

## PARADIGM SHIFTS IN SOVIET LINGUISTICS AND TRANSLATION STUDIES: THE CASE OF THE LINGUISTIC DISCUSSION OF 1950

ANASTASIA SHAKHOVA

### 1. Introduction

The term *Linguistic Discussion* refers to a series of articles published by Soviet scholars in the newspaper «Правда» in 1950. The linguistic discussion began with Čikobava's article, which raised vibrant questions concerning the state and the further development of the Soviet Linguistics. The culminating point of the linguistic discussion was the publishing of Stalin's contribution entitled «Марксизм и вопросы языкознания» («Marxism and Problems of Linguistics»). In this work, Stalin denied that language was a superstructure on the base, though the class character of language was assumed by the Soviet scientific community. He severely criticized the theory of Marr, which used to be an officially acknowledged linguistic theory at that time, and offered a new Marxist definition of *national language*. "According to Marr, the structure of a society determines not just superficial sociolinguistic differences but the basic structural and typological features of that society's language. The burden of the Pravda articles was to denounce this view", says Mossop [Mossop].

Stalin's essay had a great impact on the development of the Soviet linguistics. It was followed by the restructuring of the discipline and by a *paradigm shift*: linguistics and consequently translation studies became new objectives, new terminology and had to develop new methods and approaches that would fit into the new paradigm. The science in general and linguistics in particular received a new function; they had to become ideological and to promote Marxist ideology. Being at that time a sub-discipline of linguistics, Soviet translation studies absorbed the ideas of the linguistic discussion as well. They can be found in Fedorov's «Введение в теорию перевода» — the work,

which heralded the establishment of the linguistic approach in the Soviet translation studies [Федоров 1953]. Through institutionalized reception and translation, the ideas of the linguistic discussion as well as Stalin's theses travelled to East Germany where they were presented as scientific achievements.

The paradigm shift motivated by Stalin's essay was a result of an intervention of a nonprofessional authority into the scientific development. However, the present contribution is intended to prove that this paradigm shift had features of both a scientific and a non-scientific revolution. In the present article, the ideas of the linguistic discussion are analyzed from two perspectives. On the one hand, the linguistic discussion can be considered a sort of *anomaly* [Kuhn], which affected the existing paradigm in linguistics, namely the theory of Marr. On the other hand, the ideas of the linguistic discussion can be regarded as *travelling theories* [Said; Susam-Sarajeva]. They crossed interdiscursive borders and travelled into the discourses of the Soviet translation studies. Their traces in East German discourse can be also regarded as a result of a travelling process.

The analysis of the case of the linguistic discussion is aimed to draw attention to the political and ideological factors, which influence the development of scientific disciplines.

## 2. Paradigm Shifts and Scientific Revolutions

From the historical perspective, the processes that affected the development of the Soviet linguistics and translation studies and led to the establishment of the linguistic approach in Translation Studies can be described with the help of the model suggested by Thomas S. Kuhn in his work "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" (1962).

According to Kuhn's theory, a scientific discipline's development is a complex process that includes several stages. A mature science can be described as 'normal science', i. e. a "research firmly based upon one or more past scientific achievements, achievements that some particular scientific community acknowledges for a time as supplying the foundation for its further practice" [Kuhn: 10]. Kuhn points out that one of the features of a 'normal science' is "the assumption that the scientific community knows what the world is like" [Ibid.: 5]. This assumption results in a conservative behavior of the scientific community:

Much of the success of the enterprise derives from the community's willingness to defend that assumption, if necessary at considerable cost. Normal science, for

example, often suppresses fundamental novelties because they are necessarily subversive of its basic commitments [Kuhn: 5].

A 'normal science' has its own objects of analysis, methods, and objectives as well as a set of principles of scientificity and patterns of discourse production. "The entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community" is a *paradigm* [Ibid.: 175]. Kuhn characterizes the 'normal science' stage as a period of puzzle-solving activities [Ibid.: 35–36]. The tasks and objectives are usually chosen according to the existing paradigm, while solutions are meant to prove the rightfulness of the paradigm.

No matter how successful a paradigm may be, it can be shaken by unexpected phenomena, by anomalies that cannot be explained or studied within the paradigm's frame. Kuhn admits that "if an anomaly is to evoke crisis, it must usually be more than just an anomaly" [Ibid.: 82]. An anomaly that questions the rightfulness of the paradigm can lead to its crisis and, consequently, to the transition to another stage of the scientific development, which fosters the emerging of new theories, approaches, and, consequently, paradigms [Ibid.: 82]. A shift from an old paradigm to the new one can be described as a *scientific revolution* [Ibid.: 90]. Why does Kuhn call paradigm shifts *revolutions*? He underlines the similarity between a political revolution and a scientific revolution: "In both political and scientific development the sense of malfunction that can lead to crisis is prerequisite to revolution" [Ibid.: 92].

Kuhn points out the restrictive and normative features of a paradigm shift:

The new paradigm implies a new and more rigid definition of the field. Those unwilling or unable to accommodate their work to it must proceed in isolation or attach themselves to some other group [Ibid.: 19].

As far as the phase preceding the stage of a 'normal science' is concerned, Kuhn suggests that the type of research conducted during the pre-paradigm stage resembles the research during the periods of crisis [Ibid.: 84]. He describes this kind of activities as following:

The pre-paradigm period, in particular, is regularly marked by frequent and deep debates over legitimate methods, problems, and standards of solution, though these serve rather to define schools than to produce agreement [Ibid.: 47–48].

According to Kuhn's model, Stalin's ideas concerning the class character of language and the historical development of languages can in general be considered an *anomaly*. Neither Stalin's intervention nor his linguistic ideas were expected by the scientific community. By that time, Marr's theory was a dogma in linguistics; however, some members of the scientific community

doubted its scientific character, but could not prove its unscientific nature. Stalin's ideas denied the scientific nature of Marr's theory and attacked its premises for not being truly Marxist.

Stalin's ideas were incompatible with the theory of Marr; consequently, a paradigm shift became inevitable. Even those scholars, who supported Marr at the beginning of the linguistic discussion, had to revisit their attitude towards his theory. Academician Meshchaninov, who previously used to support Marr in his contribution «За творческое развитие наследия академика Н. Я. Марра» ("For the creative development of the heritage of the academician N. J. Marr"), had to address a penitential letter to the editors of Pravda and confess that his views were erroneous. So did Chemodanov in a similar letter.

The anomaly, namely, the Stalin's linguistics ideas, resulted in structural and content-related changes in linguistics. This restructuring changed its status among other scientific disciplines and influenced the development of its subordinate disciplines. Mossop points out that "linguistics had a very high profile when Fedorov was writing his book. Indeed the entire fifth chapter of the book is devoted to the Pravda articles and their relevance to translation" [Mossop]. Mossop even sees direct connections between Fedorov's monography [Федоров 1953] and the consequences of the linguistic discussion: "One might even imagine that Fedorov realized, in the aftermath of the Pravda articles, that certain ideas he already had could now be published" [Ibid.].

The consequences of the linguistic discussion, such as reforms in linguistics and in translation studies, will be described in the next subchapters of the present contribution.

One more important aspect of the paradigm shift, caused by the linguistic discussion, is worth mentioning in the present chapter. Kuhn suggests that scientific disciplines develop in a natural way only if the choice between paradigms remains in the hands of the scientific community; meanwhile he admits that political powers might have as well certain impact on the paradigm debates. However, if a nonprofessional authority forges a paradigm shift in a scientific discipline, this kind of 'revolution' wouldn't be a scientific one [Kuhn: 167].

Stalin's intervention was, of course, an example of the interference of a non-professional authority into the development of Linguistics. However, Stalin's linguistic theses did not come out of the blue. It is worth mentioning that Stalin's "brilliant ideas" were already expressed a few decades ago by Polivanov [Jacobs: 76–77]. Mossop even suggests that Stalin's essay was written with the help of Georgian linguist Arnold Čikobava [Mossop], which would, on the one hand, explain why these theses could be so easily and quickly integrated

in the discourse of the Soviet linguistics. On the other hand, the real author of the essay published under Stalin's name did not matter: it was not about the authorship, but about the status of the person claiming authorship. Stalin's personal influence was so strong that his name was already a reason to agree with his thoughts. No wonder that quotations from Stalin's essay were later often used as evidence in scientific debates, as well as quotations from the works of Marxism classics. However, this was not quite a new practice, as Marr's followers preferred to use political arguments instead of scientific arguments in linguistics debates as well [Erren: 322]. It might seem bizarre, but Marr's theory, which gained its status as a scientific paradigm with the help of ideological arguments, was finally beaten down by ideological arguments.

### 3. The Consequences of the Linguistic Discussion

#### 3.1. Paradigm Shift in Linguistics

The influence of the Soviet government on the scientific discourses can be described as *patronage* in Lefevere's terminology. Though this concept basically refers to the discourse production in literary systems, it can be also applied to the norms discourse production in scientific systems. Lefevere suggests that *poetics* and *ideology* represent two major mechanism of text production control in literary systems. Ideology prescribes what the world should look like, and poetics prescribes what the literature should be like [Lefevere: 65]. According to Dizdar, similar mechanisms influence text production in general [Dizdar: 357], including text production within a discourse of a discipline, such as linguistics or translation studies.

The analysis of text production in scientific systems shows that ideology maintains here a similar role, while the function of poetics is performed by the principles of scientificity. While the principles of scientificity control the discourses of a discipline from inside, the ideology, being a component of patronage, influence the development of the scientific discourse from outside. With his essay, Stalin set new norms of discourse production and established new principles of scientificity in the field of the Soviet linguistics and consequently in translation studies. The abolition of Marr's dogmas in linguistics as well as the establishment of new ideologically marked discourse patterns testifies the fact that Stalin's intervention in linguistics was "less of scientific than of political-ideological value" [Hartmann, Eggeling: 224; my translation].

Hartmann and Eggeling point out that, on the one hand, the "independence of the language from social formation", proclaimed in Stalin's essay, slowed

down the development of sociolinguistics in the USSR [Hartmann, Eggeling: 224–225]. On the other hand, “a green light was given to the rehabilitation of the psycholinguistic studies of Baudouin <de Courtenay> and the Petersburg school” [Bruche-Schulz: 144; my translation]. After the linguistic discussion, the discourse production in linguistics and, consequently, in the field of translation studies, changed in terms of content and structure. The new “genuinely scientific” Stalinist concept of language became an indispensable premise for further scientific activity.

The impact of Stalin’s essay on the discourse of the Soviet linguistics can be traced in works of Soviet scholars of that time, published after the linguistic discussion. Vinogradov informs the reader about the structural and content-related changes in Soviet linguistics after the publication of Stalin’s essay. He announces the three most important development objectives of the Soviet linguistics defined by Stalin’s essay, including “the liquidation of the Arakcheev regime in linguistics”, “the liberation of Soviet linguistics from the Marr’s doctrine”, and “the establishment of Marxism in linguistics”, while the latter objective is referred to as the most important one [Виноградов: 10; my translation].

Vinogradov also announces that the study of the internal rules of language development, the study of grammar and basic vocabulary of the languages of the USSR and other languages, as well as the comparative grammar studies of the languages of the socialist nations are the new objectives of linguistics [Ibid.: 11]. This reflects Stalin’s thesis about the primacy of grammar as well as his understanding of a *national language*. Similar ideas can be found in works of Sukhotin and Sevortjan [Сухотин; Севортян].

Stalin’s work is highly approved by scholars and explicitly praised in most contributions of that time. “New Era”, “turning point”, “ingenious program”, “logical and profound theory of Marxist Linguistics” [Виноградов: 10; Сухотин: 3; Севортян: 510] are typical expressions aimed to show respect and ideological loyalty. The praise of Stalin and his thesis is characterized by a constant iteration of epithets like гениальный труд / work of genius, крепкий / solid, незыблемый / steadfastly, подлинно научный / genuinely scientific, творческий / creative, etc. This positive *image* of Stalin as a *linguist* is shaped by Soviet scholars and their works in order to present his essay as a scientific linguistic contribution.

### 3.2. The Traces of the Linguistic Discussion in Fedorov's «Введение в теорию перевода»

The fact that the ideas of the linguistic discussion can be traced in several important works concerning translation theory allows regarding them as a *travelling theory*. This concept as well as a model illustrating how theories and ideas travel from one literary or scientific system to another, being adapted to the needs of the target system, was elaborated by Edward Said in 1983.

Said puts forward a four-stage-model of a *travelling process*. First of all, there is a point of theory's origin, which may be regarded as a starting point of a travelling process. Then there is "a passage through the pressure of various contexts as the idea moves from the earlier point to another time and place where it will come into a new prominence" [Said: 126]. Travelling theories are then accepted or rejected, and, finally, transformed and adapted to the needs of their new use [Ibid.].

Neumann and Nünning conceive travelling process "as a multilayered, complex and conflictual process which generates difference and defies tendencies towards homogenisation and universalization" [Neumann, Nünning: 7]. The authors enhance Said's model and propose four directions of a travelling process: 1) travelling between academic disciplines: crossing disciplinary boundaries; 2) travelling between academic and national cultures and cultures of research: crossing national borders; 3) travelling diachronically across time: crossing the boundaries between historical periods; 4) travelling synchronically between functionally defined subsystems: travelling between academia and society, its cultural practices, norms and power relations [Ibid.: 11].

The ideas of the linguistics discussion travelled synchronically between academic disciplines and anchored in the discourse of the Soviet translation studies. This would not be possible without active support of the scientific authorities and without adaptation of these ideas to the needs of the Soviet translation studies.

The institutionalized development of Soviet translation studies as a sub-discipline of Linguistics began in the 1950s. Surely, some essential publications concerning theoretical aspects of translation already appeared earlier, such as Fedorov's monography «О художественном переводе» ("On the literary Translation"), 1941 [Alekseeva: 27], as well as works of Chukovsky (for example: [Чуковский 1936; Чуковский 1941]). However, contemporary Russian and European scholars regard Fedorov's «Введение в теорию перевода» as a starting point in the establishment of translation studies as an independent discipline [Нелюбин, Хухуни: 119; Menzel, Pohlan: 9; Aleksee-

va: 28]. Both Fedorov's essay [Федоров 1952] and his most famous work [Федоров 1953] bear imprints of Stalin's essay "On Marxism and the Problems of Linguistics".

In the introduction to his monography (1953), Fedorov claims that a fruitful development of translation studies in the Soviet Union can be possible only if based on Stalin's ideas expressed in his prominent "linguistic works" [Ibid.: 3] as well as on Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist premises [Ibid.: 14–15].

Fedorov explains that after the publication of Stalin's essay, translation studies has received a set of new objectives. First of all, the experiences of Marx, Engels, and Lenin in translation should be examined and generalized. Secondly, Stalin's ideas concerning the national character of languages, the peculiarities of a national language, and the inseparability of thought and language should be applied in translation studies. Consequently, the principle of translatability, which according to Fedorov results in a fundamental possibility of a full-value translation as well as the concept of adequacy, should be formulated and integrated into translation studies [Ibid.: 102–103]. Finally, Fedorov points out that though many works have been written on literary translation, such important issues as translation of political and scientific literature still remain an open question [Ibid.: 104].

According to Fedorov, the works of the classics of Marxism constitute a particular text type [Ibid.: 231], consequently, translating the political literature requires not only special translational skills, but the ideological fidelity of the translator. It is remarkable how these new objectives of translation studies reflect the state patronage over the development of the discipline; the mediation and promotion of the ideology are represented as scientific objectives.

Fedorov supposes that translation studies can only make progress if based on the comparative analysis of languages [Федоров 1952: 3]. He explains that translation is a linguistic task from a practical perspective, and a linguistic problem from a theoretical point of view [Ibid.]. He repeatedly refers to Stalin's thesis that thinking is inseparable from language [Ibid.].

In accordance with Stalin's theses, Fedorov pleads for the principle of fundamental translatability. He criticizes the idea of untranslatability for its agnosticism and idealism [Ibid.: 17]. According to Fedorov, the principle of translatability is already proved by the translation experience itself. Though deviations from the norms of the national language, such as jargon expressions, may represent a translational problem, the absolute translatability between standardized national languages is, however, an axiom for Fedorov [Федоров 1953: 106–108].



Fedorov introduces new terminology into the discourse of translation studies. He criticizes the definition of adequacy proposed by Smirnov and proposes the term ‘polnocennost’ (full-value) instead [Федоров 1952: 17]. Fedorov states that it is now possible to classify different types of linguistic material [Ibid.: 9] with the help of the linguistic concepts with which Stalin enriched Soviet science. In Fedorov’s taxonomy, each genre should be defined according to the correlation between the elements of the basic vocabulary and the elements not typical for the basic vocabulary [Федоров 1953: 197].

In accordance with Stalin’s theses, Fedorov proposes new requirements to translators. He blames translators for the “excess of lexical borrowings from the source language” and recommends replacing them with national-language equivalents [Федоров 1952: 5]. Fedorov regards excessive borrowings as an ideological abuse of the national language [Федоров 1953: 225]. Fedorov also postulates that a translation must conform to the norms of the national language [Ibid.: 117].

The most important requirements for translators are the principles of partisanship and ideological responsibility. The ideological responsibility of the translator is expressed in the text selection, in the quality of the translation and in the veracity of the translation [Ibid.: 3].

Fedorov expresses the opinion that a translator, regardless of his specialization field, always serves a particular country, society or class. He postulates that a translation always has an ideological component. A Soviet translator serves the interests of the Soviet people and should rely on the genuinely scientific worldview, on Marxism-Leninism [Федоров 1952: 21].

Fedorov describes the Marx, Engels, and Lenin as experienced translators. He analyzes their translational decisions in order to summarize the conditions for a successful translation. These conditions include excellent language skills, broad general knowledge, and treatment of the original as an inseparable unity of form and content, as well as a creative approach towards translation [Федоров 1953: 72]. The works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism are the most cited texts in Fedorov’s monography.

While the classics of Marxism are described as experienced translators in Fedorov’s work, Stalin is depicted as a strong scientific personality. Fedorov states that “Stalin’s brilliant work” saved Soviet Linguistics and offered a “genuinely scientific approach” [Ibid.: 97]. Although Stalin’s works are not quoted very often (just few examples: [Ibid.: 8, 59]), Stalin’s voice can often be found between the lines of Fedorov’s monography.

New objectives, new terminology, new principles of scientificity and discursive patterns, as well as a new image of an ideal translator testify to the

establishment of a new paradigm in Soviet translation studies. The state patronage, especially its ideological component, makes itself evident in the fact that the principles of scientificity as well as the requirements imposed on the translators are based on ideological premises. Fedorov, however, not only interpreted and adapted Stalin's ideas. He also claimed that he had used them as a starting point for scientific argumentation. Nevertheless, in the latter editions of Fedorov's work, the whole chapter about Stalin's essay and its importance for the development of translation studies was completely removed from the text, also for political reasons. The passages including quotations from Stalin's works were rewritten and or replaced with similar quotations from Marxist classics. The fact that Fedorov's monography maintained its coherence after Stalin's theses were removed, proves that references to Stalin's ideas served as a discursive marker of ideological loyalty of the author.

### 3.3. The Ideas of the Linguistic Discussion in East Germany

The ideas of the linguistics discussion have also travelled from the Soviet discourse to the discourse of other scientific systems, having crossed national borders. The analysis of the East German publications in the field of linguistics and translation studies reveals that the linguistic discussion was presented there as a series of scientific publications rather than a political issue. This became possible through institutionalized reception as well as through translation and other forms of rewriting.

Susam-Sarajeva points out that theories do not travel by themselves and that translation often serves as a vehicle for travelling theories. Translation as a form of *rewriting* in Lefevere's terminology plays a *formative role* in the migration processes as it shapes the travelling theory to the needs of the target system. Translation also plays an indicative role, showing what the needs and expectations of the target system are [Susam-Sarajeva: 1]. It reflects the power constellation between the source and the target system, which characterizes any intercultural contact, where interference takes place [Even-Zohar: 117–118]. Bassnett and Lefevere point out that "all rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics" and refer to rewriting as to "manipulation, undertaken in the service of power" [Bassnet, Lefevere: 1–11].

The linguistic discussion had a resonance in East Germany and influenced the discourses of Linguistics and Translation Studies there. Stalin's essay was

translated into German already in 1950 and was re-edited several times. Here are some examples of how often the work was reprinted in East Germany<sup>1</sup>.

The essay was discussed on the governmental level at the Conference of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party (Germ. SED) in Berlin (1951). The focus of the discussion was on the significance of Stalin's essay for scientific development. New responsibilities concerning politics and economics were attributed to science [Maffeis: 101]. The traditional German secular understanding of the function of science was replaced with its new ideological objectives [Schulz: 27]; and Marxism-Leninism was declared the only possible premise for scientific development. Schulz emphasizes that the new understanding of science also affected the "cognitive aspects of scientific activity" [Ibid.: 27].

In 1952, a number of contributions belonging to the linguistic discussion were translated into German and published by Kuczynski and Steinitz. According to the preface, the editors offer to the readership several most important contributions of the Linguistic Discussion [Kuczynski, Steinitz: 5]. The preface begins directly with the praise of Stalin and his essay, which is described as a "work of genius". The editors explain that these contributions are supposed to stimulate research in East German Linguistics and to inform the reader about the current state of development of Soviet Linguistics [Ibid.].

Following articles were translated from Russian into German:

1. A. S. Čikobava. Über einige Fragen der sowjetischen Sprachwissenschaft (On Some Problems in Soviet Linguistics). Translated by H. Zikmund, E. Becker and K. Günther. This article originally opened the linguistic discussion. The focus is on the development perspectives of linguistics as well as on the critique of Marr's theory.

2. Gr. Kapancjan. Über einige allgemeinlinguistische Thesen N. Marrs (On Some General Linguistic Theses of N. Marr). Translated by E. Becker and H. Zikmund. The focus of the article is on the critique of Marr.

3. V. Vinogradov. Es gilt, die sowjetische Sprachwissenschaft auf der Grundlage der marxistisch-leninistischen Theorie zu entwickeln (It is necessary to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Stalin, I.* Über den Marxismus in der Sprachwissenschaft. Berlin: Einheit, 1950; Berlin: Neues Leben, 1951; *Stalin, I.* Der Marxismus und die Fragen der Sprachwissenschaft. Berlin: Dietz. First edition, 1951; Berlin: Dietz. Second edition, 1951; Berlin: Dietz. Third edition, 1952; Berlin: Dietz. Fourth edition, 1953; Berlin: Dietz. Fifth edition, 1954; Berlin: Dietz. Sixth edition, 1955. West German and Austrian editions: *Stalin, I.* Über Marxismus in der Sprachwissenschaft. Wien: Stern-Verlag, 1950; *Stalin, I.* Marxismus und Fragen der Sprachwissenschaft. München: Rogner u. Bernhard. First edition, 1968; München: Rogner u. Bernhard. Second edition, 1972; *Stalin, J.* Werke. Bd. 15. Dortmund: Roter Morgen, 1979 / <http://www.kpd-ml.org/doc/partei/stalin-band15.pdf> [08.08.2017].

develop Soviet Linguistics on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist theory). Translated by H. Zikmund and B. Hammer. Vinogradov calls for the rejection of Marr's theory and for new development perspectives.

4. L. Bulahovskij. Auf dem Wege zur materialistischen Sprachwissenschaft (On the Way to Materialistic Linguistics). Translated by R. Köhler, G. Kirchner, R. Ružička and J. Schütz. The article is about the critique of Marr's theory and new development strategies in Linguistics.

5. P. Čornyh. Zur Kritik einiger Thesen der "neuen Lehre von der Sprache" (On the criticism of some theses of the "new doctrine of language"). Translated by H. Zikmund. The focus of the article is on the defaults of Marr's theory.

6. B. V. Gornung. Über die historische Gemeinschaft der indoeuropäischen Sprachen (On the Historical Community of Indo-European Languages). Translated by H. Zikmund. The focus of the work is on the criticism of Marr's theory.

7. B. A. Serebrennikov. Über die Mängel der historisch-vergleichenden Methode in der Sprachwissenschaft (On the Defects of the Historical-Comparative Method in Linguistic Science). Translated by H. Zikmund. The focus of the work is on the criticism of Marr.

8. R. I. Avanesov. J. W. Stalin über Sprache und Dialekte (J. V. Stalin on language and dialects). Translated by H. Zikmund. The focus of the work is on the application of Stalin's theses in linguistics.

9. V. Vinogradov. Über den Grundwortschatz und seine wortbildende Rolle in der Geschichte der Sprache (About the Fundamental Treasure and Its Vocal Educating Role in the History of Language). Translated by H. Zikmund. The focus of the work is the application of Stalin's theses in science.

The contributions 1–5 represent a systematic critique of Marr's linguistic theory. His "palaeontological" analysis of the four elements, as well as his ideological views concerning the class character of the language, are strongly criticized for their non-Marxist and consequently non-scientific premises. The most important argument, however, is that Marr's theory had never been an approved theory or a paradigm in the East German discourse. Consequently, the publication of the articles concerning the critique of Marr's theory cannot be explained by the needs of the target system, but is more likely the result of the Soviet patronage. Furthermore, the praise of Stalin's linguistic theses as well as the description of the new principles of scientificity can be regarded as an attempt to impose the same ideological principles of scientificity on the East German linguistics.

#### 4. Conclusion

The main focus of the present contribution was on the interdiscursive migration of theses of the linguistic discussion and on the paradigm changes, caused by these theses. Stalin's direct intervention into the development of the Soviet linguistics was, on the one hand, a sign of political and ideological control. On the other hand, it allowed a quick and effective abolishment of the previous paradigm, namely, the theory of Marr, which was slowing down scientific development.

Stalin's intervention can be regarded as an anomaly from the perspective of the scientific system. His essay contained ideas which were incompatible with the existing paradigm. Meanwhile, though Stalin was not a member of the scientific community, the personal influence of the leader of the Soviet state was so strong, that the ideas, published under his name, were accepted by the scientific community immediately. The members of the scientific community who used to express other opinions and support Marr's theory were forced either to retire or to publicly confess that they were wrong.

The reforms, which followed Stalin's intervention, affected the objectives of Linguistics as well as its methods and terminology. Similar changes took place in the young Soviet translation studies. Fedorov's pioneering work «Введение в теорию перевода» contained an entire chapter about Stalin's essay and its role in the development of the discipline. Fedorov's arguments for the principle of translatability, his requirements concerning translation and translators as well as new objectives in translation studies were underpinned with quotations from Stalin's work. These quotations were used as axioms and as scientific judgements. However, the fact that Fedorov's work remained consistent and coherent after Stalin's theses were removed from its text proves that Stalin's theses were used rather as markers of ideological loyalty than scientific judgements.

Scientific disciplines in general as well as linguistics and translation studies in particular were given a new function: they had to be ideological and promote *the Marxist ideology*. The theses of the linguistic discussion set new norms of the scientific discourse, new principles of scientificity as well as new rules of text production. Methods, approaches and theories that were not compatible with Stalin's theses were either severely criticized or completely excluded from the scientific discourse.

In accordance with the Soviet colonization claims, the theses of the linguistics discussion spread to the areas of influence of the USSR. Through translation and reception, these theses and their interpretation crossed the

language borders between science systems. Through translations, reviews and criticism, a positive image of the theses of the linguistic discussion was shaped in the discourse of the East German Linguistics. Selective translation as well as other forms of rewriting such as reviews and criticism played a decisive role in the travelling processes of the ideas of the linguistic discussion.

The case of the linguistic discussion and its institutionalized reception in the discourses of linguistics and translation studies shows how political institutions and patrons can affect the development of a scientific discipline as well as how easily the ideology can be anchored in the principles of scientificity. The theory of Marr, which used to be an acknowledged official linguistic theory, gained its position with the help of ideological arguments. Consequently, a successful transition to a new, more productive paradigm became possible due to the ideological criticism of this theory. Taking this fact into consideration, it can be said that an intervention of a nonscientific authority triggered a non-scientific revolution, which however resulted in a breakthrough in linguistics and translation studies. This break-through became then a condition for a scientific revolution.

## References

- Alekseeva: *Alekseeva, I.* Zur gegenwärtigen Situation der Übersetzungswissenschaft in Russland. Russische Übersetzungswissenschaft an der Schwelle zum 21. Jahrhundert / Eds. B. Menzel, I. Pohlen // *Ost-West-Express. Kultur und Übersetzung* 12. Berlin: Frank&Timme, 2013.
- Bassnett, Lefevere: *Bassnett, S.; Lefevere, A.* Introduction. Where are we in Translation Studies? // *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation. Topics in Translation* 11 / Eds. S. Bassnett, E. Gentzler. Multilingual Matters Ltd., 1998.
- Bruche-Schulz: *Bruche-Schulz, G.* Russische Sprachwissenschaft: Wissenschaft im historisch-politischen Prozeß des vorsowjetischen und sowjetischen Russland // *Linguistische Arbeiten* 151. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984.
- Dizdar: *Dizdar, D.* Translation. Um- und Irrwege. Berlin: Frank&Timme, 2006.
- Erren: *Erren, L.* "Selbstkritik" und Schuldbekennnis. Kommunikation und Herrschaft unter Stalin [1917–1953]. München: Oldenbourg, 2008.
- Even-Zohar: *Even-Zohar, I.* Gesetzmäßigkeiten der kulturellen Interferenz // *Ästhetik und Kulturwandel in der Übersetzung* / Ed. M. Krysztofiak. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Hartmann, Eggeling: *Hartmann, A.; Eggeling, W.* Sowjetische Präsenz im kulturellen Leben der SBZ und frühen DDR 1945–1953. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998.
- Jacobs: *Jacobs, S.* Zur sprachwissenschaftstheoretischen Diskussion in der Sowjetunion: Gibt es eine marxistische Sprachwissenschaft? // *Slavistische Beiträge* 283. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1992.

Kuczynski, Steinitz: *Kuczynski, J.; Steinitz, W.* Beiträge aus der sowjetischen Sprachwissenschaft 1 // Berlin: Kultur und Fortschritt, 1952.

Kuhn: *Kuhn, Th. S.* The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Second edition, enlarged. The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Lefevere: *Lefevere, A.* Interpretation, Übersetzung Neuschreibung: Ein alternatives Paradigma. Deskriptive Übersetzungsforschung. Eine Auswahl / Ed. S. Hagemann // Translationswissenschaftliche Bibliothek 4. Berlin: Saxa, 2009.

Maffeis: *Maffeis, S.* Zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik. Transformationen der DDR-Philosophie 1945–1993. Frankfurt; New York: Campus Verlag, 2007.

Menzel, Pohlan: *Menzel, B.; Pohlan, I.* Vorwort // Russische Übersetzungswissenschaft an der Schwelle zum 21. Jahrhundert / Eds. B. Menzel, I. Pohlan. Ost-West-Express. Kultur und Übersetzung 12. Berlin: Frank&Timme, 2013.

Mossop: *Mossop, B.* Andrei Fedorov and the Origins of Linguistic Translation Theory / <http://www.yorku.ca/brmossop/Fedorov.htm> [08.08.2017].

Neumann, Nünning: *Neumann, B.; Nünning, A.* Travelling Concepts as a Model for the Study of Culture // Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture / Eds. B. Neumann, A. Nünning. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.

Said: *Said, E. W.* Traveling Theory // Said, E. W. The Text, the World and the Critic. Cambridge; Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Schulz: *Schulz, T.* Sozialistische Wissenschaft. Die Berliner Humboldt-Universität [1960–1975]. Köln; Weimar; Wien: Böhlau, 2010.

Susam-Sarajeva: *Susam-Sarajeva, Ş.* Theories on the Move. Translation's role in the Travels of Literary Theories. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 2006.

Виноградов: *Виноградов В.* Развитие советского языкознания в свете учения И. В. Сталина: доклад на сессии отделений общественных наук Академии Наук СССР, посвященной годовщине опубликования гениального произведения И. В. Сталина «Марксизм и вопросы языкознания», 20 июня 1951 года / [http://www.ras.ru/publishing/raserald/raserald\\_articleslist.aspx?magazineid=2ae4b4b8-e5f6-472c-8822-fd8b60b2bdbb](http://www.ras.ru/publishing/raserald/raserald_articleslist.aspx?magazineid=2ae4b4b8-e5f6-472c-8822-fd8b60b2bdbb) (Дата обращения: 08.08.2017).

Нелюбин, Хухуни: *Нелюбин А., Хухуни Г.* История и теория перевода в России [History and Theory of Translation in Russia]. М., 2003.

Севортян: *Севортян Э.* Советская тюркология в последискуссионные годы [Soviet Turkish Studies after the Linguistic Discussion] // Известия АН СССР. Отд. литературы и языка. 1953. XII. № 6.

Сухотин: *Сухотин В.* Советское языкознание на новом пути [Soviet Linguistics on the New Way] // Вестник АН СССР. 1951. № 6.

Федоров 1952: *Федоров А.* Основные вопросы теории перевода // Вопросы языкознания. 1952. № 5.

Федоров 1953: *Федоров А.* Введение в теорию перевода [Introduction to the Theory of Translation]. М.: Издательство литературы на иностранных языках, 1953.

Чуковский 1936: *Чуковский К.* Искусство перевода. М.; Л., 1936.

Чуковский 1941: *Чуковский К.* Высокое искусство. М., 1941.