

TRANSLATION THEORIES IN THE SLAVIC COUNTRIES:
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Lorenzo Costantino

In the late 1990s, Maria Tymoczko criticized *Translation Studies* for adopting an exclusively Western point of view, inviting the reconsideration of the phenomenon of translation and the theoretical models it offers, taking into account non-Western translation experiences (both practical and theoretical).¹ That was the beginning of a dialogue that opened TS to concepts and perspectives developed in the non-Western world. Attention initially focused on the cultures of the African and Asian continents.² Only in recent times it has become clear that entire areas within the Western world itself were being ignored in the international debate. Brian James Baer observed, for example, how little attention was being paid in the West to the translation experiences and theoretical discourse in all of central-Eastern and Eastern Europe in general, including the Slavic countries.³

The present collection of essays intends to explore the fertile tradition of theoretical research on translation conducted in the Slavic countries starting

¹ M. Tymoczko, *Translation in a Postcolonial Context*, Manchester, St. Jerome, 1999.

² *Asian Translation Traditions*, ed. by E. Hung, J. Wakabayashi, Manchester, St. Jerome, 2005; *Translating Others*, voll. 1-2, ed. by T. Hermans, Manchester, St. Jerome, 2006; *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation*, ed. M. Cheung, Manchester, St. Jerome, 2006; *Decentering Translation Studies: India and Beyond*, ed. by R. Kothari, J. Wakabayashi, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2009; *Translation Studies in Africa*, ed. by J. Inggs, L. Meintjes, London-New York, Continuum, 2009.

³ B. J. Baer, *Introduction: Cultures of translation*, in Id. (ed.), *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2011, pp. 1-16. This lack of attention has been highlighted in different terms also by other scholars: in Italy, for instance, L. Salmon e B. Osimo have repeatedly spoken of a “fracture”, which divides Eastern and Western Translation Theories (L. Salmon, *Teoria della traduzione. Storia, scienza, professione*, Milano, Vallardi, 2003, pp. 12-13; B. Osimo, *Popovič e la ricerca contemporanea*, in A. Popovič, *La scienza della traduzione. Aspetti metodologici. La comunicazione traduttiva*, trad. D. Laudani and B. Osimo, Milano, Hoepli, 2006, p. XIII).

from the first half of the twentieth century to the present time. The articles here collected describe specific traditions of research which have been developing over several decades in different countries (taking into account theories produced in different fields: cybernetics, linguistics, literature etc.) as well as the contributions provided by groups of scholars, single scholars and centers of research from the Slavic context. Slavic T-theories are generally little known in the West. This publication is the result of the collaboration between experts in T-theory and experts in Slavic Studies, involved in the common effort to make known Slavic T-theory to a larger number of western scholars, who inevitably do not have access to the sources of that debate.

This publication is the first wide contribution on the topic in a Western language and does not pretend to present a systematic and complete description of research produced in the Slavic countries, it is intended rather to stimulate further critical reflection and more specific and in-depth descriptions.

Attempts to bridge the gap between the two research traditions, Western and Eastern, that developed in parallel, had actually been made in the past, as well. Sporadic contacts between them had even contributed in some cases to significant advances in Western research: for example the fundamental contribution made by Roman Jakobson to Western translation theory, or the encounter between James Holmes and Anton Popovič, which to a great extent led to the very foundation of the discipline of Translation Studies.⁴ Some works by Slavic scholars, like *Translation as a decision process* by Jiří Levý,⁵ have become classics in the Western debate (also thanks to the fact that they were written in non-Slavic languages). After a Visiting Professorship at the University of Alberta in Edmonton (Canada), Popovič published a *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*,⁶ which until the mid-

⁴ In Bratislava an important international conference was held in 1968, entitled *Translation as an Art*, whose speeches (collected in *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, ed. by J. S. Holmes, F. de Haan, A. Popovič, The Hague, Mouton, 1970) inspired the birth of Translation Studies (see E. Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, Clevedon-Buffalo-Toronto-Sydney, Multilingual Matters, 2001², pp. 80-91).

⁵ J. Levý, *Translation as a decision process*, in *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, II, The Hague-Paris, Mouton, 1967, pp. 1171-1182. In Germany, the book *Umění překlady* by J. Levý became well known after translation into German in 1969. Other works by scholars, written in czech and not translated in any western languages, are instead little known.

⁶ A. Popovič, *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*, Edmonton, University of Alberta, Department of Comparative Literature, 1976. For a complete report of publications in English and German by Popovič, see J. Špírk, *Anton Popovič's contribution to translation studies*, "Target", 21 (2009) 1, pp. 3-29.

1990s, was the only dictionary of translation science terminology published in English. A significant effort was made in 1993 to introduce the Russian and Bulgarian traditions of translation studies to a wider audience, with the publication of an anthology of texts edited by Palma Zlateva for the prestigious Bassnett-Lefevere series.⁷ In some cases the Slavic scholars themselves have written or translated their works into Western languages (and this has generally guaranteed greater visibility): for instance Aleksandăr Ljudskanov self-translated his own work into French in 1969,⁸ whereas more recently Elzbieta Tabakowska wrote her *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation* directly in English.⁹ For its part, the Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (founded in 1953) has always tried to promote the dialogue with this part of Europe, in conferences organized in Slavic centers (Dubrovnik, Warsaw, Belgrade)¹⁰ and in the journal “Babel”, which has published many articles dealing with these countries (though only a small number of them are dedicated to purely theoretical research). Since the '90s and the fall of the Iron Curtain, the international context of research has changed, the two traditions have found new dialogue opportunities and some international collaborations are now underway (such as the Maastricht-Łódź Duo Colloquium).¹¹

Notwithstanding, contacts have been so far rather sporadic¹² and knowledge of Slavic translation theories in the West is actually incomplete or

⁷ *Translation as Social Action: Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives*, ed. by P. Zlateva, London-New York, Routledge, 1993.

⁸ A. Lyudskanov, *Traduction humaine et traduction mécanique*, Paris, Centre de Linguistique Quantitative de la Faculté des Sciences de l'Université de Paris, 1969.

⁹ E. Tabakowska, *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1993. Only in 2001 appeared polish translation of this work (*Językoznawstwo kognitywne a poetyka przekładu*, transl. by A. Pokojńska, Kraków, Universitas, 2001).

¹⁰ The IV Conference in Dubrovnik in 1963 (see proceedings in “Babel” 9/3); the IX Conference in Warsaw in 1981 (see *The Mission of the Translator Today and Tomorrow*. Proceedings of the 9th World Congress of the International Federation of Translators. Warsaw 1981, ed. by A. Kopczyński et al., Warszawa, Stowarzyszenie Tłumaczy Polskich, 1983); the XII Conference in Belgrade in 1990 (see *Prevodjenje kao stvaralački čin*. XII Svetski kongres FIT-e, Beograd 1990: zbornik radova / *La traduction, profession créative*. XIIe Congrès mondial de la FIT: actes du Congrès “Translation, a creative profession” XIIth World Congress of FIT, ed. by M. Jovanović, Belgrade, Prevodilac, 1990).

¹¹ That produced the series of publications tit. *Translation and meaning* ed. by B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and M. Thelen.

¹² Related to such contacts are also the positive reviews of parts of the studies conducted in Slavic countries that from time to time appeared (as, for example, by J. Holmes and E. Gentzler, which appreciated the contribution of Eastern Europe for the investigation of trans-

superficial, as demonstrated also by the entries on the subject in encyclopedias, which are too short or incomplete (such as the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* and the third volume of *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*),¹³ or by handbooks on translation theory (where the Slavic T-theories occupy a marginal place). Generally speaking Western knowledge of Slavic T-Theories appears limited to particular studies or aspects of the Russian or Czechoslovakian traditions, the understanding of which however seems to contain various gaps. Even less is known about translation theories in other Slavic countries.

There are several reasons for this situation. In 1980, commenting on the lack of dialogue between the two traditions, Popovič wrote: “Unfortunately it is still true today that in studies on the problems of translation, too little attention is paid, in particular by Western researchers, to the results of research studies conducted in Socialist countries”.¹⁴ It is true that the political barrier was a factor in the scarcity of communication between the two sides. The political situation that developed in the early twentieth century (when the first theoretical research studies on translation were being undertaken in Eastern Europe), and was consolidated after World War II when the world was divided into two blocks was certainly not propitious to the circulation of ideas and people (and in many cases prevented it). The political barrier however is not the only or the most important of causes. It is sufficient to observe that in many cases the old division still persists, and is evident in some of the most recent scientific production.

lation studies of literary texts emphasizing in particular the contribution of the Czechoslovak School). However, they testified of the limited awareness of the context which the same research had been conducted.

¹³ *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. by M. Baker, G. Saldanha, New York-London, Routledge, 2009²; *Übersetzung Translation Traduction: ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Encyclopédie internationale de la recherche sur la traduction*, Vol. III, ed. by Kittel et al., Berlin-Boston, de Gruyter, 2011. The first one includes only entries about Bulgarian, Czech, Polish, Russian and Slovak traditions. However, in general, reports in both publications attempt to concentrate into a few lines not only contemporary theoretical debate but also the history of translation in the various countries. The space dedicated to theoretical studies from the 20th century onwards is therefore very limited and does not help to identify any specific orientations of individual research traditions.

¹⁴ Quoted from A. Popovič, *La scienza della traduzione*, cit., p. 3 (from the first chapter added to the Russian translation of Id., *Teória umeleckého prekladu*).

The barriers have been and are still evidently a matter of language, to some degree. The limited understanding of Slavic European languages by Western scholars is a fact, not just a scientific convention. There is no doubt that the Slavic texts usually become accessible to non-Slavic scholars only if they have been translated into English, French or German, or if they were originally written in one of these languages.

However, there seems to be a more important cultural reason. As Baer noted, underlying the lack of interest in the theories developed in this area is an ancient European prejudice, dating as far back as the eighteenth century, which considers this part of the continent to be less advanced and therefore undeserving of particular attention.¹⁵

Growing interest in the subject has been attested to in recent years, by publications in Europe and Americas that include studies on Slavic T-theories, the translation of classic works by Slavic scholars and by some important conferences recently organized specifically to fill this gap,¹⁶ such as “Czech, Slovak and Polish Structuralist Traditions in the Translation Studies Paradigm Today”, Prague (26-27 September, 2013), “Translation Theories in Slavic Countries”, Bologna (7-8 May, 2014) (whose works are the basis of this publication), “Going East: Discovering New and Alternative Traditions in Translation (Studies)”, Vienna, (12-13 December, 2014).

Two essays dedicated to translatology in Russia open this collection of essays. Laura Salmon begins with the historical (cultural and political) pre-

¹⁵ B. J. Baer, *Introduction: Cultures of translation*, cit.

¹⁶ Among the translations, fragments of classical studies from this area are published in journals (like “Translation and Interpreting Studies”); *Umění překladau* by J. Levý was also recently translated into English (*The art of translation*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins, 2011; transl. by P. Corness, edited with a critical foreword by Z. Jettmarová). Initiatives aiming at investigating local traditions (or at making known it at western scholars) have also arisen in the Slavic countries, in Poland: *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza: antologia*, ed. M. Heydel, P. Bukowski, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2013; in Ukraine: T. Šmiger, *Istorija ukrajins'kogo perekladoznavstva XX storiččja*, Kijiv, Smolozkip, 2009; and especially in Czech and Slovak: *Chimera prekladania. Antologia slovenskeho myslenia o preklade I*, ed. D. Sabolova, Bratislava, VEDA, 1999; *Tradition Versus Modernity: From the classic period of the Prague school to Translations Studies at the beginning of the 21st century*, ed. J. Kralova, Z. Jettmarová et al., Praha, Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta, 2008; *Present State of Translation Studies in Slovakia*, ed. L. Vajdová, Bratislava, Slovak Academic Press Institute of World Literature SAS, 2013 (V. Biloveský, *Slovak Thinking on Translation*, “European Researcher”, 77 (2014) 6/2, pp. 1177-1181; see also the pages devoted to these traditions in E. Prunč, *Einführung in die Translationswissenschaft*, Bd. 1: Orientierungsrahmen, Graz, Selbstverlag, Institut für Theoretische und Angewandte Translationswissenschaft, 2002² and M. Snell-Hornby, *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms Or Shifting View-points?*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 2006).

conditions that fostered the eighteenth-century debate, illustrating the development of the discourse in the Soviet era (an era that drew attention to the bond between cultural communication and ideology and in which translation became a social mission). This evolution had its own basis on the particular characteristics of Russian linguistic research, and the ‘macrolinguistic’ approach, pointed out by Salmon, which it embraced in the ’20s (comprehensive of a psycho-linguistic, pragma-linguistic and socio-linguistic dimension). Thus she describes a tradition that developed along a coherent path from the earliest research in the field of automatic translation by Petr Smirnov-Trojanskij to Tamara Kazakova’s research in the field of psycho-semiotics. Kazakova is in fact the author of the second essay on Russia, which illustrates various phases in translation studies from the 1980s to the present, inspired by psychological, cybernetic and semiotic research (in the work of Aleksandr Švejcer, Rajmund Piotrovskij, Rjurik Min’jar-Beloručev, Leonora Černjachovskaja, Nadežda Rjabceva, Jurij Sorokin, and Sergej Tjulenev). The author sustains that: “Within the last twenty-five years, the traditionally linguistic paradigm in Russian translation studies has lost its positions and bowed to pressure of psychological, informational and semiotic approaches and/or their correlation”. Though actually, considering what Salmon writes, it would seem to be an evolution in the light of the most recent scientific knowledge, which follows in the wake, however, of earlier research.

Historically linked to the Russian debate is the Ukrainian one. The problem of the existence of a specific Ukrainian tradition, usually effaced or encompassed within the Soviet area, has emerged in a series of recent publications.¹⁷ Taras Šmiger is the author of the essay dedicated in this book to the Ukrainian tradition, which is very cautious in addressing the preliminary definitions first; he delineates the framework of research in a culture that – one might say – has always been forced to translate itself with respect to other dominating cultures, and then briefly outlines an overview of the theoretical debate (which, it must be said, may be considered to have begun in 1929 and continued through the ’30s in the works of Sergej Dloževs’kyj, Oleksandr

¹⁷ The aforementioned, third volume of de Gruyter’s encyclopedia *Übersetzung Translation Traduction* includes a chapter dedicated to the Ukraine, but it consists of an overview of considerations on translation since its very origins in the Ukraine, in which the theoretical debate is just briefly mentioned, basically in a list of scholars’ names. The specific problem of the theoretical debate is addressed in a series of recent studies (in Ukrainian); of particular interest a collection of essays ed. dedicated to Finkel’, the “forgotten theoretician of translation”: *Oleksandr Finkel’: Zabutyj teoretyk ukrajins’kogo perekladoznavstva*, ed. L. M. Černovatyj, V. I. Karaban, Vinnicja, Nova kniha, 2007; and the first comprehensive research study on the theme, by T. Šmiger, *Istorija ukrajins’kogo perekladoznavstva XX storiččja*, cit.

Finkel', Mychajlo Kalynovyč and Mykola Zerov). It therefore opens a window onto Ukrainian translatology that lays the groundwork for specific investigations in the future.

Two essays are dedicated to the Bulgarian tradition: one by Laska Laskova and Svetlana Slavkova on Ljudskanov, the other a more synthetic text by Roberto Adinolfi. The Bulgarian tradition, as Zlateva had already noted, has strong ties to the Russian tradition, not only in terms of the research paradigm (it is significant, for example, that the studies of Sider Florin and Sergej Vlachov were firstly published in Russian and only subsequently translated into Bulgarian; whereas the theme of translation between Bulgarian and Russian also generates a theoretical reflection on translation between similar languages). The articles confirm that Bulgarian translation studies, which arose later than their Russian counterpart (starting in the '60s), based on a project for strong 'cybernetic semiotics', in which the phenomenon of translation plays a key role, developed in the direction of a multifaceted reflection on language, which also focuses on the psychological and sociological aspects of translation. The contribution of Ljudskanov, the father of Bulgarian translation theory, is so fundamental as to deserve a chapter of its own. Whereas the article by Adinolfi offers a quick overview of research studies that have appeared in Bulgaria (and abroad), contributing to increasing the understanding of Bulgarian translatology, while remaining open to expansion and further exploration.

In a hypothetical map of research into T-theory in Europe, Prague, Bratislava, Nitra and Brno should be highlighted as significant centres. The important tradition of studies in the Czech and Slovak areas, which fostered one of the most intense debates between scholars of the two areas that developed in mutual contact with each other, is the subject of the essays by Zuzana Jettmarová and Edita Gromová and Renáta Kamenárová. Jettmarová reconstructs the bases of the methodological thought underlying this tradition. The scholar underlines how the differences that have existed since the very beginning between the Structuralism of this area (on which a large part of Czech translation theory is founded) and that of the West, allowed Czechoslovakian Structuralist translatology to anticipate many fundamental changes in western research (Constructivism, Holism, Phenomenology, Cognitivism, Interpretation, socio-historical dialectics and dynamism, culture functions, human agency, the communication process and the sociology of the translator and translation practices) avoiding other developments (Deconstruction and Post-Modernism, extreme cultural relativism and agnosticism, as well as the ideology of post-colonialism.) For their part, Gromová and Kamenárová concentrate on the school of Nitra, from its most significant figure, Popovič, to later developments, following a tradition that has always been known to

“stress the idea that, although the translator makes decisions at the level of the text, there are also broader macro-contextual and socio-cultural factors at play”. Finally, Anna Radwan provides a short profile of the Czech theoretician Bohuslav Ilek, whose research interest combines literature studies, linguistics, versology and theory of translation.

Structuralism was a strong paradigm for Poland, as well, in the field of research into literary translation. It was within this fold that research into translation developed its primary orientation: the so-called Poznań school was quite prolific in this field, though less renowned at the international level than the Czechoslovakian schools. Ewa Kraskowska, who was one of the major exponents of the Poznań school (with a very important research study, among others, on self-translation in which she broke through what were considered the boundaries of classic Structuralism), examines the research studies of that group of scholars, questioning whether it should be defined as a ‘school’ rather than as a ‘tradition’.

The other two articles concerning the Polish area (by Elżbieta Tabakowska and by Magdalena Heydel and Piotr de Bończa Bukowski) are dedicated to paradigms that emerged after the ’80s, “together with the overall change in humanities and the general crisis of the structural meta-language”. Until then, the Structuralist research into literary translations had dominated Polish translatology; it was not until the ’90s, especially with Tabakowska’s work, that research studies in Poland which addressed the translation process from the perspective of psychology (and cognitive linguistics) became particularly significant. It is possible however to reconstruct a *fil rouge* of linguistic research in Poland that has been considering these aspects for decades. In this perspective, the essay written by Tabakowska offers an overview of Polish translatology from its origins to the most recent studies, many of which have yet to be published (nor are they limited to the field of literature, but consider the audio-visual field as well, for example). The crisis of the Structuralist model, with its clear separation between the terrains of different disciplines, has been accompanied in more recent Polish research studies by early explorations of a ‘transdisciplinary’ approach (inspired by the contact with western research). Heydel and Bukowski then present the evolution in Polish translation studies from the traditional interdisciplinary approach to the transdisciplinary approach referring to three areas: philosophy, sociology and psychology.

Though they represent two distinct approaches, the Serbian and Croatian traditions, explored by Natka Badurina, developed in close contact with one another. Unlike other Slavic countries, translation theory in the area of the former Yugoslavia is far more recent (late ’70s), and is inspired by a more diversified plurality of approaches. In this case too, or particularly in this case,

the discussion involves a series of studies, rather than a school. The dawning of a debate on translation does not seem to be connected to the debate that developed in the USSR or in the rest of the Slavic world. It is as such an area unto itself, which seems open to a variety of stimuli from Western Europe (with more frequent post-Structuralist inspirations), more inclined to consider translation from a more specifically cultural perspective, which excludes the glottocentric scientism typical of so much of Slavic research (an interesting point of view is expressed by the ‘transnational authors’ Boris Buden and Tomislav Longinović, theoreticians of the ‘cultural translation’). Martina Ožbot explores the debate in another country of the former Yugoslavia, Slovenia. The development of an academic debate here is even more recent (late 1980s) and, at the time, less tied to a local experience.

If research studies in the field of translation theory developed separately in the West and in Eastern Europe, with only occasional contact between the two, the Slavic circuit of research into translation should not be perceived as a single monolithic body of research. As well in the West, Slavic tradition includes a multiplicity of approaches, local developments and directions in research, some of which developed in isolation, others as a result of joint efforts.

However, there are several elements that make the Slavic tradition (or at least part of it) a tradition unto itself. There are elements that originate from the general cultural history of this area, and that more specifically involve the scientific aspect of research (works originating in agreement over the same research paradigm in the whole Slavic area or in a single Slavic country; bonds of exchanges between different theoretical schools that highlight common problems and features, witnessing the existence of a ‘Slavic dialog’).

As is pointed out in some of the articles contained in the volume, there are many historical reasons for which the cultures in this area, unlike many of those that have participated in the Western debate on contemporary translation, have always attributed a positive value to translation, recognizing its importance from a literary and cultural standpoint, and not considering it a secondary activity.¹⁸ These cultures are historically ‘sensitive’ to the issue of translation.

In almost all the Slavic countries, pure theoretical research was preceded as early as the late nineteenth century by lively debates on translation, containing many a theoretical observation that would later constitute the founda-

¹⁸ Clearly the difference was not in the value that translations have had, but in the value that was recognized to them by these cultures.

tion for the real theoretical debate that ensued, which, upon closer scrutiny, in some cases, began in the first half of the twentieth century (ahead of the rest of the Western world). The first, often forgotten, book-length study of translation theory in Europe was *Theory and Practice of Translation* by Finkel', published in Ukrainian in 1929. Research studies on literary translation by Andrej Fedorov, the father of Russian translatology, began in the mid-'20s.¹⁹ In Russia, traces of theoretical considerations were apparent in the debate on literary translation which had become quite intense in the early twentieth century, so it should come as no surprise that in 1934, the *Literaturnaja Ėnciklopedija* featured an entry dedicated to translation (containing a section dedicated to the *Theory of literary translation*; in it Aleksandr Smirnov underscored how every translation involves an "ideological subservience" to the original, which is already implicit in the choice of text to translate). Research on machine translation began in the USSR as early as the 1930s, with Smirnov-Trojanskij, marking the onset of a season rich in thought which, not only in Russia but in other Slavic countries as well, opens up from cybernetics to linguistics, semiotics and the cognitive sciences. In Czechoslovakia, the first traces of a theoretical discussion on translation date back to the turn of the century, and in 1913 Vilém Mathesius wrote an article on translation in which he lays the basis for "a functional understanding of translation", at the basis of later Czech tradition. The examples could go on and on.

The works of these Slavic scholars generally refer to a common legacy of research studies produced in various Slavic languages, which do not correspond to the legacy of Western scholars. The language factor, which has been an obstacle to us, in Eastern Europe or at least in its Slavic sections, seems in the past to have fostered greater communication between scholars from various countries.

On the other hand in the Slavic countries and throughout Eastern Europe there has been an ongoing international debate fueled by the participation of scholars from various countries (Slavic, such as P. Kopanev from Belarus, and non-Slavic, such as Peeter Torop from Estonia, or, during the Soviet period, scholars from the various Socialist republics, such as Givi Gačėčiladze from Georgia, Levon Mkrtčan from Armenia, and others). The Russian language has therefore played a key role as the language of communication between various researchers from different countries, fostering an international research effort of remarkable breath, running parallel to the international research conducted in the West.

¹⁹ The first Fedorov's study devoted to translation was *Problema stichotvornogo perevo-da*, "Poėtika", II (1927), pp. 104-119.

This dimension of the debate also stimulated common research themes and directions, such as research studies on the history of reflection on translation (which also began ahead of similar studies in the West, but have been totally ignored in our research in this field). Interest in the history of translation and of reflection on translation was already alive in the early decades of the XX century in Ukraine (see the article by Šmiger in this volume). Research into the history of reflection on translation produce publications in Czech, Russia and Poland.²⁰ In the theoretical field, the attempt by Jerzy Ziomek of combining theory of information and stylistic analysis of literary translation and the project of Ljudskanov of a cybernetic semiotics in which translation occupies a central place, were inspired by the same ample inter-Slavic debate which between the '50s and the '70s sought to bring together linguistics and the literature of mathematical and cybernetic sciences. Research studies inspired by the same formalist-structuralist-semiotic paradigm are common for many research studies in Czechoslovakia and Poland (its acceptance in these countries may be considered one of the reasons for the significant development and timeliness with which these countries inaugurated their research into literary translation).

The most characteristic aspect, which may however apply to all the Slavic tradition, in general (with the exception of the former Yugoslavia), is that the traditions of research into translation, spanning linguistics, cybernetics, literature and semiotics, often seems inspired by a common scientific approach that becomes the basis for a deeper collaboration among these disciplines than in the West.

The collection of essays ends with an article on the circulation of Slavic translation theories in Italy. The article presents an overview of studies on Slavic T-theories and of translations published in Italy of texts produced by Slavic theoreticians. The situation it depicts is, however, rather indicative of how these theories were received, a reception that was often dependent, as one might expect, on translated versions of these texts (but the situation it describes could apply in part to other Western countries as well). In conclusion, this can only be a stimulus to continue the study of Slavic translation theories, pursuing them with studies such as those presented here, and to translate what others are saying and have said before us about translation, thereby enriching the debate that surrounds it.

²⁰ J. Levý, *České teorie překladu*, Praha, SNKLHU, 1957; Ju. D. Levin, *Russkie pisateli o perevode XVIII-XX vv.*, Leningrad, Sovetskij pisatel', 1960; E. Balcerzan, *Pisarze polscy o sztuce przekladu. 1440-1974. Antologia*, Poznań, Wydawnictwo poznańskie, 1977.

Main references

Russian tradition. S.G. Barchudarov, *Jazyk i perevod*, Moskva, Meždunarodnye otnošenija, 1975. L.A. Černjachovskaja, *Perevod i smyslovaja struktura*, Moskva, Meždunarodnye otnošenija, 1976. A.V. Fedorov, *Osnovy obščej teorii perevoda*, Moskva, Vysšaja škola, 1968. Id., *Iskusstvo perevoda i žizn' literatury. Očerki*, Leningrad, Sovetskij pisatel', 1983. T. Kazakova, *Chudožestvennyj perevod: v poiskach istiny*, St. Petersburg, Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 2005. V.N. Komissarov, *Slovo o perevode*, Moskva, Meždunarodnye otnošenija, 1973. B.A. Larin, (ed.), *Teorija i kritika perevoda*, Leningrad, Izd. vo LGU, 1962. R.K. Min'jar-Beloručev, *Obščaja teorija perevoda i ustnyj perevod*, Moskva, Voenizdat, 1980. Ja.I. Recker, *Teorija perevoda i perevodčeskaja praktika*, Moskva, Meždunarodnye otnošenija, 1974. I.I. Rezvin, V.Ju. Rozencvejg, *Osnovy obščego i mašinogo perevoda*, Moskva, Vysšaja škola, 1964. V.M. Rossel's, (ed.), *Voprosy chudožestvennogo perevoda*, Moskva, Sovetskij pisatel', 1955. Ju.A. Sorokin, *Perevodovedenie: status perevodčika i psihogermenevtičeskie procedury*, Moskva, Gnozis, 2003. A.D. Švejcer, *Teorija perevoda: Status, problemy, aspekty*, Moskva, Nauka, 1988. P.M. Toper, *Perevod v sisteme sravnitel'nogo literaturovedenija*, Moskva, Nasledie, 2000. P. Torop, *Total'nyj perevod*, Tartu, Izd. Tartuskogo Universiteta, 1995.

Ukrainian tradition. O. Finkel', *Teorija j praktyka perekladu*, Charkiv, DVU, 1929. V. Koptilov, *Peršotvir i pereklad. Rozdumy i sposteržennja*, Kyjiv, Dnipro, 1972. V. Koptilov (ed.), *"Chaj slovo movleno inakše...": statti z teorii, krytyky ta istoriji chudožn'ogo perekladu*, Kyjiv, Dnipro, 1982. O. L. Kundzič, *Tvorči problemy perekladu*, Kyjiv, Dnipro, 1973. M. Ryl's'kyj, *Myctectvo perekladu: statti, vystupy, notatky*, Kyjiv, Radjans'kyj pis'mennyk, 1975. T. Šmiger, *Istorija ukrajins'kogo perekladoznavstva XX storiččja*, Kijiv, Smoloskop, 2009.

Bulgarian tradition. S. Florin, S. Vlahov, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, Sofija, Nauka i izkustvo, 1990. I. Likomanova, *Prevodät meždu teorijata i praktikata*, Sofija, UI "Sv. Kliment Ochridski", 2002. A. Lilova, *Uvod v obsšata teorija na prevoda*, Sofija, Narodna kultura, 1981. A. Ljudskanov, *Preveždat čovekät i mašinata*, Sofija, Nauka i izkustvo, 1967. L. Ognjanov-Rizor, *Osnovi na prevodačeskoto izkustvo*, Sofija, Kamara na Narodnata kultura, 1947. I. Vaseva, *Stilistika na prevoda: specijika na prevoda na različni vidove i žanrove tekst*, Sofija, Nauka i izkustvo, 1989. I. Vladova, *Prevod u vreme*, Sofija, Nauka i izkustvo, 1988.

Cech and Slovak traditions. E. Gromová, M. Hrdlička, (eds.), *Antologie teorie uměleckého překlada*, Ostrava, Filozofická fakulta OU, 2010³. J. Ferenčík, *Kontexty prekladu*, Bratislava, Slovenský spisovateľ, 1982. B. Hochel, *Preklad ako komunikácia*, Bratislava, Slovenský spisovateľ, 1990. K. Horálek, *Příspěvky k teorii překlada*, Praha, SPN, 1966. J. Levý, *České teorie překlada*, Praha, SNKLHU, 1957. Id., *Umění překlada*, Praha, Československý spisovateľ, 1963. Id., *Translation as a Decision Process*, in, *To Honor Roman Jakobson: essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday: 11 October 1966*, v. 2 The Hague, Mouton, 1967, pp. 1171-1182. F. Miko, *Text a štýl*, Bratislava, Smena, 1970. A. Popovič, *Teória umeleckého prekladu*, Bratislava, Tatran, 1975. J. Rakšányiová, *Preklad ako interkulturná komunikácia*, Bratislava, AnaPress, 2005. D. Sabolova, (ed.), *Chiméra prekladania*:

antológia slovenského myslenia o preklade, Bratislava, VEDA, 1999. D. Slobodník, *Teória a prax básnického prekladu*, Bratislava, Slovenský spisovateľ, 1990. J. Vilikovský, *Preklad ako tvorba*, Bratislava, Slovenský spisovateľ, 1984.

Polish tradition. E. Balcerzan, 1968, *Styl i poetyka twórczości dwujęzycznej Brunona Jasińskiego. Z zagadnień teorii przekładu*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1968. Id., *Literatura z literatury (strategie tłumaczy)*, Katowice, Śląsk, 1998. S. Barańczak, *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu. Szkice o warsztacie tłumacza poezji z dołączeniem malej antologii przekładów-problemów*, Kraków, Wydaw. "a5", 2004³. M. Heydel, P. de Bończa Bukowski (eds.), *Polska myśl przekładoznawcza. Antologia*, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2013. K. Hejwowski, *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*, Warszawa, PWN, 2004. E. Kraskowska, *Twórczość Stefana Themersona. Dwujęzyczność a literatura*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1989. A. Legeżyńska, *Tłumacz i jego kompetencje autorskie. Na materiale powojennich tłumaczeń A. Puszkina, W. Majakowskiego, I. Krylowa i A. Błoka*, Warszawa, PWN, 1986. R. Lewicki, *Obcość w odbiorze przekładu*, Lublin, Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2000. M. Rusinek, (ed.), *O sztuce tłumaczenia*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1955. E. Tabakowska, *Cognitive Linguistics and Poetics of Translation*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, 1993. O.A. Wojtasiewicz, *Wstęp do teorii tłumaczenia*, Wrocław, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo PAN, 1957.

Serbian and Croatian traditions. M. Bonačić, *Tekst diskurs prijevod. O poetici prevođenja*, Split, Književni krug, 1999. B. Čović, *Umetnost prevođenja ili zanat*, Novi Sad, Književna zajednica Novog Sada, 1986. V. Ivir, *Teorija i tehnika prevođenja*, Sremski Karlovci, Centar Karlovačka gimnazija, 1984². B. Hlebec, *Opšta načela prevođenja*, Beograd, Naučna knjiga, 1989. R. Marojević, *Lingvistika i poetika prevođenja: međuslovenski prevod*, Beograd, Naučna knjiga, 1988. Lj. Rajić, (ed.), *Teorija i poetika prevođenja*, Beograd, Prosveta, 1981. M. Sibinović, *Novi original – uvod u prevođenje*, Beograd, Naučna knjiga, 1990.

Slovenian tradition. M. Stanovnik (ed.), *Prevajalci o prevodu: Od Trubarja do Župančiča: antologija*, Ljubljana, Založba ZRC, 2013. E. Prunč, *Translationskultur (Versuch einer konstruktiven Kritik des translatorischen Handelns)*, "TEXTconTEXT", 11 (1997) 1, pp. 99-127. V. Gorjanc (ed.), *Slovensko tolmačeslovje*, Ljubljana, Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, 2013.