

Отримано: 12 травня 2018 р.

Прорецензовано: 29 травня 2018 р.

Прийнято до друку: 1 червня 2018 р.

e-mail: oksana.dzera@yahoo.com

DOI: 10.25264/2519-2558-2018-2(70)-11-15

Dzera O. Intertextuality and translation theory: strategies of research. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»: серія «Філологія»*. Острог : Вид-во НаУОА, 2018. Вип. 2(70), червень. С. 11–15.

УДК: 27-23:811.111'42=161.2

**Oksana Dzera,**  
PhD, associate professor  
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

## INTERTEXTUALITY AND TRANSLATION THEORY: STRATEGIES OF RESEARCH

*The new millennium has brought about tangible changes into the scholarly paradigm of translation studies, thus, re-forming traditional research strategies. Translation-focused investigation of intertextuality is carried out by representatives of different schools and trends. Generalization and systematization of their contribution makes manifest the following fields of research: general philosophic (translation of quotations and explicit allusions); poststructural (reproduction of implicit intertext); polysystemic (introduction of translation intertexts, i.e. literary and paraliterary references to the target culture); genrological (translation as intertext with a correlation of the primary and the secondary, thus determining the corresponding translation genre); discourse (intertextuality viewed as a textual determinant representing pragmatic signs and motivating reception).*

**Key words:** intertextuality, intertextuality, intertextual irony, mythoworld, implicit intertext, logopoiea, metatext, metacommunication, intertextual hybrid, topology of culture.

**Дзера Оксана Василівна,**  
Кандидат філологічних наук, доцент  
Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка

## ІНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНІСТЬ І ТЕОРІЯ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ: СТРАТЕГІЇ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

*Початок нового тисячоліття вніс суттєві зміни в науковий парадигму перекладознавства, що призвели до помітного переформатування ustalених дослідницьких стратегій. У перекладознавстві дослідження інтертекстуальності ведуться представниками багатьох шкіл і напрямів на різних методологічних засадах. Узагальнюючи і систематизуючи їхні праці, виділяємо ряд таких напрямів: загальнофілософський (усвідомлення перекладу як інтертекстуального явища та інтертексту як моделі перекладу); традиційний (переклад цитат і експліцитних алюзій); постструктуральний (відтворення імпліцитного інтертексту); полісистемний (поява в цільовому тексті перекладацьких інтекстів – літературних і паралітературних покликів на сприймаючу культуру); жанрологічний (переклад як інтертекст з певним співвідношенням первинного і вторинного, що мотивує наявність відповідних перекладацьких жанрів перекладу); дискурсний (інтертекстуальність як детермінанта тексту, яка репрезентує прагматичні ознаки і визначає рецепцію).*

**Ключові слова:** інтертекстуальність, інтекстуальність, інтертекстуальна іронія, міфосвіт, імпліцитний інтертекст, логопоеія, метатекст, метакомунікація, інтертекстуальний гібрид, топологія культури.

**Дзера Оксана Васильевна,**  
Кандидат филологических наук, доцент  
Львовский национальный университет имени Ивана Франко

## ИНТЕРТЕКСТУАЛЬНОСТЬ И ТЕОРИЯ ПЕРЕВОДА: СТРАТЕГИИ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

*Начало нового тысячелетия внесло существенные изменения в научную парадигму переводоведения, что заметно переформатировало традиционные стратегии исследования. В переводоведении изучение интертекстуальности ведут представители многих школ и направлений на разных методологических принципах. Обобщая и систематизируя их труды, выделяем следующие направления: общефилологический (осмысление перевода как интертекстуального явления и интертекста как модели перевода); традиционный (перевод цитат и эксплицитных аллюзий); постструктуральный (воспроизведение импліцитного интертекста); полисистемный (введение в текст перевода переводческих интертекстов – литературных и паралитературных ссылок на воспринимательную культуру); жанрологический (переводкакинтертекст с определенным соотношением первичного и вторичного, что мотивирует соответственный жанр перевода); дискурсный (интертекстуальность как детерминанта текста, которая репрезентурует прагматические признаки и определяет рецепцию).*

**Ключевые слова:** интертекстуальность, интекстуальность, интертекстуальная ирония, мифомир, импліцитный интертекст, логопозія, метатекст, метакомунікація, інтертекстуальний гібрид, топологія культури.

The article reflects an effort to scrutinize significant developments in the field of interfaces between intertextuality and translation, as well as to provide the general outline of approaches towards intertextuality research within the framework of translation studies. The research is *topical* as it is the first attempt at an overview of the overall strategies towards adapting intertextuality to translation analysis.

The term *intertextuality* is so broad that some scholars predict the danger: any researcher may bestow it with any meaning s/he fancies and this meaning will be correct [15, p. 2]. According to the apt remark of William Irving, most critics regard intertextuality as a stylish way to speak about allusions and influences [21, p. 228]. Yet originally this term used to explain the very ontology of literature rather than allusions as a literary phenomenon. On the one hand, intertextuality is a method of reading one text through the other, on the other hand, it is “a recognition and belief that all texts exist in a network of relations” [5, p. 171]. The researchers tend to focus on intertextuality as a method and disregard it being a philosophical and ideological trend as well as an integral parameter

of textuality in general. Thus, *the novelty* of the research lies in the effort to highlight and generalize most widespread as well as marginal but perspective approaches towards intertextuality within the translation studies framework as well as to afford their practical interpretation.

Intertextuality is so widely employed as a method of analyzing explicit references to other texts that it seems to have lost all connections with deconstruction that gave rise to it. Since each sign keeps traces of other signs, each discourse – traces of other discourses, each text – traces of other texts, all text are virtually intertexts. Some intertexts are explicit while others are so implicit that even the author himself may be unaware of them. In the philosophical sense the phenomenon of intertextuality entails: 1) the ability of any text to generate senses through the presence or copresence of other texts in it; 2) the shift of the authoritative right on true understanding of the text from the author to the reader; 3) the recognition of inner instability of the text and correspondingly, the possibility of multiple interpretations.

Derived from the Latin *intertexto* (intermingle while weaving) intertextuality is a term first introduced by French semiotician Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s. The scholar argues that a literary work is not simply the product of a single author, but of its relationship to other texts and to the structures of language itself. Thus, any writing is not absolutely creative because it always repeats something previously repeated.

The translation studies research of intertextuality can cover a lot of problems as the translation itself can be viewed as an intertextual phenomenon. Peeter Torop draws a parallel between the translation activity and the author's strategy of integrating somebody else's word into one's individual style [12, p. 169]. The secondary nature of both activities derives from their relying on prototexts.

As "each text is an intertext", "a multidimensional space in which a variety of writing, none of them original, blend and clash" [14, p. 146], the text we translate from can be regarded as an original only conventionally as its originality, according to Kristeva's metaphor, consists of "the mosaic of quotations" [22, p. 66]. Only multiple translations supplementing each other direct the reader (Eco's Model Reader, an imaginary ideal reader who can decode potential senses of the text and create a Model Author [3, p. 561-562]) to more or less complete understanding of the source text in combination of its own inner source texts.

Though intertextuality is a scholarly construct of the second part of the 20<sup>th</sup> c., the term suggests that there is nothing new under the sun. The phenomenon of intertextuality has been in the focus of translation analysis long before the coinage of the very term. In a series of Pound's articles "I gather the limbs of Osiris" (1911–1912) Osiris becomes a double metaphor of the original and translation: the god of death that is transformed into the source of new life after his scattered limbs are gathered [28]. Pound's idea that translation gives life to a dead original reverberates with Derrida's postulate: to translate means to give new life to the original that it can live "more and better [...] beyond the means of the author" [17, p. 203].

Pound's terminoid *vortex* (whirlwind) is also very close to the term *intertext*: "the power of traditions, centuries of race consciousness, conventions, associations" that live in words. In the 1930s Ezra Pound referred to this "charging of the language" as *logopoeia*, "the dance of intellect among words" comprising direct meanings of words, their traditional use, context and implicit irony [27, p. 170]. Since logopoeia implies intertextual associations, this notion conflates with the deconstructive metaphor *play* and the postulate about the language generating senses as there is nothing behind the language. According to E. Pound, logopoeia cannot be translated, only paraphrased.

This method is also called *interpretative*: the translator shows "where the treasures lie" making the target reader feel the flavour of the original (e.g. Pound's translation of the early Italian prose where he used English of the pre-Elizabethan epoch). If not interpretative, the translation is "the other sort" where the interpreter is making a new poem [26].

Similar dichotomy is typical of later translation typologies: illusionist and antiillusionist (I. Levy), affirmative and controversial (A. Popovic), formal and pragmatic (Yu. Nida), semantic and communicative equivalence (P. Newmark), primary and secondary functions of translation in the polysystem (I. Even-Zohar), documentary and instrumental (Ch. Nord), covert and overt translations (J. House) and the key dichotomy of foreignizing and domestication that dates back to F. Schleiermacher.

Pound's theory flashes out two approaches to comprehending intertextuality within the contemporary translation theory framework: 1) the word (Logos) accumulates explicit and implicit senses that require adequate translation; 2) secondary texts (metatexts) comprise all texts derivative of a prototext with various degrees of originality.

In the 1970s Anton Popovič ("Aspects of metatexts", 1967) [25] elaborated a detailed typology of intertextual (his term is metatextual) links both at microstylistic and macrostylistic levels of the text. He employs the term *metacommunication* to describe all types of text interpretation – by translators, literary critics, scholars and readers. Metatexts are discriminated according to their correlation with the prototext in different aspects: semantic, stylistic, axiological and in the aspect of reproducing the authors strategy.

According to the axiological and stylistic criterion metatexts can be: a) *affirmative* imitating the prototext and b) *controversial* which contradict the prototext; in both cases they can be either explicit or implicit.

Since the 1990s intertextuality has become one of the main parameters of discourse analysis. Basil Hatim and Ian Mason ("Discourse and the Translator", 1990) define intertextuality as a semiotic category: a sign system that expands the boundary of the textual meaning through connotations. A pragmatic status of an intertextual reference takes priority over its semiotic and informative status. In other words, to be adequate to the intention behind the allusion a translator can sacrifice this allusion by shifting or even neutralizing it [20, p. 134].

Albrecht Neubert and Gregory Schreve ("Translation as Text", 1992) conceive of intertextuality from the angle of the prototypical semantics. Intertextuality is perceived as the most important quality of the text along with intentionality, informativity, situationality, acceptability, cohesion and coherence. It is a model the reader compares with already existing samples abstracted from his / her experience. In other words, intertextuality is a set of the reader's textual expectations that should be heeded by a translator.

Intertextuality has a structure of the prototype with the hard core (typical features of the genre, which the reader easily identifies) and blurred edges of the periphery where some features are shared by different genres or text-types. Each translation has double intertextuality: the original has intertextual links with texts of the source language (SL) and translation establishes intertextual links with the texts of the target language (TL). The translator should give preference to textual connections of the TL to meet the target reader's (TR's) expectations. In general, the translator is the mediator of intertextuality of the source text (ST) and the target text (TT), thus translation can be referred to as *mediated intertextuality*.

Sometimes the translator makes the language of the original “to show through” the translated text and create *intertextual hybrids*. If such translations are repeated, they can result in lingual changes and introduce new textual traditions into the TL, “to enlarge the set of its cognitive repertoire” [23, p. 117–123].

George Steiner (“After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation”, 1992) regards intertextual elements in the broad cultural sense (not only words but also forms, themes and motifs) and refers to them as *topologies of culture* [30, p. 448]. Topologies are “manifold transformations and reordering of relations between an initial verbal events and its subsequent reappearances in other verbal or non-verbal forms”. Correspondingly, *topoi* are “invariants and constants underlying the manifold verbal, formal and thematic shapes and expressions in our culture” [30, p. 449].

The phenomenon of translation is also viewed correspondingly: “Defined topologically a culture is a sequence of translations and transformations of constants”. G. Steiner substitutes the term *intertextuality* by his coinage *interanimation*: “The new beginning draws on precedent or canonical models so as to reduce the menacing emptiness which surrounds novelty” [30, p. 477]. This “transfer of souls” (interanimation) has exerted influence on a substantial portion of Western literature, plastic art and philosophy and can vary from the obvious repletion to implicit allusion and change almost beyond recognition.

Translation studies paradigm of intertextuality has been elaborated by P. Torop (“Total translation”, 1995). Total translation covers 1) *textual translation* – translation of the whole text into the whole text; 2) *metatextual translation* – translation of the whole text into the culture: commentaries, reviews, ads; 3) *intertextual translation* – the author translates into his text somebody else’s word or the whole complex of them; 4) *extratextual translation* – splits the text into codes rendered by other than verbal means (screen production) [12, p. 23–24].

Torop discriminates between the terms *intertextuality* and *intertextuality* as broad and narrow understanding of intertextual links. *Intertextuality* is the whole semiotic space that generates senses and connects parallel or related phenomena within the same generation or literary trend. *Intertextuality* is defined as elements of one text in another one, intertexts have double function: as a unit of a given text and as a link to the prototext [12, p. 155].

Torop describes two strategies of reproducing intertexts depending on the type of their connection with the prototext: 1) *recoding* – adequate reproduction of the form; and 2) *transposition* – adequate reproduction of the content. Recoding consists of macrostylistic, microstylistic translation and citation, transposition comprises descriptive, thematic, free and expressive translations [12, p. 164–165].

Umberto Eco (“To Say Almost the Same Thing: Experiences in Translation”, 2003) views intertextuality in the poststructuralist light. The scholar introduces the term *intertextual irony* but the component *irony* loses its rhetorical and stylistic meaning. Intertextual irony is always implicit as 1) its references to other texts are not obvious, it is just “winking at the possible intellectual reader”; 2) it gives the possibility of dual reading: “the text can be read and enjoyed naively feeling no intertextual references, or the reader can fully comprehend those references and even hunt for them” [4, p. 259].

U. Eco advises a translator not to be afraid of radical transformations and substitute allusions that are unlikely to be known to the TR by absolutely different ones that can create similar pragmatic effect and evoke similar response. Ideal translation of an intertextual reference is the one where a translator reproduces no less but also no more of what the original hints at [4, p. 255–269].

Galina Denisova (“In the World of Intertext: Language, Memory, Translation”, 2003) conceives of the intertext as a semiotic and pragmatic notion and defines it as any sign of the cited culture and any reproduction of phrases from the discourses available in the language [2, p. 77].

Denisova singles out several functions of intertextemes due to the criteria of recognizability of the prototext and implicitness / explicitness of the intertext. The choice of the translation method depends on the fact what encyclopaedia (individual, national or universal) these intertextemes belong to. Main methods of translating intertextemes are 1) adaptation a) to find a ST creative analogue; b) to refer to the translated versions of the intertextemes in the TL; and 1) foreignizing a) by means of commentary; b) literally and without the commentary where intertextuality is lost [2, p. 298]. The key demand to the translation is that it “should create the third cultural space and generate new senses in the target culture” [2, p. 263].

Over the course of the past decade the ideas reverberating with the translation-focused notion of intertextuality has rapidly acquired currency among Ukrainian authors despite their diverse terminological preferences.

For Marina Novikova (“Myths and Mission”, 2005) translation is the most obvious form of intercultural dialogue: “Translation has transformed all literary plots into international and wandering ones, all authors (together with their multilingual translators) have turned into “narrators” while all national languages and cultures got involved into a direct dialogue where interlocutors speak about *the same though differently*” (Tr. by O. D.) [8, p. 47].

The structure of the book represents stages of this dialogue or intertextual connections: chapter 1 analyses translation as a dialogue of languages, cultures and mentalities; chapter 2 focuses on the national dialogue of “my” and “the other” in the culture; chapter 3 elucidates history as a dialogue of epochs; chapter 4 views metahistory (religion and faith) as a dialogue of time and the timeless values.

The scholar accentuates one of the favourite “orally theoretical” ideas of Mykola Lukash – “*the method of thin layers or rings*”: even the culture whose development was hindered keeps hints, “shifting traces” of great European styles resembling thin rings in the trunk of the tree in its hard years. M. Novikova argues that translators of Dante should take into account not only the experience of previous translators but also analyze so called Dante’s “prototypes” generated by the Ukrainian culture: Ivan Franko “translated” Dante into his own lyrical poems, Lessya Ukrainka – into her dramas and Mykhailo Drab-Khmara – into his new coinages [2, p. 45, 49–51].

The unique approach of M. Novikova is to read some texts (namely, “The Lass that Made the Bed to Me” by R. Burns, “Carman” by P. Merimee and “The Snow Maiden” by A. Ostrovskiy as implicit mythological intertexts (mythoworlds). She goes to great length to demonstrate that even the best translation can put out this “glimmer of the myth”. The most radical change is the shift of genre markers, e.g. Robert Burns ballad in the translation by Mykola Lukash is transformed into a folk song and in Samuel Marshak’s translation – into a romantic elegy [2, p. 94].

Andriy Sodomora (“The Study of one Verse”, 2006) avoids the term “intertextuality”, yet widely explores this phenomenon. The intertextual analysis traced throughout the monograph goes beyond allusions and quotations into the whole intertextual space that often remains implicit.

Instead of “intertextuality” A. Sodomora uses bright metaphors: “circles on the water running from the source” [11, p. 184], “reverberation” [11, p. 186], “go to the distance” [11, p. 327], “return to the proto-sources” [11, p. 130] etc. Intertexts are very individual, they appear “from the shadow of memory” that is an unconscious remembrance of something previously read which has become a part of your soul [11, p. 352].

The first scholarly attempts to elaborate the intertextual paradigm in the Ukrainian translation studies was done by Laryssa Hrek [1], Olena Kopyl’na [7], Anzhela Kamianets and Tetiana Nekriach [6]. A. Kamianets, in particular, mainly focuses her analysis on ironical allusions in the Russian and English author’s versions of Nabokov’s *Lolita* (there are differences between the two) and strategies of reproducing them into Ukrainian.

The phenomenon of intertextuality is elucidated to describe one of the translator’s key strategies in the monographs by Hanna Kossiv “Vira Rich. The creative portrait of the translator” (2011) [8] and Valentyna Savchyn “Mykola Lukash as a devotee of the Ukrainian artistic translation” (2014) [10]. The scholars opt for absolutely different kinds of intertextuality due to the strategies of the translators they research: H. Kossiv focuses primarily on Vera Rich’s translations of intertextual elements used in the works of Ukrainian authors (*translating intertextuality*) while V. Savchyn traces down intertextual references to the Ukrainian literature and folklore in Mykola Lukash’s translations (*translation intertextuality*).

In probing the notion of intertextuality as motivated translation strategy one can stress too disparate approaches:

1) different translators link themselves up to different codes, draw senses from different sources provided by the intertextual space of the original. E.g. The biblical intertext of the initial line of Ivan Franko’s “Prologue” – “*Народе мій, замучений, розбитий*” [13, p. 67] – is translated as a) “*My people so tortured and scattered*” [18, p. 47] – the Biblical intertext of the scattering of Israel, comp. “*And they shall know that I am the LORD, when I shall scatter them among the nations, and disperse them in the countries*” [31, Ezekiel: 12:15]; b) “*O People mine, divided, deathly tired*” [19, p. 38] – the New Testament intertext of incompatibility of the good and the evil that has acquired a new sense in Lincoln’s speech “The House Divided”, comp. “*Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to isolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand*” [31, Matthew 12:25]; c) “*My people, tortured, broken by ill-usage*” [13, p. 66] – historical reference to the oppression of Ukraine;

2) target culture (TC) broadens the intertextual space of the text referring to the sources from the receiving system of the past and modern discourses. E.g. in Yuriy Andrukhovych’s translation of Shakespeare’s “Hamlet” Claudius’ speech about his precipitated marriage with his brother’s widow – “*With a defeated joy, // With an auspicious, and a dropping eye, // With mirth in funeral, and with dirge in marriage, / In equal scale weighing delight and dole*” [29, p. 672] – the title image of Oleksandr Oles’ classical collection of poetry is used: - *Обнялися // З журбою радість, усміх і сльоза* [14, p. 21].

Each new translation through the penetration of new temporal and cultural layers transforms the original and its previous translations. The original together with its multiple translations of different languages and epochs constitute a common universe where texts indefinitely refer to each other and to themselves.

On looking at the legacy of intertextuality the article flashes out key fields of its adoption by translation studies scholars: 1) *philosophical* interpretation of the ontology of translation as an intertextual phenomenon; 2) *discourse* model mapping the concept of intertextuality as prototypical signs of the ST recognized by SRs and those of the TT identified by TRs; 3) *genre* discrimination of metatexts according to types of their correlation with the prototext; thus translation is viewed as a fluctuation of primary and secondary elements in the structure of a translation that determines its genre; 4) *traditional* idea of intertextuality as the presence of explicit allusions and quotations in the structure of the ST (most widespread trend); 5) *polysystemic* approach aiming to single out translation intertextuality, i.e. literary and paraliterary references to the target culture in the text of translation; 6) poststructural studies whose object is the implicit intertext (mythoworld, intertextual irony) and its translation potential (perspective research trend).

The analysis of intertextuality and translation studies conflation raises one of the most topical theoretical problems – genre translation theory, now limited to some random ideas. The other perspective for further research is the systemic analysis of mechanism of implicit intertext actualization in translation.

#### Література:

- Грек Л. Інтертекстуальність як проблема перекладу (на матеріалі англomовних перекладів української постмодерністської прози): дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.16 / Київ. нац. ун-т імені Тараса Шевченка. Київ, 2006. 220 с.
- Денисова Г. В мире интертекста: язык, пам’ять, перевод / предисл. С. Гардзонио; предисл. Ю. Караулова. Москва: Азбуковник, 2003. 298 с.
- Еко У. Надінтерпретація текстів. Поміж автором і текстом. *Антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. 2-е вид., доповн. Львів: Літопис, 2001. С. 549–578.
- Эко У. Сказать почти то же самое. Опыт и перевод / [пер. с итал. А. Коваль]. Санкт-Петербург: Symposium, 2006. 574 с.
- Енциклопедія постмодернізму / за ред. Ч. Вінквіста та В. Тейлора; пер. В. Шовкуна. Київ: Вид-во Соломії Павличко «Основи», 2003. 503 с.
- Кам’янець А., Некряч Т. Інтертекстуальна іронія і переклад. Київ: Видавець Карпенко В. М., 2010. 176 с.
- Копильна О. Відтворення авторської аллюзії в художньому перекладі (на матеріалі українських перекладів англomовної прози ХХ століття): автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.16 / Київ. нац. ун-т імені Тараса Шевченка. Київ, 2007. 16 с.
- Косів Г. Віра Річ. Творчий портрет перекладача. Львів: Піраміда, 2011. 264 с.
- Новикова М. Міфи та місія. Київ: ДУХ І ЛІТЕРА, 2005. 432 с.
- Савчин В. Микола Лукаш – подвижник українського перекладу. Львів: Літопис, 2014. 374 с.
- Содомора А. О. Студії одного вірша. Львів: Літопис, 2006. 364 с.
- Тороп П. Тотальний переклад / пер. з рос. О. Кальниченка, О. Оржицького. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2015. 264 с.
- Франко І. Мойсей: Поема / Ivan Franko: Роем. Львів: ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2017. 312 с. (укр. та англ. мовами).
- Шекспір В. Гамлет, принц данський / [пер. Ю. Андрухович]. Київ: А-БА-БА-ГА-ЛІА-МА-ГА, 2008. 238 с.
- Allen G. Intertextuality. New York: Routledge, 2000. 238 p.
- Barthes R. Image–Musis–Text. London: Fontana, 1977. 220 p.
- Derrida J. Des Tours de Babel. *Psyche. Inventions of the Other*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 2007. Vol. 1. P. 191–225.

- 
18. Franko I. Prologue / [transl. by M. Skrypnyk]. *The Ukrainian Canadian*. 1986. July–August. P. 40–41.
  19. Franko I. Moses and Other Poems / [transl. by A. Hnidj]. New York; Atlanta; Los Angeles; Chicago: Vantage Press, 1987. 146 p.
  20. Hatim B., Mason I. Discourse and the Translator. London; New York: Longman, 1990. – 258 p.
  21. Irwing W. Against Intertextuality. *Philosophy and Literature*. 2004. № 28.2.P. 227–242.
  22. Kristeva J. Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art / ed. L. S. Roudiez, transl. T. Gora et al. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1980. 305 p.
  23. Neubert A., Shreve G. Translation as Text. Kent; London: The Kent State Univ. Press, 1992. 197 p.
  24. Steiner G. After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation. Oxford; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992. 538 p.
  25. Popovic A. Aspects of Metatext. *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*. 1976. Autumn. P. 225–235.
  26. Pound E. Guido's Relations. *The Translation Studies Reader* / ed. by L. Venuti. London; New York: Routledge, 2000. P. 24–33.
  27. Pound E. Polite Essays. London: Faber & Faber, 1937. 207 p.
  28. Pound E. Selected prose. 1909–1965. New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation, 1975. 475 p.
  29. Shakespeare W. The Complete Works. Oxford: The Shakespeare Head Press, 1999. 1263 p.
  30. Steiner G. After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation. Oxford; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992. 538 p.
  31. The Holy Bible (the King James Version). London: Trinitarian Bible Soc., s. a., 1152 p.