
LACUNAS AND NON-EQUIVALENT LEXICS AS A REFLECTION OF LINGUISTIC CULTURE

R.Jumamuratova

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh, Ch.Abdirov St. 1, Nukus city,
Republic of Karakalpakstan, Uzbekistan, 230112

Abstract

This article deals with linguistic gaps and the correlation of non-equivalent vocabulary with them in the English and Karakalpak languages. Invisible from within, but revealed when comparing two linguocultures, lacunas and non-equivalent vocabulary are fixators of their specificity and in the teaching process deserve special attention, since they also carry rich information about the culture of the language being studied and the mentality of its bearer.

Keywords: lacunas, lexical, linguistic, reflection

Introduction

According to SI Ozhegov's dictionary, a lacuna means "a gap, a gap, a missing place in the text" [5]. The concept of lacunarity is widely considered by both foreign and domestic researchers. Studying the problem of lacunae in the lexical systems of languages, scientists use different terminology. For example, the Canadian linguists Jean-Paul Vine and Jean Darbelne in the work "Comparative stylistics of the French and British languages. Method of translation" [6] call this phenomenon "lacunae", as did VL Muravyov in the study of the Russian and French languages [7]. K. Hale in his work "Gaps, gaps in grammar and culture", examining the Australian language, compares it with English, while using the term "gap" ("space, lacuna") [8]. Yu. S. Stepanov in his work "French stylistics in comparison with Russian" uses the term "anti-words", "blank spots on the semantic map of the language" [9]. The Voronezh scientist IA Sternin calls this phenomenon "no equivalents" [10] and others. Different terminology when considering this linguistic phenomenon speaks of its diversity, complexity and insufficient knowledge. All this requires further consideration and elaboration. Using the method of comparison, we studied gaps in the indicated languages (interlanguage gaps) and linguistic units within one language (intra-lingual gaps). Therefore, the subject of our research is interlingual gaps, or interlingual gaps. Typological comparison of the lacunae in the Turkic languages (Karakalpak), on the one hand, and Romano-Germanic (English), on the other, is done for the first time, in which we see the novelty of this study.

Materials and methods

In the narrow sense, a lacuna is the absence in the lexical system of the language of a word to denote a particular concept. These are language lacunasthat Yu.S. Stepanov called spaces, "white spots" on the semantic map of the language [1. p. 120]. They exist in every language and are invisible from the inside, but they are revealed when juxtaposed. Yu.S. Stepanov proposed to distinguish between absolute and relative gaps. Absolute gaps are recognized when compiling translation dictionaries as words that do not have an equivalent in the form of a word in a given language. In other words, absolute gaps are the absence of a lexical unit in one language if it exists in another, as a result of which the meaning of a given unit can only be conveyed descriptively. So, for example, the absolute gaps for the English language are the Karakalpak words *ayran*, *botakoz*, *arebek*. Relative lacunae are words that are rarely used in a language and under special circumstances.

The Karakalpak words *sholmek*, *kiymeshek*, *baldyz*, which are key words for the Karakalpak language and culture, can be considered relative gaps for the English language.

The division of lacunae into absolute and relative is, however, not supported by all researchers. According to D. B. Gudkov, the very term "relative gap" does not seem to be a good one, because, as he notes, "there can be no relative gap" [2. p. 79].

In a broad sense, the term "lacuna" is used to compare not only languages, but also other aspects of culture. Some researchers propose to define gaps as gaps, "white spots" on the semantic map of language, text or culture, which are the ways of existence of national consciousness [2. P. 4]. They are also revealed in the comparison that takes place in the context of intercultural communication. I.V. Tomasheva proposes to call gaps "nationally specific elements of culture, which have found a corresponding reflection in the language of the carriers of this culture, which are either not fully understood, or are misunderstood by carriers of a different culture and language in the process of communication" [3. p. 49].

Lacunas in the most general sense fix what is in one culture and what is not in another, i.e. they are a signal of the specificity of language and culture. Linguists who consider gaps in a broad sense, in addition to linguistic gaps, they also highlight cultural gaps. They consider this approach expedient and methodologically justified, since, on the one hand, such an extension of the concept of "lacuna" is based on the actually existing relationship between language and culture; on the other hand, it can help to establish some specific forms of interrelation between language and culture.

Different classifications of lacunae are proposed depending on the differences and grounds highlighted. In ethnopsycholinguistics, the following types are distinguished: 1. linguistic gaps (lexical, stylistic and grammatical); 2. culturological gaps (ethnographic, psychological, behavioral and kinesic); 3. text gaps.

If we compare English and Karakalpak languages, then an example of lexical lacunae in English can be, for example, the Karakalpak words *shubat*, *jiyen*, *dayi*.

The grammatical gap in the English language is the gender category. In English, the Karakalpak words *shalap*, *takya*, *tobelik*, etc. are the stylistic lacunae distinguished on the basis of the absence of a word with a similar stylistic coloration in one of the compared languages.

Ethnographic lacunas are directly related to extra-linguistic reality, their existence is due to the absence of realities characteristic of one culture in another culture. For example, such gaps for the English language are the Karakalpak words *tara*, *onirmonshak*, *ashigan*. Since ethnographic lacunas occupy an intermediate position between linguistic and extralinguistic, some authors propose to call them not cultural, but linguistic cultural.

Psychological lacunas are associated with differences in the national psychological types of participants in communication (an example of such a gap can be, for example, the Karakalpak good-naturedness and sluggishness compared to English restraint).

Behavioral lacunas represent a discrepancy in the rules of everyday behavior among different peoples. Gaps in communication etiquette and routine are highlighted. So, for example, the wish for *bon appetite*, adopted in many European cultures, can be called a behavioral gap for English culture.

Text gaps are usually associated with case texts.

There are also emotive lacunae, which are closely interconnected with linguistic and cultural. Lacunarity in the sphere of emotions is felt both in their nomination and in the means of expression. Lacunar for the English language are, for example, the Karakalpak calls with diminutive-affectionate (*bozlag'*) in the Karakalpak language, English addresses *sweetheart honey* are lacunas.

By extra-linguistic conditioning, motivated and unmotivated gaps are distinguished. Motivated ones are gaps that are explained by the absence of a corresponding object or phenomenon in the national culture, unmotivated gaps cannot be explained by the absence of a phenomenon or object - there are corresponding objects and phenomena in culture, but there are no words to denote them. So, for example, the words of the Karakalpak language *tarlam balalaika*, *botaköz* are motivated lacunas in the English language, since they call realities that do not exist in English culture, and the words *ayran*, *juriarebek*, are unmotivated.

When studying gaps, we certainly come across non-equivalent vocabulary, and it is no coincidence that non-equivalent units and gaps are always revealed "in pairs", i.e. if there is a gap in one language, then in the compared language it is a non-equivalent unit, and vice versa [1. P. 207]. In fact, gaps and non-equivalent vocabulary consider the same phenomenon, but from different positions: speaking of gaps, we pay attention to the fact that one or another unit is absent in one language, speaking of non-equivalent vocabulary - to the fact of its presence in another language and the possibility of correlating it with the first language.

Non-equivalent lexicon - lexical units of one language that do not have equivalent correspondences in another language, i.e. they are units of one language that oppose gaps in another. These are, first of all, realities and concepts specific to a particular culture, names of objects and phenomena of traditional life, also historicisms, phraseological units, etc. Examples of non-equivalent vocabulary calling specific realities in the Karakalpak language are the words *shalap*, *shubat*, *kymyz*, in English - *beefeater*, *pint*, *double-decker*. - Words that name realities and concepts existing in another language, but do not have their own names in it (in the Karakalpak language there are no equivalents to the English words *sibling*, *grandparents*, *neighborhood*, *fortnight*, etc.) can also be non-equivalent.

These examples confirm the opinion of researchers that the absence of a word in a language does not mean the absence of a corresponding concept [12. P. 6]. Other words and expressions are found, with the help of which it is possible to at least approximately convey the corresponding meaning, but the presence of a special word in a language indicates its special significance for a given culture.

The English word friend, according to dictionaries, is someone you know and who you like, but is not a member of the family ('someone you know and like, that is not, a member of your family'). The word friend is not only does in the understanding of the Karakalpaks, but also *tanysbilis*. As a result, the number of British friends can reach hundreds. In English culture, friends exist for a pleasant pastime, they should not be burdened with problems, in relations with them it is necessary to maintain a distance. English proverbs teach this as well: A Hedge between keeps friendship green Friends are like fiddle-strings and they must not be screwed too tightly.

Compare with the Karakalpak *duspannyshindedebirdostynbolsyn* (people are needed everywhere. Acquaintances). *Dos basynaistuskandebilinedi* - you get to know a friend in trouble, i.e. the Karakalpaks share their joy and problems with their friends. This is due to the preservation of tribal relations among the Karakalpaks. Friends can also be called brothers. The Karakalpak word "*doslyk*" and the English "friendship" are not equivalents. In the Karakalpak language, *dostlyk* means "a close relationship based on mutual trust, affection, community of interests," it's such a friendship that "*arasynankylotpes*" and "cannot be cut with an ax". In English, friendship ----- 'a relation between people who are friends', i.e. the relationship (exactly in the singular) between people who are friends. Other linguistic facts also testify to the fact that these relations are different between the Karakalpaks and the British. In English, there is no verb to be friends, i.e.; this word for the English language is a linguistic gap. Dictionaries translate it as be friends or keep company. However, in an English company, each person is a separate person, whose independence and individuality cannot be infringed upon. In such a company, one should not forget about the distance, which in English culture is the guarantor of good relations (J hedge between keeps friendship green). Friends are not burdened with problems, they are needed for a pleasant pastime.

Conclusion

Thus, the lacunas, being specific to each language, reflect the mental and cultural identity of the people. Differences in their semantics are often related to. the values of a particular culture of the Lacuna fixed in the word, as well as non-equivalent vocabulary, are revealed when comparing languages and cultures and reflect their characteristics.

References

1. Stepanov, Yu.S. French style. Moscow, Higher school, 1997.
2. Bogdanova L.I. The problem of lacunae in the process of interaction of languages and cultures. *Humaniora: Lingua russica. Works on Russian and Slavic philology. Linguistics IX. Interaction of languages and linguistic units.* - Tartu: 2006. pp. 27-30.

3. Bykova GV Lacunarity as a category of lexical systemology. - Blagoveshchensk: 2003
4. Vezhbitskaya A. Russian cultural scripts and LACKS AND NON-EQUIVALENT LEXICO AS a reflection of linguistic culture.
5. Ozhegov S.I. Dictionary of the Russian language. Moscow,Russianlanguage, 1986.797 p.
6. Muravyov V.L. Lexical gaps (based on the vocabulary of the French and Russian languages). Vladimir, 1975.96 p.
7. Vinay J. P., Darbelnet J. Stylistiquecomparee du francais et de l'anglais. Methode de traduction. Paris, 1958. 331 p.
8. Hale K Gaps in grammar and culture.Linguistics and anthropology in honor of C. F. Volgelin-Jisse. New York, 1975. pp. 295-315.
9. Stepanov Yu. S. French stylistics in comparison with Russian. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2003.359 p.
10. Sternin I.A. Lexical lacunarity and conceptual non-equivalence. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 1997, 18 p.