

UDC 81'25:811.111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.1/32.214478>**Tomash VRABEL,***orcid.org/0000-0001-5837-5153*

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Associate Professor at the Department of Philology

Ferenc Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education
(Uzhhorod, Ukraine) *tomashvrabel@gmail.com*

THE HISTORY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF TRANSLATION STUDIES AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENCE

The article presents a historical overview of researches that resulted in the emergence of translation studies that has by now incorporated the subject matter of a wide range of disciplines. The first studies of translation dealt with religious and belles-lettres texts. Naturally, the literary theory of translation was the first to be developed by scholars. 1930s marked the start of researches in the field of translating special texts that were not related to religion or fiction. The next direction of translation studies was the linguistic one and was based on equivalence theory. In the course of time it became clear that the linguistic approach has its own limitations. The next paradigm some linguists, like Yves Gambier and Anthony Pym single out is the Internet format due to the digital environment in which translation is performed. We do not agree with this point of view as far as the new technical conditions do not justify a new approach to be distinguished. It seems logical to single out the functionalist approach as the successor of the linguistic one. Translation is regarded as an integral part of a communicative situation; therefore all the parameters of the latter are taken into account in the process of rendering a source text into a target text by means of the instruments of the target language. In 1980s linguists started researching the effect of culture on translation and vice versa. They found the influence so significant that they suggested singling out new approaches: transcreation, transadaptation, and transculturation. However, they fail to recognize that what these new terms refer to has long been known in translation studies as pragmatic or cultural adaptation. At the beginning of the XXI century researchers elaborated an integrative (or interdisciplinary) approach to translation and distinguished three possible views on its character.

Key words: translation studies, literary theory of translation, linguistic approach to translation, functionalist approach, transcreation, transadaptation, transculturation, interdisciplinary approach.

Томаш ВРАБЕЛЬ,*orcid.org/0000-0001-5837-5153*

кандидат філологічних наук,

доцент кафедри філології

Закарпатського угорського інституту імені Ференца Ракоці ІІ
(Ужгород, Україна) *tomashvrabel@gmail.com*

ІСТОРІЯ СТАНОВЛЕННЯ ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВА ЯК МІЖДИСЦИПЛІНАРНОЇ НАУКИ

У статті подано історичний огляд досліджень, що спричинилися до появи перекладознавства, яке нині включає проблематику цілої низки дисциплін. Перші наукові розвідки перекладознавства були присвячені аналізу релігійних і художніх текстів. Природно, що саме літературну теорію перекладу дослідники розробили першою. У 1930-х рр. з'явилися перші роботи у галузі перекладу спеціальних текстів, які не належали до релігійного жанру або художнього стилю. Наступним напрямом дослідження перекладознавства був лінгвістичний, який базується на теорії еквівалентності. Згодом стало зрозуміло, що мовознавчий напрям має свої обмеження. Наступною науковою парадигмою, яку виділяють вчені, зокрема Ів Гамб'є та Ентоні Пім, є Інтернет-формат через цифрове оточення, у якому виконується переклад. Ми не погоджуємося з цією думкою, оскільки нові технічні умови не виправдовують виділення нового підходу. Нам видається логічним виділити комунікативно-функціональний підхід, який приходить на зміну / або доповнює лінгвістичний. Переклад вважається невід'ємною частиною комунікативної ситуації; відповідно, беруться до уваги всі параметри останньої під час переведення оригіналу у текст перекладу інструментами цільової мови. У 1980-х рр. мовознавці почали вивчати вплив культури на переклад і вплив перекладу на культуру цільової мови. Вплив виявився настільки потужним, що було запропоновано виділити нові підходи: транскреацію, трансадаптацію і транскультурацію. Проте ми не можемо погодитися із цією думкою, оскільки нові терміни позначають те, що у перекладознавстві вже давно відомо під назвою «прагматична, або культурна, адаптація». На початку ХХІ ст. лінгвісти розробили інтегративний (також відомий як міждисциплінарний) підхід до перекладу й виділили три можливі погляди на його характер.

Ключові слова: перекладознавство, літературна теорія перекладу, лінгвістичний підхід до перекладу, комунікативно-функціональний підхід, транскреація, трансадаптація, транскультурація, міждисциплінарний підхід.

Target setting. It is a well-known fact that translation studies acquired the status of a branch science in the second half of the XX century. It was a natural phenomenon conditioned by the need to conceptualize the peculiarities and regularities of translators' activity. The initial ideas on translation referred primarily to two main varieties: translation of religious texts and fiction. Naturally, the very first direction of researches in the field of translation was the literary one. In 1930s linguists started studying the issues of special, not fiction or religious, translation. It could be attributed to developments in international cooperation, scientific, technical, military, and diplomatic spheres, and, subsequently, the need to train translators for these spheres (Сдобников, Петрова, 2006: 54–55). Linguists' interest to the comparative study of languages in synchrony caused the linguistic direction of translation studies to emerge. E. Gentzler claims it was linguistics that contributed to the emergence of a discipline with the necessary theoretical and language instruments to create a systematic approach to translation (Gentzler, 1990: 67). It was a kind of "turn" from literary studies to linguistics resulting in the linguists' admitting that even in the field of literary translation linguistic factors play a significant role on both stages of the translation process, i.e. in the process of interpreting the original and in the process of creating the translation (Ларин, 1962: 3). However, it was only the initial period of establishment and development of translation studies as a science. In this article we will dwell on the main events in the history of translation that led to its current state.

Analysis of latest researches. The direction that served the starting point for further development of translation studies was the linguistic one. Yves Gambier names two paradigms in modern translation. The first one is "the most traditional concept of translation that has been existing for centuries and is represented in the paradigm of equivalence". The researcher claims this system is more directed at the receiver and the audience (Гамбье, 2016а: 57). We fully agree with this statement. V. N. Komissarov, one of the founders of linguistic theory of translation, the author of the equivalence level theory states, "The translator is to have a clear vision of the purpose, the recipient of the translation, the task of the text he creates and who will use it. Therefore, at the advanced level of teaching, the tasks for translators-to-be should be accompanied by the aim of the translation, the expected readers, the media to be published in, etc. Based on these data the translator can decide whether he will translate or conduct a different kind of linguistic mediation" (Комиссаров, 2001: 357). In the course

of time the limitations of this approach became obvious. Yves Gambier claims it "does not allow one to consider, describe and explain the process of taking translator's decisions and the result of the translation. The difference between what is explicit and implicit leads to misunderstanding of the process of translation, while the translator's interpretation of the content becomes unclear" (Гамбье, 2016а: 58–59).

The second paradigm Yves Gambier singles out is the one where translators move from the paper format to the digital, Internet format. "This quickly changing context causes the multitude of emerging new terms to name what was once translation" (Гамбье, 2016а: 57). He claims that the latter is caused by the use of modern environment in which translation takes place. We do agree that technically the conditions of translators' professional activity changed significantly. However, following V. V. Sdobnikov's view, we do not think this is enough to determine a new approach to translation studies (Сдобников, 2018: 74). Anthony Pym seems to share Yves Gambier's opinion stating that new translation technologies "are altering the very nature of the translator's cognitive activity, social relations, and professional standing" (Pym, 2011: 4).

We do not share Y. Gambier and A. Pym's view because contrasting the equivalence paradigm (or linguistic approach in other terms) to a paradigm characterized by the use of new environments does not seem natural or logical. The equivalence paradigm presents the character and the essence of the tasks performed by the translator, while the second approach only specifies the set of translator's instruments to increase the speed and efficiency of the translation process, as well as peculiarities of its use.

Erich Prunč contrasts equivalence paradigm to functionalist approach (Прунч, 2015: 57; Львовская, 1985; 2008; Nida, 1964; Nida, Taber, 1969; Reiß, Vermeer, 2013; Sdobnikov, 2017). According to the latter translation is viewed as part of a particular communicative situation. Performing translation presupposes immersion – both in theory and in practice – into a particular communicative situation, taking into account the parameters of the situation, aims of translation, the communicants' needs and expectations, as well as linguistic factors influencing the course and the result of the translation process – from the peculiarities of correlation of the two languages to the type of text and its communicative aim. This approach is of special significance for professional training of translators because it enables one to get rid of the erroneous understanding of translation as transformation of one text into another, as well as to teach and persuade translators-to-be that translation is an activity directed at

satisfying the needs of people by creating a text in the target language (TL) oriented at the source text (ST).

We do not oppose the linguistic approach to the functionalist one. The latter is viewed as a general approach to translation, a type of translator's thinking that covers all kinds of translation and creates the environment to conduct all kinds of translation activity with maximum efficiency.

Translation studies could not remain in the framework of the linguistic approach only for a long time. The very nature of translation activity led researchers to include culture into the factors influencing translation. A. D. Shveitser states that "the clash of two cultures in translation occurs both at the communicative and the text levels" (Швейцер, 1988: 52). Speaking of culture, we ought to mention speakers of different cultures for whom translation serves as a means of communication. This brought about the coinage of the term "cross-cultural communication" and resulted in a cultural or anthropocentric turn in translation studies (Сдобников, 2019: 310).

1980s marked the beginning of studies on the influence of culture on translation and vice versa (Bassnett, Lefevere, 1988; Bassnett, 2005; Cranmer, 2015; Gentzler, 2001; Hatim, Mason, 2005; Katan, 2009; Koskinen, 2015; Nida, 1993; 1996; Toury, 1995). Transcreation approach is more oriented at the theory than the practice of translation. E. D. Malionova claims that "within transcreation approach translation is viewed as an instrument of recreating the ideas and images of the source text in the context of the recipient culture" (Малёнова, 2018: 54). The researcher calls it a "transcreation turn" in modern translation studies. She explains that the cultural distance influencing the process of translation predetermines the use of creative strategies, like transcreation, transadaptation, and transculturation (Ibid.).

E. D. Malionova suggests the following definitions of the above-mentioned notions: "Transcreation in translation is understood as a strategy of creative re-thinking of a ST segment followed by the creation of a new text by means of the TL taking into account the text's polymodal and culturally specific context, parameters of the communicative situation, technical and legal limitations, the recipient's expected reaction...By applying transadaptation the translator changes various elements of the cultural, visual, audial and other codes for deeper immersion of the ST into the context of the target culture (TC). Maximum immersion of the ST into the TC is achieved by applying the strategy of transculturation – complete

change of the text in the process of its translation and creation of a new creative product on its basis to be perceived by TC recipients as a natural element" (Ibid.).

The suggested definitions testify to the fact that the specified strategies differ first and foremost in the degree of what has long been known in translation studies as pragmatic or cultural adaptation. Following V. V. Sdobnikov's opinion (Сдобников, 2018: 77), we cannot agree with the statement that it is only in transcreation that we need to take into account the communicative situation and the recipient's expected reaction. In our view, it is an indispensable condition of any efficient translation irrespective of any applied strategies. "Transadaptation" seems to be a special kind of translation, viz. audiovisual translation, "localization", i.e. the translation of websites, computer games, etc. "Transculturation" is often referred to as "rewriting". V. N. Komissarov defines the latter as translator's activity aimed at "creating a parallel text in the TL that is not the translation of a foreign source language (SL), not claiming to be, not functioning as a translation, but based on the ST that served an impulse, cause and guide to create a text in a foreign language" (Комиссаров, 1997: 69).

Purpose statement. The present paper aims at analysing the main approaches to define the peculiar character of translators' activity, determine the place of translation within the professional translation process, as well as reveal those erroneous views that may lead in future to the decrease of translation quality.

Presentation of the basic material of the research. At the beginning of the XXI century an increasing number of linguists consider translation studies an independent interdisciplinary science (Гарбовский, 2004; Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines, 2006). The first to apply the word "science" to translation was E. Nida in his book "Toward a Science of Translation" (Nida, 1964) and the term "translation studies" was introduced by J. Holmes at an international congress of applied linguistics and then published as an article in 1988 (Holmes, 1988). The researcher presented a map of translation where he offered his own view of the system of future researches in the field of translation, division of translation studies into "pure" and "applied", delimitation of theoretical and descriptive translation studies, as well as singling out of relevant branches within them. The linguist claims that three translation branches (theoretical, descriptive and applied) should be viewed as interrelated and interconnected, thus their study ought not to be conducted in isolation.

The interdisciplinary character of translation studies was not challenged by the representatives of the linguistic approach to translation. One of its greatest representatives A. D. Shveitser wrote in 1990s that the theory of translation should be studied as an interdisciplinary science as far as it “is situated at the intersection of interdisciplinary researches and it shows the tendency to elaborate an integrative and multidimensional approach to the analysis of translation” (Швейцер, 1999: 21).

Linguists distinguish three possible views on the interdisciplinary character of translation. The first recognizes the interdisciplinary status of the translation theory and considers the former as analysing the object in the light of various sciences (Гарбовский, 2004: 206). In accord with this concept, the object of study of translation studies is defined accurately, however, the subject matter cannot be formulated so distinctly due to the great number of branches included within this science or interacting with it. According to the second view, interdisciplinary character is only postulated in relation to translation as a mental, verbal, semiotic, and social activity. The third, integrative, view interprets interdisciplinary character as a common basis to study internal and external factors of influence on the translation process on the side of a) the translator himself and other participants of the translation process; b) the society; c) the environment (Ibid.).

As translation studies become an independent science, they attract knowledge from other sciences, still preserving autonomy. E. N. Mishkurov suggests analysing the theory of translation in a global interdisciplinary plane. Based on the philosophical hermeneutic theory and Jean Piaget’s views, E. N. Mishkurov interprets interdisciplinary character as “a kind of meta-methodology”, approves of “holistic view on the subject matter without clearly defined borders between disciplines” that allows not to limit researches by the interdisciplinary character, but place “these relations within a global

system having no rigid borders between disciplines” (Мишкuroв, 2015: 33).

N. K. Garbovskiy presents translation as a goal-oriented systematic cognitive activity whose elements are closely interrelated and highlights that both the form of the target text and its content “are created in the course of translator’s cognitive activity as a reaction to the ST and other information, social, psychological, historical, economic, ethical, aesthetic, etc. factors that are systematically interrelated” (Гарбовский, 2015: 17).

I. V. Ubozhenko observes that within integrative approach “translation starts with text-in-situation that is an indispensable part of the cultural background; and the text analysis goes from the macrostructure text to the microunit word that is not studied in isolation, but from the point of view of its relevance and function in the text” (Убоженко, 2014: 69).

Conclusions. In this article we analysed the history of establishment of translation studies as an interdisciplinary science, described the main tendencies in modern theory of translation, as well as the practice of translation. The presented material brings us to the conclusion that some theoreticians and practical translators still regard translation as an activity aimed at transmitting cognitive information in the form it was done in the ST. Pragmatic and cultural adaptation of the text arising due to the differences between the two cultures are viewed as a separate kind of translation activity beyond the borders of translation proper. We do not share this opinion. In cases where the cultural factor acquires special significance researchers tend to regard translator’s activity as different kinds of translation or ascribe it a special status of translator’s strategy, which we cannot agree with. In our view, any translation presupposes a certain degree of cultural adaptation in various communicative situations. Therefore, localization, transcreation, transadaptation and transculturation comprise translation performed with a different degree of pragmatic and cultural adaptation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Гамбье И. Перевод и переводоведение на перекрестке цифровых технологий. *Вестник СпбГУ. Серия 9. Филология. Востоковедение. Журналистика*. 2016. Вып. 4. С. 56–74.
2. Гарбовский Н. К. Теория перевода. Москва : Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 2004. 544 с.
3. Комиссаров В. И. Новые тенденции в переводоведении. Информационно-коммуникативные аспекты перевода : сборник научных трудов. Ч. 1. Нижний Новгород : НГЛУ им. Н. А. Добролюбова, 1997. С. 62–77.
4. Комиссаров В. И. Современное переводоведение : учебное пособие. Москва : ЭТС, 2001. 424 с.
5. Ларин Б. А. Наши задачи. *Теория и критика перевода*. Ленинград : Изд-во ЛГУ, 1962. С. 3–7.
6. Львовская З. Д. Теоретические проблемы перевода (на материале испанского яз.). Москва : Высшая школа, 1985. 232 с.
7. Львовская З. Д. Современные проблемы перевода. Москва : Изд-во URSS, 2018. 224 с.
8. Малёнова Е. Д. Креативные практики в переводе. Перевод и культура: взаимодействие и взаимовлияние : тезисы III Междунар. науч. конф. Вологда : ВоГУ; Нижний Новгород : НГЛУ, 2018. С. 53–55.

9. Мишкурое Э. Н. Герменевтико-переводческий методологический стандарт в зеркале трансдисциплинарности (ч. 1). *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22. Теория перевода*. 2015. № 2. С. 17–37.
10. Прунч Э. Пути развития западного переводоведения. От языковой асимметрии к политической / пер. с нем. Москва : Р. Валент, 2015. 512 с.
11. Сдобников В. В., Петрова О. В. Теория перевода. Москва : Восток-запад, 2006. 448 с.
12. Сдобников В. В. Новые тенденции в переводоведении. *Казанский вестник молодых ученых. Педагогические науки. Перевод в XXI веке: вызовы эпохи и перспективы развития*. 2018. Т. 2. № 4 (7). С. 72–79.
13. Сдобников В. В. Переводоведение сегодня: вечные проблемы и новые вызовы. *Вестник РУДН. Серия : Лингвистика*. 2019. Т. 23. № 2. С. 295–327.
14. Убоженко И. В. Зарубежное переводоведение. Великобритания. Москва : Р. Валент, 2014. 227 с.
15. Швейцер А. Д. Теория перевода: статус, проблемы, аспекты. Москва : Наука, 1988. 280 с.
16. Швейцер А. Д. Междисциплинарный статус теории перевода. *Тетради переводчика*. Москва : МГЛУ, 1999. Вып. 24. С. 20–31.
17. Bassnett S. *Translation Studies*. London and New York : Routledge, 2005. 176 p.
18. Bassnett S., Lefevere A. *Constructing Cultures. Essays on literary translation*. Clevedon-Philadelphia : Multilingual Matters (Topics in translation 11), 1998. 143 p.
19. Cranmer R. *Introducing Intercultural Communication into the Teaching of Translation*. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. 2015. P. 155–174.
20. Gentzler E. *Contemporary Translation Theory: Dissertation submitted for the degree of PhD in Comparative Literature*. Nashville, 1990. 370 p.
21. Gentzler E. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters, Ltd., 2001. 232 p.
22. Hatim B., Mason I. *The Translator as Communicator*. London; New York : Routledge, 2005. 244 p.
23. Holmes J. S. *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*. *Papers of Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam : Rodopi, 1988. P. 67–80.
24. Katan D. *Translation as Intercultural Communication*. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London; New York : Routledge, 2009. P. 74–92.
25. Koskinen K. *Training Translators for a Superdiverse World. Translators' Intercultural Competence and Translation as Affective Work*. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. Issue 19 (4). 2015. P. 175–184.
26. Nida E. *Toward a Science of Translation. With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translation*. Leiden : Brill, 1964. 331 p.
27. Nida E. *Language, Culture and Translating*. Shanghai : Foreign Language Education Press, 1993. 208 p.
28. Nida E. *The Sociolinguistics of Interlingual Communication*. Eugene A. Nida. Brussels : Les Éditions du Hazard, 1996 (Collection Traductologie). 118 p.
29. Nida E., Taber C. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden : Brill, 1969. 220 p.
30. Пым А. What Technology Does to Translating. *Translation and Interpreting*. Vol. 3. № 1. 2011. URL: <http://www.trans-int.org/index.php/transint%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20/article/viewFile/121/81> (дата звернення: 11.08.2020).
31. Reiß K., Vermeer H. *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action. Skopos Theory Explained*. Manchester : St. Jerome Publishing, 2013. 240 p.
32. Sdobnikov V. V. *Communicative-Functional Approach in Russian Translation Studies: Where Does It Come From?* *Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2. Языкознание*. 2017. Т. 16. № 3. С. 71–79.
33. Toury G. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing, 1995. 311 p.
34. *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines / J. F. Duarte, A. Assis Rosa, T. Seruya (eds.)*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2006. 217 p.

REFERENCES

1. Gambier I. *Perevod i perevodovedenie na perekrestke tsifrovyykh tekhnologiy [Translation and Translation Studies at the Crossroads of Digital Communications]*. *Vestnik SpbGU. Seriya 9. Filologiya. Vostokovedenie. Zhurnalistika*, 2016. Вып. 4. P. 56–74 [in Russian].
2. Garbovskiy N. K. *Teoriya perevoda [Translation Theory]*. Moscow, Moscow University Publishers, 2004. 544 p. [in Russian].
3. Komissarov V. I. *Novye tendentsii v perevodovedenii [New Tendencies in Translation Studies]*. *Informatsionno-kommunikativnye aspekty perevoda. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Ch. 1. N. Novgorod: NGLU, 1997. P. 62–77 [in Russian].
4. Komissarov V. I. *Sovremennoe perevodovedenie. Uchebnoe posobie [Modern Translation Studies. Study guide]*. Moscow: ETS, 2001. 424 p. [in Russian].
5. Larin B.A. *Nashi zadachi [Our Tasks]*. *Teoriya i kritika perevoda*. Leningrad: LGU, 1962. P. 3–7 [in Russian].
6. Lvovskaya Z. D. *Teoreticheskie problemy perevoda (na materiale ispanского yazyka) [Theoretical Problems of Translation (on the material of Spanish)]*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1985. 232 p. [in Russian].
7. Lvovskaya Z. D. *Sovremennyye problemy perevoda [Modern Problems of Translation]*. Moscow : URSS Publishers, 2018. 224 p. [in Russian].
8. Malionova E. D. *Kreativnyye praktiki v perevode [Creative Practice in Translation]*. *Perevod i kultura: vzaimodeistvie i samovliyaniye: tezisy Tretiey Mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii*. Vologda: VoSU; N. Novgorod : NSLU, 2018. P. 53–55 [in Russian].

9. Mishkurov Ye. N. Germenevtiko-perevodcheskiy metodologicheskii standart v zerkale transdisciplinapnosti (ch. 1) [Interdisciplinary reflection on the hermeneutic and translational methodological standard (Part 1)]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta*, 2015, № 2, P. 17–37 [in Russian].
10. Prunch E. Puti razvitiia zapadnogo perevodovedeniia. Ot iazykovoi asimmetrii k politicheskoi [Ways of Development of Western Translation Studies. From Language Asymmetry to a Political One]. Moscow, R. Valent, 2015. 512 p. [in Russian].
11. Sdobnikov, V. V., Petrova O. V. Teoria perevoda [Translation theory]. Moscow, Vostok-zapad, 2006. 448 p. [in Russian].
12. Sdobnikov, V. V. Novye tendentsii v perevodovedenii [New Tendencies in Translation Studies]. *Kazanskiy vestnik molodykh uchenykh. Pedagogicheskie nauki. Perevod v XXI veke: vyzovy epokhi i perspektivy razvitiya*, 2018. Vol. 2. № 4 (7). P. 72–79 [in Russian].
13. Sdobnikov, V. V. Perevodovedenie segodnya: vechnye problem i novye vyzovy [Translation Studies Today: Old Problems and New Challenges]. *Vestnik RUDN. Seriya: Lingvistika*, 2019. Vol. 23. № 2. P. 295–327 [in Russian].
14. Ubozhenko I. V. Zarubezhnoe perevodovedenie. Velikobritaniya [Translation Studies Abroad. The United Kingdom]. Moscow, R. Valent, 2014. 227 p. [in Russian].
15. Shveytser A. D. Teoria perevoda: status, problem, aspekty [Translation Theory: Status, Problems, Aspects]. Moscow: Nauka, 1988. 280 p. [in Russian].
16. Shveytser A. D. Mezhdisciplinarnyi status perevoda [Interdisciplinary Status of the Translation Theory]. *Tetrady perevodchika*. Moscow, MGLU Publishers, 1999. Vypusk 24. P. 20–31 [in Russian].
17. Bassnett S. Translation Studies. London and New York: Routledge, 2005. 176 p.
18. Bassnett S., Lefevere A. Constructing Cultures. Essays on literary translation. Cleveendon-Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters (Topics in translation 11), 1998. 143 p.
19. Cranmer R. Introducing Intercultural Communication into the Teaching of Translation. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 2015. P. 155–174.
20. Gentzler E. Contemporary Translation Theory: Dissertation submitted for the degree of PhD in Comparative Literature. Nashville, 1990. 370 p.
21. Gentzler E. Contemporary Translation Theories. Cleveendon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd., 2001. 232 p.
22. Hatim B., Mason I. The Translator as Communicator. London; New York: Routledge, 2005. 244 p.
23. Holmes J. S. The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. *Papers of Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988. P. 67–80.
24. Katan D. Translation as Intercultural Communication. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. London; New York: Routledge, 2009. P. 74–92.
25. Koskinen K. Training Translators for a Superdiverse World. Translators' Intercultural Competence and Translation as Affective Work. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. Issue 19 (4). 2015. P. 175–184.
26. Nida E. Toward a Science of Translation. With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translation. Leiden: Brill, 1964. 331 p.
27. Nida E. Language, Culture and Translating. Shanghai: Foreign Language Education Press, 1993. 208 p.
28. Nida E. The Sociolinguistics of Interlingual Communication. Eugene A. Nida. Brussels: Les Éditions du Hazard, 1996 (Collection Traductologie). 118 p.
29. Nida E., Taber C. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: Brill, 1969. 220 p.
30. Pym A. What Technology Does to Translating. *Translation and Interpreting*. Vol. 3. № 1. 2011. URL: <http://www.trans-int.org/index.php/transint%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20/article/viewFile/121/81> (Last accessed: 11.08.2020).
31. Reiß K., Vermeer H. Towards a General Theory of Translational Action. *Skopos Theory Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2013. 240 p.
32. Sdobnikov V. V. Communicative-Functional Approach in Russian Translation Studies: Where Does It Come From? *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie*. 2017. Vol. 16. № 3. P. 71–79.
33. Toury G. Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 1995. 311 p.
34. Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines / J. F. Duarte, A. Assis Rosa, T. Seruya (eds.). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2006. 217 p.