LINGUOCULTURAL REALIA IN CONTEMPORARY LINGUISTICS.

Rasulova Gulmira Xursanbek qizi
Namangan engineering-technology institute, teacher of the department of "Foreign languages"
e-mail: gulmirarasulova95@gmail.com

Abstract: The article deals with an extremely significant role of linguoculturemes in the world picture representation, types of linguoculturemes, the functional-semantic and typological problems of rendering realia. The representation 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. This research article is devoted to the study of culture specific features of realia, their usages, classification. The aim of the article is to study semantic and cultural features of linguoculturemes, to highlight the most comprehensive existing classifications of realia, description of the realia and to work out the ways of rendering them in the process of translation.

Keywords: linguocultureme, realia, linguoculturology, cultureme, non-equivalent lexicon, mythology.

I. INTRODUCTION

Efficient communication is impossible "without deep and wide background knowledge of native speakers' cultures which implies way of life, mentality, vision of the world, the national character, customs, beliefs, systems of values, kinds of social behavior" [4] (Ter-Minasova, 1995). There are close relationships between language and culture, and text is a means of studying culture, it is the main source of cultural knowledge and information [11] (Ольшанский, 2000; Маслова, 2007).

Linguocultureme is a complex, interlevel language unit, a dialectical unit of both linguistic and extra linguistic factors, the correlation between the form of a verbal sign, its semantic content and cultural sense [10](Vorobyov, 2008). The sources of cultural information in a linguocultureme are specific for each culture: realia, outstanding people, myths, images, beliefs, customs and traditions.

In their scientific researches linguoculturologists strive to concstantly refine the terminology of the young science linguoculturology. Because of this, various researchers, focusing on certain aspects of the linguoculturological notions, create terms with a lot of common ground. On one hand, it enriches and deepens the reaearch observations, but on the other hand, it is a perquisite for a lack of terminological consistency, which we believe prevents the understanding of this matter and is a setback when establish a uniform terminology.

A number of terminological issues in linguoculturology has been borrowed from the science *culture-through-language studies* and relates to the methods of joining the "other" – not native culture through language. The study of this phenomenon is possible thanks to the meticulously developed theory of the semantic structure of the word, which focuses on the cumulative function of

the language, understood as "reflection, fixation and storage in the linguistic units of some information about the human being reality" [6] (Vereshchagin, Kostomarov, 1980:7). For the culture-through-language studies and linguoculturology the established units, fully loaded with cultural specificity and having represented a rich source of information about national culture, are of great importance. The in-depth study of the issue gives a reason to believe that the term linguocultureme is more widely accepted in the specialized literature on linguoculturology compared to the term cultureme. The author of both these terms is the distinguished Russian linguoculturologist Vladimir VasilievichVorobyov. In his monograph Linguoculturology he reveals the essence of the term linguocultureme [9] (Vorobyov, 2006: 44-57) though in his earlier works he distinguishes the notion cultureme as well: "Cultureme is an element of reality inherent to a particular culture; linguocultureme is a projection of the element culture in the linguistic sign" [8] (Vorobyov, 1997).

II. Main part

In prof. Vorobyov's understanding the linguocultureme is a combination of the shape of the linguistic sign, its content and the cultural meaning accompanying this sign. In order for the essence of a linguocultureme to be understood he atteches a great importance to the deep meaning potentially existing in the signification of a word or a phrase as an element of their content. A linguocultureme has a connotative meaning, very often not the only one, which cannot always be updated in the minds of people perceiving it. When considering lexical units and their meanings in various languages it becomes clear that the members of a particular semantic family create another, different connotation compared to other matched languages. This shows that the "immersion" of words into a respective culture contributes to their linguistic and extralinguistic semantics being manifested more fully and thus to enable one to penetrate deeper into the essence of cultural values and to better understand their national specifics.

In structural terms linguoculturemes are presented in a variable way- they can be expressed by a word, phrase or a full text of varying sizes. Very often they are represented by a single word – Homer, Napoleon, Churchill, a great example of this is the Russian lexeme" sobornost" (соборность); by a precedent phrase: "To be or not to be?", by a precedent text: "Romeo and Juliet". The Russian researcher S. D. Bidagaeva notes that the contemporary semiotic approach to culture allows its consideration as a set of certain signs – culturemes [2] (Bidagaeva, 2015: 41).

Linguoculturemes can be presented by a great variety of linguistic forms including words, word combinations, syntactical structures, text fragments and even the whole text. Accordingly, linguoculturemes can be verbalized by non-equivalent lexicon, anthroponyms, mythologemes, phraseological units, paroemia, speech forms of etiquette, image-bearing means [1] (Ashurova, 2016). Most illustrative of it are the followings:

i. Non-equivalent lexicon. It includes words which reflect a national world picture and have no verbal equivalents in different cultures. They may denote: a) toponyms: Big Ben, Hyde Park, Trafalgar Square; b) rituals: christening, coronation; c) holidays: Easter, Thanksgiving, Halloween; d) food: sandwich, pudding; e) measurement and money: foot, pound, penny; f) titles and degrees: lord, lady and etc.

ii. Phraseological units. Phraseology is the source of valuable information on national culture and mentality. In phraseology certain nation's conceptions of myths, traditions, folktales, stereotypes, spiritual and moral values are embodied. Phraseology is the mirror where the human's national and cultural identity is reflected.

Phraseological units may be associated with:

a) superstitions (e.g. "a black sheep" means "someone who is the shame of the family" and refers to the seal of devil); b) the names of famous people

(e.g. "according to Cocker" means "reliable information" and refers to a famous scientist; "Florence Nightingale" means someone who cares for ill people and refers to the English nurse who set up a hospital for soldiers during the Crimea War); c) folk tales and fables (e.g. "Tom Thumb" means "a person of a small size" and refers to the character in a fairy tale who was only as big as a person's thumb); d) geographical names (e.g. "to cross the Rubicon" means to do something that inevitably commits one to following a certain course of action; to make a decision or to take an action that cannot be changed later and it refers to Roman history: Julius Caesar started a war by crossing the river Rubicon in Italy in B.C. 49)

iii. Mythologemes. As is known, myths are understood as legends about gods and heroes, stories and fables about superhuman beings taken by the preliterate society to be a true account, usually of how the world and natural phenomena, social customs, etc., came into existence. Myths reflect basic elements of religion, philosophy, science, art, etc. Myths are based on archetypes — an inherited pattern of thought or symbolic imagery derived from the past collective experience and present in the individual unconscious. Myths are represented in the text by means of "mythologemes" - linguistic units denoting important mythological personages, situations or events transiting from one myth to another and shared by cultures throughout the world; stable images and motives that are repeated in the mythological systems and are represented in the fictional text.

About realia as bearers of coloring, concrete elements of national peculiarity linguists obviously spoke only at the beginning of 50th years. In L.N. Sobolev we find not only use of term "realia" in its modern understanding but sufficiently expressed definition.1 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 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. [5] (Tomakhin, 1988)

The term realia has been suggested by S.I. Vlakhov and S.P. Florin [7] (Vlakhov, Florin, 2012). The term has evolved to refer to objects, customs, habits and other cultural and material aspects influencing the shaping of a certain language. Realia can be discussed in frames of equivalent-lacking units. Equivalent-lacking units are those concepts lacking in the target language and culture. They are also sometimes referred to as untranslatable units. Depending on the criteria used several classifications of realia are distinguished in the current linguistic research.

Olga Denti outlines three types of realia:

1. Geography: physical geography (pampa, fjord, mistral, steppe, tornado, tsunami); geographic objects tied to man's activity (polder); endemic species (kiwi, koala, sequoia).

2. Ethnography: everyday life (paprika, spaghetti, empanada, sauna, kimono); work (carabinieri, concierge, machete, trade union); art and culture (tarantella, banjo, gong, commedia, allegro, Santa Claus, vampire, murals); ethnic characterizations (cockney, gringo, yankee); measures and money (mile, kilometer, lira, peseta, talent).

3. Politics and society: administrative divisions (region, province, county, department, state, promenade); organs and functions (agora, forum, дума, senate, chancellor, царь, pharaoh); politics

and social life (Ku Klux Klan, lobbying, lord, untouchables, samurai); military (cohort, phalanx, marines) [12](Proshina, 2008).

CONCLUSION

According to the research, Peter Newmark suggest the classification of foreign cultural words, establishing such categories: ecology (flora, fauna, winds, climate); material culture (food, clothes, houses, towns, transport); social culture (work and leisure); organizations, customs, activities, procedures or concepts(which include artistic, religious, political and administrative subcategories); gestures and habits [3](Newmark, 1998: 46).

According to Tomakhin, the classification of realia are: geography, ethnographic, folklore, mythology, everyday life, politics and society, history. In his book, "Реалии Американизмы", he suggested several types and subtypes of realia. For example, Chapter IV is about education, religion and culture of realia. It includes education, religion, literature, theatre and cinema, art, musical culture. [5](Tomakhin, 1988: 37).

Realia are born in popular culture, and are increasingly found in very diverse kinds of texts. They are words and expressions for culture-specific items. One of its main purposes is to convey cultural information.

REFERENCES:

1. Ashurova D.U., Galiyeva M.R. Text Linguistics. –Toshkent: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. –P. 322.
2. Bidagaeva C.D. Asymmetry of Linguocultureme.// East-West Interaction of languages and Cultures. 2015, p.40-48.
3. Newmark P. More Paragraphs on Translation/ P. Newmark. – Multilingual Matters, 1998. -226p.
4. Ter-Minasova S. Language, Culture and Teaching Methods//Language, Culture and Communication. – Moscow. 1995
5. Tomakhin, Gennadii D. (1988) Realii-amerikanizmy, Moscow: Vysshaia shkola.
6. Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Лингвострановедческая теория слова. – М., 1980
7. Влахов С.И., Флорин С.П. Непереводимое в переводе/ С.И. Влахов, С.П. Флорин. –Р. Валент, 2012. -406с.
8. Воробьёв В.В. Лингвокультурология: теория и практика. – М.: Изд-во РУДН, 1997
9. Воробьёв В.В. Русский язык в диалоге культур. – М.: Изд-во РУДН, 2006
10. Воробьев В.В. Лингвокультурология. –М.: РУДН, 2008
11. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. – М.: Изд.центр академия, 2007
12. Прошина З.Г. Теория перевода/ З.Г. Прошина. –Владивосток: Изд-во Дальневост. ун-та, 2008. 278с.