

BAER, Brian James (2016): *Translation and the Making of Modern Russian Literature*. New York/London: Bloomsbury, 213 p.

Gleb Dmitrienko

Volume 62, numéro 1, avril 2017

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1040480ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1040480ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (imprimé)

1492-1421 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Dmitrienko, G. (2017). Compte rendu de [BAER, Brian James (2016): *Translation and the Making of Modern Russian Literature*. New York/London: Bloomsbury, 213 p.] *Meta*, 62(1), 233–235. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1040480ar>

construida sobre pilares argumentados para la resolución de conflictos, mientras que el segundo término del título alude a ese mismo proceso, pero en el que los interlocutores, siendo los mismos, traban una relación en la que los conceptos resultan útiles para el trabajo y la convivencia entre ellos. A Pain se le considera el padre de la biorretórica, disciplina nacida en la década de los noventa del siglo pasado.

El siguiente artículo, firmado por Frederik Stjernfelt, versa sobre las veintidós hipótesis básicas de la biosemiótica, disciplina fundada por Jesper Hoffmeyer, primer autor presente en la selección de textos de esta antología. El interés del texto de Stjernfelt radica en la claridad de la exposición sobre las ideas fundamentales en las teorías que propugna Hoffmeyer, por lo que consideramos un acierto el haber incluido la traducción por parte del equipo editorial y traductor, cuya encomiable labor va más allá de la traducción de unos textos ensayísticos y científicos. El producto del trabajo de los traductores es ser un auténtico puente no sólo lingüístico-cultural, metáfora que siempre se menciona, sino también ser fuente documental para posteriores investigaciones.

Otro de los artículos clarificadores sobre las disciplinas tratadas en la antología es el que escribe Marcel Danesi, «Hacia una terminología estándar para la (bio)semiótica». Este versa sobre la terminología básica para comprender el contenido de las ideas desarrolladas en la biosemiótica, justificándose en la frecuente inconsistencia terminológica que aqueja a la teoría semiótica y, consecuentemente, a las disciplinas derivadas de ella. El autor propone una serie de términos sustentados en la teoría de sistemas modelizantes que explica el comportamiento semiótico de las especies. De acuerdo con ello, propone los términos antroposemiótica, zoosemiótica y fitosemiótica.

El último de los textos seleccionado por la editora y el equipo traductor lo firma Mijail Lotman y lo titula «Umwelt y semiosfera». El autor comienza su exposición citando al ya mencionado Jakob von Uexküll y construye el contenido de su texto sobre la base de la semiótica cultural y las funciones de la semiosfera o «constructo compuesto por los textos, la razón y los sistemas modelizantes de una cultura».

Para finalizar, deseamos reiterar el valor del trabajo traductor, tanto del proceso como del producto, del equipo formado por la Dra. Silvia N. Barei, directora del grupo de investigación sobre Estudios de Retórica, Lic. Ana Inés Leunda y Prof. Ariel Gómez Ponce, coordinados por la editora de la antología Dra. María Inés Arrizabalaga. La labor mediadora de este equipo traductor amplía horizontes sobre disciplinas cuyas teorías, investigaciones y resultados podrían quedar oscurecidos en la

vastísima comunidad científica mundial de habla española de no haber sido por su encomiable y difícil trabajo de traducción de textos ensayísticos.

CRISTINA NAUPERT
Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid

NOTAS

1. Véase al respecto el estudio introductorio, en la edición crítica de Martino Alba, P. (2015), a la traducción de la obra narrativa cumbre de Rilke: *Los apuntes de Malte Laurids Brigge*, Madrid: Ed. Cátedra, col. Letras Universales.
2. Nombre artístico de Balthasar Klossowski.
3. Remitimos nuevamente al estudio introductorio citado en la primera nota a pie de página.

BAER, Brian James (2016): *Translation and the Making of Modern Russian Literature*. New York/London: Bloomsbury, 213 p.

In the era of total globalization, people of different cultures and religions, living in different countries and speaking different languages will always seek for the means of preservation of their national identities. The feeling of belonging, being part of a particular community is, according to Maslow (Maslow 1943), one of the basic human needs. Driven by this need of socialization, a human being is prone to look for the sense of security among the people who speak the same language and who share the same values which are usually embedded in particular social regulations and cultural artifacts, sometimes reinforced by different systems of beliefs. In the contemporary world of globalization and multiculturalism, with the traditional ethnic states becoming more and more obsolete, with the boundaries between different nations and cultures becoming more and more transparent, and with national languages eventually surrendering to “Globish,” people still struggle to preserve what makes them stand out as a nation and what constitutes the core of their national identities: their native language, their national historical and cultural heritage.

When it comes to preservation of national identities, cultures and languages, it seems obvious that the leading role here belongs to national literatures which can be seen as tribunals of “national spirit,” metaphoric sanctuaries of what any particular community considers valuable. For the sake of preservation and promotion, the values get embedded into comprehensive literary forms and then passed from one generation to another. However, given that “communities are to be distinguished...by the style in which they are imagined” (Anderson 1991: 6), it becomes

obvious that national identities can only be seen in contrast of translation as it exposes what can and what cannot be “carried over.” An example of such investigation, situating the origins of the Russian national identity in translation and imitation which played a crucial role in the making of the Russian national literature throughout the 19th-20th centuries, may be seen in the recent monograph of Brian James Baer *Translation and the Making of Modern Russian Literature*.

Speaking about the necessity to examine the Russian national literature and, by extension, its national identity, through the lens of translation, Baer explains his choice of research methodology by the fact that translation, being “hybrid in its core” (Hermans 2010: 210) fully corresponds to the intrinsic hybridity of Russian culture. The “belatedness” Russian nation-building project led by the non-Russian cosmopolitan elite as well as the internal otherness of different nations constituting multiethnic Russian Empire (p. 6) – those are the main characteristics of Russian dual identity which can be reduced to the oxymoronic combination of phrases “imperial nation” (Clowes 2011: 70) within the “empire of nations” (Hirsch 2005). Ironically, the intrinsic ability of Russian culture to absorb alien elements and to transform them into domestic artifacts (Wachtel 1999: 57) has made it possible to build up a unique Russian nationhood and make it the core of the multiethnic but monolingualized empire (p. 13-14). Here Baer makes a remarkable observation that it was translation that has become the main tool for building and sustaining the hybridity of Russian national identity. A playground of imitation of French and German romanticists, translation rapidly developed into a workshop where Russian national literature, and by extension, its national culture and identity were called to existence. Comparatively weak in its “belatedness,” Russian literature reevaluated imitation as “following the steps of genius” (Pushkin 1836/1986: 401) and evolved towards the rejection of the Western cult of original authorship which resulted in the appropriation, adaptation and integration of translated texts into the monolingualized Russian culture if they had been originally created by Russian authors. As Belinsky puts it, “translations into Russian belong to Russian literature” (Belinsky 1838/2013: 31).

Having set the research objectives in revisiting “a transnational history of Russian literature by rereading Russia’s rich literary culture through the lens of translation,” Baer seeks to prove his hypotheses that “translation has always been in the center of Russian thinking about literary production and national identity” (p. 16). To do so, the author adopts the methodology of mixed analysis of literary representations of translators and their works,

whether translated or genuine, together with the critical overview of actual translational tendencies at various historical moments throughout the 19th-20th centuries. Thus, besides presenting his vision of the making of Russian literature and, by extension, Russian national identity, Baer also presents his reader with an interesting and prospective methodology which implies full integration of the problematics of translation into the study of literature and culture (p. 16). As a method, these commented “micro-histories,” rather than simple retraction of the history of translation, in the author’s own opinion, is quite close to that adopted by Naomi Seidman and referred to as “translation stories” which embed translation as “the material, political, cultural, or historical circumstances of its production, that it in fact represents an unfolding of these conditions” (Seidman 2006: 9).

In terms of content, the book contains seven “micro-histories” which altogether cover almost two centuries of literary production in Russia, namely the most productive and controversial periods in the history of Russian national literature – the 19th and the 20th centuries. Although, placed in a rough chronological order, the essays do not pretend to be either a history of literary production, or a history of translation in Russia. Instead, the book delivers the author’s thoughts on how the actual tendencies in translation were carried over and adapted to the needs of the Russian imperial and nation-building project as well as to its intrinsic duality. All this together with the hybrid research methodology makes the book, which was initially meant for Slavists and Translation Studies scholars (p. 20), also appealing to those interested in Literary and Cultural Studies.

Starting with the analysis of translation as “a highly-politicized practice that was “safer” than original writing” (p. 17) in the context of propagation of revolutionary thoughts in the early 19th century (Chapter 1), the author presents his reader with the examples of mistranslation (Chapter 2) and language slips (Chapter 3) while pondering their roles in imperial and national discourse and presenting both as a result of split identity of the Russian cosmopolitan elite. Further discussion about the role of translation in the making of Russian literature reveals “a complex cultural positioning in regard to foreign cultural values” (p. 19) such as gender (Chapter 4), subjectivity (Chapter 5) and general acceptance of gay (Chapter 6) and post-modern (Chapter 7) culture. Gradual appropriation of liberal Western values by the cosmopolitan Russian culture in fact continues the Petrine tradition of Westernization of Russia. However, in the case of literary production, this Westernization took the form of progressive liberalization rather than forced cultural conversion.

The hybridity of translation as a practice of “safe” engaged writing, as remarkably depicted by Baer in his “micro-stories,” made it possible to establish certain continuities of the discourse on the role of translator in the making of a national literature as well as on the constructive role of translation in different national and imperial projects.

GLEB DMITRIENKO

Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada

REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, Benedict (1991): *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- BELINSKY, Vissarion (1838/2013): Vissarion Belinsky (1811-1848). In: Brian James BAER and Natalia OLSHANSKAYA, eds. *Russian Writers on Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome: 31-39.
- CLOWES, Edith W. (2011): *Russia on the Edge. Imagined Geographies and Post-Soviet Identity*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- HERMANS, Theo (2010): The Translator's voice in Translated Narrative. In: Mona BAKER, ed. *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge: 193-212.
- HIRSCH, Francine (2005): *Empire of Nations. Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- MASLOW, Abraham H. (1943): A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*. 50(4):370-396.
- PUSHKIN, Alexander (1836/1986): In: Tatiana WOLFF, ed. *Pushkin on Litterature*. (translated from the Russian by Tatiana WOLFF). Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- SEIDMAN, Naomi (2006): *Faithful Renderings. Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- WACHTEL, Andrew (1999): Translation, Imperialism and National Self-definition in Russia. *Public Culture*. 11(1):49-73.
- GALLEGO-HERNÁNDEZ, Daniel, (ed.) (2015): *Current Approaches to Business and Institutional Translation – Proceedings of the International Conference on Economic, Business, Financial and Institutional Translation/Enfoques actuales en traducción económica e institucional – Actas del congreso internacional de traducción económica, comercial, financiera e institucional*. Bern: Peter Lang, 254 p.

Cet ouvrage réunit des articles qui ont été soumis à un comité scientifique et évalués par des pairs à la suite du premier colloque international ICEBFIT qui s'est tenu à Alicante en Espagne du 29 au 31 mai 2014. L'ouvrage est publié sous la

direction de Daniel Gallego-Hernández, président du comité organisateur du Colloque et professeur au Département de traduction et d'interprétation de l'Université d'Alicante. L'ouvrage compte une vingtaine d'articles courts d'au plus une dizaine de pages, rédigés en espagnol, en anglais et en français.

En premier lieu, Armando Valdés Aumente présente trois grands avantages de la spécialisation en traduction économique, commerciale et financière comme traducteur salarié d'un organisme du secteur de spécialisation: le fait de faire partie d'une équipe de traducteurs (et notamment de recevoir une rétroaction sur son travail); la valorisation de la formation qui découle de l'importance accordée à la qualité des traductions; et l'immersion dans l'environnement du domaine de spécialisation (proximité des spécialistes et des utilisateurs des traductions). Izaskun Fuentes Milani Orkwis donne des conseils pour commencer à travailler à la pige pour une grande institution internationale et pour rester ensuite sur sa liste des fournisseurs de prédilection («la liste des A»). Quelques *trucs* simples et utiles sont fournis, tant sur le plan professionnel, la pratique du doute méthodique, la vérification des termes, et même du sexe des personnes citées dans les textes, la lecture attentive du site Web de l'institution, comment ajouter de la valeur à son travail (en acceptant de nouveaux délais, par exemple), etc., que sur le plan administratif et commercial comme le calcul des délais et des honoraires, l'envoi du curriculum vitae et les communications avec l'institution cliente.

Dans le contexte de la traduction juridique du français et de l'espagnol au polonais, Agnieszka Konowska puise dans son expérience de traductrice assermentée (une pratique professionnelle que l'on appelle au Québec la traduction de documents officiels) différents exemples de déplacement du *Skopos* ou de la finalité de la traduction qui peuvent provenir d'un conflit d'intérêts entre le demandeur d'une traduction et l'institution publique qui est aussi le destinataire ou l'utilisateur de la traduction. Pour résoudre ces difficultés de traduction particulières (la présence d'éléments dans le document source que ne souhaite pas traduire le demandeur, ou dont la traduction est exigée par l'administration publique, la traduction des timbres et des sceaux, la non-traduction des titres et des diplômes, la présence de termes d'une troisième langue dans le document source, etc.), l'auteure fait part des règles de déontologie et des pratiques professionnelles que doivent suivre les professionnels de la traduction.

Emmanuelle Pensac présente une analyse de corpus de rapports de développement durable publiés par les entreprises pour les besoins de l'organisme *International Global Reporting Initiative*. L'auteure analyse les collocations du