e-ISSN 3060-5059
DOI: 10.67227

IJTIMOIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNAL

Scientific and Innovative Research in Social and Humanitarian Studies

Vol. 3 • Issue 8

2026



Founded in 2024

publishscience.uz | publish_science_journal@mail.ru

PEER REVIEWED • OPEN ACCESS

ISSN 3060-5059 (Online)
Article / Original paper https://doi.org/10.67227/n7dyws64

MASHINA TARJIMASINING PARAMETRLARI VA MUAMMOLARI

Utayeva Iroda Baxodirovna
Samarqand davlat pedagogika instituti, dekan, professor.
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-7268-8083

Annotatsiya.
Ushbu maqolada marketing matnlarini tarjima qilish semantik muvofiqlik, pragmatik samaradorlik va ijtimoiy-madaniy moslashtirish nuqtai nazaridan tahlil qilinadi. Maqsadli til muhitida kommunikativ jihatdan ahamiyatsiz yoki samarasiz deb hisoblanishi mumkin bo‘lgan asl matn komponentlariga nisbatan tarjimon tomonidan qabul qilinadigan qarorlarga alohida e’tibor qaratiladi. Tadqiqotda marketing tarjimasi ijodiy va strategik yo‘naltirilgan transkreasiya jarayoni sifatida konseptuallashtirilib, unda lingvistik transformatsiya pragmatik va madaniy moslashtirish bilan uyg‘unlashishi asoslab beriladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: tarjima, transkreasiya, tarjima strategiyasi, semantik muvofiqlik, funksional ekvivalentlik, pragmatik moslashtirish, madaniy moslashtirish, milliy-madaniy xususiyatga ega birliklar.

ПАРАМЕТРЫ И ПРОБЛЕМЫ МАШИННОГО ПЕРЕВОДА

Утаева Ирода Баходировна
Самаркандский государственный педагогический институт, декан, профессор.

Аннотация.
В статье рассматривается перевод маркетинговых текстов с точки зрения семантического соответствия, прагматической эффективности и социокультурной адаптации. Особое внимание уделяется решениям переводчика в отношении компонентов исходного текста, которые могут рассматриваться как коммуникативно нерелевантные или неэффективные в среде целевого языка. В исследовании маркетинговый перевод концептуализируется как творческий и стратегически ориентированный процесс транскреации, в котором языковая трансформация сочетается с прагматической и культурной адаптацией.

Ключевые слова: перевод, транскреация, стратегия перевода, семантическое соответствие, функциональная эквивалентность, прагматическая адаптация, культурная адаптация, культурно-специфические элементы.

PARAMETERS AND CHALLENGES IN MACHINE TRANSLATION

Utayeva Iroda Baxodirovna
Samarkand State Pedagogical Institute, Dean, Professor.

Abstract.
This article examines the translation of marketing texts from the perspectives of semantic correspondence, pragmatic effectiveness, and sociocultural adaptation. Particular attention is paid to translators’ decisions regarding source-text components that may be considered communicatively irrelevant or ineffective in the target-language environment. The study conceptualizes marketing translation as a creative and strategically oriented process of transcreation in which linguistic transformation is combined with pragmatic and cultural adaptation.

Keywords: translation, transcreation, translation strategy, semantic correspondence, functional equivalence, pragmatic adaptation, cultural adaptation, culture-specific elements.

Introduction. Approaches to translation-oriented analysis and their conceptual content have evolved alongside the development of translation studies, which, at each stage of its disciplinary formation, has incorporated theoretical and methodological achievements from linguistics and related fields within the humanities. On the one hand, the diversity of existing approaches has considerably broadened the scope of translation research and enhanced opportunities for identifying theoretically grounded solutions to both scholarly and practical translation problems. On the other hand, this development has resulted in a relatively eclectic set of analytical tools, concepts, and categories, while certain outdated procedures of textual analysis continue to be applied. One example is the attempt to predict specific translation transformations in advance as appropriate mechanisms for resolving particular translation difficulties.

Consequently, the determination of the structure and constituent elements of translation-oriented analysis remains methodologically problematic. It is still insufficiently clear which parameters should constitute the basis of such analysis, whether a universal analytical framework applicable to all text types can be theoretically justified, and which textual characteristics should be identified in order to ensure the practical relevance of analysis for translation decision-

ISSN 3060-5059 (Online)

making. A further research issue concerns the extent to which analytical findings can provide a valid rationale for the selection and justification of particular translation strategies and solutions.

Contemporary translation studies increasingly emphasize the principle of integrativity, which provides a methodological basis for combining the theoretical, practical, and didactic dimensions of translation. M. A. Polikarpov argues that integrative translation studies can contribute to systematicity not only in the scholarly investigation of translation but also in the accumulation and conceptualization of professional translation experience [2]. From this perspective, translation quality assessment constitutes one of the central concepts for the further development of integrative translation studies and should be examined across educational, professional, production-economic, and discursive dimensions.

It may therefore be argued that the analytical dimension of translation activity represents one of the fundamental determinants of translation quality. This applies both to technology-assisted translation involving automated tools and to conventional human translation characterized by interpretative and creative decision-making. Nevertheless, translation-oriented analysis itself requires further theoretical conceptualization in accordance with contemporary research paradigms, particularly those emphasizing communication, cognition, discourse, culture, and functional adequacy.

Literature review. The emergence of modern translation theory within the Russian scholarly tradition is generally associated with the mid-twentieth century and, more specifically, with the publication of A. V. Fedorov's *Introduction to the Theory of Translation* in 1953, which was subsequently republished under the title *Fundamentals of the General Theory of Translation*. At that stage, translation theory was predominantly conceptualized as a branch of applied linguistics and was largely shaped by the principles of the systemic-structural paradigm that dominated linguistic scholarship at the time [2]; [8]. Within this theoretical framework, translation was interpreted primarily as the transformation or recoding of a text from one linguistic system into another. Accordingly, the principal objects of investigation were linguistic units and the various forms of interlingual correspondence established between them. Literary texts generally constituted the primary empirical material. The substantial body of empirical evidence accumulated during this period enabled researchers to systematize interlingual transformations and to identify a range of translation techniques that came to be regarded as the principal linguistic instruments available to translators.

Translation-oriented text analysis during this period was therefore primarily directed toward identifying units of translation in the source text. Its major purpose was to anticipate potentially applicable translation techniques and determine appropriate equivalents for particular linguistic units, ranging from phonemes and graphemes to phrases and complete sentences. Such an explicitly linguistic approach was theoretically coherent within the structural paradigm; however, it could not provide a sufficiently comprehensive explanatory framework for actual translation decision-making.

Translation decisions are generally intended to reconstruct and communicate multiple semantic, pragmatic, stylistic, and contextual dimensions of an utterance rather than merely to establish formal equivalents for isolated lexical units or grammatical structures. Consequently, an exclusively equivalence-oriented model proved insufficient for explaining the interpretative processes through which translators identify, negotiate, and reproduce meaning in a target communicative environment.

A qualitatively different understanding of translation became possible with the emergence of the anthropocentric research paradigm and the development of scholarly approaches that shifted attention from linguistic units as components of an abstract sign system toward their functioning within communicative contexts. Within this paradigm, translation research increasingly addressed processes of meaning construction and meaning interpretation, the roles of the author and recipient, and the specific characteristics of the communicative situation in which translation occurs.

This stage in the development of translation studies may therefore be characterized as a gradual, and in some respects decisive, departure from what N. K. Garbovsky [3] describes as the "naivety of linguistic conceptions of translation." Translation research progressively moved from the relatively isolated examination of particular dimensions of translation activity toward their systematic integration through theories, concepts, and methodological instruments derived from different academic disciplines.

Developing the principles of the communicative-functional approach to translation, V. V. Sdobnikov [4] proposes that translation analysis should focus not exclusively on the source text but rather on the entire communicative situation of translation, within which the source text constitutes only one component. This methodological reorientation significantly expands the analytical framework because the translation situation incorporates the purpose of the translation itself, rather than merely the communicative purpose of the source text, as well as the intended target-text recipient, rather than exclusively the recipient originally envisaged by the source-text author.

As a consequence of this shift, translation-oriented text analysis acquires an explicitly discursive character. The analytical process extends beyond the internal linguistic organization of the source text and incorporates communicative intentions, contextual conditions, recipient characteristics, pragmatic objectives, sociocultural factors, and the functional requirements imposed on the target text.

The empirical domain of translation analysis has likewise expanded considerably. Rather than concentrating predominantly on literary discourse, contemporary translation studies investigate the broad spectrum of text types encountered in professional translation practice. This development reflects the increasing interaction between translation theory, professional practice, and translator education. Accordingly, translation-oriented analysis now encompasses technical, marketing, media, scientific, political, institutional, and other specialized forms of discourse.

The diversification of research objects has been accompanied by the emergence and development of numerous

theoretical perspectives that have subsequently influenced the conceptualization of translation-oriented text analysis. These include communicative-pragmatic, communicative-functional, linguocultural, cognitive-communicative, and cultural-cognitive approaches. L. G. Fedyuchenko [6], for example, develops a cognitive-communicative orientation within translation research, whereas N. G. Valeeva investigates the cultural-cognitive dimension of translation theory [7].

Despite these theoretical developments, the process of resolving translation problems continues to be interpreted by a number of researchers through a relatively mechanistic model based on the application of translation transformations. Such transformations are conventionally classified as lexical, grammatical, and stylistic procedures and are frequently treated as mechanisms for selecting alternative forms of interlingual correspondence at the level of individual linguistic units. Within this framework, translation-oriented analysis may consequently be reduced to the identification and description of selected extralinguistic information and isolated textual characteristics without establishing systematic relationships among linguistic, communicative, cognitive, pragmatic, and cultural parameters.

At the present stage of translation studies, there is therefore a clear need to reconsider both the structure and substantive content of translation-oriented text analysis. Contemporary research requires the alignment of analytical procedures with the actual demands of professional translation practice and the formulation of theoretically grounded parameters for a comprehensive, integrative model of translation analysis. Such a model should move beyond the mechanical identification of linguistic correspondences and translation transformations and instead provide a multidimensional analytical framework capable of supporting informed translation decision-making.

Within this integrative framework, cultural specificity may be regarded as one of the fundamental properties of a text. The identification, interpretation, and adequate reconstruction of culturally determined meanings in the target language represent some of the most complex aspects of professional translation activity. The transfer of cultural information is not limited to lexical equivalence but involves the interpretation of culturally embedded meanings, conceptual structures, communicative conventions, pragmatic implications, value systems, and discourse-specific patterns.

Accordingly, the representation of culturally specific content in translation continues to constitute a significant theoretical and methodological problem and remains the subject of scholarly debate within contemporary translation studies. From this perspective, the principal research objective is to conceptualize and describe the cultural component as one of the core parameters of translation-oriented text analysis, thereby contributing to the development of a comprehensive and integrative analytical framework capable of connecting translation theory, professional practice, and translator training.

First, it is necessary to clarify the concept of a “parameter” in order to ensure a systematic framework for the analysis and to incorporate all essential characteristics of the research object. According to L. L. Nelyubin’s *Explanatory Dictionary of Translation Studies* [9], the term parameter, in the sense most relevant to translation research, denotes a quantitative or qualitative variable that characterizes the principal properties of a particular object, phenomenon, or process. Another interpretation defines a parameter as an indicator or criterion whose value exerts a substantial influence on the processes under investigation. On the basis of these definitions, the parameters of translation analysis may be conceptualized as those characteristics of the text and the communicative situation of translation that perform a determining function both in the creative process of translation decision-making and in the subsequent justification of the decisions adopted.

The principal objective of translation analysis is to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the unique immanent properties of the source text and its extralinguistic context. The parameters relevant to the analysis of a particular text cannot be reduced to an exhaustive and universally applicable inventory, since their selection is determined by the specific conditions of each translation situation. For example, the translation of media discourse may require careful consideration of the prevailing political context; technical translation may depend on technical regulations and environmental standards; and the translation of marketing discourse may require an analysis of the value orientations and sociocultural expectations of the target audience. Consequently, it is methodologically appropriate to distinguish between constant and variable parameters of translation-oriented text analysis.

Constant parameters encompass those characteristics that represent the communicative-pragmatic, functional, and text-categorical properties of a text. Nevertheless, an adequate interpretation of a semantically complex textual construct requires a differentiated analytical procedure that takes its distinctive features into account. Accordingly, the framework of translation analysis becomes situationally conditioned, while its configuration is determined by the analytical focus or reference point that is most relevant to translation decision-making in a particular communicative situation. Such a reference point cannot be standardized for all text types. Rather, it requires the translator to demonstrate analytical sensitivity toward the material by examining not only the structural, semantic, pragmatic, and functional properties of the source text but also the mechanisms through which that text is incorporated into the receptive culture.

The identification, interpretation, and transfer of the cultural specificity of a text have traditionally been regarded as fundamental components of the translation process, particularly because translation facilitates communication between representatives of different linguistic and cultural communities. Accordingly, the concept of culture and related categories—including culture-specific realia, cultural markers, and culturally conditioned units—have remained significant objects of scholarly inquiry throughout the development of translation studies. L. V. Kushnina, for example, considers ethnolinguistic asymmetry to be an inherent characteristic of translation [11]. Cultural differences constitute an integral component of the communicative situation in which translation occurs and may produce variability in the communicative effect generated by the target text. For this reason, cultural specificity should be regarded as one of the fundamental parameters of translation analysis applicable to a substantial proportion of texts encountered in

professional translation practice.

Although its terminological representation varies according to particular theoretical frameworks and its semantic scope continues to expand within contemporary research paradigms, the cultural component remains a relatively stable analytical category reflecting the interdependence between linguistic semantics and the cultural environment of language users. Research in this field initially concentrated on the realia of the source language and on culture-specific realia as elements of non-equivalent vocabulary. Subsequently, scholarly attention expanded toward the national-cultural specificity of linguistic phenomena and the intercultural nature of translation. These developments generated research directions that substantially enriched translation theory by providing more detailed classifications of techniques for transferring different categories of realia and by theoretically substantiating various strategies of cultural adaptation.

The investigation of cultural and ethnic—and, more broadly, culturological—dimensions of translation, particularly when combined with the concept of the linguistic worldview, has resulted in the formulation of such theoretically significant categories as L. K. Latyshev's linguo-ethnic barrier and Z. D. Lvovskaya's cultural intertextuality. These and related concepts have contributed substantially to theoretical discussions concerning translation equivalence and adequacy [13]; [14].

The transition from predominantly linguistic theories of translation toward broader translation models has further intensified scholarly interest in the cultural dimension of translational activity. Within contemporary cognitive-communicative approaches, researchers increasingly employ such concepts as cultural marker, culture-marked unit, culturally significant information, and cultural specificity. Nevertheless, a persistent tendency remains to investigate the cultural component primarily at the lexical level. A considerable number of studies continue to differentiate relevant lexical units on the basis of previously established linguistic classifications, although such units are now frequently conceptualized through the category of cultural markers. In methodological terms, therefore, established translation techniques are sometimes redescribed through updated terminological frameworks.

While such investigations retain scholarly relevance, their contribution should be evaluated in relation to the already extensive body of research in this area. More promising research trajectories may therefore involve the identification of systemic principles, the synthesis of previously obtained findings, and the development of more integrative analytical models. Irrespective of particular stages in the evolution of translation theory, the cultural component has preserved its fundamental function as a carrier of information concerning the culture of a specific linguistic community. At the same time, it may be conceptualized both as an intralinguistic component of textual analysis and as an extralinguistic determinant of translation decision-making.

From an intralinguistic perspective, the cultural parameter is traditionally interpreted as a component of lexical meaning that encodes information concerning the cultural specificity of a particular linguistic community. Under this interpretation, its analytical scope is primarily restricted to the lexical level. From an extralinguistic perspective, however, researchers tend to incorporate the cultural component into a broader system of contextual factors affecting text comprehension and translation. For example, alongside communicative, functional, structural, semantic, and discursive dimensions, V. B. Kashkin distinguishes a linguocultural parameter, which incorporates the source and target cultures as well as background knowledge and presuppositions [15]. Thus, whether cultural specificity is interpreted as a culturally conditioned divergence between linguistic systems or as a contextual determinant affecting translation quality, the cultural component remains an integral dimension of text analysis and one of its key translation parameters.

Changes in the conceptual structure of the cultural component, reflecting contemporary tendencies in translation research, indicate the complex and dual nature of this parameter and make it possible to distinguish between its narrow and broad interpretations. In its narrow sense, the cultural parameter is realized primarily at the lexical level, irrespective of text type or terminological variation in its designation, ranging from cultural realia to culture-specific units. In its broader interpretation, the parameter encompasses an interaction between intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors directed toward identifying culturally specific meanings whose adequate transfer continues to represent a complex problem at both theoretical and empirical levels.

Within the narrow interpretation, the lexical dimension constitutes the invariant component of the cultural parameter and is traditionally associated with such established categories as realia and non-equivalent vocabulary. For example, the analysis of virtually any text may identify culture-marked lexical units as distinctive textual characteristics and, in many cases, as potential translation difficulties. Regardless of the position occupied by a text within a translation-oriented typology or its genre classification within the functional-stylistic approach, the translator is required to identify an optimal translation solution for such units in order to preserve their culturally specific semantic and pragmatic characteristics.

A comparable problem arises in the translation of German-language media discourse into Russian. An article published in *Der Sprachdienst* refers to the Spanish conquistador Hernando Cortés in discussing the presumed historical origin of the expression meaning "to burn one's own ships." Because this historical figure is widely known and already possesses an established conventional equivalent in the target linguistic culture, the translator must determine whether to employ the historically conventionalized form Fernando Cortés or a contemporary transcription-based variant corresponding more closely to Hernán Cortés. The widespread use of transcription in contemporary open-access information sources may encourage the latter solution; however, the existence of an established historical equivalent provides grounds for selecting the conventional form [5]; [6].

The choice between these translation variants constitutes a representative example of a context-dependent translation problem, the solution to which must be determined by the specific communicative situation. In a historical context, priority may reasonably be given not to a modern transcription-based representation of the name but to the

preservation of its historically established and nationally specific cultural form, particularly when that form is documented in authoritative target-language sources. Such cases demonstrate that particular strategies for rendering proper names may vary according to contextual, pragmatic, historical, and cultural considerations. What remains constant, however, is the invariant dimension of the cultural parameter, namely its intralinguistic component, characterized by the relative stability and explicitness of its representation in translation.

Discussion. The cultural component, when treated as an analytical parameter in textual and translation research, comprises both an invariant dimension, primarily realized at the lexical level, and a variable dimension whose manifestation may involve lexical resources but is not restricted to them. The variability of this parameter presupposes the interaction of intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors aimed at identifying culturally significant information and, more broadly, at reconstructing culture-specific meanings. Such meanings may be encoded either explicitly or implicitly in the textual structure, thereby requiring differentiated analytical procedures and translation strategies.

In the translation of documents produced by educational institutions from German into Russian, including certificates of qualification, professional examination records, and related institutional documentation, translation solutions may demonstrate an orientation toward the strategies of domestication or foreignization. German source-language units such as *Sachbearbeiter Rechnungslegung*, *hausinterne Fortbildung*, and *die Personalabteilung* belong to the conceptual domain of economics and, more specifically, human resource management. In their primary semantic function, these units cannot be classified as explicitly culture-bound lexical items. Nevertheless, they may function as markers of corporate culture, since their culture-specific component can be represented through alternative target-language equivalents. Thus, depending on the communicative situation and translation strategy, such concepts may be rendered through equivalents corresponding to financial consultant/manager, continuing education/in-house training, and personnel department/human resource management. The selection of variants such as accountant, professional development courses, or personnel department demonstrates how the translator may adapt institutionally conditioned meanings to the conceptual and terminological conventions of the target culture.

Translation analysis, however, cannot be reduced to the identification of explicitly represented culturally significant information followed by the mechanical substitution of unfamiliar realia, idiomatic expressions, terminology, or other textual elements with forms regarded as conventional in the target culture. In its broader interpretation, the cultural component involves identifying the culture-specific configuration of the text and reconstructing the meanings embedded within it. This dimension may be conceptualized as an implicit or “invisible” layer of textual information manifested through evaluations, judgments, references, allusions, culturally conditioned associations, and orientations toward particular systems of cultural values. Such information becomes analytically accessible only when translation is conceptualized not as a process of linguistic transcoding but as a process of meaning transfer and intercultural mediation.

Culture-specificity, similarly to the global meaning of a text, cannot be reconstructed through the simple aggregation of the meanings of its individual linguistic units. Rather, it emerges holistically through the interaction of lexical, semantic, pragmatic, discursive, and extralinguistic components. Consequently, the cultural dimension of translation should be investigated at the level of the text as an integrated communicative and semiotic construct rather than exclusively through isolated lexical correspondences.

To date, a considerable proportion of research in this area has been conducted on texts that have been studied to varying degrees and are intended primarily for human or traditional translation, although contemporary information technologies, including computer-assisted translation tools and translation automation systems, may also be employed. The volume of such textual material is generally manageable from the perspective of human processing, making it possible for translators or researchers to conduct a comprehensive analytical reading from the beginning to the end of the source text.

Contemporary translation practice, however, increasingly involves texts that are difficult to classify within established linguistic and translation-oriented text typologies. Even when such texts can formally be assigned to a particular category, for example, the group of primarily cognitive texts, this classification generally provides information only about their universal or generalized characteristics rather than their distinctive structural, functional, pragmatic, and cultural properties. Moreover, emerging hybrid text types are increasingly processed through machine translation systems. This tendency enhances the relevance of reconsidering the methodological foundations of translation analysis in general and the mechanisms for transferring the cultural component in particular.

The substantial volume of such texts frequently makes conventional analytical reading impractical. Consequently, translators may be unable to perform all procedures traditionally associated with pre-translation analysis, including exhaustive identification of universal and distinctive textual characteristics, systematic classification of translation difficulties, comprehensive examination of culture-bound elements, and detailed assessment of communicative and pragmatic parameters. Nevertheless, the use of machine translation does not eliminate the need for translation analysis. Instead, it necessitates a modified analytical framework adapted to contemporary technological conditions and emerging professional translation workflows.

Within such a framework, translation analysis may incorporate the assessment of translatability indicators in order to select an appropriate machine translation system or technological solution. In collaborative translation projects, analytical procedures may additionally include parameters related to translation project management, workflow organization, quality assurance, and the distribution of translation and post-editing tasks. Thus, technological transformation modifies the operational structure of translation analysis without eliminating its methodological significance.

It should also be emphasized that the invariant dimension of the cultural component, as in conventional human

translation, remains largely concentrated at the lexical level. Its transfer is comparatively stable because culturally relevant lexical elements normally remain identifiable in the translated text and constitute translation difficulties whose resolution can be monitored and corrected by a professional translator during post-editing. From this perspective, human intervention remains an important component of quality control, particularly where lexical equivalence, terminological adequacy, and culturally appropriate representation are concerned.

The translation of the variable dimension of the cultural component presents a more complex methodological problem. Owing to the objective functional limitations of machine translation systems, culturally significant information may, in certain contexts, be unintentionally omitted, neutralized, generalized, or insufficiently reconstructed. As a consequence, implicit culture-specific meanings, pragmatic associations, evaluative nuances, and culturally conditioned semantic relations may fail to be transferred into the target text. This problem demonstrates that effective machine-assisted translation requires analytical models capable of identifying not only explicit lexical markers of cultural specificity but also implicit cultural meanings distributed across the semantic, pragmatic, discursive, and extralinguistic levels of textual organization.

Conclusion. Thus, the degree of semantic correspondence between the source and translated marketing texts is directly determined by the number of source-text components that the translator identifies as irrelevant or communicatively ineffective, as well as by the functional role these elements perform within advertising discourse. From a translation-studies perspective, the translation of marketing texts constitutes a creative and strategically oriented process commonly conceptualized as transcreation. Within this framework, the translator's primary objective may involve not merely preserving culture-specific features of the source text, but rather reconstructing and functionally adapting cultural specificity in the target text in accordance with the linguistic, sociocultural, and pragmatic expectations of the target audience.

REFERENCES

1. Боголепова С. В. Современные подходы к обучению иностранному языку: общее и частное // *Лингвистика и методика преподавания иностранных языков.* – 2020. – Т. 13, № 2. – С. 168–189. – DOI: 10.37892/2218-1393-2020-13-2-168-189. https://iling-ran.ru/library/sborniki/for_lang/2020_13_2/index.htm
2. Поликарпов А. М. Интегративное переводоведение: предпосылки возникновения и основные идеи // *Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2: Языкознание.* – 2017. – Т. 16, № 3. – С. 6–17. – DOI: 10.15688/jvolsu2.2017.3.1. – URL: https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2017.3.1
3. Гарбовский Н. К., Костикова О. И. Перевод и общество // *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 22: Теория перевода.* – 2018. – № 1. – С. 17–40. – URL: https://vestnik-translation.ru/articles/article/315/
4. Сдобников В. В. *Перевод и коммуникативная ситуация: монография.* – 4-е изд., стер. – Москва: ФЛИНТА, 2022. – 463 с. – ISBN 978-5-9765-2112-4. – URL: https://m.ibooks.ru/products/352235
5. Гуреева А. А., Усачёва А. Н., Попова О. И., Новикова Э. Ю. и др. *Переводчик XXI века — агент дискурса: коллективная монография* / науч. ред. В. А. Митягина, А. А. Гуреева. – 2-е изд., стер. – Москва: ФЛИНТА, 2017. – 278 с. – ISBN 978-5-9765-2692-1. – URL: https://e.lanbook.com/book/92726
6. Федюченко Л. Г. // *Теория перевода в классической и современной исследовательской парадигме: онтология, методология, аксиология: коллективная монография* / под общ. ред. Л. В. Кушниной. – Москва: ФЛИНТА, 2020. – С. 192–207. – ISBN 978-5-9765-4260-0. – URL: https://www.ibooks.ru/bookshelf/366997/reading
7. Валеева Н. Г. *Теория перевода: культурно-когнитивный и коммуникативно-функциональный аспекты: монография.* – 3-е изд., испр. и доп. – Москва: РУДН, 2018. – 244 с. – ISBN 978-5-209-09241-4. https://rkiff.philol.msu.ru/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/%D0%92%D0%B0%D0%BB%D0%B5%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%B0.pdf
8. Княжева Е. А. Переводческий анализ текста и качество перевода // *Вестник Воронежского государственного университета. Серия: Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация.* – 2012. – № 1. – С. 170–174. – URL: https://englishtesthelper.ru/articles_on_translation_theory.html
9. Нелюбин Л. Л. *Толковый переводоведческий словарь.* – 9-е изд., стер. – Москва: ФЛИНТА, 2018. – 320 с. – ISBN 978-5-89349-526-3. – URL: https://library.bmstu.ru/Catalog/Details/Lan/277967
10. Сарыбеков М. Н., Сыдыкназаров М. К. *Словарь науки: общенаучные термины и определения, науковедческие понятия и категории: учебное пособие.* – 2-е изд., доп. и перераб. – Алматы: ТРИУМФ-Т, 2008. – 504 с. – URL: https://www.studmed.ru/sarybekov-mn-sydyknazarov-mk-slovar-nauki-obschenauchnye-terminy-i-opredeleniya-naukovedcheskie-ponyatiya-i-kategorii_2a745ff8935.html
11. Кушнина Л. В. Переводческие дихотомии в современном освещении // *Теория перевода в классической и современной исследовательской парадигме: онтология, методология, аксиология: коллективная монография* / под общ. ред. Л. В. Кушниной. – Москва: ФЛИНТА, 2020. – С. 10–29. – URL: https://www.ibooks.ru/bookshelf/366997/reading

ISSN 3060-5059 (Online)

12. Комлев Н. Г. *Компоненты содержательной структуры слова.* – 3-е изд., стер. – Москва: КомКнига, 2006. – 192 с. – ISBN 5-484-00368-7. – URL: https://www.books.ru/books/komponenty-soderzhatelnoi-struktury-slova-385488/
13. Латышев Л. К. *Перевод: проблемы теории, практики и методики преподавания: книга для учителя школ с углубленным изучением немецкого языка.* – Москва: Просвещение, 1988. – 160 с. – ISBN 5-09-000706-3. – URL: https://ecatalog.gasu.ru/cgi/irbis64r_11/cgiirbis_64.exe?C21COM=S&I21DBN=IBIS_PRINT&P21DBN=IBIS
14. Львовская З. Д. *Современные проблемы перевода* / пер. с исп. – Москва: Издательство ЛКИ, 2008. – 224 с. – ISBN 978-5-382-00125-8. – URL: https://rusneb.ru/catalog/010003_000061_e227c9d6124ca22229bae2182bb8f7eb/
15. Кашкин В. Б. Чтение текста для перевода: анализ, понимание, интерпретация, прогноз // *Проблемы перевода, лингвистики и литературы: сборник научных трудов.* – Нижний Новгород: НГЛУ им. Н. А. Добролюбова, 2012. – Вып. 15, т. 1. – С. 79–87. – URL: https://kachkine.narod.ru/Articles2012/2012KashkinNN50.pdf
16. Алимова М. Р. Маркетинговый текст как объект перевода: особенности, виды и проблемы перевода // *Международный академический вестник.* – 2019. – № 10 (42). – С. 110–111. – URL: https://eastjournal.ru/wp-content/uploads/2023/77/7731.pdf
17. Серегина А. И. Выбор ключевых слов как условие достижения адекватности при переводе маркетинговых текстов // *Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия: Лингвистика.* – 2013. – № 3. – С. 94–99. – URL: https://dspace.tltsu.ru/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/26495/Sb-k_SDN_4-05-22_Z.pdf
18. Шейко А. М. Перевод маркетинговых текстов: сложности и особенности // *HOMO LOQUENS (Вопросы лингвистики и транслятологии): сборник статей.* – Волгоград: Волгоградский государственный университет, 2016. – Вып. 9. – С. 147–157. – URL: https://dspace.tltsu.ru/jspui/bitstream/123456789/30072/1/%D0%A1%D0%94%D0%9D-2023_4-09-23_Z.pdf
19. • Иванова С. В., Николаева А. В. Роль «пустых» слов в тексте рекламы (на материале англоязычных рекламных текстов) // *Политическая лингвистика.* – 2011. – № 4 (38). – С. 202–209. – URL: https://politlinguistika.ru/images/4-2011/32.pdf