



DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-1-64-77

EDN: DRFFQX

UDC [811.161.1:811.133.1:811.111]:255:808

Research article / Научная статья

## Bakhtin's Philosophical Anthropology in Translation: Rhetoric Devices and Text Cohesion

Natalia Bruffaerts<sup>1</sup> ✉, Svetlana A. Moskvitcheva<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Saint-Louis-Brussels, *Brussels, Belgium*

<sup>2</sup>RUDN University, *Moscow, Russian Federation*

✉ [natalia.bruffaerts@usaintlouis.be](mailto:natalia.bruffaerts@usaintlouis.be)

**Abstract.** The concepts developed by Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, a Russian theoretician of the 20th century, have had an important impact on the evolution of paradigms in humanities. However, his later works on literary theory continue to be far better known than his early essays on philosophical anthropology despite their key role in shaping Bakhtin's thought. Published achronologically and imbued with innovative terms, Bakhtin's works were sometimes translated by those who were unfamiliar with his concepts. The purpose of this study is to examine one of the earliest Bakhtin's essays, *Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity*, through a comparative perspective. The analysis is based on its French (1984) and English (1990) translations. It aims at revealing how the mechanisms of text cohesion and rhetoric are rendered in translation in order to convey the author's ideas. The analysis has shown that the strategies chosen by the translators into French and English do not coincide and vary from ellipsis in French to amplification in English. The choice of coreferential models turns out to play a crucial role in structuring ideas in the target texts.

**Keywords:** Bakhtin, translation, rhetorical devices, text cohesion, Russian, French, English

### Conflict of interests:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### Authors' contribution:

N. Bruffaerts — the concept of the study, research methodology, collection and processing of material, writing part of the text; S. Moskvitcheva — design of the study, analysis of the data obtained, writing part of the text.

### Article history:

Received: 01.09.2023

Accepted: 15.12.2023

### For citation:

Bruffaerts, N.S., & Moskvitcheva, S.A.(2024). Bakhtin's Philosophical Anthropology in Translation: Rhetoric Devices and Text Cohesion. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 15(1), 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-1-64-77>

© Bruffaerts N.S., Moskvitcheva S.A., 2024



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

## Философская антропология М.М. Бахтина в переводе: риторические приемы и текстовая когезия

Н.С. Бруффартс<sup>1</sup>  , С.А. Москвичева<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Университет Сен-Луи — Брюссель, г. Брюссель, Бельгия

<sup>2</sup>Российский университет дружбы народов, Москва, Российская Федерация

 natalia.bruffaerts@usaintlouis.be

**Аннотация.** Идеи Михаила Михайловича Бахтина оказали значительное влияние на развитие парадигм гуманитарного знания. Тем не менее, его более поздние труды по литературоведению по-прежнему имеют гораздо более широкую известность, чем его ранние работы по философской антропологии, хотя именно последние сыграли ключевую роль в формировании бахтинской мысли. Труды ученого увидели свет не в хронологическом порядке и насыщены новаторской терминологией; кроме того, их переводчики не всегда были достаточно знакомы с бахтинскими концепциями. Цель исследования состоит в сопоставительном анализе одной из самых ранних работ М.М. Бахтина — «Автор и герой в эстетической деятельности» — и ее переводов на французский (1984) и английский (1990) языки. Исследование направлено на то, чтобы выявить, как механизмы текстовой когезии и риторические приемы передаются в переводе и насколько оригинальные идеи автора оказываются отражены в нем. Проведенный анализ показал, что стратегии, выбранные переводчиками на французский и английский языки, не совпадают и варьируются от эллипсиса во французском до лексического добавления в английском. Выявлена ключевая роль выбора разновидностей текстовой прогрессии при структурировании текстов переводов.

**Ключевые слова:** Бахтин, перевод, риторические приемы, текстовая когезия, русский, французский, английский

### Конфликт интересов:

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

### Вклад авторов:

Бруффартс Н.С. — концепция исследования, методика исследования, сбор и обработка материала, написание части текста; Москвичева С.А. — разработка исследования, анализ полученных данных, написание части текста.

### История статьи:

Дата поступления: 01.09.2023

Дата приема в печать: 15.12.2023

### Для цитирования:

*Bruffaerts N.S., Moskvitcheva S.A.* Bakhtin's Philosophical Anthropology in Translation: Rhetoric Devices and Text Cohesion // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. 2024. Т. 15. № 1. С. 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-1-64-77>

## Introduction

Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, a Russian thinker of the first half of the 20th century, is well known across various fields of the humanities comprising, inter alia, philosophy, literary studies, linguistics and translation studies, which have appropriated and developed a number of his key concepts. According to Natalia Bonetskaya, this extraordinary malleability of the Bakhtin's theory is explained

by the fact that it forms a “special humanities discipline”, which is not restricted to dealing with specific aspects of philosophy or literary studies but always “raises and solves the problem of *man’s being*” [1. P. 68]. Bakhtin’s works have been translated into all major world languages; however, his terminology consisting of coinages, calques (mainly German) and borrowings from other fields of knowledge constitutes a real challenge for translators. In his preface to *The Dialogical Principle*, Tzvetan Todorov states that “[T]ranslations do exist, but I am not sure we should derive any solace from that fact” [2. P. XII]. He argues that Bakhtin’s works were often translated by people who knew little of his thought or did not understand it. Another difficulty involved in reading Bakhtin in translation is connected with the peculiar story of his publication in Russian [3. P. 158]. His early works dating back to the beginning of 1920s were published only posthumously in 1979, while his later book *The Problems of Dostoyevsky’s Creative Art (Poetics)* in the revised edition of 1963, was published in 1929. Translations into French and English were also published achronologically [3. P. 158].

The English and French versions of Bakhtin’s works have already been analyzed, and this research has revealed how mistranslation of Bakhtin’s key terms contributed to the inappropriate rendition of his thought for foreign readers [4. P. 78]. However, these studies cover translations of Bakhtin’s later (and also more well-known) works, such as *Problems of Dostoyevsky’s Poetics*, *Discourse in the Novel* or *Rabelais and His World* (see, for instance, [3–7]). On the contrary, translations of Bakhtin’s earlier works, which lay the foundation of the concepts discussed in his later writings, have not yet become the object of a comparative study. This article aims at filling this lacuna, at least partially, by comparing the translations of Bakhtin’s early treatise on aesthetics *Avtor i geroy v jesteticheskoy dejatel’nosti (Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity)* (hereinafter, ‘Author and Hero’) (ca. 1920–1923, published in 1979) [8] into French (1984) [9] and English (1990) [10].

In *The Dialogical Principle*, Tzvetan Todorov admits that, although the chapter on Bakhtin’s early works on philosophical anthropology concludes his book, they are the most valuable for him (*ont pour moi le plus de prix*) as they offer a key to the whole oeuvre of the Russian thinker (*la clé de son œuvre toute entière*) [11. P. 145]. *Author and Hero*, Bakhtin’s “aesthetic gospel” [12. P. 37], explains the basis of his anthropology, where the principal modes of human existence, “I” and “the other”, are determined through aesthetic categories of “author” and “hero”. This early text is a vivid illustration of perichoresis inherent in Bakhtin’s thinking, where “the ethical is construed through the aesthetical, and the aesthetical through the ethical” [1. P. 70]. Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist summarize the key points of *Author and Hero* as follows: “...Bakhtin’s thought is a philosophy of creation, a meditation on the mysteries inherent in God’s making people and people’s making selves, with the activity of people creating other people in literary authorship as a paradigm for thinking at all levels of creating” [13. P. 80].

Both translations translations of *Author and Hero* into French and English are based on the appropriate chapter from the Russian collection of essays *Estetika Slovesnogo Tvorchestva* released in Moscow by the Iskusstvo Publishing House in 1979. According to the preface to the volume, the majority of articles comprised in the volume were not published during Bakhtin's life. The purpose of the volume is "to give the overview of how the author's thought developed throughout the decades, allowing the readers to feel the coherence and continuity of Bakhtin's philosophical and scientific work" [14. P. 5–6]. Which is why the volume is organized chronologically, although the exact years in which the essays were written are not mentioned.

The translation into French is entitled *L'Auteur et le Héros*. The translation was made by Alfreda Acouturier and published in 1984 by Editions Gallimard. The text is preceded by the preface by Tzvetan Todorov. The essay is followed by the translations of *Roman vospitanija i ego znachenie v istorii realizma* (*Le roman d'apprentissage dans l'histoire du réalisme*), *Problema rechevyh zhanrov* (*Les genres du discours*), *Problema teksta v lingvistike, filologii i drugih gumanitarnyh naukah* (*Le problème du texte*), *Otvet na vopros redakcii «Novogo mira»* (*Les études littéraires aujourd'hui*), *Iz zapisej 1970–1971 godov* (*Les carnets 1970–1971*), *K metodologii gumanitarnyh nauk* (*Remarques sur l'épistémologie des sciences humaines*). The other texts contained in the original volume are only mentioned at the end of the preface. Like in the original version, the years are not indicated. A closer look at the translation of the titles evidences the translator's penchant for ellipsis. Thus, the title of the essay analyzed in this paper is truncated to *L'Auteur et le Héros* (*Author and Hero*), totally omitting the "aesthetic activity", which is mentioned only in the note giving the details of the source text — *Titre de l'édition originale: L'auteur et le héros dans le processus esthétique* (Title of the original edition: Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity). *The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology and Other Humanities* becomes just *Problem of the Text*. *The Problem of Speech Genres* is translated as *Speech Genres*, despite the fact that Todorov, who authored the preface to the translation, laments that the word *problema* (problem, or rather *issue*) has unfortunately disappeared in many French translations of Bakhtin's works (*a malencontreusement disparu dans plusieurs traductions françaises*) [11. P. 9]. The French version contains four translator's notes, explaining mainly the etymology of Bakhtin's neologisms.

The translation into English was made by Vadim Liapunov, a Bakhtin's researcher, and published in 1990 by the University of Texas Press under the title of *Art and Answerability. Early Philosophical Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Caryl Emerson, a renowned Bakhtinian scholar, highly praised Liapunov's translation calling it "superb" [15. P. 126]. The English version starts with a dedication in Russian: "In loving memory of Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin." The introduction by Michael Holquist [16], the co-author of Bakhtin's most comprehensive biography, contains a subtitle — *Architectonics of Answerability*, which refers directly to the original title of Bakhtin's unfinished volume (this fact discovered by Holquist is also mentioned

in Todorov's preface with reference to him, but not highlighted as in the English version). *Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity* (ca. 1920–1923) is preceded by *Art and Answerability* (1919) and followed by *The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art* (1924) in the form of a supplement. The years of creation are given in brackets, which makes the chronology clear for the reader. The text of *Author and Hero* comprises 234 endnotes explaining in detail the etymology of Bakhtin's concepts as well as dwelling on intertextual elements such as names of Russian poets, quotations not known by foreign readers, biblical allusions etc. Liapunov identifies the lineage of Bakhtin's numerous coinages as calques from German and quotes the sources, of their origin. This appears even more important in the light of the confession made by Emerson and Holquist, researchers and first translators of Bakhtin's works into English, about certain unfortunate choices of terms because of their inability to identify the philosophical concept at the origin of Bakhtin's ideas [3. P. 160]. The translator's notes are completed by the notes from the Russian edition.

The original text is divided into five sections: *The Problem of the Author's Relationship to the Hero*, *The Spatial Form of the Hero* (comprising seven numbered points), *The Temporal Whole of the Hero* (having *The Problem of the Inner Man — the Soul* as subtitle and comprising four numbered points), *The Whole of the Hero as a Whole of Meaning* (comprising six numbered points), *The Problem of the Author* (comprising four numbered points).

The French translation consists of five sections as well, although their translation is sometimes, yet again, somewhat elliptical: *The Problem of the Author's Relationship to the Hero* becomes *Le problème du héros (The Problem of the Hero)*. Like the original version, the sections are divided into points, each of them bearing a title.

In the English version, all sections which consist of various points bear their own subtitles given in square brackets. *The Spatial Form of the Hero* consists of seven numbered and titled points, the last three of them being, in their turn, subdivided into subsections, each bearing its own title. *The Temporal Whole of the Hero* comprises three numbered and named points, contrary to four in the source text.

In this article, we shall firstly discuss some stylistic features of the original text and their reflection in the translation. We shall then dwell on the rhetorical devices, thematic progressions and coreferential relations in order to compare the original and the translations. For this purpose, we are going to recur to the methods of continuous sampling and comparative analysis.

### **Language and Style of *Author and Hero***

Bakhtin's style is characterized by cumbersome syntax and repetitions, which complicate the translator's task.

#### **Example 1**

*Original:* В божьем мире, на божьей земле и под божьим небом, где протекает житие, авантюрная ценность тоже, конечно, невозможна [8. P. 147].

*French:* Dans la vie terrestre (dans l'ici-bas, sous le regard du ciel) où se déroule l'existence, les valeurs de l'aventure sont également impossibles [9. P. 165].

*English:* Adventure-value is also impossible, of course, in God's world, on God's earth, and under God's sky, where a saint's life is accomplished [10. P. 159].

Example 1, the adjective *bozhiy* (pertaining to God) is repeated three times: God's world, God's earth, God's sky. The example contains another word from the religious discourse — *zhitie*, which is used when speaking about a saint's vita, contrary to *zhizn*, a human life. In English, the repetition of the adjective is rendered with the help of the noun 'God'. *Zhitie* is translated through amplification — a saint's life. The French version preserves the syntactic structure of the original. However, the first expression is translated as *dans la vie terrestre* (In earthly life), which is followed by two other expressions given in brackets: *dans l'ici-bas* (down here) and *sous le regard du ciel* (under heaven).

Bakhtin, a profound connoisseur of the Russian language, pays particular attention to the choice of linguistic means, which contribute to a clearer expression of his ideas. Prefixes constitute one of these means.

### Example 2

*Original:* Это отношение **изъе**млет героя из единого и единственного **объе**мляющего его и автора-человека открытого события бытия... [8. P. 18].

*French:* Ce rapport de l'auteur va **soustraire** le héros à l'événement, seul et unique qu'est l'existence, et qui **englobe** le héros et l'auteur-homme... [9. P. 36].

*English:* Such a relationship of the author to the hero **removes** the hero from the open unitary and unique event of being which **encompasses** both him and the author-as-person... [10. P. 14–15].

The original sentence of Example 2 comprises two verbs of the same root, but different prefixes: *iz'emlet'* (remove) and *ob'emlet'* (encompass, embrace). This feature is not preserved either in French or in English.

On the contrary, the English translation of Example 3 renders the specifics of the original based on the opposition between prefixes *iz-* (out of) and *vo-* (into). This is done through the use of the verbs with the same root: "to image" and "to imagine". The translator highlights this feature by using italics. In the French text, this trait is lost.

### Example 3

*Original:* Что же общего у игры с искусством?

Только чисто отрицательный момент, что и тут и там имеет место не действительная жизнь, а лишь ее изображение; но и этого сказать нельзя, ибо только в искусстве она **изображается**, в игре — **воображается**, как мы это и ранее отметили... [8. P. 73].

*French:* Qu'y a-t-il, tout compte fait, de commun entre le jeu et l'art ?

Il n'y a que l'aspect négatif: dans l'un et l'autre cas, on a une vie représentée et non la vie réelle, encore qu'elle ne soit, à proprement parler, **représentée** que dans l'art, tandis que dans le jeu elle est **imaginée**... [9. P. 90].

*English:* What, then, does play have in common with art?

No more than a negative feature: what occurs in play as well as in art is not actual life, but only an imaging of life. And even that is saying too much, for it is only in art that life is *imaged forth*, whereas in play it is *imagined*, as we noted earlier... [10. P. 75].

As all of Bakhtin's works, *Author and Hero* contains quite a few neologisms. One of them is *vnenakhodimost'*, a derivate from the expression *nakhodit'sja vne* (to be situated or located outside the bounds of someone or something) meaning "the state of being situated outside the bounds of" [10. P. 235].

#### Example 4

*Original:* Отсюда непосредственно вытекает и общая формула основного эстетически продуктивного отношения автора к герою — отношения напряженной **внеаходимости** автора всем моментам героя, пространственной, временной, ценностной и смысловой **внеаходимости**... [8. P. 17–18].

*French:* Il en découle directement la formule générale du principe qui marque le rapport créateur, esthétiquement productif, de l'auteur au héros, un rapport empreint de la tension propre à **une exotopie** — dans l'espace, dans le temps, dans les valeurs... [9. P. 36].

*English:* The general formula for the author's fundamental, aesthetically productive relationship to the hero follows directly from what has been said. It is a relationship in which the author occupies an intently maintained **position outside** the hero with respect to every constituent feature of the hero — a **position outside** the hero with respect to space, time, value, and meaning. [10. P. 14].

Acouturier follows Todorov, who translates *vnenakhodimost'* into French as *exotopie* using the Greek root [9. P. 153]. The sentence is reformulated in order to avoid the repetition of the term. Liapunov translates the term as "outsideness" or uses other expressions containing the adverb "outside", which is given in italics. He explains the etymology in an endnote, where he mentions as well that other translators have preferred to render *vnenakhodimost'* as "extopy" or "extra-location" [10. P. 235]. The original syntax is also changed as the sentence is divided in two. It should also be noted that the French translation omits *moment*, one of the terms frequently occurring in the essay, which is translated into English as "constituent feature". Consequently, the text in French, contrary to the English version, does not underscore that the outsideness of the author takes place "with respect to every constituent feature of the hero".

The English translation renders the nuances of Bakhtin's language to the maximum extent. To achieve this, the translator often recurs to amplification. The French text is in many cases more succinct and contains less repetitions, which is more conventional for the target audience, but glosses over the specifics inherent in the original text.

#### Rhetoric devices and text organization: original and translation

In order to illustrate how rhetorical devices and text cohesion mechanisms function in the source and target texts, I am going to dwell on four of the key concepts of the essay: *avtor* (author), *zadannost'* (positedness), *dannost'* (givenness) and *pokajanie* (penitence).

The concept of the author is the cornerstone of Bakhtin's aesthetics. According to Bakhtin, the author possesses a "surplus of vision", i.e. he knows more about the hero than the hero himself. The hero as a whole is known only to the author as the latter "finalizes" the former in space [8. P. 25]. "I can see you, but I cannot see what is behind my own head; from your position you can see me, but only in your own way... any image of anyone requires, as a minimum, two concrete consciousnesses at work", explains Caryl Emerson [15. P. 116].

Bakhtin compares the surplus of the author's vision with a bud, where the form slumbers and whence it unfolds like a flower.

#### Example 5

*Original:* Избыток видения — почка, где дремлет форма и откуда она и разворачивается, как цветок. Но чтобы эта почка действительно развернулась цветком завершающей формы, необходимо, чтобы избыток моего видения восполнял кругозор созерцаемого другого человека, не теряя его своеобразия [8. P. 27].

*French:* Le surplus de ma vision contient en germe la forme achevée de l'autre, dont l'éclosion exige que je complète son horizon sans lui enlever son originalité [9. P. 46].

*English:* The excess of my seeing is the bud in which slumbers form, and whence form unfolds like a blossom.

But in order that this bud should really unfold into the blossom of consummating form, the excess of my seeing must "fill in" the horizon of the other human being who is being contemplated, must render his horizon complete, without at the same time forfeiting his distinctiveness [10. P. 24–25].

This metaphor of the "blossom of consummating form" vividly pictures how the hero's horizon gradually opens up while being completed by the author. The cohesion between two sentences is ensured by a simple linear progression in the original, where the rheme of the previous sentence becomes the theme of the following [17. P. 118]. The French text preserves only the first part of the metaphor ("the bud" is translated as *le germe* — the germ), but omits the second as two sentences are merged into one. The English translation reproduces the same thematic progression as the original, and the metaphor is fully rendered in it. Moreover, the translator begins a new paragraph with the second sentence.

Example 6 contains Bakhtin's definition of the author.

#### Example 6

*Original:* Автор — носитель напряженно-активного единства завершеного целого (Rh), целого героя (Rh') и целого произведения (Rh''), трансгредиентного каждому отдельному моменту его [8. P. 16].

*French:* L'auteur est le dépositaire de la tension qu'exerce l'unité d'un tout achevé (Rh), le tout d'un héros (Rh') et le tout d'une œuvre (Rh''), un tout transcendant à chacun de ses constituants pris isolément [9. P. 34].

*English:* The author is the bearer and sustainer of the intently active unity of a consummated whole (Rh) (the whole of a hero (Rh') and the whole of a work (Rh'')) which is transgredient to each and every one of its particular moments or constituent features [10. P. 12].



The original text contains a split rheme (a consummated whole), which is doubled (“the whole of a hero” and “the whole of a work”) [17. P. 120]. This structure is preserved in both translations and is made even more evident in the English version due to the use of brackets. The definition of the author is based on anaphoric encapsulation in all three texts [18]. However, in each translation the anaphor is presented differently in each translation. The French version describes the author as a depository of tension, which is exercised by a unity of an accomplished whole, while in the original text the author constitutes a depository of a unity of a consummated whole, which is tense and active. The focus in the original text and in the English translation is made on the unity, while in the French version it is shifted to tension. Besides, Liapunov recurs to amplification and positions the author not only as the receptacle but also as the custodian of the whole of the hero and the whole of the work.

What us draws our attention further in this passage is the translation of the two of Bakhtin’s preferred terms, frequently occurring in *Author and Hero: transgredientny* (transgredient) and *moment* (moment, or constituent feature).

Todorov notes that Bakhtin borrows “transgredient” from German aesthetics, namely from Jonas Cohen, and uses it to name the elements of consciousness, which are exterior to it but which are nevertheless indispensable for its completion [11. P. 146]. The term “transgredient” is accompanied by notes both in French and English texts. Like Todorov, Acouturier notes that the term “transgredient” is borrowed by Bakhtin from German aesthetics. She explains further her choice of *transcendant* (literally, “transcendent”) in order to avoid terminological ambiguity [9. P. 31]. Liapunov refers to the works of Jonas Cohn, Wilhelm Windelband and Johannes Volkelt. He also quotes Cohn’s remark that the use of “transcendent” in lieu of “transgredient” would be misleading, as in the Kantian tradition the term means “beyond the limits of possible experience” [10. P. 233]. Therefore, Liapunov’s choice appears to be more justified from the terminological point of view.

The term *moment* is not accompanied by any note in the French translation. Acouturier renders it mainly as *constituant*, *composant* (constituent), or simply omits it. Liapunov renders *moment* as “constituent”, “constituent feature”, or “moment” and makes a note referring to Edmund Husserl’s theory of moments as the fundamental constituents of *phenomenal* reality [10. P. 233, 19]. Liapunov’s comment as well as his choice of the lexeme “moment” in translation wherever it is possible seems pertinent and enlightening in terms of establishing links between Bakhtin’s work and German philosophy, which is hardly possible to grasp in Acouturier’s translation.

The relationship between *self* and *other* is rendered in *Author and Hero* through the parallel of their respective states of *zadannost’* (that which is incomplete, in the process of becoming), and *dannost’* (that which is given, fully present, completed) [12. P. 42]. Bakhtin argues that a person’s unity always lies ahead of him. The person can grasp his actual being only from the “to-be-achieved” perspective,

otherwise his givenness falls apart. The concept of *zadannost'* is related to that of penitence: in one's moral self-reflex inner givenness can only be apprehended in penitent tones [12. P. 46].

#### Example 7

*Original:* (1) Все положительное (Th1) в этом единстве (Rh1) — только в заданности, в данности же — только отрицательное, оно (Th2) дано мне только тогда, когда всякая ценность мне задана. <...> (2) Над своею наличностью я могу замедлить только в покаянных тонах, ибо это промедление совершается в свете заданности. (3) Но как только я выпускаю из ценностного поля своего видения свою заданность и перестаю напряженно быть с собою в будущем, моя данность теряет свое предстоящее единство для меня, распадается, расслаивается в тупо-наличные фрагменты бытия [8. P. 117–118].

*French:* (1) Tout ce qui est positif dans cette unité vient du pré-donné, ce qui est négatif en constituant le donné; cette unité ne m'est donnée qu'au moment où toute valeur m'est pré-donnée. <...> (3) Il suffit que ce pré-donné se perde de vue dans le champ de mes valeurs pour que la tension retombe qui me faisait être avec moi-même dans le futur, pour que mon donné perde son unité à-venir et qu'il se défasse, s'écaille en fragments obtusément actuels d'existence [9. P. 134].

*English:* (1) Everything positive in this unity (Rh1) belongs solely to that which is set as a task, whereas that which is already given comprises everything negative. It is a unity (Th2) which is given to me only when any value confronts me as a task — as a value to *be* achieved. <...> (2) I can linger over my factually given being, but I can do so only in penitent tones, inasmuch as such lingering takes place in the light of what is yet-to-be-achieved. (3) But as soon as I release myself as the one-who-is-yet-to-be-achieved from the axiological field of my vision and stop being intensely with myself in the future, my own givenness loses its yet-to-be unity for me and disintegrates into factually existent, senseless fragments of being [10. P. 126].

The first two clauses of sentence 1 contain two antitheses. The one embraces the opening and closing elements of the clause: *polozhitel'noe* (positive) — *otricatel'noe* (negative). The second one stays in-between: *zadannost'* (positedness) — *dannost'* (givenness). The second antithesis could be also be construed as a polyptoton comprised of the words having the same root (*zadannost'* — *dannost'*). The French translation does not conserve the syntactic structure of the original. Moreover, the French translator completely omits sentence 2, which deals with the penitent tones of lingering over one's given being, although penitence plays an important role in *Author and Hero*, as we are going to see later. The English version renders both stylistic figures of the original. The translator preserves the linear progression, with *edinstvo* (unity), the rheme of the first clause, becoming the theme of the second. In fact, “unity” is a predicated theme in the English translation [20. P. 95], and thus it becomes even more highlighted than in the original text. Besides, the figure of amplification occurs twice in the English translation of sentence 1, which is divided in two (“It is a unity...”; “as a value to *be* achieved”, note again the italics added by the translator). Contrary to other cases, the translator renders *zadanny* as “set as a task”, which justifies the use of amplification: it establishes a link with the other translation of this term (“to-be-achieved”), which occurs in the following sentence and prevails throughout the passage.

Sentence 3 in the source text comprises two clauses, the subject of the subordinate clause being “I”, and that of the principal clause — “my givenness”. This emphasizes the pro-active role of the person in maintaining the yet-to-be unity of his givenness and personifies the givenness, which loses its unity, falls apart and disintegrates. In French, the sentence begins with *il suffit que* (it suffices that), with the subordinate clause opening with *ce pré-donné* (this positedness). This subordinate is, in its turn, followed by two other subordinates having *la tension* (tension) and *mon donné* (my givenness) as subjects, each of them being preceded by *pour que*. Contrary to the original, all three subjects represented by Abstract concepts are personified. It is therefore not the person (“I”), who is the actor, but the positedness, which vanishes out of the axiological field of the person’s vision. According to the original text, stopping intensely being with oneself results in the collapse of one’s givenness. However, the French translator transforms the adverb *naprjashenno* (intensely) into the noun (*tension*), making thereof the subject of the subordinate: it is now tension that makes the person be with himself in the future, but not the person himself. The French text speaks about “my axiological field” (*champ de mes valeurs*), while in the original we note the “axiological field of my vision”. This restricts the sense of the Bakhtinian idea of fixating oneself axiologically through vision. The English translation meticulously renders all syntactic and lexical features of the original.

Penitence, one of the most persistent motifs in *Author and Hero* [12. P. 46], is discussed in the passage containing the definition of the “introspection-confession”.

#### Example 8

*Original:* Там, где является попытка зафиксировать себя самого в покаянных тонах в свете нравственного долженствования, возникает первая существенная форма словесной объективации жизни и личности (личной жизни, то есть без отвлечения от ее носителя) — самоотчет-исповедь [8. P. 131–132].

*French:* C’est là qu’on voit apparaître la tentative qui vise à fixer un moi dans une tonalité repentante, dans une optique de devoir moral, c’est là qu’on voit apparaître la forme initiale d’une objectivation verbale de la vie et de la personne (de la vie personnelle au sens où elle ne fait pas Abstraction du sujet de la vie), c’est là qu’on voit apparaître l’introspection-confession [9. P. 149].

*English:* Wherever there is an attempt to fixate oneself in repentant tones in the light of the ethical ought-to-be, the first essential form of verbal objectification of life and personality (a verbal objectification of *personal* life, that is, without Abstraction from the *bearer* of that life) arises: confession as an accounting rendered to oneself for one’s own life [10. P. 141].

According to Bakhtin, the “introspection-confession” as the first essential form of verbal objectification of life and personality appears, when the person tries to fixate himself in penitent tones. The original definition is based on a cataphoric reference — a forward reference to the following term. This form of reference, which the defined term by placing it at the end of the sentence, is in the English translation through the use of a semi-column. The French translation is structured around the anaphoric repetition of *c’est là qu’on voit apparaître* (it is here that we see appear). The anaphora introduces three accusative objects: *la tentative qui*

*visé à fixer un moi dans une tonalité repentante, dans une optique de devoir moral* (an attempt to fixate oneself in repentant tones, in the light of the ethical ought-to-be), *la forme initiale d'une objectivation verbale de la vie et de la personne* (the first essential form of verbal objectification of life and personality) and *l'introspection-confession* (the introspection-confession). This type of reference glosses the definition over by making the defined term a part of enumeration of coordinate clauses in a compound sentence.

The Russian text demonstrates that self-fixation in penitent tones occurs “in the light of the ethical ought-to-be”. However, the French text contains repetition of the preposition *dans* (in) preceded by a comma, resulting in an enumeration, making the reader believe that these two elements are not complementary but equivalent.

We should also notice that the term “introspection-confession” is rendered through amplification in English: confession as an accounting rendered to oneself for one's own life, while the French text contains a calque (*l'introspection-confession*).

Varying from one translation to the other, the mechanisms of text organization shift the emphases and focusses inherent in the original. The choice of thematic progressions and the means of coreference, such as anaphora and cataphora, by the translators pre-determines the readers' perception of original concepts.

### Conclusions

The comparative analysis of translations has demonstrated that the translators into English and French follow different, sometimes even opposite, strategies. Alfreda Acouturier, the translator into French often recurs to ellipsis. This technique has been implemented both in translation of the titles and the main body of the text. The translator omits repetitions, typical for Bakhtin's style, but uncommon for French readership. She also omits certain concepts and terms, which make an integral part of the Bakhtin's philosophy. On the contrary, Vadim Liapunov, the translator into English, makes use of amplification in order to render the maximum of the specific features typical for Bakhtin's writings. He often divides compound sentences into several simple ones with the view of avoiding cumbersome syntactic structures, which hinder the understanding of the original text. Liapunov frequently uses visual elements such as italics to attract the readers' attention.

The English translation is also remarkable for its extensive comments tracing back the origins of Bakhtin's terms as well as explaining literary and biblical allusions. French readers are deprived of the opportunity to deepen their understanding of Bakhtin's ideas as the French translation contains hardly any notes to this effect.

The mechanisms of text cohesion such as thematic progression and coreferential relation play a primordial role in rendering the emphases of the source text in translations. Differences were revealed even in the cases, where both translations are based on the same coreferential models, as they use discrepant nominal components (e.g., distinct anaphors in anaphoric references). The choice of syntactic structure combined with the use rhetorical devices such as personification changes

the performer of the action from a person to an Abstract notion. Discrepancies between anaphoric and cataphoric references result in glossing over term definitions and turning complementary phrase components into equivalent ones.

### References / Библиографический список

1. Bonetskaya, N.K. (2022). S Bakhtin as a philosopher. Action, dialogue, carnival. Saint Petersburg: Aleteiya publ. (In Russ.).  
*Бонецкая Н.К.* Бахтин как философ. Поступок, диалог, карнавал. СПб.: Алетея, 2022.
2. Todorov, T. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*, W. Godzich (trans.). Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
3. Zbinden, K. (2006). The Bakhtin Circle and Translation. *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 36(1), 157–167.
4. Zbinden, K. (2006). *Bakhtin Between East and West: Cross-cultural Transmission*. Leeds: Maney Publ.
5. Zbinden, K. (1999). Traducing Bakhtin and Missing Heteroglossia. *Dialogism*, 2, 41–59.
6. Nowakowska, A. (2005). Dialogisme, polyphonie: des textes russes de M. Bakhtine à la linguistique contemporaine. In: *Dialogisme et polyphonie: Approches linguistiques*. J. Bres, P.P. Haillet, S. Mellet, H. Nølke, L. Rosier (eds.). Louvain-la-Neuve: De Boeck. pp. 19–32.
7. Suchet, M. (2009). *Outils pour une traduction postcoloniale: littératures hétérolingues*. Paris: Editions des Archives Contemporaines.
8. Bakhtin, M.M. (1979). Avtor i geroj v jesteticheskoj dejatel'nosti. In: *Jestetika slovesnogo tvorcestva*. S.G. Bocharov (ed.). Moscow: Iskustvo publ.. pp. 9–191. (In Russ.).  
*Бахтин М.М.* Автор и герой в эстетической деятельности // Эстетика словесного творчества / сост. С.Г. Бочаров. М.: Искусство. 1979. С. 9–191.
9. Bakhtine, M. (1984). L'Auteur et le Héros. In: *Esthétique de la création verbale*. A. Acoururier (trans.). Paris: Gallimard. pp. 25–210.
10. Bakhtin, M. (1990). Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity. In: *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. V. Liapunov (trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press. pp. 4–256.
11. Todorov, T. (1981). *Mikhail Bakhtine: Le Principe Dialogique suivi de Écrits du Cercle de Bakhtine*. Paris: Seuil.
12. Coates, R. (2005). *Christianity in Bakhtin: God and the Exiled Author*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Clark, K. & Holquist, M. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Belknap Press.
14. Bocharov, S.G. (1979). Ot sostavitelja. In: *Jestetika slovesnogo tvorcestva*. M.M. Bakhtin. S. Bocharov (Ed.). Moscow: Iskustvo publ. pp. 5–6. (In Russ.).  
*Бочаров С.Г.* От составителя // Эстетика словесного творчества / М.М. Бахтин. М.: Искусство, 1979. С. 5–6.
15. Emerson, C. (1990). Russian Orthodoxy and the Early Bakhtin. *Religion & Literature*, 22 (2/3), 109–131.
16. Holquist, M. (1990). Introduction: The Architectonics of Answerability. In: *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. V. Liapunov (trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press. pp. ix—iii.
17. Daneš, F. (1974). Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organization of the Text. In: *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*. F. Daneš (Ed.). Prague: Academia. pp. 106–128.
18. Conte, M.-E. (1996). Anaphoric Encapsulation. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 10(1), 1–10.
19. Maurin, A.-S. (2018). Tropes. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. E.N. Zalta (ed.). <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/tropes/>
20. Halliday, M. & Matthiessen, Ch. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.

**Information about the authors:**

*Natalia Bruffaerts*, D.Sc. (Philology), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Russian Language of the Marie Haps' Translation Faculty, University of Saint-Louis-Brussels (5, d'Arlon str., Brussels, Belgium, 1050Ixel); *Research interests*: rhetoric, translation, discourse analysis; *e-mail*: natalia.bruffaerts@usaintlouis.be

ORCID: 0000-0003-1621-9413; Scopus Author ID: 57190029574. SPIN-code: 7356-9314, AuthorID: 392487

*Svetlana A. Moskvitcheva*, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of General and Russian Linguistics, Faculty of Philology, RUDN University (6, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation, 117198); *Research interests*: semantics, translation, sociolinguistics, linguistic ideology, linguistic discourse analysis; *e-mail*: moskvitcheva@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-8047-7030; Scopus Author ID: 57222667811. SPIN-code: 9596-7692, AuthorID: 388517

**Сведения об авторах:**

*Бруффартс Наталья Сергеевна*, доктор филологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры русского языка переводческого факультета им. Мари Хапс Университета Сен-Луи — Брюссель, Бельгия (1050 Иксель, Бельгия, Брюссель, ул. д'Арлон, 5). *Сфера научных интересов*: риторика, перевод, анализ дискурса; *e-mail*: natalia.bruffaerts@usaintlouis.be

ORCID: 0000-0003-1621-9413; Scopus Author ID: 57190029574. SPIN-код: 7356-9314, AuthorID: 392487

*Москвичева Светлана Алексеевна*, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры общего и русского языкознания филологического факультета Российского университета дружбы народов (117198, Российская Федерация, г. Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 6); *Сфера научных интересов*: семантика, переводоведение, социолингвистика, языковые идеологии, анализ дискурса; *e-mail*: moskvitcheva@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-8047-7030; Scopus Author ID: 57222667811. SPIN-код: 9596-7692, AuthorID: 388517.