Advances in Science and Humanities



Advances in Science and Humanities, 2026, 106–109

doi: 10.70728/human.v02.i04.024
Volume 02, Issue 04
ISSN: 3060-5393
Paper

PAPER

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REALIAS AND BARBARISMS IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS: NOMINATIVE NEED, CULTURAL SEMANTICS AND NORMATIVE STATUS

Panjiyeva Ro‘zixol Beknazar qizi[1,*]

[1]PhD student at Termez State University

* panjiyevarozixol@gmail.com

Abstract

This article distinguishes realia and barbarisms in Uzbek linguistics through nominative necessity, cultural-semantic load, and normative status. The study applies contextual analysis, comparative semantics, and close reading of diverse texts. The results propose a multi-criteria diagnostic model and demonstrate its implications for lexicography, translation practice, and stylistic norm-setting.

Key words: Realia, barbarism, equivalence, cultural semantics, norm, borrowing, context

INTRODUCTION

Subtle differences in the classification of linguistic units often begin with the definition of the boundary between theoretical terms, but the practical value of this boundary is felt even more sharply in lexicography, translation, text editing, and methodology. Although the tradition of describing the layer of assimilations in Uzbek linguistics is stable, a number of methodological ambiguities remain within the framework of the terms realia and barbarisms: in some works, realia is broadly interpreted as a general “nationally specific” lexicon, while in other approaches, barbarism itself is identified with a “unit introduced from abroad.” As a result, the same linguistic material is defined differently by different authors, especially in the analysis of literary texts or translation reviews, which leads to a violation of terminological consistency. The problem is that realia and barbarism are often distinguished on the basis of superficial signs, such as “foreign appearance” or “national color”; whereas their nature is determined by complementary factors

Compiled on: March 3, 2026.
Copyright:©2026 by the authors. Submitted to Advances in Science and Humanities for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 license.

such as the need for nominativeness, the cultural specificity of the denotation, the possibility of finding an equivalent, the pragmatic function in the text, and the relationship to the literary norm.

The relevance of this study is explained, on the one hand, by the increased influx of foreign elements into Uzbek texts in the context of globalization, and on the other hand, by the acuteness of the problems of adequately rendering national-culturally defined nominations in translation. Realias usually name a denotation specific to one culture and require the preservation of this specificity in the text, while barbarisms function more as a stylistic choice or communicative strategy of the author, presenting in a foreign language the content that can be expressed with the available means of the Uzbek language. Therefore, the scientific gap is not in the search for a “single sign” that distinguishes realia and barbarism, but in the systematization of the distinction as a multi-criteria diagnosis. The research problem is to consistently distinguish the linguistic status of realias and barbarisms on the basis of Uzbek language material, to show their semantic-pragmatic function and to substantiate the criteria for normative assessment.

As a theoretical basis for the study, the approaches to the lexical-semantic system, the concept of realia in cultural linguistics and translation theory, and the methodological-innovative nature of barbarism were comparatively studied [1; 2; 6]. Views on the issues of appropriation and literary norms in Uzbek linguistics also served as a methodological guiding source [3; 4].

METHODS

The study combined theoretical and empirical approaches. At the theoretical stage, the definitions of reality and barbarism, their borderline with other related terms (appropriation, exoticism, neologism, term) were analyzed comparatively; in this process, attention was paid to the internal logic of the definitions, the hierarchy of criteria, and the scope of practical application. The comparative-semantic method was used to separate the denotative base and connotative load of reality and barbarism, since these units are often distinguished by the difference between “what is being named” and “what effect it has”. The contextual analysis was aimed at identifying the pragmatic function that the unit performs in the text, such as creating authenticity, establishing social distance, individualizing the speech role, or providing intertextual reference.

As empirical material, a qualitative analysis was conducted on the basis of observation units selected from Uzbek texts of various genres (fictional prose, journalistic text, advertising, and written discourse close to everyday communication). Since the goal was not to make statistical generalizations, but to demonstrate the operation of diagnostic criteria in typical contexts, priority was given to examples that highlight the variability of units depending on the communicative situation and differences in the normative assessment of the units. The “minimal pair” method was also used in the analysis process: the options for presenting one denotation using an Uzbek medium and presenting it in a foreign language were compared, and it was clarified at which layer the difference appears. Also, the concepts of equivalence and strategies for transmitting realities in translation theory served as a methodological test for testing diagnostic criteria, since reality is often determined in the absence of a “complete equivalent” [2; 6; 7]. On the issue of normative status, views on the dynamics of the assimilation of modern literary language norms and appropriations served as a theoretical foundation [3; 4; 5].

RESULTS

The results of the analysis showed that the difference between realities and barbarisms can be reliably distinguished not by a single sign, but by four complementary parameters: the denotative-cultural parameter, the nominative necessity parameter, the equivalence parameter, and the normative-stylistic parameter. According to the denotative-cultural parameter, reality is a name directly associated with a specific institution, object, tradition, social practice, or historical-domestic detail of a culture; the semantic core of this name is the component of “locality”. In barbarism, the denotation is often universal or already has a name in the Uzbek language; the foreign language form enhances the speech effect, not the denotation. Therefore, in reality, the cultural referent is

the main one, and in barbarism, stylistic-social indexation is the main result.

In the parameter of nominative necessity, reality usually fills the gap: when there is no ready-made, generally accepted name for a certain denotation in the Uzbek language or when the existing name loses its cultural identity, the name reality becomes communicatively "necessary". Barbarism, on the other hand, often arises not from necessity, but from choice: the author, knowing the Uzbek alternative, retains or introduces a foreign language form, as a result of which additional goals are achieved in speech, such as modernity, "professional atmosphere", proximity to the brand, or showing the social type of the image. This result shows that while in reality the need for nominativeness is primary, in barbarism the pragmatic strategy is primary.

Based on these parameters, a diagnostic model was formed: if a unit names a culturally specific denotation, if there is no ready-made name in Uzbek or an alternative name loses its specificity, if a full equivalent becomes difficult in translation, and the unit seeks to be standardized with an explanation, it is classified as a realia. On the contrary, if the denotation is universal, if there is an Uzbek alternative, if a foreign language form is chosen for stylistic effect, if the problem of giving a pragmatic effect is more urgent than semantic in translation, and if the signal of the "foreign form" of the unit is preserved, it approaches barbarism. The model also showed borderline cases: some units initially enter as realia and then become standardized in wide consumption, the signs of barbarism weaken; in other cases, the name of the realia is deliberately left in a foreign form and is reinforced with a stylistic load characteristic of barbarism. Thus, the classification is not absolute, but has a gradational nature, determined by the balance of parameters.

DISCUSSION

The results obtained show that it is not enough to simplify the concept of reality to the level of "nationally specific word", since reality is, first of all, a nominative unit standing at the intersection of language and culture, and its semantic structure has a strong encyclopedic component. In translation theory, the issue of transmitting realities is often explained by the "lack of equivalents", in which transliteration and explanatory translation strategies are indicated as the main tools [6; 7]. Our analysis supports this view, but clarifies it: the lack of equivalents is not the only sign of reality, but an indicator that works together with the cultural referent and nominative necessity. Therefore, in translation, the issue of not only preserving the form, but also to what extent the minimum package of cultural knowledge is conveyed comes to the fore; in the translation of reality, loss is manifested not only as lexical, but also as cognitive loss. In the case of barbarism, in Russian linguistics it is often characterized by the stylistic function of a foreign language element in the text, in particular, by the semantic-pragmatic signals such as "foreignness", "fashion", "belonging to a social group" [1; 5]. Our results also confirm the indexical nature of barbarism, but in the Uzbek material this situation is complicated by another layer: even in the presence of an Uzbek alternative, the selection of barbarism is often associated with the specialization of the communicative environment or approximation to institutional discourse. Here, barbarism denotes a "speech position" rather than a "name of a thing"; therefore, confusing it with reality leads to a misinterpretation of text pragmatics. In other words, if in reality the "denotative identity" is the main one, in barbarism the "speaker identity" or "discourse identity" comes to the fore.

In Uzbek linguistics, within the framework of issues of assimilation and literary norms, the dynamics of the standardization of units is particularly emphasized: as the assimilation adapts to the language system, its signs of foreignness decrease, writing and pronunciation stabilize, and when recorded in dictionaries, it acquires a normative status [3; 4]. The model we have proposed directly applies this dynamics to the distinction between realism and barbarism: realism often comes with a cultural referent and is strengthened as a "necessary nomination" in the process of standardization, while barbarism, since it tends to preserve the effect of foreignness, retains stylistic determination more than standardization. At this point, the need to enrich the normative

approach with criteria of stylistic acceptability and correspondence to the communicative situation, without reducing it to an absolute “right-wrong” scheme, becomes apparent.

CONCLUSION

The study substantiated the need to explain the difference between realities and barbarisms through multi-criteria diagnostics based on Uzbek language material. It was shown that reality is a unit that names a culturally specific denotation, is motivated by nominative necessity and often causes the problem of semantic-cultural equivalence in translation, and barbarism is a marker that arises as a result of choosing a foreign language form for pragmatic-stylistic influence, despite the existence of an Uzbek alternative. The proposed model theoretically enhances terminological accuracy, and practically helps to justify the choice of translation strategy, the establishment of interpretation principles in dictionaries, and editorial normative decisions. In the future, it is advisable to cover the manifestation of realities and barbarisms in oral speech, social network discourse, and professional communication on a corpus basis, and to monitor the dynamics of their normalization over time.

References

1. Vinogradov V. S. Perevod: obshchie i leksicheskie voprosy. Moskva: Knizhnyy dom «LIBROKOM», 2010. 240 s.
2. Vlahov S., Florin S. Neperevodimoe v perevode. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 1980. 352 s.
3. Rahmatullaev Sh. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent: Universitet, 2006. 320 b.
4. Abdurahmonov G‘., Shukurov Sh. O‘zbek tilining leksikologiyasi. Toshkent: O‘qituvchi, 1996. 256 b.
5. Rozental D. E., Golub I. B., Telenkova M. A. Sovremennyy russkiy yazyk: leksika i frazeologiya. Moskva: Ayris-Press, 2012. 384 s.
6. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. London: Prentice Hall, 1988. 292 p.
7. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge, 2011. 352 p.
8. Wierzbicka A. Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. 328 p.