

## PROBLEMS OF NON-EQUIVALENT WORDS IN UZBEK-ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

**Bakiev Fakhridin**

Senior teacher at the Department of Translation Theory and Practice, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

**Akhmedova Shakhnoza Farkhod qizi,**

First-year student of MA program of Comparative Linguistics, Linguistic Translation Studies, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

**Abstract** — This article is dedicated an interesting development in fiction, abetted by Modernism, was a shift from naturalistic to poetic writing. There was an increased tendency to select details and endow them with symbolic meaning, to set down the thought processes and emotions of the characters, and to make use of rhythmic prose.

**Keywords** — cultural differences, semantic gaps, cultural realia, non-equivalence, alternatives for non-equivalent vocabulary, translation techniques.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Translating words without equivalents in the target language is a challenging task. It is crucial to accurately interpret such words to ensure they are conveyed correctly and comprehensibly. This article explores the perspectives of scholars on the broader issue of non-equivalent words from English to Uzbek, offering examples from both languages and insights from specific researchers. Misunderstandings often arise with words lacking direct equivalents, such as those related to food, clothing, culture, and tradition. Indeed, many of these words lack direct counterparts in the target language, necessitating careful editing and the search for suitable alternatives to fully grasp both languages. While some non-equivalent words have been translated into the target language, many others remain unrendered. Hence, this research paper highlights various methods and principles for transferring non-equivalent words from the source language to the target language.

### 2. MAIN PART

This article describes effective rules for avoiding ambiguity. However, these rules and regulations are well known among translators and interpreters around the world and have the ability to follow the rules to understand the audience when interpreting or translating an event, but this is not sufficient to ensure clear communication around the world. It would be better if others at least have general information about non-equivalent rendering rules. Therefore, this article aims to explain and simplify the main difficulties and challenges of non-equivalent words. An universal feature of language materials is that they aim to describe worldviews of speakers of different languages. Therefore, presenting words of non-equivalence of different languages and recognizing their difficulties will help people all over the world to have pure communication and understand each other easily. Results and Discussion. Many researchers believe that in translation, the study of non-equivalent vocabulary is related to the concepts of "transferability" and "equivalence", the non-equivalent problem and the problem of vocabulary translation, that is, the object or phenomenon of translation.

Classification of non-equivalent vocabulary can be done based on genetic characteristics:

- Words of life (all neologisms)
- Names of traditional life objects and phenomena.
- Historicism
- Dictionary of phrases
- Folk vocabulary
- Colloquial/Youth language, crime language, military language, professional language Colloquial language
- Sociopolitical Vocabulary
- Reduction of colloquial vocabulary.

The most common types of non-equivalence problems and difficulties for translators, and proven strategies for dealing with them, are categorized into several elements.

- A word of warning
- Additional linguistics.

The problem of non-equivalence has attracted the attention of many researchers. Jacobson argues that “there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code units”. Jacobson also clarifies the contrasts between structures, phrasing, linguistic use and lexical shapes of languages are the most reasons of non-equivalence. Jacobson states that “equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics” [1, 252].

As researchers (I.M. Vereshagin, V.G.Kostomarov, etc.) have shown, in order to establish the availability of national cultural characteristics of the meaning of words, it is necessary to compare the semantics of words in two languages (or several). Comparative linguistic research has shown that cultural differences between countries occur particularly at the level of lexical expression.

A.O. Ivanov classifies the entire non-equivalent vocabulary into three major groups:

1. Indicative non-equivalence involving terms, individuals (authors), neologisms, semantic gaps, words with broad semantics, and complex words;
2. Pragmatic non-equivalence, integrative anomalies, foreign inclusions, abbreviations, words with subjective expansion suffixes, interjections, sound imitations and associative gaps;
3. Alternative non-equivalent vocabulary including proper nouns, distribution, realism and usage.

Non-equivalence occurs at the word level. This means that there is no word in the target language (TL) that directly corresponds to a word that appears in the source language. There are possible problems that can result in non-equivalence between two languages. Non-equivalence occurs when a message in the source language is not equivalently translated into the target language [2, 117].

Baker states that global non-equivalence in technical translation means that there is no direct equivalent in the target language to words that occur in the source text. Lack of equivalence at the word level causes translation problems. She further deciphers this statement by asking questions. What does a translator do when the target language does not have a word that has the same meaning as a word in the source language?

Famous scientists in the field of translation such as L.S.Barhudarov, S.Vlakov, 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 significant contribution to the development 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), “realia”, “exoticisms” (S.Vlahov, S.Florin) “xenonims” (V.V.Kabakchi), “logoepistemes” (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. From the point of view by 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. [3.p. 138]

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 directly 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 [4.p 52].

In the language vocabulary of any nation there are some words with specific national-cultural meaning, which reflect referents inherent to only one particular nation and absent in nation-speaker of comparing language. For example:

name of meals of national cuisine/ Rus. Борщ, щи, квас; Uzb. Plov, beshbarmoq, sumalak); national clothes/ Rus. Сарафан, Uzb. Chopon, belbog’) and etc.

They reflect typical reality of certain country, certain nation and certain culture and do not have conformity in the consistently of other languages accordingly, their lexical notions have national-cultural specifics. We can conclude that semantics of words with national-cultural specifics are peculiar “mirror” of national culture and reflect features and trends of the language system development. [5.p.157.158] National-cultural specifics of semantics of words. We differ from national-language originality which does not concern to the cultural features. V. Gladrov stress that “it is necessary to differ names of realism from names which have no equivalent correspondence in comparing language spite of corresponding “denotat” [6.p. 15]. For example: There is no lexical unit in Uzbek language corresponding to English meaning drugstore and in English language there is no lexical unit with corresponding meaning to Uzbek corresponding “пахта тўйи” “holiday on harvest occasion”. These kind of lexical unit L.S.Barhudarov calls random lacunas, [7.p 95] V.L.Muravyev – “absolute linguistic lacunas” [8.p 8] I.A.Sternin – “unmotivated lacunas” [9.p 31].

The basis of the classification non-equivalent lexical units was proposed by V.N. Krupnov, put temporary principle, based on how established non-equivalent lexical units in the teaching language. The researcher identifies 4 groups of non-equivalent words:

- words-realities,
- temporarily non-equivalent units,
- random non-equivalent units

- exoticisms [10].

Realias include the words that call customs, traditions elements of everyday life and culture of native speakers of a particular language. For example: drive-in “providing certain opportunities to a person for business operations, when such operations can be performed by a person without leaving car”, or an Uzbek word “Chopon” - it is a type of clothes which is made from the cotton and fabric, mostly by hand. Also other words like “mahsi”, “kovush”, “paranji” are very difficult to be translated in other languages, because another culture may not have such things in their daily life. In order to understand them, learners should be aware of Uzbek culture.

Temporarily non-equivalent units include such lexical units of the foreign language, which have not yet established themselves in the teaching language, but with over time, their equivalent appears in it. For example: to post -to make a post (place any information on the Internet), prank -prank (prank, hooliganism).

Random non-equivalent units arise when in a foreign language a certain the phenomenon is denoted by some word, and in the teaching language such a word is absent [10]. If this phenomenon can be conveyed in other ways, then in this case it is believed that there is no need to enter the word or phenomenon into the teaching language that is available in the foreign language. For example: ear-worm -obsessive music, laptop-portable microcomputer.

Exoticisms are such words that associate with the cultural experience of only one group of people and denote objects of reality that are known by only this ethnic group [11. 133-134]. For example, the German verb "wunschdenken" translated into English in two words - wishful thinking, into Uzbek language this word can be translated as "Xudo xohlasa" [10. 168-170].

The type and difficulty of varies greatly depending on the type of non-equivalence. Different types of non-equivalence require different strategies. Some are very simple, while others are more complex and difficult to manage. Strategies for dealing with word-level inequalities in technical translations include:

- translations with more common words.
- Translation with more neutral/less expressive language.
- Translation through cultural displacement.
- Translate foreign words or foreign words with explanations.
- Paraphrase and translate using related words.
- Paraphrasing and translating using unrelated words.
- Translating by omitting.
- Illustrated translation.

According to Mona Baker, word-level inequivalence means that there is no direct equivalent in the target language for a word that appears in the source text. [12, 3-4].

### 3. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the intricate challenge of translating non-equivalent words reveals the profound interplay between language, culture, and communication in our increasingly interconnected world. This paper has underscored the essential role of translation in bridging linguistic and cultural divides, particularly through the meticulous handling of non-equivalent vocabulary. As technology facilitates more global interactions across diverse linguistic landscapes, the necessity for effective translation strategies becomes paramount. Our exploration of various categories of non-equivalent vocabulary, alongside prominent research contributions to this field, highlights the nuanced complexities involved in achieving true intercultural understanding. The insights derived from examining the semantic and pragmatic dimensions of non-equivalence enrich our appreciation of the subtleties of language and its impact on effective communication. Moving forward, the cultivation of a broader awareness of translation challenges among all language users could enhance clarity and mutual understanding in global discourse. Ultimately, addressing the intricacies of non-equivalence not only enriches our linguistic competence but also fosters a more empathetic and inclusive global community.

### 4. REFERENCES

- [1] Jakobson Roman (1959). 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', in R. A. Brower (ed.) On Translation, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, p. 252.
- [2] Ivanov A.O. (2007). Equivalent Vocabulary. Voronezh, Russian, p. 117.
- [3] Baker M. (1992). In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation. London:
- [4] Routledge.
- [5] Zokirova S.M. (2016). The notion of non-equivalence Vocabulary in Translation, IJSELL.
- [6] Верещагин Е.М. Язык и культура. – М.: Русский язык, 1990. – 387 с.
- [7] Мечковская, Н.Б. Социальная лингвистика. – М.: аспект Пресс, 2006. – 206с.
- [8] Зубкова Л.И. Лингвострановедческий подход в изучении национально-культурной специфики слова // Научно-методический сборник. – Воронеж, 1993. №43. – С. 157–158.
- [9] Gladrow W. Russischim Spiegelndes Deutschen / W. Gladrow. – Wien: Lang, 1998. – 271 S.
- [10] Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод: вопросы общей и частной теории перевода – М.: Академия, 2004. – 237с.

- [11] Муравьев В.Л. Лексические лакуны (на материале лексики французского и русского языков). – Владимир, 1975.
- [12] Стернин И.А. Контрастивная лингвистика. – М.: Восток-запад, 2006. – 206с.
- [13] Крупнов В.Н. Практикум по переводу с английского языка на русский: учеб. пособие для вузов / В.Н.Крупнов. –М.: Высшая школа, 2005. –279 с.
- [14] Алексеева И.С. Введение в перевод введение: учеб. пособие для студ. филол. и лингв., фак. высш. учеб. заведений / И.С.Алексеева. –СПб.:Филологический факультет СПбГУ. –М.: Издательский центр «Академия»,2004. –352 с.
- [15] Baker M. (1992). In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation. London: Routledge.
- [16] Zokirova S.M. (2016). The notion of non-equivalence Vocabulary in Translation, IJSELL.
- [17] Catford J. C. (1965). A Linguistic theory of translation; An Essay in Applied.
- [18] Newmark P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation, U.K. Prentice Hall International
- [19] Abdirashidovna, C. N., & Nasimovna, A. K. (2021). The Problems of Translation When Translating Into Uzbek Languages. *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION*, 1(2), 207-209.
- [20] Bakiyev, F. J. (2023). TRANSLATION STRATEGY AS A BASIC CONCEPT OF TRANSLATING SUBTITLES. *GOLDEN BRAIN*, 1(15), 220-223.
- [21] Bakiev, F. (2024, February). LEXICAL CORRESPONDENCE ISSUES IN UZBEK-ENGLISH TRANSLATION STUDIES. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 478-481).
- [22] Nuritdinova, P., & Shermatova, B. (2024). THE IMPACT OF CHATGPT ON THE TRANSLATION INDUSTRY. *Ta'limning zamonaviy transformatsiyasi*, 4(2), 345-347.