

**„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iasi  
Faculty of Letters  
Doctoral School of Philological Studies**

**Doctoral thesis – summary**

**THE TRANSLATION OF CRITICAL  
DISCOURSE. FRENCH-ROMANIAN  
DOMAINE**

**Scientific advisor,  
Prof. Marina Mureșanu, PhD**

**PhD candidate,  
Pavel (căs. Durdureanu)  
Ioana Irina**

**Iasi - 2012**



## Table of contents

<b>Table of contents</b> .....	1
<b>List of abbreviations</b> .....	5
<b>Introduction</b> .....	7
<b>First part : Literary criticism, an autonomous discourse</b> .....	15
<b>1. Defining literary criticism</b> .....	15
1.1. What does literary criticism mean ?.....	16
1.1.1. The history of the tem .....	17
1.1.2. The « scientific » statute of literary criticism .....	20
1.2. Directions of literary criticism in the XX <sup>th</sup> Century .....	35
1.2.1. The fight of the two criticisms .....	40
1.2.2. Characteristics of the new criticism.....	43
1.2.3. Renewal of the ideas in the XX <sup>th</sup> century – tendencies and representatives.....	49
1.2.3.1 The French open relationship to the foreign theories .....	49
1.2.3.2. Psychocriticism .....	55
1.2.3.3. Thematic criticism .....	60
1.2.3.4. Sociocriticism.....	67
1.2.3.5. Linguistics and literature .....	71
1.2.3.5.1. Structuralism .....	71
1.1.2.3.5.2. Semiotics .....	76
1.3. Conclusions .....	82
<b>2. Characteristics of critical discourse</b> .....	84
2.1. Criticism as metadiscourse .....	84

2.1.1. Text / discourse dichotomy .....	85
2.1.2. Discourse components .....	92
2.1.3. From metalanguage to metadiscourse .....	94
2.2. The critical discourse, specialized or not ? .....	97
2.3. Conclusions .....	99

**Second part : Modern theories about translation..... 101**

<b>3. Translation – dilemma and conceptual controversies .....</b>	<b>101</b>
3.1. Defining translation .....	101
3.2. The translation between fidelity and unfaithfulness .....	105
3.3. Beginning from the Tour of Babel .....	109
3.4. The concept of <i>equivalence</i> and its implications ....	113
<b>4. Towards a science of translation .....</b>	<b>120</b>
4.1. Emergence of a new discipline.....	121
4.2. Translation Studies at present : theories and innovation .....	127
4.2.1. Translation and linguistics .....	127
4.2.2. Beyond linguistics : pragmatics and translation .....	132
4.2.3. The <i>skopos</i> of translation .....	136
4.2.4. Categorization and text typologies .....	143
4.2.4.1. K. Reiss : types and textual genres ....	146
4.2.4.1.1. Informative texts .....	149
4.2.4.1.2. Expressive texts .....	151
4.2.4.1.3. Appellative texts .....	151
4.2.4.2. The role of conventions in Text typologies .....	152
4.2.5. The concept of <i>norm</i> in translation .....	157
4.3. Analysis methods and translation strategies .....	163
4.3.1. Nord’s model .....	163

4.3.2. Translation strategies .....	170
4.4. Translation as communication .....	177
4.5. As a conclusion : for a “correct” translation .....	180

**Third part : Contrastive analysis of literary criticism  
works .....** 185

**5. Particularities of specialized translation applied to  
critical discourse .....** 185

5.1. Special languages .....	185
5.1.1. Definitions and characteristics.....	185
5.1.2. Common language, specialized language .....	195
5.1.3. Scientific vocabulary .....	197
5.1.4. Morphosyntax of specialized languages.....	202
5.1.5. The« style » of specialized languages .....	205
5.2. Conclusions .....	208

**6. C. Nord’s model for translation analysis .....** 212

6.1. Extratextual factors .....	213
6.1.1. Sender and his/her intention .....	213
6.1.2. Audience .....	215
6.1.3. Medium .....	216
6.1.4. Place and time .....	219
6.1.5. Motive .....	219
6.1.6. Text function .....	220
6.2. Intratextual factors .....	223
6.2.1. Subject matter .....	223
6.2.2. Presuppositions.....	224
6.2.3. Non verbal elements .....	226
6.2.4. Suprasegmental elements .....	226
6.2.5. Effect .....	227
6.2.6. The lexical and syntactical characteristics of the text .....	227

<b>7. Criticism, between philosophy and exact sciences.</b>	
<b>How to translate it ?</b> .....	241
7.1. Terminological characteristics of literary criticism and their translation .....	241
7.1.1. From a heterogeneous discourse... ..	243
7.1.2.... to a more “scientific” discourse .....	259
7.2. Casual register and specialized languages .....	302
7.3. The translation, between literality and freedom .....	309
7.4. Transpositions and other semantic transformations .....	330
7.5. Some translation difficulties and their implications .....	335
7.5.1. From the concept of <i>langue</i> to the concept of <i>parole</i> , from <i>parole</i> to <i>discourse</i> .....	335
7.5.2. The concept of <i>écriture</i> .....	342
7.5.3. The concept of <i>écart</i> .....	347
7.5.4. The concept of <i>récit</i> .....	352
7.5.5. The translation, between error and clumsiness .....	357
7.6. Translation of quotations .....	363
7.7. Translator’s intrusions and footnotes .....	365
7.8. Cultural-bound terms and word plays – challenges and lost in translation .....	380
7.9. Title translation – freedom and constraint .....	402
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	408
From theory to practice. The translator, on his/her way to Golgotha .....	408
Research perspectives .....	420

<b>Bibliography</b> .....	423
Corpus .....	423
References. A. Literary theory and criticism.	
Language and discourse theories .....	425
B. Theory and practice of translation .....	437
<b>Appendix</b> .....	450

## Thesis summary

**Keyword :** critical discourse, specialized language, text typology, *skopos*, translation strategy, translation competence

**Introduction.** Our thesis, entitled *The translation of critical discourse. French-Romanian domain* wants to make evident the manner in which francophone literary criticism from the XX<sup>th</sup> century has been translated into Romanian. It is a field which, at first sight, does not seem to raise translation problems but which proves to be a very complex operation, necessitating not only linguistic but also extralinguistic and professional knowledge and prior experience.

**The main purpose** of our thesis is to render evident the translation strategies of the critical discourse as discourse finding itself between philosophy and scientificity, taking into account the still disputed inclusion of literary criticism among other sciences. Starting from a great linguist's and translation scholar's definition who noticed since 1960's that translation consists in producing in the target language the message of the source text, first in terms of signification<sup>1</sup> we can observe that literary criticism needs translation strategies which must be

---

<sup>1</sup> G. Mounin, *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*, Gallimard, Paris, 1963, p.12.



raised from each translator's translation competence and professional background.

The main hypothesis we have formulated takes into account the fact that critical discourse is specialized, since it is not accessible to the general audience. Consequently, translation strategies have been selected so as to transmit the source text message towards the target culture in an adequate and comprehensible manner, including cultural bound terms, word plays which are evident throughout our corpus. Among the main objectives of our thesis, we may cite: presenting literary criticism as an autonomous discipline, having a scientific statute; render evident critical theories compiling our corpus; systemizing translation theories in order to lay emphasis on textual and functionalist approaches; establishing how specialized texts work and which are their components, focusing on literary criticism; proposing a model for translation analysis based on C. Nord's model; analyzing translation strategies used during the translation process with regard to concepts and sentences in which they are used.

The approach we are proposing is audacious and complex, considering the fact that such an attempt of classification of literary criticism into a certain text typology following the present taxonomies has not been done yet. Our approach is much more difficult because critical discourse has

not been included in any translation theory book, considering its ambiguous statute from an epistemological point of view.

As research methods, we have used syntheses, analogies, comparisons between different translation theories and taxonomies from a textual and functionalist point of view in order to find a model for translation analysis to be applied to our corpus. We are also proposing an inductive approach consisting in the choice of the source texts, their integration into a determined context, their insertion into an existent text typology, the contrastive analysis of translations, of language varieties, of cultural adaptations. We also use a deductive method by valorizing the prefaces, the introductory studies or the final notes signed par the translators in person or by other specialists, university professors, as well as translator's notes where they frequently justify their terminological choices or give supplementary information about the cultural turn of problematic structures.

Contemporary translation theories (textual, functionalist, cultural) have offered us the possibility to review the translation problem as vector for culture and knowledge which must be transmitted to another culture. We may speak about concepts such as *equivalence* and *faithfulness*, whose degree depends on the text type to translate. The complex process represented by translation justifies the choice of our

theme for research. The discourse on translation will exist forever, being thus a subject matter of present interest in many other domains, such the one we have decided to render evident, the francophone critical discourse. The development of critical approaches in the XX<sup>th</sup> century has influenced the study of literary works, opening the way to other perspectives for literary text analysis. Everybody recognizes authors such as Barthes, Genette, Todorov, Mauro, Groupe  $\mu$ , for mentioning just some of the authors forming our corpus. The discourse on translation practice will never cease, consequently, we have decided to apply them to a domain which has not yet found its place in the contemporary or traditional translation theories, considering its specificity and problematic issues which may appear during the translation process either from a terminological point of view or a cultural one. We can observe how the context, the text type, the cultural turn, the translator's experience will determine the most adequate translation strategy.

The structure of our thesis comprises three parts, divided in seven chapters. Each chapter treats a different aspect.

The first part – **Literary criticism, an autonomous discourse** – wants to render evident the characteristics of literary criticism as autonomous discourse, focusing on the

contributions of the francophone literary criticism by its research directions in the XX<sup>th</sup> century.

In the first chapter – **Defining literary criticism** – we have decided that it is necessary to define and make a diachronic survey over the evolution of literary criticism, so as to render evident the characteristics of the French new criticism and the renewal of ideas it has supposed. Thus, literary criticism, besides other disciplines such as literary history and theory aims at studying literary works. A. Béguin considers that the departure point of each critical approach is the need to respond to a personal demand<sup>2</sup> and not a research on an author's biography and works. For R. Barthes, the object of criticism would be a discourse on another discourse which cannot be qualified as true or false. We have focused on the scientific statute of literary criticism, considering the debate over the concept of “literary science”, phrase where there are gathered two terms axiological opposed. Since 1842, this phrase is used by Rosenkranz so as at the beginning of the XX<sup>th</sup> century it has been introduced in other countries. Linguistic theories applied to literary studies represent a turning point in this context. R. Wellek himself noted that the issue of literary

---

<sup>2</sup> A. Béguin, *Création et destinée : essais de critique littéraire : l'âme romantique allemande, l'expérience poétique, critique de la critique*, Seuil, Paris, 1973, p. 167.

criticism was much greater in England, where the concept of “literary science” has been easier accepted. In order to render evident the major contribution of French criticism, we have decided to summarize the main contributions of the psychocriticism, thematic criticism, sociocriticism, structuralism, semiotics, which have opened the way to original interpretations of literary works.

The second chapter – **Characteristics of critical discourse** – aims at presenting criticism as metadiscourse, which has a certain degree of specialization. F. Thumerel was talking about criticism as literary metadiscourse, *i.e.* a discourse on literature, a discourse talking about itself, since literature needs a metadiscourse<sup>3</sup>. As J. Demers points out<sup>4</sup>, considering criticism as metadiscourse helps us to identify the characteristics and the relationship between poetics / criticism / writing. The concept of *discourse* proves to be very important throughout our thesis, considering its contextual and situational side without which translation analyses would be impossible. We have decided to observe how a large domain such as literary criticism has been translated into Romanian, focusing

---

<sup>3</sup> F. Thumerel, *La Critique littéraire*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2000.

<sup>4</sup> J. Demers, « Critique et écriture: faut-il vraiment les distinguer ? », *Etudes françaises*, n° 33, vol. 1, 1997, p. 31.

on a number of works presenting a certain terminology or discourse typology.

The second part of our thesis – **Modern translation theories** – develops the analysis methods of the corpus in order to dress up a model for translation analysis which could be used for all text types.

Thus, the third chapter – **Translation – dilemma and conceptual controversies** – opens the way to a more systematic analysis of translation theories developed subsequently. We want to offer a definition for a “correct” translation, by raising for discussion some keywords in Translation Studies, *faithfulness* and *equivalence*. The dialectics of these notions have caused many debates, starting from the Babel Tour until present day, so that the definitions are frequently based on these concepts or on the concept of *message*. If in the 1960’s G. Mounin noted that translation would be the passage of the meaning of a text from one language to another, A. Berman considered that the translation purpose is to be a link between languages. As for U. Eco, he argued that the translation is “almost the same thing”<sup>5</sup>. The translator must transmit for the recipient culture first the message according to the linguistic resources of the target

---

<sup>5</sup> U. Eco, *Dire presque la même chose : Expériences de traduction*, Grasset, Paris, 2007, p. 10. [Our translation]

language. G. Steiner was talking about the “radical tension” existing between the operations of reproduction and recreation which affect the source text. Translator’s mastership is based on his/her professional background and experience in order to obtain what Nida called “dynamic” or “functional equivalence”.

We arrive thus to the forth chapter – **Towards a science of translation** – where we develop in a systematic manner the translation theories which best support the analysis of the corpus undertaken in the third part of our thesis. Translation Studies as science dates since the XX<sup>th</sup> century and has at its disposal an impressive bibliography, considering the development of textual linguistics, pragmatics, anthropological and cultural studies, psychology, philosophy. These theories aim at offering to translators a guideline to follow in their attempt to render a text into another language. We start to see translation not only as product but also as a very complex process, which implies more than simple linguistic knowledge. Theorists such as C. Catford or P. Fawcett were favoring the linguistic side of translation, which would be but a linguistic transfer from one language to another, without taking into account the situation of communication, the cultural-bound terms, the presuppositions etc. Considering the evolution of thoughts with regard to discursive theories and translation, the

approach of Translation Studies as science proves to be very important because it offers some guides for the translators. Thus, once the linguistic approach of translation has been surpassed, we synthesize translation theories developed in Netherlands (J. Holmes, J. Lambert, R. van des Broeck), Israel (G. Toury și I. Even-Zohar), Great Britain (S. Bassnett, T. Hermans), United States (A. Lefevere, D. Robinson, L. Venuti), France (G. Mounin, A. Berman, H. Meschonnic, J.-R. Ladmiral), Germany (K. Reiss, C. Nord, H. Vermeer), in order to concentrate on the approaches which represent the focus of our thesis, the textual and functionalist theories of translation. In the case of the text typology proposed by K. Reiss, we have included literary criticism in the first type, *i.e.* the informative texts, according to the characteristics given by the author to this category. The translator's strategies depend on the text type and on the translation *skopos*, its function in the target culture. The *skopos* theory, developed by scholars such as H. Vermeer, K. Reiss, C. Nord, J. Holz-Mänttari, has been seen as a very important trend, according to J. Munday.

The third part – **Contrastive analysis of literary criticism works** – proposes an analytical and synthetical approach of the corpus. At the beginning of the fifth chapter – **Particularities of specialized translation applied to critical discourse** – we considered that it is necessary to present the



characteristics of the specialized translation, because we have seen the critical discourse as being specialized (according to the different degrees of specialization which we will render evident by specific examples). It is not always so simple to define a specialized language and we are still waiting for a final response to the question concerning the connection between common language and specialized language. As J. Demers points out, specialized language means the all the linguistic and pragmatic factors which work together in order to form the discourse produced by some specialized fields<sup>6</sup>. It is evident that literary criticism, even if it uses concepts belonging to common language, is addressing to specialists. If it gives another meaning to terms already existing or if it introduces new concepts, the reader must have a prior knowledge in order to decipher the message of the source text, considering in the same time the amount of definitions, tables, schemes, graphics, present at authors like C. Bremond, J. Lintvelt, J. Kristeva ou chez le Groupe  $\mu$ . Concepts such as *obsessive metaphor*, *personnel myth*, *heterodiegetic narration*, *homodiegetic narrator*, *tabular lecture*, *metaplasms*, *metasemes*, *metataxes*, *metalogisms*, *isotopy*, *progressive metamorphose*,

---

<sup>6</sup> J. Roald, « Polylexicalité : Examen structurel à la lumière du discours juridico-économique », in Heribert Picht (ed.), *Modern Approaches to Terminological Theories and Applications*, Peter Lang, Bern, 2006, p. 199.

*narration* (récit, histoire), *deviation* (écart), *reiterative time*, for mentioning just some of the terms, show the complexity of the critical discourse which undertakes a dialectics concerning the study of literary works.

Consequently, the sixth chapter – **C. Nord’s model for translation analysis** – develops a model for translation analysis proposed by C. Nord. This model is based on two types of factors, intratextual and extratextual, which can be applied to the source text as well as to the target text. Among the intratextual factors, Nord includes the subject matter, the presuppositions, the lexical and syntactical characteristics of the text, the suprasegmental elements, the effect, the non verbal elements. The extratextual factors comprise the sender and his/her intention, the audience, the medium, the place, the time, the motive, the text function.

After having applied to the works of our corpus the translation analysis proposed by Nord, which must be prior to any translation activity, the seventh chapter – **Criticism, between philosophy and exact sciences. How to translate it ?** – analyzes in a more detailed manner the strategies used in the translation of concepts, sentences, language varieties belonging to authors such as G. Poulet, T. Todorov, Ch. Mauron, G. Durand, R. Barthes, C. Bremond, G. Genette, Groupe  $\mu$ , J. Lintvelt. We have ranged the text types according

to a growing degree of specialization in order to observe the complexity of the translation process. The calques, the literal translations or the loans are the most used strategies for this type of discourse, instance where the translator resorts to translator's notes or final notes so as to explain their choice or the difficulties they encountered while translating a certain concept. This is the reason why we have decided to analyze in a subchapter apart the translator's notes and their importance in the translation process. The cultural-bound terms, the word plays prove to be inevitable in any discourse; consequently, translation strategies will be different (adaptation, omission, adding, borrowing). The translation of titles may raise some translation problems, considering the major function the title has as main element which captures the reader's attention.

Finally, the conclusions confirm our initial hypotheses. The critical discourse enjoys a high degree of erudition, notions and concepts created by their authors or borrowed from the common language and reused in a particular context. Consequently, translation strategies have followed the same way concerning the freedom and the constraints translators must obey to during the laborious and complex process of translation.



## Selective bibliography

### Corpus

BARTHES, Roland, *Le degré zéro de l'écriture*, Seuil, Paris, 1953.

BARTHES, Roland, *Gradul zero al scriiturii*. Trad. de Margareta Nasta, in Mihail Nasta, Sorin Alexandrescu, *Poetică și stilistică : orientări moderne*. Univers, București, 1972, pp. 220-234.

BARTHES, Roland, *Gradul zero al scriiturii*. Trad. de Dolores Toma, in *Secolul 20*, n° 8-9-10, 1981, pp. 37-39.

BARTHES, Roland, *Gradul zero al scriiturii*. Trad. de Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasiliiu, in Roland Barthes, *Romanul scriiturii*, Univers, București, 1987, pp. 50-67.

BARTHES, Roland, *Gradul zero al scriiturii*. Trad. de Alex. Cistelecan, Cartier, Chișinău, 2006.

BARTHES, Roland, *Sur Racine*, Seuil, Paris, 1963.

BARTHES, Roland, *Despre Racine*. Trad. de Virgil Tănase. Prefață de Toma Pavel. Ed. pentru Literatură Universală, București, 1969.

BREMOND, Claude, *Logique du récit*, Seuil, Paris, 1973.

BREMOND, Claude, *Logica povestirii*. Trad. de Micaela Slăvescu. Prefață și note de Ioan Pânzaru. Univers, București, 1981.

DURAND, Gilbert, *Les structures anthropologiques de l'imaginaire*, PUF, Paris, 1963.

- DURAND, Gilbert, *Structurile antropologice ale imaginarului*. Trad. de Marcel Aderca. Prefață și postfață de Radu Toma, Univers, București, 1977.
- FONTANIER, Pierre, *Les figures du discours*, Flammarion, Paris, 1968.
- FONTANIER, Pierre, *Figurile limbajului*. Trad. de Antonia Constantinescu, Univers, București, 1977.
- GENETTE, Gérard, *Figures I*, Seuil, Paris, 1966.
- GENETTE, Gérard, *Figures II*, Seuil, Paris, 1969.
- GENETTE, Gérard, *Figures III*, Seuil, Paris, 1972.
- GENETTE, Gérard, *Figuri*. Trad. de Angela Ion, Irina Mavrodin, Univers, București, 1978.
- GROUPE  $\mu$  – Jacques Dubois, Francis Edeline, Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, Philippe Minguet, *Rhétorique générale*, Larousse, Paris, 1970.
- GROUPE  $\mu$  – Jacques Dubois, Francis Edeline, Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, Philippe Minguet, *Retorica generală*. Trad. de Antonia Constantinescu și Ileana Littera, Univers, București, 1974.
- GROUPE  $\mu$  – Jacques Dubois, Francis Edeline, Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, Philippe Minguet, *Rhétorique de la poésie. Lecture linéaire, lecture tabulaire*, Éd Complexes, Bruxelles, 1977.
- GROUPE  $\mu$  – Jacques Dubois, Francis Edeline, Jean-Marie Klinkenberg, Philippe Minguet, *Retorica poeziei. Lectură*

- lineară, lectură tabulară*. Traducere și prefață de Marina Mureșanu Ionescu, Univers, București, 1997.
- KRISTEVA, Julia, *Sémèiotiké. Recherches pour une sémanalyse*, Seuil, Paris, 1969.
- LINTVELT, Jaap, « Pour une typologie de l'énonciation écrite », in *Cahiers roumains d'études littéraires*, n° 1, Univers, Bucarest, 1977, pp. 62-78.
- LINTVELT, Jaap, *Essai de typologie narrative : le point de vue*, José Corti, Paris, 1981.
- LINTVELT, Jaap, *Încercare de tipologie narativă : punctul de vedere*. Trad. de Angela Martin. Studiu introductiv de Mircea Martin, Univers, București, 1994.
- MAURON, Charles, *Des métaphores obsédantes au mythe personnel*, José Corti, Paris, 1963.
- MAURON, Charles, *De la metaforele obsedante la mitul personal*. Trad. de Ioana Bot. Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.
- POULET, Georges, *Les métamorphoses du cercle*, préface de Jean Starobinski, Flammarion, Paris, 1979.
- POULET, Georges, *Metamorfozele cercului*. Trad. de Irina Bădescu și Angela Martin. Studiu introductiv de Mircea Martin. Univers, București, 1987.
- TODOROV, Tzvetan, *Théories du symbole*, Seuil, Paris, 1977.
- TODOROV, Tzvetan, *Teorii ale simbolului*. Trad. de Mihai Murgu, prefață de Maria Carpov, Univers, București, 1983.

## References

### A. Literary theory and criticism. Language and discourse theories

ANGENOT, Marc, Jean Bessière, Douwé Fokkema, Eva Kushner, *Théorie littéraire. Problèmes et perspectives*, PUF, Paris, 1989.

BACHELARD, Gaston, *La formation de l'esprit scientifique*, Vrin, Paris, 1971.

BAKHTINE, Mikhaïl, *Esthétique et théorie du roman*, Gallimard, Paris, 1978.

BEAUGRANDE, R.A., W.U. DRESSLER., *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, Longman, London/New York, 1996.

BÉGUIN, Albert, *Création et destinée: essais de critique littéraire : l'âme romantique allemande, l'expérience poétique, critique de la critique*, Seuil, Paris, 1973.

BÉHAR, H., R. FAYOLLE, *L'Histoire littéraire, aujourd'hui*, A. Colin, Paris, 1990.

BESSIÈRE, Jean, Eva KUSHNER, Roland MORTIER, Jean WEISGERBER, *Histoire des poétiques*, PUF, 1997

BÜHLER, Karl, *The Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language*, JohnBenjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1990.

CAMPION, Pierre, *L'Agir littéraire. Le beau risque d'écrire et de lire*, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, Rennes, 2010.



- CARON, Jean, *Les Régulations du discours psycholinguistique et pragmatique du langage*, PUF, Paris, 1985.
- CHATEAU, Dominique, *À propos de "La critique"*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 1995.
- COMPAGNON, Antoine, *Le Démon de la Théorie*, Seuil, Paris, 1998.
- COMPAGNON, Antoine, *Les Antimodernes : de Joseph de Maistre à Roland Barthes*, Gallimard, Paris, 2005.
- DOUBROVSKI, Serge, Tzvetan TODOROV (éds.), *L'enseignement de la littérature*, Plon, Paris, 1971.
- DOUBROVSKI, Serge, *Parcours critique II (1959-1991)*. Texte établi par Isabelle Grell, ELLUG, Grenoble, 2006.
- DUBOIS, Richard, *La page critique*, Fides, Québec, 1994.
- ELIOT, T.S., *Funcția criticii*, Univers, București, 1974.
- FLOCH, J.M., *Identités visuelles*, PUF, Paris, 1995.
- FONTANILLE, J., *Sémiotique et littérature. Essai de méthode*, PUF, Paris, 1999.
- FOUCAULT, Michel, Roland BARTHES, Jacques DERRIDA, Jean-Louis BAUDRY et al., *Théorie d'ensemble*, Seuil, Paris, 1968.
- FRYE, Northrop, *Anatomia criticii*. Traducere de Domnica Sterian și Mihai Spăriosu. Prefață de Vera Călin. Univers, București, 1972.
- GARDES-TAMINE, J., M.-C. HUBERT, *Dictionnaire de critique littéraire*, Armand-Colin, Paris, 2002.

- GENETTE, Gérard, *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*, Seuil, Paris, 1982.
- GILBERT, Pierre, *L'invention critique de la Bible, XV<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Gallimard, Paris, 2010.
- HAWTHORN, Jeremy, *A Concise Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*, Edward Arnold, London, 1992.
- HYLAND, Ken, *Metadiscourse : exploring interaction in writing*, Continuum International Publishing Group, London, 2005.
- LANE, Philippe (éd.), *Des discours aux textes : modèles et analyses*, Publications des Universités de Rouen et du Havre, 2006.
- LECERCLE, Jean-Jacques, *Deleuze and Language*, Macmillan, London, 2002.
- MACÉ, Marielle, *Façons de lire, manières d'être*, Gallimard, Paris, 2011.
- MAINGUENEAU, Dominique, *Le discours littéraire. Paratopie et scène d'énonciation*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2004.
- MAINGUENEAU, Dominique, *Contre Saint-Proust ou la fin de la Littérature*, Belin, Paris, 2006.
- MARINO, Adrian, *Introducere în critica literară*, Aius PrintEd, Craiova, 2007.
- MARKIEWICZ, Henryk, *Conceptele științei literare*, Univers, București, 1988.
- MUREȘANU IONESCU, Marina, *La littérature – un modèle triadique*, Fundației Chemarea, Iași, 1995.
- RAVOUX RALLO, Elisabeth, *Méthodes de la critique littéraire*, Armand Collin, Paris, 1999.

- REBOUL, Anne, Jacques MOESCHLER, *La pragmatique aujourd'hui. Une nouvelle science de la communication*, Seuil, Paris, 1998.
- TADIÉ, Jean-Yves, *La Critique littéraire au XX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Belfond, Paris, 1987.
- THUMEREL, Fabrice, *La Critique littéraire*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2000.
- TODOROV, Tzvetan, *La littérature en péril*, Flammarion, Paris, 2007.
- WELLEK, René, *Conceptele criticii*. Trad. de Rodica Tiniş. Univers, Bucureşti, 1970.
- WIDDOWSON, H.G., *Discourse analysis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.

## **B. Theory and practice of translation**

- BAKER, Mona, G. Saldanha, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Routledge, London/New York, 1998.
- BALLARD, Michel, *De Cicéron à Benjamin : Traducteurs, traducteurs, réflexions*, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, Villeneuve d'Ascq, 2007.
- BASSNET, Susan, A. LEFEVERE (eds.), *Translation, History and Culture*, Pinter, London/New York, 1990.
- BEEL, Roger T., *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*, Longman London/New York, 1991.

- BERMAN, Antoine, *L'épreuve de l'étranger*, Gallimard, Paris, 1989.
- CABRÉ, Maria Teresa, *Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications*. Ed. by J.C.Sager, transl. J.A. DeCesaris, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1999.
- CATFORD, J. C., *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Oxford University Press, London/Oxford, 1965.
- CHESTERMAN, Andrew, A. E. Wagner, *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface*, St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester, 2002.
- DELISLE, Jean, *L'analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction*, Ed. de l'Université d'Ottawa, Ottawa, 1980.
- DERRIDA, Jacques, « Des Tours de Babel » in *Psyché: Invention de l'autre*, vol. I, Galilée, Paris, 1987, pp. 203-236.
- ECO, Umberto, *Dire presque la même chose : Expériences de traduction*, Grasset, Paris, 2007.
- FAWCETT, Peter, *Translation and Language. Linguistic Theories Explained*, St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester, 1997
- GENTZLER, Edwin, *Contemporary Translation Theories: 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, 2011.
- GUIDÈRE, Mathieu, *Introduction à la traductologie. Penser la traduction : hier, aujourd'hui*, De Boeck, Bruxelles, 2008.
- HATIM, Basil, Ian Mason, *Discourse and the Translator*, Longman, London, 1990.
- HATIM, Basil, J. Munday, *Translation : An Advanced Resource Book*, Routledge, London/New York, 2004.

- HOUSE, Juliane, *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, 1997.
- LADMIRAL, Jean-René, *Traduire: théorèmes pour la traduction*, Payot, Paris, 1979.
- LAVAUT-OLLEAON, Elisabeth (éd.), *Traduction spécialisée : pratiques, théories, formation*, Peter Lang, Bern, 2007.
- LERAT, Pierre, *Les langues spécialisées*, PUF, Paris, 1995.
- LEVÝ, Jiří, *The Art of Translation*, transl. Patrick Corness, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2011.
- MESCHONNIC, Henri, *Poétique du traduire*, Verdier, Paris, 1999.
- MICLĂU, Paul, (coord.), *Les langues de spécialité*, TUB, București, 1982.
- MILLIARESSI, Tatiana, (éd.), *De la linguistique à la traductologie*, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, Villeneuve d'Ascq, 2011.
- MOUNIN, Georges, *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*, Gallimard, Paris, 1963.
- MUNDAY, Jeremy, *Introducing Translation Studies*, Routledge, London, 2001.
- NEUBERT, Albrecht, Gregory Shreve, *Translation as Text*. Kent, Ohio, Kent State University Press, 1992.
- NIDA, Eugène A., Charles Russel Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Brill, Leiden, Holland, 1969.
- NORD, Christiane, *Text Analysis in Translation*, Rodopi, Amsterdam/Atlanta, 1991.
- OUSTINOFF, Michaël, *La traduction*, PUF, Paris, 2009.

- PYM, Anthony, *Translation and Text Transfer. An Essay on the Principles of Intercultural Communication*, Intercultural Studies Group, Tarragona, 2010.
- REISS, Katharina, K., H. J. Vermeer, *Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation*, Niemeyer, Tübingen, 1984.
- REISS, Katharina, *Translation Criticism – The Potentials and Limitations. Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment*, St. Jerome Publishing, Manchester, 2000.
- ROBINSON, Douglas, *Becoming a Translator*, Routledge, London, 1997.
- SCHLEIERMACHER, Friedrich, *Des Différentes méthodes du traduire et autre texte*, Seuil, Paris, 1999.
- SELESKOVITCH, Danika, LEDERER, Marianne, *Interpréter pour traduire*, Didier Érudition, Paris, 2001
- SNELL-HORNBY, Mary, *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?*, John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam/New York, 2006.
- STEINER, George, *Après Babel*. Trad. de L. Lotringer, Albin Michel, Paris, 1978.
- TROSBORG, Anna (ed.), *Text Typology and Translation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1997.
- VENUTI, Lawrence, *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London/New York, 2000.
- VINAY, Jean-Paul, Jean Darbelnet, *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais; méthode de traduction*, Didier, Paris, 1960.