

(in Hebrew with English summaries)

## THEORY — POETICS — HEBREW AND COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Editor: Itamar Even-Zohar

Style Editor: Raphael Julius

Editorial Board: Benjamin Hrushovski, Menakhem Perry, Gideon Toury (Secretary)

Advisory Board: Itamar Even-Zohar, Daniel E. Fineman, Benjamin Hrushovski (chairman),  
Dan Pagis, Khone Shmeruk

Overseas Members: Robert Alter, Arnold J. Band

HA-SIFRUT is published by Tel-Aviv University, Israel. Annual subscription rates (3 issues): IL 65.— in Israel; \$ 20.00 abroad. This issue: IL 25.— in Israel; \$ 8.00 abroad. Address: Ha-Sifrut, P.O.B. 39085, Tel Aviv 61 390, Israel.

## CONTENTS

	English Summary
SCHOOLS IN SEMIOTICS AND POETICS	
1 Ladislav Matejka      Prague School Semiotics .....	i
HEBREW CONCRETE POETRY	
13 Dan Pagis <i>Carmina Figurata</i> in Pre-Modern Hebrew Poetry .....	i
TRANSLATION AND TRANSLATED LITERATURE	
28 José Lambert      Literary Contacts and Translation: Theoretical vs. Descriptive Studies .....	iii
33 Gideon Toury      Equivalence and Non-Equivalence in Translation as a Function of Norms .....	iii
40 Itamar Even-Zohar      The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem .....	v
44 Zohar & Yaacov Shavit      Translated vs. Original Literature in the Creation of the Literary Center in Erez Israel .....	v
HISTORY OF HEBREW LITERATURE	
69 Joseph Heinemann      The Art of the Sermon of Palestinian Amora'im: Analysis of Two Proems .....	vi
80 David Weinfeld      Dialogue and Monologue in Peretz Smolenskin's Stories	vii
101 Tova Rosen-Moked      On the Closural Features of the <i>Muwaššah's</i> Last Division .....	viii
BIBLICAL NARRATIVE	
109 Meir Sternberg      Repetition Structure in Biblical Narrative: Strategies of Informational Redundancy	
151 NEW BOOKS — BRIEF REVIEWS	

equivalence" could be defined, for instance, as "that relationship between two linguistic utterances defining translation," or "that relation between two linguistic utterances distinguishing translation from non-translation," etc. And just as any actual phoneme can be described in terms of constituents of a lower order (the so-called "distinctive features" deriving from the basic characteristics of a human sound and from the possible modes of its production), so it should be possible to describe every actual type of translational equivalence in terms of constituents of a lower order: the basic characteristics of a natural language and of a text in natural language, the inherent differences between any two linguistic systems, the essential properties of the translating process, and, in the case of literary translation, also the

basic characteristics of a literary text and of a literary polysystem as well as the inherent differences between any two literary polysystems (Cf. Toury [2a]).

Such a definition, along with the structural mechanism mentioned above, implies and entails an overall change in the *concept* of translational equivalence, and is not a mere semantic change. Hence, we regard equivalence as a relational-functional category, the ever-changing realization of which is *norm*-governed, and not rule-governed. This *historical* concept of the realization of the equivalence postulate enables every possible relationship between TT and ST (describable in terms of the structural mechanism) to function as "equivalence" under certain socio-historical conditions, giving rise to a certain set of translational norms.

## THE POSITION OF TRANSLATED LITERATURE WITHIN THE LITERARY POLYSYSTEM

by ITAMAR EVEN-ZOHAR

[Hebrew article: 40-44]

This is a translation of a paper presented to the international symposium "Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies," the Catholic University of Leuven, 27-30. 4. 1976. Forthcoming in *Literature and*

*Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*, eds., James S. Holmes, José Lambert & Raymond van den Broeck. ACCO, Leuven & Antwerp.

## TRANSLATED VS. ORIGINAL LITERATURE IN THE CREATION OF THE LITERARY CENTER IN EREẒ ISRAEL

by ZOHAR & YAAKOV SHAVIT

[Hebrew article: 45-68; bibliography: 58-59]

The end of the second decade of this century was a crucial period in the history of the modern Jewish community in Erez-Israel. Those years were characterized by a messianic fervor that developed after the Balfour Declaration and the "Jewish legions," the new possibilities for realizing Zionism that opened up after the British conquest of the country, and the increased self-awareness of the Jewish community and its attempts to become an autonomous society.

At that period, there was a profound recognition of the function of Hebrew literature and literature in Hebrew, and of the importance of a Hebrew literary center within the general process of evolving an autonomous Jewish society. The maintenance of a literary center in Erez-Israel was especially urgent because activity in the centers of Europe was diminishing. This was clearly indicated by the situation in the Hebrew publishing field: in 1928 only nine Hebrew books were published in Poland, and six in Germany, while about one book a day appeared in Erez-Israel.

The transfer of the Hebrew literary center to Erez-Israel occurred in two stages. The first took place in the

1910s about the time Brenner moved there, and was related to his literary activity undertaken out of a feeling of being the "last on the ramparts" which he had already expressed earlier when trying to set up a literary center in London. During that period, awareness of the central function of literature in the development of the Jewish community in Erez-Israel was interpreted to mean the need to produce many books and flood the country with books, original and translated. The books were supposed to fill the needs of the educated readers, the reading craftsmen, the school children and the students, in the Hebrew language.

The attitude to translated literature in those years, and the considerations which dictated the choice of the translated books, are described, based on primary source material and public archives, mainly "Genazim" (Tel Aviv) and the Zionist Archives (Jerusalem).

The intensive awareness at the time of the need for translated literature led to deliberations dealing with two questions: 1) What was the proper ratio between translated and original literature, and 2) what considerations should affect the selection of books for translation.

(1) At the time the literary center in Erez-Israel was just starting to take shape with tremendous material difficulty, translated literature was accorded a vital function. Contrary to what happened later, it was not then thought to be in competition with original works and Hebrew culture. In fact it was deemed a *sine qua non* for the creation of a literary center, in the absence of which there would be no reading public, no evolution of publishing, no expansion of the printing industry. It was the desire to see all these flourish that determined the status of translated literature. Some of the translating was also designed to provide literary work for the writers who had settled in the country, and during the war years the activity of the Palestine Office in this area was based first and foremost on the need to at least provide those writers with a minimal standard of living. In 1914 that Office set up a committee composed of Dr. Nissan Turov, J. H. Brenner and Yehjak Wilkansky (the documents of which are in large measure the basis of this article). In the middle of the war, the committee planned a comprehensive project for the translation of classics, and gave out more than thirty assignments. Only a few of them were published during the war, by the "Ba-kfar" publishing company, and the majority were issued after the war by various publishers, after the translators had released the manuscripts.

Translated literature also fulfilled some of the functions of original literature, either because original literature was unable to fulfill them due to the absence of literary ability, or because the literary norms of original prose were unsuitable. Thus translated literature fulfilled functions ordinarily reserved for original literature, and this was manifested in the fact that certain literary genres were available only in translation, as were works in certain areas of culture.

Somewhat later, translated literature was conceived as a

standard-setter for original literature and a model to be imitated. It was assumed also that translated literature prepared the ground by getting the public accustomed to reading Hebrew, and by compelling original literature to rise to its level. Asher Barash, one of the dominant figures in the literary center of the period, believed that translated literature would force a change in Hebrew literature in the direction of increased emphasis on realistic description and plot, in which most of the literature translated during the 1920s excelled.

(2) In the preceding decade two points of view are traceable in translation policy. One can be described as the value-esthetic approach, and the other as the value-popular approach.

The value-esthetic approach, represented by Brenner and Berl Katznelson, held that translated literature should reflect values in harmony with the social ideology of the labor movement, and therefore books outside that category should not be translated even if their literary value was unassailable. Translated literature was conceived as part of the didactic system producing the ethos promoted by the labor movement, and the prime consideration in the choice of books for translation was whether they were in keeping with that ethos.

The value-popular approach, represented by Dr. Turov and Zeev Jabotinsky, held that both original and translated literature must first of all be readable, and consequently based on an appealing and gripping plot. The prime consideration in choosing a book for translation into Hebrew was not how well it fit a certain ethos, but how readable and exciting it was. Only a book of that sort, the value-popular approach felt, could educate the readers to the national and human values the value-esthetic approach wished to transmit to the public.

## THE ART OF THE SERMON OF PALESTINIAN AMORA'IM: ANALYSIS OF TWO PROEMS

by JOSEPH HEINEMANN

[Hebrew article: 69-79]

Even though we can not always be certain to what extent the material preserved in the homiletic Midrashim represents actual sermons as they were preached before an audience in their entirety, some of the longer proems, at least, may be taken to reflect outlines of such sermons; for the proem form undoubtedly was originally created for use in live sermons. If an in-depth analysis of such proems demonstrates that they are, indeed, creations that skillfully integrate many different materials and shape them anew according to the purpose in the mind of the preacher, it provides, in turn, some confirmation that we are dealing with authentic sermons.

The proem on Num. 7:1 (*Pesiqta d. R. Kahana* I,i) links the erection of the Tabernacle with Cant. 5:1 "I am come

into my garden, my sister, my bride" (on the basis of a play on words)—and thus presents it as the consummation of the marriage between God and Israel; for henceforth the divine Presence will dwell among Israel. Therefore, the Tabernacle and the dwelling of the Shekhina on earth are, it would seem, of concern to Israel exclusively; and yet the preacher implies again and again that this even affected the whole of mankind. Nor is this the first time that the Presence comes to dwell among men, but, on the contrary, it is the restoration of the ideal state of affairs which had prevailed until Adam, and the generations after him, had sinned. The sermon deliberately creates a dialectical position in which the "Israelitic" and the all-human significance of the event—though apparently