



## Phraseological Units in Kazakh and Ways of Their Expression in Russian

Dilyara Ilurovna Sharapova<sup>1</sup>, Gelinya Chayretdinovna Gilazetdinova<sup>2</sup>, Ruzilya Rashitovna Salakhova<sup>3</sup>, &  
Ilmira Kanatovna Yerbulatova<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University, Kazan; [sharapova.dil@mail.ru](mailto:sharapova.dil@mail.ru)

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Zhangir Khan University, Kazakhstan; [ggilaz@mail.ru](mailto:ggilaz@mail.ru)

<sup>3</sup>Corresponding author, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University; [ruzilya5@mail.ru](mailto:ruzilya5@mail.ru)

<sup>4</sup>Center for the Development of Languages, West Kazakhstan Agrarian Technical University, Zhangir Khan; [ilmira.yerbulatova@inbox.ru](mailto:ilmira.yerbulatova@inbox.ru)

### Abstract

At the present stage of translation studies development as a scientific area, researchers are increasingly attracted to linguistic issues related to examining similarities and differences of the national and cultural code between comparable languages and ethnic groups rich in the material in order to determine translation patterns and generalization standards. Studying translation matter in question both from linguistic and cultural aspects is based on understanding the essence and nature of translation as an operation performed in two languages and cultures. Consequently, examining linguistic elements making up the language national and cultural specificity is one of the core tasks of modern translation studies in the academic area. The article discusses the "culture-centred" approach in translation science based on the example of Kazakh phraseological units. Preliminary results and conclusions of the study presented herein showed that, under the "culture-centred" approach, translation is not "switching from one language code to another," since it consists in transferring a hidden metaphorical meaning from the "native" cultural environment to the environment of the perceiving culture.

**Keywords:** Phraseological Units; Metaphoric Essence; Semantic Meaning; National and Cultural Component; Translation Methods.

### 1. Introduction

The translation is the method of translating findings into measures that enhance the health of people and the public in the hospital, clinic, and community; from diagnostics and therapeutics to medical procedures and behavioural improvements. Each stage of research is described by the translational science continuum (T1-T4) along the path from the biological basis of health and disease to interventions which improve the health of individuals and the public. Of process builds upon the others and reminds them. In translation, patient participation is a vital aspect of all stages (Curtis, Fry, Shaban, & Considine, 2017; Laviosa, 2002).

T1; the method of applying preclinical laboratory research findings to experimental experiments in primates and human subjects.

T2; Study enables researchers to expand limited clinical findings into controlled environments (e.g., clinical trials in phase III) to assess evidence-based effectiveness in ideal settings.

T3; researchers decide how particular prevention and treatment interventions function in real-world population environments (e.g. phase IV trials), evaluate feasibility, cost-effectiveness, and effects on clinical practice. In order to educate the appropriate implementation and basic discovery processes, the critical health agenda in the community needs to be translated back to the clinic and bench, respectively; these experiments are called reverse T3 projects.

T4; study includes applying community-based, validated health interventions to their impact on human populations.



In the new century, translation science is undergoing a kind of Cultural Revolution (Tan, 2017; Wang, 2018). The translation is seen as a crucial means of intercultural communication. In the exchange of messages between two or more cultures, the quality of translation and interpretation in intercultural communication is a primary factor. When it comes to consistency in the translation, the specificity of finding the equivalence or correspondence suitable for the contact of two distinct identities must be positioned in the forefront. The accuracy is entirely in the hands of but not only the translator. In this contact, the correct translation is linked to the position of the interpreter, but also to the understanding of elements of jogging, as well as the social context in which the process takes place. It is well known that translation science has contributed to intercultural communication, as it is clear that intercultural interactions do not take place without this science. There isn't a way to get used to all the world's languages. Various verbal and nonverbal meanings between various cultures have had to be conveyed since the development of human life. Intercultural communication depends heavily on translation and interpretation, which are two very critical resources, from one language to another and from one community to another to establish a bridge of meaning-crossing (Katan, 2009; Snell-Hornby, Jettmarová, & Kaindl, 1997). One of the more ancient linguistic phenomena is translation. At a time when civilization had just begun to spread widely to a planet called Earth, it was seen as the necessary solution that brought about the great number of languages across the world. In interacting between two speakers who speak different languages and have different cultures, translation has special merit. Merit relates to the exchange of words between two interlocutors that bear the meaning and precise transmission of the message, or between two distinct identities with unparalleled customs, cultures and behaviors. In intercultural communication, translators are left free to use terms during the translation process to explain the concepts from source language to sign language, but this free hand is only permitted by being faithful to the context. A social context plays an important role as the translator should be attentive to discern which culture is being interpreted and is always ready for the sole purpose of realizing communication to find the correct linguistic and cultural parameters. An interpreter's function cannot be performed by someone who knows two languages. A strong connoisseur of the language and culture of the source language and sign language should be the interpreter (Liddicoat, 2016; Schäffner & Adab, 1997; Shigenobu, 2007). The translator must also obviously be a very strong social meaning connoisseur, who translates or interprets. The work of an interpreter should not be left to linguistic equivalence alone in intercultural communication, as the transmission of a coherent message is extremely hazardous. Signals are sent from the sender to the recipient. These signals find no significance for a man who does not know the language - the root of the message, so it is imperative for the interpreter to interfere, who, aside from being able to embody them, makes meaningful sense to the receiver of the message. How is he doing this? The necessary verbal and nonverbal parameters are found, of course, as well as the time or social context in which the translation takes place is necessarily measured. The interpreter should always be keen to achieve an experienced conversation, considering all the above elements. He should know the language and culture of the source language very well and the language and culture of the sign language very well. The social time or meaning for which you are translating well you should also know. The inner state or curiosity of the interpreter himself should not be ignored.

Until the message is sent and is heard by the communicants, contact is unlikely. However, only if the information found in the language units corresponds to the context-awareness of the facts described in the message can this understanding be accomplished. Representatives of a certain culture are the people speaking one language. They have many traditional traditions, routines, and ways of doing stuff and talking about it. They have a shared understanding of their nations, their geography, their history, their environment, their political-economic, social and cultural institutions. All this data is the basis of the assumptions of communicants that enable them to generate and comprehend messages in their linguistic form. In the translation process, not only two languages communicate, but also two cultures with both similar features and national specificities. In researching intercultural communication and translation, disclosing this specificity is essential. In the process of intercultural communication, the translator plays an important role, because he/she also not only translates sentences but also interprets the communicants' cultures. He acts as the mediator on both sides, explaining to them the countries' keycodes of conduct and customs. For the language phenomenon, the translator can choose an equivalent that specifically represents another culture. In communication, empathy is the cornerstone of mutual understanding (Gibb & Good, 2014; House & Blum-Kulka, 1986; Robin, 2015). It is the ability to picture yourself with your eyes in the position of another human, trying to see the world. And the translation process is complete and efficient if the translator manages to do it. By contrasting languages and cultures, collateral elements and uncollateralized elements are distinguished. Language, as a whole, being an aspect of culture, is an uncollateralized element. The equivalent-lacking lexicon is, first of all, an uncollateralized feature. Inadequate comprehension of a country's past,



customs and culture lead to confusion of similarities, historical references, misunderstanding, also in everyday speech, i.e. language incompetence. In order to eventually become translatable or understandable, translators appear to omit or modify culturally incongruous objects. As cultural differences are part of the culture, the combination of languages in translation depends on cultural untranslatability. It means that cultural untranslatability is not equally applicable to all language combinations, audiences and translators. For translation, the principle of cultural untranslatability is important. An effective translation does not sound like a translation. Naturalness is the main condition. Cultural untranslatability is important only when cultural differences are very broad because it is difficult for translators to achieve naturalness or even to convey the communicative role of the initial text without facing these distinctions (G Ozerova et al., 2019; V Anisimova, R Lisenko, & V Savina, 2019; Vyacheslavovich Bodrov, Vasilovich Zakirov, & Ibragimovich Sharifzhanov, 2019).

Communication is a normal and well-known aspect of our lives that we sometimes do not pay attention to the value of communication. In addition, we often only engage as senders and recipients of information in the communication process without being aware that we are dealing with a dynamic process that involves several interconnected steps. Thanks to the human capacity for communication, human culture is constructed and exists precisely. There are several tools to communicate between individuals: gestures, cries, distinct signs, but nested speech is the key tool, etc. It is really important to know how to connect with other people, but on the other hand, you have the ability to be comprehensible about what you want to say to them is a situation that encourages relationships with them, preventing misunderstandings, disputes or conflicts (Davies, 2012; Faiq, 2004; House, 2020; Munday, 2009). We have found on a few occasions in our everyday lives that the source of great and often insoluble disputes might have been an incorrect term, not in the right place, as well as poorly understood or heard. Even when someone has seriously spoken to us or did not understand us completely, we might have also felt bad. Mark Twain would write in his comment specifically on the proper use of the word that the difference between the word accurately and what is almost correct is the difference between the light of lightning and the light of the candle. To this end, the experience of daily life has shown that it is difficult to find the best contact with others. Communication is not only an integral part of our everyday lives but also an essential component of any sort of human coexistence. Communication includes everyone in all human cases; it seems. Given this, it is not surprising that there are so many theories of communication, and that it is not at all easy to define the notion of communication, but an incredibly complex problem. Intercultural communication research is relatively recent and began precisely when language science was not only confronted with language morphology and morphology but also with realistic vocabulary. It distinguishes four dimensions, namely: individualism-collectivism, power of distance, avoidance of uncertainty and feminism/masculism. The word intercultural encompasses all the phenomena that emerge from the interaction between different cultures, but which do not always have a communicative component. The first dimension cannot be interpreted politically, but in anthropological terms (individualism and collectivism). Individualist societies believe that everyone cares about themselves in the first place. In communal societies, it happens very differently. Everyone belongs to a certain category in such a culture, who must remain faithful to the power of distance as a particular feature of culture implies acceptance of this distance from the poor within a society, calling it very natural. But minimizing confusion dictates what facets of a society display nervousness under ambiguous and unpredictable circumstances. In spite of this, by developing behavioural rules and faith in absolute reality, they aim to prevent certain circumstances (Cheung, 2014; Schäffner, 2003; Vermes, 2003). More involved, hostile, sensitive, intolerant and in search of protection are societies that have a severe avoidance of ambiguity. While societies are less violent, cold, relatively accommodating and tolerate personal risks, they aim to prevent the least confusion. In feminist and machinist societies, the last component connects. Male communities stress the prohibition of men by women and the domination of men. Men should be ambitious and competitive. They should also aim to be successful. It is somewhat different in feminist societies, where the distinctions between men and women are not sufficiently obvious. There are other variants of quality of life, including social relationships, as well as caring for the weakest, which are highlighted by scholars. Any contact situation essentially carries a danger of its own. This occurs if there is no awareness of the cultural good of the speaker to escape the dangers (R Gagarina, V Shelestova, P Sheinina, & R Leake, 2019; Tajvidi & Arjani, 2017; Vladimirovna Marsheva, Albertovna Sigacheva, Mihajlovna Peretochkina, & Vladimirovna Martynova, 2019).

In the modern translation area, the scientific paradigm is called the "cultural turn". As it is noted, the term essentially means a shift in focus to cultural aspects in translation studies. It complies with the name of a new



"culturological" direction to become the paramount one for the science of translation in the future, according to Mary Snell-Hornby (Holmes, 2011; Sánchez, 2009).

Therefore, scientists are examining the issues of lexical unit essence transfer paying special attention to their "cultural" components. In our opinion, points current for the academic area have a rather high index of relevance, since national and cultural divergence in different comparable language; systems represent one of the fundamental difficulties in translation (Davletbayeva, Arsenteva, Ayupova, & Arsentyeva, 2016; Lefevere, 2016).

Thus, this study addresses the description of the most characteristic discrepancies in the global linguistic pictures of representatives of the Kazakh and Russian linguistic systems using phraseological units as examples to display the national and cultural identity of the people.

The research results make a particular contribution to the "general picture" on the issue and assist in directing the attention of researchers and translators to cultural and linguistic phenomena in translation practice.

## 2. Methods

Kazakh phraseological units and their presentation specificities in Russian were used and the research material.

To solve the tasks set, the following examination methods were applied:

- Analytical method implying analysis of academic, scientific, and methodical literature on the topic under research, as well as various concepts in modern scholarly works;
- Comparative analysis method to single out similarities and differences between the matched lexical units;
- The descriptive method based on depiction, systematization, and analysis of the language units studied;
- Context analysis of lexical units with national and cultural essence components.

The phraseological units collected were handled by applying the continuous sampling method and the descriptive-analytical method. Direct observation was employed as a field research method to the Kazakh language material.

## 3. Results and Discussion

One of the fundamental problems in modern linguistics is the issue of relationships between language, culture and speakers. Many researchers define this issue as an 'anthropological' problem. Language is a representation of the culture of an ethnic group, a way of transmitting cultural values over centuries and the key instrument of cognition. As language sets the boundaries of human understanding of the world and stereotypes of everyday actions, the interrelationships of the definitions of language, culture, and personality are discussed in any linguistic research in the field of language semantics. The globalization of cultures, together with that, actualizes the idea of intercultural contact. The issue of intercultural communication is discussed in many fields, such as linguistics, literary criticism, cultural studies, sociology, psychology, and new science. Phraseological units constitute a significant and particular category of any language and are of core value in representing the national and cultural component of a specific language system. The political and social situation in the modern world raises the question of adequate communication, but it is only possible to talk about adequacy if members of different cultures communicate in different languages and have a complete shared understanding.

Conveying national identity expressed in the language is not an easy task. In this regard, the translation of phraseological units and figures of speech should be treated with thorough attention. Translating fixed phrases and idioms is an independent and rather complex issue solved differently depending on the unit nature and usage characteristics (Ilmira Kanatovna Yerbulatova, Gilazetdinova, & Bozbayeva, 2019).

The study results revealed that differences in employing phraseological units are caused by a number of extra-linguistic factors, among which a significant place is occupied by cultural traditions of native speakers – living conditions, religion, and others.

Let us provide some examples. In the Russian language practice, the expression "show at the door" means to drive away, to get somebody leave. In Kazakh, they call it the first invitation to visit – *ESIK KÓRSETÝ*, i.e., getting to know the house. Here is another example: the expression *QOI KÓZ* (literally – ram eyes) has a positive connotation as it



means beautiful brown eyes. In the Russian language, the word "ram" can be attributed to a simple stupid person, and "ram eyes" denote expressionless, meaningless eyes or look. Thus, based on the example of these lexical units, we can see a difference in fixed phrases application expressed in a positive/negative expression and connotation.

Let us consider another example of phraseological units with a lexical component "door". Thus, when a Kazakh having come to someone's home doesn't catch the owners, they say *ESIKTI SYIPAP KETTİM* (I left stroking your door). In Russian, the idiom corresponds to the fixed phrase "kiss the lock (door)", i.e., find the door locked; do not catch somebody at home or be late. A similar way to express phraseological units is used to the following idioms:

*AIT– AITPA, BĀRĪBĪR* – Russian counterpart "say or do not say – it's all the same", i.e., useless, to no avail.

*BASYNAN AIAĠYNA DEIIN* – Russian counterpart "head to toe", i.e., completely, entirely, throughout.

*ERTEDEN QARA KESHKE DEIIN* – Russian counterpart "from dawn till dusk" meaning for a long time, of long continuance

*IT PEN MYSYQTAI TURÝ* – Russian counterpart "lead a cat and dog life", i.e., continuously argue, disagree.

Some cases have been revealed when symbols of two phraseological units – the source language and the target one – have nothing in common, but the general meaning may remain equivalent. The ability to convey fixed phrases with imagery analogues that do not have a common ground in the source language and the target language can be explained by the fact that, in most situation, these are erased, or half-erased metaphors not perceived at all or perceived unconsciously by a native speaker. Thus, a phrase in Kazakh *AT TUIĠY TIMEGEN* (literal translation – the horse hoof didn't stop there) in the meaning of "a wild, uninhabited place" has a semantic analogue in Russian – "no man's foot has step there".

Let's compare:

*DYMYŇ ISHĪNDE BOLSYN* (keep one's breath within oneself) – Russian "keep one's mouth shut", i.e. keep silence and keep guard on one's tongue.

*QOIDY QASQYRĠA BAQTYRÝ* (set the wolf to gaze sheep) – Russian "set the goat to mind the kitchen garden" (set the fox to mind the geese), i.e. let somebody act where they can be especially harmful.

*TASTAĠAN TAQIA JERGE TÚSPEÝ* (literally, no room to drop a skullcap) – Russian "no room to drop an apple" (no room to swing a cat), i.e. extreme shortage of room, overcrowded place.

Not all phraseological units have their counterparts in another language. In such cases, those are most often replaced with analogues having a common meaning with the original, though embodied in a different form. Let's compare the following:

*AĠAMA JEŇGEM, APAMA JEZDEM SAI* (literally, my sister-in-law matches her husband, while my brother-in-law matches my sister) – Russian equivalent "two boots make a pair" (make quite the pair), i.e. be similar to each other in their qualities.

*AĠASH ATQA MINGIZÝ* (literally, put on a wooden horse) – Russian equivalent "bandy about", i.e. often mention, speak ill of somebody/something (Kenesbaev, 2007; Kozhakhmetova, Zhaysakova, & Kozhakhmetova, 1988).

Thus, when translated, some alteration in figurative meaning, partial or complete replacement of individual components and phrases, and, sometimes, lack of metaphorical imagery can be observed.

#### 4. Summary and Conclusion

During the study, we managed to identify the following possible types of translation transformations found with phraseological unit modifications:

1. with a completely preserved foreign image;
- with partially changed figurativeness;
- with the complete replacement of figurativeness;
- with figurativeness removed.



Under the first type, phraseological units of a very diverse structure and international nature are translated – fixed metaphors, periphrases, proverbs, sayings, and catchphrases.

The study analysis displayed that the first three methods are the most frequent ways to reconstruct phraseological units, namely: transferring fixed phrases with their form and metaphorical content completely preserved; transfer with a partial change in imagery, i.e., matching the equivalent of the reconstructing language to one of the phrase components in the target language; and, finally, translation of phraseological units with a complete replacement of imagery, which involves the replacement of a Kazakh locution with an identical phraseological unit in Russian (Jetibai, Zamaletdinova, Zamaletdinov, Gabdrakhmanova, & Uderbaev, 2018; Khasanzyanova, Zamaletdinov, Sibaeva, & Salakhova, 2018). Translation with idiom imagery removal is the most passive method out of the transformations proposed. It is only allowed in exceptional cases.

Thus, during the translation process, two cultural representations of reality are combined, or one representation is imposed on the other. As a result, coinciding segments may appear, i.e., universal cultural representations are actualized under the context segments. In terms of translation, these are spots of the least semantic and linguistic resistance; that is, they represent a minimum complexity for the translator.

The original fragments are containing national and cultural information – as these are points of maximum semantic tension and deviation between contexts of the generating culture and the perceiving one cause the greatest difficulty.

Differences in systems of two comparable languages (the original language and the target one) as well as their representation peculiarities during the translation process, can limit the ability to completely preserve the denotative and connotative content of the lexical unit to a varying degree. Therefore, the crucial principle when transferring phraseological units, and, primarily, nationally coloured idioms, is a creative approach, at which it is important not only to preserve the meaning of the phrase, but also to convey its imagery, aphoristic nature, and national colouring. There are no untranslatable language units; however, when choosing a translation method, it is worth considering the degree of their perception by a foreign language addressee.

The study shows that, at the present stage of translation science development, academic focus is set on the translation cultural aspects and the verbal utterance contexts it is created within. Currently, translation is primarily considered as a means of interlinguistic and cross-cultural communication.

The examination of theoretical sources exhibited numerous works addressing the word category based on linguistic and private translation studies (Galimova, Yusupova, Nabiullina, Khusnutdinov, & Huseynova, 2019; Garbovsky, 2004; Robinson, 2019; Sibgaeva, Nurmukhametova, Sattarova, & Smagulova, 2017; Ilmira K. Yerbulatova, Kirillova, & Sahin, 2019; Zagidulina, Kh, & Islamova, 2016). Such scientific areas reflect phraseological units as regional linguistic studies, cultural linguistics, ethnopsycholinguistics, etc.

The research permitted us to conclude the following: phraseological units as a linguistic phenomenon act like "guardians" and "carriers" of national and cultural information and represent a particular layer in the language's linguistic system. The translation specificity of fixed phrases as bright indicators of the world linguistic picture is due to a problematic transmission of both their semantic content and their meaning expressive component.

Nowadays, the presented study proceeds to develop further general and particular issues of the translation theory and practice, comparative linguistics as an academic area and provides to the expanding the translation method system to transfer of phraseological units. The outcomes displayed in this paper increase the scope of scientific research in line with the issues of translating nationally coloured lexical units associated with specific features of people's life and culture.

### **Acknowledgements**

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.



## References

- Cheung, M. P. (2014). Translation as intercultural communication: Views from the Chinese discourse on translation. *A Companion to Translation Studies*, 179–190.
- Curtis, K., Fry, M., Shaban, R. Z., & Considine, J. (2017). Translating research findings to clinical nursing practice. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 26(5–6), 862–872.
- Davies, E. E. (2012). 18 Translation and Intercultural Communication: Bridges and Barriers. *The Handbook of Intercultural Discourse and Communication*, 29, 367.
- Davletbayeva, D., Arsenteva, E., Ayupova, R., & Arsenteyeva, Y. (2016). Contextual use of phraseological euphemisms: Component addition. *Modern Journal Of Language Teaching Methods*, 159–163.
- Faiq, S. (2004). The discourse of intercultural translation. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 13(3), 35–46.
- G Ozerova, E., F Alefirenko, N., A Kosharnaya, S., I Plotnikova, L., I Chumak-Zhun, I., V Pupynina, E., & V Dekhnich, O. (2019). Mental Representations of Lyrical Prose. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia).
- Galimova, G. N., Yusupova, A. S., Nabiullina, G. A., Khusnutdinov, R. R., & Huseynova, M. (2019). Good Wishes In The System Of Speech Cliches Tatar And Turkish Cultures. *Revista Turismo: Estudos e Práticas*, 2(2), 17–29.
- Garbovsky, N. K. (2004). Theory of translation. *Moscow: MSU*.
- Gibb, R., & Good, A. (2014). Interpretation, translation and intercultural communication in refugee status determination procedures in the UK and France. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 14(3), 385–399.
- Holmes, J. S. (2011). *The nature of translation: Essays on the theory and practice of literary translation* (Vol. 1). Berlin/ Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- House, J. (2020). Translation as a prime player in intercultural communication. *Applied Linguistics*, 41(1), 10–29.
- House, J., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies* (Vol. 272). Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Jetibai, J. M., Zamaletdinova, G. F., Zamaletdinov, R. R., Gabdrakhmanova, F. H., & Uderbaev, A. J. (2018). The verbalization of the concept " Bure/Kaskir"(Wolf) in Tatar and Kazakh folklore. *Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores*, 6.
- Katan, D. (2009). Translation as intercultural communication. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*, 74, 92.
- Kenesbaev, S. (2007). *Phraseological dictionary of Kazakh language* (p. 952). Almaty.
- Khasanzyanova, G. I., Zamaletdinov, R. R., Sibaeva, F. R., & Salakhova, R. R. (2018). Reflection of Emotions in the Phraseology of the Tatar Language. *HELIX*, 8(1), 3004–3007.
- Kozhakhmetova, K. K., Zhaysakova, R., & Kozhakhmetova, S. (1988). Kazakh-Russian phraseological dictionary. *Alma-Ata: Mektep*.
- Laviosa, S. (2002). *Corpus-based translation studies: Theory, findings, applications* (Vol. 17). Rodopi.
- Lefevere, A. (2016). *Translating literature: Practice and theory in a comparative literature context*. Modern Language Association of America.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Intercultural mediation, intercultural communication and translation. *Perspectives*, 24(3), 354–364.
- Munday, J. (2009). *The Routledge companion to translation studies*. Routledge.
- R Gagarina, V., V Shelestova, O., P Sheinina, D., & R Leake, J. (2019). Adaptation of the English Language in Intercultural Political Discourse. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 894–902.
- Robin, C. (2015). Introducing intercultural communication into the teaching of translation. *Вестник Российского Университета Дружбы Народов. Серия: Лингвистика*, (4).
- Robinson, D. (2019). *Becoming a translator: An introduction to the theory and practice of translation*. Routledge.



- Sánchez, M. T. (2009). *The Problems of Literary Translation: A study of the theory and practice of translation from English into Spanish* (Vol. 18). Peter Lang.
- Schäffner, C. (2003). Translation and intercultural communication: Similarities and differences. *Studies in Communication Sciences*, 3(2), 79–107.
- Schäffner, C., & Adab, B. (1997). Translation as intercultural communication-contact as conflict. *BENJAMINS TRANSLATION LIBRARY*, 20, 325–338.
- Shigenobu, T. (2007). Evaluation and usability of back translation for intercultural communication. *International Conference on Usability and Internationalization*, 259–265. Springer.
- Sibgaeva, F. R., Nurmukhametova, R. S., Sattarova, M. R., & Smagulova, G. N. (2017). Man as an object of evaluation in the phraseological picture of the world (on the material of Tatar language). *AD ALTA-Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 7(2), 267–269.
- Snell-Hornby, M., Jettmarová, Z., & Kaindl, K. (1997). *Translation as intercultural communication: Selected papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995* (Vol. 20). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Tajvidi, G.-R., & Arjani, S. H. (2017). Appraisal Theory in Translation Studies: An Introduction and Review of Studies of Evaluation in Translation. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 3–30.
- Tan, Z. (2017). Censorship in Translation: The Dynamics of Non-, Partial and Full Translations in the Chinese Context. *Meta: Journal Des Traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal*, 62(1), 45–68.
- V Anisimova, M., R Lisenko, A., & V Savina, V. (2019). Communication Problems in Modern German Drama. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1017–1024.
- Vermes, A. P. (2003). Translation: Intercultural Communication or Interlinguistic Transfer. *Communication and Culture. Argumentative, Cognitive and Linguistic Perspectives. Amsterdam: Sic Sat*, 53–60.
- Vladimirovna Marsheva, T., Albertovna Sigacheva, N., Mihajlovna Peretochkina, S., & Vladimirovna Martynova, E. (2019). Some Issues of Translation of Idioms from English into Russian. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 542–549.
- Vyacheslavovich Bodrov, O., Vasilovich Zakirov, A., & Ibragimovich Sharifzhanov, I. (2019). Sociocultural Discourse Analysis of the “New Left” in the USA by Tom Heyden: Linguistic Characteristics and Socio-Cultural Viewpoints. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1228–1236.
- Wang, N. (2018). Translation and revolution in twentieth-century China. In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics* (pp. 467–479). Routledge.
- Yerbulatova, Ilmira K., Kirillova, Z. N., & Sahin, L. (2019). National and cultural realias of translations into tatar. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(6), 984–987.
- Yerbulatova, Ilmira Kanatovna, Gilazetdinova, G. K., & Bozbayeva, A. G. (2019). Peculiarities of Kazakh Reality Translation with Cultural-Historical Educational Components. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(8), 51–54.
- Zagidulina, A. F., Kh, G. G., & Islamova, E. A. (2016). Associative fields of lexemes "Homeland" and "Vatan" in Russian and Tatar linguistic consciousness. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7, 289–292.



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

