

Current State of the Slovak Thinking on Translation

MÁRIA KUSÁ

Institute of World Literature

The Slovak thinking on translation at the end of the twentieth century naturally carries with it traditions of these reflections from previous decades. What were these decades like? And what, on the other hand, has changed in the last decade?

In regard to (also) an international prestige of the Slovak thinking on translation, mainly the Popovič school which experienced a considerable flowering in the 1970s and 1980s, the domestic evaluations of the state of this thinking in the Slovak cultural milieu have multiplied in the last years, either out of an understandable effort to produce a *fin de siècle* summarization¹, or in an attempt to confront it with the current thinking about the language, word, discourse, translation, literary studies...” of- tentimes in the sense of pragmatic, e.g. didactic purpose.² Each of these evaluative and summarising principles, each of these approaches to the “history of translatology” is legitimate. Therefore I would like to try to: A. briefly characterise the place and importance of each of them, including its significance for further theoretical and historiographic endeavours; my aim in the second part of this reflection will be to attempt to B. consider the fact that - hypothetically - what differs in the research into translation as a process, product as well as concept, in the previous decades in the Slovak tradition as well as at present, is the way of determining the subject of research and, associated with it, methods of its analysis.

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE APPROACHES TO THE SLOVAK “HISTORY OF TRANSLATOLOGY”

The first approach formulated in the Slovak translatalogical community is **1. the principle of a certain summary of the state of the art**, seen as a starting point for further research as well as a certain measure of self-reflection. It manifested itself perhaps most strikingly in the final shape of *Anthology of Slovak Thinking on Translation 1. Chimera of Translating* (*Antológia slovenského myslenia o preklade 1. Chiméra prekladania*, 1999). In spite of the formulated “otherness, novelty” of the interpretive approach, explicitly formulated in the introductory essay by D. Sabolová, the selection is perhaps the most traditional, apparently also with respect to the nature of the published essays: if one speaks about “translation, translating”, one implicitly understands by this that what is called, maybe not entirely rightly and legitimately, but rather simplistically, artistic translation – the translation of artistic/literary texts.

“Development” – a concept, a word whose enchanting strength as if forced us to think about the changes of quality in the sense of moving from a less ideal to a more ideal, to something proceeding in the spirit of a certain line which is closest to some of the ideas of the concept, phenomenon, process. Like in previous decades, also nowadays several tendencies operate simultaneously in various areas of literary studies as well as translatology, drawing in their analysis of translation either primarily on the mastering of the “matter”, the texture, or moving to the idea of translation as such. Also in Slovak translatology both of these approaches are creative, and even complementary.

Studies making up the mentioned selection *Chimera of Translating* deal with an approach to the translation seen not only as concept, category of the system, not only with a perception of the translation as a process (the issue of a serial translation), but also with particular parts, elements, phenomena of this process (translation of non-standard lexis, etc.).

Another possible reason, the second motivation behind the reflection of the existing, or at least previous, time of Slovak translatology is **2. the effort to confront it with current thinking about the language, word, discourse, translation, literary studies...**, potentially in this sense to formulate its hiatuses, inaccuracies, and questions put through them.

Since the 1990s this has been done especially by B. Suwara, also due to her Cracow (i.e. Polish) philological and philosophical training, from the position of a person less “saturated” by Popovič, Miko as well as Felix, Jesenská, Ferencík, etc. Her works are “specifically” situated in the Slovak thinking on translation, specifically reflecting and commenting on this thinking: they not only originate in the Slovak cultural milieu and for a Slovak addressee, but “do not avoid” the not very explicitly formulated, by Slovak researchers, reflection of Popovič either (because it is this “historical section” of the Slovak translatalogical research which is in question). The “Polish” element is manifested in her attempt to reconstruct central questions of the Popovič’s texts to which the author is trying to find an answer. These are the questions which, as a result of historical and other circumstances, are put very rarely, or never at all, by the Slovak environment. It is no coincidence that B. Suwara’s several essays, including the one in question – *On the Boundary of Two Epistemes. From a Linguistic Understanding of Translation to the Semiologic One* (Na rozhraní dvoch epistém. Od lingvistického chápania prekladu k semiologickému, 2003: 17–44), were becoming at the turn of the millennia subject of (also) polemic attitudes resulting from her “daring” to reflect the offered solutions, context and applications of the work of A. Popovič and his followers. From a certain temporary (as well as non-insignificant spatial) distance, Suwara could see clearer outlines of theoretical as well as historical relationships of the Slovak translation theory in the period of the 1960s – 1990s, the motivations of origin, the formulation as well as real fulfilment of individual concepts.

A critical intonation thus proves to be a distinctively stimulating and inspirational impulse which is perceived and creatively processed by the Slovak (F. Koli, E. Gromová, B. Hochel, A. Keníž) as well as foreign reflection (Polish, Czech). Again, in a part of Slovak translatalogical public opinion several Suwara’s findings – related to the nature of Popovič’s as well as Popovič-inspired research: especially problematis-

ing the expectations of a “new higher synthesis” in the translational research, an excessive closeness of the theoretical system not allowing a natural problematising of conceptual starting points, oftentimes almost contradictory explanations of concepts and phenomena – have become as if a “public property” or an explicitly unformulated inspiration. If we are thus to summarise the contribution of Suwara’s reflections for further ways of the Slovak context, we have to say that it is her reading of the subject in a wider context of contemporary as well as present translational, literary theoretical, culturological and philosophical efforts. They are one of the sources of her sceptical view of present possibilities, of present application of a global “process of theoretical thinking whose character, aims and language have significantly changed” in favour of the reflection of partial problems in pragmatic relationships.

Another not insignificant form of the confrontation, even though not an explicit one, of the Slovak thinking on translation with the current thinking on language, word, discourse, translation, and literary studies is the publication *Thinking on Translation* (Myslenie o preklade, 2007), even if at first glance it seems to answer to a contrary purpose – to familiarise the Slovak cultural milieu with foreign conceptions of perceiving, interpreting and analysing the translation.

The third motivation to summarise the ways of Slovak translology is **a need** – especially for didactic purposes – **to re-formulate certain starting points of further concrete work with the text of the original and translation.** In the text from the 1990s, mentioned above, E. Gromová (1998, 7–13) claimed that translology “has constituted itself as an integrated discipline on an international scale as late as in the 1980s”, after a pre-preparation phase of the 1960s and 1970s. She maintains that in Slovakia it meant that after the “analytical-interpretive” approach to the translated text of the Felix provenance, a conception of artistic translation on the “basis of the theory of communication” elaborated by A. Popovič gets established; Popovič based the description and evaluation of this confrontation on F. Miko’s works devoted to thematic analysis and stylistics; their efforts were theoretically elaborated and synthesised in the common publication *Production and Reception* (Tvorba a recepcia, 1978). Popovič himself summarised his journey and the journey of his school theoretically in his *Theory of Literary Translation* (Teória umeleckého prekladu, 1975) as well as in the efforts to present the discipline’s own language – in the interpretive dictionary *Original/Translation* (Originál/Preklad, 1983).

As the 1980s contribution to Slovak translology is considered, by E. Gromová, the Vilikovský’s monograph *Translation as Creation* (Preklad ako tvorba, 1984), synthesising “bi-polarity of the translation opposition of the ‘aesthetics from the above’ and the ‘aesthetics from the bottom’.” Drawing basically on the semiotic-communication theory, Vilikovský pays great attention to the reader of the translation, as well as understands language in translation non-simplistically – as a carrier of non-linguistic, aesthetic, cultural and social meanings.” Immediately after the first edition of this text there emerged reviews which highlighted the Vilikovský’s book as being complementary in its relation to the previous, predominantly “theoretical”, texts of A. Popovič or F. Miko. D. Slobodník has remarked that at the turn of the 1950s and 1960s Slovak translation studies “...began to crystallise in the same ‘starting block’ as the theory of translation in the rest of the world and did not have, right from the be-

gining, to catch up with others...”, and pointed out what most suited to his conception of looking at translation – i.e. that it is already a book’s name what “gives a true picture of the nature of translating, its creativity“, since “concentration on the process of translation, on the phase between the prototext and metatext (in the Popovičov terminology) may substantially contribute to the understanding of translation as a creative act and to the identification of the regularities of the translation process, concretised in the final text.” Like other contemporary as well as later Vilikovský’s reviewers and critics, also Slobodník maintains that the “concentration on the translation process, on its phases (the author sums them up into subchapters *A. Interpretation; B. Conception; C. Reproduction of the original*, op. cit., p. 96–129), , is an appropriate and necessary completing of A. Popovič’s communication conception which was focused on other important elements of the original and translation context.” Dušan Slobodník (Institute of Literary Studies of Slovak Academy of Sciences) has duplicated his opinion on Vilikovský’s place in the Slovak translatology of the mid 1980s also in his survey essay *Translation Theories in our Country After 1945* (Teórie prekladu u nás po roku 1945): “The Vilikovský’s book defines translation as a reproduction of invariant information, though also for him the information does not have only semantic parameters, but a formal side of the text is composed in it as well. Vilikovský thus defends a complex, maximalistic approach to the original...” Praising the meaning of the chapter *Translation as a Process*, he emphasised its continuity with E. Nida and J. Levý.

A generation younger translologist Braňo Hochel (Faculty of Arts, Comenius University) has pointed also to the fact that: “...a hidden ‘stream’ of the whole book is the consciousness of translation as a cultural fact, as an equal and often also initiating value ... of literature, culture...” and has confirmed it by Vilikovský’s aphoristic statement of the meaning of translation in the Slovak cultural milieu: “Through translation a culture becomes aware of itself.”

A basically similar tone can be found, with an almost twenty year distance, in Bogumiła Suwara’s (2003) reflection: “The Slovak translation theory of the late 1970s and 1980s is characteristic by the fact that it is dominated first of all by practitioners (Feldek, Hečko) or theorising practitioners (Ferenčík, Turčány, Rybák, Vilikovský, Slobodník, Hochel).” And Suwara emphasises Vilikovský’s position as a „non-a priori” one: “A more attentive reading of their books shows that in the given period a partial (mostly non-polemic) correction of most apparent ‘Popovič’s’ a priori statements and simplifications was on the agenda”. In her opinion, Vilikovský’s was an attempt at an interesting and fruitful dialogue with the Popovič inspired system. He does not argue with his apriorism directly, but through historical interpretation of principal concepts (function of the language, communication, equivalence, shift, etc.). Suwara observes a “change in the overall atmosphere”, which is documented by the name of the books of the above quoted authors, when “...they signalise both a departure from the ‘clear’ theory and an effort to bring it closer to a concrete, even personal translating practice, as well as a departure from a ‘total Popovič’s interpretation’ to the reflection of partial problems in the ‘adventure’ of translation as creation.” The scholar highlights Vilikovský’s conception of translation as creation, seeing its importance “...in the implicit hinting of the necessity to move from an ‘a priori

normative episteme' to an 'episteme of dialogue' which is capable of a more truthful capturing of nuances, of the nature of probability and dialogism of the creation in translating as an unending search for new solutions, further in making the cultural and historical context of translating more real..." Detailed analyses of the Slovak thinking on translation also allowed Suwara to make a summarising statement: "Vilikovský – even though only passively – stakes out a road to a more modern and finer understanding of the semiosis of translation..." (Gromová, 1998: 7–13).

The aspect of "personableness" as well as a high measure of the operability of Vilikovský's publication has resonated even after a distance of almost two decades during the second – so far only Czech edition of the monograph *Překlad jako tvorba* (2002). With respect to the pragmatic use of Vilikovský's findings, references to his work appeared in translational reflections (especially the didactically oriented ones) at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty first century. As a pars pro toto one can mention not only the above quoted *Interpretation in the Process of Translation* by Edita Gromová (*Interpretácia v procese prekladu*, 1996), or *Translatological Dictionary* by Milan Hrdlička (*Translatologický slovník*, 2002), but also the monograph of a translationalist from Eastern Slovakia M. Andričík *On the Poetics of Artistic Translation* (*K poetike umeleckého prekladu*, 2004) and several studies from the proceedings *Translation and Interpreting and Its Didactic Transformation* (*Preklad a tlmočenie a jeho didaktická transformácia*, Valcerová, A. ed., 2005) from the same part of the country.

Gromová thus sees the tendencies of the 1980s in the Czecho-Slovak context as a movement "from a general theory of translation based on semiotic and communication principles (Ilek, Hrdlička, Popovič) to the stylistics of translation (Miko, Hausenblas), to versology (Turčány, Slobodník, Hvišč, Válková, Vilikovský, Feldek, Bacigálová), to the translation – original relation (Ďurišin), and to the history of translation (Vlašínová, Panovová, Lesňáková)." During three decades, the list of translationalists aimed at versological analysis has undergone a significant change; alongside the works of A. Valcerová, M. Andričík, O. Kovačičová or A. Eliáš (i.e. the Prešov or Bratislava "university based" translationalists), it is dominated especially by exact analytical reflections of J. Zambor.

The translational texts of the 1990s: B. Hochel's monograph *Translation and Communication* (*Preklad ako komunikácia*) and the proceedings-homage to A. Popovič entitled *Metatext and Translation* (*Metatext a preklad*) is already interpreted by Gromová as a clear confrontation of the traditional Popovič-inspired theory with complements and evaluative attitudes to individual problems (status of translation theory, situating of Popovič's theory in literary studies and social sciences per se, history of translation and history of national literature, status of translation criticism, and so on).

Gromová rounds off this pragmatically motivated, though quite a complex, summary of the Slovak thinking on translation of the second half of the twentieth century by a description of translational activities in the Slovak Academy of Sciences, at its Institute of World Literature. She mentions theoretical and applicatory works in which, as she claims, "is reflected the Popovič-based tradition presented through a reception aspect". How can one, in fact, "read" current debates of various Slovak (including the above mentioned) reflections on translation?

II. ON DETERMINING THE RESEARCH SUBJECT OF CURRENT SLOVAK TRANSLATOLOGICAL EFFORTS

At the beginning of these reflections I have expressed a hypothesis that “what differs in the research into translation as a process, product as well as concept, in the previous decades in the Slovak tradition as well as at present, is the way of determining the subject of research and, associated with it, methods of its analysis”.

Let me mention, in this respect, the activities of Ján Zambor explicitly materialised in the book *Translation as Art* (Preklad ako umenie, 2000), aiming at the questions connected with Slovak translation concretisations of poetic texts. The author has consciously situated the book into a line of the above mentioned publications written by Slovak translatoLOGISTS working at the faculty of Arts of Comenius University in the 1980s and 1990s - J. Vilikovský: *Translation as Creation*, B. Hochel: *Translation as Communication*. A greater methodological closeness to Vilikovský can be read in the name which, in the case of both of them, underlines creativity, production... as a *conditio sine qua non* of artistic translation. The name is, at the same time, a reminder of continuity with the analogical translatoLOGICAL starting points of J. Levý and his book *Art of Translation* (Umění prekladu, last edition in 1983), as well as with the reflections of, perhaps, the most fruitful Slovak translator of the 20th century Zora Jesenská, summarising her translation practice.

J. Zambor brings essential opinions on the translation of poetic texts in the field of translatology that is not taken up by anybody, even in the Slovak environment traditionally favourable to the thinking on translation. As an exception from the rule one can consider the work of poets/translators/translatoLOGISTS growing up from the Prešov cultural background – the above mentioned H. Valcerová-Bacigálová, L. Šimon or M. Andričík, the Romance studies scholar L. Franek, and Russian studies scholars O. Kovačičová and A. Eliáš. Zambor formulates his approach as a “movement in the space of comparative poetics”, as “problematic probes into the poetics of translated poetry”, including into poetics also the “semantic sphere.”

A measure of argument was hinted already in the book’s name, and is also articulated in its introductory words through an almost aphoristically formulated author’s view of the development of Slovak translatology: “One cannot get rid of a feeling of a certain snobbery of some (...) cultivators of theory, of an unwillingness to ‘dirty one’s hands’ by practical translation,” says the author who openly admits that his way of thinking will be to think about translation from the aspect of the “poetics of excellent acts of translation”. He claims that the 1970s and 1980s theory “did not provide a satisfactory answer to the question of how, in fact, Slovak poets translate.” From this point of view, the answer to the question is not provided by current translatology either; the formulation of the questions results, however, into another authorial imperative: Zambor perceives translated poetry as part of the Slovak poetic context, and not taking into account their mutual status is for him – in the case of poetic translation - unacceptable. Self-reflecting on the chosen method, Zambor polemically distinguishes himself against the “communicational” understanding of translation and claims for his own the J. Levý’s aspect of translatoLOGICAL reflections which makes relative, so to say, the “usefulness” of the translation theory (the Levý’s question and, at the same time, the name of an essay *Will the Theory of Translation Be Useful to*

Translators?), as well as the Viličkovský's approach as translational reflections originating in the translation practice and making an arch to get back to it. The Zambor's compact conception of poetry translation is open for discussion, polemic. Even if it seems that the analyses of translator solutions are rather, as far as reception is concerned, an exclusive matter, the contrary is true. The book may be read as a "history of Slovak post-war poetic translation", as "portraits of Slovak poets-translators", as a "dictionary of the Slovak thinking on poetic translation." This aspect projected itself to the subject index of the book which does not have, or aspires to have, a normative, but rather a summarising character.

The reception and translation of foreign literatures in the context of Slovak culture from theoretical and historical aspects have been, in recent years, analysed especially at the Institute of World Literature of the Slovak academy of Sciences. It is this workplace where one can find a creative and scholarly polemic with the existing conceptions of translation theory (A. Popovič, the Nitra School), where, like in the Nitra Centre and in collaboration with it (regarding the publishing as well), the staff analyse, comment on, and discuss conceptions of the reflection of translation (the literary-historical and general theoretical), not avoiding the foreign ones (especially French, Anglo-Saxon, Polish, and Russian).

The problems of reception and translation of foreign literatures was first tackled in the Institute through the analyses of translation reception in Slovakia in its social, religious, cultural and literary coordinates, or through the analyses of the conceptions of translating, its strategies and poetics (P. Winczer, E. Panovová, S. Lesňáková, E. Maliti, M. Žitný). In 1995 - 1998 the research focus shifted to the formulation of concrete history of foreign literatures – to their translation and reception form – as well as to a more complex general reflection of the processes associated with translating and reception of foreign texts (J. Koška, L. Vajdová, B. Suwara).

Resulting from the current state of the art, the second half of the 1990s witnessed a research shift towards a more complex theoretical (defining function, place and status of reception and translation of foreign literatures) and historical (formulating concrete reception and translation destinies of individual literatures) reflection of the problems. Volumes of the edition *A Brief History of Artistic Translation* (*Stručné dejiny umeleckého prekladu*), as an expression of cultural situation in its historical development, have already served the public as study and teaching texts, and as the new (resulting from a long-term concrete research) naming of important phenomena, processes and concepts, and provide a possibility to fill in the so far unexamined places which helped influence a constitution of the nation's culture and even nowadays participate in the creation of its current shape.

It was this aspect which, at the end of the twentieth century, became relevant in the "historic" reflection on translation. The historicity of the academic (SAS) reflections on translation results primarily from the traditions of the Ďurišín-based and reception research which affected the nature of research into foreign literatures in this institution in the 1970s and 1980s, but, at the same time, is aware of the impulses and incentives of foreign translatology (T. Hermans), sociology of culture (P. Bourdieu), etc.

I will try to provide a brief summary of a collective experience of research into history of translation in the form of individual, so far unpublished, volumes from the

edition *A Brief History of Artistic Translation in Slovakia*. The reflection of the problems of translation in the 1990s and early 2000s in the Institute of World Literature perceives translation and translated literature as modelled by: 1. national political system (history, economic situation, political orientation, political tendencies, ideology, etc.); 2. socio-cultural system (ideology, culture, cultural policy, character of culture – imposed/democratic, national/cosmopolitan, open/closed, ideological filter, propaganda and translation, caesura, denomination and translation, literary and cultural traditions in relation to “other” literatures and cultures, commitment, publishing policy, publishing houses and editions, censorship, its shapes and institutions); and 3. literary system (author, text, reader, reader’s anticipation, taste and traditions, reader/cultural stereotypes, reader’s snobbism, reader’s experience). The selection of text for translation and the used method are determined by the function of translation in a cultural milieu: 1. informational, educational; 2. substitutional; 3. creative, development-forming versus retardational; 4. translation as an independent literary activity; 5. utilitarian versus culture-formational, aesthetic; 6. complementary; 7. socio-cultural. The translation functions are interpenetrated, complementary, have various mutual effect, change in space and time depending also on other extra-literary factors, such as geopolitical relationships, size of the country, level of culture of the nation/the minority, development and state of standard language, tradition and “state” of ideas in a given space, and so on.

In the Slovak cultural environment it is manifested as follows: 1. translation as a culture-forming and creative phenomenon in relation to the original literature per se; 2. history of the translation of artistic literature (but not only of it) as an inseparable part of the constitution of national culture. In this sense it is important to remind of the fact, significant especially for the so-called “small” cultures – that the selection, quality and quantity of the translated literature always represents a two-way information value: 1. a signal towards other cultural environments about the maturity of the cultural context which has “its” – let me say, *Faust*, *Hamlet*, *Don Quixote*, *Little Prince*, as well as *Petersburg*, *Eugene Onegin* or *The Dream of the Red Chamber*; 2. a signal into its own culture “about the same thing”, supporting the self-identification of national culture/cultural space.

The results of also this research represent a contribution for the mentioned university practice and the scholarly confrontation on an international scale. An important role, especially for its character of the history of scholarly reflection which is not so often dealt with in Slovakia, is played by the above mentioned *Anthology of Slovak Thinking on Translation 1. Chimera of Translating* and *Thinking on Translation*. The scholarly and pedagogical public should also benefit from encyclopaedic and synthesising type of works, under preparation in the cooperation of scholars from most of the Slovak translational institutions (Bratislava – SAS, Comenius University, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica): *Dictionary of Translators in Slovakia* (under the preparation) and *Thinking on Translation II*. (Myslenie o preklade II.), focused on detailed self-reflection.

The observed problems are in the sphere of interest of also other Slovak scholarly centres of philological and translational research (Nitra, Prešov, Banská Bystrica), even as if there occurred a certain natural “distribution of labour”:

Individual centres produce important research impulses: quite a “branched out” shape assume the impulses from the “traditional” Slovak translational Mecca – Nitra, either from the aspect of formulating the research subject as translation in the Czecho-Slovak context (F. Koli), translation as a means of globalisation and anti-globalisation (P. Liba, A. Červeňák), or through an in-depth search for a research subject in neuralgic points of current translatology, such as the orientation on the perception of translation as a phenomenon which, especially from a didactic aspect, includes its different concretizations: translation of literary, non-literary texts, interpreting in the sense of many current translational conceptions (E. Gromová, D. Muglová, G. Miššíková, Z. Gadušová, E. Dekanová, etc.); as well as, related to it, inevitable reflections on translation in interdisciplinary circumstances (E. Gromová, D. Muglová, oftentimes in cooperation with J. Rakšányiová – Comenius University Bratislava).

The above mentioned H. Valcerová-Bacigálová, L. Šimon or M. Andričík represent, most geographically said, the “Eastern-Slovak” approach, in many respects harmonising their emphasis on the translation of literary texts with J. Zambor’s conception. Primarily focused on the translation of poetry, this approach is oriented on poetological aspects of translation and its literary and linguistic as well as wider relationships. In the monographic works and essays of all the three mentioned scholars, however, one can clearly distinguish a conscious orientation on a didactic aspect as well.

If at the end of the twentieth century the translationalists from Matej Bel University (Banská Bystrica) were only gradually looking for their place in the sketched out composition, the first decade of the twenty-first century shows that, drawing on a strong theoretical linguistics (V. Patraš) and, above all, linguistically oriented theoretical translatology (J. Dolník), as well as on the impulses of Slovak and foreign provenance, they constituted a centre which because of its “young age”, and being unbiased by tradition, is able to bring impulses which oftentimes deserve attention with regard to the formulation of the subject of translational activities: as a *pars pro toto* one can mention incentives of A. Huťková’s work in the theory, methodology and criticism of translation as well as in a different approach to the reflection of the history of translation, or the orientation on translation of the so-called boundary texts, primarily on the stylistic aspects as well as on, equally didactically utilisable, anthologising manuals (V. Biloveský).

CONCLUSION

If we are thus to, summarisingly, confirm (not disprove) our introductory hypothesis, that as a differentiating symptom may serve the distinguishing of the research subject of differently oriented translational reflections, one can say that this short travelling along the journey of Slovak translatology of recent decades, and in the horizon of its current outlines, allows to do it. Slovak translatology is quite naturally trying to fill in its blank pages, whether by formulating its research subject as translation in the wider sense – that is not exclusively (but also) the translation of artistic texts (UKF Nitra, UMB Banská Bystrica), by defining its subject in the sense of the history of translational, translation and reception activities (ÚSvL SAV, or FiF UK Bratislava), or in the sense of “translation as art” – for example in the translation of poetic texts (Zambor).

The subjects of research articulated in this way get gradually complemented in individual Slovak translational centres, quite understandably, by an analysis of such parts of texts which, until recently, were “escaping” the Slovak translationalology from various reasons; one can thus “see”, on one side of the spectrum, an analysis of the problems of translating non-secular, religious, biblical, sacral texts, on the other side there are efforts to describe translations and the translating of the texts of “today’s everydayness” – the so-called European (legislative), administrative, advertisement texts, as well as texts associated with primarily visual media.

Translated by A. Pokrivčák

USED LITERATURE

- ANDRIČÍK, Marián.: *K poetike umeleckého prekladu*. Levoča: Modrý Peter 2004. 108 s. ISBN 80-85515-59-8.
- BILOVESKÝ, Vladimír: *Termín a/ alebo metafora? (Preklad anglicky písaných neumeleckých textov s umeleckými prvkami)*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, 2005. 146 s. ISBN 80-8083-078-9.
- BILOVESKÝ, Vladimír – KRÁLOVÁ, Zdena: *Štýl v procese prekladu*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, 2002. 100 s. ISBN 80-8055-133-2.
- DEKANOVÁ, Eva: *Adjektívniá v translačnom procese*. Nitra: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Konštantína Filozofa, 2006. 126 s. ISBN 80-8050-991-3.
- DEKANOVÁ, Eva: *Kapitoly z teórie a didaktiky prekladu odborných textov*. Nitra: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Konštantína Filozofa, 2009. 152 s. ISBN 978-80-8094-598-5.
- ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz: *O literárnych vzťahoch. Sloh, druh, preklad*. Bratislava: Veda, 1976. 278 s.
- ĎURIŠIN, Dionýz: *Teória literárnej komparatistiky*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1975. 408 s.
- FELDEK, Lubomír: *Z reči do reči*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1977. 192 s.
- FELIX, Jozef: *Literárne križovatky*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1991. 567 s. ISBN 80-220-0163-5.
- FERENČÍK, Ján: *Kontexty prekladu*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1982. 149 s.
- FRANEK, Ladislav: *Štýl prekladu. Vývinovo-teoretická a kritická analýza slovenských prekladov Paula Claudela*. Bratislava: Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 1997. 161 s. ISBN 80-224-0466-7.
- GROMOVÁ, Edita: *Kapitoly z úvodu do prekladateľstva I*. Nitra: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Konštantína Filozofa, 1998, 2000. 100 s., 188 s. ISBN 80-88738-56-3.
- GROMOVÁ, Edita: *Teória a didaktika prekladu*. Nitra: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Konštantína Filozofa, 2003. 188 s. ISBN 80-8050-587-X.
- GROMOVÁ, Edita – MÜGLOVÁ, Daniela: *Kultúra – interkulturalita – translácia*. Nitra: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Konštantína Filozofa, 2005. 102 s. ISBN 80-8050-946-8.
- GROMOVÁ, Edita – RAKŠANYIOVÁ, Jana: *Translatologické reflexie*. Bratislava: Book & Book, 2005. 74 s. ISBN 80-969099-2-4.
- HEČKO, Blahoslav: *Dobrodružstvo prekladu*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1991. 362 s. ISBN 80-220-0160-0.
- HEČKO, Blahoslav: *Nehádzte perly sviniam*. Bratislava: Veda, 2005, 416 s. ISBN 80-224-0820-4.
- HOCHÉL, Braňo: *Preklad ako komunikácia*. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1991. 100 s. ISBN 80-224-0820-4.
- HRDLIČKA, M.: *Translatologický slovník*. Ostrava: FFOU 2002.
- HREHOVČÍK, Teodor: *Prekladateľské minimum*. Bratislava: Iris, 2006. 113 s. ISBN 80-89256-02-3.
- HUŤKOVÁ, Anita: *Vybrané kapitoly z dejín prekladu literárno-umeleckých textov*. Banská Bystrica: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Mateja Bela, 2003. 108 s.
- CHIMÉRA *prekladania. Antológia slovenského myslenia o preklade*. Ed. Dagmar Sabolová. Bratislava: Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 1999. 236 s. ISBN 80-224-0562-0.
- JANKOVIČ, Ján: *Chorvátska literatúra v slovenskej kultúre I. (Do roku 1938)*. Stručné dejiny umeleckého prekladu na Slovensku. Zv. 2. Chorvátska literatúra. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 1997. 324 s. ISBN 80-88815-06-01.
- JANKOVIČ, Ján: *Chorvátska literatúra v slovenskej kultúre II. (1939-1948)*. Stručné dejiny umeleckého prekladu na Slovensku. Zv. 3. Chorvátska literatúra. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 1997. 324 s. ISBN 80-88815-06-01.

- prekladu na Slovensku. Zv. 6. Chorvátska literatúra. Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2002. 467 s. ISBN 80-224-0703-8.
- JANKOVIČ, Ján: *Poézia slovensko-srbskej vzájomnosti (1827–1938). Abeceda pobratimstva – Bukvar bra-timljenja*. Bratislava: Jaga, Veda, Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2008. 550 s. ISBN 978-80-89030-40-8.
- JANKOVIČ, Ján: *Srbská dráma na Slovensku*. Bratislava: Jaga a Divadelný ústav, 2008. 236 s. ISBN 80-89030-30-0.
- K otázkam teórie a dejín prekladu na Slovensku I.* Zost. Pavol Winczer a kol. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 1993. 261 s. ISBN 80-967046-1-3.
- K otázkam teórie a dejín prekladu II.* Zost. Katarína Kenížová-Bednárová. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej lit-eratúry SAV, 1994. 223 s. ISBN 80-967046-5-6.
- K otázkam teórie a dejín prekladu III.* Zost. Katarína Kenížová-Bednárová. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 1995. 176 s. ISBN 80-967046-8-0.
- KENÍŽ, Alojz: *Preklad ako hra na invariant a ekvivalenciu*. Studia Translatologica Bratislavensia 12. Bratislava: AnaPress, 2008. 96 s. ISBN 978-80-89137-38-1.
- KOPRDA, Pavol: *Talianka literatúra v slovenskej kultúre v rokoch 1890-1980*. Stručné dejiny umeleck-ého prekladu na Slovensku. Zv. 1. Talianka literatúra. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 1994. 144 s. ISBN 80-967046-6-4.
- KOPRDA, Pavol: *Talianka literatúra v slovenskej kultúre*. Bratislava: Academic Elektronik Press, 1997. 132 s. ISBN 80-88880-12-2.
- KOŠKA, Ján: *Recepcia ako tvorba. Slovensko-bulharské literárne vzťahy (1826–1989)*. Bratislava: Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2003. 192 s. ISBN 80-224-0748-8.
- KOVAČIČOVÁ, Oľga: *Textové a mimotextové determinanty literárneho prekladu*. Bratislava: Veda a Ústave svetovej literatúry SAV, 2009. 192 s. ISBN 978-80-224-1100-4.
- KUSÁ, Mária: *Literárny život. Literárne dianie. Literárny proces. Vnútroliterárne, mimoliterárne a medziliterárne súvislosti ruskej literatúry 20. storočia*. Bratislava: Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 1997. 192 s. ISBN 80-224-0463-2.
- KUSÁ, Mária: *Preklad ako súčasť dejín kultúrneho priestoru*. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2005. 173 s. ISBN 80-88815-15-0.
- LESŇÁKOVÁ, Soňa: *Slovenská a ruská próza. (Kontakty a preklady.)* Bratislava: Veda, 1983. 130 s.
- MACÚRA, Martin: *Počítačom podporovaný preklad*. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa, 2007. 76 s. ISBN 978-80-8094-309-7.
- MAKAROVÁ, Viera: *Tlmočenie – hraničná oblasť medzi vedou, skúsenosťou a umením možného*. Bratis-lava: STIMUL, 2004. 197 s. ISBN 80-8898-281-2.
- MALITI-FRAŇOVÁ, Eva: *Tabuizovaná prekladateľka Zora Jesenská*. Bratislava: Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2007. 208 s. ISBN 978-80-224-0954-4.
- Mária Rázusová-Martáková, spisovateľka a prekladateľka. Zborník príspevkov z vedeckej konferencie 11. mája 2005. Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici. Ed. Anita Hutková, Kamila Brtk-ová. Martin: Matica slovenská, 2006. 128 s. ISBN 80-7090-800-9.
- METATEXT a preklad. *Miscelaneá k nedožitým šesťdesiatym narodeninám Antona Popoviča*. Nitra: Vys-oká škola pedagogická, Fakulta humanitných vied,
- MIŠŠÍKOVÁ, Gabriela: *Analysing Translation as Text and Discourse*. Praha: Jednota tlumočníkú a prekladateľú, 2007. 160 s. ISBN 978-80-7374-046-7.
- MIŠŠÍKOVÁ, Gabriela: *Preklad v kontexte Európskej únie. Medzijazykový transfér alebo interkultúrna komunikácia?* Acta Nitriensia 9. Nitra: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Konštantína Filozofa, 2007, 250 s. ISBN 978-80-8064-236-6.
- MÜGLOVÁ, Daniela: *Komunikácia. Tlmočenie. Preklad alebo Prečo spadla Babylonská veža*. Nitra: Enig-ma, 2009. 319 s. ISBN 978-80-89132-82-9.
- MÜGLOVÁ, Daniela: *Preklad v teórii a praxi cudzojazyčnej výučby*. Nitra: Vysoká škola pedagogická, 1996. 106 s. ISBN 80-8050-427-X.
- MYSLENIE o preklade. Ed. Libuša Vajdová. Bratislava: Kalligram a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2007. 184 s. ISBN 978-80-8101-006-4.
- NOVÁKOVÁ, Taida: *Tlmočenie. Teória – výučba – prax*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, 1993. 171 s. ISBN 80-2230-348-8.

- Od textu k prekladu. Odborná komunikácia v zjednotenej Európe.* Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, 2006. ISBN 80-7374-040-0.
- OPÁLKOVÁ, Jarmila: *Preklad ako mediácia interkultúrnej komunikácie.* Prešov: Prešovská univerzita, 2006. 92 s. ISBN 80-8068-412-X.
- PANOVOVÁ, Ema: *Stopäťdesiat rokov slovensko-ruských literárnych vzťahov.* Bratislava: Veda, 1994. 212 s. ISBN 80-224-0105-6.
- POPOVIČ, Anton (ed.): *Originál – preklad. Interpretačná terminológia.* Bratislava: Tatran, 1983. 363 s.
- POPOVIČ, Anton: *Poetika umeleckého prekladu. Proces a text.* Bratislava: Tatran, 1971. 166 s.
- POPOVIČ, Anton: *Umelecký preklad v ČSSR. Výskum. Bibliografia.* Martin: Matica slovenská, 1974. 123 s.
- POPOVIČ, Anton: *Teória umeleckého prekladu. Aspekty textu a literárnej komunikácie.* Bratislava: Tatran, 1975. 293 s.
- RAKŠÁNYIOVÁ, Jana: *Preklad ako interkultúrna komunikácia.* Bratislava: AnaPress, 2005. 142 s. ISBN 80-89137-09-1.
- RAKŠÁNYIOVÁ, Jana: *Translatologické kompetencie adepta prekladateľstva.* Bratislava: STU, 2009. 54 s. ISBN 978-80-227-3042-6. (Učebný text.)
- RAKŠÁNYIOVÁ, Jana – ŠTEFKOVÁ, Markéta: *Rozvoj prekladateľskej kompetencie v oblasti odborných textov.* Bratislava: STU, 2009. 116 s. ISBN 978-80-227-3043-3. (Učebný text.)
- RYBÁK, J.: *Kapitoly o jazyku a prekladaní.* Bratislava: Smena 1982.
- SUWARA, Bogumila: *O preklade bez prekladu.* Bratislava: Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2003. 176 s. ISBN 80-224-0752-6.
- ŠIMON, Ladislav: *Úvod do teórie a praxe prekladu (nielen) pre nemčinárov.* Prešov: Nauka, 2005. 143 s. ISBN 80-89038-36-0.
- ŠKRLANTOVÁ, M.: *Preklad právnych textov na národnej a nadnárodnej úrovni.* Bratislava: AnaPress, 2005. 174 s. ISBN 80-89137-19-9.
- TRUHLÁŘOVÁ, Jana: *Na cestách k francúzskej literatúre. Kapitoly z dejín prekladu a recepcie na Slovensku.* Bratislava: Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2008. 212 s. ISBN 978-80-224-1017-5.
- VAJDOVÁ, Libuša: *Sedem životov prekladu.* Bratislava: Veda a Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2009. ISBN 978-80-224-1101-1.
- VAJDOVÁ, Libuša: *Rumunská literatúra v slovenskej kultúre (1890-1990).* Stručné dejiny umeleckého prekladu na Slovensku. Zv. 5. Rumunská literatúra. Bratislava: Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV, 2000. 411 s. ISBN 80-88815-07-X.
- VALCEROVÁ, Anna: *Hľadanie súvislostí v básnickom preklade.* Acta Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Prešovensis. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity, 2006. 220 s. ISBN 80-8968-546-0.
- VALCEROVÁ, Anna: *V labyrinte vzťahov.* Acta Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Prešovensis. Monografia 24 (AFPhUP 33/115). Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity, 2000. 104 s. ISBN 80-8068-011-6.
- VALCEROVÁ, Anna: *Text ako inšpirácia.* Acta Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Prešovensis. Monografia 25 (AFPhUP 25/2000). Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity, 2000. 122 s. ISBN 80-8068-025-6.
- VALCEROVÁ, Anna – BACIGÁLOVÁ, Anna: *Vzťah významu a tvaru v preklade poézie. Preklady poézie A. Voznesenského do slovenčiny a češtiny.* Acta Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Prešovensis. Monografia 18 (AFPh UP 17/99). Prešov: Filozofická fakulta PU, 1999. 219 s. ISBN 80-88722-63-2.
- VILIKOVSKÝ, Ján: *Preklad ako tvorba.* Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1984. 234 s.
- VILIKOVSKÝ, Ján: *Preklad jako tvorba.* Uprav. a dopln. vyd. Praha: Ivo Železný, 2002. 284 s. ISBN 580-237-3670-1.
- ZAMBOR, Ján: *Preklad a umenie.* Bratislava: Univerzity Komenského, 2000. 240 s. ISBN 80-233-140-2.

SÚČASNÝ STAV SLOVENSKEHO MYSLENIA O PREKLADĚ

Dejiny translatológie. Reflexia východísk. Diferenciácia predmetu výskumu. Centrá výskumu prekladu. Literárny preklad. Odborný preklad. Inštitúcie. Preklad v médiách. Publikácie. Konferencie.

Od 60. rokov 20. storočia možno v bývalom Československu konštatovať zvýšený záujem o problematiku reflexie prekladu, v prvom rade prekladu literárnych textov. Táto stať predstavuje krátke „putovanie“ ďalšími osudmi slovenského uvažovania o preklade až do súčasnosti.

Štúdia je rozdelená do dvoch častí: v prvej Charakteristika prístupov k slovenským „dejinám translatológie“ sa nastoľuje úvodná hypotéza, že diferenciačným príznakom rôznorodých translatologických aktivít v slovenskom kultúrnom priestore môže byť vymedzenie predmetu skúmania. V druhej časti K vymedzovaniu predmetu výskumu súčasných slovenských translatologických úsilí čitateľ podstúpi krátke putovanie po cestách slovenskej translatológie posledných desaťročí a v horizonte jej dnešných obrysov. Slovenská translatológia sa celkom prirodzene usiluje zapíňať svoje nepopísané stránky, či už z hľadiska formulovania si predmetu ako prekladu v širšom zmysle – teda nie výlučne (ale aj) umeleckých textov (UKF Nitra, UMB Banská Bystrica), definovania si predmetu v zmysle dejín translatologických, prekladateľských a recepcných aktivít (ÚSvL SAV, resp. FiF UK Bratislava), alebo ako „prekladu ako umenia“ – napríklad v oblasti prekladania básnických textov (Zambor). Takto artikulované predmety bádania dopĺňajú postupne v jednotlivých slovenských translatologických centrách celkom pochopiteľne aj skúmania takých súčastí slovesnosti, ktoré doteraz slovenskej translatológii z rozličných dôvodov „unikali“, tam, popri iných, na jednej strane spektra „vidno“ napr. skúmanie otázok prekladu nesvetenských, náboženských, biblických, sakrálnych textov, na druhej strane škály sú to úsilia opísať a skúmať preklady a prekladanie textov „dnešnej každodennosti“ – tzv. európskych (legislatíva), administratívnych, reklamných, ale i textov súvisiacich primárne s vizuálnymi médiami.

*Prof. PhDr. Mária Kusá, CSc.
Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV
Konventná 13
813 64 Bratislava
masa.kusa@azet.sk*