



THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL  
EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

THE UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY  
II ENGLISH PHILOLOGY FACULTY  
ENGLISH STYLISTICS DEPARTMENT

## **QUALIFICATION PAPER**

on

**THE PROBLEM OF REALIA**

Written by the student of  
the 4th course group 435 A  
AXMEDOV BAHODIR

Scientific supervisor:  
EGAMBERDIYEVA N. KH.

This qualification paper is admitted to defense by the head of the  
Department protocol № \_\_\_\_  
of \_\_\_\_\_ 2011

**TASHKENT 2011**

## Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter I. The national colouring words—realia .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.1 The criteria of the realia .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.2 The background of the term “realia” .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Chapter II. Dialects and realias.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>2.1 Dialectics of national coloring in the translation.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>2.2 Coloring and erasure of coloring.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Chapter III. The translation of the national coloring words.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.1 The types of realias and their translating ways.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.2 The classification of realias and their rendering ways.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.3 Practical Part. Translation Uzbek realias into English.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>60</b>

# Introduction

The present qualification paper deals with the functional-semantic and typological problems of rendering realia of the English language into the Uzbek language and vice versa.

The translation of realia is one of great and important problems of transference of national and historical peculiarities, which ascend to the very conception of theory of translation as independent discipline. Not setting ourselves a target to give a historical survey we bring only some facts and names connected with the elaboration of this problem in translation. This qualification paper is devoted to the study of national coloring words, their usages, classification, and erasure of rendering.

**The actuality** of the qualification paper is explained by the deep interest to the problem of translation of words realia and by the absence of literature based on the translation of English realia into Uzbek and Uzbek realia into English realia.

**The novelty** of the qualification paper is defined by the concrete results of the research that is translation of realia from English into Uzbek and vice versa. The results can be used in the lectures of translation, lexicology, stylistics and in practical lessons of English.

**The main aim** of this qualification paper is to give a complete and through description of the realia and to work out the ways of rendering them in the process of translation.

**The tasks** of the present qualification paper are:

- to clarify the notion “realia” used both in linguistics and translation theory
- to classify the realia

- to work out the principles of translation of realia in the intercultural communication
- to define the problem of preserving national colouring in translation;

**Theoretical and practical value** of materials, such as examples and notes of “realia” gathered in the present work is in possibility to be used at lectures, as a source for course and qualification works of senior students of foreign faculty. In addition, one also can observe translation of principles and conceptions concerning national colouring words.

**Methods of research** used in this qualification paper are the following: semantical, comparative, typological, translational, and special linguistic methods.

**The structure of this qualification** paper is listed in the following rows:

Introduction, three chapters, conclusion, summary bibliography

**The first chapter** entitled the national coloring words - realia. The chapter consists of two paragraphs. They are devoted to background and criteria of realias.

**The second chapter** entitled dialects and realias. In this chapter the author has highlighted the difference between dialects and realias. The chapter consists of two paragraphs which are: Dialectics of national coloring in the translation; Coloring and erasure of coloring.

**The third chapter** entitled the translation of the national coloring words. In this chapter types and classification of realia are explained. Structurally the chapter consists of three paragraphs.

**In the conclusion** the researcher has given brief summary for rendering national coloring words, their usage, conveying ways into target language, types of realias, difference between dialect and realia. Conclusion is a brief version of this qualification paper. In the conclusion all above mentioned points are highlighted step by step. And in order to make clear and understandable even slight difference

among dialects and realias the author of this qualification paper make a pause to explain them in brief rows once more.

## Chapter I. The national colouring words—realia

### 1.1 The criteria of the realia

Every nation has its own language and its own history. During the nation's developing its language also changes according to the internal and external influence. The translation of realia is partly great and important problem of transference of national and historical peculiarity which ascend to the very conception of theory of translation as independent discipline. Not setting ourselves a target to give a historical survey we bring only some facts and names connected with the elaboration of this problem in translation.

To this sphere all theoreticians of translation, the supporters of non-translability derived their arguments, theoreticians –realists refused them showing and proving the possibility of transference of coloring by deviation from the translation of «letters». I. Kashkin also wrote a lot about **«the transference of national peculiarity» of original, «national spirit» and «national specifics», about «the traits of time and place», «preservation of stylistic peculiarity of original», transference of text in its «national cloth».**<sup>1</sup>

About realias as bearers of coloring, concrete elements of national peculiarity linguists obviously spoke only at the beginning of 50<sup>th</sup> years. In L.N. Sobolev we find not only use of term **“realia”** in its modern understanding but sufficiently expressed definition.<sup>1</sup>

Western authors, for instance, Peter Newmark(1981) has not a term for realia in our understanding. In his books we find **“national institutional terms”** that obviously correspond to our **“social-political”** realias, cultural terms for other majority significant realias; other groups not called realias are scattered both here and there.

The word **«realia»** is an adjective in neuter, plural (*realis, pl. realia* **«material», «real»**) turned into a noun under the influence of analogous lexical

---

<sup>1</sup> I. Kashkin

categories. By realia they express materially existing or existed «object, thing», often connecting with the conception «life», for instance, «realia of European social life». According to the lexical definition realia are objects of material culture. In translation study, by the term «realia» they express mostly the words naming the objects that's name of realia. In terminology, connected with them there are a lot of discrepancies.

The term «*realia*» in translation study literature got rather wide dissemination in the meaning realia word, in the capacity of mark realia-object and as the element of lexis of present language.

The absence of legibleness in terminology being used by translators and theoreticians of translation, linguists and lingua–country studiers in reference to this conception, unsteady borders between realia and «not realia», between realia in translation study and realia in history and criticism of literature and linguistics, between realias and other classes of vocabulary demand at least approximate explanation of contents of realia as term. It's more comfortable to begin such approximate definitions of conception with comparison and contrasting.

If to analyse the difference and combinability of realia and term at first one can see the resemblance of realia with term. Unlike the most lexical units, terms mean the exactly definite conceptions, objects, phenomena; as ideal they are synonymous, derived synonyms of words(and word-combinations), not infrequently foreign language origin; there are also such historically limited meanings among them. All these can be told about realias either. Moreover there are series of units on resemblance of these two categories which are difficult to define as term or as realia, and there are such units that «on a legal basis» can be considered at the same time both as terms and realias,<sup>2</sup> has introduced even a name «**term-realialia**».

However the difference between them is not less. Realias undoubtedly belong to the vocabulary which has no equivalent, when terms in the main belong to the

---

<sup>2</sup> A.D Shweitser(1973,p253)

few language units, which have full language discharge in translation language, that's units, translated as equivalents almost in many context. Term, is an element of sublanguage of science, deprived national and or historical color in overwhelming majority cases carries out naming function; getting into the text of another genre, besides it acquires the role of means for fulfilling those or other stylistic tasks. Realia mostly is connected with fiction, where it represents one of means of transference of local and temporary coloring; in scientific text realias not infrequently play the role of mediocre terms.

The term usually spreads by spreading of a subject, which comes its denomination. It enters the language of any nation as its own house, which in that or another way meets its referent. It is prohibited to demand «national accessories» from the term, apart from its origin it is a property of all mankind which it was born. Unlike the terms, it penetrates into other languages in general independently from acquaintance of corresponding nation with object meant by it, often from literature and or on channel of means of mass information. It is accepted temporarily and it stays in the nation which accepted it sometimes for a day, sometimes for a year and may happen so that it stays so long that enriching or obstructing the language it turns into borrowed word.

Moreover there are realias which not being terms have an international spreading and are used almost as widely as terms. But there is difference between them in the sphere of using even it is hardly noticed by national or historical shade.

Also terms differ from realias by origin. Many terms are made artificially to call the subject or by remaining the present words while realias are national words, closely connected with mode of life and world outlook of people creating them.

Unlike the terms as important feature of realias is their general use, popularity «familiarity» to all or most bearers of initial language and on the contrary, unfamiliarity, «alienance» with barriers of language accepting them. Considering the possibility of some detailization in dissociating realias from terms ( and also other categories of vocabulary) we'll try to state at least our reflection on examples

with denomination of tribes and plants –two semantic groups which are very close to terms.

In L.V Shaposhnikov's fine essays about India one can meet dozens of denominations of tribes: **анади, паня,аранадани, вышаиани,каникары, муллукурумба, etc.**<sup>3</sup>

And all these denominations seem to be typical realias. However a logical reflection must make us come to the conclusion that such impression is stipulated for only unfamiliarity these words. Actually, what is the difference between denominations of tribes «**каникары**», and nation «**масай**» «**болгары**». All three are the denominations of ethnic community which is the characteristics of their relation with exactly definite object of place and time for each one, that's their rarity; besides they have the signs of proper noun and term. But in such case if «**ямади**» is considered as realia it seems that «**французы**» must be realia too.

It is considered to say that a special terminology is a sphere of special science and a cause of narrow specialists. But in our century of scientific-technical revolution this opinion may be considered somewhat old one even with reference to some terms of highly narrow branches of science. Thanks to not only the continents but also men of science with the rest of humanity for our time, it's characteristic of simultaneous tendency to **terminology** and **despecialization**, stipulated «wide penetration of terms into people's life». It comes out that ultimately indexes of familiarity/ not familiarity as limited criterias must not be considered quite reliable. If we add the partial and easy transition of realias than for more convincing means of difference of realia from term we must accept local and temporary(national, historical coloring) color, character of literature (fiction, scientific) where one can meet the present unit and of course the context.

### **Realia and proper noun.**

Some realias have the signs of proper nouns, others are between two categories and it would be correct to say that many nouns may even claim to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Yuldasheva Ch. "In original and translation." 1989

title realia. As a matter of fact, the close features of many realias and proper nouns make their delimitation almost impossible, not infrequently one has to make the border leaning only on orthography but this pure formal sign must not be considered reliable, at first because of partial irregularity of orthography of those or other nouns. For example: Snowman, at second, because of difference of orthographical rules of various languages and at last because of that the context may require the sudden decision.<sup>4</sup>

We can bring the Indian words-nouns in «Hiyawath» as examples for such indefinite condition, being between proper nouns, realias and usual words and even the terms. For such «frontier» realias we can bring the Bulgarian names of festivals, some mythical beings and so on.

From typical proper nouns some realias differ in the plan of contents only with availability of proper meaning and by this sign they might be equated to so-called speaking proper nouns. For example, there are a lot of intelligible ones among the names of festivals: *Teacher's day*, *International women's day* and there are such names that are not clear to the reader: *нала*, *меледу*.

In this way we can repeat the conclusion made in the time of comparison the realias with terms: the limits between some proper nouns and realias are unsteady, sometimes they are absent at all, sometimes one category turns into another and we can rank present words to that or another one only leaning on orthography.<sup>5</sup>

### **Realia the reality out of language.**

The realia is closely connected with the reality outside the language on which indicates at least the etymology of the term itself. Being the name of separate objects, conceptions, appearance of mode of life, culture, history of present nation or country, the realia as an individual word can't reflect the present part of reality on the whole. Most of these which must be «read between lines» and which are expressed or prompted in either case by means of language are not contained in the

---

<sup>4</sup> Rossels V.M. "Realia." 1971.

<sup>5</sup> Nation, I.S.P. (2001). Learning Vocabulary in Another Language. Cambridge University Press

narrow frame of individual word-realia. These are characteristic allegories, hints, allusions, all «told» by the language of gestures and more wider the whole outside the language background, details which might be called «*situative realias*» and which reflect immediately in the translation of text.

Being the means of artistic representation realias are the linguistic units obeying the rules of corresponding language and consequently representing the object of linguistics. In this chapter we are not going to give the full linguistic analysis but dwell on borrowed realias: the rest by the point of view of form differ a little from usual vocabulary.

Being strange they may infrequently cause some difficulties to a translator with their forms, lexical, phonetic and morphological peculiarities, possibilities of word building and combinability, also with the mechanism of borrowing and their behavior as borrowed words. We are not going to number of questions which sometimes the success of translator's work depends on eight decision. The translator like a writer, takes part in enriching the language, into which he translates.<sup>6</sup>

Even more than the writer, because many foreign words before strengthening in a language and getting into vocabulary pass through the translations. So it is not unnecessary to note some moments of translator's work with borrowed realias whether this process potential enriching or on the contrary, obstruction of native language.

To this question which category of language units the realias must be taken to, the specialists give various answers. For instance, M.L Wiseburg thinks, that the conception belonging to the number of realia may be expressed by individual words and word combinations. This is wider but not the exact imagination about realias we met. Most other authors speak about «words», «lexical units», adding sometimes «word combinations».<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Rossels V.M. "Realia." 1971.

<sup>7</sup> [www.yandex.ru](http://www.yandex.ru)

1. In our opinion realias are only words, in addition to this case «word combinations» means that on general grounds we can take also nominative word combination or «composed realias» to them that's such word combinations that are semantically equal to words: if we think that «sporting» or «нортесы» are realias, than logically we can put the Vulgarian «national meeting» together with them.

2. Speaking about the form of realia first we'll dwell upon phonetic and graphical appearance of transcribing of borrowed realia depends of whether it figures in the dictionaries of the language of translation or not. The lexical realias go into the word stock of language and it seems that they already have a definite so-called legalized form, officially fixed in conformity with the rules of phonetics and orthography of the language which accepted them.

In this attitude the practical conclusion is one: transcribing the realia already confirmed in the form of translation language, the translator often must appeal to the dictionaries.

We shall not touch upon the cases, when accepted, confirmed form of realia is too far from original or by another reason doesn't satisfy the translator: changes in accepted transcription have their «for» and «against», the discussion which is not our problem. Speaking about the phonetic form of realia one must tell some words about stress. Bringing a new realia unfamiliar to the reader into the text, it will be better if the translator marks the stressed vowel almost in primary use of it: otherwise in the reader's memory will remain a distorted foreign word for ever. This recommendation especially concerns to the translators of language with free stress.

3. The grammatical form of realia is connected with the definition of its membership to this part of speech, various grammatical categories and of course, with the possibilities of formation.

The observations showed that most of realias are nouns. This is stipulated for a subject matter of realia as a special class of vocabulary, that is clear from our definition and classification.

Unlike the terms, among realias there are almost no verbal nouns, that are explained with absence of objected action in the contents of realia.<sup>8</sup>

Under such condition the problem of belonging of realias to other parts of parts of speech is introduced in the following way: Independent, unproductive realias among other parts of speech are met infrequently and putting such words together with realias is risky. For instance, in the story «Kazak», explaining the verbs (*o'tirib turmoq, yalintirmoq, yorilib ketadi*) in footnote, L. Tolstoy in «kazak language» adds the thing which the explanation of nouns doesn't have. So here one can speak about more dialectisms than realias. As far as the parts of speech are concerned produced by realias, whatever they are, of course they must keep at least partially or completely their national or historical coloring

Many transcribed realias get in the language of translation quite right forms of gender and number: «*rouble*» in English, in plural «*roubles*», in German «*rubels*», in French «*roubles*»; «*koneйка*» acquired in French the form of male «*kopeck*» and accordingly, plural «*kopeks*»; correctly transcribed in Vulgarian «*kanu*» (compare with Russian «*каное*») is used with post positive article in singular «*kanuto*» and in plural «*kanutata*» however that sounds rather awkwardly. It happens that a strange realia enters the language not in the initial form sometimes because of rarity of this initial form but perhaps often because of oversight or ignorance of a translator.<sup>9</sup>

The other index of mastering of borrowed realia in the language of translation may be its ability to reproduction. For example we can take the word «*cowboy*». Entering the Russian language as a noun of masculine gender, first declension it formed the adjective «*ковбойский*» and the noun «*ковбойка*». The

---

<sup>8</sup> Rossels V.M. "Realia." 1971.

<sup>9</sup> Alex Dick "Thoughts about language" 1988

more interesting case is the word «*xunnu*», the word itself remained indeclinable, but nevertheless there is a number of offspring. It follows that almost full set of parts of speech has formed from only this realia. And all these cases must be considered most probably as exception, stipulated for «*abnormally high popularity*» of present realia.

## 1.2 The background of the term “realia”

Having to face the question of practical application of translation shift categorization, we need material to work with and, for a part of such shifts, maybe the most apt material that is taken from everyday life, where the way of living of a people, the prosaic details of social life dictate the spontaneous origin of expressive forms that then, transposed into literature, can be very hard to translate.

Some of these spontaneous expressive forms enter the vocabulary and eventually characterize the cultural, if not linguistic, way people express themselves. Single fragments of populations carry on specific cultural traditions, that use special words to indicate them.<sup>10</sup>

To enter this field it is necessary to understand what "realia" means in the first place, both within translation studies, and without; in this we will be helped by two Bulgarian researchers, Sergej Vlahov and Sider Florin, who in 1980 published a whole book covering what is normally called "untranslatable", realia included.

The word "realia" has its origins in Latin, not the language spoken by Romans, that used by Middle Age scholars in many European countries as a language of science, research, philosophy. Since in Latin the plural neuter nominative of an adjective transforms it into a name, "realia" means "the real things", as opposed to words, that are considered neither "things" nor "real". For this reason, the word is a plural of "realis" (real), that, however, is not found in most Latin dictionaries because they usually contain the Classical, not Medieval, Latin occurrences.

In this meaning, the word signifies the objects of the material culture.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Tomakhin G. D. "Realias –Americanizms." 1988

<sup>11</sup> Yuldasheva Ch. "In original and translation." 1989

Entering in the field of translation studies, a radical terminological change must be enforced: "realia", in fact, does not mean objects, but signs, words and, more precisely, those words signifying objects of the material culture, especially pertaining to a local culture. It is, therefore, necessary to distinguish realia-objects (mostly outside translation studies) and realia-words (mostly inside translation studies).

In every language, there are words that, without in any way distinguishing themselves in the original from the verbal co-text, however they are not easily transmissible into another language through the usual means and demand from the translator a peculiar attitude: some of these pass to the text of the translation in unaltered form (they are transcribed), others may only partially preserve in translation their morphological or phonetic structure, still others must sometimes be substituted for lexical units of a completely different value or even "composed". Among these words, we meet denominations of element of everyday life, of history, of culture etc. of a given people, country, place that do not exist in other peoples, countries and places. Exactly these words have received in translation studies the name of "realia".

In order to further complicate the terminological framework that is already very confused, researchers of the East European area, among the first to use this term in translation studies, do not consider it to be a plural neuter, but a feminine singular. In particular, in Russian there is the word *реалия* (*realija*) that is a singular feminine. Consequently, it is, first, possible to speak about "realia" using the singular (in order to mean one of these words), which we cannot afford, short of using the word *realium* which, however, as singular, loses its value as a nominalization of the adjective. Moreover, when the word is used in the plural, it loses the -a ending, following the feminine declination, and becoming *реалии* (*realii*).

---

Linguistic differences notwithstanding, we need to be careful not to confuse the field of realia with the field of terms. Let's get Vlahov and Florin's opinion on the subject:

Between realia and terms there is a fundamental difference. Terms are the basis of scientific lexicon; their scope is specialized, scientific literature; in other spheres, above all in artistic literature, they are used with a definite stylistic aim. Realia are not met mainly in artistic literature, as it is well known they represent elements of the local and historical color; we find them in some descriptive sciences also, but they are now used, above all, as denominations of described objects or even as pure terms.

In the next units we will examine concrete instances of realia to see what are their possible actualizations and how they can be systematized.<sup>12</sup>

Vlahov and Florin, having shown in their book about realia that it is possible to categorize them based on the object type, or on place and time parameters, go on arranging the processes to transmit realia in translation<sup>3</sup>. Such classification, presented after the examples in the two previous units, in their book bears a more systematic character.

First of all, translation is distinguished from transcription of realia as a first fundamental divide. In the case of translation, it is implicit the attempt at a greater appropriation of the alien element. In the case of transcription, there is an attempt to preserve the alien element through own means.

Transcription is, in turn, divided into transcription proper and transliteration. By "transcription" we mean:<sup>13</sup> transmission of sounds of a foreign language (usually proper name, geographic name, scientific term) using the letters of the alphabet of the receiving culture.

Whether or not the receiving culture and the source culture use the same or differing alphabets involves further differences. If the alphabet is different, the

---

<sup>12</sup> [www.pdfessay/english/lex/realia.php](http://www.pdfessay/english/lex/realia.php)

<sup>13</sup> Yuldasheva Ch. "In original and translation." 1989

change is all the more necessary so that the receiving culture reader is able to process the message. If the alphabet is the same, there can be cases of adaptation reproducing the pronunciation (for example, the English chewing gum can become in Italian «ciuinga», and be treated as an Italian word of feminine gender).

Transliteration is on the other hand transmission of letters of a foreign word using the letters of the alphabet of the receiving culture.

The emphasis of transcription is, consequently, on sound, while the emphasis of transliteration is on the graphic form. When transliteration is taken to the extreme, it is possible to anyone (even a computer) reconstruct the original form of a word, as if it were the coding/decoding of the Morse alphabet.

One could even go further, and say that the transcription approach is useful in direct interpersonal relationships, in everyday, matter-of-fact situations, while transliteration is useful in the more intellectual relationships, mediated by written formulation.

The example given by Vlahov and Florin concerns the native North-American axe (that in itself is already a transcription by the British colonists of a word in a pre-existing language without a written form): the tomahawk. The Russian transcription would be *томахок*, i.e. «tomahok», which is a way to make pronounceable to a Russian speaker this word in a way similar to the American pronunciation. The word entered Russian culture instead as *томагавк* i.e. letter by letter transliterated, in a way that in Latin characters would be «tomagavk», since, usually, the sound of aspirate h is rendered in Russian with a hard g sound, and w, non-existing any better, is rendered with a simple v.

As to realia translation, there are many possibilities, many ways of incorporating. The first actualization consists in the neologism, often amounting to a calque. By "**calque**"[kálk] we usually mean the "translation calque": with material of the receiving language a simple or composed word is formed by literally translating the elements of the expression in the source culture.

Then there are half-calques, in which just a part of a composed expression is preserved. For example, the translation of the German Dritte Reich is in Italian Terzo Reich, in Russian tretij rejh, in English Third Reich.

There are instances of appropriation, i.e. of adaptation of foreign realia: a word in the receiving language is created that, however, fundamentally is worn over the frame - even from a phonemic point of view - of the original word. It is what happens with the **pirozke**, typical Russian filled little pies, that in Estonian are called **pirukas**; it is what happens with the German Walküre, actualized in other languages as "**valchiria**" (Italian), Valkyrie (English), **val'kirija** (Russian) etc.; the French concierge that in Russian becomes **kons'erzka**, ending up being inflected any other Russian word of the feminine declination in -a. In many of these cases it is a matter of "grammatical" appropriation, in the sense that the adaptation allows the treatment of the word along the rules of grammatical government, inflection, conjugation of the receiving culture.

The semantic neologism, on the other hand, is different from the calque due to the absence of an etymological connection to the original word. It is a word, or word combination, "**created**" by the translator in order to permit the rendition of the meaning contents of realia. It is also called semantic calque. One example is the English snowshoes from which the Russian **snegostupy** derives, formed with the **sneg-** root, meaning "snow", and the **root stup-**, meaning "**step**" (and having the same etymology of the English word). The Italian, on the same word, has created a translation calque instead, producing "**racchette da neve**".

An example of semantic calque is the Italian "**realizzare**", on the English "to realize", where the original Italian meaning of the verb (to make real, to do) the meaning of the English verb (understand) is overlaid, in sentences like:

There are also instances of fake calques, or pseudocalques, or presumed calques. For example, in American English the Italian word latte is used to mean not what in Italian is meant by latte (milk), but «espresso coffee mixed with steamed milk», i.e. «cappuccino», another element of realia that, by contrast, has passed

unchanged in the English-speaking culture. In Italian there is the word "golf" that, in many Italians' view, would be an English word with the same meaning. It is a pseudocalque, because in English "golf" doesn't mean "sweater" - as it happens in Italian - but only the sport. The pseudocalque probably derives from the British expression "golf jacket". Deprived of the name "jacket", however, in English it loses part of its meaning, but it still has it in Italian, in a very similar way to what happens with "latte", "caffelatte" and "cappuccino"<sup>14</sup>

### **Looking around for solutions—translating realia and idioms**

So, assuming that this is a problem, what is the solution, then? The first thing to note is that idioms and cultural references like the ones we are dealing with can be accommodated in a broader definition of realia, i.e. lexical items designating elements specific to a particular culture. See for example the following definition, originally by the Bulgarian scholars Vlahov and Florin, and quoted by B. Osimo in an online course on translation theory: realias are words (and composed expressions) representing denominations of objects, concepts, typical phenomena of a given geographic place, of material life or of social-historical peculiarities of some people, nation, country, tribe [sic], that for this reason carry a national, local or historical color; these words do not have exact matches in other languages (my emphasis).

A couple of examples from Vlahov and Florin's list of "political and social" realia can clarify the kind of translation problems. There are plenty of realias at the following: **canton, principedom, bidonville, arrondissement, suk, promenade, corso, prospekt, agora, storting, kneset, дума, czar, doge, vizier, alcalde, ayatollah, satrap, Bürgermeister, Union Jack, fleur de lis, and so on.**<sup>15</sup>

Set against this definition of realia, both our examples appear to designate objects or concepts typical of a given culture: traditional British culture—British cuisine?—in the case of the pudding, American sci-fi in the case of the quantum

---

<sup>14</sup> Fedorov A.V. "The essays of general and comparative stylistics." 1971

<sup>15</sup> Fedorov A.V. "The essays of general and comparative stylistics." 1971

leap. Neither of them has "exact matches" (whatever this means) in our target languages. Both phrases carry some "**local colour**," as is witnessed by the fact that other speakers felt compelled to take them up again and develop on them, perhaps in order to enrich their own speech with some humour. That's why it should be argued that phrases like these can be considered as a specific type of realia.

As is often the case in legal reasoning, and occasionally in scholarly argument on translation too, once you agree on how to categorize something, you already have a clue as to how to handle it. So how do you go about translating realia? The standard answer is that you choose from the weaponry of translation techniques ranging from transcription, through loan and calque, to various ways of explaining what the item is. One end of the range is more controversial: the search for a cultural or functional equivalent to substitute for the original. Basically, techniques mentioned in scholarly discussion of realia are still the ones exemplified decades ago by Vinay and Darbelnet.

Even more than with single-word realia, when dealing with set phrases like the ones in our examples, language professionals are keen to search for a cultural equivalent, as is witnessed for example by the many multilingual lists of idioms circulating in interpreter-training institutions. One important point to be made is that translators will to some extent mix the available techniques, partly depending on factors such as text type and function. A good example of this are bilingual in-flight magazines: here, substitution of the realia by a (supposed) cultural equivalent is frequent, perhaps because the two versions are meant to be read independently (that is, unless the readers are frequently traveling interpreters suffering from a serious professional deformation). This would imply that articles are to be entertaining in each language separately.

## **Chapter II. Dialects and realias**

### **2.1 Dialectics of national coloring in the translation.**

Any literary work appears on the national ground, reflects national problems, features and at the same time the problems common to all mankind. Passing from one nation to another literature enriches and extends the notion of peoples about each other.

It is one of the most difficult cases to convey national coloring. Owing to the translation very important literary works were able to appear in many other countries and became available for people speaking other languages. The translation helps mutual knowing and peoples' enrichment.

National coloring must be reflected adequately in the translation.

Dialectics of national coloring reveals itself specifically in different fields of spiritual culture of people and thus in various types of translation.

In the scientific and technique literature the national psychological categories are less expressed. The contents of such translations is valuable for all nations in spite of their national specific.

Thus, for example, concerning natural sciences Darwin's theory or classic physics of Newton or modern physics of Einstein or Bore have the same meaning for all the countries and nations. The original texts of natural-scientific works and their translations do not differ much from this point of view.

Here there is another case in the field of social-political literature. It is closely connected with the ideological society of the country with its history and its historical specifics and it can never be separated from country peculiarities and demands, political conditions, the events of its time and it is changed by the factors that reflect the notion development. National peculiarities, problems and interests

put impress both on the contents and style of any author. In general the translation of social-political literature is more similar with scientific literature.<sup>16</sup>

Comparing the works of J. Steinbeck, J. Austin and others we shall see the specific of author's personality and country specific.

The national beginning of one or another country reflected in its literature culture and in written culture that is especially interesting for us from the translation point of view is the aggregate of characteristic peculiarities and features that are specific for this nation and the constant historical development of this nation.<sup>17</sup>

It also has common to all mankind, international character to which historical conditions give its own national coloring, its self-expression. That is why we speak about national specific character that was formed in the certain historical, social, geographic and other conditions of this country. This specific character has enough concrete expression where one or another sign is predominant and that is seen in one or another nation form. There is national originality reflected in the literature and other fields of social science and it has the more significance the more it is rich in content, progressiveness, brightness: other nations are enriched meeting with it discovering something new, interesting, useful and important for them in this specific character.

The difficulties while translating are connected most of all with conveyance of national character of one or another work: the brighter it reflects national life the more illuminate characteristic situations the more difficult for the translator to find adequate functional figurative means.

It will be enough to recollect the difficulties that the translator faced with translating wonderful works of outstanding American writer John Steinbeck. Steinbeck is not only a deeply national, original writer but also a modern writer. His creative work could appear only in our days. Many translators mark out

---

<sup>16</sup> Fedorov A.V. "The essays of general and comparative stylistics." 1971

<sup>17</sup> [www.yahoo.com](http://www.yahoo.com)

originality of his feature world and that is why the originality of his language and style and the specific usage of popular speech and dialectisms. For example: *It's the grapes!* – *Вот это жизнь!* *Got to blow town.* – *Мне пора сматываться из города.* Steinbeck often uses parallel literary words and its dialect synonyms. For example: *dish* also translated into Russian as *красотка*, *деваха*, *jazz* is translated as *болтовня*, *брехня*, *болтология*. Therefore, the translator must determine national peculiarities of the contents and the form (that is language peculiarities, melodies, rhyme and so on) and substitute national figurative means (realias, poetic images) for others that are equivalents to the firsts in their national determination to convey its national contents. The task of the translator is to find and rail the essence of national peculiarities and specific character. Correct conveying of these nationality elements opens the way to reveal internationality in the work. The popular speech, dialectisms, social coloring, realias in Steinbeck's works do not only total the basing of his original stylistics but also express certain over-text or behind-the-text peculiarities of his work, modern feelings system, the exclusive rich fantasy, deep thoughts, piercing visible and spiritual words, plastic gift and ability of transformation. All of these are united into complete combination of original artistic picture of life together with unique intellectual foreshortening of views on it. For example: *Don't you have a silly bone in your body?* - *Неужели у вас нет ни капли юмора?*<sup>18</sup>

Therefore it is not possible to create only conveying realias, social coloring and so on to display of national character while translating. It can be got only if the translator is able to create the combination of varied forms of national character in the creative work of one author or another in his works. National coloring is not an appendix in the work but it is one of its main parts that total the work structure.

Originality and specific character do not show that the work cannot be translated but they show the creative character of the translation process. World

---

<sup>18</sup> Shveitser A.D. "Translation and linguistics."

literature knows many examples when translators managed to convey all the originality of works and these translations became masterpieces as their originals. Originality, national coloring of the work is not lost in the succeed translations and that is one of the main principals of creative translation activity. National coloring like everything in the world is in the constant movement. Here the translation 's role is enriched with one positive moment. His task is to carry this constantly changing stability to readers of other nations. It is interesting that for some works this process lasts more than ten years till the form is adopted and reconstructed.

Reconstruction of national coloring in the translation very often depends on the prevailing methods used in different literary schools.

The volume of the translation is not underlining of national specifics of origin text but it is the creation of its truly wholeness, finding of adequate concrete form that is to help to show the unity of national and common to all mankind coloring in the origin.

Translator must convey adequately the national character connected with the real representation of life. It means that he must know social conditions and nation development whose literature he translates, he must know and understand the specific spiritual way of life, find explanations of problems caused with peculiarities of this nation and originality of his development. For example, the figure of Marullo in John Steinbeck's novel *The winter of our discontent* is a collective figure of one of the representatives of Italian emigrant in America who became rich in the period of 20-s years. Such figures were in many other works of that period and like them Marullo is the bearer of common for native Americans problems but at Steinbeck's work this figure differs with his national and artistic originality, caused by peculiarities of American emigrants development at that period.<sup>19</sup>

What does every translator imply and what kind of tasks are in front of him? Why does he begin to translate works from another national literature?

---

<sup>19</sup> Shveitser A.D. "Translation and linguistics."

At first he must know and understand the individuality, unique of figures. Every artistic figure is unique according to its nature and irrespective of its national origin.

Secondly he must know and understand the essence of figures and ideas of works of social class.

Thirdly he must take into account the national originality reflected in the work: its plot, form, images, style, language etc.

Fourthly he must reveal international coloring of the work that is significant for different countries, states and nations elements.

Fifthly he must reveal elements common to all mankind irrespective of their belonging to any country, epoch, and nation.

National and international, folk and common to all mankind activities are tightly connected with each other and perform the complicate dialectic unity.

Translation is not only outward form of these mutual relations; it is also dialectic unity of the national and international coloring of its essence.

The point of the translation is a bridge between national and international coloring. That is why its main function is the turning of spiritual values of one nation into the property of other nations; translation is transmission assisting to mutual penetration and influence of national cultures. In our days we can be witnesses of the powerful aspiration to mutual knowing, intellectual and spiritual communication. Every nation culture goes out the limits of its own country. Its relations with cultures of other nations development on multilateral basis, they become more and more all-embracing, acquiring bigger significance.<sup>20</sup>

It is easy to note that major part of themes and problems in the different national literature coincide. But treatment to these themes and solutions of these problems are various and original in the works of different cultures. For example the theme of Motherland in three poems of A. Block, R. Burns and I. R. Beher.

---

<sup>20</sup> Shveitser A.D. "Translation and linguistics."

Common to all mankind theme of Motherland these three poets express in different ways: their lyrical characters express their feelings differently and have different notions of Motherland. Ideal of Motherland in these poets' minds was formed in the different nations and spiritual environment. Originality of their attitude and artistic representation, originality of expressive means are the result of environment and other factors.

For Russian poet Alexander Block his Motherland is the most desirable dream, hope that it will be the place of his last rest. In his poem Russia embodies its beautiful nature; for Robert Burns Motherland is associated with the figure of the mother's sadness missing her sons who fight for the freedom and will never come back; in Beher's poem we do not hear cry but anger and appeal to revenge for the outraged and ashamed Motherland. Grief, ache, anger and love are lyrical moods common to these three poets.<sup>21</sup>

But for this specific feature in the expression of common to all people feeling of love to Motherland these poems would lose their concrete character.

International character in spiritual literature does not exist abstractly; in every national culture it acquires concrete forms. It is this dialect that must become ruling principle in the translating activity. The translator must convey truly both components on this unity keeping in his mind the frequent absence of confines between national and international coloring because they interlace with each other.

The translator only conventionally finds and marks out national, social, individual, international, common to all mankind coloring.

They cannot be separated in any artistic work. Their separating leads to the art destroying. if the translator does not manage to convey this floating it means that he has not able to create high-quality authentic translation.

## **2.2 Coloring and erasure of coloring**

---

<sup>21</sup> Fedorov A.V. "The essays of general and comparative stylistics." 1971

The notion of coloring appeared in the literary criticism terminology and meant a special quality of literary work, speech characteristic of personage, a special emotional or linguistic look of separate literary work or an writer's works, that is all peculiarities and originalities. Coloring of a word shows its belonging to a certain people, country, concrete historical epoch.<sup>22</sup>

National (local) and historical coloring of realia is a new additional meaning to its main signification. A.S. Pushkin uses realias *евных, гарем, зяур, чубук, шербем* in *Bahchisaray's fountain*; their specific coloring gives an oriental coloring to the poem. According to dictionaries *шербем* is an oriental fruit soft drink and it differs from lemonade by its regional belonging and it is considered as a coloring. This neutral word turns into realia owing to relation with this region. But if an inhabitant of this region who works in the West faces with this word it gives him an association connected with his motherland, his recollections and feelings.

It makes us consider coloring a part of connotative meaning of a realia.

It is appropriate to compare realias – words with specific national and historical coloring – *connotative lexis* – with words deprived of such coloring. We may use two words – *bird cherry* and *rook*. They are only details of nature: bird cherry is a tree that grows in Northern America, Europe and Asia; and rook is specie of birds from crow family. These words are not realias because of their wide-spreadness and they are not connected with people or country. However associations connected with *bird cherry* (the height of spring) and *rook* (expectation of spring) make a heart of Russian man quicken. He connects their connotatively with realia not turning them into realia.

Another example touches up some difficulties translating of the title of famous Russian film *Летят журавли* into the French language: the French word *grue* also means silly girl and a woman of easy virtue.

So they had to substitute the word “crane” for the word “stork”.

---

<sup>22</sup> MacMillian dictionary

In these examples connotative words in contradiction to realia have full and significant equivalents.

“Inconvenient” word is often substituted for its functional analogies. For example, *bird cherry* can be substituted for early blooming tree or bush – for England it can be substituted for plum or cherry-tree or even for lilac; instead of *rook* they can use any convenient bird. The main idea is to evoke a reader of translated text the same associations that has a reader of origin text.

The transmission of connotative word by means of devices that are characteristic feature for the transmission of realia usually leads to an undesirable results: a corresponding word must evoke a definite reaction.<sup>23</sup>

Classifying the realia we noted that realias were allocated according to their place or/and time. It is often happens that realia that means the same or close material notions can be from different places and historical rubric: that is, they differ from each other according to connotative meaning, coloring. For example, supreme organ is called *seim* in Poland, *Supreme Court* in Russia, *cortes* in Spain and Portugal, *Public Meeting* in Bulgaria, *bundestag* in Germany, *rikstaf* in Swiss, *storting* in Norway, *folketing* in Denmark, *knesset* in Israel. All these words mean Parliament and they do not differ much from each other but their traditional names represent characteristic national realia. Each of them has its own features that belong only to it. However, but for these distinctions, national and historical coloring would not allow substitution for another word in translation. Such substitution would destroy all coloring, to be more exact; it would lead to anachronisms and analogisms that can destroy the harmony, so called truth of life.

It is clearly seen when such close in meaning word like *хайдутин* and *клефм* are compared. Both of them mean peasant-partisans who fought against Turkish ruling; both of them mainly attacked local Turkish feudalists and representatives of Turkish Administration, and also their landowners who called them “thieves” or “bandits”; both of them acted in the same historical epoch (the time of Osman

---

<sup>23</sup> Kenyon, John Samuel and Knott, Thomas Albert, A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English

Dominion on the Balkans). These dates about клефт are related with хайдути́н; the only difference is that хайдути́н is *Bulgarian* and клефт is *Greek*. But it is enough to be impossible to translate хайдути́н as клефт.

Connotations and coloring are part of meaning that means they can be translated equal with semantic content of a word. If a translator managed to convey only a semantic lexical unit the translated text lost its coloring for the reader.

But there are cases when connotation of a realia dies down, erasures. Such erasure logically leads to the turning of realia into common, uncolored word.

To distinguish this phenomenon from loss of coloring in a translation we use a term “*erasure*” of coloring or connotation (*erased reality*).

Some exotic words can be adopted by language and lose their exotic character.

To lose its status realia must lose quality that differs it from a common word, that is loss of coloring.

### Chapter III. The translation of the national coloring words

#### 3.1 The types of realias and their translating ways

It will take much time to turn *proper realia* such as Russian пирожок into national uncolored, neutral word entered in the kitchens and languages of many countries and to make people forget its strange origin.

Related to *a strange realia* it will also take much time to adopt it into a language. It can turn into usual borrowing in the result of intensive usage of this object in private life depriving it both original national coloring and a kind of alliance.

1. It seems that international and regional realias are to lose their status of realia at first owing to their wide-spreadness. Many *international realias* go around the world without losing their national originality. For example, the names of money. There is another case with *regional realias*. Their national coloring is almost equal to national but it is limited by its regional belonging. For example, “the eastern coloring” is close to Syrian, Turkish and Egyptian etc. All above-mentioned regarding to proper realias is equal for national and regional realias.

2. These are the general considerations about coloring erasure or color keeping that depends on peoples and countries. But there are positions where color erasure depends on proper realia and its function in speech.<sup>24</sup>

Often the realias can have *an extended meaning* in the context.

3. Sometimes a realia can be used in a text not in the direct but in the *figurative meaning*. For example *цепѐм* can be used in Bulgarian language as an adjective in the meaning of something oversweet and it is almost similar with Russian сироп.

In general we may say about realia using in the figurative meaning in all cases of their usage as tropes, metaphor and comparison. When an author says about

---

<sup>24</sup> Aznaurova E.S., Abdurahmonova D.I. “Translation theory and practice.” 1982.

mushroom's cap "*about two kopecks size*" he does not mean a kopeck as a kind of money but only its two signs: its size and its round form, so the kopeck here has only word cover.

For example, when an author describes land that is *flat like a pan-cake* he takes only one characteristics of a pan-cake: its flatness and plane and Russian reader even does not think about pan-cake as a food but it is only an image that author promoted with the help of trope.

The same with "*stone jungles*" and "*cowboys of cold war*" etc.

Some adjectives derived from mentioned realias can be literary comparisons and metaphors. Using such words as *богатырский*, *стопудовый*, *аршинный*, *саженный* at first we look at their figurative meaning, certain signs but not on their sign as a realia: for example, *пудовый* means *very heavy*, *грошовый* means *very unimportant, cheap*.

4. Among these examples there were phraseological units and set expressions as well, where realias lose their status more often than in the mentioned cases.

In these four cases realias are to lose their coloring that is the status of realia is to turn into common language unit. However, if we look more attentively we shall see that a total erasure is not possible. If it happens it will be an exception.<sup>25</sup>

For example, *macaroni* (international realia) and *tyubeteyka* (regional realia). *Macaroni*, also spaghetti entered in the languages by way of transcription. These words appeared in the languages having kept the meaning of national Italian dish. The best example is Italian scornful nickname *baked macaroni pudding*. *Tyubeteyka* also did not lose its oriental coloring in spite of its wide-spreadness in the USSR and even on Gorky's and Kuprin's heads reminds East.

One should take into account all above-mentioned choosing a translation style in these cases.

The transcription is usual way of translation of such words. *Ruble*, *macaroni*, *tyubeteyka* keep their form after translation.

---

<sup>25</sup> Fedorov A.V. "The essays of general and comparative stylistics." 1971

Another case when realia is wrong used or when it is a part of phraseologism. Right translation is stipulated with finding the most concordant and equivalent words that is usually deprived of coloring in the translation as a usual lexical unit. For example, *вершок* in Goncharov's story is translated into the English language as a *miserable part*. *Дюйм* translated from English inch is a realia but it also may have an extended meaning.<sup>26</sup>

Realia preservation in trope function (comparison, juxtaposition, metaphor etc.) could mean the volume definition of one thing unknown by author. If, for example, an English faces with two *kopecks* coin with the help of that we define a size of mushroom cap in Russian translation he would never know the mushroom size. Here a realia almost totally lost its natural coloring: in one language a reader almost does not understand its meaning, seeing only the given quality indicator. Transcription is possible in two languages only as an exception, for example, international realia that indicator is known in both languages. But it is easier to translate a realia as a neutral function equivalent because in the original text realia is used without connotative meaning.

But even in the third and fourth positions realia is kept. For example, translating comparison we usually substitute a strange realia for ours: it is not always convenient to use such phrases as *как блин*. The same is with a realia that forms phraseologism.

One should notice that translating a realia in one or another means it is wanted to lose a trope and accordingly phraseologism. Trope should be transferred by tropes, phraseologism by phraseologism; only "filling" will differ from origin one.

5. There are many cases of realia translation in the comparison when the realia not only loses its coloring but also receives excessive connotation and they are wide-spread. An author compares the contents of strange realia with his own realia. And in a translation one notion is happened to be denoted with the two

---

<sup>26</sup> Aznaurova E.S., Abdurahmonova D.I. "Translation theory and practice." 1982.

realias: internal and external. What should a translator do to convey the content of realia without coloring losing?

There are some theoretical variants.

At first a translator should transcribe each separate realia. For example, we can face with such translation from the Czech language: “In the evening a young teacher couple ... invited us for barbecue. It reminded us our evening by the camp fire where we did not do shpekachkis.” These two words: *barbecue* and *shpekachkis* are explanations of one unknown word by another.

At second place a translator can substitute an internal realia for his proper realia. For example, he should substitute *shpekachkis* - for a regional realia – Caucasus shashlik. As a result a reader would be able to get more clear notion about Australian dish (barbecue is a Haitian word that was taken by the English language from Spanish and then was borrowed by Australian). But a reader would be astonished hearing from Czech about “evenings with shashlik”. Theoretically this variant is more vicious because it leads to mixture of different realias that belong to different nations.

The third possibility is to refuse transcription of both realias and to convey their contents with the help of descriptive translation that approximately can sound so: “... in the evening we were invited for a picnic that reminded us our evenings by a camp fire and we ate meat grilled on a spit.” But this translation deprives the text of Australian coloring.<sup>27</sup>

And, at last, the fourth variant consists in transcription of external realia and conveying internal realia with its functional equivalent. And we shall have the next sentence: “In the evening ... a young teacher pair invited us for barbecue. It reminded us our evenings by camp fire when we ate meat grilled on a spit.”

The last variant is considered to be more successful because the translation is true and the translator managed to keep coloring having transcribed main realia.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Kenyon, John Samuel and Knott, Thomas Albert, A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English

<sup>28</sup> [www.englishforum.com](http://www.englishforum.com)

In Margaret Aliger's notes "Chilean summer" we face with more difficult case: "... it is possible to eat here, one woman bakes pies – *empanados*. *Empanados* is something similar with *chebureks*, they are very hot, tasty and big." Here we have three realias: the main external Spanish – *empanados* that is explained as Russian national pies and one regional Caucasus – *chebureks*. In the translation one should keep the main realia because it stands in the center of the author's attention and other realias should be substituted for neutral.

### 3.2 The classification of realias and their rendering ways

#### *The classification of realia.*

A common scheme of the classification of realia is:

1. Subject deviation.
2. Local deviation (depending on national and linguistic belongings).
3. Periodical deviation (in synchronic and diachronic plan, by signs of «familiarity»).

#### **Subject deviation**

##### *A)Geographic realias.*

- 1.The names of objects of physical and also meteorology: prairie, desert, dasht, cho'l; valley; tornado;
- 2.The names of geographical objects connected with human activity: well, pond, ditch, aryk;<sup>29</sup>
- 3.The names of endemics: kiwi, koala, jaguar, galapagos;

The realias of geographical groups specially the names of objects of physical geography and meteorology and the names of endemics are more terms than realias; therefore we can't limit them exactly. For instance: prairie, desert. It is a type of vegetations. In Hungary they are called «pushta» (typical realia). Prairies of North America are subdivided into meadow prairies (also realias) South American

---

<sup>29</sup> Kenyon, John Samuel and Knott, Thomas Albert, A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English

prairie desert is called «pampa» (typical realia). It appears that «step» is not a realia but a term; its types-prairie, pushta and pampa are realias. As a geographical conception «step» entered the other language by transcription, that's more typical way of transference for terms than realias.<sup>30</sup>

All these point to the extremely unstable limits of geographic realias and the necessity especially an individual approach to their transference during translation; one has to take into consideration a great number of indexes; the statistics of dictionaries (also the absence of statistics) the degree of «familiarity» and «diffusion» of both the word itself and its referent, coloring and context, the degree of «elucidation» of words in the text which is being translated.

**B) *Ethnographic realias*** are closely connected with the geographic ones. Since this term is more capacious here we considered possible to include into the group of ethnographic realias a great number of words with the meaning of those conceptions which really belong to the science, «studying the mode of life and culture of nations», «the forms of material culture customs, religion», «the spiritual culture», including the art, folklore, etc.<sup>4</sup>

### **Mode of life:**

A) Food, beverages, etc: spaghetti, hamburger, pizza, cake, chebureki, qimiz, manti, chuchvara.

B) Buildings: tavern, saloon, drugstore, sauna, choyxona, xammom.

C) Clothes: (including shoes, head-dresses and others): sandals, trainers, slippers, flip-flops, sari, kimono, chopon, paranji.

D) Dwelling, furniture, dish and other pots and pans: hut, bungalow, terraced houses, detached houses, semi-detached houses; grater, kettle casserole microwave, qozon, lagan, payola;

E) Transport (means and «drivers»): the Underground, hydrofoil, hovercraft, ferry, tram, minibus, moped, helicopter, coach, bicycle katamaran, yamshik, ot –arava, ulov.

---

<sup>30</sup> [www.allbest.ru](http://www.allbest.ru)

F) Other : sanatorium, accommodation, pansionat.

### **Labour:**

G) people of labour: translator, brigade-leader, farmer, ударник, табельщик.

H) Instruments of labour: ketmon, tesha, xaskash, saw.

I) Organization of labour: (including the economy and others ): kolkhoz, enterprise, agrokompleks, rancho.

### **Art and culture:**

J) Music and dances: lazgi, kazachok, lezginka, tarantella, kansonetta.

K) Musical instruments and other: flute, clarinet, saxophone balalaika, dutor, rubob, chang, childirma, tor.

L) Folklore: saga, lapar, qasida, частушки.

M) Performers: minisinger, трибадур, скомфох.

N) Customs, rituals, \: confirmation, cooker, масленица, мартеница, церемония, тя-но- ю.

(tea ceremony), namoz, ramazon, hayit.

O) Festivals, games: Teacher's Day, cricet, pasxa, xoli, Navro'z, boychechak.

P) Mythology: troll, валкирия, qorbobo, yalmog'iz kampir, devil, dragon, suv parisi, dev.

Q) Theatre: comedy, mistery, djatra, херппинг, петрушка, каспер.

R) cults words and followers; abbey, domla, mulla' muftiy, qori, haj, darvesh.

S) Calendar: saraton, chilla, baba marta.

### **Ethnic objects:**

T) ethnonymy : anar, рембранка, казах;

U) nicknames (usually funny or offensive): горилла, хохол, бош, фриц, янки;

V) names of persons by domicile: габровец, аверниц, абердинец, кариока;

### **Measures and money:**

W) Measures units: hound, yard, foot; десятина, кварта, баррель; чорак, чакирим.

X) Pecuniary units: rouble, dollar, frank, dinar, so'm, tanga;

### **1.Administrative-territorial units:**

- a)County-графство, state-штаты, department, tuman, viloyat-province;
- b)Populated areas: aul, block-mahalla, village-qishloq, guzar.
- c)Parts of populated areas:row-ряд, kreml-кремль,корзо, медина, форум , аropa.

### **2.Organs and bearers of power (authority):**

- a)Organs of authority:Parliament; congress, sporting, дума, Oliy majlis, yuqori palata.
- b)bearers of authority: lord, king, queen,captain, хон, bek, amir, devon,vazir.

### **3.Social-political life:**

- a)Political organizations and political parties: Ku-Klux-Klan, vigs, перонисты, торилар.
- b) Patriotic and public movements(and their figures): Fatkh, Hamas, Taliban, partizanlar, Qizil yarimoy.
- c)Social appearances and movements(and their representatives): business, publicision, kibic(German), kibik(Vulg).<sup>31</sup>
- d)Ranks, degrees, titles, treatments:Bachelor, prince, Mr, Mrs, sir, Madam, baron, graf, knyaz, lord, gersog, xonim, afandi, taqsir.
- e)Offices: British Council, Ministry, state department, European Commission, Vazirlik, Hokimiyat.
- f)Educational institutions and cultural institutions: campus, lyceum, college, madrasa.
- g)Estates(and their members): grand, gentry, unker, samuray, braxman, мужик, shayx, bek, to'ra, mirza, pir.
- h)Estatic signs and symbols:UNION JACK, Yarimoy.

### **4. Military realias:**

- a)Subunits:legion, a hundred, legia, falanga, qo'shin, o'nlik, yuzlik.

---

<sup>31</sup> www.ref.uz

b)Weapon : bomb, gun, dagger-xanjar,to'qmoq, palaxmon.

c)Uniform:civer,mentic, chakmon.

d)Serving soldiers(and commanders):captain, unter,ataman, yuzboshi, sardor, mongboshi, mirshab, bakovul.

At the end of subject classification we'd like to remind that further distribution on place and time concerns the same realias, but examined from the other point of view.

### ***Local devision.***

Leaning on the specifics of translation- «means of communication on the surface of two languages»-and logical consistence of translation process. One may say that most expedient basis of such division is not represented strictly local that's extra linguistic, more probably language principle which allows to examine the realias .

- 1) On the surface of one language, that's own and alien.
- 2) On the surface of two languages, that's internal and external.

Depending on the width of area own realias may be national, local or micro local and alien ones- international and regional. In this way our scheme of division on place and language acquires the following shape:

#### **A)On the surface of one language:**

##### **1. Own realias:**

a)national          b)local          c)micro local

##### **2.Alien realias:**

a)international   b)regional

#### **B)On the surface of two languages:**

1)Internal          2)external

A. On the surface of one language realia represents the lexical unit with qualities pointed out above. Here the first practical question concerns its recognition

in the initial language, and besides it's more difficult to recognize own realias.<sup>32</sup>

1. Own realias are mostly root(native) words of present language, such as English «heet» (health-marshy place), «ale»(bright English beer); Russian «самовар», «боярин», «комсомолец»; Bulgarian «bucklisa»(original form of dish or vine), «kaval»

(national wind instrument like pipes); German «burger» «choirige» (Hewrige-fresh vine and festival in Vienna connected with it), «вермахт»(Wehrmacht); French «fiakr»(fiacre-light carriage, cab); «bosh» (boshe-scornful nickname of German), Uzbek:mahalla, hashar, chopon, do'ppi, palov.

1. **Alien realias** are either borrowing, that's the words of foreign language orogin, entered the language word-stock, or tracing-papers that's morphemic or word for word translation of alien nomination for objects of present nation, or transcribed relias of another language often occasionalizms and neologisms.

B)On the surface of two languages the realias are examined from the point of view of translation. Besides, this problem is closely connected with lexicography and any comparative study of language.

**3.External realias** are the words which belong to one of the two languages and, consequently, alien to another; if «fiord» is external for Uzbek and Russian language, it will be internal for pairs Russian –Norwegian or Bulgarian – Norwegian.<sup>33</sup>

That's on the surface of one language according to our terminology it will be own for Norwegian and alien for the rest languages. This way for the purpose of translation theory the realias can be examined in two plans;

a)from the point of view of initial language, that are the realias in original-own and alien realias;

<sup>32</sup> McCrum; Robert MacNeil, William Cran (1986). The Story of English

<sup>33</sup> Kenyon, John Samuel and Knott, Thomas Albert, A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English

b)from the point of view of the language of translation-external and internal realias; but in the time of translation into initial language the realias are only internal. This way, regional and international realias overlapping in both languages will always be alien, external for both languages and usually they are transferred from the initial language of translation automatically. Strictly local division requires some more detailed elucidation. We'll bring it in some logical order, without taking into consideration that whether the realias are examined on the surface of one or two languages, however, every time marking their place in the scheme brought above.

5. By national realias they understand the objects belonging to present nation, people, but alien out of the country; this is the overwhelming majority of realias, all the more that national belonging of referent is one of the categorical signs of realia at all. But there is an exception; therefore the title «national realias» must not be considered pleonasm.

Having national realias in the text now and then it will be enough to give rise to association, connected with nation and country.

The national realia is an initial point for local division: before becoming international or regional it had to have a national character: local and micro-local realias in that or other degree also have a national coloring.<sup>34</sup>

Regional realias we call those, which crossed the borders of one country or spread among some nations, usually together with referent, being, this component of vocabulary of some languages. In this attitude the units are typical which E. M. Vereshagin and Kostomarov collected to the seventh groups of their classification: «The words of not Russian, origin so-called turkizms, mongolisms, ukrainizms, and etc.», which «might be called twice without equivalent: at first they didn't have equivalents from the point of view of foreign languages with reference to Russian».

---

<sup>34</sup> [www.cl.cam.ac.uk](http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk)

A group of Latin American realias, African realias, a group of realias of English speaking countries also belong to the regional realias. In this attitude the location of some Bulgarian national realias is peculiar. As a result of long development of the language in proximity with Turkic and Arabian most of our realias turned to be in one region on one hand with the realias of soviet nations and on the other hand with the realias of Arabian countries of Asia and Africa . Compare, for example, such Uzbek national realias as «usta» (master), «imom»<sup>5</sup>; Kirgizian-mulla, ayran<sup>6</sup> ; Algirian-kus-kus, kadi, myuftiya.<sup>7</sup>

International realias, as the term itself shows, 1)figure in the vocabulary of many languages and entered the corresponding vocabularies; 2)usually keep the initial national color either. If to take into consideration the most typical sign of any realias- national coloring, the combination of the word «realia» with epithet itself seems contradictory rejecting this national stipulation. And nevertheless «it happens so that exotic words deviated from the framework of one language and spread in number of languages, become international words»<sup>8</sup> .

One more peculiarity of international realias : their contents may differ from the primary, initial one. Again that «ковбой» etimologically (cow+boy)and by essence-«пастух, гуртовщик» (in the south) southwest of the USA), not more; its difference from other herdsmen is that it is a horse herdsman though not only cowboys may be horse herdsman. But everywhere where there is no cowboy ,they almost lost their pastoral mode of life having turned into «fearless adventurer», «heroes» of countless American films –westerns and adventure romans.

### ***Local realias.***

Unlike the national realias they don't belong to the language of corresponding nation, but belong either to the dialect of the language of to the language of less significant social group. On the other hand, being ,dialectizms, they mean specific objects for present district or relation to them , having the signs of typical realias we can take the «family» of Baikal winds: «barguzin»(more popular) «kumtuk», «verxovik», «sarma», «xius» ,«zaryanka»<sup>9</sup> .

Microlocal realias-quite conventional term, which we mean such realias whose social or territorial basis is very narrow local: the word may be typical for one city or village, not loosing its peculiarities and consequently, demanding the same approach during translation. Generalizing the facts about local division of realia, we'd like to underline some conventionality of all divisions in the sense, that not infrequently one and the same unit may be with the same realia taken to different headings. Obviously, familiarity /unfamiliarity of alien realias and the degree of mastering-index, closely connected with temporary factor play role in more accurate definition.

### ***Periodical division.***

On the basis of temporary criteria all realias may be conventionally divided in the very general features into: 1) modern and 2) historical. That such division has acquired real maintenance, we'll examine following, stipulated with the factor of time, questions of status of realia in dependence on 1) time and subject, 2) time and place, 3) the ways of penetrating and acquiring (alien) realias.<sup>35</sup>

### ***The relation of realia by place and time.***

At the very beginning of chapter we wrote that the status of realia is not always constant quality of word. The alteration of this status in time is clearly seen in examples of transference of terms into realias and on the contrary realias into terms and others, non-terminological units.

Some terms by that or another reason, usually connected with alteration of referent (for example, obsolescence of machines), gradually depart into the sphere of history, turning into historical realias. Adverse process is connected also with referent: for recreated machine, detail, for coming into usage of object there was need for denomination and it was found in old realias which, this way, becomes the name of new referent, sometimes loosing and sometimes keeping its connection with previous: the old word begins a new life in the form of term. We can bring the

---

<sup>35</sup> Tom Gray "Realia and its nature" DV 1985

word «спутник» as an example. The word «спутник» developed in rather brief period. From the primary common language word till astronomical term it passed indeed long way, approximately came into the category of realia; and what's more it came out highly; in the language of translation it was a term (man-made sputnik of the Earth), but in any foreign language dictionary it may be found as a typical sound realia: English "sputnik", French «spoutnik», German «sputnik», meaning not satellite in general, not any other man-made sputniks of the Earth, but launching in the former Soviet Union.

The historical realias are seldom torn away from their national source. This happens only when alien realia belongs to the deep antiquity (Ancient Rome; Ancient Greek): amphora, ostrakizm, etc.

In this case historical coloring has an advantage over the national one. Moreover, time by time most of these realias acquired figurative meanings, turned into the category of phraseologisms that much more made weaker their belonging to definite place. However most of realias may be considered in historic plan, not losing sight national membership, more correctly such words represent equally historical and national realias.

### ***Mastering alien realias***

The penetration into a vocabulary of foreign language is carried out parallel with consolidating or seldom weakening international relations that, in its turn, is connected with those or other political-historical and cultural events in nation's life with social bursts which are felt as «jolts» or «waves» and in mastering this vocabulary and wider in the development of language. These process are often stipulated as the course into literature and art and not infrequently as the tastes, interests, the passion of society altering periodically under the influence of ideas of great persons, etc. The historian of language and culture could outline some periodization of entering of these elements by historical epochs like the entering of borrowed words at all. Most of alien realias penetrates into language through

translations either probably one must note that this is more typical for the work of the modern translators.

Depending on the degree of mastering realias may be divided into: 1) familiar and 2) unfamiliar. These conceptions are very relative and loose, that's why we'll try to define them a little. The quality of «familiarity» alien realia acquires time by time in the course of use : the word of foreign language which is often met in literature becomes familiar, is used by most of bearers of the language that accepted it and at last it becomes interesting to thousands of readers, all of this happen during rather long time. In consequence, the word becomes a part of vocabulary of present language and gets into its dictionary. This way present division may be produced in the form of two categories of alien realias :

- 1) realias which belong to the word stock of the language that accepted them ,
- 2) realias which haven't entered it's vocabulary yet.

### ***Ways of rendering foreign realias.***

There exist some ways of rendering foreign realias:

1. transliteration (translate on the level of graphemes: Lincoln)
2. transcription (transference on the level of phonemes: drug –store)
3. calque (word for word translation)
4. descriptive or explanatory translation (coroner)
5. approximate translation (with the help of “analogue”: drug –store – apteka)
6. transformative (contextual) translation.

1) Transcription (transliteration) is often used in the cases, when the question is about proper names, the names of governmental institutions, educational establishments and so on. The serious drawback of this method leads to the appearance of unusual and loss clear words in translation.

For example, while translating the novel “Rantime” by E. Doctorow the realia “escapist” (the question is about famous Harry Haudini) was translated as

“эскейпист”. However in our real life there is no such fakirs who in order to entertain the public appear with this kind of tricks, (release from various chains, fetters, shackles). Owing to its communicative value of the word “эскейпист” (in contrast to “escapist”) is equal to zero. One can perceive only the suffix “-ist” which shows that “escapist” –is a person who does something.

From the other hand using methods of broadening information (explanation of the realia in the translated text, the explanation of historical situation and etc.) the translator can use foreign realia, preserving national coloring in the language of translation.

Two variants of interrelation between realia and context are more typical:

1. Realias are homogeneous, thematically united with the context and came forward as its essential on realias and the content of the text serves as a good background to understand and remember them.<sup>36</sup>

2. Realias are heterogeneous, thematically not united with the context and are used as the methods of literary expressiveness. It is very difficult to understand realias in these texts because of absence of the necessary information. Additional difficulty is to use realia in a figurative meaning.

The meaning of realias thematically united within maximal semantic unit of the language –text is expressed with the means of the context. Three main variants of their normative usage are distinguished, limited by either standard (stereotype), or explanatory of situational context. In stereotype context words and word combinations, designating realias are used without any commentary or detailed definition of the realia is given e.g.: “Frivey –Los Anjelesning hashamatli va ramziy obrazi” (free way –svetafor va boshqa har xil cheklashlardan xoli yo’l).

In this way G. Longfellow reveals the meaning of Indian realities in “Song of Gaya var ta”.

Word –realias can be used in a figurative meaning which situational context, e.g. “But at least her filibuster gave me a chance to decide on my next speech”. –

---

<sup>36</sup> McCrum; Robert MacNeil, William Cran (1986). The Story of English

Uning gaplari menga hech bo'lmaganda nima deyishni o'ylab ko'rishga imkon berar edi". In this context "filibuster" designates not obstructionist at American senate but a long speech of landlady who praised to the skies the rooms she let out.

In lingua –country study and usual language textbooks, the realias within texts, as a rule, require special explanations. The character of information and their completeness depend on that whether the acquaintance with the given fact is essential for communication within limits of the country of studying language, if it is important for understanding the history of development of the country or it has sense only for understanding the text.

Depending on the content of explanations they can have the shape of paginal footnotes, aftertext commentaries, be given within the text itself or in preface.

Probably, determinant in choosing between descriptive translative variant foreign realia or its transliteration (temporary borrowing) must be the factor of expediency of preserving connotation: preservation of connotation is necessary in describing the reviewer, specific to this country, the usage of transliteration can be warranted with the necessity of preservation of local colouring and more precise transmission of the content within essays and descriptions of the country, guide books.<sup>37</sup>

2)Calquing is literal (word for word) translation of the word or word combinations and it is widely used for rendering realities into another language. Assimilation of the calque is very complicated phenomenon being subject to consideration within diachronic plan and is stipulated not only with intralinguistic but the whole range of cultural and social factors.

Calque can be widely spread in the language, but at the same time it remains as "exotizm" for the denotant correspond to it is alien to is culture.

In connection with considerable divergence of lexico –semantic systems calques are sometimes perceived as unusual or even destroying the norms of the

---

<sup>37</sup> Fedorov A.V. "The essays of general and comparative stylistics." 1971

language by the bearers of the language of translation. Thus, for example, the calques from Russian “travail de choc” (zarbdor mehnat) met in the pages of newspaper is perceived by French people as word combination not fully adequate to the norms of language.

In creating calque it is necessary to take into account the cultural component of the initial word, it mustn't be eliminated or substituted with the components of another culture.

3) Descriptive or explanatory translation has the advantage that it includes incomplete understanding which is characteristic to transliteration or calquing, but the drawback is that realia is translated not with analogous unit by its structure of another language but with diffuse description. (long four –axial vans, covered with canvas, which used by migrants on moving through boundless prairies in the period of colonization of western lands of the USA beginning with the end of XVI till the middle of XIX centuries). –prairie schooners.

In lingua –country study dictionaries and commentaries short description is often used as well, limited by ancestral belonging of phenomenon of this type as: “Ilya Muromets –rus eposining qahramoni” (Ilya Muromets is a hero of Russian epos). The translation consists in the usage of the word designating something close by its content, however the realia is being lost. Serious drawback of this method of translating realias is that national specificity of the notion is concealed, and in the field of social –political life and spiritual culture it may lead to the alien phenomenon indications not characteristic to it on the bases of appropriateness with the familiar one. In this cases the difference in ideology comes forward. Scherba wrote about it: “a lot of notions have been changed in their content but how to reflect this simply and clearly in translation?” It is quite obvious, e.g. that our “prokuror” isn't the same as in European countries but nevertheless we translate it with the word “procureur” and thus in the endless range of cases.

### 3.3 Practical Part. Translation Uzbek realias into English

#### *Ways of translating the meanings of Uzbek realias into English.*

<i>Uzbek</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Way of translating</i>
Piyola	tea bowl	by descriptive way
Peshtoq	adorned portal	by descriptive way
Rabot	caravansaroy; fortren of Islam,	by descriptive way
Registon	sandy place, square	by descriptive way
Sardoba	cold water, water reservaoir	by descriptive way
Saroy	palace	by calque
So'zani	needlework	by calque
Tandir	rick oven to cook non-bread	by descriptive way
Tahoratxona	hall for ablutions	by descriptive way
Tosh	stone	by calque
Tepa	fort	by calque
Tim baraar	with one entrance	by descriptive way
Xalat	chapan	by calque
Xonaqoh	dervish hostel	by descriptive way
Chayla	house, dwelling	by descriptive way
Chopon	long striped Uzbek cloak	by descriptive way
Shahriston	inner town around an ark	by descriptive way
Qalin	bride price	by descriptive way
Qishloq	rural Uzbek statement	by descriptive way
Qibla	wall, orientated to Mecca	by descriptive way
Qum	desert, sands	by calque
Qushbegi	Prime Minister	by calque

Qo'sh	double	by calque
Qo'riqsona	where the blind recite from the Koran	by descriptive way
Hammom	Turkish baths	by descriptive way
Harom	forbidden, women'l living quarters	by descriptive way
Hovli	palace	by calque
Hovuz	pool	by calque
Hujra	students cell in Madrassah	by descriptive way

## Conclusion

At the end of the qualification paper we can sum up all above mentioned ideas about realia. In reality willingly or reluctantly we use realias. It is one of the reasons that people got interested in learning language, because words like this of national colouring words help us to learn one nations tradition, customs, dialects and their history. Therefore national colouring words are called in the language as “realia.” The researcher of this qualification paper mentioned and highlighted the background of the realia including their classification, translating and rendering ways, difference between dialects and realias.

Due to all facts and ideas which were taken in this qualification paper we can make a concept about the national colouring words. Thus the realias are:

- culturally loaded words;
- they represent an object peculiar to this or that ethnic culture;
- they represent the word or words naming that object of culture: *kovush*, *chopon*, *dutor*, *zog'ora*, *гжель*, *мужик*, *кимоно*, *babyshower*, *вытрезвитель*, *canoe*, *trailer*, *sophomore*, *bush fire (Canada)*, *charisma (God's gift)*, *drugstore*, *happy hour*, *Easter rabbit*, *Washington Cherry tree*, etc.

Types of realia

According to comparison of languages and cultures:

- Unique realia: *Muqumiy teatri*, *Labi-hovuz*, *Abduxoliq G'ijduvoni*  
*Maqbarasi*, *Gulag*, *the Kremlin*, *the Pentagon*, *The Globe Theatre*
- Analogues: *mulla*, *choyxona*, *drug-store*, *дедовщина (hazing)*
- Similar realia with different function: *cuckoo's call*
- Language lacunae of similar notions: *hammering heart (watch)*, *shock work*  
(ударный труд, *subbotnik*), *clover-leaf*

According to the semantic field:

- Toponyms (geographical terms): *Munich*, *Illinois*, *Washington D.C.*

- Anthroponyms, or people's names: *Henry Adams, Raisa M. Gorbachev*
- Zoonyms: *kangaroo, weasel, grizzly*
- Social terms: *The House of Lords, Госдума*
- Ergonyms: *DalZavod* (Far Eastern Docks), *Heinemann, санэпидстанция*
- Titles and headlines: *The Da Vinci Code, Woe from Wit, The Diamonds to Sit On.*

Ways of translating realia:

- Transcription, transliteration: voucher,
- Calque: skyscraper, Статуя Свободы
- Half-calque: carpet-bagger
- Assimilation: canoe --> каное, кану; afternoon - вечер
- Semantic neologism: sauna - сауна; дача - dacha
- Hyponymic (приблизительный): сенцы - entrance; рысак - horse; уха - fish soup
- Explicatory: 13 зарплата - annual bonus payment; breadline - очередь безработных за бесплатным питанием
- Lexical substitutions: Scout ("To Kill a Mockingbird") - Глазастик; Secretary of State - министр иностранных дел
- Contextual translation: путёвка на советский курорт - accommodation at Soviet health resort

### Various Ways of Translating the Same Word of Realia

1. Пошли **мужики** на рыбалку.
2. Пришли **мужики** к царю.
3. **Мужик** - это деревенский житель.

### **The translation of lexis without equivalence: “realia”**

- translating the names of objects characteristic of a L community (meals, clothes, dishes, dances, etc.) into another L in which these objects do not exist

The theory of L contacts treats the activity of two L communities aimed at exploring each other’s realia as a **process** (= exploring-denoting activity)

**The process of exploring another L community’s realia differs according to**

- geographical distance and length of the contact situation:

e.g.,

Hungarian and German → in **permanent contact** for several centuries,

Hungarian and Russian → came into contact in the second half of the **20th century**

Hungarian and Japanese → are geographically **remote** from each other

- the social-economic level of L communities:

same level → **two-way** process


different level → **one-way** process

### **Translatability and untranslatability**

→ provides an opportunity for translation scholars to express their views on the relationship between **language and reality**

Opposition:



- View 1 = reality is the same for all of us; only the L expressions referring to the different segments of reality are different
- View 2 = L also affects reality (Whorf 1956, Sapir 1956) (e.g., the way we perceive the external characteristics of objects is influenced by the kind of words available in our L1 to describe these characteristics)
- if languages segment reality differently ⇒ **different “world view”**

 certain phenomena of reality appear in **excessive detail** in one L, while there is only a **collective name** for them in another one: e.g.,


- Eskimo: many names for the different types of snow;
- Argentinean *gauchos*: the multitude of colour names for horses;
- Arabic: the postures of camels;
- Russian: the types of fish;
- Italian: the types of pasta;
- English: the objects and concepts related to navigation

### **Realia and untranslatability**

Problems:

-  if realia are simply translated into the TL → translation will make no sense
-  if the translator tries to find some TL realia with a similar function → the informative, culture-enriching function of translation is endangered

Solution: research methods of socioLics (e.g., questionnaires)

-  to be able to translate them, i.e. find equivalences for them, one has to start out from the knowledge and evaluative relationship the TL society possesses about the given realia and not the SL norm

### **Summary**

In every language, there are words that, without in any way distinguishing themselves in the original from the verbal co-text, however they are not easily transmissible into another language through the usual means and demand from the translator a peculiar attitude: some of these pass to the text of the translation in unaltered form (they are transcribed), others may only partially preserve in translation their morphological or phonetic structure, still others must sometimes be substituted for lexical units of a completely different value or even "composed". Among these words, we meet denominations of element of everyday life, of

history, of culture etc. of a given people, country, place that do not exist in other peoples, countries and places. Exactly these words have received in translation studies the name of "realia".

Vlahov and Florin's research is precious, we will return to it many times again. For the time being, what I wish to stress is the definition the two Bulgarian scholars give to "realia" within the framework of interest of this course: words (and composed expressions) of the popular language representing denominations of objects, concepts, typical phenomena of a given geographic place, of material life or of social-historical peculiarities of some people, nation, country, tribe, that for this reason carry a national, local or historical color; these words do not have exact matches in other languages.

As to realia translation, there are many possibilities, many ways of incorporating. The first actualization consists in the neologism, often amounting to a calque. By "calque" we usually mean the "translation calque": with material of the receiving language a simple or composed word is formed by literally translating the elements of the expression in the source culture. One classic example is the English skyscraper, that has many calques in different languages: the Russian neboskreb, the Italian grattacielo, the French gratte-ciel, the German Wolkenkratzer, for example.

There are instances of appropriation, i.e. of adaptation of foreign realia: a word in the receiving language is created that, however, fundamentally is worn over the frame - even from a phonemic point of view - of the original word.

A couple of examples from Vlahov and Florin's list of "political and social" realia can clarify the kind of translation problems we are talking about: think of how you would "translate" into your own language county, canton, principedom, bidonville, arrondissement, suk, promenade, corso, prospekt, agora, storting, kneset, дума, czar, doge, vizier, alcalde, ayatollah, satrap, Bürgermeister, Union Jack, fleur de lis, and so on.

Set against this definition of realia, both our examples appear to designate objects or concepts typical of a given culture: traditional British culture—British cuisine?—in the case of the pudding, American sci-fi in the case of the quantum leap. Neither of them has "exact matches" (whatever this means) in our target languages. Both phrases carry some "local colour," as is witnessed by the fact that other speakers felt compelled to take them up again and develop on them, perhaps in order to enrich their own speech with some humour. That's why I argue that phrases like these can be considered as a specific type of realia.

Every nation has its own language and its own history. During the nation's developing its language also changes according to the internal and external influence. The translation of realia is partly great and important problem of transference of national and historical peculiarity which ascend to the very conception of theory of translation as independent discipline. Not setting ourselves a target to give a historical survey we bring only some facts and names connected with the elaboration of this problem in translation.

To this sphere all theoreticians of translation, the supporters of non-translability derived their arguments, theoreticians –realists refused them showing and proving the possibility of transference of coloring by deviation from the translation of «letters». I. Kashkin also wrote a lot about «the transference of national peculiarity» of original, «national spirit» and «national specifics», about «the traits of time and place», «preservation of stylistic peculiarity of original», transference of text in its «national cloth».

The term «realia» in translation study literature got rather wide dissemination in the meaning realia word, in the capacity of mark realia-object and as the element of lexics of present language.

If to analyse the difference and combinability of realia and term at first one can see the resemblance of realia with term. Unlike the most lexical units, terms mean the exactly definite conceptions, objects, phenomena; as ideal they are

synonymous, derived synonyms of words (and word-combinations), not infrequently foreign language origin; there are also such historically limited meanings among them. All these can be told about realias either.

Some realias have the signs of proper nouns, others are between two categories and it would be correct to say that many nouns may even claim to the title realia. As a matter of fact, the close features of many realias and proper nouns make their delimitation almost impossible, not infrequently one has to make the border leaning only on orthography but this pure formal sign must not be considered reliable, at first because of partial irregularity of orthography of those or other nouns. For example: Snowman, at second, because of difference of orthographical rules of various languages and at last because of that the context may require the sudden decision.

The realia is closely connected with the reality outside the language on which indicates at least the etymology of the term itself. Being the name of separate objects, conceptions, appearance of mode of life, culture, history of present nation or country, the realia as an individual word can't reflect the present part of reality on the whole. Most of these which must be «read between lines» and which are expressed or prompted in either case by means of language are not contained in the narrow frame of individual word-realial.

Unlike the terms, among realias there are almost no verbal nouns that are explained by the absence of objected action in the contents of realia. Under such condition the problem of belonging of realias to other parts of parts of speech is introduced in the following way: Independent, unproductive realias among other parts of speech are met infrequently and putting such words together with realias is risky. For instance, in the story «Kazak», explaining the verbs (o'tirib turmoq, yalintirmoq, yorilib ketadi) in footnote, L. Tolstoy in «kazak language» adds the thing which the explanation of nouns doesn't have. So here one can speak about more dialectisms than realias.

Any literary work appears on the national ground, reflects national problems, features and at the same time the problems common to all mankind. Passing from one nation to another literature enriches and extends the notion of peoples about each other.

It is one of the most difficult cases to convey national coloring. Owing to the translation very important literary works were able to appear in many other countries and became available for people speaking other languages. The translation helps mutual knowing and peoples' enrichment.

The notion of coloring appeared in the literary criticism terminology and meant a special quality of literary work, speech characteristic of personage, a special emotional or linguistic look of separate literary work or writer's works, that is all peculiarities and originalities. Coloring of a word shows its belonging to a certain people, country, concrete historical epoch.

Classifying the realia we noted that realias were allocated according to their place or/and time. It often happens that realia that means the same or close material notions can be from different places and historical rubric: that is, they differ from each other according to connotative meaning, coloring. For example, supreme organ is called *seim* in Poland, *Supreme Court* in Russia, *cortes* in Spain and Portugal, *Public Meeting* in Bulgaria, *bundestag* in Germany, *rikstaf* in Swiss, *storting* in Norway, *folketing* in Denmark, *knesset* in Israel. All these words mean Parliament and they do not differ much from each other but their traditional names represent characteristic national realia. Each of them has its own features that belong only to it. However, but for these distinctions, national and historical coloring would not allow substitution for another word in translation. Such substitution would destroy all coloring, to be more exact; it would lead to anachronisms and analogisms that can destroy the harmony, so called truth of life.

In general we may say about realia using in the figurative meaning in all cases of their usage as tropes, metaphor and comparison. When an author says about mushroom's cap "*about two kopecks size*" he does not mean a kopeck as a kind of money but only its two signs: its size and its round form, so the kopeck here has only word cover.

***Ways of rendering foreign realias.***

There exist some ways of rendering foreign realias:

7. transliteration (translate on the level of graphemes: Lincoln)
8. transcription (transference on the level of phonemes: drug –store)
9. calque (word for word translation)
10. descriptive or explanatory translation (coroner)
11. approximate translation (with the help of “analogue”: drug –store – apteka)
12. transformative (contextual) translation.

## Bibliography

1. Andress A. "The distance of time and translation." 1965.
2. Aristov N.B. "The basis of translation." 1959
3. Aznaurova E.S., Abdurahmonova D.I. "Translation theory and practice." 1982.
4. Barkhudarov L. S. "Language and translation." 1975
5. Bragina A.A "The lexics of language and culture of country."
6. Chomskiy N. "Language and mind." 1972.
7. Fedorov A.V. "The basis of general theory of translation." 1971
8. Fedorov A.V. "The essays of general and comparative stylistics." 1971
9. Hayford, Harrison; Howard P. Vincent (1954). Reader and Writer. Houghton Mifflin Company. "Internet Archive: Free Download: Reader And Writer". Archive.org. 2001-03-10.
10. Howatt, Anthony (2004). A history of English language teaching. Oxford University Press. ISBN 0194421856
11. Kenyon, John Samuel and Knott, Thomas Albert, A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English, G & C Merriam Company, Springfield, Mass, USA, 1953.
12. Mazrui, Alamin (1998). The power of Babel: language & governance in the African experience. University of Chicago Press.
13. Mc Mordie W. "English idioms and how to use them." 1956
14. McArthur, T. (ed.) (1992). The Oxford Companion to the English Language. Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-214183-X.
15. McCrum; Robert MacNeil, William Cran (1986). The Story of English (1st ed.). New York: Viking. ISBN 0-670-80467-3.
16. Nation, I.S.P. (2001). Learning Vocabulary in Another Language. Cambridge University Press. p. 477. ISBN 0521804981.
17. Naumov E.B. "The way of transmitting phraseologisms." 1971

18. Newmark P “Approaches to translation.” 1981.
19. Plotkin, Vulf (2006). The Language System of English. BrownWalker Press. ISBN 1-58112-993-9.
20. Robinson, Orrin (1992). Old English and Its Closest Relatives. Stanford Univ. Press. ISBN 0-8047-2221-8.
21. Rossels V.M. “Realia.” 1971.
22. Shveitser A.D. “Translation and linguistics.”
23. Superanskaya A. V. “The general theory of proper nouns.” 1971.
24. Tomakhin G. D. ”Realias –Americanizms.” 1988.
25. Vereshagin E.M., Kostomarov A.V. ”Lingua –country study theory of word.” 1973.
26. Vlahov S., Florin S. “Untranslatable in translation.” 1960.
27. Yuldasheva Ch. “In original and translation.” 1989
28. [www.cl.cam.ac.uk](http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk)
29. [www.onestopenglish.com](http://www.onestopenglish.com)
30. [www.ul.ie](http://www.ul.ie)
31. [www.english\\_stylistics.com](http://www.english_stylistics.com)