

# **Non-equivalent Vocabulary and the Main Methods of its Transmission during Translation (on the Example of Uzbek and Turkish Languages)**

*Dr. Zilola Khudaybergenova,  
Professor, Bartin University, Türkiye. E-mail: [aloliz74@mail.ru](mailto:aloliz74@mail.ru)*

**Abstract---** Recently, more and more attention is paid to such areas in modern science as cultural linguistics, linguistic and regional studies. A large number of works that in one way or another touch on the problem of "language and culture" testifies to the relevance of studying the phenomena of language in their correlation with its Non-equivalence Non-equivalence Non-equivalence and cultural specifics of linguistic units and, above all, the word as a complex unit of language and culture. Among the nationally colored layers of vocabulary, a special place is occupied by non-equivalent vocabulary. Language is a specific system that reflects the cultural, mental and psycholinguistic space of a nation, so it is not surprising that there are "untranslatable" concepts in every language. The specificity of the linguistic picture of a foreign cultural communicant is especially vividly manifested when using non-equivalent vocabulary.

Many researchers have dealt with the problem of non-equivalent vocabulary, for example, V.N. Komissarov, Ya. I. Retsker, S. Vlahov, S. Florin, A.V. Fedorov, L.S. Barkhudarov, M.G. Komlev, T. D. Tomakhin, A.D. Schweitzer, G.V. Chernov e.i. [9, 10, 18, 23, 4, 1, 10, 21, 20, 2, 3]. Speaking of non-equivalent vocabulary, one cannot bear in mind its absolute untranslability. The question comes down to how to transfer this vocabulary to another language.

**Keywords---** Equivalence, Non-Equivalence, Non-Equivalent Vocabulary Non-Equivalent Vocabulary, Lacuna, Semantic Gaps, Correspondence, Pragmatically Non-Equivalent Vocabulary, Generalization, Concretization, Analogy.

## **I. Introduction**

Traditionally, translation is viewed from the point of view of fidelity, i.e. completeness and accuracy of transmission of the original. It is in this sense that one speaks of "good" or "bad" translations. The original is aimed at the reader who knows the language in which the original was written, while the translation is designed for the recipient who, not knowing the original language, needs the mediation of the translation, through which he gets to know the original. It is clear that it is impossible to achieve full compliance of the translation with the original. When trying to preserve in translation as much of the original as possible, the text turns out to be unjustifiably cumbersome and even incomprehensible [22: 72].

According to L.K. Latysheva and A.L. Semenov, it is very useful to look at the translation through the prism of the philosophical doctrine of identity + equality + equivalence, since the concept of equivalence in translation, which has recently become widespread, is used without sufficient scientific justification, as something a priori or intuitively accepted [12: 23; 13: 121].

Meanwhile, it is the introduction of the term "equivalence" into translation theory and its replacement of the synonymous term "adequacy" that open up a favorable opportunity to link the

problem of translational equivalence with the broad general scientific and philosophical problems of identity + equality + equivalence and solve it at a much higher theoretical level.

The word “adequacy”, used in translation theory specifically to denote translation equivalence, is a local, purely translation term: in the general scientific sense, adequacy is not a term, but is used non-terminologically - in the meaning of “quite appropriate”, “equal”. Because of this, in those cases when the term “adequacy” is used instead of the term “equivalence”, the problem of translational equivalence is already at the terminological level isolated from the broad general scientific and philosophical problems of identity - equality - equivalence.

Another thing is the term "equivalence", which is the designation of the generic concept of all kinds of relations such as equality.

Equivalence of objects means their equality in some respect; there is no equality of objects in all respects. Everything of the universe is the only thing; two things, each of which is the same thing as the other, do not exist.

Non-equivalence is a phenomenon arising from the difference in thinking and division of reality among different peoples. In addition to functional-situational aspects, linguistic units in a statement often bring additional meaning to the content, which is directly related to the linguocultural space and experience of a particular people. The nature of non-equivalence is a question that cannot be fully answered, being only within the framework of linguistics, it is necessary to resort to other sciences, such as cultural studies, sociology, history, ethnography. G.D. Tomakhin defines non-equivalent vocabulary as lexical units that do not have dictionary equivalents in one of the compared languages, either due to the absence in social practice of its carriers of the corresponding realities, or due to the lack of lexical units denoting the corresponding concepts in it [21: 72]. The lexical units of the source language that do not have a corresponding equivalent in the translating language are considered to be non-equivalent vocabulary in linguistics. At the same time, “non-equivalence” should not be understood as a complete absence in the translating language of means for conveying the meaning of a given lexical unit of the source language. Such funds are usually available. The non-equivalence of the lexical unit of the source language can only be understood as the fact that it has no analogue in the lexical system of the translating language, that is, such a “ready-made” word or stable phrase that can be substituted for it in the context of a specific translation.

Ya.I. Retsker also defines non-equivalent vocabulary as a designation of realities characteristic of the country of the original language and alien to another language and other reality [18: 63]. Under the non-equivalent vocabulary of L.S. Barkhudarov means lexical units of one of the languages that “have neither full nor partial equivalents among the lexical units of another language” [1: 78].

The author classifies three large categories of lexical units as non-equivalent vocabulary.

The first category - proper names, geographical names, names of institutions, organizations, newspapers.

The second category is realities - words denoting objects, concepts and situations that do not exist in the practical experience of people speaking another language, for example, the names of dishes of national cuisine, types of folk clothes, that is, objects of material and spiritual culture.

The third group includes "random gaps", i.e. lexical units of one of the languages for which, for whatever reason, there is no correspondence in the lexical composition of another language.

V.N. Krupnov does not disclose the composition of the non-equivalent vocabulary. He defines this category as "words and phrases denoting objects, processes and phenomena that at this stage of translation development do not have equivalents in it." [11: 42].

V.N. Krupnov divides non-equivalent vocabulary into two groups [11: 46]:

1. Vocabulary that belongs to the category of non-equivalent, because at this stage in the target language, sufficiently successful matches have not yet been proposed (that is, temporary non-equivalence);
2. Vocabulary, which belongs to the category of non-equivalent, because in the translation language there can be no equivalents at all.

V.N. Komissarov also dwells on the phenomenon of non-equivalence in languages. He calls non-equivalent units of the source language that do not have regular correspondences in the target language [9: 65]. According to this translation theorist, non-equivalent vocabulary is found among neologisms, among words that name specific concepts and national realities, and among little-known names and titles for which one has to create occasional correspondences in the translation process.

In translation theory, non-equivalent vocabulary traditionally includes: words-realities, temporarily non-equivalent terms, accidentally non-equivalent words.

A.K. Gatilova included one more, new class in the non-equivalent vocabulary: lexical units with a morphological structure unique for the translating language, the so-called structural exoticisms [5: 17]. It is known that the Turkish language has a powerful word-formation potential. This allows you to create unique, purely Turkish concepts with very complex semantics, which are not found in many other languages.

Some researchers include in the composition of non-equivalent vocabulary such a concept as semantic gaps. V.L. Muravyov extends the term "lacuna" to all non-equivalent vocabulary [17: 71]. L.S. Barkhudarov talks about "accidental gaps" [1: 93].

The term "lacuna" is convenient when it comes to the inexplicable absence of any concept in the target language. In most cases, it is not possible to find a "rational" explanation for the absence of a word with a specific meaning in one language and its presence in another. It can be difficult to determine the specific reasons for the presence or absence of one degree or another in a given language, and one has to refer to the "national identity" of the structure of a particular language. For example the non-linguistic reality that surrounds Uzbek and Turkish can be identical, and yet one language notices and linguistically formalizes those aspects of this reality that the other language prefers not to express. The absence in the compared languages of fixed concepts corresponding to Turkish words is due to the fact that each language in its own way divides objective reality. These concepts exist in Uzbek and Turkish reality.

There is no unity among researchers in defining the concept of non-equivalence. Some linguists have general definitions of non-equivalent vocabulary. They include in its composition all words of the source language that have no equivalents in the target language. Other linguists narrow the concept of non-equivalent vocabulary to lexical units that name national-specific realities, that is, words denoting various kinds of objects of material and spiritual culture inherent only to a given nation (Schweitzer A.D., Fedorov A.V.). Meanwhile, from the review of works on translation theory, it is clear that realities are part of the non-equivalent vocabulary as one of its categories. Still others (Vlakhov S., Florin S.) consider it as a complex group that includes many categories, including realities.

The characteristics of non-equivalent vocabulary offered by translation theorists and specialists in cultural linguistics generally coincide. A comprehensive consideration of non-equivalent vocabulary as a multilayer group of lexical units, which is the subject of research in such sciences as the theory and practice of translation, makes it possible to more fully outline the entire variety of these language units, clarify the ways of their transmission in other languages, methods of interpretation in a foreign language audience.

L.K. Latyshev and A.L. Semenov emphasize that translation equivalence is not identical to communicative-functional equivalence, but reflects the optimal fulfillment of a number of conditions [14: 92]. Thus, a translation that has, in general, a potential effect on the addressee, similar to that characteristic of the original, but containing unmotivated semantic and structural deviations from it, can be recognized as non-equivalent. Conversely, a translation that does not have an impact that is sufficiently similar to the original can be recognized as generally equivalent if the lack of communicative-functional equivalence is due to objective reasons. But, according to Komissarov, the main thing is that at any level of equivalence, translation can provide interlanguage communication [8: 64].

Thus, the lexical composition of different languages is not the same. Despite the fact that most of the words of any language have more or less exact matches in other languages (if this were not the case, no translation would be possible), each language has a certain amount of vocabulary that is unique to it and has no analogue in other languages. Such vocabulary is called non-equivalent.

## **II. Ways to Classify Non-equivalent Vocabulary**

A non-equivalent lexical unit is often called a "lacuna". Defining the term "lacuna", D.W. Hashimova [6: 96], the author of the article on gaps, refers to the works of many famous linguists: for example, L.S. Barkhudarov gives the following definition of gaps: gaps are vocabulary units of one of the languages, which for some reason (not always clear) do not correspond in lexical composition (in the form of words and phrases) of another language [1: 121].

I.Yu. Markovina argues that gaps in the most general concept fix what is in one linguocultural community and what is not in another, these are signals of the specificity of one or another linguocultural community in comparison with some other community [16: 9].

S. Florin and S. Vlahov understand gaps as linguistic and extralinguistic facts inherent in a particular language and a particular culture in their comparison with other languages and cultures [23: 137].

According to S. Volkov, the core of the lacuna are words-realities [24: 126]. S. Volkov defines words-realities as a special category of vocabulary of each language, which reflects the national-specific features of the culture of the people - of the native speaker of this language and is the main part of non-equivalent words, the content plan of which cannot be compared with any foreign language lexical units.

Practical reality can be considered everything that, for its adequate description, requires either an encyclopedic reference, or reports of some everyday (known to native speakers, but not known to foreigners) information [15: 231].

In addition to the usual realities, marked with non-equivalent vocabulary, background information contains realities of a special kind, which can be called associative. These realities

are associated with a variety of national historical and cultural phenomena. Associative realities were not reflected in special words, in non-equivalent vocabulary, but were fixed in the most ordinary words. They find their materialized expression in the components of word meanings, in shades of words, in emotionally expressive overtones, in the internal verbal form, etc., revealing informational discrepancies between conceptually similar words in the languages being compared.

L.K. Latyshev divides the non-equivalent vocabulary into words-realities, temporarily non-equivalent terms, random non-equivalents and structural exotisms, and speaks about the reason for the lexical non-equivalence [14: 152].

The reason for the lack of equivalence of words-realities is the absence in the practical experience of native speakers of translating objects or phenomena, and therefore, the concepts indicated by these words.

For example:

*Uzbek: Do'ppi (national headdress) – Turkish: doppi;*

*Turkish: fes (national headdress) – Uzbek: fes;*

*Uzbek: cho'pon (national outerwear) – Turkish: çopon;*

*Turkish: çarşaf (top women's national cape, designed to cover the head and face) – Uzbek: chorshaf.*

By their nature, temporarily non-equivalent terms are close to words-realities. The lack of equivalence is due to the uneven distribution of achievements in the field of science and in the social sphere, as a result of which the innovation present in the practical experience of native speakers may for some time be practically unknown to the native speakers of the target language. Then, usually, this inequality is leveled, and the corresponding term (very often through transliteration) also appears in the translating language.

Compare:

*in Uzbek:*

*compyuter (from English. computer);*

*marketing (from English. marketing);*

*monitoring (from English. monitoring);*

*in Turkish:*

*jenerasyon (from English. jeneration);*

*objektif (from English. objective);*

*versiyon (from English. version);*

Random non-equivalents denote objects and phenomena that are present in the practical experience of both native speakers of a foreign language and native speakers of the translated language, but in the latter, for some (not always explainable reasons), did not receive their name.

The most general explanation of random lexical non-equivalence can be a reference to the well-known theory of linguistic relativity, according to which different languages form a picture of the world in different ways for people who speak them. At the same time, some languages

may "fail to notice" some details of reality and leave them unmarked. Separately, each of these cases has no obvious explanation.

In linguistic literature, random non-equivalents are most often referred to as "random gaps". However, according to L.K. Latyshev, this term is unfortunate, because it is semantic nonsense. When they talk about non-equivalent vocabulary, they mean the vocabulary of the source language, while gaps (voids) as such do not take place in the source language, but in the translating language [13: 74].

Structural exoticisms are similar to random non-equivalents in that the objects and phenomena they designate are also present in the practical experience of native speakers of the translating language, but they also do not have designations in it, as in the case of random non-equivalents. The difference between structural exoticisms and random non-equivalents is that their absence can be explained. It boils down to the fact that the translating languages simply do not have the means that would be similar to the means of the source language and would allow creating a sufficiently compact designation for the objects and phenomena mentioned. So, for example, the Turkish or Uzbek word composition in certain cases allows one complex word to designate rather subtle details of the reality around us, while in Uzbek this requires a detailed description.

The lexical units of the source language with a derivational structure impossible for the translating language when comparing the source and the translating languages look very unusual, one might say, exotic when viewed from the side of the translating language. Therefore, they are called structural exoticisms.

In the classification proposed by A.O. Ivanov, he considers the equivalence-non-equivalence of lexical units as a coincidence-divergence of meanings, relying in the description of non-equivalent vocabulary and its types on the semiotic classification of meanings, which is based on the relationship of a sign to something outside of it, and thus presupposes the selection of three types of meanings [7 : 57]:

- Referential (or denotative, subject-logical), expressing the relationship between a sign and its referent;
- Pragmatic (or connotative, emotive), expressing the relationship between a sign and a person or linguistic community using it,
- And intra-linguistic (intra-linguistic), expressing the relationship between a sign and other signs or elements of the structure of the same language system, in our case language.

However, the intra-linguistic meaning, due to its nature, cannot be directly related to non-equivalence, i.e. to be considered as its immediate cause, since, by transferring only the relations between a given sign and other signs of the same system, it in itself cannot be relevant for signs of another system, which allows us not to take into account the discrepancies in the intra-linguistic meanings of units of the source and target languages and consider the lack of equivalence only as a divergence of referential and pragmatic meanings.

In this regard, Ivanov divides all non-equivalent vocabulary into three large groups [7: 59]

- Referential-non-equivalent, which includes terms, individual (author's) neologisms, semantic lacunae, words of broad semantics, compound words;

- Pragmatically non-equivalent, combining deviations from the general language norm, foreign language inclusions, abbreviations (abbreviations), words with suffixes of subjective assessment, interjections, onomatopoeia and associative lacunae;
- Alternatively non-equivalent vocabulary, including proper names, appeals, realities and phraseological units.

### III. Referential and Non-equivalent Vocabulary

Although the referential meaning in translation is usually preserved to the greatest extent, nevertheless, cases of discrepancy in the referential meanings of the corresponding lexical units of the source and target languages are quite common in translation practice. In this case, these discrepancies are reduced to two types:

1. The absence in the translating language of a lexical unit that has the same referential meaning as the original unit of the source language;
2. Incomplete coincidence of the referential values of the units of the source and target languages.

The absence in the dictionary of the translating language of a word with the same referential meaning implies the absence in the translating language of a concept denoted in the original language by the original word, since the concept, as is known, arises before the word arises. The translator most often encounters the absence of a certain concept in the translating language when translating such types of non-equivalent vocabulary as terms, individual (author's) neologisms and semantic gaps.

Terms-words or phrases of a special (scientific, technical, etc.) language, created (adopted, borrowed, etc.) for the exact expression of special concepts and designation of special objects, for the most part have constant equivalents in other languages, which is explained by the more or less uniform development of science and technology, which in their movement do not depend on national differences. This also determines the relatively equal level of material culture of modern mankind, which leads to the leveling of terminology and the rapid spread and assimilation in those linguistic communities for which it is initially new. Only those terms that reflect some new concepts for the translating language can be non-equivalent. It is quite understandable that with the development of the same areas of knowledge and material culture in the society of the translating language, this lack of equivalence gradually disappears.

The main advantages of the term are its brevity and unambiguity. This determines the choice of methods for translating terms, the leading place among which is borrowing of the type:

*eng. radar - uzb. radar;*

*rus. napaxod - uzb. parahod (steamer).*

The widespread use of borrowing is explained by the fact that it ensures the preservation of the main characteristics of the term brevity and unambiguity, and, in addition, borrowing terms from the original language ensures the unification of the metalanguage of a given science at the international level, which is important for any of the sciences.

Other commonly used methods of translating terms are: tracing and descriptive translation.

Speaking about individual (author's) neologisms from the point of view of translation, it would be unproductive to combine into one group of non-equivalent vocabulary all lexical units

that can be defined as neologisms, that is, words or phrases created to denote a new object or concept. Author's neologisms differ from all groups of neologisms in two important ways:

- They are created by one author of one work and exist only in it;
- They carry a special semantic load within the framework of a given work and are the most important element of its artistic structure.

This type of neologism requires a very special approach to translation. Such authorial neologisms, although they are quite rare, nevertheless, represent one of the most difficult groups of vocabulary to translate and all, without exception, are non-equivalents.

For example, the surname Khudoyberganov in the Uzbek language has the meaning "given by God." The Uzbek writer Mirmukhsin changed this surname to Khudoyurganov, which means "beaten by God". The name of this character Shilarbek was formed by transforming the Uzbek name Ishlarbek. Ishlarbek means "hard-working, working hard." The change of this name to Shilarbek, which means "ripping off" and indicates the essence of the character.

Skipping neologisms in translation is highly undesirable. As a rule, it is useless to search for words of this type in the dictionary. An important element of their meaning turns out to be both referential meaning (that is, the concept the author puts into such a word) and pragmatics, which includes, first of all, the meaning of novelty, individuality and imagery itself.

The term lacuna refers to a space or gap. Speaking about semantic gaps, we mean the absence in the translating language of a definite, concrete concept denoted in the source language by a given lexical unit (word or phrase). But we are not talking about the impossibility of expressing this concept by means of the translating language, but only about the absence in the translating language of a unit of a similar level to denote this concept. Another thing is that in this case the level of the expression plan may not coincide in the source and translation languages. The very existence of such semantic gaps in specific pairs of languages clearly demonstrates the thesis about the discrepancy between the pictures of the world in different languages.

Examples of such words in Uzbek, denoting concepts that are completely inexplicably absent in Turkish and require a verbose description to convey their meaning during translation, can be:

*nasvai - The reason this substance is called "us" is probably due to the fact that a plant called us was once used to make it. Nowadays, it is mainly made from tobacco. When preparing nasvai, slaked lime, ash of various plants, camel or chicken manure, and sometimes oil are added. Some sources report that fruit peels and spices are also added to the preparation of nasvai.*

*nosqovoq – container for nasvai*

In Turkish, examples of such lacunae are in relation to the Uzbek language the words:

*Matina - a paid women-only party hosted once a month with food and concert*

*Kına / kına gecesi (henna / henna night) - a ceremony of putting henna on the girl's side and saying goodbye to her mother the day before the wedding day a ceremony of putting henna on the girl's side and saying goodbye to her mother the day before the wedding day.*

Thus, sometimes the absence of equivalents of this kind of vocabulary in one of the languages can find a cultural, historical and social explanation.

It should be noted that descriptive translation is the main way to translate semantic gaps.



The lack of equivalence of the types of lexical units discussed above can be explained by the discrepancy in the referential meaning of the corresponding units of the source and target languages. Much less unambiguous in this regard is another type of divergence of referential meaning - incomplete coincidence of the referential meanings of lexical units of the source and target languages (or, so-called, words of broad semantics) of the type:

*uzb. pilov (Uzbek national dish made from meat, carrots, oil, onions, rice, spices and water) - tr.pilav (Turkish national dish made from oil, onions and water)*

*tr. danışman (consul) -uzb. maslahatchi / murabbiy (consultant / trainer / counselor (in universities)).*

In all cases, we have in the original language a word that expresses a broader meaning than its correspondences in the translating language, and in cases where the context and the extralinguistic situation do not contain indications of the relevance of one or another of its variant equivalents, it will be non-equivalent.

L.S. Barkhudarov talks about words like a hand, which he calls words of undifferentiated meaning: "If you cannot find appropriate indications in a broad context, then the correct choice of the required correspondence in translation is possible only if you go beyond the linguistic context and know the actual situation or situation." [1: 76]

Specification is the main way of translating words of broad semantics.

Compound words, as a rule, do not have ready-made equivalents in the translating language. In Uzbek, this kind of words, which can often be non-equivalent in relation to Turkish, include the following:

- Complicated nouns of other models:

noun + ho'r

*(oshho'r - a person who loves to eat pilaf, a national dish);*

noun + furush

*(mevafurush - fruit reselling man, gilamfurush - person selling or reselling carpets).*

Complicated adjectives of other models:

ser + noun

*(sergo'sht - with a lot of meat, sergap - high-spoken, chatting);*

kam + noun

*(kamquvvat - exhausted, kamgap - laconic, few speaking).*

- Phrase words (prepositive-attributive combinations of words, similar in structure to a sentence or phrase, and performing a function in a sentence similar to the function of a single word):

*келинтушди (the bride arrived),,*

*қорғғди (it snowed),*

*қирювди (it was washed). T*

These compound words express Uzbek national ceremonies associated with marriage and funeral.

Most often, the meanings of words and phrases in Uzbek can be conveyed by means of a detailed descriptive translation or through various transformations at the level of the entire sentence.

#### IV. Pragmatically Non-equivalent Vocabulary

Discrepancies in the pragmatics of the lexical unit of the source language and its correspondence in the translating language are much more common than discrepancies in referential meanings. In each language, in comparison with any other, you can find words that coincide in referential meaning, but differ in stylistic characteristics, register or emotional coloring i.e. by what is usually included in the pragmatic meaning of a lexical unit.

The largest class of pragmatically non-equivalent vocabulary, which includes a fairly large number of types, represents deviations from the general linguistic norm. This includes, first of all, both territorial and social dialectisms, localisms, jargonisms, vulgarisms, slangisms, general language norms that do not have pragmatically adequate equivalents in Uzbek or Turkish language. So, the following lexical units of the English language have no equivalents in Uzbek and Turkish:

*Big Apple* – *uzb.katta shahar, tr. büyük şehir (any, but more often New York),*

*nixy* – *uzb.yo'q, tr. hayır,*

*rope* – *uzb.sigareta, tr. sigara.*

Deviations from the general linguistic norm also include the "liberties of oral speech" (*ishchalar, do'stchalar*).

The group of pragmatically non-equivalent vocabulary also includes foreign language inclusions - words and expressions in a foreign language for the original of morphological or syntactic changes introduced by the author to give the text authenticity, to create color, atmosphere or the impression of being well-read, or learning, sometimes - a shade of comic or irony. Although words of this kind are not included in the vocabulary of the source language, nevertheless, they are used in the text along with the words of the source language to create a certain pragmatic meaning that must be conveyed in translation along with the referential meaning of such words, which is often not possible. In this case, the determining factor will be the role of the foreign language inclusion in the text. If it is used to create local color or to convey the nationality of the speaker, then it is included in the translation text in its original form.

At the same time, if it is understandable and without translation, then you can do without a footnote. For example, in the below given excerpt from the novel by the Turkish writer R.N. Guntekin "Chalikushi" we are talking about the main character who is brought up in a French-Turkish school. Caught for a petty offense, Feride tries to make excuses and speaks using the French words "Ma Sör":

*Tr. Merak etmeyiniz Ma Sör... Duvar çok alçak... Hem nasıl istiyorsunuz ki kapıdan çıkayım?... Kapıcı beni bırakır mı hiç? Birinci defasında: "Ma Sör Terez seni çağırıyor!" diye aldattım da öyle kaçtım...*

*Uzb. Xavotir olmag, ma sæur, panjara juda past ... Va keyin, siz nima istaysiz?.. Qanday qilib men darvozadan chiqib ketishim mumkin ... Darvozabon meni qo'yib yuboradimi?.. To'g'ri,*

*bir marta men uni aldashga muvaffaq bo'ldi ... Men: "Ma sœur Tereza sizni chaqirmoqda", deb qochib ketdim.*

*Ing. Don't worry, ma sœur, the fence is very short ... And then, what do you want? .. How can I go out through the gate ... Will the gatekeeper release me? .. True, once I managed it deceive ... I said: "Your call is ma sœur Teresa. " So she ran away.*

In this case, the French national coloring of the speech of one of the speakers does not play an essential role for the general plot of the story, but it indicates a certain feature of the main heroine of the novel, that is, her love for the French language and everyday life.

## V. Basic Techniques for Translating Non-equivalent Vocabulary

In the process of studying the English non-equivalent vocabulary, we came to the conclusion that a non-equivalent lexical unit can exist not only in language, but also in speech. In this case, we consider as non-equivalent lexical units of the source language that have a one-word equivalent in the target language (i.e., a one-word correspondence is recorded in the English-Russian translation dictionary), however, used in speech (in certain sentence constructions), they are untranslatable by the lexical unit, specified in the dictionary. We consider this kind of non-equivalence to be contextually conditioned. The methods of transferring the English non-equivalent vocabulary of the group under consideration can be different:

1. Replacement with a word from the same thematic group or analogy. Analogy is similarity with one or the other, i.e. giving with an alternative concept.

Let's take a look at the realities translated by analogy in Hussein Atsiz's *The Resurrection of the Blue Wolves*. For example, "keçe" is "coarse fabric made by braiding goat hair without touching it" or "coarse fabric made only by beating off goat hair". The translator uses for this word the Uzbek word "kigiz." "Kigiz" - "thick woolen palms, wool felt".

So, in this case, the translator used the method of analogy, because "kigiz" is created by striking the skin of an animal, and felt - from animal hair.

Compare:

*Tr. Urungu'nun çadırı yoktu. Atının terkisindeki keçesi onun hem yatağı, hem yorganı idi. Dokuz Oğuz binbaşısı öteki üç erle birlikte yatabileceği çadırı gösterdiği zaman Urungu, binbaşuya sağlık dileyerek reddetti; keçesinin kendisine yatacağını bildirdi".*

*Uzb. "Urunguning chodiri yo'q edi. Otining egari ortiga bog'lab qo'ygan kigizi unga ham to'shak, ham yotoq edi. To'qqizo'g'uz mingboshisi Urunguga uch askarning chodirida yotishi mumkinligini aytdi, biroq u mingboshiga minnatdorlik bildirib bunga ko'nmadi, kigizimda uxlab o'rganganman, dedi".*

*Ing. "Urung didn't have a tent. The woolen carpet he tied to the back of his horse's saddle was both a mattress and a bed for him. The commander told Urung that he could sleep in the tent of three soldiers, but he thanked the commander and refused and said that he had jumped into sleeping on his rug".*

The word "çadır", used in the same text, means "a portable shed made of felt, skin, animal hair, or thick cloth held together by staves. The translator of the book, T. Kakhhor also uses the method of analogy to express this word and uses the word "chodir": "Chodir" is interpreted as "cloth tent", "go'shanga, chimildiq" (a special white curtain or colorful tent, which is held in the corner of the room of the bride's parental house on the wedding day, and in the corner of the

room of the groom's house where the newlyweds spend their wedding night), "a special blanket instead of a woman's shawl", "curtain, veil". So in this case, Tahir Kakhhor used a similar translation method, that is, he chose words based on similarity.

2. Concretization is a lexical-semantic transformation, in which a word or phrase of the source language with a wider subject-logical meaning is replaced by a word or phrase of the target language with a narrower meaning. As a result of applying this transformation, the created correspondence and the original lexical unit appear in logical relations of inclusion - the unit of the source language expresses the generic concept, and the unit of the target language expresses the specific concept included in it.

For example:

*the collective of the plant - workers and employees.*

When concretizing, an additional differential seme is introduced into the initial structure.

In the next excerpt from the novel by Turkish writer Reshad Nuri Guntheikin "Night of Fire", a conversation goes between a man guest and a woman owner of the house. The woman offers one of her nighties, but for this she uses the word "entari" with a general theme. The word "entari" means "usually one-piece clothing for women." When translating into Uzbek, in one case, the translator uses the word "kechalik kiyim", which expresses "nightie", in the second case - "ko'ylak" - "man's shirt". That is, in this case, the translator used the method of concretization, proceeding from the fact that the conversation between the characters is a man and a woman. T. Kakhhar chooses Uzbek words meaning specific types of men's or women's clothing. Also in this sentence the word "elbise" is used, which means "clothes". Since we are talking about a man, the translator uses the words "ko'ylak", which is used in the meaning of "man's shirt".

Tr.

- *Elbiseyi verirsem ben ne halde kalırım? Geceliğim yok...*
- *Ben size entarilerimden bir tane vereyim. Merak etmeyin, gül gibi temizdir.*
- *Asıl entari beni merak etsin çünkü yoldan gelirim.*

Uzb.

- *Ko'ylagimni bersam, o'zim nima qilaman, kechki kiyimim yo'q.*
- *Men kechalik ko'ylaklarimdan birontasini berib turaman.*
- *Qanday bo'larkin?*
- *Bir kecha uchun hech narsa qilmaydi... Ko'nglingizga kelmasin, gulday top-toza.*
- *Aslida ko'ylak mendan jirkansin, chunki yo'ldan kelganman.Eng.*
- *Ing.- What will I do if I give you my shirt, I have no nightie.*
- *I'll give you one of my nightgowns.*
- *As it will be?*
- *He won't do anything overnight ... Don't worry, he's as pure as a flower.*
- *Actually, let the shirt be disgusting, because I'm out of the way.*

3. Generalization is a lexical-semantic transformation, in which a unit of the source language, which has a narrower meaning, is replaced by a unit of the target language with a wider meaning. The generalization technique has to be used if there are no specific

concepts in the target language that are analogous to the concepts of the source language. This technique helps the translator to get out of a difficult situation when he does not know the designation of a specific concept in the target language. For example: bananas, oranges, pineapples are fruits. During generalization, the semantic structure changes due to the loss of the differential seme: "table - furniture, chair - furniture".

Fez is the national headdress of the Turks made of red, thick fabric (velvet) with a tassel at the top, in the form of a truncated cone. The translator does not use the transliteration method when translating into Uzbek, but uses the word "hat", which has a broad meaning:

*Tr. Kenan, kisa beyaz yeldirmeli bir güzel kızla beraber eşeğin yularını tutuyordu. Ceket ve fesi yoktu.*

*Uzb. Kanon qisqa oq ko'ylakli bir go'zal qiz bilan birga eshakning tizginini ushlab turardi. Kostyumi va bosh kiyimi yo'q edi.*

*Ing. Kanon held the reins of the ass ass along with a beautiful girl in a short white dress. He had no suit or hat.*

4. Analogy is similarity, similarity with one or the other, i.e. giving with an alternative concept. Let's take a look at the realities translated by analogy in Hussein Atsiz's 'The Resurrection of the Blue Wolves':

For example, "keçe" is "coarse fabric made by braiding goat hair without touching it" or "coarse fabric made only by beating off goat hair".

The translator uses for this word the Uzbek word "kigiz." "Kigiz" - "thick woolen palms, wool felt".

So, in this case, the translator used the method of analogy, because "kigiz" is created by striking the skin of an animal, and felt - from animal hair.

Compare:

*Tr. Urungu'nun çadırı yoktu. Atının terkisindeki keçesi onun hem yatağı, hem yorganı idi. Dokuz Oğuz binbaşısı öteki üç erle birlikte yatabileceği çadırı gösterdiği zaman Urungu, binbaşuya sağlık dileyerek reddetti; keçesinin kendisine yatacağını bildirdi".*

*Uzb. "Urunguning chodiri yo'q edi. Otining egari ortiga bog'lab qo'ygan kigizi unga ham to'shak, ham yotoq edi. To'qqizo'g'uz mingboshisi Urunguga uch askarning chodirida yotishi mumkinligini aytdi, biroq u mingboshiga minnatdorlik bildirib bunga ko'nmadi, kigizimda uxlab o'rganganman, dedi".*

*Ing. "Urung didn't have a tent. The woolen carpet he tied to the back of his horse's saddle was both a mattress and a bed for him. The commander told Urung that he could sleep in the tent of three soldiers, but he thanked the commander and refused and said that he had jumped into sleeping on his rug".*

The word "çadır", used in the same text, means "a portable shed made of felt, skin, animal hair, or thick cloth held together by staves."

T. Kakhhor also uses the method of analogy to express this word and uses the word "chodir": "Chodir" is interpreted as "cloth tent", "goshanga, chimildik", "a special blanket instead of a woman's shawl", "curtain, veil". So in this case, Tahir Kakhhor used a similar translation method, that is, he chose words based on similarity.

## 5. Adding Distributors:

In the Turkish language, indefinitely personal sentences are widely used. Whereas, when translating into Uzbek, the addition of distributors is required. For example, in the novel by the Turkish writer Reshchad Nuri Gunthekekin "The Night of Fire" the subject is not used:

Tr. *Hayvan seslerini taklitte son derece mahareti vardı.*

When translating into Uzbek, it was added the word "yigitcha" (young man).

Uzb. *Yigitcha hayvonlarning ovozigga taqlid qilishga g'oyat usta edi.*

Ing. *The young man imitated animal sounds very well.*

In the sentence below, which we met in this work of R.N.Guntekin, the compound verb "ayırt edilmez (not different)" is translated and cannot be conveyed by the word suggested by the dictionary without adding the distributor "hech" (nothing):

Tr. *Civardaki tarla veya çiftliklerde meleyen kuzulara, böğüren ineklere, anıran eşeklere kendi seslerinden ayırt edilmez seslerle cevap veriyor, yol arkadaşlarını gülmekten kırıp geçiyordu.*

Uzb. *Атрофдаги дала ёки қўраларда маъраган қўзиларга, мў-мўлаган сигирларга, ҳанграган эшакларга, уларнинг овозидан ҳеч фарқ қилмайдиган сасда жавоб бериб, ҳамроҳларини ичагини уздирғудай кулдирадди.*

Ing. *In the surrounding fields or sheds, he answered lambs, cows and donkeys in a voice that did not differ from their voice, and made his companions laugh.*

Thus, we came to the conclusion that the translation of contextually non-equivalent vocabulary can be carried out using concretization, generalization, analogy, replacement, in a word, from the same thematic group, using an approximate translation, adding distributors.

## VI. Conclusion

In modern translation studies, there are various approaches to defining the concept of "equivalent". So, for example, a linguistic dictionary defines the concept of an equivalent as a unit of speech that coincides in function with another, capable of performing the same function as another unit of speech. V.N. Komissarov also believes that the "equivalence" of the translation consists in the maximum identity of all levels of the content of the original and translated texts. According to Komissarov, the equivalent is a constant equal correspondence, as a rule, independent of the context.

Further, it was found that the term "non-equivalent vocabulary" is found in many authors, who, however, interpret it in different ways. In our research, we proceed from the understanding of non-equivalent vocabulary proposed by A.O. Ivanov. By such vocabulary, the researcher understands lexical units of the source language that do not have equivalents in the vocabulary of the translating language, that is, units with which it is possible to convey at a similar level of expression all the components of the meaning that are relevant within a given context, or one of the variants of the meaning of the original lexical units. S. Vlahov and S. Florin point to the main distinguishing feature between the status of reality and non-equivalent vocabulary: if a given word is reality, then it will be reality regardless of a particular language, while non-equivalence is established within a given pair of languages.

In the course of the study, we analyzed the reasons for lexical non-equivalence and found that traditionally, the reasons for non-equivalence, by which its types are usually also classified, include:

- The absence of an object, a phenomenon in the life of the people of the translating language (material non-equivalence);
- The absence of an identical concept in the translating language (lexico-semantic non-equivalence);
- The difference in lexical and semantic characteristics (stylistic lack of equivalence).

Choosing a word from a different stylistic register does not always convey the original associative potential, i.e. can only be a partial match, in the absence of a full equivalent. In our opinion, such a translation decision can be recognized as admissible in those cases when it is dictated by objective reasons. But at the same time, it is always important to take into account the linguistic tradition and genre and stylistic features of the texts of the receiving language.

## References

- [1] Barkhudarov L.S. Yazik i perevod. – M.: Mejdunarodniye otnosheniya, 1975. - 239s.
- [2] Chernov G.V. K voprosu o peredache bezekvivalentnoy leksiki pri perevode sovetskoj publisistiki na angliyskiy yazik // Uchenie zapiski 1-go MGPIIYa: T.4. – M., 1958. – 223 s.
- [3] Chernov G.V. Teoriya i praktika sinhronnogo perevoda.—M: Mejdun,-nar. otnosheniya, 1978-208s.
- [4] Fyodorov A.V. Vvedeniye v teoriyu perevoda. - SPb.: «FILOLOGIYA TRI», 2002. - 416 s.
- [5] Gatilova A.K. Bezekvivalentnaya leksika kak ponyatie i yavlenie. – Dis. ...kand. filol. nauk. – M.: MPU, 1996. – 212 s.
- [6] Hashimova D.U. Lakuni kak sovokupnost slov ili slovosochetaniy, markirovannih nalichiem nasionalno-kulturnogo soderzhatelnogo komponenta // Voprosi filologicheskikh nauk. – 2004 – №6. – C. 96-98.
- [7] Ivanov A.O. Bezekvivalentnaya leksika. – SPb: Tipografiya izdatelstva SPbGU, 2006. – 200 s.
- [8] Komissarov V.N. Teoreticheskie osnovi metodiki obucheniya perevodu. – M.: Rema, 1997 – 111s.
- [9] Komissarov V.N. Teoriya perevoda: Lingvisticheskie aspekti. – M: Visshaya shkola, 1990 – 420 s.
- [10] Komleva A. Perevod na sovremenniy russkiy yazik. - Ural, 1997.
- [11] Krupnov V.N. Kurs perevoda. Angliyskiy yazk: Obshchestvenno-politicheskaya leksika. – M.: Mejdunarodnie otnosheniya, 1979. – 92 s.
- [12] Latishev L.K. Tehnologiya perevoda. - M.: Akademiya, 2005. - 320 s.
- [13] Latishev L.K. Perevod: problemi praktiki i metodiki prepodavaniya. – M.: Voenizdat, 1988–264 s.
- [14] Latishev L.K., Semenov A.L. Perevod: teoriya, praktika i metodika prepodavaniya. -M.: ACADEMA, 2003. - 190 s.
- [15] Levij I.P. Iskusstvo perevoda. – M.: Progress, 1974. – 396 s.

- [16] Markovina I.Yu. Vliyaniye lingvisticheskikh i ekstralingvisticheskikh faktorov na ponimaniye teksta: avtoref. dis. na soiskaniye uchenoy stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. -M., 1982. - 21s.
- [17] Muravev V. L. Leksicheskie lakuni. – M.: Sov. Uchitel, 1974. -232s.
- [18] Retsker Ya.I. Teoriya perevoda i perevodcheskaya praktika. -M.: R.Valent, 2007. -246s.
- [19] Shveyser A.D. Teoriya perevoda: status, problemi, aspekti. – M.: Nauka, 1988. – 214 s.
- [20] Shveytser A.D. Perevod i lingvistika. - M.: Voenizdat, 1973 -280s.
- [21] Tomahin G.D. Realii-amerikanizmi: Posobie po stranovedeniyu. – M.: Visshaya shkola, 1988– 180s.
- [22] Tyulenev S.V. Teoriya perevoda. M.: Gardariki, 2004. -334 s.
- [23] Vlahov S., Florin S. Neperevodimoe v perevode - M.: Vissh. shk., 1986. - 416 s.
- [24] Volkov A.A. Obshche yazikoznanie. - M.: "VAKO", 2002. - 206 s.