
**THE SLOVAK SCHOOL OF TRANSLATION STUDIES
(DIONÝZ ĎURIŠIN AND TRANSLATION FUNCTIONS)**

LIBUŠA VAJDOVÁ

Institute of World Literature, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava

ABSTRACT

The turns in the humanities over the past decades have not brought any radical renewal to contemporary translation studies, but rather an extension of the view to summarize or focus on some of its particular aspects. This may be the reason why some traditional notions have reappeared as a part of recent concepts in translation studies. The following text reflects on the modalities of interpreting several notions in current TS concepts as compared with the Slovak Translation School (Popovič, Ďurišin), which are based on Czech and Slovak structuralist thinking from the 1920s and 1930s. The aim is also to draw attention to the potential of conceptualization in current TS, such as the role of creation in translation, the decisive position of the receiving environment (Target) in the translating process, or representations of the translation movement in multilingual, multiethnic and multicultural spaces as well as the undeniable literarity of every translation.

Keywords: Czech and Slovak structuralism; Russian formalism; inter-literary process; receiving/sending context or environment; functions of receiving/sending environment; creative equivalence; decisions; needs; multilingualism; multiculturalism; domestication; adaptation; borrowing; rewriting

Introduction

The turns in the humanities over the past decades have surprisingly extended the number of aspects studied, but not their main principles, or as Maria Tymoczko wrote, there are “Signs of necessity to rethink fundamentals” (2009: 401). Perhaps this is the reason we are witnessing recurrent discussions in TS about new turns, whether it involves reviving the old theories, parallel views towards old and new theories, the known and unknown, or space and time.

Reconsideration of the old theories is a very current topic of international debate in the humanities.¹ One of the symptoms of reconsidering the issues forgotten in the past

¹ See the large number of meetings organized on such issues as the Russian formalist school (Moscow 2013), Czech, Slovak and Polish Structuralism (Prague 2013), TS in Slavic Countries (Bologna 2014),

is the fact that some traditional notions have reappeared as a part of recent concepts in Translation Studies (creation, process, function, conception, interliterarity or literariness, poetics, domestication, adaptation, localization, foreignization, etc.).

A new concept based on an older one is nothing exceptional. In spite of this, we are usually not very conscious of how the new concepts maintain traces of their former use which are altered and hybridized into new meanings. It is quite difficult to assess the consequences of the former meanings in a new concept. In the following discussion, I will provide a few examples of this based on the material of the Slovak School of TS.

The role of structuralism in Slovak TS

The Slovak School of Translation Studies, known under the name of Anton Popovič, has been built on structuralist and formalist foundations. Slovak structuralism started at the beginning of the 1940s with the volume *Teória literatúry* (The Theory of Literature), an anthology of Russian Formalism translated into Slovak by Mikuláš Bakoš in 1941, including the articles of Veselovsky, Shklovsky, Tynyanov, etc. This happened two decades after the golden era of Czech structuralism during the interwar period. Czech structuralism was known in the Slovak academic environment because of the numerous Czech intellectuals who were active in Slovakia after the establishment of Czechoslovakia in 1918. Even Jan Mukařovský was teaching at Comenius University in Bratislava between 1931 and 1937.

Unfortunately, this process was interrupted during the 1950s by the ideological oppression and international isolation stemming from Soviet Union communist rule in the countries of central and south-eastern Europe. The revival started during the 1960s with an ideological emancipation, and in turn, translation studies regained its main positions immediately.

In the 1960s, Slovak Translation Studies began to develop its own theoretical concepts, built upon the renewal of structuralist thinking at the time. This involved, in particular, the aesthetics theory formulated by Mukařovský, Vodička, and the Slovak structuralist, Mikuláš Bakoš, the communication model of translation constructed by Roman Jakobson in the 1920s in the Prague Linguistic Circle, well before leaving for the USA, and Jiří Levý's translation theory based on his socio-historical concept. A common Czech and Slovak foundation for TS was first presented by Levý's work *České teorie překladau* (Czech Theories of Translation, 1957) and later by his seminal book *Umění překladau* (The Art of Translation, 1963, 2011). The fact that the Slovak TS scholar Popovič was a doctoral student and a very close disciple of Levý at Masaryk University in Brno is also significant.

Slovak school of translation studies

The relevance of Czech structuralism and Russian formalism in Slovak thinking on translation is demonstrated also by the contribution presented by the Slovak comparativ-

the workshops on the issue of New and Old Theories at the XXth ICLA Congress (Paris 2013), and many publications on the same topic.

ist and TS scholar Dionýz Ďurišin at the 6th International Congress of Slavonic Studies in 1968 in Prague titled “Otázky porovnávacieho skúmania literatúr a analýza prekladateľskej metódy” (Issues of Comparative Literature Research and the Analysis of Methods of Translation). According to Ďurišin, the asset of structuralism to literary criticism is for his generation decisive: “The traditions of structuralism in literary scholarship were especially inspiring. Their legacy, in a somewhat changed form, opened up great possibilities for studying the artistic literary work itself” (1968: 389).²

Again, he brought back the incentives of structuralism in his book *Z dejín a teórie literárnej komparatistiky* (From the History and Theory of Comparative Literature, 1970: 39–68, 69–95), where he analysed the works of the Russian scholar and literary historian A. N. Veselovsky, often drawing on his works, Russian formalists and other Czech and Slovak structuralists, such as Karel Krejčí and Frank Wollman (his doctoral tutor in Brno).

In the quoted article “Issues of Comparative Literature Research and the Analysis of Methods of Translation” from 1968, Ďurišin stated that interest in translation is increasing rapidly. Theoretical background, however, is missing, thus leaving the analyses and evaluation, as well as translation criticism, behind practical translation. A similar feeling was shared by his whole generation, and thus theoretical concepts of more translato-logists, such as Anton Popovič (1968, 1971, 1975, 1976) or František Miko with his theory of expressivity in translation were created.

When the Slovak School of TS was formed at the turn of the 1960s and the 1970s, both main theorists, Popovič and Ďurišin, started from the communication model of translation. The difference between them was neither in the direction of action, nor in its main actants, as indicated by the general communication model of translation AUTHOR – TEXT – RECEPTOR, amended by Popovič as EXPEDIENT – TEXT 1 – TRANSLATOR – TEXT 2 – PERCIPIENT. The difference was that Ďurišin understood the flow of information as a simple relay, analogous to journalistic news (announcements, reports, references, etc.). He called this function of translation mediation, and he did not consider it important as it dealt only with the intermediation of information (1968: 393). In his opinion, the analyses of translation from the communication point of view understood translation only as an exchange of lexical or syntactic elements, thus they focused on searching for exact linguistic equivalents or shifts, deviations, which made the translation much simpler. Ďurišin found shifts to be an inevitable part of each translation (1976: 140–142). However, the substantial shifts are not linguistic. They are creative changes at all levels of the translated work. The important factor is how the translator shifts the work, either in terms of language or on the artistic, literary level.

According to Ďurišin, the mediation function refers to professional translations, whereas literary translation, on the contrary, concerns the creative and meta-creative function. Literary translation embodies the artistic vision of the original – the creative function, and at the same time, creates new aesthetic information within the secondary modelling system – the function of meta-creation. Already in the 1970s, he used Lotman’s semiotics, and in this spirit, he also understood the meaning of equivalence. At the

² In Slovak: “Podnecujúco pôsobili najmä tradície literárnovedného štrukturalizmu, ktorého určitým spôsobom pretvorené dedičstvo otváralo veľké možnosti pri práci s vlastným umeleckým dielom” (1968: 389).

linguistic level of the text, he saw it as information equivalence. At the level of the entire work, he understood it, however, as functional or creative equivalence, i.e. as a system of creative changes, deviations and shifts brought into the new text by the translator, thus creating a translation, which is different from the original work. Only creative changes enable the translation to actively participate in the new receiving environment. The value of translation lies in the highest possible level of creativity, i.e. not in the transfer of information, but in the creative transformation.³ Hence, Ďurišín's approach to translation is the opposite of the customary use, even today: not from language to the work, but from the work to the language level.

This resulted from the methodological advantage he had. Since he was grounded in comparative literature studies, he perceived translation as a part of two literatures at the same time – as a process, which enables the original to work not only in the environment of its origin, but also in the new receiving medium, in the environment of new literature, where it received different features. In his first theoretical work *Teória literárnej komparatistiky* (Theory of Comparative Literature Studies, 1975), he defined translation as “one of the significant expressions of inter-literary co-existence”, the primary function of which was to “get the narrowest bands of domestic literature with the evolutionary process in the literatures of other nations” (originally “inonárodné”, that means “other-national literatures”, 1975: 145).⁴ Translation did not have to arise as a consequence of impact or contact, as confirmed by traditional comparative literature studies in the 1970s. It could also be an echo of the impulse from a third literature or a translation to a third language or an expression of the fact that the receiving environment (translator, publisher, literary critics, readers) realized the importance of the work in its own situation.

He also included in this book the study “Preklad ako forma vzťahu” (Translation as a form of relationship, 1975: 172–180), where he defines translation as a process with different stages of independence from the original, from faithful translation through adaptation and resemblance up to an original creation (named “re-creation”). Although these terms were commonly used in literary criticism, Ďurišín changed the perspective, using them from the point of view of relationships between the texts and arranging them under the heading “Classification of integration and differential forms of reception”: allusion, reference, variation, borrowing, resemblance, plagiarism, adaptation, translation.⁵ With this understanding of translation, Ďurišín had already come close in the mid-1970s to the current meaning of intertextuality.

³ Ďurišín understood the communicative transfer of information in a relatively narrow way as a transfer analogous to journalistic information. According to him, analyses of translation from the communication point of view searched only for shifts at the linguistic level, not for complex changes of the meaning. In order for translation to have more than a mediation function, it had to be creative. Many of the directions in TS focused exclusively on the research of linguistic forms in the texts and stopped at the primary language level, having difficulties incorporating the elements of cultural meaning into their analysis.

⁴ In Slovak: “jeden z významných prejavov medziliterárneho spolužitia”; “obstarávať najužšie vzťahy domácej literatúry s procesom inonárodného literárneho vývinu” (1975: 145). Ďurišín constructed the terms “interliterary” co-existence, or “interliterary”: process, as well as the term “othernational literatures” instead of the term “foreign literatures”.

⁵ In Slovak: “Klasifikácia integračných a diferenciačných foriem recepcie: alúzia, narážka, variácia, výpožička, ponáška, plagiát, adaptácia, preklad.”

At the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, further changes had occurred. In two consequent volumes *O literárnych vzťahoch: sloh, druh, preklad* (About Literary Relationships: Style, Genre, Translation, 1976) and *Teória medziliterárneho procesu* (Theory of the Interliterary Process, 1985), Ďurišin laid down the principles for his extensive systematics, to which he added additional terms. Since he considered translation to be an expression of movement, which permanently takes place between various literatures and includes all connections, parallels, processes of recognition or contacts, he named this movement the interliterary process.

He also worked on the notion of the interliterary process in the 1980s.⁶ Although the term systematics – theory of the interliterary process – sounds theoretically, it expresses an extraordinarily dynamic phenomenon – the life of literatures, changes, movement. This is also obvious from the terms and notions of his model. Let's look at the most important of these:

- (1) Translation as a variable form of the interliterary process, translation as a creative equivalent,
- (2) The decisive role of the receiving environment in the translation process, the functions of translation,
- (3) The inevitability of changes in creative translation and the different forms of freer or more strict translation,
- (4) The geographical concept of literatures as well as the multi-functionality of translation in interliterary communities and centrism,
- (5) Various approaches to world literature and the role of translation in it.

Relationship between the Source and the Target

The term interliterary process was unique at the time of its creation. Even if we use rather the term transliterary today, the meaning of interliterary has not disappeared. It denotes a movement of literary works between individual cultures, languages and literatures in the world. In Ďurišin's opinion, what will be translated is decided by the receiving environment. It is the same as in the case of intertextual relationships. In addition, the initiators of relationships between texts are the authors (translators) who choose from the existing texts and not the authors who are sending them.⁷ It is the same approach to intertextuality that was applied by functional TS and by the theories of reception and reader studies.

Current TS continues to reproduce a traditional, classical model of transfer, i.e. transfer of the text from the Source Context to the Target Context (SC → TC). Based on

⁶ Ďurišin's concept of translation occurred in two stages:

- The first of these (1970s and 1980s) focused on translation and its connection to the interliterary process. He analysed artistic translation, equivalence, translation shift, and others in the background of literary history and literary theory (semiotics).
- The second stage (1980s to 1990s) examined translation within interliterary communities, centrism and world literature, which represent its original contribution to world comparative studies.

⁷ Many books, texts, expressions, images, media messages, works of art, etc. submitted by authors remain without response, not provoking a positive or negative reaction, because the receivers themselves choose the message to which they want to react.

this, the dependence of translation on the original work is then derived. Consequently, translation is evaluated depending on the extent to which it corresponds to the original. Ďurišín, however, similarly as Tymoczko (2009) mentioned recently,⁸ pointed out that the process of translation takes place the other way round. The starting point of translation is not in the sending environment, but in the receiving environment, because it actively selects the work for translation, seeks the way of interpretation and translation. Thus, in the translation process, the receiving environment is decisive, not the sending environment.

Sometimes it happens that a translation arises in the sending environment (literature of the original work), i.e. in the Source Context. Even in such a case, it is changed either by the language it is translated into or later by the perception in the receiving environment, i.e. the Target Context. The concept of transfer from SC → TC is an expression of still persistent fetishizing of originality and of the biologized model of evolution from the roots to the blossom, resulting from the idea of historical causality as well as progressist and determinist understanding of temporal continuity from the beginning to the endless future.

Ďurišín's statement must be mentioned. He had already formulated it in the 1970s, nevertheless, it is discussed again, despite the attempts to solve the problem by several theoreticians of TS (Vermeer, Toury⁹). Ďurišín also brought other features into the thinking about translation – reasons for choice and the manner of translating. As we have mentioned, the choice of the work for translation is made by the receiving literature (translator, editor, literary criticism, social order, institutions, etc.), to which the work will belong after being translated. Based on what criterias is the work chosen? Ďurišín claims it depends on the evolutionary needs of the receiving environment. A new factor enters the game – evolutionary needs. This means that a certain type of work is required by the receiving literature or culture at a certain time because this work is relevant to it. A foreign literary work can be involved in the receiving literature only when its translation (a) is suited to the literary norms and cultural ideas of the receiving environment,¹⁰ and (b) adds to or innovates the receiving literature. The receiving environment also decides about the way in which the work is translated. The differences between the original and translation occur thanks to the receiving environment's interpretation of a foreign work, which can be perceived quite differently than by its author

⁸ Tymoczko (2009: 401–421) expressed her doubts about the transfer hypothesis as the dominant conceptual model of Eurocentric translatology “terms like localization indicate a movement away from the old transfer hypothesis that has dominated Eurocentric thinking about translation” (2009: 401) and further “translation involves close transfer of the message (particularly the semantic meaning) of the source text” defining the transfer as an action of “carrying across”, “leading across”, “setting across” an object (2009: 405).

⁹ Besides the teleological approaches to language and communication in the works of Czech structuralism, we should also mention that Gideon Toury (1980: 30) wrote about Ďurišín's approach as follows: “Translation is a highly teleological activity; in other words, that the exertion of any single act of translating is to a large extent conditioned by the goal it serves. Thus, in order to be able to understand the process of translation and its products, one should first determinate the purposes which they are meant to serve, and these purposes are set mainly by the target, receptor pole which, in processes of this type, serves as the ‘initiator’ of the inter-textual, inter-cultural and interlingual transfer.” In *In Search of the Theory of Literary Translation*.

¹⁰ This means the translated work is perceived as a translation.

or its original environment.¹¹ In the 1970s, a similar differentiated comprehension of the literary process was unusual.

Limits of translation

We have seen what forms of reception relationships Ďurišín formulated – ranking from allusion, through borrowing up to plagiarism, adaptation, and artistic translation (1975: 172–180). Translation expresses an image of foreign literature in the receiving environment, but in a modified form. Translation cannot create an exact equivalent of the original because the two language systems are inadequate or incommensurable (1976: 122). In addition, the methods of translating change depending on the norms of the particular time period. Ďurišín did not reject the concept of equivalence, though, according to him, the aim of translation is to construct functional equivalence.¹² This can only be achieved if the equivalent is creative.

The choice of a functioning equivalent of artistic processes [...], might sometimes lead to the complete negation of the individual language means, e.g. at the level of the morpheme, word, or even the sentence. [...] Respecting equivalence of linguistic means is unbinding in terms of the functional equivalence of an artistic text¹³ (Ďurišín 1976: 129).

We can see that Ďurišín loosens the relationship between the original and translation up to the limit of the new text, which was an unacceptable approach at a time when the original work and translation strictly differed.

Translation in interliterary communities

Translation Studies used to have an extraordinary position in Czech and Slovak society also because the region of former Czechoslovakia is a multilingual, linguistically and ethnically mixed unit. Unlike the linguistically and culturally unified countries in Western Europe, translation played a significant role in central and south-eastern Europe for centuries. The international TS community did not recognize this difference because it built its concepts with regard to its own conditions. In recent years, however, perceptions have started to change, in particular in the USA (Saussy, for exam-

¹¹ See the study of Leena Laiho “A literary work – Translation and Original: A Conceptual Analysis within the Philosophy of Art and Translation Studies” (*Target* 2007: 297) based on the well known Borges essay “Pierre Ménard, auteur del Quijote” where Borges argues that even a faithful transcription of a literary work can be considered as a new original work.

¹² Functional equivalence differs from the original because it is creative. Ďurišín used Lotman’s concept of a secondary modelling system. As the translating process is a specific creative activity, the translator as a kind of creator subordinates the language categories to literary categories, which Ďurišín called the structural-semantic categories (1976: 129).

¹³ In Slovak: “Voľba funkčného ekvivalentu umeleckých postupov [...], môže niekedy viesť k úplnej negácii jednotlivých jazykových prostriedkov napr. na úrovni morfémy, slova, ba dokonca aj vety. [...] Rešpektovanie ekvivalentnosti jazykových prostriedkov je z hľadiska funkčnej ekvivalentnosti umeleckého textu nezáväzná” (Ďurišín 1976: 129).

ple), and some typical phenomena, such as bilingualism and multilingualism, bi-literarity and poly-literarity, or the author, translator and even translation having two or more homes, have become more common in TS. Ďurišín was forced to see translation from this point of view, and he, therefore, brought to TS the idea of the functioning of a translation in Specific Interliterary Communities (SICs), which are one of the forms of the interliterary process.¹⁴

Translation has a unique position in the SICs. It functions in several cultural, linguistic, ethnic or religious environments, by which the reception of the translated work gains various mixed forms. The translator (and the author) often works with multiple languages and must reflect the characteristics of several cultures. Interliterary communities are complex units of languages and cultures, where translations are moving between them. By their formulation, Ďurišín demonstrated that translations do not occur equally, but are also based on preferences, depending on the geographical, i.e. spatial, arrangement of linguistic and cultural units. The factor of space in TS has been referred to by, for example, the American sinologist and comparative literature scholar Haun Saussy.¹⁵

Translation in world literature

The model of the interliterary process originates from the level of national literature, and through interliterary communities and interliterary centrism, it advances to the level of world literature. In this regard, Ďurišín wrote several studies and two books (1992, 1993).¹⁶ His contribution to developing the categorization of world literature was assessed by César Domínguez in the study “Dionýz Ďurišín and the systemic Theory of World Literature” (2011: 99–107). He used as the basis predominantly the book that Ďurišín published in 1992 entitled *Čo je svetová literatúra?* (What is World Literature?).

Also in this work, Ďurišín deals with translation and asks a very indicative question: “Does the artistic translation take on a new meaning?” (1992: 185–190). From a certain point of view, yes, because it finds itself in a much wider interactive framework. In his opinion, translation becomes a part of all levels and parts of world literature and individual literatures at the same time. He designated the phenomenon “domestication of *other national* works [...] in *other literary* system” (1992: 184).¹⁷ It means that a work

¹⁴ Interliterary communities are groups of literatures of different languages and cultures living in one administrative unit (Belgium) or one historical or political unit (Slavonic literatures, Spain). They are characterized by the cultural and linguistic diversity being, at the same time, internally interconnected (historical functions). Ďurišín published 6 volumes of *Specific interliterary communities* in a Slovak-French edition: *Osobitné medziliterárne spoločenstvá I–VI / Communautés interlittéraires spécifiques I–VI*, (1987–1993).

¹⁵ As was done, for example, by Haun Saussy, who entitled his contribution about translation in the XXth ICLA/AILC Congress in Paris 2013 “By land or sea: models of World Literature”. Not published. See Bulletin AILC 2013. Paris: Université Paris Sorbonne 2013, 32.

¹⁶ The latter one, *World literature with pen and chisel* (1993), is interesting as it expresses terms, such as communities, interliterary process or world literature in words and also through the fine arts in a three-dimensional wood sculptures made by Vladimír Korkoš. The French version of the publication has the title: *Littérature mondiale en tant que communauté interlittéraire finale*.

¹⁷ We are using the forms of Ďurišín's terms *other national* and *other literary* because they were essential for his thinking on translation. The meaning of the terms is not yet complicated: “domestication of

from a different literary, historical and cultural environment is incorporated, after being translated in each specific literature in which its translation was published, as its own production. The translated work fulfils the same functions as all literary works created in this literature, becoming part of the receiving environment. Domestication is only possible if the work is translated creatively and contains relevance indicators for the receiving environment. Otherwise, it remains in the new environment as an external phenomenon that can join it later.

More factors participate in the domestication of foreign works. Ďurišín does not think of the external indicators, such as updating, naturalization or localization, but the creative reworking of features of the translated works (composition, figurative language, style, metaphors, expressiveness, message, factography, etc. on the level of meta-creation). The methods of transforming the qualities of the work in the process of translation may be varied – toward the past, towards foreignization, popularization, hybridization or creolization. An important aspect is what is relevant for the receiving environment.

Ďurišín outlined several concepts of world literature (normative, additive, historical, based on literary values or on historical poetics, total, etc.). Thanks to his spatial imagination, he built a model based on the relations between various literatures and on the movement of translations in space (as ideas, texts and objects). His concept of world literature could be characterized as a system of geographical segments (other national literatures, communities, centrism, networks), which are layered above each other according to the level of complexity, whereas they include the same literary phenomena, just at different levels of involvement.

Terms

The previous meanings are not completely or definitively missing from the redefined terms and notions. Let's look at several terms from Ďurišín's systematics, which are not considered as new but are reintroduced with new content.

The term *domestication* has been used in Slovak theories on translation for several decades. Ďurišín used the term in 1992 when interpreting the forms of translation in his book *What is world literature?*¹⁸ In international TS, the term *domestication* started to be used after 2000 by Lawrence Venuti. According to Ďurišín, domestication is not identical to assimilation or naturalization, as it is not about adjustment of the content (facts), but about reworking the literary components and procedures of construction, by which the work was created. Basically, both authors express the same phenomenon, only with a diametrically different evaluation. Ďurišín positively evaluates domestication of the translated work because he understands it as a result of the activity and creativity of the receiving environment, whereas Venuti evaluates domestication negatively because he understands it as a result of violence, pressure and deformation of the sending environment.

a literary work of a foreign nation [...] in the system of another literature". Ďurišín did not agree with the notion of foreignness. Instead, he invented his own concepts on the basis of the notion of otherness.

¹⁸ A leading American comparatist, David Damrosch, published his book under the same title *What is World Literature?* (2003) more than 10 years after Ďurišín without any mention of it.

The main role is played by the receiving environment when selecting the work for translation and during its translation. Ďurišin named this phenomenon the *decisive role of the receiving environment (context)* even in the early 1970s. Functional theories of translation used the same manner of thinking. It is the opposite to that outlined by the transfer model, established in western TS, which understands the movement of translation exclusively from source to target. It is remarkable how long this model has endured despite its mechanical notion of the sequence from beginning to end and from cause to consequence (from ST to TT). Historiography rejected the causal model and the continuous understanding of time a long time ago. Let's not forget how the movement in the cultural area was captured by Pierre Bourdieu with his theory of competition in the field of intellectual products, where translations can compete with original literary works. In the basic transfer model from ST to TT, there is one idea only – binary understanding of phenomena, where the entire process of changes and mutual interconnections vanishes in favour of two separate poles.

Interliterary process is another term that Ďurišin uses to express the complexity of translation. He is the only one in TS to present translation as a living movement of different directions between languages, literatures and cultures, mapping the origin and occurrence of translation in historical time, in the sphere of literary poetics and multiethnic and multilingual complexes. The term was created in the second half of the 1970s.

At the end of the 1960s, Ďurišin also focused on the role of *creativity* in translating. In his opinion, the translator has the status of author, overlapping with the role of writer, which is a daring idea even today. Thus, he brought *literariness* to the forefront, which appears in both literary and utilitarian discourse. This term also returns to TS, and not only when studying literary texts.

We have mentioned that, in the mid-1970s (1975: 172–180), Ďurišin defined translation as a process with different levels of freeing up the translation from the original work. Thus he allowed for understanding *translation as a creative equivalent of the original work* that adapts to the needs of the receiving environment. He drew attention to the changing translation norms in history and accommodated the phenomena that are not suitable for the currently valid norm. These are not only adaptations for the stage or in the media, but also borrowings, rewritings, reinterpretations, free processing of texts or merging of various artistic languages in translation. Translation is thus present in each expression of an intertextual relationship, even in the case of a copy or plagiarism.

Conclusion

How translation is understood is rapidly changing today. TS has realized that it is impossible to continue to rely on the usual, static model of translation. This has been demonstrated in a number of attempts to try to summarize the current state of TS as well as new attempts to reveal the mechanism that makes the model inflexible (i.e. theories of power, postcolonial studies, eurocentrism, etc.). The current model of ST → TT is no longer suitable for TS – not because it is eurocentric, but because it absolutizes the mechanical transfer of a certain object from one place to another, forgetting that

the translation process is not a simple replacement but an extraordinarily mixed, changing, heterogeneous, and often contradictory or illogical reality.¹⁹

In her study “Why translation should want to internationalize?” (2009), Tymoczko states that the idea of a relationship between the source and target is mechanical, and translation is not an ordinary transfer of the original to another language (“carrying across”). To illustrate the opposite, she mentions the Chinese and Arabic expressions for translation and points to their figurativeness and metaphorical construction. TS in Europe was acquainted with different understandings through concepts from remote parts of the world and changing the relationships between texts. We cannot help but recall Ďurišín’s statements from the 1970s and 1980s. An interesting fact is that attention was drawn to his works in the Balkans, China (Gálik 2009) and Japan (2007).²⁰

Ďurišín’s opinion that translation is only a translation if it is creative meant that it sometimes produces a radically changed version from the original. This is a reality that the current model of translation accepts only to a certain extent (i.e. adequacy). However, this could be proved, for example, by thousands of translations of Shakespeare’s plays around the world or translations of classical works from past centuries for today’s readers. In addition, translated works often cannot be differentiated from original works, because the borders between them are disappearing and translation very often functions as an original work. Ďurišín defined the levels of translation freedom as differentiated and integrated forms of reception (1975: 172–180). Tymoczko also approaches the problem from the position of translation and finds that translation is borrowing and taking over. The translator and, through the translator, the receiving environment decide to what extent the translation is freed from the original work or comes closer to it.

Ďurišín could freely think about translation because he did not respect the established concept of transfer from Source to Target. Besides deciding the role of the receiving environment during the translation process, he pointed out another fact – namely the causes of its decisions denoted as the needs of the receiving environment. Tymoczko also returned to the term *needs*, which was displaced for a long time due to its deterministic nature, in which however the particularities of different areas of the world can be revealed.

Due to the widespread and early awareness of structuralism (1920–1940) and semiotics (Lotman, from the 1970s), the Czech and Slovak concepts on translation were very flexible, unencumbered by simplistic and unilateral visions. Even today, after repeated waves of poststructuralism, deconstruction or post-colonial studies, reality is seen by the varied and inherently contradictory linguistic, literary, social or politic intertwining of endeavours. If TS returns to familiar terms and notions, it could suggest that the traces of their previous meanings reveal noticeable suggestions. Yet the aim is not to repeat history. The important thing is to let flexibility and changeability enter

¹⁹ Tymoczko finds the basis of this model in the transfer of the economic notion of market as the transfer of goods. It is a very interesting idea which, however, brings power relations once again into the process of translation, so that it does not go beyond the limits of post-colonial thinking.

²⁰ Ďurišín, Dionýz: *Hikaku-bugoku hōhō-ron. Methodology of Comparative Literature*. Tokyo: Tirit-su-shoho 2007.

contemporary TS, to realize the diversity of reality, and to admit that there are always other possibilities.

Translated by Slávka Gánovská
Revised by Andrew Fisher

REFERENCES

- Bassnett, S. (1993) *Comparative literature*, Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell.
- Bednárová, K. (2013) *Dejiny umeleckého prekladu na Slovensku I.: od sakrálneho k profánnemu* (History of literary translation I: from the sacred to the profane), Bratislava: Veda, ÚSvL SAV.
- Borges, J. L. (1999) 'Autor Quijota Pierre Menard' (Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote), in *Nesmrtelnost* (Immortality), Prague: Hynek, 111–119.
- Domínguez, C. (2011) 'Dionýz Ďurišin and a Systemic Theory of World Literature', in *Routledge Companion to World Literature*, London & New York: Routledge, 99–107.
- Ďurišin, D. (1970) *Z dejín a teórie literárnej komparatistiky* (From the History and Theory of Comparative Literature Studies), Bratislava: VSAV.
- (1972) *Vergleichende Literaturforschung*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- (1975) *Teória literárnej komparatistiky* (The Theory of Comparative Literature Studies), Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ.
- (1984) *Theory of Literary Comparatistics*, Bratislava: Veda.
- (1987–1993) *Osobitné medziliterárne spoločenstvá 1–6. / Les communautés interlittéraires spécifiques 1–6* (Specific Interliterary Communities 1–6), D. Ďurišin (ed.), Bratislava: Veda.
- (1989) *Theory of interliterary process*, Bratislava: Veda.
- (1992) *Čo je svetová literatúra?* (What is World Literature?), Bratislava: Obzor.
- (1993) *Svetová literatúra perom a dlátom, Littérature mondiale en tant que communauté interlittéraire finale* (World Literature by Pen and Chisel), Bratislava: ÚSvL SAV.
- and A. Gnisci (eds.) (2000) *Il Mediterraneo. Una rete interletteraria. La Méditerranée. Un réseau interlittéraire. Stredomorie. Medziliterárna sieť*, Rome: Bulzoni.
- (2007) *Hikaku-bugoku hōhō-ron. Methodology of Comparative Literature*, Tokyo: Tiritu-shoho.
- Gálik, M. (2000) 'Interliterariness as a Concept in Comparative Literature', *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 2 (4): <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol2/iss4/6>.
- (2009) 'Slovak comparatist Dionýz Ďurišin and his international reception', in *World Literature Studies* 19 (1): 6–14.
- Gentzler, E. (1993) *Contemporary Translation Theories*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Gromová, E. (2013) 'Translation Studies in Nitra', in L. Vajdová (ed.) *Present State of Translation Studies in Slovakia*, Bratislava: SAP, ÚSvL SAV, 17–40.
- Iuvan, M. (2008) 'Towards a History of Intertextuality in Literary and Culture Studies', *CLCWeb: Comparative literature and Culture* 10 (3): <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol10/iss3>.
- Jettmarová, Z. (2008) 'Czech and Slovak translation theories: the lesser-known tradition', in J. Králová, Z. Jettmarová et al. (eds.) *Tradition versus Modernity. From the Classic Period of the Prague School to Translation Studies at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, Prague: TOCCA, Univerzita Karlova, 15–46.
- (2005) 'East meets West: On paradigms in translation studies', in K. Károly et al. (eds.) *New trends in translation studies*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kiossev, A. (1999) 'Notes on Self-Colonizing Cultures', in *After the Wall. Art and Culture in Post-Communist Europe*, Stockholm: Moderna Museet.
- Laiho, L. (2007) 'A literary work – Translation and Original: A Conceptual Analysis within the Philosophy of Art and Translation Studies', *Target* 19 (2): 295–312.
- Levý, J. (1957) *České teorie překladau* (Czech Theories of Translation), Prague: SNKLHU.
- (1963) *Umění překladau* (The Art of Translation), Prague: Český spisovatel.

- (2011) *The Art of Translation*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lotman, J. (1970) *Struktura chudežestvennogo texta* (Structure of the Literary Text), Moscow: Isskustvo.
- Miko, F. (1969) *Estetika výrazu. Teória výrazu a štýl* (The Aesthetics of Expression. The Theory of Expression and Style), Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- (1970) 'La théorie de l'expression et la traduction', in J. S. Holmes, F. de Haan, A. Popovič (eds.) *The Nature of Translation*, The Hague: Mouton, 61–77.
- and A. Popovič (1978) *Tvorba a recepcia. Estetická komunikácia a metakomunikácia* (Creation and Reception. Aesthetic Information and Metacommunication), Bratislava: Tatran.
- Michalovič, P., V. Zúška (2009) *Znaky, obrazy a stíny slov* (Signs, icons and shadows of the words), Prague: Nakladatelství Akademie múzických umění v Praze.
- Popovič, A. (1968) *Preklad a výraz* (Translation and Expression), Bratislava: VSAV.
- (1971) *Poetika umeleckého prekladu* (The Poetics of Literary Translation), Bratislava: Tatran.
- (1970) 'The Concept "Shift of Expression" in Translation Analysis', in J. S. Holmes, F. de Haan, A. Popovič (eds.) *The Nature of Translation*, The Hague: Mouton, 78–87.
- (1975) *Teória umeleckého prekladu* (The Theory of Literary Translation), Bratislava: Tatran.
- (1976) *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton: Department of Comparative Literature, The University of Alberta.
- (2006) *La scienza della traduzione. Aspetti metodologici. La comunicazione traduttiva*, trans. B. Osimo and D. Laudani, Milan: Hoepli.
- Teória literatúry* (1941) (The Theory of Literature. Anthology of texts from Russian Formalist School), M. Bakoš (ed. and transl.), Trnava: Fr. Urbánek a spol.
- The Known Unknowns of Translation Studies* (2012), Special issue of *Target* 24 (1), E. Brems, R. Meylaerts and L. van Doorslaer (eds.).
- Tymoczko, M. (2009) 'Why translators should want to internationalize translation studies?', *Translator* 15(2): 401–421.
- Toury, G. (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Vajdová, L. (2007) 'Teória polysystémov a preklad' (Polysystem Theory and Translation), in L. Vajdová (ed.) *Myslenie o preklade* (Thinking about Translation), Bratislava: ÚSVL SAV, Kalligram, 14–39.
- Zymner, R., A. Hölter (eds.) (2013) *Handbuch Komparatistik. Theorien, Arbeitsfelder, Wissenspraxis*, Stuttgart & Weimar: Metzler.

Libuša Vajdová
lvajdova@chello.cz