ARTICLE

Linguistic Nature of Ethnocultural Norms formed by the Lexical-Semantic Approach

Dinara Orynbayeva [1], Mereke Atabayeva [1], Yerkinbek Turgunov [2] , Zhanar Abitova [3]*

[1]Department of Language and Linguistics, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty 050010, Kazakhstan
[2]Department of Language and Linguistics, Research Fellow Eurasian Research Institute, Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan 161200, Kazakhstan
[3]Department of Philology, Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University, Kyzylorda 120000, Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

Language plays a crucial role in intercultural communication, especially when it comes to nationally marked vocabulary and phraseology. These linguistic elements often contain meanings that are difficult to fully translate, yet they provide valuable insights into a nation's cultural and historical background. Like a mirror, they reflect the history, settlement, and development of a people, making them an essential area of study not only for linguists but also for historians, ethnographers, and geographers. Idioms, as a fundamental part of any language, also serve as a rich repository of cultural heritage, encapsulating centuries of traditions and ways of life. Their study helps deepen our understanding of both language and culture. The concept of "realities"—words that convey tangible and culturally specific elements—emerged in linguistic discussions around the 1950s. These terms capture unique aspects of a nation's material culture, historical events, governmental institutions, folklore figures, and mythological beings. Similarly, non-equivalent words refer to concepts that do not exist in other languages and therefore lack direct translations. These words highlight the uniqueness of each culture's worldview and emphasize the importance of studying language as a bridge to understanding different societies and their distinct identities.

Keywords: Ethnocultural Vocabulary; Realities; Toponyms; Idioms; Transcription; Transliteration; Tracing

1. Introduction

Scholars from various disciplines, not just linguists, have long been fascinated by the deep connection between culture and the way information is embedded, preserved, and communicated through language. The traditions, customs, and artistic expressions of a society inevitably find their way into its language, making language a mirror of national culture. It carries the unique cultural identity of a people, encoding their history, values, and worldview. Certain words and expressions hold a special cultural significance, reflecting this deep connection between language and culture. These include realia, personal names (anthroponyms), place names (toponyms), ethnic group names (ethnonyms), proper nouns, and idiomatic expressions.

As an integral part of culture, language is unique in its structure and evolution. The more distinct two languages are and the fewer historical and cultural interactions they have shared, the greater their linguistic differences will be, both as a whole and in specific elements. Ethnocultural vocabulary is particularly recognizable when comparing languages, as it vividly illustrates the uniqueness of a given culture.

The term "ethnocultural vocabulary," sometimes referred to as "ethnocultural lexicon" or "ethnolexemes," is defined as a collection of words that reflect a people's cultural knowledge as a historical and ethnic community. This concept closely aligns with the idea of realia, toponyms, and idioms, often incorporating an ethnographic and cultural perspective.

Geographical names, in particular, are an essential part of daily life. As toponymy expert E. M. Murzaev notes, "It is impossible to imagine modern society without geographical names. They are ever-present, accompanying our thoughts from early childhood. Everything has an address—beginning with a person's birthplace, their hometown, the street they live on, and extending to their country." These names serve not only as markers of location but also as reflections of historical and cultural heritage [1].

Toponymy, the study of geographical names, provides valuable insights into the linguistic, historical, and cultural development of a region. This study focuses specifically on microtoponyms—names of small geographical features that are often undocumented but rich in local significance. By examining these names within a specific ethnocultural context, the article aims to uncover linguistic patterns and cultural narratives that are otherwise overlooked. The goal is to contribute to the broader understanding of how language and place interact, particularly in regions with complex historical layers.

All geographical names have their own meaning. No people called a river, lake or village "just like that", a random combination of sounds. Hence, the conclusion suggests itself: any, even the most complex and, at first glance, incomprehensible geographical name can be explained. The language of the people is not something frozen; it changes and develops; some words disappear completely, and some change their meaning. Therefore, it is difficult to find an explanation for the name of this or that river, village, or city. But what is surprising, thanks to the names in our days, obsolete, long-forgotten words of the native language, words of foreign and even disappeared, "dead" languages sound. Behind every word there are amazing stories, often legends, and sometimes curiosities.

Toponyms are an integral part of the background knowledge of the speakers of a given language and culture. It reflects the history of the people as in a mirror. Therefore, it is this part of the vocabulary that has long attracted the attention of not only philologists, but also historians, ethnographers, geographers, etc [2,3].

When learning a foreign language, we encounter such concepts as *idiomatic expressions and realities*, which are the direct object of study of many scientists.

An idiom (idiom) is an important expressive means of language. An idiom is a stable expression with an independent meaning. For the most part, idioms are created by the people, and therefore are closely related to the interests and daily activities of ordinary people.

The science that studies the structure, origin and cases of the use of idiomatic expressions (phraseological units) is called phraseology. It is the most lively, vivid and original part of the vocabulary of any language. The overwhelming majority of the phraseology of the English, French, and Russian languages belongs to various functional styles and has an expressive coloring. Even stylistically neutral idioms are distinguished by national originality and can acquire expressive meaning in the context. Therefore, there is every reason to consider phraseology as

one of the expressive means of language and to consider it from a stylistic point of view.

Although the scientific literature on the phraseology of different languages is huge, and according to the available data, the number of books, articles, reports exceeds several thousand titles, there is no consensus even on the main issues. In particular, on the question of the definition of a phraseological unit and the framework of phraseology [4]. "Phraseological units are combinations of words, that is, separately formed formations with fully or partially rethought components, phraseological meanings. Phraseological units are characterized not by stability in general, but by stability at the phraseological level, regular dependencies of verbal components and structural-semantic lack of modeling. Phraseological units are formed according to grammatical models of variable combinations and sentences" [5].

In translation studies, one of the key areas of research is the concept of "realities." The term *realia* comes from Latin, originally an adjective meaning "real" or "actual" (realis-e; plural realia), but over time, it has evolved into a noun under the influence of similar lexical categories [6]. Essentially, realities refer to objects or things that exist or have existed in a tangible form. According to dictionary definitions, they are considered "objects of material culture," a view also supported by O.S. Akhmanova. In linguistics and translation studies, realities encompass words and expressions that represent culturally specific elements—names and terms unique to particular nations, material artifacts, historical references, national heroes, and even mythological creatures [7].

In our opinion, the most complete definition of reality is given by the Bulgarian scientists S. Vlahov and S. Florin: "Realities are words and phrases that refer to objects, customs, or aspects of daily life, culture, and historical development unique to one people and unfamiliar to another. They often carry a distinct cultural or historical significance and typically have no direct equivalents in other languages. Because of this, they cannot be translated in a standard way and require a specialized approach to convey their meaning accurately" [8].

This definition is given by scientists from the point of view of translating words-realities, so it is of great interest to us, since in the process of translation not only languages, but even texts, cultures and situations are opposed to each other.

Relia are characteristic of any language; they have a pronounced national color. Comparison of different languages and cultures, according to G.D. Tomakhin, allows us to identify the following features of the use of realities [9]:

(1) Reality is characteristic of only one linguistic group, and in the other it is absent: American. Drugstore Pharmacy - snack bar / there is no Russian analogue.

(2) Reality is present in both language groups, but in one of them it has an additional meaning: amer. clover leaf – cloverleaf; A road intersection with a cloverleaf interchange.

(3) In different societies, similar realities differ in shades of their meaning: American. sponge – sponge / russ. washcloth (when washing in the bathroom, in the bath).

(4) In different societies, similar realities differ in shades of their meaning: cuckoo's call in American folk beliefs predicts how many years a girl has left before marriage, in Russians – how many years are left to live.

Realities highlight the deep connection between language and culture. As new aspects of material and spiritual life emerge in a society, so do the words that describe them. What makes realities unique is their strong link to specific cultural or historical contexts—they can even be specific to a particular group or institution. Additionally, realities carry a sense of time; they evolve with society, reflecting changes through new words (neologisms), fading into history (historicism), or becoming obsolete (archaisms). Because they are so closely tied to culture, these words adapt quickly to shifts in the world around them.

In their properties and functions, realities are close to terms and proper names. Researchers of culturally marked units have repeatedly noted that the border between terms and realities is very conditional and very mobile. In some cases, it is quite difficult to establish the difference between linguistic realities and terms. But there are still signs by which it is quite possible to differentiate realities from terms. The scope of the terms is scientific literature. Realities, on the contrary, are more often used in fiction, where they serve not only stylistic purposes, but also the recreation of national, local, and historical coloring. Realities arise naturally, as a result of folk word-making. Terms, being the name of some objects, spread with the spread of

these objects, and realities are the property of the people in whose culture and language they appeared. Terms, as a rule, are not characterized by either emotionality or imagery, but realities, having specific properties, usually have them. S. Vlakhov and S. Florin also note that terms belong to units that can be translated equivalents in almost any context, and realities, as mentioned above, belong to non-equivalent vocabulary. Terms also differ from realities in their origin. Realities, as found in the language of artistic culture and mass media, are deeply intertwined with the culture of a particular people. These terms are not only common in the language of the group they belong to, but they are also foreign to other languages. While some terms are neutral and mainly used in scientific contexts, others are created specifically to name an object or phenomenon, becoming widely accepted as the object or idea spreads.

Certain realities share similarities with proper names—like Santa Claus, Koschei the Immortal, or the Frog Princess. In some cases, realities deviate from the literary norm, incorporating dialects, colloquial speech, or even slang. These deviations reflect the close relationship between language and culture, as the emergence of new concepts or cultural shifts gives rise to new realities in language.

What sets realities apart is their connection to both national identity and historical periods. In other words, realities carry a distinct national and historical flavor, making them strongly reflective of the culture and time they come from. As a linguistic phenomenon, realities are most closely linked to the culture of the country where the language is spoken.

The types of realities and their division according to certain characteristics are mentioned by many of those who wrote on these issues, but more or less formalized classifications were created by only a few authors.

In A.E. Suprun's work, realities are divided mainly by the subject feature. The same can be said about a small classification by V.I. Repin, built taking into account a particular situation - translation from Kazakh into German. The table by A.A. Reformatsky, compiled for the course of introduction to linguistics, is built on the subject-linguistic principle: it is noted from which languages foreign words entered the Russian vocabulary, meaning: 1) proper names, 2) positions and designations of persons, 4) details of costume and jewelry, 5) food and drinks, 6) addresses and titles for names.

There is no universally accepted classification of culturally marked words, and scholars have proposed different systems based on various principles. E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov, focusing on the Russian language, identified seven categories of words that carry national-cultural meaning [10]:

(1) Sovietisms – Terms that emerged after the October Revolution to describe new social and political concepts (e.g., *Supreme Soviet, deputy*).

(2) Words reflecting the new way of life – Closely related to Sovietisms, these words describe new societal norms and institutions (e.g., *park kultury, subbotnik, registry office, test*).

(3) Names of traditional objects and customs – Words referring to cultural and everyday items from Russian life (e.g., *cabbage soup, bagel, felt boots, accordion*).

(4) Historicisms – Words denoting things and phenomena from past historical periods (e.g., *sazhen, foot, verst, caftan, uyezd*).

(5) Phraseological expressions – Idioms and set phrases with cultural significance (e.g., *to beat the forehead, to learn all the ins and outs*).

(6) Words of non-Russian origin – Borrowed words from Turkic, Ukrainian, and other languages that have become part of Russian vocabulary (e.g., *taiga, bazaar, arkan, robe, raisins, pilaf*).

(7) Folklore words – Terms rooted in traditional stories, legends, and myths (e.g., *good fellow, not by the day but by the hour, the betrothed, chudo-yudo, firebird, brownie*).

From this classification, Vereshchagin and Kostomarov view realities as words that carry background cultural knowledge. Similarly, V.S. Vinogradov defines background information as encompassing key historical events, governmental structures, geographical features, material culture of both past and present, and ethnographic folklore concepts—all of which are commonly considered realities in translation theory [11].

Concepts that represent realities are deeply rooted in national identity and often materialize in what is known as non-equivalent vocabulary—words and expressions that have no direct translation in other languages. V.S. Vinogra-

dov explored the issue of realities through the lens of Latin American culture and classified lexical units carrying cultural background information into several thematic groups:

(1) **Everyday life realities** – Words related to daily living, including:

a) Housing and property

b) Clothing and accessories

c) Food and beverages

d) Jobs and occupations

e) Currency and units of measurement

f) Musical instruments, folk dances, songs, and performers

g) Traditional holidays and games

h) Forms of address

(2) **Ethnographic and mythological realities** – Words referring to:

a) Ethnic and social groups, along with their representatives

b) Deities, mythical beings, and legendary locations

(3) **Natural world realities** – Terms describing:

a) Animals

b) Plants

c) Landscapes and geographical features

(4) **State, administrative, and public life realities** – Vocabulary related to both past and present governmental and social structures, including:

a) Administrative divisions and state institutions

b) Political organizations, parties, and their members

c) Industrial, agricultural, and commercial establishments

d) Military and police units, ranks, and titles

e) Civil service roles, professional titles, and social ranks

(5) **Onomastic realities** – Proper names that carry cultural significance, such as:

a) Personal names (anthroponyms)

b) Place names (toponyms)

c) Names of fictional characters from literature

d) Names of institutions, businesses, landmarks, and public spaces (e.g., museums, theaters, restaurants, airports)

(6) **Associative realities** – Words and symbols that carry cultural or metaphorical meaning, including:

a) Plant symbolism (e.g., *madroño* as a poetic symbol of Madrid)

b) Animal symbolism (e.g., *kaburé*, a bird of prey believed to have magical properties)

c) Color symbolism (e.g., green representing hope in Panama and Chile, yellow symbolizing mourning in medieval Spain)

d) Folklore, historical, and literary allusions—references to cultural traditions, historical figures, legends, and myths

e) Linguistic allusions—phrases that evoke idioms, proverbs, famous sayings, or cultural catchphrases

Through this classification, Vinogradov highlights how realities serve as carriers of cultural identity, shaping the way language reflects a nation's history, traditions, and worldview.

Associative realities are associated with a variety of national historical and cultural phenomena and are embodied in language in a very peculiar way. Such realities are not reflected in special words, in non-equivalent vocabulary, but are "fixed" in the most ordinary words (for example: color, symbols). G.D. Tomakhin also singles out the same type of realities, but calls them connotative realities – "lexical units which, denoting the most ordinary concepts, at the same time express semantic and emotional "background shades" [3]. Connotative realities are opposed to denotative – lexical units, the semantic structure of which is entirely filled with background lexical information. Connotative realities find their materialized expression in the components of word meanings, in the shades of word meanings, in emotionally expressive overtones, in the internal form of the word, etc., revealing information discrepancies of conceptually similar words in the languages being compared. Thus, the words "sun", "moon", "sea", "red", etc., which embody universal background knowledge, are accompanied in the literary texts of a particular language by background knowledge and background information conditioned by associative realities.

Thus, V.S. Vinogradov examines and systematizes the stock of lexical units that convey background information and notes that "the proposed and, apparently, incomplete classification of such units irrefutably testifies to how deeply the roots of the national culture go into the folk language and how widely the roots of the national culture branch out in it" [11].

In a number of works by researchers of culturally marked vocabulary, word-realities represent a separate category of non-equivalent vocabulary. Thus, L.S. Barkhudarov distinguishes the following categories of non-equivalent vocabulary [12]:

1. Proper names, geographical names, names of institutions, organizations, newspapers, etc., which do not have a constant correspondence in the vocabulary of another language.

2. Realities are words that denote objects, concepts and situations that do not exist in the practical experience of people who speak another language.

3. Random lacunae are units of the vocabulary of one of the languages, which, for some reason, do not correspond in the lexical composition of another language.

S. Vlakhov and S. Florin offer the most detailed classification of realities in their monograph, dividing them into **subject-based** and **local-based** categories.

1.1. Subject-Based Classification

1.1.1. Geographical Realities

- Names of natural geographic features, including meteorological terms.
- Names of geographic locations shaped by human activity.
- Names of endemic species (animals and plants).

1.1.2. Ethnographic Realities

- Daily life: food and drinks, clothing, housing and household items, transportation, and other aspects of everyday existence.
- Work-related terms: professions, labor-related objects, and work organization.
- Art and culture: music, dance, musical instruments, folklore, theater, other arts, performers, rhythm and volume in music, holidays, games, mythology, religious practices, clergy, and calendars.
- Ethnic identities: ethnonyms (names of ethnic groups), nicknames, and place-based personal names.

- **Measurements and currency:** units of measurement and monetary systems.

1.1.3. Socio-Political Realities

- Administrative and territorial organization: names of regions, settlements, and districts within inhabited areas.
- Governing bodies and officials: political institutions and people in power.
- Social and political life: political organizations, movements, social phenomena, titles, academic degrees, institutions, educational and cultural organizations, class divisions, and associated symbols.
- **Military terms:** military departments, weapons, uniforms, and military personnel.

1.2. Local-Based Classification

1.2.1. Within a Single Language

1. **Native realities** – original words of a given language:

○ *National realities* – words specific to a nation that may be unfamiliar outside its borders.

○ *Local realities* – words that exist within a dialect or social group rather than the entire national language.

○ *Microlocal realities* – words that belong to a very specific region, sometimes limited to a single city or village, yet retain cultural significance.

2. **Foreign realities** – words borrowed or adapted from another language:

○ *International realities* – terms widely used across multiple languages while maintaining their original cultural meaning.

○ *Regional realities* – words that have spread beyond one country and are used among multiple nations, even if they are not geographically adjacent.

1.2.2. Translation-Based Classification

- External realities – concepts unfamiliar to both languages in a translation pair.

- **Internal realities** – words that exist in one language but not in the other, making translation more challenging.

Vlakhov and Florin emphasize that these classifications are flexible, as many words can fit into multiple categories depending on context. This system highlights the complexity of cultural vocabulary and its role in language and translation.

2. Literature Review

Transcription refers to the process of representing foreign words—especially untranslatable ones—using the alphabet of a given language. This challenge arises particularly when rendering personal names, surnames, geographical names, and other culturally specific terms in writing. Each language has a unique phonetic system, which can make transcription a complex task.

In *The Song of Hiawatha*, Longfellow employs numerous transcribed Native American words, many of which contain sounds and spellings unfamiliar to English speakers. The use of capital letters and phonetic patterns that are distinct from standard English helps signal to the reader that these words represent cultural realities.

Some transcribed words appear without explanation, as they have already been introduced and explained earlier in the poem. Examples include:

- Yenadizee
- Oweenee
- Mudjekeewis
- Mohawks
- Nawadaha
- Hiawatha
- Iagoo

These names feature letter combinations such as *-dji-, -ee-, -ai-, -awk-, -aha-, -ah-, -ia-, -djoo-*—structures uncommon in English but phonetically similar to the original Native American words.

In other cases, Longfellow provides both a transcribed version and an equivalent meaning:

- **Subbekashe** – the spider
- **Kagh** – hedgehog
- **Kayoshk** – sea-gull
- **Keneu** – eagle
- **Adjidaumo** – the squirrel

- **Pishnekuh** – the brant (a type of goose)

These words contain letter patterns like *-ashe-, -agh-, -ashk-, -eu-, -ito-, -uh-*, which are also uncommon in English but reflect the original Native pronunciations.

Longfellow primarily preserves the original sounds of these cultural terms, adapting them into English spelling while maintaining their phonetic authenticity. The unfamiliar structure of these words helps readers recognize them as cultural realities. Additionally, most transcribed words in the poem are supplemented with translations or explanatory equivalents, ensuring clarity while preserving the essence of the original language.

"Calque" is a literal literal translation of a word from one language to another. Concepts inherent only in certain nations are combined into denotative realities that denote objects and phenomena that are characteristic of a given culture, but have no correspondence in the culture being compared. In his poem, Longfellow recreates everyday life, traditions, Indian culture, etc., using a variety of realities, each of which is explained in some cases with the help of tracing paper. Giving one word in the Indian sound, he also gives a copy of existing synonyms, or a functional analogue:

Wigwam

Sacred lodge

Sacred chamber

Home

As the story progresses, and the words become familiar to the reader, the author gives them either in the Indian sound, or gives the already given tracing paper. Very often, the tracing paper comes immediately after the realities separated by a comma:

Cheezis, the great sun

Sebowishe, the brook

Wabemo-wusk, the yarrow

Dahinda, the bull-frog

Ahmeek, the beaver

We cannot assert that the above examples are a calque or equivalent due to the lack of knowledge of the Indian language.

We have identified more than 200 realities in the work. And almost all of them are calqued, thereby the author makes it easier for the reader to understand the meaning of the Indian reality in the text of the poem.

In addition to transcribing and tracing Indian realities, Longfellow uses descriptive translation in order to give a more accurate description of the characters, to recreate the fullness and reality of customs and rituals.

From these lines, the reader learns that *Gitchee Manito* was the Supreme Deity who descended to earth [13]:

Gitchee Manito, the mighty

The creator of the nations

He the Master of Life, descending

Here Longfellow explains the Indian reality with the help of the English equivalent, emphasizing the main feature of the character — cowardice.

"Back, go back! O Shaugodaya!

Back to old Nokomis, Faint-heart!"

Longfellow, with the help of a descriptive translation, reveals the meaning of Indian reality *the Keneu*, showing the reader that he was a mighty war eagle, the leader of the birds.

And the noble Hiawatha

Sang his war-song wild and woful

And above him the war-eagle

The Keneu, the great war-eagle,

Master of all fowls with feathers

In this passage, the author describes the evil magician, the Spirit of Wealth, the one whom all peoples called the Feather of Pearls.

"Yonder dwells the great Pearl-Feather,

Megissogwon, the Magician,

Manito of Wealth and Wampum,

In all of the above examples, Longfellow uses descriptive translation, revealing to the reader the meaning of reality, explaining it exactly.

In the next episode, the very description of the event in its content and meaning is a reality, since it is inherent only in a certain nation – the Indians. It describes the harvesting tradition to which the tribes, and in particular the women of these tribes of Minnehaha, Nokomis and others, attached great importance.

Then Nokomis, the old woman,

Spake, and said to Minnehaha:

`T is the Moon when, leaves are falling;

All the wild rice has been gathered,

And the maize is ripe and ready;

Let us gather in the harvest,

Let us wrestle with Mondamin,

Longfellow gives a description of folk divination for the groom, which is also an ethnographic behavioral reality.

And whene'er some lucky maiden

Found a red ear in the husking,

Found a maize-ear red as blood is,

"Nushka!" cried they all together,

"Nushka! you shall have a sweetheart,

You shall have a handsome husband!"

"Ugh!" the old men all responded

Descriptive realities also include the scene of the expulsion of ravens — thieves of crops:

"Wagemin, the thief of cornfields!

Paimosaid, who steals the maize-ear!"

Till the cornfields rang with laughter,

Till from Hiawatha's wigwam

Kahgahgee, the King of Ravens,

Screamed and quivered in his anger,

And from all the neighboring tree-tops

Cawed and croaked the black marauders.

"Ugh!" the old men all responded,

From their seats beneath the pine-trees!

In the excerpts we have cited, the author combines two types of realities: transcribed realities and English words, which we also have the right to consider descriptive Indian realities, since they describe customs peculiar only to the Indian people [13].

From the above analysis, we can conclude that Longfellow chose, in our opinion, the most optimal ways of presenting Indian realities: transcription, transcription and equivalent, tracing and description, and practically none of the realities remained unexplained to the reader.

3. Materials and Methods

In this study, we analyze two works that offer unique insights into the transmission of ethnocultural vocabulary: *The White Steamer* by Chingiz Aitmatov and *The Song of Hiawatha* by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. The materials for this study were selected based on their significant role in cross-cultural exchange and their representation of ethnocultural elements in translation.

Research Design:

This study employs a comparative textual analysis

approach, focusing on how the ethnocultural vocabulary is translated in both works. The analysis compares the English translations of Aitmatov's *The White Steamer* (translated by Tatiana and George Feiffer, 1972; Mirra Ginsburg, 1974) and Longfellow's *The Song of Hiawatha*.

Analytical Framework:

The analytical framework for this study is based on translation theory, particularly focusing on the balance between universal and national elements in the translation process. The works of Aitmatov and Longfellow are examined through the lens of **cultural transference**, considering how each translator handles cultural-specific terms, imagery, and ideologies. The study also explores the broader implications of translation in shaping cross-cultural perceptions, with a particular focus on how translators navigate the tension between preserving the cultural uniqueness of the source text and making it accessible to a global audience.

The main reason for turning to the story for the purpose of translation Tatiana and George Feiffer (the authors of the English translation) and Mirra Ginsburg (the author of the American translation) note the artistic solution in it to problems of a universal nature. However, if the Feiffers are inclined to absolutize the universal aspect, then Ginsburg considers the problem of the universal in direct connection with the problem of the national, which was manifested in the nature of the interpreters' interpretation of the ideas, images, problems of Aitmatov's work, their translation concept [12].

Common to all translators was the task of recreating the contrasting opposition of characters and situations characteristic of the works of Chingiz Aitmatov, which determines the development of two main stylistic layers in the story, correlated with each other and united in its common context into a single artistic whole: the style of the legend of the Horned Mother Deer and the tale of the white steamer, on the one hand, and the prose of the everyday bustle of the inhabitants of the cordon. on the other. The development and resolution of the internal conflict of the story, the reflection of this process in the translation largely depended on the most accurate transfer of the author's characteristics of the characters, their speech features. In the language of the characters, revealing the distinctive features of their thinking, in general, and the author's char-

acteristics of each character, to a large extent, the national originality of the story is embodied. One of the difficulties in recreating Aitmatov's style is that the writer naturally, without strain, introduces into the author's text the reasoning of the boy, Momun, Orozkul, Koketai, conveying the way of thinking, the lexical, intonation structure of the characters' speech. Thus, innocence, the feeling of powerlessness in front of the ignorant Orozkul are manifested in the colloquial vocabulary of Momun. Listening to his son-in-law's shouts and mentally assessing Orozkul and others like him, Momun thinks: "Again it came upon him," the old man was sad to himself, "If he drinks, he becomes beastly. With a hangover too – don't say anything..." [14–16].

In the Feifers' translation, the main features of the vocabulary and intonation characteristic of Maumoon are erased, which leads to a partial depersonalization of the image of the old man, to his abstract perception by the reader: "He is out of his senses again", the old man sadly to himself. He turns into some kind of animal when he drinks. And when he's in one of his hangovers, you can't say anything to him either" [15–17].

The translation by M. Ginsburg, in our opinion, more accurately conveys the meaning of Momun's characterization of Orozkul. In her translation, the main features of the colloquial speech of the characters are more clearly manifested, the style of translation has internal energy, tension: "It's come over him again, the old man thought sadly. Takes a drink and turns into a beast. And when he has a hangovers you aren't say a word either" [18,19].

Guided by the author's principle of revealing this or that image, Ginsburg strives to recreate the main features of the hero's speech in accordance with his psychology and social affiliation. As a result, she achieves organicity in conveying the main features of Orozkul and Momun's thinking and speech, the images acquire vividness and authenticity.

However, in some cases, when Ginsburg departs from the author's principle of revealing the character of the hero, laconism and accuracy are lost in her translation. This happened when translating a scene that is important for understanding the extent of the fall of Maumoon's grandfather, the collapse of patriarchal values in general. Laconicism, accuracy and expressiveness of style allowed Aitmatov to give an artistically convincing picture of hu-

man humiliation: "He almost pushed his grandson away from him and, as if turning away from the whole world, turned his face to the hearth again." In Ginsburg's translation, this scene turns out to be blurry, stylistically amorphous: "He almost pushed the boy away from himself. As though turning his back on the whole world, he knelt again before the hearth, never glancing around, absorbed only in himself and in the fire". Interlinear: "He almost pushed the boy away from him. As if turning away from the whole world, he fell on his knees before the hearth, never once looking around, absorbed only in himself and the fire" [20].

The translator's desire to strengthen the external leads her to dystrophy of the emotional effect.

In both versions, there is a certain shift in emphasis in the characterization of the image of Maumoon due to the fact that in the English translation he is addressed by everyone, including Orozkul, as "grandfather" (grandfather), in American — "grandpapa" or "grandpa" (grandfather). Maumoon is a grandfather only for a boy, but for the rest he is a pathetic and stupid old man. The translation interpretation of the image of Maumoon does not allow readers of the English and, to a certain extent, American versions to understand that Maumoon's obedience is the basis of Orozkul's despotism.

The story debunks not so much the system of patriarchal and clan way of life, as the negative aspects of modern reality, reflected in the images of Orozkul, Seidakhmat, Koketai, whom the writer in his later work will call mankurts.

Orozkul's speech is rude, deliberately down-to-earth, with a characteristic abrupt intonation, poor vocabulary. In Ginsburg's translation, his internal monologues sound more natural and artistically convincing than in the Feiffers' translation. In the English version, Orozkul's speech is literate, correct, which does not correspond to the logic of the development of his character. This, in particular, is observed in the expression of Orozkul's impotent anger at the jackdaws chattering above his head, at the dumb Momun, at the lazy Seidakhmat, at the whole world that does not want to be what Orozkul wants to see it. Orozkul's life credo is expressed in his shout: "Okay, beauty," Orozkul interrupted discontentedly. "There's no need to stand. You will not be satisfied with beauty" [21].

The literalist approach of T. and J. Feifer in this case deprives the speech of the pragmatist Orozkul of credibility, as a result of which the effect of the opposition of good and evil, philanthropy and inhumanity is weakened: "All right, enough of the beauty stuff, 'interrupted Orozkul in resentment.' **And enough standing around. You can't fill your belly on beauty**" [22].

The translation by M. Ginsburg reflects the characteristic lexical and intonation features of Orozkul's abrupt, as if chopped, speech, filtering through his teeth: "Never mind beauty', Orozkul broke in morosely. ' No use standing here. **Beauty won't fill your belly**" [23].

Triumphant over the "victory" over the weak old man, filled with the consciousness of his own "greatness", Orozkul grumpily complains: "The people have been dismissed. And now they themselves complain: they say they don't respect the chairman, they don't respect the director" English version: "They've got too loose with handling people now. Then they themselves complain: people don't respect the chairman, don't you see, people don't look up to the director" [24].

In this case, the characteristic features of the vocabulary and intonation of Orazkul's "complaint" have been lost in the Feyfers' translation, his speech is built correctly, devoid of the liveliness inherent in the original. Ginsburg, on the other hand, convincingly emphasizes the incorrectness of Orozkul's speech: abruptness, incompleteness of phrases to a certain extent are equivalent to the colloquial "complain" in the original. The unexpected effect is caused by the word "leeway", which literally means "drifting (of a ship) under the wind, being blown away by the wind". It corresponds to the verb "raspusili" in the original. Orozkul's philistine psychology and his spiritual poverty are also manifested in his reflections on the delights of life in the city, on the "unworthy" existence in the village. In the Feyfers' translation, the insufficiently accurate transfer of the lexical features of Orozkul's reflections leads to the depersonalization of his image, to an unjustified softening of the harshness of the author's characterization of the hero. For example, Orozkul, scolding those who take logs from him, and then complain about him, a bribe-taker, concludes: "Darkness!" In the Feyfers' translation, this disparaging expression loses the characteristic features of the thinking of the narrow-minded Orozkul: "Plain ignorance!" (Ordinary ignorance!). M. Ginsburg, in our opin-

ion, finds a more accurate equivalent: "Bastards. Ignorant fools! " (Reptiles. Ignorant fools!).

Translators were guided by various principles of translation interpretation of the original when recreating the features of Seidakhmat's colloquial speech, presented in the story as a self-satisfied, lazy, selfish mediocrity. On the whole, the translators quite accurately reproduce the noted features of his "broad nature", as evidenced by the translation of the phraseological turn of phrase "And a cup in fat, and a spoon in fat, and a mouth in fat", in which the life credo of such people as Seidakhmat is expressed. These words of the drunken Seidakhmat after the murder of the maralitsa acquire the meaning of a blasphemous mockery of all living things. T. and J. Feiffers apply the principle of translation transformation — an equivalent replacement: "A full bowl, a full spoon, a full mouth". (Full cup, full spoon, full mouth). Ginsburg, on the other hand, preserves the exact meaning of the original: "The bowl is fat, the spoon is fat, and the mouth is fat." Both variants contribute to the correct understanding of the meaning of this phrase. In the interpretation of the translators, the image of Seidakhmat ultimately becomes the personification of blind evil, which, triumphing over good and light, wins.

The emotional and evaluative attitude of the author, and then the translators, to the characters is also manifested in the rhythmic and intonation structure. For example, the impression of Orozkul's heavy tread, whom Aitmatov compares to an ox in a furrow, is reproduced by Ginsburg much more vividly than in the English translation: "Like a bull, with his head thrust forward, his cost catching at the bushes, he breathed heavily." Compare with the Feiffers' translation: "Tensed like a bull, his rain coat catching on the bushes, he clumped down like an ox ploughing a furrow". Original: "Having had enough, clinging to the bushes with his cloak, he walked like an ox in a furrow."

Thus, the almost simultaneous publication in the United States and Great Britain of two independent translations of Chingiz Aitmatov's novel "The White Ship" testifies to the objective possibility of creating a number of versions of a talented work with topical moral and ethical problems, with a pronounced national identity and universal, universal content. Each translation, distinguished by an independent translation concept, contributes to the development of certain ideas of the English-speaking reader

about the artistic and national world of the Kyrgyz writer. Both options contain an attitude towards the perceiving side. However, the translations are not equal in the completeness and depth of the recreation of the ideological, stylistic, and national features of the original, which is primarily due to differences in creative attitudes and in the principles of interpretation of the original. The Feifers are characterized by an undifferentiated approach to the writer's word, which is expressed in the fact that translators, as a rule, did not strive to convey key concepts that are important for the disclosure of ideas, they often translated all without taking into account the socio-psychological determinism of this or that image. Ginsburg, on the other hand, follows the author's principle of revealing the social and psychological characteristics of the characters. In our opinion, it is more fluent than the Feifers in possessing the valuable skill of restructuring the syntactic structure of the original, due to the lexical and grammatical norms of the English language. Rightly aware of the impossibility of a descriptive translation of Aitmatov's associative prose, Ginsburg strove to recreate the key words, phrases, rhythm of a particular period or fragment as accurately as possible, which are of decisive importance for the perception of the ideological, aesthetic and national originality of the original. The translator reasonably introduces this or that word that has the effect of surprise and causes a certain aesthetic impact. In this paragraph, we are going to consider the form of presentation of realities by the writer himself, because for Longfellow Indian realities were a phenomenon in a foreign language, so we considered it possible to use a translation of the methods of reproduction of realities in the target language.

4. Results

Having studied and analyzed the realities in Longfellow's work "The Song of Hiawatha", we considered it necessary and possible to classify them into semantic groups. In the course of the analysis on a semantic basis, we identified the following groups of realities:

-Geographic

- religious and mystical

- realities of everyday life

Anthroponymy

For a clearer idea of the essence of the above classifi-

cation, we will characterize each group separately and give examples of the realities identified by us in Longfellow's work "The Song of Hiawatha" in the following sections of our work.

5. Discussion

Ethnographic realities include descriptions of holidays, designations of traditions and customs, and the culture inherent in a particular nation. In the work "The Song of Hiawatha", Longfellow gives a broad idea of the culture of the North American Indians, using ethnographic realities.

Of great interest when reading the poem is the description of the wedding of Hiawatha and his chosen one Minehaha.

She had sent through all the village

Messengers with wands of willow

As a sign of invitation

This phrase shows that the culture of the Indians was already rising to a higher level. To make the wedding not boring, the Indians performed many songs, dances, and various tricks. The realities denoting proper names give us an idea of how developed the folklore genres of the Indians were:

Osseo, Son of the Evening Star

Chibiabos, musician

Nawadaha, musician, the sweet singer

Megissogwon, the magician

Yenadizze, the dancer

But among the Indians there was a famous *Iagoo, the great boaster,* who entertained the people with his stories and legends. Knowledge of legends broadened the horizons of the people. To brighten up their leisure, the Indians played games

Kuntasoo, the Game of Plumstones

Ozawabeek, a round piece of brass

Copper in the Game of Bowl

Pugasaign, the Game of Bowl

Let's consider another interesting example describing the names of the months of the year and seasons. The Indians associate these names with phenomena characteristic of each of the months [24–26].

Moon of Falling Leaves, September

Moon of Bright Nights, April

Moon of Leaves, May

Moon of Strawberries, June

Moon of Snow-Shoes, November

Mighty Peboan, the Winter

Segwun, Spring

When the *Mighty Peboan season began*, the Indians were skiing. From the above, we can see that the civilization of the Indians had already risen to a fairly high level, and the appearance of talented people contributed to the development of the culture as a whole.

Religious and mystical realities reflect adherence to a certain religion and the performance of religious rites. The Indians believed in spirits, appealed to their power, and asked for help. In their understanding, there were gods of good and evil. The highest god to whom they turned their eyes was

Gitche Manito, the Mighty.

"Gitche Manito, the Mighty!

Give your children food, o father!

Give us food or we must perish!

Among the evil spirits they included *Puk-Wudjie,* and since the Indians were uneducated, for them such natural phenomena as *Waywassimo, the lightning; Annemeekee, the thunder,* they attribute to the manifestation of evil spirits and the wrath of the gods. To avoid the wrath of the gods, they performed ritual dances *the Death-Dance of spirits* and sacrifices.

The Sacred Belt of Wampum *was considered to be the embodiment of goodness and unity of peoples*, which, according to legend, brings happiness to the one who has it. But this belt was in the possession of the evil spirit *Mishe-Mokwa,* and in order to bring peace to the nations on earth, the West Wind destroyed *Mishe-Mokwa* and returned the sacred belt to the people. Hiawatha did not eat anything for seven days, to appeal to the Supreme Deity to give them *Mondamin – corn*.

In showing the worship of the Indians to the spirits of good and evil, Longfellow used various descriptive realities:

the magic virtues, the power of evil,

the envious evil spirit

The Indians worshipped many different gods, who had their own names and expressed in the poem with the help of transcribed and calqueed realities:

Cheezis, *бог солнца*

Unktahee, *bog vodka*

Manito of Wealth, *the spirit of wealth that all peoples have called*

"With a pearl feather".

For example, when the Indians were working in the fields, they cried out to God and sang the song *"Blessing of the Cornfields"* because they believed that God would send them a rich harvest. They also sang songs that drove away *the evil spirits* of the fields

Wagemin, the thief of cornfields

Paimosaid, who steals the maize

Religion among the North American Indians is represented by a strong belief in supernatural forces. The gods played a leading role in the life of the Indians, the Indians hoped for their help. At the same time, they believed that misfortunes and troubles were caused by the intervention of evil spirits and evil forces and performed cult rites to expel them [27,28].

The realities of everyday life reflect the nature of housing, decoration, features of national clothing, dishes, food, etc.

For example, in the poem "The Song of Hiawatha" the first thing that catches our eye is the well-known reality of *wigwam,* which denotes the dwelling of North American Indians. Inside the wigwam, a fire was lit, which served to heat the room. All day long, the smoke of the fire streamed over the wigwam, which was visible from afar. For the name of the wigwam, the author uses such analogues and synonyms as *lodge, chamber, Sacred Lodge,* which in the concept of the Indians means a sacred dwelling [29,30].

Describing the appearance of the Indians, Longfellow focuses our attention on the festive attire of the people during the celebrations with the help of descriptive realities:

He was dressed in deer-skin leggings,

Fringed with hedgehog quills and ermine,

And in moccasins of buck-skin,

Thick with quills and beads embroidered.

On his head were plumes of swan's down,

On his heels were tails of foxes,

In one hand a fan of feathers,

And a pipe was in the other.

Barred with streaks of red and yellow,

Streaks of blue and bright vermilion,

The Indians were very skillful in decorating their clothes, using embroidery, trimming with fur, feathers, semiprecious stones, and beads.

As a token of the feasting;

And the wedding guests assembled,

Clad in all their richest raiment,

Robes of fur and belts of wampum,

Splendid with their paint and plumage,

Beautiful with beads and tassels [31].

With such descriptions, the author wanted to show the reader how the Indians had to work hard to dress and shoe themselves in the difficult conditions in which they lived.

From the poem we learn that the Indians made children's cradles from linden, moss and reeds served as a feather bed, a child was swaddled with the help of dried veins of deer

There the wrinkled old Nokomis

Nursed the little Hiawatha,

Rocked him in his linden cradle,

Bedded soft in moss and rushes,

Safely bound with reindeer sinews;

Men knew how to make a bow from ash branches, a bowstring from deer skin, arrows from oak branches, tips were made from flint, chalcedony, jasper; To increase the speed of the arrow, feathers were attached to it [32].

Made a bow for Hiawatha;

From a branch of ash he made it,

From an oak-bough made the arrows,

Tipped with flint, and winged with feathers,

And the cord he made of deer-skin.

The Indians knew how to make boats — canoe from birch bark, strengthened them with strong but flexible cedar branches, tied with fibrous *larchtree roots* and sealed cracks and holes with coniferous resin. They had the art of decorating their boats, painted with the sap of roots and berries [13].

The Indians shared all their knowledge, skills and abilities in any field with their children and youth. Here is how Hiawatha was raised:

Out of childhood into manhood

Now had grown my Hiawatha,

Skilled in all the craft of hunters,

Learned in all the lore of old men,

In all youthful sports and pastimes,

In all manly arts and labors.

For a clearer representation of the life of the Indians, Longfellow uses not only the realities that denote clothing, but also gives the names of tools, kitchen utensils, and various delicacies used during holidays.

Orudiya Labor:

fishing line of cedar

canoe, bow, silver arrows, lances

arrow heads of flint, jaspher, chalcedony

Puggawaugun

Cheemaun, a birch canoe

Kitchenware:

bowls of bass-wood

the spoons of wood

the spoons of horn of bison

Food:

Mondamin, corn

Mahnomonue, wild rice Meenahga, the blueberry

the Bemahgut, grave-vine

suger from the maple

Here is another example of a festive table given by Longfellow in the poem.

First they ate the sturgeon, Nahma

And the pike, the Maskenozha,

Caught and cooked by old Nokomis;

Then on pemican they feasted

Pemican and buffalo marrow

Haunch of deer and hump of bison

Yellow cakes of the Mondamin

And the wild rice of the river [13].

A large number of realities of everyday life used by the author in the poem give the reader the opportunity to learn more about the image and way of life of the Indians, about the variety of their occupations: hunting, fishing, agriculture, crafts. The beauty of clothing and the use of comfortable shoes and kitchen utensils tell us about the origin and development of culture among Indian tribes.

6. Conclusions

In the course of this work, we tried to give an explanation of such lexical units as realities, toponyms and idioms. The main part of the article consists of two chapters,

the first one dealt with the problem of translating realities, toponyms, idioms. Setting a goal, we tried to identify and study the ways of conveying these lexical units. To begin with, we got acquainted with the works of many well-known researchers, such as Florin S., Vlakhov S. "Untranslatable in translation", Kazakova T.A. "Practical Foundations of Translation. English<>Russian", Gachiechiladze G.R., "Introduction to the Theory of Literary Translation", Fedorov A.V. "Fundamentals of the General Theory of Translation", Tomakhin G.D. "Realities-Americanisms", Vinogradov V.S. "Lexical Issues of Translation of Literary Prose", etc., who paid a lot of attention to these language units. Each of these scholars tried to define realities, toponyms, and idioms, and after reviewing them, we chose the most complete and accurate one. For toponyms, this is the definition of Tomakhin G.D.: "Toponyms are an integral part of the background knowledge of native speakers of a given language and culture. Like a mirror, they reflect the history of the people, the history of settlement and development of the territory. Therefore, it is this part of the vocabulary that has long attracted the attention of not only philologists, but also historians, ethnographers, geographers, etc." An idiom is a stable expression with an independent meaning. For the most part, idioms are created by the people, and therefore are closely related to the interests and daily activities of ordinary people."

In the course of this work, we tried to find out the problems of translating realities, toponyms and idioms. For example, a translator may have them when translating microtoponyms that are known only to a narrow circle of people living near the named object; There is one more problem in toponymy, which is the problem of revising the spelling of foreign names distorted in speech. In phraseology, the difficulty of translating idioms begins with their recognition in the text. In addition to the problem of recognizing phraseological units, the translator encounters national and cultural differences between similar phraseological units in two different languages. Similar problems may arise even when translating international phraseological units. Another problem is the presence of a double or even triple "bottom" of a phraseological unit.

The topic of ways of conveying toponyms, or the translation of words that do not have direct lexical correspondences, has been addressed by many researchers and

translators. There are several ways of transferring toponyms. This is transcription/transliteration, tracing, often a mixed type of translation is used, that is, a combination of transcription and semantic translation, or when part of the name is translated by transcription, but in general the principle of tracing is preserved.

When translating idioms, it is better to follow the advice of Kazakova T.A. or Rossels M.V., who offers three ways to translate idioms:

1. When translating one type of idioms, you should either choose the appropriate ones in another language (if there is one), or try to translate the image itself. At the same time, you should not strive for a literal transfer of meaning.

2. Idioms of the second type, as a rule, are not translated literally; Analogies should either be found for them, or new idioms should be constructed in order to introduce them into everyday life in the native language.

3. The third type of idiom, containing a pun, requires replacement and creation of a similar pun in the native language, because the pun is especially closely related to language.

Analyzing the use and transmission of culturally specific words, or **realities**, in *The White Steamboat* and *The Song of Hiawatha* leads to several key insights:

(1) **Realities are a unique yet complex aspect of a language's vocabulary.** They do not always fit neatly into linguistic categories, making them both fascinating and challenging to study.

(2) **As a core part of non-equivalent vocabulary, realities serve as cultural markers.** They preserve and convey important historical and societal information, playing a crucial role in literature by enriching the reader's understanding of a culture.

(3) **There is no universally accepted term for culturally significant vocabulary.** Researchers have referred to these terms using different labels, such as background vocabulary, culturally specific words, or nationally distinct lexical units. For the sake of consistency, we've chosen to use the term "realities" in this study.

(4) **A standardized classification system for realities has yet to be established.** However, most existing classifications follow a subject-based approach, grouping words according to their thematic relevance.

In conclusion, exploring this topic has deepened our understanding of the lexical strategies involved in translating culturally embedded words, shedding light on the intricate relationship between language and culture.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, D.O. and Y.T.; methodology, M.A.; formal analysis, Z.A.; investigation, Y.T.; resources, Z.A.; data curation, M.A.; writing—original draft preparation, D.O.; writing—review and editing, M.A.; visualization, D.O.; supervision, D.O. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Alkhayat, A., Mahmod, D.R., Khafaji, S.K., 2023. Interlingual subtitling of ethno/cultural representation: The case of the animated TV series Yahya and Kunooz. Journal of Translation and Language Studies. 4(1), 40–59. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48185/jtls. v4i2.783

[2] Murzaev, E.M., 1984. Dictionary of folk geographical terms. Mysl: Moscow, Russia.

[3] Tomakhin, G.D., 1988. Realities-Americanisms [in Russian]. Vysshaya shkola Publ.: Moscow, Russia.

[4] Retsker, Y.I., 1974. Theory of translation and translation practice. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya Publ.: Moscow, Russia.

[5] Kunin, A.V., 1970. English phraseology. Vysshaya

shkola Publ.: Moscow, Russia.

[6] Kofman, A.F. (ed.), 2023. Dictionary of literary trends of the 20th century: Russia, Europe, America [in Russian]. Vol. 1: A–O. IWL RAS Publ.: Moscow, Russia. Available from: https://ed-imli.ru/index.php/en/2732-dictionary-of-literary-trends-of-the-20th-century-russia-europe-america-in-2-vols-vol-1-a-o

[7] Akhmanova, O.S., 1966. Dictionary of linguistic terms [in Russian]. Soviet Encyclopedia: Moscow, Russia.

[8] Vlakhov, S., Florin, S., 1986. Untranslatable in translation. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya Publ.: Moscow, Russia.

[9] Tomakhin, G.D., 1997. Realities in language and culture. Foreign languages in school. 3, 13–18.

[10] Vereshchagin, E.M., Kostomarov, V.G., 1983. Language and culture: Linguistic and cultural studies in teaching Russian as a foreign language [in Russian]. Russkii yazyk Publ.: Moscow, Russia.

[11] Vinogradov, V.S., 1978. Lexical issues of translation of fiction prose. Moscow University Publ.: Moscow, Russia.

[12] Barkhudarov, L.S., 1975. Language and translation [in Russian]. International Relations: Moscow, Russia.

[13] Zeman, P., 2024. Problematizing urban microtoponyms: Toward a conceptual framework. Geography Compass. 18(3), e12732. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12732

[14] Krupnov, V.N., 1976. In the translator's creative laboratory. International Relations: Moscow, Russia.

[15] Kazakova, T.A., 2000. Practical foundations of translation [in Russian]. Soyuz Publishing House: St. Petersburg, Russia.

[16] Fedorov, A.V., 1983. Fundamentals of the general theory of translation [in Russian]. Vysshaya shkola: Moscow, Russia.

[17] Kabakchi, V.V., 1998. Fundamentals of English-speaking international communication [in Russian]. Herzen State Pedagogical University: St. Petersburg, Russia.

[18] Sarsekenova, V.Z., 2000. Manual on practical translation from English into Russian. Kainar University: Almaty, Kazakhstan.

[19] Gachechiladze, G.R., 1970. *Введение в теорию художественного перевода* [*Introduction to the Theory of Literary Translation*]. Tbilisi University Publishing House: Tbilisi, Georgia.

[20] Kolesnikova, V.S., 2001. On the problem of artistic translation as speech and speech activity. The World of Language and Intercultural Communication. BSPU Publ.: Barnaul, Russia. pp. 147–153.

[21] Osovskiy, O., 2024. On some features of the prehistory of Mikhail Bakhtin's "Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics": Lev Pumpyansky's marks on Bakhtin's 1929 book "Problems of Dostoevsky's Creation". Literaturovedcheskii Zhurnal, 63, 57–79. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31249/litzhur/2024.63.04

[22] Ivinsky, D.P., 2024. Odoevsky in the historical and literary concept of V.V. Rozanov. Literaturovedcheskii Zhurnal. 66, 57–79. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31249/litzhur/2024.66.04

[23] Komissarov, V.N., 1980. Linguistics of translation. International Relations: Moscow, Russia.

[24] Komissarov, V.N., 1999. General theory of translation. CheRo: Moscow, Russia.

[25] Shveitser, A.D., 1988. Theory of translation [Теория перевода]. Nauka: Moscow, Russia. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/30807616/Швейцер_А_Д_Теория_перевода_1988_

[26] Kofman, A.F. (ed.), 2023. Dictionary of literary trends of the 20th century: Russia, Europe, America [in Russian], Vol. 2: R–Ya. IWL RAS Publ.: Moscow, Russia. Available from: https://ed-imli.ru/index.php/en/2734-dictionary-of-literary-trends-of-the-20th-century-russia-europe-and-america-in-2-vols-vol-2-r-ya

[27] Garbovsky, V.S., 2004. Theory of translation: Textbook. Iz-vo Mosk. u-ta: Moscow, Russia.

[28] Karaeva, B.Z., Alkaya, E., Meirbekov, A., 2023. A comparative analysis of Kazakh-English toponyms from linguistic and cultural perspectives. Eurasian Science Review. 13(1), 45–56. DOI: https://doi.org/10.63034/esr-306eurasia-science.org

[29] Adilova, Z.K., Seiitova, S.B., 2024. History and language interactions of toponyms of East Kazakhstan. Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. PHILOLOGY Series. 146(1), 8–21. Available from: https://bulphil.enu.kz/index.php/main/article/view/757

[30] Shkliaryk, V., 2024. Studying microtoponymy in Belarus: The main achievements of the last 60 years. Onomastica LXVIII. 68, 347-360. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17651/ONOMAST.68.21

[31] Tort i Donada, J., 2023. Microtoponymy as a paradigm of cultural heritage – A case study of Catalan oronym. Onoma. 58, 37–54. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34158/ONOMA.58/2023/3

[32] Roig-Sanz, D., Campanella, L., Carbó-Catalan, E., 2025. Translation as a soft power resource: exploring the possibilities, scope, and challenges of an interdisciplinary approach. Perspectives. 33(1), 1–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2025.2447143