



COMPARISON OF UNTRANSLATABLE WORDS IN UZBEK, RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH (BASED ON "SHUM BOLA" GAFUR GULOM)

Alimova Munisa Anvar qizi,

KIMYO International University in Tashkent Translation Studies
 (Chinese and English) International University Student.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54613/ku.v18i.1615>

MAQOLA HAQIDA/ О СТАТЬЕ

Qabul qilindi: 15-aprel 2026-yil

Tasdiqlandi: 17-aprel 2026-yil

Jurnal soni: 18-A

Maqola raqami: 55

KALIT SO'ZLAR/ КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА

tarjima qilib bo'lmaydigan so'zlar, madaniyatga xos leksika, tarjima metodi, qiyosiy tarjima tahlili "Shum bola", madaniy kontekst, leksikal lakunalar

ANNOTATSIYA/ АННОТАЦИЯ

Ushbu maqola zamonaviy tarjima nazariyasi doirasida tarjima qilib bo'lmaydigan so'zlar masalasini o'rganishga bag'ishlangan. Birinchi qismda ushbu fenomenning Rossiya, AQSh va O'zbekiston tarjimashunosligida tadqiq etilish tahlil qilinib, uning tildagi o'rni va turli yondashuvlar shakllanish jarayoni ko'rib chiqiladi.

Madaniy bo'yoqdor leksikani yetkazishda yuzaga keladigan asosiy tarjima qiyinchiliklari muhokama qilinadi. Tarjima qilib bo'lmaydigan so'zlar mavzulariga qarab (ovqat, kiyim-kechak, ism va madaniy realiyalar bilan bog'liq leksika) tasniflanadi va ularni kontekst va kommunikativ vazifaga muvofiq eng samarali tarjima strategiyalari tahlil qilinadi.

O'zbek tilidagi «Shum bola» asarining ingliz tilidagi tarjimasi qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Misollar tahlili orqali madaniy so'zlarni tarjimada qayta yaratish muammosi o'rganiladi.

Tarjima qilib bo'lmaydigan so'zlarni o'rganishda asosiy yondashuv va tarjima metodlarini tanlashda madaniy kontekstning muhimligi ochib beriladi.

ABOUT THE PAPER

Accepted: 15 april 2026

Approved: 17 april 2026

Volume: 18-A

Paper number: 55

KEYWORDS

Untranslatability, culturally specific vocabulary, translation strategies, comparative translation analysis "A Naughty boy", cultural context; lexical gaps

ANNOTATION

This article examines the issues of untranslatable words within the context of modern translation theory. In the first section of analyzes how this phenomenon has been studied and developed in Russia, in the United States and Uzbekistan with a focus on the formation of different approaches to understanding untranslatability and its role in language.

Then explores the translation challenges that arise when conveying culturally specific vocabulary. It proposes a classification of untranslatable words into thematic groups (such as vocabulary related to food, clothes and others), also analyzes the most effective strategies for translating them, taking into account context and communicative purpose.

In the practical section will be given some examples from the Uzbek book "Shum bola", comparing the original text with English translation. The analysis of specific examples makes it possible to identify the singularity of translation cultural words and to determine how accurately they are conveyed in translation. As a result, the study helps to identify translation approaches and demonstrates the importance of cultural context in choosing translation methods.

Introduction. Translation plays a crucial role in facilitating intercultural communication and enabling the exchange of ideas between different linguistic and cultural communities. However, one of the most challenging issues in translation studies is the phenomenon of untranslatability, particularly when dealing with culturally specific vocabulary. Such lexical units often carry meanings that are deeply embedded in the cultural, historical, and social context of the source language, making it difficult to find direct equivalents in the target language.

Untranslatable words are not simply linguistic gaps; they represent cultural concepts that may not exist in another language system. As a result, translators are often required to use various strategies such as transliteration, descriptive translation, adaptation, or functional substitution in order to convey both meaning and cultural essence. The difficulty becomes even more evident in literary translation, where stylistic features, emotional coloring, and cultural imagery must be preserved alongside semantic content.

The issue of untranslatability has been widely discussed in translation theory. Scholars such as Roman Jakobson, Eugene Nida, Lawrence Venuti, and others emphasize different aspects of this phenomenon, ranging from linguistic equivalence to cultural adaptation and communicative effect. Their theories demonstrate that translation is not merely a mechanical process of replacing words, but a complex act of interpretation and cultural mediation.

In Uzbek literary tradition, Gafur Ghulom's novel *Shum Bola* serves as a rich source of culturally marked vocabulary that reflects everyday life, traditions, and national identity. The English and Russian translations of this work provide valuable material for comparative analysis, as they reveal different approaches to rendering culture-specific elements across languages. In particular, words such as *yaktak*, *kavush*, *mahalla*, and *tariq go'ja* illustrate the challenges of translating concepts that are closely tied to Uzbek culture.

Literature review. The problem of untranslatable words is widely recognized in translation studies as one of the most complex and

multidimensional issues. Scholars from different linguistic traditions have approached this phenomenon from structural, functional, and cultural perspectives, highlighting the close relationship between language and culture in translation.

Roman Jakobson, a representative of structural linguistics, considers translation as a broader semiotic process. He distinguishes three types of translation: intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic, emphasizing that any cognitive experience can be expressed in another language through various linguistic means [1, p. 233]. However, he also acknowledges that complete equivalence between linguistic units is often impossible, which leads to the problem of untranslatability. Thus, untranslatability is viewed not as an absolute barrier but as a relative linguistic phenomenon.

In Russian translation theory, A.V. Fedorov focuses on the practical aspects of translation, particularly in literary texts. He argues that when literal translation is not possible, the translator should aim to reproduce the functional and stylistic effect of the original text [2, p. 152]. This approach highlights the importance of preserving meaning and communicative impact rather than formal correspondence, especially in culturally specific lexical units.

From the perspective of American translation studies, Eugene Nida introduces the concept of dynamic equivalence. According to him, the main goal of translation is to produce the same effect on the target reader as the original text does on its source reader [3, p. 159]. Nida prioritizes communicative effectiveness over literal accuracy and suggests using adaptation and explanatory translation strategies to overcome untranslatability.

Lawrence Venuti, on the other hand, emphasizes the cultural dimension of translation. He introduces the concepts of "foreignization" and "domestication," arguing that translators should not completely eliminate the cultural uniqueness of the source text [4, p. 20]. At the same time, excessive foreignization may reduce readability, which makes balancing cultural preservation and comprehensibility an essential task in translation practice.

In Uzbek translation studies, N. Ruzmatova classifies untranslatable words into several categories, including lexical gaps, idiomatic expressions, phonological features, and cultural realia [5, p. 70]. She suggests using transliteration, descriptive translation, calque, and adaptation as main strategies for dealing with such units. This classification provides practical tools for translators when working with culturally specific vocabulary.

Literary studies also play an important role in understanding translation challenges. Gafur Ghulom's novel *Shum Bola* is rich in culturally marked vocabulary that reflects Uzbek traditions and everyday life. Words such as *mahalla*, *kavush*, *yaktak*, and *tariq go'ja* carry deep cultural meaning that goes beyond dictionary definitions [6, p. 15]. Their translations into Russian and English, carried out by Naumov and Tukhtasinov, demonstrate different translation strategies and reflect the theoretical approaches discussed above [7, p. 42; 8, p. 27].

Overall, the literature review shows that untranslatability is not an absolute linguistic limitation but a translational challenge that depends on context, strategy, and cultural awareness. While different theories offer different solutions, they all agree that cultural context plays a crucial role in achieving meaningful translation equivalence.

Methodology. This study adopts a qualitative and comparative research approach. It focuses on the analysis of untranslatable words in Gafur Ghulom's *Shum Bola* and their Russian and English translations. The research method is based on comparative textual analysis, which allows the identification of lexical units without direct equivalents in the target languages.

The study also uses descriptive and functional methods to examine how culturally specific words are translated. Special attention is given to translation strategies such as transliteration, descriptive translation, adaptation, and calque. These methods are analyzed in terms of their effectiveness in preserving meaning and cultural context.

Results. Translation plays an important role in intercultural communication; however, one of the most challenging problems remains the untranslatability of words, especially when it comes to culturally specific vocabulary, puns or idioms. Such words often carry meanings deeply tied to the linguistic and cultural context, which makes their accurate translation a complex task. Roman Jakobson noted that all cognitive experiences can be expressed in any language through borrowings, new words, paraphrases, and semantic shifts. He also identified three types of translation: intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic, which help adapt a text for the reader and preserve meaning across different modes of communication [1].

This classification shows that there are several strategies for overcoming linguistic and cultural differences when dealing with untranslatable words, allowing the content and structure of a text to be maintained. Fedorov emphasized that if a pun cannot be conveyed literally, the translator can create a similar effect using other linguistic means [2].

He considered puns not as an obstacle but as an opportunity to demonstrate creativity while preserving the artistic integrity of the text. This approach shows that maintaining the effect and function of words is more important than a literal translation, especially when dealing with stylistic or humorous elements of a work. Eugene Nida developed the idea of dynamic equivalence, arguing that in translation the key is not the literal meaning but the effect that words have on the reader [3].

He noted that exact reproduction of phonological play or ambiguity is often impossible, so functional substitution and adaptation help preserve the reader's overall perception of the text, making the translation lively and understandable. Venuti, on the other hand, emphasizes the cultural distance between languages. He believes that the translator should not completely smooth over the foreign culture but use the strategy of *foreignization* to highlight the original's features [4].

At the same time, it is important to find a balance: if the text is too alien to the reader, it may lose their interest, so sometimes a combination of preserving cultural color and ensuring comprehensibility is necessary. Nigora Ruzmatova identifies several types of untranslatable words: grammatical and syntactic gaps, phonological features, cultural realities, idioms, and emotional-pragmatic nuances [5].

To convey them, she suggests various methods: transliteration, descriptive translation, adaptation, or calquing. This approach demonstrates that untranslatability is not a limitation but an opportunity to choose the most suitable strategy depending on the text and the purpose of the translation. Despite a large number of theoretical studies, there are still few works that combine different approaches and analyze their application to specific texts. This gap becomes the research problem of the present study. In particular, there is a lack of comparative research that simultaneously examines the original literary text and its translations into different languages, especially Russian and English, with a focus on the strategies used to convey culturally specific and untranslatable elements. To address this gap, the present article examines the Uzbek literary work

Shum Bola, comparing the original text with its Russian and English translations. To the best of our knowledge, these versions have not previously been analyzed together in a single comparative framework. The study is structured in such a way that the original Uzbek text is first presented, followed by the Russian translation and then the English translation. This approach allows for a detailed comparison of translation strategies and highlights how different translators handle culturally bound vocabulary, stylistic devices, and artistic effects. The aim of the study is to identify and analyze the strategies used in translating culturally specific elements and to demonstrate how linguistic, cultural, and stylistic factors influence translation choices in both Russian and English versions of the text.

This study adopts a quality approach directed at a comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon of untranslatability in translation, with attention to culturally specific vocabulary. The theoretical and methodological foundation based on the principles of comparative analysis, the descriptive method and elements of the functional approach in translation studies. The main objective of the research is to describe linguistic and cultural factors that complicate translation, as well as to determine strategies that permit the most acceptable translation of the source text meaning in different target languages.

At the first stage of the research, an analysis of differences in the semantic structure of Uzbek, Russian and English is performed. Special attention is paid to identifying lexical units that lack of direct equivalents in the target languages. Such words are associated with national-cultural specificity and reflect unique elements of daily life, traditions and worldview. The analysis considered not only the denotative meanings but also the connotative, emotional and pragmatic components.

Another important aspect is determining the elements of meaning that are partially or completely lost in the process of translation into Russian and English. These include the cultural associations, imagery, expressiveness and conceptual features. In some cases, Uzbek words require extended explanation, as their meaning cannot be fully translated by a single lexical word either Russian or English.

Special attention is given to the analysis of translation methods like transliteration, descriptive and adaptation. The choice of methods determined by the target audience, communication and the degree of cultural and linguistic distance between Uzbek, Russian and English.

Discussion. The practical part of the research is based on a comparative analysis of examples of the Uzbek national book "Shum bola", its Russian translation and its English translation. This allows to understand clearer how different translators approach the rendering culturally elements and stylistic features across languages.

Thus, in the following example:

1.SL (Source Language):

Ustida oldi ochiq yaktak, oyog'ida qala kavush, zangori shohi qiyiq bog'lagan, yelkasiga xolparang ro'mol tashlagan xushfe'l yigit edi (Page 5).

TL (Target Language):

Чайханщик — худощавый парень по прозвищу Асра-льсый, в легком халате нараспашку, подпоясанном голубым шелковым платком, услужливо носится среди посетителей. Через плечо у него перекинут кисейный платок в горошек, на ногах — кавуши (Page 4-5).

TL:

He wore a yaktak on his shoulder, leather-shoes on his legs, and a glittering blue belt on his waist and covered his shoulders with a shawl (Page 5).

The Russian translation conveys the meaning accurately, but it does not always preserve the cultural specificity. For instance: "yaktak" is translated as "халат нараспашку", which reflects the general idea but loses the national nuance of the original term. At the same time, the word "кавуш" is preserved, which helps retain cultural identity. The English translation shows more significant inaccuracies: the phrase "yaktak on his shoulder" misrepresents the original meaning, and "leather shoes" simplifies the culturally specific term "kavush". Therefore, the Russian version is closer to the original but partially loses cultural detail, while the English version lacks both accuracy and cultural precision.

2.SL:

Bu choxonada meni mahliyo qilgan narsalaming biri kiraverishning shiftiga ilib qo'yilgan katta, simlarga zarhal berilgan, har xil tumorlar, bayroqchalar bilan

bezatilgan qafas va bu qafasdagi jonli to'ti edi, o'lib ketay agar, tirik to'ti edi (Page 6).

TL:

Много удивительных вещей можно увидеть в этой чайхане. Но, конечно, самое замечательное в ней — это подвешенная к потолку у входа большая клетка, позолоченная, украшенная амулетами от

дурного глаза и пестрыми флажками. В клетке живет попугай, ей-богу, настоящий, живой попугай (Page 5)!

TL:

One of the things that fascinated me in this teahouse was a large cage, hung from the ceiling at the entrance, its bars gilded and decorated with various amulets and little flags. Inside the cage was a real, living parrot (Pages 5–6).

The Russian translation conveys the meaning but becomes more interpretative and generalized. For example, “meni mahliyo qilgan narsalarning biri” is translated as “самое замечательное”, while the original only means “one of the things” not the main one. It also adds “много удивительных вещей”, which is not present in the source text. However, cultural elements such as amulets and decorations are naturally. The English translation is closer to the original in structure and meaning, accurately reflecting “one of the things that fascinated me” and the description of the cage. But, the emotional phrase “olib ketay agar” is omitted, which reduces the expressiveness of the original. Therefore, the Russian version is more expressive but less precise, while the English version is more accurate but less emotional.

The Russian translation preserves the word “choyxona”, which helps retain its cultural and national specificity. In Uzbek culture, a choyxona is not just a place to drink tea, but a traditional social space associated with customs, gathering and a particular atmosphere. In contrast, the English translation uses “teahouse”, which only conveys a general meaning and lacks cultural depth. In English, a “teahouse” may refer to any place where tea is served and does not reflect the traditional Uzbek context. Therefore, the English version loses part of the cultural significance of the original term.

3. SL:

Onam meni tergay boshladi. Men jimgina quloq solib, o'choqning yoniga cho'qqayib, o't qalashirmoqqa boshladim (Page 13).

TL:

— Только и знаешь, что бегать, проклятый! — кричала мать. — А ну, иди сюда, помоги мне разжечь огонь. Дымит, чуть не ослепла!.. Делать было нечего, я пошел к тандыру и стал раздувать пламя (Page 18).

TL:

My mother began to investigate me. I was silent and began to turn on the stove (Page 11).

The Russian Translation significantly expands and enhances the original emotionally. For example: “Onam meni tergay boshladi” is translated as direct speech with strong scolding like “Только и знаешь, что бегать, проклятый”, while the original simply means “my mother began to scold me”. In addition, details are introduced that are not present in the original text. But the actions are conveyed relatively accurately, as “разжечь огонь” corresponds to “o't qalashirmoq”. In contrast, the English translation is both overly literal and inaccurate: “investigate me” does not match the meaning of “to scold”, and “turn on the stove” misrepresents the actions, since it refers to lighting a fire rather than switching on a stove. So, the Russian version is more natural but too free, while the English version lacks accuracy and contains semantic errors.

4. SL:

Oyim qolidagi xamir yoyib o'tirgan o'qlov bilan boshimga astagina urdi. – Juvonmarg, kap-katta bola, uylansang bolang bo'ladi, shu yerda, shunday Fotima Zaxroning dastgoxlari bo'lgan kutlug' yerda siyib o'tiribsanmi? (Page 13).

TL:

— и тут на мою голову обрушился удар.
— Чтоб ты сдох! — кричала мать, размахивая скалкой. — Такой здоровый балбес, сам мог бы иметь детей, если б женился, — и обмочился здесь, в священном месте, где хранятся принадлежности Фатимы и Зухры (Page 18).

TL:

My mother hit me slowly on my head with a stick. – You are an idiot, you are big boy now and if you marry, you will have your own children, and you are robbing in such a sacred place? (Page 11).

The Russian translation intensifies the tone and makes it much harsher than the original. For instance: “astagina urdi” translated as a “обрушился удар”, which exaggerates the action.

The word “Juvonmarg” is translated as “Чтоб ты сдох” which is much stronger than in the original text. However, the cultural elements of a “священное место, где хранятся принадлежности Фатимы и Зухры” is generally preserved, although the name is translated inaccurately “Zaxro” becomes “Zuhra”.

The English translation is closer in terms of the action “hit me slowly”, but contains serious mistakes: “stick” is not an accurate equivalent for “o'qlov” (rolling pin), and “you are robbing” completely distorts the meaning of “siyib” (to urinate). Overall, the Russian version is expressive

but overly harsh and inaccurate, while the English version is more neutral but contains major semantic errors.

5. SL:

Ramazon oyida o'yinimizning turlari yana ko'payib ketadi. Oqshomlari mahallada eshikma-eshik yurib, ramazon aytamiz (Page 7).

TL:

В месяц поста ко всему этому прибавляется много интересного. Вечерами мы ходим по махалле из дома в дом и поем «Рамазан» (Page 12).

TL:

In the Ramadan month, our game was walking from door to door and singing Ramazon songs (Page 8).

The Russian translation conveys the general meaning but slightly shifts the focus. The phrase “o'yinimizning turlari yana ko'payib ketadi” is translated as “прибавляется много интересного” which is more general and loses the idea of “variety of games”. The expression “ramazon aytamiz” is translated as a “поем «Рамазан»”, which sounds natural. The word “mahalla” is preserved, maintain cultural context. The English translation is less accurate: “our game was walking...” misrepresents the meaning, as it reduces a broader activity to a single “game”. “Ramazon songs” partially conveys the idea but lacks cultural depth. Overall, the Russian version is closer to the original but generalized, while the English version contains semantic inaccuracies.

6. SL:

— Bolalar qanda, oshiqqlar manda, — deb sevinch bilan qichqirmoqda edim (Page 12).

TL:

Я радостно вопил:

— А-а, проворонили! Ащички мои! (Page 16)

TL:

— Boys, well, all oshiks are in my pocket, — I shouted joyfully (Page 10). In the Russian translation, the emotional tone is well conveyed “радостно вопил”, but the meaning is changed by adding “проворонили”, which is not present in the original. But the cultural term “oshiks” is preserved. In the English translation the meaning is closer to the original “all oshiks are in my pocket”, but the phrase “Boys, well” sounds unnatural and does not reflect the playful, teasing tone of “Bolalar qanda”. Therefore, the Russian version is more expressive but less accurate, while the English version is more accurate in meaning but weaker stylistically.

7. SL:

– Charchadik, ozgina ovqatlanaylik, - dedi Omon.

– Yur bo'lmasa, nima yeymiz?

– O'zi arzon-u to'q tutadigan ovqat bo'lsin, – dedi Omon.

– Bo'lmasa tariq go'ja ichamiz (Page 23).

TL:

- Ох, устал я! — потягиваясь, сказал Аман. - Надо перекусить, а?

— Пошли. Что будем есть?

— Главное, чтоб дешево и сытно!

— Тогда просяную похлебку! (Page 40).

TL:

We got tired and Omon suggested eating something.

– Let's go, what will we eat?

– Something cheaper and good and with high nutrition, – Omon said.

– Then we will eat guja.

Guja* - made by corn and sour-milk! (Page 17).

The Russian translation translated the dialogue in a natural and conversational way, adding expressions like “Ох, устал я”, which makes the speech more natural, although the original is more neutral “Charchadik” – “we got tired”. The phrase “ozgina ovqatlanaylik” is accurately translated as “Надо перекусить” and “arzon-u to'q tutadigan ovqat” is well conveyed as “дешево и сытно”. The translator replaces “tariq go'ja” with the descriptive phrase “просяная похлёбка” to make the meaning clear for Russian readers, who may be not familiar with this traditional dish.

This method assist convey the meaning. In the English translation, the overall meaning is conveyed, but there are some inaccuracies. For example: the phrase “something cheaper and good and with high nutrition” sounds unnatural and grammatically incorrect a more natural expression would be “something cheap and filling” or “something inexpensive but nutritious”. At the same time the term “guja” is preserved, and Translator's Note is added “made by corn and sour-milk”, which demonstrates a translation strategy of retaining a cultural term with explanation.

This is an effective method, but the explanation is not fully accurate, since “tariq” refers to millet, not corn. Overall, the Russian version is more natural, while the English version uses a translator's note method but include stylistic and factual issues.

Conclusion. In this study has demonstrated that the problem of untranslatable words is not just a linguistic issue, but a complex interaction

of language, culture and context. Through the comparative analysis of the Uzbek literary work "Shum bola" and its Russian, English translations, it becomes evident that culturally specific vocabulary presents considerable challenges that cannot be resolved through direct lexical equivalence.

The analysis confirms that untranslatability often arises from the deep cultural connectedness of certain lexical units. Words like *yaktak*, *kavush*, *mahalla* and *tariq go'ja* reflect not only material objects but also traditions and cultural identity. As a result, their meaning extends over and above dictionary definitions, requiring translators to make interpretative decisions that balance accuracy and readability. The comparison shows that different languages and translation traditions apply different strategies.

The Russian translation tends to prioritize naturalness and emotional expressiveness, often using adaptation translation. While this approach makes the text more accessible and stylistically rich for the target audience, it sometimes leads to over-interpretation and loss of some nuances present in the original. In contrast, the English translation generally follows a more literal approach and occasionally preserves original terms through

transliteration. But this often results in stylistic difficulties and in some cases, serious semantic inaccuracies that distort the original meaning.

The study also highlights the effectiveness of combining translation strategies. Methods like translator's note, descriptive translation and functional substitution can help preserve both meaning and cultural specificity when used appropriately. At the same time, the findings emphasize that no single method is universally applicable, the choice depends on the communicative purpose, the target audience and the degree of cultural distance between languages.

In conclusion, successful translation of culturally bound vocabulary requires the translator to act as a cultural mediator rather than a simple linguistic converter. The "untranslatable" should not be viewed as an obstacle, but as an opportunity to convey cultural richness and diversity. This research contributes to a deeper understanding of translation processes and underscores the importance of cultural awareness in achieving equivalence between languages.

References

1. Jakobson R. On linguistic aspects of translation. In R.A. Brower: *On translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959. — 232–239 pp.
2. Fedorov A.V. *Foundation of general translation theory (Linguistic Problems)*. Moscow: OOO Filologiya Tri, 2002. — 416 p.
3. Nida E.A. *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964. — 331 p.
4. Venuti L. *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London: Routledge, 1995. — 353 p.
5. Ruzmatova N. Problems of translating of untranslatable words. *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 2023, Vol. 3, Issue 11, pp. 69–72.
6. G'afur G'ulom. *Shum bola*. Tashkent: O'zbekiston Davlat nashriyoti, 1936. — 253 b.
7. A. Naumov. *Озорник*. Tashkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 1962. — 270 b.
8. I.M. Tukhtasinov. *A Naughty Boy*. Tashkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2017. — 127 p.
9. Baker M. In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge, 2011. — 352 p.
10. Newmark P. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. — 292 p.
11. Catford J.C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965. — 103 p.
12. Bassnett S. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 2014. — 192 p.
13. Hatim B., Mason I. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman, 1990. — 264 p.
14. Schäffner C. (ed.) *Translation and Intercultural Communication*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2003. — 220 p.
15. Chesterman A. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1997. — 184 p.