INTRODUCTION TO A THEORY OF LITERARY TRANSLATION

Thesis submitted for the degree

"Doctor of Philosophy"

by

Itamar Even-Zohar, M.A.

Submitted to the Senate of the Tel-Aviv University,

July, 1971

SUMMARY

This study proposes a theoretical and methodological framework for literary translation.

Chapter 0 (introduction) clarifies some preliminary points. There are two main activities which deal with translation: a theoretical and exploratory on the one hand and practical on the other. The theoretical and exploratory activity is concerned with the theoretical problems translation involves and with translation products, and is characterised by its descriptive and explicatory approach. The practical activity, on the other hand, consists in laying down norms and developing methods to aid translators. In spite of the interrilations between these two concerns (the ideal would of course be to give the practical activity a status of an applied science) they are to be taken as distinct. In this inquiry, the primary orientation is theoretical. Still, it is to be hoped it has various practical implications.

Further, the question of what discipline should deal with translation is raised. Quite naturally, most of the work in this field has been carried out in the framework of linguistics. However, the fact that there are various kinds of verbal texts gave rise to debates on the problem whether the linguist is exclusively competent to deal with them all. For example, is linguistics or theory of literature the right discipline to explore literary translation? This debate (briefly summarized in 0.2 and notes) seems to miss the point, since modern theory of literature cannot be conceived of as totally separate from general semiology, which among other things subsumes linguistics. Due to the fact that the literary work is first and foremost a verbal artefact, one cannot but deal with it in terms of linguistic theory. On the other hand, however, its peculiar characteristics as text (as opposed to "language") and moreover as literary text, necessitate its discussion on terms of literary theory, especially (literary) textual theory. Moreover, just as linguistics may derive much benefit from a theory of translation (as Barxudarov [28], 14 puts it), so may the theory of literature do from the theory of literary translation.

Since the theory of literature is relatively undeveloped as a science, any discussion which has to rely upon the conceptual set of this theory must elaborate such a set at least ad hoc. It is therefore attempted in this study to formulate a basic set of concepts for a literary textual theory, as a preliminary to any discussion of literary translation proper.

Since the object of this study is to establish a general theoretical (and methodological) framework, it contains no discussions of specific issues such as the differences between various specific literatures (and languages), genres or periods. There are already thousands of studies of particular problems of literary translation, but we still lack an adequate theoretical (and methodological) framework, which may serve such studies.

In the light of the foregoing statement that it is necessary to make use of the conceptual sets of both linguistics and literary theory, this study is carried out in the following order: first (chapter 1), general issues of translation are clarified in terms of linguistic comparative models; then, an outline of literary textual theory is suggested (chapter 2); and finally (chapter 3), a theoretical framework of literary translation is proposed on the basis of the two previous chapters. Comparative analyses of translation products illustrate the theoretical theses (theoremes) and exemplify a method of analysing literary translations.

At the beginning of Chapter 1 (Basic Problems of a general Theory of Translation), eight various (haphazardly chosen) definitions of translation are quoted and then re-defined with a minimal and a maximal formulation as follows (minimum version denoted by a, first addition by b, supplementary addition by b_1, and second addition by c):

In translation [a] the linguistic means (signs) of SL (=Source language) [b] [carrying a certain mass of meaning [content] / meaning and attitude] are converted by means (signs) of TL (=Target language) [b] [carrying a certain mass of meaning [content] / b_1 + style [form]] [c] (in equivalent/synonymous/full and exact way).

Between the eight definitions quoted there are clear similarities and differences with regard to the conception of language and the optimal factors considered as indispensable for the description of translation. The differences mainly stem from disagreements about the nature of the relations between means (signs) and functions in language, although even the minimum formilation implies that one cannot speak of converting "means" into "means" of another language, but rather of converting function-carrying means into menas of another language carrying the same functions. As far as the optimal factors involved in translation are concerned, there are differences in the readiness of the various definers to refer clearly and unambiguously to this linguistic issue (that used to be somewhat controversial until a new interest in semantics arose in the fifties). Even cursory examination indicates to what an extent a theory of translation is dependent already in its first steps on basic conceptions of the nature of language. The theory of translation may resolve these disagreements either by relying upon a specific linguistic theory or by trying to delimit the minimum agreed upon. Both ways are risky, the first tending to onesidedness, the other to eclecticism. Still, it seems to me that there is no verifiable way of deciding which way is preferable, and that such a decision can be made only on the ground of scientific convenience. Thus, it seems to me preferable to build upon conceptions commonly agreed upon. All the definitions cited agree at least that linguistic means have communicative functions, and that these functions play a crucial rôle in translation. Linguistic theories, however different from each other, still commonly postulate one basic dichotomy between the aspects of communication. We shall call these aspects in the sequel "information" and "rethoric" respectively, and

try to construct a concise model for each.

In section 1.2 (1.2-1.2.7) a model of linguistic information is presented. The term information is not used here in the sense given to it by information theory (which is only a reduction of its wide sense, and as a matter of fact a short form for "quantity of information"). It is employed in the sense of "an aggregate of data produced by and derived from signs"; and, consequently, linguistic information is defined as "an aggregate of data produced by and derived from linguistic signs". Since information may refer to all factors which take part in the act of communication (AC), the widest communication scheme should be adopted, one including the following factors: addresser, addressee, message, code, object world (or "context"), channel, contact and noise. Jakobson [1o2b] constructed his well-known table of functions on the basis of these factors:

referential

poetic

emotive ——————————— conative

phatic

meta-linguistic

Accordingly, one may speak of "emotive information" - that which convey information about the addresser; "conative information" - that which conveys information about the addressee; etc.

Further, a working definition of linguistic information is suggested. According to it,

> Linguistic information is the result of a series of relations within a sequel of linguistic means (signs) of a discourse which function (explicitly and/or implicitly; habitually or transformationally) in a communication act in referrence to a situational context (one or two or both) and is conditioned by both linguistic and non-linguistic systems.

In symbols: $I \longrightarrow com \underset{e\text{-}i}{\overset{Sl\,S'l}{R}} CL f^{\frac{t}{h}} StCt_{1+2,3\ldots}$

(I = information; com = communication; Sl = linguistic system; S'l = non-linguistic system; CL = linguistic means/signs; f = function; StCt = situational context; t = transformationally; h = habitually; e = explicitly; i = implicitly.)

A detailed discussion of this definition follows, and will be briefly summarised here.

Linguistic means are defined as all kinds of formal linguistic units regarded as such by any linguistic theory: sounds (phones), phonemes, morphemes, lexemes ("words"), graphemes and tones. However, it must be stressed that only phones and graphemes may (as a matter of principle) be considered exclusively "formal", while all the other units are function-

conditioned.

The series of relations within a discourse are extra(non-)-linguistic and (intra-)liguistic. Extra-linguistic relations are both explicit and implicit. Explicitly, information is directly derived from extralinguistic knowledge (or presuppositions). Implicitly, information is derived by contrasting the habitual piece of information conveyed by a sign with an extralinguistic situation. For example, only intonation (or gesture, etc) may dictate what emotive information may be derived from the utterance "it's raining". "A lovely day" on a rainy one may carry either transformational ("ironic"), incorrect, or phatic information (the addresser knowing the English social norms and using this utterance only to create a kind of contact with an addressee), depending on the specific extralinguistic situation.

(Intra-) linguistic relations occur in sequences or in a whole of a linguistic discourse. Sequential relations may be syntactical, contextual (in the sense of environmental or other. Several theories regarding the types of sequential relations have been profounded, nothing that of the "Scottish school" (Firth, Halliday and others), which suggested the principle of the combination of CL in a sequence, known as collocation. The idea of collocation is also shared by Soviet linguists (who refer to it as "frazeologiya"). Contextual relations occur in various cases, but so far no satisfactory description of the implication of contextual relations for information production is available.

Derivation of information from a whole depends on the way this whole is organised and on the presuppositions or expectations habituation of a decoder related to this whole. E.g. the information deriving from a limerick (as suggested by Firth [70a]. A further discussion within a textual theory is provided in chapter 2.

When dealing with the function of CL in StCt, there is so far no way of explaining why a certain sign x occurs in reference to a $StCt_1$ and not $StCt_2$; and it is this that has given rise to the repeated objections to incorporating the field of "meaning" in linguistics. However, in the present framework, it is sufficient to accept the common connection that CL function in StCt arbitrarily, in the sense that this function necessitates an agreement among the users of a language. A CL has then a habitual (agreed upon by habit) function; and as a result it may be deduced that such a habitual function may change, since it depends wholly on common agreement. Still, arbitrariness does not mean anarchy. Once habituality has been established in a language, there is no total arbitrariness. The combinations of CL become conventional already on the phonic level. It has been proved that every language has its typical trigrams, and that certain phonic combinations are excluded. This gives CLs a priori habitual potentialities even when there is no actual habitual use (function). In other words, habituality means not only

that certain CL habitually function in a certain StCt, but that in every language one may locate certain phonic combinations which may be regarded as potentially habitual CL, and hence, as information-producing. This fact explains clearly why even "nonsense" is never "meaningless" (or rather "lacking in information") in a language. Moreover, language has created formators (see following discussion) by which additional new CLs are created, which are consequently motivated and therefore by definition less arbitrary than that CLs not including formators. Indeed, languages vary greatly as far as "motivation" is concerned. English and French are very little motivated in comparison with Hebrew, Russian or German.

The concept of transformation (a term which should not be confused with the generative one) is based on that of habituality, and hence by implication also on changeability. Transformations may be produced by various factors.

A large number of classifications have been suggested for the types of CLs with StCt function. A discussion of Weinreich's distinction 242a between designation and denotation follows, as well as a detailed classification of formators. These distinctions are more or less agreed upon in modern semantics. On the other hand, the concept of connotation seems very controversial. "Connotation" is used at least in three different meanings, all dispensable for an informational description. Still, since no developed tools of informational description are available at present, it is suggested that the two last meanings of connotation should be retained.

The first use of connotation is based upon the (implicit) statement that CL can function in more than one StCt, and that in one StCt all these functions may eventually function simultaneously. Hence,

(a) in $StCt_1$, a connotatum is the designatum of a CL which habitually functions in $StCt_2$ (or 3...), but when it occurs in $StCt_2$, it is not necessarily eliminated. Such a notion of connotation is dispensable, since it is covered by the broad definition of information.

A lightly different meaning of connotation is based upon the conception that two pieces of informations which are irrelevant to one another may still function simultaneously because of sound resemblance or formatory derivation, Hence,

(b) In $StCt_1$ a connotation of a CL_1 is the designatum of CL_2, which resembles in sound CL_1 or is derivated from it by a formator.

The third use of connotation is based upon the fact that a CL denotes only a few features of a StCt. Hence,

(c) In $StCt_1$ (or 2,3... or 2 + 3...), a connotatum is the designatum (or a potential designatum) of a CL, which refer to a feature (features) of the denotatum, or its continuation in time and space.

A still less rigorous use of connotation is the widespread (especially among literary critics) notion of "secondary meaning", which is based in its turn on a conception of a fixed hierarchy of meanings, either historical or lexical (according to the number of "meanings" in a dictionary). This is based on the evaluative concept that the "object world" is more important than the "inner (psychological/implicit etc) world". This is rejected in our model, basically because primary and secondary informata are determined by textual dynamic relations and not a priori. (A fuller discussion is to be found in section 2.)

It is further suggested that when there is no need to indicate the type of CL, the terms informator-informatum should be used.

Further, the question of multi-information ("ambiguity") and uni-information ("unambiguity") is raised. In uni-information all functions of a CL other than habitually relevant to $StCt_1$ are eliminated, while in multi-information, functions are accumulated. The multi-functionality of CL is decidedly one of the means of achieving linguistic economy. It is the textual relations (Chapter 2) which determine whether an elimination or an accumulation process should be carried out. One of the cases may of course be that of hesitation, which result in indefinite ("vague") information.

Accumulation and elimination are two basic linguistic procedures. Language does not seem to be a uni-informational thing turned by means of deliberate manipulation ("semantic densification") into a multi-informational so as to render it "richer" or "connotative". As a matter of fact, language is highly accumulative, but all standard registers (especially administrative and scientific ones) have artificially or deliberately become highly eliminatory. This throws into question the common habit of literary critics to regard literary language as common language densified by special accumulative devices. It seems rather that literary language has kept and intensified an originally accumulative language.

In conclusion, the concept of informational decomposition (dissection) is clarified. It is stated (1.2.5) that it may be concluded from the previous discussion that information may be reduced to its components. Not only the CLs may function in different StCts but the contrary holds true as well: different CLs may function for the same StCt. Hence, different informata may be stated (or restated) by other informators than the ones encountered in an utterance. As is well known, Katz and Fodor [113] have suggested a model of componential analysis by which information may be analysed, decompositioned (dissected) and restated by other CLs.

Due to the informational model, it becomes clear why languages are no different nomenclatures of a given "world", but that every language functionalizes its CLs in a different way for situational contexts. Hence there is never complete overlapping between languages in the informata.

In section 1.3 (1.3.- 1.3.1.2.1), a model of linguistic rethoric is suggested. Linguistic rethoric is defined as the aggregate of linguistic units which create attitudes in the addressee (or decoder). It is divided into primary and secondary rethoric. Primary rethoric is defined as attitudes which are not created by information, while secondary rethoric as attitudes evoked by it.

What kinds of linguistic phenomena create primary rethoric? In different situations, man has developed different behavioural semiotic sets. The same goes for language. Language has developed different sets (systems and sub-systems) to be used in different situations, depending on the whole situation or on a certain feature of it (e.g. addresser vs. addressee). This has in turn created a differentiation between the different CLs to be used in different situations not because of their information but because of their occurrence in one set or another. Thus, each CL in a language has acquired a "value" for its users, or, in other terms, an inherent attitude (including attitude ∅). It is then the polysystemic nature of language (standard vs. colloquial, juridicial vs. literary registers etc) which gives rise to this differentiation.

Primary rethorics as briefly described here makes it possible to define style in reductive rather than wide terms. (Various approaches to style are briefly summarised.) Style may be identified with primary rethoric, so as to be defined as "an aggregate of the inherent attitudes of an utterance". Since those inherent attitudes are created, as has been claimed, by the polysystemic differentiation, this definition may be replaced by the following one: "Style is the aggregate of the polysystemic differentials (con)textually conditioned". Any CL that may be differentiated and which includes inherent attitude(s) after (con)textual conditioning is called a styleme. Further, the basic ways of identifying stylemes are discussed. The position of style within the framework of overall textual relations is more fully explored in chapter 2, while here it is only stated that stylistic facts vary in different languages on the same lines that informata do. It is clarified that information may be derived from stylistic facts.

Secondary rethoric is defined as the aggregate of inherent attitudes produced by information. To decode secondary rethoric, extralinguistic norms must be known. The attitudes created by the British "quite warm" versus the American "boiling" on a hot day are different in the two respective cultures due to the different dominant norms concerning expression of feelings in American and British (middle class) societies. This

kind of rethoric has important manifestations in human communocation.

In section 1.4 (1.4-1.4.2), the question of information and rethoric in different languages and its implications for translatability is discussed.

The difference, or rather non-equivalency, between languages was first systematically (though somewhat vaguely) put forth by Wilhelm von Humboldt. In modern times, the same assumption was adopted and elaborated by Sapir and especially Whorf, though without the strong mental implications of the Humboldtian thesis about the Weltbild. It seems that if one accepts the Humboldtian hypothesis (or for that matter the Neo-Humboldtian one) one must admit the impossibility of translation. All translations known to us are consequently new works fashioned after a certain original. The question of translatability appears then as crucial for a theory of translation. Either one must accept the Humboldtian thesis and admit that no real translation is possible, or one must either wholly reject or modify this claim. It has been attempted by some major theoreticians of translation to validate translatability at least by minimizing the alleged total validity of the Humboldtian hypothesis. To summarized such arguments as have been put forwars by Mounin [162], Nida [166a], Revzin-Rozencvejg [189] and others:

1. The relations between "world" and "language" are not unilateral and unchanging;

2. There are some basic common denominators in human communication, e.g. similarities in mental processes, similarity of somatic reactions, range of cultural experience, capacity for adjustment to the behavioural patterns of others, etc.

3. The relations between languages are not unchanging. There are dialectic relations between languages. "L'intraductibilité de deux langues données résulte au moins autant de l'histoire des contacts entre ceux deux langues, que d'une propriété déculant des caractères communs à toutes les langues" (Mounin [162], 276; See also revzin-Rozencvejg [189], 74).

In general terms it may be said that the chance of identifying certain CLs in a pair of languages with identical functions increases in direct proportion to the extent of the contact between them. The "family" relations between languages is less important than contacts. Peter [173] states that it is much easier to translate Czech texts from the first World War into Hungarian than into Russian owing to the Austro-Hungarian common cultural denominators. It is clear then that the rigid Humboldtian conception of Weltbild is decisively shaken when one has investigated the results of contacts between languages. The basic fact of difference between languagesdoes not change. The categorial insulation of human beings from foreign languages is rejected, but not the fact that there are languages closer to each other than to other languages as well as languages that in spite of their close contacts have remained unabridgeable.

4. There are more common features between languages than (Neo-)Humboldtians would admit.

This is especially claimed by the new linguistic research on language universals.

5. Human experience demonstrates that translations can be effective. The speakers of different languages can communicate via translation quite satisfactorily, so as to convey to one another at least the cntral information.

All these arguments do not nullify the Humboldtian hypothesis but modify it to such an extent as to validate translatability. Mounin(162 , 278) suggests that "au lieu de dire, que la traduction est toujours possible ou toujours impossible, toujors totale ou toujours incomplète, la linguistique contemporaine aboutit à definir la traduction comme une opération, relative dans son succès, variable dans les niveaux de la communication qu'elle atteint". While Catford (46 , 93) claims that "translatability here appears, intuitively, to be a cline rather than a clear-cut dichotomy. SL texts and items are more or less translatable rather than absolutely translatable or untranslatable".

Following the previous discussion, it is attempted in 1.4.1 to formulate basic principles ("laws") of translatability. The basic law may be formulated thus: "The degree of translatability increases when the relational series which produce information and rethoric in Sl and TL grow closer". The following particular laws are discussed:

1. Translatability is high when a pair of languages are of a close basic "type", under condition that they fulfill laws 2 and 3.

2. Translatability is high when there is contact between (a pair of) languages.

3. Translatability is high when the general cultural evolution proceeded on parallel lines.

4. Translatability is high when one translates no more than a single kind of information.

It has been argued quite often in studies of translation that referential information is more translatable than other kinds of information (e.g. emotive). This claim does not hold water. It is not that a certain type of information is more or less translatable but that a smaller quantity of information (produced by a certain quantity of CLs) is more translatable. Syncretic relations are of a low translatability (Syncretism - accumulative quantitative relations between CLs and their functions).

5. Translatability is high when the polysystemic diffrentiation produces close inherent attitudes.

In conclusion (1.4.2), translation is redefined in the light of the previous discussion. It is claimed that one should introduce a distinction between translation, equivalent translation and adequate translation, as follows:

1. Translation is conversion of CLs carrying in SL information+rethoric by CLs carrying

information+rethoric in TL.

Accordingly, if one translates "viens ici mon enfant" with "Do'nt come here, child", one is translating, but not correctly, or rather - in no equivalent way. The same is true of such utterances as are gramatically deviant etc. On the ither hand, equivalence must be admitted if after analysing and dissecting the informata and rethoric items one has arrived at the maximal equivalence permitted by TL. If one takes Catford's "I have arrived" translated into Russian by "Ja prišla" (See quotation note 24 to Chapter 1), though only 3 features out of 8 are common in the two languages, still equivalence must be admitted. According to Catford, "Translation equivalence occurs when an SL and a TL text or items are relatable to (at least some of) the same features of substance". ("Features of substance" may be substituted by informata.) Consequently,

2. Equivalent translation is a conversion of CLs carrying in SL information+rethoric by CLs carrying equivalent information+rethoric in TL.

Now, when an equivalent translation is rejected on the grounds that it is unacceptable because of, for instance, lack of quantitative proportion between the CLs and their functions, there is another kind of equivalence, which is far more exacting than the loose one which would accept that 20 CLs may be converted by 50 CLs. This is a postulate of translation which we shall call the postulate of adequacy, deriving from the implicit wish that translation may read "as an original work". Consequently,

3. Adequate translation is a conversion of CLs carrying in SL information+rethoric by CLs carrying an equivalent information+rethoric while maximally keeping the quantitative proportion between the CLs and the information+rethoric they produce.

In Chapter 2 ("Basic Principles of a Textual Theory"), an outline of a (literary) textual theory is proposed. A text is defined as a finite linguistic continuum, either written or non-written. Linguistic continuum is assumed to be infinite, an assumption needed at least in order to explain why any segment of the finite continuum is decodable and why finite continuums are generable by any speaker. Otherwise, a finite continuum would have to be considered a unicum. On the other hand, it is only finite continuums that are empirically given. This has long made linguists regard the unit of the sentence as the biggest finite continuum to be dealt with. This view is largely being abandoned at present and the interest in larger continuums is increasing, especially since linguistic functions (notably information and rethoric) of continuums larger than a sentence cannot adequately be described as a sum of the sentence functions carried by the sentences alone. Literary criticism, on the other hand, was never interested in dealing with continuums smaller than a sentence, and text has always been conceived of as "the whole work", whose borders are usually clearly delimited by various external conventions. It has, however, always been claimed that there is a decisive difference between the linguist and the literary

theoretician ("critic") as regards "texts". The theory of literature, it has been said, is exclusively interested in literary "texts" as a final object or goal, while for linguistics any text is taken only as a representative of the infinite text. This is only partly true. Literary theory (and "criticism") has always, even in its most traditional form, posed questions that go beyond the specific individual text, such as the problem of leitmotivs, comparisons, etc. It tries to formulate literary laws which are valid for the whole of literature. A theoretician of literature may then often deal with a literary text only as representative of the infinite literary text. Still, both linguist and literary theoretician (or "critic") can pose questions about rules inherent in (literary) texts on the ground that they theoretically constitute segments of an infinite continuum (text), although constantly keeping in mind that the (literary) text as such is finite.

There are different kinds of texts. One may presume that each kind, as well as each individual text, has its own peculiarities. Still, there is no reason to think that there are essential peculiarities by which texts are distinguished. The fact that all texts belong to the same semiotic system, the linguistic one, makes it obvious that the principles operating within this system are applicable to them all. Hence, one may evolve a general textual theory referring to the basic features of any text. In the general framework of such a theory, specific theories may be elaborated. The literary text is no exception to this rule, although literary tradition has long inclined to generalise conclusions about the unique peculiarities of the literary text. Russian Formalism, which began with a clear tendency to dichotomize all literary and all non-literary kinds of texts, ended more or less with the conception that the principle which differentiates texts is that of the"centre-and-periphery" or the "dominance" of certain peculiarities (Tynjanov [236a], 33). In terms of Czech structuralism (which further developed this hypothesis), the borderlines between texts (kinds of texts) pass through their periphery, and the difference between them is conspicuous in their "centre", or in other words: determined by their dominant features. Jakobson restated this thesis in his "Linguistics and Poetics" [102b], where he argues that the poetic function should not be regarded as exclusively literary, but rather as exclusively dominant in literature.

After a brief analysis of textual segmentation, the question of textual means (or components) is discussed. It is claimed that, since "text" has been defined as a linguistic finite continuum, there is no reason to suppose that the textual means are different from those of language in general. Still, it clearly emerges that, in addition to the common linguistic decoding procedures, the reader is forced to decode textual relations, which may modify the common decoding based upon the linguistic procedures alone. Therefore, one should pay close attention to those CLs that participate in textual relations (and are conditioned by them). Such CLs are tentatively called textemes.

Section 2.5 consists of a brief survey of textual relations. These relations occur in two modes - time and space. A discussion of textual hierarchy follows. There are two main conceptions of textual hierarchy, one which considers hierarchy to be static, and another which considers it to be dynamic. According to the static conception, each CL has its fixed position in the hierarchy in realtion to all the other CLs. E.g. sounds are always at the bottom of the hierarchy while "words" (and "ideas") are always at the top. According to the dynamic conception, on the other hand, hierarchical relations are determined by the functions dominant in a text. Tynjanov 236a showed how functions change their textual positions in the course of literary history. This view makes it possible to consider all the CLs in a literary text as equivalent until textual relations have determined the dominant function(s).

Still, another conception of hierarchy is that proposed by information theory, namely, that central units alone carry "information", while the peripheral ones are "redundant". The informational entropy is examined for each letter. When "words" are taken as units it is asked what part of the word carries the "information". According to Piotrovski (176 , 103), information is concentrated in the concluding parts of a word, though different kinds of texts considerably vary in this respect. What is interesting about the literary text is the fact (totally ignored by cyberneticians) that the poetic function may wholly modify (or reorganise) this entropy ajd invest redundant parts with informational value, thus diminishing their redundancy in varying degrees.

Three main kinds of textual relations are then discussed: combination, generation and position-in-the-order (matriciality).

Combination is considered the basic relation of linguistic syntagmatics actualized by a text. The principle, as well as the act or process, of combination is called structuration. The result of structuration is called structure. The notion of structure is thus reduced, but it is certainly clarified. This reduction follows Benjamin Hrushovski's proposal to regard as a structure at least the combination of two elements in a text. Structuration must be taken as a basic human inherent competence, though highly individual as far as the capacity to effect it is concerned. Structuration is always potential and its actualization depends upon structurability, but, on the other hand, structurability may be both reduced and enlarged. In principle, in other words, there is no unstructurable element in a text, but there undoubtedly are elements which are more structurable than others. It must be emphasized that structuration does not apply only to "elements" (e.g. CLs) but to structures as well. Sometimes, the largest and most dominant structure in a text is called its super-structure, or simply "the structure of" (a novel, a poem, etc).

Structuration takes place on the basis of various principles (or factors), which will be called here structurators. Six different structurators are suggested and briefly dis-

cussed: (1) environmental and successional; (2) matricial; (3) of formal similarity and opposition; (4) of functional relations within a StCt (including categorizations of the StCt in reapective cultures); (5) secondary; (6) false.

This classification is highly tentative, and should be taken as a working hypothesis. Still, it seems that the basic dichotomy underlying it is typical of many such classifications recently suggested. I refer to the distinction between a formal and a functional structurator. With the formal structurator, structuration is carried out on the basis of formal relations (envoronment, succession, formal similarity or opposition, position-in-the-order etc), while with functional structurator, structuration is carried out by various relations in the StCt (experiences of "real life", various categorizations, such as causality, temporality, etc.). In the literary text, as in any other, there is a constant struggle between the various structurators; and texts may be differentiated by their dominant structurators. For instance, in periods tending to take the litarary work of art as a kind of immediate reality (as "a room without its fourth wall"), the functional structurator is predominant. On the other hand, whenever the medium and the game-like nature of the work is thrown into relief, the use of formal structurators is prevalent.

Coherence, automatization and de-automatization of strucruration are discussed next. Then the question of exclusively literary structurations is raised. From the previous discussion it must be concluded that there are no exclusive literary structurations, but there must still be found some peculiar (or characteristic) ones. Formal, syncretic (highly accumulative) structurations, secondary structurators, de-automatization - all these are usually described as characteristic of the literary text; and this is also taken as a working hypothesis.

The relation of generation is then briefly presented. Generation (not in the sense of generative grammar) may manifest itself in either concatenation or prediction. In concatenation, unit B is placed after unit A, and nor vice versa. This is a very important relation in the literary text. For instance, when a concatenator (in similar way to a structurator) is functional, belonging to the causal category, the result is tragedy, naturalistic novel (and drama), or psychological novel. The questions of concatenation are, however, little investigated.

The other aspect of generation, predition, is defined as the principle according to which, when a unit A appears, the producer or decoder foreknows the appearance of a unit B after it. Informational theory formulates the exact probability of prediction. The theory of literature uses the notion of "expectations", which has been little defined and investigated so far.

The third kind of basic textual relations is the position-in-the-order relation. The position of a unit in the order decisively determines its function. It is easy to imagine, for instance, the functional disturbances that would be caused by placing the point of a joke in an initial instead of a final position. The positions-in-the-order in a text are hence called a matrix (the position-in-the-order relation may hence be called matriciality). When there is a tight matrix, constant and repeated positions are distinguishable (e.g. in strophic forms, verses, etc.). In such matrices, quantitative matricial relations have been described. On the other hand, in looser matrices, such as those occurring in a novel, quantitative relations are not traceable, and their investigation is still in its preliminary stages.

Section 2.6 discusses the question of textual function. In a text, any unit may function for another unit. For instance, if we get a structure "protagonist No 1", all the other units may function for this structure, and vice versa. In other words, the information/rethoric produced by "protagonist No 1" may serve the plot, the other protagonists etc. On the other hand, plot, point of view (which is also a function of textual relations), style, function for "protagonist No 1", i.e. convey information about him and manipulate (a decoder's) attitudes towards him. When textual functions are organised in centre-and-periphery relations, all the other units of the text are accordingly hierarchically organised. Hence, the relations between the units as means and their functions are circular. Units create textual relations, which put forth certain functions, which organise themselves hierarchically and redetermine the textual relations and their units. Each textual unit is therefore function-conditioned.

Are there any peculiar literary functions? As has been shown, the formalist thesis about the "orientation towards the utterance" was restated in terms of "aesthetic function" by Mukařovský 163 and of "poetic function" by Jakobson 102b . This is conceived of as an "empty function", which operates reflexively. The question of the poetic function is discussed, and the following conclusions are reached: (1) the poetic function is capable of reorganising the centre-and-periphery relations within an utterance; (2) it is not clear whether it should be considered as the differentia specifica of literature, unless syncretic proportion is considered a manifestation of poetic function. The latter is obviously dominant in the literary text, as the analysis of translations clearly demonstrates (see below, Chapter 3).

Textual information and rethoric are next discussed in detail. Two point are made about textual information and style in literature. First, in order to validate our definition of information, it is necessary to apply the concept of StCt to every StCt transmitted in literature, and the concept of extra-linguistic system to the poly-system of literature.

In literature, various situational contexts are transmitted, some of which have become part of the common cultural stock. Without a full decoding of these StCts, no full informational decoding of many literary texts is possible. Thus, allusions to known works (such as the Bible or classical literature) are part of the StCt in which a CL habitually/transformationally function. In a parallel way, the polysystem of literature must be considered part of the extra-linguistic system, indispensable for an adequate decoding of a literary text. The Formalists conceived of literature as a system; and this conception was further developed by the present author who showed it (in 1) to be a poly-system, parallel to the linguistic poly-system. The main systems of literature are suggested to be the cannonized vs. the non-cannonized, each divided into sub-systems. A knowledge of the relative literary norms largely conditions the procedures of deriving information from a text. E.g., accumulation or elimination of informata are often dependent upon the position the text is presumed to occupy in the literary poly-system.

Second, the position of style in a literary text is examined; and is indicated to be determined by the centre-and:periphery relations. Another question dealt with is that of literary style. It is claimed that one cannot adequately describe it merely on the basis of the general stylistic concepts suggested in chapter 1. It must be explained, for instance, why a certain CL carries diffrent stylemes in different contemporaneous texts within the same linguistic poly-system. Obviously, what must also be taken into consideration are the relations within the literary poly-system, or to be more precise, the relations of the linguistic poly-system within the literary poly-system. The general distribution of differentials and their functions in various literary systems determine the decoding of specific textual stylemes.

The last section of this chapter (2.8 and 2.8.1) recapitulates the problem of the texteme. In a text, as has been previously claimed, some of the CLs are decodable according to the common linguistic procedures, while others only according to specific textual relations. In the latter case we come to deal with textemes. Hence, a texteme is a CL which takes part in the textual relations (including the extra-textual relations which condition the textual ones), and whose functions are subordinate to these relations. A detailed analysis of the textematic relations of Baudelaire's "Spleen" ("Quand le ciel lourd et bas") exemplifies the methods and importance of textematic procedures. Finally, the study proposes a tentative overall scheme of textual relations and of the position of the texteme in it (section 2.8.1).

In Chapter 3, the basic problems of literary translation are discussed in the light of the literary textual theory proposed (including the models of information and rethoric).

The definitions of translation reached at the end of chapter 1 are reformulated as follows:

1. Translation of a text is a conversion of its specific textemes in SL into textemes of a text in TL.
2. Equivalent translation of a text is a conversion of the specific textemes of this text in SL into equivalent textemes of a text in TL.
3. Adequate translation of a text is a conversion of maximum number of textemes of a text in SL into maximum number of equivalent textemes of a text in TL.

It appears then that the key problem of adequate literary translation is the question of the relations between means and textual relations of a specific text in a specific language.

In order to adhere to the rigorous conditions of adequacy, a translation cannot modify anything in the following: the extent of the text, its natrix(es), the order of segments. Moreover, it cannot freely determine genre, school, "real" (historical, geographical etc) background. In other words, many decisions made by an original writer are denied to the translator aiming at adequacy. On the other hand, even "equivalent translation" involves much more free decisions. Most English translations of poetry are, for example, rendered in prose, doubtlessly a far-reaching modification of the original matrix.

According to these definitions, the texteme must be recognised as the optimal unit of textual (literary) translation. A textual theory of translation (as opposed to a general theory) can discuss CLs if and only if, they are textemes.

It was shown above (2.8) that texteme is a junction of textual raletions. In 1.4.2 it was stated, that since an utterance is reducible to components, such a reduction unavoidably occurs in translation. It may now be argued that such a decomposition is feasible in textual relations as well: structures are decomposited, structurators are modified (or disappear), chains are broken, textual functions are altered, and so on. The postulated condition of adequate translation is that, though such decompositions inevitably take place, an adequate translation can however reconstruct the original relations in the closest possible way. Such a reconstruction is actually made by CLs, both conditioning and conditioned by textual relations. This double conditioning, it has been claimed, is manifested in a texteme. Therefore, even though an adequate translation does not involve direct decisions as regards to literary school and system, genre or "real" background, still the actual series of textematic decisions is crucial for all these. Otherwise, a "symbolic" poem may become "romantic", and a tragedy may become a comedy. Consequently, the question to be discussed is: what laws direct textual translation, make it possible or impossible to carry our a close reconstruction, and introduce

various "shifts" in a text? A close examination of textemes is necessary before this question can be answered.

Section 3.2 compares the textual relations in original works with those in their translations. The analysis is both textematic and textual, based upon the textual theory proposed and the textual scheme (2.8.1). It is not attempted to exhaust all textematic possibilities, since their number is ultimately infinite. The coice of textemes for analysis is totally haphazard. The whole discussion should thus be taken as an exemplification of theses and methods rather than scientific demonstration. Ten diffrent textematic cases are first analysed (section 3.2.1); and two larger texts, one in poetry and the other in prose, are then studied.

In the analysis of textemes, examples from Hebrew, Russian, English, French, German, Ukrainian, Scandinavian and Scottish literatures are cited. In each case, the specific problems, suggested according to the theoretical models, are dealt with. This methodological demonstration has significant implications for any discussion of literary translation, not least because it clearly proves that in order to discuss even the smallest texteme, the whole theoretical apparatus proposed is absolutely indispensable.

The translation of Baudelaire's "Spleen" into Hebrew (by the late poet Lea Goldberg) is analysed in section 3.2.2. The following conclusions are drawn:

1. Much information is converted into little information;
2. Exact and concrete information becomes vague and generalised, or totally non-equivalent;
3. Explicit information becomes implicit, and vice versa;
4. The style is elevated, even when compared to the relatively elevated style of the poetry of Baudelaire and his contemporaries.
5. Structuration is modified both quantitatively and qualitatively;
6. Original features are converted into commonplaces. For example, original metaphors are converted into commonplace linguistic collocations;
7. The extra-textual links of the work with the literary poly-system are not preserved.

The causes of such decisive non-adequacy are suggested. Since L.G. was an expert on French poetry, there is no reason to suspect her of insufficient knowledge of Baudelaire. The cause of non-adequacy lies much deeper. It is the Hebrew poetic norms influenced by Russian fin de siècle and post-Romantic poetry. Thus, the importance of the norms of the literature of TL for adequacy possibilities in translation is clearly demonstrated.

In section 3.2.2.2, the translation of A.B Yehoshua's "Massa ha ereb Šel Yatir" ("The Evening Express of Yatir") into English (by N.Rabin) is examined. In this translation, the norms of making for standardization and rationalization are systematically applied on all possible levels, either by way of deviation or omission. This is observed in four fields: rhythmical structures, tenses, figurative language, informational syncretism. The secondary rethoric of the story, its style and various structures are decomposed. The functions of these structures are changed (or sunk), and as a result the interpretation of the story changes too. The prominent impressionistic features of the story are replaced by typical realistic ones.

Section 3.3. discusses the Possibility of formulating laws of translation (translatability). It is claimed that one can hardly expect to be able to formulate specific local laws, valid for any texteme in any text, since the number of rextematic possibilitie is unlimited, and since any law is subject to the interference of other laws, such as the cntre-and-periphery law, or the specific functions of a texteme for both certain structures and other functions in a text. As a consequence, only conditional laws are of major importance.

Conditional laws of translation (or translatability) may be objective (or rather inter-subjective) or subjective. There are different degrees of "objectivity". Some "objective" laws change more rapidly than others. The "character" of a language changes more slowly than stylistic or other norms, but both must be accepted as "objective", since they decisively dictate the (impersonal) procedures of a translator. On the other hand, subjective laws of translation are highly individual, and are only of secondary importance from the viewpoint of a literary theory of translation. The postulate of adequacy makes it unnecessary to deal with such "laws", unless practical specific problems of translation are dealt with.

Consequently, in 3.3.1.1, general laws of translation (translatability) for the literary text are suggested, in addition to the general ones outlined in Chapter 1 (see p. IX of this summary).

1. Translatability is high when the poly-system of a pair of literatures is parallel or has developed on parallel lines.

2. Translatability is high when there has been such a contact between the literatures as is peculiar to the pair of literatures in question.

3. Translatability is high when the literary stylemes can be similarly functionalized and distributed.

4. Translatability is high when the textual relations are not complex.

All this is discussed and analysed in detail.

Further, it is clarified (section 3.3.2.1) that in addition to the objective laws of translation clines may in various periods become so inter-subjective that they can no longer be regarded as personal but rather as objective laws. Most clines of translation may be generalised as one principle:

> Even when there is a fair knowledge of both SL and TL, there is an often cline in translation to make decisions according to literary and general cultural norms prevalent in the TL literature and TL culture.

In other words, even when a translator is quite capable of adequately decoding the original text and producing an objectively adequate translation, it is the contemporary norms of his language, literature and culture which inform his procedures. Such translational norms may be one or more of the following:

1. A norm of precise information, or the contrary;
2. A norm of simple or low style, or the contrary;
3. A norm of standard langauge, or the contrary: a norm promoting the use of all the resources of the linguistic poly-system;
4. A norm of rich figurative language, or the contrary;
5. A norm of rationalizing irrationalities or "illogical" (or "unrealistic") features. There is no opposite norm.
6. A norm of tabou as regards certain subjects (such as sex), or the contrary.

These norms are discussed in detail, while examples for each are provided in the previous analyses and notes.

Other norms may be observed as well.

It is claimed that such norms of translation evolve out of the norms of the TL original literature, but they do not necessarily change with the latter. More often than not, they continue to exist quite long after the original TL norms have changed. This is motivated by the law of petrification in secondary cultural activities (such as translation, when comoared with original writing). Moreover: even when norms of translation are contemporaneous with the original literary ones, they are often simplified. The relations between original literary and translational norms require, however, a separate study.

It has been observed, that there may be various cases of deviations (or non-adequacies), such as amplification, reduction, explicitation, implicitation, etc. One cannot ignore the fact that non-adequacy is often a result of applting norms of TL literature rather

than a result of intranslatability. Moreover, it may happen that an adequate translation is rejected by the TL readers just because it does not fulfill the dominant normative demands. The evolution of translational norms (and, eventually, the increase in the degree of adequacy) occurs, then, according to principles quite similar to those characterising general literary evolution, as described by the Formalists, for instance. In any case, it is demonstrated beyond any doubt that a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL and their respective literatures is in itself no guarantee for adequate translation.

In section 3.3.3, the problem of the borderline between equivalence and adequacy in literary translation is discussed, especially in relation to the problem of maintaining the proportional syncretism. It is suggested that a translation may be called equivalent or adeqaute only on the basis of the centre-and-periphery analysis.

Section 3.4 concludes this concludes this study with a recapitulation of the peculiarities of literary translation in the light of the functional approach. When the "poetic (empty) function" is added to the verbal functions, the hierarchical relations within a text become much more complex than otherwise. Moreover, the "poetic (empty) function" throws into relief the quantitative relations between the means and their functions, or, in other terms, makes the syncretical proportion very important. This proportion has been described as a sine qua non for adequacy in literary translation, while secondary in other kinds of translation. Functional syncretism involving complex textual relations, appears moreover to be rather typical of the literary text; and this makes the issue highly important for the procedures of literary translation. It is consequently the poetic (empty) function and the functional syncretism that characterise the literary translation more than any other peculiarities.

In chapter 4, the main theses of the study are briefly recapitulated.

Finally, a selective bibliography of studies about translation, theory of literature and linguistics is offered.

4. רשימת ביבליוגראפיה נבחרת

בגלל המספר הרב של הפריטים הביבליוגראפיים שחייבו את הכנתו של המחקר, יובא ברשימה זו חלק נבחר בלבד. הבחירה בעשתה לפי התחומים הבאים: א. חיבורים המטפלים בתרגום ספרותי; ב. חיבורים המטפלים בתיאוריה של הספרות; ג. חיבורים בבלשנות ובתחומים גובלים, ששימשו את מחקרי. ביבליוגראפיות משלימות בנושא התרגום ראה: בראואר [40], יומפלם [109], לוי [144d], מונן [162], ניידא [166a], פיודורוב [67d, 67g]

1. אבן-זהר, איתמר. "לבירור מהותה ותפקודה של לשון הספרות היפה בדיגלוסיה". 'הספרות', ב מס' 2 (1970) 286-303.

1 א. ----------. "הפובקציה של הרב=מערכת של הספרות בהיסטוריה של הספרות". 'משא', 6.3.1970.

2. האפרתי, יוסף. "'מתי מדבר' - פואמה תיאורית". 'הספרות', א מס' 1 (1968), 101-130.

3. הרושובסקי, בנימין. "על תחומי מדע הספרות". 'הספרות', א מס' 1 (1968), 1-11.

3 א. ----------. "האם יש לצליל משמעות? לבעיית האקספרסיביות של תבניות הצליל בשירה". 'הספרות', א מס' 2 (1968), 410-421.

3 ב. ----------. "השיטות הראשיות של החרוז העברי מן הפיוט עד ימינו: מסה על מושגי היסוד". 'הספרות', ב מס' 4 (1971), 721-750.

4. ואן דייק, ט.א. "אספקטים של תיאוריה גנראטיבית של הטקסט הספרותי". 'הספרות', ב מס' 3 (1970), 447-462.

5. ליהמן, ג'ון. "סיפור הבן האובד: רילקה ויומנו של מלטה לאורידס בריגה". 'על המשמר', 21.10.1960.

6. מרגולין, אורי. "עקרונות הסטרוקטורליזם (סקירה)". 'הספרות', א מס' 1 (1968), 228-229.

6 א. ----------. "לבעיית החלוקה לתקופות בהיסטוריה של הספרות". 'הספרות', ב מס' 1 (1969), 5-14.

7. פרי, מנחם. "האנאלוגיה ומקומה במבנה הרומאן של מנדלי מו"ס: עיונים בפואטיקה של הפרוזה". 'הספרות', א מס' 1 (1968), 65-101.

7 א. ---------. "התבוננויות במבנה התמאטי של שירי ביאליק". 'הספרות', ב מס' 1 (1969), 40-90.

8. פרי, מנחם, ומאיר שטרנברג. "זהירות, ספרות! - לבעיות האינטרפרטאציה והפואטיקה של הסיפור המקראי". 'הספרות', ב מס' 3 (1970), 608-664.

9. סימון, אוריאל. "סיפור מקראי בתפיסה אירונית: על האינטרפרטאציה של סיפור דוד ובת שבע". 'הספרות', ב מס' 3 (1970), 598-608.

10. ערפלי, בעז. "זהירות, סיפור מקראי! - הערות לסיפור דוד ובת שבע ולשאלות הפואטיקה של הסיפור המקראי". 'הספרות', ב מס' 3 (1970), 580-598.

11. רוזן, חיים. "על סגנונות ישראליים". בתוך רוזן, חיים. 'העברית שלנו'. עם עובד, תשט"ז, 246-282.

12. שטרנברג, מאיר. "על עקרונות הקומפוזיציה של 'אור באוגוסט' לפוקנר: לפואטיקה של הרומאן המודרני". 'הספרות', ב מס' 3 (1970), 498-538.

13. Aaron, Richard. The Theory of Universals. Oxford, ^{2} 1967.

14. Abraham, S.& Ferenc Kiefer. A Theory of Structural Semantics. The Hague, 1966.

15. Abramovič; Абрамович, Г.Л. Ed. Теория Литературы, I-II. Москва, 1962.

16. Admoni & Sil'man; Адмони, В.& Т. Сильман. "Структура художественного текста и перевод". In Kulmanova [129], 97-108.

17. Ahlström, Stellan. Strindbergs erövring av Paris. Stockholm, 1956.

18. Akhmanova, O.S. "Linguistic Meaning and Translation". In Akhmanova, O.S. et al. Exact Methods in Linguistic Research. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963, 19-23.

19. Albeck, Ulla. Dansk stilistik. København, 5 1965.

20. Alekseev; Алексеев,М.П. "Проблема художественного перевода". in Сб. Трудов Иркутского Гос. Унив. XУII, I I93I , I49-I96.

21. Alekseev & Smirnov; Алексеев,М.П. & А.А. Смирнов. "Перевод". in Литературная Энциклопедия , УIII.Москва, I934, 5I2-532.

22. Andreev; Андреев,Н.Д. Статистико-комбинаторные методы в теоретическом и прикладном языкознании. Москва, I967.

23. Antokol'skij; Антокольский,П.Г. Ed. Мастерство перевода. Сборник статей.Москва,I957

24. Arrowsmith, William & Roger Shattuck, eds. Craft and Context of Translation". A Critical Symposium. Austin, Texas, 1964.

25. Arrowsmith, William. "The Lively Conventions of Translation". in Arrowsmith & Shattuck [24], 122-140.

26. Bally, Charles. Traité de stylistique française. I -II. Heidelberg-Paris, 2 1932.

27. Barth, Gilbert. Recherches sur la fréquences. Paris, 1961.

28. Barxudarov; Бархударов,Л.С. "Общелингвистическое значение теории перевода. In Larin [133], 8-15.

29. Batjuskov; Батюшков, Чуковский, Гумилев. Принципы художественного перевода. Сб.Ст. Петроград, 2 I920.

30. Benveniste, E. Problèmes de linquistique générale. Paris, 1966.

31. Bergh, Lars. Moyens d'exprimer en français l'idée de direction. Étude fondée sur une comparaison avec les langues germaniques, en particulier le suédois. Göteborg, 1948.

32. Betti, Emilio. "Probleme der Übersetzung und der nachbildenden Auslegung". Deutsche VJLG. XXvII (1953), 489-508.

33. Blackall, Eric. The Emergence of German as a Literary Language. 1700-1775. Cambridge, 1959.

34. Bolinger, Dwight. "Transformulation: Structural, Translation". Acta linguistica Hafniensia, IX (1966), 130-144.

34a. ---------. "The Atomization of Meaning". Language, 41 (1965), 555-573.

35. Booth, A.D., L. Forster et al. Aspects of Translation. London, 1958.

36. Booth, A.D., ed. Machine Translation. Amsterdam, 1967.

37. Brandt, Elisabeth H.P. A Study of Invariance under Transformation in a German-English Translation. Denver Diss, 1960; Univ. xeroxy, Ann Arbor, 1965.

38. Braun, Otto & Harald Raab. Beiträge zur Theorie der Übersetzung. (Beiträge zur Gegenwartsliterstur, XV). ? 1959.

39. Brin, Joseph G. Introduction to Functional Semantics. London, 1949.

40. Brower, Reuben, ed. On Translation. New-York, 1959, ^{2}1966.

41. Brun, Louis. "Contribution à l'étude de la traduction". TCLP, I (1929), 156-169.

42. Budagov; Будагов, Р.А. Литературные языки и языковые стили. Москва, 1967.

43. Bušmin; Бушмин, А.С. Ed. Вопросы методологии литературоведения. Москва, 1966.

44. Camutaliova, Irena. "K otázce stylizace autorske reči a dialogu v beletrii". Československa russistika, 1962 No 2, 98-102.

45. Cary, Edmond. La traduction dans le monde moderne. Genève, 1956.

45a. ---------- "Traduction et poésie". Babel, III (1957), 11-32.

45b. ---------- "Théories soviétiques de la traduction". Babel, III (1957), 179-190.

45c. ---------- "L'indispensable débat", in La qualité en matière de traduction. Actes du IIIème congrès de la Fédération Internationale de Traducteurs (FIT), Bad Godesberg, 1959. Oxford-London-New-York-Paris, 1963,21-48.

46. Catford,J.C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London, 1965.

47. Cherry, Collin. On Human Communication. Mass., 1966, 1968.

48. Chocheyras, J. " A propos d'une experience: Traduction, poésie et style". Revue de littérature comparée, XLI (1967), 386-401.

49. Cohen, Jean. Structure du langage poétique. Paris, 1966.

50. Christensen, N.E. On the Nature of Meaning. Copenhagen, ^{2}1965.

51. Cressot, Marcel. Le style et ses techniques. Paris 1947.

52. Čxeidze; Чхеидзе, Н. "О критерии верности" in Kulmanova [129], I, 286- 296

53. Dagneaud, R. Les éléments populaires dans le lexique de la Comédie Humaine d'Honoré de Balzac. Paris 1954.

54. Daneš, František. "The Relation of the Centre and Periphery as a Language Universal". Travaux linguistiques de Prague, II (1966), 9-23.

55. Daneš & Hausenblas; Данеш, Ф. & К.Гаузенблас."Проблематика уровней с точки зрения структуры высказывания и системы языковых средств". in Jarceva [105a], 7-20.

56. Delavenay, Emile. La machine à traduire. Paris,1959.

57. Diderichsen, Paul. Helhed og struktur. København, 1966.

57a. ----------. Sprogsyn og sproglige opdragelse. Køb.,1968.

57b. ----------. Elementær dansk grammatik. Køb., 3 1966.

58. Dubois, Jean. Grammaire structurale du francais. Paris, 1965.

59. Ducrot, Oswald et al. Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme? Paris,1968.

60. Eco, Umberto. La struttura assente. Introduzione alla ricerca semiologica. Milano, 3 1968.

61. Eidem, Odd. " Om stilfølelse og ny rettskrivning". Vårt sprog, No 5 (nov. 1966), 3-4.

62. Ejxenbaum; Эйхенбаум, Борис. Сквозь литературу. Ленинград,1924.

62a. ---------- Литература. Теория. Критика. Полемика. Ленинград,1927.

63. Eisner Pavel. "O věcech nepřeložitelných". Slovo a slovesnost, IY (1936), 230-238. Rep: in Levý [144] , 670-682.

64. Engdahl, Sven. Studier i nusvensk sakprosa. Uppsala, 1962.

65. Erlich, Viktor. Russian Formalism. The Hague, 2 1965.

66. Etkind; Эткинд, Е.Г. Поэзия и перевод. Москва-Ленинград,1963.

66a. -------. "Теория художественного перевода и задачи сопоставительной стилистики". in Larin [133], 26-34.

66b. ------- "La stylistique comparée, base de l'art de traduire", Diogène, 57 (1967), 43-56.

67. Fedorov; Федоров,А.В. "Проблема стихотворного перевода". Поэтика, II (1927), 104-118

67a. ---------. "Звуковая форма стихотворного перевода (Вопросы метрики и фонетики)". Поэтика, IУ (1928), 45-69.

67b. ---------. О художественном переводе. Ленинград, 1941.

67c. ---------. "Основные вопросы теории перевода". Вопросы языкознания, 1952 № 5, 3-22.

67d. ----------. Введение в теорию перевода. Москва, 1953, ^{2}1958.

67e. ----------. "О смысловой многоплановости слова как проблема художественного перевода. in Larin [133], 15-26.

67f. ---------- " К вопросу переводимости" in Kulmanova [129], I, 33 - 39.

67g. ---------- Основы общей теории перевода. Москва, 1968.

68. Filin, ed.; Филин, Ф.Н. Ed. Теоретические проблемы советского языкознания. Москва, 1968.

69. Finkel'; Финкель, Ф.М. "Об автопереводе" in Larin [133], 104-126

70. Firth, J.R. "Linguistic Analysis and Translation". in For Roman Jakobson, The Hague, 1955, 133-139.

70a. -------- "Modes of Meaning". in Essays and Studies, Iv. London, 1951, 118-149.

71. Flydal, Leiv. "Remarques sur certains rapports entre le style et l'état de langue". Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskab, XVI (1952), 241-258.

72. Frake, Charles O. "The Ethnographic Study of Cognitive Systems". in T. Gladwin & Wm.C. Sturtevant, eds. Anthropology and Human Behavior. Washington, 1963, 73-85.

73. Friedrich, Hugo. Zur Frage der Übersetzungskunst. Heidelberg, 1965.

74. Gačečiladze; Гачечиладзе, Г.П. Вопросы теории художественного перевода. Тбилиси, 1959.

74a. ---------- "О реализме и искусстве перевода". in Kulmanova [129], I, 39-51.

75. Gafurova; Гафурова, Г. "Некоторые особенности воспроизведения колорита эпохи в художественном переводе". in Kulmanova [129], II, 28-36

76. Galperin; Гальперин, И.Р. "Перевод и стилистика". in Gan̆šin & Karpov [77], 127-141

77. Gan̆šin & Karpov; Ганшин, К.А. & В. Карпов, Eds. Вопросы теории и методики учебного перевода. Сб.Ст. Москва, 1950.

78. Garvin, Paul, ed. A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style. Washington, 1964.

78a. ---------- ed. Natural Languages and the Computor. New-York, 1963.

78b. ---------- "The Definitional Model of Language". in Garvin [78a], 3-22.

79. Gerbstman; Гербстман, А. "Звукопись и вопросы художественного перевода". in Kulmanova [129], II, 278-286.

80. Gipper, Helmut. Sprachliche und geistige Metamorphosen bei Gedichtübersetzungen. Düsseldorf, 1966.

81. Godin, H.F. Les resources stylistiques du français contemporain. Oxford, 1964.

82. Gorny, Woyciech. "Text Structure against the Background of Language Structure". Poetics, Warsaw, 1961, 25-37.

83. Greenberg, Joseph H.ed. Universals of Language. Camb. Mass. London, 1963, 2 1966.

84. Greimas, A.-J. Sémantique structurale. Paris, 1966.

85. Guiraud, Pierre. La semantique. Paris, 1955.

86. Güttinger, Fritz. Zielsprache. Theorie und Techik des Übersetzens. Zürich, 1963.

87. Guxman; Гухман, М.М., Ed. Норма и социальная дифференциация языка. Москва, 1969.

88. Gvozdev; Гвоздев, А.Н. Очерки по стилистике русского языка. Москва, 3 1965.

89. Haas, W. "Linguistic Structures". Word, XVI (1960), 251-276.

89a. -------. "The Theory of Translation". Philosophy, 37 (1962), 208-228.

90. Halliday, M.A.K. "Categories of the Theory of Grammar". Word XVII (1961), 241-292.

91. Hargreaves, Peter S. Better English Conversation. Stockholm, 1966.

92. Havránek, Bohuslav. "The Functional Differentiation of the Standard Language". in Garvin [78], 3-17.

92a. ----------. "Influence de la fonction de la langue littéraire sur la structure phonologique et grammaticale du tchèque littéraire". TCLP, I (1929), 106-120.

93. Hjelmslev, Louis. Omkring sprogteoriens grundlæggelse. København, 1943, [2]1966. [=Prolegomena to a Theory of Language. Baltimore, 1953.]

94. Horálek, Karl. Kapitoly z teorie překládání. Praha, 1957.

94a. ---------- " O překladani versů". Slovo a slovesnost, 14 (1953), 49-62.

94b. ----------." K otázce překladové stylistiky", Československa russistika, 1962 No 2, 87-89.

94c. ----------. "Sprachfunktion und funktionelle Stilistik". Linguistics , 14, 14-22.

95. Humboldt, Wilhelm von. Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts. in Humboldt, W. von. Werke, VII/I. Berlin, 1907.

96. Ingarden, Roman. "O tłumaczeniach". in Rusinek [194] , 127-193.

97. Italiaander, Rolf, ed. Übersetzen - Vorträge und Beiträge vom Internationalen Kongress literarischer Übersetzung in Hamburg. Frankfurt am Main, 1965.

98. Ivanov,V; Иванов Вяч.В. "О языковых причинах трудностей перевода художественного текста". in Kulmanova [129] , II,259-278.

98a. ---------- "Лингвистистические вопросы стихотворного перевода". in Машинный перевод, Москва, I96I.

99. Ivanová-Šalingová, Maria. Štylistika. Bratislava, 1965.

100. Ivič, M. Trends in Linguistics The Hague, 1965.

101. Jacobsen, Eric. Translation. Copenhagen, 1958.

102. Jakobson, Roman. " O překladu versů". Plan, II (1930) 9-11. Rep. in Levý [144] , 640-643.

102a. ----------. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation", in Brower [40], 232-240.

102b. ----------. "Linguistics and Poetics". in Sebeok [201], 350-378.

[285-274, (1970) 2 'מס 'הספרות' ,"בלשנות ופואטיקה" =]

103. Jakobson, Roman & Morris Halle. Fundamentals of Language. The Hague, 1956.

104. Jakubinskij; Якубинский Ив. "О звуках стихотворного языка". Сборники по теории поэтического языка. I (1916), 16-31.

104a. ----------. "Скопление одинаковых плавных в практическом и поэтическом языках. Сборники по теории поэтическог языка, II (1917), 15-24

105. Jarceva; Ярцева В.Н. "Развитие литературных языков". in Filin [68], 50-71.

105a. ---------, ed. Единицы разных уровней грамматического строя языка и их взаимодействие. Москва, 1969.

106. Jechová, Hana. "Symboly polské romantické poezia a možnosti jejich překladu". in Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis, Philologica X. Praha, 1964, 127-138.

107. Jefimov; Ефимов, А.И. История русского литературного языка. Москва, ^{2}1967.

107a. ---------- Стилистика художественной речи. Москва, 1961.

108. Joos, Martin. "Semology: A Linguistic Theory of Meaning". Studies in Linguistics, XIII, Nos 3-4 (1958), 53-70.

109. Jumpelt, Rudolf Walter. Die Übersetzung naturwissenschaftlicher und technischer Literatur. Berlin-Schöneberg,1961.

110. Kade, Otto. Subjektive und objektive Faktoren im Übersetzungsprozess. Leipzig,1964 (Mimeo Phil Diss).

111. Karlgren, Hans. "Positional Models and Empty Positions" in Structures and Quanta. Copenhagen, 1963, 22-57.

112. Kaškin; Кашкин, Иван. "В борьбе за реалистический перевод". in Вопросы художественного перевода [240], I20-I55

113. Katz, J.J. & J.A.Fodor. "The Structure of Semantic Theory". Language, 34 (1963), 170-210. Rep. in [113a], 479-518.

113a. ----------, eds. The Structure of Language. Readings in the Philosophy of Language. Englewood Cliffs, N.L., 1964.

114. Kellgren,Johan.

115. Kemp, Friedhelm. "Vom Übersetzen französischer Dichtung". in Die Kunst der Übersetzung [130], 75-109.

116. Kiefer, F., ed. Studies in Syntax snd Semantics. Dordrecht, 1969.

117. Kinnander, Bengt. Sammanhangsanalys. Studier i språkets struktur och rytm. Uppsala, 1959.

118. Klemensiewicz, Zenon. " Przekład jako zagadnienie językoznawstwa". in Rusinek [194], 85-99.

119. Kloepfer, Rolf. Die Theorie der literarischen Übersetzung. München, 1967.

120. Koch, Walter A. Recurrence and a Three-Modal Approach to Poetry. The Hague, 1966.

121. Kochol, Viktor. " Lermontov v slovenčině - K problematike prekladania poézie". Literarnohistorický sborník, X (1953), 91-115.

121a. ----------, "Problema l'udovosti v básnickom preklade". Slovenské pohlády, 70 (1954), 158-167.

122. Koefoed, H.A. Sprog og sprogvidenskab. Oslo, 1968.

123. Koptilov; Коптилов,В.В. "Трансформация художественного образа в поэтическом переводе". in Larin [133], 34-42

123a. ----------, "Отражение стилистического своеобразия оригинала в поэтическом переводе". in Вопросы стилистики, вып.I, Изд. Саратовского университета, 1962, 231-241.

124. Koževniková, Květa. "Zamyšlení nad jedním z úkolů teorie prekladu". Československa russistika, 1962 No 2, 87-89.

125. Krautter, Ruth. Grenzen der Übersetzbarkeit. Tübingen, 1958. (mimeo Phil Diss)

126. Kristensen, Sven Møller. Impressionismen i dansk prosa 1870-1900. København, ^{2}1965.

127. Kristeva, Julia. " Problèmes de la structuration du texte". in Tel Quel. Theorie d'ensemble. Paris,1968, 297-316.

128. Kulagina O.S. & I.A. Mel'čuk. "Automatic Translation: Some Theoretical Aspects and Design of a Translation System". in Booth [36], 139-171.

129. Kulmanova; Кулманова,З., ed. Актуальные проблемы теории художественного перевода. (Материалы всесоюзного симпозиума,1966), I-II, Москва, 1967

130. Die Kunst der Übersetzung. München,1963

131. Kuryłowicz; Курилович, Е.Р. "Заметки о значении слова", Вопросы языкознания, 1955 № 3, 73-81.

132. Kuz'min; Кузьмин,С. "Заметки по вопросу об адекватности", in Тетради переводчика, Москва, 1967, 86-91.

133. Larin; Ларин,Б.А. ed. Теория и практика перевода. Ленинград, 1962

134. Laszló, Antal. Questions of Meaning. The Hague,1963.

134a. --------, Content, Meaning and Understanding. The Hague, 1964

135. Lecocq, L. "Stylistique et traduction". Langues modernes, 55 (1961) N° 3, 188-193.

136. Leishman, J.B. "Betrachtungen eines englischen Rilke-übersetzers". in Die Kunst der Übersetzung [130], 137-156.

137. Leisi, Ernst. Der Wortinhalt. Seine Struktur im Deutschen und Englischen. Heidelberg, ^{2}1961.

138. Lejtes; Лейтес,А. "Художественный перевод как явлениеродной литературы".in Вопросы художественного перевода [240],97-120.

138a. -------. "Парадоксы переводческого искусства - К вопросу о построении научной теории художественного перевода". in Kulmanova [129], II, 319-334.

139. Leont'jev; Леонтьев, А.А. Психолингвистические единицы. Москва,1969.

139a. ----------. "Исследования поэтической речи". in Filin [68], 143-153.

140. Lepschy, Giulio C. La linguistica strutturale. Torino, 1966.

141. Leška Oldřich. "Několik poznámek k otácze překládáni". Československá russistika, 1962 № 2, 87-89.

142. Levin, Poul . Semantik. København, 1968.

143. Levin, Samuel E. Linguistic Structures in Poetry. The Hague, 1964.

144. Levý, Jiři, ed. České theorie překladu. Praha, 1957.

144a. ----------, "Will Translation Theory be of Use to Translators?" in Italiaander [97] , 77-83.

144b. ----------. Umění překladu, Praha, 1963 (= 144d)

144c. ----------. "Translation as a Decision Process". in To Honor Roman Jakobson. The Hague, 1967, II, 1171-1182.

144d. ----------. Die literarische Übersetzung. Theorie einer Kunstgattung. Frankfurt am Main-Bonn, 1969 (=144b).

145. Ljudskanov, Alexandre. Traduction humaine et traduction mécanique, I-II. Paris, 1969.

146. Lotman; Лотман, Ю.М. Лекции по структуральной поэтике. Тарту, 1964. [= Brown Univ. Slavic Reprint v,1968.]

146a. ----------. О разграничении лингвистического и литературоведческого понятия структуры". Вопросы языкознания. 1963 № 3, 44-52.

147. Malblanc, Alfred. Stylistique comparée du français et de l'allemand. Paris, ^{2}1963.

148. Malinowski, Bronislaw. Coral Gardens and their Magic. New-York, 1935.

149. Malkiel, Yakov. " The Esthetic Dimension of Derivation". in Current Trends in Linguistics, III. The Hague, 1966, 346-355.

150. Malmberg, Bertil. Det spanska Amerika i språkets spegel. Stockholm, 1966.

151. Marchais, Gilles des. La grammacritique. Postulats préliminaires por une théorie de la critique des textes de littérature. Montréal, 1965.

152. Martinet, André. Eléments de linguistique générale. Paris, ^{6}1966.

152 a. --------. A Functional View of Language. Oxford,1961.

153. Mates, Benson. "Synonymity". in Meaning and Interpretation. Berkeley, 1950, 201-229.

154. Mauthner, Fritz. Beiträge zu einer Kritik der Sprache. Berlin,1901-1902.

155. Merkel, Gottfried F., ed. On Romanticism and the Art of Translation (Studies in Honor of Edwin Hermann Zeydel). Princeton, N.J., 1956.

156. Merwe, Fritz P. van der. Die vertaling as kuns; die grense en moontlikheid van vertaling. Johannesburg,1958.

157. Meyer, Michael. " A Translator's Note on His Trade". Industria - The Year in Sweden. Stockholm, 1962/3, 44-46; 160-164.

158. Meynieux, André. "Sur l'article d'Edmond Cary 'Traduction et poésie' ". Babel , III (1957), 125-140.

159. Michaëlsson, Karl. Det franska språket. En karakteristik. Göteborg, 1944

160. Minderaa, Zie. "Het vertalen van poezie". in Jaarboekvande Maatschapij der Nederlandse Letterkunde te Leiden. 1953-1955, 15-30.

161. Morozov; Морозов, М.М. Пособие по переводу русской художественной прозы на английский язык. Москва, 1954, 2 1956.

162. Mounin, George. Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction. Paris, 1963.

162a. -------, La machine à traduire. La Haye, 1964.

162b. -------, Teoria e storia della traduzione. Torino, 1965.

162c. -------, "La traduction au théâtre". Babel, XIV, 1 (1968) 7-12.

163. Mukařovský, Jan. "Standard Language and Poetic Language". in Garvin [78], 17-21.

163a. ---------, "The Rethorics of Language". in Garvin [78], 31-71.

163b. ---------, "La phonologie et la poétique". in TCLP, IV (1931), 278-288.

163c. --------, Kapitel aus der Poetik. Frankfurt am Main, 1967.

164. Muller, Robert. The Linguistic Relativity Principle and Humboldtian Ethnolinguistics. The Hague, 1968.

165. Nabokov, Vladimir. "The Servile Path". in Brower [40], I-IV. New-York, 1964.

165a. ----------, ed. and trns. Alexandr Pushkin, Eugene Onegin, I-IV. New-York, 1964.

166. Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Translation as exemplified by Bible Translation". in Brower [40], 11-32.

166a. Nida, Eugene. Towards a Science of Translation. Leiden, 1964.

167. Nyrop, Kristoffer. Grammaire historique de la langue française. Copenhague, 1903-1930.

168. O'brien, Justin. "From French to English". in Brower [40], 78-93.

169. Öhman, Suzanne. Wortinhalt und Weltbild. Vergleichende und methodologische Studien zur Bedeutungslehre und Wortfeldtheorie. Stockholm, 1951.

170. Ortega y Gasset, José. "Miseria y esplendor de la traduccion". in Obras completas, V. Madrid, 1947, 429-448.

171. Osgood, Charles E. "Semantic Differential Technique in the Comparative Study of Cultures". American Anthropologist, 66, 3 (1964), 171-200.

172. Paris, Jean. "Translation and Creation". in Arrowsmith & Shattuck [24], 57-67.

173. Peter; Петер,М. "О стилистической эквивалентности художественного перевода". Studia slavica, IX (1963), 193-210.

174. Petrov; Петров,С. "Об уравнении коэффициентов импрессии и экспрессии в языке художественного перевода". in Kulmanova [129], II, 228- 245.

175. Pike, K. Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior. The Hague, 1967.

176. Piotrovskij; Пиотровский, Р.Г. Информационные измерения языка. Ленинград, 1968.

177. Plard, Henri. "Vom Übersetzen ins französische". in Die Kunst der Übersetzung [130], 156-177.

178. Počebcov; Почебцов, Г.Г. "О сохранении индивидуального своеобразия подлинника при переводе". Тетради переводчика. Москва, 1967, 94-101

179. Politzer, Robert L. "A Brief Classification of the Limits of Translatability". Modern Language Journal, XL (1956) 319-322.

180. Popovič, Anton. Preklad a výraz. Bratislava, 1968.

180a. ------, "Translation Analysis and Literary History: A Slovak Approach to the Problem". Babel, XIV, 2 (1968), 68-77.

181. "Problèmes de traduction". in Langue et littérature - Actes du VIII[e] congrès de la Fédération internationale des langues et littératures modernes. Paris, 1961, 185-218.

182. Procházka, Vladimír."Poznámky k překladatelské technice". Slovo a slovestost, VIII (1942), 1-20 [="Notes on Translating Technique". in Garvin [78], 93-113].

183. Quine, Willardy V. "Meaning and Translation". in Brower [40], 148-173.

184. Rabin, C. " The Linguistics of Translation", in Booth, A.D.et al. [35], 123-145.

185. Radecki, Sigismund von. "Vom Übersetzen". in Die Kunst der Übersetzung [130], 40-75.

186. Recker; Рецкер,Я.И. "О закономерных соответствиях при переводе на родной язык". in Gansin & Karpov [77], 156-183.

186a. ------, Теория и практика перевода с английского языка на русский язык. Москва,1956.

186b. Recker; Рецкер Я.И."Задачи сопоставительного анализа переводов" in Larin [133], 42-53

186c. --------- "Следует ли передавать аллитерацию в публицистическом переводе?" in Тетради переводчика,Москва,1966,73-77.

187. Regnell, Hans. Semantik . Stockholm, 1958.

188. Reichlin, A. Verzamelde studies over hedendagse problemen der taalwetenschap , Amsterdam, 1965.

189. Revzin & Rozencvejg; Ревзин,И.И. & А.Ю. Розенцвейг. Основы общего и машинного перевода. Москва, 1964.

190. Riesel, Elise. Stilistik der deutschen Sprache, Moskau, 1953.

191. Riffaterre, Michael. Essais de stylistique structurale, Paris, 1971.

192. Rosielli, Luigi."Significato e uso". Lingua e stile. I (1966), 217-230.

193. Rubow, P.V. Originaler og Oversaettelser. Kobenhavn,1929.

194. Rusinek, Michał, ed. O sztuce tłumaczenia,Wrocław,1955.

195. Ruwet, Nicolas. "Limites de l'analyse linguistique en poétique. Langages, XII (1968), 56-70.

196. Ryl'skij;Рыльский,М.Ф. Художественный перевод с одного славянского языка на другой. АН СССР, Советский комитет славистов. Москва, 1958.

197. Sapir, Edward. The Expression of the Ending-point Relation in English, French and German, Baltimore, 1932.

197a. ----------. Language.

198. Savory, Theodore. The Art of Translation. London, 1957.

199. Schmidt, Siegfried J. "Alltagssprache und Gedichtsprache" Poetica II, 3 (1968), 285-304.

200. Schmidt, Wilhelm. Lexikalische und aktuelle Bedeutung, Berlin,1963.

201. Sebeok, Thomas A. ed. Style in Language. Camb. Mars,1960.

201a. ------ "The Informational Model of Language: Analog and Digital Coding in Animal and Human Communication". in Garvin, [78a], 47-64.

202. Sedov; Седов,В.Ф. "Разговорная лексика и фразеология в языке драматургии Бвльзака" in Вопросы лекмикологии,стилистики и сопоставительного изучения языков".Ленинград,I959, I74-I9I.

203. Segre, Cesare. I segni e la critica. Fra strutturalismo e semiologia. Torino, 1969.

204. 'Sgall, P. & L. Nebesky. "Vztah formy a funkce v jazyce" SaS, XXIII (1962), 174-189.

205. Siertsema, B. A Study of Glossematics. The Hague,^{2}1965.

206. Sigurd, Bengt. Språkstruktur, Stockholm, 1967.

207. Šklovskij; Шкловский,Виктор. "Заумный язык и поэзия". Сборники по теории поэтического языка, I /I9I6/, I - I6.

207a. Šklovskij; Шкловский, Виктор. "Искусство как прием".Сборники По теории поэтического языка, II /I9I7/,3-I5.

208. Slama-Cazacu, Tatiana. Language et Contexte. The Hague,1961.

209. Smith, Barbara Harnstein. Poetic Closure, Chicago,1968.

210. Sobolev; Соболев, Л.Н. "О переводе образа образом". in Вопросы художественного перевода [240], 259-309.

211. Söderlund, Börje. Att översätta. Stockholm,1965.

212. Sommerfeldt, Alf. Diachronic and Synchronic Aspects of Language. The Hague,1962.

213. Šor; Шор, В. "Об общем и своеобразном в переводах". in Kulmanova [129], I, 99-111.

214. Sørensen, Holger Steen. "Meaning". in To Honor Roman Jakobson, III. The Hague, 1967, 1876-1889.

215. Sorokin; Сорокин, Ю.С.ed. Процессы формирования русского литературного языка. Москва, 1966.

216. Spencer, John ed. Linguistics and Style. London,1964.

217. Stankiewicz, Edward. " Linguistics and the Study of Poetic Language". in Sebeok [201], 69-81.

218. Stepanov; Степанов, Ю.С. Основы языкознания, Москва,1966.

219. Stern, G. Meaning and Change of Meaning. Gothenburg,1931.

220. Störig, Hans J, ed. Das Problem des Übersetzens, Stuttgart, 1963.

221. Striedter, Jurij. "Zur formalistischen Theorie der Prosa und der literarischen Evolution". in Striedter, Jurij,ed. Texte der Russischen Formalisten, I, München, 1969, IX-LXXXIII.

222. Strindberg, August. Öppna brev till intima teatern. In Samlade skrifter, ed. John Landquist. Stockholm, 1919, 50.

223. Süskind, W.E. & George van der Vring. "Die Kunst der Übersetzung". in Die Kunst der Übersetzung [130], 9-40.

224. Svanberg, Nils. Svensk stilistik. Sth, 3 1966.

225. Swanson, J.W. "Linguistic Relativity and Translation". Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, XXII, 2 (1961) 185-192.

226. Tancock, L.W. "Some Problems of Style in Translation from French". in Booth, A.D. et al. [35], 29-52.

227. Telija; Телия, В.Н. "Фразеология". in Filin [68], 257-278.

228. Theses, CLP. in TCLP, I (1929), 7-29.

229. Timofeev; Тимофеев, Л.И. Основы теории литературы. Москва, 1963.

230. Todorov, Tzvetan, "L'héritage methodologique du Formalisme", in Todorov, Tzvetan. Poétique de la prose. Paris, 1971, 9-31.

230a. ----------, "Poétique" in Ducrot et al. [59], 97- 165.

230b. ----------, ed. Théorie de la littérature. Textes des formalistes russes. Paris, 1965.

231. Togeby, Knud. Structure immanente de la langue française. Paris, 1965.

232. Tomaševskij; Томашевский, Борис. Теория литературы Москва-Ленинград, 1925.

233. Toper; Топер, П. "О некоторых принципах художественного перевода". Новый Мир , 1952 № I, 232-247.

234. Tschizewskij, Dmitrij. Gogol'. Turgenev. Dostoevskij. Tolstoj. München, 1966.

235. Turover; Туровер, Г. "О переводе диалектизмов" in Тетради переводчика. Москва, 1966, 94-98.

236. Tynjanov; Тынянов, Ю.Н. Проблема стихотворного языка. Москва,1924, ^{2}1965.

236a. ---------, Архаисты и новаторы. Москва, 1929; München, 1967.

237. Tytler, Alexander Fraser (lord Woodhouselee). Essay on the Principles of Translation. London, 1790, ^{2}1797.

238. Vinay, J.-P. & J. Darbelnet. Stylistique comparée du francais et l'anglais. Paris, 1958.

239. Vinogradov; Виноградов,В.В. Этюды о стиле Гоголя,Ленинрад,1926.

239a. ----------, Проблема исторического взаимодействия литературного языка и языка художественной литературы . ВЯ, 1955 № 4, 2-34.

239b. ----------, О языке художественной литературы,Москва 1959.

239c. ----------, Стилистика. Теория поэтической речи. Поэтика. Москва, 1963.

239d. ----------, Проблемы литературных языков и закономерностей их образования и развития. Москва, 1967.

240. Voprosy; Вопросы художественного перевода. Москва,1955.

241. Weber, Hans. Das Tempussystem des Deutschen un des Französischen. Übersetzungs- und Struktur-probleme. Bern, 1954.

242. Weinreich, Uriel. Languages in Contact. The Hague, ^{3}1967.

242a. ----------, "On the Semantic Structure of Language". in Greenberg [83], 142-217.

243. Whorf, Benjamin L. Language, Thought and Reality. N.Y. & London, 1958.

244. Widmer, Walter. Fug und Unfug des Übersetzens. Köln-Berlin, 1959.

245. Winter, Werner. "Impossibilities of Translation", in Arrowsmith & Shattuck [24], 68-76.

246. Wojtasiewicz, Olgierd. Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia. Wrocław-Warszawa, 1957.

247. Zand; Занд М.И. "Идиш как субстрат современного Иврита". Семитские языки, Вып. 2 /ч.I/, I22-I28.

248. Zarev; Зарев П. "Об актуальных вопросах литературоведения и структурализма". Вопросы литературы, I2 /1969/, 58-72.

249. Zima, J. "Problem archaismů v překladu literárního díla" Slovo a slovesnost, XV (1954), 122-128.

250. Žirmunskij; Жирмунский, В.М. Национальный язык и социальные диалекты. Ленинград, I936.

251. Zola, Emile. Le naturalisme en théâtre, Paris, 1928.

252. Zvegincev; Звегинцев, В.А. Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика, Москва, I968.

252a. ---------,