

THE CONCEPT OF NON-EQUIVALENT VOCABULARY IN LINGUISTICS

Islomova Matluba Isroil kizi

1st year master of faculty of foreign philology, The National University of Uzbekistan
named after Mirzo Ulugbek

ABSTRACT

The article clarifies some peculiarities and analysis of non-equivalent vocabulary in linguistics. Using some linguistic methods and literatures of linguists we make an effort to clarify what is non-equivalency and the role of it in translation.

Keywords: *non-equivalence vocabulary, comparative method, equivalence, lacuna, lacunas unit.*

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье уточняются некоторые особенности и анализ безэквивалентной лексики в языкознании. Используя некоторые лингвистические методы и литературу лингвистов, мы пытаемся выяснить, что такое неэквивалентность и ее роль в переводе.

Ключевые слова: *неэквивалентная лексика, сравнительный метод, эквивалентность, лакуна, единица лакуны.*

INTRODUCTION

In the procedure of translation, there are different correlations between two languages: the source language and the target language. Analysing translation we should overcome the typical difficulties of translation connected with the specific of each language and what elements of original stay untranslatable in the text. A comparative analysis of translations reveals the fact that there are some lexical units in the source language that don't have direct correspondence in the target language. These lexical units are called non-equivalent units. Non-equivalent units can be found primarily among neologisms, in the words indicating specific notions and national realities, among little known names and appellations for which we have to create occasional correspondences in the process of translation [9]. For example such English words such as *glimpse, baby-sitter, barber, beauty sleep*, don't have direct equivalents in Uzbek. We aim to show the importance of researching untranslatable vocabulary for translator's activity, about non-equivalent vocabulary of different fields.

In this article we tried to clarify the concept of non-equivalent vocabulary, how to translate them, the scientific researches of some linguists on this theme.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Learning non-equivalent vocabulary system we used some linguistic methods to ease the understanding. First of all traditional-descriptive method is used in this research. Following general linguistic method are served as methodological bases of our investigation. Contrastive and comparative methods, which let to analyze and to describe lexical units, reveal general and peculiar things in investigated languages. Materials of investigation have been taken from different internet resources, genres and art style, newspaper publicist and popular science texts, linguistic literatures and etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

However the fact of existence of non-equivalent units doesn't mean that their meaning can't be transferred in translation. Numerous linguistic researches showed that despite the big difficulties in transferring of non-equivalent vocabulary the solution of this problem can be found.

The problem of equivalence lies in the area, in which an interdisciplinary consensus has been achieved: lexico-semantic structures of lexis of a particular language are peculiar, specific to this language and, therefore, they are partially unique. It means that the lexical-semantic structures of two (or more) languages are non-isomorphic. Non-isomorphy of lexis forms the theoretical and observed empirical circumstances, examination of which leads to concrete manifestations of the problem of equivalence in different disciplines [5;56]. The history of every language gives evidence of constant changes of vocabulary according to rapid modifications of the life of society with the development of production, culture, science. Distinction between languages provided by cultural difference is noticeable in vocabulary and phraseology because the nominative means of language linked with extra linguistic reality. There are some words in any language which have no one-word translation in other languages. This is so-called **non-equivalent lexis** particularly denotation specific notions of local culture [6;.52]. So semantics of words with national-cultural specifics are peculiar "mirror" of national culture and reflect features and trends of the language system development. [3;157-158] National-cultural specifics of semantics of words. V. Gladrov says that "It is necessary to differ names of realias from names which have no equivalent correspondence in comparing language spite of corresponding denotat" [7; 15]. L.S.Barhudarov calls such lexemes "random lacunas," [1; 95] . Distinction of the notion "lacunar unit" and "lacuna" excludes synonymization of the notion "lacunar unit" and non-equivalent unit. As we can see, the word of one language can be lacunar correlating

with lacuna of the the other language and at the same time has an equivalent in this language. For example, uzbek word “*ko`k*” covers the meaning of three words – “**blue, dark blue, green**”. One uzbek word – “*ola*” corresponded to the English as two words “*black and white*”. The notion of lacunar unit and non – equivalent unit is not synonymous because lacunar unit as a language unit has level characteristics.

Comparative researches of languages showed that national – cultural differences appeared especially on the lexical – phraseological levels. A lot of researchers agree that in translation studying of non–equivalent vocabulary is linked with the notion of “transferability” and “equivalent”, with the problem of non-equivalent and vocabulary translation means which denotes items or phenomena of national culture. Famous scientists of the field of translation such as L.S.Barhudarov, S.Vlahov, S.Florin, V.N.Komissarov, Ya.I.Resker, V.L.Rossels, G.V.Shatkov, A.V.Fedorov, A.D.Shveysarov, G.V.Chernov, A.O.Ivanov and others did notable contribution to the progress of this issue. Differences in modern linguistics, linguistic theory of translation, ethno-linguistics, ethno-psycholinguistics, contrastive linguistics, theory of intercultural communication mismatching between languages and cultures fixed in different language levels are described with different terms by authors. So words denoting notion, items, phenomena which are typical only for certain language collective and not having analogue in another language are defined with following terms: “non-equivalent vocabulary” (L.S.Barhudarov, E.M.Vereshagin, V.G.Kostomarov), “realiz”, “exoticisms” (S.Vlahov, S.Florin) “xenonims” (V.V.Kabakchi), “logoepistememes” (E.Yu.Prohorov), “lacuna” (I.A.Sterkin, V.L.Muravev) and others. Exactly this kind of language units make national – cultural content of initial language text and represent ethno semantic level difficulties which recipient faces in intercultural communication. According to F.M.Vereshogina and V.G.Kostomrova, non-equivalent vocabulary – these are words which cannot be semantic with the assistance of translation (they have no sustainable compliance in other languages, they have no notional compliance in the content system, particular to other languages) “words, plan of content which cannot be compared with any other foreign language vocabulary notions. That’s why the notion of “non-equivalent vocabulary”, involve not only absence of equivalent but also the reason of this certain absence – “reflection with specific material and spiritual culture words. [2;138]

Classification of non-equivalent vocabulary can be conducted by genetic trait.

1. Word of life (all neologisms)
2. Names of items and phenomena’s of traditional life.
3. Historicisms

4. Lexis of phrasedogical units
5. Folklore words
6. Slang words / youth slang, criminal slang, military slang, any professional slang
7. Social – political vocabulary
8. Reduced, colloquial vocabulary.

A.O.Ivanov divides all nonequivalent vocabulary into three big groups:

1. Referentially – nonequivalent, which includes term, individual, neologisms, semantic lacunas, words of wide semantics, complex words;
2. Pragmatically – nonequivalent, uniting abnormalities, foreign inclusions, abbreviations, words with suffixes of subjective evolution, interjections, imitation a sound and associative lacunas;
3. Alternatively – nonequivalent vocabulary including proper names, circulation, realia and phraseologisms [4; 46] .

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, non-equivalent vocabulary is treated very wide from the point of availability of translation equivalent. Thus, in this article we examined different types of nonequivalent vocabulary. We discovered the followings:

-there are two reasons caused the factor of nonequivalence: divergence of referential meanings of lexical units in the source language and the target language and divergence of pragmatic meanings of lexical units;

-the cases of discrepancy of referential meanings are usually connected with a lack of lexical unit in the target language equal by its referential meaning with lexical unit in the source language or in another case, caused by incomplete coincidence of referential meanings of the lexical units in the source and target languages.

We saw that some types of non-equivalent units can be easily transferred by different types of translation like for instance, terms or semantic lacunas, and don't arouse big difficulties for a translator. But some other types of non-equivalent units can be a hard deal for a translator to transfer their meaning. Non-equivalent vocabulary of English language we viewed peculiarities of translation of the units-departures from language norm: dialecticisms, slang, vulgarisms, archaisms and other. We made sure in the fact that all these types of nonequivalent units always represent rather a complication as they often don't have equivalents in the vocabulary of the target language. They also present difficulties because they often mix one with another and form so-called vernacular.

So we can make a conclusion that non-equivalent units in English bear quite concrete character and can be researched in the theory of translation.

REFERENCES

1. Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод: вопросы общей и частной теории перевода – М.: Академия, 2004. – 237с.
2. Верещагин Е.М. Язык и культура. – М. : Русский язык, 1990. – 387 с.
3. Зубкова Л.И. Лингвострановедческий подход в изучении национально-культурной специфики слова // Научно-методический сборник. – Воронеж, 1993. №43. – С. 157–158.
4. Иванов А.О. Безэквивалентная лексика. – Спб.: Союз, 2007, - 256с.
5. Кармин А.С. Культурология. Ч. 1. Морфология культуры. Гл. 2. Семиотика культуры. - Спб., 2001.
6. Мечковская, Н.Б. Социальная лингвистика. – М.: аспект Пресс, 2006. – 206с.
7. Стернин И.А. Контрастивная лингвистика. – М.: Восток-запад, 2006. – 206с.
8. Gladrow, W. Russischim Spiegelndes Deutschen / W. Gladrow. – Wien : Lang, 1998. – 271 S
9. <https://www.livescience.com>
10. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/language>