On the Matter of Lexico-Semantic Relativity and Intercultural Versatility in Translation

A M Antonova

Doctor of Philology, Professor, Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Russian Federation

Sh R Hakimova

PhD, Gulistan State University, Republic of Uzbekistan

B G Mammadova

PhD, Azerbaijan University of Languages, Republic of Azerbaijan

Abstract

The aim of the article is to discuss translation regularities in correlations of words that denote culture-related phenomena that exist in many cultures or that are specific to certain cultures and languages. The focus is on Russian and English culturonyms. The authors dwell on the principle of functional dualism that claims that language can equally address internal and external cultures. This principle is developed in the new linguistic discipline termed "*interlinguoculturology*" (Kabakchi & Beloglazova 2020). Nonetheless, under the impact of the *World Englishes* paradigm, the article points to blurring the concept of "external culture" – Russian bilinguals, speaking or writing in Russian English, use this variety for expressing their own culture; the same is true for other *World Englishes* that have branched from the prototypical British English model. Despite the polemical relations of the two research schools, which are close and yet different in some of their tenets, there is much in common in their semantic and pragmatic research of how varieties of English adapt and domesticate culturonyms, in particular binary words belonging to two languages and often associated with each other in translation. The paper discusses examples of *binary polyonyms* ("*universal*" culturonyms) whose meaning depends on the context of the situation and, therefore, is differently received in diverse cultures; *binary analogues* whose equivalent selection is based on scrutinizing the dictionary entry and on the knowledge of the cultural background, and *binary interonyms* that partly help translators and partly interfere with their work, being deceptive cognates differing in their referential or connotational meanings. The article concludes that the interpretation of culture-bound words in foreign-culture-oriented texts depends on various pragmatic and semantic processes and is grounded in a word semantic flexibility and its matter-of-course adaptation in a cultural and language environment.

Introduction

In the last quarter of the twentieth century the era of "globalization" began (Kabakci, Yuzefovich 2007: 115) with the dominance of the English language. The focus of many linguists was the numerous variants of the English language in different parts of the globe, which received the name *World Englishes*, which at first seemed ungrammatical (the first mention in scientific discourse was in an article by B. Kachru (Kachru 1980).

Corresponding author:
Angelique M. Antonova, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, 48 Moika River, Saint Petersburg 191186, Russian Federation. Email: angelique_antonova@gmail.com

Later it became established in the corresponding name of the journal published by the publishing house Wiley-Blackwell and became the mouthpiece of a new theoretical paradigm, called contact variantology of the English language in Russia (Proshina 2017). Trumpism in the USA in the middle of the second decade of the 21st century has dramatically changed the situation in the world, which has turned from monopolar to multipolar, and now seems prophetic. words spoken at a Tokyo symposium in the third quarter of the twentieth century: "Perhaps in the next two centuries, the greatest challenge for humanity will be the preservation of cultural diversity and even the optimal degree of isolation in the face of the threat of incredible pressure from a world "*superculture*" built on a scientific basis" (" It may be that the greatest problem of the human race in the next two hundred years will be the preservation of variety of culture and even of the optimum degree of isolation, in the face of the enormous pressures of the science-based world *'superculture'* " (Boulding 1976: i). Contact variantology, as time has shown, has much in common with the theory of interlinguoculturology that arose in our country (Kabakchi, Beloglazova 2020), both concepts turned out to be in demand. However, there are significant differences between the two paradigms (Proshina 2018), which made this article controversial. The purpose of this work was the desire to show some patterns of comparative linguoculturology, lexicology and translation studies in the combined framework of the two above-mentioned paradigms, which is of particular importance for the practice of translation and intercultural communication.

Functional dualism of language: its primary and secondary cultural orientation

As empires fell apart, the peoples of the world became aware of the need to use English (and other leading languages of international communication) in connection with their cultures to reach a wider audience. The orientation of these languages towards foreign culture has become relevant. The most popular use of this function was the English language as a language of global communication (Crystal 1997), or lingua franca (Seidlhofer 2011). The Soviet Union also collapsed, the position of the Russian language weakened, Russian culture began to be spoken and written in the global lingua franca, which aroused interest in the theory and practice of the English-language description of Russian culture. (Russian-Culture-Oriented English, RCOE), which became the main object of study of interlinguoculturology and attracted the attention of researchers of the Russian variety of English within the framework of contact variantology (Proshina & Eddy 2016).

Linguists of the past exaggerated the uniqueness of language. Thus, according to W. Humboldt, "...each language describes a circle around the people to which it belongs, from which a person is given the opportunity to leave only insofar as he immediately enters the circle of another language" (Humboldt 1984: 80). L. Wittgenstein echoes him: "The fact that the world is my world is manifested in the fact that the boundaries of language (the only language that I understand) mean the boundaries of my world" (Wittgenstein 1958: 81).

Meanwhile, in a multilingual world, not a single language, especially of a politically active people, can be confined to its own ("*internal*") culture, but is forced to turn to foreign ("*external*") cultures earthly community. In other words, we are dealing with the "*functional dualism of language*", with its two-way cultural orientation: depending on the communicative situation, language switches from the world of internal culture to the foreign world of external cultures. Naturally, historically, with all its development, a language is oriented towards its own internal culture.

Vocabulary and its cultural orientation

The world around us is made up of millions of different objects, animate and inanimate, connections between them and processes. They are fixed in the language, first of all, thanks to words. "There are as many meanings in a certain continuum as there are divisions in it that are essential for human practice. And these meanings are as discrete as the discretization of the corresponding section of the denotative sphere is significant and practiced in experience" (Nikitin 1996: 207). In the field of view of an educated person, according to linguists, there is only part of the vocabulary of a language, while domestic scientists claim that the average person has about 50 thousand words in his vocabulary (Panov 2007), and foreign researchers insist on an even smaller figure: " …it is not likely that most English speakers know more than 20–30,000, or about the number of words available to most human beings in any language". This relatively insignificant set of names for the elements of the world around us actually (judging by linguistic practice) turns out to be sufficient to describe it.

Words are divided into classes, each of which performs a specific communicative function. To name elements of the surrounding reality, a noun is first used. Description of culture is impossible without using the names of cultural elements. At the same time, a significant part of the vocabulary is neutral in relation to the cultural orientation of the text. First of all, such words should include auxiliary parts of speech (prepositions, conjunctions, articles). This group also includes those significant parts of speech that are not names of specific cultural elements and can equally participate in the description of the most diverse cultures of the peoples of the world - pronouns, adverbs, numerals, most adjectives, verbs and a significant part of nouns. These are, for example, the English words back, large, they, nine, to dance, cold, happiness.

We call the names of cultural elements "*culturonyms*", which we divide into *polyonyms* and *idioculturonyms*.

Polyonyms include nouns and substantive phrases that act as a designation for such elements of the world around us that are represented in all or most of the currently existing cultures of the peoples of the world (for example, television, housing, peace). These are universal cultural names that appear in various cultures as a result of centripetal processes in the development of earthly civilization.

Idioculturonyms are specific names for elements of cultures. In interlinguoculturology, this class of words is further divided into idionyms - original, "own", names of specific elements of internal cultures and xenonyms - foreign language, "alien" idiocultural names, translated versions of idionyms. Idioms are the result of the primary verbalization of the cultural continuum, while xenonyms are the result of its secondary verbalization. Let's compare two groups of cultural names using the Russian and English languages.

I. Idioms: (1) Russian language: *царь, казак, степь, старовер*; (2) English language: *lord, House of Commons, Church of England, pub*. II. Xenonyms: (1) Russian language: *лорд, палата общин, Англиканская церковь, паб*; (2) English language: *tsar, Cossack, steppe, Old Believer*.

However, in contact variantology, which recognizes the fact of differentiation of the pluricentric English language into variants that belong not to the British (primary) but to their own cultures, this division of idiocultural names raises many questions, the main one of which is the following: how can one assume that the English language of later variants does not express them? native, but primary (British) culture, if it has absorbed contacting elements of the indigenous population, which have become an integral part of the vocabulary of this variant, but alien to British culture? Isn't this division of cultural names a manifestation of "native speakerism" (Holliday 2006)? After all, today the English language belongs not only to the British and represents not only national, but also regional variants.

For the British, the American word cowboy and the Australian kangaroo are not elements of their culture and, accordingly, cannot be considered idioms, while for English-speaking Americans and English-speaking Australians these are, of course, elements of their native (internal) culture. Similarly, for English-speaking Indians, the words *sari, masala chai, pandit*, etc. are words of their native culture, and for many Indians they are even words of their native language, therefore they cannot be considered xenonyms for the Indian version of the English language. Likewise, those who use English as their "*functional native language*" (Kachru 1998, Smith 2016), that is, acquired but mastered to a high degree of linguistic competence, consider it a secondary means of expressing their native culture, but not "*alien*", so there is doubt that for the Russian version of the English language the words *tsar, Cossack, steppe, Old Believer* are "*alien*" nominations, or xenonyms.

The dilemma of availability and adequacy

Even if we do not divide idiocultural names into "*us*" and "*strangers*," many studies confirm the specificity of the use of language in orientation not only to one's own, but also to the culture of other countries: "The use of a non-native language in the contexts of the native culture to denote new themes, characters and situations is akin to reformulating the semantic and semiotic potential of a language, which causes it to express the meaning of something that is not part of its traditional 'meaning'" ("Using a non-native language in native contexts to portray new themes, characters, and situations is like redefining the semantic and semiotic potential of a language, making language mean something which is not part of its traditional 'meaning'" (Kachru 1992: 316–317).

The main problem of the English-language description of Russian culture turned out to be achieving a reasonable compromise between the accuracy of the text and its accessibility.

Accuracy of description, as studies have shown, is achieved (including) by directly introducing transliterated Russianisms into the text (Kabakchi, Yuzefovich 2007). Filling the text of a foreign language description with incomprehensible borrowings makes it difficult to access for the uninitiated: "Not Do svidania but Proshchai – this is a final parting – never again shall I see these hills" (Pray 2019: 11). Compare a similar impression from the Russian text, which is replete with English borrowings in an outdated and seemingly distorted form today: За кофеем Александр Иванович [Герцен] читал «Теймс», делал свои замечания и сообщал нам разные новости. … Во втором часу в столовой был приготовлен завтрак (*lunch*), который состоял из двух блюд: почти всегда из холодного мяса и еще чего-нибудь из остатков вчерашнего обеда. На столе стояли кружка pal al (should be, *"pale ale" – "светлого пива".* – Авт.) и бутылка красного вина или хереса. Герцен очень любил pal al и пил его ежедневно (Романов 2009: 135).

Of course, you can minimize the presence of borrowings in the text, but this reduces the accuracy of the description. It is enough to compare the original proposal with its simplified version: *The young Peter had a wet-nurse (kormilitsa), nurse (mama), and nanny (niania) (Hughes 1998: 195). => The young Peter had a wet-nurse, nurse, and nanny.*

With the omission of Russian realities, the text became extremely simple, however, losing its accuracy. In the first case, a specialist, or at least an inquisitive reader, can restore the original spelling of words and go to Russian-language sources. The simplified version gives only an approximate idea of the culture being described.

In the last example, we were convinced that simplifying the text is achieved at the cost of a significant loss of accuracy. According to V.P. Berkova, "...in general, during translation there is always a loss of information, and therefore, when comparing two different equivalents for the same word in another language, we must in a certain way assess the degree of information loss in each of them" (Berkov 1977: 49).

Analysis of the texts shows that in the overwhelming majority of cases they are filled with "polyonymic" vocabulary familiar to the reader. Just look at the following excerpt of the original text: Dr. Pnin nimbly walked into the passage, voiced a query, received a quiet answer, and returned with his son Timofei, a thirteen-year-old gimnazist (classical school pupil) in his gimnazichesky uniform – black blouse, black pants, shiny black belt (I attended a more liberal school where we wore what we liked). Do I really remember his crew cut, his puffy pale face, his red ears? Yes, distinctly. I even remember the way he imperceptibly removed his shoulder from under the proud paternal hand, while the proud paternal voice was saying: 'This boy has just got a Five (A+) in the Algebra examination' (Nabokov 1990: 130).

A number of realities are present: the name of the hero of the novel (Timofei, Pnin); Russianism "gimnazist" is explained in parallel, and in the case of Russianism "gimnazichesky" the author believes that the reader will understand this adjective, especially taking into account the existence of the word 'gymnasium', which already has a new meaning: (1) a room or building equipped for gymnastics ; (2) a school in Germany or Scandinavia that prepares pupils for university entrance (OEED). However, the overwhelming majority of words are familiar to the English-speaking reader and are perceived in the meaning well known to them (black blouse, black pants, shiny black belt, a liberal school). You should also pay attention to the explanation of the "5" rating using the American equivalent: "a Five (A+)".

Polyonymic vocabulary, which is the action of centripetal processes in the development of earthly civilization, is characterized by flexibility and the ability to adapt in accordance with the communicative situation. "...It is impossible to indicate with complete certainty how many meanings a word has and what meanings they are, so as to predetermine all possible speech actualizations of the word," M. V. Nikitin rightly argued (Nikitin 1983: 23–24). In this case, the linguist only supports the traditional point of view: "Cases of complete coincidence of lexical units of different languages in the entire scope of their referential meaning are relatively rare" (Barkhudarov 1975: 75).

In this case, foreign translation scholars talk about directional equivalence, opposed to natural equivalence in that the first represents asymmetrical and contextually dependent relationships in the source and target texts and does not always allow equivalent reversibility of translation in the other direction, while as the second exists even before the translation process begins and has a fairly rigid equivalent (Pym 2010: 7, 26). However, as Anthony Pym notes, natural equivalence is rather an ideal relationship between the source and target words and is rarely found in a real translation situation.

The principle of linguistic economy and binaries as lexical interlingual pairs

Intercultural communication occurs in conditions of bilingualism or even multilingualism, and this in many respects is determined by the factor of economy of linguistic means, as H. Paul already pointed out: "In general, language activity is characterized by a certain tendency towards frugality" (Paul 1960: 372). According to André Martinet, in the course of communication people prefer the path of least resistance (Martinet 1963: 532).

A. Martinet described the economy of speech effort called a linguistic law at the phonetic level, but in reality, this law manifests itself at all levels of the language structure, including lexical-semantic, especially in speech activity and, of course, in translation.

Description of a foreign language culture is a search for the optimal translation of a Russian cultural name. In this case, a comparison of cultural names is carried out at the interlingual level. Language practice selects the most popular (although not always adequate) translation options, and lexicographers consolidate this in bilingual dictionaries in the form of pairs of translation correspondence, which we call "binaries" ("binary lexical interlingual pairs", bilingual cultural substitutes) (Kabakchi, Beloglazova 2020: 26), i.e. interlingual pairs of lexical units that are regularly mechanically associated with each other during intercultural contacts during the translation process. However, dictionary correspondences cannot in any way be considered as interlingual equivalence.

In the practice of intercultural contacts, binaries can be both sufficiently adequate (let's call them "working") options for translating cultural names, and those pitfalls (such as "false friends of the translator") that a specialist so often stumbles upon. According to H. Paul: "When the meaning of a foreign word coincides with the meaning of a word in their native language, but only partially, we are often inclined to attribute to the foreign word the full amount of meaning that the native word has. As is known, this error is one of the most common in translation exercises" (Paul 1960: 470–471).

Characterizing the search for translation correspondences, which constitutes "semantic translation engineering" (Burak 2010: 141), A.L. Burak identified several levels of translation correlates:
1) close approximations: *монтировка – a tire iron*;
2) adequate approximation, near equivalents: *кинуть кого-то – to stiff sb*;
3) functional communicative analogues: *авось – blind trust in sheer luck / divine providence / faith in serendipity*;
4) translation by paraphrase (interpretations or translation through definitions): *голубой огонёк – a popular New Year's Eve TV show*;
5) loan translations, calques: *новые русские – new Russians*;
6) transcriptions-transliterations: *Дума – the Duma, крыша – krisha*;
7) untranslatable loans (transplantations): *VISA, Windows* (Бурак 2010: 141–142).

There are various types of binaries, which, depending on the specific communication situation, influence to a greater or lesser extent the perception of the text describing a foreign language culture. These binaries can be of two types: heterogeneous, i.e. having no common etymology (*улица / street*) and homogeneous, going back to a common foreign language source (*армия / army*).

Heterogeneous binaries

Let's consider the proposal: "It appears that he climbed into a window over in the house and got upstairs, but was discovered before he stole anything". From the point of view of cultural orientation, this proposal appears to be cosmopolitan, since nothing in it indicates any specific culture.

The culturonyms *'window'* and *'house'* can be considered as polyonyms. At the same time, it is obvious that these cultural names will change their meaning once they find themselves in a specific culturally oriented context. The word *'window'* refers to an element of the wall of a house, which has different shapes and different sizes depending on the country and climate. The word *'house'* also denotes different types of buildings, differing in shape, height, functions - it can refer to both residential premises and official and functional buildings. The noun 'upstairs' in association with home may refer to the second floor of a typical American home, where the bedrooms are usually located, which then begs the question: what was the thief doing in the bedroom? The same word can refer to the attic of an ordinary Russian village house, which adds even more intrigue to the situation being described: were some treasures stored in the attic? To adequately perceive the text, knowledge of the culture and historical era is necessary. Depending on the communication situation, the polyonyms '*window*', '*house*' and '*upstairs*' are filled with different content, adapting it to suit this situation.

Now let's change this sentence a little and see how it sounds in the original: "It appears that he climbed into a window over in Churin's house and got upstairs, but was discovered before he stole anything" (Pray 2019: 45). This is a line from the collection of letters of the American Eleanor Pray, who lived for many years in pre-revolutionary Vladivostok. The introduction of the proper name "*Churin*" into sentences will immediately tell a lot to a person familiar with the history of the Far East: Churin's company was known for its large trading houses not only in Vladivostok, Khabarovsk and other cities of Eastern Siberia and the Far East, but also in China (one of the symbols Harbin is still ("Qiulin lieba" – "Чуринский хлеб"). Since the action takes place in Vladivostok, it becomes clear that through the window the thief entered the department store, as we would call it now, and went up to the top floor, where he was caught. Consequently, only the context of the situation fills polyonyms with specific content, which, like semantic chameleons, adapt to the situation, realizing their lexical meaning.

Thus, we see that the universal nature of the language, which allows us to address any topic, is based on the extraordinary flexibility of the semantics of lexical units, which, in principle, within the limits of a rather limited vocabulary, an ordinary person has at his disposal. However, it is precisely this flexibility that poses the danger of distorted perception of the original information.

Translation practice brings together cultural names that are far from equivalent into interlingual pairs and consolidates this with bilingual dictionaries.

(1) For example: "*деревня" / "village*"

Popular fairy tale by P.P. Ershov «Конёк-Горбунок» opens in a good English translation with the words: "Past the woods and mountains steep, / Past the rolling waters deep, / You will find a hamlet pleasant / Where once dwelt an aged peasant" (Yershov 1988: URL). In original: «Жил старик в одном селе». «Село» – is a large populated place, why did the translator choose not the usual dictionary correspondence, 'village', but the word 'hamlet'? Let's turn to dictionaries and directly to practice: hamlet: a very small village; e.g.: Both lived in Coahoma, a hamlet of about 1,200 residents 10 miles to the east of Big Spring [LDCE].

As we can see, the scale of determining the size of a settlement is not Russian. On the one hand, hamlet is, according to the dictionary, a very small village, but, on the other hand, according to the example, about 1200 inhabitants can live in it. Other British dictionaries (OALD, CIDE) add: "usually without a church" – "обычно без церкви".

Let us now turn to the word "village": village: "a group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, esp. in a rural area" (OEED). Wikipedia even gives approximate population figures, which certainly do not correspond to our ideas about the Russian village: "A village is a clustered human settlement or community, larger than a hamlet but smaller than a town, with a population ranging from a few hundred to a few thousand" (Wikipedia: village). Those. 'village' for English is a small, but still a city. It is significant that Hedrick Smith, in his book about Brezhnev's Soviet Union, uses the word 'hamlet' in his application to our village: The snowbound hamlets with their weatherbeaten, smoking peasant izbas, floated past like unconnected islands, seemingly uninhabited in the sea of snow (Smith 1976: 409).

(2) *"обед" / "dinner"*

Significant distortions in the perception of the English-language description of Russian culture are introduced by this pair of factual analogues, and not equivalents. In English, the word 'dinner', like 'to dine', describes a meal often taken outside the home and in the late afternoon: 'the main meal of the day, eaten in the middle of the day or the evening' (LDCE). Foreigners, when describing Russia, usually emphasize this: Most people had gone home: the Russians normally dined at two but it was not unusual for Bobrov to be in his office this late, since he often dined in the fashionable English quarters, where they liked to eat at five. (Rutherford 1992: 534). Cf.: The delegation has decided to have dinner at seven o'clock – American style ... (Wilson 1961: 55).

Homogeneous binaries-interonyms

Interlingual lexical-semantic binaries, close not only in meaning, but also in form, are naturally associated with each other, and at first glance it seems that they are the first to be combined into binaries. They have a common origin and exist in many languages, and therefore are called internationalisms.

According to the authoritative "Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary" (ЛЭС), internationalisms are "words that coincide in their external form (taking into account the natural correspondences of sounds and graphic units in specific languages), with a fully or partially coinciding meaning, expressing concepts of an international nature from the field of science and technology, politics, culture, art and functioning in different, primarily unrelated (at least three) languages. ...The proportion of internationalisms in a number of languages is quite large (for example, in the active dictionary of Russian, English, German, French there are more than 10% of them" (Belchikov 1990: 197).

The Russian language is surprisingly tolerant of foreign borrowings from Western European languages and has accumulated a significant number of them in its arsenal. In recent decades, many words entering the Russian language come from English - for example, the dictionary of anglicisms by A.I. Dyakov (2014) includes about 20,000 words, most of which are words of international circulation. Through the English language, a certain number of words of East Asian origin came into Russian - this path of borrowing is called indirect, and the borrowings themselves are called indirect borrowings (Proshina 2020). Internationalisms of Russian origin also exist in the English language, due precisely to the global nature of which the words of the Russian language are often spread and consolidated in other languages - for example, *"интеллигенция" – "intelligentsia", "тундра" - "tundra", "степь" – "steppe", "водка" – "vodka"*.

At the same time, the term "internationalism" has such wide application as a socio-political term that it seems inappropriate to use it as a linguistic term to denote the lexical type of a word. Therefore, we prefer to use the term proposed by Svadost: "*interonym*" (Svadost 1968: 48). The apparent similarity of interonyms does not always guarantee their interlingual equivalence. Linguists are well aware that a foreign word, once in a new language, begins to undergo assimilation and acquires new meanings.

Several types of interonym binaries should be distinguished.

Close interonyms: *"университет" / "university"*
These are "classical" interonyms that have a common origin and coincide in their basic meanings. They really help significantly in intercultural communication. Examples of such interonyms are army, globalization, demarcation, discrimination, ideology, crisis, modernization, rationalization, revolution, recession, socialist, function, excavator, escalator, escalation and many others. In cultures with a Latin alphabet, interonyms may have spelling and pronunciation differences, compare: *армия – army [англ.] – armée* [фр.] – *Armee* [нем.]; *фотография – photography* [англ.] – *photographie* [фр.] – *fotografia* [исп.] – *Photographie* [нем.]. Through the Latinization of Eastern words, interonyms of Chinese, Japanese and Korean origin also began to appear in Western European languages.: *feng shui* (англ., фр.) – *Feng Shui* (нем.) – *фэн-шуй*; *karate – karaté* (фр.) – *Karate* (нем.) – *каратэ*, *kimchi* (англ., фр.) – *Kimchi* (нем.) – *кимчи*.

However, some of them, having transformed the meaning in Russian discourse, manifest a new meaning in English, as happened, for example, with the word *kimono*: in Russian everyday discourse it began to mean «свободный халат с цельнокроенным рукавом»: "Aunt Galya appeared in my doorway almost every night, holding her faded silk robe over her large breasts. Her robe used to be a kimono, but she had holes on one side and sewn buttons on the other" (Vapnyar 2003: 128). "I'd never seen this pot before. Aunt Galya must have borrowed it from a neighbor, along with the green apron that was tied over her 'kimono'" (p. 133). Once in foreign language discourse, the word reoriented its meaning from exotic to everyday, using the distant similarity of the object with the form of its primary denotation.

Ideological interonyms: *"демократия" / "democracy"*
It is known that it is around interonyms like демократия/democracy, либерал/liberal, национальный/national, etc. the most heated debates are underway, since these words are ambiguously understood by supporters of different ideologies and thereby acquire different connotations: e.g., *Demokratizatsiya* – another troublesome word because it does not mean the same thing as its English equivalent – democratization (Canadian Tribune 29.02.1988). It is no coincidence that such interonyms are often put in quotation marks, thereby making it clear to the reader that the author distances himself from the interpretation of this word as interpreted by opponents: e.g., After 1957 the terms "*revisionism*" and "*dogmatism*" became an integral part of Communist discourse. They were applied in a variety of meanings (Encyclopedia Britannica 2001).

Localoids: *"такси" / "taxi"*
Localoids are borrowed words that have returned to the original language in a spelling that reflects the pronunciation of the language that adopted them. These kinds of interonyms differ in their spelling, since they correlate in languages with different writing systems: *бизнес – biznes – business*. Localoid can facilitate memorization of a foreign word, and therefore intercultural contact itself: You will be greeted by eager gypsy cab drivers shouting "*Taksi*! *Taksi*!" (Fodor 1999: 109). This type of interonym is used in official documents for the accuracy of reverse translation and understanding in the original culture, for example, when transmitting an address, station, etc.: *Lomonosovskiy Prospekt, Metro Universitet*. Localoids may indicate the unique meaning of this word in a foreign culture: The country was flooded with western culture, turning Russians into "*biznesmen*" overnight (Guardian 07 Feb 2003).

Interonyms – "false friends": *"магазин" / "magazine"*
Of course, we cannot fail to mention the so-called "false friends of the translator." Increased interest in this translation phenomenon was observed in the 1960s, and in the USSR it was associated primarily with the works of V.V. Akulenko. In particular, one can name the English-Russian and Russian-English dictionary of "false friends of the translator," created under his leadership in 1969, which included his article on "false friends" (Akulenko 1969). To false cognates (Newmark 1988), as sometimes are called "false friends of the translator", have returned most recently due to the unprecedented scale of learning English as a second or foreign language, which inevitably confronts language learners with the problem of "false friends". These words have already begun to be included in educational dictionaries, for example, the Cambridge International Dictionary of English.

Conclusion

The foregoing allows us to conclude that the perception of a foreign language description of a culture is largely subject to subjective factors of semantic adaptation of the vocabulary of the language of description in the process of its reorientation towards a foreign language culture in combination with the stereotype of this culture, supported by society and the individuality of the addressee of the information. It is still necessary to study the combination of diverse factors that influence the addressee who begins to study the English-language description of Russian (or any other) culture. The interpretation of words, even those seemingly present in the source and host cultures, is subject to different pragmatic and semantic processes. The fact of the inevitable adaptation of the word in a new cultural and linguistic environment remains indisputable. Linguists, translators, and language users must be attentive to the manifestations of such adaptation, as well as to the dynamics of language change, for, as Lynn Visson rightly argues, "the use of any innovation in a language depends largely on the tone and precise stylistic context. The incorrect use of a foreign word can lead to curiosities, misunderstandings and misunderstandings, and sometimes even to offense, or cause laughter among listeners" (Visson 2010: 18).

Cultural-pragmatic adaptation, which is the result of a collision of "two opposite vectors - cultural unification, on the one hand, and a kind of cultural nationalism, on the other" (Pavlovskaya 2020: 9) leads to misunderstanding and even intercultural conflicts. It is precisely to solve these kinds of problems that the efforts of researchers in interlinguoculturology and contact variantology, new disciplines developing in an interdisciplinary direction, are aimed.

Funding

References

Boulding, Kenneth E. 1976. Foreword. In John C. Condon & Mitsuko Saito. Communicating Across Cultures for What? A Symposium on humane responsibility in intercultural communication, i-iii. Tokyo: Simul Press.

Burak, Alexander L. 2010. Translating Culture. Moscow: R. Valent.

Crystal, David. 1997. English as a Global Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1966. Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Holliday, Adrian. 2006. Native Speakerism. ELT Journal 60 (4). 385–387.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1984. Selected Works in Linguistics. Moscow: Progress.

Kabakchi, Victor V. & Elena V. Beloglazova. 2020. Introduction to Interlinguoculturology. Moscow: Yurait.

Kabakchi, Victor V. & Natalia G. Yuzefovich. 2007. Transliteration of Russianisms in the English language description of the Russian culture: Dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the search for Russian loan transliteration. The Humanities and Social Sciences in the Far East 15 (3). 115–124].

Kachru, Braj B. 1980. The new Englishes and old dictionaries: Directions in lexicographical research on non-native varieties of English. In L. Zgusta (ed.), Theory and Method in Lexicography: Western and non-Western perspectives, 71–101. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.

Kachru, Braj B. 1992. Meaning in deviation: Toward Understanding Non-Native English Texts. In Braj B. Kachru (ed.), The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures. 2nd edn, 301-326. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, Braj B. 1998. English is an Asian language. Links and Letters 5. 89-108.

Martinet, André. 1963. Fundamentals of General Linguistics. 366–566. Part 3. Moscow: Progress.

McCaughey, Kevin. 2005. The kasha syndrome: English language teaching in Russia. World Englishes 24 (4). 455–459.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. A Textbook of Translation. New York a.o.: Prentice Hall.

Paul, Hermann. 1960. Principles of the History of Language. Moscow: Foreign Literature Publ.

Proshina, Zoya G. & Anna A. Eddy (eds.). 2016. Russian English: History, Functions, and Features. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pym, Anthony. 2010. Exploring Translation Theories. London & New York: Routledge.

Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2011. Understanding English as a Lingua Franca. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Larry E. 2008. Familiar issues from a World Englishes perspective. Вестник РУДН. Сер. Вопросы образования: Языки и специальность. 2016. № 1. С. 14–18. [Bulletin of the Russian University of Peoples' Friendship. Series: Education Issues: Languages and Speciality 1. 2016, 14–18].

Svadost, Ehrmar P. 1968. How does a worldwide language emerge? Moscow: Nauka.

Visson, Lynn. 2010. Chameleon Words and Metamorphoses in Modern English. Moscow: R. Valent.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1958. Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus. Moscow: Foreign Literature Publ.

Акуленко В.В. О «ложных друзьях переводчика» // Англо-русский и русско-английский словарь «ложных друзей переводчика». М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1969. С. 371–384. [Akulenko, Valerii V. 1969. O "lozhnykh druz'yakh perevodchika" (On 'translator's false friends"). Moscow: Sovetskaya Ehntsiklopediya. P. 371–384.].

Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод (Вопросы общей и частной теории перевода). М.: Международные отношения, 1975. 240 с. [Barkhudarov, Leonid S. 1975. Yazyk i perevod: Voprosy obshchei i chastnoi teorii perevoda (Language and Translation: Issues of General and Specific Translation Studies). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya].

Бельчиков Ю.А. Интернационализмы // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. М.: Советская Энциклопедия, 1990. С. 197. [Bel'chikov, Yurii A. 1990. Internatsionalizmy (Internationalisms). Lingvisticheskii ehntsiklopedicheskii slovar' (Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary), 197. Moscow: Sovetskaya Ehntsiklopediya].

Берков В.П. Слово в двуязычном словаре. Таллин: Валгус, 1977. 140 с. [Berkov, Valerii P. 1977. Slovo v dvuyazychnom slovare (A Word in a Bilingual Dictionary). Tallin: Valgus.]

Никитин М.В. Курс лингвистической семантики. СПб.: Науч. Центр проблем диалога, 1996. 760 с. [Nikitin, Mikhail V. 1996. Kurs lingvisticheskoi semantiki (Course in Linguistic Semantics). Saint Petersburg: Research Center for Dialogue].

Никитин М.В. Лексическое значение слова: Структура и комбинаторика. М.: Высшая школа 1983. 127 с. [Nikitin, Mikhail V. 1983. Leksicheskoe znachenie slova: Struktura I kombinatorika (Lexical Meaning of a Word: Structure and Combinations). Moscow: Vysshaya shkola].

Павловская А.В. Глобальное vs региональное: к вопросу о проблемах межкультурной коммуникации в глобальном мире // Вестник Московского ун-та. Сер. 19. Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. 2020. № 1. С. 9–21. [Pavlovskaya, Anna V. 2020. Global'noe vs regional'noe: K voprosu o problemakh mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii v global'nom mire (On challenges of intercultural communication in the global world). Moscow University Bulletin. Series 19. Linguistics and Intercultural Communication 1. 9–21].

Прошина З.Г. Интерлингвокультурология и контактная вариантология английского языка // Лингвистика в эпоху глобанглизации: Сб. статей к юбилею В.В. Кабакчи. СПб.: Изд-во СПбГЭУ, 2018. С. 86–93. [Proshina, Zoya G. 2018. Interlingvokul'turologiya i kontaktnaya variantologiya angliiskogo yazyka (Interlinguoculturology and the World Englishes Paradigm). Lingvistika v ehpokhu globanglizatsii: Sbornik statei k yubileyu V.V. Kabakchi (Linguistics in the epoch of globanglization: Collection of articles dedicated to Victor V. Kabakchi), 86–93. Saint Petersburg: SPb State University of Economics].

Прошина З.Г. Контактная вариантология английского языка. Проблемы теории. World Englishes Paradigm. М.: Флинта: Наука, 2017. 208 с. [Proshina, Zoya G. 2017. Kontaktnaya variantologiya angliiskogo yazyka. Problemy teorii. (World Englishes Paradigm. Theoretical Issues.) Moscow: Flinta: Nauka].

Прошина З.Г. Межкультурная коммуникация: Английский язык и культура народов Восточной Азии. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. М.: Юрайт, 2020. 399 с. [Proshina, Zoya G. 2020. Mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya: Angliiskii yazyk i kul'tura narodov Vostochnoi Azii. (Intercultural Communication: English and Culture of East Asia). 2nd edn., revised. Moscow: Yurait].

Dictionaries

CED – Cambridge English Dictionary. 2020. URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/ru/словарь (13.07.2020).

CIDE – Cambridge International Dictionary of English. 1995. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LDCE – Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 4th edn. London: Pearson Education, 2006. URL: https://www.ldoceonline.com

OALD – Oxford Advanced Learner's Encyclopedic Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. URL: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com

OEED – Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary / J.M.Hawkins, R.Allen (eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Дьяков А.И. Словарь англицизмов русского языка. Новосибирск, 2014. URL: http://anglicismdictionary.ru/ (дата вхождения 17 июня 2020). [D'yakov, Anatolii I. 2014. Slovar' anglitsizmov russkogo yazyka (Dictionary of Anglicisms in the Russian Language). Novosibirsk. URL: http://anglicismdictionary.ru/ (accessed 17 June 2020)].

ЛЭС – Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / Под ред. В.Н. Ярцевой. М.: Советская Энциклопедия, 1990. 685 с. [Victoria N. Yartseva (ed.). 1990. Lingvisticheskii ehntsiklopedicheskii slovar' (Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary). Moscow: Sovetskaya Ehntsiklopediya]

Texts

(The) Guardian, 07 Feb. 2003.

Canadian Tribune. 1988. 29.02.

Fodor's Moscow and St. Petersburg. 4th edn. Fodor's Travel Publications, 1999.

Hughes, Lindsey. 1998. Russia in the Age of Peter the Great. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nabokov V. 1990. Selected Prose and Verse. Moscow: Raduga.

Pray, Eleanor Lord. 2019. Selected Letters. 1907-1917. Edited, with introductions and notes by Birgitta Ingemanson. Vladivostok: Rubezh.

Smith, Hendrick. 1976. The Russians. London: Sphere Books, 1976.

Vapnyar, Lara. 2003. There Are Jews in My House: Stories. New York: Anchor Books.

Wilson, Mitchell. 1961. Meeting at a Far Meridian. New York: Doubleday.

Yershov, Pavel. 1988. The Little Humpbacked Horse. Tr. by Louis Zellikoff. Moscow: Raduga, 1988. Available at: http://lib.ru/LITRA/ERSHOW/horse.txt (accessed 07 July 2020).

Романов С.К. Русский Лондон. М.: АСТ: Астрель, 2009. 480 с. [Romanov, S.K. 2009. Russkii London. (Russian London). Moscow: AST: Astrel'].

Author biographies

Angelique M. Antonova, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Russian Federation

Shohista R Hakimova, PhD, Gulistan State University, Republic of Uzbekistan.

Banovsha G. Mammadova, PhD. Azerbaijan University of Languages, Republic of Azerbaijan.