**Additional material for reading**

**1. Anthropocentric paradigm of linguistic sciences**

Translation. Cognitive processes in the language. Methodology and metalanguage of translation. Translation and Translation. Sociological foundations of the language and problems of translation. Communicative aspect of translation. Theoretical and methodological foundations of cognitive and communicative concept of translation.

Translation as represented in this Handbook is an approach to the analysis of natural language that originated in the late seventies and early eighties in the work of George Lakoff, Ron Langacker, and Len Talmy, and that focuses on language as an instrument for organizing, processing, and conveying information. Given this perspective, the analysis of the conceptual and experiential basis of linguistic categories is of primary importance within Translation: the formal structures of language are studied not as if they were autonomous, but as reflections of genera conceptual organization, categorization principles, processing mechanisms, and experiential and environmental influences.

 Because Translation sees language as embedded in the overall cognitive capacities of man, topics of special interest for Translation include: the structural characteristics of natural language categorization (such as prototypicality, systematic polysemy, cognitive models, mental imagery, and metaphor); the functional principles of linguistic organization (such as iconicity and naturalness); the conceptual interface between syntax and semantics (as explored by Cognitive Grammar and Construction Grammar); the experiential and pragmatic background of language-in-use; and the relationship between language and thought, including questions about relativism and conceptual universals.

 Crucially, there is no single, uniform doctrine according to which these research topics) are pursued by Translation. In this sense, Translation is a flexible framework rather than a single theory of language. In terms of category structure (one of the standard topics for analysis in Translation), we might say that Translation itself, when viewed as a category, has a family resemblance structure: it constitutes a cluster of many partially overlapping approaches rather than a single welldefined theory.

Even so, the recognition that Translation has not yet stabilized into a single uniform theory should not prevent us from looking for fundamental common features and shared perspectives among the many forms of research that come together under the label of Translation. An obvious question to start from relates to the ‘‘cognitive’’ aspect of Translation: in what sense exactly is Translation a cognitive approach to the study of language?

Against the background of the basic characteristics of the cognitive paradigm in cognitive psychology, the philosophy of science, and related disciplines, the viewpoint adopted by Translation can be defined more precisely.

**2. Conceptual organization of knowledge in the translation process**

The concept of cognition and basic definitions of translation. Object of cognitive and communicative concept of translation. Cognitive processes in translation and interpretation. Basic definitions and problems of cognitive concept of translation.

Cognition and informativeness. The main provisions of the information theory of translation. Types of information (background, semantic, situation, information about the structure of the speech products). Search and transfer of information as the content of the translation process. The notion of information stock of a translation.

Translation is distinct from other movements in linguistics, both formalist and functionalist, in two respects. First, it takes seriously the cognitive underpinnings of language, the so-called *Cognitive Commitment*. Cognitive linguists attempt to describe and model language in the light of convergent evidence from other cognitive and brain sciences. Second, cognitive linguists subscribe to a *generalization commitment*: a commitment to describing the nature and principles that constitute linguistic knowledge as an outcome of general cognitive abilities—rather than viewing language as constituting, for instance, a wholly distinct encapsulated module of mind. In this section I briefly elaborate on these two commitments which lie at the heart of the translation enterprise.

 The Cognitive Commitment represents the view that principles of linguistic structure should reflect what is known about human cognition from the other cognitive and brain sciences, particularly psychology, artificial intelligence, cognitive neuroscience, and philosophy. In other words, the Cognitive Commitment asserts that the models of language and linguistic organization proposed should reflect what is known about the human mind, rather than purely aesthetic dictates such as the use of particular kinds of formalisms or economy of representation.

 The generalization commitment represents a dedication to characterising general principles that apply to all aspects of human language. This goal reflects the standard commitment in science to seek the broadest generalizations possible. In contrast, some approaches to the study of language often separate what is sometimes termed the ‘language faculty’ into distinct areas such as phonology (sound), semantics (word and sentence meaning), pragmatics (meaning in discourse context), morphology (word structure), syntax (sentence structure), and so on. As a consequence, there is often little basis for generalization across these aspects of language, or for study of their interrelations.

**3. Cognitive concept in translation studies**

Methods of conceptual organization of knowledge in the process of translation (formation and understanding of the text.) Typology of concepts: frames, schemas, scripts, cognitive (mental) pictures. Frames as translation units. Frame structure and features of its broadcast.

Categorization and conceptualization of the world. Models of representation of knowledge about the world in the language. Language picture of the world.

Categorization is the process in which ideas and objects are recognized, differentiated, and understood. Categorization implies that objects are grouped into categories, usually for some specific purpose. Ideally, a category illuminates a relationship between the subjects and objects of knowledge. Categorization is fundamental in language, prediction, inference, decision making and in all kinds of environmental interaction. It is indicated that categorization plays a major role in computer programming.

Сategorizations our ability to identify entities as members of groups. Of course, the words we use to refer to entities rest upon categorization: there are good reasons why we call a cat ‘cat’ and not, say, ‘fish’. One of the reasons behind the interest in this area stems from the ‘Cognitive Commitment’: the position adopted by cognitive linguists that language is a function of generalized cognition. The ability to categorize is central to human cognition; given the ‘Cognitive Commitment’, we expect this ability to be reflected in linguistic organization. The other reason behind

 In the 1970s, pioneering research by cognitive psychologist Eleanor Roschand her colleagues presented a serious challenge to the classical view of categorization that had dominated Western thought since the time of Aristotle.

According to this classical model, category membership is defined according to a set of necessary and sufficient conditions, which entails that category membership is an ‘all-or-nothing’ affair

**4.Communicative concept in translation studies**

Communicative concept of translation. Translation as a special kind of communication. Basic definitions and problems of communication of a translator. The concept and essence of the communicative aspects of translation. The activities of the translator as a central component of communication using two languages. The act of speech and translation. Communicants under the influence of different types of information. Cognitive communication scenario in translation.

The findings of Eleanor Rosch and her team revealed that categorization is not an all or nothing affair, but that many categorizationjudgments seemed to exhibit prototype or typicality effects. For example, when we categorizebirds, certain types of bird (like robins or sparrows) are judged as ‘better’ examples of the category than others (like penguins).

 In his famous book Women, Fire and Dangerous Things, George Lakoff (1987) explored some of the consequences of the observations made by Rosch and her colleagues for a theory of conceptual structure as manifested in language. An important idea that emerged from Lakoff’s study is the theory of idealized cognitive models (ICMs), which are highly abstract frames. These can account for certain kinds of typicality effects in categorization.

For example, let’s consider once more the concept BACHELOR. This is understood with respect to a relatively schematic ICM MARRIAGE. The MARRIAGE

 ICM includes the knowledge that bachelors are unmarried adult males. As we have observed, the category BACHELOR exhibits typicality effects. In otherwords, some members of the category BACHELOR (like eligible young men) are ‘better’ or more typical examples than others (like the Pope). The knowledge associated with the MARRIAGE ICM stipulates that bachelors can marry.

 However, our knowledge relating to CATHOLICISM stipulates that the Pope cannot marry. It is because of this mismatch between the MARRIAGE ICM (with respect to which BACHELOR is understood) and the CATHOLICISM ICM (with respect to which the Pope is understood) that this particular typicality effect arises.

**5.Information modeling in translation.**

The information model of the translation process. Transition from one language to another in terms of the information level. Variability of the structure of information to be transmitted. Disentangling invariable information in translation. Invariant information transmission as the goal of translation. Translation units in the of cognitive and communicative concept.The theory of informativeness of texts. Source text as a carrier of semantic information, and information about the structure. Translation and types of statements depending on the place of the semantic information. Types of information in the text: cognitive (cognitive), operational, emotional (expressive), aesthetic information. Highlighting of the information of different values ​​in the text. Determination of the coefficient of informativeness of the text. Modeling background knowledge and implicit information in translation.

The position adopted in translation is that there are commonalities in the ways humans experience and perceive the world and in the ways human think and use language. This means that all humans share a common conceptualizing capacity. However, these commonalities are no more than constraints, delimiting a range of possibilities. As we have seen, there is striking diversity in the two domains we have surveyed, which shows that the way English speakers think and speak about space and time by no means represents the only way of thinking and speaking about space and time. According to cognitive linguists, language not only reflects conceptual structure, but can also give rise to conceptualization. It appears that the ways in which different languages ‘cut up’ and ‘label’ the world can differentially influence non-linguistic thought and action. It follows that the basic commitments of translation are consonant with a weak version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, a position that some linguists argue is gathering increasing empirical support.

 There are two notable approaches to meaning construction that have been developed within translation. The first is concerned with the sorts of mechanisms central to meaning construction that are fundamentally non-linguistic in nature. Meaning construction processes of this kind have been referred to as ‘backstage cognition’ (Fauconnier, 1985/ 1994, 1997). There are two distinct, but closely related, theories of backstage cognition: mental spaces theory, developed in two monographs by Gilles Fauconnier (1985/1994, 1997), and conceptual blending theory, developed by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (2002). Mental spaces theory is concerned with the nature and creation of ‘mental spaces’, small packets of conceptual structure built as we think and talk. Conceptual blending theory is concerned with the integrative mechanisms and networks that operate over collections of mental spaces in order to produce emergent aspects of meaning—

Behind the idiosyncrasies of language, translation has repeatedly uncovered evidence for the operation of more general cognitive processes. Mappings between mental spaces are part of this general organization of thought. Although language provides considerable data for studying such mappings, they are not in themselves specifically linguistic. They show up generally in conceptualization. A striking case of a general cognitive operation on mental spaces, that is reflected universally in the way we think, is conceptual integration.

Conceptual integration consists in setting up networks of mental spaces which map onto each other and blend into new mental spaces in various ways. In everyday thinking and talking, we use conceptual integration networks systematically in the on-line construction of meaning. Some of the integrations are novel, others are more entrenched, and we rarely pay conscious attention to the process, because it is so pervasive. In a conceptual integration network, partial structure from input mental mental spaces is projected to a new blended mental space which develops dynamic (imaginative) structure of its own.

**Cognitive equivalence in translation**

Most aspects of human life, not just language, bring in conceptual integration networks. This remarkable cognitive capacity has been studied in a variety of domains, such as mathematics, action and design, distributed cognition, magic and religion, anthropology and political science. It has been suggested that the capacity of conceptual integration evolved biologically to reach a threshold, double-scope creativity, that constitutes a necessary condition for the cognitively modern human singularities of art, creative toolmaking,religious thought, and grammar.

**Problem questions:** To what extent do the personal experience and interests reflect the speech of communicants.How can the language influence the person’s understanding and interpretation of the environment?

**Structural and activity-based model of the translation process in the paradigm of cognitive-communicative concept**

Following the thesis of embodied cognition, cognitive linguists view language as reflecting the embodied nature of conceptual structure and organization. Hence, cognitive linguists study language by taking seriously the way language manifests embodied conceptual structure.

 An outstanding example of this is the study of ‘conceptual metaphor’. For instance, we use language relating to more abstract domains such as time, in terms of space, as exemplified by the example in (1), or states in terms of locations exemplified in (2), precisely because at the level of conceptual structure time is systematically structured in terms of conceptual structure recruited from the domain of space, and states are structured in terms of locations in space. I consider the issue of conceptual metaphor in more detail later on.

1. Christmas is approaching.
2. She is in love.

Language is a lens on the mind

 Second, language serves as a lens for studying aspects of the mind. Itdoes so precisely because it reflects organizational principles of embodied cognition. For instance, by studying metaphorical patterns in language, the cognitive linguist is able to discern patterns in the nature and organization of conceptual structure. Conceptual metaphors, qua cross-domain mappings—mappings that relate distinct conceptual domains—are evidenced by virtue of examining distinctive and productive patterns in language in order to uncover their existence.

 **6. Language provides a mechanism for construal.**

The equivalence as a category of translation. The problem of translation equivalence in cognitive and communicative concept. Compliance at the level of formal components (the literal translation), according to the level of key information (free translation). Cognitive and communicative factors of creating communication-equivalent translation.

Cognitive-communicative aspect of the theory of differences in interpretation. Estimate of the number and quality of the transmitted information. Translation as the transfer of invariant information (messages) in a different source and destination codes. Nature Linguo-ethnical differences of communicative competence. Cognitive-communicative nature of the problem of overcoming the linguo-ethnical barrier in translation. Nature of Linguo-ethnical differences of communicative competence. Cognitive and communicative nature of the problem of overcoming of the Linguo-ethnical barrier in translation.

 Third, as language is constituted of a language-specific inventory of symbolic units, following the symbolic thesis, any given language provides a means of viewing the same state, situation, or event from the range of perspectives that are conventionally available to the language user, given the language-specific symbolic resources available. In other words, a language provides the language user with resources for viewing the same scene in multiple, and hence alternative, ways. This constitutes a mechanism for ‘construal’. Construal is a technical term for the facility whereby the same situation can be linguistically encoded in multiple ways. For example, someone who is not easily parted from his or her money could be either described as stingy or as thrifty. In keeping with the thesis of encyclopedic semantics, each of these words is understood with respect to a different background frame or cognitive model, which provides a distinct set of evaluations. While stingy represents a negative assessment against an evaluative frame of giving and sharing, thrifty relates to a frame of careful management of resources (husbandry), against which it represents a positive assessment. Hence, lexical choice provides a different way of framing ostensibly the same situation, giving rise to a different construal. Indeed, any given language, by virtue of containing a language-specific set of symbolic units, thereby provides a ready-made language-specific repertoire for construing human experience and the world in, necessarily, different ways. One reason for this is because different languages often encode culture-specific ideas and hence perspectives. For instance, the Korean word nunchi, which might be translated as ‘eye-measure’ in English, provides a conventionalized means of encoding the idea that a host evaluates whether a guest requires further food or drink in order to avoid the guest being embarrassed by having to request it. Of course, languages provide conventional means of alternate construalseven when two similar ideas are both conveyed in two different languages.

**7. Cognitive and communicative competence of a translator.**

Method of translation as a category of the science of translation: semantic and symbolic methods of translation. The implementation of the method of translation of the sign in the form of automated operations. Implementation of semantic method of translation. Search for invariant information using techniques of semantic analysis. Speech segment as the smallest unit of text. Methods of written, consecutive and simultaneous interpretation with cognitive-communicative perspective. Cognitive-communicative specificity of specific methods of translation. Cognitive-communicative description of translation transformations at different levels (lexical, semantic, information). Transformation at the information level as translation operations, defining the specificity and the right to independence of the science of translation.

The discussion of the English and French utterances in (1) and (2) also helps illustrate the fourth dimension of the translation worldview. As language provides a means of construing reality in alternate ways, and moreover remains connected to conceptual representation, it has a transformative function: It can influence aspects of non-linguistic cognition. That is, language doesn’t merely reflect conceptual representation; it can influence and affect it. For instance, as French and English each have conventionalized alternative ways of encoding a particular spatial scene, this leads to what Slobin has labeled differences in ‘thinking for speaking’: Users of any given language must pay attention to particular aspects of their experienced reality, at the expense of others, in order to package their thoughts for purposes of linguistic communication. Cognitive linguists hold that this language-specific ‘packaging’ has profound consequences on non-linguistic cognition. That is, language influences how we categorize aspects of our socio-physical environment, and how we think about reality, independently of language.Thus, different ‘choices’ of language for representing concepts can indeed affect non-linguistic thought, such as reasoning and problem solving.

 **8. A common human conceptualizing capacity.**

Cognitive and communicative competence of a translator as a basis of the translation process. Sub competence. Operational structure of translation activities in cognitive-communicative concept. Skill of switching and its cognitive-communication mechanisms. The ability to paraphrase. Compensatory competence of a translator. The use of cognitive processes in simultaneous and consecutive translation. Ability to identify cognitive-communicative features of texts of different genres and functional styles.

Cognitive-communicative training as a method of training the translation process, modeling and skills.

 Of course, one of the charges that has been leveled at those who subscribe to a (neo) Whorfian perspective is that this entails that language determines how the world is viewed and categorized. If this view were correct, language would effectively provide a straitjacket, resulting in wholly distinct ways of conceptualization across languages and language users, which would be insurmountable.

 However, the translation worldview treats language as but one of the mechanisms whereby humans construct their perceptual, cognitive, and socio-cultural reality. Cognitively modern humans have a common conceptualizing capacity: we share with our conspecifics a similar range of cognitive mechanisms and processes that provide us with multiple ways of construing reality. Language is but one modality, and hence but one way in which we interact with and learn about our environment, our socio-cultural reality, others around us, and ourselves. Cognitive linguists fully recognize that there are myriad ways in which humans experience their environment, including sense-perceptory experience, proprioception, and subjective experiences including affect, the visceral sense, and diverse cognitive evaluations and states. All of these experiences provide a rich basis for a multiplicity of mental representations, providing often complementary and even competing ‘views’ of reality. From the perspective of translation, semantic structure encoded by language can influence our conceptualizations, and other outputs of cognitive function, such as categorization, for instance. However, languagedoesnotdeterminethem.