

UDC 81`2+821.111

DOI 10.35433/brecht.7.2021.66-75

Oleh KOLIADA,
orcid.org/0000-0003-1869-1260
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Germanic Philology and Foreign
Literature
Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University (Zhytomyr, Ukraine)
o.v.kolyada@gmail.com

Олег КОЛЯДА,
orcid.org/0000-0003-1869-1260
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри германської філології та зарубіжної літератури
Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка (Житомир,
Україна)
o.v.kolyada@gmail.com

Metaphrase and Paraphrase. Self-Translation as Exile Art

Abstract

Метафраз і парафраз. Самопереклад як мистецтво вигнання

Стаття розглядає питання перекладу та автоперекладу з огляду на 1) типологію перекладів: консервативний, діалогічний та радикальний та 2) класичну методологію сучасного перекладу за Дж. Драйденом: метафраз, парафраз та імітацію. Переклад умовно подається як форма компаративної мажоритарної літератури, коли власний досвід є критерієм та засобом експліцитно-імпліцитного порівняння (експліцитно, порівнюючи текстуально та метатекстуально через історичні документи або імпліцитно, співставляючи текстуальні аспекти до суми знань про мову взагалі), який найефективніше працює на стадії переходу від абстрактного уявлення до словесного опису, коли переклад перетворюється на метатекст, корелюючи першоджерело та ціловий (переклад) тексти. Автопереклад, натомість, розглядається як мінораторний простір, що перебуває на межі різних систем — культур, соціальних цінностей, і який зазнає їхнього суперечливого впливу на авторів, для яких практика превалює над теорією за аналогією граничного положення особистості щодо якоїсь соціальної спільноти, коли замість догмату точності пропонується альтернатива відповідності, а саме — відтворення первинної свободи творення архітектонікою та ритмо-синтаксичною організацією вихідного тексту, які інтуїтивно стимулюють уявлення та спонукають до образних модуляцій в тексті цільовому, так звана "необхідна свобода". Автопереклад розглядається на прикладі лінгвістичного статусу С. Беккета та його білінгва, центральним елементом якої є формальність дії та спілкування, переосмислених взаємодією автора з текстом на рівні спілкування між текстами, наповнюючи вакуум абсурду інтертекстуальним діалогом.

Ключові слова: переклад, автопереклад, метафраз, парафраз, імітація.

Metaphrasen und Paraphrasen. Selbstübersetzung als Kunst des Exils

Der Artikel betrachtet das Thema Übersetzung und Autoübersetzung im Hinblick auf 1) die Typologie der Übersetzungen: konservativ, dialogisch und radikal und 2) die klassische Methodik der modernen Übersetzung von J. Dryden:

Metaphrasen, Paraphrasen und Imitation. Übersetzen wird konventionell als eine Form der vergleichenden Mehrheitsliteratur präsentiert, wenn die eigene Erfahrung ein Kriterium und ein Mittel des explizit-impliziten Vergleichs ist (explizit, textuell und metatextuell durch historische Dokumente vergleichend oder implizit, Textaspekte vergleichend mit der Summe des Wissens über Sprache in allgemein), die am effektivsten funktioniert von der abstrakten Darstellung bis zur verbalen Beschreibung, wenn die Übersetzung in Metatext umgewandelt wird, wobei die Originalquelle und der gesamte (Übersetzungs-)Text korreliert werden. Autotranslation hingegen wird als ein Minderheitenraum am Rande verschiedener Systeme - Kulturen, gesellschaftlicher Werte - gesehen, der ihrem widersprüchlichen Einfluss auf Autoren unterliegt, für die Praxis durch die Analogie zum Rande einer Person auf eine Alternative der Entsprechung wird vorgeschlagen, nämlich - Reproduktion der primären Gestaltungsfreiheit durch Architektur und rhythmisch-syntaktische Gestaltung des Ausgangstextes, die die Phantasie intuitiv anregen und figurative Modulationen im Zieltext fördern, die sogenannten "notwendige Freiheit". Die Autotranslation wird am Beispiel des sprachlichen Status von S. Beckett und seiner Zweisprachigkeit betrachtet, deren zentrales Element die Formalität des Handelns und der Kommunikation ist, neu interpretiert durch die Interaktion des Autors mit dem Text auf der Niveau der Kommunikation zwischen Texten, die das Vakuum der Absurdität mit intertextuellen Dialogen füllt.

Schlüsselwörter: Übersetzung, Autoübersetzung, Metaphrasen, Paraphrasen, Nachahmung.

Metaphrase and Paraphrase. Self-Translation as Exile Art

The article regards the matter of translation and self-translation in view of 1) the typology of translations: conservative, dialogical and radical and 2) the classical methodology of modern translation according to John Dryden: metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation. Translation, on the one hand, is conventionally presented as a form of comparative majority literature, when one's own experience is a criterion and means of the complex comparison (explicitly, comparing textually and meta-textually, or implicitly, juxtaposing the textual aspects to the sum of knowledge about language in general), which works most effectively. from an abstract representation to a verbal description, when the translation is transformed into meta-text, correlating the original source and the target (translation) texts. Self-translation, on the other hand, is seen as a minority segment on the border of different systems – cultures, or social values, and which has their contradictory influence on authors, for whom practice prevails over theory by analogy with the limitation of a personality in relation to a social community, when an alternative of correspondence is suggested, namely, the molding of the primary freedom of creation by the architectonics and rhythmic-syntactic organization of the source text, which intuitively stimulates the imagination and encourage figurative modulations in the target text, the so-called "obligatory freedom". Self-translation is exemplified by the linguistic status of Samuel Beckett and his bilingual texts, the central element of which is the formality of action and communication, reinterpreted by the author's interaction with the text itself on the level of communication between texts, filling the vacuum of absurdity with inter-textual dialogue.

Key words: translation, self-translation, metaphrase, paraphrase, imitation.

Introduction

The **problem** of translation has recently come to the front in the contemporary critical literary studies, cross-referential with its interdependent constituent, self-translation, as a peculiar derivative, for decades sceptically overlooked or ignored by the academic research field, due to obvious subjectivism, its criteria flexibility and variability have seemingly been beyond a standardized classification. While many modern linguists witness a definite problematic core to delve into self-translation, there is a unanimously accepted need presently to research and adjust its diversity to a mediated paradigm. The **analysis** of the latest studies and publications state a growing interest in the phenomenon of self-translation, diversifying the contemporary approaches to nature of a linguistic discourse in relation to bilingualism as a complex system itself with its compound and coordinate sub-segments on the level of broader individual and social categories that give an insightful glimpse into learning and developing one's linguistic competence in simultaneous, separate or filtered bilingual contexts, dramatically enhanced when artistically rendered.

The **purpose** of this article is to unify somewhat arbitrary concepts of the translation **methods** under one common denominator, a hermeneutic approach in outlining a particular theory and methodology of interpretation that makes it possible to fundamentally merge the contrasting viewpoints into one perspective to redefine a classical representation of translation as the expression of the meaning of a source-language text in the form of an equivalent target-language text and its influence on the language communities. When a traditional concept of the communication of the meaning is viewed radically in translation and, in return, a radical one treated conventionally multiplied by artistic transference of the meaning, the merged perspectives as a result reveal a myriad of thought-provoking relations between translation and self-translation to further bilingually clarify, interpret, and communicate a given community's cultural identity, synthetically reproducing certain cultural attitudes, values, and beliefs. These aspects of translation within self-translation demand a multidisciplinary awareness of bilingual education. From Leonard Bloomfield's "Language" (1933), Uriel Weinreich's "Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems" (1953), Einar Haugen's "Bilingualism, Language Contact, and Immigrant Languages in the United States" (1973) as a few major proponents of the bilingual sociolinguistic problematics to the contemporary researchers like Colin Baker, Jan Blommaert, Jim Cummins, Bonny Norton, Gerard Postiglione, or Tove Skutnabb-Kangas among others to the literary & fictional bilingualism adepts like Steve Connor, Raymond Federman, Brian Fitch, Rainier Grutman, or Carolyn Shread it is obvious that the statement of the basic material of the research in question with its substantiation of the received scientific **results** prove to be academically perspective as far as the **prospects** of the further researches concern. It would be useful to revisit the traditional monolingual target translations and reconsider them in the backdrop of bilingual self-translation, or even the matter of trilingualism (French/English/German) of a particular author to benefit readers, literary critics, scholars and translators alike by facilitating the access to the bilingual world of self-translation.

1.

When the so-called 'social parasite' Joseph Brodsky, while in exile in a labour camp in the Arctic north, had found a collection of the Anglophone poets and

came across one of the poems by Wystan Hugh Auden ("*In Memory of W. B. Yeats*", 1939), which contained the following lines: "*Time that is intolerant / Worships language and forgives / Everyone by whom it lives*", he, Brodsky, a renegade poet since 1972, not only discovered another poet in self-exile (Auden left England for the USA at the beginning of World War II), but also experienced an important epiphanic moment of self-awareness as a constructor-author and reconstructor-translator, the latter ironically spellbound by the three muses of the poetry translation: 1. *Mishearing*, 2. *Misunderstanding*, 3. *Mistranslating*, according to a Romanian literary critic and essayist in exile Andrei Codrescu (Perlmutter).

¹ These elemental muses haunted Brodsky during his period of adaptation in the United States, the time of teaching (as a protégé of Auden) in the American universities to meet the confused students who listened enthusiastically to the problematically challenging lectures, or the first American adepts of his poetry, who, unsuccessfully, attempted to translate the poems the author did not forgive due to inaccuracy of their rhyme or metre, the muses, who in a cohort of some distant connoisseurs, eventually led Brodsky to a logical realization of the need for self-translation.

The mystery of the 'original versus translation', which is sometimes simplified to a formal 'truth :: error' statement, implicitly contains a code for a potential solution in self-translation, which is a mystery, an esoteric parallel reading of the source text in order to create a target text, the final text of the translation, which will further direct the author's poetics in the parallel perspective of the dual, sometimes schizophrenic, discourse, when the target text is an analysis of the source text, and the act of translation itself turns into a cyclical tact of a cooperation with the muses, who do not only contrast and compare, but also incentivize the author's poetics through: 1. *Co-hearing*, 2. *Co-understanding*, 3. *Co-translating*. Translation is a *form* of comparative 'majority' literature, when one's own experience is a criterion and means of explicit and implicit comparison (explicitly, contrasting textually through language, genre, epoch, meta-textually through historical documents, adaptations, etc., or implicitly comparing via certain aspects of the text to the sum of our knowledge of language in general), which works most effectively at the stage of transition from an abstract representation to a verbal description, when the translation is transformed into a meta-text, correlating both the source and target texts. Self-translation is a 'minority' *uniform* literature for the marginals, allergic to theory when practice prevails, who offer an alternative of correspondence instead of the dogma of accuracy, namely, a reproduction of the primary freedom of creation, when the architectonics, rhythmic-syntactic organization of the source text intuitively stimulates transition of the target one, the so-called "obligatory freedom", as defined by an American poet, theologian and critic Willis Barnstone.² Bilingualism paradoxically deprives a self-translator of a burden that any translator usually has to patiently bear: to semantically change the original without a subordination of the poet to the translator and to limit oneself to these legitimized privileges by definition.

1 Codrescu, Andrei. (2010). *The Poetry Lesson*: Princeton University Press.
<https://www.perlego.com/book/734900/the-poetry-lesson-pdf>

2 Barnstone, Willis. (1993). *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Poetics-of-Translation%3A-History%2C-Theory%2C-Barnstone/2c2345282666e26eff1a4b3a069f6b89c6bd6b77>

Most of Brodsky's, as well as his compatriot expatriate Vladimir Nabokov's, self-translations were perceived by the native English speakers as unnaturally strange (but not artificial), but the idiosyncrasy of the classics of American poetry Walt Whitman and Emily Dickinson had been just as much surprisingly unconventional. Therefore, regarding the peculiar political conjuncture the afore-mentioned (anti-) Soviet authors have been periodically included into the anthologies of the contemporary American literature. The analysis of evaluation of the art of self-translation should be based, perhaps, on the functional compliance, equivalence, which is largely a criterion of the former.

2.

According to one of the conditional typologies of translations, they can be classified as: 1) *conservative* translation within linguistic objectivism with its most loyal, true reproduction of the source text without any authorial intervention; 2) *dialogical* translation on the rational basis in the form of interpretation; and 3) *radical* translation as a postmodern counter-cultural product as defined by Willard Van Orman Quine, an American analytical philosopher and logician, who put forward the thesis of indeterminacy of translation, which presupposes the existence of many different, contradictory, yet coherently correct translations, because there is no identical meaning of a word translated from one language to another, and therefore, the language is interpreted from the standpoint of behaviourism as a set of tendencies to speech behaviour. The latter view has been widely criticized by his fellow American philosophers and linguistic theorists: John Rogers Searle, as an opponent of the idea of artificial intelligence and cognitive psychology, and Avram Noam Chomsky, whose counter-argument to Quine's radicalism was the creative aspect of a language.

Conservative or liberal regardless, a translator exists in a certain coordinate system, Gadamer's hermeneutic circle, when the comparison and analysis of one cultural 'milieu' is interpreted in the perspective of another, forming a fusion of horizons, and translation serves as a medium that establishes a hermeneutic dialogue between the traditional past and innovative present, contextualizing the past in the present and vice versa. Interesting, from this point of view, is the origin of the Western hermeneutics as a corpus of rules for understanding and interpreting the religious texts, when exegetical methods of translation were aimed to find the truth and value of the original source through self-reflection of a translator, a discovery of the sacred intention instead of figurative translation, apparently, reducing the author's presence to a minimum in its subordination to the explanation of the original text-message. In the afore context it is amusing to recollect some episodes from the history of the English translation of the Bible, commissioned and published under the patronage of King James I ("Authorized King James Version" of the Bible, 1611), which has been recognized as a classic religious and literary work, that was formerly translated by John Wycliffe, a theologian, professor at Oxford University, a forerunner of the European Reformation, and William Tyndale, a Protestant reformer, who both were declared heretics and burned at stake. James I as one of the most educated intellectuals of his time had gained fame even before the translation of the Bible, publishing in 1597 "Daemonologie" as a philosophical dissertation on the belief in the existence of evil spirits, which was largely the author's seemingly hyperrealistic interpretation of the court processes on divination and prophecy, which, as a prince, he attended as an observer. Did the interpreter-demonologist, who, on the one hand, granted the Inquisition a license to persecute and assassinate and, on the other, immortalized himself as

a translator-theosophist, prophesy his own ambivalent future, asserting the divine right of kings, which absolutization also ended in tragedy, the execution of the royal throne successor, his son, Charles I? Gadamer's hermeneutic horizons merged in a figure of the eccentric king who evolved from a demonologist to theosophist, from the 'source to target' relation, from an author to co-author who had made a pact with three witches, disguised as the muses.

3.

Back to the thesis of translation as a hermeneutic medium, it is worth to recollect a particular method to translation by the founder of English literary criticism, a classic of the Restoration period, John Dryden, as exceptionally characteristic. Dryden distinguished between *metaphrase*, *paraphrase*, and *imitation* which to a certain degree have been coherent to the modern translation methodology.

The first, metaphrase, involves a literal, word-for-word translation to preserve the obvious clarity of the original source, a translation that denounces a figurative interpretation as an obstacle to the transference of truth, although it itself makes it impossible to adequately perceive the text by ignoring its meaning and intentionality: "Tis much like dancing on ropes with fettered legs: a man may shun a fall by using caution; but the gracefulness of motion is not to be expected: and when we have said the best of it, 'tis but a foolish task; for no sober man would put himself into a danger for the applause of 'scaping without breaking his neck".³ In other words, we deal, typologically, with the above-mentioned 'conservative' translation within linguistic objectivism as the truthful reproduction of the text without any authorial intervention.

Instead, philosophical hermeneutics encourages 'dialogical' interaction between the text and translator-reader, who interprets and makes sense concurrently when a certain historical consciousness and situationality is established as a result of self-reflection, and that is the reason why one and the same text will have different meanings for different translators at different times. The translator, without neglecting the text, outlines not one possible way, but, on the contrary, suggesting many guidelines to achieve the author's intention, offers a new form, a variant (from the Latin 'variatus', 'change', 'deviate from the norm'). According to Dryden, this approach is correlated with the second method of translation, namely, paraphrase. Unlike metaphrase, paraphrase unleashes a creative potential of a translator: "translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered".⁴ This approach is discussed by Edwin Gentzler, a Professor Emeritus of Comparative Literature and former Director of the Translation Centre at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, in his work "Poetics of Translation", 2001: "to capture the sense of the original in an analogous rather than identical form, one that functions in a similar fashion within the target culture", in other words. a conscious replacement of the literal translation by the semantic one, the potential risk of which is, naturally, subjectivity of a translator, who is more self-sufficient via such attributes as 'adopt' and 'explain' rather than 'copy' or 'paste'.⁵

3 Dryden John. (2011). Preface to Ovid's Epistles, Translated by Several Hands, 1680. EEBO Editions, ProQuest, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A53606.0001.001/1:3?rgn=div1;vid=53770;view=fulltext>

4 Ibid. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A53606.0001.001/1:3?rgn=div1;vid=53770;view=fulltext>

5 Gentzler, Edwin. (2001). Translation, hypertext, and creativity: Contemporary translation theories. Bristol: Multilingual Matters: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>

The conceptual framework of the modern and postmodern 'radical' approach to translation is based on deconstructivism, relativism, language games and 'volatility' of meanings: Quine's indeterminacy of translation relates to John D. Caputo's "Radical Hermeneutics: Repetition, Deconstruction and the Hermeneutic Project", 1987, which is a quintessence of the views of Kierkegaard, Husserl, Nietzsche, Meister Eckhart, the late Heidegger and Derrida, whose philosophical position can be reduced to a denial of the existence of the absolute truth, which, instead, is relative and tangible to the changes and, therefore, any text involves many anti-dogmatic interpretations and suspicious improvisations. Deconstruction destroys the sacred myth of the original source as a serious truth and offers, on the contrary, a frivolous game or, in Dryden's terminology, the third approach to the translation studies, imitation: "Where the translator assumes the liberty from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion, and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the groundwork as he pleases."⁶ Accordingly, this approach introduces a notion of the "author's death" and "text rewriting" which in the field of translation is summarized by the fundamental denial of the merging of the perspectives of the author and a translator, when there is permission to represent the source text at their own discretion, subduing and localizing the original text according to their own needs. The radicalization of imitation generates the imagination without borders and leads to the unrecognizability of the original source, the 'cognitive' loss of cognition itself, which should be recognizability, an important prerequisite for any translation as an ethical interpretation. Between metaphor, paraphrase and imitation, Dryden emphasizes the golden cross-section, tending, of course, to the paraphrase as a translation standard.

4.

Given the problematic specifics of the relationship between the translator and the appropriate approach to translation, self-translation, only at first glance, seems to provide a desirable comfort zone. Irish in French exile, Samuel Beckett continues his linguistic banishment metaphysically through bilingualism, when self-translation both does help to identify variations between the English and French versions of the same work, and diversify the author's aesthetics and poetics. Beckett first translated his works in 1946 ("First Love" in 1946 in French, in 1973 a self-translation in English, or "Mercier et Camier" in 1946 in French, in 1974 a self-translation in English with significant edits of the original), and since 1955 he published two versions simultaneously. Other well-known bilingual authors who also chose French as their second language included Arthur Adamov and Eugène Ionesco among others.

Contextually, I would like to note that, in my opinion, the publication of a bilingual text should be organized in a certain way, namely the parallel printing of both versions, then the issue of the original text is secondary, and the completeness of perception is doubled due to simultaneous reading of the two originals and two complementary translations, although to some extent levelling the notion of the author's self-identification, when a reciprocal alteration is triggered because self-translation in another language modifies the original in accordance with a foreign language aesthetic equivalent for a deeper understanding of the original source. Translating their texts, the authors

325082991_GENTZLER_Edwin_Translation_hypertext_and_creativity_Contemporary_translation_theories_Bristol_Multilingual_Matters_2001_232_p

6 Dryden John. Preface to Ovid's Epistles, Translated by Several Hands, 1680. EEBO Editions, ProQuest, 2011. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A53606.0001.001/1:3?rgn=div1;vid=53770;view=fulltext>

improve the original by manipulating the language, but translation itself also acquires the features of an autonomous text, at least the reading of the meaning of a single individual text is less than the set of meanings of the two. Thanks to the 'obligatory freedom' mentioned above, the author-translator rises *above* the two countries, languages, dual identities and psychoanalytically renders translation as a cultural exchange *between* the countries, languages, identities which are different when linguistically coded but identical, culturally decoded.

Bilingualism in Beckett's poetics, the central element of which is the formality of action and communication, reconsiders the author's interaction with the text at the level of communication between the texts, filling in the vacuum of the absurd with an inter-textual dialogue. Beckett's linguistic status in the literary circle has been still uncertain: 1) polyglot-monolingual (at the beginning of his career Beckett wrote in English and translated Rimbaud, Apollinaire, Éluard, Breton); 2) Anglophone-bilingual; 3) Francophone-bilingual (during 1940-50s) and 4) mixed-bilingual (from 1955/56 until his death)⁷, but it is equally certain that the conversion to another language, which initially performed a merely utilitarian function, "allowed him to escape the habits inherent in the use of native language"⁸, eventually let the author to control his style, which was radically different from the English period: it was the French language that allowed Beckett to create his own minimal, deceptively uncomplicated, basic and simple style (although the following statement is also true: his texts, written in English, are abound of Gallicisms, and those in French – Anglicisms). All of Beckett's works exist in several versions, because he reviewed the original texts, translating them from one language into another, when self-translation turned into a textual transformation of the basic text, and translation into the parallel text respectively, emphasizing that it was impossible to accurately reproduce one in another considering the specific of self-translation as a process of double writing rather than solely translational reading / writing, and to some extent disarming some potential translators of his works (the model that Brodsky repeated decades later). Beckett's self-translation is a rewriting of the original during translation ("Fin de partie" vs. "Endgame", 1957), but it is necessary to distinguish between self-translation approximate and distant in time from the time of writing the original, with the correspondingly low and a high percentage of the changes in the tone, register and idiomatic expression (for example, a trilogy "Molloy", "Malone Dies", "Unnamable" vs the novels "Murphy" and "Watt"). In Beckett's case, self-translation is a means of creating a double original that retains authenticity in both versions and is not a copy or substitute, but a logical continuation of the author's esoteric polylogue with himself, as the Franco-American writer, translator, and critic Raymond Federman writes in his "Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett".⁹ It is impossible to determine the nature of the bilingual changes: the author's intention or linguistic requirements, cultural imperatives of another language? Federman positions Beckett as the destroyer of the myth of translation as a subversive, derivative, and harmful act that "reassures, reasserts the knowledge already

7 Mirna Sindičić Sabljo. (2011). Beckett's Bilingualism, Self-Translation and the Translation of his Texts into the Croatian Language. <https://silo.tips/download/beckett-s-bilingualism-self-translation-and-the-translation-of-his-texts-into-th#>

8 Charles, Juliet. (1986). *Rencontre avec Samuel Beckett*. Paris: Edition Fata Morgana.

9 Federman, Raymond. (1987). The Writer as Self-Translator. In A.W. Friedman, C. Rossman, & D. Sherzer (Eds.), *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*. 7-16. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP.

present in the original text."¹⁰ Brian Fitch, a French-Canadian author of scientific literature, professor of French in Toronto at Trinity College, interprets Beckett's bilingualism as a creative critical commentary on the original; the translated text is not a duplicate of the original source and should be studied independently and in mutual correspondence between the two texts.¹¹ Steve Connor, a British literary critic at Cambridge, in his work "Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory and Text" is guided by modern post-structuralist theory of Derrida and Deleuze and questions the necessity of asserting the source and the target text relation, when the ideal text exists outside the reading; instead, the critic focuses on the poetics of repetition, a translation as a repetition, which depends on and forms the integrity of the original text: two texts are both original and translated, and their identity is established only by the difference from each other.¹²

Summing up the variety of interpretations of Beckett's self-translation, which can be rendered within the Dryden's classical paradigm of metaphrase, paraphrase and even radical imitation, it is a fact that bilingualism is a fundamental aspect of Beckett's poetics, a means of authorial self-revival through inter-textual dialogue between the original and the translated as the parallel texts of the same discourse. For a proper understanding of Beckett it is necessary to read him as a bilingual author, and does this not mean to familiarize with the author on a deeper level of comprehension it is necessary to be a bilingual reader, a bilingual critic, a bilingual translator (perhaps even in exile)?

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Bruce, Frederick F. (2020) "The Critical Study of Biblical Literature: Exegesis and Hermeneutics, 20th Century Developments. Developments since the mid-20th century." In Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/biblical-literature>
2. Caputo, John D. (1987). *Radical Hermeneutics, Repetition, Deconstruction, and the Hermeneutic Project*. Bloomington and Indianapolis, US: Indiana University Press.
3. Connor, Steve. (1989). *Traduttore, Traditore: Samuel Beckett's Translation of Mercier et Camier*. *Journal of Beckett Studies*.
4. Connor, Steve. (2007). *Repetition and Self-Translation: Mercier et Camier, First Love, The Lost Ones*. In S. Connor (Ed.), *Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory and Text*. Aurora: The Davies Group Publishers.
5. Federman, Raymond. (1987). *The Writer as Self-Translator*. In A.W. Friedman, C. Rossman, & D. Sherzer (Eds.), *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP.
6. Fitch, Brian. (1987). *The Relationship between Compagnie and Company: One Work, Two Texts, Two Fictive Universes*. In A. W.

10 Federman, Raymond. (1987). *Samuel Beckett: His Works & his Critics* (Co-author with John Fletcher: Critical Bibliography). University California Press.
<https://www.biblio.com/book/samuel-beckett-his-works-his-critics/d/1175103860>

11 Fitch, T. Brian. (1989). *The status of the second version of the Beckettian text: the evidence of Bing/Ping Manuscript*. 11-12, 19-26. *Journal of Beckett Studies*.

12 Connor, Steve. (2007). *Repetition and self-translation: Mercier et Camier, First Love, The Lost Ones*. In S. Connor (Ed.), *Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory and Text* (pp. 99-127). Aurora: The Davies Group Publishers.

- Friedman, C. Rossman & D. Sherzer (Eds.), *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
7. Fitch, Brian. (1988). *Beckett and Babel. An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work*. Toronto, Buffalo & London: University of Toronto Press.
 8. Friedman, A.W., Rossman, C. & Sherzer, D. (Eds.). (1987). *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
 9. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. (2004). *Truth and Method*. New York and London: Continuum.
 10. Gentzler, Edwin. (2001). Poetics of Translation. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. by Mona Baker assisted by Kirsten Malmkjær, 166-176. New York: Routledge.
 11. Grutman, Rainier. (1998). Auto-translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 17-21). New York: Routledge.
 12. Lyndon, M. (1997). Stretching the imagination: Samuel Beckett and the Frontier of Writing. *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association*.
 13. McGuire, James. (1990). Beckett, the Translator, and the Metapoem. *World Literature Today*, 64 (2).
 14. Shread, C. (2009). Redefining translation through self-translation: the case of Nancy Huston. In J. Day (Ed.), *Translation in French and Francophone Literature and Film*, French Literature Series, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 51-69. Amsterdam & New York: Editions Rodopi.