

UNFAITHFUL TRANSLATORS AND TRANSLATION INFIDELITY

Daniela ȘORCARU

Understanding a literary work as a whole (in our particular case prose) means understanding not only the language but also the intrinsic elements of the story (theme, plot, characterization, and setting), the symbolism, the metaphors, the author's style and cultural background. This means that, at the stage of analyzing the text, a translator must take all the aspects above into account. A very small misinterpretation of the work may cause a wrong perception. As a result, the target language (TL) reader will also misinterpret the story.

When translating a text, especially a literary work, the translator requires broader background knowledge. S/he cannot depend on the text and the dictionary alone. The cultural background that contributes to the creation of the text must be studied before working on the translation itself. A careless decision in choosing equivalent expressions to be used in the translated text may cause various problems, such as loss, gain and gap of meaning.

Unfortunately, not everything is translatable, and a transfer of meaning necessarily involves changes entailing loss or gain of linguistic, cultural and stylistic features.

The target text (TT) will always lack certain culturally relevant features that are present in the source text (ST). Translation is fraught with compromise, which means reconciling oneself with the fact that, while one would like to do full justice to the richness of the ST, one's final TT inevitably suffers from various translation losses. Often one allows these losses unhesitatingly.

Once the principle is accepted that sameness cannot exist between two languages, it becomes possible to approach the question of loss and gain in the translation process. It is again an indication of the low status of translation that so much time should have been spent on discussing what is lost in the transfer of a text from SL to TL while ignoring what can also be gained, for the translator can at times enrich or clarify the SL text as a direct result of the translation process. Moreover, what is often seen as lost from the SL context may be actually replaced in the TL context.

With a view to debating upon unfaithful translators and translation infidelity, we have chosen to analyse the Romanian and Spanish translations of Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code*, focusing on some text samples that seem to support our case.

A first problem of infidelity in both target texts is the loss of meaning that can be observed on the very first page of the novel under scrutiny, namely the prologue.

So as to better understand the following example, we found it useful to provide the dictionary dimension of some words. According to the Macmillan English Dictionary *to crawl* means *to move along the ground on your hand and knees or with your body close to the ground*; *to scan* – *to look at something very carefully, because you hope or expect to see a particular person or thing. (in our case to see a particular thing)* and *cavernous* refers to a room or building very large and dark.

Both verbs in TT_{1.1} and TT_{2.1} are not exactly the perfect synonyms of *to crawl*, so they are not transmitting the same message as the original, because the verb *se trase într-o parte de sub pânză* / *he dragged aside from under the canvas* is used in Romanian and *se dio la vuelta, se desembarazó del lienzo* / *he turned and removed the canvas* in Spanish, missing at the same time the idea that the person was under the canvas.

Scanned the cavernous space offers the SL reader the image of a person in a scary place, trying with desperation to find a place to hide, but it becomes simply *privi în jur* / *looked around* (TT_{1.1}) and *buscó con la mirada* / *looked for a place* (TT_{2.1}), in this case missing the feeling the man had in that place, whereas *cavernous space* is translated only as *a space to hide* - *căutarea unui loc*. Considering the fact that Romanian does not have a word to render the verb *to scan* exactly, this case may be included under semantic gap.

By rearranging the next sentence, TT_{2.1} might have tried to provide the TT with the same intonation as the original but loses another detail of the ST: the adjective *chillingly*, thus, *A voice spoke, chillingly close. 'Do not move.'* is simply translated - *No se mueva – dijo una voz muy cerca de él.* / *Don't move – a close voice said.*

ST ₁ : <i>He crawled out from under the canvas and scanned the cavernous space for somewhere to hide. A voice spoke, chillingly close. 'Do not move.'</i> (p.1)	TT _{1.1} : <i>Se trase într-o parte de sub pânză și privi în jur, în căutarea unui loc în care să se ascundă. O voce răsună, cutremurător de aproape:</i> — Nu mișca! (p. 1)	TT _{2.1} : <i>Se dio la vuelta, se desembarazó del lienzo y buscó con la mirada algún sitio donde esconderse en aquel espacio cavernoso. - No se mueva – dijo una voz muy cerca de él.</i> (p. 1)
--	--	--

The next excerpt is a good example of both semantic loss and gain at the same time. *Langdon thought*, is lost completely in TT_{1.2}, and in TT_{2.2} there is just *pensó* / *he thought*, thus making the TL readers take a guess at who is talking. TT_{2.2} also resorted to a change of structure, introducing the dialogue first and continuing with the observation that *the driver arched his eyebrows*. TT_{2.2} gained an observation by adding explicitation to the dialogue *respondió el conductor* / *the driver answered* which is not to be found in ST₂ as we can easily see.

ST ₂ : <i>The driver arched his eyebrows. 'Your French it's better than you admit, Monsieur Langdon.' My French stinks, Langdon thought, but my zodiac iconography is pretty good.</i> (p. 11)	TT _{1.2} : <i>Locotenentul își arcui sprâncenele:</i> — Franceza dumneavoastră este mai bună decât vreți să recunoașteți, <i>monsieur</i> Langdon. "Franceza mea e de doi bani, dar la iconografia zodiacală mă pricep bine." (p. 11)	TT _{2.2} : —Su francés es mejor de lo que admite, <i>monsieur</i> Langdon - <i>respondió el conductor arqueando las cejas.</i> «Mi francés es pésimo - <i>pensó</i> - pero mi iconografía zodiacal es algo mejor. (p. 11)
---	---	--

Sometimes semantic gain, loss or gap occurs because target texts need to provide TL readers with further explanations so that they have a better understanding of the text. This is exactly what happens in TT_{1.3} where the translator feels compelled to add *pe care îl alintau "Ea"* / *spoilt She*, because it is recurrent in the text.

ST ₃ : <i>'She</i> (The Eiffel Tower) <i>is the symbol of France. I think she is perfect.' [...]</i> Symbolologists often remarked that France [...] could not have chosen a more apt national emblem than than a	TT _{1.3} : Este simbolul Franței. Mie mi se pare perfectă! [...] Cei care studiau simbolistica remarcaseră adesea că francezii [...] nici n-ar fi putut să aleagă un simbol național mai potrivit decât un falus de trei sute de	TT _{2.3} : —Es el símbolo de Francia. A mí me parece perfecta. [...] Los simbologistas solían comentar que Francia [...] no podía haber escogido mejor emblema nacional que un falo
--	---	--

thousand-foot phallus. (p. 18)	metri înălțime, <i>pe care îl</i> de trescientos metros de altura. <i>alintau "Ea".</i> (p. 17)	(p. 18)
--------------------------------	--	---------

A case of semantic gain is exemplified by the next set of text samples when the Romanian translator thought of employing explicitation and the structure of the ST sentence. Hence, TT_{1.4} adds *În cercurile de specialitate, se știa că* and if we look at ST₄ this sentence does not exist. Another semantic gain occurs when TT_{1.4} introduces the adjective *retras* when translating *era un om discret și retras*. A better translation would simply have been *Apreciatul Jacques Sauniere era faimos pentru discretia sa și acorda foarte putine întâlniri*. TT_{2.4} is a faithful copy of the original by adjusting the translation to the original.

ST ₄ : The venerated Jacques Sauniere had a renowned penchant for privacy and granted very few meetings; Langdon was grateful simply for the opportunity to meet him. (p. 26)	TT _{1.4} : <i>În cercurile de specialitate, se știa că</i> apreciatul Jacques Sauniere <i>era un om discret și retras, care accepta foarte rar să iasă în public,</i> și Langdon nu putea decât să fie recunoscător pentru ocazia ce i se oferise. (p. 24)	TT _{2.4} : El prestigioso Jacques Sauniere era famoso por su discreción y concedía muy pocas entrevistas. Langdon se había sentido honrado al brindársele la ocasión de conocerlo. (p. 25)
--	---	---

Another problem causing infidelity in the Romanian translation is the loss of an entire sentence from ST₅. TT_{1.5} may have missed the sentence *that hung suspended from ceiling cables* because the translator thought it was not an important thing to add to the TT. The translator's wrong choice would result in the TL readers getting the wrong idea of the situation. However, if the text is not read in the original, TL readers would never know this part is missing.

ST ₅ : The reddish glow of the service lightning sifted upward, casting an unnatural smolder across a staggering collection of Da Vincis, Titians and Caravaggios <i>that hung suspended from ceiling cables</i> . (p. 40)	TT _{1.5} : Licărirea roșiatică a luminilor de serviciu proiecta o aură nefirească asupra zecilor de Tiziano, da Vinci sau Caravaggio. (p. 36)	TT _{2.5} : El brillo tenue y rojizo de las luces de emergencia apuntaba hacia arriba, iluminando con un resplandor artificial la colección de Leonardos, Tizianos y Caravaggios <i>suspendidos del techo con cables</i> . (p. 37)
---	--	--

With the next set of excerpts which illustrate a case of translation loss, the translator may have accidentally missed one question (*And what does it mean?*), as the following sentence implies the existence of a question. This is supported by *o întrebare de genul ăsta*. Thus, mistakes may occur without explicit intentionality on the part of the translator. Nevertheless, as long as the sentence is completely deleted, this makes up a case of translation loss.

ST ₆ : 'It's a pentacle, [...] used over four thousand years before Christ.' 'And what does it mean?' Langdon always hesitated when he got this question. (p. 44-45)	TT _{1.6} : Este o pentagramă [...] folosita cu peste patru mii de ani înaintea lui Hristos. Profesorul ezita întotdeauna când i se punea o <i>întrebare de genul ăsta</i> . (p. 40)	TT _{2.6} : —Es el pentáculo [...] Ya se usaba cuatro mil años antes de Cristo. — ¿Y qué significa? Langdon siempre vacilaba cuando le hacían aquella pregunta.
---	---	---

Another example of loss in the process of translation can be found in the next samples in which the Spanish translator refuses to use slang, thus altering the impact of ST register on the TL readers. Hence, *Damned good question* is translated as *Esa sí que es una buena pregunta/ this is really a good question* missing the ST informality altogether. This time it is TT_{1.7} that is more faithful to the source text by keeping the latter's way of conveying the message.

ST ₇ : 'Why did he remove his clothing?' <i>Damned good question</i> , Langdon thought. (p. 48)	TT _{1.7} : De ce și-a scos hainele? "Asta e o întrebare al naibii de bună", își spuse Langdon. (p. 43-44)	TT _{2.7} : ¿Por qué se quitó la ropa? «Esa sí que es una buena pregunta», pensó Langdon. (p. 44)
---	--	---

When tackling the issue of culture specific elements, we may discover that the target language is at a lack. Nonetheless, when the translator completely ignores certain sentences in the ST, we are no longer faced with semantic loss but with what we may call whole translation loss. The reasons behind such an occurrence may vary from lack of relevance for the subject at hand or the easy possibility of omission. In TT_{1.8} we may notice that the Romanian translator missed the following sentence *Lieutenant Collet had returned to the Louvre* and there is no information, or compensating detail at least, to suggest the action. Yet, both target texts gained the possessive *al custodelui* (TT_{1.8}: *imensul birou al custodelui*) and *del conservador* (TT_{2.8}: *el enorme escritorio del conservador*) by explicitation, when referring to *the enormous desk*. Both TTs translated it as *the curator's enormous desk*.

ST ₈ : Not far away, inside Saunière office, <i>Lieutenant Collet had returned to the Louvre</i> and was huddled over an audio console set up on <i>the enormous desk</i> . (p. 50)	TT _{1.8} : Nu departe, în biroul lui Jacques Saunière, locotenentul Collet ședea aplecat asupra unei console audio așezate pe <i>imensul birou al custodelui</i> . (p. 46)	TT _{2.8} : No lejos de allí, en el interior del despacho de Saunière, <i>el teniente Collet había regresado al Louvre</i> y estaba inclinado sobre una consola de audio instalada sobre <i>el enorme escritorio del conservador</i> . (p. 47)
--	---	--

A simple but important detail of the action is again lost in the next examples, when TT_{1.9} forgets to specify that at a certain moment a discussion was taped, mentioning only the fact that the conversation was listened to. As we can see, TT_{1.9} passes on from one action to another, without specifying this detail. TT_{2.9} adapts the text to the original, paying careful attention to the details.

The correct meaning of the verb *to settle in* is also lost (*to make yourself comfortable in a place because you are going to stay there for a long time* – Macmillan English Dictionary), being translated as *se lăasă pe spătarul scaunului* without the added connotation of being comfortable. However, the translator later adds another verb *a se delecta*, which may be regarded as making up for the previous slip. TT_{2.9} cannot find the perfect synonym to exactly show the idea of settling in, but it also gains semantically by means of another verb, *se dispuso a disfrutar* / *he laid out to enjoy the rest of the conversation*.

ST ₉ : Smiling he closed his eyes and settled in to enjoy the rest of the conversation <i>now being taped</i> inside the Grand Gallery. (p. 50)	TT _{1.9} : Surizînd, închise ochii și <i>se lăasă pe spătarul scaunului</i> , pentru a se delecta cu restul conversației din Marea Galerie. (p. 46)	TT _{2.9} : Sonriendo, cerró los ojos y <i>se dispuso a disfrutar</i> del resto de la conversación que tenía lugar en la Gran Galería y que a <i>partir de ese momento empezaba a quedar grabada</i> . (p. 47)
--	--	--

If we have so far found more mistakes in the Romanian target texts, this time the error is to be identified in the Spanish translation. Instead of expressing the literal translation of the message from the original text, TT_{2,8} prefers to literally let it be and passes on to the next sentence. Without knowing the original content of the message, the TL readers go on reading, thinking that is the correct form. Thus, the message *Just listen calmly* in ST₁₀ totally vanishes in TT_{2,10}.

ST ₁₀ : 'Do not react to this message. <i>Just listen calmly</i> . You are in danger right now. Follow my directions closely. (p. 67)	TT _{1,10} : "Nu reacționa la acest mesaj. <i>Ascultă-l în liniște</i> . Ești în pericol. Urmează-mi indicațiile cu strictețe." (p. 61)	TT _{2,10} : No reaccione de ningún modo cuando oiga este mensaje. En este momento se encuentra en peligro. Siga mis instrucciones al pie de la letra.» (p. 63)
--	---	---

Devils are known to be black with red eyes. Yet, if the author himself had wanted to express it as such, he might actually have done it. TT_{1,11} ignored the form of the original text, but there was no impediment in using the adjective *red* in *ochi roșii de drac*. A simple translation like *ochi de drac* would have been more appropriate without causing translation gain. This is yet another example of Spanish TT_{2,11} being faithful to the ST.

ST ₁₁ : A ghost with the <i>eyes of a devil!</i> And he felt like a ghost... (p. 70)	TT _{1,11} : "O stafie cu <i>ochi roșii de drac!</i> " Și chiar se simțea ca o stafie... (p. 63)	TT _{2,11} : «Un fantasma con <i>ojos de demonio.</i> » Y sí, sentía que era un fantasma... (p. 66)
--	---	--

A complex transfer of meaning always implies certain changes at text level entailing loss and/or gain of linguistic, stylistic and cultural features. We notice that, although Spanish does not regularly use short forms of saying *how much?* or *how long?*, the translator felt the need to be more explicit. He thus chose the long versions «¿Cuánto tiempo lleva en marcha?/ *for how long has it been moving?*; Cuánta distancia ha recorrido?/ *what distance has it covered?* The Romanian translation is not exactly loyal to the English version of the book either. *How far*, which indicates the distance, is translated as *Încotro?*, indicating the destination in Romanian, this being a case of loss of meaning in translation.

ST ₁₂ : When he awoke the train was moving. <i>How long? How far?</i> A pain was growing in his gut. (p. 71)	TT _{1,12} : Când se trezise, trenul mergea. " <i>De cât timp? Încotro?</i> " În burtă simțea o durere înțepătoare. (p. 64)	TT _{2,12} : Cuando se despertó, el tren se movía. «¿Cuánto tiempo lleva en marcha? ¿Cuánta distancia ha recorrido?» En sus entrañas sentía un gran dolor. (p. 67)
---	---	--

During the process of transferring the message from the SL to the TL, a translator must be able to find equivalent phrases. Sometimes these collocations suffer some loss of meaning or some facts are completely lost in the transfer process. This is the case of *Salle des États - the room that housed the Mona Lisa* from ST₁₃ which is lost in TT_{1,13} and it becomes only *ale sălii în care se afla Mona Lisa*. Thus, the instance of code-switch from the original is entirely ignored and, at the same time, there is meaning loss, as the translator gave up trying to find an equivalent to better convey *the room that housed* as TT_{2,13} does.

ST ₁₃ : Sophie arrived breathless outside the large wooden doors of the <i>Salle des États - the room that housed the</i>	TT _{1,13} : Sophie ajunse la ușile mari de lemn <i>ale sălii în care se afla Mona Lisa</i> cu răsuflarea tăiată.	TT _{2,13} : Sophie llegó casi sin aliento ante los portones de madera de la <i>Salle des États, el espacio que albergaba la Mona</i>
--	---	---

The next set of excerpts may be regarded as one of the best examples of semantic loss. Missing a word in the ST may prove essential to the TT, as that very word may well change the entire meaning of the sentence it is part of. Furthermore, missing a whole sentence is inconceivable, especially when it contains certain details that can be paramount to the understanding of the plot. TT_{1.14} does not provide a correct translation of the ST, but at least the conclusion stays the same. If the Romanian text gains by *rostea la rîndul ei nou învățatul cuvînt în engleză*, which in ST₁₄ is differently put, TT_{2.14} ignores the entire sentence in the source text, and it does not try, at least, to render some of its words and ends up by adding just *Eso / that*. A better translation in TT_{1.14} and more observant of ST₁₄ would simply have been *știind că discutia nu avea să continue pînă ce nu-si repeta noul cuvînt din vocabularul său*.

ST₁₄: 'She's even worse than in the books. Her face is ... *brumeux*. 'Foggy', her grandfather tutored. 'Foggy,' Sophie repeated, knowing the conversation would not continue until she repeated her new vocabulary word. (p. 127)

TT_{1.14}: — E chiar mai urâtă decât în poze. Figura ei este... *brumeux*. — Foggy¹, o corectase bunicul. — Foggy, repetase ea, știind că discuția nu avea să continue pînă ce nu rostea la rîndul ei nou învățatul cuvînt în engleză. (p. 113)

TT_{2.14}: —Es aún peor que en los libros. Tiene la cara... *brumeux*. —Borrosa —apuntó su abuelo. —Eso. (p. 118)

Target texts reveal some mistakes that could easily have been avoided. A translator must take into consideration translating style adequately because careless translation of the style will affect the TL reader's interpretation of the whole message. A case of translation gain can be seen in TT_{1.15} where the Romanian translator, trying to preserve the 'flavour' of the original, introduces the code-switch strategy: she keeps the word *horny*, explaining the word and its origin, so that it can be better understood by the TL readers. Moreover, if TT_{1.15} does not properly convey the idiomatic phrases *No shit* from ST₁₅ and translates them with *Pe bune* which is not the exact Romanian synonym in terms of register and style, we are at least not dealing with a translation loss as we can see in TT_{2.15} which skips them altogether and passes directly to the next sentence. However, TT_{1.15} displays another mistake by missing the fact that the professor was *grabbing a grease pen* while he was talking, also replacing *Langdon* with *the professor*. This time TT_{2.15} is more faithful to the original, avoiding loss, gain or gap of meaning.

ST₁₅: Amon is indeed represented as a man with a ram's head, and his promiscuity and curved horns are related to our modern sexual slang "horny". 'No shit!' 'No shit,' Langdon said. 'And do you know who Amon's counterpart was? [...]' 'It was Isis,' Langdon told them, *grabbing a grease pen*. (p. 155)

TT_{1.15}: Amon era reprezentat, într-adevăr, ca un om cu cap de berbec, iar promiscuitatea și coarnele sale curbate au dat naștere termenului argotic „*horny*” din limba engleză, care desemnează un *îns excitat sexual*. — *Pe bune?* — *Pe bune!* Și știți care era corespondentul feminin al lui Amon? [...] Era Isis, continuă profesorul. (p. 134)

TT_{2.15}: Amón se representa como un hombre con cabeza y cuernos de carnero, y por su promiscuidad es lo que hoy en día llamaríamos un «cachondo». ¿Y sabe alguien quién es su equivalente femenina? [...] — Era Isis —les dijo Langdon, *cogiendo una tiza* —. (p. 142)

When translating a text, the translator must pay great attention to the details of the source text and s/he must try to create an identical copy of the original message. In TT_{1.16} we can notice a perfect case of simultaneous translation loss and gain, as compared to the ST. Thus, *Grouard told himself, keeping his gun levelled* becomes *își spuse Grouard, făcându-și curaj*, TT_{1.16} missing the fact that the man carried a gun and gaining by adding *the courage*, while also changing the sentence structure (combining them). TT_{2.16} is more loyal to the source text.

<p>ST₁₆: <i>Another few metres, Grouard told himself, keeping his gun levelled.</i> <i>'Arrêtez! Ou je la détruis!'</i> the woman's voice echoed across the room. (p. 169)</p>	<p>TT_{1.16}: "Încă trei sau patru metri", își spuse Grouard, <i>făcându-și curaj</i>, când vocea femeii răsună, reverberându-se în sala pustie: <i>— Arrêtez! Ou je la détruis!</i> (p. 147)</p>	<p>TT_{2.16}: «Unos metros más», Grouard se decía a sí mismo <i>con el arma bien levantada.</i> <i>— Arretez! Ou je la détruis!</i> —La voz de la mujer reverberó en la sala. (p. 157)</p>
--	---	---

There is nothing wrong with making the text more comprehensible for your TL readership, but in some cases the author's ST collocations may have been easier to express. An example of semantic gain by means of explicitation is present in TT_{1.17} where the translator finds it more appropriate to translate *I drive an automatic* with *Eu am mașină cu transmisie automată!* / *I have an automatic car* also replacing the verb *I drive* with *I have*. From the ST context (they were in hurry), the man did not have enough time to 'shout' a sentence that long, as in the Romanian version.

<p>ST₁₇: 'I tried to warn you,' he shouted over the sound of gnashing gears. <i>'I drive an automatic!'</i> (p. 215)</p>	<p>TT_{1.17}: — Am încercat să te previn, strigă el încercând să acopere scrișnetul pneurilor. <i>Eu am mașină cu transmisie automată!</i> (p. 182)</p>	<p>TT_{2.17}: —He intentado advertírtelo —le gritó para hacerse oír por encima del rechinar de la caja de cambios—. <i>¡Yo conduzco sólo automáticos!</i> (p. 198)</p>
---	---	--

In the next sequence, the existence of a dialogue makes it irrelevant to specify all the details such as *Sophie asked, Teabing replied*, because they can be inferred from the context, but this is no reason for them to be completely ignored in the process of translation. Thus, as we may easily notice, *Sophie asked* in ST₁₈ is translated in TT_{1.18} with *întreba ea cu glas tare* / *she asked loudly*, gaining *cu glas tare* / *loudly* and *Teabing replied* is absent in both target texts. *Sophie turned* is ignored in both Romanian and Spanish texts as well. Mention must be made here that TT_{1.18} gains another word *Păcătoasa*, which does not occur in the ST, with a view to drawing a conclusion that may be regarded as being already obvious considering the context and the cultural background of readers.

<p>ST₁₈: 'Who is she?' Sophie asked. <i>'That my dear,' Teabing replied, 'is Mary Magdalene.'</i> <i>Sophie turned. 'The prostitute?'</i> (p. 313)</p>	<p>TT_{1.18}: — Cine e? întreba ea <i>cu glas tare.</i> — Aceasta, draga mea, este Maria Magdalena! — <i>Păcătoasa, prostituata din Biblie?</i> (p. 268)</p>	<p>TT_{2.18}: — ¿Y quién es? —preguntó. — Esa, querida, es María Magdalena. — <i>¿La prostituta?</i> (p. 292)</p>
--	--	--

In their attempt to provide a better translation of the ST, translators sometimes fail. They often use explicitation, meant to make the TT more comprehensible for their TL audience. This is exactly what happens in TT_{1.19} when an entire sentence is added: *Americanul făcu ochii mari, dar renunță să se chinuie să mai priceapă ceva și dădu să se ridice*. The only thing which corresponds to the ST is *dădu să se ridice*, the rest counting only as semantic gain.

Excalibur also becomes just a *sword* (*spadă*). Once again TT_{2,19} is more faithful to the original and adapts the TT, by replacing the English interjection *Huh?* with the Spanish one *¿Eh?* and by providing a correct translation of the ST.

ST₁₉: 'You were rescued by a knight brandishing an Excalibur made by Acme Orthopedic.'
Huh? Langdon tried to sit up. (p. 356)

TT_{1,19}: — Ai fost salvat de un cavaler înarmat cu o spadă "made by" Acme Orthopedic!
Americanul făcu ochii mari, dar renunță să se chinuie să mai priceapă ceva și dădu să se ridice. (p. 308)

TT_{2,19}: — Te ha rescatado un caballero que blandía su Excalibur de Ortopedia Acmé.
— ¿Eh? — musitó Robert intentando incorporarse. (p. 335)

Since the goal of translation is that of transferring meaning, the use of appropriate collocations in the TL is of the utmost importance. A good translation does not translate words, but meaning itself. By reacting to this translated meaning, the TL reader must experience the same impact of the TT as the SL reader did when confronted with the ST. This similar impact may be achieved by reproducing the message in natural and accurate TL. Translating fiction requires not only the translator's linguistic competence, but also his/her competence in analyzing the literary work. Failure to translate both the content and the form of the text (with all that these two aspects entail) will lead to translation infidelity. The translation s/he thus produces is based on superficial reading, without trying to observe the author's style and the cultural background embedded in the text as required in the case of a successful translation. As a result, loss, gain and/or gap of meaning frequently occur in such TTs. Such a situation obviously leads to the unwanted result of SL and TL readers interpreting the story differently.

Notes

¹ *Foggy* – încețoșată (engl., n.tr.)

Corpus

Brown, D. (2004) *The Da Vinci Code*, Great Britain: Corgi Books.

Brown, D. (2005) *Codul lui Da Vinci*, translated by Adriana Bădescu, București: Rao.

Brown, D. (2003) *El Código Da Vinci*, translated by Juanjo Estrella, Barcelona: Urano S.A. Aribau.