INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF LACUNA UNITS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

UZLWU, 1- Master's degree
Sanokulova Marjona
marjonasanokulova@gmail.com
934735575

Annotation. The article is devoted to the description of the concept of lacunae, which is a common problem of language and culture. It provides insights into the emergence, study, and linguistic significance of the concept of lakuna. In particular, the study of the concept of lacuna in Uzbek linguistics and the achievements and shortcomings in this area are analyzed.

The article pays special attention to the specificity of the concept of lacuna, its description. It is clarified that this phenomenon differs from related events, in particular, from realities. In the current period, linguistics has critically analyzed the cases related to the mixing of these two phenomena.

Keywords: lacunae, reality, concept, inequality, lacunarity, lexical space, linguistic need, lexicon

The term lacuna, which emerged in the process of comparing different languages and cultures, has become one of the most widely used concepts in linguistics in recent years. Today, this concept is actively used in research in linguoculturology, linguocultural studies, translation studies, the theory of intercultural communication, cultural studies. In each area, there are differences as well as commonalities in its application. These differences are reflected in the different interpretations by researchers based on the needs and requirements of the research field.

The term lacuna was first coined by Canadian scientists J. Vine and J. Darbelne. In their book, The Method of Comparing French and English, these scholars described lacunae as a linguistic phenomenon defined by the comparison of two languages: It is also clear from the tariff that the term was used to describe a concept that is defined in the comparison of two languages and has no alternative in one of the languages [6, p.12]. The same tariff serves as the primary basis for the preservation of the original terminological features of the term lacuna, despite the fact that it underwent minor semantic changes in the following period.

Another scholar who seriously dealt with the problem of lacunae, V. Gak, describes lacunae as "gaps at the lexical level of language, the absence of words that should exist" [14, p.261]. It can be seen from this explanation that the scientist recognizes that it is possible to identify and evaluate the gaps in a language lexicon without comparing it with another language. Of course, the existence of gaps in the lexicon of language is already known in linguistics. Alisher Navoi, the founder of the Uzbek language, explained in his Muhokamat-ul lug'atayn that by comparing Turkish and Persian, there is no alternative to a word that expresses certain concepts in a particular language in another language [6, p. 515-519].

The contribution of Russian scholars in revealing the linguistic nature of the Lakuna phenomenon and recognizing it as a separate linguistic category is great. In the works of I. Stern, the linguistic significance of the lacuna phenomenon is recognized, that it can be observed even within a language. G.Bikova described the occurrence, types, definition and other features of the lacuna on the example of the Russian language. Today, world linguistics relies on the experience of Russian linguists in covering lacuna problems [13, p.221]. In particular, the school of lacunology, formed by I. Sternin and his followers, pays great attention to the study of internal lacunae of language, and this work is of great interest to linguists around the world.

The widespread use and popularity of the term lacuna began in the 70s of the twentieth century. In the same years, in the field of linguoculturology, translation studies, linguistics, comparative study of languages, the study of their interrelationships and differences became more and more important. In these studies, the concept of lacuna is called interval, lacuna, contradictory words, spaces, lacunae or white spots on the language map, non-translatable words, alternative, zero word, alternative or background lexicon, random lacunae, untranslated lexicon [12, p.129–130]. Although named differently in different sources, the views of researchers on this phenomenon, which represent a concept (semema) that does not have its own name (nomema) in language, are close.

In-depth study of the phenomenon of lacuna in Uzbek linguistics. In connection with the work of Kholmanova. The "Study of Linguoculturological Concepts" prepared under the leadership of this scientist contains valuable insights into the study of the phenomenon of lacuna in linguistics, its essence, how it differs from other linguistic phenomena, the internal lacuna (introlacuna) and the problems of its study. Z. Kholmanova's article "Alisher Navoi's role in the development of modern linguistics" is devoted to the analysis of A. Navoi's views on the

phenomenon of lacuna (gap) in language [11, p. 9-18]. As the scholar points out, even in the absence of the concept of lacuna, scholars have expressed their views on empty cells in the language lexicon.

One of the recent works on the study of the phenomenon of lacuna in Uzbek linguistics is the dissertation of N. Ismatullaeva "The occurrence of lacunae in Chinese and Uzbek languages." Analyzing lacunae in the Chinese and Uzbek conceptospheres, the scholar acknowledges the inevitability of such a linguistic phenomenon in comparing the two languages and cultures. Describes their types and methods of definition on the basis of theoretical views available in world linguistics. According to N. Ismatullaeva, "lacuna occurs in cases where a concept exists in the set of concepts of a nation, but is not expressed in lexical form" [16, p.21].

Another researcher, F. Musaeva, in her monograph "Linguistic and cultural study of Uzbek dialects", a separate paragraph is devoted to the enrichment of lacunae in the Uzbek language with dialect words. In this work, the researcher also made important remarks about the occurrence of the lacuna phenomenon, its distinction from adjacent linguistic phenomena, as well as the possibility of dialectal words in their elimination [17, p.120].

In linguistics, the concept of non-equivalence (and adjacent equivalence), which serves the comparative study of several languages and cultures, also emerged simultaneously with the term lacuna (both concepts were introduced into scientific circulation by Canadian scholars J. Vine and J. Darabelne). Also, for some time the lacuna phenomenon has been studied and studied together as a manifestation of inequality. The term reality was not used during this period, and this phenomenon was also considered in the context of non-equivalent words. Although the term reality appeared as early as the 1920s [7, p.72], controversy continues to be expressed in confusing it with the phenomenon of lacunae and describing non-equivalent words. The main reason for this is the different interpretations that reality is an element unique to the language and culture of a particular nation. Although "realities are considered to be the people, events, institutions, and objects that make up the historical development and culture of a particular nation" [15, p. 209], the relativity of defining their scope and boundaries causes one to differ from another. At this point, there is a need to clearly define the similarities and differences between these two concepts [3, p.160]. These two concepts are felt and defined in the comparison of different languages and cultures; there will be no alternative word to them in one of the comparable languages. If we

conditionally define a particular language (L1) and the language being compared to it (L2) as L1, L2, the lacuna is a unit that exists in L2 as both a concept and a word, but in L1 only as a concept; reality is a unit that exists in L1 as both a concept and a word, but not as a word or concept in L2.

In some works, which focus more on the connection between reality and lacuna, translation is still confusing: M. Ismatullaeva, based on the ideas of M. Shattlvorz, M. Kovie, divided the difficulties of translation into linguistic and cultural difficulties. and it is expedient to distinguish object units as realities "[16, p.21]. It is not so difficult to understand that the features that exist in reality are unusual, unfamiliar, unnatural and incomprehensible. However, in some studies there are those who believe that these features also belong to the lacuna [17, p. 120]. The same kind of views lead to a mixture of lacuna and reality.

The most important difference between reality and lacuna is that lacuna is a concept that exists in the consciousness of a particular nation but is not named (lexemed) in the language of that nation; it is easily understood by both the representatives of this nation and those who speak other languages. The reality is a bit difficult to understand and imagine. Because it is a product of the customs worldview of a certain nation, it does not exist in the consciousness (culture) of another nation (s). So it seems unnatural and unusual for someone of another language (and culture).

From the moment of its creation, each word acquires national-cultural characteristics as a product of the culture and mentality, linguistic perception and worldview of the nation that owns it [8, p.218]. This feature is especially vividly reflected in the words related to the realities - the specific culture of the nation (Tadjibayev, 2021). This is the main reason why these words (and concepts) are so widely accepted by people of other nationalities [4, p.5]. In Lakuna, the semaphore of the name takes precedence over national-cultural identity [3, p.158]. In general, the understanding of reality as a concept and word specific to a particular nation, and lacuna as a non-lexical concept that can be understood and applied, ensures the correctness of the scientific purpose in research in this area.

A concept (lacuna) that is known to language owners but is not named with a separate lexeme usually feels bright when comparing two language lexicons. In general, lexical lacunae can be identified in one language (without comparison with another) [2, p.88]. For example, in Uzbek, an artificial bump that is installed across the road to slow down traffic (to ensure pedestrian safety) does not have a name. Or the part of the hand from the palm to the elbow is called the wrist, while

the part from the elbow to the shoulder is not named with a separate word. Such lexical gaps can also be observed in the comparison of diachronic and synchronous lexicons of the language: for example, in the old Uzbek language the word "pig" is called chorpa (today in some dialects it is found as chulpak), but in modern Uzbek literary language there is no lexeme. Such lexical lacunae can be found in any language as desired. Because it is difficult for all the concepts in the mind to be realized in the form of a lexeme.

The lexemation of a concept in language depends on the linguistic-verbal need to name that concept. In general, the relevance and necessity of naming a particular concept can be objectively assessed by examining whether the concept is named in another language [20, p.569]. The fact that the Lacuna phenomenon is being studied extensively today is also related to these aspects.

When comparing the lexicon of two languages, although most of the words in it are equivalent, they cannot be completely alternative, compatible with each other [19, p.188]. The main reason for this is that a particular concept will have different cultural semantics in different nations. For example, the concept of a dragon is understood in Uzbek as a mythical imaginary snake, while in Chinese culture it is realized as a symbol of glory and power with a totemistic semaphore. Such cases arise in connection with the linguistic perception, worldview, priesthood of the speakers of the language. It can be seen from this that units that are equivalent in two languages can also be lacunar according to a certain sema [9, p.686]. In the above example, the religious-totemistic semantics of the dragon concept in Chinese culture is a lacuna for the Uzbek language.

Another example: New Year's Eve is present in the culture of many nations as a tradition of celebrating the beginning of the new year. However, due to the fact that peoples use different calendars, it is observed that the time of their celebration differs from each other. Although their essence and content are the same, they differ significantly from each other according to certain national-cultural features. Thus, "although the meanings of lexemes in two languages are similar or close to each other, which serve to express the concept of the same thing in reality (denotation, so-called), the spiritual value of a lexeme in each language is different" [18, p. 22.].

In the comparison of the two languages, the difference between the concepts is more pronounced in the semantic and fragmentary analysis. For example, in Russian there are two lexemes (yabloko, yablonya) naming an apple and a tree, while in Uzbek these two sememas are represented by one lexeme. In

similar processes, the naming of two (or more) sememes by a particular word results in a distinction between the concepts of lacunae and lacunar units in interpreting the mutual lacunarity of a semi-alternative word (i.e., naming one of the sememas it represents) in comparable languages [12, p. 76]. . In fact, in the languages being compared, there are many cases where several concepts are called by the same name. This is because the gradual development of language, the use of words in figurative senses, and other factors contribute to the formation of such cases. Due to the common linguistic worldview of language owners, the semantic content of a particular word in one language may be consistent with that of a word in another language. Such cases usually apply only to monosemantic, rarely used words. It is natural that such compatibility is rarely observed on polysemous and actively used words.

L.K.Bayramova, who suggested to study the lacunar defined by language comparison in two categories, said that in one of the compared languages (conditionally in L1 language) it is necessary to separate open, fallen lacuna, in the second (comparable - L2) language the concept (semema) as lacunar unit emphasizes. In our opinion, it is expedient to analyze these units separately. After all, to describe a gap in the L1 language without studying it without comparing it to a specific standard (or model) is not very justified. It is also difficult to make a realistic assessment of the need to fill a lacuna in L1 without knowing the linguistic significance and value of the lacunar unit in L2.

While most tariffs on lacunae refer to a linguistic phenomenon that is defined by a comparison of two lexical systems, it is necessary to name and describe them separately in order to better understand the differences and commonalities of the two units being compared.

When analyzing lacunae in a particular lexical system, many gaps can be identified. However, the comparison of the two lexical systems in determining the relevance of which of them provides a more accurate decision. In such processes, too, attention needs to be paid to the separate and common aspects of the comparable units in the two lexical systems.

The fact that the Lacuna phenomenon is widely studied today is explained by the fact that it is also useful in identifying the interrelationships and differences of different languages. Especially in today's era of globalization and integration, there is a need for research on the concept of lacunae in the study of various factors that affect the language and culture of each nation.

The study of lacunae today is not just about identifying the different

aspects of the two languages. In order to systematically supplement and enrich the vocabulary of the language, it is necessary to study this linguistic phenomenon in more depth. Researchers are trying to identify and eliminate gaps at the lexical level by comparing their native languages with other languages, as well as objectively studying the emergence of new concepts related to thinking and imagination, forming in the mind, and their naming processes. In Uzbek linguistics, it is important to revive the work in this area, in particular, to compare the Uzbek language with other languages, to identify and fill lexical gaps in it, to ensure the development and purity of the language.

REFERENCES

1. Khasanov A. 2020. "The linguocultural significance of euphemisms as a speech lacunae". *Лисоний маданиятни шакллантириш: тажриба, муаммо ва ечимлар" мавзусидаги илмий-амалий анжуман материаллари*, 100-105. Шахрисабз: TDPU nashriyoti.

2. Khasanov A. 2021. "ENRICHMENT OF UZBEK LEXIC RESERVE WITH KYPCHAK DIALECT". *ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ И ИХ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ В ПРАКТИКЕ ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ РУССКОГО И ИНОСТРАННЫХ ЯЗЫКОВ,* 84-89.

3. Majidovich K. 2021. "Features of Dialectal Words That Fill in the Gaps in the Language Vocabulary". *International Journal on Integrated Education* 4(10): 157-164.

4. Majidovich K. 2021. "Filling Lexical Gaps In The Uzbek Language With Dialectisms (Based On The Turkic-Kaltatoy Dialect)". *International Journals of Sciences and High Technologies* 25: 01-07.

5. Majidovich K. 2021. "Possibilities of Kipchak Dialects in filling the Lexicon of Uzbek". *International Journal on Integrated Education* 4: 287-294.

6. Navoiy A. 2012. Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn. *To‘la asarlar to‘plami,* 515-519. Tashkent: G‘afur G‘ulom nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi.

7. Rakhimjonovich T. 2020. "THE STUDY OF NATIONAL-CULTURAL UNITS IN UZBEK AND WORLD LINGUISTICS". *ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies* 9(6): 68-76.

8. Tojiboev B. 2021. LISONIC AND NOLISONIC FACTORS OF NATIONAL-CULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University* 2 (2): 215-220.

9. Umurzakova M. 2020. "THE SEMANTIC-STRUCTURAL

DESCRIPTION OF SEGMENTED CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE AND THE PROBLEMS OF THEIR STUDY". *Theoretical & Applied Science* 5: 685-688.

10. Vinay J. Darbelnet J. 1958. Stylistique comparee du fraicais et de I'anglais. Paris: 1958.

11. Xolmanova Z., Saidahmedova O., Nurillayeva O. 2018. Lingvokulturologiyaga oid tushunchalar tadqiqi. Toshkent: Navro'z.

12. Xolmanova Z. 2021. "Alisher Navoiyning zamonaviy tilshunoslik taraqqiyotidagi o'rni". *Alisher Navoiy* 1: 9-18.

13. Быкова Г. 2003. Лакунарность как категория лексической системологии. Благовещенск: Изд-во БГПУ.

14. Гак В. 1977. Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. Ленинград: Просвещение, 1977.

15. Коллектив. 1983-1985. Алишер Навоий асарлари тилининг изоҳли луғати (Э. Фозилов таҳрири остида). Тошкент: Фан.

16. Исматуллаева Н. 2021. Хитой ва ўзбек тилларида лакуналарнинг воқеланиши: Фил.ф.б.ф.д (PhD) дисс. Тошкент: ТДШУ.

17. Мусаева Ф. 2021. Ўзбек шеваларининг лингвомаданий тадқиқи. Тошкент: Фан.

18. Неъматова Г. 1996. "Ўсимлик номларининг маъновий қиймати". *Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти* 6: 22-25.