

A vibrant photograph of sunflowers in a field. The sunflowers have bright yellow petals and dark brown centers. The background is a clear, bright blue sky. The sunflowers are in various stages of bloom, with some fully open and others still budding. The leaves are green and have a serrated edge. The overall scene is bright and cheerful.

Nové tendencie

MLADÁ RUSISTIKA

a trendy IV

BRATISLAVA, 2017

Mladá rusistika – nové tendencie a trendy IV

Zborník príspevkov účastníkov 4. bratislavskej konferencie mladých rusistov

Bratislava, STIMUL, 2017

ISBN 978-80-8127-184-7

EAN 9788081271847

Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave
Filozofická fakulta
Katedra rusistiky a východoeurópskych štúdií

Mladá rusistika – nové tendencie a trendy IV

Bratislava 2017

Editori

Mgr. Nina Cingerová, PhD.

Mgr. Miroslava Danišková

Mgr. Michal Mikuláš

Recenzenti

prof. PhDr. Anton Eliáš, PhD.

prof. PhDr. Mária Kusá, CSc.

doc. Mgr. Ľubor Matejko, PhD.

doc. Mgr. Irina Dulebová, PhD.

Mgr. Nina Cingerová, PhD.

Mgr. Zuzana Močková Lorková, PhD.

Mgr. Ivan Posokhin, PhD.

Poznámka – príspevok Mgr. Ivana Posokhina, PhD. recenzovala prof. PhDr. Mária Kusá, CSc.

Organizačný výbor konferencie

Mgr. Miroslava Danišková

Mgr. Katarína Hrčková

Mgr. Andrej Kállay

Mgr. Michal Mikuláš

Grafická úprava

Mgr. Katarína Hrčková

Zborník s názvom *Mladá rusistika – nové tendencie a trendy IV* je výstupom Katedry rusistiky a východoeurópskych štúdií Filozofickej fakulty Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave. Pozostáva z príspevkov účastníkov 4. bratislavskej konferencie mladých rusistov – doktorandov, mladých vedeckých pracovníkov a študentov, pôsobiacich na viacerých európskych univerzitách.

Za obsahovú a jazykovú stránku príspevkov zodpovedajú jednotliví autori.

Pod'akovanie

Týmto by sme chceli poďakovať za spoluprácu, cenné pripomienky a užitočné rady recenzentom a všetkým, ktorí sa nejakým spôsobom podieľali na organizácii konferencie a tvorbe zborníka.

Editori a organizačný výbor konferencie

Obsah

Predhovor	7
Sekcia dejín a kultúry	8
DANIELE ARTONI: КАРЛІА СЕРЕНА О ЮГЕ РОССИЙСКОЙ ИМПЕРИИ.....	8
KATARÍNA HRČKOVÁ: SOVIETSKY METANARATÍV AKO EXPORTNÝ ARTIKEL (NA PRÍKLADE ŽENY-HRDINKY).....	20
MATEJ PEMČÁK: OHLAS FILOZOFIE L. N. TOLSTÉHO NA SLOVENSKU: REFLEXIA SLOVENSKÝCH TOLSTOJOVCOV	28
SYLVIA MIČÍKOVÁ: MIESTA PAMÄTI O DEDIČSTVE KOMUNISTICKÝCH REŽIMOV V POSTSOVIETSKOM PRIESTORE	41
Translatologická sekcia	53
MIROSLAVA DANIŠKOVÁ: RETOUR A PILOTÁŽ V RÁMCI PROCESU VÝUČBY SIMULTÁNNEHO TLMOČENIA.....	53
MICHAL MIKULÁŠ: SLOVENSKÉ PREKLADY RUSKÝCH DOKUMENTÁRNYCH FILMOV PO ROKU 1989 A PROBLEMATIKA PREKLADU Z DRUHEJ RUKY	61
Lingvistická sekcia	70
ЕЛИЗАВЕТА МАДЕЙ: КАЛЬКИ В РЕЧИ СЛОВАЦКИХ РУСИСТОВ.....	70
MARCO MAGNANI, TANIA TRIBERIO: DISENTANGLING REALIA. A LEXICOGRAPHIC ACCOUNT OF RUSSISMS IN ITALIAN	79
ТАТЬЯНА УХАНОВА: ИМЕНА ПРИЛАГАТЕЛЬНЫЕ СЛОВООБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОЙ КАТЕГОРИИ «ПРИЗНАК ПО ОТСУТСТВИЮ СУБСТАНЦИИ» В РУССКОМ ЖАРГОНЕ.....	92
Literárnovedná sekcia	100
GALINA PROKUDINA: ПЕРЕСЕЧЕНИЕ КОМИЧЕСКОГО И ДРАМАТИЧЕСКОГО В ПЬЕСЕ А. С. ГРИБОЕДОВА «ГОРЕ ОТ УМА».....	100
NIKOLETA ZILIZIOVÁ: CIRKUS ŠARDAM AKO ABSURDNÁ DRÁMA.....	111
JANA HUŤOVÁ: АЛЬТЕРНАТИВНО-ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ РОМАН ВЯЧЕСЛАВА РЫБАКОВА «НА БУДУЩИЙ ГОД В МОСКВЕ»	122
NATÁLIA DUKÁTOVÁ: ÚLOHA DETSKÝCH ČASOPISOV V ROZVOJI LITERATÚRY MEDZIVOJNOVÉHO OBDOBIA A RUSKÉ PREKLADY V NICH	130
ИВАН ПОСОХИН: СЕРГЕЙ ДОВЛАТОВ И ДЭВИД БЕЗМОЗГИС: МИГРАНТСКИЕ МОТИВЫ В ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЯХ «ДВУХ ПОКОЛЕНИЙ ТРЕТЬЕЙ ВОЛНЫ».....	137

DISENTANGLING REALIA. A LEXICOGRAPHIC ACCOUNT OF RUSSISMS IN ITALIAN

PhDr. Marco Magnani, postdoc

Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Verona,
marco.magnani@univr.it

Mgr. Tania Triberio, PhD Student

Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Verona,
tania.triberio@univr.it

РЕЗЮМЕ: Когда надо передать значение так называемых реалий (то есть слов, обозначающих объекты или концепции, относящиеся к определённой культуре) на другом языке, даже их простое лексическое выражение часто представляет собой сложную задачу для переводчика. В этой статье мы применим лексикографический подход к двум типам русских реалий – историческим русизмам и советизмам, представленным в одном итальянском одноязычном словаре (Трессани) и в двух русско-итальянских двуязычных словарях (Добровольская и Ковалев). Во-первых, мы покажем, какие различия существуют между этими тремя словарями, в особенности относительно диапазона значений и количества примеров. Во-вторых, мы не только опишем эти различия, но и выдвинем предложение более однородной трактовки таких реалий в русско-итальянских двуязычных словарях, полезной как для изучающих русский язык, так и для переводчиков-лингвистов.

Translating a text into a foreign language is a difficult task, involving linguistic and cultural factors, both in the source language (SL) and in the target language (TL). In fact, if it is true that any language reflects and creates a national culture generally¹, as well as the outer and inner world of a person specifically², the translation process is not only bilingual, but also – and crucially – bicultural. In this complex bicultural process, one notable challenge for the

¹ Cf. WIERZBICKA, A.: Human emotions: Universal or culture-specific? In: *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 88, pp. 584 – 594.

² Cf. BARKHUDAROV, L. S.: Язык и перевод (Voprosy obshcheyj i chastnoy teorii perevoda). *Language and translation. Questions in the general and specialized theory of translation*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.

translator is posed by realia (i.e. words and expressions denoting objects or concepts that are specific to one culture), in so far as they are lexical items for which the TL typically lacks an equivalent. Not surprisingly, realia have been an area of great interest in translation studies – some of them exploring the nature of the relationship between language and culture in the SL³, and others focusing on the range of linguistic strategies used by translators to convey the meaning of realia in the TL⁴. It is however surprising that far less systematic attention has been given to realia in the lexicographic tradition, where most work has focused on how they are encoded in monolingual dictionaries⁵ and often neglected their registration in bilingual dictionaries.

This study aims to contribute to the body of lexicographic research on realia by looking at how they are encoded in bilingual dictionaries, in both the SL section and the TL section. Bilingual dictionaries are an important resource in translation, useful not only for professional translators, but also for learners (and teachers) of a foreign language; however, they often provide partial (and sometimes conflictive) information on realia. Specifically, in this paper we will consider some examples of Russian realia (henceforth Russisms) that entered the Italian language in various forms (chiefly among them borrowings and calques), and analyse how they are encoded in two of the most prominent Russian-Italian bilingual dictionaries: Dobrovol'skaja (2001) and Kovalev (1995). We will show how – even by considering a small sample of realia in only a couple of dictionaries – there is significant variation in the range of meanings and semantic extensions presented in each of the two dictionaries, often resulting in incongruities. We will therefore analyse such variation and suggest how further work in linguistic theory on realia may help us resolve some of these incongruities.

* * *

It is a commonly held assumption that successful translation of a text from the SL entails finding an 'equivalent' in the TL⁶. Although the notion of 'equivalence' in translation is not

³ Cf. e.g. YOKOYAMA, O.: Culture and Language: Realia Explored through Linguistics. In: Y. Kawaguchi, I. Kameyama, N. Tomimori, & T. Takagaki (eds.), *Sinposiumu, kouenkai, kenkyuu houkoku*, pp. 105 – 120. TUFUS: Tokyo; DJACHY, K. – PARESHISHVILI, M.: Realia as carriers of national and historical overtones. In: *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2014, Vol. 4, part 1, pp. 8 – 14.

⁴ Cf. e.g. SANTOYO, J. C.: Traducción de cultura, traducción de civilización. In: *Estudis sobre la traducció*. Ed. Amparo Hurtado Albir. Castellón: Universitat Jaume, Vol. I, pp. 141 – 152; YIFENG, S.: "(Un)translatability and cross-cultural readability". In: *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, Vol. 20, pagg. 231 – 247; FERNÁNDEZ GUERRA, A.: Translating culture: problems, strategies and practical realities. In: *[SIC] – A Journal of Literature, Culture and Literary Translation*, Vol. 5.

⁵ Cf. NICOLAI, G. M.: *Dizionario delle parole russe che s'incontrano in italiano*. Roma, Bulzoni Editore.

⁶ Cf. e.g. NIDA, E.: *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.; CATFORD, J.: *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Oxford: OUP; NIDA, E. – TABER, Ch.: *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

without its shortcomings⁷, it still remains a predominant concept in the broadest field of translation studies⁸, to such an extent that Barkhudarov⁹ defines realia as безэквивалентная лексика. Thus, a key feature of realia is that no equivalent word or expression is available in the TL. In the absence of direct equivalents, when faced with a realia the translator is left with two options: either s/he keeps the lexical item in the SL, and explains it, or s/he picks up a word or expression in the TL that approximates the meaning of the realia. The former option consists in what is traditionally defined in linguistics as a borrowing. The latter option may give rise to a variety of adaptation processes, not mutually exclusive, such as calques, literal translations, and explanations. Needless to say, different taxonomies have been proposed by scholars working in the field of translation studies¹⁰. In the remainder of this paper we will stick to the broadest distinction between borrowings and calques¹¹, and primarily focus on two examples registered in Dobrovol'skaja (henceforth D.) and Kovalev (henceforth K.): *pogrom* and *kolchoz*.

* * *

Borrowing a term implies taking a word or expression from a SL and replicating it, without translation, in a TL. A borrowing can be “pure”, if the word undergoes no structural changes in the TL, as in *pogrom*, *troika* or *samovar* in Italian (also defined by Torre (1994) as “foreign word” or “foreignism”), or “naturalized”, if the word acquires some structural features of the TL, as in the Italian *mugicco*¹², from the Russian *мужик*¹³, where the grapheme *g* signals a change of phoneme from the fricative [z] (not used in Italian) to the affricate [dʒ], and the addition of the *-co* ending reproduces the prosodic structure of Italian words (ending in a vowel).

Be it pure or naturalized, when a realia becomes a borrowing, it also becomes part of the lexicon of the TL. Confirmation of this is that the realia is registered in monolingual dictionaries of the TL. For example, the word *troika* occurs among the entries of the *Vocabolario Treccani*

⁷ Cf. e.g. REISS, K. – VERMEER, H.: *Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer; HERMANS, T. (ed.): *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London/Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985; SNELL-HORNBY, M.: *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

⁸ Cf. HOUSE, J.: “Text and Context in Translation”. In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 38, pp. 338 – 358.

⁹ BARKHUDAROV, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. GRAEDLER, A.: Cultural shock. In: *Oslo Studies in English on the Net - Translation course*. University of Oslo; HARVEY, M.: “A beginner’s course in legal translation: the case of culture-bound terms.” In: Tradulex.org. Geneve 2000: Actes. La traduction juridique. Histoire, théorie(s) et pratique.

¹¹ Cf. GUSMANI, R.: *Saggi sull’interferenza linguistica (Essays on linguistic interference)*. Firenze, Casa Editrice le Lettere.

¹² Cf. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>. Translation: **mugicco** (o **mugic**, **mugico**, **mugik**, **mugiko**) s. m. [adapt. from Russian *му́жик*, liter. dim. of *му́ж* «man»] (pl. *-chi*, alternative *-ki*).

¹³ Kovalev (1995: 434) **му́жик** *т.* (-а) **1** (*крестьянин*) **mugik** *м.*, **contadino** *м.*

dell'Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana ('Treccani Dictionary of the Institute of the Italian Encyclopaedia'), along with its range of meanings, as shown in (1).

(1) Entry for *troika* in the Italian monolingual dictionary Treccani

tròika (meno com. **tròica**) s. f. [dal russo *trojka*, propr. «terzina», der. di *tri* «tre»]. –
1. Tiro a tre, tipo di attacco per tre cavalli usato in Russia sia per carrozze sia per slitte: i tre quadrupedi sono affiancati, quello di mezzo è attaccato alle stanghe, quelli laterali con semplici tirelli; in genere il cavallo centrale va al trotto e quelli laterali al galoppo. Per estens., carrozza, slitta tirata da tre cavalli. **2.** fig. Nella pubblicistica, direzione a tre, organo collegiale, soprattutto politico, o economico, costituito da tre membri: *la t. sovietica del periodo successivo a Kruscëv; la t. che presiede all'industria di stato.*¹⁴

What about bilingual dictionaries? Unlike monolingual dictionaries, they are primarily concerned with providing an equivalent in the TL, and offer no explanation of the lemma. Thus, one could argue that there may be no point in listing realia in the TL section of a bilingual dictionary (i.e. the Italian section, in the case of a Russism), in so far as it is obvious that the outcome will be the SL word (i.e. the Russian word). However, there are good reasons to list realia in both sections. First, in looking up a Russism, the user of the dictionary may ignore that the word is a borrowing, especially when it has been naturalised (see *mugicco* above). Secondly, if, as we have just seen, the formal properties of a borrowing are (more or less faithfully) replicated in the TL, the same may not hold for its semantic ones. In fact, when a realia enters a TL as a borrowing, only some of its meanings from the SL may be preserved also in the TL. An example is the Russian word *sputnik*. This word is attested in Italian as a borrowing from the Russian language, as confirmed by its registration in Italian monolingual dictionaries. However, in Italian it is used as a Russism only to designate the satellites that were launched in the Soviet Union – although the Treccani monolingual dictionary explains that in Russian its primary meaning is that of 'fellow-traveller', and the meaning 'satellite' originates by extension, as shown in (2)¹⁵ (see also Orioles 1984: 52).

¹⁴ Cf. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>. Translation: **tròika** (less common **tròica**) s. f. [from Russian *trojka*, liter. «triplet», der. from *tri* «three»]. 1. three-horsed shot, three horses towing used in Russia for both carriages and sledges: the three quadrupeds are side by side, one in the middle is hitched up to the shafts, the lateral ones with simple traces; typically the central horse goes trotting and the lateral ones proceed galloping. Extens., carriage, sledge pulled by three horses. 2. fig. In journalism, three-directors team, collegial body, especially political, or economic, consisting of three members: *the Soviet t. of the period following Khrushchev; the t. presiding at State industry.*

¹⁵ Cf. ORIOLES, V.: Su alcune tipologie di russismi in italiano (On some typologies of Russian realia in Italian). University of Udine.

(2) Entry for *sputnik* in the Italian monolingual dictionary Treccani

Sputnik <*spùtn'ik*> s. m., russo. – Termine che in russo significa propr. «compagno di viaggio» e poi «satellite», e che è stato il nome dei primi dieci satelliti artificiali terrestri sovietici, ma si è diffuso a livello internazionale per indicare genericam. anche i successivi satelliti artificiali che furono messi in orbita dall'Unione Sovietica (essendo allora usato come nome comune). Il primo della serie, che è stato anche il primo della storia dell'astronautica, fu lanciato il 4 ottobre 1957, su un'orbita con perigeo di 227 km, apogeo di 947 km, inclinazione 65,1°, periodo di rivoluzione 96,2 minuti.¹⁶

How do we expect, then, borrowings to be registered in our two Russian-Italian bilingual dictionaries? First, they should be listed in both sections, especially in the cases of morphophonological adaptations in Italian. Secondly, in both sections the lemmas should appear with their grammatical features, in so far as these may vary in the two languages. Thirdly, it would seem reasonable to expect the Russian section to be more informative than the Italian one when the use of a Russism in Italian is limited to one or only some of the semantic areas to which it pertains in Russian. Specifically, in these cases, the Russian section should explain the full range of meanings of the word, which would otherwise remain unknown if the Russism were only transliterated. On the other hand, all of this is unnecessary when the Russism is used in Italian with its full range of meanings. Specifically, in these latter cases we would expect the two sections to be symmetrical, and the Russian section to move on to the examples without having to explain the meaning of the realia.

We will now illustrate by way of an example the entries for *pogrom* in both sections of D. (cf. Table 1) and K. (cf. Table 2). Before doing so, however, we note that the word is registered also in the Treccani dictionary, as shown in (3), which confirms that *pogrom* has become a Russism in Italian.

(3) Entry for *pogrom* in the Italian monolingual dictionary Treccani

¹⁶ Cf. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>. Translation: **Sputnik** <*spùtn'ik*> s. m., Russian. – Word meaning, in Russian, liter. «fellow traveller » and then «satellite». It was the name given to the first ten Soviet artificial earth satellites, but then it spread internationally to indicate, in general, also the following artificial satellites that were launched by the Soviet Union (being then used as a common name). The first of the series, which was also the first in the history of astronautics, was launched on October the 4th 1957, on an orbit with a perigee of 227 km, apogee of 947 km, inclination 65.1 °, period of revolution 96.2 minutes.

pogrom <paǵròm> s. m., russo [propr. «distruzione, devastazione», der. del v. gromit' «devastare, saccheggiare», col pref. po- che indica il completamento di un'azione]¹⁷

Table 1. Entry for *pogrom* in Dobrovol'skaja

DOBROVOL'SKAJA	
Italian-Russian	Russian-Italian
pogrom <i>m. invar. (anche fig.)</i> погрóм; organizzare un ~ учинить (устроить) погрóм; partecipante a un ~ погрóмщик (<i>m.</i>) ¹⁸	погрóм [pogróm] <i>m. 1</i> (антисемитский ~) (<i>stor.</i>) pogrom; еврейские ~ы i pogrom anti ebraici (<i>in Russia</i>) 2 devastazione (<i>f.</i>); учинить ~ devastare 3 (<i>fig.</i>) gran disordine; в доме настоящий ~ la casa è sottosopra ¹⁹

Table 2. Entry for *pogrom* in Kovalev

KOVALEV	
Italian-Russian	Russian-Italian
pogróm <i>m.</i> неизм. еврейский погрóм <i>m.</i>	погрóм <i>m.</i> (-а) 1 (антисемитский) pogróm <i>m.</i> ▪ еврейские погрóмы 2 (полный беспорядок) gran disordine <i>m.</i> ♦ в квартире настоящий п. nell'appartamento tutto è sottosopra ²⁰

To begin with, we note that the word occurs in the two sections of both bilingual dictionaries. Both of them also indicate its grammatical features, which are different in Italian: *pogrom* too is masculine, but unlike погрóм it is invariable in the number feature. This is most likely due to the prosodic structure of most Russian masculine nouns, which end in a consonant – an untypical outcome in Italian, where words typically end in a vowel.

¹⁷ Cf. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>. Translation: **pogrom** <paǵròm> s. m., Russian [liter. «destruction, devastation», der. from v. gromit' «destroy, plunder», with prefix po- that indicates action completion].

¹⁸ Translation: **pogrom** *m. invar. (also fig.)* погрóм; to organize a ~ учинить (устроить) погрóм; who takes part to a ~ погрóмщик

¹⁹ Translation: **погрóм** [pogróm] *m. 1* (антисемитский ~) (*hist.*) pogrom; еврейские ~ы i pogrom anti Hebrew (*in Russia*) **2** devastation (*f.*); учинить ~ to destroy **3** (*fig.*) big disorder; в доме настоящий ~ the house is upside down.

²⁰ Translation: **погрóм** *m.* (-а) **1** (антисемитский) **pogrom** *m.* ▪ еврейские погрóмы **2** (полный беспорядок) big disorder *m.* ♦ в квартире настоящий п. In the apartment everything is upside down.

With regards to the meaning of the word, we note that D. and K. are quite similar in the Russian section, but they differ substantially in the Italian one, where K. only provides the Russian equivalent with no examples. There is however another important difference between D. and K: whereas the equivalent for *pogrom* in D. is погром, in K. it is еврейский погром. It would thus seem that K. is more accurate in pointing out that the Russism is used in Italian only in its antisemitic acceptance, but not in its connotation as ‘big disorder’. Indeed, neither the monolingual Treccani nor the bilingual D. in the Italian section provide examples of *pogrom* in Italian sentences similar to the Russian one ‘в доме настоящий погром’. More specifically, Treccani defines *pogrom* as “violenta sollevazione popolare contro comunità ebraiche”²¹, and the only semantic extension it provides still bears ethnical or religious overtones: “Per estens., qualunque azione di persecuzione esercitata contro minoranze etniche o religiose con l’appoggio più o meno manifesto dell’ autorità centrale.”²²

* * *

Unlike borrowings, calques are literal translations in the TL of a word or phrase taken from the SL²³. Calques can be semantic or structural²⁴. The difference between them is that, in the structural calque, what is reproduced in the TL is not only the descriptive content of the SL word, but also its structure. An example of structural calque is the Italian phrase *culto della personalità*. This phrase originates from the Russian one культ личности, and replicates the SL model both semantically and structurally. Semantically, not only the meaning of the two Russian nouns is preserved in Italian (культ is *culto* and личность is *personalità*), but also the context in which the expression is used, as pointed out in Treccani and exemplified in (4).

(4) Entry for (*culto della*) *personalità* in the Italian monolingual dictionary Treccani

personalità s. f. [dal lat. tardo *personalitas -atis*, der. di *personalis* «personale»]. [...] **4b.** *Culto della p.*, espressione (in russo *kul't ličnosti*) con la quale il 20° congresso del Partito comunista dell’URSS (1956) definì il cieco ossequio alle direttive politiche non espresse dalla volontà dello stato tutto, ma di un governante (nella fattispecie Stalin),

²¹ Translation: violent popular uprising against Jewish communities.

²² Cf. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>. Translation: For extent., any persecutory action exerted against ethnic or religious minorities with more or less manifest central authority support.

²³ VINAY, J. P. – DARBELNET, J.: *Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais. Méthode de traduction*. Paris: Didier.

²⁴ GUSMANI, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

stigmatizzandolo come principio di un regime di dittatura e contrario a ogni concetto di reggimento democratico. Per estens., esaltazione collettiva e acritica di un uomo politico, un personaggio pubblico e sim²⁵.

Structurally, in both languages there is a complex noun phrase with a genitive complement, which is case-marked in Russian and marked by the articulate preposition *della* ('of the') in Italian. Such structural equivalence is absent in semantic calques. An example is the Italian word *disgelo* ('thawing') for the Russian оттепель, used also in its political acceptation, as Treccani shows (5).

(5) Entry for *disgèlo* in the Italian monolingual dictionary Treccani

disgèlo s. m. [der. di *disgelare*]. [...] anche, l'attenuarsi di un controllo politico troppo rigido nella situazione interna di un paese (con quest'ultimo sign., il termine è stato usato dallo scrittore russo I. G. Erenburg come titolo di un suo noto romanzo, in russo *Ottepel'*, che narra vicende relative all'epoca successiva alla morte di Stalin)²⁶

Borrowings and calques, as we have seen, are two fruitful ways to convey realia in the TL. Although they represent two different strategies, they are not mutually exclusive in the TL. An interesting example is the Russism колхоз (an abbreviation of the phrase коллективное хозяйство), which appears in the Italian language both as a borrowing and as a calque.

When it appears as a borrowing in Italian, колхоз is subject to different degrees of phonetic adaptations. Among them, the most significant is the change of the phoneme [x] into [k], in so far as the former is not extant in the Italian phonological system. This in turn has produced graphic realisations of the Russism other than the transliterated standard ones (i.e. *kolchoz* or *kolkhoz*), such as *colcos* and *kolhoz*²⁷, which aim to reproduce the phonemes rather than the graphemes using the Italian alphabetical system. Specifically, *colcos* would reflect the

²⁵ Cf. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>. Translation: **personality**. f. [from late Latin *personalitas -atis*, der. of *personalis* «personal»]. [...] **4b**. *Cult of p.*, expression (in Russian *kul't lichnosti*) through which the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR (1956) called the blind deference to policy directives, not originating from the will of the State all but from a man in power (in the case in point Stalin), stigmatizing it as the beginning of a dictatorship government and opposed to any concept of democratic regime. Extens., collective and uncritical glorification of a politician, of a public figure and sim.

²⁶ Cf. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>. Translation: **thaw** s. m. [der. of *to thaw*]. [...] also, the weakening of a too rigid political control in the internal situation of a country (with this last meaning, the term was used by the Russian writer I. G. Erenburg as the title of his famous novel, in Russian *Ottepel'*, which tells stories about the period following Stalin's death).

²⁷ ORIOLES, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

‘italianised’ version, where the grapheme *c* identifies the phoneme [k], and *kolhoz* attempts a mirror-image of the Russian pronunciation, with the grapheme *h* signalling the aspiration in [x]. Neither of them, however, achieves its purpose successfully, because the former generates more adaptations than it may be necessary, and the latter fails to account for phonetic aspects other than aspiration, such as the reduction of the unstressed [o] into [ʌ], and the devoicing of the final consonant [z] into [s]. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that, despite its various phonetic and graphic adaptations, the Russism *колхоз* has remained a pure borrowing.

When it appears as a calque, in Italian *колхоз* is found in three forms: *economia collettiva* ‘collective economy’²⁸, *azienda/proprietà (agricola) collettiva* ‘collective agricultural firm’²⁹ and *fattoria collettiva* ‘collective farm’.

Even from this brief presentation of the various ways in which *колхоз* has been lexicalised in Italian, it is easy to see that their registration in dictionaries is not without its problems. One issue concerns transliteration, because, as we have seen, in Italian *колхоз* is spelled in different ways. It would thus seem legitimate to see whether Italian monolingual dictionaries and the Italian section of bilingual dictionaries do include all these forms or only list the standard transliterated one (*kolchoz*). Another issue concerns calques, in so far as these too show different outcomes. Furthermore, in the case of *колхоз*, all calques in Italian are two-word phrases, so one may wonder under which of the two lemmas the phrase should be looked up in Italian. Let us then address these two issues separately by looking first at Treccani and then at D. and K.

Beginning with *колхоз* as a borrowing, in Treccani it appears under the voice *kolchoz*, namely the standard transliterated one, as shown in (5). The form *colcos* is mentioned in brackets before the explanation of the lemma, clarifying that it is an ‘italianised’ version, but it is not found as an independent entry.

(5) Entry for *kolchoz* in the Italian monolingual dictionary Treccani

kolchoz *<kalkhòs>* s. m., russo [abbrev. di *kol(ektivnoe) choz(jajstvo)* «azienda collettiva»] (anche italianizzato in *colcos*). – Nell’Unione Sovietica, l’azienda agraria collettiva, fondata sull’accordo di persone fisiche e disciplinata da un regolamento interno, concordato in armonia con i principî generali del codice agrario sovietico, che operava, sia pure con una certa autonomia, all’interno degli schemi produttivi generali fissati dallo stato; il

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 79.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 80.

kolchoz aveva la proprietà della terra da esso coltivata e dei mezzi impiegati nella produzione (si differenziava in ciò dal *sovchoz*, che era un'azienda agraria di stato).³⁰

The two bilingual dictionaries in turn offer different solutions, neither of them reflecting Treccani's: although they both include the lemma as a borrowing in Italian, D. (Table 3) only provides the standard transliterated form with no reference to others, whereas T. (Table 4) lists both *kolchoz* and *colcos* as separate entries, in which latter case the reader is referred to the former.

Table 3. Entry for *kolchoz* in Dobrovol'skaja

DOBROVOL'SKAJA	
Italian-Russian	Russian-Italian
kolchoz <i>m. invar. (stor.)</i> КОЛХО́З (КОЛЛЕКТИВНОЕ ХОЗЯЙСТВО); del (dal) ~ КОЛХО́ЗНЫЙ (agg.)	КОЛХО́З [kolchóz] <i>m. КОЛЛЕКТИВНОЕ ХОЗЯЙСТВО</i> kolchoz

Table 4. Entry for *kolchoz* in Kovalev

KOVALEV	
Italian-Russian	Russian-Italian
còlcos <i>m. неизм. см.</i> kolchoz kòlchoz <i>m. неизм.</i> КОЛХО́З <i>m.</i>	КОЛХО́З (-а) <i>m. còlcos</i> распустить к. sciogliere un còlcos

It could thus be argued that K. is a more helpful tool than D. to a less specialised Italian audience, who may ignore transliteration criteria and look up the borrowing under the initial *c* instead of *k*. But this holds true only for the Italian spelling of колхоз, and not for its meaning. Indeed, the less specialised audience may also ignore that колхоз stands for коллективное хозяйство, in which case the necessary information would be accessed in D. but not in K.

Moving on to calques, in theory at least, they could appear under multiple voices of the dictionary: under the adjective *collettivo*, which unites all forms, or under any of the three nouns

³⁰ Translation: **kolchoz** <Kalkhòs> s. m., Russian [abbrev. *kol(ektivnoe) khoz(yaystvo)* «collective farm»] (also Italianised in *còlcos*) - In the Soviet Union, the collective agricultural enterprise, founded on the agreement of individuals and governed by internal regulations, in accordance with the general principles of the Soviet agrarian code, which operated, albeit with a certain autonomy, within the general production schemes established by the state; the kolkhoz had ownership of the land it cultivated and of the means used in the production (it differed, in this sense, from the *sovkhos*, which was a state agrarian company).

economia, *azienda*, and *fattoria*. In practice, however, Treccani reports the calque only under the entry for *fattoria* (even though *azienda agricola* is also mentioned in brackets, but not listed as a separate entry), as shown in (6), whereas – perhaps surprisingly – D. and T. show no record of it under any of the lemmas that the calque consists of.

(6) Entry for *fattoria* in the Italian monolingual dictionary Treccani

fattoria s. f. [der. di *fattore*] [...] **2c.** *F. collettiva*, uno dei nomi con cui è stato tradotto (insieme con *azienda agricola collettiva*) il termine russo *kolchoz* (v.) [...] ³¹

Far from considering this a deficit of bilingual dictionaries, we interpret it as a sign that the Russism *колхоз* has become more popular in Italian as a borrowing than as a calque, despite – and perhaps even more surprisingly – the strongly ‘un-Italian’ phonological and prosodic structure of the word, causing a variety of phonetic and graphic adaptations. The fact however remains that, if a non-specialised user came across a calque such as *economia collettiva* and wished to know its Russian equivalent, s/he would find it neither in monolingual nor in bilingual dictionaries.

* * *

In sum, we have seen how – even by selecting only a couple of Russisms in the Italian language (*pogrom* and *kolchoz*), and comparing their registration in two bilingual dictionaries (Dobrovol’skaja and Kovalev) – there is significant variation as to how realia are encoded in the target language section, in three important respects: (a) range of semantic areas to which the Russism is associated in Italian (wider in D. than in K.), (b) range of graphic forms in which the Russism is attested as a borrowing (wider in K. than in D.), and (c) number of calques (highly dispreferred over borrowings in both D. and K.). We have seen how linguistic theory can help us analyse such differences. Why then not trying with further examples, possibly including other target languages in a lexicographic perspective (an area that cries out for further research on realia)?

³¹ Cf. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>. Translation: **Farm** s. f. [der. from *farmer*] c. *F. collective*, one of the names used to translate the Russian word *kolchoz* (cf.) (together with *agricultural collective firm*).

Bibliography:

1. BARKHUDAROV, L. S. 1975. Yazyk i perevod (Voprosy obshchey i chastnoy teorii perevoda). *Language and translation. Questions in the general and specialized theory of translation*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
2. CATFORD, J. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Oxford: OUP.
3. DJACHY, K. – PARESHISHVILI, M. 2014. Realia as carriers of national and historical overtones. In: *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2014, Vol. 4, part 1, pp. 8 – 14.
4. DOBROVOL'SKAJA, J. 2001. *Grande dizionario russo-italiano/italiano-russo (Russian -Italian/Italian-Russian big dictionary)*. Milan, Ulrico Hoepli Editor.
5. FERNÁNDEZ GUERRA, A. 2012. Translating culture: problems, strategies and practical realities. In: *[SIC] – A Journal of Literature, Culture and Literary Translation*, Vol. 5.
6. GRAEDLER, A. 2012. Cultural shock. In: *Oslo Studies in English on the Net – Translation course*. University of Oslo.
7. GUSMANI, R. 1981. *Saggi sull'interferenza linguistica (Essays on linguistic interference)*. Firenze, Casa Editrice le Lettere.
8. HARVEY, M. 2012. “A beginner’s course in legal translation: the case of culture-bound terms.” In: *Tradulex.org. Geneve 2000: Actes. La traduction juridique. Histoire, théorie(s) et pratique*.
9. HERMANS, T. (ed.). 1985. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London/Sydney: Croom Helm, 1985.
10. HOUSE, J. 2006. “Text and Context in Translation”. In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 38, pp. 338 – 358.
11. KOVALEV, V. 1995. *Russo Pyckkuy. Dizionario russo-italiano/italiano-russo (Russian-Italian/Italian-Russian dictionary)*. Bologna, Zanichelli, 1995.
12. NICOLAI, G. M. 2003. *Dizionario delle parole russe che s'incontrano in italiano*. Roma, Bulzoni Editore.
13. NIDA, E. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
14. NIDA, E. – TABER, Ch. 1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

15. ORIOLES, V. 1984. *Su alcune tipologie di russismi in italiano (On some typologies of Russian realia in Italian)*. University of Udine.
16. REISS, K. – VERMEER, H. 1984. *Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
17. SANTOYO, J. C. 1994. Traducción de cultura, traducción de civilización. In: *Estudis sobre la traducció*. Ed. Amparo Hurtado Albir. Castellón: Universitat Jaume, Vol. I, pp. 141 – 152.
18. SNELL-HORNBY, M. 1988. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
19. TORRE, E. 1994. *Teoría de la traducción literaria*. Madrid: Síntesis.
20. TRECCANI on-line <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>
21. VINAY, J. P. – DARBELNET, J. 1977. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction*. París: Didier.
22. VLAHOV S. – FLORIN S. 1986. *Neperevodimoe v perevode*. Moskva: Vysšaja škola.
23. WIERZBICKA, A. 1986. Human emotions: Universal or culture-specific? In: *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 88, pp. 584 – 594.
24. YIFENG, S. 2012. “(Un)translatability and cross-cultural readability”. In: *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, Vol. 20, pagg. 231 – 247.
25. YOKOYAMA, O. 2006. Culture and Language: Realia Explored through Linguistics. In: Kawaguchi Y., Kameyama I., Tomimori N., & Takagaki T. (eds.), *Sinposiumu, kouenkai, kenkyuu houkoku*, pp. 105 – 120. TUFS: Tokyo.