

EXPLICITATION, SIMPLIFICATION AND NEUTRALISATION IN THE TRANSLATION OF REFERENCE

Mona Arhire

Transilvania University of Braşov, Romania

Abstract

Recurrent features of translation, sometimes labelled as ‘translation universals’, have been intensively investigated within Descriptive Corpus-based Translation Studies. Numerous language pairs have been set under researchers’ lens with a view to observing languages from a contrastive viewpoint, but also individually, in their translational manifestations. This has enabled the identification of characteristic features of the translational facets of languages, which have generated more and more nuanced scholarly theories. This paper examines the occurrence of some of the most frequent features of translation, namely: explicitation, simplification and neutralisation in the translation of reference as a cohesive device.

Methodologically speaking, the investigation combines the theoretical and applied areas of Translation Studies, with an interdisciplinary dimension provided by the fusion of methodological input borrowed from Descriptive Translation Studies, Discourse Analysis and Contrastive Studies. The theoretical component of the research refers to issues of contrastiveness between English and Romanian viewed from a translational angle, in terms of equivalence and the occurrence of the three features of translation. The applied area of Translation Studies comprises the empirical approach to the translation of reference, while addressing not only the researchers’ community, but also the practitioners in translation and the translator training environment. The research applies both quantitative and qualitative methods to investigate the data selected from John Fowles’ novel *Mantissa* (1982) and its translation into Romanian by Angela Jianu (Fowles 1995).

The findings provide insights into the nature and functions of referring expressions as formal links, but also as stylistic devices, and shed light into issues related to contrastiveness of reference between English and Romanian, to aspects of equivalence and translatability, as well as to the occurrence of translation universals.

Keywords: Reference; Translation universals; Cohesive devices; Contrastiveness; Equivalence.

1 Introduction

Minor as they might seem, cohesive devices have substantial bearing in the creation of the texture of any discourse. Moreover, they impact the coherence of the message

and essentially determine the effectiveness of any act of communication. This formal connectedness is therefore equally important in translation as mediated communication. Besides, if the use of formal language means occurs quite naturally in non-mediated discourses, in translational enterprises it might prove to be by far more challenging. This is chiefly due to structural differences between any two languages that come into contact in the process of translation, with their distinct means of providing cohesiveness. This is what justifies the study of reference as one of the formal links commonly associated with ellipsis and substitution.

The research set off in an educational setting, by observing the translator trainees' translational performance. The experience triggered the need for some systematic account of the nature and translatability of cohesive devices. In this undertaking, which includes reference, the concepts of translation universals, equivalence, translatability and contrastiveness were employed for methodological purposes.

2 Research Framework and Methodology

The investigation of reference in translation is part of a more extensive research project on the contrastiveness and translatability of cohesive devices between English and Romanian. The project emerged in the translator training environment at the Faculty of Letters at *Transilvania* University of Braşov, Romania, where the master's degree programme *Language Studies for Intercultural Communication* offers courses on Translation Studies. In this educational context, the trainer has the opportunity to observe the translation process of trainees at advanced level, the training in the practice of translation occurring only months ahead of the trainees possibly becoming translators on their own. In this context, the translation of cohesive devices emerged as a necessary topic of research with a view to offering students some more precise insight into the translation of cohesive devices. The systematic investigation turned out to be fruitful in terms of raising students' awareness of the importance of dealing with these seemingly 'minor' and predominantly formal language items in translation. Their use impacts the overall cohesive value of the discourse, enhances its coherence and possibly enriches it with additional values of a stylistic and/or rhetorical nature.

This has been the triggering force behind this undertaking, which started with the examination of the three cohesive devices of ellipsis, substitution and reference together. The investigation was first grounded on a translational learner corpus compiled from translations made by the master's degree students (Arhire 2017). Subsequently, the translation of ellipsis and substitution were dedicated two separate and more in-depth studies (Arhire 2018a, 2018b), while reference is the topic of this very study.

The investigation relies on instances of reference depicted from the novel *Mantissa* by John Fowles (1982), which are compared with their translational

counterparts provided by the translation into Romanian made by Angela Jianu (Fowles 1995).

The objective of this study is to look into the translational solutions offered by a professional translator so as enable the transfer of knowledge to the area of translator training in terms of referring expressions. This is envisaged to lead to the formulation of a strategy to be introduced in the translator training programme in order to raise awareness of suitable manners of translation and thereby enhance the quality of students' translation.

The empirical research uses some common features of translation as posited in the literature, namely simplification, explicitation and neutralisation, in order to assess the translation into Romanian and to set it in contrast with the original English version.

3 Theoretical Background

This article is organised so as to provide brief presentations of the theoretical concepts entailed in this study with a view to creating the framework of analysis meant to support the underlying research methodology.

3.1 Recurrent features of translation

Corpus-based Translation Studies uses the notion of universality in relation to the translational language, which appears to exhibit recurrent features. This has been observed with various language pairs in contact in the process of translation, which initially justified terming these features 'universals' of translation. Later on, further investigation on the matter determined that the term 'universals' is to be used cautiously since there is not enough scientific evidence yet to coin the identified features of translation as being universal (Kenny 1999, Kenny 2001, Chesterman 2004, Toury 2004, Olohan 2004, Mauranen 2007, Malmkjaer 2008, House 2008, Becher 2010, Pym 2010, Zanettin 2012, Zanettin 2013, etc.). Indeed, the research for the examination of the so-called 'universal' features has developed and is still ongoing with the recurrent features of translated language constantly nuanced and enriched.

Out of the features posited under various denominations, this paper focuses on simplification, explicitation and neutralisation for suitability reasons related to the nature and the content of the investigation.

From the definitions given to simplification, the one considering the use of fewer lexical items in translation as compared to the original (Blum-Kulka, & Levenston 1983) is adopted in this study. Explicitation is understood as opposing simplification by using more words in the target language version as compared to the source language text. It is what Baker defines as "an overall tendency to spell things out rather than leave them implicit in translation" (Baker 1996: 180). Elaborating on Baker's definition, Klaudy (1996) distinguished among obligatory

and optional, pragmatic and translation-inherent explicitation. As Klaudy (1996) claims, obligatory explicitation occurs due to structural differences between the two languages in contact in the act of translating. Neutralisation is the phenomenon which might diminish the stylistic effect in the translation (Bassnett 2002) or it might eliminate certain rhetorical features (Künzli 2004) or it might manifest in a lower intensity of the emotional content or the reduction of the social distance between the characters in a literary work (Zlatnar Moe 2010).

3.2 Reference as a cohesive device

Reference, along with ellipsis and substitution, is a device meant to provide cohesion to a discourse by establishing the formal connectedness among the constitutive parts of the message. As Blum-Kulka asserts, “[t]he choice involved in the types of cohesive markers used in a particular text can affect the texture (as being loose or dense) as well as the style and meaning of that text” (1986: 21).

Despite the acknowledgement of the importance of these cohesive devices, the three of them have been defined in rather inconsistent manners both in the scholarly literature at international level (Halliday, & Hasan 1976; Hoey 1991; Baker 1992; Toolan 1998; Wilson 2000; Merchant 2001; McShane 2005; Johnson 2008) and in Romania (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călărășu et al. 2001, Stoichițoiu-Ichim 2002). From a synthetical analysis of the above-mentioned scholarly contributions, the explanation seems to lie in the fact that different languages possess different means of creating cohesion, some of which extend beyond their grammatical systems. What remains relevant for this very study is that reference shares with its sister-devices the feature of coreferentiality, meaning that none of them can have independent meaning apart from the context which they are part of. On the other hand, what distinguishes referring expressions from ellipsis and substitution is that they create sematic relations rather than grammatical ones. This means that referring expressions are used as anaphoric or cataphoric references to ideas, but do not occur in order to omit (ellipsis) or replace (substitution) a lexical or grammatical unit.

Being endophoric, reference is used to avoid repetition or redundancy and thereby to enhance cohesion. It offers an alternative expression to an idea, a concept or a phenomenon, which creates a relation of sematic identity between two linguistic expressions (Halliday, & Hasan 1976). The interpretation of the referring expressions is context dependent and their comprehension requires relating to their referent, placed in another spot in the discourse.

As Baker (1992) claims, there can be different patterns of reference between languages. Personal pronouns, deictics, and comparatives are the prevailing coreferentiality items (Caldas-Coulthard 2000). Demonstratives and other lexical units arranged in referring lexical strings are also adopted for reference in English, as well as in Romanian (Bidu-Vrănceanu, Călărășu et al. 2001: 45-47, 113, 158, 412, 425). However, pronouns seem to be the most frequent referring expressions both in English and in Romanian even if the verbs in Romanian inflect information about

person, number and gender, which usually entails the omission of the explicit pronoun.

3.3 The translation of reference as a cohesive device

Even though the translation of cohesive devices has not been a central concern in Translation Studies scholarly work, the practical enterprises in translation have striven to obtain cohesive versions of source language texts. For naturalness and fluency of discourse, but also its coherence, are essentially determined by the level of cohesiveness. The importance of cohesion in relation to translation is clearly expressed by Newmark: “the topic of cohesion [...] has always appeared [...] the most useful constituent of discourse analysis or text linguistics applicable to translation” (1987: 295). Given the textual relevance of cohesion *per se* and drawing on Baker’s (1992) pertinent observation regarding the different ways of manifestation of cohesion in different languages, it becomes obvious that cohesion requires special attention from translators. More precisely, contrastive knowledge of the two languages in contact in the process of translation should include insight into the cohesive means of both languages. This is what Baker also asserts: “[t]he translator need only be aware that there are different devices in different languages for creating texture and that the text hangs together by virtue of the semantic and structural relationships that hold between its elements” (Baker 1992: 188). Many other translation scholars have acknowledged the fact that languages have different cohesive systems and different manners of creating cohesive harmony (Hasan 1984) as well as bonding patterns (Hoey 1991). Moreover, Blum-Kulka claims that “the process of translation necessarily entails shifts both in textual and discursal relationships” (1986: 18), and Schäffner (2002) considers that there are inevitable shifts in the translation of cohesive means. In the same line, Larson (1984) argues that the cohesive device, if translated one-for-one, would most likely distort the intended meaning of the original text, a consideration which is similarly referred to by Leuven-Zwart (1990) but with particular reference to narrative texts. Their narrative function might be possibly affected by adopting formally equivalent cohesive devices in translation with the ones present in the source text. So, given that perfect equivalence between two languages in matter of achieving cohesiveness is not possible, “equivalence may not even be a desirable criterion” (Trosborg 2002: 42).

Little research has been done in the area of the translation of cohesive devices that implies English and Romanian as pair of languages. Moreover, even if the few studies may have generated some useful results (e.g., Arhire 2017, Arhire 2018a, 2018b, Protopopescu, & Vişan 2008, Ilisei, Mihăilă et al. 2011), they are not enough for a consistent theory to be constructed. Besides, out of the three cohesive devices named herein, ellipsis and substitution benefitted from far more attention than reference. At international level, reference is also hardly treated separately, but is considered pack and parcel with the other cohesive devices, just as the theoretical

account above reflects. This paper attempts at filling this gap with at least some initial and preliminary data that might be used for further research.

4 Analysis

This section presents a selected set of examples from the study, depicted to illustrate the occurrence of all three recurrent features of translation as they are exhibited in the translation of reference from English into Romanian: simplification, explicitation and neutralisation. The examples extracted from Fowles' *Mantissa* (1982) and their translation into Romanian by Angela Jianu (Fowles 1995) are accompanied by explanations on the formal and functional equivalence of reference in the two languages. Back translations are also offered for enhanced clarification.

The first example illustrates perfect formal and functional equivalence between the English and the Romanian reference employing a demonstrative:

- (1) *You're only getting this because you're a private patient, Mr. Green.*
 (Fowles 1982: 11).
 (translation) Asta numai pentru că sunteți tratat ca pacient privat, domnule Green. (Fowles 1995: 36).
 (back translation) This only because you are treated as a private patient, Mr. Green.

Although the translation displays an elliptical version by omitting the subject and the verb (*You're getting*), the reference, a demonstrative, is preserved in the target language. The entire meaning in the translation can be safely retrieved from the context and the cohesive value of the expression is similarly maintained by the preservation of the demonstrative reference. The result proves the translator's dynamic approach to the translation of the idea, thereby generating a natural utterance, which is not only correct and cohesive, but also appropriate in the register of the dialogic interaction.

Similarity in the use of reference in English and Romanian can be observed also in more complex references with modifiers offering a nuanced version of the referent, in form of lexical strings:

- (2) *For what his equally blurred yet definite real self rose against, [...], was the idea that it would, in its right mind, ever have allowed any of this to happen.* (Fowles 1982: 16).
 (translation) Căci eul său, și el încețoșat, dar cert, se ridica [...] împotriva ideii că, aflat în posesia tuturor facultăților lui mintale, ar fi permis să se petreacă asemenea lucruri. (Fowles 1995: 48).
 (back translation) For his self, also blurred, but real, rose [...] against the idea that, if in his right mind, he would have allowed such things to happen.

Though slightly different, the Romanian version does ensure the cohesive flow of the discourse and the natural spontaneous dialogue in a suitable way. The same similarity in the expression of complex reference can be viewed in the next example:

- (3) *I trust you can accept at least this.* (Fowles 1982: 14).
(translation) Sper că sunteți de acord măcar cu acest lucru. (Fowles 1995: 43).
(back translation) I hope you can accept at least this thing.

The difference stems from the fact that this utterance displays a higher register, with the distant relationship made obvious in Romanian through the use of the second person plural for politeness. It is the social context determining the choice in Romanian of *acest lucru* (*this thing*) for just *asta* (*this*) which is much more informal. Otherwise there is no shift in cohesion whatsoever and the translator's option for the reference is appropriate and preserves the cohesiveness of the message.

- (4) *The proper means is the most efficacious means. Which is what you are getting.* (Fowles 1982: 11).
(translation) Mijloacele corecte înseamnă mijloacele cele mai eficiente. Adică exact ce vi se oferă acum. (Fowles 1995: 34).
(back translation) The proper means is the most efficacious means. Namely exactly what you are being offered now.

In the example above, the relative pronoun *Which* has the function of a subject and is used at the beginning of the sentence instead of the demonstrative *that*. This is typical of the spoken language and can be employed in the literary dialogue to display the natural flow of the hero's thoughts and thereby provide the dialogue with orality and authenticity. In Romanian, the separation of the two sentences follows the norm of the written discourse. The colloquial value is of a lexical nature and is given by the informal *Adică* (*namely/that is*). The cohesiveness of the message could have been achieved in a formally equivalent manner, but the translator's choice is a proper and equivalent alternative.

Simplification sometimes operates in relation to reference. Here are two examples illustrative of how or whether it affects the Romanian version:

- (5) *That's very good.* (Fowles 1982: 17).
(translation) Așa, bine. (Fowles 1995: 53).
(back translation) Right, good.

Although suitable in context, the translation adopts a different manner of rendering the semantic content, namely by using ellipsis instead of reference. This entails the omission of the English demonstrative which acts as reference, therefore manifesting simplification. However, the cohesiveness of the message is well preserved.

Simplification by using ellipsis instead of the referring expression is also employed in the example below. The omitted item is the demonstrative as well:

- (6) *I had realised that.* (Fowles 1982: 18).
 (translation) Da, mi-am dat și eu seama. (Fowles 1995: 54).
 (back translation) Yes, I have realised myself.

Even though the back translation might sound slightly alien since mentioning the reference feels necessary in English, the Romanian version, without the reference, is perfectly natural. The demonstrative could have been used the same suitably in Romanian but is not necessary and its omission does not affect the cohesiveness of the expression or its semantic content at all.

The next example comprises two references in English and only one in Romanian:

- (7) *That's exactly what it is.* (Fowles 1982: 18).
 (translation) Păi, chiar asta și e. (Fowles 1995: 53).
 (back translation) Well, that's exactly [it].

Whilst the demonstrative *that* occurs in Romanian as well (*asta*), the pronoun *it* does not have a physical counterpart in Romanian. This is because the Romanian verb *e* (*is*) inflects the information about the subject which is not specifically named. This is a case of simplification due to structural differences and not as the translator's preference as in the previous example for instance. Therefore, it can be classified as an obligatory simplification and not an optional one, as in the example right above this one.

The example below is interestingly made up almost entirely of references. More exactly, the meaning is wholly formal in construction with no content word. Instead, it comprises two references, the former being anaphoric and the second cataphoric.

- (8) *That's another thing.* (Fowles 1982: 11).
 (translation) Mai e ceva. (Fowles 1995: 34).
 (back translation) [There] is something else.

Being made up almost solely of references, this sentence is a very obvious example of how reference is context dependent since it includes no clue as to the meaning behind the words. The retrieval of the semantic content is divided between the context before it (for the first reference: *that*) and to the context following it (for the second referent: *another thing*).

The Romanian version is again a simplified one as it entirely omits the first, anaphoric reference. This alters the semantic accuracy of the immediate context, but does not affect the overall meaning, at macro-contextual level. Simplification is non-obligatory here since the anaphoric reference would have been possible in Romanian in the form of a demonstrative just as in English.

Explication can also be observed in relation to the translation of reference even if considerably less frequently than simplification:

- (9) *I take exception to that.* (Fowles 1982: 9).

(translation) Aș prefera să nu vă răspund la o asemenea întrebare. (Fowles 1995: 30).

(back translation) I'd rather not answer such a question.

The meaning as provided by the larger context is taken over explicitly in Romanian, which makes it a case of non-obligatory explicitation. The Romanian demonstrative *asta* (*this*) would have been possible and cohesively similar.

Neutralisation is an occurring feature in this analysis but falls outside the umbrella of the formal function of reference, *i.e.*, as a cohesive device. Instead, it can manifest in the cases when reference acquires stylistic values. In such situations, some emotional content intertwines with the formal function of reference and the two components are jointly dependent on the context for semantic retrieval. Here is an example thereof:

(10) *If that were so – my God, a day would come when he would arraign doctor, hospital, treatment, all...* (Fowles 1982: 16).

(translation) Dacă așa era – Dumnezeu, va veni o zi când îi va aranja el pe toți, și pe doctoriță, și spitalul, și tratamentul... (Fowles 1995: 49).

(back translation) If [it] were so – my God, a day would come when he would arraign them all, doctor, hospital, treatment...

This example offers evidence of the fact that demonstratives and pronouns can be interchangeable as references, not without impact upon the message though. For the sake of clarification, I suggest the comparison between the sequence in the original example where a demonstrative is used – *If that were so...* – with its semantic equivalent using a pronoun – *If it were so...* The replacement produces no change at a semantic or formal level, but it is obvious that there is a difference in emotional intensity: The former version, which uses the demonstrative *that* is stronger emotionally speaking, providing some emphasis. In Romanian, the omission of the demonstrative (though possible) triggers the reduction of the intensity and provides a neutral manner of expression, missing the emphasis and thus representing a case of neutralisation.

The pronoun *it* is in brackets in the back translation because it is not explicitly expressed in Romanian. This is due to the fact that the information about the subject is embedded in the verb form, so the pronoun subject can only remain implicit, as compared to a demonstrative subject which could have been used and would have rendered the emphatic value. Therefore, despite structural correctness and semantic equivalence, the stylistic value of the source language version is suppressed in Romanian.

Neutralised emphasis is present in the translation of the example below as well, where the expression of the reference, also a demonstrative, is extended to a string of lexical items meant to generate a stressed manner of expression:

(11) *I don't know how you can even 'think' of doing a thing like this*. (Fowles 1982: 17).

(translation) Nici nu știu cum de puteți face asa ceva. (Fowles 1995: 53).

(back translation) I don't even know how you can do something like that.

The meaning has not suffered any deviation in the translation, but the stress provided by *a thing like this* is cancelled by the simple and neutral Romanian *așa ceva* (*something like that*). This is an unsatisfactory translation since the emphasis could have been preserved exactly as it is expressed in English, namely as *un lucru ca acesta* (*a thing like this*).

Proof that emphasis attached to a demonstrative as reference can be preserved in a translation into Romanian is the following example:

- (12) *Was not that just the sort of snide, childishly malicious remark the general public like to make about their elected representatives?* (Fowles 1982: 16).
 (translation) *Oare nu era și asta una din acele remarci insinuante și naiv-malițioase pe care publicul le face la adresa reprezentanților lui aleși?* (Fowles 1995: 48).
 (back translation) *Was not that the sort of snide, naively-malicious remark the public make about their elected representatives?'*

Reference is part of an emphatic structure which comprises a non-contracted negative form, unlike the overwhelmingly frequent contractions in the present dialogue (*was not* versus *wasn't*). Despite the differences in translation, since a contraction could not be realised, the reference has been successfully translated together with the emphatic value it acquires, as has the whole sematic content. The overall cohesiveness has been preserved in translation.

5 Findings and Conclusions

The reference in the English original version is normally validated as a cohesive device in the translation into Romanian, usually employing the same language means. Alternatively, the translations display simplification and explicitation without affecting the overall cohesiveness of the target language discourse though. On the contrary, oftentimes the changes seem to occur naturally for an equally natural expression in Romanian.

Simplification is definitely the prevailing feature in the translation of reference, by far more frequent than explicitation. It is mostly realised by translating reference into ellipsis. This occurs due to two possible reasons: either due to structural differences between English and Romanian reference on the one hand or due to the translator's preferences or deficient translation on the other hand. In this case, Klaudy's theory regarding the distinction of explicitation between obligatory and optional one can be well extended to simplification. Namely, when structural differences hinder the equivalent translation at a formal level, it is certainly an obligatory type of simplification (as in example (7)). However, when the target language possesses means to translate a certain kind of reference, but the translator

opts for ellipsis, then it is an optional or non-obligatory simplification, as in example (6), for instance.

Explicitation can be both obligatory and non-obligatory as well in the translation of reference. It is usually employed for the sake of clarification or, in colloquial dialogue, to produce a fitting utterance in the particular social context exhibited by the interacting characters. So, when it is adopted to compensate for a structural difference, explicitation seems to come naturally. However, explicitation, in its non-obligatory facet, is interestingly and often creatively resorted to in order to generate naturalness in the target language.

Nevertheless, the occurrence of neutralisation indicates that, when stylistic values (e.g., emphasis) accompany reference, these might get lost in translation. Important is here, first of all, that reference can acquire stylistic values beside its formal language function just as ellipsis and substitution can. What differentiates neutralisation from simplification and explicitation is that it can only be optional or non-obligatory (see also Arhire 2017). Even in the event of structural, formal differences between the two languages, the stylistic effect should be compensated for especially in a literary work where the emotional content is of utmost importance. The lack of formal equivalence in matter of reference does not justify the reduction of the stylistic effect.

To sum up the discussion about universals in the translation of reference, only obligatory simplification is unavoidable, and it will be unproblematically compensated by some suitable device of the cohesive system of the target language. As results from the analysis of the examples where explicitation and neutralisation were entailed, they presented some alterations of the stylistic value, which generated some losses. Therefore, of relevance here is (i) the finding that reference, just as ellipsis and substitution, can be enriched with stylistic and emotional values and that (ii) these values need to be acknowledged and transferred to the target language as well. This can be achieved either together with the cohesive device (as in the original) or, if this is not possible or appropriate, it should be compensated for by other language means. For neutralisation can never be a solution to structural inequivalence between two languages but will always generate some undesired loss at the stylistic level.

From a comparative-contrastive vantage point, the study has confirmed the scholarly assumptions relative to the structural differences between the pair languages in the manifestation of reference as a cohesive device. Despite certain similarities, what this study has highlighted are mainly differences pertaining to the fact that the Romanian verbs inflect the information about the subject in terms of person and number. Therefore, if the reference subject is a pronoun, it remains implicit. That is why it cannot be translated as such from English where its mention is mandatory. However, if the subject uses as referring expression a demonstrative, this can be explicitly expressed in Romanian as well (see example [10]).

The issue might be of even more relevance in translator training activities since the professional translator seems to produce natural instances of cohesion rather than the students, especially when additional stylistic functions are embedded

(see Arhire 2017). While the students tend to remain more attached to the source language version, the professional translator of Fowles' *Mantissa* (1982) adopts a more target language-oriented stance and offers a more dynamic and hence natural cohesive and stylistic solution in translation. Even if the professional translator situates herself on a formally remote position in translating reference, the equivalent cohesiveness of the discourse it achieved. This achievement is indeed what matters, while confirming the structural differences in the manifestation of cohesive devices between English and Romanian. Therefore, seeking suitability in terms of cohesion is what translator trainees should be encouraged to do.

While being aware that this is not an all-encompassing study of translational aspects posed by the translation of reference, it hopefully creates grounds for further research and contributes to the practitioners' area and to translator training. The findings herein will definitely serve as a possible set of strategies to be resorted to by trainees, who can be taught to adopt a two-fold perspective when translating cohesive devices. One is offered by the recurrent features of translation which can be used as translation strategies, and the second pertains to the contrastive knowledge of the functional and stylistic values of the cohesive devices in general, and of reference in particular.

References

- Arhire, M. (2017). Cohesive devices in translator training: A study based on a Romanian translational learner corpus. *Meta Translators' Journal*, 62(1), 155-177. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1040471ar>
- Arhire, M. (2018a). A contrastive-translational approach to substitution. *Bulletin of Transylvania University of Braşov Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 11. 60(1), 189-198.
- Arhire, M. (2018b). The translation of ellipsis as identity marker in the literary dialogue. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae Philologica*, 10(3), 19-32. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.2478/ausp-2018-0025>
- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words. A coursebook on translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (1996). Corpus-based translation studies. The challenges that lie ahead. In H. Somers (Ed.), *Terminology, LSP and translation* (pp.175-186). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.18.17bak>
- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies* (3rd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Becher, V. (2010). Abandoning the notion of 'translation-inherent' explicitation: Against a dogma of translation studies. *Across Languages and Cultures* 11(1), 1-28. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.11.2010.1.1>

Bidu-Vrănceanu, A., Călărășu, C., Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, L., et al. (2001). *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*. București: Nemira.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. (1983). Universals of lexical simplification. In C. Faerch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in inter-language communication* (pp.119-139). London and New York: Longman. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1978.tb00143.x>

Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House, & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication* (pp. 17-35). Tübingen: Narr.

Caldas-Coulthard, C.R. (2000). *Written discourse*. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.

Chesterman, A. (2004). Beyond the particular. In A. Mauranen, & P. Kujamäki (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp.33-49). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.48>

Fowles, J. (1982). *Mantissa*. New York, Boston, London: Little, Brown and Company.

Fowles, J. (1995). *Mantisa*. (A. Jianu, Trans.). București: Univers. (Original work published in 1982).

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Longman.

Hasan, R. (1984). Coherence and cohesive harmony. In J. Flood (Ed.), *Understanding reading comprehension* (pp.181-219). Delaware: International Reading Association.

Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

House, J. (2008). Beyond intervention: Universals in translation? *Transkom 1*(1), 6-19.

Ilisei, I., Mihaila, C., Inkpen, D., & Mitkov, R. (2011). The impact of zero pronominal anaphora on translational language: A study on Romanian newspapers. *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai, Informatica LVI*(2), 43-50.

Johnson, K. (2008). A view of QR from ellipsis. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Topics in ellipsis* (pp.69-94). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511487033>

Kenny, D. (1999). CAT tools in an academic environment: What are they good for?. *Target 11*, 65-82. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.11.1.04ken>

Kenny, D. (2001). *Lexis and creativity in translation: A corpus-based study*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Klaudy, K. (1996). Concretization and generalization of meaning in translation. In M. Thelen, & B. Lewandoska-Tomaszczyk (Eds.), *Translation and meaning Part 3* (pp.141-163). Maastricht: Hogeschool Maastricht.

Künzli, A. (2004). 2004. I find that a bit exaggerated - Neutralization in Translation. In A. Papaconstantinou (Ed.), *Choice and Difference in Translation: The Specifics of Transfer* (pp.81-96). Athens: The National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

Larson, M.L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. Lanhan, New York and Oxford: University Press of America.

Leuven-Zwart, K.M. van (1990). Translation and original: Similarities and dissimilarities, II. *Target* 2(1), 69-95. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.2.1.05leu>

Malmkjaer, K. (2008). Norms and nature in translation studies. In M. Rogers, & G. Anderman (Eds.), *Incorporating corpora: The linguist and the translator* (pp.49-59) Clevedon: Multilingual Matter.

Mauranen, A. (2007). Universal tendencies in translation. In M. Rogers, & G. Anderman (Eds.), *Incorporating corpora: The linguist and the translator* (pp.32-48). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

McShane, M.J. (2005). *A theory of ellipsis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, J. (2001). *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Newmark, P. (1987). The use of systemic linguistics in translation analysis and criticism. In R. Steele, & T. Threadgold (Eds.), *Language topics: Essays in honour of Michael Halliday* (pp.293-304). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.lt2.28new>

Olohan, M. (2004). *Introducing corpora in translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203640005>

Protopopescu, D., & Vişan, N. (2008). Compensation and translation in James Ellroy's White Jazz. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 10(2), 41-50.

Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring translation theories*. London and New York: Routledge.

Schäffner, C. (2002). Discourse analysis for translation and translator training: status, needs, methods. In C. Schäffner (Ed.), *The role of discourse analysis for translation and in translator training* (pp.53-77). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Stoichiţoiu-Ichim, A. (2002). *Semiotica discursului juridic*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Toolan, M. (1998). *Language in literature: An introduction to stylistics*. London: Hodder Arnold. Publication.

Trosborg, A. (2002). Discourse analysis as part of translator training. In C. Schäffner (Ed.), *The role of discourse analysis for translation and in translator training*. (pp.9-52). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Toury, G. (2004). Probabilistic explanations in translation studies. Welcome as they are, would they qualify as universals? In A. Mauranen, & P. Kuyamaki (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist?* (pp.15-32). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.48.03tou>

Wilson, P. (2000). *Mind the gap: Ellipsis and stylistic variation in spoken and written English*. London: Longman. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315839448>

Zanettin, F. (2012). *Translation-driven corpora: Corpus resources for descriptive and applied translation studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Zanettin, F. (2013). Corpus methods for descriptive translation studies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 95, 20-32. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.618>

Zlatnar Moe, M. (2010). *Styling popular fiction: A comparison of stylistic shifts in Slovene translations of popular fiction and literary prose*. Paper presented at IV Congreso Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Literarios de Cultura Popular, Mallorca. Retrieved 19 August, 2019, from <http://www.uibcongres.org/congresos/>