

# TRANSLATION AND TERMINOLOGY. APROPOS OF TWO SPANISH VERSIONS OF DUMARSAIS' *LOGIQUE* (MADRID, 1800)<sup>1</sup>

Brigitte Lépinette  
Brigitte.Lepinette@uv.es  
Universitat de València-IULMA

Elena Rodríguez Murphy (Translation)

## Abstract

Framed in the field of philosophical translation (*lato sensu*), this article deals with two different versions of Dumarsais' *Logique* ([1769] 1797, Paris), both published in Madrid in 1800. We argue that these two *Lógicas*, which were translated by two different persons, had distinct purposes. This is evidenced by their respective bibliographical contexts and metatexts and by their translators' use of different sets of Spanish terminological equivalents for the concepts that, as set out in the first few pages of his *Logique*, are key in Dumarsais' theory of knowledge. In the first of these translations, which envisions logic as having an introductory role in the acquisition of scientific knowledge, terms are systematically borrowed from the source text. On the other hand, in the second translation, by J. M. Alea (1781-1826), we find an entirely different set of terminological equivalents, none of which coincide with those used in the first text. J. M. Alea's terminological (and philosophical) *infidelities* may be explained by the translator's desire to update Dumarsais' theory of knowledge by using the alternative terminology of Condillac.

## Résumé

Cette étude qui relève du domaine de la traduction philosophique (*lato sensu*) a pour objet deux versions de la *Logique* de Dumarsais (Paris [1769] 1797) éditées en Espagne (toutes deux à Madrid en 1800). Nous montrons que ces deux *Lógicas*, oeuvres de deux traducteurs différents, qui eurent chacun des fins également différentes, comme le prouvent le contexte bibliographique et les métatextes respectifs, manifestent la présence d'une terminologie espagnole divergente pour les termes clé de la théorie de la connaissance que l'auteur français exposa dans les pages initiales de sa *Logique*. La première de ces traductions, qui attribue à la logique un rôle d'introduction aux sciences, choisit des termes systématiquement calqués sur ceux de Dumarsais tandis que J. M. Alea (1781-1826) argumente l'emploi d'une terminologie spécifique, non concordante avec celle du texte source. Ces *infidélités* terminologiques (et *in fine* idéologiques) de J. M. Alea peuvent s'expliquer par le désir de ce traducteur de mettre à jour une théorie de la connaissance qu'il voudra rendre conforme à celle de Condillac.

**Key words:** Terminology. Translation. Enlightenment. Logic. Dumarsais. 'Soul', 'Understanding', 'Spirit'.

**Mots clé:** Terminologie. Traduction. Siècle des Lumières. Logique. Dumarsais. 'Âme', 'Entendement', 'Esprit'.

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is the English version of "Traducción y terminología. A propósito de dos versiones al español de la *Logique* (Madrid, 1800) de Dumarsais" by Brigitte Lépinette. It was not published on the print version of MonTI for reasons of space. The online version of MonTI does not suffer from these limitations, and this is our way of promoting plurilingualism.

Matters pertaining to the translation of scientific and technical terminology gained special significance in the 18th century when a great number of translators tried to render into the Spanish language texts that could introduce a whole new range of scientific and technical knowledge into the Iberian Peninsula. In these specialized scientific and technical fields, neological procedures were used by translators, following in the footsteps of those previously adopted by the French, which included: creations of a metaphorical nature as well as new words with a basis or an affix of learned origin (Greek or Latin).<sup>2</sup> In both cases, neologisms were integrated into the Spanish language according to its specific procedures of terminological creation, even in the case of metaphorical expressions. However, it must be noted that, owing to their characteristic nature, metaphorical expressions took some time to be finally integrated into dictionaries as new entries.

Philosophical terminology –we consider the scholarly logic of the 18th century to be within this field and to make use of its specific terms– poses problems that differ from those that emerge when dealing with purely technical or scientific texts. Indeed, although philosophical contents may be new in some works (this is the case of the *Logique* by Dumarsais or that by Condillac because their ideas mark a turning point in relation to other systems of thought that had preceded them), terms, on the other hand, are not (and, therefore, they cannot be considered, from a formal point of view as neologisms). What actually vary in these texts are the concepts, the interpretation of which will differ in accordance with each system of thought. For example, terms such as ‘âme’, ‘entendement’ or ‘esprit’, which we will be examining here, each correspond to a specific notion that transmits the ideology of the author or that of the school of thought in which it was used. Moreover, in the 18th century, a time of constant change, these notions were greatly influenced by their rejection or their adoption by traditional thinking. In this kind of text, the author must, therefore, establish which concept corresponds to each term. Translation of philosophical terminology in this context is far from being an innocent act, as many translators already know, and, in some cases, it requires an explanation of the concepts and the use of equivalents that are not necessarily related in a morphological sense (as in *âme* and *alma*). It is precisely on these conceptual shifts that occur in relation to a particular ideology that we will be focusing throughout this paper by studying two different translations into Spanish (1785/1800 by J. Serrano and 1800 by J. M. Alea, 1781-1826) of Dumarsais’ *Logique ou Réflexions sur les principales opérations de l’esprit* ([1769] 1797).<sup>3</sup>

## 1. Dumarsais’ *Logique*: thought and terminology

1.1. Dumarsais’ *Logique* has been considered a text that has (Brekle 1971<sup>4</sup>: x, cited in G. Sahlin, 1928: x):

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lépinette 1998.

<sup>3</sup> César Chesneau Dumarsais (or du Marsais) (1676-1756) was not able to see all of his works published before his death. *La Logique ou Réflexions sur les principales opérations de l’esprit* – which is the focus of this study – was first published in 1769, under the general title *Logique et Principes de grammaire*. *La Logique* was reedited in 1797 (7 volumes in-8°) in *Oeuvres complètes de Dumarsais* edited by Duchosal & Millon (Sahlin 1828: X-XI). In this paper we will be using the *Logique* that is included in *Reproduction en facsimilé du cinquième volume de l’édition complète de 1797* (Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Hozboog): Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1971).

<sup>4</sup> In *Reproduction en facsimilé des textes tirés de l’édition complète de 1797* (Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Hozboog): Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1971). *Avec une introduction par Herbert E. Brekle*.

très peu de valeur [...], vide d'idées personnelles et assez scolastique, quoique la méthode proposée à la fin soit celle de Descartes. L'auteur examine d'abord la différence entre langage et l'âme humaine et d'autres questions scolastiques. Il passe ensuite très rapidement sur l'idée et le jugement pour consacrer la plus grande partie du livre aux syllogismes et aux sophismes. En somme, cet ouvrage est sensiblement inférieur à la logique de Port-Royal.

Even though Sahlin insists on the *scholastic* basis of Dumarsais' *Logique*, as far as we are concerned, the first part of this text has given rise to other works which, from diverse perspectives, integrate a theory of knowledge that would later take shape during the 18th century, especially in the works of Condillac – a philosopher that was known in Spain better and earlier than Dumarsais was. As we will see, by drawing on Condillac's *Logique*, J. M. Alea, one of the translators we will be studying, initiated the terminological discussion to which we would like to add some light in this paper. The terms 'âme', 'esprit' and 'entendement' are the pillars that support Dumarsais' thought. Consequently, in the first place we will try to describe the conceptual content of the terms 'âme' and 'esprit', as well as that of 'entendement', 'idée' and 'sentiment', within Dumarsais' *Logique*.<sup>5</sup>

1.2. In the first pages of Dumarsais' *Logique*, the soul is primarily “substance spirituelle” (in opposition to “substance corporelle”, both created by God, *Dieu*<sup>6</sup>) and it is defined as (1971: 303): “ce qui a la propriété [...] d'avoir des affections sensibles”. Thus, the soul is the organ (in its literal sense) that allows external objects to arouse human sentiments – a term that has been translated differently depending on the translator. As we will see, Spanish translators hesitated between 'sentimiento' and 'sensación'.

Dumarsais argues that there are two types of *sentiments*: the “sentiment immédiat”, which is defined as: (1971: 309) “celui que nous recevons immédiatement des impressions extérieures des objets sur les organes des sens” and which (ibid.) “ne suppose que l'objet et l'organe”, and the “sentiment médiat”, considered as: (ibid.) “sentiment du sentiment, [qui] suppose un moyen et ce moyen est le sentiment immédiat”. According to the theory of the Encyclopedist, which can be defined as organicist (not far from Descartes), the “sentiment immédiat” is aroused because the nerves connect the human *extérieur* to the brain<sup>7</sup>. And it is the brain – specifically the (1971: 311) “corps calleux, regardé comme le siège de l'ame”<sup>8</sup> – that can be marked by impressions (in its literal sense), “traces” or “plis” which, “rappelés par le cours des esprits animaux<sup>9</sup> ou du sang” enable us to conceive an “idée”. In this way, the “sentiment médiat” can be said to be a kind of internalization of the external impression that would allow us to identify the “sentiment immédiat” and turn it into an “idée” (Dumarsais considers that the soul has other additional faculties such as willpower (1971: 313): “qui est aussi une propriété de notre ame”. However, *La Logique* does not make reference to other “propriétés de l'ame”).

1.3. The “simple” idea is the “image d'une chose”, the result of perception, which is turned into a “complexe” idea when it includes two elements. For example, (1971: 312) the idea of *montagne* coupled with that of *or* results in *montagne d'or*. The notion of an “idée complexe”

<sup>5</sup> We have only considered here the pages that range from Article I to Article VIII, and we have decided to exclude the rest of the text taking into account that it focuses on syllogism and sophism and not on Dumarsais' *philosophy*.

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that the term *Dieu* appears in Dumarsais' work but not in Condillac's *Logique*. On the other hand, the distinction between *substance corporelle* and *substance spirituelle* or *âme* inevitably brings to mind the philosophy of Descartes, who separated the human *corps-machine* from the *âme-conscience*. All the functions of the body are conducted automatically. The soul, related to the pineal gland, is connected to the organs which allow it to perceive different sensations.

<sup>7</sup> (1971: 310): “Il suffit de remarquer ici que les nerfs, par lesquels toutes les sensations se font, ont deux extrémités; l'une extérieure, qui reçoit les impressions des objets; l'autre intérieure, qui la communique au cerveau”.

<sup>8</sup> The term 'âme' (in contemporary French) is spelled 'ame' (as was the case in the 18th century) in Dumarsais' writing.

<sup>9</sup> It is well known that the *esprits animaux* are present in Bacon's and Descartes' philosophy as material bodies. In this sense, Descartes seems to be a keen follower of Bacon's ideas, though Bacon identified the *esprits animaux* with the sensitive soul as Dumarsais did.

takes us from the sphere of the soul to that of the spirit. Hence, (1971: 312) “à l’occasion des impressions que nous avons reçues”, it is possible to carry out some “opérations”, including “joindre ensemble certaines idées” or “former des idées par abstraction”. These “idées complexes”, which the reader may consider as an image or a concept, are “simples considérations de notre *esprit* [car] elle se représente un objet sans en porter aucun jugement”. So, if we proceed from Dumarsais’ thought, while the soul is spurred in pure sensation (*idée simple*), when the idea is complex it is the spirit that is involved. The term ‘esprit’ – and no other –, is used when talking about *opérations*, which are not images or ideas, but judgements (1971: 316): “si je pense par exemple que le triangle a trois côtés, je passe de l’*idée* au *jugement*”.

1.4. The word ‘judgement’ can also be found to be used in a more *classic* sense (in previous logics), as the faculty of reasoning or expressing propositions (*judgements*, mental or verbal, although Dumarsais refers to the *mots* used, 1971: 317). *Esprit*, in this case, can be considered to be an equivalent of *entendement*, that is, the faculty that favours *raisonnement* (*discursus*, i.e. *tirer un jugement d’autres jugements*, 1971: 325), which, at the same time, allows for syllogism, something that Dumarsais would touch upon extensively in his *Logique*. It is not surprising that Dumarsais decided to study the operations of the *esprit* and those of the *entendement* and that he did not concentrate on the description of sensations (even though beforehand he had to establish his understanding of them).

1.5. So, in a few words, the polyvalence of the notion *esprit*, a conceptual equivalent of *âme* as well as of *entendement*, will be, as we will see in the case of J. M. Alea, the main source of the discussion surrounding, on the one hand, the notional content of ‘âme’, ‘esprit’ and ‘entendement’, and, on the other, the translation of ‘alma’ vs. ‘espíritu’, ‘entendimiento’ and ‘mente’. The reason in both cases is the absence of neat definitions for each of the terms used by Dumarsais –a reason that is to be found in the source text. Moreover, some of the ideological *a priori* of one of the translators have also played a major role in the conscious usage of this unfaithful terminology.

## 2. Bibliographical context and metatexts regarding the Spanish translations of Dumarsais’ *Logique*

[1785: *Lógica sacada de la Enciclopedia traducida por [...] Don Joaquín Serrano Manzano con Elogio de Du-Marsais* (Madrid, Miguel Escribano);<sup>10</sup>

1800 *Elementos de medicina del Doctor Juan Brown, traducidas del latin al ingles con comentarios é ilustraciones por el mismo autor Y del ingles al Castellano por el Doctor Don Joaquín Serrano Manzano Físico, Secretario perpetuo del Real Colegio de Medicina de Madrid y del Real Colegio de la Facultad reunida en S. Carlos. Lleva a su frente la Lógica de Mr. Du-Marsais.*<sup>11</sup> Contient : *Lógica o Reflexiones sobre las principales operaciones del entendimiento escrita en frances por Mr. Du-Marsais Sacada de la Enciclopedia y traducida por el mismo Don Joaquín Serrano Manzano*;

1800 *Colección española de las obras gramaticales de Cesar Du-Marsais ordenada para la Instrucción pública con aplicaciones y exemplos correspondientes a la elocución española*, Madrid : Imprenta de Aznar [included in part II (p. 148- 266): *Lógica o Reflexiones sobre las principales operaciones del alma*].

2.0. In relation to the bibliography of the translated texts –see description above–, which, as earlier indicated, will constitute the basis of our study, it should be noted that three versions of

<sup>10</sup> This reference to *El Elogio de Du-Marsais* means that the source text of this translation is the French reedition of the 1769 text.

<sup>11</sup> Madrid, Imprenta Real 1800.

Dumarsais' *Logique* appeared on the Spanish market between 1785 and 1800. Two of them were done by the same translator, Joaquín Serrano Manzano, who would later (in 1800) use his first version and would include it in a treatise on medicine (initially in English).

As José Miguel Alea points out in the introduction to his translation (that is, the third into Spanish), at that moment two translated versions already existed of Dumarsais' *Logique* in Spanish (1800: 148):

Dos traducciones se han hecho en España de la *Lógica* de Du-Marsais : la primera en esta corte, imprenta de Miguel Escribano, año de 1785 ; sin el nombre del traductor y con el *Elogio de Du-Marsais* por D'Alembert al principio de ella ; y la segunda del Dr. D. Joaquín Serrano y Manzano, imprenta Real, año de 1800, al frente del tomo primero de los *Elementos de Medicina* del Dr. Brown, a cuya obra tuvo por conveniente (y con razón) dicho Dr. Serrano agregarla, para dar a los principiantes de medicina las nociones lógicas que necesariamente deben preceder al estudio fundamental de aquella ciencia.

On the other hand, although we have not been able to actually see the text of the 1785-version, it is interesting to underline that *La Gazeta* (sic) *de Madrid* (25th September 1785, p. 612) reported that a volume titled *Reflexiones sobre las principales operaciones del entendimiento* written by Du-Marsais had just been published. The title was followed by two other specifications: firstly, the allusion to what, according to the translator, is the origin of the source text, [*Lógica*] *sacada de la Enciclopedia*, and, secondly, a reference to the name of the translator, “[obra] *traducida por el mismo Don Joaquín Serrano Manzano*”. We can therefore put forward the hypothesis that the translation by Serrano Manzano (1785) of Dumarsais' *Logique* is the same as the one that, in 1800, would precede *Elementos de medicina* by ‘Juan Brown’ (1800, Madrid : Imprenta Real), taking into account that this second text by Serrano Manzano includes the same allusions as those used in 1785, with the exception of the reference to *L'Eloge de Dumarsais* by D'Alembert. The omission of *L'Eloge de Dumarsais* is actually not surprising since it had nothing to do with the treatise on medicine to which the *Logique* was added.<sup>12</sup>

2.1. As for Serrano Manzano, we must underline the fact that this translator declares that he is a *físico*<sup>13</sup> and that what really interests him about the text is the formation of future doctors for whom the combination *Lógica* and *Elementos de medicina* by John Brown is directed. This combined publication of two documents of apparently very different nature was not at that time as incongruous as it may seem today.

2.1.1 According to L. Sánchez Granjel (1979: 44), in the educational reform designed by Carlos III, the learning of experimental physics was made compulsory in the field of *Artes* (from 1771). Future doctors also studied this modern subject. Some years later, in 1786, this same monarch established that (ibid.):

no deberán ser admitidos a oír la explicación de la Facultad de Medicina en la Universidad los que no justifiquen haber cursado en ella [...] los quatro años ; a saber uno de *lógica parva y magna*, o sea *dialéctica y lógica*, otro de *metafísica*, otro de *aritmética*; *Algebra y Geometría*, y otro de *Física experimental*.

So, ‘logic’ as a discipline came to be a part of medicine studies (entirely theoretical in those days).<sup>14</sup>

In so far as the metatext that introduces his translation is concerned, J. Serrano Manzano alludes in his preface not to the translation as such –as opposed to what J. M. Alea would later

<sup>12</sup> In this page of the *Gaceta*, Du-Marsais' *Lógica* is described as clear and simple. Surely this is because the author expounds extensively, as is common practice in other *lógicas*, on the subject of syllogisms and sophisms.

<sup>13</sup> In the Spanish terminology of that time a *físico* was a doctor.

<sup>14</sup> L. Sánchez Granjel (1979: 44): “La formación del médico es exclusivamente teórica, sujeta a la lectura de los libros galénicos, que solo muy avanzado el siglo serán sustituidos por las obras de Boorhaave y la actualización de los escritos hipocráticos”.

do—, but to the method that ought to be followed in medicine. Serrano Manzano considers the two pillars on which medicine must rest are, on the one hand, the observation of phenomena perceived by the senses (1800: vi):

todo lo que se sabe en medicina sea respecto á las enfermedades y sus causas, sea respecto á su pronostico y su curación, todo debe su origen á la observacion de los fenomenos que se presentan á los sentidos.

And, on the other, *el estudio de los hechos* which involves reasoning (p. xi): “el buen método [es] observar y raciocinar”, as Serrano asserts in a less orderly fashion than could be expected.<sup>15</sup>

*La Lógica*, in this sense, seems to be well placed as an introduction to *Elementos de medicina*. The critique that Serrano makes of Descartes, an important element of his argumentation, is not surprising at that moment in time and, especially, in that specific context given that it underlines that the basic principle of Cartesian thought, which privileges reasoning and not the consideration of fact, should be excluded from medical studies.<sup>16</sup> It is important nonetheless to take into account that Dumarsais’ *Logique* did not actually contribute that much to supporting an experimental approach, except for the fact that he followed the general principle which establishes that knowledge has its origin in perception (which is shaped by the senses). Consequently, when teaching future doctors, the process of observation (in this case of symptoms) could be privileged instead of an *a priori* reasoning.

2.1.2. There is another reason that, perhaps in a more convincing manner, can explain the appearance of *La Lógica* at the beginning of Brown’s *Elementos de medicina*. As S. Auroux points out, at the end of the 18th century logic was defined as (1993: 42-3): “une étude préliminaire, préparatoire, certes, à l’éloquence mais aussi à la réflexion scientifique”. This linguist cites several works in order to support his statement among which we can find the logic of J.-B. Cochet (Paris, 1750): *La clef des sciences et des Beaux-arts ou la logique*.<sup>17</sup> In his preface, Cochet defended that logic is more important than any other discipline (Préface, 1750: xij):

La logique qui perfectionne la raison, & enseigne à en faire un bon usage dans le discernement du vrai & du faux, est utile à toutes sortes de personnes. Toutes les autres sciences ont des usages bornés; mais l’utilité de la Logique s’étend aussi loin que l’utilité du bon sens & de la justesse de l’esprit. Rien n’est plus important que de penser juste.

In this sense, the main purpose of logic would be (ibid.) “découvrir, [...] enseigner, [...] prouver le vrai”, beyond its traditional usage as a way of introducing the subject of rhetoric. It may well be the case that Serrano was aware of this, although we do not know if, at some point, he read Cochet in French or the translation of *La clef des sciences*, which was published after Serrano’s translation (1785) of Dumarsais’ *Logique*. Either way, in Serrano’s case, the Encyclopedist’s *Logique* served as an introduction to a scientific treatise which means that he must have approved of Cochet’s statement when he asserts that (translated by Vicente Martínez, 1793: iv): “[La lógica] conduce al más fácil conocimiento de las otras ciencias; porque suponen

<sup>15</sup> (1800: xi): “Aquel arte [*La lógica* de Dumarsais] enseña quales son las fuerzas del entendimiento, qual es el uso que se debe hacer para llegar al conocimiento de la verdad, especialmente tratándose en ellos de una doctrina enteramente nueva en su modo, y para cuya inteligencia se requiere mucha penetración y séria meditación. [Este arte] pues nos enseña á raciocinar exactamente y con orden , y á perfeccionar el discurso ó raciocino, el cual nos dirija para conducir la razón en el conocimiento de las cosas é indagación de la verdad”.

<sup>16</sup> (1800: xi): “Descartes cayó en [...] muchos errores por haberse apartado del camino que nos dicta la razon, y es el que naturalmente sigue el entendimiento en sus operaciones, caminando desde los mas sencillo á lo mas compuesto, como que las ideas sencillas son las primeras que resultan de los sentidos y de la reflexion, y que no hubiera tomado el muy contrario, despreciando el estudio de los hechos, y queriendo que sirviesen de principios sus nociones abstractas, por haberse persuadido que nuestros sentidos son unas guias falaces y engañadoras que no pueden alcanzar verdad alguna”.

<sup>17</sup> Paris: Dessaint, 1750. Cochet’s logic was translated into Spanish as: *La llave de las ciencias y bellas artes ó La lógica traducida al castellano por D. Vicente Martínez*, Madrid: Ibarra 1793.

todas la rectitud del juicio y del razonamiento á caminar advertidamente en la investigación de la verdad”.

2.1.3. The appearance of the *Lógica* as an introduction to a scientific text destined for pedagogical usage (it serves as justification of the method that should be adopted in medicine) can help to understand why matters related to the process of translation, especially in regard to terminology and its translational difficulties, are not described by J. Serrano.

Furthermore, as a strong believer in the benefits of the experimental method for medicine, the translator will tend to emphasize intellectual work in order to put such a method into practice. This explains why, from the very beginning, Serrano chose to translate *esprit* as *entendimiento* instead of using the word *alma* as J. M. Alea (see below).

2.2. In comparison to Serrano y Manzano's, the initial metatext included in J. M. Alea's version does insist on the translation of the terminology related to logic and metaphysics (*Lógica*, Advertencia, 1800: 148):

Uno y otro traductor varian más ó menos en el uso de algunos términos que la precision del lenguaje filosófico ó de las ideas tiene consagrados como technicos é insustituibles por otros, y que yo he conservado cuidadosamente para no faltar á la exactitud y precision de ideas del autor. Y porque en materia de tanta importancia, qual es la significación determinada de las voces en punto de lógica y metafísica, no debe haber vaguedad, ni la menor indeterminación, me he separado también de los referidos traductores de la Lógica de Du-Marsais en la version del título francés : *Reflexions sur les principales opérations de l'esprit* tomando la voz *esprit* por alma, y no por *entendimiento*, como aquellos hacen. No hay precaucion que sobre, tratandose de metafísica; y el medio mas seguro de precaver el abuso de las palabras es simplificar el lenguaje [...].

In this explanatory note to the reader (*ibid.*), Alea defends the thesis that the expression *opérations de l'esprit* had to be translated as *operaciones del alma*. In this regard, he follows Condillac, who had previously affirmed that, although technical terms were sometimes necessary, for pedagogical reasons, one could decide not to use them (*Principes généraux de grammaire*, an VI: 5):

Persuadé que les arts seroient plus faciles s'il étoit possible de les enseigner avec des mots familiers à tout le monde, je pense que les termes techniques ne sont utiles qu'autant qu'ils sont absolument nécessaires. C'est pourquoi j'ai banni [du *Cours d'étude*] tous ceux dont j'ai pu me passer.

Moreover, Alea claims that *esprit* has to be translated as *âme*. This affirmation, as we will later see, has its roots in Condillac's *Cours d'étude*. But, for now, let us examine Condillac's definition of *entendement*:

la collation ou la combinaison des opérations de l'ame. Appercevoir, ou avoir conscience, donner son attention, reconnoître, imaginer, se ressouvenir, réfléchir, distinguer des idées, les abstraire, les composer, les décomposer, les analyser, affirmer, nier, juger, raisonner, concevoir: voilà l'entendement.

This quotation taken from Condillac's *Cours d'étude* proves that there is a semantic equivalence between *entendement* and *âme*. These terms involve, in an undifferentiated manner, an ensemble of *opérations* which were however divided in Dumarsais' work between (i) feeling –it was the soul that was involved– and (ii) judging and reasoning –in this case, it was the spirit and understanding that were involved.<sup>18</sup>

Condillac asserts that the term *âme* (linked to thought) –his logic is a reflection on *les premiers développements de l'art de penser*– refers to the same concept as *esprit* (chap. VII, p.

<sup>18</sup> Dumarsais attributed other faculties to the soul, among them willpower.

54): “On trouve dans la faculté de sentir toutes les facultés de l’âme: attention, comparaison, jugement, réflexion, imagination, raisonnement, entendement”.

Succinctly, these are Dumarsais’ and Condillac’s definitions:

Dumarsais	Condillac
El concepto de <i>alma</i> ( <i>âme</i> ) está diferenciada del de espíritu ( <i>esprit</i> ): el alma ( <i>âme</i> ) siente / el espíritu ( <i>esprit</i> ) concibe y juzga. El entendimiento ( <i>entendement</i> ) – también – juzga.	El alma ( <i>âme</i> ) engloba sensación, juicio, así como las demás facultades humanas no puramente físicas.

It is possible to realize that trying to translate such important concepts in Dumarsais’ work as *âme*, *esprit* o *entendement* according to Condillac’s theorizations, which was what Alea did, involved the risk of creating conceptual difficulties, making the target text unclear for the prospective reader and, finally, transferring into the country of reception a theorization whose profound meaning was, as we shall see, distorted.

### 3. J. Serrano’s and J. M. Alea’s translations

If the title of the translations is already highly significant,

Dumarsais 1797	Serrano 1800	Alea 1800
<i>Logique ou les principales opérations de l’esprit</i>	<i>Lógica o las principales operaciones del entendimiento</i>	<i>Lógica o las principales operaciones del alma</i>

there is another parameter that can also be considered as essential (as the metatexts below reveal), that is: the purpose each translator considered the text to have and their specific ideological stance in relation to the ideas that underlie Dumarsais’ *Logique*. Such a purpose will also have an influence on other translational equivalences we have been able to observe within the target text.

3.1. For J. Serrano Manzano, the main function of *La Lógica* was to encourage the development of the reasoning capacities of future doctors by carefully selecting facts and subsequently observing and interpreting them. Undoubtedly, this is why, in his text, Serrano always translates *âme* as *alma* and *entendement* as *entendimiento* or *espíritu*, taking into account that Dumarsais uses *entendement* as a synonym of *esprit* (p. 316). For example:

Dumarsais 1797 (p. 313)	Serrano 1800 (p. 6)
C’est par cette opération de l’ <b>esprit</b> que les géomètres disent que la ligne n’a point d’étendue	Por esta operación del <b>entendimiento</b> , dicen los géometras que la línea no tiene latitud.
Dumarsais 1797 (p. 314)	Serrano 1800 (p. 7)
Ce nom marque le point de vue de l’ <b>esprit</b> qui considère par abstraction	Esta mira de nuestro <b>entendimiento</b> es una abstracción
Dumarsais 1797 (p. 313)	Serrano 1800 (p. 7)
Il n’y a de réel que les êtres particuliers, qui existent indépendamment de notre <b>esprit</b>	no hay de real sino los seres particulares que existen independientemente de nuestro <b>entendimiento</b>



In the above cases, the presence of the term *espíritu* is made possible as a result of the synonymic relation established by Dumarsais.

Dumarsais 1797 (p. 316 Article V)	Serrano 1800 (p. 8 Artículo V)
Des quatre principales opérations de l' <b>esprit</b> . Par ce mot <b>esprit</b> on entend ici la faculté que nous avons de concevoir et d'imaginer, On l'appelle aussi <b>entendement</b> .	De las quatro principales operaciones del <b>espíritu</b> Por esta palabra <i>espíritu</i> se entiende aquí la facultad de concebir, de imaginar. Se llama tambien <b>entendimiento</b>

Dumarsais' theory of knowledge does not seem to pose great comprehension difficulties for the translator, who systematically uses morphological equivalents that are close between French and Spanish.

Nonetheless, Serrano Manzano seems to doubt when confronted with the term *sentiment*, which coincides in Dumarsais' writing with *sensation*, the effect produced by sensorial perception. The doctor resorts therefore to both words, something common in scientific translations (see, for example, the work of J. Pinilla 2004, who analyses the Spanish translations of Duhamel du Monceau). So, in Serrano's translation we are faced with an equivalent relation between *sentiment (immédiat et médiat) = sentimiento o sensación (inmediato y mediato)*. It must however be noted that he employs both terms in a different manner: in order to translate the word *sentiment*, Serrano Manzano sometimes uses only the term *sentimiento*, but he never uses *sensación* on its own (p. 4):

Quando yo he visto el sol, este **sentimiento o sensación** que el sol ha excitado en mí por él mismo, es lo que llamamos el *sentimiento inmediato* (en cursiva en el texto), porque este **sentimiento** no supone sino el objeto y el órgano.

The appearance of structures comprising two words is quite frequent, although they are not always that relevant from a terminological point of view:

Quando las impresiones de los objetos **afectan ó estimulan** [affectent] la parte exterior de los sentidos, son como se dice comunmente, **conducidas ó llevadas** [*portées*] por la extremidad interior de los nervios á la sustancia del cerebro (sic).

Here are other examples:

Dumarsais (p. 311)	Serrano (p. 5)
[Le cerveau] est le réservoir et la source des esprits animaux	[el cerebro] es el receptáculo, y el <b>origen o fuente</b> de los espíritus animales
Dumarsais Article VII (p. 325)	Serrano (p. 12)
Du raisonnement	Del <b>razonamiento o raciocinio</b>

The term *raciocinio* comes up as a translation of *raisonnement*, and, as in the case of Dumarsais, as a synonym of *syllogisme*. So, it is not surprising to observe that structures comprising two words serve to define certain concepts that may be difficult for the Spanish reader to understand (depending on the nature of the concept or the characteristics of the translation which, as in *sentimiento*, could seem imprecise).

On the other hand, Serrano Manzano does not appear to have any problem with Dumarsais' description of the process of perception and includes a footnote that refers to a treatise of medicine (p. 4, note I, "Véase el epitome Esplanalógico y Fisiológico de Rousley, T. 4"). As for the general term *cerveau*, he decides to use a more technical one, *sensorio* (p. 5). We could say that we are dealing here with a *faithful* translation: Serrano does not intervene in the

interpretation of Dumarsais' doctrine (we have already stated why in 2.1.2).<sup>19</sup> Alea, on the contrary, will act differently.

3.2. As we have already mentioned, Alea considers the *Lógica* to be a scholarly treatise that can open the way for a new theory of knowledge. He is particularly interested in Dumarsais' understanding in regard to the perception and formation of ideas. This specific interest places Alea within the ideological margins of *L'Encyclopédie*, whose conceptions are still well known among the Spanish elite. It is interesting to underline that in 1800, there were already two published translations of Condillac's *Logique* (see appendix). The fact that Alea decided to translate Dumarsais' *Logique*, the first edition of which dates back to 1730, leads us to develop several hypothesis about the reasons for choosing such a source text.

3.2.1. On the one hand, it may be that the translation was commissioned by Manuel Godoy (1767-1851), as in the case of *Des tropes*, since the *Logique* is included within the collection: *Colección de las obras grammaticales de Cesar Du Marsais* (Madrid, Aznar 1800). On the other hand, we know that J. M. Alea was part of –although we do not know if there was a personal relationship– the circles of erudites and translators who, as praised by Godoy in his memoirs, made a whole range of texts, translations from French or reeditions of the Spanish classics of the Golden Age, available for the *Imprenta Real* at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century. More than thirty years later, Godoy in an evidently *pro domo* discourse exclaimed that (*Memorias* 1836 : 247):

¡Qué nación de Europa entre las vecinas de la Francia pudo entonces atender á las letras y á las ciencias como atendió España en aquel tiempo! Lo excelente, lo bueno, lo mediano y aun lo ínfimo que vió la luz en aquel tiempo fue un tributo, si se puede decir así, de oro, plata y cobre y talco que una infinidad de aspirantes al honor de enriquecer su patria presentaron al común tesoro.

After listing all of the works and translations whose writing and impression he promoted in the *Imprenta Real* –the *Colección española de las obras gramaticales de Du-Marsais* being one of them– Godoy highlighted that his purpose was linked to his wish of improving education.

3.2.2. Alea's decision to embark on the translation of Dumarsais' work may also have its roots in Serrano's version and his apparent interest in a specific point (*alma* vs. *espíritu*). It became an opportunity to criticize Serrano Manzano's text (first published in 1785). Alea sometimes looked for specific arguments in Condillac's writings while, on other occasions, reading Condillac meant acquiring the ideological and translational stance he defends. In both cases, the result is the same in relation to the translation of the controversial notions *alma* and *espíritu*.

3.2.3. Alea argues that *esprit* should be translated as *alma*, taking into account that the soul becomes the place where sensations have their origin and ideas are generated, something already suggested by Condillac (whom he only quotes once in a footnote, 1800:169, making reference to the introduction that we have already mentioned). The use of the term *alma* to translate *esprit* can be detected from the very beginning as we read the Spanish title in relation to the French one:

Dumarsais 1797	Alea 1800
<i>Logique ou les principales opérations de</i>	<i>Lógica o las principales operaciones del</i>

<sup>19</sup> There is however an important omission of information in Serrano Manzano's translation. Dumarsais affirms that (p. 1): "A l'égard des anges, **la foi nous en apprend fort peu de choses, l'imagination beaucoup et la raison rien ; en effet le peuple en rapporte une infinité d'histoires fabuleuses**". The first part of this affirmation appears to be modified in the translation while the second part has been cut (Serrano, p.1): "En quanto a los ángeles, nosotros no sabemos sino lo que **la fe nos enseña**". In the case of Alea's translation, it is interesting to point out that this reflection about faith has been included entirely (p. 154): "En quanto a los ángeles **la fé nos enseña muy pocas cosas, la imaginacion mucha, y la razon nada, en efecto el vulgo cuenta de ellos una infinidad de historias fabulosas, de patrañas**".

<i>l'esprit</i>	<i>alma</i>
-----------------	-------------

There are several points in the text that we are analysing here where *esprit* is translated as *alma*. For example, even judgement, reasoning and method are considered to be operations of the soul or *alma* (p. 167):

Dumarsais 1797 (p. 314)	Alea 1800 (p. 167)
“Il y a surtout quatre opérations de notre <b>esprit</b> qui demandent une attention particulière i° l'idée [...], 2° le jugement, 3° le raisonnement, 4° la méthode”.	“Las operaciones del <b>alma</b> que piden una atención particular, son cuatro principales. La 1ª es la idea [...]. La 2ª el juicio. La 3ª el raciocinio o discurso. La 4ª el método”.

Further on, Alea includes something not found in Dumarsais' text: he states that it is within our soul where ideas merge:

Dumarsais 1797 (p. 312)	Alea 1800 (p. 164)
“Voici quelques opérations que <b>nous</b> pouvons faire à l'occasion des impressions que nous avons reçues [...]”.	“con ocasion de las impresiones recibidas, puede nuestra <b>alma</b> hacer las operaciones siguientes [...]”.

In Alea's text, this transformation of *esprit* into *alma* seems to be the result of a philosophical interpretation in which the specificities of the soul or *âme* (as defined by Dumarsais) and those of the spirit or *esprit* (also described by Dumarsais) are erased. Thus, for our translator there could only be one unique entity, the soul, spiritual and mental at the same time, in opposition to the physical one (*grosso modo* as described by Condillac, see 2.). However, it is possible to observe that Alea's understanding of Dumarsais' work was difficult to sustain given that one of Dumarsais' main purposes until Article VIII was precisely to differentiate in his text two distinct entities, *l'esprit* and *l'âme*, each with its own particularities. As a matter of fact, it is very difficult to successfully transmit a theory by changing one of its main concepts, as Alea tried to do throughout his entire translation.

This *a priori* determination to translate *esprit* as *alma* in accordance with specific ideological beliefs is *in fine* the cause of some translational decisions which seem quite surprising. For example, Alea, who did not know (or did not want) to use the term *espíritu* (or what Dumarsais' defines as its equivalent: *entendement /entendimiento*), which he refers to in his initial comment to the reader as being unacceptable, will simply delete it from the translation:

Dumarsais 1797 (p. 313)	Alea 1800 (p. 166)
“C'est par cette opération de l' <b>esprit</b> que les géomètres disent que la ligne n'a point d'étendue”.	“Por esta misma operacion, dicen los géometras que la línea no tiene latitud”.

In other cases, Alea finds himself, despite his initial statements, having to follow the source text and ends up using a structure comprising two words. This appears to be incoherent in relation to his explanations to the reader and other parts of the translated text:

Dumarsais 1797 (p. 316 Article V)	Alea 1800 (p. 167)
“Des quatre principales opérations de l' <b>esprit</b> . Par ce mot <b>esprit</b> on entend ici la faculté que nous avons de concevoir et d'imaginer, On l'appelle aussi <b>entendement</b> ”.	“De las quatro principales operaciones del <b>espíritu (ó alma)</b> Por esta voz <b>espíritu</b> se significa aquí la facultad que tenemos de concebir y de imaginar Lláname tambien <b>entendimiento</b> ”.

3.3. These attempts to *rewrite* Dumarsais' text carried out by Alea were, from the point of view of the target text, doomed to failure. They made the Encyclopedists's text less coherent and increased the possibilities of it being misinterpreted.

Although the *Logique* was not Dumarsais' best piece of work (in fact, the information offered in the long part devoted to syllogisms was hardly new), it did provide access to a theory of knowledge that made Cartesianism obsolete. This aspect, as we have already stated, was actually pointed out by Serrano Manzano in his introduction. What Alea did, on the other hand, was to *rewrite* the *Logique* by erasing the differentiation that Dumarsais had established between two main concepts, *âme* and *esprit*. Alea's decision may be explained taking into account not only his determination to adapt Dumarsais' terminology to Condillac's, which was more modern and better known, but also his interest in updating a 1730-text to a translation done in 1800.

4. At the end of this analysis concerning the terminological changes consciously introduced (although not always coherently) by one of the translators as opposed to the way the other translator renders his text in a more literal manner, it must be underlined that such changes are also ideological. If we take into consideration our previous explanations, we can assert that modifications were part of the adaptation process of the text to an updated theory of knowledge that dominated the Spanish elites in 1800. It was basically an attempt by Alea to progress from Dumarsais, still *scholastic* in some ways, to Condillac.

From a translational point of view, the aforementioned changes –terminological, although they also impinge on the basis of philosophical theory–, reveal the great liberty the translator was able to take with respect to the source text during the 18th and 19th centuries. Furthermore, it is obvious that a close examination of the social context in which the translation is produced as well as that of the initial metatexts (in this case put in contrast since we have two different translations of the same text) allows us to better understand how and why two translators have happened to choose such different options when dealing with the same text in the same period. Serrano's *Lógica* was part of an attempt to develop the genre, transforming it into a helpful introduction to the sciences. However, J. M. Alea's *Lógica* was conceived as an oeuvre of prestige –commissioned by the political establishment– whose potential readers were not clearly defined. This *Lógica* underwent a process of renewal of the aspects that were considered obsolete from a philosophical point of view. Clearly, the decision to translate Dumarsais' work in 1800, a moment when his theory of knowledge was less prestigious than Condillac's, can only be understood within a systematic programme of translation approved (imposed) by the establishment – in this case, Godoy – and whose participants were not always as *enlightened* as could be expected. They were, nonetheless, informed about what went on in France at that time. Without a doubt, the reedition of Dumarsais' works in 1797 was crucial in the enhancement of his prestige and the main cause for Alea's translation of the *Colección española de las obras gramaticales de Cesar Du Marsais, ordenada para la instrucción pública*.

Finally, it may be said that a study of this nature brings to the fore the special interest of the data that can be generated by the linguistic analysis of translations, i. e. a better understanding of the manner in which this kind of knowledge is transmitted and the way in which it is received in the target culture. In all, this study constitutes a valuable contribution to the history of translation as well as to the history of linguistics and linguistic historiography.

## Works cited

- AUROUX, Sylvain. (1992) *Histoire des idées linguistiques* Liège: Mardaga.  
 AUROUX, Sylvain. (1993) *La logique des idées* Paris : Bellarmin/Vrin.  
 CHESNEAU DU MARS AIS, César. (1769) *Logique et principes de grammaire. Ouvrages posthumes en partie, et en partie extraits de plusieurs traités qui ont déjà paru de cet auteur*. Paris: Briasson, Le Breton, Hérisant.

- CHESNEAU DU MARSAIS, César. (1971 [1797]) *Logique ou Réflexions sur les Principales Opérations de l'Esprit* [Paris: Pougin] Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt : Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Reproduction en fac-similé du tome cinquième de l'édition complète de 1797).
- [CHESNEAU DU MARSAIS, César] Alea, J. Miguel. (trad.). (1800-1801) *Colección española de las obras gramaticales de Cesar Du-Marsais: ordenada para la instrucción pública, con aplicaciones y ejemplos correspondientes a la elocución castellana; Por D. José Miguel Alea destinado a la Real Biblioteca para el examen y arreglo de la literatura Inglesa, Bibliotecario del Real Establecimiento de Clínica, y últimamente comisionado por S. M. Para el estudio de la Ichtiología. Parte Primera: Tratado de los Tropos* Madrid : Imprenta de Aznar [Parte II, *Lógica o Reflexiones sobre las principales operaciones del alma*, 148-266].
- GODOY, Manuel. (1836) *Cuenta dada de su vida política por Don Manuel Godoy, Príncipe de la Paz o sean Memorias críticas y apologéticas para la historia del Reinado del Señor Don Carlos IV de Borbón* Madrid: Sancha 1836 (T. II).
- COCHET, abbé. (1750) *La clef des sciences et des Belles Lettres ou la Logique* Paris : Saillant.
- [COCHET, abbé] Martínez, Vicente (trad.). (1793) *La Llave de las ciencias y Bellas Artes o Lógica* Madrid: Ger. Ortega y hereds. de Ibarra.
- CONDILLAC. (An XI) (1803) *Oeuvres complètes de Condillac, revues et corrigées par l'auteur et imprimées sur ses manuscrits autographes (Logique tome 30)* Paris : Dufart.
- GROULT, Martine. "La philosophie dans l'Encyclopédie : le projet et l'article"  
[http://books.google.es/books?id=zAsqOfaA6iMC&pg=PA111&dq=Encyclopédie+Diderot+Syllogisme&hl=es&ei=26yxTZSBBMnU4wazg\\_yBDA&sa=X&oi=book\\_result&ct=result&resnum=5&ved=0CD8Q6AEwBA#v=onepage&q=syllogisme&f=true](http://books.google.es/books?id=zAsqOfaA6iMC&pg=PA111&dq=Encyclopédie+Diderot+Syllogisme&hl=es&ei=26yxTZSBBMnU4wazg_yBDA&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=5&ved=0CD8Q6AEwBA#v=onepage&q=syllogisme&f=true)
- LÉPINETTE, Brigitte. (1998) "La traduction scientifique en Espagne au XVIIIe siècle". *Europe et Traduction* (éd. : M. Ballard), Arras/Ottawa Presses de l'université, 117-137.
- LÉPINETTE, Brigitte. (2008) "De la traducción como ciencia auxiliar de la historia. Condillac en España". *La traducción: balance del pasado y retos del futuro* (eds.: F. Navarro Domínguez, M.A. Vega, J. A. Albaladejo, D. Gallego, M. Tolosa) Alicante: Editorial Aguaclara y Dpto. de Traducción e Interpretación, Universidad de Alicante, 431-453, <http://www.histal.umontreal.ca>
- PINILLA, Julia. (2008) *La traducción técnica y científica en España durante el siglo XVIII. Estudio traductológico de la obra en español de H.L. Duhamel du Monceau (1700 - 1782)*. Tesis doctoral. Universitat de València.
- SAHLIN, Gunvor. (1928) *César Chesneau Du Marsais et son rôle dans l'évolution de la grammaire générale*, Paris: PUF.
- SÁNCHEZ GRANJEL, Luis. (1979) *La medicina española del siglo XVIII*, Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca
- TAMISIER, François. (1862) *Dumarsais. Sa vie et ses écrits*, Marseille: Librairie de V. Boy (Hathi Trust Digital Library).

## Appendix 1

### Editions of Condillac's *La logique* published in France The Ancien Régime and the Revolution

1780	<i>La logique ou les premiers développements de l'art de penser; ouvrage élémentaire</i>	Paris : L'Esprit & De Bure aîné
1789	<i>La logique ou les premiers développements de l'art de penser; ouvrage élémentaire que le conseil préposé aux Ecoles palatines avoit demandé &amp; qu'il a honoré de son</i>	Paris : (s.n.) An XI (1802)

	<i>approbation</i>	
1792	<i>La logique ou les premiers développements de l'art de penser</i>	Paris : s.i.
An III 1795	<i>Ouvrage ou les premiers développements de l'art de penser</i>	Paris : Impr. de F. Dufart
An VI 1798	<i>Oeuvres de Condillac. La Logique, ou les premiers développements de l'art de penser</i>	Houel, Charles/ Gratiot Guillaume (Impr.): Paris/Strasbourg

## Appendix 2

### Condillac's *Logiques* translated into Spanish at the end of the 18th century

	Translator	Title	
1784	B.M de Calzada <sup>20</sup>	<i>La Lógica o Los primeros elementos del arte de pensar Escrita en francés por el abad de Condillac.</i>	Madrid : J. Ibarra (203 p.)
1786 (2 <sup>e</sup> éd.)	B.M de Calzada	<i>La Lógica o Los primeros elementos del arte de pensar Escrita en francés por el abad de Condillac .</i>	Madrid : J. Ibarra
1796	Valentín de Foronda	<i>Lógica de Condillac puesta en dialogo por D. - y adicionada con un pequeño tratado sobre toda clase de argumentos y sofismas con varias reflexiones de la aritmética moral de Buffon, sobre medir las cosas inciertas, sobre el modo de apreciar las relaciones de verisimilitud, los grados de probabilidad, el valor de los testimonios, la influencia de las casualidades, el inconveniente de los riesgos, y sobre formar el juicio del valor real de neutros temores y esperanzas.</i>	Con licencia Madrid: en la imprenta de González

## Appendix 3

### Other *lógicas* translated into Spanish at the end of the 18th century

1797	Borrelli, M	<i>Elementos del arte de pensar, ó la Lógica reducida á lo que es meramente útil / trad. del francés por D. Josef Maria Magallon y Armendariz, Marqués de Santiago,</i>	Madrid: Aznar (262 p.)
1798	Baldinotti, Cesare	<i>Arte de dirigir el entendimiento en la investigacion de la Verdad ó Logica, escrita en latin por Cesar Baldinoti y traducida en castellano por Don Santos Diez Gonzalez y Don Manuel de Valbuena</i>	Madrid: Benito Cano (VIII + 399 p.).

<sup>20</sup> B. M de Calzada (ca. 1750-1807).

**BIONOTE / NOTICE BIOGRAPHIQUE**

Brigitte Lépinette (1944) holds a 'licenciée és Lettres' from the Université de Paris-Sorbonne and earned her doctorate at the Universidad Complutense of Madrid. She is full professor of French Philology at the Universitat of València (Spain), where she has supervised ten doctoral theses. She pursued postdoctoral studies on linguistics in Canada (Montréal) and in France (Paris-VII). She has published several books on the teaching of French grammar in Spain and on the history of translation, together with numerous articles in international journals on topics related to linguistics, the history of linguistics, the historiography of linguistics, translation, and the history of translation of works on linguistics.

Brigitte Lépinette (1944), licenciée és Lettres de l'Université de Paris (Sorbonne) et docteur de l'Universidad Complutense de Madrid, est actuellement titulaire d'une chaire de Philologie française à l'Universitat de València (Espagne), où elle a dirigé une dizaine de thèses doctorales. C'est au Canada (Montréal) et en France (Paris-VII) qu'elle a réalisé des recherches post-doctorales en linguistique. Elle est l'auteure de plusieurs livres sur l'enseignement de la grammaire du français en Espagne et l'histoire de la traduction dans ce pays, ainsi que d'un vaste corpus de publications parues dans des revues scientifiques internationales relevant des domaines suivants: linguistique, histoire de la linguistique, historiographie linguistique, traduction et histoire de la traduction d'oeuvres linguistiques.