DOI 10.36145/DoC2020.06

Darko Štrajn
Educational Research Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia
darko.strajn@guest.arnes.si
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7950-5276

Contexts and Texts, Communication and Translation. The Benefits and Impediments of Publishing Research Outcomes in English

Abstract: The paper addresses the problem of publishing in the English language by researchers from other language areas, above all, by those from the former socialist "Eastern bloc" countries. Historically speaking, the problem became gradually acute after the social changes in 1989, when social changes also instigated the changes of institutions of research and education. These changes were based on the notion of internationalisation. The paper addresses three main components of the problem applying the appropriate methodology to discern each of them. The explanation of the first component, which combines the historical method and the critical theory approach, points to the system of compulsory publishing in English in a highly competitive international research environment. In it the co-operative "model" of the mutual recognition by scholars, as was suggested by St. Augustin in his "irenic" vision of epistemic community, cannot exist. The second main component is revealed through a loose application of deconstructive reading. The inception of semiology, which was prevalently formulated in the French language, was followed by the philosophical repudiation of the importance of linguistics above all in social sciences and humanities. Within this framework the difference between two philosophical paradigms – Anglo-Saxon and continental – emerged in a new form. This is still visible in the glitches of transferring the meaning from one culture and language to the other in English as lingua franca. The third component is viewed through the hermeneutical approach, notably by Paul Ricoeur, who highlighted the role of translation. In his vision, a translation encompasses far more than just a transfer from one language to another. The notion of "untranslatability" transposes the problem to the level of intercultural communication. At the same time this does not justify, in Ricoeur's words, any insistence on "self-sufficiency as a core 'value' of every nationalism and cultural exclusivism". It seems that this contradiction remained unsolved so far.

Key words: language, metrics, epistemology, translation, scientific capital

Prologue

The realities of the universe of scientific research are undoubtedly multifaceted. Of course, they always were. However, after the emergence of the combined consequences of the impacts by the agencies of globalisation, technological transformations, political changes and the ensuing social changes, the plurality of these realities amounts to unprecedented proportions. The emergence of complex changes coincided to a great extent with the process of a "return to capitalism" by former communist countries, which meant a quiet all-embracing synchronisation of the "Eastern" systems of institutions with the Western ones. For decades in the post-Second World War period, many researchers in the East, except in Yugoslavia from the early 1960s on, had to overcome many obstacles to travel and communicate freely. They enviously glanced to the West, dreaming about a comparable autonomy, communication channels and the funding of research. Zhores Medvedev recorded this situation in his overview of Soviet science. "In 1965–1971 the main issues for dissent were political – the struggle against the rehabilitation of Stalin, protests against political trials, censorship, and so on. During the last few years, the right to emigration and foreign travel emerged as the main problem. In the future (...) there will be a strong demand for more general human rights, not by individuals, but by more influential groups of intellectuals" (Medvedev, 1979, pp. 207–208). Therefore, the scientific community was among the first social groups in the Eastern and Central European systems which worked on the opening of worldwide cooperation. And, as it appeared at the time, only a change of political system would do the job of the opening of free access to international scientific communication. Indeed, in the first few years after the famed fall of the wall, the researchers in all disciplines enjoyed a degree of curiosity for their work by their Western peers. Researchers in some fields of social sciences and humanities were particularly welcomed to report at different conferences[1] about their survival strategies under the "totalitarian control" and about their involvements in various social movements. The movements[2] of the period

1. Some of these conferences were organised by NGOs, most of them were convened by professional scientific associations, often with the involvement of UNESCO and Council of Europe, some private foundations, and so forth. I had a number of my own experiences in the lively exchanges at the time, and so I can say that in at least the first half of the 1990s the participation of researchers from the East had been very generously invited. Travel cost was often funded, conference fees weren't charged and in many cases proceedings were published in book form. The proofreading of contributions was on many occasions free of charge.

2. Academics played a significant role in the political, artistic and wider cultural movements and trends of the 1980s in Central European countries. By and large, these movements were understood as the movements of "civil society". For example, in Poland, a support organisation KOR helped Walesa's rebellion; in Czechoslovakia, Charter 77 worked along

of late socialism (or, if you prefer a different naming, communism) worked towards the goal of liberalisation and democratisation. Hence, generally speaking, the liberation of research from the so-called ideological control seemed to be in harmony with the introduction of political democracy in the larger society. In those first few years after the fall of the wall, it seemed that in scientific research and communication between scholars we were approaching the Augustinian ideal of open cooperation between scientists and their respective institutions in different countries. My late friend and colleague at the Educational Research Institute in Ljubljana, Janez Justin, discovered that in St. Augustine's work, the idea of the so-called testimonial speech played a great role in his imagining of academic life. "In his later writings, Augustine elaborates the idea of an epistemic community, whose members exchange 'information' about the world" (Justin, 2010, p. 10). A vision of such a community of academics and a free circulation of knowledge, which presupposes unhindered communication, is inscribed into a background of the motivation of any researcher for his/her work in any field. However, especially after gathering some experience, researchers tend to think about such a vision in terms of merely an ideal or even just a phantasy.

Contexts of competition and distribution of power

In his last years of active research, Pierre Bourdieu tried to conceptualise the split between the ideal and the practice of research. In his booklet, published within the collective Raison d'agir in 2001, he observes the harsh

with some exposed writers and underground rock musicians; in Slovenia, the "Debate Forum 89" instigated political changes and accelerated translations of books in the Humanities and the artistic group Laibach subverted the "ruling ideology", and so on.

reality that contradicts the "irenic vision" of cooperation in sciences: "The idea of the field also leads one to call into question the irenic vision of the scientific world, that of a world of generous exchanges, in which all scientists work towards the same end" (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 45). At the time, when Bourdieu published his observations containing the records of his own research experiences in the field of theoretical sociology (un sport de combat, as he called this field in the documentary film about him), the whole new organisation of research on the international scale had not yet existed in its full-blown arrangement. Still, Bourdieu had enough evidence to claim that the "irenic vision" was harshly "(...) contradicted by the facts: what one observes as struggles, sometimes ferocious ones, and competitions within structures of domination" (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 45). Bourdieu's insights in the fields of reflexive sociology and anthropology, within which he invented the notion of social capital, apply also to the area of scientific research. "Scientific capital is a particular kind of symbolic capital, a capital based on knowledge and recognition" (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 34). Two concepts, "symbolic" and "recognition" are notably interesting for the aim of my paper since I shall try to formulate a few points on the role of English language and its multiple impacts in the universe of scientific research especially in the fields of social sciences and humanities. Both concepts, of course, work through relations, which are "power relations" operating through, as Bourdieu points out in different contexts in most of his books, cognitive and communicative relations. These relations are generated through the distribution of (scientific) capital. The possession of "a large quantity of capital gives power over the field" (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 34).

Since the beginning of the 21st century, we have been increasingly faced with ever more detailed "metrics" for assessing the success of the distribution of scientific capital. Hence, scientific research became utterly "modelled" and heavily influenced by specific marketing, based on publications and the estimation of the quality of any research through quantity (number) of publications in a designated period. Publications in journals with an "impact factor" are main indicators of "quality" as well as the amount of citations. Thorsten Gruber (2014) perceived this approach to recording research results, which decidedly influence the organisation of research, as the "academic sell-out". In his paper, he also finds that this system instigates researchers to cite articles, which they did not read, "follow fashions" and work in "already well-established areas" to gain recognition by other researchers. All this is discouraging academics from carrying out "risky, but possibly ground-breaking studies". Furthermore, researchers have to be highly "productive" in the "game" of competition for research funding. Although a degree of competition (as against collaboration) in science always existed, it had never been in the past dependent on such an array of "instruments" for evaluating outputs as has been the case in recent decades, when a turn from "content to counting" has been observed by the critics of such practices, who, surprisingly, manage to exist.

As I am not stating anything unknown so far here, let me make a long story short:

a. *The publishing aimed at the acquisition of good promotional achievements for written products, points to a whole new structure of research on a global scale.* Growing digitalisation, which hugely multiplies and accelerates the circulation of all kinds of information, definitely encourages not only a hyper-production of papers but also a phenomenon of some journals that try to cater to aspiring researchers. This quite often enables some utterly un-ethical practices of which many "Eastern European" researchers fall prey to by paying significant sums of money for publications. There are offers for acquiring co-authorships (!) and, for instance, for memberships of the editorial boards of the journals, which in the worst cases do not even exist. Such phenomena and many others, which are not the main focus of this paper, are direct consequences of the process of obviously abused internationalisation of scientific research.

b. *Most former socialist countries along with other "under-developed" states on different continents pushed their research communities into the rat race of scientific publishing.* In these countries, they have introduced the entire package of strange new rules of measuring the value of publications. Researchers' positions in the sphere of funding depend on their "success" in self-promotion through publishing. In many cases, Ministries and the State research agencies of newcomers into the global settings of research developed even harsher and more complex metrics than those in the West. This measuring is based on publishing in "reputable journals" in the West. Finally, *this means that all papers must be written in English.*

c. *Taking into account the fact that the Western researchers struggle for their own survival as well, the unavoidable usage of English means an additional huge disadvantage for the Eastern researchers in the unstoppable and very harsh competition.* The research in the East in most areas of science deals with relatively smaller national funds for research, the institutions (universities and institutes) lack reputation and, consequently, the financing of research is comparably much weaker. Instead of paying full attention to the organisation of research and to the linking of institutional capacities, the funding authorities tend to place a whole burden on researchers as individuals, who are compelled to seek "references" in the "Wild West". In such a framework, stronger domestic publishing could increase the empowerment of research groups.

My intention with the prologue[3] above was primarily just to point to the complex context, within which a struggle for the positions of individual researchers occurs. Still, there are encouraging signs that diversity in scientific publishing comes through. Some new breakthrough Eastern European authors in humanities (for instance, Žižek, Manovich, Groys, etc.) have even become "academic celebrities" in the West. The scientific community is caught in endless efforts to gain recognition for projects by funding agencies. Of course, one should not underestimate all the "good science", which is an issue of who decided what is "good". Despite these circumstances, interesting research findings are produced and disseminated to other researchers in the international networks as well as to students in many universities, which are themselves also under the pressures of the "marketization". Hence, when we are discussing many issues of publishing in English, we should keep in mind these frameworks of communication in the sciences of today. "However, if the text and context are seen as mutually determining, caught in the same process of production, then the interrelation between the speaker and the spoken has to be examined" (Coward, & Ellis, 1977, p. 62). What is "spoken" in scientific reports, articles, conference papers and books are, of course, texts, which are generated in the context which I tried to point out briefly in this paper so far. A whole range of difficulties and problems, which concern non-native speakers of English in the global research sphere, can be changed and solved through the break-up of the "regime". This implies the disruption of the powerful management of research,

3. I deliberately used this old-fashioned word for the title of the opening of my argument to signal my discomfort with the prescribed schemes of academic writing, which suggest a sequence of steps to attain the ideal of so-called clarity. For instance, one should start with narrowing down the topic, then put up a research question related to the larger background, then demonstrate the relevance of one's research by presenting proofs and, finally, he/she must reiterate the point provided by the research results. This might be good to describe some innovation in a machine or medical procedure, but "narrowing" the meaning of a notion, say in philosophy, is a work of mythical Procrustes.

which boils down to the forms of domination according to Bourdieu. Of course, this is a very complex perspective of almost unimaginable proportions, which also requires a change in a wider context within which a political and economic order would be challenged. In view of looming "post-corona" crisis and the role of science in inventing approaches to the dealing with the ongoing crisis, some effects on the structural position of science globally may emerge. Nevertheless, the researchers in the former "Eastern bloc" experienced the trickiness of militant social engagement for the "freedom of research", which moved them, their institutions and the successive generations, not into the heaven of unlimited freedom and delight of sharing knowledge, but into a hell of competition and reification where they, on top of everything else, cannot avoid the compulsory communication in another language. In this view, the existence of one common language of science, which happens to be English, is not the problem as such. It is the problem in the given research environment, where it functions as an advantage for one side and as a disadvantage for the other.

The benefits of semiology and discourse studies

Since it is obvious that the changes to the global system of research are a matter of structural shifts, it seems that the levers at hand are those, which are related to *text* rather than to *context*:

a. *Any text including research papers of all kinds must transmit a meaning.* Here one cannot avoid thinking that there are huge differences between different scientific discourses.

b. *Differences are related to methodology or epistemology, the usage of metalanguages, to specific codes and symbolic representations.*

However, in any case, the researchers in all non-English speaking countries have to report their results in the scientific press at home or abroad *in English* to participate in the global communication and to gain recognition in their local environment.

c. *Before English became the lingua franca there was no such "obligation".* Yet, communication had existed although the researchers themselves did not so frenziedly care about presenting their discoveries, theories and ideas in any specific different language other than their own.

d. *In quite different historical, cultural and political contexts, scientists found ways to communicate with their peers* and many books and papers has been *translated*.

Especially in social sciences and humanities, many translated books from Slavic languages participated in the build-up of the so-called structuralist revolution in the 1960s and 1970s. I am referring here to the Russian formalism and to the contributions of the Prague school, which were developed along with Saussure's fundamental intervention in linguistics and interwove into what became "French structuralism". The enormous impact of this epistemological breakthrough, which was more visible in the fields of social sciences and humanities – although there were some interactions with parallel developments of mathematics due to Bourbaki School – brought about a whole new terminology. Above all, structuralism pinpointed the decisive role of language in the knowledge universe. Parallel to these developments, the very institutions of higher education and research were under pressure from forces from "outside" (meaning economy and politics) and the opposing ones from the "inside" (teaching staff and students). These tensions instigated a conflicting debate on university reform. "The reflection on the fundamentals drew to the criticism of relationships between science and society" (Habermas, 1969, p. 78). In this constellation, the agents of autonomous sciences stood against the "technocratic rule" over universities and, supported by a wave of the political student movement, succeeded only to postpone the onset of the spirit of utilitarianism.

For quite some time in the 1960s and 70s, linguistics reigned as the most important field of research in the humanities. Many of us, who at the time studied subjects such as philosophy, anthropology, history, sociology and other humanities embraced this linguistic turn. Consequently, this produced an ultimate epistemology for understanding, interpreting and navigating through the complexities of a social and symbolic universe. What now seems like a simple truism, namely that language and thinking are inseparable, functioned as a special enlightening insight at the time. The same goes for concepts of difference, signifier, structure, sign and so on. For some time *semiology* was the ubiquitous discipline of all disciplines and emerging multi-inter-trans disciplinarity. However, in the realm of the expanding fields of knowledge, and based on the post-structuralist critique, semiology's centrality and fundamentality gradually decreased, but it never disappeared. Specifically, in the field of philosophy Deleuze and Guattari somewhat renounced the pretences of linguistics and semiology. Along with it, they also opposed the overstretching of the study of (Lacanian) psychoanalysis, thereby re-establishing the philosophical "authority" on consistency of concepts and notions. "By themselves, resemblances and codifications are poor methods; not a great deal can be done with codes, even when they are multiplied, as semiology endeavours to do" (Deleuze, 1997, p. 28). What remained was a huge momentum in linguistics, but especially philosophy detached itself from it. In the whole sphere of social sciences and humanities, the conceptual apparatuses retained a range of concepts such as "discourse", "paradigm", "enunciation", and many others. These concepts mark the importance of understanding the operating processes of language in what we accept as speech, message, communication, knowledge, narrative, text and so on.

I only superficially pointed to the vast history of a still decisive condensation of breakthroughs in humanities and social sciences. I mean it only as a reminder that taking too lightly the "problem" of publishing in English by non-native speakers does not help the multiplicity and plurality of research and ensuing knowledge. It should be noted that the structuralist revolution in its peak phase happened predominantly in French, not the English language. Now taken for granted, the spread of post-structuralist theories and multi-layered disciplines in the space of English speaking research community, owes its existence to a large extent to the appropriation of knowledge and inventions, originally published in other languages. In his introduction to the seminal volume of discourse studies, van Dijk (2007, p. xxxi) admits this fact: "Incidentally, although nearly all internationally influential studies referred to in this chapter are written in English, we should not forget that vast amounts of discourse studies have been published in French, German, Spanish, Russian and other major languages." And, one should add: also in some not so much "major" languages. Van Dijk's nicely summed up observations contain other points, which shed light also on discourses in sciences. As he calls attention to "(...) 'macrostructures' and the 'microstructures' of the local meanings of words and sentences" (van Dijk, 2007, p. xxxi) he then argues for "*cognitive analysis* of discourse" in the studies of these structures "(...) also because they require an explicit account of the fundamental role of knowledge in the local and global coherence of text and talk" (van Dijk, 2007, p. xxvii). Without further displaying van Dijk's crucial discoveries, it follows from what I cited here that differences between discourses cannot be easily elucidated. How these specific units of meaning or, semiologically speaking, unique utterances related to the "microstructures" of a contextual culture, can be transferred to readers from other cultural contexts, will be briefly discussed in the next section of this paper. But, before that, let me point to another inner division, which traverses social sciences and humanities and which is often referred to as a split in cultural paradigms. There are many differences in the naming of this split such as Anglo-Saxon vs continental, or analytical philosophy vs philosophies of reflection on totality or "holistic philosophy" and so on. Philosophies of language (as, for instance, Wittgenstein, Austin, Chomsky, Searle, Cavell, Derrida and others) although they lean to one or the other "paradigm", seem to offer opportunities for bridging the gap. Indeed, some interesting exchanges happened although without a lasting effect. Due to the movements or flows of discourses, expounding in hybridisation processes between emerging disciplines, which are negotiating for the best enunciations of truth and explanations of reality, unexpected dialogues come to fruition. "The humanities, like history and philosophy, on the other hand, employ abstraction rather than a technicality, moving from instances to generalizations by gradually shifting away from particular contexts to build ever-more abstract interpretations of events" (Hyland, 2019, p. 9). This holds for humanities on both sides of the persisting split, although the "continental" thinkers tend to adhere to more speculative approaches in their development of notions. "Specifically, Hegelian arguments are arguments based on little or no empirical evidence, to the conclusion that some scientific approach (observational astronomy, evolutionary biology, behaviourist psychology) will fail" (Chemero, 2009, p. 7). Researchers, who were educated in a more "Teutonic" environment, tend to insist on their paradigm as they transfer what could be perceived by the "other side" as a bit peculiar into their expressions in English. Hence, the problem appears when they enter the "Anglo-Saxon" environment, where clarity, evidence, strict references as well as sticking to the agreed norms of presentation play an important role. I can't say how much such grammar is inscribed into the communication between researchers in so-called exact sciences, but in most social sciences and humanities it does play a significant role. Such contemplations are gaining already a large prominence in the English speaking academic environment of many interdisciplinary studies.

Translation

About three decades ago for very complex reasons, but also due to the demand for one common language to simplify the circulation of knowledge, the English language seemed to be a shortcut to the unlimited communication in sciences and a variety of other areas of knowledge. There is no doubt that this solution works as it would work in the case of some other language instead of English.[4] While many researchers who are not very fluent in English spend some of their own or their institution's money for translations, one could guess that the number of those who make the effort to write their papers themselves from scratch in English is growing – particularly with the demise of academic senior echelons, who simply didn't learn English as the first second language.

a. *Still, the translation of scientific papers is unavoidably a component of the research even in the cases of authors' "direct" writing in English.* To put it simply, for vast numbers of non-native users of English, the translation is operating in their heads.

b. *As compelling as it is, translation is more a problem than a solution.* An authority in the field of contrastive linguistics Tomasz P. Krzeszowski (2016) spent over five hundred pages to show that translation equivalence is really a delusion.[5] Therefore, the translation of

4. Based on Edward Said's notion of the "colonial gaze", many critics in the field of cultural studies (themselves, of course, writing in English) would tend to see the fact of English rule as a cumulative effect and continuation of the historic aggressive de-territorialisation and colonisation in the sphere of culture.

5. For this point I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer of the first version of this paper. Otherwise, this topic is widely discussed by many specialists in translation studies,

a scientific paper, should be as much as possible free of cultural glitches. However, this implies the exigency that any researcher must be hundred percent fluent in English.

c. *Within two large fields, that of so-called natural or "exact" sciences and that of social sciences and humanities, researchers have to tackle different problems, when they translate their work to English.* It seems that natural sciences, which are focused on so-called external reality, of course, not without a dosage of reflexivity, have a somewhat easier task conveying their messages in another language. They are more universally agreed on methodologies and highly coded systems of symbolisation, which generate meta-languages that are incomprehensible to any non-expert, but readable to knowledgeable actors in a given field. Hence, things are arguably somewhat less dependent on such contextual aspects as cultural and terminological differences.[6]

d. *Consequently, English functions as a common language without much "noise" in communication in various fields of "exact" sciences.* Conversely, in the fields of many social sciences and humanities, it becomes obvious that English, although nonetheless accepted as the common language, does not simultaneously function as the *universal language.* This means that everything cannot be smoothly translated to English without added contextual explanations of the differences in meanings.

semioticians, culturalists and others. However, any attempt by me to make an overview of all diverse theories and hypotheses would enormously expand this paper.

6. I can report that Slovenian natural and technical scientists (including in such fields as engineering, life sciences, a range of applied sciences, and so on) publicly exposed themselves with their demand to "legalize" English as a second *official* language of instruction at the University. This was strongly opposed by some representatives of humanities, arguing that the inseparability of language, thought and culture, which includes the category of identity, represent a reason for keeping the exclusiveness of the native language as the compulsory language of instruction.

On this level of the elaboration of problems in the usage of English for academic publishing, one should take into account the degree of relevance of *hermeneutics*, which grasps the role of language in the formation of thought systems in a much more comprehensive manner than the disciplines, which concentrate on rhetoric, lexical aspects, semantics, and locutions and so on. This is well demonstrated in the hermeneutical approach to the theme of translation also in view of a broader theory of interpretation. Not by really an orthodox hermeneutical philosopher's, Walter Benjamin's essay on *The Task of the Translator* caught the interest of hermeneutics due to his discussion of a "category" of *translatability*. "Translatability is an essential quality of certain works, which is not to say that it is essential for the works themselves that they be translated; it means, rather, that a specific significance inherent in the original manifests itself in its translatability" (Benjamin, 1969, p. 71). The task of the translator is, therefore, far from simply the transmitting of the original to a translation. "Yet any translation that intends to perform a transmitting function cannot transmit anything but communication – hence, something inessential. This is the hallmark of bad translations" (Benjamin, 1969, p. 71). With these reflexive phrases, Benjamin does not mean that only certain texts can be translated and others not, but refers to the difficulties in transferring intentions, meanings and cultural nuances in the translation.

Paul Ricoeur further discussed the idea of translatability: "What would then be aspired to would be the pure language, as Benjamin puts it, that every translation carries within itself as its messianic echo. In all these forms, the dream of the perfect translation amounts to the wish that translation would gain, gain without losing" (Ricoeur, 2006, p. 9). Almost every translation from French, Italian, Russian, and so on, of a philosophical or an interdisciplinary book by some prominent author, is accompanied by an explanation of the difficulties of translation. Deleuze and Guattari pointed to the specific work of philosophy consisting of creating new concepts. In comparison to philosophy "(…), there are other ways of thinking and creating, other modes of ideation that, like scientific thought, do not have to pass through concepts. We always come back to the question of the use of this activity of creating concepts, in its difference from scientific or artistic activity" (Deleuze, & Guattari, 1994, p. 8). A scope of discourses represents different problems for translation. Similar "untranslatability" as in philosophy is transferred to other areas due to the agencies of interactivity in a culture. At this instance I would also like to point to an aspect, which was recently reiterated by Agamben in his quest for an explanation of philosophy as a topic of the "unsayable": "(…) the unsayable does not take place outside of language as something obscure that is presupposed, but, as such, it can be eliminated only in language" (Agamben, 2018, p. 35). Since I cannot dwell on this very interesting topic here, let me only point out that the work on the "unsayable" makes part of a discursive invention, which is more often than not tied to a native language. Apart from the many cases of simply pretentious or poor texts, the reasons for turning down an article, which is legible and accepted in the native environment are usually expressed in terms of weak clarity, poor English, illegible argument and so on. Do reviewers always take into account the fact that there must be an original text behind the submitted one and that they should make an effort to reflect on their ability to read out the meaning of such translations?[7] How seriously do they understand communication as an interactive exchange? A more open attitude could be "modelled" on

7. I remember only once at a conference on humanities that a researcher from Scotland expressed in her presentation an admiration for colleagues from other language areas and their ability to attain a level of communicating their ideas in English. Otherwise, we mostly have to come to terms with an overwhelming feeling that native speakers think that English makes up part of the norm in scientific publishing (including humanities).

communicative events within any language; "(...) we need to realize that such discourse has many 'non-verbal' dimensions, such as intonation, gestures, applause, music and other aspects of oral performance, as well lay-out, printing types, color, pictures, drawings, film, and so on for written discourse" (van Dijk, 2007, p. xxxv). Such elements which determine theoretical descriptions of more elusive phenomena (for instance in aesthetics, poetry, film studies, etc.) generate prominent differences between discourses in different languages. "(..) languages are different not only owing to the way they carve up reality but also owing to the way they put it together again at the level of discourse" (Ricoeur, 2006, p. 30).

Epilogue

The author of the *Introduction* to the translation of the Ricoeur's booklet *On Translation* describes its contribution in rather broad terms: "There are two paradigms of translation for Ricoeur. There is, first, the linguistic paradigm which refers to how words relate to meanings within a language or between languages. And there is, second, the ontological paradigm which refers to how translation occurs between one human self and another" (Kearney, 2006, p. xii). Ricoeur's notion of translation, therefore, transcends the linguistic dimension. As for the "human selves", they may well be imagined as scientists from different cultural or linguistic environments. And as it follows from my elaboration, there is no symmetry in this communication. Still, as much as many foundations for complaining about the disadvantages in the race to "get published" exist, there is also a highly important other side to the problem. Ricoeur, who in his writings contributed a lot to expand the sense of translation as a concept, signals another dimension: "The work of translation, won on the battlefield of a secret resistance motivated by fear, indeed by hatred of the foreign, [is] perceived as a threat against our own linguistic identity" (Ricoeur, 2006, p. 23). The regime of obligatory publishing in English has also helped to eradicate what we remember as a figure of the public intellectual from the end of the era of communism.[8] However, it also, in the long run, helps a renunciation of self-sufficiency as a core "value" of every nationalism and cultural exclusivism, which are usually based on "linguistic ethnocentrisms" (Ricoeur, 2006, p. 4). In some smaller ethnic or national communities, for instance in the Balkans, a link between language and existence of the community is an essential part of identity. Despite many hindrances installed by the rule of metrics, market mentality and the destructive competition between sciences and between scientists, as opposed to the Augustinian spirit of cooperation of the knowledgeable, there are ever-more indications that the communication with the dominant English is a two-way street. A further explaining of this claim would require a whole new effort to come up with persuasive evidence.

My approach as demonstrated in this article, cannot lead to any final conclusion. What I as a non-linguist find to be of utmost importance is shedding light from different angles on the problem which non-native speakers encounter. Probably, a focus in a framework of scientific self-reflection on the manifold impacts of digitalisation and its role in enhancing our ability to communicate in sciences could produce some new grasps of the differences in negotiating positions in communications. Certainly the proverbial Sofia Coppola's dictum, "lost in translation", persists in the times of digitalisation, no matter what help is available from the tools in various computer programmes. Many

8. Evidently, in most ex-socialist countries especially critical social scientists are almost absent from the media. This was not the case in roughly the last decade of socialism. Part of the reason for this is probably that the obsession with publishing in the international science journals acquired a priority over public engagement.

aspects of the expressing ideas in the foreign language in research are being discussed on somewhat anarchic internet sites such as Academia.edu and Research gate, which connect researchers from all over the world. Therefore, this looks like a kind of virtual self-organisation of researchers. Just to illustrate this point, let me give a few examples from a forum on Research Gate. The topic of publishing in English is very much present on this and other sites on the internet. In this case, participants were reacting to the question posted by Rafael Hernandez Barros:

"Do you think that academic journals in general are fair when publishing articles by non-native English scientists?"

• Some answers advocated pragmatic aspects such as that publishing in English increases visibility and that, no matter what, the researchers must acquire a good level of English.

• A participant in this debate, Dean Whitehead expressed an understanding as a reviewer for the troubles of non-natives: "If anything, I might perhaps give 'extra credit' to someone who has tried hard to express themselves as best they can, but not in their native tongue. I know that might sound a little subjective – but that's how I work" (Barros, 2014).

• Vasilios Pergialiotis saw simply a sort of rip-off as a rationale for "unfairness" towards non-natives: "Adding to this conversation I would like to state that publishers might want to push non-native English scientists towards their rather expensive language editing services" (Barros, 2014).

• Aceil Alkhatib made a comment which points towards a change of the regime: "I agree, native English speakers have an advantage which should be considered by reviewers and editors. However, with the taxpayer's right to access publicly funded research, I believe that researchers should publish in their native language and submit an abstract written in English" (Barros, 2014).

• Emeka W. Dumbili pointed out that "editors should suggest to publishers to provide free language aid to authors whose papers are good but may have language problems" (Barros, 2014).

• Rahul Pratap Singh Kaurav answered resolutely to the question: "In my opinion 'NO' they are not fair" (Barros, 2014).

Such on-line discussions obviously signal the acuteness of the problem. But, it seems, that the problem is the status of publishing in the regime (the context) of research such as it is. Additionally, a level of publishing in our different languages should not be suppressed for all imaginable cultural reasons. "Either way, it is worth mentioning that publication is not the endpoint of scientific discovery: the results should feed into the pool of knowledge and this might inspire other researchers to pursue new avenues or devise new experiments" (Meneghini, 2012, p. 107). The ethics of communication with regard to truth as a ruling principle of any science is all too often forgotten and existing surplus of production of publications due to the competitive model might harm science at its core.

References

Agamben, G. (2018). *What is Philosophy?* (p. 35). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Barros, R.H. (2014). *Do you think that academic journals in general are fair when publishing articles by non-native English scientists?.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/post/Do_you_think_that_academic_journals_in_general_are_fair_when_publishing_articles_by_non-native_English_scientists. Accessed 26 April 2020.

Benjamin, W. (1969). *Illuminations* (p. 71). New York: Schocken Books.

Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of Science and Reflexivity* (p. 34, 45). Chicago, Cambridge: University of Chicago Press, Polity Press.

Chemero A. (2009). *Radical Embodied Cognitive Science Cambridge* (p. 7). Massachusetts: A Bradford Book, The MIT Press.

Coward, R., & Ellis, J. (1977). *Language and Materialism. Developments in Semiology and the Theory of the Subject* (p. 62). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Deleuze, G. (1997). *Cinema 2, The Time-Image* (p. 28). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze. G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* (p. 8). New York: Columbia University Press.

Gruber, Th. (2014). Academic sell-out: how an obsession with metrics and rankings is damaging academia. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 24*(2), 165–177.

Habermas, J. (1969). *Protestbewegung und Hochschulreform* (p. 78). Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Hyland K. (2019). Academic Cultures and Disciplinary Writing: Specificity in EAP. *Discourses on Culture*, 11, 7–24.

Justin, J. (2010). Avguštin, singularnost in prezgodnje rojstvo subjekta [St. Augustin, Singularity and the Premature Birth of the Subject]. *Monitor ISH*, *12*(2), 7–50.

Kearney R. (2006). Introduction: Ricoeur's philosophy of translation. In P. Ricoeur, *On Translation* (p. xii). London, New York: Routledge.

Krzeszowski, T.P. (2016). *The Translation Equivalence Delusion: Meaning and Translation.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Medvedev, Zh.A. (1979). *Soviet Science* (pp. 207–208). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meneghini, R. (2012). Emerging journals The benefits of and challenges for publishing scientific journals in and by emerging countries. *EMBO reports*, 13, 106–108.

Ricoeur, P. (2006). *On Translation* (pp. 4, 9, 23, 30). London, New York: Routledge.

van Dijk, T. (2007). Editor's Introduction. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *The Study of Discourse: An Introduction* (pp. xix – xxxvii). London Sage.