Dissidence in Seven Romanian Alternative Translations of *The Great Gatsby*

Nadina VIŞAN[1]

The present article investigates instances of intertextuality in retranslation, especially cases of dissidence, namely situations in which a choice in a retranslated text differs from the obvious choices employed in previous versions of the same source text. By analysing a translational series that is made up of seven target texts, the article argues that filiation (strategic similarities in retranslation) is much easier to prove than dissidence and that a correlation between textual analysis and the study of paratexts remains the effective method of illuminating the process of retranslation.

Keywords: *retranslation, filiation, dissidence, paratexts*

1. Introduction

One of the topics that have been the butt of debate in retranslation studies is translational intertextuality. One of the most frequently quoted studies is Koskinen and Paloposki's (2015) article on how the first translator in a translational series made up of more than one target text will always leave their mark on subsequent translations. Koskinen and Paloposki (2015, 26) refer to this phenomenon as "anxiety of influence", borrowing the term from Harold Bloom's (1973) seminal book on literary theory. A similar point was previously made in Pym (2004, 106) who related the notion of "influential translation" to that of the original text itself: "Influential translations remain in cultural canons or receivers' minds, becoming pertinent points of departure themselves. They complicate matters by becoming pseudo-originals." In other words, a translational series may contain a target text that is so influential that it might count as a "definitive" translation, which means that it might even block the series and close it. In the event that the series stays open, the subsequent retranslators will take this "pseudo-original" as a point of

---

[1] University of Bucharest, nadina.visan@lls.unibuc.ro

reference, either "appropriating" some of its solutions creatively, or checking their own solutions by consulting this previous version.

The idea that first translations are important for retranslation can be traced back to Berman's (1990) famous essay on retranslation, which has inspired Chesterman's (2000) well-known Retranslation Hypothesis, according to which a first translation is imperfect and introductory, as well as target-oriented, whereas subsequent translations strive to "improve" and update the first rendition, by adopting a more source-oriented stance. Faced with a body of literature that has attempted for the past 20-odd years to check this hypothesis, the retranslationist cannot but point to the paradoxical status of the first translation: on the one hand, it is seen as a text that can always stand "improvement", yet on the other hand it can be an "influential" text that most subsequent target texts are judged by.

The purpose of the present paper is to look closely at an open translational series and investigate instances of intertextuality in retranslation, defined in Zhang and Ma (2018, 578) as "textual relationships between retranslations", whether they appear under the form of textual "similarities" or of "differences". The motivation behind this investigation lies in a desire to find out to what extent the first target text in the Romanian translational series of Scott Fitzgerald's novel *The Great Gatsby* can be seen as an "influential" target text for the elements in the series. The investigation is worth pursuing because the novel in question has proved to be one of the literary texts that have been many times retranslated into Romanian, which provides ample material for textual comparisons. Moreover, in my previous investigations of Romanian translational series (Vișan 2024a, 2024b) I have noticed the fact that in the Romanian polysystem it is often the second, not the first target text in the series, that has been many times republished, even "uncreatively appropriated", as is the case of Ana Almăgeanu's version of *Pride and Prejudice*. This means that, in some cases, it is the second, rather than the first, target text in the series that counts as the "influential" element of the set.

The more specific purpose of this research is to identify traces of "dissidence" in retranslation, a type of intertextuality defined by Zhang and Ma (2018, 581) as "textual differences that indicate that one translation is made to distinguish from or even compete against another". This type of retranslational intertextuality may be placed in a relation with Alvstad and Assis Rosa's (2015, 10) "confrontational" translation, which refers to a target text that confronts its predecessor(s) "by pursuing different overall translational goals and applying different translational procedures", or with Koskinen's (2018, 320) notion of "creative opposition" in retranslation. To my knowledge, the case studies in the literature have analysed only instances of "filiation" (Zhang and Ma 2018), or

"assimilation" (Alvstad and Assis Rosa 2015, 10), or "creative incorporation" (Koskinen 2018, 320), or strategic "overlap" (Van Poucke 2020, 15). However, none of the studied I consulted – with the exception of Zhang and Ma (2018) – has focused on identifying textual cues that hint at "hostility" towards a previous target text in a translational series. This is probably because "dissidence" is much more difficult to prove than "filiation" is, as suggested in Vișan (2024a, 184).

In light of all this, the present article attempts to identify traces of "dissidence" in a corpus where the excerpts under analysis have been selected according to Zhang and Ma's (2018, 581) specifications that have to do with the following points: similar or dissimilar treatment provided by (re)translators to foregrounded language, additions and/or deletions made by translators, similar or dissimilar translation errors, similar or dissimilar treatment granted to culture-loaded items and parallel or opposing translational strategies. My expectations are that one particular target text will always "stand out" in the translational series, becoming the main "dissident" of the lot. The analysis is exclusively textual and the results are based on a set of textual cues as proposed in Zhang and Ma (2018), in the absence of paratexts that might have helped the researcher establish which of the target texts in the series are "parallel" translations (in the sense of Van Poucke 2020, 14) and which are not, that is which of the retranslators have been aware of the previous versions and which have not.

2. The Corpus

The source text under analysis may be identified as a "comet", if we were to borrow the metaphor proposed in Frank and Schultze (2004, 72), and the plethora of Romanian alternative translations that Fitzgerald's novel has acquired may be seen as a genuine "comet's tail": although the first translation (TT1) was produced more than four decades after 1925, when *The Great Gatsby* was published, and remained its only Romanian version for almost half a century, right after cessation of copyrights, the novel was retranslated into Romanian seven times and, since the most recent translation was made in 2025, it is fair to suppose that the translational series stays open and that more retranslations are yet to be produced in future. Consider the information provided in Table 1:

Table 1. Romanian versions of *The Great Gatsby*

THE COMMUNIST PERIOD (1947-1989)	TT1 – *Marele Gatsby* 1967, translated by Mircea Ivănescu, 'Editura pentru literatură universală', preface
THE POST-COMMUNIST PERIOD	TT2 – 2013, George Volceanov, 'Polirom', footnotes
	TT3 – 2014, Mihai Miroiu, 'Rao', preface and footnotes
	TT4 – 2015, Ileana Velescu, 'Aldo Press'
	TT5 – 2016, 2024, Simona Goșu, 'Corint', footnotes by translator and editor, preface by Anca Peiu
	TT6 – 2018, 2019, Cristina Jinga, 'Litera'
	TT7 – 2023, Miruna Andriescu, 'Librex'
	TT8 – 2025, Elisabeta Ivan, 'Didactica Publishing House'

The history of the (re)translation of Scott Fitzgerald's novel is peculiar for the Romanian polysystem, as confirmed in Burlacu et al. (2005, 589), in that the first translation was due to Mircea Ivănescu as late as 1967 and was published during the "communist period". Thus, unlike other classic British or American novels, this particular source text lacks a "pre-communist" Romanian target text, if we are to make use of the periodization proposed in Constantinescu et al. (2021, 134). It is also interesting to notice that the first target text (TT1) was many times republished after 1989: in 1991, by 'Noua Europă' and 'Excelsior Multi-Press', in 1994, by 'Sophia', in 2002, 2007 by 'Polirom', with a postface by Mircea Mihăeș, in 2013, 2018, 2021, by 'Humanitas' with Scott Fitzgerald's preface translated by reputed author and translator Radu Paraschivescu. The last edition, published by 'Humanitas', mentions the name of the translator (reputed poet and translator Mircea Ivănescu) on its cover. It is thus fair to say that in the post-communist period TT1 has so far competed with retranslations for the attention of the same readership. The fact that only two of the retranslations (TT5 and TT6) were republished, while the first translation has continued to be republished and refurbished with new prefaces and notes, indicates that TT1 is still influential on the book market. It would be interesting to see to what extent its influence can also be identified textually, by comparing it with the other target texts.

TT2, translated by reputed specialist George Volceanov, is the first Romanian retranslation of the source text and the only one of the subsequent target texts that is marked by visibility in its peritext (its cover), which reads: "in a new translation by George Volceanov". Thus, TT2 may be considered an "overt retranslation" (Alvstad and Assis Rosa 2015, 16), with a "visible" translator, whose signature is a mark of prestige. None of the other retranslations, although published shortly after, makes use of their front cover to provide information about their having the status of retranslations, which means that a "lay reader" (Hickey

2003, 62) may treat each of these target texts as, possibly, a first translation. This is another aspect worth mentioning, because according to Alvstad and Assis Rosa (2015, 17), normally "invisible retranslations appear to be rare", a fact which is disproved by the series under analysis.

Also, I have no way of knowing whether the retranslators were aware of (and consulted) the first target text, but since some of the retranslators are also reputed academics (such as George Volceanov, or Mihai Miroiu) or writers (Simona Goşu), I can only assume that they knew of TT1 and must have consulted it at some point, whether in filiation or in dissidence. This means that, to my knowledge, there are no paratexts that might help me identify whether this particular translational series has "parallel retranslations" among its members and that my only way of trying to establish this fact is by textual analysis.

As for the most recent element of the series, namely the 2025 version (TT8), I have not been able to acquire it yet, so this particular target text, although mentioned in Table 1, has not been made available for the current analysis.

3. *The Great Gatsby* in Translation

As demonstrated by Zhang and Ma (2018, 581) in their groundbreaking article on retranslational intertextuality, a textual analysis might indeed prove fruitful in tracing instances of filiation (similarities between target texts despite the existence of "available alternatives" in translation) or of dissidence (dissimilarities between target texts in those spots where "similar or identical solutions are more likely to have been adopted").

In what follows, I will discuss a set of examples selected according to the indications of Zhang and Ma (2018). I admit that my selection started with the solutions offered in TT1, which I took as a point of departure in order to extend my investigation. Since all the retranslations available in the series can be labelled as "cold" retranslations (Alvstad and Assis Rosa 2015, 12) in that they were produced almost five decades after the first translation, one reason for possible "dissimilarities" between the first translation and the rest of the target texts might be attributed to a change in translational norms and in editorial preferences. Bearing this in mind, let us consider the first example, an excerpt selected from the first chapter of the novel, which introduces the feminine protagonists of the story (Daisy and Jordan) by means of an extended metaphor.

(1)   ST: The only completely stationary object in the room was an enormous couch on which two young women *were buoyed up* as though upon an anchored *balloon*. They were both in white, and their dresses were *rippling and fluttering* as if they had just been *blown back* in after a short *flight* around the house. I must have stood for a few moments listening to the whip and snap of the curtains and the groan of a picture on the wall. Then there was a boom as Tom Buchanan shut the rear windows and the caught *wind* died out about the room, and the curtains and the rugs and the two young women *ballooned* slowly to the floor. (p.16)

       TT1:   Singurul obiect cu totul imobil era o sofa enormă pe care se aflau, agățate parcă de o geamandură, două femei tinere. […] perdelele, covoarele și cele două femei se lăsară să plutească încet, spre dușumea, ca niște baloane din care iese încet aerul. (1967, 20)

       TT2:   Singurul obiect cu totul nemișcat din această încăpere era o canapea enormă, pe care două tinere stăteau cocoțate ca pe o geamandură. […] iar perdelele, carpetele și cele două tinere plutiră încetișor pe dușumea. (2013, 17)

       TT3:   Singurul obiect cu totul nemișcat din cameră era o sofa enormă pe care erau cocoțate două tinere ca și cum s-ar fi aflat în nacela unui balon ancorat. […] iar perdelele, covoarele și cele două femei au plutit încet spre podea. (2014, 51)

       TT4:   Singurul obiect nemișcat din încăpere era o canapea uriașă pe care stăteau cele două tinere, ca într-un balon oprit pe loc. […] perdelele, covoarele și cele două tinere aterizară încet pe podea. (2015, 13)

       TT5:   Singurul lucru cu totul imobil din cameră era o canapea enormă, pe care două tinere păreau să plutească de parcă s-ar fi aflat într-un balon ancorat. […] iar perdelele și covorașul, împreună cu cele două tinere, au coborât parcă lin pe podea. (2016, 34)

       TT6:   Singurul obiect perfect nemișcat din încăpere era un divan enorm, pe care pluteau două femei tinere, ca agățate de o geamandură. […] iar perdelele, covoarele și cele două tinere plutiră ușor spre podea. (2018, p. 18)

       TT7:   Singurul obiect complet nemișcat din încăpere era o canapea uriașă pe care săltau două femei tinere, ca pe un balon gata să-și ia zborul. […] iar perdelele, covoarele și cele două tinere s-au coborât pe podea, plutind alene. (2023, 15-16)

The source text plays upon the double meaning implied by 'navigation', which can either take place through liquid, or through air. The repetition of the word 'balloon', both as a noun and as an intransitive verb, disambiguates this image. However, three of the target texts (TT1, TT2, TT6) opt for the 'liquid' reading by using the Romanian word 'geamandură' (defined as a "body that floats in liquid used as a signal for navigation restrictions"). This option creates semantic dissonance between the first and the second part of the excerpt. Of the remaining target texts, TT3 adds the technical term 'nacelă' (the nacelle of a dirigible, hot-air balloon), explicitating the image provided in the source text. TT7 seems to be the most accurate of the target texts by using the verb 'a sălta' (to bounce), chosen over 'a sta' (stay) or 'a se afla' (be) or 'a pluti' (float), which are the solutions provided by the rest of the target texts. Thus, TT3 can be considered a "dissident" because of the addition (by explicitation) made to the image suggested in the source text, while TT7 stands out by employing a more fine-grained lexical choice for the verb 'buoy up'.

Let us also consider the following excerpt where the author selects a marked gender-based lexeme ('girl') that seems to pose problems to the Romanian translators. Consider the examples under (2):

(2)   ST: There was music from my neighbor's house through the summer nights. In his *blue* gardens *men and girls* came and went like *moths* among the *whisperings* and the champagne and the stars. (p. 39)

TT1:   În nopțile verii aceleia, dinspre casa vecinului meu se auzea mereu muzică. În grădinile lui albăstrii, bărbații și femeile pluteau tremurători ca niște fluturi de noapte, înconjurați de șoapte, de șampanie, de stele. (1967, 53)

TT2:   În nopțile de vară, dinspre casa vecinului meu răsuna întruna muzica. În grădinile lui albastre era un du-te-vino de bărbați și femei tinere, roind ca fluturii de noapte printre șoapte, șampanie și stele. (2013, 55)

TT3:   În nopțile de vară, de la ferestrele vecinului meu se auzea muzică. În grădinile lui albastre bărbați și fete veneau și plecau aidoma fluturilor de noapte, printre murmure, șampanie și stele. (2014, 87)

TT4:   În nopțile de vară, dinspre casa vecinului meu se auzea tot timpul muzică. În grădinile lui scăldate de lumină, bărbații și tinerele veneau și plecau, ca niște fluturi de noapte, prin atmosfera plină de șoapte, șampanie și stele. (2015, 38)

TT5:   În nopțile acelea de vară, din casa vecinului meu se auzea muzică. Prin grădinile sale albastre, bărbați și femeiuști [footnote] veneau și plecau precum fluturașii de noapte printre șoapte și șampanie, sub stele. (2016, 63)

TT6: Muzica a răsunat în toate nopțile de vară din casa vecinului meu. În grădinile sale melancolice, băieți și fete roiau ca fluturii de noapte, printre șoapte, șampanie și stele. (2018, 51)

TT7: În serile de vară se auzea mereu muzică dinspre casa vecinului meu. În grădinile lui albastre, bărbații și femeile veneau și plecau ca niște fluturi de noapte, printre șoapte și șampanie, și stele. (2023, 51)

Let us consider the phrase 'men and girls' employed by Fitzgerald at the beginning of the third chapter of the novel when referring to the guests coming to Gatsby's parties. Out of the seven versions listed under (2), TT1 and TT7 opt for the noun 'femei' (women) to render the noun 'girls', whereas TT2 chooses to explicitate by employing the phrase 'femei tinere' (young women). TT3 and TT6 opt for equivalence, in choosing the noun 'fete' (girls), whereas TT4 makes use of the adjective-to-noun convert 'tinere' (young women). TT5, on the other hand, stands out by selecting a derogatory noun (with a suffix that marks it as pejorative), namely 'femeiuști' (little women). More than that, TT5 (page 63) chooses to add extratextual explicitation by a footnote that reads: "*Autorul folosește termenul girls (engl.) care are o nuanță peiorativă în engleza americană atunci când se referă la o reprezentantă a sexului frumos care a depășit vârsta copilăriei (n. red.)*" [The author uses the term *girls* (English) that has a derogatory meaning in American English when it refers to a representative of the fair sex that has surpassed the age of childhood (editor's note)].

TT5 also stands out in the use of a diminutive suffix for the noun 'fluturi' (butterflies) with a derogatory meaning, when translating 'moths' from English to Romanian. All the other versions opt for the unmarked phrase 'fluturi de noapte' (night butterflies) to render the source text noun 'moths'. Funnily enough, in another excerpt that repeats the word 'moths' when referring to Gatsby who "dispensed starlight to occasional moths" (Fitzgerald 2014, 68), TT4 is the version that stands out by literal translation and inconsistency: 'moths' is rendered as 'molii', which sounds completely inappropriate under the circumstances because in Romanian the first meaning of the word is that of insect pests.

Last but not least, it is interesting to notice that TT3 is the only version that stands out in the rendering of the noun 'whisperings' as 'murmure' (murmurs) instead of 'șoapte' (whispers). As can be noticed, there is a lot of overlapping that occurs in the above-mentioned target texts which seems to be coincidental rather than strategic. Bearing in mind the definition provided by Zhang and Ma (2018, 581) for dissidence, I believe that such marked lexical choices as the one mentioned above qualify as instances of dissidence.

The third example is selected from the first paragraph of the fourth chapter of the novel and, in my opinion, is meant to symmetrically echo the phrase 'men and girls' employed in the first paragraph of the third chapter. This, I believe, was the most troublesome spot for translators. Let us consider the examples under (3):

(3)   ST: On Sunday morning while church bells rang in the villages alongshore, *the world and its mistress* returned to Gatsby's house and twinkled hilariously on his lawn. (p. 55)

     TT1:   Duminica dimineața când clopotele bisericilor răsunau în cartierele din jurul golfului, *lumea și stăpânul ei, soarele*, se reîntoarseră în jurul casei lui Gatsby și, sclipind de bună dispoziție, își îndreptară privirile spre pajiștea lui. (1967, 70)

     TT2:   Duminică dimineața, când răsuna dangătul clopotelor din bisericile înșirate de-a lungul țărmului, *lumea și metresa ei, soarele*, reveneau la reședința lui Gatsby, scânteind cu voioșie pe pajiștea din jurul casei. (2013, 82)

     TT3:   Duminică dimineața, când clopotele bisericilor răsunau în satele de-a lungul țărmului, *lumea întreagă și stăpânul ei, soarele*, reveneau la casa lui Gatsby și scânteiau cu hohote de veselie pe peluza lui. (2014, 113)

     TT4:   Duminica dimineața, când clopotele bisericii băteau în satele de pe țărm, *lumea și soarele* se întorceau la casa lui Gatsby și scânteiau zgomotos pe pajiștea lui. (2015, 56)

     TT5:   Duminică dimineața, când clopotele bisericii răsunau în așezările de pe țărm, *lumea toată și stăpânul ei* se întorceau în preajma casei lui Gatsby și străluceau, plini de voie bună, pe pajiștea acestuia. (2016, 84)

     TT6:   Duminică dimineață, când clopotele bisericilor răsunau în cartierele de pe țărm, **toată crema societății și paraziții ei** se întoarseră la casa lui Gatsby, plesnind de bună dispoziție pe pajiștea lui. (2018, 74)

     TT7:   Duminică dimineață, când clopotele bisericii răsunau în localitățile de pe coastă, *lumea și stăpânul ei* s-au întors la reședința lui Gatsby și luceau comic pe pajiștea lui. (2023, 77)

The phrase 'the world and its mistress' is a metaphor that resumes 'men and girls' in the previous chapter, but the Romanian translators do not make this connection in their renderings, with the exception of Cristina Jinga (TT6), that comes closest semantically, by opting for 'toată crema societății și paraziții ei' (all the good society and their parasites). It seems that the main verb of the sentence (twinkled

hilariously) prompts the first translator to explicitate the noun 'mistress' by an apposition ('soarele', the sun). The matter is also complicated by the fact that, in Romanian, the noun 'lumea' (the world) is marked as [+feminine], which forces the translator to interpret the English noun *mistress* as a [+masculine] noun in Romanian: 'stăpân' (master). Thus, the phrase 'the world and its mistress' is rendered as 'lumea şi stăpânul ei, soarele' (the world and her master, the sun). This, in my opinion, counts as an instance of mistranslation, which seems to be replicated in TT2, TT3 and TT4. TT5 and TT7 do not explicitate, leaving 'the sun' out, but adopt the same gender-inverted phrase as their predecessors: 'lumea şi stăpânul ei' (the world [+female] and its master [+male]). TT2 stands out by choosing the noun 'metresa' (kept woman, mistress) which should count as an equivalent for 'mistress' in the source text, but explicitates it by adding the word 'soarele' (the sun), thus invalidating the attempted equivalence.

In order to make sure that my intuition was correct, I also checked the solutions provided in other languages, such as Italian ('il mondo e la sua amante', the world and his mistress), French ('une faune des plus disparates', a fauna of the most diverse), Spanish ('los huéspedes de la noche anterior', the guests from the previous night) and Portuguese ('todos retornavam à casa de Gatsby acompanhados de suas amantes', all returned to the house of Gatsby, accompanied by their mistresses). All these solutions confirmed my intuition that the phrase 'the world and its mistress' has been mistranslated in Romanian, with the notable exception of TT6, which, in this case, appears as the "dissident" of the lot.

The last example I would like to discuss here contains a culture-loaded item, which receives a similar treatment in all Romanian target texts, with the exception of TT3. Consider the examples under (4):

(4)   ST: I was a bridesmaid. I came into her room half an hour before *the bridal dinner*, and found her lying on her bed as lovely as the June night in her flowered dress – and as drunk as a monkey. (p. 81)

       TT1:   Eram domnişoară de onoare. Cu o jumătate de ceas înainte de *masa festivă*, am intrat în camera ei şi-am găsit-o întinsă în pat în rochia înflorată, frumoasă ca şi noaptea aceea de iunie – şi beată turtă. (1967, 83)

       TT2:   I-am fost domnişoară de onoare. Am intrat la ea în camera cu o jumătate de oră înainte de *masa festivă* şi am găsit-o întinsă în pat în rochia ei înflorată, era la fel de frumoasă ca seara aceea de iunie – şi beată criţă. (2013, 102)

TT3: Eram domnișoară de onoare. Am intrat în camera ei cu o jumătate de oră înainte de *cina de repetiție* și am găsit-o șezând în pat, în rochia ei înflorată – era la fel de încântătoare ca noaptea aceea de iunie – și beată criță. (2014, 132)

TT4: Eu am fost una din domnișoarele de onoare. Înainte cu o jumătate de oră de *cina de dinaintea nunții* m-am dus în camera ei și am găsit-o întinsă pe pat, îmbrăcată într-o rochie înflorată, fermecătoare ca o seară de iunie – și beată ca o maimuță. (2015, 69)

TT5: I-am fost domnișoară de onoare. Cu o jumătate de oră înainte de *dineul din ajunul nunții*, m-am dus la ea în camera și am găsit-o trântită în pat, frumoasă ca noaptea aceea de iunie, în rochia ei cu flori și… beată criță. (2016, 99)

TT6: Eu am fost domnișoară de onoare. M-am dus în camera ei cu o jumătate de oră înainte de *masa festivă* și am găsit-o zăcând întinsă pe pat, frumoasă ca noaptea de iunie în rochia ei împodobită cu flori, și beată criță. (2018, 91)

TT7: Eram domnișoară de onoare. Am intrat în camera ei cu jumătate de oră înainte de *masa festivă* și am găsit-o întinsă pe pat, frumoasă ca seara aceea de iunie, cu rochia ei înflorată, și beată turtă. (2023, 95)

The phrase 'the bridal dinner', which is nowadays known as 'the rehearsal dinner receives similar treatment in TT1, TT2, TT6 and TT7. By opting for the phrase 'masa festivă' (the festive meal), these target texts choose implicitation as a translational strategy, as the target phrase is much vaguer than its source counterpart. On the other hand, TT3, Mihai Miroiu's version, stands out by providing the most accurate rendition in 'cina de repetiție' (the rehearsal dinner), a concept that does not exist in the Romanian culture. TT4 and TT5 opt for 'cina de dinaintea nunții' (the dinner before the wedding) and 'dineul din ajunul nunții' (the dinner on the eve of the wedding), which results in semantic vagueness.

An interesting point may be made regarding the translation of the simile 'as drunk as a monkey', attested in Green (2009, 436) as a set phrase. As all formulaic language in translation, its renderings are characterized by a lot of coincidental (rather than strategic) overlapping (Vișan 2024b), under the form of either 'beată turtă' or 'beată criță' (dead drunk), which are both instances of formulaic language with resultatives in Romanian. The only target text that stands out in this case is TT4, that opts for literal translation ('beată ca o maimuță', drunk as a monkey), which, to my mind, is an instance of unnatural Romanian.

4. Concluding remarks

The textual analysis provided in this article indicates that there is a lot of overlapping material in the Romanian target texts under investigation. Some of this overlapping is, probably, strategic, and qualifies as filiation (as is the case of renderings for phrases such as 'the world and its mistress' or 'bridal dinner'). This phenomenon should, in my opinion, be correlated with the large distribution and longevity of TT1 and with the fact that this version has been republished many times by various publishing houses. It is my belief that TT1 has, indeed, proved to be an "influential" first translation, even if it has not blocked its translational series.

The present article has also attempted to identify cases of dissidence in retranslation, by looking at lexical choices, translational strategies, translators' footprints, as suggested in the literature. From this perspective, it seems that TT3, TT5 and TT6 have manifested the most frequent cases in which the choices of the translators were dissimilar with the tendencies traced in most of the other retranslations. It is difficult, however, to establish whether these differences were strategic, in the sense of their being a deliberate departure from previous translational choices. Zhang and Ma's (2018) article is more successful in proving dissidence, probably because it analyses two versions produced by the same translators, which means that they investigate two non-parallel translations. The fact remains that, in the absence of paratexts that might shed light on awareness of previous target texts, it is difficult to demonstrate dissidence only by analysing textual cues in retranslation.

However, the last example presented here, where one target text opted for literal translation of a set phrase, might lead us to believe that what that particular retranslator did *not* do was consult previous versions, for it stands to reason that, had they done so, they would have probably been persuaded to revise their own choices and produce a more natural text in Romanian. This only goes to show that, if coupled with a rigorous study of paratexts, textual investigations can be an effective tool in shedding light upon the process of retranslation.

References

Alvstad, Cecilia and Alexandra Assis Rosa. 2015. "Voice in Retranslation." *Target* 27(1): 3–24.

Berman, Antoine. 1990. "La retraduction comme espace de la traduction" [Retranslation as a space for translation]. *Palimpsestes* 4:1–7.

Bloom, Harold. 1973. *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burlacu, Doru, Constantin Colhon, and Ion Istrate. 2005. *Dicționarul cronologic al romanului tradus în România de la origini până în 1989 [A chronological dictionary of the novel translated in Romania from its origins up to 1989].* București: Editura Academiei Române.

Chesterman, Andrew. 2000. "A Causal Model for Translation Studies." In *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects,* ed. by Maeve Olohan, 15–28. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Constantinescu, Muguraș, Daniel Dejica and Titela Vîlceanu (eds). 2021. *O istorie a traducerilor în limba română* [*A history of translations into the Romanian language*]*.* București: Editura Academiei Române.

Frank, Armin Paul and Brigitte Schultze. 2004. "Historische Ubersetzungsreihe I: Kometenschweifstudien." [Historical Translation Studies I: Comet Tail Studies]. In *Die literarische Übersetzung in Deutschland. Studien zu ihrer Kulturgeschichte in der Neuzeit* [*Literary Translation in Germany. Studies on Its Cultural History in the Modern Era*]*,* ed. by Armin Paul Frank and Horst Turk, 71–92. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.

Fitzgerald, Scott F. 2014 [1925]. *The Great Gatsby.* London: Arcturus Publishing.

Green, Jonathon. 2009. *Chambers Slang Dictionary.* Edinburgh: Chambers.

Hickey, Leo. 2003. "The Reader as Translation Assessor." *Studies in Translation* 1(1): 59–92.

Koskinen, Kaisa and Outi Paloposki. 2015. "Anxieties of Influence. The Voice of the *First* Translator in Retranslation." *Target* 27(1): 25–39.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2018. "Revising and Retranslating." In *The Routledge Handbook of Literary Translation,* ed. by Kelly Washbourne and Ben Van Wyke, 315–324. London and New York: Routledge.

Pym, Anthony. 2004. *The Moving Text.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Van Poucke, Piet. 2020. "The Effect of Previous Translations on Retranslation: A Case-Study of Russian Dutch-Literary Translation." *TransCulturAl* 12(1): 10–25.

Vișan, Nadina. 2024a. "The Dinner Was as Well-Dressed as Any I Ever Saw: Intertextuality in Nine Romanian Versions of *Pride and Prejudice*." *Cultural Intertexts* 14: 183–195.

Vişan, Nadina. 2024b. "'Pompous Nothings' and Condescension in the Romanian Retranslation of *Pride and Prejudice*". *Analele Universității „Ovidius" Constanța. Seria Filologie* 35(2): 281–295.

Zhang, Huanyao and Huijuan Ma. 2018. "Intertextuality in Retranslation." *Perspectives* 26(4)*:* 576–592.