

CONSIDERATIONS ON SEVERAL ASPECTS OF LITERARY TRANSLATIONS INTO ROMANIAN BETWEEN 1944-1989

GEORGIANA I. BADEA

West University of Timișoara

***Abstract:** This paper describes, from a historiographical post-totalitarian position, the social and political circumstances in 1940-1989 Romania and their impact on translation practices, on translators, and on the way in which it was decided which writers were “worth” translating into Romanian. I shall examine the (d)ef(f)ects of totalitarian censorship on translators and translations during the communist period and shall also refer to instances of (self-)censorship – considered from the perspective of suppression and of how it may have distorted and prevented translated works from going to press. The article studies totalitarian censorship (political, of literary works,–education) as an active strategy of avoiding radical censorship (including commercial, economic, and religious censorship).*

***Keywords:** back-censorship, blacklist of writers, (self-)censorship, literary translation, post-totalitarian historiography*

1. Introduction

Written from a historiographical post-totalitarian position that takes into account the Romanian context, this study will hopefully add some new information in the research area of translation and censorship. There are studies on censorship in other countries of the former Eastern bloc, in which the periodical division of those 45 post-war years (of censorship) is different (Petcu 1999). This is interesting, as it proves that, although the political situation was similar in all the countries of the Eastern bloc, there were individual differences. At the time, many Romanian writers, were not allowed to publish their own work and they chose translation into Romanian as a form of self-censorship and a way of making a living. It is in this sense that I use the term self-censorship here.

In July 1971, the theses approved by the Ceaușescu regime marked the end of a relative cultural liberty. After that, censorship and self-censorship prevented very important Romanian writers from publishing, and this is how the dictatorship of mediocrity came into being. Back (or retroactive)-censorship is also worth noting as a form of censorship applied to writers fallen into disgrace: works whose translation had been allowed before 1971 were then either forbidden altogether or allowed only in a revised and truncated form.

The Fascist totalitarian regime of 1940-1944 ended when the Soviet troops entered the Romanian territory and set up the communist regime, which ended in December 1989. As everywhere else in the Soviet bloc, totalitarianism spread and contaminated profoundly the Romanian society, mentality, and culture. Consequently, Romania’s traditional opening towards Western literature, some of

which was read in the original, but mostly in translation, was nearly annihilated. As a result of various dictatorial directives, decades-long isolationism from the West ensued that turned Romania into an enclave. However, between periods of intense isolation and sharp worsening of censorship and of the control exerted over intellectuals at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s, there were intervals of relative permissiveness, particularly the period 1974-1977. This even made the US government grant Romania the status of most favoured nation, a clause withdrawn in 1988.

In the period under scrutiny here, Romanian culture was dominated by Socialist Realism. Its theses, though, are contradicted by the effects of their antitheses. The communist regime and the Proletkult (*proletarskaya kul'tura*, proletarian culture) movement promised to guarantee the freedom of expression and fundamental individual, social, and civil rights. However, the social, cultural, and individual reality abounded in facts that contradicted these theses and constituted the antitheses of the regime. In Romania, the totalitarian regime disregarded the fundamental individual rights and liberties, and went as far as denying human dignity, the principle of equality, and the right of free movement. The freedom of expression was among those fundamental rights that were abused.

The censorship of the titles to be translated and of the writers accepted by the USSR had an inevitable effect on the receiving audience. It widened the gap between Western realities and the reality *allowed* to readers in the Soviet bloc. Since the West was perceived as potentially contagious, authorities tolerated only (re)translations and reprints of translations sanctioned by the USSR and by the Romanian Communist Party (RCP) and considered formative for *Homo Sovieticus*, the new type of citizen. Censorship also affected pop culture (films, theatre, music), all the main genres, and, in general, what the media of those times could broadcast (Marino 2000, Volceanov 2013). This traumatised generations of Romanian artists, actors, musicians, and composers.

The entire 1944-1989 period was dominated by political stakes, problems, and tensions that impacted the choice of works and authors to be translated and changed the very act of translation (Lungu-Badea 2017). The ideological, cultural and/or linguistic censorship was justified in a rudimentary way by an allegedly moral purpose: translation was going to contribute to the education of a society made up of new citizens. The economic censorship of the 1980s, prompted by the regime's desire to pay off all external debt, put an end to translations of foreign authors. The economic censorship policy favoured socialist and Soviet markets and prohibited capitalist markets; the Romanian economy was based on state ownership of the means of production, collective farming, and industrial manufacturing. Ideological censorship came into use as an all-encompassing term, relative to those other types of censorship which marked the dogmatic regulatory policy of public discourse.

2. The brave new world promised by the communist regime; censorship and translation

2.1. The brave new world promised by the communist regime

In the first decade after the Second World War, the dwindling relations with the rest of the world, on the one hand, and the Soviet influence, on the other, had terrible repercussions on the Romanian culture and literature, and therefore, on translation as well (Frunză 1990, Selejan 1994, F. Manolescu 2003, Cătănuș 2006,

2011, N. Manolescu 2008, Boia 2013). This situation is explained by the alliances that Romania made from 1940 onwards.

In the 1940s, the most significant historical and cultural moments were the coup that led to Romania joining the allied forces (August 23, 1944); the armistice agreement between Romania and the United Nations, as a result of which Romania came to be under the tutelage of the USSR and had to accept the armistice terms (September 12, 1944); the implementation of Stalinism in Romania and Eastern Europe (1945). Although theoretically the leftist strategy of the USSR was renewed after 1953, the same methods of organisation and control of the Soviet Bloc states continued to be used. The “Stalinisation” of Romania began during the Groza government (1945-1947) and continued under Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, Romania’s communist leader from 1947 until his death in 1965. One of the consequences produced by Stalinization in the Romanian cultural and intellectual life was the dissolution of the Romanian Academy on June 10, 1948, and its replacement by the Academy of the Romanian People’s Republic (RPR hereafter) – an institution which politicised all activities. This is how the process of ideological harassment began and class considerations became criteria for reforming the Academy of RPR. This was the case of the *Journal of Ophthalmology*, sharply criticised by the party: the journal was accused of “cosmopolitanism” and “anti-patriotism”, because, on the one hand, it chose English and French as publication languages instead of Romanian or Russian, and, on the other hand, because it did not disseminate appropriately the Russian contributions in the field (Boia 2013: 325). The political witch-hunt was becoming pervasive in society and the political persecution of the writers led to many devastating consequences on the individual, the literary community, and on the society at large. The political witch-hunt produced the *Index* and collaborationism.

In 1948, the Romanian Workers’ Party started putting together an *Index* of banned authors, periodicals, and titles, which remained in force even after 1965 (more than 8,000 titles according to Papacostea (1998: 246); see also Boia 2013). The *Index* was a blacklist of writers and intellectuals considered hostile or dangerous to the Romanian regime for ideological reasons, whose careers were ruined by their honesty. Institutionalised communism and politicised culture led to the marginalisation of writers and artists who rejected the Proletkult principles. There were also translators who fell out of favour and whose translations were not reprinted. The banned writers took refuge in doing translations. If the translators were on the blacklist, their translations were no longer re-edited. Inclusion on this blacklist had serious consequences for these writers: censorship, persecution, harassment, publication bans, or even arrests. The existence of the *Index*/the Blacklist of writers proves how freedom of opinion, expression and creation was suppressed in Romania and how the totalitarian regime attempted to control and manipulate culture and the intelligentsia in order to maintain its power. When free speech was under attack, the writers found various ways to escape censorship. To avoid the effects of persecution, some of them resigned themselves to not being published and preferred to turn to translation, while others, in order to face the vicissitudes of everyday life, agreed to collaborate with the communist regime.

Regarding the Collaborationism with the Romanian government and the Soviet Union, many intellectuals, writers, translators, and others gave in to pressure. The “old” and therefore “bourgeois” elite was purged or forced to step back and was *gradually replaced* by intellectuals of the Soviet type. Since a pogrom of the intellectual elite would have destabilised the system, the regime

persecuted and abused intellectuals into collaboration. All kinds of dictatorial tactics were used to make intellectuals give in: deprivation of freedom, incarceration, and institutional cleansing. The dictatorial regime spared no effort in discrediting and terrifying writers, translators, scientists, and academics.

The 1950s were marked by a variety of developments. After 1953, during the years of the still undigested Stalinist “legacy”, the government ideological surveillance tightened the vise less drastically. Consequently, a “breeze of liberalism” started blowing after 1956, bringing with it the hope that shedding the Stalinist skin would lead to a change in the sombre political, social, and behavioural perspectives. The mutation was fragile though, and the ideological curtain held fast (Cătănuş 2006: 45-47). In Romania, the extent of the thaw was dictated by the relations that the Romanian communist leaders had with their Soviet counterparts (Anton 2006: 37). Therefore, whatever changes there were, they were visible only at the level of the political class, while the intellectual elite either felt culpable for giving up in hopelessness (Tismăneanu 2008:114), or went for acquiescence. Moreover, in 1956 the Romanian Writers’ Congress was the only one in the Soviet Bloc that fully reaffirmed the Stalinist Socialism Realism. Two years later, in 1958, the resumption of cultural relations with France was labelled as counter revolutionary. If the Romanian regime opposed the geographic and administrative interference of the Soviets (Cătănuş 2011: 265-292, 293-310), the de-Stalinisation process started by Khrushchev did not gain any traction among the Romanian authorities, who feared that the amplitude of potential protests would lead to a destabilisation of the regime. What was emphasised was the damage that Stalin’s personality cult did in the USSR, but the symptoms of the phenomenon among the Romanian nomenklatura were ignored or minimised. The most critical moment in the crisis of the relations between Romania and the USSR, which coincided with the crisis in the Sino-Soviet relations, was in 1958, when Gh. Gheorghiu-Dej, the head of the Romanian state, requested the withdrawal of the Soviet army from Romania. Consequently, it was decided that the “re-education” of the intellectuals was imperative. Mihai Beniuc, one of the opportunists and re-educated Romanian writers, a favoured translator and reviewer, stated in 1956 that whoever refused to write about Stalin could be accused of being an enemy of the people. Beniuc told young writers off for their alleged artistic liberalism and snobbery, and for writing “escapist” literature. (Simion 2000: 12) Censorship paralysed the creativity of some people, banned the publication of others and thus made them turn to translation for shelter; it also stimulated the subversive creativity of others, who either tricked the vigilance of the censors or suffered dire consequences:

As in the case of Communist translations of Shakespeare, self-censorship, the result of psychological terror, was worse, more destructive than censorship itself. (Volceanov 2013: 754)

The political, ideological, and cultural thaw begun at the end of the Stalinist era continued into the 1960s, though this liberalisation manifested itself differently in the various satellite-states of the USSR. The 1970s in Romania were opened by Ceauşescu’s *July Theses* (1971), an ideological speech meant to put an equal sign between *propaganda* and *national culture*. The hijacking of national culture for the benefit of the communist regime led to terrible censorship: any text, no matter how long, which was to be made public, had to be validated by the General Directorate

for Press and Print. The principles of censorship were non-negotiable: only those artistic creations that met the Party expectations were going to be published and subsidised. Still, the translation from Western authors resumed at the *Univers* and the *Editura Politică* Publishing Houses. Contacts with foreigners continued to be forbidden and, when they couldn't be helped, they were closely monitored.

The austerity measures forced upon Romanians in order to pay off the country's external debt, and the growth of the security and control services in the 1980s came to an end in December 1989, when the Romanian Revolution took place. This event is part of the Fall (or Autumn) of Nations, which marks the fall of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe. Officially, it also marks the end of censorship. However, all over the world today, new, subtle forms of (self-)censorship have insinuated themselves into the fabric of daily life, prompted by the phenomena of political correctness, cancel culture, cultural appropriation, etc.

In order to illustrate censorship in the translation of novels into Romanian, I have used a fundamental tool, namely *Dicţionarul cronologic al romanului tradus în România de la origini până în 1989* ('Chronological Dictionary of the Novels Translated in Romania, from the Beginnings until 1989'), which, as the title suggests, takes stock of the novels translated before the fall of totalitarianism. These works are part of the world literary canon, but they are also contemporary novels, many of which meet the Proletkult criteria. The information offered by this reference tool has been checked on the ROLINEST platform. This has enabled me, on the one hand, to add information regarding the original title and the name of the translator (translators), and, on the other hand, to establish the number of retranslations and reprints done before 1960 and after 1989. The inventoried translations were published officially, at publishing houses endorsed by the totalitarian regime. The politicising of Romanian literature in historical and ideological circumstances that characterise not only Romanian culture, but that of other cultures as well in the former Soviet Bloc, have been analysed, fully or partially enumerated, etc. in several books, doctoral theses or studies (e.g., Popa 2002, Constantin 2009, Măriucuța 2012 et passim)

2.2. Translation through the totalitarian looking glass: 1944-1989

Starting with 1944 and until 1958-1960, the circumstances were almost exclusively favourable to translating works from the USSR, by Russian writers. There were, however, translations of works from other spaces as well. A politicised selection process and distribution of works explains the "preference" for promoting the French classics, translated, retranslated or reprinted. Certain emblematic Socialist Realist writers also rejoiced a favourable reception, endorsed indirectly by the Soviet literary criticism and directly by the French one, for upholding the Proletkult literary ideology and principles. The translator's standing, their skill and methods were secondary aspects; the censors' attention focused exclusively on the status of the translated writer and on the ideological content of the translated work, and these were the elements according to which the translation's itinerary was predicted (Constantin 2009).

Censorship and self-censorship, well-known phenomena in the history of humanity – in ancient Rome, during the Inquisition, during the Enlightenment, during the Nazi period, etc. (see Domenech 2005) – manifested themselves as forms of direct and indirect persecution during the totalitarian regime. The first duty of a Romanian translator was to meet the expectations of the ideological apparatus and only then those of the potential reader in the target language. This

hierarchy of the translator's obligations – censorship first, then readers, and then the auctorial instance – reveals objective causes and subjective (d)ef(f)ects and is responsible for the repercussions on the aesthetics of reception. Censorship constraints are rarely appreciated by translators, even if some of the latter were lucky to be allowed to translate the great names of classical literature. Overall, censorship devalued the author, rendered the translator invisible, misrepresented the source text, and deceived the reader. There were “invisible” translators and translators with a partial, intermediate status, an option of writer-translators, who translated from Russian and who sometimes signed using a pseudonym, because a “stylist”, in fact a censor-editor endorsed by the regime, had been given the task to revise the translated text stylistically.

We can identify another contradiction in the expectations of Socialist Realism. Theoretically speaking, Socialist Realism requires both the author and the translator to represent reality faithfully. Practically, however, the Proletkult ideology expects them to adjust this representation in order to make the revolutionary progress believable, and thus their identity construct is distorted (Por 2010). Under such circumstances, translation of other literatures – Soviet, French, German or any other – into Romanian needed to prove submissiveness to Party ideology. The translation process became overdetermined by the co-presence of a diversity of literary forms and formulae. From an ideological perspective, the primordial selection criterion was the canonical status of the authors, but other criteria had to be met as well, such as the frequency with which they published articles that responded to the Proletkult rhetoric. As a result, translation became an echo of this rhetoric. The *filter of the ideological cleansing* worked hand in hand with *linguistic censorship*: language perceived as obscene (e.g., Rabelais translated by Hodoş), erotic language, as well as various other taboos became targets of the ideological, cultural, and linguistic censorship.

The monopoly of all publication was held by Editura Cartea Rusă (‘the Russian Book Publishing House’), founded in December 1944. Its translation plan, published in the journal *Veac nou*, issue no. 2, December 17, 1944, informed those interested of the works that were to be translated, since they met the aesthetic requirements of Socialist Realism (Constantin 2009). These authorised authors and books were meant, on the one hand, to contribute to the development of Socialism, and, on the other, to create a Romanian socialist literature. Consequently, the editorial priorities were as follows:

1. translations from *Russian literature* (the only truly revolutionary, heroic, and exalting literature), first *Soviet authors* and then *classic Russian authors*;
2. translations from *democratic Western writers* and then from *democratic Romanian writers*, who had learned the important lesson that socialist literature is class literature (a single class, therefore a kind of early globalisation). The Romanian writers' works were predominantly ideological;
3. children and youth books, as well as books about the Soviet life and culture, all meant to enable Romanians to learn communist values and to distinguish them from the capitalist degeneration and dehumanisation that had marred non-socialist literature.

Towards the end of the 1950s, Socialist Realism tried to do away with the monopoly of translations from Russian and to increase the number of languages

from which translations were published. After Russian, French became the language with the highest number of translations.

2.3. A present devoid of history: censorship and self-censorship in translation

The censorship mechanism developed by the Romanian Communist Party aimed to exert a strict control over the mentality, culture, and society as a whole. In order to achieve this, the censorship apparatus had to destroy all previous structures, annihilate all the residues of “bourgeois decadence” (Tismăneanu 2005: 147), and then reconfigure them according to the ideology of the totalitarian regime and create a new literature, a new history, etc. A new history meant a history without a past, written according to the standards of totalitarianism. Scholars and writers were asked to be increasingly engaged, and those who had already pledged their engagement were asked to be increasingly dedicated to the cause of the Party and to focus on what was specifically necessary to build socialism: to prepare a new literature, a new biology, a new mathematics, etc.

If in the 1950s the translations were mainly from Russian, starting with 1958 and in the 1960s, there was an increase in the number of socialist and classic writers from the West. It is also a moment of awakening for certain major, minor, or obscure writers, who understood that they could not survive artistically, financially or even physically outside the Party: examples of such writers are M. Sadoveanu, V. Eftimiu, G. Călinescu, G. Galaction, Camil Petrescu, Cezar Petrescu.

The brave new world promised by the Party fascinated many writers. However, some knew from the beginning, other realised along the way that the freedom promised to intellectuals and artists was just an illusion and there was an overwhelming probability that their activity would be paralysed (Comarnescu 2003: 275, 289). While possible in principle, neutrality is a complicated issue. Sometimes it is opportune, and at other times it represents a way of avoiding controversy and consequences. For the Romanian intellectuals, however, neutrality was not an option, because it was associated with opposition to the regime. Free will was not abolished in totalitarianism, but the intellectuals who tried to remain neutral were stripped of any chance to succeed professionally, socially, or even in terms of family life (Boia 2013: 335). In such a context of constraints, censorship, and threats, translation became a means of escaping censorship and terror. Writer-translators, however, no longer benefited from the prestige enjoyed by this group before 1944, when publishers asked writers to translate the works of Western authors and recognised their cultural contribution in financial terms as well. By 1952, publishers no longer resorted to writers for translations (Constantin 2009: 4-6). The freedom to be a writer became a thing of the past and authors now wrote what was dictated to them, about what others believed (see ACNSAS, Felix Aderca, I 375824, quoted by Boia 2013: 345); the same degrading situation is experienced by M. R. Paraschivescu in the 1970s:

I do not want anything to do with the disappointing performance of our present literature. I do know that a new aesthetics and a new art can and must be born from these Middle Ages we live in. But this art shall not be official, it cannot and must not be animated by this regime, where the destiny of cultures is managed by all kinds of Fadeevs. For the public, I will continue to publish poetry translations. (Paraschivescu 1975: 102, my translation)

To build a socialist identity, a new type of individual, *Homo Sovieticus*, had to be formed. Be it individual, collective or national, the socialist identity could be achieved only with the help of the intellectuals, who were mobilised to reshape mass education in order to carve this new, communist human being, whose fundamental “rights” were the unconditional devotion and absolute submission to the regime. The new intellectual class, which called itself progressive and opposed the old, and therefore bourgeois and retrograde intellectual elite, fabricated for the proletariat their own class and mass identity (Lungu 2003).

The programme of the Cartea Rusă publishing house served this purpose. In 1945, a year after the Soviet troops were stationed in Romania, this house published translations only from Russian, while other publishers translated and published extremely few foreign writers (cf. *Ce vom citi anul acesta?* [‘What will we read this year?’], *Veac nou*, October 6, 1945, qtd. in Constantin 2009: 2):

- From Dutch, Martha Albrand, *Nu ne predăm*, translated by Eugen B. Marian;
- From Yiddish, Sholem Asch, *Judecata. Evreul cu psalmii*, translated by M. Rubin and Cecilia Weschler;
- From French, Auguste Bailly, *Orgiile lui Nero*, translated by M. Săveanu; Gabriel Chevalier, *Clocherle*; and a reprint of the translation of B. de St Pierre, *Paul și Virginia*, translated M. Săveanu.
- From Austrian German, Vicki Baum, *Marion*, translated by Nora and Paul B. Marian;
- From American English, Louis Bromfield with two titles: *Lotus amar*, translated by Paul B. Marian, and *Secolul de aur*, translated by Ana Edith Răileanu;
- Pearl S. Buck, *Promisiunea*, translated by Eduard Ellenberg;
- James Mallahan Cain, *Serenade*, translated by Eugen Marian;
- Erskine Caldwell, *Drumul tutunului*, translated by Silviu Iosifescu.

In the 1950s, the Soviet embargo on the decadent and destabilising Western literature culminated in the institutionalisation of the Soviet censorship mechanism in the entire Soviet bloc. This was doubled by each country’s own censorship. Only those works were translated (from Russian or other languages) that were considered appropriate from the point of view of the Proletkult ideology or were censored in such a way as to become appropriate (Popa 2002: 9). We could almost speak of a Soviet political correctness. Translations worth mentioning here are:

From Russian:

- A. N. Ostrovsky, *Așa s-a călit oțelul* (‘How the Steel Was Tempered’);
- Ilya Ehrenburg, *Puterea cuvântului* (‘The Power of the Word’),
- A.P. Cehov, *Opere* (‘Works’), 11 volumes,
- N. V. Gogol, *Taras Bulba* (‘Taras Boulba’).
- L. N. Tolstoi, *Opere* (‘Works’), 14 volumes
- I. S. Turgheniev, *Opere* (‘Works’), 11 volumes

From other languages:

- A. Malraux, *Speranța* (*L’espoir*),
- L. Aragon, *Cartierele fericite* (*Les beaux quartiers*),
- John Dos Passos, *1919, Paralela 42* (*The 42nd Parallel*),
- J. Steinbeck, *Cartierul Tortila* (*Tortilla Flat*),
- W. Faulkner, *Lumină de august* (*Light in August*), etc.

The interference of Eastern European ideological conformism with the choice of writers to be translated in the space of the ex-Soviet bloc also functioned

as a filter for Eastern European writers who were to be translated in the West. Prejudices work on both sides. Because of the same ideological conformism, the literary products of Romania and other countries from the Soviet bloc were rejected in the Western world. The communist countries translated only those works that served the ideology of the USSR. The modern impulse of opening up towards the West through translation was suppressed in the 1950s. The closing of Romania was the sole effect of ideological conformism. Western works were anachronistically and tendentiously labelled as politically incorrect and accused of promoting a decadent bourgeois spirit. This became the reason why they were not translated anymore. On the other hand, though, those writers endorsed by the Kominform (the information bureau of the communist and workers' parties from USSR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Poland, Romania, and Hungary, created in 1947-1956) were published. They were commended for publishing biographies and monographs dedicated to Stalin or for promoting the values of communism. Among the beneficiaries were Louis Aragon, Selma Lagerlöf, Romain Rolland, Lion Feuchtwanger, etc. (Manolescu 2008: 1394). In Romania, although short lived, the internal liberalisation and the resumption of commercial exchanges with the West provided an impulse to translation, although overall this activity remained faithful to the Proletkult principles. Among the conformist translations, though, several exceptional translations from Russian and world classic authors managed to squeeze in, probably also because they came from a safe distance in time and were deemed impossible to assimilate ideologically: Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Rabelais, but also Balzac, Dumas, Daudet, Verne, etc. The 1980s brought a deterioration of the economic and social circumstances. Censorship, terror, and isolation complicated for the worse a situation in which Romania tried to regain its status as an open country, its freedom, and autonomy.

According to the inventory provided by the Casa Rusă publishing house at the end of 1952, during the period 1944-1951, 1,131 titles of Russian literary works were translated and printed in about 19 million copies - 1,069 titles into Romanian and 200 into the languages of the ethnic minorities living in Romania (Constantin 2009: 4). The best sold authors were: Mihail Sholokhov, A. Fadeyev, N. Ostrovsky, Maxim Gorky, L. N. Tolstoy, N. G. Chernyshevsky, A. P. Chekhov, M. I. Lermontov. The 25 collections of the Cartea Rusă publishing house were accomplished with the help of 335 translators, of whom 125 translated at least one title (ibid.). There were two categories of translators who published at the Cartea Rusă publishing house: prolific translators and well-known writer-translators, like Tatiana Berindei, Eusebiu Camilar, Paul Celan, Rotislav Donici, Izabela Dumbravă, Andrei A. Ivanovski, George Lesnea, Cezar Petrescu, Alexandru Philippide, Ada Steinberg. The ideological censorship and the fact that their own writings were banned forced some of the great Romanian intellectuals to choose either translating from several languages or translating several authors from the same foreign literature. Here is a brief list of writers and the translations they did:

- **Tudor Arghezi** translated Dostoyevsky, *Записки из Мёртвого дома* /*Amintiri din Casa morților* – 1921, reprinted in 1991; Anatole France, *La vie en fleur* /*În floarea vieții* – 1953; La Fontaine, *Fables* /*Fabule*– 1954, reprinted in 1955, 1998; Villon, *Balade et autres poésies* /*Balade și alte poezii*– 1956; Gogol, *Похождения Чичикова, или Мёртвые души* / *Suflete moarte: poem* – 1963, reprinted in 1987, 1995, 1997, 1998; Bertolt Brecht, *Die Dreigroschenoper* / *Opera de trei parale* – 1967; Molière, *Théâtre* (*Avarul, Mizantropul, Domnul de Pourceaugnac*, George

Dandin sau Soțul păcălit) – 1958, reprinted in 1964, 1972, 1986); excerpts from works by Rabelais, Rimbaud, Baudelaire, Verlaine – 1964;

- **Lucian Blaga** translated Goethe, *Faust*, Lessing, *Nathan înțeleptul / Nathan der Weise* – 1956, *Opere* – 1958, *Laocoon sau Despre limitele picturii și ale poeziei / Laokoon: oder über die Grenzen der Malerei und Poesie* – 1971; excerpts from works by R. M. Rilke;

- Between 1944 and 1947, **Paul Clean** translated: Lermontov (*Геоуі науезо времени / Un erou al timpului nostru* – 1946); S I Galperin (*Viață și moarte în lumina științei moderne*, 1947); K. S. Simonov (*Chestiunea rusă*, 1947); A. P. Cehov (*Moujiki/Țăranii*, 1948); and into German: *Drei russische Dichter: Blok, Mandelstam, Esenin*, 1963, reprinted 1988; Alexandre Blok (*Die Zwölf*, 1958, new editions in 1965, 1977), Ossip Mandelshtam (*Gedichte*, 1959), etc.

- **Miron Radu Paraschivescu** translated Pușkin, *Basme* -1962, *Ruslan și Ludmila* – 1963; Malraux, *Calea regală* – 1970, *Cuceritorii*; Marie-Anne Desmarest, *Torente* – 1943; Jean-Richard Bloch, *Toulon: cronică franceză în 3 epoci* – 1945; Ungaretti, *Poezii* + (1998) *Fântâna dragostei*; Nekrasov, *Opere alese* - 1953 et *Poezii* – 1959; Juliusz Slowacki, *Ceasul meditației* – 1962; Adam Mickiewicz, *Poezii, Îndoiala* – 1957; *Juan de la Cruz. Antologie de texte* – 1946, *L. Aragon, Antologie de texte* – 1946; excerpts from works by Ovidius Naso in 1969, Rilke, etc.

- **Cezar Petrescu** translated Balzac, *Eugénie Grandet* – 1950, reprinted in 1959, 1965, 1972, 2012; *Père Goriot*, 1959, reprinted in 1964, 1965, 1968; Sienkiewicz, *Pentru pâine* – 1953 and *Nuvela*– 1960, 1987; Tolstoy, *Părintele Serghi*, reprinted in 2005, 2008, *Sonata Kreutzer* – 1971, reprinted in 1991, 2008; Makarenko, *Poemul pedagogic* – 1951, *Cartea pentru părinți* – 1954; Gorky, *Copilăria* – 1959, reprinted in 1960, 1981, 1988, 1994, 2013, 2018; Konstantin Sedyh, *Daura* – 1951; Vasili Ajaev, *Departa de Moscova* – 1950; Sholokhov, *Pe Donul liniștit* – 1948, reprinted in 1953, 1957, 1959, 1968, 1983-1986, 1987; Sădăbecov, Turgel'bij, *Oameni de azi (Lădi nașih dnei)*– 1951);

- **Marin Preda** translated *Ciuma* by Camus, 1965, and *Demonii*, by Dostoevsky, 1970.

Apart from the writer-translators, we also need to mention the names of certain linguists and intellectuals from the old elite who translated from at least three foreign languages and literatures (Russian, English, French, German) into one or two languages (Romanian and/or German, etc.):

- **Alexandru Philippide** translated Baudelaire, *Flori alese*, 1957 (reprinted in 1965, 1998, 2012); A. R. Lesage, *Istoria lui Gil Blas de Santillana*, 1960; Voltaire, *Naivul*, 1962, reprinted as *Candid sau optimismul* (in 1969, 1998, 2008); Choderlos de Laclos, *Legăturile primejdioase, sau, Scrisori culese într-o societate și publicate pentru instruirea altor societăți*, 1969; Lermontov, *Un erou al timpului nostru*, 1946 (Cartea Rusă Publishing House); Tolstoy, *Război și pace*, 1949, translated together with Nicolae Paroescu; Nicolae Teică; Nina Radici; Schiller, *Don Carlos*, 1955 (new editions in 1950, 1965, 2002); *Hoții*, 1965 (new edition in 2002); Thomas Mann, *Moarte la Veneția*, 1965; H. C. Andersen, *Povestiri*, 1968; etc.
- **Leon Levițchi** translated Theodore Dreiser, *O tragedie americană*, 1954 (reprinted in 1971, 1994); Jerome K. Jerome, *Trei într-o barcă (fără a mai socoti și câinele)*, 1959; J. Swift, *Călătoriile lui Gulliver*, 1967 (reprinted in 1997, 2009); W. Shakespeare, *Opere*, 1956, 1957, 1960, 1963 et passim; (with D. Duțescu)

Hamlet, 1974 (reprinted in 2009); (with Duțescu et al.), *Henric al IV-lea. Mult zgomot pentru nimic. Henric al V-lea. Nevestele vesele din Windsor*, 1985; etc. Philip Gosse, *Istoria pirateriei*, 1975; Ch. Marlowe, *Teatru*, 1988; V. I. Lenin, *Opere complete*, 1960

Other translators were interested in translating either several authors from a foreign language and literature, or just from a literary current, a period or an author. For example, Romulus Vulpesu or Al. Hodoș translated several authors from French – Villon, Rabelais, Flaubert, Baudelaire, etc.; Dan Duțescu, A. Dima, A. Bantaș translated one author – Shakespeare; George Lesnea translated Lermontov, Esenin; Alexandru Miran translated from Ancient Greek, Ștefan Bezdechi, from Latin, Ion Roman translated 20th century German literature; Nicolae Iliescu and Janina Ioanoși translated from Russian; Andrei Bantaș and Irina Horea, from English; Emanoil Marcu, from French; Mihai Cantuniari and Cristina Hăulică, from Spanish; Ion Petrică, from Polish, Micaela Ghițescu from Portuguese, George Lăzărescu from Italian, Grete Tartler from Arabic and Persian.

The literary and historical study of the aesthetic issues posed by translation in the period under scrutiny reveals the divergent and diverging efficiency of this practice (see Braga 1982: 224-227), who develops ideas put forth by Ibrăileanu 1908 and Iorga 1936. Braga also claims that re-translations were and continue to be relevant, because they display the vitality of a language and culture and are determined by a cultural necessity situated beyond a short-term, relative interest. To fulfil this vocation for re-translations, several types of censorship had to be overcome: an official, thematic, and external censorship, exerted by the regime; an economic censorship; an individual, inner censorship, i.e., self-censorship; and a linguistic and stylistic censorship, which complied with the Proletkult norms. Inevitably, since 1949 and under the control of the State, the translations from Russian had contributed to the transformation and Russification of the Romanian vocabulary and syntax. In order to control the Romanian cultural and linguistic values, the regime and its censorship mechanism aimed to impose certain linguistic norms that would conform to Lisenko's (1949) genetic theory, to Zhdanov's (1947) doctrine, and to Stalin's theory of language (1951). Among those who publicised these discoveries was also linguist Alexandru Graur, a member of the academy, in his series of lectures "For a proper orthography of the Romanian language" (see Selean 1994: 246).

The selection of the foreign writers to be translated was based on ideological cleansing criteria borrowed from the USSR and on linguistic censorship. The authors who met the requirements, were classic or socialist writers who, one way or another, observed the required standards, a sifting process laid bare by the inventories of translations done at the time. The works of the contemporary engaged writers carried a double endorsement, both from a literary and a translation point of view, guaranteed by the critical and censorship agencies, responsible for the literary import and export. Although the disengaged contemporary writers did not meet the Proletkult requirements, they did produce and publish a few translations from Duras, Sarraute, Butor, Perec, or Robbe-Grillet:

- Marguerite Duras, *Moderato cantabile*, 1966, translated by Alexandru Baciu, reprinted in 1974 (retranslated in 2006 by Carmelia Leonte);
- Nathalie Sarraute, *Portretul unui necunoscut (Portrait d'un inconnu)*, 1967 translated by Paul Dinopol; *Fructele de aur (Les fruits d'or)*// excerpts in 1965 and full translation in 1977 by Radu Toma

- Michel Butor, *Renunțare (La Modification)*, 1967, translated by Georgeta Horodincă
- Georges Perec, *Lucrurile. Povestire din anii 60 (Les Choses. Une histoire des années 60)*, 1967, translated by Livia Stroescu
- Alain Robbe-Grillet, *Gumele (Les Gommages) //1967, În labirint (Dans le labyrinthe)*, 1968, translated by Dumitru Tsepeneag

It is a commonplace that translation has a significant and beneficial influence on literature. This influence did not disappear entirely during the totalitarian regime, although it diminished substantially. Even when the decrease was not so much quantitative, it was visible in qualitative terms. Whether they were involved or not in translation as actants-agents, some Romanian writers (actants-objects) were translated into other languages. Their translation is a reflection of the relationship they had with the regime or of their international standing. The following categories are worth mentioning:

- Engaged writers, translated and advertised in the circles validated by Kominform, as a reward for being reliable party members (an example would be Zaharia Stancu and his novel *Descult*);
- Disengaged writers of international standing, such as Mircea Eliade (*Maitreyi, Elixirul Diavolului, Pădurea Interzisă*), or Paul Celan, a multilingual poet (Romanian, Russian, French, English, German), who chose German to express himself in, and it is from German that he was translated into other languages);
- Dissident writers from outside Romania, for example Paul Goma (*Celula Liberalilor, Gherla*, etc.), Dumitru Tsepeneag (*Arpièges, Cuvântul nisiparniță*);
- Dissident writers from within Romania, officially not published and not translated.

3. Conclusion

The versatile nature of the censorship apparatus between 1944 and 1989, as well as the censors' ability to renew and redefine the censorship criteria led to the generalisation of censorship and self-censorship in the Romania of Nicolae Ceaușescu, a chameleonic Big Brother. Several reasons emerge for taking into consideration the retranslation of all the writers translated between 1944 and 1989. The first reason is the inevitable ageing of the language used in the translated texts, a language which cannot escape the passage of time, in the same way that, paradoxically, the source language can (Benjamin 1921). The second reason relates to the (d)ef(f)ects produced by the ideological circumstances, by an exaggerated visibility of the translators of certain canonical or non-canonical works. The third reason is, in fact, a combination of the first two, and refers to the black-listed translator-writers, who unleashed their creativity and talent in translation, compensating in this way for the lack of opportunity to publish their own works. A study of these translations would allow the discovery of the mechanisms through which the writer-translator represented the translated author and, more interesting still, the analysis would shed light on the mind and personal history of the translator. Self-censorship did not disappear after 1989; various forms of censorship and self-censorship persist and emerge, including censorship prompted by the global phenomenon of political correctness.

References

- Anton, Mioara. 2006. „'Progresiști' contra 'Reacționari'. Subordonarea intelectualilor (1944-1955)” in Dan Cătănuș, Mioara Anton, Ana-Maria Catanus, Alexandru-Murad Mironov, Nicoleta Raluca Spiridon. *Intelectuali români în arhivele comunismului*, București: Editura Nemira, pp. 13-43.
- Benjamin, Walter. 2000 (1921). “Sarcina traducătorului” in Walter Benjamin. *Iluminări*. Trad. Catrinel Pleșu. București: Editura Univers, pp. 45-55.
- Boia, Lucian. 2013 (2011). *Capcanele istoriei. Elita intelectuală românească între 1930-1950*. București: Humanitas.
- Braga, Mircea. 1982. “Teoria traducerii și «eficiența» ei deviată” in Mircea Braga. *Istoria literară ca pretext*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia, pp. 224-227.
- Burlacu, Doru et al. 2005. *Dicționarul cronologic al romanului tradus în România de la origini până în 1989*. București, Editura Academiei Române.
- Cătănuș, Dan. 2006. “Regimul comunist în România și problema intelectualității” in Dan Cătănuș, Mioara Anton, Ana-Maria Cătănuș, Alexandru-Murad Mironov, Nicoleta Raluca Spiridon. *Intelectuali români în arhivele comunismului*. București: Nemira, pp. 44-75.
- Cătănuș, Dan. 2011. *Tot mai departe de Moscova... Politica externă a României în contextul conflictului sovieto-chinez: 1956-1965*. București: Editura Nemira.
- Comarnescu, Petru. 2003. *Pagini de jurnal, vol. I*. București: Editura Noul Orfeu.
- Constantin, Letiția. 2009. “Literatură și propagandă: Editura Cartea rusă. Fundația România literară” in *România Literară* 25, p. 2.
- Domenech, Jacques (sous la direction de). 2005. *Censure, autocensure et art d'écrire. De l'Antiquité à nos jours, Actes du Séminaire européen du Ctel (Nice, octobre 2001-juin 2003)*. Bruxelles: Éditions Complexe.
- Frunză, Victor. 1990. *Istoria stalinismului în România*. București: Humanitas.
- Ibrăileanu, Garabet. 2000[1908]. *Spiritul critic în cultura românească*. București: Editura Cartier.
- Iorga, Nicolae. 1936. *Traducerile din limba franceză în literatura românească*. Vălenii de munte: Tip. Datina românească,
- Lisenko Trofim Denisovic and Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences of the U. S. S. R. (Moscow). 1949. *The Situation in Biological Science : Proceedings of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences of the U. S. S. R. : Session July 31 - August 7. 1948 : Verbatim Report*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.
- Lungu, Dan. 2003. *Construcția identității într-o societate totalitară. O cercetare sociologică asupra scriitorilor*. Iași: Editura Junimea.
- Lungu-Badea, Georgiana. 2010. “Le rôle du traducteur dans l'esthétique de la réception. Sauvetage de l'étrangeté et / ou consentement à la perte” in Georgiana Lungu-Badea, Alina Pelea, Mirela Pop (eds.). *(En)Jeux esthétiques de la traduction. Éthique (s), techniques et pratiques traduction*. Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest, pp. 23-40.
- Lungu-Badea, Georgiana. 2017. “Traductions d'hier, traductions d'aujourd'hui. Quelques considérations générales sur la traduction roumaine à l'époque communiste suivies d'un mini inventaire des traductions du roman français (1960-1968)” in *Études Interdisciplinaires en sciences humaines*, 4, pp. 21-50.
- Mallarmé, Stéphane. 2002. *Album de versuri*. Trad. de Șerban Foarță. București: Editura Institutul European.
- Manolescu, Florin. 2003. *Enciclopedia exilului literar românesc (1945-1989). Scriitori, reviste, instituții, organizații*. București: Editura Compania.
- Manolescu, Nicolae. 2008. “Traducători și traduceri” in Nicolae Manolescu. *Istoria critică a literaturii române. 5 secole de literatură*. Pitești: Editura Paralela 45, pp. 1394-1395.
- Marino, Adrian. 2000. *Cenzura în România. Schiță istorică Intoductivă*. Craiova: Editura Aius.

- Măriuța, Daniela. 2012. *Traduire pour le peuple. Réception de la littérature française en Roumanie de 1948 à 1965*. București: Thèse de doctorat, directeur de thèse PR Radu Toma, Université de Bucarest, Library of Bucharest University.
- Papacostea, Șerban. 1998. "‘Clio’ în captivitate: istoriografia română în perioada comunistă" in *Revista de Istorie* 9 (4-5), pp. 241-261.
- Paraschivescu, Miron Radu. 1975. *Cahiers de l'Est* 1-4, pp. 80-130.
- Petcu, Marian. 1999. *Puterea și cultura: o istorie a cenzurii*. Iași: Editura Polirom.
- Popa, Ioana. 2002. "Un transfert littéraire politisé. Circuits de traduction des littératures d'Europe de l'Est en France, 1947-1989". Edited by Seuil, in *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 4(144). Paris: Seuil, pp. 55-69. [Online]. Available: doi:<https://doi.org/10.3917/arss.144.0055>. [Accessed 2021, June 24].
- Popa, Marin. 2009. *Istoria literaturii române de azi pe mâine: 23 august 1944 – 22 decembrie 1989*. București: Editura Semne.
- Por, Cristian Vasile. 2010. *Literatura și artele în România comunistă, 1948-1953*. București: Editura Humanitas.
- Rabelais, François. 1993 (1967). *Gargantua și Pantagruel*. Trans. Alexandru Hodoș. Chișinău: Hyperion,
- Rolinest, *Romanian Library Network Science & Technology*. [Online]. Available: <https://abr.org.ro/rolinest/> [Accessed 2021, May 20]
- Selejan, Ana. 1994. *Literatura în totalitarism 1949-1951*. Sibiu: Thausib.
- Simion, Eugen. 2000. *Prefață la Nicolae Labiș, Poezii*. București: Cartex, pp. 9-20.
- Stalin, Iosif. 1951. *Marxismul și problemele lingvisticii*. București: Editura Partidului Muncitoresc Român.
- Tismăneanu, Vladimir. 2005. *Stalinism pentru eternitate*. Iași: Polirom.
- Tismăneanu, Vladimir. 2008 (1992). *Arheologia terorii*. București: Curtea Veche .
- Volceanov, George. 2013. "The Paradoxes of Romanian Pop / Rock / Folk in Communist Romania". Edited by www.euacademic.org. *EUROPEAN ACADEMIC RESEARCH* 1 (5), pp. 746-754.
- Zhdanov, Andrei. 1947. *The International Situation: Speech Delivered at the Informatory Conference of Representatives of a Number of Communist Parties Held in Poland in the Latter Part of September 1947*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Pub. House.