

This is a self-archived – parallel-published version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details. When using please cite the original.

AUTHOR(S)

Yves Gambier

TITLE

A French-speaking translation studies area: Under influence?

YEAR

2025

CITATION

Gambier, Y. (2025). A French-speaking translation studies area: Under influence? In Elsherif, G. & Sobesto, J. (eds.). *Positionalities of Translation Studies: On the Situatedness of Translation Research*. Bloomsbury Advances in Translation.

URL

<https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/positionalities-of-translation-studies-9781350447868/>

VERSION

Final draft

A French-speaking *translation studies* area

Under influence?

Yves Gambier

1. Introduction

Our initial question is simple: how are international contacts made in Translation Studies? Simple in appearance but quickly coupled with other questions: what kind of contact are we talking about? Between which communities or geolinguistic areas? Do all these contacts have an influence on the evolution of the field? The social sciences and humanities cannot claim universality in the manner that the hard or natural sciences can. Their development is linked to the historical conditions that surround and permeate these disciplines. Translation studies is no exception to this historicity. Two major questions emerge:

- What areas do we envisage when we ask ourselves about intellectual exchanges, for instance, between France and the USSR? Are these areas not like tectonic plates – moving and deep?
- What are the foundations, the acts, the contributions and the agents of these exchanges? How are the works from each of these areas disseminated? Is there not a risk of falling into a certain idealism that would privilege certain individuals and their reception, to the detriment of a collective, connected history over the long term?

2. Putting things into perspective

The title of our contribution requires some clarification. For this, a step back is first necessary into the history of translations, as well as that of translated texts,

agents and practices, on the historiography of *ts*.¹ The latter has been sketched out for a few years (D'hulst 2022), but still with gaps, inaccuracies and hesitations.

The break between the study of discourses on translation (the so-called pre-scientific and pre-disciplinary period) and scientific study is not systematically questioned, as if the transition from one to the other was brutal, radical. Moreover, many historiographical problems proper remain unresolved: such as the presuppositions, the implications and the constraints that weigh on the writing of this history, including the notions of duration, periodization, change and space that are often taken for granted, for example the sources and the archives to be selected and used. Other unresolved problems involve the logic at work that energizes the actors, the means by which this history and the history of those who write it at a later stage, and the very concepts to be treated in this history (power, culture, mediation, agents, influence etc.), such as the possible relationship to the history of knowledge (D'hulst and Gambier 2018). The meta-position of the historian and his/her metalanguage are not easy to define, especially since the targeted history (connected, *croisée*/entangled, comparative, social, cultural, counterfactual and micro-) involves various levels and directions of approach. From the outset, it should be noted that the positionality of the researcher can be threefold: it can indeed be part of either the positivist paradigm (etic perspective: the researcher's position is not or rarely reflected upon), or the interpretivist paradigm (emic perspective: one of an engaged participant), or the critical perspective (the participant has political agency and an agenda and is reflexive about his/her own position in knowledge production). The notion of paradigm here encompasses a set of beliefs, assumptions and visions/worldviews that impact what should be studied, how research should be done and how results should be interpreted (Zwischenberger 2023).

One of the illusions that permeates the historiography of *ts* is the belief that the terms *traductologie* (in French), *traduktologia* (in Polish), *vertaalstudies* (in Afrikaans), *Estudios de Tradução* (in Portuguese), *Übersetzungswissenschaft/Translationswissenschaft* (in German-speaking countries), *Teorija prevoda/perevodovedenie* (in Russian), *perekladoznavstvo* (in Ukrainian), *käännöstiede* (in Finnish) and so on cover the same univocal and stable concept of translation, share the same *a priori* and implications, have inherited the same intellectual and epistemological background and have evolved according to the same rhythm over the same periods – in short, the history of *ts* has proceeded at the same pace as soon as it was in the English lingua franca, modelled on TS. Translation studies, like any discipline, is defined both by its epistemological implications (presuppositions, implications, definition of its object, frames of

reference, logic implemented, identification of ‘problems’ etc.) and by the socio-institutional mechanisms and factors that legitimize it in the eyes of its members and outside it. What are the mechanisms of translation studies in French? Their particular significance, their distinctive features can only be grasped in a global, comparative approach to TS (in English, in German etc.), which is out of question in the space of this paper. Let’s just recall that these mechanisms include the conditions, the basic constraints and what allows the affirmation and the expansion of the field. The former include associations, networks, training centres, nominating, promotion and funding bodies. The latter are the means of communication and dissemination, that is, doctoral schools, training programmes, research teams, conferences, journals and book series.

Moreover, the singular (‘the’ translation studies, ‘the’ theory of translation) is an illusion with a performative effect: it tends to make us believe in the existence of a homogeneous, autonomous, stable whole, whereas the field has its tensions, its contradictions – translation studies does not perfectly cover the ambitions of TS; it has distinct tendencies, if not ‘schools’ (the so-called Paris school is not the school of manipulation or the Geneva school), and its relations to linguistics, psychology, semiotics, history and so on are not similar depending on whether one is in the centre or periphery of the discipline, for example, in Paris or Seoul.

Our aim in this chapter is to question the possible exchanges, within and across borders, the circulation of certain ideas that have fuelled translation reflections between two particular spaces: France, within the French-speaking space sharing a common language, and the USSR, particularly between the 1950s and the early 1980s, at a time when intellectual, cultural, associative and trade union life in France at least was marked by the influence of the Communist Party. But first, a question must be answered: from where am I talking?

3. Critical positionality

As a scholar in TS, I have been engaged in translator education for forty years (1973–2014). My scholarly stance was shaped by different work experiences in the industry and at a translation agency. And as an educator, my interest always lay in ensuring that graduates find appropriate employment thanks to their professional and academic competences, that training programmes in translation and interpreting are recognized (by universities, ministries, European institutions, Chambers of commerce etc.) and that research projects in *ts* and translation knowledge are disseminated widely outside of our small

community. But, also relevant here, I was a student in France, at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, in a department of linguistics (specialized in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis). The professors there and then, politically committed and involved in union activities, edited the first *Introduction à la Sociolinguistique: la linguistique sociale* (Marcellesi and Gardin 1974)² and launched *Les Cahiers de Linguistique Sociale* in 1983 and *Glottopol* (an online journal launched in 2003). Works on political and trade union discourses, on languages in the working place, on lexical creativity, neologisms and socio-terminology, on interactions in different social settings, on dialectal variations and norms, on language policies, diglossia, minoritized languages and so on, have all obviously oriented my thoughts about translation (Gambier 2023b). In addition to this background in training, I must add regular teaching as a visiting professor at the I. Kant Baltic Federal University in Kaliningrad (2014–19) and the Technology University of Kaunas in Lithuania (2018–23). In Kaliningrad, I could study the role and the position of translation in various journals (I could also participate in the Fedorov Readings X, University TS (2008, St Petersburg State University)).

4. There was a prior *translation studies*

Translation studies (TS) is relatively recent.³ The first drafts can be dated to the 1930s (e.g. in the Soviet Union, then including Ukraine), in the 1950s (with comparative stylistics with Vinay and Darbelnet) and then in the 1970s (with the programmatic map of J. Holmes, sketched in a conference on applied linguistics held in Copenhagen in 1972). Very early on, therefore, the emerging discipline was transnational and multidisciplinary (with references to formal and contrastive linguistics, semiotics, stylistics, philosophy, comparative literature). It was also enriched by earlier discourses, such as those of Cicero, St. Jerome and often short writings: prefaces, treatises, essays and notes of the sixteenth century (Dolet, Amyot, for instance, for the French-speaking area) and then more frequently after the seventeenth century (Antoine Lemaistre, Gaspard de Tende, Pierre-Daniel Huet etc.). The archaeology and genealogy of *ts* remain to be done, wherever translation has given rise to prescriptions and injunctions. We will recall here by way of example the four periods of translation in the West, envisaged by George Steiner as early as 1975. In other words, whether for France or China, Canada or Portugal and so on, limiting *ts* to being based on a few decades of the twentieth century would be to construct a truncated history –

probably based on a misunderstanding: any approach to practices can be ‘theory’ in the first sense of the Greek term *theoria*, *θεωρία*: a way of observing, of having a point of view on, expressed, for example, by metaphors, but not necessarily ‘theory’ in the scientific sense (seen as a set of concepts, explanations deduced from systematically applied methods). Therefore, *ts* can be seen as a very old effort to gather translation knowledge drawn from experience and as a relatively new scientific discipline. It is in this last sense that we will treat it now, bearing in mind that this modern *ts* has also inherited the past, especially, for example, when it is often based on translations of literary, religious and philosophical texts, to the detriment of pragmatic, scientific texts, and that it has developed at the same time as it has become a university discipline.

5. Challenges of a historiography of translation studies (*ts*)

Various media have multiplied in recent years, with introductions, anthologies, handbooks (or guides) and encyclopaedias whose objectives and methods of approach are not always explained and in which the discourses on translation in particular are, paradoxically, often a-historicized and decontextualized, the emphasis being rather on the justification of the texts, of the selected entries, to say nothing of the conception of the history underlying these collections (Venuti 2021; Robinson 2014)

In fact, the historiography of translation studies has long been satisfied with and limited to a national vision,⁴ even if history is never written by a single country – focusing on a given geographical area and/or period (studies on Germany in the second half of the twentieth century, on Japan, on China – imperial or twentieth century – on Russia, on Eastern Europe etc.) or on a language or a family of languages (history of French, English, Finnish, Portuguese translations etc.). It is not a question of delegitimizing *a priori* these efforts, elements of a puzzle still fragmented, but of questioning the history at work, the logic that brings together such authors, such texts, such translators and such publishers because the national approach (inherited from a vision of the history of the nineteenth century) is too often anecdotal, accumulating names, dates and titles according to chronology alone, without shedding light on the role that translators and translations may have played in historical change (in the evolution of languages, literary history, that of international and diplomatic relations, cultural and scientific exchanges etc.).⁵ Nevertheless, translation studies collect, classify and interpret their data within the framework of a certain dominant intellectual and epistemological

tradition that does not necessarily correspond to other traditions (local, regional, national, continental, postcolonial etc.). *Übersetzungswissenschaft* (in German) has its beginnings as early as the nineteenth century, *perevodovedenie* (in Russian) starts around the years 1920–30, while *traductologie* (in French) and *Translatologie* (in German) date back to the years 1960–70. Moreover, the boundaries of the discipline are subject to many variations (institutional, pedagogical) without saying anything about the other disciplines that helped it emerge – contrastive linguistics, comparative literature and the teaching of classical and foreign languages (Gambier and van Doorslaer 2016: 2–6). The national withdrawal can be justified, but probably not from the perspective of a historiography of multidisciplinary translation studies, based on universal practice (whatever the conceptual definitions).

6. A French-language ‘translation studies’

A language would also be a relative worldview (reality pre-organized by linguistic categories and cultural patterns) and an epistemological heritage (see Section 2) (Taivalkoski-Shilov 2021). Such metonymic links between languages, areas and worldviews and intellectual traditions would make it possible to construct not only homogeneous entities but also binary oppositions. Many historical studies focus on specific *areas* and *languages* – for instance, the following: Siever (2010) on Germany; Wakabayashi (2012) on Japan; Chan Tak-hung (2004) on China; Bushsmanova (1997), Garbovskiy (2012, 2016, 2021), Hansen and Witt (2016), Lygo (2016) and Tyulenev (2018) on Russia; Albrecht (2016) on the Romance area; Ceccherelli, Costantino and Didi (2015) on Slavic counties; Schippel and Zwischenberger (2017) on Eastern Europe; Bończa Bukowski and Heydel (2019) on Poland and so on. Thus, for example, the problem of the history and theorization of science is more a matter of the philosophy of knowledge in France and more of the fields of knowledge in Great Britain, as conceptualization is a privileged approach in French while empiricism and the appetite for description would prevail in the Anglo-Saxon world. Admittedly, these oppositions are schematic and require consideration with caution, especially since for a very long time binary thinking has dominated the Western vision,⁶ seen as reductionist and questioned, among other approaches, by deconstruction. In TS, such dichotomous traces persist (us/others, universal/particular, meaning/form, system/set of agents, source/target, domestication/foreignization, word for word/free etc.).

In addition, it is necessary to differentiate between the state of TS in a country at a given time and TS qualified by the name of a place – such as TS in Canada, that is, the stage of development of TS between 1970 and 2000, and Canadian TS, as if TS (or part of it) were specific to that country. We will not speak here of French translation studies, linked to a territory, but of French-language translation studies (Gambier 2023a). There are three meanings of *ts* in French:

- 1) This language is the native language of the authors, whether they are from France, Belgium, Switzerland or Quebec. They mostly write in this language and most often use data in French.
- 2) *Ts* is developed by researchers who have French as a second language; this is the case of researchers in Poland, Greece, Italy, Romania, South Korea, Brazil and so on.
- 3) *Ts* in French can also mean that which uses French-language data, documents, the scholars being considered specialists in this language-*lingua franca* (by training, recruitment, affiliation). This is the case for Scandinavian, Finnish, Spanish researchers and so on. It remains to be seen whether this recourse to sources in French also implies an epistemology, a particular intellectual tradition, or if this use of French, in publications mainly in English, blurs the tracks and can be analysed in a different framework of thought, more Anglo-Saxon for example.

Can these three possible directions of a *ts* into French constitute a specific *ts* area,⁷ with common characteristics (besides language), which has been called a ‘translational area’ (Chalvin 2011)? As, for example, for *Middle Europe* (*Europe médiane*) gathering sixteen languages, ranging from Finland to Albania, having in common a founding role attributed to the Bible, the late emergence of written vernaculars, nationalist movements in the nineteenth century, massive cultural borrowings from Western Europe and, for most of the countries, a similar experience of post-war totalitarianism (Chalvin et al. 2019). Or *Sinitic Asia*, that is, China, Japan, Korea and Vietnam, sharing the use of Chinese writing, the prestige of Chinese classics and a form of colonialism in the nineteenth century (Wakabayashi 2005). These commonalities should make it possible to develop a certain history of translation. What would be the categories common to a *ts* in French that would justify structuring the historiography of TS according to such areas, neither national nor universal, at least for a given period?

The French-speaking *ts* area would therefore have in common the following: language, an epistemology oriented towards conceptualization rather than empirical work and the tendency, for example, to privilege the sociological

approach rather than the psycho-cognitive. Does the set of names, periods and perspectives compose a historiography of translation studies? What story are we talking about then? The geolinguistic criterion, offering a discontinuous space made up of territorial entities (France, Belgium, Switzerland and Canada) would allow comparisons but would move away from a global history that would suppose a larger and continuous space. Moreover, is the delimitation to the French-speaking space sufficient to constitute a traductological area, without it being known whether the paradigm(s) are both held in common and distinguished from other areas (German, English, Chinese, Portuguese, Russian etc.)? Obviously, it is hardly possible to define such a paradigm or paradigms before having studied the area in question. Certainly, to avoid this vicious circle, we can start from a few intuitions based on already established knowledge. But what would be these coherence factors for the French-speaking area? The role and history of translation, the functions of reflection (metaphorical, scientific) are not shared in the same way, for instance, between France and Canada: one was more marked by structural linguistics, the other by contrastive linguistics; one was more under the influence of hermeneutics, the other under the influence of comparative literature; one was a centre of world literature, the other more subject to the obligations of bilingualism – all these elements make *ts* diverge in many areas.

7. Brief reminder on the *ts* in the USSR

In the USSR, *ts* was sketched as early as the 1930s, addressing various issues – such as translatability, equivalence, functional correspondence, adequacy, types of texts to be translated, realia or cultural elements, the translation unit, translation procedures or methods and so on. It was informed by various works in structuralist linguistics and semiotics (the latter is still present, for example, in a journal such as *Слово/Σλοβο* established in 2010), but also in machine translation (from the 1960s) and literature. Besides, since the early eighteenth century, Russian writers made translation a very visible and much-discussed practice (Baer and Olshanskaya 2013).

The USSR then included Ukraine, already engaged in translation reflections over the years 1920–30 (Kalnychenko 2011, 2019, 2022; Odrekhivska 2021) with university programmes in Kharkiv (TS Department), Kyiv (Department of Philology and Translation) and Lviv (Department of TS and Contrastive Linguistics)⁸ and researchers such as Volodymyr Derzhavyn, Mykola Zerov,

Mykhailo Kalynovych, Oleksander Finkel, Hrykoryi Kochur, Andriy Paniv, Anatolii Oryshko and Mikola Lukash, not to mention the history (in Ukrainian) of translation and literary translators (Strikha 2006; Kolomiyets 2015). We should also mention, as a reminder, the work carried out then, especially after the 1950s, in Hungary (Klaudy, Lambert and Sohar 1996), Bulgaria (Zleteva 1993), Czechoslovakia and Estonia (Monticelli and Lange 2014; Baer 2011). The geopolitical ensemble is marked by multilingualism, the promotion of internationalism and a deliberate policy of translation (and not only literary) both internally and with foreign works. In Russia, names like Smirnov and Retsker (1950, 2007) on regularities in ‘correspondences’ in translation, Fedorov, Reicher, Alekseev, Čukovsky and Reznikov and so on have been slow to resonate in the community of translators, despite some pioneering works of dissemination, such as those of Koptjevskaja-Tamm (1989), Rozentsvej (1992), Fernández Vernet (1995, 1996), Balliu (1979, 2005) and Dmitrienko (2015, 2019, 2021). I should also mention the lectures given in Finland in the 1980s by Chernov and Komissarov, which I was able to attend. It should be noted that the overview proposed in this section is not intended to be exhaustive.⁹

The author probably the most cited in the West (Vasserman 2021, 2023) remains Fedorov, whose 1953 work has long remained inaccessible in Western languages but, translated into Chinese in 1955 by Li L et al. (Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company), it influenced Loh Dian-yang who proposed in 1958 (like Vinay and Darbelnet in the same year) eleven translation techniques in connection with three types of text (literary, commercial and technical), thus opening a long pedagogical tradition, still current. The 1953 work was also translated into French by R. Deresteau and A. Sergeant in 1969, at the *Institut Supérieur de Traduction et d'Interprétation* (ISTI) in Brussels, but remained in manuscript, never published and still difficult to access. Rendered in English (Baer 2021), it allowed us to better understand the novelty of its author's approach, marked by Russian formalists and convinced of the contributions of linguistics in the theorization of translation. It should be noted, however, that Fedorov was not completely unknown in the West, thanks to one of his articles published in 1974 in *Linguistics* (Fedorov 1974 [1927]) and previously thanks to the reflections of E. Cary¹⁰ in particular in the journal *Babel*: favourable in 1957 to the various genres of translation but reluctant to give linguistics a unifying role and almost laudatory in 1959 in his review of the second edition of Fedorov's volume (1958) published with a new subtitle: ‘Linguistic Problems’ (*Lingvisticheskie problemy*) and the omission of the chapter on Stalin and linguistics.¹¹ Added to these publications is the perspective of George Mounin in 1959 that (literary) translation is not just

a linguistic operation (limited to lexical, morphological and syntactic analyses) and Cary (1985 [1958]), who refuses the subservience of translation to linguistics alone, leaning towards psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and stylistics,¹² thus making translation both a science and an art, like architecture and medicine – something that Cary himself confirmed in his own speech at the same FIT congress and which Fedorov also partially claimed in 1953, understanding translation as a creative activity and stylistic operation. In fact, ‘linguistics’, mentioned by Fedorov, has not ceased to arouse controversy for lack of a precise definition since it could mean an approach oriented by formal linguistics and/or an approach based on the languages, bearer of cultural identity. Mounin, actually the pseudonym of Louis Leboucher (chosen in 1943 to escape the censorship of the Vichy government), was another mediator, an often polemical, informed semiologist and ‘worried communist’ (‘communist inquiet’ in his own words, qtd in Balliu 2003: 24) and, in addition to his article of 1959, he also referred to Fedorov in his later publications (Mounin 1963, 1976 [1963]). Thus, political commitment and interest in translation problems brought Cary and Mounin closer together and justified their curiosity about what was happening in the USSR.

Fedorov also influenced the writings of Otto Kade (an interpreter and teacher of Russian in post-war Germany and one of the founders of the Leipzig School of *Übersetzungswissenschaft*, establishing TS as an academic discipline in the German Democratic Republic) on objective and subjective factors in the translational process and the writings of Itamar Even-Zohar, inspired in the 1980s and 1990s by Soviet formalists and semioticians in the development of his polysystem theory, seeking to identify the multiple possible causes of translations in a given culture. Fedorov’s impact is therefore more present than previously assumed in the 1990s and 2000s when researchers were anglicizing themselves excessively (Pym and Ayzazyan 2015). The fact remains that the various editions of the 1953 book, as well as the various publications of Fedorov, deserve to be further analysed in their evolution and circulation: through which channels were they disseminated? To whom and by whom were they first interpreted? What is the part of the initial training of the authors, the ambient ideology, the academic rivalry, in their writings and during their reception a few decades later? Obviously, the genealogy of a thought, the archaeology of influence, cannot be reduced to rectilinear trajectories or stereotyped traditions, as relays or mediators of theories and institutions (like Cary) also often play as filters, so complex are the sources of inspiration, the contexts of writing and reading. Thus, Fedorov co-authored a book with Chukovsky in 1930 in which there is reference to the

formalist notion of literary device (Fedorov 1930); in 1941 he also published an *Introduction to Literary Translation* in which he asserts that translation is a fact of the receiving language and culture, and that the translator always has several options before deciding. His book of 1953 (reprinted in 1958, 1968 and 1983) thus appears as a long maturation: his reflections evolve in the course of the intellectual and ideological history of the USSR, from the 1920s to the 1950s, from Marr's theses to their rejection by Stalin, from objectivism in linguistics to subjectivity defended, for example, by Efim Etkind (exiled in France in the early 1970s, sharing ideas with A. Bergman and whose ideas on comparative stylistics in 1967 and especially the book published in 1982, first in French, marked me as a young academic more than other publications quickly stamped as translation studies). To give priority, if not exclusivity, to the 1953 version would be to give a fragmented, static vision of Fedorov, then struggling with the ideological tensions of the state, the still little-studied practices of translators (Popa 2010; Kamovnikova 2019) and the internal struggles in cultural circles.

8. In conclusion

The 1950s and 1980s saw the growing curiosity of intellectuals and academics in France towards Soviet works of the time, whether sociolinguistic, poetic or traductological. From Bakhtin and Voloshinov to Jakobson, from Propp to Fedorov, from Tynianov to Zhimsky, many poets, semiologists and translators have inspired researchers like Todorov, Barthes, Genette and so on. The social sciences and the theories of literature are then impregnated with Marxism, including a sociologist like Bourdieu, Marxizing but denying being so.¹³ During this Soviet 'thaw', narratology, literary theorization, semiotics and translation studies renewed their approaches and perspectives, supported by institutions such as the *École Pratique des Hautes Études*, journals such as *Tel Quel* and *Change* and the editions of *Minuit* and *Seuil* that amplified the movement. The *Theory of Literature* in 1966 undoubtedly marks an increased visibility of this effervescence. After the invasion of Hungary (1956), then that of Czechoslovakia (1968), the double radicality, political and intellectual, was to be blunted and curiosities were oriented towards other horizons.

Fedorov's works have contributed to the Western scholarship in TS even though none of his originals were translated into English before 2021. This is constantly questioned today when everything or almost everything passes only through English (Snell-Hornby 2007; Bennett 2013; Bennett and Queiroz de

Barros 2017): whole sections of *ts*, in various geolinguistic areas, thus risk falling into oblivion.

Moreover, should we perhaps not measure the influence of an author before grasping how ideas and texts circulate (Popa 2010; Kaźmierczak 2021)? To apprehend this circulation of notions, their debate, is to open up to the diversity of concepts, to the variety of conceptualizations of *ts*. A *lingua franca* risks repressing this diversity, this variety. We can continue the reflections of a researcher by quoting them, by taking up these arguments or by contradicting them, by referring to them, sharing excerpts, sometimes plagiarizing them, thus confirming both the intertextual and dialogical dimension of any contribution (written and oral) and its indirect influence; the bridges between reflections, research here and there, also depend on political agendas, language policies, academic logics and dissemination media, with implications for our perception of *TS*, its history and its trends.

Let's go back now to the notion of the translation area. The French-speaking one would have in common the language, an epistemology oriented towards conceptualization rather than empirical work, the tendency, for example, to favour the sociological rather than the psycho-cognitive approach – all these elements cause translation studies to diverge here and there. Moreover, based on the influence of Soviet authors, especially in the mid-twentieth century, we realize that the explicit and hidden circulation of ideas and concepts is more complex than expected, sometimes based on a shared ideology, sometimes linked to personal contacts. In addition, the relations that a scholar maintains with another area do not imply immediate, permanent and unequivocal effects. The notion of area was developed in relation to a comparative approach in order to explain the diffusion of certain cultural features. In translation studies, it seems inadequate (at least to a certain extent) to talk about a cultural focus or centre from which new concepts would emerge and be disseminated.

Besides, would the study of these translation study areas (areas to be confirmed, whether they are French, English, German, Spanish, Chinese etc.) make it possible to de-Westernize the concept of translation (Susam-Saraeva 2017), to 'provincialize Europe' (i.e. to free it from its historicist model to think about historicists of non-Western notions) (cf. Chakrabarty 2009)? An extensive programme . . .¹⁴ which the present presentation has barely touched upon. For the time being, *TS* favours micro-history, sometimes comparative history, rarely cross-history, in terms of accounting for the dynamics of translations. It is still at a standstill when it comes to the historiography of *TS*/translation studies.

Notes

- 1 I will use *ts* (translation studies), in small letters and italics, as a generic term, not referring exclusively to the English tradition of a 'science of translation', to TS, but encompassing different concepts 'translating' scientific studies of translation/interpreting. These studies have become an independent discipline, according to societies and universities.
- 2 The seven parts of the book refer, after the introduction, to (2) 'Language, superstructure and class phenomenon?', citing Marr, Jirmunsky, Reznikov and Stalin (Marcellesi and Gardin 1974: 34–89), (3) the relationship between social linguistics and Saussurian and generative linguistics (Marcellesi and Gardin 1974: 90–109), (4) American social dialectology (Fishman, Labov etc.) (Marcellesi and Gardin 1974: 110–57), (5) social classes and socio-semantic codes (Bernstein, Henderson, Halliday etc.) (Marcellesi and Gardin 1974: 158–83), (6) language change (Volochinov, Bally, Weinreich, Guilbert etc.) (Marcellesi and Gardin 1974: 184–205), (7) the problems and concepts of social linguistics (linguistic variation, linguistic atlas, covariance, dialectology and history, linguistic individuation etc.) (Marcellesi and Gardin 1974: 206–48).
- 3 The ambiguity of *studies* in TS remains: learning how to translate (*studies in translation*) and/or *studies on translation*? Its status is also ambiguous: an interdiscipline, praxeology (connected to the practice that was for a long time limited to linguistics), science, art, reflection and so on? Let us say that it has become independent from linguistics, then comparative literature, then philosophy and so on.
- 4 Recall that the journal *Meta* published, in the 1990s, issues focusing on one country, on one region: 33 (1) 1988 on Japan; 35 (3) 1990 on the Spanish and Portuguese-speaking world; 37 (1) on Russia; 38 (1) 1993 on the north of Canada; 41 (2) 1996 on Brazil; 42 (2) 1997 on India; 43 (1) 1998 on Israel; 44 (1) 1999 on China; and 45 (3) on the Arabic world.
- 5 The second part of the *Encyclopedia of TS*, published in 1998 by M. Baker and G. Saldanha, deals with 'traditions' for the most part national (Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Swedish etc.) but six entries of the thirty-two refer to wider geographical areas (African, American, Arabic traditions etc.). Yet all follow the same model as if the periodization were similar (Eurocentric chronology) regardless of society. The implicit concept of history is conventional, with key figures and so-called central events. The second edition (2009) omitted this entire part.
- 6 Oppositions such as human being/animal, good/bad, body/mind, sacred/profane, nature/culture, true/false, innate/nurture, theory/practice, diachrony/synchrony, concrete/abstract, system/usage, raw/cooked and so on.

- 7 The concept of area is also used in anthropology: areology is the study of geographical areas in which certain cultural features (such as myths, tales etc.) could be distributed.
- 8 On 12–13 May 2022, the University of Bratislava organized a conference on ‘TS in Ukraine as an Integral Part of European Context’. On 7 June 2022, the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv held an international conference on ‘Translation as Resistance: The Politics of Intercultural Mediation in East-Central Europe’.
- 9 The theses of the linguist Nicolas Marr (1864–1934) are then discussed in relation to the ‘new theory of language’ already developed in the 1920s and 1930s (concerning language as superstructure, linguistic change, the relationship between language and social dialects), with contributions published in *Pravda* and the interventions of Stalin (concerned about language policy in a multilingual USSR) and so on. See Mounin (1972: 230–46), Marcellesi and Gardin (1974: 34–87), L’Hermitte (1969), Marcellesi (1977).
- 10 Born in St. Petersburg in 1912, Cyrille Znosko-Borovsky (his pseudonym Cary is an anagram of the Russian diminutive of his first name: Kyra) emigrated to Paris after 1917, and became (after the Second World War) an interpreter, a permanent one at UNESCO (1962 until his death in 1966). He published numerous articles on translation and interpreting in journals such as *Babel* (vol. 1, 1955), *Diogenes* (launched in 1953) and *The New Criticism* (published from 1948 by the French Communist Party). In France, he relayed a number of foreign authors of his generation (Quay, Jumpelt, Fedorov, Ortega and Grasset). In 1947, he engaged in the creation of the French Society of Translators (SFT) and in 1953 in that of the FIT.
- 11 The book was revised and republished in 1968 and 1983, with the title changed to *Osnovy obshchei teorii pervoda* (Fundamentals of a General Translation Theory), with a new subtitle each time: in 1968, *Lingvisticheskii ocherk*/A linguistic essay, and in 1983, with the subtitle of the 1958 edition.
- 12 Pym (2014) suggested that Charles Bally (*Traité de Stylistique française*, 1909/1951) could be the link between Fedorov and Vinay and Darbelnet. What about the interest of the linguist Lucien Tesnière in translation, as early as the years 1925–30, especially from Slovenia?
- 13 Remember also that *The Index Translationum*, launched in 1932, has been managed by UNESCO since 1946 and that the international organization has launched a programme of translations of representative works (1948–2005), the collection bringing together more than a thousand titles. The role of Roger Caillois, translator of Borges and Octavio Paz, in this database and collection cannot be underestimated; he had been appointed a senior official of UNESCO in 1948. Other thinkers, not related to the teaching of languages and literature, such as Maurice Leenhardt (who published notes on translation in 1922), Jean Paulhan, Michel Leiris and Maurice Blanchot, also multiply remarks on translation based on

their experiences in New Caledonia, Madagascar, Ethiopia, Mali and so on. This ethnographic contribution announces the problem of ‘intraduisibilité’ (cf. Mounin) and criticisms of ethnocentric translation (cf. Berman). We thus arrive at the dawn of the 1950s that did not come out of nowhere, not to mention the effects of the internationalization of trade, the Marshall Plan and the nascent Americanization after the Second World War.

- 14 Eurocentrism cannot be replaced by Afrocentrism, Sinocentrism or Americanocentrism, because all centrism, including that of the colonized, establishes a hierarchy, excludes, limits, divides the world into blocs, races and so on.

References

- Albrecht, J. (2016), ‘Reflections on Translation in Latin Countries from Leonardo Bruni (1420) to José Ortega y Gasset (1937). An Overview of the Prehistory of Romance Translation Studies’, in J. Albrecht and R. Métrich (eds), *Manuel de traductologie*, 28–45, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Baer, J. B. ed. (2011), *Contexts, Subtexts, and Pretexts. Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Baer, J. B. (2021), *Fedorov’s Introduction to Translation Theory* (Vvedenie v teoriuu pervoda, 1953), trans. J. B. Baer and R. Green, London: Routledge.
- Baer, J. B. and N. Olshanskaya, eds (2013), *Russian Writers on Translation. An Anthology*, Manchester: St Jerome.
- Baker, M. and G. Saldanha, eds (1998), *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge.
- Baker, M. and G. Saldanha, eds (2009), *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Second Edition*, London: Routledge.
- Balliu, C. (1979), ‘Tendances actuelles de la traduction en Union Soviétique’, *Equivalences*, 10 (1–2): 45–8.
- Balliu, C. (2003), *Louis Leboucher dit Georges Mounin*, Bruxelles: Ed. du Hazard.
- Balliu, C. (2005), ‘Clefs pour une histoire de la traductologie soviétique’, *Meta*, 50 (3): 934–48.
- Bennett, K. (2013), ‘English as a Lingua Franca in Academia. Combating Epistemicide through Translator Training’, *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 7 (2): 169–93.
- Bennett, K. and R. Queiros de Barros, eds (2017), *International English and Translation*, special issue of *The Translator*, 23 (4).
- Bończa Bukowski, P. and M. Heydel, eds (2019), *Polish Translation Studies in Action. A Reader*, Bern: Peter Lang.
- Bushmanova, N., ed. (1997), *Russian Translation Studies*, special issue of *Perspectives*, 5 (1).
- Cary, E. (1957), ‘Théories soviétiques de la traduction’, *Babel*, 3 (4): 179–90.

- Cary, E. (1959), Book review: 'Andréi Fedorov: Introduction à la théorie de la traduction', *Babel*, 5 (1): 19–20.
- Cary, E. (1985 [1958]), *Comment faut-il traduire?*, Lille: PU de Lille.
- Ceccherelli, A., L. Costantino and C. Didi, eds (2015), *Translation Theories in the Slavic Countries*, Salerno: Europa Orientalis.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2009), *Provincialiser l'Europe: la pensée postcoloniale et la différence historique*, trans. O. Ruchet and N. Vieillescazes, Paris: Éd. Amsterdam.
- Chalvin, A. (2011), 'Comment écrire une histoire aréale de la traduction?', in A. Chalvin, A. Lange and D. Monticelli (eds), *Between Cultures and Texts. Entre cultures et textes*, 77–86, Bern: Peter Lang.
- Chalvin, A., J.-L. Muller, K. Talviste and M. Vrinat-Nikolv, eds (2019), *Histoire de la traduction littéraire en Europe médiane, des origines à 1989*, Rennes: PU de Rennes.
- Chan Tak-hung, L. (2004), *Twentieth-Century Chinese Translation Theory. Modes, issues and debates*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chukovsky, K. and A. Fedorov, eds (1930), *Iskusstvo perevoda* (The Art of Translation), Moscow: Academia.
- D'hulst, L. (2022), 'About the History of Translation Studies as a Discipline', in C. Rundle (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Translation History*, 3–22, London: Routledge.
- D'hulst, L. and Y. Gambier, eds (2018), *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dmitrienko, G. (2015), 'Vers une science de la traduction? Contextes idéologiques, politiques et institutionnels du développement de la Théorie Linguistique de la Traduction en Russie soviétique (1922-1991)', MA thesis, Université de Montréal.
- Dmitrienko, G. (2019), 'Redefining Translation Spaces in the Soviet Union: From Revisionist Policies to a Conformist Translation Theory (1919-1950)', *TTR*, 32 (1): 205–29.
- Dmitrienko, G. (2021), 'La théorie linguistique de la traduction comme "programme de recherche": profil historique, disciplinaire épistémique et institutionnel de la traductologie russe contemporaine', PhD thesis, University of Montreal.
- Etkind, E. (1967), 'La stylistique comparée, base de l'art de traduire', *Babel*, 13 (1): 23–30.
- Etkind, E. (1982), *Un art en crise. Essai de poétique de la traduction poétique*, Geneva: l'Age d'homme.
- Fedorov, A. (1930), 'Priemy i zadachi khudozhestvennogo perevoda' (Devices and objectives of Literary Translation), in K. Chukovskiy and A. Fedorov (eds), *Iskusstvo perevoda* (The Art of Translation), 87–235, Moscow: Academia.
- Fedorov, A. (1941), *O khudozhestvennom perevoda* (On literary translation), Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura.
- Fedorov, A. (1953), *Vvedenie v teoriyu perevoda* (Introduction to translation theory), Moscow: Izdatelstvo literatury na inostrannykh iazykakh.

- Fedorov, A. (1958), *Vvedenie v teoriu perevoda (Lingvisticheskie problemy)* (Introduction to translation theory (Linguistic problems)), Moscow: Izdatelstvo literatury na inostrannykh iazykakh.
- Fedorov, A. (1974 [1927]), 'The Problem of verse Translation', *Linguistics*, 12 (137): 13–30.
- Fernández Vernet, E. (1995), '1950-1985: La escuela soviética de traducción (I)', *Sendebarr*, 6: 53–72.
- Fernández Vernet, E. (1996), '1950-1985: La escuela soviética de traducción (y II): el modelo comunicativo de Zinaida Lvóvskaya', *Sendebarr*, 7: 21–38.
- Gambier, Y. (2023a), 'Jalons pour une historiographie de l'aire traductologique francophone', *Między Oryginałem a Przekładem*, 29 (2) and (3) (in two parts).
- Gambier, Y. (2023b), 'La traductologie au contact de la sociolinguistique', in F. Laroussi (ed.), *Jean-Baptiste Marcellesi. Le sociolinguiste, le pionnier, l'homme*, 135–53, Louvain-la-Neuve: EME éditions.
- Gambier, Y. and L. van Doorslaer (2016), 'Disciplinary Dialogue with Translation Studies', in Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer (eds), *Border Crossings. Translation Studies and other Disciplines*, 1–21, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Garbovskiy, N. (2012), 'Science of Translation Today: Change of Scientific Paradigm', *Meta*, 57 (1): 48–66.
- Garbovskiy, N. (2016), 'La traductologie russe de la Révolution d'Octobre à la Russie post-soviétique', *Équivalences*, 43 (1–2): 31–86.
- Garbovskiy, N. (2021), 'Un siècle de traductologie russe', in L. D'hulst, M. Mariaule and C. Wecksteen-Quinio (eds), *Au cœur de la traductologie. Hommage à M. Ballard*, 99–118, Arras: Artois PU.
- Hansen, J. and S. Witt, eds (2016), *Contexts of Russian Literary Translation*, special issue of *Translation & Interpreting Studies* 11 (1).
- Holmes, J. (1972), 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies', paper given at the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Copenhagen 21–26.8.1972. First printed in Holmes, J. (1988), *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*, 67–80, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Kalnychenko, O. (2011), 'A Sketch of the Ukrainian History of Translation of the 1920s', in A. Chalvin, A. Lange and D. Monticelli (eds), *Between Cultures and Texts. Itineraries on Translation History*, 255–67, Bern: Peter Lang.
- Kalnychenko, O. and N. Kamovnikova (2019), 'Oleksandr Finkel on the Problem of Self-translation', *InTRAlinea* 21, https://www.intralinea.org/archive/article/oleksandr_finkel_on_the_problem_of_self_translation (accessed 14 May 2024).
- Kalnychenko, O. and L. Kolomyiets (2022), 'Translation in Ukraine during the Stalinist Period: Literary Translation Policies and Practices', in C. Rundle, A. Lange and D. Monticelli (eds), *Translation under Communism*, 141–72, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kamovnikova, N. (2019), *Made under Pressure: Literary Translation in the Soviet Union 1960–1991*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

- Kaźmierczak, M. (2021), 'Une théorie itinérante? La pensée traductologique occidentale dans la traduction russe. Réception éditoriale', *Romanica Wratislaviensia*, 58: 101–18.
- Klaudy, K., J. Lambert and A. Sohá, eds (1996), *Translation Studies in Hungary*, Budapest: Scholastica.
- Kolomijets, L. (2015), *Ukraiïnskyi khudozhnii pereklad ta perekladachi 1920–30-kh rokiv* [Ukrainian Literary Translation and Translators in the 1920s–30s]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (1989), 'Linguistic Translation Theory in the Soviet Union (1950–1980s): A Review', *Publications of the Institute of Interpretation and Translation*, 2.
- Leenhardt, M. (1922), 'Traduire du Nouveau Testament en langue primitive', *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 2: 193–218. Partly translated into English: 'Notes on Translating the New Testament into New Caledonian', *The Bible Translator*, 2 (1951): 97–105 and 145–52.
- L'Hermitte, R., ed. (1969), *La linguistique en URSS*, special issue of *Langages*, 4 (15).
- Loh, D. (1958), *Translation: Its Principles and Techniques*, Beijing: Times Publishing.
- Lygo, E. (2016), 'Between Ideology and Literature: Translation in the USSR during the Brezhnev Period', *Perspectives*, 24 (1): 48–58.
- Marcellesi, J.-B., ed. (1977), *Langage et classes sociales. Le marxisme*, special issue of *Langages*, 11 (46).
- Marcellesi, J.-B. et B. Gardin (1974), *Introduction à la sociolinguistique: la linguistique sociale*, Paris: Larousse.
- Monticelli, D. and A. Lange (2014), 'Translation and Totalitarianism: The Case of Soviet Estonia', *The Translator*, 20 (1): 95–111.
- Mounin, G. (1959), 'La notion de qualité en matière de traduction littéraire', *Babel*, 5 (2): 84–8. Reprinted in 1963 in E. Cary and R. W. Jumpelt (eds), *La qualité en traduction: actes du IIIème Congrès de la Fédération Internationale de Traducteurs (FIT) / Quality in translation: proceedings of the IIIrd Congress of the International Federation of Translators (FIT)*, 50–7, New York: Macmillan Company.
- Mounin, G. (1972), *La linguistique au 20^{ème} siècle*, Paris: P.U.F.
- Mounin, G. (1976 [1963]), *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Odrekhivska, I. (2021), 'Historiosophy of Translation. Reflecting on Ukrainian Translation Conceptualizations – From Franko to Maksym Strikha', in L. van Doorslaer and T. Naaijken (eds), *The Situatedness of Translation Studies*, 34–59, Leiden: Brill.
- Popa, I. (2010), *Traduire sous contraintes. Littérature et communisme. (1947–1989)*, Paris: CNRS éditions.
- Pym, A. (2014), 'Charles Bally and the Missing Equivalents', *Forum*, 12 (2): 45–63.
- Pym, A. and N. Ayvazyan (2015), 'The Case of the Missing Russian Translation Theories', *Translation Studies*, 8 (3): 321–41.

- Retsker, Y. I. (1950), 'O Zakonomernik Sootvetstviah pri Perevode na Rodnoy Yazik' (Regular conformities in the translation to the mother language), in K. A. Ganshina and I. Karpov (eds), *Teoria I Metodika Uchebnogo Perevoda* (The theory and method of translation in the learning process), 156–83, Moscow: Akademia Pedagogicheskikh Nauk, RSFSR.
- Retsker, Y. I. (2007 [1974]), *Teoria Perevoda i Perevodcheskoy Praktiki* (The theory and translational practice), Moscow: Mezhdunarodnie Otnosheniya.
- Robinson, D. (2014 [1997]), *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, London: Routledge.
- Rozentsveij, V., ed. (1992), *La traduction en Russie. Théorie et pratique*, special issue of *Meta*, 37 (1).
- Schippel, L. and C. Zwischenberger, eds (2017), *Going East: Discovering New and Alternative Traditions in Translation Studies*, Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Siever, H. (2010), *Übersetzen und Interpretation. Die Herausbildung der Übersetzungswissenschaft als eigenständige Disziplin im deutschen Sprachraum von 1960 bis 2000*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2007), 'Is Translation Studies going Anglo-Saxon? Critical Comments on the Globalization of a Discipline', in D. Gile, G. Hansen and N. Pokorn (eds), *Why Translation Matters*, 97–103, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steiner, G. (1975), *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strikha, M. (2006), *Ukrainian Belles-lettres Translation: Between Literature and Nation-making*, Kyiv: Fact Publishing House.
- Susam-Saraeva, Ş. (2017), 'In Search of an "International" Translation Studies: Tracing *Terceme* and *tercüme* in the Blogosphere', *Translation Studies*, 10 (1): 69–86.
- Taivalkoski-Shilov, K. (2021), 'La réception de la "pensée française" en Finlande: que nous enseignent les voix contextuelles des traductions de Barthes et Foucault', *Palimpsestes*, 35: 75–90.
- Tyulenev, S. (2018), *Translation and the Westernization of the Eighteenth Century Russia*, Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Vasserman, E. (2021), 'Andrei Fedorov's Theory of Translation and Its Place in the History of Translation Studies', PhD thesis, University of Leeds.
- Vasserman, E. (2023), 'Andrei Fedorov's Impact: A Scientometric Analysis', *Perspectives*, 31 January 2023, 1–17.
- Venuti, L. (2021 [1998]), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Vinay, J.-P. and J. Darbelnet (1958), *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*, Paris: Didier: Beauchemin.
- Wakabayashi, J. (2005), 'Translation in the East Asian Cultural Sphere. Share Roots, Divergent Paths', in E. Hung and J. Wakabayashi (eds), *Asian Translation Tradition*, 17–65, Manchester: St Jerome.

- Wakabayashi, J. (2012), 'Japanese Translation Historiography: Origins, Strengths, Weaknesses and Lessons', *Translation Studies*, 5 (2): 172–88.
- Zlateva, P., ed. (1993), *Translation as Social Action: Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
- Zwischenberger, C. (2023), 'On Turns and Fashions in Translation Studies and beyond', *Translation Studies*, 16 (1): 1–16.