

The Relationship between Reality and Culture

*Juraeva Laylo Zhiyankulovna*¹

Abstract: The relationship between reality and culture is studied from a linguocultural aspect, various definitions of realities are presented, their place and significance in the system of Uzbek linguocultural realities are assessed, and the relationship of the modern Uzbek literary language to these units is determined.

Keywords: reality, culture, linguocultural studies, ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics, country studies, translation studies.

It is clear that in the linguistics world, special attention is paid to studying the language in relation to the way of life of the person using it and their unique cultural, national and spiritual world. As a result of such approaches to the study of language, after the middle of the 20th century, the research areas of linguistics expanded, new areas of linguistics such as ethnolinguistics, linguoculturology, sociolinguistics appeared on the scene, and opportunities were created to reveal new aspects of language related to the human world. As a result, the study of the historical development of the language and the people speaking in this language, their lifestyle, traditional culture formed during their daily lives, and their spiritual world in an inextricable connection is becoming one of the important issues in linguistics. Language and culture are interconnected, and the existence of each language is determined by culture.

The word reality is derived from the Latin word “realia” and means material, real. In the “Dictionary of Linguistic Terms” it is defined as follows: “The result of material culture in existence, and in classical grammar, words expressing the state structure of a particular country, the history and culture of particular people, a linguistic unit expressing the features of communication in a particular language.”²

Linguists began to argue about the features of realia reflecting a certain color in the 50s of the 20th century. It was quite difficult to come to a conclusion on this issue. The main reason for this is that the real essence of this issue was not the focus of attention in the works of those researchers who were debating. As a result of the analysis of existing scientific research, it can be seen that there are two different approaches to assessing realia. These are:

- view from the perspective of translation;
- approach in the context of country studies.

In translation studies, the term "reality" refers to objects and concepts related to a particular national culture. Reality has a broad meaning, which does not always coincide with the meaning expressed by a word. Reality is one of the main elements of the vocabulary of a particular language, directly reflecting the linguistic sign of objects in everyday life.

Some scientists, when defining reality, make incomplete or abstract conclusions. Only one aspect of these linguistic units is covered. Therefore, when responding to this concept, it is necessary to review

¹ Independent researcher at Bukhara State University, Teacher of the Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute
laylojurayeva@buxdpi.uz

² Вернигорова В.А. Понятие реалии в современном переводоведении. ISSN 1993-5552 Альманах современной науки и образования, -№ 3 (34), 2010, часть 2.



the previous definitions. In particular, M. L. Weisburd approaches reality from the perspective of national studies and expresses the following thoughts about it: "It consists of the names of events of the social and cultural life of a particular country, the names of social enterprises or organizations, the names of everyday objects, the names of historical figures and many other things."³

This idea requires a more serious consideration of the issue of reality. In this regard, it is necessary to clarify its appearance as linguistic terminology. According to the Russian scientist L.N. Sobolev, "reality is a national word and phrase that has a special character and has no other equivalents in the language environment of one language and other countries."⁴ However, this view ignores the fact that there are different changes and stages of development in the life of a country, and that what is common in one country may not be so in another, as well as the possibility of such words crossing over between languages.

An example of this is the word "sputnik". This word actually appeared during the former Soviet Union. Because this work was carried out in this country for the first time. It should not be forgotten that the appearance of a particular word in the form of a reality is, first of all, associated with the region, country, nation, people in which that reality was created. As soon as that thing acquires a certain significance, it can spread to other countries, and even throughout the world. As the well-known translation expert V.M. Rossels noted, "Realities are words that have entered the language being translated and represent the name of certain national, local things and objects or concepts in the original language."⁵

Realities consist of words and expressions denoting cultural, social and historical objects, the development of which directly affects the content and system of realities. The culture of one people can directly or indirectly influence the culture of another people for socio-political reasons. Some national and culturally specific items do not have a clear equivalent in another language(s). Therefore, a special approach to the naming of such items is required⁶.

The "Brief Encyclopedic Dictionary of Literary Terms" provides a rather detailed explanation of realia: "Realia are specific words that express objects, concepts and events and characteristic of the history, culture, everyday life or period of life of a particular people. Realia can also be word combinations, phraseologisms, proverbs, sayings."⁷ One of the major theorists of linguistic translation studies, L. S. Barkhudarov, gave a rather concise definition of realia: "Realia are such words that are lexical units that do not exist in the languages and practical lives of peoples speaking another language."⁸

A.V. Fyodorov is critical of this definition. In his opinion, "Realia are not just words, but words and word combinations that express the names of things, objects and events in the life of particular people."⁹ This scientist recommends talking not about realities, but about the names of things that exist in real life. N. Gak also prefers to talk about word-realities¹⁰.

The important feature of realities comes from the essence of the subject they represent. The way of life, socio-economic development of a particular people in different historical periods, certainly has its impact on the essence of realities. That is why, when talking about realities, it is impossible to

³ Вайсбурд М.Л. Реалии как элемент страноведения // Русский язык за рубежом. -1972. -№ 3. С. 98-100.

⁴ Соболев Л.Н. Пособие по переводу с русского языка на французский язык. – Москва: Просвещение, 1952.

⁵ Россельс В.М. Эстафета слова. Искусство художественного перевода. – Москва, 1972

⁶ Влахов С, Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. Издание третье. Исправленное. – Москва: Валент, 2006. 47с.

⁷ Краткая литературная энциклопедия. – Москва: 1972.

⁸ Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод (вопросы общей и частной теории перевода). -М.: Международные отношения, 1975. -240 с.

⁹ Федоров А.В. Основы общей теории перевода. – Москва: Просвещение, 1983. -290 с.

¹⁰ Гак В.Г. Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. –Л.: Просвещение. Ленингр. от-е, 1977. –С. 261



overlook the issue of national identity and historical color. Because realities in any case have a national and historical color at the same time. This requires a special attitude to them.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar:

1. Ахманова, О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – Москва: КомКнига, 2005. – 576 с.
2. Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод (вопросы общей и частной теории перевода). -М.: Международные отношения, 1975. -240 с.
3. Вайсбурд М.Л. Реалии как элемент страноведения // Русский язык за рубежом. -1972. -№ 3. С. 98-100.
4. Влахов С, Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. Издание третье. Исправленное Москва: Валент, 2006. 47с.
5. Вернигорова В.А. Понятие реалии в современном переводоведении. ISSN 1993-5552 Альманах современной науки и образования, -№ 3 (34), 2010, часть 2.
6. Гак В.Г. Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. –Л.: Просвещение. Ленингр. от-е, 1977. –С. 261
7. Краткая литературная энциклопедия. – Москва: 1972.
8. Kurbanazarova N. Surxondaryo vohasi to‘y marosimi etnografizmlarining semantik tabiati va lingvomadaniy tadqiqi: Fil. fan. bo‘yicha fals. dok. diss. – Termiz: 2021. – B. 39.
9. Россельс В.М. Эстафета слова. Искусство художественного перевода. – Москва, 1972
10. Слепова А. Д. Выпускная квалификационная работа Проблема перевода реалий в художественном тексте (на материале рассказов И.А. Бунина и их переводов на английский язык): Дисс. ... д-ра филол. наук. Санкт-Петербург: 2022.
11. Соболев Л.Н. Пособие по переводу с русского языка на французский язык. – Москва: Просвещение, 1952.

