1. The distinction between the French words, langue (language or tongue) and parole (speech), enters the vocabulary of theoretical linguistics with Ferdinand de Saussure’s Course in General Linguistics, which was published posthumously in 1915 after having been collocated from student notes. La langue denotes the abstract systematic principles of a language, without which no meaningful utterance (parole) would be possible. The Course manifests a shift from the search for origins and ideals, typical of nineteenth century science, to the establishment of systems. The modern notion of system is reflected in the title of the course: General Linguistics. Saussure in this way indicates that the course will be about language in general: not this or that particular language (Chinese or French) and not this or that aspect (phonetics or semantics). A general linguistics would be impossible by empirical means because there exist innumerable objects that can be considered linguistic. Instead Saussure’s methodology allows him to establish a coherent object for linguistics in the distinction between langue and parole. Langue represents the “work of a collective intelligence,” which is both internal to each individual and collective, in so far as it is beyond the will of any individual to change. Parole, on the other hand, designates individual acts, statements and utterances, events of language use manifesting each time a speaker’s ephemeral individual will through his combination of concepts and his “phonation”— the formal aspects of the utterance.

2. Roland Barthes calls the different ways of addressing oneself to others “imagerepertoires.” In “From Science to Literature” Barthes uses lessons learned from the failure of structuralism to turn itself into the science of literature, to establish the enunciative modality of science itself. In this way he forces science (in his own structuralist hands) to reflect on its own conditions of being a science, thereby taking it outside science (still understood on the model of predicative and cause-effect oriented statements). Science in his hands thus becomes a kind of literature as it begins to more and more rigorously attempt to come to terms with the impossibility of grasping its own conditions of possibility, as a scientist would grasp the identifiable qualities of some object. 4 In psychoanalytic theory the distinction corresponds to Sigmund Freud’s distinction between consciousness and the unconscious. Jacques Lacan argues that since the subject comes into being through language he does so through the exercise of signifying articulation. As soon as he comes into being he finds himself not as he is (what Lacan would call the truth of his being) but as he imagines himself to be—that is, as a representation (at the level of the statement). In order to discover the subject of the unconscious the analyst must focus on the level of enunciation (performance, expression) in order to recognize the truth of the subject in the articulation of language, its enunciation. So the relation between statement and enunciation (the said and the saying) actualizes the divided structure of the psychoanalytic subject and helps to clarify the difference between the imaginary (fixed and complete image of person) and the symbolic (the constitutive function of language).

3. Every normal person in the world, past infancy in years, can and does talk. By virtue of that fact, every person — civilized or uncivilized — carries through life certain naive but deeply rooted ideas about talking and its relation to thinking. Because of their firm connection with speech habits that have become unconscious and automatic, these notions tend to be rather intolerant of opposition. They are by no means entirely personal and haphazard; their basis is definitely systematic, so that we are justified in calling them a system of natural logic — a term that seems to me preferable to the term common sense, often used for the same thing. According to natural logic, the fact that every person has talked fluently since infancy makes every man his own authority on the process by which he formulates andcommunicates. He has merely to consult a common substratum of logic or reason which he and everyone else are supposed to possess. Natural logic says that talking is merely an incidental process concerned strictly with communication, not with formulation of ideas. Talking, or the use of language, is supposed only to “express” what is essentially already formulated nonlinguistically. Formulation is an independent process, called thought or thinking, and is supposed to be largely indifferent to the nature of particular languages. Languages have grammars, which are assumed to be merely norms of conventional and social correctness, but the use of language is supposed to be guided not so much by them as by correct, rational, or intelligent THINKING.

4. Instead of no theories of translation, there are a multiplicity of such theories, even though they are seldomly stated in terms of a full-blown theory of why, when, and how to translate. One of the reasons for so many different views about translating is that interlingual communication has been going on since the dawn of human history. As early as the third millenium BC, bilingual lists of words — evidently for the use of translators — were being made in Mesopotamia, and today translating and interpreting are going on in 19 more than a thousand languages — in fact, wherever there are bilinguals. One of the paradoxes of interlingual communication is that it is both amazingly complex (regarded by LA. Richards (1953) as "probably the most complex type of event yet produced in the evolution of the cosmos") and also completely natural (Harris and Sherwood, 1978). Interpreting is often done by children with amazingly fine results, especially before they have gone to school and have learned something about nouns, verbs, and adjectives. One reason for the great variety of translation theories and subtheories is the fact that the processes of translating can be viewed from so many different perspectives: stylistics, author's intent, diversity of languages, differences of corresponding cultures, problems of interpersonal communication, changes in literary fashion, distinct kinds of content (e.g. mathematical theory and lyric poetry), and the circumstances in which translations are to be used, e.g. read in the tranquil setting of one's own living room, acted on the theatre stage, or blared from a loudspeaker to a restless mob.

5. Since translating always involves at least two different languages, it was inevitable that a number of persons studying the issues of translation would focus upon the distinctive features of the source and receptor languages. Important studies of diverse linguistic structures by such persons as Sapir, Bloomfield, Trubetskoy, and Jakobson laid the foundation for a systematic study of the functions of language. Then the analysis of languages outside of the Semitic and IndoEuropean families by linguist-anthropologists provided the creative stimulus for seeing interlingual relations in new and creative ways. Chomsky (1965, 1972) and his colleagues added a dynamic dimension to language structure through the use of transformations. All this led to the publication of a number of books on translating which have focused primary attention on the correspondences in language structures. Some of the most important of these books were by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), Nida (1964), Catford (1965), Tatilon (1986), Larson (1984) and Malone (1988). 23 Except for Malone's volume, most books dealing with the linguistic aspects of translating have been essentially aimed at meaningful relations rather than purely formal ones. This is particularly true of the approach of Nida and of Larson. But Malone's volume employs a transformational orientation for a number of formal and semantic processes, including equation, substitution, divergence, convergence, amplification, reduction, diffusion, and condensation. This focus on processes is very productive, but greater attention needs to be paid to the pragmatic features of the original message and to the circumstances regarding the use of a translation.