PAPERS ON POETICS AND SEMIOTICS 8

Itamar Even-Zohar

PAPERS IN HISTORICAL POETICS

The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics
Tel Aviv University

PAPERS ON POETICS AND SEMIOTICS 8

Even-Zohar PAPERS IN HISTORICAL POETICS

Itamar Even-Zohar

PAPERS IN HISTORICAL POETICS

The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics
Tel Aviv University

PAPERS IN HISTORICAL POETICS

PAPERS ON POETICS AND SEMIOTICS
Edited by B. Hrushovski and I. Even-Zohar

No. 8

The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics
Tel Aviv University P.O.B. 39085
ISRAEL

Itamar Even-Zohar

PAPERS IN HISTORICAL POETICS

Tel Aviv, 1978

המכון הישראלי לפואטיקה ולסמיוטיקה ע"ש פורטר
עבודות בפואטיקה ובסמיוטיקה
סידרת חיבורים בעריכת ב. הרושובסקי וא. אבן־זהר

8

איתמר אבן־זהר
עבודות בפואטיקה היסטורית

Printed in Israel
University Publishing Projects
28 Hanatziv Street, Tel Aviv

CONTENTS

Foreword

This book consists of articles and papers written between 1970 and 1977, dealing with various aspects of literary history mostly from the point of view of historical poetics. literature is herein conceived of as a stratified whole, a polysystem, whose major opposition is assumed to be that of "high," or "canonized," versus "low," or "non-canonized," systems. The repertoire of components (items, models) possessed by the polysystem behaves according to certain principles. The main principle governing this behavior is assumed to be the opposition between primary and secondary patterns (activities/systems). These are hypothesized as universals of any cultural system, but are discussed mainly within the scope of literature. "Primary" activity is presumed to be that activity which takes the initiative in creating new items and models for the repertoire ("the system," "the axis of selection"), while "secondary" is conceived of as a derivatory, conservatory and simplificatory activity.

With the help of these categories of stratification and typology, it is assumed that a whole range of questions about the synchronic and diachronic existence of literature can be discussed in a more fruitful way than that pursued by traditional histories of literature with little theoretical basis. This does not mean an improvement on the methodological level only, but also implies a modification of the very concept of literature, i.e., of the object of study itself. First and foremost, it may rid itself of aesthetic fallacies which, for any theory, are incompatible with what is postulated by historical analysis. Thus, the way will be opened for a sound and unbiased discussion of some of the important components of (literary) culture such as translated literature, "low" genres and semi-literary phenomena. These, and others, will not only become "legitimate" objects of study, but will be integrated and correlated with phenomena from which they were previously isolated and detached.

As is well known, because of the heterogeneity of the historical scene and what would appear to be the overwhelming disparity of the data, scholars lamentably chose to apply reduction, as if the reduction of heterogeneity to homogeneity were the only tenable way of saving the idea of structured and systematic inhesion. This approach no longer seems prevalent in linguistics, but it can still be observed in literary studies. The hypothesis of the polysystem with its derivatives-may, therefore, be a useful tool in overcoming this unsatisfactory state. But it should immediately be added that "reality" does not offer only univocal polysystemic structures in which the principles of stratification and the dynamics of change are, as it were, as "pure" as in classical textbook examples. In order to be scientifically valid the polysystem hypothesis must serve not only for such cases where the whole range of hypothesized relations can be demonstrated, but also for cases in which the concept of absence ("zero sign") cannot be avoided.

Accordingly, it is not sufficient that one recognize that literary polysystems be discussed in their relationships with other literary poly systems. One has also

to realize that whole literatures may behave vis-à-vis one another as various strata within a single whole, thus constituting an over-all literary aggregate, a kind of mega-polysystem, the structure of which could explain relations hitherto neglected. Moreover, certain literatures may turn out to overlap some other literature(s), thus creating symbiotic structures. Rather than considering them a hornet's nest in an otherwise harmonious theory, these cases thus become test cases *par excellence* for both the validity and flexibility of the theoretical concepts suggested.

Written over a period of seven years, the papers in this collection are naturally diverse in tone, scope and degree of elaboration. As they represent various stages of work, they inevitably include repetitions and inconsistencies, as well as different points of view about identical issues. Nevertheless, they reflect a more or less coherent endeavor whose points of departure are deeply rooted in the structuralist and semiotic traditions of the Russian Formalists and the Czech Structuralists. As the work discussed in this collection is still in progress, I would prefer these papers to be seen as an interim report rather than as chapters in a finalized theory. I believe that in fields as dynamic as poetics and the semiotics of culture, this approach can be useful.

* * * *

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to institutions and individuals who have assisted me in a variety of ways. I am indebted to the Institute of General Literary Studies of the University of Amsterdam and The Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.) which enabled me to stay in Amsterdam for research purposes in 1975 and 1976. "Universals of Literary Contacts," "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem," and "Interference in Dependent Literary Polysystems," published here, are the outcome of the year I spent there. I would also like to acknowledge my indebtedness to the Germanic Department of the University of Antwerp (U.I.A.) and the Catholic University of Leuven (Louvain) where I discussed and presented various ideas which appear in this collection. My colleagues in Amsterdam, James S Holmes, Bernard Scholz, Jens Ihwe and Teun A. van Dijk, as well as Raymond van den Broeck, André Lefevere and Frank Coppieters of Antwerp and José Lambert of Leuven were of enormous assistance. It was my further privilege to discuss several questions dealing with my work with Maria Renata Mayenowa, who was also a guest at the University of Amsterdam in 1975 and with Jeanne and Jan van der Eng, who never lost patience listening to my green ideas. My thanks also to Irene Portis Winner and Thomas G. Winner for their helpfulness and friendly assistance with my paper "Russian and Hebrew," presented to the Bellagio conference at Rockefeller Center, which they organized. Last, but not least, Benjamin Hrushovski, Gideon Toury and the late Joseph Haephrati of Tel Aviv University were of invaluable help in reading and discussing some of these papers with me.

Tel Aviv, July 1977

I

The Function of the Literary Polysystem in the History of Literature

The Relations between Primary and Secondary Systems in the Literary Polysystem

The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem

The Polysystem Hypothesis Revisited

*The Function of the Literary Polysystem in the History of Literature**

The importance for literary history of the correlations between central and peripheral literature as well as between "high" and "low" types was raised by Russian Formalists as soon as they abandoned their partially a-historical attitude, early in their history. The nature of these correlations became one of their major hypotheses in explaining the mechanisms of change in literary history As Šklovskij put it:

> When the "canonised" art form (i,e,, that which occupies the center of the literary system – I E-Z.) reaches an impasse, the way is open for the infiltration of the elements of non-canonised art, which by this time have managed to evolve new artistic devices (1923.27).

A fascinating pre-theoretical work on the function of popular forms for high literature was Vinogradov's article on Gogol's "The Nose", published as early as 1919. There he collected much evidence for the use of popular elements in the Gogol text. He failed, however, to interpret the results of his inquiry in terms of literary history; those implications were drawn only later by Tynjanov, Ejxenbaum and their students.

If the whole of literary production in a certain period can be described in terms of the oppositions between central and peripheral, high and low, each existing as it were in its own sphere, then one could assume a model of literary production similar to the one I recently suggested for language (Even-Zohar, 1970). Since it is by now fully acknowledged that language is a heterogeneous, not homogeneous, system, i.e., a system of systems, I suggested to label it, for the sake of convenience, a *polysystem.* The same, so it seems, holds true for the literary system. To adopt Šklovskij's terms (though not exactly in the same sense), the literary polysystem can be dichotomised into *canonized* vs. *non-canonized* systems, each divided in its turn into sub-systems. The non-canonized system would include all those types normally ejected from the realm of "literature," and often called "sub-literature," "penny literature," "entertainment," "cheap," "vulgar" literature, etc,; this includes "thrillers," detective stories, sentimental novels, pornographic literature and so on.

To get an idea of how different these systems were felt to be, let us look at French literature from the 1850's onwards. We have there two famous cases of writers, who, while operating within the framework of canonized literature, eventually introduced elements from the non-canonized sub-system of erotic and pornographic literature. As a result they had to defend themselves in court against the charge of having committed a crime of "outrage a la morale publique."

* Paper presented to the Tel Aviv Symposium on the Theory of Literary History, Tel Aviv University, February 2, 1970.

Nobody could possibly consider the "indecent" descriptions in *Madame Bovary* as anything more than innocent *études* as compared with the rich and flourishing non-canonized pornographic literature of the day. Baudelaire, on the other hand, was much more audacious in his *Fleurs du mal*, though, again, hardly comparable with *la flore pornographique* of the time. Zola, though never prosecuted on these grounds, was not the last French writer to use non-canonized literature *pour épater les bourgeois*. In all these cases, the scandal and shock were not necessarily caused by the appearance of certain features m the works mentioned above. It was rather their introduction into canonized literature, and the consequent disorder caused to the established stratification within the polysystem, that met with so much objection. In a polysystem where highly codified stratification prevails, any minor move from one stratum to another may be taken as a major offense. This should be understood in light of the fact that, at least for the cultural elite, all literary types were accessible, i.e., this section of society might have availed itself of both canonized and non canonized literature.

The tensions within the literary polysystem may serve as a most interesting explanation not the least for "enigmatic" historical cases. Hebrew literature, to take a concrete example, has had a very peculiar history, which needs complex explanations. It seems that, due to historical circumstances, this literature maintained symbiotic relations with other, non-Hebraic, literatures. However, it is not the symbiotic nature of Hebrew literature as such which concerns me here, but rather the symbiotic relations within a literary polysystem as far as they constitute a factor in literary evolution.

The most remarkable fact about Hebrew literature in the so called "Revival period" (around the 1880's) is that it almost completely lacked a non-canonized system. In spite of that, we still observe in that literature certain features that might well suggest the existence of some land of non-canonized system. This, I believe, can be explained as follows:

1. Non-canonized elements interfered with Hebrew literature via another literature, notably Russian.
2. Some other literature functioned for Hebrew as its non-canonized system.

I will not discuss the first assumption because I have not yet gone beyond primary studies with it. The second assumption, however, seems to be clearer. Yiddish literature seems to have functioned as Hebrew's non-canonized system; at the same time the latter functioned as the canonized system of the former. This may explain not only the transformations which certain texts underwent when translated from one of these languages to the other, or the fact that many Jewish writers were bilingual, or that Yiddish writers often desperately wished to be translated into Hebrew (as a means of canonization). It may also furnish an explanation as to how a literature written in an unspoken language could

maintain its vitality and from time to time actualize those changes without which a literary polysystem would probably petrify. It also suggests the indispensability for a system of certain items, so that if it does not already possess them it has either to invent them or borrow them in some way or another.

There still remains a lot of work to be done in testing and refining these hypotheses, but I hope they will be accepted as a basis for better literary history. The case of Hebrew briefly discussed here is by no means unique, and it seems to me that the historical situation of many other literatures can be discussed in the same terms with fruitful results.

Tel Aviv, February, 1970

(Published in Hebrew translation in *Masa*, 6.3.1970. This version is slightly revised.)

*The Relations between Primary and Secondary Systems in the Literary Polysystem**

One of the major achievements of Russian Formalism at its latest and most developed stage was its vital interest in all the facts of literature and its attempt to analyze the intricate relations between them. Thus, not only "major" literature, accepted on the grounds of "aesthetic" values or any other kind of cultural reputation, was admitted as a legitimate object for literary science, but also such phenomena as "mass literature": popular literature of all sorts, marginal and peripheral literature (such as "journalese" semi-literary texts), folktales, etc. This type of literature was accepted not on general cultural, anthropological or sociological grounds, as is often the case in Western scholarship today but on the solid ground of literary science, particularly theoretical and historical poetics. This does not mean that a sociological point of view was excluded; it was rather transformed into socio-literary notions. Thus, in one of his most brilliant articles, "On the Evolution of Literature," Jurij Tynjanov ([1927], 1929:30-47) suggested that we view literature as a system, correlated with other, extra-literary systems. Boris Ejxenbaum, too, who cooperated with Tynjanov on this subject, did research on what he called "the literary ethos," i.e., the multiplicity of socio-literary facts involved in the processes of literary production and existence. All this work was abruptly stopped, as we know, by extra literary circumstances. In the West, interest in types of literature other than the usual "major" ones has grown rapidly of late. In English speaking countries, much interest is shown in detective fiction and science fiction, and less in other kinds of "popular literature"; in Germany, all kinds of "Trivialliteratur" and "Unterhaltungsliteratur" have become an object of investigation; in France, various kinds of popular literature have been dealt with (mainly by the Bordeaux group). In other words, many scholars now admit that literary or semiliterary texts, traditionally excluded from literature or considered unworthy of intellectual or academic treatment, are an indispensable part of the literary culture of a society, and their study contributes to the development of the human sciences. This is, of course, an enormous change in traditional attitudes towards this kind of literature.

In spite of this change, we are still a long way even from the pioneering formulations of the Russian Formalists in these matters. The main reason for this is that the theoretical frameworks for dealing with all types of popular literature/ Trivial-/Unterhaltungsliteratur are very vague and incomplete, and often miss the main point to wit, *the relations between the various types of literature,* their interactions both synchronically and diachronically. Most studies devoted

* Paper presented to the VIIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association, Montreal-Ottawa, August 13-19, 1973.

to the subject do not conceive of literature as a system, and consequently observe each type separately, without any attempt to link it to the other. Moreover, most of these studies pay little attention to the *literary* aspects of the subject. As a result, many of their findings have not been integrated into literary studies or criticism, but have, at best, remained at the margin.

It would be, therefore, rewarding – I believe – to come back to Tynjanov's conception of literature as a system. I would, however, like to introduce a slight terminological modification and call it a *polysystem*, thus making it possible to speak of literary *systems* as members of this polysystem. Most scholars have come to agree that the most rewarding typology of this polysystem is that which dichotomizes it into *canonized* vs. *non-canonized* systems, each consisting of sub-systems. By "canonized" literature we mean roughly what is usually considered "major" literature: those kinds of literary works accepted by the "literary milieu" and usually preserved by the community as part of its cultural heritage. On the other hand, "non-canonized" literature means those kinds of literary works more often than not rejected by the literary milieu as lacking "aesthetic value" and relatively quickly forgotten, e.g., detective fiction, sentimental novels, westerns, pornographic literature, etc.

In this paper I will not attempt to discuss whether this dichotomy is justified or not, and on what grounds; nor will I propose any further and more precise definitions for the respective systems. I will rather sketch some hypotheses on the nature of the interrelations between the various literary systems. My point of departure may be formulated thus: "Suppose literature can be conceived of as a polysystem; suppose its main systems are *canonized* vs. *non canonized* literature. What kind of relations could we then observe between these systems?"

Both canonized and non-canonized literature must be further classified into sub-systems, or *genres.* Although many common denominators exist for westerns and detective-fiction or for both of these and sentimental magazine short stories, they are still different genres, and have had different relations with each other and with the various genres of canonized literature. From another point of view, all of these may again be classified according to other criteria. Thus, it is necessary to include *translated literature* in the polysystem. This is rarely done, but no observer of the history of any literature can avoid recognizing as an important fact the impact of translations and their role in the synchrony and diachrony of a certain literature. Further, diachronic shifts create a situation where previously dominant norms become peripheral or even obsolete within "the new phase of literature," but are still in use and still have their public. This kind of literature is usually labelled "epigonic"; I would like to keep this term, while excluding any pejorative meaning connected with it. "Non-epigonic" literature has no name; I will therefore call it "dominant" (though I am still looking for another term). Another criterion for classification may be the *reading public.* Thus we have literature for *adults* vs. literature for *children and youth*; literature

for men vs. literature for women (and, of course, literature for both).

According to what is presumed about the nature of systems in general and the nature of literary phenomena in particular, there can obviously be no equality between the various literary systems and types. These systems maintain *hierarchical* relations, which means that some maintain a more central position than others, or that some are *primary* while others are *secondary.* On traditional grounds one could suggest that the whole of non-canonized literature, literature for youth and children, epigonic literature and the whole corpus of translated literature be considered secondary systems. Primary systems, on the other hand, would be original cononized literature for adults of both sexes, if it is not epigonic.

Can we accept this as a valid classification? If one wants to argue on social grounds that every group should have its cultural needs legitimized, equalized (and even financed) by government, it would only be natural to consider the hierarchy suggested above as reactionary and unjustified. But it does not seem necessary to deal here with a democratic cultural policy, in which no group in an ideal welfare state would be discriminated against because of its peculiar taste. What we are dealing with here is the analysis of literature functioning as a polysystem on factual cultural grounds. Consequently, it seems to me rewarding even here to accept the above classification as a starting point for further analysis, while attempting to give it a more solid basis.

The relations between center and periphery, or primary and secondary activities (social, cultural, etc.) usually conform to the following pattern: phenomena in the center are gradually driven towards the periphery and remain there as new phenomena arise in the center – and may sometimes be even those of the periphery. But when these phenomena change positions they rarely remain the same: in the periphery, they often lose their original functions while remaining materially unchanged, "petrified" so to speak. And vice versa. Consequently, while new procedures and initiatives are encouraged in primary activities, secondary ones demand maximum perseverance of sanctioned patterns. This can be put the other way round, too: when one tries new procedures which violate convention, one works per definition within the framework of primary activity, and vice versa.

This general pattern of primary vs. secondary activities seems to be valid for the literary polysystem, too. While canonized literature tries to create new models of reality and attempts to illuminate the information it bears in a way which at least brings about *deautomatization,* as the Prague Structuralists put it, non-canonized literature has to keep within the conventionalized models which are highly automatized. Hence the impression of stereotype one gets from non-canonized works. Although both systems are based on rules which can be called conventions, and both make use of stereotypes (indeed, no modeling can be done without them) on all levels (mimetic or linguistic), there is still a basic opposition between them of a less codified vs. a more codified system. In my own investigations into the various genres of non-canonized literature, I have observed a

recurring pattern that may illustrate my point: no literary structures on any level were ever adopted by the non-canonized system before they had become common stock of the canonized one. Most literary techniques such as the shifting point of view or the *flashback* could not be adopted by the non-canonized system until they had attained recognition in the canonized system. To put it in general terms: *in synchrony, canonized and non-canonized systems manifest two various diachronic phases, the non-canonized overlapping with a previous canonized phase.* But as I tried to explain before, this does not mean that the non-canonized system adopts canonized structures as they are. What really happens is a kind of *simplification.* If it is a question of a literary technique, we get the same technique "made simple."

If a writer of westerns adopts linguistic registers to differentiate characters, we get a much less nuanced differentiation than is usual in canonized literature. The same holds true for psychological explanations and other kinds of inner "motivation" for the acts of characters in a novel. What one gets then is more accessible structures, much more univocal (unequivocal) than in canonized works. This makes the rules of the non-canonized system more obvious, and it is relatively easier to extract from such texts even operative manipulation rules (e.g., the "ingredients" a publisher often requests from an author of non-canonized literature). This feature is actually the reason why, when speaking of "literary paradigmatics," or the literary *langue,* one should think of non-canonized literature; canonized literature, on the other hand, often represents deviations from the *langue,* and in many cases each work is an *idiolect* rather than a *text,* that is, a performance of the system, of the *langue.*

At this point one may mistake my description for an indictment of the non-canonized system. This, however, is not the case: all the terms I use, such as "simplification" and the like, should be understood not as evaluations but as termini technici. I would, therefore, like to put forward my second thesis immediately, and that is that *the oppositions between the various literary systems create an ideal literary and cultural balance within the literary polysystem.* Viktor Šklovskij already pointed out that literary novelties (in the canonized system) are often borrowings from the non-canonized system, folktales included. Viktor Vinogradov was one of the first to demonstrate, in his little-known analysis of Gogol's "The Nose" (1919), how non-canonized and semiliterary texts served a variety of purposes in this Gogol masterpiece. In other words, at least as far as the nineteenth century is concerned, a non-canonized system was the *sine qua non* for a dynamic and vivid evolution of the canonized one. The canonized system got its popularity, flexibility and appeal by a constant and positive struggle with the non-canonized system. Dostoevskij and Dickens would be inconceivable without the popular sensational and sentimental literature of the time. These writers could not dissociate themselves from the literary reality by highbrow scorn and contempt for "subculture." Instead, *they made use of it,*

tried to compete with it, and clearly were conscious of the fact that their readers were often consumers of both systems, so that all kinds of manipulations could be meaningfully grasped by them just like any kind of literary "allusions." These facts disturb me when I read of or hear lamentations over the decline of culture and the sweeping victory of sub-culture. The fact is that where there is no sub-culture, or "sub-literature" (I put it in inverted commas) in our particular case, there is little chance for a vivid and vital "high culture" or canonized literature. The reason is not any mysterious hierarchy of cultural (or literary) structures, but the simple fact that only through its struggle with non-canonized literature does canonized literature succeed in gaining ground. I would go further and argue that even when there is a tendency towards dissociation, i.e., when the canonized system refuses to make use of the non-canonized, the very existence of non-canonized norms are indispensable for the canonized system. The interrelations between the systems are manifest here through evasion: the canonized system avoids non-canonized structures rather than manipulating, ridiculing or borrowing them. In other words: whether or not there are positive interrelations between the systems, overt, latent, direct or indirect, connected or disconnected – the very existence of inevitable differences between the systems create the peculiar literary balance that is necessary for literature.

I believe that this pattern can be observed not only in cases of full-fledged literary polysystems, such as Russian or English literatures in the nineteenth century, but even – and perhaps the more so – in cases of what I call "defective polysystems." This latter notion may seem paradoxical, since it is difficult to speak of a polysystem, when a decisive part of that polysystem is missing. But this notion is no more paradoxical than the "zero sign," which has been shown to be a very valuable tool for linguistic analysis. An example of a defective polysystem is Hebrew literature, even in its new Israeli period. This literature consisted only of a canonized system, while the non-canonized one was either totally missing or fulfilled by other literatures, Jewish (as in Yiddish literature) or non-Jewish. When the non-canonized system was totally missing, one could observe a kind of literary sterilization: Hebrew literature became heavy, highly learned, with little if any attention being paid to a potential or real public. One could even say that it became very academic, often "unreadable," even for the intelligentsia. The lack of stimuli from a strong "sub-culture" or "popular art" just does not create the need for real competition. Literature becomes highly bookish. Of course one should not forget the economic factors involved in this socio-literary pattern: competition in Russian and English literature was on economic grounds as well. Such competition made little sense in Hebrew literature, since hardly any Hebrew writer was able to make a living by writing. And when competition focusses on being famous, being noted by critics, included in school and university syllabi, the canonized system naturally wins without a struggle. Non-canonized literature, whether it exists or not.

whether it is written in another language or not, is either ignored or scorned at.

Here I would like to make a few more remarks on children's and translated literature. Children's literature need not be identified with non-canonized literature, in spite of its inferior status as against canonized literature for adults. The relations of this literary class with other classes are too intricate to be analyzed here. I would like merely to point out that as a secondary type it manifests most of the features I tried to describe above. One need only recall the brilliant analysis by Frazer in *The Golden Bough* of how meaningful ancient rites gradually ended as children's ceremonials, either as simple games or festivities. A similar process often occurs with literature for children. Structures that are taken in period A as fully effective and meaningful for an adult public, often become in period B a peculiarity of children's literature. Stories of adventure or sentimental agonies (as launched by Eugene Sue), as well as fantastic criminal mysteries, are gradually driven out from either canonized or non-canonized literature for adults and come to rest in either canonized or non-canonized literature for children. In other words, what has become a naive model for adults, is transferred to children's literature and considered there to be fully acceptable. This is just another fascinating illustration of the point made by Tynjanov on literary changes: Automatized structures do not disappear, they just move forward (or down, if you wish) from the canonized system for adults to other literary systems. This implies, though, a correction of the concept of automatization, but it need not deter us at present.

As to translated literature, its suggested status as a secondary system does not always hold true. It seems that the position of this system is a shifting one, not to speak of the differences in this matter between various national literatures. There are evidently differences between the literatures of large nations and small ones, and between old ones and young. Thus, the literature of a large nation, which is also old, would tend to put translated literature in a secondary position, while a literature of a small nation, whether old or young, would tend to give translated literature a more primary position. Of course, these are only general patterns of behavior; one has also to take into consideration more specific local factors, such as the *cultural openness* of certain people to others. For instance, Anglo-American and French literature are far more closed in this matter than German or Russian literature, which have given translation much greater weight. But I would like to stress once more that by "primary" or "secondary" I do not mean sociological status, although this might be implied, too. What is decisive in this matter is *to what extent a certain system or type plays a major role within the literary polysystem*, so that one may observe that it structurizes the center of this literature and dictates literary norms. Of course, there can be a situation where translated literature is widely read and even well paid for (if this is to be taken as a symptom of status) yet hardly plays any major role within the polysystem. There is no better way, in my view, to test such cases than by analyzing the translational norms. If one finds that the translated literature keeps to the

contemporary norms of the canonized home system or employs literary innovations and more or less "freely" uses (a relative concept, of course) the resources of language, one would tend to conclude that in this case translated literature occupies a primary position. This is more often than not coupled with the fact that translations are the province of dominant canonized writers. Still one should remember that such a situation is not evidence enough, since even dominant writers may use secondary norms in their translations, i.e., norms that are not even contiguous with their own original writings. On the other hand, if one finds that the translational norms of a certain period represent petrified norms, often simplified, i.e., similar to epigonic and non canonized norms, then there is no doubt that the translated literature in question constitutes a secondary system. As such, it represents, diachronically, a previous phase of the canonized literature, and often damages the nature of the works translated, if they belong to contemporary literature. Impressionistic or surrealistic works translated according to simplified naturalistic norms are not rare in English translations. And again, this literary situation cannot be dissociated from a general cultural background. It seems to me that only large scale research projects with the cooperation of various experts will make it possible to analyze the intricate interrelations between the various literary systems more adequately. I hope I have made some small contribution towards that end.

August 1973

(Published in:
Ha-SifrutI Literature, 17 (Sept, 1974), 45-49 (Hebrew)
Strumenti critici, No, 26 (Feb, 1975), 71-79: "Le relazioni tra sistema primario e sistema secondario alTintemo del polisistema letterario" (Italian)
Forthcoming in:
Proceedings of the Vllth Congress of the International Comparative Literature AssociationfMontreal-Ottawa, August 13-19, 1973.)

*The Position of Translated Literature Within the Literary Polysystem**

In spite of the broad recognition among historians of culture of the major role translation has played in the crystallization of national cultures, it is amazing to realize how little research has been done in this field, on either the theoretical or the descriptive level. Histories of literature mention translations only when there is no way to avoid them, when dealing with the Middle Ages or the Renaissance, for instance. One might of course find sporadic references to literary translations in various other periods, but they are seldom incorporated into the historical analysis in any coherent way. As a consequence, one hardly gets any idea whatsoever of the function of translated literature for a literature as a whole or of its position within that literature. Moreover, there is no awareness of the possible existence of translated literature as a particular literary system. The prevailing concept is rather that of "translation" or "translated works" treated on individual grounds.

In point of fact there is no reason to feign surprise at this state of affairs. After all, in most literary studies, whether of periods, genres, or writers, one hardly gets an idea about anything in terms of *historical functions.* Not merely translated literature, but all sorts of other literary systems ate dealt with *en passant,* if at all. Children's literature, magazine short stories, or thrillers, to pick up a few examples at random, are in the same boat. Western literary science, only recently beginning its attempts to rid itself of ossified historicism, has deserted the field to traditional scholars. In many respects, we have not moved much beyond the stage of Russian formalism in the early twenties. The works of Tynjanov, Ejxenbaum, or Žirmunskij on literary historiography and history have not yet been outdated and still wait to be put to actual application. The case of translated literature is therefore not unique in this connection, and we should bear that in mind even as we make it our main concern.

As is no doubt clear, I use the term "translated literature" not just as a conventional term to cut short the long circumlocution "the group of translated literary works," but as a denotation for a body of texts which is structured and functions as a system. What is the basis for such an assumption? Is there the same sort of cultural and verbal coherence within an often arbitrary group of translated works as there would seem to be within the body of original literature? After all, one might argue, original literary works written in the accepted idiom of a certain national literature correlate with each other, and there is a constant struggle, as has been demonstrated by Tynjanov, about who will win the central position. What kind of correlations might there be between translated works,

* Paper presented to the Leuven International Symposium "Literature and Translation: New Perspective in Literary Studies", The Catholic University of Leuven, 27 30 April 1976.

which are presented as completed facts, imported from other literatures, detached from their home contexts and consequently neutralized from the point of view of center-and-periphery struggles? My argument is that translated works do correlate in at least two ways: (a) in the way they are selected by the target literature, the principles of selection never being uncorrelatable with the home co-systems (to put it in the mildest way); and (b) in the way they adopt specific norms, behaviors, and policies which are a result of their relations with the other co-systems. These are not confined to the linguistic level only, but are manifest on any selection level as well. Thus, translated literature may possess modelling principles of its own, which to a certain extent could even be exclusive to it.

It seems to me that these points make it not only justifiable to talk about translated *literature,* but rather imperative to do so. I cannot see how any scholarly effort to describe and explain the behavior of the literary polysystem in synchrony and diachrony can advance in an adequate way if that is not admitted. In other words, I conceive of translated literature not only as a system in its own right, but as a system fully participating in the history of the polysystem, as an integral part of it, related with all the other co-systems My task now is to try to analyse what kind of relations obtain.

The idea of the literary polysystem need not detain us long. I first suggested this concept in 1970 in an attempt to overcome difficulties resulting from the fallacies of the traditional aesthetic approach, which prevented any preoccupation with works judged to be of no artistic value. My approach was based on the working hypothesis that it would be more *convenient* (rather than more *"true")* to take all sorts of literary and semi-literary texts as an aggregate of systems. This is by no means a totally new idea; it was strongly emphasized in the twenties by such scholars as Tynjanov, Ejxenbaum, and Šklovskij. Taking their works as a starting point, I proposed a preliminary formulation of the concept in a paper presented in 1973.

In a more recent paper, Toury discussed in some detail whether the concept is fruitful and what typologies might be suggested for it (Toury 1974). I find much of the same approach in a paper by Lotman (1973, English 1976), according to whom Baxtin's study on Rabelais (1965, English 1971) is the best analysis of the mechanism of relations between high and low literature to have been written so far on the basis of a historical corpus. In order to avoid discussing the whole issue here, I refer the reader to these works.

The polysystem hypothesis can advance our knowledge not only because it enables us to observe relations where they had hardly been looked for before, but because it helps to explain the mechanism of these relations and consequently the specific position and role of literary types in the historical existence of literature. Šklovskij sees a manifold of literary models, one of which occupies the top position while all the rest wait their turn. Tynjanov draws out attention to the struggles between innovatory and conservatory forces, policies, types, and

models within the structure of literature as a whole. Implicitly, the notion of conservationism includes simplification, schematization, and stereotyping processes. The question of "epigonic" literature becomes of major importance in this context. Consequently, we no longer have to do with an *a priori* literary stratification, but with positions assumed by various types or systems which elicit certain features. When the top position is maintained by a literary type whose pertinent nature is innovatory, the more we move down the scale of strata the more conservatory the types prove to be, but when the top position is maintained by an ossified type, it is the lower strata which tend to initiate renewals. When, in the second situation, the holders of positions do *not* change places in spite of this, the entire literature enters a state of stagnation.

In the light of these assertions, the major issue seems to me not which types are stratified high or low, but under what conditions certain types participate in the process of changes within the polysystem. This is why I have suggested the notions of primary versus secondary activities (Even-Zohar, 1973), the primary activity representing the principle of innovation, the secondary that of maintaining the established code.

What is the position of translated literature in this constellation: is it high, low, innovatory, conservatory, simplified, stereotyped? In what way does it participate or not participate in changes? My answer to the first of these questions is that translated literature may be any one of these. It maintains no unchanging position in principle. Whether it becomes primary or secondary depends upon the specific circumstances operating in the polysystem. This does not necessarily mean that its position is permanently shifting; long-lasting conditions of a certain kind may confine it for rather an extensive time to one position only.

To say that translated literature maintains a *primary* position is to say that it participates actively in *modeling the center* of the polysystem. In such a situation it is by and large an integral part of innovatory forces, and as such likely to be identified with major events in literary history while these are taking place. This implies in fact that no clear-cut distinction is then maintained between original and translated writings, and that often it is the leading writers (or members of the avant-garde who are about to become leading writers) who produce the most important translations. Moreover, in such a state when new literary models are emerging, translation is likely to become one of the means of elaborating these new models. Through the foreign work features are introduced into the home literature which did not exist there before. These include not only a possible new model of reality to replace conventions no longer effective, but a whole range of other features as well, such as a new poetic language, new matrices, techniques, intonations, whatsoever. It is clear that the very principles of selecting the works to be translated are determined by the situation governing the polysystem: the texts are picked according to their

compatibility with the new approaches and the supposedly innovatory role they may assume within the target literature.

What then are the conditions which enable a situation of this kind? It seems to me that three major cases can be discerned: (a) when a polysystem has not yet been crystallized, that is to say, when a literature is "young," in the process of being established; (b) when a literature is either "peripheral" or "weak," or both; and (c) when there are turning points, crises, or literary vacuums in a literature.

In the first instance translated literature simply fulfils the needs of a young literature to put into use its newly founded (or renewed) tongue for as many literary types as possible in order to make it functionable as a literary language and useful for its emerging public. Since a young literature cannot create major texts in all genres and types immediately, it benefits from the experience of other literatures, and translated literature becomes in such a way one of its most important systems.

The same holds true also for the second instance, that of relatively established literatures whose resources are limited and whose position within a larger literary hierarchy is generally peripheral. As a consequence of this situation, such literatures do not produce all systems "required" by the polysystemic structure, but instead fill some of them with translated literature. For instance, non-canonized literature in such cases may be wholly, or to a great extent, translated. But far more important is the consequence that the ability of such literatures to initiate innovations is often less than that of the central literatures, with the result that a relation of dependency is established not only in secondary systems, but in the very center of these literatures. (To avoid miscomprehension, I point out that these literatures may rise to a central position in a way analogous to the way this is done by secondary systems within a certain polysystem, but this is not the point which concerns us now.) As unpleasant as this idea may seem to us, since peripheral literatures tend to be identical with the literatures of smaller nations, we have no choice but to admit that within a group of relatable national literatures, such as the literatures of Europe, hierarchical relations are soon established, with the result that within this macro-polysystem some literatures take peripheral positions, which is so much as to say that they are often modelled to a large extent upon an exterior literature. For such literatures, translated literature is not only a major channel through which fashionable models are brought home, but also constitutes a model to be imitated. In certain cases we can observe that translated literature becomes the major source of alternatives. In other words, whereas richer or stronger literatures may have the option to adopt novelties from some peripheral type within their indigenous borders (as has been demonstrated by Šklovskij and Tynjanov), "weak" literatures in such situations often depend on import alone.

In the third case, the dynamics within the polysystem creates turning points, that is to say, historical moments where established models are no longer tenable for a younger generation. At such moments, even in central literatures, translated

literature may assume a primary position. This is all the more true when at a turning point no item in the indigenous stock is taken to be acceptable, as a result of which a literary "vacuum" occurs. In such a vacuum, it is easy for foreign models to infiltrate, and translated literature may consequently assume a primary position. Of course, in the case of "weak" literatures or literatures which are in a constant state of impoverishment (lack of literary items and types existing in a neighbour or accessible foreign literature), this situation is even more overwhelming.

To say, on the other hand, that translated literature maintains a *secondary* position is to say that it constitutes a peripheral system within the polysystem, generally assuming the character of epigonic writing. In other words, in such a situation it has no influence on major processes and is modelled according to norms already conventionally established by an already dominant type. Translated literature in this case becomes a major factor of conservatism. While the contemporary original literature might go on developing new norms and models, translated literature adheres to norms which have been either recently or long before rejected by the (newly) established center. It no longer maintains positive correlations with original writing. A highly interesting paradox manifests itself here : translation, by which new ideas, items, characteristics can be introduced into a literature, becomes a means to preserve traditional taste. This discrepancy between the original central literature and the translated literature may have evolved in a variety of ways. For instance, when translated literature, after having emerged as a primary system within a situation of great changes, soon lost contact with the original home literature which went on changing, and thereby remained untouched. Thus, a literature that might have emerged as a revolutionary type may go on as an ossified *système d'antan*, often fanatically guarded by the agents of secondary activities against even minor changes.

The conditions which enable this second state are of course diametrically opposite to those which give rise to translated literature as a primary system: either there are no major changes in the polysystem or these changes are not effected through the intervention of interliterary relations materialized in the form of translations.

The hypothesis that translated literature may be either a primary or secondary system does not imply that it is always wholly the one or the other. As a system, translated literature is itself stratified, and from the point of view of polysystemic analysis it is from the vantage point of the central stratum that all relations within the system are observed. This means that while one section of translated literature may assume a primary position, another may remain secondary. In the foregoing analysis I pointed out the close relationship between literary contacts and the status of translated literature. This seems to me the major clue in this issue. When there is intense interference, it is that portion of translated literature deriving from a major source literature which is likely to

assume a primary position. For instance, in the Hebrew literary polysystem between the two world wars literature translated from the Russian assumed an unmistakable primary position, while works translated from English, German, Polish, and other languages assumed an obviously secondary one. Moreover, since the major and most innovatory translational norms were produced by translations from the Russian, other translated literature adhered to the models and norms elaborated by those translations.

The historical material analyzed so far in terms of polysystemic operations is too limited to provide any far-reaching conclusions about the chances of translated literature to assume a certain position. But work carried out in this field by various other scholars, as well as my own research, indicates that the "normal" position assumed by translated literature tends to be the *secondary* one. This should in principle be compatible with theoretical speculation. It may be assumed that in the long run no system can remain in a constant state of weakness, "turning point," or crisis, although the possibility should not be excluded that some polysystems may maintain such states for quite a long time. As a rule, in order that there might be change, there must be some stability. Admittedly, the fact should not be ignored that not ail polysystems are structured in the same way, and cultures do differ significantly. For instance, it is clear that the French cultural system, French literature naturally included, is much more rigid than most other systems. This, combined with the long traditional central position of French literature within the European context (or, if you wish, within the European macro-polysystem), have caused French translated literature to assume an extremely secondary position. The state of Anglo-American literature is rather similar, while Russian, German, or Scandinavian would seem to show different patterns of behavior in this respect.

What bearings may the position taken by translated literature have on translational norms, behaviors, and policies? As I stated above, the distinction between a translated work and an original work in terms of literary behavior is a clear function of the position assumed by the translated literature at a given time. When it takes a primary position, the borderlines are *diffuse*, so that the very category of "translated works" must be extended to semi- and quasi-translations as well. From the point of view of translation theory I think this is a more adequate way to deal with such phenomena than to reject them on the basis of a static and a-historical conception of translation. In any case, as translational activity participates, when it assumes a primary position, in the process of creating new models, the translator's main concern is not to look for ready-made models in his home stock, into which the original texts could be transferable ; instead he is prepared to violate the home conventions. Under such conditions the chances that a translation will be close to the original in terms of adequacy (in other words a reproduction of the dominant textual relations of the original) are greater than otherwise. Of course,

from the point of view of the target literature the adopted translational norms might for a while be too foreign and revolutionary, and if the new trend is defeated in the literary struggle, the translations made according to its conceptions will never gain ground. But if the new trend is victorious, the code of translated literature may be enriched and become more flexible. Under any circumstances, from the point of view of translation behavior such periods are almost the only ones when a translator is prepared to go far beyond the options offered to him by the established code and is willing to attempt a different treatment of the textual relations of the original. Let us remember that under stable conditions items lacking in a target literature may remain untransferred if the state of the polysystem does not allow innovations. But the process of opening the system gradually brings closer certain literatures and in the longer tun enables a situation where the postulates of adequacy and the realities of equivalence may overlap to a relatively high degree. This is the case of the European literatures, though in some of them the mechanism of rejection has been so strong that the changes I am talking about have been rather on a limited scale.

Naturally, translated literature when it occupies a secondary position behaves totally otherwise. Since it is then the translator's main effort to concentrate upon finding the best ready-made models for the foreign text, the result often turns out to be a non-adequate translation or (as I would prefer to put it) a greater discrepancy between the equivalence achieved and the adequacy postulated.

In other words, not only is the socio-literary status of translation dependent upon its position within the polysystem but the very practice of translation is strongly subordinated to it. And even the question of what is a translated work cannot be answered *a priori* in terms of an a-historical out-of-context idealized state: it must be determined on the grounds of the operations governing the polysystem. Seen from this point of view, translation is no longer a phenomenon whose nature and borders are given once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relations within a certain cultural system. Consequently, such key concepts as adequacy and equivalence cannot be dealt with fairly unless the implications of polysystemic positions are taken into account. I would go as far as to say that this negligence is one of the major mistakes of contemporary translation theories, which lean too heavily on static linguistic models or underdeveloped theories of literature. I have attempted to sketch some points which might give us greater ability to formulate questions relevant for the literary situation.

Amsterdam-Leuven, April 1976.

(Forthcoming in:
Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies. James S. Holmes, José Lambert and Raymond van den Broeck, eds.,ACCO, Antwerp & Leuven).

The Polysystem Hypothesis Revisited

Work developing the polysystem hypothesis goes on, its applicability being discussed and tested in various investigations (Toury [1974] [1976] ; Lambert [1976]; Scholz [1976] ; Shavit [1974] [1976] ; cf. also Nemer's detailed survey [1977], esp. 71-75, 76-78, 80-82). This is encouraging for the development of historical poetics within the framework of the semiotics of literature. Yet in order for it to cope more adequately than previous models with the complexity of phenomena it hopes to explain, its major notions require continued reformulation and reevaluation. As several points seem now neither fully explicated nor fully understood, I would like to discuss them below, though no exhaustive reconsideration of relevant questions will be attempted.

1. *The PS hypothesis involves a rejection of value judgments as criteria for an a priori selection of the objects of study.*
Although this is the most unsophisticated principle derived from the PS hypothesis, it seems to need special emphasis. It is based on the assumption that we can no longer confine ourselves m the historical analysis of literature to the so called masterpieces, even if we consider them the only reason for studying literature at all. Further, this kind of elitist attitude must be banished altogether from literary historiography. This has nothing to do with standards we may have as critics or private readers. It means rather, that as scholars committed to the discovery of the mechanisms of literary history, we cannot use arbitrary and temporary value judgments as criteria in selecting the objects of study in a historical context. The prevalent value judgments of any period are themselves an integral part of the objects to be observed. No field of study can select its objects according to norms of taste without losing its status as an intersubjective discipline. Naturally one may take an interest in one particular area of a broad field but even then it is clear that no particular part of any system can be analyzed in isolation. On the other hand, I would like to warn against what can be termed a "reverse high-brow" approach. There is a tendency among what we might call "high-brows with a bad conscience" to ignore cultural hierarchies altogether and play up, instead, popular, commercial or naive literature as "the true and exclusive culture," the kind that *really* matters for a historian. This kind of approach, popular enough in certain circles, is no more useful than traditional elitism or any other form of romantic enthusiasm for products of "the true spirit of the nation," uncorrupted, as it were, by sophisticated civilization. A non-elitist and non-evaluative historiography will attempt to eliminate *all* sorts of biases. The PS hypothesis, therefore, should not be allowed to become a pseudo-rational justification for "democratic" ideas (often expressed by the denigration of "high-brow" culture) propagated by literary agents. Such trends, legitimate as they may be within the context of "literary struggle," have nothing to do with a discipline whose task is to observe it.

2. *The PS hypothesis allows for a more adequate analysis of intra- and interrelations.*

Traditionally, both literature and language have been discussed in terms of homogeneity. With both, homogeneity has been wrongly identified with structuredness and systematicity. This unsubstantiated conception, completely out of date in linguistics, was also rejected in the 1920s by Tynjanov and Jakobson, separately and together (cf. Tynjanov [1929a], Tynjanov & Jakobson [1928]). The notion of a dynamic system, undergoing constant change, the process of which is in itself a system, i.e., a structure, has since been regrettably ignored by poetics making possible the triumph of the erroneous synchronistic fallacy in the works of the so called French structuralists, now so popular in Anglo-American circles. This notion, however, lies at the base of our PS hypothesis. Its merit lies not only in the possibility of integrating history *(both* synchrony and diachrony) into poetics (and the semiotics of culture) and preventing both the theoretically and empirically intolerable transformation of a historical object into a series of a-historical occurrences. Its supreme merit is in making it possible to think of a heterogeneous whole, a whole which is structured, and consequently whose elements are mutually dependent, in spite of the possible contradictory and seemingly incompatible features of each of them in isolation. It thus becomes clear that in order for a system to function, uniformity need not be postulated. One only need assume the center-and-peripheiy relation in order to be able to reconciliate heterogeneity with functionality. Thus, the notion of hierarchy, of strata, is not only unavoidable but useful as well. To augment this with the notion of a system of systems, a multiple system, i.e., a system whose intersections are more complex, is but a logical step necessitated by the need to elaborate a model "closer" to "the real world." There is nothing in the *polysystem* which was not in the [uni]system except for the stress on the multiplicity of intersections, and hence the greater complexity of structuredness involved. On the theoretical level, this would require more sophisticated theorems and the calculation of probabilities would be, so to speak, less finite.

Perhaps more room will be given for "entropy," which may be quantitatively higher due to the fact that more relations must be taken into consideration, and more than one center (or rather a hierarchy of centers) must be postulated. On the descriptive level, this would simply make it possible to focus on a larger variety of observables without having to reduce the probable *number* of relations detected. From the point of view of further investigation, the PS hypothesis will entail more risk but it may also produce a more flexible model for coping with the complex hierarchy which literature is in its broad sense.

These principles, valid for the *intra*-relations of the system, seem to hold true for its *inter*-relations, too. Here we are faced with yet another augmentation of the model, i.e., with the assumption that the literary PS is just a component of a larger PS – that of "culture" to which it is, semiotically speaking, both subjugated

and iso-morphic (cf. “On Systemic Universal in Cultural History,” below, pp. 39-44), and thus correlated both with this greater whole and its other components. The complicated questions of how one literature correlates with another, how literature correlates with society, language, economy, etc., may here merit less simplistic and reductionist hypotheses than otherwise. Thus, the infiltration of a literary PS *A* into a literary PS *B*, for instance, need no longer be taken as occurring on either an individual (“molecular”) basis, or through one particular stratum or another (e.g., the central one[s]). The polysystemic structure of literature postulated here can account for more, and (in an ultimate phase of its development) hopefully follow up the full course of interference processes.

Similarly, social facts need no longer be assumed to find an immediate and unidirectional, univocal, form in literature, as primitive sociology or history of ideas (Marxism included) would like us to believe. The intricate correlations between these cultural systems, if seen as iso-morphic in nature and functional only within a cultural whole, can be observed on the basis of their mutual give-and-take, which often occurs obliquely, i.e., through transformational devices, and often via peripheries. I think I have demonstrated this at least in part in my observations on the function of translated literature and other strata which function largely at the periphery. The elaboration of social phenomena in semiotic terms now being carried out by a number of scholars will, hopefully, supply the conceptual common ground hitherto lacking.

Two examples may perhaps illustrate the point. The first is the suggestion that once we have postulated the notion of system as a construct for an otherwise incoherent conglomerate of isolated facts, we may very well suppose that systems do “exist.” The notion of volume, therefore, may be posited for them, i.e , the PS can be taken to be an augmented S (“unisystem”). If we assume that the literary system is iso-morphic with, say, the social system, its hierarchies can only be conceived of as intersecting with the hierarchies of that social system. The idea of a less stratified literature becoming more stratified, which I suggested as a universal (“All literary systems strive to become polysystemic” cf. “On Systemic Universal in Cultural History” p. 39) can be thus understood because of the homologous relations obtaining between literature and society. Accordingly, if the PS hypothesis is available, more adequate interrelations can be detected. The same holds true for a key notion of the PS hypothesis, that of the canonized/non-canonized dichotomy. This dichotomy is formulated in literary terms, because literature is assumed to be a self-regulating system. Thus, stratification is carried out by the interrelations within the system. But such a conception is tenable only if the literary PS, like any other of a cultural semiotic nature, is simultaneously autonomous and heteronomous with all other semiotic co-systems. The degree of autonomy and heteronomy will depend on whether the co-systemic items (“facts”) function at its center or periphery. Thus, facts of “literary life,” e.g., literary ideologies, publishing houses, criticism, literary groups – or any other means for dictating taste (cf. Ejxenbaum

[1929], 1971.) function in a more immediate way for the stratification of the PS than other social "facts." In other words, literary stratification, (or, for the PS, multi-stratification), does not operate on the level of "texts" alone, nor are texts stratified exclusively according to features inherent in them. Rather, the constraints imposed upon the "literary" PS by its various semiotic co-systems contribute their share to the hierarchical relations governing it.

3. *The PS hypothesis is a functional concept, not a tool for classification.* Classificatory habits are hard to dislodge and tend to creep in unnoticed. They can be a serious pitfall when trying to apply concepts suggested by the PS theory. Moreover, on the research level, they produce a preoccupation with irrelevant and futile questions, such as what specific "class" ("stratum") each individual text under study "belongs" to. This is fruitless because the PS theory, including the canonized/non-canonized dichotomy, is simply not intended to answer such questions. It rather attempts to provide more sophisticated tools for overcoming reductionist models and explaining how a great deal of heterogeneous data undergoing constant change is interrelated and able to function as a meaningful whole. This, within, and/or for, other homologous wholes which together constitute "human culture." The PS hypothesis is, therefore, a functional, not a typological-classificational concept. It is concerned with dynamic complexes, not with static phenomena. The functions it may detect are conditioned by complex inter- and intra-relations within a hypothesized multi-leveled system. The formal items supposed to carry these functions are admitted as "facts" of this system only if such functions can be hypothesized for them, i.e , only if it is analytically fruitful to consider them as variously (cor)related with other items to which the same procedure applies. Further, being a historical phenomenon, the range and nature of the PS "facts" necessarily change. Formal units change their functions, while functions shift to other formal units. The principles according to which these processes occur are of a systemic nature on both the diachronic and synchronic axes. In short, all standard hypotheses of systems theory must be kept in mind.

I believe that two implications immediately follow. First, if one *is* interested in using the PS theory for classification, the idea of rigid nomenclature must be rejected. Otherwise, the PS theory will be of little use. Clearly, more detailed categories must be elaborated to that end, as the PS theory itself is not designed for such a purpose. Secondly, the object of study of the PS hypothesis cannot be individual texts, although they are no doubt indispensable to it. Since the PS is supposed to be a network of multi-relations, it is imperative that it deal with many texts, often through sampling methods. Hence, it is the idea of the *model* (i.e., a certain selection from a repertoire upon which proper textual relations* have already been imposed) which needs replace that of the individual

* Order, concatenation and positions (matrix), cf. Even-Zohar,1972.

text. The latter is discussed as a manifestation of a certain model, whether conservative or innovatory (and thus unprecedented). The importance of a text for the PS is determined only by the position it might have occupied in the process of model creation and/or preservation. Instead of dealing with texts exclusively as closed systems, we are directed towards developing concepts of the literary repertoire, the literary model and methods of handling large numbers of texts, among them sampling. Obviously, the *syntagmatic* aspects of the literary text, the "proper textual relations" are insufficient, even with the most advanced formulations, to fulfill the demands of the PS hypothesis on levels of both theory and research.

4. *Canonized* vs. *non-canonized is a stratificational opposition.*
In my paper "The Relations Between Primary and Secondary Systems" (above, pp. 14-20), I attempted to provide a model consisting of two pairs of oppositions for handling the PS relations: canonized vs. non-canonized and primary vs. secondary. The canonized/non-canonized dichotomy is intended to represent the "macro-opposition" of the multi-layered system. Although it might be possible to reduce it to the more general notions of systems theory, i.e., center vs. periphery, it was felt that the augmented concept of the PS required a more specific term to denote the tension between official and unofficial cultural strata. Moreover, this was not just a question of terminology as center-and-periphery relations are hypothesized for *both* the canonized and the non-canonized strata. Hence, this distinction makes it possible to observe more than *one* center and periphery within each system and there is, therefore, no need to replace (or "improve") such a dynamic model with trichotomies, as has been suggested (cf. Toury. 1974: 2.1.3). Such notions as high-, middle- and low-brow may be useful for popular discussion, but constitute a real burden on theory and research. One of the difficulties in handling them is their tendency to develop into classification categories and increase indefinitely.

Canonicity, however, is not a simple notion, i.e., it does not express *one* clear-cut relation but, rather, a bundle of relations, which have not yet been satisfactorily clarified. Moreover, it expresses, by a contiguity of ideas, not only the status already acquired by a particular literary unit (text, model), but also its potential status. That is, it can be applied to literary units either about to gain status or about to lose status. The former, because of newly-created options, possess the potential of moving from the periphery into the center of the canonized system. The latter, on the other hand, tend to decline in the center although their status may still be perpetuated. The latter, technically known in the literature as "epigonic," may easily be pushed into non-canonized strata once such units give up certain features. As the situation on the margin is constantly fluctuating, only minute historical comparative analysis will be able to cope with an attempt at description. A-historical classification attempted on such a corpus

must fail. It should be emphasized that canonicity is analogous not to the hierarchical oppositions of language function, but to the hierarchical relations governing the linguistic *polysystem.* The oppositions that determine what variety of language will be considered "standard," "civilized," "vulgar," "slang," or "high-brow," are not primarily linguistic, but socio-cultural. The selection of a certain aggregate of features for the assumption of a certain status is extraneous in this case to that aggregate itself. Obviously, once it has been selected, it may also contribute to its own continued select position. But even then it would only be perpetuating a principle which was generated not by itself, but by some other system. Canonized literature, supported in all circumstances by either conservatory or novatory *elites,* is constrained by those cultural patterns which govern the behavior of the latter. If sophistication, eccentricity or the opposite features are required by the elite to gratify its taste and control the center of the cultural semiotic system, then canonicity will adhere to these features as closely as it can. Of course, many components of this mechanism have in fact been transformed into functions operating within co-systems "closer" to the literary PS. Facts of "literary life," i.e., literary establishments such as criticism (not scholarship), publishing houses, periodicals and other mediating factors, are often "translation" functors of the "more remote" constraining socio-cultural system. Thus we are enabled to carry out descriptive work, at least up to a certain extent, "in the field of literature itself," and supply poetics with well-defined terms of reference. We can observe what features agglomerate around which models, and assume that the PS "regulates itself" (cf. Lotman: 1976); that is, we simply register what status has been dictated by what functors of "literary life," especially by those explicitly formulated, e.g., polemical articles, encyclopedias, traditional literary histories, school syllabi, etc. Intra-systemic analysis is therefore perfectly manageable; moreover, it is indispensable if we wish to avoid falling back on prefunctionalist practices or a-historical, positivist sociology. But if we reject the idea that the intra-systemic stratification relations within a PS are ultimately constrained by the larger socio-cultural system, we will be left with a set of questions badly asked and badly answered.

5. *Primary vs. secondary is a historical-typological notion.*

While the idea of canonicity denotes hierarchical relations, the primary/secondary dichotomy refers to the degree (and type) of admissibility of new elements into a closed repertoire. I would therefore drop the term "system" in connection with it, and replace it with "pattern" or "model." When a repertoire is established, and all derivative models are constructed in full accordance with what it makes available, then we are faced with a conservative system. Every individual product (text) of the system will be highly predictable, and any deviation will be considered outrageous. Products of the conservative system I label "secondary." Contrariwise, the augmentation and restructuration of a

repertoire by the introduction of new elements, as a result of which each product is less predictable, are expressions of an innovatory system. The models it offers are of the "primary" type: the pre-condition for their functioning is the discontinuity of established models. Of course, this is a purely historical notion. It does not take long for any "primary" model, once it is admitted into the center of the canonized system, to become "secondary," if perpetuated long enough. The struggle between the primary and secondary options is not a lesser determinant of system evolution than the struggle between high and low strata within the system. Naturally, change occurs only when a primary model takes over the center of a system: its perpetuation denotes stabilization and a new conservatism. Usually, perpetuation is governed by its own specific rules. Thus, it has not been possible so far to observe the perpetuation of any primary model without structural modifications that can be termed in an ad hoc manner "simplification." This does not mean that primary models are more sophisticated than secondary, but that during the course of their perpetuation, and within the secondary models which ultimately emerge out of them, a process of reduction takes place. For instance, heterogeneous models are ultimately transformed into homogeneous models; the number of incompatible patterns within the same structure is thus reduced; complex relations are gradually replaced by less complex and so on. Naturally, the reverse procedure takes place when a secondary model is manipulated in such a way that it is virtually transformed into a primary one.

As I argued above (§4.), canonicity does not necessarily overlap with primariness, although this may have been the case in more recent times, i.e , since the Romantic Age. It is therefore important to discover the sort of relations which obtain between canonized/non-canonized systems and primary/secondary models. The more we observe literature with the help of these notions, the more it becomes apparent that we are facing an overall semiotic mechanism rather than an exclusively literary one. As systems are governed by those who control them, the tools fought for will depend on their relative efficacy for controlling the system. Thus, when control can be achieved only by break ("change"), this becomes the leading popular principle. It will not be supported however, as long as "perpetuation" can satisfy those who might lose more by break. Naturally, once there is a takeover, the new repertoire will not admit elements which are likely to endanger its control. The process of "secondarization" of the primary thus turns out to be unavoidable. It is further reinforced by a parallel mechanism of "secondarization," by which a system manages to stabilize itself, or repress innovation. By such a process, new elements are retranslated, as it were, into the old terms, thus imposing previous functions on new carriers rather than changing the functions. Thus, as in the case of a new regime which carries on the institutions of the old by transferring their functions to new bodies, so a primary literary model, gradually altered, serves the same functions of secondary models of a previous stage. Semiotically speaking, this is a mechanism by which the less immediately understandable, the less

decipherable, becomes more so. The less familiar, and hence more frightening, more demanding and loaded with more information, becomes more familiar, less frightening and so on. Empirically, this seems to be what the overwhelming majority of "culture consumers" really prefer, and when one desires to control them, this preference will be fully met.

As with Pandora's box, the PS hypothesis may let loose many questions the answers for which are neither easy nor always pleasant. There is much work to be done, a fact not less encouraging than frightening.

Tel Aviv, October 1977

II

On Systemic Universals in Cultural History

Universals of Literary Contacts

Interference in Dependent Literary Polysystems

*On Systemic Universals in Cultural History**

I

The overall conceptual framework which semiotics tried to provide for the sciences of man was never reductionist in nature. Because of its vast scope, it was always dominated by the idea of human activity as an aggregate of sign systems carrying information, i.e., a system of systems necessarily correlated and functioning despite their heterogeneity as a *structured* whole.

It is this view that has made it possible to renew scientific investigation of those areas which could not previously be integrated into the systematic sciences of man. Deep dissatisfaction with both the metaphysics of the *Geistesgeschichte* and the dogmatic doctrines of art as a reflection of life resulted in relatively prolonged neglect of questions intuitively felt to be important: the relations between "world," art and society, and the function of the historical context for them, As a consequence, history, society, language, literature, culture, and other semiotic systems have been isolated and dealt with separately. True, this made it possible for each of the disciplines to better clarify its scope and define its methods. But now an atmosphere of crisis has focussed the concern of many scholars on semiotics. Crises have always been beneficial for the development of science, and thus, the emerging semiotic framework has made it possible for various disciplines to meet again and even open their borders to integrate previously rejected fields of study. But even more important it has rendered the search for the general possible without losing sight of the particular. In this connection one of the most valuable contributions seems to have been the revival of the notion of culture in correlation with language, literature and other sign systems.

In numerous works, Soviet semioticians have been discussing culture and the way to investigate it semiotically. In a recent article by Lotman, Uspenskij, Ivanov, Toporov & Pjatigorskij, culture is discussed in the following terms (1975:57):

> In the study of culture the initial premise is that all human activity concerned with the processing, exchange, and storage of information possesses a certain unity. Individual sign systems, though they presuppose immanently organized structures, function only in unity, supported by one another. None of the sign systems possesses a mechanism which would enable it to function culturally in isolation. Hence it follows that, together with an approach which permits us to construct a series of relatively autonomous sciences of the semiotic cycle, we shall also admit another approach, according to which all of them examine particular aspects of the *semiotics of culture,* of the study of the functional correlation of different sign systems.

* Paper presented to the Tel Aviv Symposium "Literature and Meaning in Language, Society and History," The Porter Israeli Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University, April 28, 1977.

Consequently, the authors believe, "culture is constructed as a hierarchy of semiotic systems" and "it is precisely [this] inner structure, the composition and correlation of particular semiotic subsystems, which determine the type of culture in the first place" (ibid., 61). They admit that "several cultures may also form a functional or structural unity" and that "such an approach proves especially fruitful in solving problems of the comparative study of culture" (ibid.). Thus, "culture" is considered the highest regulating principle of organized human activity, which, by means of its subsystems, manages to structure the world for human society. Yet it seems that certain subsystems, due to their ready-made organizational features, may have a more central role for the function of culture than others. Thus, Lotman and Uspenskij state in their article "On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture" (1971) that

> The main "work" of culture [. . .] is the structural organization of the surrounding world. Culture is a generator of "structuredness" and it creates social sphere around man which, like biosphere, makes life possible (in this case social and not organic). But in order to fulfil this role, culture must possess a structural "stamping device". This function is carried out by natural language. The language imparts an intuitive feeling of structure to all members of the community: by its evident systemic nature [. . .], by its transformation of an "open" world of realia into a "closed" world of names, language makes people treat as structures even such phenomena the structural nature of which is, at least, not self-evident. (Lotman & Uspenskij, 1971:146-147; quoted from Segal, 1974 94-95.)

Language, no doubt, is the most articulate and least mediated sign system, and also has the ability to comment upon itself. But even from the works of the above-mentioned Russian scholars it is evident that the role of literature as an "organizer of the world" has not been less central. Moreover, as an activity expressed by language, yet integrating into itself other sign systems by means of larger modelling units than those possessed by language *per se*, it has become an even more powerful organizer. This can be corroborated by the data which history offers us which indicate what a tremendous role literature played in the crystallization of the cultures of various collectives. This also clarifies the privileged status assigned to literature since the emergence of modern nationalist ideology in the Romantic Age.

Taking all of these considerations into account it should be clear by now that the semiotic idea of culture is by no means a modern disguise for traditional *Geistesgeschichte* nor a new hash of various disciplines. Not only is it capable of becoming a powerful working hypothesis, tightly linked with both language and literature in a *concrete* way, but it already appears that we have little choice as to whether or not to use it. Unless we want to repeat the mistake

of interpreting a general principle as if it were a unique feature of one subsystem or another, we will be forced, eventually, to consider cultural phenomena as both structured by and iso-structural with other semiotic systems, notably though not exclusively literature and language. In other words, even if our individual points of departure are language, literature, sociology, history, fashion or public traffic, we are likely to reach a point at which we cannot proceed satisfactorily unless we consider our specialized fields as both iso-structural and correlated with culture, that is both structuring it and structured by it.

II

Using these conclusions as working hypotheses, I would like to discuss the question of universals in cultural history or, rather, culture within the historical context. Once we overcome our "fear" of the notion of culture, the quest for universals has to be seen as implied by it. If we think of "culture" in terms of a universal phenomenon which manifests itself in various times and places as *a specific culture*, there remains no theoretical basis for rejecting the possibility of formulating universals. The quest for universals has been an intellectual goal for many generations, and has been discussed recently with some intensity in the framework of linguistics and the philosophy of language. Many objections have been raised to the often uncontrolled data used or far-fetched conclusions reached in linguistic inquiry in this field. But as long as universals do not become the new ideological dogmas of our time, as long as they are seen as historical generalizations rather than unhistorical truths, they are no more hazardous or unreliable than any other scientific hypothesis.

At a symposium in honor of Roman Jakobson (Bielefeld Interdisciplinary Center, April 20-22, 1975), the question of language universals was discussed, in a not altogether positive or fraternal spirit. The distinguished semiotician had to take a firm stand in favor of universals, and he did so in a most unusual way. Instead of arguing for high-level universals he simply maintained that not only can our basic linguistic hypotheses be easily reformulated in terms of universals but that their status as such is unavoidable. For example, he said, we cannot conceive of language without consonants, nor, from another angle, can we conceive of it without communication. Hence, these *are* universals, amply sustained as far as human language is concerned. At that moment I realized that much of our work in poetics could have been reformulated in such a way, at the cost, it is true, of making bold statements which hitherto might have been disguised as solid commonplaces. Steps can be taken towards reinterpreting our concepts in terms of universals as well as directing further accumulation of data to that end. At the end of 1975 I formulated a series of possible universals in a specific section of historical poetics, that of literatures in contact ("Universals

of literary Contact," above pp. 45-53). I realized that the result was a set of more coherent generalizations where before we had had a body of isolated or badly linked hypotheses. In addition, the generalizations thus formulated opened immense opportunities for new research. However, while working on the particular universals it became increasingly clear that on such a level of abstraction almost *all* processes analyzed in the literary system could be seen as iso-structural with the cultural system as a whole, and/or with any of its components. Thus, the conclusions arrived at on the basis of speculation could have been drawn from the descriptive work carried out which was historical by nature. Therefore, the danger of static observation where the dynamic principle is dominant could be eliminated.

True, the concept of historicity is not unequivocal, but people tend to neglect the solid, rich tradition developed in that field of modern poetics since the pioneering work of Tynjanov, Ejxenbaum, Jakobson, Žirmunskij and others. According to this tradition, the historical dimension is conceived of as a polychronic system, and should by no means be identified with the static and partial notion of diachrony professed by Saussure. It is to be regretted that such misunderstanding dominated the science of language for decades, in spite of the work done in Russia and Czechoslovakia prior to World War II. Jurij Tynjanov and Roman Jakobson had already made this point in their famous 1928 *theses*:

> The sharp opposition of synchronic (static) and diachronic cross sections has recently become a fruitful working hypothesis, both for linguistics and for the history of literature; this opposition reveals the nature of language (literature) as a system at each individual moment of its existence. At the present time, the achievements of the synchronic concept force us to reconsider the principles of diachrony as well. The idea of the mechanical agglomeration of material, having been replaced by the concept of system or structure in the realm of synchronic study, underwent a corresponding replacement in the realm of diachronic study as well. The history of a system is in turn a system. Pure synchronism now proves to be an illusion: every synchronic system has its past and its future as inseparable structural elements of the system: (a) archaism as a fact of style; the linguistic and literary background recognized as the rejected old-fashioned style; (b) the tendency in language and literature recognized as innovation in the system.
>
> The opposition between synchrony and diachrony was an opposition between the concept of system and the concept of evolution; thus it loses its importance in principle as soon as we recognize that every system necessarily exists as an evolution, whereas, on the other hand, evolution is inescapably of a systemic nature. (Tynjanov & Jakobson, 1928; quoted from Matejka & Pomorska, 1971:79-80.)

The following illustration will clarify my point. It was hypothesized by various scholars, myself included, that literature within the historical context can be conceived of as a polysystem, that is, a stratified whole, where the various strata function as systems. This should have turned out to be particularly fruitful for both description and explanation of the dynamics of literature within the historical context. As soon as I started working with this hypothesis, it appeared that there were cases of literatures which were otherwise structured: they were unstratified and lacked items, or even whole strata, already established in some of the highly developed literatures. But this also turned out to be a fallacy, caused by our traditional prejudices concerning the borders of literature. Thus, both in full-fledged, highly developed polysystems and in defective ones (those which lacked items), a strong and marked cline of stratification was *always* present. True, different means were used to achieve this and the degrees of detailed stratification differed largely in the various cases in the course of history. But it became clear that no literature really ever functions as a non-stratified whole, and, if the correlation between the strata within it disintegrates for some reason or other, a sort of stagnation takes over. As a result the system collapses. This has been amply demonstrated in more than one historical case. Thus, the methodological hypothesis which presumed literature to be a polysystem could now be reversed and reformulated in terms of a universal: *all literary systems strive to become polysystemic.* Even those which appear to function otherwise turn out in the long run to behave according to the same pattern.

I intend no *jonglement de mots* here. I am not looking for another way to say "the same thing." It is an altogether *different* hypothesis, and a much more risky one. Still, it is testable, refutable, and definitely calls for the accumulation of vast new data and the reinterpretation of the old. But here is a second point, and this is that such a universal cannot possibly be conceived of as peculiar to the literary system exclusively. *All* cultural systems seem to follow the same pattern of behavior, and although it goes without saying that the sign-strata cannot be materially the same, the same principles apply. This should not sound new to either linguists or sociologists, although I can not point to any exact formulation. There is no un-stratified language, even if the dominant ideology governing the norms of the system do not allow for an *explicit* consideration of other than the high, or canonized, strata. The same holds true for the structure of society and everything involved in that complex phenomenon. Moreover, all anti-stratification ideologies and experiments on the social level have turned out to be unsuccessful. What might have changed are the *means* by which stratificational oppositions are inherently maintained. That is to say, certain aspects of social injustice may have been eliminated in one society or another, but as soon as they were eliminated, others replaced them for stratification purposes, perhaps with less social harm to the underprivileged. The very same process governs language change from the point of view of register hierarchy. To quote one example, between 1969

and 1970 through propaganda and wide consensus, the Swedish people decided to eliminate from their language the polite pronoun “ni”, equivalent to the French “vous” and the German “Sie”. This should have increased egalitarian feelings among large sections of Swedish society, but soon new stratificational means appeared to distinguish between more and less intimate speech. Only that particular formalized opposition was neutralized.

If we accept this kind of reasoning and consider it fruitful for cultural history, then a whole series of hypotheses connected with the one illustrated above can be elaborated. Such questions could be the struggle between innovatory and conservatory forces within a system, manifested in terms of primary versus secondary activities, using either literary models or fashion norms; or the universality of the processes whereby items rise to the center and are pushed to the periphery; or the less acknowledged process by which all primary features in diachrony become secondary after having been simplified and standardized. All these, and many other points, *need* to be and *should* be reinterpreted and reformulated as universals.

Tel Aviv, April 1977.

Universals of Literary Contacts

1. *Introduction*

There is an incredible number of works dealing with particular cases of literary relations, contacts or influences. And there has been a great deal of discussion recently on basic problems of comparative literary studies. Still, relatively little has been done in terms of generalizations as to when and under what conditions such contacts emerge, take place and decline, and what their characteristic features are.

In this article I intend to raise some major questions about literary contacts which I have labelled in a rather pretentious way *Universals of literary contacts.* Of course, the very existence of "universals" may be doubted. One may argue that the variety of cases and the fluctuous historical contexts are too complex and divergent to make them really available. Moreover, the state of our knowledge in this area is so lamentable that a lot of work must be done before any such attempt can be made. My point of departure, however, is the very opposite. It is *because* of this poor state that I consider it highly valuable to posit a set of universals, the controversial nature of which might force both methodological speculations and research into a position where this issue can no longer be neglected. In other words, although the value and existence of universals cannot yet be reasonably maintained, it seems to me worthwhile trying to formulate some.

Investigating literary contacts should by no means be taken as a sine qua non of historical studies under any circumstances. Many issues of a historical description of national literatures can in fact be investigated without undertaking any research into the nature of literary contacts at all. I find it necessary to stress this point because of the current practice by literary scholars to mix up comparative studies with general literary ones and to subsume under these headings problems which do not belong to them at all. Thus, when a target literature is relatively independent, a source literature might be of secondary importance for its evolution. On the other hand, when a target literature is highly dependent, literary contacts might be a major factor for its development. Consequently, the major condition for considering contacts to be valuable is the extent of their contribution to the structure of a literature. Obviously, when a whole period, a whole genre or a group of major writers use appropriations from a source literature in order to introduce changes in their proper system, a historian of literature can no longer ignore this.

2. *Some terms for literary contacts*

Two literatures related to each other in one way or another are said to have *contacts.* These may be either *unilateral* and/or *bilateral,* which means that they are either maintained in both literatures or only by one of them. The contact shows itself in such a way that a literature A *interferes* with a literature B.

Thus, literature B takes over from A certain items: components of the literary stock, techniques, whole models and matrices. Via this taking over, many non-literary items may also move from A to B: verbal expressions, whole attitudes, socio-linguistic patterns, etc. In such types of relation A may be called the *source literature* (SLt), and B the *target literature* (TLt). From the point of view of the SLt, an item is *expropriated* by the TLt, while from the point of view of the TLt, an item is *appropriated.*

If the rate of appropriations in a TLt is very massive, we may speak of an *invasion,* whereas a gradual and limited stream of appropriations may be called an *infiltration.* In terms of the item itself, it is *introduced* into a TLt so as to be *transplanted.* This may turn out to be either successful or futile. Often, due to *resistance* (the opposite of *receptibility)* within the TLt, SLt items are *rejected.* However, a transplantation may still take place when there are not enough resisting powers within the TLt to instigate a rejection. Without insisting on a directional perspective one could state fairly neutrally that items *migrate* from one literary system into another. To put it rather generally, an *influence* is exercised, a term which preferably should be replaced by any of the technical terms discussed above whenever possible.

3. *The two major types of literary contacts*

Generally speaking, it is necessary to distinguish between two major types of literary contacts (i) contacts between relatively established systems which are consequently relatively *independent,* and (ii) contacts between non-established or fluid systems which are partly or wholly *dependent* upon some other system(s).

In the first instance, literatures develop more or less within their own spheres. Sometimes a foreign system or individual, or a certain "fashion," may be of importance for them in view of their possible contribution to the process of changes within them. This happens under relatively favorable conditions for a TLt. Such has been the case, e.g., of both French and English literatures, at least during the last two hundred years. Although a lot of observations have been made about the influence of Ibsen on Shaw or Laforgue on Eliot or Strindberg on a host of English and French playwrights, it is not yet clear to what extent these contacts have been more than a mere stimulation for the evolution of creative minds.

In the second case, a certain literature can, to a relatively great extent, be dependent upon another literature, because of, inter alia, its "tender age," or "weakness" or specific cultural or political conditions. In such cases, a SLt may function for a TLt almost as if it were a part of it. This generalization applies roughly to the literature of a minority group within a majority group, or to groups which are geographically connected to or politically subjugated by some other group. For example, Ukrainian vs. Russian, Flemish vs. French in the nineteenth century, Hebrew vs, Arabic in medieval Spain, Norwegian vs, Danish (up to 1900), Czech vs. German (roughly up to World War II), etc. In some

cases, target literatures in such a constellation are already symbiotic, i.e., they combine two (or more) languages. For a certain period, Norwegian was symbiotic with Danish, and Hebrew and Yiddish literatures constituted a symbiotic literature up to World War I, when they parted. Symbiosis is often dictated by the "defective" nature of a certain literature, i.e., its lack of certain systems (types, genres), which is frequently a result of socio-cultural conditions. When a community uses two (or more) languages (which may be as different and unrelated as Hebrew and Yiddish), these are often differentiated in terms of functional oppositions. For example, in the above mentioned Hebrew-Yiddish symbiosis, Hebrew occupied the position of "high" literature whereas Yiddish occupied that of a popular and non-canonized one. For such literatures, literary contacts obviously play a more decisive role than for the "independent" ones. In this article, however, the structure of symbioses will not be discussed; only probable contacts of those with an *outside* SLt will be taken into account.

4. *Channels of literary contacts*

The channels through which contact may take place, and consequently cause migration of items, are various. Generally, one could distinguish between cases where a SLt is known directly in its own language and cases where the SLt is known and read only, or mainly, through translation. In the first case, TLt writers have to coin verbal items for SLt items with no intermediary activity. In the second case, translators are already doing this job, and writers take the verbal solutions from a ready made corpus in their own language. In both cases however one encounters processes of translation because of the fact that a translation already occurs in the first case. However, the behavior in both cases is not identical, because writers who are directly appropriating are likely to be less subjugated to secondary norms within the target literature.

5. *Some examples of possible universals of literary contacts*

No. 1 *Literatures are never in non-contact*

For a long time linguistics ignored all cases of heterogeneous systems. Methodologically, this was of course very convenient. This attitude is no longer maintained. The Prague school work on language interference, and most decisively Uriel Weinreich's work (*Languages in Contact*, 1955) pointed to the need to deal with heterogeneous structures. In literary studies, the lamentable situation of historical and comparative studies, more often than not being a hotchpotch of mechanical sortiments of "facts," "parallelisms" and "influences," forced many literary scholars – striving for a sound literary theory – to turn their backs on questions of interference of systems, and to deal with the literary system as if it were "pure" and homogeneous. But this attitude can no longer be maintained in either literary studies or in linguistics. We must admit that with the exception of some very

remote and isolated cultures (which still may have had decisive contacts in an unknown past), most systems known to us grew out of a continuous contact in terms of processes of reception and rejection of outside items. There is not one European literature which, at one time or another, did not have to lean heavily on some other literature, whether Greek, Latin, French or German. For certain literatures, political, geographical and cultural conditions made interferences less imposing. For others, this became the normal situation. On the whole, I would be inclined to assert that contacts are the rule rather than the exception. Of course, the extent of real interference and its role for any TLt is a separate question.

No. 2 *Literary contacts are not necessarily linked with other contacts between (two) communities*

It seems inconceivable to isolate literary contacts from contacts on other levels of human activity. For instance, could one think of a literary contact without a linguistic one? The answer, however, is positive: when the contact channel is exclusively via translation, linguistic contacts do not take place between the target community and the source community. For example, Turgenev probably played a decisive role in Danish letters, but there emerged no affinity with the Russian language. The same holds for the role played by other Russian writers in the various European literatures. Of course, such a situation does not exclude appropriations on the verbal level, but these are introduced by the channel and do not involve any direct linguistic contacts. On the other hand, when the contact occurs via direct channels, the linguistic contact is virtually a prerequisite for the literary one. For example, Russian writers in the nineteenth century often acquired a knowledge of French before they knew any Russian (Puškin, Tolstoj). It goes without saying that the role of the source language was of major importance for their literary development.

The same holds for general cultural contacts, and even more so for political ones. Literary contacts may be part of a general cultural affinity, as a consequence of which a target community may appropriate social habits as well as verbal constructions, tones and fashions. This may even be part of political affinity, even if achieved by violence, e.g., colonialism (French in some Arabic countries). But this is not always the case. In many instances we can observe migration of *partial* systems only, and there is no mutual concatenation in this respect for other cultural series.

The meaning of these assertions is that while it is true that no cultural items are isolated, a target culture may still have contact only with some isolated features of a source culture. This is determined by the conditions under which a contact takes place. It is clear that groups which are in a state of geographical, political, economic and linguistic interference, often have literary contacts only as a part of a whole relationship. However, one could supply examples where hardly any *literary* contacts take place in spite of a large front of contacts.

No. 3 *Contacts are mostly unilateral*
There is no equality in literary contacts. More often than not a TLt maintains contacts with a SLt while the latter ignores the former. Of course, there are many cases where both literatures have some contacts, but these are never of the same nature. For example, Russian literature did influence French literature to a certain extent in the nineteenth century, but French literature contributed to the very evolution of Russian literature at that time.

No. 4 *A SLt is selected by prestige and dominance*
(1) *Prestige*. A literature may be selected as a SLt because it is considered a model to look up to (cf. the status of Greek and Latin literatures for all European ones, and later French, English and German for almost all of the rest). In cases of "defective systems" and minority cultures, a prestigious literature may function as a literary *superstratum* for a TLt. In simpler words, it is a source on which to model the TLt, and it takes a position within the TLt as if it were part of its polysystem.

The reasons for prestige are various, as for instance, when a SLt is old and there is no established local literature to begin with. This was the position of Greek vs. Roman culture, and of both vs. all European literatures. Of course, political and economic power played a big role, but not an exclusive one. Certain literatures kept their reputations and prestige even when their political power declined (e.g., French). Of course, ideological affinity is of no less importance; a literature of "revolutionary society" may have a strong influence even when the purely literary conditions are not necessarily favorable.

In order to make the notion of prestige more meaningful, it seems fruitful to take all European literatures as a system. In this system, there are obvious hierarchical relations: some literatures assume a position in the center while others are pushed to the periphery. Central ones are "major" and "strong," whereas peripheral ones are "minor" and "weak" from the point of view of relations within the system (the reader is asked not to translate these statements into aesthetic value judgments!). Those literatures which assume a peripheral position behave like all peripheral entities: they take over features which are often outdated for the central system; they are usually target literatures and rarely function as source literatures. Of course it may happen that under certain conditions (which have not yet been clarified) a "peripheral" literature may rise to a central position and become a major source literature (cf. the Scandinavian literatures in the late nineteenth century). On the other hand a central literature may be pushed to the periphery (e.g., Spanish).

(2) *Dominance.* A literature may be selected as a SLt when it is dominant due to extra-literary conditions. Of course, a dominant literature often has prestige, but the dominant position does not necessarily result from it, as for example, when a colonial power simply makes its own language and literature "unavoidable"

for a subjugated community. The fact that English and French dominated many national literatures under their political influence is simply due to this influence. The same seems to be true of all minority groups necessarily connected to a majority group. For example, Hebrew poetry in medieval Spain heavily appropriated Arabic literary models; likewise, Ukrainian heavily leaned on Russian.

No, 5 *Contacts are also favored/non-favored by a general attitude of a potential TLt*
In addition to the above mentioned principles according to which a SLt may be selected, it would seem that one could speak of pre-existing attitudes in various communities towards probable contacts. Sometimes, highly nationalistic societies reject any contact which is felt to be a threat to national integrity. Thus, Zola, Daudet and the Goncourts (among others) violently objected to the introduction of Ibsen, Strindberg or Tolstoj into France, and tried to demonstrate the incompatibility of such writers with "the French spirit." They highly criticized even the most naive appropriations. This strong resistance, and the rather systematic rejection of outside items even when French translations existed, is a manifestation of a highly *closed* system. On the other hand, other communities do not resent borrowings from the outside so violently, and one may observe some kind of cultural *openness* towards other literatures.

No. 6 *Interference occurs when a TLt cannot resist it or has a need for it*
It is a well known thesis that a literature selects items only in accordance with its own needs. Of course this is generally true, but we should not ignore cases where contacts and interference take place *in spite of* resistance of a TLt. Sometimes there is not even a rejecting mechanism and so transplantations may take place almost freely. This has been the case with many literatures during fermentation, growth or crisis situations: all appropriated an incredible amount of *calques*, whole models, techniques, etc., without any filtering mechanism. Yet, a retrospective rejecting mechanism may evolve at a later stage, and many supposedly settled appropriations may then turn out to have been temporary ones.

A "need" is a rather vague notion, but for our purposes it may be interpreted in a wide sense. For instance, a need may arise when a new generation feels that the norms governing the system are no longer effective and therefore must be replaced. In case of favorable conditions for contacts, some SLt functions as a source for innovation in a TLt. Another common case is when a certain type evolved in a certain literature is lacking in another, which consequently might wish to acquire it. For example, thrillers and detective stories undoubtedly migrated from *English* literature to practically all the others.

No. 7 *Contact may take place with one part of the TLt, and then proceed to other parts*
Even when appropriations are "heavy," there is not necessarily an over-all contact. It is not unusual that whereas some systems (types, genres) remain untouched,

others are under massive invasion, or literally created by appropriations. For example, a type which did not exist in a TLt is introduced and incorporated in it through appropriation (cf. No.6.).

In the same way contacts may be confined to only one stratum, e.g., to "high literature" or to "low literature." Very often, literary items may migrate towards a lower stratum of a TLt, only to be picked up later by a higher one. For example, French sensational literature was apparently manipulated and utilized by Dostoevskij not directly from the original texts but via translations and adaptations in Russian letters, probably established long before he started writing. The opposite is perhaps even more common; features of high literature are appropriated from a SLt, only to go down to some lower type at a later stage, e.g., to the romantic novel or children's literature.

No. 8 *Contacts are not necessarily maintained with a major (primary) system of a SLt*

In traditional comparative studies, where attention is paid mostly to major writers, one often ignores the fact that there is no necessary correlation between the position of an item (a work, a writer) within the SLt and its receptibility for a TLt. Very often, the direct source of appropriation is only one system, or one type (as stated above, No. 7), but it need not be the major (primary or central) item of that type. Obviously, an appropriation may result from a dominant set of literary norms, either contemporarily or (more frequently) "belatedly" (cf. No. 11). But it may also come about from a secondary system, an epigonic literature, where norms of a higher, more innovatory source, have been schematized, regularized and simplified.

Many minor literatures appropriate common literary patterns (such as "romanticism," "realism," "symbolism") after these are well established in the major SLt. This is not necessarily carried out by appropriation from a major source (major writer and the like), but often occurs via epigonic intermediaries, who have already elaborated a more digestible model in terms of easily appropriatable ingredients.

In studies concerned with "influences" it would, therefore, be advisable to look for the major epigons of a certain period before drawing direct lines between a certain major SLt norm (or writer) and a TLt norm (or writer). This means that the process of making a certain item more explicit and more accessible for the public taste may already occur within a SLt before it is expropriated by a TLt.

No. 9 *Selection of items is commanded by TLt structure; appropriated items may assume a different function*

According to the principle mentioned earlier (No.6) and with the exceptions stated there (violent SLts and weak TLts), it may be assumed that the selection of items is done in accordance with the interests and structure of the target

literature. Items are not mechanically transplanted from a SLt to a TLt, but "needs" determine and guide the selection,

When selecting an item, the TLt may filter out some of its components. Moreover, it does not necessarily keep its SLt function, but rather the opposite seems to be true: it acquires a new one. Think of Tynjanov's masterly study "The Ode as an Oratoric Genre" (in *Arxaisty i novatory*, 1929) where he demonstrates how the classical ode appropriated by Russian literature acquired widely different functions within the target literature.

No, 10 *When a system is defective, it is more receptive and less selective*
This can be deduced from Nos. 4, 6 and 9.

No, 11 *A TLt tends to behave like a secondary system with respect to a SLt*
Secondary systems within a literary polysystem are those no longer dominant in the sense of having a central position for contemporary writers of an emerging generation, or one which is about to become established. Such a literature therefore tends to stick to norms which are gradually pushed to the periphery of the literary polysystem. Traditionally, such norms (and the works produced by them) have been labelled *epigonic* (a term which is worthwhile keeping, though free from any evaluative meanings).

The position of the TLt vis-à-vis the SLt is often of the same nature. Diachronically speaking, it is rarely fully contemporary, and often there is a real gap of time. In many cases where the evolution of the TLt is not as advanced as that of a SLt (when, for example, a SLt is a major source of new initiatives and innovations) there are no grounds for a TLt to keep contact with the center. TLt then produces a literature which is very much similar to the epigonic mass production within the SLt polysystem itself. This is even more so when appropriation occurs directly from a secondary SLt system and not at all from a major one (cf. No. 8).

This does *not* mean, however, that in a TLt itself appropriations assume the position of an epigonic literature. As stated above (No, 9), being integrated in the SLt they assume their position in accordance with the latter's structure.

No, 12 *A TLt tends to appropriate from a SLt established stratum*
This formulation is based on the observation stated above (No. 11) that a TLt often behaves as a secondary system. This means that a TLt, under the conditions mentioned above, makes contact with a diachronic phase of a SLt which is wholly or partly outdated, and disregards a contemporary SLt phase. For example, "romanticism" migrated from Germany to Scandinavia when it began to decline in Germany itself. When a young literature like that of Esperanto evolved and reached a rather interesting development in the 1930s, it was modelled after the "common European" stock of romanticism, which had been "out of date" for quite a long time.

The reasons for such a behavior may be partly those indicated in No 4, that is, hierarchical relations – especially in terms of diachronic evolution – between literatures. When it comes to dependent systems one may also think of simpler reasons such as the fact that members of a peripheral minority group, often remote from centers of "innovations" (like the capital) may acquire their knowledge of a SLt in a more traditional way as "news" reaches them belatedly.

Still, this is not an established universal, and although I have no ready sustained cases where the opposite holds, I am sure they can be provided, e.g., when under specific conditions immediate and direct contact takes place with the latest phase viz. the avant-garde of the SLt.

No. 13 *Appropriation tends to be simplified, regularized, schematized (?)*
It is relatively established that what I would call "secondary activities" (translation, non-canonized literature, epigonic literature) tend to regularize patterns which are relatively free in a given source (a source text [for translation], canonized literature [for non-canonized], major literature [for epigonic]). By implication, regularized entities are also schematized and simplified. This may mean that while a certain item may have an intricate or plurivocal function within the SLt, its function within the TLt may be much more univocal or limited.

Still, the very opposite patterns can be demonstrated too, when for instance a certain appropriated item which is either "simple" or "complex" in a SLt may be manipulated by a TLt in a complex way, or produce a series of other complex items, or be put into a nonsimplified, non regularized, non-schematized context.

Obviously, simplificatory behaviors are common, but we lack knowledge about the specific conditions which determine when they are preferred and when they are not.

6, *Conclusion*
The set of universals suggested in this article should be taken as highly tentative. They are neither exhaustive nor sufficiently sustained. Many problems raised are very difficult and often controversial. However, I hope to have demonstrated one possibility of taking the field of comparative studies out of its stagnant waters and linking it with both theoretical and historical poetics. It may be fruitful to try and reinterpret many of the particular case studies in terms of my suggestions to see whether or not the questions raised here are valid. But it seems even more important to launch new research projects with these suggestions as part of their working hypotheses, so as to proceed not only towards a fuller knowledge of the pattern concerned, but also towards a better formulation of the relevant questions.

Amsterdam, November 1975

(Forthcoming in:
Functional Studies in Language and Literature. F. Coppieters and D. Goyvaerts, eds. Story-Scientia, Ghent.)

*Interference in Dependent Literary Polysystems**

In my paper "Universals of Literary Contacts" ([1975] 1977; in this collection) I suggested that we distinguish between two major types of literary contacts: (i) contacts between relatively established systems which are, consequently, relatively *independent* and (ii) contacts between non-established or fluid systems which are partly or wholly dependent upon some other system(s). In the first instance, literatures develop more or less within their own spheres, though sometimes a foreign system or part of one may be of importance for them in view of its possible contribution to the process of change within them. Such has been the case, e.g., of both French and English literatures at least during the last two hundred years. In the second case, a literature can to a relatively great extent be dependent upon another literature, which may function for it as if it were a part of it. While for an independent literature, an alien literature may be of only secondary or temporary importance, for a dependent one it may become a *sine qua non* of its very existence, for a longer period of time. Such has been the case, e.g., of Ukrainian (vs. Russian), Flemish (vs. French in the nineteenth century), Hebrew (vs. Arabic in medieval Spain), Norwegian (vs. Danish between 1500-1900), Czech (vs. German; roughly up to World War II), and many others.

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss problems connected with literary contacts in dependent systems. Although the mechanisms of interferences are basically common for all types of literatures, dependent systems are peculiar in several aspects. Moreover, as they disclose "acute" processes of interference, they throw more light on these mechanisms, and are therefore worthwhile studying in order to enlarge our knowledge in this field.

The main condition necessary for making a literature dependent is that it should be *weak.* This does not necessarily result from political or economic weakness, although more often than not it is correlated with physical conditions which allow for contacts by pressure (such as subjugation) or otherwise (such as majority-minority or proximity relations). Thus, when there are no cultural conditions for a "weak" situation, i.e., when there are no *intra*systemic (literary) conditions, hardly any dependency is likely, even in case of pressure unless a community is cruelly forced to assimilate. If we look at the history of conquests we can hardly find a case where political power alone, independent of other factors, caused cultural interference of system A within B. The Germanic tribes which conquered *Romania* (Italy, France, Spain) adopted the Romanic vernaculars and the culture of the conquered peoples rather than vice versa, the reason commonly accepted being the conquerors' cultural inferiority. On the other hand, the Celts in Gaul had adopted Latin culture in earlier times not because they were forced to, but because

* Paper presented to the VIIIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association, Budapest, August 12-17, 1976.

it was "stronger" than theirs, i.e., it could offer items nonexistent (or little developed) in their own culture. In the long run, however, Latin did not totally replace the local language and culture, but rather interfered with it so heavily that the result was a merged system. Neither Latin nor the new merged system ever gained ground, however, in peripheral regions (notably Bretagne, still Gaelic). Similarly, while it is true that Persian heavily borrowed Arabic lexemes and integrated them into its own system (not to speak of the Arabic alphabet), Arab letters during the Abasside time heavily appropriated in its turn Persian literary (as well as general cultural) models. Both systems (Persian language and Arab letters) were restructurated due to these kinds of interference. This occurred because both had become mutually "weak": having adopted Islam, the Persians would not resist its language. Arabic letters, on the other hand, was confronted with a system that had much to offer at a time when its own old norms were breaking down.

The weakness of a literary system is then conceived of exclusively in terms of literary features. Other factors are obviously correlated with the state governing the literary system, but it is the weakness of the latter as such that determines whether or not it will assume a dependent position vis-à-vis another system. Hence, "weakness" means the inability of a system to function by confining itself to its home inventory only, and the extreme of such a state would then denote a situation wherein a literature can function only because it has the opportunity of using some other literature. Naturally, in such a state, a literature is neither able to nor interested in rejecting interferences on any scale.

It seems then that insufficiency of resources is the direct cause of weakness. By contrast, "strong," full-fledged polysystems behave differently when pressed for change: they have the option of carrying out change by means of their home inventory. Thus, restructuration of the system occurs by internal hierarchical shifts, a hypothesis suggested and amply sustained by Tynjanov, Ejxenbaum and Šklovskij in the 1920's. Within strong systems there are always, so to speak, candidates for taking over; and therefore it is only when, for some reason, these "candidates," numerous as they may be, cannot fulfill a replacement function that an alien system may interfere.

Of course, insufficiency (or sufficiency) is a relative state: it is only when a system is confronted with another at a time when certain conditions have arisen within it that it may no longer consider itself sufficient. We clearly operate here with a functional, not a quantitative, concept. There is no numerical value for insufficiency, and therefore no universal rate for it. There is a possibility, however, to determine a general principle, a parameter, of insufficiency. This should be based on the notion of literary optimum, suggested as an indispensable implication of my hypothesis on literature as a polysystem (Even-Zohar, 1970, 1973; cf. also Toury, 1974). The concept of optimum is a hypothesis on the optimal volume of a polysystem, i.e., the repertoire considered necessary for those sets of relations without which the system is not considered to be able to function

in an optimal way. Thus, I have suggested as a universal rule (cline) that a literature strives to achieve a polysystemic state. This implies that there can be "vacant" or "void" slots in a system, which, reaching a certain degree, may make a system "defective" from the point of view of its optimal state. Such a system, even if it lacks indispensable strata (e.g., canonized or non-canonized systems) is nevertheless a polysystem, although the meaning of "poly" in this case is negative.

This "defective" state is prevalent only from the point of view of the center governing the system, since, as a matter of fact, no literary polysystem can remain weak without falling apart or entering a state of stagnation which might end with nonexistence. For any weak system, the major options available are either adopting some other system (or parts of it) with its proper idiom, or producing what it lacks by means of the home inventory. In the first case we normally get bi- or even multi-lingual polysystems, accessible in full only to a certain section of the community to which they belong. The high rate of such symbiotic polysystems must clearly lead us to drop our "neat" models, according to which we consider non-symbiotic literatures only to be "the normal case." On the other hand, such symbiosis is by no means an optimal state. Our data demonstrate quite clearly that sooner or later a symbiotic literature tends to eliminate what is considered its alien part(s). This happens not because symbiosis as such unavoidably breaks down for literary reasons, but more often than not because the community concerned has undergone radical changes which make such a structure no longer tenable: territorial shifts, political changes (in most cases rising nationalism which prohibits the use of "alien" systems) or cultural ones (such as democratization processes enlarging the social range of literary consumers thus making lingual heterogeneity undesirable). In the second case, i.e., when a system tries to provide what it lacks by its own means, it avoids adoption of another system, but still has to lean on the latter for appropriations. These are carried out by translational and transformational procedures, i.e., the weak literature uses its own indigenous language and its own repertoire as a means to carry new functions, transferred from a source literature. Thus, in various stages of weakness (the highest of which makes a "defective" polysystem) various degrees of interference with other systems are actualized. A target literature may naturally go over from one stage to another; thus a symbiotic state may be replaced with a non-symbiotic dependent state. We also have cases in which a literature is both symbiotic and dependent, that is, in contact with at least three different literatures. Obviously, the borders between a state of strong dependency and that of symbiosis are not clear cut. In all cases however the behavior of the polysystem involved is irrefutably inexplicable in terms of its home structure only, and a larger context must be taken into account. On a possible polar scale of dependency it is clear though that a non-symbiotic literature is less dependent than a symbiotic one.

While in a symbiotic situation a literature A cannot absorb another literature B (or part thereof) by transforming it into its own means and is therefore forced to adopt it in its own original tongue, a non-symbiotic dependent literature strives to

avoid using an alien system by developing *means of appropriation* which are of a translational nature. It is consequently the only way a weak literature can supply its needs without giving up its unilingual character. This does not mean, however, that it stays "untouched," or "protected" from another system. While it certainly maintains its own language, which is an undeniable factor of unity, it is perhaps even more vulnerable than within a symbiotic situation. In the latter, one may argue, the components of the "artificial" polysystem keep their relatively independent characters and are dependent upon each other only in terms of the overall structure. At least this holds true for the major (dominant) component of a symbiosis. Thus, a non-symbiotic literature maintaining dependent relations with another literature often has to restructurate itself by means of appropriations to a degree hardly observable in exclusively symbiotic situations. Of course, when conditions are favorable, even in highly dependent situations a target literature may *disguise* appropriations thus moderating their alien nature and facilitating their absorption. This is feasible when the home repertoire is relatively rich, so that procedures of equivalency can be used, i.e., finding ready-made or seemingly ready-made means to carry the new functions inserted by interference. Only literatures with a tradition are able to proceed in such a way, while newly established ones rarely have any home stock to make use of.

Hebrew literature is quite an interesting case for both dependency and symbiosis relations. During its long history, it shifted centers with the decline of the old centers of the communities which carried it. In the course of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries it gradually moved from Italy and Holland to Austria and Germany, and finally to the territories of the Russian empire, where it stayed until the emigration to Palestine and the decline of Hebrew letters in Soviet Russia (caused mainly by persecutions by anti-Hebraistic Yiddishists). In Czarist Russia, the Jewish intelligentsia gradually became acquainted with the Russian language and literature under the influence of the Enlightenment *(Haskala* Movement, circa 1800-1880). Within a short time, Hebrew literature developed dependent relations versus Russian, thus using the latter as its immediate stock for innovations. One of the major Hebrew poets, H.N. Bialik, a dominant figure in what is commonly called the "Revival period" (1880-1920) heavily appropriated Russian models, from "romantic" (Puškin, Lermontov, Fet, Tjutčev) to "symbolistic" (Bal'mont, Ivanov). But the inner state of Hebrew literature enabled him to disguise these appropriations by finding and coining Biblical and quasi-Biblical phraseological units that could be accepted as authentic and autochtonous innovations. Thus, Russian literature functioned for Hebrew as if it were a part of it *on all levels,* but due to the equivalency policy adopted by Bialik and his contemporaries, there was a very strong illusion of domestic "originality." Alongside its dependency upon Russian, Hebrew literature maintained an enduring symbiotic relation with Yiddish, which declined only towards the end of World War I, when the latter became independent and

separated from Hebrew, For centuries, Yiddish texts functioned as the non-canonized system of Hebrew literature, and the two literatures (for quite a long time there was no awareness of Yiddish letters being an institutionalized literature) kept within the symbiosis separate states. There also existed a non-canonized pronunciation tradition of Hebrew, the so called Ashkenazi pronunciation. This was rejected by the Hebrew poets up to Bialik, who fully canonized it on the level of versification, thus creating a tremendous revolution, with the help of which Russian versification norms could be easily introduced. As I already indicated, at that time Hebrew letters was physically situated in Russia, and the Hebrew language was still an exclusively *written* language.

Towards the end of World Wat I, the Hebrew-Yiddish symbiosis fell apart; the Hebrew center gradually moved to Palestine, where Hebrew had by now become a spoken language for the Jewish community. A new generation emerged, which rejected the literary norms of the Revival period and its second-class followers. The need for change was strong, and the home stock hardly offered any acceptable alternatives for the new generation, who still maintained the contact with Russian letters. Thus, while Russian still maintained its source position versus Hebrew, the procedures adopted by Bialik could not be used this time. Therefore a much more transparent kind of appropriation took place. In order to introduce the new models, the new poets were prepared to go very far in using alien features, thus creating a highly "Russified" poetry on all possible levels: intonation, versification, word order, phraseological units, composition, matrix structure and thematic level. What is striking in this example is that when it possessed no spoken vernacular and had territorial minority relations versus Russian, Hebrew literature managed to develop a stronger resistance mechanism towards Russian and "Russianisms" than 40 years later, when the territorial proximity no longer existed, when Hebrew was already a spoken vernacular and some of the poets hardly knew Russian. This stronger Russification process took place and governed the center of Hebrew letters for almost 25 years (roughly between 1925 and 1950).

It becomes obvious then that when a dependent situation prevails, as long as the home repertoire does not offer alternatives and as long as there are conditions permitting continuous contacts, *all other factors may be neutralized.* When, as a result of successful appropriations, features are domesticated, they may function for quite a while in spite of their foreign character, though this may be alien to basic lingual habits outside literature. Russified models prevailed even in Hebrew narrative prose in the 1940's, when an Israeli-born generation emerged, which hardly knew any Russian (or any foreign language), and which adopted Russian and Soviet Russian features, having rejected all other alternatives available within the proper stock. It appears that the source of these "Russianisms" was the large number of texts translated from Russian with a low level of disguise, i.e., in full conformity with the procedures used by the former generation. Thus, heavy interference continued via translated literature, and while Hebrew poetry violently

rejected these Russified models in the 1950's as artificial and untenable (though hardly aware of the exact source of these ardently disliked models), Hebrew prose, which also underwent radical changes, eliminated them only moderately. Thus, due to the emergence of a totally new generation as late as the 1950's, which rejected the established norms in both poetry and narrative prose, the Russian models were forced from the center to the periphery of Hebrew letters. For a while, Russified models remained in children's literature (not the least in nursery rhymes) and to a certain extent in political rhetoric. We are not yet in a position, however, to define the extent of appropriations not rejected up to date but totally incorporated and integrated into the Hebrew literary system. It is clear though that more than 80 years of Hebrew letters cannot be described without the dependency relations with Russian.

The loosening contacts and the diminishing role of Russian literature for Hebrew were caused by various factors. As I already remarked, the territorial shift was far from playing the major role in the beginning, and even a later generation, which had already lost direct contact with the Russian language, still utilized to a great extent Russian models provided via translated literature. Due to the situation of the Hebrew polysystem, translated literature from the Russian kept its prestigious status, thus assuming a primary position within the Hebrew polysystem (while translations from other languages assumed a clearly secondary position), and consequently could be a major source for extracting new models when needed. The ideological affinity with Soviet culture which prevailed in literary circles at the center of Hebrew letters reinforced the continuity of contacts and the option for interference. Only when a third Israeli generation emerged, with no knowledge of Russian, and a very weak affinity with Soviet ideology (or with the desire to neutralize any ideology in literature) and which above all disapproved of the norms of the older generation, did a shift occur without the Russian option as the closest available one.

To sum up, when the condition of weakness is not marked, even physical contacts and pressures may not result in interference; when it is marked, a state of dependency is very likely, especially if simultaneously accompanied by accessible contacts even in the absence of physical contact and pressures. When the condition of weakness wanes, dependency gradually disappears, and contacts with a certain source may even stop altogether, if extraliterary conditions are favorable. Therefore, when we discuss problems of interference in dependent literary polysystems, a leading hypothesis must be the intrasystemic conditions of a literature in terms of insufficiency, while "contacts" as such are preconditioned by the former. Independent literatures seem to behave in a similar way, but never to such a degree.

Amsterdam, August 1976

(Forthcoming in:
Proceedings of the VIIIth ICLA Congress, Budapest, August 12-17, 1976.

III

Russian and Hebrew: The Case of a Dependent Polysystem

Israeli Hebrew Literature: A Historical Model

*Russian and Hebrew: The Case of a Dependent Polysystem**

I

The history of contacts between Slavs and Jews is old and long. In West Slavic territories, particularly Bohemia, the Jews of the late Middle Ages – probably engaged in selling Slavs as slaves (a verbal tautology at that time) – used to write West Slavic in Hebrew letters. This was a language they adopted using the name "The language of Canaan," where "Canaan," as in the Bible, stood for "slave," identified with "sclavus"/"Slav" (Jakobson & Halle, 1964). In Poland, a certain Abraham Prochovnik, alias Pech (identified by some scholars with the *Beg,* the title of the Khazar chancellor) supposedly ruled as a legendary king. Of less legendary character are the famous Polish coins with Hebrew letters ("Mšk krl polski"), which are evidence not only of the high position and privileges enjoyed by Jews in Poland, but probably also of a wide-spread knowledge of the Hebrew letters among tradesmen. This fact can be corroborated for earlier periods from other sources too. As for East Slavic territories, the presence of the mighty "Jewish country," the "zemlja židovskaja," as Khazaria later came to be called in the Russian heroic epos (Skaftimov, 1924:177-178; Propp, 1955:147-160), had long been a fact of life for the oppressed Slavs, both a threat and a model for imitation. However, when, towards the end of the ninth century the opportunity arose, the Swedish rulers who occupied the Kiev area succeeded in establishing a local, independent princedom, ancient *Rus.* Yet, cultural, economic and political Khazar influences seem to have persisted in *Rus* for a while. The principle of double kingship, – an uncontested example, was clearly taken from the Khazar system, as were such details as the title of "kagan" for the supreme Russian ruler (cf. Chadwick, 1946; Dunlop, 1967:237), or the three Hebrew letters borrowed by the Russian alphabet (Ш, Ц, Ч).

Needless to say, this idea has never been too popular among Russian scholars (Prof. Artamonov was taken to task for supporting it: *Pravda,* 25.12.1951). On the other hand, Jewish historians have been equally unhospitable to the probability that the mass of the Jewish population, at least in Podolia and Wolynia, came not from Germany but from the previously Khazar territories on the Black Sea, where an autochtonous Jewish population had existed since Roman times. Thus, neither of the groups was particularly interested in having their communities culturally linked from olden times. Both preferred, rather, to see the Jews as recent guests on Slavic territories, little interfered with by their hosts.

So far for the beginnings. But even later periods pose several riddles, the solutions of which are not simple. Take for example the case of Yiddish in the Slavic lands, which deviated remarkably from the Western Yiddish the Jewish

* Paper presented to the International Symposium "The Dynamics of East European Ethnicity Outside of Eastern Europe." The Rockefeller Center, Bellagio (Italy), June 28-July 2, 1977.

immigrants were supposed to have brought with them to the new countries. There are data indicating that in Podolia and Wolynia Yiddish was not as wide-spread among Jews as in regions closer to urban and commercial centers. Consequently, several scholars have been inclined to describe Eastern Yiddish, at least in part, not as a language brought by all members of the community from another territory (Germany), but rather as a language introduced by the socially and culturally influential immigrants, and gradually adopted by their brothers, who were already there. In the course of this process, major changes were introduced into the language itself, and the more remote its speakers were from the cultural centers, the less adequate was their appropriation of it. Thus, the possibility of conceiving of at least a part of Eastern Yiddish as a Germanic vernacular structured upon a Slavic substrate should have been dealt with more seriously by linguists who thought it satisfactory to explain the case by "standard" processes of interference (notably Weinreich, 1958). However, even if the substrate hypothesis should be false, the impact of Slavic on Eastern Yiddish is commonly acknowledged.

Other cases pertaining to our subject are not better illuminated. There is no documented or well-elaborated explanation for either the "Jewish heresy" *(eres' židovstvujuščix*) in Russian of the fifteenth century or for the emergence of the *subbotniki* (known to us only from the seventeenth century). The same holds true for the phenomenon of *Hassidism,* a Jewish movement that spread through the southern regions towards the end of the eighteenth century. Can one say that the affinity of this movement with populistic Slavic cultural and religious ideas was completely, as it were, coincidental? The very fact that such an affinity was acceptable to begin with should be taken as evidence for the presence of a deeply rooted and long tradition. Although rejected and despised by the Jewish establishment, it succeeded in gaining ground and finally becoming a major cultural trend in modern East European Judaism. Its affinity with local Slavic populistic ideas, music and dance, and the fact that it arose precisely in those areas where this affinity may have existed of old cannot be accounted for by the most minute explication of the economic and social background alone. The receptiveness of the cultural system to Slavic patterns must be recognized as irrefutable, too.

Nevertheless, dissatisfaction with slavicized Yiddish, the very late use of Eastern Yiddish as a literary language while Western Yiddish – though dying out – was still used, the strong resistance to Hassidism in the North (Lithuania), and the perseverance of Hebrew as the only commonly acceptable language of "culture" – all these indicate that the establishment and "high" culture tried to resist the penetration of alien patterns and items from the undesired Slavic system. Moreover, it seems striking that all these types of interference did not take place with any "high" Slavic culture. The latter was not accessible at all to the Jews, even if they would have considered it worthwhile to try and establish contact with it. In Germany, although Western Yiddish did not considerably differ from the contemporary German literary language, Jewish readers could become familiar with

its literature only through transliterations into Hebrew characters. The Latin alphabet, identified with Christianity, was ignored, rejected. It seems, therefore, most reasonable that the contacts Yiddish literature gradually established later with canonized Polish literature should begin by being mediated by Hebrew, i.e., the vehicle of "high" culture, and remain that way for a long time (Shmeruk 1975:74).

It was only with the emergence of the Jewish Enlightenment movement, which penetrated into the Russian Empire from Germany and Austria in the 1820s, that we witness a growing contact of both Hebrew and Yiddish literatures with the high Slavic cultures, first and foremost with Russian, but also gradually (although never to the same extent) with Polish. This new stage was of a highly secularized nature and consequently clashed considerably with traditional Jewish culture Jewish literary culture thus entered a new phase, but the major structural features of the previous periods persisted. Thus, cultural stratification persisted in the different roles assigned respectively to Yiddish and Hebrew. Hebrew continued to be the vehicle of "high" and of official culture, though now secularized, while Yiddish stuck to its old function as the lower cultural and literary stratum. Thus, both continued throughout the nineteenth century to constitute what I have elsewhere called "a symbiotic literary polysystem," and only gradually separated from each other shortly after World War I. Both used Russian literary models to produce their own new literary models, but they also used each other, and thus the channels of appropriation were often oblique and indirect. Moreover, if we take into consideration the already slavicized features of Eastern Yiddish, which in their new phase were adopted by the new writers, we will not find it easy to distinguish between Slavic patterns directly appropriated and those which penetrated via the use of Yiddish features in Hebrew literature.

In other words, the function of the Russian system for the Hebrew-Yiddish literary polysystem cannot be detached from the previous stages of (unilateral or bilateral) contacts between these cultures. Nevertheless, the revolutionary character of the new phase and the shift it represents both on the ideological and structural levels will justify a separate discussion, at least until more knowledge of the previous stages will enable us to better integrate our data. Moreover, it is precisely these shifts which constituted the beginning of the modern era, and whose features persisted long after geographical and political proximity, or co-existence, ceased. It is here then that our major subject begins.

Let me, therefore, sum up, before going on, the main theses suggested so far:

1. The fact that Jews lived among Slavs for centuries, in privileged positions for short periods but in unprivileged most of the time, did not automatically result in the penetration of Slavic cultural patterns into the Jewish cultural system. This was conditioned by the structure of the latter. Thus, in certain regions the penetration was very heavy, while in others, the mechanism of rejection was rather strong.

2. Even when the Slavic system penetrated the Jewish one to a great extent, it seems that it took place mostly with the lower strata, such as vernacular, popular (or oral) literature and unprivileged cultural aggregates. "High" Jewish culture, mostly through the vehicle of Hebrew, either rejected foreign patterns or was affected by them to a lesser degree, more often than not only through mediation, such as Yiddish vernacular.

3. Direct contacts between "high" Slavic and "high" Jewish culture were initiated only as late as the nineteenth century. This was a turning point in Jewish social and cultural history, the beginning of a process which has brought it to the present stage.

II

The problem of contacts between Slavic (especially Russian) and Hebrew culture is normally discussed in terms of the "influence" of the former on the latter. Thus, the presence of the Russian system is acknowledged, but there is little acknowledgement on the theoretical level of the major role Russian played in *structuring* modem Hebrew culture, and this is reflected in the almost total lack of research in that field. Ideological reasons, caused no doubt by interest in the self-preservation of Hebrew secular culture which for over a century was often on the verge of total disappearance, caused historians and critics to ignore data which could, as it were, damage its image of self-sufficiency. There was of course the impact of common critical habits which originated in the Romantic Age, but I am inclined to think they played a secondary role in this case, or that they would not have been so strongly enforced had ideological reasons not existed. This is true not only for Slavic (mainly Russian) culture, but also for the function of Yiddish for Hebrew. As a consequence, research into Hebrew culture has been stymied for decades.

As I have argued before, Hebrew literature, whether pre-Enlightenment or post-Enlightenment (i.e., as a religious or as a secularized system) was the carrier of "high" Jewish culture only. In this connection, "culture" refers only to verbal culture, though not necessarily to literary works alone. It refers to anything from a prayer through official letters and contracts down to ceremonial correspondences between people about to marry (and who may not even understand the messages exchanged between them). As no low cultural strata existed in Hebrew, anyone interested in the semiotics of culture must recognize that entity which functioned as their substitute. Otherwise it will be difficult to understand not only how the symbiotic system functioned as a whole, but also how and why it maintained contacts with outside systems.

The new phase of Hebrew following upon the Enlightenment is generally called "The Revival Period." This should not be taken literally in the sense of a cultural

revivification. As I stated before, Hebrew had always been in use. Only this use now became more intensified and variegated, producing literary works, newspapers and journals, and ultimately, towards the end of the century, the revival of Hebrew as a spoken language in Palestine. In the course of this period, Slavic literature (largely Russian) functioned not simply as the closest available system. One could say that Hebrew literature behaved as if the Russian system were a part of it, to be either appropriated or rejected, according to its home interests. Thus, Hebrew culture enlarged its repertoire and its stock by adopting Russian as a major set of possible options. Consequently, we have to extend the function of appropriation not only to "active" but also to "passive" appropriations. (By "active" appropriations I mean those items transferred from system A to system B either as direct borrowings or through translational devices. "Passive" appropriations, on the other hand, are those items in system B which system A may use indirectly, by intertextual procedures such as allusion, pastiche, parody and the like. Even in these latter cases we have to admit the function of the alien system for the home system, although it may be more difficult to detect.) The role of Russian for Hebrew was not confined then to secondary or occasional "influences." Rather, Russian participated in the very structuring of Hebrew literature, and thus a relation of dependency can be posited. As I formulated elsewhere, "a literature can to a relatively great extent be dependent upon another literature, which may function for it as if it were a part of it. While for an independent literature, an alien literature may be of only secondary or temporary importance, for a dependent one it may become a *sine qua non* of its very existence for a long period of time" (Even-Zohar, 1976).

Gradually, and with different components of the possible repertoire available on the linguistic and literary (and general cultural) level, russified items were appropriated. However, we are not dealing here with an indifferently open repertoire of a not yet established system. The Hebrew system was at the same time both established and non-established. Therefore not only is there a mechanism according to which items are appropriated or rejected, but another mechanism which regulates the rate of overtness in appropriations. These mechanisms are a direct result of the fact that the literary repertoire available to the Hebrew writers was traditionally established, and one could make one's choice between various and rather numerous options on all levels. On the other hand, the new phase required new models, and a good portion of the available options had to be rejected because it could not serve the new purposes. Thus, the linguistic and stylistic traditions of many generations were rejected. The new writers tried to use only so-called "Classical Hebrew" because the more contemporary Hebrew symbolized the norms of the orthodoxy against which they were fighting. Similarly, the compositional, strophic and prosodic options of the available repertoire had to be replaced by others which would clearly indicate the innovatory nature of the new stage. Under such circumstances then, Hebrew, in spite of its time-honored

traditions, entered a situation I would call "weak," i.e., a situation in which a system is unable to function by confining itself to its home repertoire only. This "weakness" is a result of the relative insufficiency of the home repertoire vis-à-vis an external system within reach, whose repertoire happens to suit its needs.

The contradiction between the existence of an established repertoire and the need for at least a partly imported one naturally created a strong clash of interests. While it was vital for the new writers to use the Russian repertoire, it was also in their interests to demonstrate the usefulness and independence of Hebrew. This was not a question of national pride, but a fundamental interest in self-preservation, a desire not to destroy the very basis for persisting in the use of "a dead language," as it were. It seems precisely that clash of interests that can explain the function of the regulating mechanisms towards appropriations. Thus, we may speak of the following types of appropriation:

1. Direct borrowings on the verbal level, such as various glosses, interjections (Ax, Nu), "gesticular sounds" (Trax, Xa-xa-xa, Xi-xi-xi, Xe, Tfu, Fuj and the like).

2. Translation borrowings, *calques,* on all verbal levels: lexical and morphological items, syntactic matrices, intonational patterns, and phraseological units (collocations and idioms).

3. Translation equivalences, i.e., items originally alien which become "domesticated" by finding existing home units to function for them. These give the strong illusion of "original" items.

4. Direct borrowing of para-verbal items, such as compositional principles, principles of segmentation, principles of distribution (position of items, the *matrix* of the text). These are of major importance for any organization of the (literary) text, easily detectable in poetry through the strophic and prosodic (meter, rhythm, rime) patterns, but also dominant in other textual types.

5. Principles *and* items on the thematic and representational levels. Thus, not only preferences for specific themes pertains here, but also the selection of "items of the represented world" indispensable for description in literature. This repertoire of "situationemes" is by no means of lesser importance than other components of a cultural repertoire.

6. Graphic conventions developed in the Russian literary repertoire with specific functions. The most important item here is the three dots (. . .) whose function is to signal "popular speech," a function which should be distinguished from the common one of "undecidedness" or "hesitation."

The rate of use of each of these types in the literary production of Hebrew texts in the last one hundred and fifty years was determined by the internal conditions of the Hebrew polysystem. The varying needs of overtness have been intermingled with stronger or weaker consciousness for the different procedures. Thus, for

instance, items already assimilated into the spoken vernacular might have been felt as less objectionable. The same holds true for items not directly verbal or paraverbal, the penetration of which, due to their absence in the Hebrew repertoire, has not always been noticed. Thus, intonational and syntactic-rhythmical patterns penetrated easily because there existed hardly any established counterparts for them in Hebrew, with the exception of the loud public reading of the sacred texts. Thus, prosodic matrices appropriated from Russian also involved to a certain extent declamation patterns common to the Russian tradition (see Ejxenbaum, 1927). The emergence of this declamatory tradition side by side with the new poetry is corroborated by the fact that it persisted long after the appearance of newer literary models and started dwindling only in the nineteen-fifties. Of a less sophisticated nature are the intonational and phonetic features of spoken Hebrew. As Hebrew gradually became a spoken vernacular in Palestine, people became more aware of the use of non-Hebrew words and to some extent of non-Hebrew syntax, but there could hardly be a strong awareness or any rejection mechanism for intonational patterns or phonetic features transferred from either Yiddish or Russian. It should be mentioned here that Jewish immigration after 1905 to Palestine, commonly called "the second immigration," consisted of people some of whom had already been "russified" to a certain extent. Strange as it may seem (and this question has never been properly investigated), people unable to speak *Russian* with a native pronunciation nevertheless introduced many Russian features into their *Hebrew* pronunciation. Thus, palatalization, neutralization of unstressed vowels and lengthened quantity of the stressed ones (in Hebrew the length of vowels is phonemically neutralized) – were common features of spoken Hebrew for a long time and can still be heard from people of that generation. (In contrast, the Hebrew pronunciation of new immigrants coming nowadays from Soviet Russia is much less russified than that which was common in Palestine for decades, probably because today's immigrants are faced with an established norm, previously non-existent.)

As a rule, it seems that russified items penetrated most easily into domains where the Hebrew repertoire was weakest, on whatever level. Thus, the spoken language on the one hand or literary dialogue on the other (both of which lacked established repertoire and norms) turned out to be much more vulnerable than philosophical, juridical texts or such sections of the literary text as narration (description), for which items have always existed.

III

Roughly, four periods can be discerned in the history of the dependency relationship of Hebrew with Russian:

1. The emergence of the dependency relationship, roughly between 1820 and 1860;

2. the first "russification" period, roughly between 1860 and 1920;
3. the second "russification" period, roughly between 1920 and 1950;
4. the decline of the dependency relationship – from about 1950 on.

Of course, the borderlines between the various periods are by no means clear cut, and each period can in turn be further divided. Yet, both the external conditions of the Hebrew system and the strategies of its repertoire towards the Russian option seem to justify such a division.

As regards external conditions, during the first two periods, i.e., roughly until 1920, the center of Hebrew literature and its dominant models were produced on Slavic soil, in Russia and in Poland. In contrast, from about 1920 on the center of Hebrew culture moved to Palestine. Although some activity persisted in Poland and Germany up to World War II, it became peripheral. This geographical shift was caused on the one hand by the growing migration to Palestine after World War I, but no less by the physical destruction of Hebrew activity in Soviet Russia. The leaders of the revolution never considered Hebrew culture counter revolutionary, nor did they consider the Hebrew language *per se* as such. Oddly enough, it was the *Jewish* Yiddishists, the leaders of the Jewish Section (*evsekcija*), who ultimately created the kind of hostility which ever since has identified Hebrew with anti-Soviet interests. Thus, Hebrew language and literature, largely secular but also religious, was deprived of all means to exist. It was in Russia that modern Hebrew culture had emerged and crystallized; the first Hebrew theatre was established in Moscow *after* the revolution, but after the 1920's there was no room for it there. Had there been no alternative, however poor and unpromising, Hebrew secular culture probably would not have survived. In Russia it was suppressed and replaced by Yiddish and Russian. It had little support among the masses of immigrants in the United States where it was replaced by Yiddish and then English. It had only feeble support in Poland and the rest of Europe (with the exception of Lithuania), and thus the only recourse for Hebrew was Palestine. There it liberated itself from its previous symbiotic relations with Yiddish, and became the main language, both literary and spoken, of the new community.

Still in all despite the geographical and political shifts, and the tragic fate of Hebrew letters in Russia, not only did the dependency relationship persist, but new russified models fully participated in the emergence and crystallization of the new literary trends in Palestine. Moreover, the literary establishment in Palestine, which was consequently the determining factor in establishing dominant literary norms, gradually became part and parcel of the labor movement and in spite of Soviet hostility, identified itself with the ideals of the Russian revolution. Sympathy for Russia reached a real apotheosis during World War II. As a consequence, the intimate relationships with Russian did not remain confined to classical Russian literature, but extended themselves to Soviet Russian literature as well. Thus, the second "russification" period, although physically detached from Russia,

and gradually from the Russian language too, was by no means less important for the history of Hebrew culture than the preceding periods.

Further, it seems that direct and active appropriations from Russian during this second period were even bolder and more overt than in the first. During the first period, when the very existence of secular Hebrew culture was in doubt, Hebrew largely adopted procedures of disguised appropriation. Thus, for example, the option of translational equivalences was preferred to direct or translation-borrowings. Poetical matrices were open to russified declamatory (intonational) patterns, but did not require them. Dialogue in fiction unavoidably appropriated Russian items, but also stuck to the older option of using ready made collocations from the established repertoire. (Some writers, presumably sensing the problem, limited the extent of dialogue in fiction. They thus avoided the necessity of choosing between what towards the end of the century had already seemed ossified stock and items available through Russian, which while suggesting more vivid speech was also a break with accepted norms.) On the whole, russification during the first period seems to have been relatively subtle, so much so that the contemporary reader can not easily detect it; this often results in erroneous interpretations and unintended reverse effects.

In the 1920s, the new generation of Hebrew poets was strongly dissatisfied with older norms. The Hebrew repertoire suggested no major alternative options, and one had to make a choice between epigonic writing and a breakthrough with new models. It was, therefore, quite natural for the new poets to make use of the option of the Russian system. Translational equivalences and other disguised and discreet procedures had to be rejected because this would mean a continuation of, not a break with, the established norms. Besides, modernistic norms would not be satisfied with moderate means; the new age was supposed to be "revolutionary." The new poets, therefore, did not hesitate to introduce overt appropriations *en masse.* Thus, prosodic and intonational matrices, syntactic constructions, numerous individual glosses, *calques,* morphological items (such as diminutives), and so on, virtually invaded the Hebrew repertoire. For at least twenty or twenty-five years these overt russified models persisted in Hebrew poetry. At first, the poets who introduced these models elaborated them on the basis of direct acquaintance with the Russian language and literature; gradually these models acquired an independent dynamics in the home system. They were thus adopted, for the first time in the history of Russian-Hebrew relations, by literary producers who had no direct access, or only a marginal one, to Russian literature. Within the second period of "russification", then, a *secondary* kind of "russification" gradually developed.

It should be stressed here that at that time the mechanisms which governed literature and specifically the literary language and those which governed the non-literary language were not identical. On the one hand, literary language appropriated Russian items in a much more intensive way than non-literary

(written or spoken) language *ever* did. This was due first and foremost to the long tradition which accepted non-homological relations between literary and non-literary language as normal, and even desirable. In contrast, the spoken language gradually developed, on the one hand, towards deeper hebraicization and neutralization of features incompatible with the Hebrew system (for example, the phonological system was neutralized, various nonfunctional features eliminated, e.g., palatalization supra-segmentai qualifiers, etc.). On the other hand, however, spoken Hebrew accepted the use of direct borrowings totally rejected by literature. For example, such suffixes as *-nik* and *čik* (kibbuc + nik = a member of a kibbutz; palmah + nik = a member of the underground striking forces; qatan + čik = very little; bahur + čik = old chap) are of that kind. The same holds for profane language which (together with borrowings from the Arabic) penetrated and settled for good in Hebrew slang. These have never been acknowledged by literary language. They were replaced, even in translations from Russian, by "literary" words, some of them inventions nobody ever used. This situation (i.e., the readiness of the spoken language to accept direct borrowings but reject appropriations, while the literary language filtered russification down to appropriation procedures only, but was ready to go a long way with them) is paradoxical but not incomprehensible. Though ready to use an external repertoire, policy was to prevent Hebrew from becoming a mixed language and maintain its historical continuity, and this appears to be true for all periods.

Let us now go back to the case of secondary russification during the first and second period. What is most remarkable about the new writers who perpetuated this tradition is that they hardly knew any Russian. They were acquainted with Russian literary models through appropriated models introduced into Hebrew, and through translations. They used russified items of a highly heterogeneous nature, as they were either not aware of the russified nature of the items they were using or did not really know very much about it. Consequently they used them at varying rates, intermingled with items from other models. Yet, in spite of the existence of a living spoken Hebrew, which was the mother tongue of the majority of the new writers, they were prepared to perpetuate verbal items which were absolutely incompatible with either the classical or the modern repertoire of Hebrew, because they had been assimilated in russified texts. This demonstrates the high position of the russified models in the Hebrew system. In poetry, such models persisted late into the 1950's, when they were abruptly rejected *in toto* as artificial and inadequate. In prose fiction, however, where russification has been of a less eccentric nature, one can detect russified items even in recent writings.

As regards secondary "russification" in prose, a very remarkable role was played by translated literature, a fascinating story in its own right. Unlike the case of poetry, no new prose models penetrated the Hebrew system and no modernistic generation emerged. The younger generation that started producing around the late 1940's was faced with a relatively dull repertoire of models

available for fiction. Most of the established Hebrew writers at that time did not appeal to them, and their social and ideological background, as well as the popular texts "on the market" which were accessible to them, directed them to use (consciously or not) Russian, but now mainly Soviet Russian literature. The latter was abundantly translated into Hebrew, and to a great extent by those poets who initiated the second period of "russification" and their followers. These translators, the majority of whom were not fiction writers themsleves, introduced a very unique russified model. They virtually created a special "Hebrew for Russian texts," which gradually became commonly admitted and acknowledged. This model was more heavily overloaded with appropriations than even the home models, full of non-existing words, collocations, stylistic quasi-differentiations and syntactical constructions. How prestigious it was may be inferred from the fact that translation from English and other European languages often made use of it. This kind of text, which from the historical point of view was in fact a simplified model of high Russian literature, served the young generation. Its components can be found not only on the verbal level (to a greater extent than one might expect), but also on the compositional level, where it has no overt verbal manifestation. It is there, too, where it remained for a long time. Thus, translated literature functioned in this case not only as a channel of literary contacts. It assumed a vacant position within a home system and functioned there as a generator of new models. I believe, too, that the level of "world," the selection of describable items ("situationemes"), in Hebrew prose can be demonstrated to have been dependent upon the Russian models. I am not yet ready to make any generalizations, however, on this point.

I have spoken so far of the dominant body of Hebrew literature since the Enlightenment. I argued that this, *per se,* was a shift in the history of relations between Jewish and Russian cultures. But as Hebrew secular culture evolved, it gradually created peripheral and lower strata, too. As is true of any other system, the dynamics of the Hebrew system operated in such a way that items that had disappeared from the center could still remain, for a longer or shorter time, on the periphery. Thus, when certain russified models were pushed out of the center, they persisted on the periphery. For example, political poetry went on using models rejected by lyrical poetry; the same is true for folksongs, children's literature (both poetry and prose), political rhetoric, stories and essays written by school-children, school and public ceremonies with their specific verbal material and *mizanscena* (vernacular in Hebrew for mise-en-scène), and so forth. Thus, while the dependency relationship with Russian dwindled and ultimately stopped as a major option for the center of Hebrew literature, it has remained on many peripheral and lower strata. Of course, one cannot wipe out a whole repertoire within a day, and Hebrew culture – literature, language, theatrical conventions, non-verbal behavior, gesticulation and cultural semiosis as a whole – has incorporated and domesticated many russified items,

introduced at various times, The investigation of this enormous complex has hardly begun. For this reason I feel myself "a pioneer, or rather a backwoodsman, in the work of clearing and opening up" of this vast field, with all the advantages and disadvantages involved.

(Forthcoming in The proceedings of the symposium, Irene Portis Winner, ed.)

Israeli-Hebrew Literature: A Historical Model

0. *Introduction*

There are no historical descriptions of Hebrew literature which would be satisfactory from the point of view of functional historical poetics as it began to crystallize in the works of the Russian Formalists and the Prague School, and further developed in later works on the sociology of literature, cultural anthropology and the semiotics of culture. This article is an attempt to formulate historiographic hypotheses on the most recent period in the history of Hebrew literature, the Israeli period. Although we possess a large quantity of bio-bibliographical and conventionally "historical" data, in the absence of a functional model there are yet only partial answers to questions which hitherto have hardly been raised. Moreover, only with help of a better theory can new data be sought and found in the first place. It is not the purpose of this article, however, to explicitly formulate and discuss literary historiography, nor is it my intention to suggest a generalized model for historical description. Rather, an attempt will be made to describe a specific historical corpus on the basis of an implicit model, whose theoretical grounds have been discussed in some of my articles (included in this collection) and in the works of scholars with which they clearly maintain an affinity. Nevertheless, it seems worthwhile, just for the sake of orientation, to sketch briefly some basic guiding principles.

a. Literature is taken to be polysystemically structured, the "canonized" and "non-canonized" categories constituting its major opposition. In this polysystem both "original" and "translated" literature participate. It is assumed that only when the correlation between these literary systems is observed, can an adequate understanding of the historical processes be achieved.

b. History of literature includes *both* synchrony and diachrony. The synchronic analysis consists of relations between "center" and "periphery" within the literary polysystem as well as the latter's correlation with extra-literary systems such as society, economy, politics and culture. The diachronic analysis consists of the same questions but from the aspect of *change* within this correlation, such as the rise and decline of literary norms.

c. It is assumed that no literary polysystem is historically isolated from the other literatures; thus interliterary contacts are an indispensable part of any historical description if they fulfill a structuring function for the literature discussed.

It is my hope that this article will be a contribution both to a more adequate description of the history of Hebrew literature and to the development of more adequate models for literary historiography. These models, we hope, will be able to cope with the achievements of theoretical poetics rather than remaining in the arrière-garde of literary studies as an antiquated positivistic activity.

ISRAELI HEBREW LITERATURE: A MODEL

1. *The structure of Hebrew literature in the pre-Israeli period*

Up to the new Israeli period (which dates from the late 1880's), two major features characterized Hebrew literature in exile: (1) its multiterritorial base, and (2) its existence as a defective polysystem within symbiotic structures. The second feature is a function of the first.

1.1 *Multi-territoriality*

Literature indispensably exists within a given territory and is connected with a community living in that territory. This generalization does not take into account the differences, which may be rather great, between sub-communities (such as middle class vs. working class; secular vs. clerical milieux, etc.), but this question will not be dealt with here. A community with the same language, living under the same social, economic, cultural and political conditions is capable of producing and possessing a literature. This kind of literary existence is conceived of as "normal" in our cultural tradition, and hence also in scholarly studies. For this reason, other cases have not yet attracted sufficient attention, such as when one territorial (political) entity includes more than one community, each carrying its own lingual culture, either close to or remote from one another (e.g., Yugoslavia, Switzerland or the Ukraine). The relations between these communities in terms of their respective linguo-literary cultures are not at all "simple," and they greatly differ from case to case. Thus, literature written in German in Switzerland is acknowledged as an integral part of "German literature," while Luxemburgian and Belgian writers in French remain more often than not at the periphery of "French literature." Flemish literature, which developed quite separately from the Dutch, has recently become more and more integrated with the latter or perhaps even merged with it. Another "deviant" case is that of a certain community with a common (though not exclusive) lingual culture divided between different, even remote, territories. This last situation has characterized Jewish communities over the centuries. When one Jewish community produced literature, it could very well be adopted by all the others, albeit with certain restrictions. At least from the Spanish period (11th-15th centuries A.D.) on, belletristic literature was accepted only if written in Hebrew. In certain genres, e.g., liturgy, Aramaic was also admitted while other genres, in other languages, were partly accepted and partly rejected for reasons we cannot discuss here. In any case, belletristic texts in "Jewish" languages other than Hebrew (such as Judeo-Spanish) were not commonly accepted and have been preserved only in part. Thus, Jewish literature written in Arabic vernaculars, Persian, Spanish or Tatic were not considered part of "the common tradition." Recently, for national and folkloristic reasons, research teams in Israel have started collecting and recording various Jewish literary products still available. But this work has no implications for the status of the non-Hebraic belletristic literary items within the commonly shared Hebrew literature. The fate of Yiddish literature might have been the same had it not had the opportunity of acquiring a special status which gradually enabled it to liberate itself from Hebrew and

become an independent literature.

In spite of the remarkable geographic distances, Hebrew literature reached places far from its territory of origin. As is well known, these territories replaced each other diachronically as literary centers. Thus, while in a uniterritorial literature center-and-periphery relations diachronically exist in time (one "period" is replaced by another), in the case of Hebrew, they have existed in both time and place: Spain replaced Palestine, Italy-Holland replaced Spain, Germany-Austria replaced Italy-Holland and Russia-Poland replaced Germany-Austria. Each shift ("transfer") partially consigned the previous stage to oblivion, and even more so the one before. Thus, for instance, the Hebrew literature of the Italy-Holland era was far from the literary consciousness during the Russian-Polish period, while Austria-Germany was still there. As a result, the synchronic center-and-penphery relations, normally expressed in uniterritorial literatures in terms of oppositions between consumption groups, were expressed in Hebrew literature in terms of territorial differences too. Thus, that kind of literature which ceased to occupy the center might still be produced in its original territory (e.g., in Italy-Holland for a while) or move to a secondary territory (for example, in Yemen one went on writing Hebrew poetry according to the Spanish norms after they had become peripheral [e.g., Šabazi, in the seventeenth century]). This could even occur through the emigration of a certain group of writers, who carried a certain "period" with them. Thus, secondary followers of the Enlightenment and the "Ḥibat Ẓiyon" [Lovers of Zion] who emigrated from Russia to the United States around the 1890's kept writing literature according to norms long after their dominance had been superceded (perhaps more than twice) in the centers. *Preservation* and *petrification* are typical features of "the decline to periphery," and are typical as well of such territorial shifts. This is also a well-known pattern in linguistic and social behavior, as when a group of emigrants stick to their old culture in their new land while in their previous home territory changes are taking place. Judeo-Spanish, for instance, still preserves fifteenth-century features while Spanish in Spain has changed, and the same holds true for Swedish and Finnish emigrants in the United States, German-Jews in Israel and so on.

1.2 *Existence as a defective dependent polysystem within symbiotic structures*

As a result of its multiterritorial existence with its consequent implications, Hebrew literature assumed a peculiar character. This may be defined as that of a system combining several heterogeneous systems but which recognizes in principle only one of them and "pretends" as a result that it is totally independent. This combination being both lingual and literary, I would label it as a "doubly symbiotic polysystem." What are the characteristic features of such a situation?

On the level of *language* this situation has been described in detail in my papers "The Nature and Functionalization of the Language of Literature under Diglossia" (1970, esp, 292-294) and "Literature Written in a Language with a Defective Polysystem" (1971). Let me therefore sum up only their main points,

Accordingly, Hebrew has been used by the Jewish communities in exile only for certain aspects of communication. Other languages were used parallelly for various other purposes. Thus, for instance, in Arabic Spain, Hebrew was used for belletristic literature, while Arabic was used for non-fiction and Arabic and Romanic vernaculars for daily speech. In The Ukraine, toward the end of the nineteenth century, Jews spoke Yiddish and/or Russian (+ Ukrainian in certain districts), read and/or wrote Yiddish and/or Russian.

As a result, the following processes took place:

(1) The Hebrew language was preserved relatively untouched, the ancient literary language functioning as the main source and model of writing. Due to this, the number of phraseological units ("collocations") was much higher than in less literary-bound languages.

(2) There was a tendency not to differentiate the various diachronic stages of Hebrew, thus synthetically synchronizing them in various degrees, according to the governing norms of the time.

(3) Language interference occurred by means of direct appropriations (*calques*), thus enriching the Hebrew stock without creolizing the language. In Spain, this *calque* practice made use of Arabic, while in Eastern Europe it was Yiddish and the Slavic languages that functioned as sources. This practice was permitted only when the extreme puristic norms declined, and in the long run, many such indirect borrowings were rejected from the body of the language in later periods. Still, without this procedure, the flexibility of the Hebrew language and its adaptability for literary use can not be properly explained.

On the level of *literature,* this situation has been described by various scholars, most recently Hrushovski (1968, 1971, 1976, 1977), Shmeruk (1969, 1977), and Sadan (1962). Unfortunately, it has never become the mainstream of Hebrew historiographic practice, possibly for romantic nationalist reasons (as if describing it would damage the reputation, purity and subsequent "authenticity" of Hebrew literature). As a result we lack even basic information on various aspects of the symbiotic existence. There is, however, a concensus among scholars concerned with the question that Hebrew literature did maintain contacts (1) with the major literature in the "host" territory (e.g., Arabic literature in Spain, Italian in Italy, Russian in Russia) and (2) with the variety of literary works produced in the languages used by the Jews in the various countries in which they lived.

The type of contacts Hebrew maintained with the major literatures in its vicinity can be described as a dependency relation (see "Univerals of Literary Contacts" and "Interference in Dependent Literary Polysystems," both in this collection). Of course, this happened when Jewish culture did not completely isolate itself from its immediate neighbors, the most "open" periods being perhaps Spain, Italy and late nineteenth-century Russia. Hebrew literature in either Arabic Spain or Czarist Russia is inconceivable without those close relations.

These foreign literatures interfered with Hebrew which appropriated their literary norms, themes and techniques. Thus, in Arabic Spain, Hebrew poetry fully appropriated the Arabic prosodic norms, even though these were highly incompatible with the nature of Hebrew phonology. Arabic preserved the long-short vowel opposition and based the principle of poetic meter upon it, while in Hebrew this opposition was neutralized quite early. Hebrew, therefore, had to find an artificial formal equivalent which would function in place of the long-short vowel opposition. The French norm (of Italian origin) of masculine-feminine rime alternations was transplanted into Hebrew via contacts with Russian, and consequently according to the *Russian* variation of that norm. These contacts were not necessarily maintained with the contemporary set of dominant norms within the source literature involved, nor with the latter's center. (Cf. Universals Nos, 8 and 12 in "Universals of literary Contacts" above).

Side by side with the contacts that Hebrew literature maintained periodically with a major foreign literature, it also maintained contacts with the literary production of Jews in other languages. In various periods, Hebrew literature considered these kinds of literary production as its lower stratum, i.e., as its non-canonized system. If we take Yiddish as an example, we see that it functioned as Hebrew's non-canonized system. The ups and downs of the positive and negative relations of Hebrew towards Yiddish, i.e., the mechanisms of adoption versus rejection, are definitely typical of any polysystemic structure. Thus, both literatures constituted together what may be called "a symbiotic literature" or "bilingual polysystem." Just as I believe that the history of any literature can be adequately described only by taking into account literary stratification, which clearly involves investigating non-canonized as well as canonized strata, so am I convinced that the history of neither Hebrew nor Yiddish can be separately dealt with for the periods during which they maintained symbiotic relations. The relative status of these literatures was perfectly clear throughout the ages, when Hebrew was called "the lady" and Yiddish "the maid," with all the implications that such a popular metaphor might involve (including the sense of respect for the lady but that of intimacy with the maid). In spite of the eventual feelings of contempt towards Yiddish and its literature after the Enlightenment, as far as the functional relations between both literatures is concerned, no antagonism was felt between them. It was a time-honored tradition for a writer to use both for different purposes and different audiences. Even the most important of Yiddish writers tried to achieve canonization via translations into Hebrew (e.g., Šalom Alekem [Sholem Aleikhem]). Yiddish was still considered a "temporary" language, an idiom dictated by circumstances and negligible in comparison with the only commonly acknowledged national language – Hebrew. Only in the twentieth century, with the liberation of Yiddish from the symbiotic structure, did both Hebraists and Yiddishists try to isolate the legacies of these literatures from one another, going so far as to neglect the production of individual writers in one of the languages and presenting

them as totally and exclusively belonging to the other (e.g., Mendele, Peretz, and Šalom Alekem for Yiddish, and Bialik for Hebrew).

On the background of clashing interests between parts of the Yiddishist and the Hebraist-Zionist movements this mutual rejection is understandable. Yiddish constituted a real threat to Hebrew, not the least a physical one, as in Soviet Russia, where Yiddish zealots attempted to annihilate all traces of Hebrew culture (cf. Gilboa, 1976). On the other hand, the needs of the Hebrew revival (which included the revival of Hebrew as a spoken language and a rejection of Diaspora traditions) reinforced the ideological disregard of Yiddish within the context of Hebrew. From the point of view of "the history of ideas" popular among Hebrew critics, Yiddish literature did not express "the spirit of the nation," and was, therefore, negligible. Such an attitude is, of course, untenable for literary historians. More intensive research is required today to document and clarify the nature of the literary symbiosis between Hebrew and Yiddish, which is perhaps the most developed example of symbiosis for Hebrew literature within the non-Hebraic Jewish literary context.

For extra-literary needs, such as the need to describe the history of Jewish culture throughout the ages, or the need of non-Jews to refer to things Jewish, it became common to speak of "Jewish literature." As I already argued, such a term can be justified for those periods when a symbiotic polysystem prevailed. It is obvious that the Arabic works of Halevi are studied within the framework of Hebrew, and not Arab culture. Similarly, Jewish poets who wrote in Russian are hardly ever discussed within the framework of Russian literature, e.g., Shim'on Frug (1866-1916). There is, however, no justification whatsoever for using that term for the autonomous periods, that is Biblical and post-Biblical or recent. Yiddish literature, as we have noted, liberated itself from its symbiotic relations with Hebrew and from its role as its lower stratum about the end of World War I. This literature has since become as alien to Hebrew literature as any other, perhaps even more so. Both literatures have simply cut off relations with one another. It is even more unjustifiable to include within an imaginary "Jewish literature" writers who, though Jewish by birth and perhaps even by education, function within the frameworks of various national literatures. Thus, Heinrich Heine, Boris Pasternak, Osip Mandel'štam, Jakob Wasserman, Arnold Zweig, Stefan Zweig, Meir Aron Goldschmidt, Oscar Levertin, Max Jacob, Carlo Levi or Nelly Sachs by no means belong to "a Jewish literature" (as, for instance, the Nobel Academy would have had us believe in 1966, when it awarded a joint Nobel prize to the Hebrew writer, Shmuel Yosef Agnon, and the German poetess-in-exile, Nelly Sachs). These writers belong to the very centers of the various national literatures whose languages they use. Only a nationalistic Jewish approach, or a racist antisemitic one, or ignorance (of the Nobel Prize variety) would adopt the term "Jewish literature" on the basis of the origin of writers. It is not enough that a writer be a Jew or even use a "Jewish" language to entitle us to speak of a Jewish literature, if we mean a literature whose core has been Hebrew literature. Thus, Šalom Alekem

still belongs to "Jewish literature;" Isaac Bashevis-Singer no longer does.

2. *Since when has there been a Hebrew-Israeli literature?*

Since when does a Hebrew-Israeli literature exist? The only unequivocal concensually acceptable answer to that question can be a territorial one, according to which "Israeli" will denote the literature produced in Hebrew by the Jewish community in Israel (or – up to 1948 – Palestine). As is well known, a Jewish community existed in Palestine throughout the ages, and produced literature of all kinds in Hebrew; but in view of the center and periphery relations within Hebrew literature, it became peripheral as early as the eleventh century AD. So in spite of the existing autochtonous literary production which in the 1890's even partly overlapped with the Israeli period (cf. Dan, 1974), the latter is not a continuation of that production of which it probably was hardly even aware. The Israeli period discussed here started with the migration of Hebrew writers to Palestine, during which time the literary center gradually moved from Eastern Europe, and, in fact, created some basic institutions before and during World War I. Moreover, it seems reasonable to assume that the changes which Hebrew literature underwent in Israel are, in principle, a direct outcome of the factors connected with the general territorial move, i.e., the complete revival of the Hebrew language, the growth of the local Jewish population, and, finally, political independence which was achieved in 1948.

The initial stages of the move to Palestine are fixed in the 1880's and last up to World War I. During these years, the writers active in the country created a local literary establishment, as a branch of the European center to begin with and later as a substitute for it. They founded publishing houses and literary journals and undertook other literary activities. The awareness that the Palestinian center might become independent of Europe as well as its heir grew considerably during World War I, at which time the second phase started. Now the center of Hebrew literature indisputably moved to Palestine. Between 1920 and 1935 a stream of major Hebrew writers immigrated and new "autochtonous" writers emerged. The crystallization of the literary institutions was intensified by the emergence of new journals, periodicals, private and public publishing houses, libraries, printing houses, a university (in Jerusalem) with a department for Hebrew literature, and other related activities.

Side by side with the positive factors that brought about the change– the most decisive of which was the growth of a Jewish population who depended exclusively upon Hebrew as its language – there were also the following negative factors:

(1) The Russian center of Hebrew letters was physically destroyed during and immediately after the Revolution, not merely by the bloody events in the Ukraine, but also because of the persecution by the "Jewish section" ("Evsekcija"), and anti-Hebraic Yiddishists. Major publishing houses were forced to move from

Odessa and Moscow. Several of them tried at first to transfer their bases to Germany (Berlin), as Palestine seemed badly located from the commercial point of view of Central Europe. There was as well no consciousness yet of its growing importance. But these efforts soon failed, for the next reason.

(2) The size of the audience for Hebrew letters in Europe and the United States diminished decisively as a result of (a) the strong position now occupied by Yiddish in the USSR, the USA and Central Europe and (b) the growing number of Jews who moved to other languages for a variety of reasons not the least the tendency toward assimilation.

The following passage by Yosef Ḥayim Brenner (1881-1921, Jaffa) is highly illuminating in this respect:

> [. . .] It is true that the new Hebrew [i.e., Jewish] community [in Palestine] is small, very shaky, and for the time being at best no more than a glimpse of a beginning; whose value, if not followed by a large, longed for, continuation, would be utterly nil; but whose hundreds, as far as Hebrew *literature* is concerned, are superior to the thousand upon thousands of any other community. Here you have people who both know and understand Hebrew; you have children and young boys and girls who speak Hebrew in an almost non-artificial way; many feel the natural character of Hebrew whose place is here where it belongs (In *Ha-Poel Ha-Ẓair* [The Young Labourer], Jaffa, 1919.)

The process by which Israeli-Hebrew literature assumed the central (and, within a short time, the only) position of Hebrew literature was completed only towards the end of the nineteen-thirties. Journals and publishing houses continued to function in Europe until the Holocaust, and it still remains to investigate the kind of relations between the European and Palestinian "bases" at that time.

3. *The Inventory of Israeli-Hebrew Literature and its Historical Analysis*

A "literary inventory" means the total of literary texts belonging to a certain literary polysystem, i.e., canonized and non-canonized, original and translated literature. The sources of information about Israeli-Hebrew literature are quite abundant. We have conventional historical accounts, general and specific bibliographies, various lexicons, the catalogue of the National Library in Jerusalem and so on. Yet, much of this information is so far only potential, since it has not been properly elaborated. Generally speaking, there is more bibliographical information about canonized literature than about non-canonized, as well as more about original literature than translated. There is no analytical classification of the material available according to categories, such as year and place of publication, ways of distribution, and the like. Such an elaboration of data is indispensable for any further advancement, but it is clearly the historical analysis of the inventory that constitutes the major challenge , In the following I will discuss the scope of this inventory and point to several aspects for analyzing it.

3.1. *Canonized literature for adults*

It is about the inventory of canonized literature for adults that we possess the largest body of information. This is by no means peculiar to Hebrew literature; in all literary systems, canonized literature for adults has constituted the major interest of "the literary milieu," literary criticism and, to a large extent, literary studies as well. But even if we accept the fact we are entitled to isolate the canonized system from the rest of literary facts for historical description, at least for methodological purposes, a lot of research remains to be done in order to be able to write its history properly. We must be able to describe and explain the relations between the center and periphery, and we must correct the static fallacy, according to which norms replaced in the literary hierarchy cease to exist. It is clear for example that for Israeli Hebrew literature, the poets of the Revival period (ca 1880-1920), and their followers continued to be active for 15-20 years after they had been, as it were, replaced by the "modernistic generation." True, historical poetics does concentrate upon the rise and decline of norms in the center, but it also takes cognizance of the fact that past or "dethroned" norms do not disappear immediately, To describe the complexity of such a situation is of course more difficult than describing the rise of new norms, whether this is done by means of traditional literary criticism (which in general reflects the temporary power relations within a literature) or by more intersubjective literary studies.

As in many other literatures (e.g., French), the processes of change differ in different genres. Hebrew *poetry* clearly moved from the Revival period, dominated by such figures as Bialik (1873-1934) and Čemihovski (1875-1943), to an expressionist-futurist-neosymbolist "modernistic" poetry dominated by such figures as Šlonski (1900-1974), Alterman (1910-1972), Grinberg (1895-) and then (in the fifties) to a sort of "neo-imagist" modernism, represented by such poets as Zach (1930-), Avidan (1934-) and Amichai (1924-). These shifts are very clear, and are expressed on all levels of the literary text, starting with materials and ending with literary and lingual organization. Narrative prose, on the other hand, did not evolve along such clear-cut lines. The variety of repertoire selections has been much more complex, and the changes of a mixed nature. The language of narrative, for example, changed much less than the implicit ideology or the nature of the subjects discussed. The options available in each period have not yet been investigated and clarified, and it would seem, therefore, that we still know relatively little about the nature of those changes. Generally and roughly speaking, it is believed that a neo-realist (somewhat similar to Soviet "socialist-realism") narrative model typical of the forties and fifties was replaced by a symbolist model in the fifties and sixties, with all the implications this has upon language and technique, both models partially combining one kind or another of "psychologism." But, though basically plausible, such a description is far from satisfactory.

A writer who acquired a really notable reputation in the sixties, Š. Y. Agnon

(Nobel Prize 1966), began his career in the first decade of the century but exerted very little influence on the younger generation until the fifties, when his writings could be appreciated as "modern." For this new generation was fed up with the social ideologies prevalent in the forties. As Agnon's narrative was paradoxically combined with a kind of artificial pre-Israeli Hebrew, with all the diglotic consequences implied (such as having a foreign language clearly hovering in the background), he could be accepted only by a generation anxious to alienate itself from a "realistic" treatment of the world. At this point, Agnon's historically unspecific language fascinated the younger generation, who began to borrow heavily from his literary repertoire. Oddly enough, this contributed to a continued preservation of an artificial literary language, which could not cope with extra-literary lingual reality except in a very superficial way.

3.2. *Non-canonized literature for adults*

Non-canonized literature is increasingly engaging the attention of literary scholars, but its position is seldom dealt with in literary histories. It was quite natural, therefore, for Hebrew criticism to ignore it too. As already mentioned, Yiddish literature functioned for a long time as Hebrew's non-canonized system, but after the separation of these literatures and the growth of a unilingual Hebrew audience a growing need for this kind of art was felt. Generally speaking, *translated* literature supplied this need. Thus, the romantic novel, detective stories and thrillers were for the most translations or adaptations, and only in the thirties was a major effort made to provide such types by original works with local color. The history of this non-canonized Hebrew literature has not yet been written, although now, with the research of Shavit & Shavit (1974), initiated at the seminar given by Toury and Even-Zohar at the Department of Poetics at the Tel-Aviv University (1973) on the literary polysystem, we possess much more information about it. This research points to the fact that in spite of the temporary success of original Hebrew thrillers, detective stories and romances writers could not make a living from this type of work and, as it lacked any artistic prestige, were not willing to devote themselves to its development. As a result, the majority of the non-canonized inventory still consists of translated works. Moreover, due to the overwhelming quantity of translations and the low status of this type, many works originally written in Hebrew have been disguised as translations.

3.3. *Literature for young people*

The position of literature for children and young people within the literary polysystem seems to be peripheral. It seldom behaves as a primary pattern, but within the framework of its secondary behavior one detects derivative canonized features on the one hand and derivative non-canonized features on the other. Thus, some parts of it come close to canonized literature, i.e., they disclose "high" features, while other parts are partially or fully modelled on non-canonized patterns. Consequently, it cannot be entirely identified with non-canonized literature.

Correlated with the rest of the literary polysystem by secondary functions, it clearly discloses inner stratification too. It is therefore almost impossible to write its history without clarifying the relations between its primary and secondary models. This is the case with Hebrew children's literature too.

For the most, the needs of children's literature in modern times have been supplied by translation and adaptation. Nevertheless a growing body of original work has gradually contributed its share. Thanks to Ofek (1977), we now possess much detailed information about the beginnings of Hebrew literature for children in modern times. Regrettably, Ofek's data lack any orientation towards historical poetics, and therefore requires some elaboration if we want to describe the polysystemic relations involved in this system on the historical plane.

Just as it is true of large parts of modern Israeli-Hebrew literature in general, children's literature depended upon the Russian, first through translations (executed according to the "Russian-Hebraic" norms) and secondly, by means of appropriations. Thus, Čukovskij and Maršak, just to mention two prominent Russian poets, are very relevant for understanding the crystallization of models in Hebrew. A whole range of items was transplanted in toto during more than a generation, of which a large number have been eradicated in more recent years. The Russian four-trochee matrix, to take one striking example, almost totally dominated (in a slightly simplified version) children's poetry, in spite of the fact that this meter is less compatible with the norms and repertoire of Hebrew (Israeli) accentuation than others, such as iamb or anapest.

3.4. *Translated literature (canonized and non-canonized)*

Translated literature occupied an important position in Hebrew literature for at least two reasons: (a) because of the relatively small production of domestic literature, compared with that of large nations (and in this respect it is identical with the literature of any small nation); and (b) because of the elements lacking in the Hebrew polysystem in the Israeli period, which were only gradually "filled in," if at all.

The functions of translated literature within Israeli-Hebrew literature have been the following:

(1) It supplied literary works to a Hebrew-reading public, and constituted, quantitatively, the majority of works in that literature. This is true not only of canonized literature for adults, but probably of other literary types as well, where the lack was even more strongly felt.

(2) It was a major channel for the creation of literary contacts with other literatures. By means of translation, foreign literary norms infiltrated into the polysystem. The importance of this function increased even further as Hebrew literature became more and more autonomous and the multilinguality of the population decreased. This was caused mainly by the decreasing ability of Hebrew writers to read foreign languages.

Although from recent research by Gideon Toury it now appears that, quantitatively, English and German literatures occupied a major position within the literature translated into Hebrew between 1930 and 1945 (29% and 26.5% respectively; Toury [1976:116]), while Russian was less central (14%, ibid.), it seems that the latter had a much stronger position from the point of view of literary models. It seems that Russian occupied the center of translated canonized literature, and was an intermediary for the translation from other languages. Thus, German, Scandinavian and even English works have often been translated from the Russian rather than from the original languages. As a consequence, the stylistic character of such translations was closer to the russified Hebrew than to any other. Moreover, even translations from the French, English and other languages, if they belonged to the center of Hebrew literature, imitated that russified model. Only towards the end of the forties did English occupy an overwhelming area of the literature translated into Hebrew. With the decline of the russified Hebrew model, the role of Russian decreased. Since the fifties, most literary contacts have taken place via English. And odd as it may seem, because of the less international orientation of English literature and the peripheral position of translated literature within it, the international orientation of literature translated into Hebrew decreased.

(3) It has been, since the Enlightenment, one of the tools for the crystallization of linguo-literary norms. In this sense, and due to (1) and (2), it has always been an integral part of the center of Hebrew literature. It always constituted a challenge to literary language, a means for its rejuvenation and for innovations within it. As a result, it assumed a primary role within the literary polysystem, and was only gradually pushed to that position it "normally" occupies within independent "full-fledged" literatures, i.e., a secondary position, where derivative norms are usually applied.

Research into the history of literature translated into Hebrew was undertaken by the Porter Israeli Institute for Poetics and Semiotics and the Chair for Translation Theory (at Tel Aviv University). So far, G. Toury's doctoral dissertation (1976) has been its most notable achievement. An analytical inventory of translated literature is also in the process of being compiled.

3.5 *The relations between the various literary systems*

So far, because of our limited knowledge of literary systems other than the canonized one (for adults), it is very difficult to establish what kinds of correlation exist within the polysystem. When Hebrew separated from Yiddish, it did not immediately create a substitute. Even when substitutes (for non-canonized literature) were gradually provided, there was a very low awareness of them, since Hebrew had been continuously identified with "high" norms only. The paper "The Relations between Primary and Secondary Systems within the Literary Polysystem" (1973, in this collection) suggests the hypothesis that the polysystemic opposition between canonized and non-canonized is the optimal balance for

a literary polysystem, and hence, when one of the systems is absent, a lack of indispensable feed-back may cause disturbances. Thus, it seems that when a non-canonized system is lacking, a literature may enter a stage of gradual sterilization, stagnation or even deterioration. This is a possible explanation for the elevated and "learned" character of a major part of Hebrew canonized literature. The research carried out by Shavit & Shavit (1974) suggests the possibility that non-canonized literature had a certain impact upon the later stages of canonized narrative prose, but wider investigation is needed before we will be able to establish this with any certainty. The same holds true for the relations between adult and children's literature. Behaving according to secondary patterns, children's literature adopted only those models already established in adult literature, often after a remarkable simplification. On the other hand, being relatively free from the literary struggle at the center of the polysystem, some parts of children's literature could offer, at least relatively, innovations. On the level of language, sometimes children's literature offered a less elevated, less ossified style, but even these cases are highly heterogeneous. There is a plausible possibility that children's literature, nursery rhymes included, has had an impact on a later Israeli-born generation. But this awaits a very thorough study.

The position of translated literature within the polysystem of Israeli-Hebrew has been oscillating between a primary and a secondary one, gradually settling on the latter in recent years. But the role of translated literature for the crystallization of literary models was enormous for a long period, at least up to the fifties. It played no lesser a role than original literature. Thus, for example, the publication (in Hebrew translation) of the anthology *Russian Poetry* (1942) constituted as major an event in Hebrew poetry as the publication of any original work by a major writer. Moreover, due to a certain vacuum in the repertoire of narrative options, it seems that the generation of the forties (commonly called "the Palmah generation") probably extracted large portions of its narrative models from Soviet works translated by major translators such as Avraham Šlonski and his circle. I make this assertion on the basis of a partial study which, hopefully, I will be able to formulate more exactly when I complete the research. In any case, one thing seems fairly settled, and that is that the history of Israeli-Hebrew literature cannot be investigated and described without integrating into it translated literature.

Our limited knowledge also prevents us from determining whether Israeli-Hebrew behaved, or still behaves, as a defective polysystem, and how far the process of autonomization has enabled it to become a full-fledged polysystem. The same holds true for all possible processes within the polysystem, interferences included.

4. *Systematic Aspects of Literary History*

In the previous passages, I have tried to formulate some major historical issues

according to the types of literary inventory of Israeli-Hebrew literature. In the following, I will try to recapitulate some systematic aspects which have partly been dealt with from different points of view.

4.1. *The evolution of literary genres*

In the evolution of the various literary genres there was never simultaneous overlapping. While poetry changed along very clear-cut lines and these changes were expressed on most textual levels, narrative prose evolved slowly and vaguely. Poetry kept very close contact with contemporary European literature, which does not seem to be the case with fiction. The genre of drama, which started as early as the Hebrew Renaissance literature in Italy, has remained undeveloped. Plays by Israeli writers were staged towards the end of the forties, and only very recently (since the late sixties) have we witnessed a more accelerated development of this genre.

4.2. *Literary contacts and literary trends*

As the multilingual symbiotic polysystem of Hebrew literature distintegrated, Hebrew continued to maintain close contact with several of the literatures with which it had contact before. Contact with Russian literature seems to have lasted longer, at least up to the beginning of the fifties. Sporadic contact of some importance can be observed with Scandinavian literatures, up until the middle of the thirties, first via Russian and later probably via German. Most important in this case were Scandinavian impressionists (Hamsun, Bang, Jacobsen, and Obstfelder) and later (to a lesser extent) neo-realists (Andersen-Nexø). The contact with German literature, which started during the early Enlightenment period (at the beginning of the nineteenth century), leaves much to be studied. It is interesting to note that contact with Russian literature stretched over Soviet Russian literature as well, not least during World War II, when a significant section of Hebrew writers and the political establishment behind them adopted Soviet ideology in many domains. This is true not only of literary works where the anti-fascist struggle is described, but also of works praising new educational ideas, agricultural and social achievements and the like. The decline of social and political engagement which prevailed in the forties, the holocaust in Europe, the diminishing number of active writers and translators with a knowledge of Russian and the increasing number of those who knew English – all these factors weakened contact with Russian literature and made contact with English possible. Contact with the French has always been largely peripheral.

As far as literary currents are concerned, there has never been a stage at which the Hebrew mainstream was contemporary with a foreign one. Thus, at the beginning of the Hebrew Enlightenment (early nineteenth century), there was contact with Romanticism, but at the same time with the features of classicism and rationalism as well. Later on, in the sixties and seventies of the last century, the growth of Hebrew nationalism enabled Russian patriotic poetry to interfere (Nekrasov), but

the reaction to that kind of simplistic nationalist poetry did not evolve in the direction of Symbolism, as Russian poetry did. It was largely an amalgamation of features from the Russian Romanticists (Puškin, Lermontov, Fet, Tjutčev) and Symbolists (Ivanov, Brjusov or Belyj). But the sort of appropriations effected in that period, commonly called "The Revival Period," were of highly heterogeneous character from the point of view of Russian diachrony. Thus, a pre-Romantic metrical matrix could have been combined with some Symbolist features at other levels of poetic language. From a Russian point of view, then, one could speak of a "strange" combination of a Žukovskij with a Brjusov. A detailed investigation is, however, still needed.

It would appear that in the nineteen-twenties Hebrew was contemporary with European modernism. But as a matter of fact, pre-war poetry took root in Hebrew only after the war and occupied a dominant position only at the end of the thirties, when Symbolism, Acmeism and Futurism had long passed their culminating point. Even then, as is always the case when various diachronic options are simultaneously available, there were combinations of "romanticism" with later "symbolism," "early symbolism" with "futurism" – all "isms" clearly of the Russian flavor, although some of the major poets were well acquainted with French and German. This is also the case with the major change of the fifties, which, from the point of view of the European scene, goes back to the expressionism of the early twenties à la Trakl with much of Lasker-Schüller and Rilke and/or English imagism à la Eliot and then gradually moves to later stages in the works of some of the innovators.

The situation in fiction, however, was much more vague. It seems that only in the late fifties did a kind of international contemporariness arise which, subsequently, was harshly criticized as "alien" and "unnatural" by the dominant literary criticism.

4.3. *Socio-literary aspects*

The structure of the Hebrew reading public (according to age, sex, education, reading habits), the living conditions of Hebrew writers, the social and political functions of that literature, the relation of the political establishment(s) to literature – all these are indispensable questions for any history of Hebrew literature. Unfortunately, hardly any work has been done in this field, and only a very elementary compilation of some data has so far been possible.

For quite some time Hebrew letters could exist economically thanks to the courage and sacrifice of individual people, such as writers or groups of writers who virtually managed to publish works with very limited financial means. Hebrew letters also had its Maecenases in difficult times, notably the tea dealer, Wyssocki, and the forest merchant, Stiebel, who made it possible to publish books and periodicals and plan translations and other activities on a large scale. This kind of financial patronage made possible many important literary projects

which would have been impossible from sales income alone. It is remarkable that this kind of support was absolutely a-political, and there was no interference with the literary policy of the editors.

In Palestine, this kind of support went on for some time, but by the end of the thirties the Labor establishment and the leftist parties had most of the literary production under control, financially speaking. Patronage on a private basis was thus replaced by political patronage. The details of this process are as yet unknown, but it would appear, according to research being carried out now by Z. Shavit. (in preparation), that this kind of relation existed in Palestine before World War I. Then the literary establishment, whose central figure was Y. H. Brenner (1881-1921), linked itself from the beginning with the Labor section of the young community. This is true at least for canonized literature; other sorts of literary production oddly enough got more support from the right-wing and bourgeois milieux (Shavit & Shavit, 1974). This is not entirely clear, however, and should be accepted with reserve.

The fact that political institutions possessed the means for literary publication and distribution gave them the power to determine publishing policy and to influence literary concensus through criticism and other ideological tools of marketing. By publishing daily newspapers, periodicals, journals, weeklies for children, and by owning publishing houses and literary clubs, they could support or ignore whichever writers they pleased. In the same way they created a large and loyal public through a well-organized system of distribution which functioned in the Kibbutzim and in factories, offices, unions, commercial and industrial firms, etc., controlled by Labor. This politization of the means of literary existence can explain the peripheral position of writers, who, had they belonged to "the right side," could have probably occupied a really central position. This is true of right-wing and communist writers alike.

It was only towards the mid-fifties that this situation gradually changed, and made possible the emergence of several a-political literary periodicals which took center stage during this literary period (such as *Keshet, Likrat, Akhshav, Yukhani).* The left-wing publishing houses which controlled the market were still there, but their status in dictating norms and taste declined. This decline was eventually linked with the general decline in the social status of literature, which rendered literary struggles less important for social and political ideologies.

We possess little data on literary consumption, but it is clear enough that Hebrew literature could have never made it possible for writers to live from their writings. True, the distribution of literature per capita has always been among the highest in the world, but in absolute numbers this could never have provided a solid economic basis. In spite of the tremendous increase of the Jewish population in Palestine since the creation of the State of Israel (from 700,000 in 1948 to 3 million in 1976), the consumption of Hebrew literature has not increased proportionally. The reason seems to be the non-literary role Hebrew has played

for the majority of immigrants since 1948. Although they had a practical need to acquire a working knowledge of Hebrew, they continued to satisfy their cultural needs via other languages.

4.4. *The systemic state of Hebrew literature in the Israeli period*

4.4.1. As regards *multi-territoriality,* it seems that Hebrew literature gradually lost this feature of its long history, and during the nineteen-forties became a uni-*territorial* entity. One might even say that the new territory *saved* Hebrew letters from complete destruction, because of the increasing use of foreign languages among Jews, and the liberation of the Yiddish language and literature from the Hebrew symbiosis. As a result, Hebrew literature was no longer co-extensive with the geographical distribution of the Jewish people. It became the exclusive literature of the Israeli Jews only, while non-Israeli Jews stopped using both Hebrew and Hebrew literature. (Even at Zionist congresses, German, and later English were used as the lingua franca.) Just as Hebrew literature lost millions of potential readers in Europe in the period between World Wars I and II, so it lost all its potential readers in the United States. It then became what one is prone to call "a normal literature," i.e., a uni-lingual literature belonging to a uni-territorial nation which has become uni-lingual, too.

The results of this development have been, as far as the features discussed in our introduction are concerned, as follows:

4.4.2. A gradual change from the condition of multi-lingual literary symbiosis to a uni-lingual autonomous literature. This evolution has not been smooth and not necessarily the same for all literary components. The external features of symbiotic existence disappeared in a relatively short time, but the norms created by symbiosis did not. For example, the strong feeling about the canonized status of Hebrew literature became even stronger after the disintegration of symbiosis, rather than vice-versa. Thus, one observes the petrification of a previous state rather than a change. Similarly, while "global" components of literature may have quickly achieved an "autonomous" state, the processes for the more "basic" components, such as language, may have been slower. Clearly enough, no individual can free himself from a language (or languages) used prior to changing to another language, and neither Hebrew purism nor anti-Yiddishist or anti-Russian attitudes were able to eliminate certain patterns of verbal behavior. It is, therefore, quite difficult to determine when "total" liberation from the consequences of a multi-lingual situation takes place, or when the non-Hebrew substrata cease being active. Even when it seems, for instance, that on the level of vocabulary, phraseology and style, the foreign substrata disappear, they may still be active for other, less conscious levels. This may be, in a language like Hebrew with no lively spoken tradition, the case with intonation, void particles, gesticular sounds, and the like, Moreover, new waves of immigration have impeded

and retarded the process of autonomization. To sum up then, the process of autonomization has been slow and uneven, with a more accelerated tempo in evidence during the late sixties and the early seventies, that is some fifty or sixty years after it started.

Yet one should emphasize that partly because of linguistic tendencies to purism, partly because of literary conservatism and adherence to established models, and partly because of the fact that verbalism has been elevated as a value in literary modernism, the language of Hebrew literature is relatively remote from extra literary Israeli Hebrew, and is even rather reluctant to make literary use of the latter. This means that even native writers who grew up with Hebrew as their sole or main language have not automatically become, as writers, capable of using the new resources made available by modern usage. Clearly enough, literary norms have always been stronger, in any literature of some tradition, than "natural native lingual habits." When it comes to Hebrew, a language cherished for hundreds of years with so much zealous ardor, modern usage could not immediately gain ground as a legitimate literary vehicle. There has been a strong feeling of temporariness, even a conviction that the first few generations of Hebrew speakers were the new generation of the wilderness, i.e., a necessary but ultimately dispensible stage towards the achievement of a hoped-for linguistic optimum.

4.4.3. The defective Hebrew system gradually fills up. This refers to original literature only, since through translated literature it always managed to supply those needs optimally filled by home resources. Literature for children gradually grew richer, but as for various types of non-canonized literature, it seems that in spite of the initiatives taken in various periods, this system still has holes and is continuously being supplied by translations. It is still not clear what specific kind of relations have existed between canonized and non-canonized literature, just as it is still not clear whether non-canonized literature will ever be written *en masse* in Hebrew. The option to use translations is so much easier and less expensive; so, as there are no other compensations, the Hebrew polysystem may always rely on import for lower literature. What the consequences of such a state for high literature might be in the long run, along with other questions, calls for much research on the one hand, and for more adequate theoretical models on the other. One thing is undoubtedly clear: the history of Hebrew literature awaits its researchers.

(A newly written, up-to-date version of:

1. "Aperçu de la littérature israélienne," *Liberté,* XIV, No, 4-5 (Octobre 1972), 104-120.
2. "Israeli Hebrew Literature: A Historical Model," *Ha-Sifrut,* V, No. 3 (July, 1973), 427-440 [In Hebrew]).

Bibliography

Ahlström, Stellan. 1956 *Strindbergs erövring av Paris* (Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell)

Altbauer, Moshé, 1977. *Meḥqarim ba lašon,* I [*Studies in Linguistics, I*] (Jerusalem: Rubin Mass).

Bakoš, Mikuláš, 1964 K otazke předmětu literárnej historie," in: *Sborník Filozofickej Fakulty Univerzity Komenského,* 16.

1974 "Historische Poetik und Literaturgeschichte," in: Flaker & Zmegač, 1974: 145-154 (trans of Bakoš, 1964).

Baxtin, Mixail', 1965. *Tvočestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaja kuť tura srednevekovja i renesansa* (Moskva Xud. Lit.).

1971 *Rabelais and His World.* trans. Iswolsky, H. (trans. of Baxtin, 1965) (Cambridge, Mass: MIT).

1975 *Voprosy literatury i estetiki* (Moskva: Xud. Lit.).

Bertalanffy, Ludwig von, 1976. "Cultures as Systems: Toward a Critique of Historical Reason," in: *Phenomenology, Structuralism, Semiology,* Harry R Garvin, ed. (Lewisburg: Bucknell Univ Press), 151-161.

Bouasis, Charles, ed., 1972. *Analyse de la périodisation littéraire* (Paris: Editions Univ.).

Cassuto, M D , 1972 (1942) "Sifrut ibrit ve sifrut knaanit" [Biblical and Canaanite Literatures"]. in *Sifrut ibrit ve sifrut knaanit [Biblical and Canaanite Literatures*] (Jerusalem: Magnes), 20-54.

Charvat, William, 1950. "Literary Economics and Literary History," in: Downer, A. S., ed. *English Institute Essays 1949* (New York: Columbia UP), 73-91.

Curtius, E. R., 1955. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern: Franke).

Dan, Joseph, 1974. "Maase ha ruah ve ha iša ha-šeda" [The Story of the Dibbuk and the Demon-Wife]. *Ha-Sifrut* 18-19: 74-84; English summary: iv-v.

Ďurišin, Dionýz, 1974. *Sources and Systematics of Comparative Literature* (Bratislava: Universita Komenského).

1976 *Vergleichende Literaturforschung* (Berlin DDR Akademie Verlag).

Eimermacher, Karl, ed., 1971. *Texte des Sowjetischen Literaturwissenschaftlichen Strukturalismus* (in Russian) (München Fink).

Ejxenbaum, Boris, 1927. *Literatura: Teorija, Kritika, Polemika* (Leningrad).

1927 (1923) "O kamernoj deklamacii," in: Ejxenbaum, 1927: 226-249.

1929 "Literatumyj byt", in *Moj vremennik* (Leningrad Izd. písatelej), 49-58.

1971 "Literary Environment," in: Matejka & Pomorska, 1971: 56-65 (trans. of Ejxenbaum, 1929).

Ejxenbaum, Boris & Tynjanov, Jurij, eds., 1926 *Russkaja proza* (Leningrad: Academia) (Rep The Hague: Mouton, 1963.).

Erlich, Viktor, ²1965 (1955) *Russian Formalism* (The Hague: Mouton).

1965 "Literary Dynamics," in: *Russian Formalism* (The Hague: Mouton), 251-271.

Escarpit, Robert, 1968 (1958). *La sociologie de la littérature* (Paris: PUF).
1968b "'The Sociology of Literature," in: The *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* IX (New York: MacMillan), 417- 425.
Escarpit, Robert, ed., 1970. *Le littéraire et le social: Eléments pour une sociologie de la littérature* (Paris: Flammarion).
Etiembie, R., 1963. *La crise de la littérature comparée* (Paris: Gallimard).
Étkind, Efim, 1973. *Russkie poety perevodčiki ot Tredjakovskogo do Puškina* (Leningrad: Nauka).
Even-Zohar, Itamar, 1970. "Le-berur mahutah ve tifqudah šel lešon ha-sifrut ha-yafa be-diglosya" [The Nature and Functionalization of the Language of Literature under Diglossia], *Ha-sifrut II, 2,* 286-303 (English summary: 443-446).
1972 "Raše praqim le-teonya šel ha teqst ha-sifruti [An Outline of a Theory of the Literary Text], *Ha-Sifrut III,* 34, 427-446 (English summary: i-iii).
1972a "Aperçu de la littérature israélienne," *Liberté* XIV, 4-3 (Octobre), 104-120.
1973 "Ha-sifrut ha-ibrit ha-yisreelit: model histori" (Israeli Hebrew Literature: A Historical Model], *Ha-sifrut IV,* 3, 427- 440 (English summary: xxi-xxiii).
1974 "The Textemic Status of Signs in Literary Text and Its Translation," *Proceedings of the First IASS Congress*, *Milan, June* 2-6, *1974* (The Hague: Mouton) (in press).
1975 (1973) "Le reiazioni tra sistema primario e sistema secondario all'interno del polisistema letterario," *Strumenti critici* 26, 71-79.
1975a "Universals of Literary Contacts," in: F. Coppieters & D. Goyvaerts, eds. *Functional Studies in Language and Literature* (Ghent: Story-Scientia) (in press).
1976 "Interference in Dependent Literary Polysystems," in:*Proceedings of the VIIIth International ICLA Congress, Budapest,August 12-17, 1976* (in press).
1977 "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem," in: J. S Holmes, J. Lambert & R. van den Broeck. eds., *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies* (Leuven & Antwerp: Acco).
Fiaker & Zmegač, eds,, 1974 *Formalismus Strukturalismus und Geschichte* (Kronberg: Taunus).
Fokkema, Douwe W. 1974. "Method and Programme of Comparative Literature," *Synthesis* (Bulletin du comité national de littérature comparée de la république socialiste de Roumanie), I: 51-62.
Gačečiladze, Givi, 1972. *Xudožestvennyj perevod i literaturnye vzaimosvjazi* [*Literary translation and literary contacts*] (Moskva: Sov. pis.).
Galan, F. W., 1976. "Towards a Structural Literary History: The Contribution of Felix Vodička," in: Matějka, 1976, 456-476.
Gans, H. J., 1975. *Popular Culture and High Culture* (New York: Basic Books).
Gilboa, Yehoshua, 1976. *Lašon omedet al nafšah* [A *Language Fights for its Life*] (Tel Aviv: Sifriat Poalim).
Gombrich, E. H., 1970. *In Search of Cultural History* (Oxford).
Greimas, A. J. et al., eds., 1970. *Sign, Language, Culture* (The Hague: Mouton).
Gullién, Claudio, 1970. *Literature as System: Essays Towards the Theory of Literary History* (Princeton UP).

Guyard, M. F. 1951. *La littérature comparée (=Que sais-je,* 499) (Paris: PUF).
Haephrati, Joseph 1974. "Tmurot be širat ha-tèba ke-dégem šel maabar mi-tqufa li-tqufa ba historya šel ha-sifrut [Changes in Landscape Description in Poetry as a Paradigm of Literary Transition], *Ha-Sifrut* 18-19: 50-54. (English summary: vi-vii).
Harkavy, A. E., 1867. *Ha yehudim u-sfat ha slavím* [*The Jews and the Language of the* Slavs] (Vilno: Romm).
Hrushovski, Benjamin, 1968. "A1 tḥume mada ha-sifrut" [On the Main Branches of Literary Study]. Ha-Sifrut I, 1, 1-10.
1971 "Prosody, Hebrew," *Encyclopedia Judaica* 13, 1195-1240.
Jakobson, Roman, 1962 (1921). "O xudožestvennom realizme," in: *Readings in Russian Poetics: Michigan Slavic Materials,* 2, 30-36 (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan) (First published in Czech).
1966 *Selected Writings* IV (The Hague Mouton).
1971a *Selected Writings* I-II (The Hague Mouton).
1971b "On Realism in Art," in: Matejka & Pomorska 1971, 38-46 (English trans. of Jakobson 1962 [1921]).
1973 *Questions de poétique* (Paris: Seuil).
Jakobson, Roman, & Halle, Morris, 1964. "The Term *Canaan* in Medieval Hebrew," in: *For Max Weinreich on His Seventieth Birthday* (The Hague: Mouton), 147-172.
Jauss, Hans Robert, 1970a. *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation* (Frankfurt a/Main: Suhrkamp).
1970b "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," *New Literary History,* II, 1, 7-37.
Lambert, José, 1977 [1976]. "Echanges littéraires et traduction: Discussion d'un projet," in: J. S Holmes, J. Lambert & R. van den Broeck, eds., *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies* (Leuven & Antwerp: Acco).
1976 *Ludwig Tieck dans les lettres françaises* (Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain & Paris: Librairie Didier).
Levin, I. D., 1963 "Ob istoričeskoj evoljucii principov perevoda," In *Meždunarodnye svjazi russkoj literatury* (Moskva & Leningrad), 5-63.
Levin, Jury, 1967. "Nacionai'naja literatura i perevod," in: *Aktual'nye problemy istorii xudožestvennogo perevoda* II (Moskva), 79-91.
Lotman, Jurij, 1964. *Lekcii po struktural'noj poetike* (Tartu [Rep. Brown Univ. Slavic Reprint Series V, 1968]).
1970 *Struktura xudožestvennogo teksta* (Moskva: Iskusstvo).
1972 *Vorlesungen zu einer strukturalen Poetik.* K. Eimermacher, ed., W. Jachnow, trans. (München: Fink) (trans. of Lotman, 1964).
1973 *Structure du texte artistique* (Paris: Gallimard) (trans. of Lotman, 1970).
1976a (1973) "The Content and Structure of the Concept of 'Literature'," *PTL - A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* I, 2 (April, 1976), 339-356 (trans. Christopher R. Pike).
1976b (1970) "Culture and Information," *Dispositio,* I, 3, 213-215 (trans.,

Stephen White)
1976c (1974) “Un modèle dynamique du système sémiotique," in: *Travaux,* 1976 77-93,
Lotman, Jury & Uspensky, B , 1971, “O semiotičeskom mexanizme kul’tury,” *Trudy po znakovym systemam* V, 144-166 (Tartu).
Lotman, J. M. Uspenskij, B. A., Ivanov, V. V., Toporov, V. N. & Pjatigorskij A. M. 1975 “Theses on the Semiotic Study of Cultures (as Applied to Slavic Texts),” in Thomas A Sebeok, ed., *The Tell Taie Sign; A Survey of Semiotics* (Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press), 57-84.
Madsen, P., Pitteikow, R., Thau C., 1973. *Samfundsteori og tekstteori: Introduktion til literatursociologien* (Copenhagen Munksgaard) (=Poetik 19)
Matejka, Ladislav, 1973. “On the First Russian Prolegomena to Semiotics,” in Vološinov, 1973, 161-174.
Matejka, Ladislav, ed., 1976 *Sound*, *Sign and Meaning: Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle* (Ann Arbor: Slavic Dept., Univ of Michigan) *(=Michigan Slavic Contributions,* 6).
Matejka, Ladislav & Pomorska, Krystyna, eds., 1971. *Readings in Russian Poetics* (Cambridge, Mass MIT).
Mayenowa, Maria Renata, 1974. *Poetyka ieoretyczna* (Wroclaw; Ossolineum).
Meždunarodnye svjazy, 1963. *Meždunarodnye svjazy russkoj literatury* (Moskva Leningrad: AN SSSR).
Mouralis, Bernard, 1975. *Les contre-littératures* (Pans: PUF).
Mukarovský, Jan, 1970 (1936). *Aesthetic Function, Norm and Values as Social Facts*, Mark E Suino trans. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
1974 *Studien über strukturalistischen Ästhetik und Poetik,* H Grönebaum & G, Riff, trans. (München: Carl Hauser).
Murdock, G. P., 1949. *Social Structure* (New York).
Nemer, Monique, 1977. “Colloque littérature et traduction,” *Cahiers de littérature générale et comparée* 1, (Printemps, 1977: *La traduction littéraire*) 67-83.
Ofek, Uriel, 1977. *Rešit sifrut ha yeladim ha-ibrit* [*The Beginnings of Hebrew Children's Literature*] (*=Literature, Culture. Meaning)* The Porter Israeli Institute for Poetics & Semiotics, Tel Aviv University (Tel Aviv: Univ. Publishing Projects) (in press).
Pichois, Claude, 1966. “Littérature comparée et histoire littéraire nationale: le cas de la France,” *Actes du IV^e congrès de l'AILC, Fribourg, 1964,* F. Jost ed. (The Hague Mouton), 357-368.
Pichois, C. & Rousseau, A. M., 1967. *La littérature comparée* (Paris PUF).
Pike, K. L., 1967. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behaviour* (The Hague: Mouton).
Popovič, Anton, 1968. *Překlad a výraz* (Bratislava: Slovenská Akad Vied).
1975 *Téoria uměleckého překlada* (Bratislava: TATRAN).
Praz, Mario, 1950 (1933). *The Romantic Agony* (trans. of *La carne*, *la morte e il diavolo*).
Propp, Vladimir, 1955. *Russkij geroiceskij epos* (Leningrad).

Rosengren, K.-E. & Thavenius, J. *Litteratursociologi* (Stockholm: Natur och Kultur).
Sadan, Dov, 1962. *Abné bedeq* (Tel-Aviv: Hakibutz Hameuchad).
Sadan, Joseph, 1977. "Vin – fait de civilisation," in: *Studies in Memory of Gaston Wiet,* M. Rosen-Ayalon, ed., The Institute of Asian & African Studies, The Hebrew Univ. of Jerusalem (Jerusalem), 129-160.
Scholz, Bernard F., 1976 "Bunyan in Dutch Literature," Instituut voor Algemene Literatuurwetenschap, Univ. van Amsterdam (Mimeographed research programme).
1976a "Literary Evolution: The Formation of Literary Groupings in Western Europen at the End of World War II," Instituut voor Algemene Literatuur-wetenschap, Univ van Amsterdam (Mimeographed research programme).
Segre, Cesare, 1969. *I segni e la critica* (Torino- Einaudi).
Seiler, Hansjakob, ed., 1974. *Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien projekts 1973/74 (=Linguistic Workshop,* 2) (München: Fmk).
Shavit, Zohar & Yaacov, 1974 "Le-toldot 'sippur ha -péša' ha-ibri be éreẓ Yisrael," [Hebrew Crime Stones During the 1930's in Palestine] *Ha-Sifrut* 18-19, 30-73 (English summary: iv).
Shavit, Zohar, 1976, "Ḥilufe normot bi-tqufat maabar ba-šira: ha maabar mi-širat ha-haskala dérek ḥibbat ẓiyon le- širat ha -tḥiya be 'Luah Aḥiasaf,'" [Changes in Poetic Norms During a Transition Period in Hebrew Poetry of the Revival Period] *Ha-Sifrut* 23, 50-75 (English summary: vii-viii).
(in preparation) *Ha-ẓmiḥa ve ha-hitpatḥut šel "hḥjim sifrutijim" be éreẓ Yisrael 1905-1935* [*The Emergence and Development of 'Literary Life' in Palestine 1905-1935*] (Ph.D. Diss. Tel Aviv Univ).
Shmeruk, Khone, 1969. "Ha- qria la-nabi: Šneur, Bialik, Pereẓ, Nadson," [The Call to the Prophet: Shneur, Bialik, Peretz and Nadson] *Ha-Sifrut II,* 1, 241-244 (English summary: 251).
1975 "Ha -magaim ben ha-sifrut ha-polanit le-ben sifrut Yidiš; Al pi sippur Esterqa ve Qazimir ha-gadol melek Polin," [Contacts between Polish and Yiddish Literatures: The Story of Esterka and King Casimir of Poland] *Ha-Sifrut* 21, 60-100 (English summary: iii-iv).
1977 *Sifrut Yidiš: praqim be-toldotéha, I* [*Chapters in the History of Yiddish Literature,* I], The Porter Israeli Inst. for Poetics & Semiotics, Tel Aviv University (Tel Aviv: Univ, Publishing Projects) (*=Literature, Meaning, Culture 5).* (in press).
Shukman, Ann, 1977. *Literature and Semiotics: A Study of the Writings of Yu. M. Lotman* (*=Meaning and Art,* 1) (Amstersdam: North Holland).
Skaftimov, A. P., 1924, *Poetika i genezis bylin* (Saratov).
Šklovskij, Viktor, 1923. *Literatura i kinematograf* (Berlin).
Sommerfelt, Alf, 1971. *Diachronic and Synchronic Aspects of Language* (The Hague: Mouton).
Steiner, Wendy, 1976. "Language as Process: Sergej Karcevskij's Semiotics of Language," in: Matejka, 1976, 291-300.
Strich, Fritz, 1949 (1922). *Deutsche Klassik und Romantik* (Bern).

Striedter, Jurij, 1969. “Zur formalistischen Theorie der Prosa und der literarischen Evolution,” in: Striedter, Jurij, ed., *Texte der Russischen Formalisten, I* (München: Fink, IX-LXXXIII).
1978 “The Russian Formalist Theory of Literary Evolution,” *PTL* 3, 1, 1-23 (trans. of Striedter, 1969, LX-LXXXIII).
Teesing, H. P. M., 1948. *Das Problem der Perioden in der Literaturwissenschaft* (Groningen).
Tituntk, I. R., 1976. “M. M. Baxtin (The Baxtin School) and Soviet Semiotics,” *Dispositio,* 1, 3, 327-338.
Tomaševskij, Boris, 1923. “Literatura i biografija,” in: *Kniga i revoljucija* 4, 6-9.
1971 “Literature and Biography,” in: Matejka & Pomorska, 1971, 47-55 (English trans. of Tomaševskij 1923).
Toury, Gideon, 1974, “Li beayat teúr ha sífrut ke rab-maaréket,” [Literature as a Polysystem] *HaSifrut* 18-19 (December), 1-19 (English summary: i-iii).
1976 *Normot šel tirgum sifruti le ibrit 1930-1945,* [*Norms of Literary Translation into Hebrew 1930-1945*] Tel Aviv University (Ph.D. Diss., Mimeo; with extensive English summary).
Travaux, Tartu, 1976. *Travaux sur les systèmes de signes: Ecole de Tartu* (Bruxelles: Complexe).
Tynjanov, Jurij, 1929. *Arxaisty i novatory* (Moskva: Academia) (Rep München: Fink, 1967).
1929a “O literaturnoj evoljucii,” in: Tynjanov 1929, 30-47 (first published 1927).
1968 *Avanguardia e tradizione* (Bari: Dedalo libri) (Italian trans. of Tynjanov, 1929).
1968a *Puškin i ego sovremenniki*. V, Vinogradov, ed. (Moskva: Nauka).
1971 “On Literary Evolution,” in: Matejka & Pomorska, 1971, 66-78, (trans. of Tynjanov, 1929a).
Tynjanov, Ju, N. & Jakobson, Roman, 1928, “Problemy izučenija literatury i jazyka,” *Novyj lef* 12, 36-37.
1971 “Problems in the Study of Literature and Language,” in: Matejka & Pomorska, 1971, 79-81 (trans. of Tynjanov & Jakobson, 1928; Paragraph 9 omitted).
Vinogradov, Viktor, 1921. “Sjužet i kompozicija povesti Gogolja ‘Nos’,” *Načala,* 82-105.
1929 *Evoljucija russkogo naturalizma* (Leningrad).
1967 *Problemy literaturnyx jazykov i zakonomernostej ix obrazovanija i razvitija* (Moskva: Nauka).
1968 “O trudax Ju. N. Tynjanova po istorii russkoj literatury pervoj poloviny XIX v,” in: Tynjanov, 1968, 5-22.
Vodička, Felix, 1976 (1942) “Response to Verbal Art,” in: Matejka, L. & I.R. Titunik, eds., *Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions* (Cambridge Mass: MIT). 197-208. (trans. of “Dějiny ohlasu literárních del,” in *Čteni o jazyce a poesii,* B. Havránek & J, Mukařovský, eds., Prague).
Vološinov, V. N., 1929. *Marksizm i filosofija jazyka: osnovnye problemy sociologičeskogo metoda v nauke o jazyke* (Leningrad).

1973 *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language,* trans. by Ladislav Matejka & I. R. Titunik, (New York & London: Seminar Press) (trans. of Vološinov 1929).
Waugh, Linda R., 1976, *Roman Jakobson's Science of Language* (Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press).
Weinreich, Uriel, 1967 (1953) *Languages in Contact* (The Hague: Mouton).
1956 "Yiddish, Knaanic, Slavic: the Basic Relationships," in: *For Roman Jakobson* (The Hague: Mouton), 622-632.
1958 "Yiddish and Colonial German in Eastern Europe: The Differential Impact of Slavic," in: *American Contributions to the 4th Int. Congress of Slavicists, Moscow, Sept. 1958* (The Hague: Mouton).
Weinreich, Uriel, Labov, William & Herzog, Marvin, L. 1968. "Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change," in: *Directions for Historical Linguistics: A Symposium* (Austin: Univ, of Texas Press), 97-195.
Weisstein, Ulrich, 1973 (1968). *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory* (Bloomington: Indiana UP).
Wellek, René, 1963 "The Crisis of Comparative Literature," in: *Concepts of Criticism* (New Haven, Yale UP), 282-295.
Wienold, Götz, 1972. *Semiotik der Literatur* (Frankfurt a/Main: Athenäum).
Winner, Irene Portis & Winner, Thomas G., 1976, "The Semiotics of Cultural Texts," *Semiotica* 18/2, 101-156.
Žirmunskij, Viktor, 1924. *Bajron i Puškin* (Leningrad; Rep. München: Fink, 1970).
Żólkiewski, Stefan, 1974. "Quelques problèmes de la sémiotique de la culture dans les ouvrages d'auteurs des pays est-européens" (Paper presented to the 1st IASS Congress, Milano, June 2-6, 1974, Mimeo.).

THE PORTER INSTITUTE FOR POETICS AND SEMIOTICS
TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY

PAPERS ON POETICS AND SEMIOTICS

1. Ziva Ben-Porat & Benjamin Hrushovski. *Snuctural Poetics in Israel.* $2.00
2. Dmitri Segal. *Aspects of Structuralism in Soviet Philology.* $3.00
3. Channa Kaufman. A *Selective Bibliography of Semiotics and Related Fields in Israel in Recent Years.* $1.00
4. Vjaceslav V. Ivanov. *The Significance of M.M. Baxtin's Ideas on Sign, Utterance and Dialogue for Modern Semiotics.* $2.50
5. Benjamin Hrushovski. *Segmentation and Motivation in the Text Continuum of Literary Prose: The First Episode of "War and Peace."* $2.50
6. *Poetics in Periodicals: 1974.* Edited by Michel Eckhard (English and French). $2.00
7. Reuven Tsur. *A Perception-Oriented Theory of Metre.* $7.00

All papers are in English (unless otherwise specified).

Send your order and remittance to P.O. Box 39085, Tel Aviv, Israel. For airmail, add $1.00 per volume.