

Ubaydullayeva Muattar O'rinbekovna

BuxDU, Xorijiy tillar fakulteti

Ingiliz tilshunosligi kafedراسi o'qituvchisi

Abstract. *The article comments on the formation of the concept of lacuna in linguistics, its widespread use, and its terminological concretization. It is also considered that the phenomenon of lacuna is different from the phenomena related to it.*

Key words: *lacuna, realia, word without alternative, lacunarity, equivalence, nameless concept, concept, lexical comparison.*

One of the concepts widely used in linguistics in recent years is lacuna. Today, this concept is actively used in linguistics, translation studies, theory of intercultural communication, sociolinguistics. Each field has differences as well as commonalities in its application. These differences are realized through different interpretations by the authors based on the demands and needs of the research field.

The term lacuna was introduced into scientific circulation for the first time by Canadian scientists J. Vine and J. Drabelne. In the book "Comparison of the French and English Languages", these scientists defined the lacuna as a linguistic phenomenon defined in the comparison of two languages as follows: "A lacuna phenomenon occurs in places where a word in one language does not have an alternative in another language." It can be seen from the definition that in this place, the scientists used this term to express the concepts of lacuna, which are determined in the comparison of two languages, and are not alternative to each other in the conceptual sphere of two cultures. When the term lacuna undergoes partial semantic changes in the later period, this same definition serves as the primary basis for maintaining its original terminological characteristics.

V. Gak, another scientist who seriously dealt with the lacuna problem, explains lacunae as "gaps at the lexical level of the language, the non-existence of words that should exist". admits its existence in. Of course, the existence of gaps in the language lexicon is already known in the science of linguistics. Even before the term lacuna was formed, in the views of F. Humboldt and F. de Saussure, "empty cells" in the lexical system, some in the lexical system There is serious debate about the non-existence of the second pole in the paradigms.

Alisher Navoi, the founder of the Uzbek literary language, in his work "Muhokamat ul-lughatayn" also explained in the analysis of artistic examples that when comparing Turkish and Persian words, there is no word expressing a certain concept in a certain language. Wide use and popularization of the term lacuna began in the 70s of the 20th century. Because in these years, in the fields of linguistics, translation studies, and linguistics, the comparative study of languages, the research of their connections and differences has increased. In these studies, the concept of lacuna is a gap, a lacuna, antonyms, gaps, lacunae or white spots on the language map, untranslatable words, no

alternative, zero word, no alternative or background lexicon, random lacunae, untranslatable lexicon. named with terms like Although it is named differently in different sources, my researcher's views about this phenomenon, which represents the namelessness of a sememe (concept) in the language, are close to each other.

Wide study of the concept of lacuna ensured its differentiation from related phenomena. Initially, all non-alternative words were evaluated as lacuna, but in the following years, the semantic scope of the term lacuna narrowed and became more concrete (terminized): concepts such as non-equivalent word used as a sememe and realia were separated from its composition. In this process, the essence of the concept of lacuna became clear and easy to understand.

In the 80s of the last century, as a result of the study of lacuna, realia and non-equivalent words, there were certain difficulties in describing and explaining the linguistic phenomena that can be determined in the age of two languages. In particular, in V. Muraveyev's work entitled "Lexical lacunae (on the example of the French and MS lexicon)" created in 1975, the phenomenon of reality is also considered as part of the concept of lacuna. Therefore, Muraveyev defines a lacuna as "In the process of communication, a representative of another culture does not understand or does not understand at all." interprets it as a national-cultural element that cannot be understood, expressed in the language of the representative of this culture".

In the book "Untranslatability in Translation" by S. Viakhov and S. Fiorin published in 1986, realities were considered as a component of the lacuna. In this book, lacuna is explained as "a word that is characteristic for the cultural, historical, social and domestic life of a certain people and is alien to other peoples, and has no clear alternative in the language of that people." M. Vereshagin describes a similar situation, can also be found in V.G. Kostomarov's work entitled "Language and Culture: Linguistic Studies in the Study of Russian as a Foreign Language". It is noted that "The highest point of the gap in the language is usually related to the absence of the concept itself. "It is the complete absence of the necessary equivalent to express this or that concept". In further studies, in particular, I. Sternin's monograph entitled "Lexical lacuna and the Concept of Equivalence" emphasizes the need to distinguish realia and non-alternative words from lacunae. The lacuna is more likely to be noticed and identified in the process of translation, which causes it to be confused with non-equivalent words and reality. In fact, until I. Stern, these two concepts were summarized and considered as lacuna. It was after the works of I. Sternin that the distinction between these linguistic phenomena became more popular. The concept of equivalence (and its related non-equivalence) appeared at the same time as the term lacuna (these two concepts were introduced into scientific circulation by Canadian scientists J. Vine and J. Drabnelne).

Also, for a while, the phenomenon of lacuna was investigated and studied together in the composition of non-equivalent words. In this period, the term reality was not used, and this phenomenon was also considered in the context of non-equivalent words. Although the term realia appeared in the 20s of the last century, its confusion with the phenomenon of lacunae and the expression of controversial opinions in the description of non-equivalent words continue to this day. The main reason for this is related to different interpretations of

the fact that reality is an element unique to the language and culture of a particular nation. "Realities are evaluated as people, events, institutions, and things that make up the historical development and culture of a particular nation, and as a result of the relativization of their scope and boundaries, the various formations of interpretations cause these definitions to differ from each other.

Similar aspects of lacuna and reality: they are felt, determined when comparing two languages and cultures; there is no alternative word for them in the comparative (subject) language. Aspects that distinguish a lacuna from reality: the convex manifestation of unusualness, unfamiliarity, abnormality and incomprehensibility in reality. However, some researchers believe that these characteristics also belong to the lacuna. These views are also the reason for the confusion of the lacuna and reality.

The most important difference between reality and lacuna is that lacuna is a concept that is not expressed in a particular language and is expressed in another language; speakers of other languages can easily understand it. And reality is a bit difficult to understand and imagine. Because it is realized as a product of traditions, linguistic perception, worldview of a particular nation. Therefore, it seems unnatural and unusual to the owner of another language (and culture). In our opinion, it is the most acceptable way to understand and describe reality as a certain "word that reflects the people's lifestyle, culture and traditions, which is foreign to other peoples and languages." In contrast to reality, the understanding of the lacuna as a lexeme-free sememe, which can be understood and used by any representative of any nation, ensures the correct achievement of the scientific goal in research in this regard.

The phenomenon of equivalence, which is one of the phenomena observed when comparing the lexicon of the language, serves to describe the existence of alternative (functional, substitute) words in the languages being compared. Due to the nature of, equivalence contradicts lacuna and reality phenomena. This phenomenon ensures easy understanding by turning words from different languages into each other.

Some scholars try to explain lacunae and equivalent units through the comparison of concepts. S.A. Askoldov-Alekseyev, who used the term concept for the first time in science, gave it the following definition: "A concept is an abstract object that replaces a concept in the process of thinking, a set of actions and mental actions of this type." Today, this concept, which is widely used as one of the main terms in cognitive linguistics, is considered as "working memory unit, mental lexical base, language of consciousness and conceptual system, quantum of knowledge".

When the lexicon of two languages is compared, although most of the words in it are equivalent, they cannot be completely alternative to each other. The main reason for this is that a certain concept has different cultural meanings in different nations. For example, in Uzbek language the dragon concept is a mythical imaginary snake, while in Chinese culture it is realized as a symbol of majesty and power with a totemistic theme. Such situations arise in connection with the linguistic perception, worldview, and priestly sajiya of the language owners. It can be seen from this that units that are equivalent in two languages can acquire lacunarity according to a certain scheme. In the above example, the religious-

totemistic theme of the dragon concept in Chinese culture is considered a lacunar unit for the Uzbek language.

Another example: New Year's Day is a tradition of celebrating the beginning of a new year in many cultures. However, due to the fact that people use different calendars, their celebration times differ significantly from each other. Although their essence and content are the same, they are significantly different from each other according to certain national and cultural characteristics. The presence of lexical units indicates the presence of a certain concept in the public mind. But for the existence of a concept, it is not necessary to have a linguistic unit". it is necessary to explain with an explanation or a word combination). This situation shows that a lexeme corresponding to a concept does not always exist in the language. The difference of the concept in the comparison of two languages is more obvious in the semantic and fragmentary analysis. For example, in Russian there are two lexemes (yabloko, yablonya) naming apple fruit and tree, while in Uzbek these two lexemes are represented by one lexeme.

In linguistics, the distinction and description of the lacuna from its related phenomena has been completed today. In particular, separate research schools have emerged in this regard in English and Russian linguistics. Although the study of lacunae in the comparison of two languages is leading in these scientific schools, recently special attention has been paid to the fact that the phenomenon of lacunae also exists within the language, and that this phenomenon is one of the developmental factors in the development of the language. One of the important researches in this regard is the work of the Russian scientist G. Bikova entitled "Lacunary as a category of lexical systemology". In it, the scientist studied the types of lacunae, methods of detection, causes of their occurrence, and ways of elimination based on the materials of the Russian language in a wide aspect.

According to Bikova, lacuna "is a concept that does not have a specific sound shell and is currently expressed by a few words, which sooner or later "stands on the springboard" for lexical realization, and is objectified as a new word. In this interpretation, lacuna is not only a linguistic comparison. , but also observed within one language. According to the scientist, any unnamed concept is not a lacuna, but a seminal lacuna on the verge of lexical realization. A concept that is often referred to in the process of communication needs lexical realization (if it is not named).

After all, linguistic and speech needs are important in the formation of language units. In some cases, the fact that the names of irrelevant (not necessarily important) concepts are not actively used in the speech and become inactive indicates that this view is appropriate.

Another important feature of a lexical lacuna is its presence in the mind of language speakers as a concept (sememe). This concept is expressed by phrases (or comments and explanations) when it does not have its own reference. Such expressions are valid only for the speech process, and after the speech process is completed, it breaks down and cannot maintain the status of a lexical unit.

Today, the study of lacunae is not only about identifying the differences between two languages. It is necessary to study this linguistic phenomenon in depth for the systematic filling and enrichment of the language lexicon. As researchers try to compare foreign languages with their own languages, identify gaps in the lexical level, and eliminate them,

they need to thoroughly research the emergence of new concepts that are formed in the mind and their naming processes related to thinking and imagination is trying.

Based on the observed and collected results, along with enriching the language lexicon, it is possible to evaluate the processes of emergence and popularization of new words. Reviving the work in this regard in Uzbek linguistics, identifying and filling lacunae in the lexicon of the literary language on the basis of comparing the dialects and dialects of the national language with the literary language will undoubtedly serve to ensure the development and purity of the language.

USED LITERATURE:

1. Vinay J., Darbelnet J. Stylistique comparee du fraicais et de l'anglais. - Paris, 1958. p.10.
2. Муравьев В.Л. Лексические лакуны (на материале лексики французского и русского языков). - Владимир, 1975. - С. 24.
3. Влахов С., Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. - Москва: Высш. шк., 1986. - С. 416.
4. "Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Лингвистическая проблематика страноведения в преподавании русского языка иностранцам. - Москва: Изд-во МГУ, 1971. - С. 43.
5. Handschin Cf.H. Methods of Teaching Modern Languages. - New York: World Book Company, 1924. p.209.
6. Musayeva F. Lakuna hodisasi va uni bartaraf etishda sheva leksikasining ahamiyati *HO'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2020. 3-son, 97-bet.
7. Kasimova Z. Dunyo tilshunosligida realiyalar tasnifi // "Til va adabiyot ta'limi" jurnali, 2020-yil 9-son, 39-bet.
8. "Аскольдов С.А. Концепт и слово // Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста: антология. - Москва, 1997. - С. 260-267.
9. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Е.С.Кубрякова, В.З.Демьянков, Ю.Г.Панкрац, Л.Г.Лузина. - Москва, 1996. - С. 245
10. "Xolmonova Z., Saidahmedova O., Nurillayeva O. Lingvokulturologiyaga oid tushunchalar tadqiqi /monografiya/ - Toshkent: Navro'z, 2018. 76-bet.
- II. "Голубева Н.А. Принципы выявления концептуальной лакунарности. Источник: https://cyberteninka.ru/article/n/printsipy_vyyavleniya-kontseptualnoy-lakunamosti/viewer
12. Быкова Г.В. Лакунарность как категория лексической системологии. - Благовещенск: Изд-во БГПУ, 2003. - С. 201-260.
13. O'rinbekovna, U. M. (2023, April). ПРОБЛЕМЫ С ЛАКУНАМИ И ИХ КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ. In Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes (pp. 30-32). <https://conferenceseries.info/index.php/online/article/view/695>

14. Ubaydullayeva, M. (2023). VARIABILITY OF THE SEMANTIC CONTENT OF THE CONCEPT "CONCEPTUAL LACUNA". ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.uz), 32(32). https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/9396