

AN INQUIRY INTO CHALLENGES OF LITERARY TRANSLATION FOR FUTURE PROFESSIONALS

Loredana PUNĞĂ, Dana PERCEC
West University of Timișoara, Romania

Abstract: The paper presents some results of the experiment the authors carried out starting from the description of literary translation competence in the PETRA-E European framework. It focuses on the assessment of the sub-competences that are required in the translation process itself, as they are demonstrated by some post-graduate translation studies students whose task was, among others in the larger experimental project, to render O. Henry's *The Gift of the Magi* into Romanian.

Keywords: extra-linguistic elements in translation, linguistic elements in translation, literary translation, PETRA-E framework, translation competence

1. Introduction. The PETRA-E framework

A useful instrument that has become available to literary translators in Europe is the so-called PETRA-E Framework of Reference for the Education and Training of Literary Translators (www.petra-education.eu), designed by CEATL (the European Council of Literary Translators' Associations) together with several universities in EU countries, and translated into several European languages. Projected on the model of the Common European Framework of Reference for Modern Languages, PETRA-E offers a set of descriptors, on the horizontal line, adjusted to a set of levels of expertise, on the vertical line. The diagram points out that the literary translation is a process in which a variety of competences must be acquired and perfected, while the literary translator is a professional who needs permanent interdisciplinary training in order to obtain successful results. If, in the history of literary translation, most translators were themselves writers, with no specific training and relying only on their talent and innate skill to render a source text pertinently into the target language, today, the areas of writing fiction and producing a translation are distinct, if not divergent. Professional literary translators do Bachelor's and Master's programs, summer schools and crash courses, which prepare them for this specific area of translation expertise.

The PETRA-E framework defines competences which are distributed on five levels: the beginner level (LT1), the advanced learner level (LT2), the early career professional level (LT3), the advanced professional level (LT4), and the expert level (LT5). The competences which are set against these levels are: the transfer competence, the language competence, the textual competence, the heuristic competence, the literary-cultural competence, the professional competence, the evaluative competence, and, last but not least, the research competence. The first enlisted competence is the most self-evident one, referring to the ability to understand the source text in order to offer a reliable translation into the target language. The second competence, like in the Common European Framework of Reference for Modern Languages (CEFR), refers to the translator's ability to use the language

correctly and efficiently, in terms of grammar, style, reading and writing skills. The textual competence consists of the translator's sensitivity about the source text's characteristics related to genre and style and their ability to transfer them into the target text. More abstractly, the heuristic competence is about the strategies employed by a literary translator to engage in a critical relation with the source text. The literary-cultural competence measures the degree of cultural information a translator has for a successful contextualization of the source text in the target culture. The professional competence is related to a translator's degree of professionalism in relation to the texts, their peers and their readers. The evaluative competence consists of the translator's capacity to be critical and objective about their own work and that of other translators. The last competence takes into consideration the methodological awareness of the translator and its applicability.

A few observations can be made after analyzing this diagonal arrangement of competences and levels. At the more basic levels, the linguistic competence is dominant. However, it would be a mistake not to include other competences even for beginners, as they can tell a professional translator apart from an amateur, or a literary translator apart from a technical one. At higher levels, the literary translator's existence within the professional community prevails, with actions that precede and follow the translation process per se: securing funding for the translated project, communicating and negotiating with the publishers, managing their own business, etc. In fact, these elements indicate that the literary translator's competences are not only skills, but a set of attitudes and values which they must internalize in order to bring their project to fruition. In terms of the literary translator's level of expertise to be matched with the descriptors in the PETRA-E framework, it must be pointed out that an academic education (at the Bachelor's and Master's levels) is only the equivalent of LT1 and LT2, which means that the successful and multi-lateral training of the professional must be a life-long learning process. Still, education institutions may use this tool as a prospective standard, designing or revising their curricula and their assessment criteria accordingly. Finally, it must be said that PETRA-E is an open document, which can be completed and revised continuously, taking into account the variable elements that make up the cultural and educational contexts in which literary translators are trained in Europe.

2. The PETRA-E framework applied. The experimental project design

Realizing how rewarding this framework may be for both teachers and students engaged in a professional translation program, we tested its applicability with a group of trainees enrolled in the Master's program of professional translation at the West University of Timișoara, during the winter semester of the academic year 2016-2017. The students were invited to tackle a literary text and perform a series of tasks and ask a number of questions inspired by the PETRA-E descriptors:

- a) Translate the text. Edit your translation so as to render it suitable for publication.
- b) Comment on the difficulties you encountered, referring to at least two descriptors for competences 1-3.
- c) Have you used any resources to help you cope with the difficulties you mentioned? Yes/No? Give details.

- d) Have you activated knowledge or abilities in the areas mentioned in connection to literary cultural competence? Yes/No? If yes, which competence/ability? Provide details.
- e) To which three Romanian publishers would you submit your translation? Why? Give reasons.
- f) Provided the publisher does not cover publication expenses, identify two funding sources for your project. Explain how you have identified and selected these sources.
- g) What legal and ethical aspects should be taken into consideration when preparing your translation for publication? (You may consider, for example, other published translations of the same text.)

Going beyond LT1 and LT2 in order to stimulate the students to the maximum, we focused on the third and fourth levels, which are also the most elaborate and detailed in the framework. Apart from our own assessment, we conceived the tasks so as to encourage the students' self-evaluation and to test their critical thinking. More precisely, our expectations were, in the area of linguistic competence, to deal with texts produced by trainees with a C1/C2 level of English, according to the CEFR, while in terms of other competences, to obtain translations that meet publication standards, which use the appropriate style and genre, which are culturally sensitive and demonstrate creativity in solving problems related to the source text. The heuristic competence was tested by task c) which made the trainees put an effort in referring to a variety of resource materials. For the professional competence to be activated (task e), we encouraged the students to investigate the availability and suitability of various more or less famous publishers, judging by the genre of the text, but also to imagine a scenario in which they would submit an application for funding by national or international institutions. Last but not least, we wanted to remind students that ethical issues related to plagiarism and copyright are not exclusively related to original texts but also to translations.

The text we invited the students to work on was *The Gift of the Magi*, by the American author O. Henry (his original name, William Sidney Porter), a short story which is famous for its subject and conveyance of the Christmas mood and its message about generosity and love. The short story was also a suitable text of medium difficulty in terms of language, style, cultural references, or historical knowledge. At the turn of the 20th century, O. Henry was already acclaimed as an author of great talent and humour, whose writings, full of realism and irony, were often compared to Mark Twain's. O. Henry made a writer's career with his short stories set in New York in the first decades of the last century and his preference for obscure, unheroic characters. *The Gift of the Magi*, first published in 1906, is the story of marital love, reactivated by the Christmas spirit. Jim and Della, a young, poor couple living in a rented flat, want to offer each other a precious gift but can only do it after selling their only prized possessions – his gold watch and her beautiful auburn hair, respectively. The tender irony of the story arranges that the presents they offer their beloved have just been made redundant by their selling of the watch and hair: Jim receives a chain on which no watch can hang, while Della is presented with a pair of beautiful combs that can no longer adorn her hair. Instead of deploring their poverty and the loss of their prized possessions, Jim and Della are only too happy to realize how profound their love for each other is and, in true Christmas mood, set the table for the festive dinner. The

author's conclusion is a Biblical reference to the birth of Baby Jesus and the presence of the three magi bringing gifts, a ritual gesture which is repeated yearly upon the celebration of this birth worldwide, symbolizing not material gain, but a spiritually gratifying closeness to those around us, generosity and love.

The text and author were not previously known to the students and, in general, O. Henry's prose is rather obscure for the general Romanian public, despite its conciseness, simplicity and entertaining quality, on the one hand, and the availability of several translations into Romanian (Al. Hallunga and I. Peltz for Editura pentru literatură universală in 1965, Veronica Focșeneanu for Agora in 2004 and Radu Tătăruță for Cartier in 2004, as well as versions available in various internet archives), on the other. However, the students were not discouraged to tackle this text due to its accessibility, the clear, unequivocal American English language in which it is written, its simple narrative structure and style, and its humour.

General considerations on how the students performed all the tasks set within the PETRA-E experimental project described above have been made elsewhere (Percec and Pungă, forthcoming, 2017). Here, we will detail more on our students' translations as final products of the translation process, highlighting both their merits and their shortcomings, as the case may be.

In assessing the target text variants they suggested, besides some of the PETRA-E descriptors for transfer, language and textual competence, we have followed the translation criticism guidelines put forward by Katharina Reiss (2014) – a choice supported by the fact that, on the one hand, they are in obvious consonance with the framework and, on the other, their clarity, wide coverage and unquestionable usefulness have been largely acknowledged in the roughly half a century since they were first published, in German (1971).

3. The PETRA-E framework applied. Translation criticism

Thus, according to Reiss, translation criticism (involving looking at the source and the target texts as the two obligatory terms of an equation and not to the target text only, as it has often been done during the first half of the 20th century) may stand great chances of being successful (i.e., of spotting errors or inaccuracies, but also of offering remedial suggestions) if it is carried out taking into consideration criteria related to two sets of elements: *linguistic* – focusing on relevant semantic, lexical, grammatical and stylistic aspects of the two texts and *extra-linguistic* – focusing on the immediate situation in which the source text is anchored, the subject matter, the time, place, speaker and audience factors and the affective implications that breathe through the original and need to be transferred into the translated piece.

It is in regard to these elements that we have analyzed our students' translations of *The Gift of the Magi*, with the PETRA-E transfer and language competence simultaneously at the back of our minds, i.e. considering the students' ability to understand literary texts in a detailed manner, to solve literary translation problems in several ways, to demonstrate literary creativity and to adopt an appropriate literary style, according to the language variety they have to translate. Before detailing on some of the results of our analysis, it should be mentioned that our assessment of the texts in Romanian has been made by adjusting – as Reiss suggested – the linguistic and extra-linguistic elements-related criteria to the type of text dealt with – a form-

focused one, whose translation places primary emphasis on aesthetic qualities and gives only secondary importance to content accuracy. We thus implicitly referred to the PETRA-E textual competence to which the ability of handling specific genres and text types, that of evaluating different stylistic features of texts and that of finding solutions and making translation choices creatively are subsumed.

3.1 Translation assessment. Linguistic elements

As far as linguistic elements are concerned, we have examined “how the translation process has represented the linguistic peculiarities of the source language in the target language” (Reiss 2014, 48), more exactly, we sought to establish whether the choice of individual words and word-combinations was adequate both in the microcontext (the immediate context, not exceeding the limits of a sentence) and in the macrocontext (the paragraph and the whole text itself). In terms of grammar, correctness was taken to be the assessment standard, but conformity of usage of the grammatical structures in the source and target texts was also considered. Attention was paid to whether our students have rightly understood and rendered the relevant semantic and stylistic value of certain (preferred) grammatical structures (some of which were intentionally non-standard). Equivalent level of formality and idiosyncratic employment of the language (both the author’s and the characters’) were the reference points in evaluating the translations style-wise.

Our findings indicated that, in general, the student translators had the ability to choose equivalents appropriately. However, this was not always the case.

Equivalents for individual words were, in some instances, not optimal (though they could have been potential Romanian variants should the English macrocontext have been different). For example, the closest Romanian equivalent of *sniffles* is *suspine*. *Scâncete* could be acceptable in a context where expressing the idea of sadness prevails over the specific lexical means by which this is done. Therefore, one may be inclined to accept it as a valid translation option here, as well. However, since the Romanian verb *a scânci* and its corresponding noun *scâncet(e)* collocate with nouns characterised by a [+very young human] seme, and Della, the character whose *sniffles* are mentioned, is a grown-up, we have considered this translation option uninspired. Translating *the (hardest) mental labour* literally as *(cea mai grea) trudă mentală* is another example of wrong choice of the optimal equivalent out of a number of potential ones (supposing that what the student had in mind was actually the adjective *mintal*, i.e. ‘belonging to the mind, which takes place in the mind’ and not its minimal pair – *mental*, i.e. ‘connected to mentality’). If *trudă*, as the node of a collocation, pairs well with collocates such as *istovitoare (tiresome)*, *veșnică/ eternă (everlasting)*, *crâncenă (terrible)*, *trudă mentală* is tautological. *Efort* could have been employed instead of *trudă*, the resulting collocation – *efort mintal* – being a much more naturally sounding solution in Romanian. *Efort intelectual/ de gândire (intellectual/ thinking effort)* would have been equally suitable.

Sometimes, the decision on whether an equivalent suggested may have been considered optimal or not had to be made not in terms of how well words fit together in collocations, but rather in terms of their belonging to the register the author originally employed – a common, everyday, non-pretentious one. Thus, in the particular case of O. Henry’s text, *duplicare* seemed to us a too technical, formal equivalent of

duplication, in bearing the privilege of exchange in case of duplication (said about the gifts brought by the magi)/ *cu posibilitatea privilegiului de schimb în cazul duplicării* (lit. *with the privilege of the possibility of change in case of duplication*). Acceptable translations were, nevertheless, offered for this sequence. Of these, we may quote the following, obtained via explanatory expansion: *aveau privilegiul de a putea fi schimbate în cazul în care erau identice* (had the privilege of being changed in case they were identical) or *bucurându-se de privilegiul de a putea fi date la schimb în cazul în care erau două de același fel* (enjoying the privilege of being given in exchange in case there were two of the kind). *Anxious* for *anxious* also falls in the category of register-inappropriate equivalents, misappropriation being augmented in this case by the fact that the Romanian *anxious*, besides being much too formal, shares only the meaning “worried, nervous” with the English word, but not “eager to do something” which is peculiar of the English word only and which was actually the one intended in *Jim might be properly anxious about the time in any company* (wrongly translated as *Jim ar putea fi de-a dreptul anxious legat de timp./ Jim could be quite anxious(ly) connected to time.*). Here too, a number of students offered suitable translation versions, e.g.: *Jim putea fi nerăbdător să afle cât e ora oriunde și oricând.* (*Jim could be anxious to find out what time it was anywhere and anytime.*); *Jim putea să fie curios să afle ora în orice împrejurare s-ar fi aflat.* (*Jim could be anxious to find out the time no matter what situation he was in.*).

The reverse situation, that in which a too informal choice was made in the context given was also encountered, though not at word, but at phrase level. The most striking of the instances of such usage may be the idiomatic comparison suggested by one student for the English *Della leaped up like a little singed cat* – *Della a sărit ca o mătă pârliță* (lit. *Della jumped up like a scorched cat.*). In Romanian, both *mătă* and *pârliță* are quite informal and the comparison itself lies well below the neutral level in terms of formality. Other students, however, dealt with it successfully. Examples in this sense include: *Della sări ca o pisicuță luată prin surprindere.* (lit. *Della jumped up like a kitty taken by surprise.*); *Della sări în sus ca arsă.* (lit. *Della jumped up like burnt.*), the latter being the most common, and therefore natural and widely used in the target language.

In some instances, the students did not fail to make an optimal choice of equivalents for some English multi-word units (be they collocations or idiomatic expressions) either because of disregarding their meaning in the macrocontext of the short story or the register that characterizes it, but seemingly, rather because they did not pay enough attention to the potential connotations a particular word combination may carry. The translation of *truant schoolboy* as *școlar chiulangiu* in *close-lying curls that made her look wonderfully like a truant schoolboy* are illustrative of this. *Școlar chiulangiu* may be the literal equivalent of the English phrase *truant schoolboy*, but it alone, like the original, carries a negative connotation, cancelled in the source text by the adverb *wonderfully*. Since the adverb is omitted in the translation, the negative undertone of the collocation remains unaltered. The situation changes for the better in “softened” variants such as: *școlar pus pe șotii* (lit. *schoolboy set on jokes*); *școlar neastâmpărat* (lit. *restless schoolboy*); *băiețandru chiulangiu* (lit. *truant schoollad*). Beyond collocations and idioms, connotation manifests at the level of whole sentences, among other ways, by the kind of imagery that it calls to the recipients’ minds. When, for instance, the readers of the *Gifts* are told that Della thought her hair was much more valuable than all a queen’s possessions and that, in order to make an imaginary queen envious of it, she *would have let her hair down the window [...] to dry*, the

imagery that takes shape is certainly not similar to that of bed sheets or clothes hung on a line to dry, but one much worthier of a romance novel or a fairytale. Therefore, a translation variant such as *și-ar fi lăsat într-o zi părul să-i atârne pe fereastră la uscat* (lit. *She would have let her hair hang to dry at the window*), devoid of any touch of delicateness or gracefulness, is certainly not the best option to render O. Henry's intentions. For the reasons announced, we consider *și-ar fi lăsat părul să se usuze în bătaia vântului, la fereastra larg deschisă* (lit. *She would have let her hair dry in the blowing of the wind, before the opened window*) to be much better suited to what the author aimed to convey.

Standard grammar is usually observed by the student translators. A few deviations from normal, natural usage have, nevertheless, been observed at the intersection of morphology and semantics. Romanian verbs such as *a devaloriza* and *a deprecia*, though transitive, are very seldom used as such – much more commonly, they are employed with non-human subjects, as process verbs, in the reflexive voice: *a se devaloriza*, *a se deprecia* (lit. *to depreciate/ devalue itself*). It is because of their frequent use in this way that, when they are accompanied by [+ human] subjects and direct objects, the resulting constructions seem odd to native Romanian speakers (let alone the fact that, in the particular context given, technical terms such as the two do not fit the everyday, non-professional register): [...] *to depreciate Her Majesty's jewels and gifts* has been translated, almost literally, as [...] *să deprecieze giuvaerurile și podoabele Majestății Sale* in one case and as [...] *să devalorizeze bijuteriile și darurile Majestății Sale*, in another. A combination of grammar and semantics-related criteria also prompted us to consider the translation of the verb *to cook* – literally, as *a găti* or by particularizing, as *a frige* (*to fry*) – unnatural, in combination with the inanimate subject *the frying-pan* (*tigaia*). It is true that, in some cases, agency may be attributed to non-living subjects (which are actually the instruments of the action designated by the verbs) in combinations that appear fully acceptable to Romanian native speakers: *mașina* (*de spălat*) *spală impecabil* (lit. *the washing machine washes impecably*); *fierul calcă bine* (lit. *the iron irons well*). But this seems not to be applicable equally unhesitatingly to *the frying-pan was [...] ready to cook the chops*. (*Tigaia era [...] gata să prăjească antricoatele/ cotletul*), as the literal equivalent of the English sentence, may sound awkward to the target readers.

Syntactically, not all empathic constructions, many of which presupposed inversion, were taken account of when translated into Romanian. To give just a few examples, *Rapidly she pulled down her hair* was most often rendered in clauses in which the adverb *rapidly* did not occupy the sentence initial position. Similarly, the emphatic word order in *Three times Della counted it* was not always preserved in the Romanian equivalent sentences and neither was it in *On went her old brown jacket; on went her old brown hat* (in the latter case, even the repetition of *brown*, certainly resorted to with aesthetic, emphatic intentions, was neglected in some of the target texts produced: e.g. *Își puse pe ea haina maro veche, iar pe cap pălăria veche în aceeași culoare cu haina* (lit. *She put on her old brown coat, and on her head, the old hat of the same colour as the coat.*)). Inversion in Romanian would have been possible and recommended in all the cases mentioned. However, there was at least one occasion when the otherwise very flexible Romanian word order rules were prevented by register requirements from perfectly mirroring an English construction – the non-standard *white fingers and nimble*, a noun phrase in which one of the modifiers of the head noun precedes it and the other occurs in post-position. Observing the same word order in Romanian would

have resulted into a too poetic phrase for the particular macrocontext of O. Henry's story: *albe degete și abile*.

Syntactic-semantic incongruence between the original text and what the students opted for in some of their target texts sometimes triggered a certain degree of diminution of the original meaning intensity. An example in point would be: *Many a happy hour she has spent planning for something nice for him!*, an exclamatory sentence translated into Romanian as a declarative one: *Atâtea ceasuri fericite petrecuse gândindu-se la un cadou frumos pentru el.* (lit. *So many hours she has spent thinking about a nice gift for him.*). An attempt at carrying over the original affective overtone in its entirety has been made by keeping the direct object in sentence initial position, but it did not succeed all the way. Occasions of emotional involvement display (of the character and, implicitly, of the author) was sometimes signaled by the interjection *oh*: *But what could I do – oh! What could I do with a dollar and eighty-seven cents?*; *Oh, and the next two hours tripped by on rosy wings.* With minor exceptions, the students took notice of these occasions and included corresponding Romanian interjections in their translations: *o, vai, ah*.

While some of the *oh*'s are the author's, others are put into Della's mouth, their use thus becoming a peculiar feature of her way of talking. Jim, the male protagonist, does not stand out with any idiosyncrasy, but madame Sofronie, the hair shop owner, does (even if she gets to utter a couple of words only). She speaks Cockney, a social (and regional) variety that most of the students chose to ignore in their translations and offered standard Romanian equivalents for. Loss in terms of style is obvious in these cases (and increased when, quite often, the cacophonous *Cumpăr păr* was the translation solution). However, Madam Sofronie's non-standard English did not always pass unnoticed so that attempts at carrying over her "stylistic persona" into the target language have been made. An example of having done this successfully is the variant *Păr? Cumpăr, da. Da' scoate-ți pălăria, să văd cum e. [...] Douăj' de dolari, spuse Madam [...]* (lit. *Hair? I buy, yes. Bu' take off your hat to see how it is. [...] Tw'nty dollars, said Madame [...]*) for *I buy hair. Take yer hat off and let's have a sight at the looks of it. [...] Twenty dollars, said Madame [...]*.

O. Henry makes a number of cultural allusions in his text. The first occurs in the very title of his work and is explained in the concluding paragraph – reference is made to the magi, the "wise men" who brought gifts to baby Jesus, in the manger, upon his birth on Christmas Eve. With one exception, the students rendered appropriately all parts of the text containing it. Quite surprisingly, one of them, however, got misled by the capitalization of the word *Magi* in the title, and, most probably, not being familiar with the foreign plural form of the noun *magus*, interpreted it as a proper name and translated accordingly – *Darul lui Magi* (lit. *the gift of Magi*). *The Queen of Sheba* and *King Solomon* are the next two culture-related elements present in the source text. Most of the students did what was done in the original text, i.e. included them in the target texts without any further explanation. One of them, clearly proving cultural awareness, chose to add a footnote in which she explained who the two Biblical figures were. A footnote was also some students' choice in dealing with another culture-specific element of the text – *the mendicancy squad*, a U.S. police department that arrests beggars and homeless people. What we found unexpected was that one of the students' footnote in this particular case clarified what the Romanian equivalent he chose – *Direcția de Ordine Publică* (lit. *Public Order Division*) stands for: the section of the Romanian police that deals, among other things, with beggars' crimes. Though

concentration on the source text cultural element or a double gloss would have been preferred, we could not but appreciate the student's effort to find an acceptable translation solution.

3.2 Translation assessment. Extra-linguistic elements

The extra-linguistic elements that determined the linguistic shape of the source text were common enough not to imprint on it any special features. Therefore, it seems the student translators did not find it difficult to imagine themselves either in the situation of the author telling the story or in that of the characters and consequently, managed, most of the times, to render the message appropriately. The inadequacies that have been pointed out in the previous section were not as serious as to dramatically impede on the overall at least acceptable if not quite good quality of most translations. The fact that the subject matter was not anchored in any special, out of the ordinary circumstances (by special, we also mean professional, specialized contexts) also contributed to ease of understanding of the original text and, consequently, to ease of translating it.

The time and place of source text production are known – early 20th century and New York, respectively. There may be specificities of both of these, but if there are, they are not highlighted in the text (because they do not actually matter). Jim and Della's story transcends both its time and its space; their buying and exchanging gifts for Christmas the way they did could have taken place anywhere, in any period of modern time.

The target readers of the source text are as non-specific as the time and space of the story and therefore, no necessity of special attention being given to any of these three factors arose in the translation process.

The speaker factor is connected to both the author's way of "speaking" to his readers and to the characters' use of language. As pointed out previously, O. Henry wrote in clear, plain, unadorned American English that should have been easy to understand and so it was in the greatest majority of cases, as proved by our students' translations. Della's linguistic display of emotional involvement in the events and Madame Sofronie's peculiar Cockney have been touched upon above. The author's affectionate attitude to the Christmas Eve story of the two young people has also been hinted at when discussing inversion, exclamatory sentences and the use of interjections as linguistic means of displaying it. How the students dealt with these idiosyncrasies has also been explained.

4. Conclusion

"Successful or good translations cannot be conceived without the activation of the source language and target language contexts and without considering the readership's expectations" (Vilceanu 2017, 295), i.e. awareness of the micro- and macro-linguistic and overall cultural context (the readership included) plays a vital role both in translating literary texts and in assessing the translation products from a functional perspective.

The analysis of our students' Romanian versions of O. Henry's the *Gift of the Magi* prompted the conclusion that their transfer, language and textual competence as future

professionals are developing, though the subtler nuances of language and the cultural allusions sometimes escape their still undertrained eye. The areas and specific points that may be problematic once identified, the students' awareness on them may be raised, with good chances of improvement of their translation abilities. Teachers, as their trainers, undoubtedly play their role in this improvement process.

References

1. ***, *PETRA-E Framework*, available at www.petra-education.eu/ [Accessed February 2017].
2. Henry, O. 1965. *Poveste neterminată*. Editura pentru literatură universală.
3. Henry, O. 2004. *Darul magilor*. Agora.
4. Henry, O. 2004. *Ofranda magilor*. Cartier.
5. Henry, O. 2008. *The Gift of the Magi and the Cop and the Anthem*. Candlewick: Wildside Press LLC, pp. 7-13.
6. Percec, D., and L. Pungă. Forthcoming 2017. "Developing literary translators' competence. A multi-leveled approach" in *Romanian Journal of English Studies* 14. DeGruyterh Open, available at <https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/rjes>.
7. Reiss, K. 2014. *Translation Criticism. The Potential and Limitations*. London: Routledge.
8. Vilceanu, T. 2017. "Managing Ambiguities and Cultural Gaps in the Translation of David Lodge's *A Man of Parts*". In M. Burada, R. Tatu, and O. Sinu (eds.) *Language Diversity in a Globalized Word*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 294-308.