

THE REALIAS OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE IN TRANSLATION STUDIES AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19505228>

G'iyasov Sardorbek Norovich

Master student of the Asia International university, Uzbekistan

*Scientific supervisor: **Gadoeva Mavlyuda Ibragimovna** doctor of philological science (DSc), professor of Asia International university, Uzbekistan*

Annotation

This article devoted to the study of the realities of the Uzbek language in translation studies and linguistic studies. **Realia** refers to real-life, tangible objects used in teaching to bring authenticity and context to the classroom, particularly in language acquisition. These everyday items—such as food, menus, tickets, or clothing—help bridge the gap between classroom theory and real-world application, enhancing student engagement, retention and comprehension.

Key words

realia, translation studies, linguistic studies, real-life, tangible objects, everyday items—such as food, menus, tickets, or clothing—help bridge the gap between classroom theory and real-world application, enhancing student engagement, retention, and comprehension.

The effectiveness of translation depends on knowledge of the history, culture, customs, and traditions, as well as the peculiarities of everyday life and habits of people who communicate in the source language. The realities that exist in every language are of great interest to researchers and translators, and require a separate approach when developing language teaching materials. At the same time, there are a number of problems associated with conveying the flavor of these realities.

The purpose of this article is to analyze translation and country studies approaches to defining the essence of the realities of the Uzbek language. In the course of covering the topic under study, literature on translation studies was examined and data concerning the realities of the Uzbek language were analyzed. In the course of the subject study, a method of analyzing ways of translating the realities of the Uzbek language into Russian was applied, and a classification of realities for linguistic and didactic purposes was carried out.

Language and culture are the main codes that facilitate communication between people. Without an understanding of the culture of the people who shaped the mentality of the participants in communication, studying a language for

the purpose of productive communication does not yield the expected results. For this reason, the relationship between language and mentality has been of interest and the subject of research for a long time. As early as the 19th century, Wilhelm von Humboldt stated: "The boundaries of my nation's language are the boundaries of my worldview"¹.

But it was not until the mid-20th century that a significant shift occurred in the development of the connection between translation studies and such fields of science as linguoculturology, linguodidactics, comparative linguistics, ethnolinguistics, intercultural communication theory, etc. It follows that modern science is developing according to the principle of expansionism – the boundaries between scientific fields are blurring. In today's world, bilingual and multilingual thinking prevails, and the integration of languages is becoming increasingly widespread. This has a significant impact on the development of national languages.

Literary language is changing under the influence of the growing need for communication at the international level. Rapid technological advances in all areas contribute to the social differentiation of languages, which is expressed in the varieties of a single national language. "Social differentiation does not lead to the formation of separate languages, but to the emergence of social varieties within a single language, with changes occurring not in grammar or phonetics, but mainly the vocabulary and phraseology..."². It follows that social differentiation complicates the study of language, which must be taken into account in the process of teaching it. The peculiarity of each language is reflected in its realities.

Linguistic realities attract attention in connection with the problems of their translation, which arise for two reasons. On the one hand, the target language lacks a corresponding equivalent for a particular concept. On the other hand, there is a need to convey not only the literal meaning (semantics) but also the flavor of the reality that reflects the national and historical coloring of the concept being translated.

In language, realia are commonly referred to as objects of material culture³. "Realia is a single object, a thing; that which is, exists"⁴. Over time, new concepts have emerged in linguistics that specify the meaning of realia. The term "national realia" refers to realia inherent to a particular nation, people, ethnic group, nationality, etc. The essence of national realia from the point of view of translation

¹ Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкознанию / пер. Г.В. Рамишвили. М.: Прогресс, 1984. –С.123.

² Крылова М.Н. 2014. Интеграция и дифференциация как процессы развития языка: история, современное состояние, перспективы // Филология и литературоведение. № 2 [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://philology.snauka.ru/2014/02/665>

³ Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. Изд. 2-е, стер.. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2004. –С.381.

⁴ Ожегов С.И. Словарь русского языка. М.: Русский язык, 1989. –С.670.

studies and didactics is reflected in the following definition: "... words or expressions denoting objects, concepts, situations that do not exist in the practical experience of people speaking another language"⁵. It follows that the range of realities is not limited to material objects, but also includes abstract concepts.

In modern linguistics, terms such as "ethnographicism," "exoticism," "alienism," "localism," "lacuna," "ethnolexeme," "non-equivalent vocabulary," etc. are used as equivalents of the term "realia." These terms are united primarily by the absence of a specific concept or name in another language. Of all the above expressions, the term "non-equivalent vocabulary" is most often used in scientific literature to refer to "words whose content cannot be compared with any foreign-language lexical concepts"⁶. This definition confirms that the relevance of a concept to non-equivalent vocabulary is determined in the process of comparing two languages.

Realities are not limited to the sphere of comparison. Their main feature is colorfulness. The concept of "realia" was not previously used in Uzbek linguistics. For a certain period, realities were referred to as "specific words," "national characteristics," "national color," "non-linguistic means," "non-equivalent vocabulary," etc. As an example, let us cite the definition of realities by the well-known Uzbek scholar and translator G. Salomov: "National characteristics refer to representations of the life of a people depicted in a work of art, concepts and names associated with material living conditions, moral values, nature, forests, mountains, fields, water, land, sky, myths and legends, history and religion, literature, art, and other special concepts. Clothing, traditions and customs, currency, and others also belong to the components of national characteristics"⁷.

The most comprehensive definition of realia is considered to be the following: "Realia are words (or phrases) that refer to objects characteristic of the life (everyday life, culture, social and historical development) of one people and foreign to another. Being carriers of national and historical color, they usually do not have exact equivalents in other languages and, therefore, cannot be translated on a general basis, requiring a special approach"⁸.

On the question of the distinctive properties of realia, discussed in a number of works, the interpretation of G.D. Tomakhin is noteworthy, which points to the close connection of realia from two positions: the connection of a concept or

⁵ Нелюбин Л.Л. Толковый переводоведческий словарь. 3-е изд., перераб. –М.: Флинта: Наука, 2003. –С.178с.

⁶ Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Язык и культура: Лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного. –М.: Русский язык, 1983. –С.56.

⁷ Саломов Ф. Таржима назарияси ва асослари. –Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1983. –Б,101. Вестник ЮУрГУ. Серия «Лингвистика». 2025. Т. 22, № 1. –С. 5–10 9 Лингвокультуроведение и вопросы перевода Cultural linguistics and translation studies

⁸ Влахов С.И., Флорин С.П. Непереводимое в переводе. Изд. 4-е. –М.: Р. Валент, 2009. –С,6-55.

phenomenon with a particular people and country, and with a historical period of time. Among the concepts that are difficult to translate, the scholar gives special attention to anthroponyms and toponyms, which require background knowledge possessed by native speakers⁹.

V.A. Vernigorova sees an important feature of realia in their common use, popularity, “familiarity” to all or most speakers of the source language, and “foreignness” to speakers of the target language of translation¹⁰.

These properties of realia are especially important when learning a new language in the absence of a linguistic environment. This problem is the subject of linguocultural studies, a scientific field that researches the history and contemporary reality of a country whose official language is being studied as a foreign language.

Linguistic regional studies was recognized as a methodological discipline relatively recently, in the late 1990s. One of its tasks is to study realities as designations of objects and phenomena that are characteristic of one culture and absent in another¹¹. This distinguishes linguocultural studies from cultural studies courses, which are developed by native speakers without taking the target audience into account. The linguistic-country studies approach is successfully applied in language teaching in many countries, although it is referred to by different terms. In particular, German methodologists call linguistic-country studies cultural studies, British methodologists call them linguistic-cultural studies, and French methodologists call them “language and civilization.”

In scientific and methodological literature in the Uzbek language, this concept has come into use relatively recently, mainly in works on the methodology of teaching English, German, and Russian. In these works, the term “lingvoo'lkashunoslik” (“linguistic regional studies”) is used to mean “linguistic regional studies”¹².

In some works, linguo-country studies is expressed by the term “mamlakatshunoslik” (“country studies”)¹³. This is explained by the relatively late development of methods for teaching Uzbek as a foreign language.

With the increase in demand for educational literature on the Uzbek language for foreigners in the absence of a language environment, there was a need to turn to

⁹ Томахин Г.Д. Теоретические основы лингвострановедения. –М.: Просвещение, 1990. –С.7.

¹⁰ Вернигорова В.А. Понятие реалии в современном переводоведении // Альманах современной науки и образования. 2010, № 3 (34), часть 2. –С. 138.

¹¹ Карапетян О.В., Мясковская Т.В. Лингвострановедение как наука // Альманах современной науки и образования. 2012, № 4 (59). –С. 117–120.

¹² Агзамова Д. Таржимашунослик ва лингвомамлакатшунослик фанларида реалиялар муаммоси // O‘zbekistonda xo‘jiyu tillar. 2015, № 3 (7). –С. 119–122.

¹³ Садиқов З. Қадимги туркий реалиялар таржимаси: моногр. –Наманган: Vodiy media, 2021. –120 с.

linguistic and cultural studies material. When teaching Uzbek as a foreign language, it is necessary to work with real-life situations in order to see the living language through the eyes of its native speakers. In this regard, it is not enough to simply learn language units; it is also important to understand the ethnic principles of the linguistic and cultural content of the language. For linguistic and cultural studies, it is first necessary to select realities and then group them according to semantic and thematic principles.

G.D. Tomakhin proposed including introductory texts, a dictionary of realities, linguistic and cultural commentary, and a system of exercises in accordance with the learning objectives in the linguistic and cultural studies course¹⁴. In the practice of teaching foreign languages, realities are introduced into the vocabulary of the language being studied from the beginner level. At this stage, it is important to form sociocultural stereotypes of world perception and to assimilate linguistic mentality.

Later, at advanced stages of language acquisition, the opposite occurs: sociocultural factors determine linguistic mentality¹⁵. Thus, the higher the goals of language learning, the more background knowledge should approach that of the average native speaker. A teacher working with texts on regional studies takes on the roles of ethnographer, historian, sociologist, etc.

It follows from the above that when teaching students to understand and correctly use the realities of the target language in speech, it is important to systematize them in advance or present them according to a specific classification. This contributes to the correct distribution of the realities being studied at different levels of language learning. There are various classifications of linguistic realities.

One of them is presented by V.S. Vinogradov:

- 1) everyday realities (housing, property, clothing, food, types of work, currency, units of measurement, folk dances and songs, holidays, forms of address);
- 2) ethnographic realities (ethnic and social communities and their representatives, deities, fairy-tale creatures, legendary places);
- 3) realities of the natural world (animals, plants, landscape);
- 4) realities of the state-administrative structure and public life (administrative units and state institutions, parties, enterprises, military and police units, positions, professions, titles);
- 5) onomastic realities (anthroponyms, toponyms, names of literary characters, names of companies, museums, theaters, etc.);

¹⁴ Tomakhin G.D. Teoreticheskie osnovy lingvostranovedeniya [Theoretical foundations of linguistic and cultural studies]. –Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1990. –324 p.

¹⁵ Почепцов О.Г. Языковая ментальность: способ представления мира // Вопросы языкознания. 1990, № 6. –С. 110–112.

6) associative realities (symbolism, folklore and literary-book allusions)¹⁶. Also known in scientific literature is the hierarchy of realities presented by Bulgarian scholars S. Vlahov and S. Florin in the book “Untranslatable in Translation.” It consists of four major sections, each of which is divided into specific groups, types, and subtypes:

- I. Subject division.
- II. Local division (depending on national and linguistic affiliation).
- III. Temporal division (in synchronic and diachronic terms, based on “familiarity”).
- IV. Translation division¹⁷.

However, we believe that it is impossible to apply a single classification of realities to most languages, since each people (nation, ethnic group) has its own “set” of characteristics.

For example, G. Rakhimov proposes dividing “special words” that have no lexical equivalents in other languages into the following groups:

- 1) words used in everyday life;
- 2) proper names and names of geographical objects;
- 3) greetings;
- 4) names of newspapers and magazines;
- 5) units of mass and length, etc.¹⁸.

In our opinion, this classification does not fully define all the realities necessary for full communication in the language being studied. The above classifications relate to translation studies. However, the classification of realities for linguistic and didactic purposes is much simpler and more specific. In particular, M. Rakhmatullaeva divides the realities of the Uzbek language into the following categories:

- 1) materials (atlas, adras);
- 2) food (palov, somsa, sumalak, patir, shavla, manti);
- 3) clothing (chopon, t'on);
- 4) sports (kurash); 5) musical instruments (dutor, doira);
- 6) social and political structure (mahalla, viloyat, hokimiyat)¹⁹.

¹⁶ Виноградов В.С. Введение в переводоведение (общие и лексические вопросы). Москва: Изд-во ин та общего среднего образования РАО, 2001. –С,54.

¹⁷ Влахов С.И., Флорин С.П. Непереваемое в переводе. Изд. 4-е. –М.: Р. Валент, 2009. –С,50.

¹⁸ Rakhimov G. Tarjima nazariyasi va amaliyoti [Theory and practice of translation]. –Tashkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2016. –P.97-98.

¹⁹ Рахматуллаева М.М. Национальные реалии в обучении узбекскому языку как второму языку [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://jurnal.org/articles/2015/ped49.html>

These groups were expanded somewhat with the following additions: tableware and household items (kosa, piyola, lagan, qozon, chakich, etc.), tools and implements (tandir, ketmon, chakich, otashkurak, obdasta, ko'rpa, etc.).

At the intermediate stage, texts containing non-equivalent vocabulary were introduced into the teaching materials, mainly referring to abstract concepts and having no analogues in other languages (baraka, rizq, nafs, farosat, andisha, iffat, etc.).

At the advanced stage, learners were gradually offered texts containing aphorisms and idioms (qo'njidan to'kilsa qo'yniga; oq yuvib, oq taramoq; sichqonning ini ming tanga; nomi ulug', suprasi quruq, etc.).

In developing communication skills, it is also necessary to pay attention to the nonverbal means of communication used by native speakers of Uzbek. Scientific literature on non-verbal means of communication characteristic of the Uzbek people often mentions the greetings used by native speakers. It is noteworthy that the choice of non-verbal means of greeting among Uzbek men depends on their age, status, social position, and degree of kinship²⁰.

Summarizing the question of the classification of realia, it should be noted that, in addition to the above-mentioned types, there is a division of realia into "own" and "foreign," which, in turn, are subdivided into national (known to all residents of the country, its people), local (belonging to a particular dialect), and micro-local (characteristic of a particular locality).²¹

Translating realia is tricky because you have to keep the flavor of the original language. At the same time, you can't let the translation get overloaded with new language units that readers or learners won't understand. Throughout the period of studying realia in the field of linguistic translation theory, various methods have been developed and solutions to the problem of their translation have been proposed.

These include the following:

- 1) transcription;
- 2) transliteration;
- 3) calquing;
- 4) use of an existing analogue;
- 5) creation of a neologism;
- 6) approximate or descriptive translation;
- 7) generalization;
- 8) concretization.

²⁰ Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasi va asoslari [Theory and basics of translation].– Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1983. –P.57.

²¹ Papikyan A.A. Realiya kak ob'ekt perevodcheskoi deyatel'nosti [Reality as an object of translation activity]. Yazyk i kul'tura. 2013, no 6, –P.88–95.

Each of the above methods has a certain negative impact on the quality of the translation, since none of them provides a complete translation. In cases where calquing, transcription, and transliteration are used, unfamiliar expressions often appear in the translation. When using an existing analogue or generalization, as well as concretization, local color is often lost. Approximate or descriptive translation in most cases deprives the text of dynamism, accuracy, and expressiveness. The task is complicated by the fact that in most cases there is a deviation from the literary norm. For example, some realities are among the words of limited use – dialectisms.

There are also realities that relate to colloquial language and slang vocabulary. Most realities correspond to the literary norm, but their interpretations may include notes on certain limitations in usage due to the local or historical affiliation of their denotations. Scientific and methodological literature provides examples of distortions in the meaning of realia in translation.

Such translations do not correspond to their original semantics, resulting in a false representation of them. For example, the words to‘n and chopon are translated as robe or frock coat, telpak as hat, kosa as large cup, ko‘rpa as blanket, ko‘rpacha as small blanket, etc.²². Before attempting to translate a realia, it is necessary to understand its meaning and function in the source language and identify its role in context in order to correctly interpret its semantic and connotative content. Thus, in the process of translating realia, there is a choice: either to preserve the flavor of the linguistic unit and thereby damage the semantics, or to convey the meaning of the realia as accurately as possible and thereby lose the flavor.

Conclusions. In the era of globalization, non-linguistic and language-related phenomena are accelerating. Year after year, the total number of languages in use around the world is decreasing, resulting in a reduction in differences between languages and an increase in the number of universals.

Today, mastering a literary language is no longer the main goal of studying it for active communication. This is confirmed by the growing interest in the diverse dialects that exist in the living Uzbek language among foreigners living in Uzbekistan and studying the Uzbek language. At the same time, it should be noted that differences between languages do not affect worldview, and as a result of diverse worldviews, linguistic models inherent in one language or another are created. There is also no connection between sentence structure and mentality. The

²² Мусаев Қ. Таржима назарияси асослари: Дарслик. Тошкент: Фан, 2005. –С.352 с.; 15. Рахматуллаева М.М. Национальные реалии в обучении узбекскому языку как второму языку [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://jurnal.org/articles/2015/ped49.html> ; 20. Ширинова Р.Х. Национальная культура и национальный колорит при переводе // Вестник ЮУрГГПУ. Серия «Филология и искусствоведение». 2013, № 1. С. –С.307–316.

behavior of a people who speak a certain language does not depend on its grammar.

Therefore, new and effective methods are needed today to study and translate the realities of language. Phraseological units in language, as an important part of reality, are of great interest to researchers, linguists, translators, and methodologists. Since they express only views at a certain period of language development, it is impossible to draw conclusions about mentality based on the internal form of a phraseological unit.

REFERENCES:

1. Агзамова Д. Таржимашунослик ва лингвомамлакатшунослик фанларида реалиялар муаммоси // O'zbekistonda xoijiy tillar. 2015, № 3 (7). -С. 119-122.
2. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. Изд. 2-е, стер.. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2004. -576 с.
3. Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Язык и культура: Лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного. М.: Русский язык, 1983. -269 с.
4. Вернигорова В.А. Понятие реалии в современном переводоведении // Альманах современной науки и образования. 2010, № 3 (34), часть 2. -С. 137-141.
5. Виноградов В.С. Введение в переводоведение (общие и лексические вопросы). Москва: Изд-во ин та общего среднего образования РАО, 2001. -224 с.
6. Влахов С.И., Флорин С.П. Непереводимое в переводе. Изд. 4-е. -М.: Р. Валент, 2009.- 360 с.
7. Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкознанию / пер. Г.В. Рамишвили. -М.: Прогресс, 1984.- 400 с.
8. Карапетян О.В., Мясковская Т.В. Лингвострановедение как наука // Альманах современной науки и образования. 2012, № 4 (59). -С. 117-120.
9. Крылова М.Н. 2014. Интеграция и дифференциация как процессы развития языка: история, современное состояние, перспективы // Филология и литературоведение. № 2 [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <https://philology.snauka.ru/2014/02/665>
10. Мусаев Қ. Таржима назарияси асослари: Дарслик. -Тошкент: Фан, 2005. -352 с.

11. Нелюбин Л.Л. Толковый переводоведческий словарь. 3-е изд., перераб. -М.: Флинта: Наука, 2003. -320 с.
12. Ожегов С.И. Словарь русского языка. М.: Русский язык, 1989. 924 с.
13. Папикян А.А. Реалия как объект переводческой деятельности // Язык и культура. 2013, № 6. -С. 88-95.
14. Почепцов О.Г. Языковая ментальность: способ представления мира // Вопросы языкознания. 1990, № 6. -С. 110-112.
15. Рахматуллаева М.М. Национальные реалии в обучении узбекскому языку как второму языку [Электронный ресурс]. URL: <http://jurnal.org/articles/2015/ped49.html>
16. Раҳимов Ғ. Таржима назарияси ва амалиёти: Дарслик-мажмуа. - Тошкент: Ўзбекистон Миллий энциклопедияси, 2016. -176 с.
17. Садиқов З. Қадимги туркий реалиялар таржимаси: моногр. - Наманган: Vodiу media, 2021. -120 с.
18. Саломов Ғ. Таржима назарияси ва асослари. -Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1983. 218 с. Вестник ЮУрГУ. Серия «Лингвистика». 2025. Т. 22, № 1. -С. 5-10. Лингвокультуроведение и вопросы перевода Cultural linguistics and translation studies
19. Томахин Г.Д. Теоретические основы лингвострановедения. -М.: Просвещение, 1990. 324 с.
20. Ширинова Р.Х. Национальная культура и национальный колорит при переводе // Вестник ЮУрГППУ. Серия «Филология и искусствоведение». 2013, № 1. -С. 307-316.