some of the more problematic bits in the excerpt above and consider the lexical choices and strategies of the target texts. Consider Table 2:

Table 2: The dinner was as well dressed as any I ever saw.

ST	The dinner was as well dressed as any I ever saw. (p. 359)	BACK TRANSLATION
TT1	Masa a fost fără cusur. (p. 312)	The meal was flawless.
TT2	-	-
TT3	Prânzul a fost foarte gustos. (p. 224)	The lunch was very tasty.
TT4	Prânzul a fost atât de reușit, cum n-am mai văzut vreodată. (p. 322)	The lunch was so excellent, as I have never seen.
TT5	Cina fu la fel de arătoasă ca nimic altceva înainte. (p. 220)	The dinner was as good looking as nothing before.
TT6	Prânzul s-a prezentat cum n-am mai pomenit de mult. (p. 377)	The lunch presented itself as I haven't found it in a long while.
TT7	În viața mea n-am mai văzut masă îmbelșugată ca aceasta! (p. 403)	Never in my life have I seen such bountiful meal as this!
TT8	Masa a fost cum n-am mai pomenit de mult. (p. 348)	The meal was as I haven't found it in a long while.
TT9	Meniul de la prânz a fost extrem de bine întocmit. (p. 476)	The lunch menu was extremely well put together.

There are two hurdles to overcome in the translation of the sentence in Table 2. On the one hand, the participle (*well*) *dressed*, which comes from the phrase *to dress food*, that means preparing food for cooking or for serving in such a way that it looks as attractive as possible. Romanian does not have an equivalent for this phrase, which prompts the translators to resort to various strategies: either by employing evaluative phrases such as *fără cusur* “flawless”, *gustos* “tasty”, *reușit* “excellent”, or participles such as *bine întocmit* “well put together”, or by using verbs such as *a se prezenta* “present oneself”, or by employing an adjunct clause of comparison as a predicative (in TT8). There is no lexical overlapping, which might hint at “dissidence” on the part of the translators. The second difficulty in translation is the comparative phrase *as any I ever saw* which is, in fact, a fake comparison since it functions more as an intensifier. This is sensed by some of the target texts: they choose to reformulate the original sentence by employing superlatives (“flawless” in TT1, “very tasty” in TT3, “extremely well put together” in TT9). I would argue this is the most appropriate strategy here because the person uttering the sentence is the mistress of the house, who is remarking upon the excellence of her housekeeping skills in plotting an excellent dinner. The implication is not that she outdid herself or other ladies of quality, but that she rose to the occasion (Mrs Bennet is, in fact, complimenting herself.) A relation of filiation might be traced between TT6 and

TT8 with respect to lexical choices: both make use of the adjunct comparative clause *cum n-am mai pomenit de mult* “as I haven’t found it in a long while”, which can hardly be seen as coincidental in this case.

Table 3: Roasted to a turn

ST	The venison was roasted to a turn – and everybody said, they never saw so fat a haunch. (p. 359)	BACK TRANSLATION
TT1	Carnea bine friptă – (p. 312)	The meat well done -
TT2	Vânatul a fost fript tocmai la țanc și toți au spus că n-au mai văzut vreodată o pulpă atât de grasă. (p. 306)	The venison was roasted in the nick of time and all said they never saw such a fat haunch.
TT3	Vânatul a fost bine pregătit și suficient de împănat și l-au lăudat toți. (p. 224)	The venison was well prepared and sufficiently laced with fat and everyone praised it.
TT4	Vânatul a fost rumenit la timp și toți au spus că n-au mai văzut o pulpă atât de grasă. (p. 322)	The venison was done in time and all said they didn’t see such a fat haunch.
TT5	Căprioara a fost pusă la rotisor și toți au căzut de acord că nu au văzut o pulpă atât de mare. (p. 220)	The deer was turned against a rotisserie and everyone agreed that they hadn’t seen such a big haunch.
TT6	Vânatul a fost fript atât cât trebuia și toți au spus că n-au mai văzut vreodată o pulpă atât de grasă. (p. 377)	The venison was roasted as much as it should and everyone said they never saw such a fat haunch.
TT7	Carnea de căprioară a fost rumenită numai bine – absolut toată lumea a spus că niciodată nu a mai avut parte de un prânz atât de bogat ca acesta! (p. 403)	The deer meat was done to a turn – absolutely everybody said that they never had such a rich lunch as this one!
TT8	Vânatul a fost fript tocmai bine și toți au spus că n-au mai văzut vreodată o pulpă atât de grasă. (p. 348)	The venison was roasted properly and all said they never saw such a fat haunch.
TT9	Vânatul a fost făcut la proțap – și toți au zis că n-au mai mâncat o pulpă atât de grasă. (p. 476)	The venison was turned on a spit – and everyone said they never ate such a fat haunch.

Table 3 provides variants for the final sentence in the excerpt quoted above. There is a clear relationship between TT2 and TT4. TT2 translates the phrase *to a turn* by *la țanc*, which is a rather rarely employed idiom in Romanian, meaning “in the nick of time”. TT4 chooses the phrase *la timp*, which is the equivalent of “in time”. Both are instances of mistranslation, and one might suspect TT4 of having consulted TT2 and replacing the rarer idiomatic phrase with a more commonly used one. Most translations resort to the verbs *a frige*

“to roast” or a *rumeni* “to brown” for the English verb *to roast*, but it is difficult to distinguish overlapping from filiation in these cases, since these are the available Romanian verbs equivalent with *roast*.

There is also overlapping between TT2/6, TT4 and TT8, and, arguably, partial overlapping between them and TT5, TT9, in the translation of the clause *they never saw so fat a haunch*. Again, it is difficult to figure out whether the overlapping is coincidental or strategic. TT5 and TT9 both resort to an unexpected image (*rotisserie, roasted on a spit*), which puts them in a relation of unlikely filiation (I believe it to be unlikely because, as I was saying, I doubt that the fifth target text was distributed widely enough so as to be accessible to subsequent translators). The most discordant of all versions seems to be TT3, which stands out by the distinct strategies employed both in its lexical choices and in its reordering syntax. However, there is nothing that indicates that the translator of TT3 has previously consulted TT1 or TT2 and is in a relation of “dissidence” with either of them.

Consider also the excerpt proposed in Table 4, where most versions have trouble finding an equivalent for the culture-specific term *mince pies* “sweet pie, filled with mincemeat, i.e. a mixture of fruit, spices, beef suet. Mincemeat formerly contained ground beef or venison.” Interestingly enough, only TT1 seems to imply that this is a kind of dessert (Lane 2003: 66), although the Romanian *budincă* “pudding” is not necessarily sweet.

All the other versions (except for the mistranslation in TT8) opt for either *pateuri* “pastry” or *placinte* “pies”, which might be because the most prestigious English-Romanian dictionary available to Romanian translators defines *mince pies* as “pateuri sau placinte cu carne” (“pastry or meat pies”), although in the next entry, *mincemeat* is correctly defined as “umplutură (din stafide, migdale, zahar, miere etc.) pentru prăjituri sau plăcinte.” (“filling made of raisins, almonds, sugar, honey, etc. for cakes or pies.”) (Levițchi et al. 1974/2004: 619).

Table 4: Dine. Mince pies.

ST	Did Charlotte dine with you? “No, she would go home. I fancy she was wanted about the mince pies. (p. 67)	BACK TRANSLATION
TT1	-Și Charlotte a rămas la masa la noi? -Nu, fiindcă zicea că are treabă acasă. Cred că avea de făcut o budincă. (p. 43)	“So did Charlotte stay for a meal with us?” “No, because she said she had work to do at home. I think she was supposed to cook a pudding.
TT2	-Charlotte a luat masa la noi? -Nu, a ținut morțiș să plece acasă. Îmi închipui că aveau nevoie de ea pentru pateuri. (p. 55)	„Did Charlotte have a meal with us?”

		"No, she was adamant about going home. I imagine they needed her about the pastry."
TT3	-Ai oprit-o pe Charlotte la masă? -Nu, a insistat să se întoarcă acasă. Se pare că trebuia să ajute la pateuri. (p. 33)	"Have you asked Charlotte to stay for a meal?" "No, she insisted on going back home. It seems she had to help with the pastry."
TT4	-Charlotte a luat cina cu voi? -Nu, a preferat să plece acasă. Cred că aveau nevoie de ea pentru pateuri. (p. 56)	"Did Charlotte dine with you?" "No, she preferred to go home. I think they needed her for the pastry."
TT5	-Charlotte a cinat cu voi? -Nu, a plecat acasă. Cred că a fost chemată în legătură cu plăcinta. (p. 32)	"Did Charlotte dine with you?" "No, she left for home. I think she was summoned about the pie."
TT6	-Charlotte a luat masa la noi? -Nu, a ținut morțiș să plece acasă. Îmi închipui că au nevoie de ea pentru pateuri. (p. 51)	"Did Charlotte have a meal with us?" "No, she was adamant about going home. I imagine they needed her about the pastry."
TT7	-Charlotte a luat cina împreună cu voi ? -Nu, a dorit să meargă acasă. Cred că a fost chemată acasă pentru a găti plăcinte. (p. 58)	"Did Charlotte dine with you?" "No, she wished to go home. I think she was called home to bake pies."
TT8	-Charlotte a rămas la masă? -Nu, s-a dus acasă. Cred că era nevoie de ea pentru țânci. (p. 48)	"Did Charlotte stay for a meal?" "No, she left for home. I think they needed her for the kids."
TT9	-Charlotte a rămas la cină? -Nu, a preferat să plece acasă. Bănuiesc că era nevoie de ajutorul ei la bucătărie, pentru pateurile cu carne. (p. 63)	"Did Charlotte stay for dinner?" "No, she preferred to go home. I guess they needed her help in the kitchen, for the meat patties."

Another interesting point to make about the example in Table 4 is that TT1, TT2/6, TT3 and TT8 translate the verb *to dine* by the much more general (and therefore vaguer) *a lua masa* "to have a meal/to eat", while all the other target texts opt to mistranslate by using the verb *a cina* "to have dinner". Thus, implicitation (by generalization) is favoured by half of the versions, whereas the other target texts (TT4, TT5, TT7, TT9) attempt equivalence, but manage to be inconsistent and mistranslate. It is, however, difficult to identify this sort of overlapping as an instance of filiation.

The last food-related culture-specific item I would like to discuss is the term *white soup*, a soup made of veal stock, almonds and cream, thickened with rice, bread crumbs or egg yolk (Lane 2003: 58, Shapard 2007: 82) that Bingley mentions in Volume I, Chapter 11 as being a prerequisite for the ball he promises to the younger Bennet sisters: "as for the ball, it is quite a settled thing;

and as soon as Nicholls has made white soup enough I shall send round my cards" (p. 79). Three strategies are applied in this case: TT1 and TT5 resort to implicitation by omission, while TT3 opts for implicitation by generalization (*cum se termină pregătirile culinare, voi lansa invitațiile* "as soon as culinary preparations are over, I will launch the invitations" p. 40). TT7, TT8 and TT9 opt for *supă albă* "white soup", although this phrase is not a commonly used one in Romanian (Romanian has only *supă dreasă cu smântână* "soup seasoned with sour cream"). TT7 translates the American editor's footnote, TT8 offers a translator's footnote that accurately explains the contents of white soup, while TT9 does not offer any kind of extratextual explication. TT2/6 and TT4 on the other hand, opt for *cremă de legume* "vegetable cream soup", which is a form of domestication. TT2 adds a translator's footnote that mentions asparagus, mushrooms and cream, which does not in fact correspond with the ingredients of white soup. The tendency to domesticate, manifest in the replacement of the term *white soup* with the less exotic *cremă de legume* is opposed by the foreignising tendency manifest in the presence of the translator's footnotes in TT2. This is interesting to a translation theorist, because, as mentioned in the introductory part of this article, one would expect mostly domestication in early target texts.

Conclusions

The present article attempted to trace instances of intertextuality in retranslation by investigating food-related culturemes in nine Romanian versions of *Pride and Prejudice*. While certain instances of filiation were identified with respect to the translation of culture-loaded items, both in the lexical choices and in the translational strategies selected by the (re)translators, it proved much more difficult to trace instances of dissidence. It was not something unexpected, which confirms my belief that further research needs to be undertaken with respect to clues that prove the existence of such relationships of IR.

While, as predicted, (re)translators seem uninclined to mediate culture-specific items for the target readers, by resorting to very few instances of intra- or extra-textual explication, the second target text (the one I dubbed "the communist version") resorted to sporadic footnotes and domestication. However, a comparison with the other target texts did not confirm my prediction that TT2 would prove to be the most influential target text of the lot, although this was the case with other retranslations of English classics into Romanian.

Most target texts proved to be inconsistent with respect to the translation of terms related to table manners such as *dinner* or *to dine*, which can be explained by the fact that food-related terminology was undergoing a period of transition at the time Jane Austen wrote her novels. These inconsistencies

indicate that the (re)translators, especially the later ones, might have been remiss in their duties and dismissed important details in the history of table manners during the Regency.

Notes

- [1] See the seminal text of Evan Zohar (1990) for a theory of the polysystem in translation.
- [2] The subgenre of regency romances started with Georgette Heyer's novels.

References

- Aixelá, J. F. (1996) "Culture Specific Items in Translation". In Álvarez, R., M. Carmen-África Vidal (eds.) *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters LTD, 52-78.
- Baicu, C. D. (2023) "Lexical and Pragmatic Discrepancies in Retranslating *Pride and Prejudice* into Romanian. Case Study". *Linguaculture* 14:2, 57-79.
- Baker, M. (1992) *In Other Words: A Course on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Bloom, H. (1997/1973) *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borza, C., C. R. Buleu, D. G. Burlacu, L. Burlacu, A., Goldiş, I., Istrate, I., Milea, M., Mudure, L., Pavel, A., Sasu, I., Tămâian, C., Teuţişan, A., Tudurachi, L., Tudurachi, M., Wachter. (2017) *Dicţionarul cronologic al romanului tradus în România 1990-2000*. Cluj Napoca: Editura Academiei Române.
- Burlacu, D. G., C. Cohlon, I., Istrate, I., Milea, D., Modola, M., Popa, A., Sasu, V., Taşcu, I., Tămâian, C., Teuţişan, M., Vartic, M., Wachter. (2005) *Dicţionarul chronologic al romanului tradus în România de la origini până la 1989*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.
- Constantinescu, M., D. Dejica, T. Vilceanu. (2021) *O istorie a traducerilor în limba română*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1990) "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem". *Poetics Today* 11:1, 45-51.
- Genette, G. (1997) *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree* (C. Newman & C. Doubinsky, Trans.). Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kamlé, J., E. Murphy Selinger, H. Teo. (2021) *The Routledge Research Companion to Popular Romance Fiction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Klaudy, K. (2009) "The Asymmetry Hypothesis in Translation Research". In Dimitriu, R., Shlesinger, M. (eds.) *Translators and their Readers. In Homage to Eugene A. Nida*. Brussels: Lés Éditions du Hazard, 283-303.
- Koskinen, K., O. Paloposki. (2015) "Anxieties of Influence. The voice of the First Translator in Tetranslation". *Target* 27: 1, 25-39.
- Lane, M. (2003) *Jane Austen and Food*. London and Rio Grande: The Hambledon Press.
- Leviţchi, L., A. Bantaş, A. Nicolescu. (2004/1974). *Dicţionar Englez-Român*. Bucureşti: Editura Univers Enciclopedic.
- Pahlau, R. (2019) "Jane Austen's Appetite for Stewardship, Hospitality and Paternalism: Food in *Pride and Prejudice*". *Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies* 19: 1, 47-57.
- Pym, A. (2004) *The Moving Text*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cultural Intertexts
Year XI Volume 14 (2024)

- Shapard, D. (2007) *The Annotated Pride and Prejudice by Jane Austen*. New York: Vintage Books.
- VanPoucke, P. (2020) "The Effect of Previous Translations on Retranslation". *Transcultural* 12:1, 10-25.
- Wei, P. R. (2021) "'It's All the Same What I Eat': Jane Austen's Dietary Philosophy". *Litera* 31:1, 19-41.
- Zhang, H., H. Ma. (2018) "Intertextuality in Retranslation". *Perspectives, Studies in Translation Theory and Practice, Topics and Concepts in Literary Translation* 26:4, 576-592.