

MARTA KAŻMIERCZAK 



<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2925-0209>

University of Warsaw

mkazmierczak@uw.edu.pl

THE TOWER OF BABEL OR IVORY TOWER? THE RECEPTION OF WESTERN TRANSLATION RESEARCH IN RUSSIAN-LANGUAGE TRANSLATION STUDIES – A RECONNAISSANCE*

Abstract

The aim of this article is to survey which texts and authors representing Western translation studies have been translated into Russian over the last seven decades and to describe the dynamics of the emergence of these translations as well as possible agendas behind their selection. It also traces, on a partial corpus, to what extent Russian translation scholars tend to cite and quote Western ones. The findings lead to a tentative conclusion that so far TS knowledge has been transferred mainly by unfrequent references to original publications and by way of mediated accounts (reviews, textbook summaries), while translations of particular studies have only recently begun appearing on a wider scale, their impact as yet uncertain.

Keywords: Western translation studies, reception, circulation of scientific concepts, publishing policies, Russia

* Originally published in Polish in *Przekładaniec* vol. 41, 2020; a shorter version of the article is available in French as: M. Kaźmierczak, “Une théorie itinérante? La pensée traductologique occidentale dans la traduction russe (réception éditoriale)”, trans. D. Karczewska, *Romanica Wratislaviensia* 68, 2021, pp. 101–118.

1. Aims and limitations of the study

As Ewa Kraskowska points out, “whose academic works and which ones are translated into particular target languages largely determines (...) the extent and manner in which specific concepts or research schools become disseminated in the academic universe” (2012: 9, my translation¹). It is also worth examining whether translation theory itself can become one of the “travelling theories”. I have attempted to probe if it can travel from the West to the East (of Europe). The article presents the results of an investigation into whether and which Western academic texts on translation have been translated into Russian, and into the reception of these texts (in the form of citations and bibliographical references). It will be opportune, however, to begin with qualifying certain components of the title.

Firstly, reception should be understood here as translational reception alone – in terms of the number and choice of texts rendered into Russian. A discussion of reception in the sense of intellectual engagement with given concepts by scholars representing the target culture would go well beyond the scope of the article. Secondly, *Western* translation studies (TS)² is taken to mean the study of translation as practised west (and south) of the borders of the former Soviet Union, not specifically in Western Europe: the investigation encompasses texts from socialist bloc countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia, where translation theory developed independently. This may complicate what could have been the convenient assumption of studying exchanges between two strong scholarly polysystems both enjoying central positions, yet this decision is motivated, for one, by the significant share of such materials in the pool of translations undertaken. What remains excluded, however, are translations of works written, for example, in Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian, as pertaining to the USSR’s internal circulation, as well as texts written by Russian or Soviet authors in foreign languages and subsequently translated. Reception is traced in Russian-language materials in both the Soviet era and in post-1991 Russia by examining the contents of, among others, an anthology of translation theory, once influential annuals,

¹ All further translations of quotations and all glosses are mine – M.K.

² The designations “translation studies” (TS), “translation theory” and occasionally “translatology” are used interchangeably in the present paper to refer to the discipline in general.

a selection of currently published professional, scholarly and cultural journals, and some other Russian publications with a translational profile.

Further caveats should be made that the article is indeed a preliminary survey and that it does not purport to be strictly scientometric. The latter is reflected, e.g., in the fact that when looking at collections, I analyse the number of foreign texts included and the “density” of references to foreign researchers only in relation to the volume (size) of a given translation-studies publication (without establishing the proportion of citations from different fields, in particular languages, etc.). I also abandoned a holistic examination of a particular corpus (cf. Skibińska 2015) in favour of a more cross-sectional, if less systematic, overview. This last decision is related to having encountered specific obstacles to constructing a closed, exhaustive corpus (cf. Pym 1998/2014: 38–54): the publications being scattered and the difficulties in locating some of the texts or in determining whether they were actually translations, or not. Indeed, in certain cases it has proved impossible to consult the publications themselves and the discussion is based partly on bibliographical and catalogue data. A limitation here is the fact that the remotely accessible catalogues of Russian libraries usually do not cover publishing history before the mid-1990s.³ Some of the complications entailed will be illustrated in the discussion. Nevertheless, I will also refer to a smaller subcorpus, examined in greater detail, in part 3 of the article. Despite the indicated limitations, the overview should go beyond a purely bibliographic outline; therefore I will also subject the collected data to a qualitative analysis, attempting, among other things, to identify the reasons for certain phenomena and tendencies observed.

³ The databases of the Institute of Scientific Information on the Social Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ИНИОН РАН) go back the furthest: they record literary and linguistic publications since 1986 (see: <http://inion.ru/resources/bazy-dannykh-inion-ran/> [access: 29.12.2019]). In addition I used, among others, the resources of the Russian State Library in Moscow (РГБ), the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg (РНБ), the BILTRA database of the University of Alicante (among the approximately 360 entries indexing the Russian language there are no translations), the digital library called “CyberLeninka” (taking over the colloquial pet name of the ‘V.I. Lenin Library’, today’s РГБ), and bibliographies in scholarly volumes and journals, too numerous to list here. It is worth noting that in earlier studies combining the reflection on the history of translation and on publishing activity, the object of research has mainly been entire book-length publications (cf. Sapiro 2018; Colombo 2019), while in the present contribution, a significant role is played by dispersed articles, essays or chapters, to a negligible extent catalogued previously to the investigation.

As yet, there is no established methodology for investigating and describing the translational trajectory of translation thought.⁴ It has not been proposed even in the comprehensive handbook *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge*: Lieven D’huylst (2018) barely touches on these issues, while for example Alexandra Assis Rosa (2018), when reviewing the forms of dissemination of translation knowledge, does not consider translation itself at all. I have therefore drawn on approaches or methodological remarks found in the works of various researchers, e.g. Elżbieta Skibińska (2015), Anna Bednarczyk (2000), Ewa Konefał (2019), Natalya Sokolova (Соколова 2017) and Daniel Gile (2015) – sometimes distancing myself from their conclusions.⁵ To the best of my knowledge, there exists no bibliographic index of translations of translation-studies texts into Russian to draw upon and reference, so the first stage of work had to be documentation. The results of the documentation effort are presented in the appendix published together with this study (see pp. 43–52), to which I will be referring in the course of the argument.

Quite evidently, when research is located at the intersection of the history of translation and the history of translation studies, it is impossible to separate the object of study of these two subdisciplines: translation as a product and the evolution of thought.⁶ At the same time, from the outset I venture to argue that in the investigated target culture the reception of foreign TS relies on phenomena that go beyond translation, and I show its other forms as well. We are actually dealing with a variety of what Lieven D’huylst (2018) calls transfer modes – with all the research complications which this entails.

⁴ The trajectories of literary and cultural theories have, of course, been studied, especially the “travels” of particular concepts, see e.g. Susam-Sarajeva 2006. My methodological background, however, is principally meta-translational explorations and attempts to provide accounts of import of sets of texts.

⁵ For obvious reasons, the approach adopted differs from the methods used by Gisèle Sapiro (2018 and elsewhere): her research is based on pre-existing corpora (although combined and expanded), where information on translations of works from multiple disciplines provides a large pool of data that can be analysed statistically, while the completeness of the subcorpora of individual domains is not of great importance.

⁶ Contrary to Ewa Konefał’s generalising the postulate to do so (2019: 251–252).

2. Overview of publications – part 1 (the second half of the 20th century)

First, a chronological overview of the translations of works by Western scholars should be given. The present register begins with the 1950s, the era when reflection on translation was taking shape as a line of scientific enquiry. For the 1950s and 1960s I have been able to locate a number of Russian versions of articles – see Appendix, List 1.

Immediately noticeable is the presence of names of genuine importance in the history of TS, such as Georges Mounin or Edmond Cary, co-founder of the French association of translators (*Société française des traducteurs*) and of the journal *Babel*. A second conspicuous trend is a preference for acquainting Russian readers with the self-reflection of translators, especially those who combined translation work with original writing, such as Valery Larbaud or the Polish poet Julian Tuwim. Interest in machine translation is also evident. In the case of Mounin's texts which begin the register it is, however, important to note the peculiarity of the place of publication. The monthly *V zashchitu mira*⁷ (*В защиту мира*, lit. 'In defence of peace'), associated with the World Peace Council, which was dependent on the USSR, could hardly count as a proper platform for the creative exchange of ideas in the field of translation studies (despite the periodical's programmatically international character⁸).

The following decade brought more translations than the previous two together, but still only a small number of articles. List 2 of the Appendix begins with a key text by Eugene Nida, in which he expounds his concept of the science of translation, published in a prestigious linguistic journal. It heads the issue, as if opening a polyphonic debate on translation, with further voices of Soviet scholars including e.g. Yefim Etkind discussing literary translation "as an art and a science" (Эткинд 1970). Apart from this, almost exclusively Slavonic authors are presented in Russian in the 1970s: Czechs,

⁷ In the main text of the article, the transliteration of Russian titles and names usually follows the BGN standard, considered most intuitive to read for users of English.

⁸ Its subtitle read 'An international monthly' ("Yezhemesachnyi mezhdunarodnyi zhurnal"). The French politician Pierre Cot served as editor-in-chief. The magazine was published in Moscow in 1950–1961, under several titles featuring the word *mir*, 'peace': *Странички мира* (no. 7–20, 1950), *Мир* (no. 21, 1950 – no. 26, 1951), *В защиту мира* (no. 1, 1951 – no. 7, 1961). There was also a French-language counterpart, *Horizons: La Revue de la Paix*.

Poles, a Bulgarian and a Serb. In the serial publication *Masterstvo perevoda* (*Мастерство перевода*, lit. ‘Mastery of translation’) it is Jiří Levý who largely defines the Czech presence. The opening chapter of the last redaction of his book *The Art of Translation* (orig. *Umění překlady*; the previous volume of *Masterstvo...* contained translations of two other chapters, cf. Appendix, List 1) was published, with an introduction in which Bohuslav Ilek recapitulates the contribution of his prematurely deceased colleague to the development of the discipline. A journal of literary studies featured reflections of the Czech translator of English prose Aloys Skoumal, translated from the French, from a publication in *Babel* (original: Skoumal 1970). Chronologically, the decade closes with a translation from Italian, which was, after Nida’s article, the only other text from the actual Western world.

The item listed with no author, “Razgovor cytat” (“Разговор цитат”, or ‘Quotations in a dialogue’), merits a comment. In 1960 an anthology of Russian writers’ statements on translation was published (it will yet be mentioned). No similar publication with foreign thought was issued, but this collection of quotes in *Masterstvo perevoda* for 1970 served as a surrogate. The ten pages display comments by 22 authors – mainly German ones (although the likes of Tytler, Belloc or Ortega y Gasset complete the set), because this re-creates the annex from Fritz Güttinger’s 1963 book *Zielsprache. Theorie und Technik des Übersetzens*. The excerpts were translated by participants of Yefim Etkind’s translation seminar (cf. Ред. 1970), but whether from the original languages, remains unsaid.

As regards book-length translations, the period spanning the 1950s to 1980s saw only six of them (Appendix, List 3). The earliest one dates to 1957 and is a rendition of an English-language collection of papers on machine translation. To the best of my knowledge, the publication preceded Soviet research in the area and it includes Yehoshua Bar-Hillel’s pioneering considerations which would later be relatively often cited in Russian-language scholarship. Another volume on machine translation was issued in 1971, under Russian editorship, with translations from English, Italian, German and French. Three authorial monographs present the achievements of Slavonic scholars: a complete text of Jiří Levý’s *The Art of Translation*, as well as books by Anton Popovič and Anna Lilova, translated from Czech, Slovak and Bulgarian respectively.

The fourth item in the list stands apart: the reader *Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoy lingvistike*, i.e. ‘Issues of translation theory in foreign linguistics’ (*Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике*), edited

by Vilen Komissarov. The structuring is conceptual and the texts, rendered from three languages,⁹ have been grouped according to broadly understood themes, with the order within particular groups not necessarily dictated by chronology. The anthology opens with contributions intended to present the ‘General linguistic aspects of translation’. Here we find Roman Jakobson’s reflections on the linguistic aspects of translation (1966 [1959]¹⁰), John R. Firth’s paper “Linguistic Analysis and Translation” (1956), the opening section of Mounin’s *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction* (1963), extracts from the works of Michael A.K. Halliday (1966) and K.-R. Bausch (1971) on comparative linguistics, as well as Otto Kade’s (1968) application of communication theory perspective to translation issues. The section ‘Equivalence in translation’ brings four chapters from John C. Catford’s *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1967), the chapter “Principles of correspondence” from Nida’s *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964) and extracts from Gert Jäger’s *Translation und Translationslinguistik* (1975). In the section ‘The process of translation’ Komissarov places the classification of translation methods or procedures proposed by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet in their comparative stylistics (1972 [1958]), and Charles F. Voegelin’s concept of “Multiple Stage Translation” (1954). The enquiry into ‘Pragmatics and Stylistics of Translation’, in turn, is represented by Albrecht Neubert (the paper “Pragmatische Aspekte der Übersetzung”, 1968) and by Katharina Reiss with her translational typology of texts (1971). The enumeration shows that the anthologised texts are mostly still valued today in the international context of developments in TS.

The picture of translational reception in the Soviet period is completed (see Appendix, List 4) by the appearance of single articles by James Holmes (the English text is: Holmes 1988) and André Lefevere – their papers from the 1978 “International Symposium on Achievements in the Theory of Translation” (“Новые достижения в области теории перевода”) were published in the book *Khudozhestvennyi perevod: Voprosy teorii i praktiki / Художественный перевод. Вопросы теории и практики* in 1982. In addition, texts by foreign authors were included alongside Russian ones in two general publications. The 1987 volume devoted to translation as “a means

⁹ All translations from English were done by Leonora Chernyakhovskaya, from French – by Genrikh Turover, from German – by A[ndrei] Batrak.

¹⁰ I give the date of the edition on which the translation was based, and if necessary add the year of the first publication.

of rapprochement between peoples” (*Perevod – sredstvo vzaimnogo sblizheniya narodov / Перевод – средство взаимного сближения народов*) contains, among others, reflections of a translated author (Gabriel García Márquez), comments by two Italian poets-translators (Margherita Guidacci and Roberto Mussapi), as well as by Robert Daglish, who rendered Mikhail Sholokhov’s prose into English. Texts by Larbaud, Tuwim and Alfred Kurella (cf. Appendix, List 1) are also reprinted here. Some contributions, including those by Mounin and Octavio Paz, were taken from the *UNESCO Courier* published simultaneously in different languages – with the authorship of the language versions of individual texts not indicated clearly, hence in the collection they feature as if they were originals (see also Mounin 1962; Paz 1975). In fact, the only foreign *theoretical* proposition presented is the structuralist one by the Slovak comparatist Dionýz Ďurišin. In the volume on the poetics of translation, *Poetika perevoda (Поэтика перевода)*, edited by Sergei Goncharenko, the translated texts include contributions by eminent practitioners (Ewald Osers, Juan Eduardo Zúñiga), by the theorist František Miko, or by Artur Sandauer, who combined the role of translator into Polish with that of a critic. Osers’s paper on poetry translation, originally published in the 1982 conference proceedings *Khudozhestvennyi perevod...* just mentioned, appears here in the author’s expanded version and in a new rendition. This is, then, the first registered instance of a text on translation becoming retranslated and thus forming a *translation series*,¹¹ as it is called in the Polish academic tradition (cf. Balcerzan 2020 [1968]). In List 4 I have also included Eugenio Coseriu’s work on translation, as well as José Ortega y Gasset’s famous essay “Miseria y esplendor de la traducción”, to show that statements on the topic were by no means omitted in Russian editions of works by foreign linguists or philosophers (such as Wilhelm von Humboldt, Johann Herder, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Montesquieu or Willard Quine, to be mentioned below). As far as the 1990s are concerned, only two contributions of a scholarly nature could be located: Antonio Pamies Bertrán’s discussion of issues of rhythm further demonstrates that reflection on poetry translation tended to be privileged, while Nida’s article was his third text made available to Russian-speaking audiences.

¹¹ The conference paper was translated from English; in the other version the source language is not indicated, but it may have been Czech, as suggested by the person of the translator, who rendered Slovak texts for the same volume (cf. Appendix, List 4, entries for Miko and Hocheľ).

3. *Tetradi perevodchika* – an overview of a journal's contents

It is worthwhile to supplement the bibliographical inventory by viewing some material from a closer perspective. In addition to the number of translations – which for philologists may not be strictly necessary – the reception of foreign theories can also be measured by the extent to which they are cited in scholarly works written in the target culture. Both parameters have been examined in the subcorpus of the periodical publication *Tempodu perevodchika* (*Tetradi perevodchika*, lit. ‘Translator’s notebooks’, hereafter also *TP*). Despite their inconspicuous format, these slim volumes quickly gained a solid reputation and became the main platform for the exchange of ideas within translation studies in the USSR. The annual was published in Moscow between 1963 and 1984 under the editorship of Leonid Barkhudarov, while the next four volumes, appearing at increasingly longer intervals, were edited by Sergei Goncharenko. The thematic range here includes all types of translation (if only occasionally) as well as issues of theory, practice and didactics (which distinguishes *Tetradi perevodchika* from the more artistically oriented *Masterstvo perevoda* and thus makes it a more representative corpus). The table demonstrates to what degree foreign researchers (through their translated and not translated works) were present on the pages of *TP*. As noted earlier, I show the “density”, i.e. the number of cited foreign works on translation in relation to the size of the publication (number of pages), not in relation to all the citations. Only references to texts on translation are taken into account, thus excluding foreign works on psycholinguistics, literary studies, philosophy, etc., as well as dictionaries and literary texts. When two values are given, the lower number expresses references to strictly translation-studies texts, while the higher score after the slash includes various types of “translation-related” texts, such as Dante’s statement on the nature of translation (quoted from the Russian edition of *The Convivio*), legal documents regulating the training or activities of translators in Germany, university curricula, or correspondence between the author and the translator. Works on linguistics or philosophy of language are part of the count only if, despite the absence of such a declaration in the title, the cited text or its passages directly bears on translation issues.

Table 1. Foreign texts about translation in *TP*

Issue (number of pages)	Number of foreign texts about translation		
	Published in Russian translation	Cited with a reference to a Russian translation [translators uncredited]	Cited with a reference to a foreign-language publication
[average number of papers per issue: 14]			
TP 1, 1963 (109 pp.)	0 (+ 1 in French, 1 in English)	0	0
TP 2, 1964 (122 pp.)	0 (+ 1 in German)	0	0
TP 3, 1966 (111 pp.)	0	0	0 + 1 book under review (Mounin)
TP 4, 1967 (117 pp.)	0	0	0
TP 5, 1968 (126 pp.)	0	0	3/4
TP 6, 1969 (112 pp.)	0 (+ 1 in Spanish)	0	2/3 + 1 book under review (Catford)
TP 7, 1970 (111 pp.)	0	0	5
TP 8, 1971 (125 pp.)	0	0	3 + 1 book under review (Nida)
TP 9, 1972 (118 pp.)	0	0	1
TP 10, 1973 (110 pp.)	0	1/2 (Nida; Rilke)	4/5 + 2 books under review (Seleskovitch; Barik)
TP 11, 1974 (103 pp.)	0	0	2
TP 12, 1975 (111 pp.)	0	1 (Nida)	12
TP 13, 1976 (127 pp.)	0	0	2/5
TP 14, 1977 (132 pp.)	0	1 (Levý)	6/7
TP 15, 1978 (111 pp.)	1 (Clara Montella)	2/3 (Bar-Hillel, Nida; Dante)	6 (incl. 2 indirect citations)
TP 16, 1979 (119 pp.)	0 (Kade – a non-translation, written in Russian)	0	9 (in 2 papers out of 12)
TP 17, 1980 (120 pp.)	0	3 (Kade; Kade, Neubert ¹²)	3 (incl. 1 indirect citation)
TP 18, 1981 (111 pp.)	0	0	1
TP 19, 1982 (126 pp.)	0	2 (Levý, Halliday)	9/10

¹² Two of the cited texts may not be translations: see below and in List 8 of the Appendix.

TP 20, 1983 (102 pp.)	0 (Viniars – a non-translation, written in Russian)	1 (Levý)	9 (+ 6 named in the text, with no references)
TP 21, 1984 (112 pp.)	0	0	3
TP 22, 1987 (159 pp.)	0	3 (Kade, Neubert, Reiss)	7/8
TP 23, 1989 (176 pp.)	0	1 (Nida 1978)	1 + 1 book under review (Newmark)
TP 24, 1999 (212 pp.)	0	2 (Levý, Popovič)	35/36
		also invoked without bibliographic references: Catford, Nida, Reiss; Toury, Wills	
TP 25, 2005 (150 pp.)	0	1 (Levý)	12

(Table compiled by the author of the article).

The contents of the table give rise to the following observations. In its history of relatively regular functioning, spanning 25 issues,¹³ *Tetradī perevodchika* published only one translation – Clara Montella’s analysis of Russian translations of a tale by Giovanni Boccaccio and different strategies employed in them (see Appendix, List 2, and above, in the chronological overview for the 1970s). An editorial footnote (TP 15, p. 23) states that the paper was rendered from Italian on basis of a submitted manuscript.¹⁴ A probable rationale was the assumption that unlike works published in TP in other foreign languages, a text in Italian would have too narrow an audience. The work, although an example of sound translation criticism, did not make impact: while authors publishing later in TP would often refer to articles from previous years, the Neapolitan researcher’s study was never cited. In the resources of the scientific electronic library “CyberLeninka” (Научная электронная библиотека “КиберЛенинка”) I found a reference

¹³ According to the catalogue of the Russian State Library (РГБ, <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01000846025>, [access: 29.01.2020]), after further interruptions and under new editorship again (I.I. Khaleyeva), there followed issue 26, published in 2007, and issue 27 (informative) in 2010. In view of their unavailability, I close the corpus with the 25th volume. In 2016, volume 28 was issued, which does not affect the findings presented here insofar as it does not contain any translation.

¹⁴ In the first issue, the editors explicitly encouraged the submission of texts in Russian and “in foreign languages” (“От редакции” 1963: 4).

to Montella in a single work (Власенко 2011), the author of which, by the way, even utilises one of the Italian's examples (2011: 27–30).¹⁵

In order to remove any doubts as to whether there is indeed just a single translation among several hundred articles, it should be stressed that the array of authors writing for *TP* reflects the multinational character of science in the huge country that USSR was and the dominant role and prestige of Russian as the language of publication. Texts by scholars from Lithuania, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, as well as by the Moscow-affiliated Aldo Canestri and the Uruguayan Marisa Viniars (Winiarski) were not translations. Otto Kade, too, wrote his programmatic polemical article for volume 16 (Каде 1979) in Russian.¹⁶ According to the editors' footnote (*TP* 16, p. 3), this publication aimed at fostering a closer collaboration with the East-German journal *Fremdsprachen* which Kade edited; however, such results are not perceptible in subsequent issues of *TP*.

The fabric of the texts in *TP* does not show signs of internationalisation either. The number of references to translations is negligible – which is partly due, as has been shown above, to their scarce availability. The insufficiency of translations is revealed in puzzling indirect references, as exemplified by Nida and St. Jerome being cited after Carlo Buzzetti's Italian study (Прокопович 1978: 76–78; Прокопович 1980: 39). However, the number of references to foreign sources in general, including in their original editions, is also very small; a positive or higher score is often linked to a given issue carrying a review of a non-Russian publication. Moreover, these references are usually confined to the set range of recurring names, the most frequently cited Western translation scholars being Vinay and Darbelnet, Nida, Catford, Theodore Savory, Kade and Reiss. In addition, the same authors cite the same texts in subsequent years, and the names of translators are systematically omitted from footnotes with publication details (I will return to this issue below). Certain subfields of more active citing of foreign scholarship can

¹⁵ In an extensive article with a long bibliography, Svetlana Vlasenko cites only one work other than Montella that is a translation, namely the Russian edition of Eco's *Dire quasi la stessa cosa* (cf. Appendix, List 10), which, for comparison, has at least 110 citations in "CyberLeninka" in texts tagged 'Linguistics and Literary Studies' (cf. <https://cyberleninka.ru/search?q=Сказать почти то же самое&page=1> [access: 29.12.2019]).

¹⁶ The article turned out to be important in terms of circulating ideas: the notion of the positively valorised *macrolinguistics*, which the Leipzig researcher promotes here as placing translation in a broad communicative context, resurfaces, for instance, in the introduction to Vilen Komissarov's book discussing foreign translation research (cf. below and Appendix, List 9).

be indicated, namely machine translation, especially in the first decade of the annual's existence (e.g. the aforementioned Bar-Hillel), and interpretation (Danica Seleskovitch, Marianne Lederer, Jean Herbert, P.E. Longley).

It is only in issue 24, in 1999, that a clear intensification in quoting foreign material can be observed (mostly in foreign-language versions). This is also when new names begin to appear in citations – Gideon Toury, Christiane Nord, Mary Snell-Hornby, Antoine Berman – testifying to Russian scholars' exposure to newer trends in worldwide research. This quantitative growth, however, did not continue in the next volume, published after an interval. It is worth emphasising that the tendencies illustrated with the example of *TP* characterise many other Russian publications.

4. If not translation, then what? (Other modes of transfer)

In view of the apparently small quantity of translations produced in the twentieth century, the question arises as to whether anything served as a functional replacement for them. **Reviews** of foreign works on translation were one such substitute. For example, *Tetradī pervodchika* and *Masterstvo perevoda* alone published reviews of eight studies: by Cary, Savory, Levý, Mounin, Catford, Nida, Seleskovitch and Barik (see Appendix, List 5). Either of the annuals also featured a review of a major Western translation journal – a summative account of several years' worth of contributions to *Babel* and *Meta* (List 6).

Concepts considered relevant were described and **problematized** (Appendix, List 7) in various publications, not necessarily devoted to translation theory. For example, Vladimir Bibikhin presented the contents of George Steiner's *After Babel* in a social sciences review journal. The studied corpus also includes Dmitry Yermolovich's review-discussion of Peter Newmark's ideas, and a monographic polemic in which Vladimir Samsonov verifies the premises of Willard Quine's hypothesis of the indeterminacy of translation. Ruben Budagov's article on the views on translation held by the Italian realist writer Giovanni Verga is an occasional contribution to the reception of foreign translation thought. By contrast, actual luminaries of translation theory are presented in the book *Voprosy istorii perevoda / Вопросы истории перевода*, which goes well beyond its title 'Issues in translation history'. In this volume John Dryden, Martin Luther, the German Enlightenment theorists, Nida, Kade, Jean Delisle are all given separate discussions. The

profile of a journal of Catalan translators and trends in Scandinavian studies at the time are also outlined. Attempts at juxtaposing the ways in which translation reflection developed in Russia and elsewhere have been rare and fragmentary – in the book listed last in this section of the Appendix, Georgy Khukhuni has endeavoured to chart such a comparison for the pre-scientific period, up to the beginning of the twentieth century.

While readers had only a few translations at their disposal, they had access to information on what was being published on the topic in various countries. *Masterstvo perevoda* offered impressive, partly annotated, **bibliographical lists** covering previous years (with possible updates on earlier omissions). For example, in volume 9 (1973), the Soviet bibliographic section for 1969 (with a supplement for 1968) makes for almost 7 densely printed pages (Галкина 1973); the foreign section (Хавес 1973) is 18 pages long and encompasses the following countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Great Britain, Hungary, East Germany, West Germany, Israel, India, Italy, Canada, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, USA, Finland, France, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Sweden, Yugoslavia. Naturally, the subsections vary in size, from one publication in the case of Israel, Italy and Finland, to 38 for Poland.

As has been mentioned, a student of reception residing outside the country of the target culture often struggles in view of the inability to access sources physically, and in this investigation also because of the absence of separate directories of translated academic texts. This matters, for example, inasmuch as in Russian resources the names of translators of works on translation are systematically omitted from the bibliographical entries, lists of sources and from citations. Consequently, it is difficult to establish whether the articles in List 8 (including some from a later period as well) should be classified as translations or not. Doubts arise with authors who speak Russian but who have occasionally been translated, such as Kade, but also for instance in the case of Daniel Gile.¹⁷ Still, like the aforementioned works by foreign scholars that were undoubtedly written in Russian, these texts can also contribute to disseminating approaches developed in other countries, i.e., to the travels of theories.

¹⁷ In this instance, the record makes it impossible to determine whether Yelena Alikina acted as co-author or as translator.

To sum up the reception in the 20th century, it turns out that the boom for translation activity in the USSR (the phenomenon is described in English in: Komissarov 1998: 545–546; see also e.g. Нелюбин, Хухуни 2018: 321–325) was not accompanied by a comparable boom in translating translation theory. The bibliographic overview presented above and in the Appendix may not be exhaustive, yet even if not all translations have been located, there is no doubt that they were few. This is confirmed by a critical comment from within the textual system under study. Pavel Toper quotes Holmes’s plea for the reception of the achievements of Soviet translation studies by the West, yet goes on to reverse it: “What Holmes said applies as much to our country – references to the works of scholars from America, Europe or Asia are very rarely made in Russian publications, and we have almost no translations of these works” (Топер 2001: 20, trans. mine – M.K.). This diagnosis was formulated in 2001. It is therefore worth checking whether the situation has changed with the new century.

5. Overview of publications – part 2 (21st century)

Before moving on to translations, it should be stressed that mediated accounts functioning in lieu of translations still appear, even increasingly, as illustrated by List 9 in the Appendix. The mediating role is primarily played by textbooks summarising foreign theories.

The first publication of this kind was Vilen Komissarov’s turn-of-the-century coursebook on “general translation theory” as approached by “foreign scholars” (*Obshchaya teoriya perevoda: Problemy perevodovedeniya v osveshchenii zarubezhnykh uchënykh / Общая теория перевода. Проблемы переводоведения в освещении зарубежных ученых*). The outline, based on 54 bibliographic items in five languages,¹⁸ concisely elucidates the tenets of major researchers, with the presentation arranged by geopolitical regions: England, France and Canada, USA, East Germany, West Germany and Scandinavia (in the last case, based on English-language publications). The last chapter, which groups the concepts of Güttinger, Aleksandar Lyudskanov

¹⁸ English, French, German, Bulgarian and Italian (Mounin).

(Alexander Ludskanov¹⁹) and Toury, breaks away from this principle of division. This overview of foreign theories came, as I also note in the Appendix, to be included in its entirety in Komissarov's final textbook, intended as a summation of knowledge about contemporary translation studies. The author did not expand the bibliographical basis for the 2004 edition, which means that in the prestigious and probably the most comprehensive textbook available to Russian students in the discipline the most recent foreign reference entry dates from 1991 (it is E.-A. Gutt's *Translation and Relevance*). Published simultaneously with Komissarov's, a textbook on the 'History and theory of translation abroad' by Lev Nelubin and Georgy Khukhuni (*Istoriya i teoriya zarubezhnogo perevoda*) also ran three editions by 2003. The dictionary of English-language translation-studies terms edited by Maria Rarenko in 2011 exemplifies, in turn, attempts to present individual foreign translational traditions in more detail. Komissarov appreciated these as a research field, and he supervised several doctoral dissertations on the translation studies in particular cultural-geographical areas:²⁰ France and Canada (Калинин 1999), the United States (Полютова 1999), and Great Britain (Убоженко 2000).²¹ The last one, by Irina Ubozhenko, became the basis for a later monograph. In the introduction, the author justifies the need for her work with the unavailability of source texts; moreover, a verbatim repetition of her mentor's formulations of fifteen years before (Убоженко 2014: 7, cf. Комиссаров 1999: 8) confirms the conjecture which I have already voiced, that the shortage of translations has been permanent.

Meanwhile, low-edition textbooks on the subject, intended for specific universities, abound.²² In the Appendix, List 9 features Elvira Sorokina's

¹⁹ Transliteration from Bulgarian is here followed by the variant of spelling associated with an English-language publication of this scholar.

²⁰ Concerning the pragmatics of delimiting the scope of research, e.g. based on geopolitical criteria, see St André 2009: 134.

²¹ Igor Kalinin and Irina Ubozhenko also published overview articles in the 24th issue of *TP* (pp. 153–179). Among later dissertations worth mentioning is one devoted to recent trends in American TS: Липагова 2010.

²² For the sake of order, one should also mention an anthology published in Yerevan, i.e. outside the borders of the present Russian Federation, but due to its availability on the internet undoubtedly present in Russian-speaking circulation: Золян, Абрамян 2007. It contains, alongside chapters from classic Russian works, reprints of the above-mentioned texts by Nida, Jakobson, Firth, Catford, Halliday, Mounin, Levý, and of Ricoeur's lecture (see Appendix, List 11), with the translators invariably uncredited. The compilers of the textbook have incorporated half of Komissarov's 1978 reader (including editorial footnotes) without the slightest mention of the source.

textbook (with the print run of 100 copies) as an illustration of a disturbing phenomenon: its monolingual bibliography list proves that this overview was written exclusively on basis of other overviews (sources include Komissarov as well as Nelubin and Khukhuni). This tendency, moreover, goes beyond the didactic context. Although the authors invariably declare that their handbooks meet the needs of students, in practice such outlines are also occasionally cited instead of proper sources in articles in scholarly journals.

Turning now to the documentation of translations in the current century, first of all, important book publications (Appendix, List 10) merit attention. Establishing the caesura somewhat earlier, in the 1990s, I begin with works on biblical translation, whose appearance in Russian, previously impossible,²³ evidently marks a new era. Christian societies acted as publishers in all the three cases, including Jan de Waard and Eugene Nida's book.

The 21st century is marked, on the one hand, by endeavours to reduce the many years' backlog, as in the case of translating Catford's study, formerly available in fragments, or the essay by Jacques Derrida. On the other hand, a number of contemporary books appeared in Russian soon after the first original edition or after an updated one that became the basis of the translation. This is an important parameter because, as D'hulst (2018: 139) rightly points out, it is principally translations of new scholarly works that play a role in the dissemination of concepts. If these, especially the renditions of Erich Prunč's and Anthony Pym's studies, could be taken as harbingers of future systematic efforts, they would indicate a wide-ranging publishing policy, but it is yet too early to judge. Two circumstances deserve a mention: the books from the first decade of the 21st century were quickly reissued (which, however, apart from their popularity, relates to small print runs of 2000–4500 copies), and the newest translations were prepared under the guidance of scholarly editors.

The translations produced after 2000 also encompass a considerable supply of articles. While *Masterstvo perevoda* and *Tetradi perevodchika* disappeared from the publishing market (the last, thirteenth volume of the former, carrying the date 1985, was issued in 1990), the niche was filled, if not immediately, by other periodicals, with varied profiles. As in earlier decades, translations of texts concerning translation continue to appear in journals not specialising in the discipline. Thus, the appended registers may

²³ The freedom to discuss the translation of religious texts is noted by Anna Bednarczyk (2016: 96) as one of the significant changes in Russian translation studies after 1990.

not be exhaustive, due to, among other factors, a significant dispersion of the places of publication, and an increased number of academic and cultural periodicals. Still, List 11 in the Appendix gathers sufficient material to illustrate several phenomena.

The absorption into Russian of texts by Friedrich Schleiermacher, Walter Benjamin and Paul Ricœur testifies to a deepening interest in the European sources of translational concepts and in the philosophical underpinnings of translation. In the case of “The Task of the Translator” we are dealing with an almost synchronous *translation series* consisting of at least four elements. Benjamin’s essay and its Russian versions have also become the focus of meta-critical reflection. The two later translations were analysed by Igor Chubarov (Чубаров 2011), and when Susan Gillespie’s essay (Гиллеспи 2018) on the translatability of Benjamin’s *Moscow Diary*, containing many quotations from “Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers”, was published in Russian, its translator did not reach for the solutions of her predecessors, but added her own (fragmentary) variant to the series. The example of Quine, in turn, illustrates that the way for the translation of a theory may be paved by previous mediated accounts (cf. List 7).²⁴ Moreover, Quine’s paper is presented in two facing-page renditions, which can also be confronted with the original text running below. A significant fact was the emergence in 2008 of a journal devoted to translation theory within the framework of the prestigious scientific journals of Moscow University: Series 22 of *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta / Вестник Московского университета: Серия 22* (particular numbers of series identify separate journals). Thus, a forum for TS-specific scholarly exchange was created, a sign of the emancipation of the discipline. The founders of the journal declared their intention to invite “voices from outside” (Гарбовский 2008: 4), and the editors indeed take care to publish contributions by contemporary foreign scholars, usually in parallel foreign-language and Russian versions (which sometimes means twin authorial versions). Michel Ballard was among those who took up collaboration with the journal from the first issue, while another of his articles, on the unit of translation, appeared in Irkutsk. A further contribution of Moscow University’s *Vestnik* to the transfer of knowledge about Western TS is that it publishes notes summing up the work and ideas of prominent

²⁴ A rendition of the whole book *Word and Object* also came to be published (Куайн 2000); given that the subject matter goes beyond translation, it is not included in List 10 of the Appendix.

scholars, like Katharina Reiss (Миронова 2018). Translations in this journal are also notable for having scholarly editorship.

The input of the bimonthly *Logos* (Логос) commands attention. In particular, its issue 5–6 for 2011 featured the introductory essay and the third chapter of Antoine Berman's *L'Épreuve de l'étranger* (Paris 1984), as well as the polemic between Henri Meschonnic and Jean-René Ladmiral that opened the 1981 translation-focused issue of *Langue française*. In addition to these items, recorded in the Appendix, List 11, the issue contained texts by Derrida, Ricœur, Michaël Oustinoff (and an interview with the latter). However, *Logos* is a philosophical-literary magazine, which, firstly, determines the specific profile of the texts about translation that occasionally appear within its covers and the choice of authors. Secondly, it accounts for the limited resonance of *Logos*'s translations in the TS community: for example, a text as important as Berman's "The Trials of the Foreign" only had 13 citations in the course of almost a decade following its publication in Russian (based on "CyberLeninka", access: 29.01.2020).

The consolidation of the discipline notwithstanding, works pertaining to translation studies still often find their way into academic journals dealing with philology at large, linguistics, literary studies and other fields; they may come collected in thematic issues or be scattered altogether. Those TS texts placed outside TS publications also include translations. The scholarly journals of St. Petersburg University provide an example (see Appendix, List 12). In 2016, series 9, "Philology, Oriental Studies, Journalism", devoted a volume to translation, which featured Russian versions of (new²⁵) texts by four foreign scholars representing distinct research paradigms and different academic centres: Edward Balcerzan, Susan Bassnett, Yves Gambier and Nike Pokorn (from Poznań, Poland; Coventry, UK; Turku, Finland; and Ljubljana, Slovenia respectively).

The analysis could not neglect the highly regarded translators' magazine *Mosty* (Мосты, 'Bridges'), which combines a practical profile, accounting for the contemporary realities of professional activity (such as working in market conditions), with in-depth reflection, also of a scholarly nature. During the first 17 years of its existence (2004–2020, 68 issues surveyed) *Mosty* has included several translations that meet the criteria adopted in this study

²⁵ Ostensibly, they did not first appear in the languages indicated as source ones, i.e. Polish in the case of Balcerzan and English in the remaining cases.

(List 13).²⁶ The publication of Cathy Flick's text in the first issue illustrates the modern approach and the pragmatism of the editors: the American expert collected questions most frequently asked by clients (somewhat grudgingly) and a seasoned freelancer's explanations. Hilaire Belloc's essay, on the other hand, fits under a category already well-represented in this overview: "foreign writers speak on the art of translation". Manfred Frühauf's self-reflection on translating Chinese poetry into German is a rare case within the studied corpus when a foreign text has been rendered whose subject matter is in no way connected to the Russian context. Translations can also be found among the regularly featured interviews with practitioners, such as the conversation with Jacolyn Harmer and Laura Burian, conference interpreters and teachers at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies in Monterey, California. In one instance a foreign text provided the starting point for a polemic: in 2009 American columnist Joel Garreaux's (original: Garreaux 2009) debatable theses on the prospects of machine translation were confronted with a substantive examination of the matter by domestic experts (Орёл 2009; Цвиллинг 2009; Книжник 2009). Last but not least, *Mosty* contributed to circulating Western approaches by featuring the translation of an excerpt from Seleskovitch and Lederer's 1984 book *Interpréter pour traduire*.

Translational aspects of other, practice-oriented professional publications (Appendix, List 14) are also worth signalling. A report on new translation technologies and their importance for the multilingual European Union was given a Russian edition. An interesting initiative was the magazine *Professionalnyi perevod i upravleniye informatsiyey* (*Профессиональный перевод и управление информацией*, 'Professional translation and information management'), which consisted of translations of materials from *MultiLingual Computing & Technology* and *Teworld*. The list of authors included recognised researchers, for example Hanna Risku (No. 6 [18], July 2008), but they appeared here as practitioners, therefore translating their articles added to the circulation of expertise and skills rather than of theories.

²⁶ The journal has also featured articles in English (e.g. by Lynn Visson, Michele Berdy) or composed by foreigners in Russian (Franklin Reeve), as well as a translation of a text originally written in English by an émigré – cf. the caveats made at the beginning of the present article.

Finally, let us look at the literary magazine *Inostrannaya literatura* (*Иностранная литература*, ‘Foreign literature’, henceforward also *IL*; Appendix, List 15). The main purpose of this monthly, which has existed since 1955, is to publish literary works in translation from various languages (it was on its pages that Soviet readers hungry for world literature could first acquaint themselves with J.D. Salinger, William Faulkner, Gabriel García Márquez or Eugène Ionesco). Often, however, the texts have been accompanied by translators’ self-commentaries or by relevant essays on translational issues. Among both types, translations can be found: some of the pieces anthologised in the volume *Perevod – sredstvo sblizheniya narodov* came from *IL*’s column dubbed ‘The Translator’s Tribune’ (e.g. Daglish, see Appendix, List 4). To move to the 21st century, in 2004 the magazine published excerpts from a seminal Polish TS essay, Stanisław Barańczak’s “Translational Manifesto” (or, in the Russian versions: ‘Translator’s Manifesto’), in which the eminent Polish translator and critic expounds his concept of the semantic dominant (another fragmentary rendition of this text was included in a limited-edition publication in 2001 – see List 11 – practically unavailable, and therefore hardly contributing to the circulation of ideas).

Although scholarly articles do not match *IL*’s profile particularly well, its contents for the years 2017–2019 interestingly complement the body of texts surveyed so far (2020 did not bring material of interest for this study). In 2017 the monthly featured Susan Sontag’s lecture “The World as India” and Heinrich Böll’s speech delivered more than 30 years earlier on the occasion of the opening of the European College of Translators (Europäisches Übersetzer-Kollegium) in Straelen. The selection of these texts continues the generic and thematic lines initiated yet in the pages of *Masterstvo perevoda* and the tendency to render into Russian “translation-related” reflection. What gravitates towards academic discourse is an article by the French Slavist Georges Nivat on the relationship between foreign poetry, translation and original poetry. In 2019 *Inostrannaya literatura* presented chapters of two books: a popularising one by the writer and translator David Bellos (as a preview of its full-text publication, see Appendix, List 10) and a philosophical one by Paul Ricœur (the third part of his *On Translation*, which thus became available in Russian in its entirety, albeit in dispersion).

Overall, therefore, in the last two decades translations have been appearing more abundantly than in the previous half-century. The increase in the number and diversity of publications makes it possible to speak of an

incipient translation boom in translation-related texts (though not necessarily academic ones).

While working on the English version of this article I became aware of an important, if obscure, publication fact. At the turn of the century, a seminar titled “2000 Perevod kak ispytaniye kultury” (“2000 Перевод как испытание культуры”, or ‘Translation as the trial of culture’) produced a “reader” (a designation even calqued in its Russian description) with translations of essays and chapters from the pen of foreign authors. The historical part embraced texts by Martin Luther, Schleiermacher, Goethe and Benjamin. Contemporary scholars and thinkers presented were Douglas Robinson (single chapters from *Translation and Taboo* and *The Translator’s Turn*), Berman (the tenth chapter of *L’Epreuve de l’étranger*), Lawrence Venuti, Pym, Derrida and Paul de Man. The materials used to be “distributed in electronic form”, as affirmed on the website of the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences,²⁷ which preserves the only trace of the project. It apparently went completely unnoticed: not recorded in catalogues, not quoted – perhaps the texts’ having no proper bibliographic address was a disincentive – and not mentioned. Some of the translations from this collection possibly entered circulation in various printed editions: the surnames of the translators credited here with rendering Schleiermacher, Benjamin, as well as Derrida, are identical with those in the records for the same works in Lists 11 and 10 of the Appendix (this also helps dating the project between 2000 and 2002). This valuable initiative falling into obscurity, baffling as it is, seems a significant reception phenomenon in itself. Appropriately for this case of invisibility, the record for Venuti’s chapter now supplements List 11 of the Appendix as a sample of the anthology’s contents.

²⁷ See: <https://iphras.ru/page47112408.htm>. The included texts are specified here, but not the actual title of the collection or the date of publication of the whole or of any instalments. Very few resources, usually didactically oriented, cite some of the materials, and then in disarmingly incomplete manner, e.g.: ‘in a reader on a distance learning website’ – “(ридер на сайте дистанционного образования)” (cf. <https://pandia.ru/text/77/482/45406.php>, access 25.07.2022). I am grateful to Dr Irina Pohlan for information about this project.

6. Citations in contemporary Russian-language research

In 2001 Pavel Toper also complained that Russian scholars fail to make references to foreign research. In the book from which the objections quoted above are taken, he himself cites nine TS texts in translations, and 67 in foreign editions,²⁸ but this approach was exceptional for the time. To limit ourselves to a single example, the list of sources in Lev Nelubin's dictionary of translation terms (Нелюбин 1997/2003) contains exclusively Russian-language sources (222 in number), including Levý, Lilova, Popovič, Komissarov's reader and his coursebook, and Nida's 1970 article. It is worth checking – even if it is to be a cursory survey – whether the translation boom in texts about translation has influenced bibliographical lists and citation practices in recent years.

An examination of several individual and collective publications, (co-)produced by variously affiliated authors, leads to the conclusion that not much has changed. In a monograph on the translation of film dialogues written by five contributors, the Russian-language part of the bibliography (Горшкова 2014: 326–351) covers 26 pages and numbers about 340 items; only two of them concern translation and *are* translations themselves: these are Levý's book and Michel Ballard's article translated by Vera Gorshkova (see Appendix, List 11). The 500-page volume of conference proceedings *Perevodcheskyi diskurs: mezhdistsiplinarnyi podkhod / Переводческий дискурс: междисциплинарный подход*,²⁹ which assembles 101 papers, contains just 3 references to translated works on translation – to Benjamin (in the electronic version) and to Nida's texts (Норец 2017: 7, 163, 200). Among the well over 150 sources used by Yelena Knyazheva in her book on translation quality assessment (Княжева 2018; reference lists, with some entries reoccurring: 37–39, 88–90, 147–149, 212–215, 242–243) there are: four translations from Komissarov's 1978 anthology (Nida, Jäger, Kade, Neubert), Levý, Benjamin, Ortega y Gasset, and Prunč, whose work

²⁸ Their density is especially high in chapter four, where Toper analyses many of the Western concepts and compares them with Russian-language theory, which is worth noting as a contribution to transfer (see Tonep 2001: 132–197).

²⁹ At present one cannot but note that the conference was organised in Simferopol well after the annexation of Crimea. At the time of writing this article, my attention was drawn to the volume by the “interdisciplinarity” declared in its title, while the presence of a participant from Kyiv put me at ease as to possible non-academic agendas.

serves to cite and present the views of Nida (in the original) and of Nord (Княжева 2018: 56, 78, 227). Aleksandra Kotovskaya and Galina Tokareva (Котовская, Токарева 2018, bibliography: 186–192), proposing a dialogical methodology for studying (and producing) poetry translation, refer to Levý, to the 1978 anthology (Mounin, Nida, Neubert, Jakobson), and furthermore to online reprints of essays by Benjamin and Schleiermacher. It can thus be seen that the same texts and/or those available in electronic reprints are quoted again and again, while new translations basically pass unnoticed.³⁰ It deserves highlighting that in all the publications examined – even in Toper’s book – the names of the translators of cited materials are systematically omitted (in particular, Levý’s work convincingly poses as an original, as the scholar’s surname looks quite domestic in the Russian spelling “Левый”). Only in the case of Prunč does Княжева indicate in general terms that this is “a translation from German” (Княжева 2018: 89, 243). Crediting Gorshkova in the bibliographic entry (Горшкова 2014: 327) makes for a rare exception, probably explained by the fact that she is the editor of both books: the one in which the quote from Ballard in her translation appears and the one from which it was taken (cf. List 11).

At the same time, foreign translation-studies texts in the original are now cited more frequently and within a broader spectrum. The aforementioned book on film dialogues references 51 publications in English and French³¹ (see Горшкова 2014: 351–359). In Irina Remkhe’s monograph on cognitive modelling of translation (Ремхе 2015: 131–141), 34 out of 90 foreign-language bibliographic items are TS texts (among the 69 Russian items translations are few and none of them itself relates to translation). The bibliography of Andrei Achkasov’s article (Ачкасов 2016) contains one Russian source in all (a TS text), while the remaining 40(!) are foreign-language works – 29 of which concern translation. However, this does not constitute the norm; on the contrary, the reverse proportions seem more typical. For example, Kotovskaya and Tokareva, whose bibliography features mainly literary texts and literary studies, cite only one foreign-language work on translation, *The Translator’s Invisibility*. Moreover, they attribute to Lawrence Venuti *endorsing* transparency as the highest translation achievement

³⁰ Admittedly, at the time of writing “CyberLeninka” had already indexed 50 citations of Prunč’s monograph, 18 of Gambier’s article and 3 of Bassnett’s [access: 29.02.2019].

³¹ This does not include studies published by Russians in foreign languages.

(Котовская, Токарева 2018: 4), which demonstrates their lack of familiarity with the book itself (beyond the title) and with the researcher's views.

Thus, the increased number of references to foreign publications should not be taken at face value. With regard to a corpus of Polish articles aspiring to the name of translation-studies texts, Małgorzata Tryuk (2011) observed that they relied on translation theories only to a small extent or superficially. While this could well be extended to much of the materials discussed here, in the case of Russian works it should also be added that when they *are* based on a TS background, then it tends to be predominantly the domestic scholarship.

7. Motivations for translation (or for lack of translations)

Let us now consider the possible reasons why, out of the many (nowadays, indeed countless) contributions to the field written in various countries, it was these and not others that found their way to the Russian reader. It should be emphasised that this is not meant to question the relevance of any of these texts or to challenge the choices of publishers, editors or translators. Undeniably, however, there have been many more works potentially worthy of rendering than the ones actually translated, therefore, some factors must have influenced the selection.

Beginning with Cary and Nida in the early stages of reception, up to Pym and Susan Bassnett nowadays, consideration has undoubtedly been given to the stature of the scholars and the importance of their findings and theoretical proposals, especially at the time of translation. Komissarov's decisions as editor of the 1978 reader were palpably merit-based (Appendix, List 3), and developments in the discipline have confirmed their validity in most cases. Nevertheless, the scope indicated in the title ('...in foreign linguistics') reveals a limitation: the long-preferred linguistic paradigm of translation studies in Russia, whose dominance, also ideological, was not conducive to assimilating works that represented markedly different methodologies.³²

The connection of the text selected for translation with the Russian language and culture emerges as another important factor. In the examined corpus, this criterion is met by a significant share of texts representing

³² On the ideological determinants underlying the reception of imported theories, see Susam-Sarajeva 2006.

translation criticism and self-commentary. In view of the proportions observed, one may assume that for the Polish poet-translator Julian Tuwim's essay "Czterowiersz na warsztacie" ('A quatrain in the making'; Appendix, List 1) the way to the Russian reader in 1965 was paved not just by the finesse and brilliance of the analysis. What almost certainly helped was the subject of his discussion, namely the opening of Aleksandr Pushkin's long poem *Ruslan and Ludmila*, an assumption corroborated by the fact that the editors of *Masterstvo perevoda* placed Tuwim's text not in the section 'Translation issues abroad' (alongside Cary and Larbaud), but in one called 'Multilingual Pushkin'. A similar rationale can be sensed behind a later choice of the article in which Andrzej Drawicz (Appendix, List 2) discusses translations from Polish undertaken by the celebrated Russian poets Anna Akhmatova and Boris Pasternak (Polish version: Drawicz 1972). Olga Uličná (Appendix, List 2) also deals specifically with the Czech reception of Pushkin. Ewald Osers translated into English from Central European literatures, above all Czech, although he also worked from German, Macedonian and from Lachian dialects; however, the relative success of his text in Russian (it was rendered into it twice, see Appendix, List 4) was certainly determined by his topic in this particular paper: the difficulties of translating Russian poetry into English. To compare, excerpting from Stanisław Barańczak's "Manifesto" for the presentation in *Inostrannaya literatura* (Appendix, List 15) entailed omitting empirical examples of English-to-Polish verse renditions and subtle analyses thereof, and retaining just the more general theoretical-critical argument. Characteristically, despite cuts elsewhere, carefully preserved is the passage – occupying two and a half columns in the Russian journal (pp. 280–282) – in which Barańczak refutes the logic behind prosifying translations, with argumentation built around an American edition of Akhmatova; a later reference to Joseph Brodsky likewise remains untouched by abridgements.

The motivation related to the target culture is particularly manifest in two translations from French. André Meynieux's 1963 text (Appendix, List 1) is a review originally published in *Babel* (Meynieux 1961) of an anthology prepared by Yuri Levin and Andrei Fyodorov of Russian writers' statements on translation (Левин, Федоров 1960). Meynieux speaks highly of the publication: seeing it as an example to emulate, he calls for similar publishing initiatives in other countries. Translating the foreign review – a type of text that rarely gets translated, after all – therefore served giving an exceptionally flattering feedback to the anthologists and satisfaction to the readers at

home. Another example of such a “reverse transfer” of enthusiastic reception is the already mentioned article by Georges Nivat featured in *Inostrannaya literatura* in 2018 (see Appendix, List 15). The French Slavist presents the Russian tradition of poetry translation as a unique phenomenon and argues that in Russia, translation, thanks to its ethical commitment, has always been “more than translation”. It is fair to assume that what is primarily of value for the target reader is not the factual content of the article (a concise overview of the translational activity of eminent writers of several epochs, which can also be found in other publications), but rather Nivat’s undisguised admiration for the receptiveness of the Russian culture and his appreciation of the Soviet school of translation as unparalleled.

Overview publications by foreign authors constitute another privileged category. Their ostensible usefulness is acknowledged in a relative eagerness to translate texts which outline the history of translation or of translation reflection in particular countries (in France – Cary, in Yugoslavia – Miodrag Sibinović, Appendix, Lists 1, 2; a similar function was fulfilled by the review of Levý’s book on Czech translation theories, List 5) or in particular periods (translation in the Middle Ages described by Astrid Guillaume, Bassnett’s discussion of the development of Translation Studies since 1975; Lists 11, 12). Such texts serve acquainting the target recipients with Western approaches not only inasmuch as they come from Western scholars, but also as metanarratives that explain history and outline the perspectives in the field. Books by Prunč and Pym, too, display such characteristics. Incidentally, it seems worth noting that a modifier has been added to the Austrian scholar’s title, so that in Russian it points to “the paths of development of **Western** translation studies” specifically, rather than to TS at large (compare: *Entwicklungslinien der Translationswissenschaft* – Пути развития **западного** переводоведения / Пути развития **западного** переводоведения). This re-touch gives the audience important information about the scope of the work (although the discussion does cover some Russian concepts as well), but at the same time it may imply that the asymmetries in language and power relations mentioned in the subtitle are of no concern in the Russian context.

The translators – and perhaps above all the publishers – have also been attracted by foreign texts of a popular or practical character. Umberto Eco’s book presents translation phenomena in an accessible way, taking as its starting point – as expressed in the Italian subtitle *Esperienze di traduzione* or the English title, *Experiences in Translation* – the experiences of a translated author (and a famous one at that). The overtly pragmatic profile is manifest

in the very title of Douglas Robinson's textbook: *Becoming a Translator* – in Russian even more emphatically: 'How to become a translator'. The peritext of Bellos's book (and likewise the note accompanying the publication of its excerpts) advertises that it is intended for an audience that takes a serious interest in translation but has no professional training in the field.

Not least important are ideological factors. In the Soviet period, political circumstances favoured, for instance, the reception of scientific ideas originating in East rather than in West Germany (hence, the Leipzig school vs Skopos theory). A publishing incentive might be found in certain authors' political outlook. One can wonder whether the decision to reprint in 1987 the translation of the speech delivered by Alfred Kurella back in 1954 in Berlin at the Congress of the Writers' Association of the GDR (see Appendix, Lists 1 and 4) was motivated by the topicality of his propositions (the task of developing a theory of translation...) or rather by the position of this writer as a communist activist and co-maker of the GDR's cultural policy. The relatively intense reception of Mounin's texts may have been prompted by the author's membership of the French Communist Party. Obviously, circulating Friedrich Engels's instructions on how not to translate Marx (Энгельс 1987)³³ has mostly political underpinnings, and this is why this item has not been included in the List 4 of the Appendix.

Finally, institutional contacts may create circumstances favourable to reception. The translation of the article by Yves Gambier (Appendix, List 12), who is affiliated with the University of Turku, highlights the advantage of geographical proximity to St. Petersburg and the cooperation between Finnish and Russian academic centres. The transfer of ideas is in this case facilitated by the "physical displacement" of the researcher, to draw on D'hulst's (2018: 136) observations.

The indicated aspects partly correspond – although not always in an obvious way – to Gisèle Sapiro's (2018) typology of groups of factors influencing (in contemporary market conditions) the publication of scholarly translations in general. According to her findings, these are: the favourable position of the polysystem from which the work is to be translated in relation to the receiving culture, the author's symbolic capital, the characteristics of the translated work, the publishers' symbolic capital (in both cultures), networks of contacts, and funding (2018: 61 and *passim*). In some cases,

³³ In this case, not crediting the translator follows on from this being a firm practice in publishing the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Compare: Маркс, Энгельс 1961: 237–245.

a commingling or synergy of influences can be observed. For example, the preference for “Russian-oriented” texts is a resultant of the desirable qualities of the work and the relationship between polysystems (*resp.* the perception of one’s own polysystem as hypercentral). The appreciation of Engels’s contribution to translation criticism is a peculiar manifestation of the power of the symbolic capital: both of the author and the subject of his remarks. Examples of the stimulating influence of networking can be found both in the past – contacts with the GDR – and today: the only text on translation mentioned in Sapiro’s study (2018: 83) is Bellos’s *Is That a Fish in Your Ear?*, named in the context of effective promotion; its appearance in Russian can be seen as further proof of the promotion’s effectiveness. The late reception of *After Babel*, on the other hand, can be linked to such a “property of the book” as its size – not necessarily as an inhibitory factor from the perspective of the publisher, but because of the enormity of the translation labour required. I have no systematic insight into certain issues, such as subsidies, yet some information can be gleaned from paratexts. Thus, the translation of Prunč’s book was published with the support of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF Der Wissenschaftsfonds), and the report on technologies in translation received funding from, among others, the Moscow branch of UNESCO.

It is also worth reflecting on the reasons for the limited number of translations in the 20th century. I have mentioned political prohibitions that, among others, hampered the reception of theories originating within the sphere of Bible translation, the work of scholars from certain countries, or trends that did not conform to the requirement of realism, which was also binding for translation and translation studies. Another ideological factor could have been the pride in the – undeniable – achievements of domestic translation studies (which is clearly echoed, for instance, in the paragraph opening V. Avramov’s review of Mounin’s book – Appendix, List 5 and Аврамов 1966: 103–104), stimulating a sense of its self-sufficiency. Indeed, the annual *Tetradī perevodchika* apparently contented itself with a national role. This is perceptible in editorial materials which never voiced an intention to assimilate foreign theories more vigorously, as well as in the text summing up its twenty years of existence, where, e.g., only Russian authors are listed when regretting a reviewing backlog (Ванников 1983: 23).

Another reason may have been the belief (of publishers, policy makers?) that translation specialists do not need translations of theoretical works, since, after all, they speak foreign languages. In practice, however, this assumption

of at least a “passive multilingualism”³⁴ proves questionable. For example, it is symptomatic that, in reviewing *Meta* for *TP*, Viktor Rozentsveyg does note the bilingual character of the journal, but bases his discussion only on contributions in French (Appendix, List 6; Розенцвейг 1985). The indirect quotations briefly recorded above are also telling and demonstrate that an Italianist might need a translation from, say, English.

In turn, the consequences of a lack of translational exchange of academic texts can be twofold. Either translato­logists close themselves within the circle of a given philology, i.e. they are familiar with works written only in one foreign language (cf. a diagnosis in the Polish context: Żmudzki 2009), or they are all forced to publish in one so-called “major” language (obviously, Russian is such a language). Neither of these perspectives bodes well for the development of the discipline, locally or globally (cf. contesting the dominance of English in the discourse on translation in: Snell-Hornby 2010); it is therefore to be hoped that the discernible increase in translation activity will continue.

8. Conclusions and further research

The surveyed material makes it possible to conclude that **in the course of the 20th century Russian translation studies developed largely in isolation from world trends**. Among the few translations, works by authors from Slavonic countries predominated. Some of them, especially the books by Levý and Popovič, published in authorised translations, even tended (and still tend) to be regarded as part of the output of Russian translation studies. In the Soviet era the reception of concepts originating in the West was limited. Some of the phenomena observed suggest that the delay in the absorption of foreign translato­logical thought was to some extent deliberate. It was not until after the political transformation (and then not immediately)³⁵ that the reception of what can indeed be termed *Western* translation studies intensified. The second decade of the 21st century has seen a marked increase in publishing activity in this field. Nonetheless, the growing availability of

³⁴ The notion is borrowed from Mary Snell-Hornby (2010: 100) and adapted to the context.

³⁵ The further delay could have been related to the closing down of state publishing houses in the transition era – concerning their collapse in the context of publishing translations in general, see Komissarov 1998: 546.

Russian versions of foreign TS publications has not yet been reflected in a change in citation practices. Among the texts that have been rendered into Russian, many represent popular approaches or even “translation-related” discourse and consequently do not contribute to the “travels of theories”. It seems reasonable, therefore, to argue that **in Russia, translation knowledge originating outside the country is still spreading less through translations as such and more through mediated accounts (reviews, textbook summaries) on the one hand and through references to publications in the source languages on the other.**

Lines of enquiry worth pursuing further include more precise bibliometric measurements, as well as qualitative analyses of citations to foreign scholars found in Russian texts. What particularly deserves investigation is whether and to what extent various re-writing practices (condensation in discussions and overviews, excerpting passages for anthologies and for the purpose of quoting; popularisation in the Russian-language Wikipedia³⁶) alter the content of the transferred concepts (see D’hulst 2018: 138). The above-cited instance of a distortion of Venuti’s views raises the conjecture that this may be a far from marginal phenomenon. The analysis of how the travelling concepts and theories become transformed on their way is indeed an extensive research perspective, the relevance and indispensability of which I would like to emphasise.

With regard to the Russian translation studies tradition vis-à-vis Western scholarship, one cannot speak of an asymmetry of relations. They are two strong polysystems that remained almost unknown to each other for decades. In the USSR, translation studies functioned as a centre that drew on its own multinational peripheries. The way Western texts have so far been absorbed within the discipline also testifies to its self-perception as a centre, for it has been a selective, unpredictable and capricious absorption. Maintaining an isolationist stance, however, could lead to the Russian TS turning into a periphery.

Will translation studies in Russia today prefer the tower of Babel to the ivory tower? For the time being it is impossible to say whether the intensification in translating Western publications observed in recent years indicates a change. Dmitry Buzadzhi and Viktor Lanchikov, while discussing the weaknesses of contemporary Russian translation research (Бузаджи,

³⁶ Wikipedia’s role in disseminating knowledge about translation is signalled by Assis Rosa (2018: 205).

Ланчиков 2012), do not mention inability or unwillingness to use a multi-national theoretical background. However, in their article they show, among other things, a misguided application of certain methodologies whose emergence and development are associated with foreign centres (cognitivist or corpus-based approaches), which indirectly testifies to the unsuccessful transfer of these research models to the East. Despite the quantitative explosion of articles, books and PhDs in the field of translation, some scholars have a growing sense of a crisis in the discipline. Buzadzhi, too, titled his introduction to a selection of Komissarov's writings nostalgically: 'When Translation Studies Was Grand' (Бузаджи 2020). Perhaps the way to overcome the crisis would be to start fully participating in the global scholarly exchange. Whether this is a realistic prospect – in the context of the apparently limited interest in Western theories in the post-Soviet academia and culture in general – remains a question beyond the scope of this article, but possibly one worth discussing.

The bibliographic research for this paper was essentially completed by early March 2020; the most recent item included in the Appendix is the translation of George Steiner's *After Babel*, published in the first quarter of 2020.

Bibliography

Resources used as databases (publishers' catalogues not included)

BITRA – Bibliography of Interpreting and Translation, at: Universidad de Alicante: <https://dti.ua.es/en/bitra/searching.html> [access: 29.01.2020].

CyberLeninka – Научная электронная библиотека «КиберЛенинка» [CyberLeninka open science hub], <https://cyberleninka.ru> [access: 29.02.2020].

ИНИОН РАН – Institute of Scientific Information for Social Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences (INION RAN), <http://inion.ru/resources/bazy-dannykh-inion-ran/> [access: 20.07.2022].

РГБ – Российская государственная библиотека [Russian State Library], <https://www.rsl.ru/> [access: 29.01.2020].

РНБ – Российская национальная библиотека [National Library of Russia], https://primo.nl.ru/primo-explore/search?vid=07NLR_VU1 [access: 29.01.2020].

References

- Assis Rosa, Alexandra. 2018. "Forms and Formats of Dissemination of Translation Knowledge", in: L. D'hulst, Y. Gambier (eds), *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge: Sources, Concepts, Effects*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 203–213.
- Balcerzan, Edward. 2020. "The poetics of artistic translation" [orig. "Poetyka przekładu artystycznego", 1968], trans. S. Gauger, in: E. Balcerzan, S. Barańczak, *Literature from Literature: Essays on literary translation*, K. Szymańska, M. Heydel (eds), Genève – Lausanne: sdivig press.
- Bednarczyk, Anna. 2000. "Przekładoznawcze zmagania polskiej rusycystyki", in: B. Stempczyńska, P. Fast (eds), *50 lat polskiej rusycystyki literaturoznawczej*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego 1857, Katowice, pp. 119–140.
- Bednarczyk, Anna. 2016. *Zmagania z przekładem w przestrzeni rosyjskojęzycznej. Teoria i praktyka w ewolucji*, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Colombo, Alice. 2019. "Intersections between Translation and Book History: Reflections and New Directions", *Comparative Critical Studies*, 16(2–3), pp. 147–160.
- D'hulst, Lieven. 2018. "Transfer Modes", in: L. D'hulst, Y. Gambier (eds), *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge: Sources, Concepts, Effects*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 135–142.
- Drawicz, Andrzej. 1972. "Anna Achmatowa i Borys Pasternak jako tłumacze liryki polskiej", in: B. Galster, K. Sierocka, assisted by A. Piorunowa (eds), *Po obu stronach granicy. Z powiązań kulturalnych polsko-radzieckich w dwudziestoleciu międzywojennym*, Wrocław: IBL i ZS PAN, pp. 163–179.
- Garreaux, Joel. 2009. "Tongue in Cheek", *Washington Post*, 24th May.
- Gile, Daniel. 2015. "Analyzing Translation Studies with Scientometric Data: From CIRIN to Citation Analysis", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 23(2), pp. 240–248.
- Güttinger, Fritz. 1963. *Zielsprache. Theorie und Technik des Übersetzens*, Zürich: Manesse Verl.
- Holmes, James. 1988. "The Future of Translation Theory: A Handful of Theses", in: J. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 99–102.
- Komissarov, Vilen. 1998. "Russian Tradition", in: M. Baker, K. Malmkjær (eds), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London–New York: Routledge, pp. 541–549.
- Konefał, Ewa. 2019. "W poszukiwaniu metodologii badań metaprzekładoznawczych", *Rocznik Przekładoznawczy* 14, pp. 247–262.
- Kraskowska, Ewa. 2012. "Wstęp", in: W. Bolecki, E. Kraskowska (eds), *Kultura w stanie przekładu. Translatologia – komparatystyka – transkulturowość*, Warszawa: Fundacja Akademia Humanistyczna–Instytut Badań Literackich PAN, pp. 5–12.
- Meynieux, André. 1961. "Un exemple à suivre: Iou. D. Lévine et A. V. Féodorov: Les écrivains russes parlent de la traduction (XVIIe – XXe siècles)", *Babel* 7(2), pp. 85–87.
- Mounin, Georges. 1962. "Le Traducteur entre les mots et les choses", *Le Courrier de l'UNESCO* 4, pp. 25–28.

- Paz, Octavio. 1975. "Sobre la traducción", *El Correo de la UNESCO* 2, pp. 36–40.
- Pym, Anthony. 1998/2014. *Method in Translation History*, London–New York: Routledge.
- Sapiro, Gisèle. 2018. "What Factors Determine the International Circulation of Scholarly Books? The Example of Translations Between English and French in the Era of Globalization", in: J. Heilbron, G. Sorá, T. Boncourt (eds), *The Social and Human Sciences in Global Power Relations*. Socio-Historical Studies of the Social and Human Science, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 59–93.
- Skibińska, Elżbieta. 2015. "Polish Translation Studies at the Turn of Centuries: Comments from the Scientometric Perspective", *AUC Philologica. Translatologica Pragensia* IX(3), pp. 113–126.
- Skoumal, Aloys. 1970. "Quelques remarques sur l'art de traduire", *Babel* 16(2), janvier, p. 74.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. 2010. "Is Translation Studies Going Anglo-Saxon? Critical Comments on the Globalization of a Discipline", in: D. Gile, G. Hansen, N.K. Pokorn (eds), *Why Translation Studies Matters?*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 97–103.
- St André, James. 2009. "History", in: M. Baker, G. Saldanha (eds), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, pp. 133–136.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Šebnem. 2006. *Theories on the Move: Translation's Role in the Travels of Literary Theories*, Amsterdam: Brill.
- Tryuk, Małgorzata. 2011. "Ile teorii przekładu w polskich tekstach translatorycznych?", in: A. Kukułka-Wojtasik (ed.), *Translatio i literatura*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 327–340.
- Żmudzki, Jerzy. 2009. "Problemy, zadania i wyzwania translatoryki", *Lingwistyka Stosowana* 1, pp. 41–60.
- Аврамов В. 1966. "О книге Ж. Мунэна «Теоретические проблемы перевода»", in: *Тетради переводчика* 3, pp. 103–111.
- Ачкасов А.В. 2016. "Жанровые вопросы перевода", *Вестник СПбГУ. Серия 9* 4, pp. 5–17.
- Бузаджи Д.М. 2020. *Когда переводоведение было большим*, in: В.Н. Комиссаров, *Переводческие исследования. Избранные статьи. 1968–2005*, Москва: Р.Валент, pp. 3–6.
- Бузаджи Д.М., Ланчиков В.К. 2012. "Скорбный список. О бедах современного российского переводоведения", *Мосты* 4(36), pp. 42–56.
- Ванников Ю.В. 1983. "Теория перевода в Тетрадах переводчика", in: *Тетради переводчика* 20, pp. 3–23.
- Власенко С.В. 2011. "Референция и референциальность в межъязыковом переводе: диахронический ракурс", *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22: Теория перевода* 1, pp. 17–37.
- Галкина Н. (сomp.) 1973. Библиография: I. Советский Союз, in: *Мастерство перевода* 9, pp. 491–507.
- Гарбовский Н.К. 2008. [От главного редактора], *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22: Теория перевода* 1, pp. 3–4.

- Гиллеспи, Сьюзан. 2018. “О переводимости *Московского дневника* Вальтера Беньямина. Критический взгляд из XXI века”, trans. from English И. Казакова, *Логос* 28(1), pp. 179–200.
- Горшкова В.Е. (ed.) 2014. *Кинодиалог. Образ – смысл – перевод: Коллективная монография*, Иркутск: МГЛУ ЕАЛИ.
- Золян С.Т., Абрамян К.Ш. (eds) 2007. *Лингвистические аспекты теории перевода (хрестоматия)*, Ереван: Лингва.
- Каде, Отто. 1979. “К вопросу о предмете лингвистической теории перевода”, in: *Тетради переводчика* 16, pp. 3–11.
- Калинин И.В. 1999. *Современное переводоведение Франции и Канады: Концептуально-историческое исследование*, PhD thesis, Москва.
- Книжник, Ирина. 2009. “Взгляд и нечто”, *Мосты* 4(24).
- Княжева Е.А. 2018. *Оценка качества перевода: история, теория, практика: монография*, Москва: ФЛИНТА.
- Комиссаров В.Н. 1999. *Общая теория перевода. Проблемы переводоведения в освещении зарубежных ученых*, Москва: ЧеРо.
- Котовская А.Е., Токарева Г.А. 2018. *Анатомия перевода в диалогах переводчиков: монография*, Москва: Флинта.
- Куайн У.В.О. 2000. *Слово и объект*, trans. from English А.З. Черняк, Т.А. Дмитриев, Москва: Праксис–Логос.
- Левин Ю.Д., Федоров А.В. (eds). 1960. *Русские писатели о переводе: XVIII–XX вв.*, Ленинград: Советский писатель.
- Липатова В.В. 2010. *Лингвопереводческие концепции американских переводоведов второй половины XX – начала XXI века*, PhD thesis, Москва.
- Маркс, Карл, Энгельс, Фридрих. 1961. *Сочинения*, vol. 21, Москва: Политиздат, 2nd ed.
- Миронова Н.Н. 2018. “Памяти: Катарина Райс (1923–2018)”, *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22: Теория перевода* 3, pp. 124–127.
- Нелюбин Л.Л. 1997/2003. *Толковый переводческий словарь*, Москва: Флинта – Наука, 3rd ed.
- Нелюбин Л.Л., Хухуни Г.Т. 2018. *Наука о переводе (история и теория с древнейших времен до наших дней)*, Москва: Флинта, 4th ed.
- Норец М.В. (ed.) 2017. *Переводческий дискурс: междисциплинарный подход. Материалы I всероссийской научно-практической конференции*, Симферополь 27–29 апреля 2017 года, Симферополь: ИТ «АРИАЛ».
- Орёл М.А. 2009. “Стоп, машина!”, *Мосты* 4(24).
- “От редакции”. 1963, in: *Тетради переводчика* 1, pp. 3–4.
- Полугова О.Н. 1999. *Концептуально-историческое исследование переводоведения в США*, PhD thesis, Москва.
- Прокопович С.С. 1978. “Адекватный перевод художественной прозы: возможен ли он? (К истории вопроса)”, in: *Тетради переводчика* 15, pp. 75–81.
- Прокопович С.С. 1980. “Адекватный перевод или интерпретация текста?”, in: *Тетради переводчика* 17, pp. 37–48.
- Ред. 1970. [editorial note in:] *Мастерство перевода* 7, Москва 1970, pp. 477.

- Ремхе И.Н. 2015. *Переводоведческий процесс в аспекте когнитивного моделирования: монография*, Москва: ФЛИНТА, 2nd ed.
- Розенцвейг В.Ю. 1985. “Журнал канадских переводчиков *Мета*”, in: *Тетради переводчика* 20, pp. 91–102.
- Соколова Н.В. 2017. “Наукометрический подход как эффективный инструмент анализа современного состояния переводоведения”, *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22: Теория перевода* 4, pp. 58–69.
- Топер П.М. 2001. *Перевод в системе сравнительного литературоведения*, Москва: Наследие.
- Убоженко И.В. 2000. *Теоретические основы лингвистического переводоведения в Великобритании*, PhD thesis, Москва.
- Убоженко И.В. 2014. *Зарубежное переводоведение: Великобритания*, Москва: Р. Валент.
- Хавес Б. (сomp.) 1973. Библиография: II. Зарубежные страны, in: *Мастерство перевода* 9, pp. 508–525.
- Цвиллинг М.Я. 2009. “Нет повести запутанней в природе, чем повесть о машинном переводе”, *Мосты* 4(24).
- Чубаров, Игорь. 2011. “Перевод как опыт нечувственных уподоблений. Причины неудач переводов «Задачи переводчика» Вальтера Беньямина на русский язык”, *Логос* 5–6(84), pp. 237–252.
- Энгельс, Фридрих. 1987. “Как не следует переводить Маркса” [trans. from English], in: А. Клышко (ed.), *Перевод – средство взаимного сближения народов*, Москва: Прогресс, pp. 283–291.
- Эткинд Е.Г. 1970. “Художественный перевод: искусство и наука”, *Вопросы языкознания* 4, pp. 15–29.

MARTA KAŹMIERCZAK

APPENDIX

Western Texts on Translation Available in Russian Translations
and Mediations³⁷(1) Articles,³⁸ 1950s–1960s.

- G. Mounin – Munen Ź., “Perevod točnyj, no točnyj li?” [trans.?],³⁹ *V zašitu mira* 71, aprel' 1957, p. 66.
- G. Mounin – Munen Ź., “Mašiny-perevodčiki” [trans.?], *V zašitu mira* 85, iûn' 1958, pp. 60–61.
- V. Yngwe – Ingve V., “Avtomatičeskij perevod s odnogo âzyka na drugoj pri pomoši mašin”, trans. from English, [in:] *Teoriâ predači soobšenij*, Fizmatgiz, Moskva 1957, pp. 255–259.
- J. Bar-Hillel – Bar-Hillel I., “Budušee mašinnogo perevoda”, *Filologičeskie nauki* 4, 1962, pp. 203–206.
- A. Kurella – Kurella A., “Teoriâ i praktika perevoda”, trans. M. Taner, ed. M. Lorie, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda*, Moskva 1959, pp. 407–437. [Reprinted in: *Perevod – sredstvo vzaimnogo sblizeniâ narodov*, ed. A. Klyško, Progress, Moskva 1987, pp. 106–131, see List 4].
- A. Meynieux – Men'ë A., “Primer, dostojnyj podražaniâ” [Un exemple à suivre], trans. M. Lorie, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda*, Moskva 1963, pp. 225–230.
- E. Cary – Kari È., “O perevode i o perevodčikah vo Francii”, trans. M. Lorie, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1964, Moskva 1965,⁴⁰ pp. 429–463.

³⁷ The bibliographical entries have been transliterated according to the ISO 9 norm. For complete information in the Russian Cyrillic see the appendix to the Polish version of the paper: <https://doi.org/10.4467/16891864PC.21.001.13583>, in the final section of the file, pp. 40–49, under the heading *Aneks*.

³⁸ In the present register, lists titled “articles” gather various single texts of small volume, not published autonomously: papers, essays, chapters in books, notes, etc.

³⁹ Bibliographical details are stated as accurately as possible. Any lack or ellipsis means that the given piece of information has proved impossible to obtain.

⁴⁰ Issues of *Masterstvo perevoda* for a given year often appeared with delay, hence two different years in the bibliographic entry – here and in some further instances in the Appendix.

- V. Larbaud – Larbo V., “Vesy perevodčika”, trans. M. Lorie, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1964, Moskva 1965, pp. 464–466.
- J. Tuwim – Tuvim Ū., “Četverostišie na verstake” [Czterowiersz na warsztacie, 1934], trans. A. Ęppel’, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1964, Moskva 1965, pp. 335–350.
- J. Levý – Levjy I., “Dve glavy iz knigi *Iskusstvo perevoda*”, trans. V. Rossel’s, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1966, Moskva 1968, pp. 440–469.

(2) Articles, 1970s

- E. Nida – Najda Ū., “Nauka perevoda”, trans. M. Makovskij, *Voprosy ŗzykoznaniâ* 4, 1970, pp. 3–14.
- B. Ilek, Vanččková [G.]. – Ilek B., Vaneččkova G., “Zametki o russkikh izdaniâh Nezvala”, trans. Ū. Moločkovskij, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 6,⁴¹ 1969, Moskva 1970, pp. 135–161.
- B. Ilek – Ilek B., “Vklad Irži Levogo”, trans. V. Rossel’s, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 6, 1969, Moskva 1970, pp. 393–405.
- J. Levý – Levjy I., “Sostoânie teoretičeskoy mysli v oblasti perevoda”, trans. V. Rossel’s, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 6, 1969, Moskva 1970, pp. 406–431.
- J. Tuwim – Tuvim Ū., “Dve zametki”, trans. A. Ęppel’, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 7, 1970, Moskva 1970, pp. 461–476.
- “Razgovor citat”, trans. R. Gorboveckaâ, M. Zak, N. Subbotovskaâ, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 7, 1970, Moskva 1970, pp. 477–486.
- S. Florin – Florin S., “Neobhodimoe posobie”, trans. N. Ogneva, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 8, 1971, Moskva 1971, pp. 327–339.
- A. Skoumal – Skoumal A., “Neskol’ko zamečanij ob iskusstve perevoda”, trans. from French V. Dmitriev, *Voprosy literatury* 2, 1971, pp. 238–239.
- O. Uličná – Ulična O., “O perevodčike, poète i... kritike”, trans. from Czech V. Rossel’s, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 10, 1974, Moskva 1975, pp. 299–318.
- A. Drawicz – Dravič A., “Pol’skaâ poèziâ v perevodah Anny Ahmatovoj i Borisa Pasternaka”, trans. from Polish K. Starosel’skaâ, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 11, 1976, Moskva 1977, pp. 183–207.
- M. Sibirinovič – Sibirinovič M., “Iz istorii poètičeskogo perevoda v Ūgoslavii”, trans. from Serbo-Croatian T. Virta, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 11, 1976, Moskva 1977, pp. 208–230.
- C. Montella – Montella K., “Zamečaniâ o russkikh perevodah Bokkaččo”, trans. from Italian P.S. Pantühin, [in:] *Tetradi perevodčika* 15, Moskva 1978, pp. 23–31.

⁴¹ Volumes were explicitly numbered only from this year on, hence the discrepancies in the way entries are put down here as compared with the previous list.

(3) Book-length publications, 1950s–1980s

- Machine Translation of Languages*, ed. W.N. Lock, A.D. Booth, New York 1955 – *Mašinnyj perevod*. Sb. n. tr. Trans. from English T.N. Mološna, V.A. Purto, Izd-vo lit. na inostr. ťzykah, Moskva 1957.
- Avtomatičeskij perevod: sbornik statej*, trans. from English, Italian, German, French, ed. and introd. O.S. Kulagina, I.A. Mel'čuk, Progress, Moskva 1971.
- J. Levý, *Umění překladu*, 1963 – Levý J., *Iskusstvo perevoda*, trans. V. Rossel's, Progress, Moskva 1974.
- Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubežnoj lingvistike*, ed. V. Komissarov, Meždunarodnye otnošení, Moskva 1978.
- A. Popovič, *Teória umeleckého prekladu*, 1975 – Popovič A., *Problemy hudožestvennogo perevoda*, ed. P.M. Toper, trans. from Slovak I.A. Bernštejn, I.S. Černâvskaâ, Vysšaâ škola, Moskva 1980.
- A. Lilova, *Uvod v obšata teoriâ na perevoda*, 1981 – Lilova A., *Vvedenie v obšui teorii perevoda*, ed. P.M. Toper, trans. from Bulgarian L.P. Lihačeva, Vysšaâ škola, Moskva 1985.

(4) Articles, 1980s–1990s

- Hudožestvennyj perevod. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, ed. N. Bažan et al., Izd. Erevanskogo un-ta, Erevan 1982.
- J. Holmes – Holms Dž.S., “Budušee teorii perevoda: neskol'ko tezisov” [The Future of Translation Theory: A Handful of Theses], trans. from English V. Golyšev, pp. 221–226.
- A. Lefevere – Lefevr A., “O specifičnosti literaturnogo perevoda: konečnyj rezul'tat važnee processa”, trans. from English I. Gurova, pp. 85–95.
- E. Osers – Ozers È., “Nekotorye aspekty perevoda russkoj poëzii na anglijskij ťzyk”, trans. from English V. Golyšev, pp. 167–173.
- Perevod – sredstvo vzaimnogo sblizeniâ narodov. Hudožestvennaâ publicistika*, ed. A. Klyško, Progress, Moskva 1987.
- G. García Márquez – Garsia Markes G., “Èti bednâgi perevodčiki”, trans. S.B. Plahtinskij, pp. 203–206.
- M. Guidacci – Gvidačči M., “Ne perevodit' stihov, kotorye ne želaût, čtoby â ih perevodila”, trans. G.P. Kiselev, pp. 206–207.
- R. Mussapi – Mussapi R., “Vo imâ sveta”, trans. G.P. Kiselev, pp. 208–209.
- R. Daglish – Dagliš R., “Perevodâ *Tihij Don*”, trans. E. Lidina, pp. 468–472.
- D. Ďurišin – Dûrišin D., “Posredničeskaâ funkciâ hudožestvennogo perevoda”, trans. I.A. Bogdanova, pp. 166–172.
- G. Mounin – Munen Ž., “Perevodčik, slovo i ponâtie”, pp. 136–141.
- O. Paz – Pas O., “Perevod, pp”. 159–166.
- Poëtika perevoda*, ed. S.F. Gončarenko, Raduga, Moskva 1988.

- E. Osers – Ozers È., “Nekotorye problemy perevoda russkoj poëzii na anglijskij âzyk”, trans. D. Kuznecova, pp. 112–123.
- F. Miko – Miko F., “Peredača zvučaniâ pri perevode liričeskoj poëzii”, trans. D. Kuznecova, pp. 124–136.
- B. Hochel – Hohel B., “Vremâ i prostranstvo v perevode”, trans. D. Kuznecova, pp. 152–171.
- A. Sandauer – Sandauer A., “Zaboty perevodčika”, trans. È. Gessen, pp. 172–179.
- J.E. Zúñiga Amaro – Sun’iga H.È., “Zametki o trudnostâh perevodčika”, trans. N. Matâš, pp. 198–204.
- E. Coseriu – Koseriu È., “Kontrastivnaâ lingvistika i perevod (ih sootnošenie)”, trans. B.A. Abramov, [in:] *Novoe v zarubežnoj lingvistike*, issue XXV, Moskva 1989, pp. 63–81.
- J. Ortega y Gasset – Ortega-i-Gasset H., “Nišeta i blesk perevoda”, trans. N. Krotovskaâ, [in:] Ortega-i-Gasset H., *«Degumanizaciâ iskusstva» i drugie raboty: Èsse o literature i iskusstve*, trans. from Spanish, Raduga, Moskva 1991, pp. 518–542.
- A. Pamies Bertrán – Pamies Bertran A., “Rol’ ritma v teorii literaturnogo perevoda”, trans. from Spanish E. Tabakov, [in:] *Âzyk – poëtika – perevod. Sbornik naučnyh trudov*, issue 426, MGLU, Moskva 1996, pp. 130–150.
- E. Nida – Najda Ū., “Izomorfnye svâzi i êkvivalentnost’ v perevode”, [in:] *Perevod i kommunikaciâ*, ed. A.D. Švejcer et al., In-t âzykoznañiâ RAN, Moskva 1997, pp. 117–129.

(5) Reviews of foreign studies on translation

(The reviewed publication – author and publication details of the Russian review)

- E. Cary, *La traduction dans la monde moderne*, Université de Genève 1956 – P. Antokol’skij, “Èdmon Kari. «Perevod v sovremennom mire»”, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1959, Moskva, pp. 456–459.
- T. Savory, *The Art of Translation*, London 1957 – I. Kaškin, “Teodor Savori. «Iskusstvo perevoda»”, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1959, Moskva, pp. 460–464.
- J. Levý, *České teorie překladu*, Praha 1957 – A. Fedorov, O. Trofimkina, «Českíe teorii perevoda», [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1962, Moskva 1963, pp. 435–444.
- G. Mounin, *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*, Paris 1963 – V. Avramov, “O knige Ž. Munèna «Teoretičeskie problemy perevoda»”, [in:] *Tetradi perevodčika* 3, 1966, pp. 103–111.
- A. Fedorov, “Žorž Munen. «Teoretičeskie problemy perevoda»”, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1966, Moskva 1968, pp. 470–476.
- J.C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Oxford–London 1965 – V. Avramov, “O rabote Dž. Kêtforda «Lingvističeskaâ teoriâ perevoda»”, [in:] *Tetradi perevodčika* 6, 1969, pp. 99–106.
- E. Nida, *Towards the Science of Translating*, Leiden 1964 – V. Komissarov: “Na puti k sozdaniû nauki o perevode”, [in:] *Tetradi perevodčika* 8, 1971, pp. 117–125.
- D. Seleskovitch, *L’interprete dans les conférences internationales*, Paris 1968; H.Ch. Barik, “A Study of Simultaneous Interpreting” (U of South Carolina 1969) – S. Černov,

“Teoriâ bez èksperimenta i èksperiment bez teorii”, [in:] *Tetradì perevodčika* 10, 1973, pp. 102–110.

(6) Reviews of foreign translation journals

Rev. of *Babel* – I. Černâk, “Žurnal «Vavilon» (informacionnyj obzor)”, [in:] *Masterstvo perevoda* 1959, Moskva, pp. 450–455.

Rev. of *Meta* – V.Û. Rozencvejg, “Žurnal kanadskih perevodčikov «Meta»”, [in:] *Tetradì perevodčika* 20, 1985, pp. 91–102.

(7) Overviews, discussions of foreign theoretical concepts (mediating accounts)

R.A. Budagov, “Džovanni Verga o hudožestvennom perevode”, [in:] *Istoriko-filologičeskie issledovaniâ, sb. statej k 75-letiu akad. N.I. Konrada*, ed. M.B. Hrapčenko, Nauka, Moskva 1967, pp. 37–40.

V.V. Bibihin, “Džordž Stajner. «Posle Vavilona: aspekty âzyka i perevoda»”, *Obščestvennye nauki za rubežom. Referativnyj žurnal. Ser. 6: Azykoznanie* 4, 1974 [sic], Moskva, pp. 22–29. [Reprinted in: Dž. Stajner, *Posle Vavilonskogo smešeniâ. Voprosy âzyka i perevoda*, trans. V. Frolov, MCNMO, Moskva 2020, see list 10].

V.F. Samsonov, “K analizu gipotezy Kuajna o neopredelennosti perevoda”, [in:] *Tetradì perevodčika* 16, 1979, pp. 21–29.

D.I. Ermolovič, “V poiskah kriteriâ èkvivalentnosti. O koncepcii Pitera N’ûmarka”, [in:] *Tetradì perevodčika* 23, 1989, pp. 15–23.

Voprosy istorii perevoda, ed. V. Komissarov et al., MGPIÂ, Moskva 1989.

G.T. Huhuni, *Russkaâ i zapadnoevropejskaâ perevodčeskaâ mysl' (osnovnye tendencii v razvitii do načala XX v.)*, Izd-vo TGU, Tbilisi 1990.

(8) Texts of uncertain status: translations or originals

O. Kade – Kade O., “K osnovnym položeniam teorii osmysleniâ perevoda kak čelovečeskoj deâtel'nosti”, [in:] *Teoriâ perevoda i naučnye osnovy podgotovki perevodčikov. Materialy Vsesoûz. nauč. konf., MGPIÂ, Moskva 1975, č. 1*, pp. 35–44.

A. Neubert – Nobjert A., “Perevodovedenie s točki zreniâ sociolingvistiki”, [in:] *Teoriâ perevoda i naučnye osnovy podgotovki perevodčikov. Mater. Vsesoûz. nauč. konf., MGPIÂ, Moskva 1975, č. 1*, pp. 56–61.

A. Lilova – Lilova A., “Perevodčeskij bum”, *Kur'er Ūnesko* 8, avgust 1983, pp. 29–31.

K. Klaudy – Klaudi K., “«Smutnye mesta» v perevodah, ili lingvističeskoe obosnovanie redaktorskih pravok”, [in:] *Perevod i komunikaciâ*, ed. A.D. Švejcer et al., In-âzykoznanîâ RAN, Moskva 1997, pp. 179–182.

G. Marcucci – Markučči Dž., “Nekotorye teoretičeskie i praktičeskie nablûdeniâ nad russkimi perevodami L. Pirandello”, [in:] *Četvertye Fedorovskie čtenîâ. Universitetskoe perevodovedenie*, issue 4, S-Peterburg 2003, pp. 207–220.

- D. Gile – Žil' D., *Trudnosti ustnogo posledovatel'nogo perevoda: kognitivnyj aspekt / D. Žil', E.V. Alikina / Obučenie inostrannym âzykam kak sredstvu mežkul'turnoj kommunikacii i professional'noj deâtel'nosti*. Mežvuz. sb. naučn. tr., ed. T.S. Serova et al., Izd-vo Perm. gos. teh. un-ta, Perm' 2003, pp. 300–304.

(9) Overview publications (mediating accounts)

- Komissarov V., *Obšaâ teoriâ perevoda. Problemy perevodovedeniâ v osvešeni zarubežnyh učenyh*, ČeRo, Moskva 1999.
[Reprinted in: Komissarov V., *Sovremennoe perevodovedenie. Učebnoe posobie*, Moskva 2004, pp. 179–316.]
- Nelûbin L., Huhuni G., *Istoriâ i teoriâ zarubežnogo perevoda*, M-vo obrazovaniâ RF / Mosk. ped. un-t / Signal' Moskva 1999 [2003: 3rd ed.].
- Sorokina È.A., *Istoriâ zarubežnogo perevoda. Učebnoe posobie dlâ studentov-bakalavrov napravleniâ «Lingvistika»*, MIIT, Moskva 2011.
- Rarenko M.B. (ed.) *Osnovnye ponâtiâ angloâzyčnogo perevodovedeniâ. Terminologičeskij slovar'-spravočnik*, INION RAN, Moskva 2011.
- Uboženko I., *Zarubežnoe perevodovedenie. Velikobritaniâ*, R.Valent, Moskva 2014.

(10) Book-length publications, 1990s – 21st century

- J. Beekman, J. Callow, *Translating the Word of God*, 1974 – Bikman Dž., Kellou Dž., *Ne iskažaâ slova Božiâ... Principy perevoda i semantičeskogo analiza Biblii*, trans. from English D. Kirsanov, N. Dmitrieva, Ū. Šabarova, ed. D. Dmitriev, Izd. Noah, S-Peterburg 1994.
- K. Callow, *Discourse considerations in translating the Word of God*, 1974 – Kellou K., *Analiz diskursa i perevod Biblii*, trans. from English N.N. Dmitriev, Germenevt / Hristianskoe o-vo «Bibliâ dlâ vseh», S-Peterburg 1997.
- J. de Waard, E.A. Nida, *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*, 1986 – Vaard Å. de, Najda Ū.A., *Na novyh âzykah zagovorât: Funkcional'naâ êkvivalentnost' v biblejskih perevodah*, trans. from English E.L. Alekseeva, E.D. Savenkova, ed. A.A. Alekseev, Rossijskoe biblejskoe obšestvo, S-Peterburg 1998.
- J. Derrida, *Des Tours de Babel*, 1985 – Derrida Ź., *Vokrug Vavilonskih bašen*, trans. V. Lapickij, Akademičeskij proekt, S-Peterburg 2002. [Reissued: Machina, S-Peterburg 2012].
- J. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, 1967 – Katford⁴² Dž.K., *Lingvističeskaâ teoriâ perevoda: Ob odnom aspekte prikladnoj lingvistiki*, trans. from English V.D. Mazo, URSS, Moskva 2004. [Reissued: LIBROKOM, Moskva 2009].

⁴² Any apparent inconsistencies in transliteration of names reflect differences in Cyrillic spellings.

- U. Eco, *Dire quasi la stessa cosa*, 2003 – Èko U., *Skazat' počti to že samoe. Opyty o perevode*, trans. from Italian A.N. Koval', Symposium / Pečatnyj dvor im. A.M. Gor'kogo, S-Peterburg 2006. [Reissued: AST / Corpus, Moskva cop. 2015].
- D. Robinson, *Becoming a Translator* (2nd ed.), 2003 – Robinson D., *Kak stat' perevodčikom: vvedenie v teoriu i praktiku perevoda*, trans. from English M. Skuratovskaâ, D. Tuganbaev, N. Šahova, Kudic–Obraz, Moskva 2005 [Reissued: Kudic-Press, Moskva 2007; S-Peterburg 2007].
- E. Prunč, *Entwicklungslinien der Translationswissenschaft. Von den Asymmetrien der Sprachen zu den Asymmetrien der Macht*, Berlin 2007, 2012 – Prunč È., *Puti razvitiâ zapadnogo perevodovedeniâ. Ot âzykovej asimmetrii k političeskoj*, trans. from German O. Bokovaâ, O. Kaškina, S. Semočko, S. Arhipov, V. Šubin, scholarly ed. N.I. Rejngol'd, «R.Valent», Moskva 2015.
- A. Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories* (2nd ed.), 2014 – Pim È., *Teoretičeskie paradigmy v perevodovedenii*, trans. from English T.A. Kazakova, scholarly ed. A.V. Ačkasov, SPbGU, S-Peterburg 2018.
- D. Bellos, *Is That a Fish in Your Ear?*, 2011 – Bellos D., *Čto za rybka v Vašem uhe? Udivitel'nye priključeniâ perevoda*, trans. N. Šahova, KoLibri [et al.], Moskva [et al.] 2019 [cf. List 15].
- G. Steiner, *After Babel*, 1975 – Dž. Stajner, *Posle Vavilonskogo smešeniâ. Voprosy âzyka i perevoda*, trans. V. Frolov, MCNMO, Moskva 2020.

(11) 21st century – articles (selection)

- F. Schleiermacher – Šlejermaher F., “O raznyh metodah perevoda”. Lekciâ, pročitanâ 24 iûnâ 1813 g. [Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens], trans. N.M. Bernovskaâ, ed. A.L. Borisenko, A. Zinov'eva, *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriâ 9: Filologijâ* 2, 2000, pp. 127–145.
- P. Ricœur – Riker P., “Paradigma perevoda”. Lekciâ, pročitanâ na fakul'tete protestantskoj teologii v Pariže v oktâbre 1998 goda [Le paradigme de la traduction], trans. M. Èdel'man, *Russkij Žurnal* 2.11.2000, http://old.russ.ru/ist_sovt/sumerki/20001102.html [access: 28.02.2023].
- W. Benjamin – Ben'âmin V., “Zadača perevodčika” [Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers], trans. from German N. Bernovskaâ, [in:] Ben'âmin V., *Ozarenâ*, Martis, Moskva 2000, pp. 46–57.
- Ben'âmin V., “Zadača perevodčika”, trans. A. Antonovskij, *Filosofsko-kul'turoloģičeskij žurnal «Z»* 3, 2000. MGU, Moskva.
- Ben'âmin V., “Zadača perevodčika”, trans. from German I. Alekseeva, [in:] Ben'âmin V., *Maski vremeni*. Èsse o kul'ture i literature, Symposium, S-Peterburg 2004, pp. 27–46.
- Ben'âmin V., “Zadača perevodčika. Predislovie k perevodu «Tableaux Parisiens» Bodlera”, trans. E. Pavlov, [in:] Ben'âmin V., *Učenie o podobii: mediaèstetičeskie proizvedeniâ*, trans. from German I. Boldyrev et al., Izdatel'skij centr RGGU, Moskva 2012, pp. 254–270. See also the reprint (as: “Zadača perevodčika.

- Predislovie k perevodu «Parižskih kartin» Bodlera”) at: <http://kassandriion.narod.ru/commentary/11/6ben.htm> [access: 29.01.2020].
- see also: P. de Man – Man P. de, “Vместo zaključeniâ: o «Zadače perevodčika» Val’tera Ben’âmina” [Lekciâ v Kornell’skom universitete, 4 marta 1983 g.] per. D.A. Ivanov, *Vestnik Moskovskogo un-ta. Seriâ 9: Filologîâ* 5, 2000, pp. 158–185.
- S. Barańczak – Baran’čak S., “Małyj, no maksimalistskij manifest perevodčika, ili Ob”âsnenie togo, čto stihy perevodât takže dlâ togo, čtoby ob”âsnit’ drugim perevodčikam, čto dlâ bol’sinstva perevodov stihov net ob”âsneniâ” [Mały lecz maksymalistyczny manifest translologiczny, 1990], [trans.?], [in:] *Studia polonica: Filologicznej al’manah*, ed. L. Kolobkova, S. Teclav, et al., Izd. Kaliningradskogo gos. un-ta, Kaliningrad 2001, pp. 89–95 [see also List 15].
- W. Quine – Kuajn U.V.O., “Ešë raz o neopredelënnosti perevoda” [Indeterminacy of Translation Again, 1987], trans. V. Surovcev; trans. P. Kuslij, *Logos* 2 (47), 2005, pp. 28–41.
- M. Ballard – Ballâr M., “K osnovaniâm realističeskoj metodologii v nauke o perevode” / “Éléments pour une méthodologie réaliste en traductologie”, trans. N. Tatarčuk, scholarly ed. O.I. Kostikova, *Vestnik Moskovskogo un-ta. Seriâ 22: Teoriâ perevoda* 1, 2008, pp. 48–81.
- M. Ballard – Ballâr M., “Poslovica i perevod” / “Proverbe et traduction”, [trans.?], *Vestnik Moskovskogo un-ta. Seriâ 22: Teoriâ perevoda* 2, 2009, pp. 38–62.
- M. Ballard – Ballâr M., “O peresmotre ponâtiâ edinicy perevoda”, trans. from French V.E. Gorškova, [in:] *Perevod v èpohu postmoderna*, ed. V.E. Gorškova, IGLU, Irkutsk 2009, pp. 120–131.
- R. Garderes – Garder R., “Istoriâ voennyh perevodčikov vo Francii” / “Historique des «interpètes militaires» français”, trans. E. Gribanovskaâ, A. Makšanceva, ed. N. Garbovskij, *Vestnik Moskovskogo un-ta. Seriâ 22: Teoriâ perevoda*, 2010, pp. 54–73.
- A. Guillaume – Gijom A., “Perevod v Srednie veka: čeharda smyslov” / “La traduction médiévale sens dessus dessous”, trans. D. Balandina, Ū. Koreneva, scholarly ed. O. Kostikova, *Vestnik Moskovskogo un-ta. Seriâ 22: Teoriâ perevoda* 1, 2011, pp. 38–66.
- P. Ricœur – Rikër P., “Vyzov i sčast’e perevoda” [Défi et bonheur de la traduction], trans. from French M. Bendet, *Logos* 5–6 (84), 2011, pp. 148–156.
- A. Berman – Berman A., “Ispytanie čužim. Kul’tura i perevod v romantičeskoj Germanii” [L’Epreuve de l’étranger, 1984], trans. from French M. Bendet, *Logos* 5–6 (84), 2011, pp. 92–113.
- H. Meschonnic, J.-R. Ladmirał – Mešonnik A. / Ladmirał’ Ź.-R., “Poëtika.../Teoremy... perevoda” [Poétique de.../Théorèmes pour... la traduction, 1981], trans. from French D. Goloborod’ko, *Logos* 5–6 (84), 2011, pp. 72–91.
- L. Venuti – Venuti L., “Glava «Naciâ» iz knigi *Perevodčik-nevidimka*”, [(part of?) the chap. “Nation” from *The Translator’s Invisibility*, 1995], trans. from English T. Venediktova, [in:] *2000 Perevod kak ispytanie kul’tury*, electronic resource, Institut Filosofii Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk [Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences], <https://iphras.ru/page47112408.htm> [last date of availability unknown, access to data record: 25.07.2022].

(12) Articles – an example of a philological journal: *Вестник С-Петербургского ун-та. Серия 9 4, 2016*

- E. Balcerzan – “Gorizonty iskusstva perevoda v literaturnoj kommunikacii”, trans. from Polish A. Babanov [Horizons of the art of translation in literary communication]⁴³, pp. 18–30.
- S. Bassnett – “Istoki i razvitie perevodovedeniâ v 1975–2016 gg”, trans. from English T. Kazakova [The origins and development of Translation Studies 1975–2016], pp. 31–44.
- Y. Gambier – “Perevod i perevodovedenie na perekrestke cifrovyh tehnologij”, trans. from English T. Aleksejeva [Translation and TS at the crossroads of digital communications], pp. 56–74.
- N. Pokorn – “Perevod na inostrannyj âzyk v podgotovke i professional’noj deâtel’nosti perevodčika”, trans. from English T. Kazakova [Translation into L2: not a shameful but a valid practice in the market and the classroom], pp. 86–99.

(13) Articles – the journal *Мосты*

- C. Flick – Flik K., “O čem obyčno sprašivaût perevodčika”, trans. N. Šahova, *Mosty* 1, 2004, pp. 56–60.
- J. Garreaux – Garro Dž., “Âzyk tvoj – drug moj”, trans. N.G. Šahova, *Mosty* 4 (24) 2009, pp. 45–49.
- C. Kelly – “Svobodnoe manevrirovanie v zadannom prostranstve”. Interv’û s Katrionoj Kelli. Prepared by D.G. Šatalov, *Mosty* 3 (27) 2013, pp. 17–23.
- K. Leeder – “Perevod – èto predpriâtie, trebuêsee izrâdnoj skromnosti i smelosti”. Interv’û s Karen Lidër. Prepared by D.G. Šatalov, trans. E.Û. Harina, D.G. Šatalov, *Mosty* 1 (37) 2013, pp. 3–12.
- H. Belloc – Bellok H., “O perevode. Vstupitel’naâ stat’â «Mister H. Bellok»” – V.I. Frolov, *Mosty* 2 (38) 2013, pp. 25–31.
- M. Frühauf – Früauf M.V., “Iz masterskoj perevodčika: Âzykovye i (mež)kul’turnye problemy perevoda poètičeskikh tekstov s kitajskogo âzyka na nemeckij”, trans. S.M. Kibardina, *Mosty* 3 (51) 2016, pp. 22–30.
- J. Harmer, L. Burian – “Interv’û s Džekolin Harmer i Loroj B’ûrian”. Prepared and trans. D.M. Buzadži, *Mosty* 1 (53) 2017, pp. 4–13.
- D. Seleskovitch, M. Lederer – Seleskovič D., Lederer M., “Ot opyta k koncepcii”, trans. K.S. Fëdorova. Vstupitel’naâ stat’â ‘O naučnom nasledii Danicy Seleskovič’ – K.S. Fëdorova, *Mosty* 3 (59) 2018, pp. 24–29.

⁴³ In this list, English titles do not point to original publications but come from the Russian edition; compare footnote 25 to the main text of the present paper.

(14) Professional publications with a practical focus

Perevodčeskie tehnologii dlâ Evropy [*Human language technologies for Europe*, 2006, project manager Gianni Lazzari]: doklady [reports], trans. from English È.G. Azgal'dov, introd. V. Reding, I. Figel', project manager: Dž. Laccari; ed. and introd. for the Russian edition: E.I. Kuz'min, E.V. Plys, Meždunar. centr bibl. sotrudničestva, Moskva 2008.

Professional'nyj perevod i upravlenie informaciej, 2008–2016 [*MultiLingual Computing & Technology and Teworld*].

(15) Articles – the journal *Иностранная литература* (for the 2017–2019 period, and an earlier sample)

S. Barańczak – Barančak S., “Malyj, no maksimalistskij manifest perevodčika, ili Ob”âsnenie togo, čto stihy perevodât eše i dlâ togo, čtoby ob”âsnit' drugim perevodčikam: dlâ bol’šinstva perevodov stihov net ob”âsneniâ”. Fragmenty èsse [Mały lecz maksymalistyczny manifest translologiczny, 1990], fragm., trans. from Polish I. Kiseleva, *Inostrannaâ literatura* 8, 2004, pp. 274–285 [see also List 11].

S. Sontag – Sontag S., “Mir kak Indiâ” [The World as India, 2002], trans. V. Golyšev, *Inostrannaâ literatura* 7, 2017.

H. Böll – Bëll' G., “Reč' na otkrytii Evrpopejskogo centra perevodčikov v Štralene” [speech, 24.04.1985], trans. A. Kukes, *Inostrannaâ literatura* 12, 2017.

G. Nivat – Niva Ž., “Vseâdnyj perevod: Gejne i Bajron v ruskoj poëzii”, trans. M. Annenskaâ, *Inostrannaâ literatura* 7, 2018, pp. 242–256.

D. Bellos, *Is That a Fish in Your Ear?* – Bellos D., “Čto za rybka v Vašem uhe? Udivitel'nye priklüčeniâ perevoda”, trans. N. Šahova, *Inostrannaâ literatura* 4, 2019, pp. 256–271 [cf. List 10].

P. Ricœur, *Sur la traduction*, 2004 – Rikër P., “Perehod: perevesti neperevodimoe” [Un « passage » : traduire l'intraduisible], trans. M. Bendet, *Inostrannaâ literatura* 9, 2019, pp. 243–250.