

TRANSLATOR'S LINGUISTIC PERSONALITY

Vrabel T. T.

Ferenc Rákóczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education

The present article is devoted to the detailed analysis of the translator's linguistic personality. Modern researchers single out a number of methods to present linguistic personality. The main purpose of this paper is to give a general overview of the linguistic, communicative, functional, typological, and cognitive approaches to the translation process with special regard to linguistic personality. In the light of this review, translation units are distinguished and translation quality assessment criteria are specified.

It has been determined that adherents of various approaches to the process of translation, based on relevant principles, elaborated and analysed a number of translation models. The linguistic approach is represented by situational and denotative, transformation, semantic models, and the theory of equivalence levels; the communicative one includes the Interpretive Theory of Translation (elaborated by French linguists D. Seleskovitch and M. Lederer in the late 20th century); the functional approach embraces eight functions of translation covering translation as a source of inspiration, translation as a school of style, transgressive translation, palliative translation, translation as a culture-forming factor, barometer translation, identifying translation, and translation as a factor of transferring literary genres (they were elaborated and singled out by the Canadian researcher J. Delisle); L. M. Alekseyeva's typological theory of translation concentrates on the extralinguistic description of translation, as well as on the notions of sense, reflection, and activity; the cognitive approach comprises the integrative model of conceptual translation, the cognitive model of the translation process, as well as the cognitive and heuristic model of translation.

It has been observed that the processes of understanding the source text and creating the target text consist of multiple stages. A text can have an infinite number of interpretations in the course of translation and the translator can come back to the latter multiple times to correct and improve it. The author has come to the conclusion that any translation model is hypothetical in character as far as there is no direct proof that the translator acts in full accord with the model and does not deviate from it. However, correspondence of the result of translation with the expected one according to the model shows that the latter has some explanatory power.

Key words: *linguistic personality, linguistic approach, communicative approach, functional approach, typological approach, cognitive approach, translation model.*

Врабель Т. Т. Мовна особистість перекладача. *Стаття присвячена детальному аналізу мовної особистості перекладача. У наш час дослідники виділяють цілу низку способів представлення мовної особистості. Основною метою цього дослідження є загальний огляд лінгвістичного, комунікативного, функціонального, типологічного та когнітивного підходів до процесу перекладу із зосередженням особливої уваги на мовній особистості. У контексті такого огляду виокремлено одиниці перекладу та окреслено критерії оцінки якості перекладу.*

З'ясовано, що прихильники різних підходів до процесу перекладу з опертям на відповідні засади випрацювали різні моделі перекладу. Зокрема, лінгвістичний підхід репрезентовано ситуативно-денотативною, трансформаційною, семантичною моделями та теорією рівнів еквівалентності; комунікативний – інтерпретативною теорією перекладу (її розробили французькі мовознавці Д. Селескович та М. Ледерер наприкінці ХХ століття); функціональний підхід представлено вісьмома функціями перекладу, серед яких – переклад як джерело натхнення, переклад як школа стилю, трансгресивний переклад, паліативний переклад, переклад як фактор формування культури, переклад-барометр, ідентифікуючий переклад та переклад як фактор перенесення літературних жанрів (їх виділив канадський дослідник Ж. Деліль); типологічну теорію перекладу Л. М. Алексєєвої зосереджено на екстралінгвальному описі перекладу, на поняттях смислу, рефлексії та діяльності; когнітивний підхід включає інтегративну модель концептуального перекладу, когнітивну модель процесу перекладу та когнітивно-евристичну модель перекладу.

Простежено, що процеси розуміння оригіналу та тексту перекладу складаються з декількох етапів. Текст має безмежну кількість інтерпретацій у процесі перекладу, а перекладач може неодноразово повертатись до останнього для його коригування й вдосконалення. Підсумовано, що будь-яка модель перекладу є гіпотетичною за своєю природою, оскільки немає безпосереднього доказу дотримання перекладачем моделі й невідхилення від неї. Однак водночас зауважено, що відповідність перекладу результатам, очікуваному згідно з моделлю, вказує на те, що остання має певну пояснювальну силу.

Ключові слова: *мовна особистість, лінгвістичний підхід, комунікативний підхід, функціональний підхід, типологічний підхід, когнітивний підхід, модель перекладу.*

Defining the problem and argumentation of the topicality of the consideration. Person-oriented development of translation studies (TS) as a system of knowledge both in synchrony and diachrony enables

one to formulate the leading principles of its systematic description. The modern stage of development of TS can be presented in the light of linguistic personality that is closely related to anthropocentric theory. This paper will

summarize the current theories on the translation process paying special attention to linguistic personality (LP) as the central notion of the theory and practice of translation.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

Yu. N. Karaulov distinguishes several ways of presenting a LP: a) a three-level organization of the LP (verbal and semantic or structural and systematic, linguistic and cognitive or thesaurus, and motivation levels) [6, 51]; b) a combination of skills to conduct verbal and cognitive activity and perform various communicative roles [6, 60–62]; c) reconstruction of the LP in the three-level language structure (phonetics, grammar, lexis), as well as of the types of speech (speaking, listening, writing, reading) and the degrees of language mastery [6, 51].

L. V. Kushnina singles out two research paradigms in the study of the LP. Firstly, translator's LP is related to the notions of linguistic consciousness, linguistic ability, communicative need, communicative competence, translator's way of thinking, translator's mindset, and translator's view of the world. Secondly, the combination of the above-mentioned characteristics of the LP is realized in various approaches to understanding the process of translation that determine the strategy and tactics of translation, ways to set concrete translator's tasks, and achieving optimal solutions in translation [11, 76].

Setting the goals and tasks of the article. This article aims at analysing the following approaches to translation in detail: linguistic, communicative, functional, typological, and cognitive as far as they give a clear picture of the state of theory and practice of translation at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries. Furthermore, we will single out units of translation, as well as determine the criteria of translation quality assessment.

The outline of the main research material. Now let us turn our attention to analysing each of the approaches and start with the linguistic one. Researchers that laid the foundation of this approach include: A. V. Barkhudarov, V. N. Komissarov, Ya. I. Retsker, L. K. Latyshev, V. G. Gak and others. They developed and described the major translation models: situational and denotative, transformation, semantic, and the theory of equivalence levels. In accord with the situational and denotative model, any real situation can be described by means of any language, thus promoting the idea of essential translatability. Transformation model focuses on lexical and syntactic rephrasing, as well as semantic modifications that resulted in numerous translator's techniques and transformations. Semantic models reveal semantic discrepancies between languages. The theory of equivalence levels deals with the possibility to reach equivalence between the source text (ST) and the target text (TT) at the levels of: the communicative aim, situation description, word, sentence structure, and signs. We will not dwell on this approach in detail as far as it has been analysed in numerous publications.

Among the communicative models of special interest is the Interpretive Theory of Translation (ITT) elaborated by French researchers D. Seleskovitch and M. Lederer [23]. The translated version of their theory is presented in the research by T. I. Bodrova-Gozhenmos. It is claimed that "ITT is not a linguistic,

but a communicative theory of translation" [4, 44]. The main idea of the ITT authors is that TT is created according to the same laws as the ST. In translation, just like in the original, we comprehend not separate words, but the sense of the utterance [4, 47]. Moreover, the authors stress that the sense of the utterance is not equal to the meaning of its component words. This level distinguishes three levels of translation and we will give a short description to each of them. The first is the level of translating separate words out of the context they are used in (e.g. technical nomenclature). The second is the level of educational translation focusing on the translation of separate sentences according to grammatical and lexical forms. Here we speak of language units, but not of communication units. The third level deals with texts that are units of communication [4, 49]. It is here that the TT is created taking into account the sense of the utterance, thus complying with the communicative aim. Furthermore, only the communicative level enables one to reveal the role of the translator's LP due to his cognitive background knowledge and the cognitive context.

The functional approach was developed by the Canadian researcher J. Delisle. He distinguishes eight functions of translation as part of linguistic and cultural theory of translation: translation as a source of inspiration, translation as a school of style, transgressive translation, palliative translation, translation as a culture-forming factor, barometer translation, identifying translation, and translation as a factor of transferring literary genres. Moreover, the linguist emphasizes that translation is not just a dialogue of cultures, but forms them [22, 46]. It seems obvious that all the above-mentioned functions belong to the translator's LP, especially the function of translation as a source of inspiration and translation as a school of style. In case of transgressive or palliative translation, the translator makes the decision as well. The same applies to barometer translation that shows what texts and into what languages are translated more often: the translator will choose the texts for which there is a demand in the target culture. The translator's role is most significant in case of culture-forming function [10; 11].

The culture-forming function presupposes that the translator managed to harmonize the cultural sense of the ST and the TT without infringing the cultural values and stereotypes of the target culture, the translator is tolerant in introducing alien values into it, thus creating a favourable background to perceive a foreign text from a different culture.

L. M. Alekseyeva in her typological theory of translation puts forward her own point of view on translation that significantly differs from purely linguistic interpretations of translation. She focuses on the extralinguistic description of translation, as well as on the notions of sense, reflection, and activity. The researcher interprets translation as an act of communication [3, 13]. Translation is understood not as one whole process; it is subdivided into separate directions. L. M. Alekseyeva develops the theory of scientific translation as an independent type of translator's activity [3, 25]. The linguist views translation as the translator's activity reflecting the translator's attitude to the knowledge expressed in the ST. Thus, the translator's activity is in the foreground of this theory testifying to the higher role of the translator's LP.

The cognitive approach to analysing the process of translation is complex. Researchers suggest an integrative model of conceptual translation [20, 203], a cognitive model of the translation process [15, 13], as well as a cognitive and heuristic model of translation [12, 25]. T. A. Fesenko claims the translator interprets the sense code of the ST and not the verbal forms, but the concepts behind them are being translated [20, 133]. He is the interpreter of the ST's conceptual programme and the author (co-author) of the TT's conceptual programme [20, 125]. The primary processing of the ST is done in an "uncontrolled workspace" by means of schemes and frames as a structural framework of a long-term memory [20, 138]. At the initial stage of text perception, a general pattern is formed that fixes a comprehensive picture of the translator's "cognitive resources" [20, 152]. The results of the initial processing of the ST help elaborate the macrostrategy of translation and further mental processes that now run in a "controlled workspace" [20, 138].

In A. G. Minchenkov's theory the processes of understanding the ST and creating the TT comprise multiple stages [12, 9]. A new text is created side by side with understanding the ST; in the course of the latter, ST units activate in the translator's mind conventional concepts that interact with the translator's background and contextual knowledge. As a result of this interaction, subjective concepts form senses (Ibid.). Knowing the meaning of ST units and the general knowledge of the world cause the changeable nature of understanding the ST by various translators; differences in individual background knowledge and subjective ideas bring about variation in text understanding (Ibid.). The author suggests two kinds of search – cognitive search of sense and the heuristic search of the means to verbalize the sense in the target language (TL) [12, 41].

The translator's total knowledge is presented in the form of a cognitive memory model based on the perception of reality via the comparison of memory frames that are related to the information obtained from the real world [16, 329]. I. N. Remkhe claims that at the stage of understanding, a foreign text is perceived and its sense is comprehended based on the search for frame correspondences of knowledge in the text, as well as translator's knowledge. An anticipation process is possible that foretells text development in the TL by interpreting dynamic frames. During translation, dynamic frames (situational, classification) are created mentally based on the ST, then they are compared with equivalent frame structures in the TL. Prototype correspondences are singled out based on prototype frame structures, the issue of their absence is solved, and an adequate translation strategy is chosen. At the final stage the translator creates a text in a foreign language taking into account its syntagmatic and syntactic peculiarities (Ibid.). Consecutive singling out of the most typical from the text requires a prototype strategy, while individual, less known issues in translation call for an adaptive strategy [15, 7]. Filling in the gaps (unknown or unclear issues for the translator) occurs from internal sources (by including additional cognitive mechanisms, contextual analysis, search by association), as well as from external ones (by using external sources of information) [15, 20].

Presenting the text as a hierarchy of frames enables the translator to see the distribution of information in the text being translated and to determine the priority of information on this basis [19, 166]. By using frames in the pre-translation text analysis, the translator can predict the lexical collocability of some text components, grammatical form of lexical components, role (sense) correlation of various text components, and to determine translation dominants (I. S. Alexeyeva's term) accurately [19, 167].

At the intersection of linguistic personology and modelling the process of translation, one can find the ludic model of translation elaborated by Ye. Yu. Kunitsyna [8]. It is based on the idea that "literary translation is a game" [8, 67]. The process of overcoming differences between languages and cultures runs amidst cognitive discord based on the translator's doubt. It does not mean that the translator is not sure of the correctness of his translation. He is sure there exists another translation, however, he risks and suggests his own translation even though he might return to it over and over again to improve it [8, 71]. The latter correlates well with the idea of an infinite number of interpretations in the process of translation [20, 141; 11, 80; 17, 118].

The translator's set of roles [13, 51] includes the role of a "cross-cultural mediator"; the role of a "consumer / interpreter" (the translator interprets the speech behaviour of cross-cultural communication participants, explains the communicative situation); the role of a "producer" (the translator constructs and creates the text in the TL); the role of a "practical psychologist" (the translator corrects his speech behaviour taking into account interpersonal relations, psychological state, as well as psychological reactions of the cross-cultural communication participants). Other roles include the role of an "organiser" (the translator creates the conditions for his work, adapts to the conditions and the kind of translation); the role of a "researcher" (the interpreter collects information on the theme of the translation and conducts a preliminary search for terms); the role of an "adaptator" (the translator adapts the TT to make it understandable for representatives of a different culture); the role of a "corrector" (the translator corrects his text observing the reaction of the listeners); the role of an "editor" (the translator edits his text while preparing it for publication) [13, 51–52].

I. R. Abdulmianova observes that at the verbal and semantic level the translator's LP is characterized by a language thesaurus and the ability to set correspondences between languages and cultures [1, 30]; at the thesaurus level the translator has the knowledge of the conceptual worldview of his own and a different language community, has mastered the functional style differentiation of the language; at the motivational level he is aware of the peculiarities of his own professional activity; the need for continuous self-improvement, increased rationality and common sense [1, 31]. Furthermore, the translator is to have some LP features of a specialist in the field he is working in (e.g. knowledge of specialized terminology in his mother tongue and the foreign language (Ibid.)). The ability to create an oral or written text of any functional style makes the translator's LP belong to an elite speech culture [18, 67].

The translator's LP is formed as a result of combining the features of collective (typical) and individual (idiolect) LP [18, 66]. Linguists distinguish three levels of abstraction in the study of the translator's LP: the LP of any translator, the LP here and now, and the translator's individual LP [21, 24]. The process of mastering a foreign language runs on the basis of available linguistic and cultural experience of the LP by means of a model created with the help of one's mother tongue [5, 8]. The translator's LP is not a natural development stage of a secondary LP; it emerges in the context of professional translation activity, is formed as a result of performing the translator's social role [21, 34]. Ye. Yu. Kunitsyna claims that in the process of moving from one field of translation to another the translator changes his discourse personality into another by adding it to the previous one. The translator changes his discourse personalities consciously based on his own thesaurus and pragmatic as qualitative characteristics of the LP [7, 104].

The mechanism of verbalizing mental content within the LP model of a bilingual translator can be represented by three interacting and intercomplementary components: mental lexicon, cognitive competence and language capacity [14, 205]. L. P. Tarnaeva suggested the notion of "multiculturalism" to characterize the translator's LP (the ability to serve as a mediator of cultures in situations of cross-cultural communication when the parties represent their national cultures, while the language that serves as a means of communication in the actual situation of translation is not their mother tongue) [18, 63].

O. N. Shevchenko claims that the translator's LP reveals itself in cases of discrepancy between the ST and the TT, its unit of analysis is translator's transformation [21, 7]. For instance, the verbal and semantic level of the translator's LP is formed by frequent non-correspondences in translation (Ibid.), the cognitive level is formed by the total of conceptual transformations [21, 8]. At the motivational level the translator's LP is based on the superintention to introduce the translated ST into the target culture adequately (literal translation, research translation, analytical translation) (Ibid.). Superintention is realized in a number of smaller aims that determine the translator's strategy and tactics in translating a concrete text [21, 16].

By comparing the classic (structural) and modern (cognitive) translation studies L. M. Alekseeva observes the change of the partitive object (translation unit) into the integral one (the strategy of successful translation) [2, 50].

Conclusions and directions for further research in this area. The theory of translator's LP is a scientifically substantiated, independent field of research that reflects the current state of modern translation studies. Despite the differences in the available approaches and scientific paradigms, the issue of the translator's LP acquires an ever greater significance. It can open up new perspectives in the field of interaction between communicants belonging to different linguistic cultures. Further research might focus on the study of functional, communicative, and cultural competence of the translator, linguistic creativity, stratification of the translator's LP, investigation into the professional LP and professional discourse in the light of multiculturalism theory.

LITERATURE

1. Абдулмянова И. Р. Теоретические основы формирования профессионального тезауруса переводчика. *Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н. И. Лобачевского*. Н. Новгород, 2009. № 1. С. 30–33.
2. Алексеева Л. М. Перевод как рефлексия деятельности. *Вестник Пермского университета. Российская и зарубежная филология*. Пермь, 2010. № 1. С. 45–54.
3. Алексеева Л. М., Шутемова Н. В. Типология перевода : монография. Пермь : ПГНИУ, 2012. 198 с.
4. Бодрова-Гоженмос Т. И. Интерпретативная теория перевода : основные положения, понятия, дефиниции. *Социокультурные проблемы перевода* : в 2 ч. Воронеж : Изд-во ВГУ, 2006. Вып. 7. Ч. 1. С. 42–51.
5. Бушев А. Б. Русская языковая личность профессионального переводчика. Тверь : ООО «Лаборатория деловой графики», 2010. 265 с.
6. Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность : монография. Москва : Изд-во ЛКИ, 2010. 264 с.
7. Куницына Е. Ю. Языковая личность переводчика как сущность и ипостась. *Известия Волгоградского государственного педагогического университета*. Сер. : Филологические науки. Волгоград, 2008. № 10 (34). С. 103–106.
8. Куницына Е. Ю. Людическая модель перевода : переводчик как его играющее eo ipso его рискующее. *Известия Санкт-Петербургского университета экономики и финансов*. Санкт-Петербург, 2010. № 6. С. 67–72.
9. Кушниина Л. В. Теория перевода как междисциплинарная антропология. *Вестник ПНИПУ. Проблемы языкознания и педагогики*. 2014. № 10. С. 45–53.
10. Кушниина Л. В. Реализация переводческих функций в тексте. *Вестник ПНИПУ. Проблемы языкознания и педагогики*. 2015. № 2 (12). С. 24–31.
11. Кушниина Л. В. Языковая личность переводчика в свете современных научных парадигм. *Вестник ПНИПУ. Проблемы языкознания и педагогики*. 2016. № 4. С. 76–84.
12. Минченков А. Г. Когнитивно-эвристическая модель перевода (на материале английского языка) : автореф. дисс. на соиск. учёной степ. докт. филол. наук. Санкт-Петербург, 2008. 43 с.
13. Поршнева Е. Р. Базовая лингвистическая подготовка переводчика : монография. Н. Новгород : Изд-во ННГУ им. Н. И. Лобачевского, 2002. 148 с.
14. Пшёнкина Т. Г. Вербальная посредническая деятельность переводчика в межкультурной коммуникации : психолингвистический аспект : дисс. ... докт. филол. наук : 10.02.19. Барнаул, 2005. 330 с.
15. Ремхе И. Н. Когнитивные особенности перевода научно-технического текста (на материале текстов металлургической промышленности) : автореф. дисс. на соиск. учёной степ. канд. филол. наук : 10.02.20. Челябинск, 2007. 25 с.
16. Ремхе И. Н. Роль переводчика в свете когнитивного моделирования переводческого процесса. *Языковая личность переводчика* : коллективная монография / отв. ред. Л. А. Нефедова. Челябинск : Изд-во ЧГУ, 2011. С. 317–336.
17. Самсонов В. Ф. Философский анализ гипотезы Куайна о неопределенности перевода. Челябинск : ОАО «Челябинский Дом Печати», 2006. 188 с.

18. Гарнаева Л. П. Концепции языковой личности в контексте проблем переводоведения. *Вестник ЛГУ им. А. С. Пушкина*. Санкт-Петербург, 2008. № 2 (13). С. 55–70.
19. Федюченко Л. Г. Применение теории фрейма при проведении предпереводческого анализа газетно-публицистических статей. *Вестник ТГУ*. Тюмень, 2006. № 4. С. 165–168.
20. Фесенко Т. А. Специфика национального культурного пространства в зеркале перевода : учеб. пособие. Тамбов : Изд-во ТГУ им. Г. Р. Державина, 2002. 228 с.
21. Шевченко О. Н. Языковая личность переводчика (на материале дискурса Б. В. Заходера) : дисс. ... канд. филол. наук 10.02.19. Волгоград, 2005. 255 с.
22. Delisle J. Dimension Culturelle de certaines fonctions de la traduction. *Atelier de traduction*. 2014. № 21. P. 37–60.
23. Lederer M. La traduction aujourd'hui. Le modèle interprétatif. Paris : Hachette, 1994. 224 p.

REFERENCES

1. Abdulmyanova, I. R. (2009). Teoreticheskie osnovy formirovaniya professionalnogo tezaurusa perevodchika [Theoretical Basis of Forming Interpreter's Professional Thesaurus]. *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta imeni N. I. Lobachevskogo*. Nizhny Novgorod, 1, 30–33 [in Russian].
2. Alekseeva, L. M. (2010). Perevod kak refleksiya deyatel'nosti [Translation as a Reflexive Activity]. *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Rosiyskaya i zarubezhnaya filologiya*. Perm, 1, 45–54 [in Russian].
3. Alekseeva, L. M., Shutemova, N. V. (2012). Tipologiya perevoda [Typology of Translation]: monografiya. Perm: Perm State National Research University [in Russian].
4. Bodrova-Gozhenmos, T. I. (2006). Interpretativnaya teoriya perevoda: osnovnye polozheniya, poniatiya, definitsii [Interpretative Theory of Translation. The Main Provisions, Meanings, Definitions]. *Sotsiokulturnye problemy perevoda*: in 2 parts. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 7 (1), 42–51 [in Russian].
5. Bushev, A. B. (2010). Russkaya yazykovaya lichnost professionalnogo perevodchika [Russian Linguistic Personality of a Professional Translator]. Tver: "Laboratoriya Delovoy Grafiki" Ltd [in Russian].
6. Karaulov, Yu. N. (2010). Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost [Russian Language and Linguistic Personality]: monografiya. Moskva: LKI Publishers [in Russian].
7. Kunitsyna, E. Yu. (2008). Yazykovaya lichnost perevodchika kak sushchnost i ipostas [Linguistic Personality of a Translator: Subject Matter and Image]. *Izvestiya Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. Series Filologicheskie nauki*. Volgograd, 10 (34), 103–106 [in Russian].
8. Kunitsyna, E. Yu. (2010). Liudicheskaya model perevoda: perevodchik kak ego igrayushchee eo ipso ego riskuyushchee [Ludic Translation Model: Translator as Ego Ludens Eo Ipso Ego Dīmīcāns]. *Izvestiya Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta ekonomiki i finansov*. St. Petersburg, 6, 67–72 [in Russian].
9. Kushnina, L. V. (2014). Teoriya perevoda kak mezhdistsiplinarnaya antropologiya [Translation Studies as an Interdisciplinary Anthropology]. *Vestnik PNIPU. Problemy yazykoznaniya i pedagogiki*, 10, 45–53 [in Russian].
10. Kushnina, L. V. (2015). Realizatsiya perevodcheskikh funktsiy v tekste [Realization of Translation Functions in Text]. *Vestnik PNIPU. Problemy yazykoznaniya i pedagogiki*, 2 (12), 24–31 [in Russian].
11. Kushnina, L. V. (2016). Yazykovaya lichnost perevodchika v svete sovremennykh nauchnykh paradigm [The Translator's Linguistic Personality in the Light of Modern Scientific Paradigms]. *Vestnik PNIPU. Problemy yazykoznaniya i pedagogiki*, 4, 76–84 [in Russian].
12. Minchenkov, A. G. (2008). Kognitivno-evristicheskaya model perevoda (na materiale angliyskogo yazyka) [Cognitive and Heuristic Translation Model as Applied to English]. (Avtoreferat dissertatsii doktora filologicheskikh nauk). St. Petersburg [in Russian].
13. Porshneva, E. R. (2002). Bazovaya lingvisticheskaya podgotovka perevodchika [Basic Linguistic Training of a Translator]: monografiya. Nizhny Novgorod: Lobachevsky State University of Nizhny Novgorod Publishing House [in Russian].
14. Pshyonkina, T. G. (2005). Verbalnaya posrednicheskaya deyatel'nost perevodchika v mezhkulturnoy kommunikatsii: psikholingvisticheskiy aspekt [Verbal Mediation of a Translator in Cross-Cultural Communication: Psycholinguistic Aspect]. (Dissertatsiya doktora filologicheskikh nauk). Barnaul [in Russian].
15. Remkhe, I. N. (2007). Kognitivnye osobennosti perevoda nauchno-tekhnicheskogo teksta (na materiale tekstov metallurgicheskoy promyshlennosti) [Cognitive Peculiarities of Scientific and Technical Translation as Applies to Texts Relating to Metallurgical Industry]: (Avtoreferat dissertatsii kandidata filologicheskikh nauk). Chelyabinsk [in Russian].
16. Remkhe, I. N. (2011). Rol perevodchika v svete kognitivnogo modelirovaniya perevodcheskogo protsessa [The Role of a Translator in Terms of Cognitive Modelling of the Translation Process]. *Yazykovaya lichnost perevodchika: kollektivnaya monografiya / executive editor L. A. Nefedova*. Chelyabinsk: Chelyabinsk State University Publishing House, 317–336 [in Russian].
17. Samsonov, V. F. (2006). Filosofskiy analiz gipotezy Quine o neopredelennosti perevoda [Philosophical Analysis of Quine's Hypothesis of the Indeterminacy of Translation]. Chelyabinsk: "Chelyabinsky Dom Pechati" [in Russian].
18. Tarnaeva, L. P. (2008). Kontseptsii yazykovoy lichnosti v kontekste problem perevodovedeniya [Linguistic Personality Concepts in Terms of Translation Studies Issues]. *Vestnik LGU imeni A. S. Pushkina*. St. Petersburg, 2 (13), 55–70 [in Russian].
19. Fedyuchenko, L. G. (2006). Primenenie teorii freima pri provedenii predperevodcheskogo analiza gazetno-publitsisticheskikh statey [Application of the Frame Theory to the Pre-Translation Analysis of Newspaper Articles]. *Vestnik TGU*. Tyumen, 4, 165–168 [in Russian].
20. Fesenko, T. A. (2002). Spetsifika natsionalnogo kulturnogo prostranstva v zerkale perevoda [National Cultural Space Specifics as Reflected in Translation]: textbook. Tambov: Derzhavin Tambov State University Publishing House [in Russian].
21. Shevchenko, O. N. (2005). Yazykovaya lichnost perevodchika (na materiale diskursa B. V. Zakhoder) [Linguistic Personality of a Translator in B. V. Zakhoder's Discourse]. (Dissertatsiya kandidata filologicheskikh nauk). Volgograd [in Russian].
22. Delisle, J. (2014). Dimension Culturelle de certaines fonctions de la traduction. *Atelier de traduction*, 21, 37–60 [in French].
23. Lederer, M. (1994). La traduction aujourd'hui. Le modèle interprétatif. Paris: Hachette [in French].