



Received: April 13, 2022
Accepted: June 20, 2022
Available online: June 25, 2022

Shoira Isaeva

Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences (PhD),
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: shoiraaisaeva14@gmail.com

TRANSLATION ASPECT OF NON-EQUIVALENT VOCABULARY

ANNOTATION

The author of the article discusses the ways of translating non-equivalent vocabulary from one language to another, and also considers the concept of non-equivalent vocabulary. In recent years, many works have appeared testifying the interest of linguists to study linguistic phenomena in a broad extra-linguistic context. In such studies, the conditionality of the language in the very meaning of lexical units is revealed, the so-called “cultural” component of the meaning is singled out, the linguistic nature of “background” knowledge is presented, peculiarities and originality of their functioning in each of the considered linguistic communities is shown.

The term of “non-equivalent vocabulary” is actively used in linguistics and linguo-culturology, but among researchers there is no common consideration of it. Non-equivalent vocabulary, due to the frequency of its use, can often be used in speech and, as a result, be lexico-graphed, but among it there are lexemes that are used rarely or even once; in addition, they are not always accompanied by an “explanatory definition”. This circumstance, as well as the degree of sound similarity with the original word, depends on the way used in their translation.

Names of national cultural objects that exist in the country of the source text not being familiar to the speakers of the culture of the target language are of great importance in translation. In the work “Kutadgu Bilig” by Yusuf Khos Khadjib such lexemes are presented several times and one of the recognized methods of their translation into English, Russian or Uzbek is transliteration/transcription. Sometimes two tools of translation are used, in which the lexical unit is preserved with simultaneous semantic translation or commentary,

Shoira Isaeva

Filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD),
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti
Toshkent, O'zbekiston

EKVIVALENTSIZ LEKSEMALARNING TARJIMA ASPEKTI

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada ekvivalenti bo'lmagan so'z birikmalarini bir tildan boshqasiga tarjima qilish usullari o'rganilgan hamda ekvivalentsiz leksika tushunchasi haqida fikr yuritilgan. So'nggi yillar olib borilayotgan tadqiqotlarda leksik birliklar ma'nosida tilning shartlilik ochildi, ma'noning “madaniy” komponenti ajratiladi, fondagi bilimlarning lingvistik tabiati, ularni qo'llashning o'ziga xos jihatlari ko'rsatib beriladi. No-ekvivalent leksikani tadqiq qilish juda muhim, chunki u mentallik xususiyati bilan bog'liq. U muayyan xalq ma'naviyatini ko'rsatib beradi, milliy-madaniy o'ziga xoslik haqidagi bilimlar yig'indisini, nutqiy kommunikatsiya mazmunini taqdim etadi.

“Ekvivalentsiz lug'at” atamasi tilshunoslik va madaniy tilshunoslikda faol qo'llaniladi, biroq tadqiqotchilar bu masalada bir xil fikrda emas. Qo'llanish uslubi tufayli ekvivalenti bo'lmagan so'zlar ko'pincha nutqda ishlatilishi mumkin, lekin ular orasida kamdan-kam yoki hatto bir marta ishlatiladigan leksemalar mavjud bo'lishi mumkin, bundan tashqari, ular har doim ham izoh bilan birga kelavermaydi. Bu holat, shuningdek, tovushning asl so'zga o'xshashlik darajasi tarjima uslubiga bog'liq.

Ekvivalentsiz leksika tarjimada muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi, chunki u tarjima qilinayotgan asar tili egallari mamlakatining madaniyatiga xos milliy va madaniy ob'yektlar nomini to'liq tarjima qilishda yordam beradi. Yusuf xos Hojibning “Qutadg'u bilig” asarida bunday leksemalar ko'p miqdorda taqdim etilgan va ularni ingliz yoki rus tillariga tarjimasida ko'p uchraydigan usullardan biri – tarjima transkripsiyasi yoki transliteratsiyasidir. Ba'zan tarjimaning ikki xil shakli ishlatiladi, bunda leksik birlik bir vaqtning o'zida semantik

or transcription is used with descriptive translation.

When translating the non-equivalent vocabulary of the text “Kutadgu Bilig”, such basic translation techniques as transliteration/transcription, calque, mixed translation are used. Calque and semi-calque are observed in the English text of the translation.

Key words: non-equivalent vocabulary, transliteration, transcription, text, translation, calque, full translation, literal translation

tarjima yoki izoh bilan saqlanadi yoki tavsifi tarjimasi bilan transkripsiya ishlatiladi. Shuni ta’kidlash kerakki, ingliz yoki rus tillariga tarjima qilinganda, universal leksemalar o’z madaniyatiga mos keladigan semantik ma’noga ega bo’ladi.

“Qutadg’u bilig” asarining tarjimasida ekvivalenti bo’lmagan so’zlar tarjimasida transkripsiya, transliteratsiya, kalkalash kabi tarjima-ning asosiy usullari qo’llaniladi.

Kalit so’zlar: ekvivalentsiz leksika, transliteratsiya, transkripsiya, matn, tarjima, kalka, asar, to’liq tarjima, so’zma-so’z tarjima.

INTRODUCTION

In the process of translation, certain relationships are established between the source text and the target text, which enable revealing the internal mechanisms of translation, identifying equivalent units and changes in their form and content occurring when the original unit is replaced by an equivalent unit of the translated text. A comparative analysis of the translations of the work of Yusuf Khos Khadjib “Kutadgu Bilig” shows the translation difficulties associated with the peculiarities of the English, Russian and Uzbek languages, as well as what elements of the source text remain untranslatable.

In the process of translation, it is necessary to take into account the needs and interests of recipients of the text, their knowledge of the world, to involve cultural and historical factors, to take into account the implicit information contained in the original text, which cannot be comprehended without knowledge of the culture, customs, and traditions of the people. The linguistic difficulties of translation from one language to another are explained by the peculiarities of the semantics, grammar and pragmatics of the language expressions of the source language and the target language, as well as the presence of extra-linguistic factors.

RESEARCH METHODS

In this research such methods as the comparative method, the method of translation transformations, the method of linguo-culturological analysis and the method of identifying lexemes are used. The material was also collected in line with a sampling method.

MAIN PART

In recent years, a number of works have appeared that testify to the interest and desire of linguists to study linguistic phenomena in a broad extra-linguistic context. To highlight national phenomena, traditions, rituals, household items, scholars, beginning with the 1950s, use such terms as non-equivalent vocabulary, exoticisms, barbarisms, localisms, ethno-graphisms, gaps, lacunae, realias, realements, each of which, despite the presence of common features, is nevertheless characterized by its own specific properties.

It should be noted that the concept of “non-equivalent vocabulary” is interpreted

from the point of view of translation and country studies, and scholars interpret it in different ways: as a synonym for *realias*, somewhat broader – as words that are absent “in a different culture and in a different language” [Budagov R.A., 1971; 121], as “words the content plan of which cannot be compared with any foreign lexical concepts” [Budagov R.A., 1971; 56], or narrower notion: like words that cannot be translated into another language. G.V. Chernov in his research analyzing the issues and difficulties of translating non-equivalent vocabulary into English mentions that an important peculiarity of non-equivalent lexemes is their common use, popularity, “familiarity” to all or most native speakers of the source language and, conversely, “alienation” [Chernov G.V., 1958; 223] for speakers of another language and culture. By non-equivalence, the scholar understands “the absence of an equivalent of all or one of the meanings of a lexical unit in the vocabulary of the target language” [Chernov G.V., 1958; 5]; non-equivalent words are lexemes that do not have a permanent stable equivalent used in different contexts [Chernov G.V., 1958; 5]. M.L. Weisburd prefers the term “*realia*” and interprets it as “events of the social and cultural life of the country, public organizations and institutions, customs and traditions, household items, names of historical figures, etc., as well as many disparate facts that cannot be classified” [Weisburd M.L., 1972; 156]. However, such understanding of the phenomenon significantly expands the boundaries of non-equivalent vocabulary. It should be noted that the scholar approaches the consideration of *realias* from the standpoint of country study. Non-equivalent vocabulary includes “every day and specific national words, and expressions that have no equivalent in everyday life, and, consequently, in the languages of other countries” [Sobolev L.N., 2010; 258]. V.M. Rossels understands non-equivalent vocabulary as “foreign words that denote concepts, objects, phenomena ... that are not in everyday life of the people of a target language” [Rossels V.M., 2005; 165-212]. From the point of view of translation studies, L.K. Latyshev assumes that the non-equivalence of a lexical unit of the source language means that in the vocabulary of the target language there is no such “ready-made word” or stable phrase that can replace the word taken from the source [Latyshev L.K., 2003; 20]. According to L.S. Barkhudarov, non-equivalent lexemes are lexical units of one of the languages that “have neither full nor partial equivalents among the lexical units of another language” [Barkhudarov L.S., 1975; 112]. Thus, the opinions of researchers dealing with the problems of theory and practice of translation about non-equivalent vocabulary are generally the same and it includes lexemes of the source language that do not have a suitable lexical analogue in the target language.

In our opinion, non-equivalent vocabulary in its semantic content is the most extensive, voluminous concept and, given the above, it should be noted that many issues in the theory of cultural linguistics remain unresolved, controversial, in particular, the question of the place of non-equivalent vocabulary in the terminological range of varieties of phenomena. It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that some non-equivalent lexemes have certain frequency of use, they can be reflected in dictionaries, but among them there are lexemes that are used rarely or even once, in addition, they are not always accompanied by an “explanatory definition”. As for the semantic side

of non-equivalent lexemes, it should be noted the nature of their denotative content, as a result of which they have a traditional national or historical flavor.

As noted above, the concept of non-equivalent vocabulary is broad, voluminous, and therefore we can assume that, in general, “a word can be a realia in relation to all or most languages, and non-equivalent mainly within a given pair of languages, i.e., as a rule, the list of realias of a given language will be more or less constant, while the vocabulary of non-equivalent vocabulary will be different for a different pair of languages” [Buryakova E.S., 1993; 63] (cf. the translation of *baxtiyor elig* into English is *glorious king!*, and into the Russian language: *элик – достославный!*). D.W. Khashimova [Khashimova D.U., 2008; 55] proposed a definition of lacunae and identified their varieties: “lacunae are lexical, grammatical, syntactic and phraseological units of one language, denoting unique phenomena, historical facts, household items, cultural phenomena, the lives of people belonging to the same socio-cultural community, and having neither full nor partial correspondences in other languages and cultures” [Khashimova D.U., 2008; 15]. This definition also contains varieties of gaps: lexical, grammatical, syntactic and phraseological. For example, the lexemes *полати, тулуп, армяк, кисель* act as Russian lacunae. D.U. Khashimova supposes that Uzbek lacunae include words and phrases, phraseological units which represent the features of Uzbek life and national rituals, traditions, customs: *chaqirdiq, go ‘shanga, nahorgi osh, chilla saqlamoq* [Khashimova D.U., 2010; 78]. A.A. Reformatsky [Reformatsky A.A., 1996; 128] instead of the term “non-equivalent vocabulary” uses the concept of “barbarism”, by which he understands “foreign words suitable for coloristic use in describing alien realias and customs”, the scholar also includes “personal proper names” into this group [Reformatsky A.A., 1996; 137-139].

Other scholars use the term “exoticism” instead of the term “non-equivalent vocabulary”. In our opinion, it is necessary to distinguish the concepts of “barbarism” and “exoticism”. Exoticisms nominate the realias of a “foreign” culture, i.e. such realias that have not become borrowings [Vinogradova E.V., Feoklistova V.M., 2000; 121, Voronkova I.S., 2006; 77-79]. The difference between exoticisms and barbarisms lies in the fact that exoticisms denote objects and phenomena of alien life that are not found, for example, in Russian or English culture, while barbarisms can be identified by their external form, since they retain the spelling of the source language. As scholars note, semantic, phonetic, graphic, grammatical and functional features are inherent in exoticisms, which together characterize them as a special layer of words in the composition of a foreign language vocabulary [Vinogradova E.V., Feoklistova V.M., 2000; 78].

Thus, in our opinion, non-equivalent vocabulary is a broader concept, and it can include lacunae, exoticisms, and barbarisms. Non-equivalent vocabulary is mainly characterized by non-ambiguity, maximum accuracy, since it conveys the living conditions, customs, history of peoples, reflects the national and historical flavor of the country: *dua – duo – ðya* are unambiguous, they convey national realias as accurately as possible. In our opinion proper names can be considered to be non-equivalent vocabulary. Proper names mostly include anthroponyms. Thus, in the work

“Kutadgu Bilig” by Yusuf Khos Khadjib the main characters have such proper names as *Одгурмыш, Айтолды, Кюнтогды, Огдюльмыш*.

There are several translation tools; in particular, a complete translation is aimed at transferring all components of the source text in units of the target language. It can be carried out in various ways, but the most common can be considered: calque or word-for-word translation, semantic translation and communicative translation. In our opinion, the translation of the work “Kutadgu Bilig” by Yusuf Khos Khadjib into Russian and English was carried out through a full translation, and all translation tools were combined. For instance, in the following example from the work “Kutadgu Bilig” by Yusuf Khos Khadjib a combination of several translation tools is observed: the text is translated into Russian quite fully, while some fragments are translated into English in an abbreviated form: there are no enumerations: *biri* (lit.: one of them) – *во-первых*, *biri* (in context: the other one) – *во-вторых*, *uchinchisi* (lit.: third) – *в-третьих*, *to’rtinchisi* (lit.: fourth) – *четвертое*, *besinchisi* (lit.: fifth) – *пятое*.

Еще пять вещей для владыки запретны,
Без них его имя и слава – всесветны.
Во-первых, поспешность, корысть – во-вторых,
А в-третьих – гневливость, будь дальше от них!
Четвертое зло – быть упрямым упорно,
И пятое: лживость безмерно позорна!
И бекам сих зол избегать надлежит,
Тогда их величью ничто не грозит [Ivanov S.N., 1983; 161].

In order to maintain his good reputation, *the prince* should keep these five things far from him: haste, stringiness, quick temper, an unruly character, and a lying tongue. If he stays far from these his name will not go bad and his command will be effective [Dankoff R., 1983; 168].

Bundan boshqa besh narsani *beg* uzidan uzoq tutishi kerak,
Toki dong va shuhrat taratish darajasida ezgu nomga ega bo‘lsin
Biri – shoshqaloqlik, biri – ochko‘zlik,
Uchinchisi – jaholat, undan ehtiyot bul, uzoq tur.
To’rtinchisi – beg uchun buzuq fe’llilik yaramaydi,
Besinchisi – yolg‘onchilik noma’qul ishdir.
Bu bir qator narsalardan *beglar* o‘zini yiroq tutishlari kerak,

(Toki) nomi bulg‘anmasa, so‘zi ravon bo‘lsa [ya’ni amri vojib bo‘lsa] [Karimov Q., 1971; 311].

Literal translation means that all significant lexemes of the source text are translated, and the order of the words can be preserved, as in the above example (compare the Uzbek and Russian versions of the text). And in the following example, a literal translation into Russian and English is made *О семи планетах и двенадцати знаках зодиака – On the seven planets and the twelve constellations – Yetti sayyora va uniki burj (haqida)*.

It should be noted that while translating the work “Kutadgu Bilig” into English and Russian, a semantic method of translation is used, since the text itself has a high socio-cultural status. At the same time, our analysis shows, that there is a more complete transfer of the contextual meaning of the linguistic units of the source text in the units of the target language. Translators, especially S.N. Ivanov, are guided by the way of expressing the notions adopted in the target language, while retaining as much as possible the features of the original form of expressing: the syntactic structure, punctuation, sentence length, metaphor, morphological structure, widespread universal and culturally marked lexemes and expressions. He managed to preserve the peculiarities of the original form of expression, while translating unique author's phrases, original stylistic devices, as well as a peculiar manner of presentation.

Их речь то огнем жжет, то влагой журчит,
 То будешь смеяться, то плакать навзрыд.
 Три вещи опасны, не будь им *соседом*:
 Огонь и вода приведут тебя к бедам.
 К тому же повадками *бек* – *словно лев*:
 Погладишь – что шелк, и сидит, присмирив.
 А станешь дразнить – и простись с головою,
 Упьется твоею он кровью живою [Ivanov S.N., 1983; 161].

Princes are now fire, now water. Now they make you laugh, now weep. With these three things do not be too *close a neighbor*: burning fire, flowing water, and the fame of princes. Consider that a prince is *like a mighty lion*: if you approach respectfully, he is soft as silk; but if you approach contemptuously, he flares up, cuts off your head, pierces your veins, and sucks your blood [Dankoff R., 1983; 168]!

(Ular) goho o't bo'ladi, ko'r, goho suv bo'ladi,
 Goho kuldiradi, kur goho yig'latadi.
 Bu uch narsaning yaqin *qo'shnisi* bo'lma,
 Kuyar o't, oqar suv (ularning) belgilaridir.
 Bu *beglar* o'zi *zabardast arslonga o'xshaydi*,
 Erkalab yaqinlashilsa, ipak (kabi) yungi yumshaydi.
 Agar dag'allashib yaqinlashilsa, g'azabga keladi, bosh kesadi,
 Tomirni (teshib qon) oqizadi, ko'r, surib qon ichadi [Karimov Q., 1971; 311].

In the given example *bek* – *prince* (*принца*) is compared to a lion in three languages: *словно лев* – *like a mighty lion* – *zabardast arslonga o'xshaydi*, showing that lion is a strong animal in three cultures.

During translation of the work of “Kutadgu Bilig” into English and Russian, a communicative method is also used, which is considered to be a way of transferring the original information in the way that leads to a translated text with an adequate initial impact on the recipient. The main attention of R.Dankoff and S.N. Ivanov was drawn not so much to the linguistic composition of the original text, but to its content and emotional and aesthetic significance.

It should be noted that the majority of poetic translations carry a specific variant of communicative translation, since the poetic text by its nature does not lend itself to simple semantic and even more so literal translation. Even attempts to translate a poetic text into prose, adhering to its lexico-semantic and grammatical components as fully as possible, do not change the essence of the matter, because with this approach the most important components of a poem are not translated – its phonetic and rhythmometric components, i.e. the poem essentially turns into a qualitatively different text and can serve only limited communicative purposes. To illustrate, the prose translation of Yusuf Khos Khadjib's work into English by R. Dankoff, which, nevertheless retains the line-by-line division of the text, adapted by the translator to the tastes of the modern American audience, as well as the numbering of the verse.

Несметны маралы среди горных гряд,
Коров и быков – не сочтешь твоих стад.
И козы, что в горных раздольях пасутся,
Твои – от неволи твоей не спасутся!
Там лани, маралы, сайгаки – все есть,
И всех тебе, доблестный, не переест! [Ivanov S.N., 1983; 201]

Great herds of yak ranging the northern slopes, oxen and cattle grazing in the plains, wild sheep and goats leaping on the cliffs – none escapes you, O, manly dragon! Gazelle and maral deer provide your daily fare. Male and female wild ass, also the grey mountain-goat, are captured and brought to you. Nor do wolf and fox escape you, lion and bear and wild boar, but all are slaughtered equally in the beat [Dankoff R., 1983; 221].

Yo tog'ning kun tushmas tomonlarida yuruvchi behisob ko'p quotos(lar),
Yo tekislik(lar)da yuruvchi buqa, sigir, ho'kiz(lar).
Qoya(lar)da yuruvchi bu serka, taka (lar)
Sendan (qochib) qutulmaydi, ey mard bahodir.
Sig'un, muyg'oq, suqoq yoki iviq bo'lsa (ham),
Senga yemish yetmaydi, ey ezgu fe'lli [Karimov Q., 1971; 401].

Any single method in the real translation process rarely works: as a rule, most complex texts are translated using various methods, but one of them is the leading one and determines the nature of the relationship between the source and the translated text as a whole, dictating both the conditions for dividing the source text, and the definition of translation units, as well as the choice of translation techniques with the help of which the source text is directly converted into the translated one.

Lexical transformations, particularly, affect any grammatical forms, including those that may have a direct correspondence in other contexts. When translating into English, there is often a discrepancy between the functions of verb forms, nominal phrases and other grammatical units, due not so much to typological differences as to differences in cultural and speech traditions regarding this or that type of a context. This type of transformation is the grammatical one, which consists in changing the

nature of the grammatical form, if the original form is either absent in the target language or performs other functions.

Одни – благородного звания мужи,
Ты с ними, о, доблестный, ладь и дружи.
Другие – чей ум веру в бога сберег,
Они – *человечных достоинств исток* [Ivanov S.N., 1983; 161].

One is the man of noble birth and outstanding qualities. Befriend him if you find him, O, choice of men! The other is the man who is pious and God-fearing. From him comes *true humanity* [Dankoff R., 1983; 168].

Yaqin tutish uchun sara kishi istasang,
Tilakni topish uchun, ular ikki turlidir.
Biri – asl, ezgu kishilarning sarasi,
(Agar bunday odam) topilsa, dust tut, ey mardlar sarvari.
Yana biri – andishali, xudoni biladigan,
U – (asl) odamdirl, *odamgarchilik* ushandan keladi [Karimov Q., 1971; 311].

In this extract *true humanity* is used in the English text, while in Russian: *человечных достоинств исток* (the plural form is used *человечных достоинств*), and in Uzbek – *odamgarchilik*.

Not only functional replacement and addition is used in the English and Russian translations, but there are such common techniques as grammatical transformations, antonymic translation, zero translation:

Когда у едящих *напитков нет рядом*,
Все яства для них могут сделаться ядом.

Wherever there is food there *should be drink*, and the two must be balanced correctly, for food taken without drink has a toxic effect.

Qayerda yeyiladigan (narsa) bo'lsa, *ichiladigan(i) ham kerak*,
Yeyiladigan ichiladigan bilan tenglashishi kerak.
Yeyiladigan bo'lsayu ichiladiganning tayini bo'lmasa,
U ovqatni yesa og'u bo'ladi, deb hisoblagin.

In this extract antonymic translation is used: *Ichiladigan(i) ham kerak* (liter. drink needs to be included) – *напитков нет рядом* (drinks are not there).

Yeyiladigan ichiladigan bilan tenglashishi kerak (lit.: food and drink should be equal) in the Uzbek translation, while in Russian this sentence is omitted, in English it is transferred as *the two must be balanced correctly*.

U ovqatni yesa og'u bo'ladi (lit. if he eats the food, he will be poisoned) – *for food taken without drink has a toxic effect* – *Все яства для них могут сделаться ядом* (all food for them can become poison).

Depending on the nature of the lexical units that are considered as initial in the process of transformation, we have identified three types of translation transformations:

lexical, grammatical and lexico-grammatical. Above we gave examples of some types of lexical transformations, in particular, the technique of omission, the technique of antonymic translation. It is worth to consider another example.

На пастбищах – овцы в бескрайней округе,
С тобою, **о, славный**, служанки и слуги.

Flocks of sheep graze on the hills and the plateaus, while slaveboys and slavegirls stand at your service.

Vodiy, tog‘, yer(lar)ni qoplab qo‘y, poda(laring) yuradi,
Yo qul(laring), joriya(laring), xizmatchi (laring), **ey fe‘li ravshan**.

In this passage a translator omitted addressing *о, славный* – *ey fe‘li ravshan* in the English version of the text.

We also identified grammatical transformations (morphological, syntactic), which include such techniques as syntactic assimilation; division of the proposal; consolidation of the offer; grammatical substitutions (word forms, parts of speech, sentence members are subject to replacement).

И ежели хочешь ты *властвовать* долго,
Четыре тебе исполнять нужно долга.

If you would *be a prince* renowned forever, four things are required.

Doim *beg bo‘layin* desang muqarrar,
Bu to‘rt narsa lozim, (toki) so‘ng (undan) bazfa olsang.

In the English version of this extract *be a prince* is used, while in the Russian version the verb *властвовать* (*lit. to govern*), in Uzbek version *beg bo‘layin* (*be a king*) is used.

Stylistic transmission techniques used in cases where the object of translation is a stylistically marked unit of the source text is of great importance in Russian and English versions of the text. As is known, some of the stylistic units cannot be translated, others require significant transformations, and only a very small part of the stylistically marked elements of the source text receives an equivalent correspondence during translation. Among the common stylistic units, one should note the metaphor, the transfer of which to another language largely depends on how close or far apart the figurative understanding and cultural traditions of the source language and the target language are.

Хвалюю *создателю* начал я слово –
Во славу *зизждителя* сил всеблагого.

I began my discourse with the name of *God* my Lord, *Creator*, Nourisher, Pardonner.

Xudo nomi bilan so‘zni boshladim,
Yaratgan, parvarishlagan, kechirgan egamdir.

In the Russian version of the provided passage archaic lexeme *зизждитель* (lit. Creator) in the meaning of *создатель* is used, the reason of using which can be the aim of the author to avoid repetition of the lexeme *создатель*. The same case can be observed in the English version of the text: *God, Creator* (in Uzbek: *Xudo* (lit.: God), *Yaratgan* (lit.: Creator).)

It should be noted that one of the ways to convey the associations that underlie the original image is a stylistic transformation; in particular, we have identified the replacement of lexical units, changing the image, literal translation with or without commentary. In the fragment below, in the English text, there are comments explaining oriental drinks in brackets, and we note that their translation is given in the Russian version (sr.: *fuqo* – *fuka* (a sweet beverage) – *брага*, *miyzob* – *mizab* (table-water) – *сок*, *gulangbin* – *julengbin* (conservé of roses) – *шербет*, *gulob* – *julab* (rose-water julep) – *мед*:

Кто *браги* захочет, кто *сока* попьет,
Кто спросит *шербета*, кто пить будет *мед*.
А что из напитков еще подается,
Спросить тебе сведущих в этом придется [Ivanov S.N., 1983; 161].

Wherever there is food there should be drink, and the two must be balanced correctly, for food taken without drink has a toxic effect. If you will, you may give him *fuka* (a sweet beverage) or *mizab* (table-water), or else *julengbin* (conservé of roses) or *julab* (rose-water julep). As to what you may offer besides these, do not ask me, ask someone else [Dankoff R., 1983; 168]!

Istasa *fuqo* 'ber, istasa *miyzob* (ber),
Istasa *gulangbin*, istasa *gulob* (ber).
Bu (lar) dan boshqa yana nimalar berishingni,
Sen mendan so'rama, bo'ladiganini so'ragin [Karimov Q., 1971; 311].

We have identified the following basic techniques for translating non-equivalent vocabulary: transliteration/transcription, calque, mixed translation (Table 1.1).

Table 1.

Basic techniques for translating non-equivalent vocabulary

Translation techniques	Examples
Transcription	Elig (Uzb.) – элик (Rus.), beg (Uzb.) – бек (Rus.)
Transliteration	Qutadg' u Bilig (Uzb.) – Kutadgu Bilig (Eng.), Oyto'ldi (Uzb.) – Айтолди (Rus.)
Calque	Oyto'ldi (Uzb.) – Full Moon (Eng.)
Mixed translation – mix of transcription and semantic translation	Baxtiyor elig (Uzb.) – о элик, достославный (Rus.)

The study of lexical units in languages with different structures in order to identify universal and national features is gaining increasing theoretical and practical significance. The linguistic picture of the world is reflected in lexical units, they convey national identity, the paradigm of national knowledge, the uniqueness of the

perception of the world by each people in the diachronic and synchronous aspects, and from this point of view, the study of translation techniques acquires great significance. A number of studies has also been carried out on the problems of equivalence between words in translation, based on the principles of intercultural communication. Scholars of different countries, in particular, W.Richard, K.David, N.A. Dudareva, L.K. Latyshev [See more about this: Watts R., 2000; 29-46; Katan D., 2004; 121; Dudareva N.A., 2003; 85; Latyshev L.K., 2003; 19-27.], conducted an analysis of the culture of translation and translation competence. Transcription or transliteration of translating words in discourse, in particular, anthroponyms are of particular relevance.

In transcription a formal phonemic reproduction of the original lexical unit is performed using the phonemes of the target language, phonetic imitation of the original word. Another method of translation is transliteration, i.e. a formal letter-by-letter recreation of the original lexical unit using the alphabet of the target language, letter-by-letter imitation of the form of the original word.

At the same time, the original word in the translated text is presented in a form adapted to the pronunciation characteristics of the target language, for example, *Kutadgu Bilig* – *Qutadg‘u Bilig*: the Uzbek form partially follows the rules for reading English spelling of sounds, for example, the sounds [y], [a], [o], [u] are direct analogues of the original ones, the translator partially transforms them into approximately similar ones – in cases where there are no phonetic analogues in English, for example, Uzbek [q], [g‘] turn into similar English [k], [g]. We can also give an example: Khan – khan – in this case, the correspondence *kh* is used relatively steadily to transmit the sound [x]. This method of transcription is a rule of thumb for translating Uzbek lexemes into English.

It should be noted that the set of rules for transcription from English into Russian has been developed quite fully, and the rules for transcription of the English-language names are reflected in many publications, including dictionaries, [Dudareva N.A., 2003; 98], however, the rules for transcription from Uzbek into English are not fully developed.

The rules existing in the practice of translation for applying transcription or transliteration to proper names often turn out to be insufficient if the proper name contains a symbolic semantic content, becoming the name of a single person, or is used not as a name, but as, for example, a nickname, being a peculiar common noun, because it reflects the individual characteristics and properties of a person. In such cases, in addition, a combination of descriptive translation with transliteration, transcription or calque is used.

In the given extract transliteration of the lexeme *хасс-хаджиб* is used in the Russian language and in the English version of the text calque is used: *privy chamberlain*.

И прочие люди различны изрядно,
Умей различать их – и все будет ладно.
Меж них есть и те, чья ученость мудра,

Ученость – источник любого добра.
 Ты их почитай и внемли их веленьям,
 Блюда *шариат*, будь исполнен смиреньем.
 Плати им, едой и питьем не обидь,
 Чтоб им, о, всевластный, без горестей жить.
 Да будут они в благолепье душевном
 Невежд наставлять поученьем вседневным.
 Еще *мухтасиб*ы есть, власть им дана,
 Рука их, о, славный, должна быть сильна.
 Им – злых и беспутных к порядку неволить,
 В довольстве мечети и общины холить.
 Еще слуги есть при особе твоей,
 Чем менее строг ты, тем слуги наглей [Ivanov S.N., 1983; 161].

Furthermore, your subjects fall into several classes. You must distinguish carefully among them to ensure that good relations are maintained among all.

One is the class of *Ulema*. They bring a man good fortune. Treat them honorably, do whatever they say; keep to the path of the *Sharifah* and bend your neck. Fail not, sage ruler, to give this class of men their due. Always provide them with food and drink lest they fall into want. Leave their hearts tranquil and secure, that they may practice their teachings and the ignorant may benefit from their instructions.

Then come the *public censors*. They must have a strong arm, O, noble one. For, it is their job to keep a close rein on fornicators and ne'er-do-wells, and to keep the mosques and congregations full [Dankoff R., 1983; 168].

Bundan tashqari yana bu elning xalqi bir necha turlidir,
 Bu(lar)ni ajratib [ya'ni farqiga borib] tutish kerak, (toki)yo'l ochiq bo'lsin.
 Ulardan biri dono, *olimlardir*,
 Bu olimlar tufayli odamga baxt keladi.
 Ularni hurmatla, nima aytsa (lar) qil,
Shariat yo'lini tut, bo'yin ber, egil.
 Bularning haq(lar)ini tiyma, ichiladigan, yeyiladigan / (narsalar)
 Berib tur, (ular) munglanmasin(lar), (ey) el boshlovchi dono.
 (Ular) ko'ngil osoyishtaligi bilan (boshqalarni) o'rgatsinlar,
 Shuningdek bilimsizlar u(lar)dan o'rgansinlar.
 Bulardan bo'lagi *muhtasiblardir*,
 Bular qo'li kuchli bo'lishi kerak, ey baraka topkur.
 Toki fosiq, behuda, beboshlarni tergap tutsa (lar),
 Masjid (va) jamoatlarni to'kis tutsa (lar).
 Bo'lak bir toifa sen uchun topinuvchilardir,
 Sen (ularni) tergap tutmasang, (ular) qopuvchilardir [Karimov Q., 1971; 311].

In the English version of the text lexeme *ulema* (derived from *alim* – theologian), in Uzbek – *olim*, in Russian – *ученость* is used. Unlike the English version of the

translation and the Uzbek source, the Russian language uses an inanimate noun. In the English version of the text lexeme derived from Arab language *alim* is used, which is transliteration, in the Russian language equivalent was found.

Shariat (arab.) – lit.: “law”, “statute”; a set of Muslim religious and legal laws, based on the provisions of the Koran. The Russian version of the text uses transcription, in English there is an incomplete transcription (cf.: *shariat* – *Sharifah*).

Muhtasib (apaб.) – warden, a person who looked after order in the bazaars, is not used in modern Uzbek speech. The Russian translation uses transliteration, the English translation uses the equivalent: *public censors*.

It should be noted that the transcription of proper names is primarily associated with a peculiar sphere of intercultural correspondences, in particular, the English transcription of anthroponyms belonging to another culture may differ to some extent from Russian and Uzbek, and therefore translators should have a fairly clear idea about the culture of the peoples into whose language the texts are translated. Through transcription S.N. Ivanov and Robert Dankoff also convey the names of peoples, tribes, nationalities, toponyms, cultural and historical objects, etc. Here are some examples: *Узбек* – *Uzbek*, *Чигиль* – *Chigil*, *Қашғар* – *Qashgar*, *Баласағун* – *Balasagun*. However, in its pure form, such a method of transferring names as transliteration is relatively rare and, as a rule, is associated with the tradition of established forms of names: *Атык* – *Atik*, *Рустам* – *Rustam*. For a number of objects, traditional forms of translation have been established, which partially coincide with the original naming (cf.: *Қоран* – *Qur'an*, *шаруат* – *sharifah*, *Везир* – *vizier*, *Ябғу* – *Yavgu*, *Юғруш* – *Yugrus*, *Эльбек* – *El Begi*).

It is necessary to single out as a translation problem the non-equivalent vocabulary, the naming of national cultural objects that are common for original culture and relatively little or not at all known to the translating culture. As noted above, in the work of Yusuf Khos Khadjib “Kutadgu Bilig” such names constitute a fairly large group and one of the most common ways of translating them into English or Russian is transcription or transliteration. Typically, such culturally marked lexemes are presented in Russian and English texts in their full foreign language form, through approximate transcription, until complete assimilation, a sign of which is the inclusion of such a unit in the basic dictionary of the language. Sometimes a double form of translation is used, in which a foreign language unit is preserved with a parallel semantic translation or commentary, or transcription is used with a descriptive translation. However, universal lexemes should also be noted, which, when translated into English or Russian, acquire semantic shades that are identical to the culture of the respective peoples (Table 2).

Table 2.

Translation of lexemes

№	Russian	Uzbek	English
1.	мускус	ifor	musk
2.	Қоран	Qur'on	Qur'an

3.	Азраил	Isrofil	Hebrew psalm
4.	ученость	olimlar	ulema
5.	шариат	shariat	sharifah
6.	мухтасибы	muhtasiblar	public censors
7.	маралы, сайгаки	muyg'oq, suqoq	maral deer
8.	брага	fuqo'	fuka
9.	сок	miyzob	mizab
10.	шербет	gulangbin	julengbin
11.	мёд	gulob	julab
12.	тамга	tamg'a	seal
13.	човган	chavgon	polo
14.	чигиль	chigil	chigil
15.	везир	vazir	vizier
16.	калям	qalam	pen
17.	молитва	duo / namoz	benedictions / prayer
18.	пост	ro'za	fast
19.	две холстины	ikki (parcha) bo'zdan	two pieces of cloth
20.	поясом повязан	bel bog'ladi	fastened belt
21.	счастье	baxt / davlat	fortune
22.	еда	ovqat, osh	dine
23.	бек	beg	prince
24.	владыки	el boshlovchi beglar	rulers
25.	власть	davlat	fortune
26.	элик	elig	king
27.	Хасс-Хаджиб	Xos Hojib	privy chamberlain / chamberlain

Thus, full transliteration, as one of the tools of translating non-equivalent vocabulary, reproduces the graphic form of the original lexical unit using the letters of the target language, while, as noted above, partial transliteration can also be used. However, it should be noted that translators S.N. Ivanov and Robert Dankoff use transliteration, in our opinion, when there is no exact match in Russian and English and it is necessary to show the uniqueness of the thing or concept.

Calque, which is characterized by the replacement of the constituent parts of a non-equivalent word or phrase with literal correspondences in the target language, is observed in the English text of the translation of Yusuf Khos Khadzhib's work "Kutadgu Bilig", for example, when rendering proper names: *Айтолди* – Full Moon, etc. Here we have identified the exact calque, for example: *Одгурмыш* – Wide Awake. Analysis of the translation made it possible to identify semi-calque, the so-called partial borrowings, also new words or set phrases, but partly from their own material, and partly from the material of a foreign word, for example: *Кюнтогды* – King Rising Sun.

When transferring non-equivalent vocabulary into English, R.Dankoff uses a descriptive or explanatory translation, which fully reveals the semantic content of the original unit through an extended description using phrases and expressions, for example, *мухтасиб* – *public censor*; *марал* – *maral deer*; *хасс-хаджиб* – *privy*

chamberlain.

Unlike other methods of transferring non-equivalent vocabulary described above, which are more or less mechanical in nature, descriptive translation requires a deep knowledge of culturally marked lexemes.

When transferring non-equivalent vocabulary in the text “Kutadgu Bilig” into English and Russian, an approximate translation is also used, in which a concept is searched for in the target language to denote an alien reality, although it does not coincide with the original one, but has a significant semantic similarity with it and to a certain extent capable of revealing to the recipient the essence of the described phenomenon, i.e. use of analogue: *пост* – *fast*, *молитва* – *prayer*, *benediction*. However, the reception of an approximate transmission of non-equivalent vocabulary has a drawback, since the lexeme, when replaced by its approximate analogue, may acquire an inaccurate meaning, and therefore the context and national cultural peculiarities should be taken into account. In the work of Yusuf Khos Khadjib “Kutadgu Bilig”, the lexeme *намоз* is used, which can approximately be translated into Russian and English, respectively, as *молитва* – *prayer*, however, it should be taken into account that *намоз* involves performing a five-time prayer daily, while *молитва* and *prayer* are used in a broader sense and can mean different types of prayer, for example, before meal or after meal.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Methods and techniques for including culturally marked vocabulary in Russian and English texts are divided into two main groups.

1. Nationally marked vocabulary is introduced into Russian and English texts without explanations and comments (cf.: *чигиль* – *chigil* – *chigil*).

As for anthroponyms and toponyms, a different picture is observed during their transmission: such lexemes are introduced into a Russian text without explanations and comments, since they are easy to determine from the context, but in the English version R.Dankoff offers explanations in brackets.

2. Culturally marked lexemes are used with an appropriate explanation. So, the translation of S.N. Ivanov and R.Dankoff's translation are replete with comments and notes that provide interpretations of lexical units, and all explanatory information is mainly taken out of the text with the help of identification marks (for example, S.N. Ivanov has asterisks). Sometimes culturally marked vocabulary is explained in brackets. To illustrate, R.Dankoff describes the connection of two words using the language of the source, in the Russian version this couplet is omitted:

In fact, the words for ‘wisdom’ (*bilig*) and ‘prince’ (*beg*) are connected: take away the *l* from *bilig* and this leaves *beg*.

И беков не зря ведь зовут словом «знать»:

Положено бекам все ведать и знать!

Beg oti Bilig bilan bog‘liqdir,

Bilig nomi ketsa beg oti qoladi.

Thus, when translating non-equivalent vocabulary in the text “Kutadgu Bilig”, such basic translation techniques as transcription, transliteration, calque, and mixed translation are used. Calque and semi-calque are observed in the English text of the translation. Non-equivalent lexemes as a whole are a nomination of lexemes denoting national customs, traditions, rituals, folk life, which, when translated, can be accompanied by additional comments or without them, if the context is sufficiently informative.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, when transferring culturally marked lexemes, in particular, anthroponyms and toponyms, from one language to another, transcription or transliteration is used. In some cases, to achieve greater accuracy, transcription or transliteration is used as a component of a mixed translation together with calque, semantic translation or commentary. Calque is used in cases where it is required to create a meaningful unit in the translated text while preserving the elements of a form or function of the original unit; it is often used along with transcription and lexico-semantic transformation.

REFERENCES

1. Alekseeva, I.S. (2004). *Introduction to translation studies*. Publishing Center Academy.
2. Barkhudarov, L.S. (1975). *Language and translation: Questions of general and specific theory of translation*. Moscow: International relations.
3. Borisova, V.V. (2017). The novel “Zuleikha Opens Her Eyes” by G.Yakhina: The conflict of receptions in the context of the regional, Russian and world literature (on the problem of national and cultural identity). *Journal of Siberian Federal University*, 5(10), 654-660. <https://doi.org/10.17516/1997-1370-0073>.
4. Budagov, R.A. (1971). *Language, history and modernity*. Moscow State University.
5. Buryakova, E.S. (1993). Linguocultural lacoons in a literary text (on the material of the works by A.S. Pushkin, M.YU. Lermontov, A.P. Chekhov, S.Yesenin). *Dis. abs. can. phil. sci.* (63 p.). Kharkov.
6. Chernov, G.V. (1958). Issues on translating Russian non-equivalent vocabulary into the English language. *Dis. abs. can. phil. sci.* (64 p.) Moscow.
7. Chernov, G.V. (1958). On the issues of translating non-equivalent vocabulary when translating works into the English language. *MSPIFL*, 16, 188-198.
8. Dankoff, R. (1983). *Yusuf Khass Hajib's "Wisdom of Royal Glory"*. The University of Chicago Press.
9. Dudareva, N.A. (2003). *Translator in the sphere of professional communication and total control of the quality*. Science.
10. Fattakhova, A.R. (2017). Culturally marked lexical units as a reflection of the “outworld” realities. *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, 14(4), 770-777. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8011-2017-14-4-770-777>.
11. Fedorov, A.V. (2002). *Fundamentals of the general theory of translation (linguistic problems)* (5th ed.) LLC Publishing House.
12. Ibrahimova, B., Tarasova, F., Yarullina, O. (2017). Proverbs and sayings as reflection of national character. *Revista Publicando*, 4(13), 626-633.
13. Ivanov, S.N. (1983). *Yusuf Khas Khadjib Balasaguni's "Blessed Knowledge"*. Science.
14. Jdanova, A.A. (1999). Eastern exotic phraseological units in publicistic text. In *Actual problems of philology in university and school* Conference materials (pp. 65-68). Tver.
15. Karimov, K. (1971). *Yusuf Khos Khadzhib's "Kutadgu Bilig": Knowledge that brings to happiness*. Science.

16. Katan, D. (2004). *Translation of cultures* (2nd ed.). Saint Jerome.
17. Kazakova, T.A. (2001). *Practical basis of translation*. Learning Foreign Languages Union.
18. Khashimova, D.U. (2008). *Problems of contrastive study of lacunae in multisystem languages* (104 p.). Tashkent State University of Law.
19. Khashimova, D.U. (2010). *National-cultural peculiarities of somatic phrasal verbs and somatic speech as an object of linguoculturology* (p. 127). Tashkent State University of Law.
20. Latyshev, L.K. (2003). *Basic components of translation competence* (pp.19-27). All-Russian Translation Center.
21. Mednikova, E.M. (1985). *The theory of translation and contrastive analysis of languages*. Moscow State University.
22. Muravyev, V.L. (1975). *Lexical lacunas* (p. 97). Pedagogical Institute of Vladimir.
23. Reformatskiy, A.A. (1996). *Introduction to linguistics*. Aspent Press.
24. Rossels, V.M. (2005). *Translation and national peculiarities of the original* (pp.165-212). USSR Academy of Sciences.
25. Sobolev, L.N. (2010). *Workbook on translating from Russian into French*. Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages.
26. Vaysburd, M.L. (1972). Realias as an element of country study. *Russian Language Abroad*, 3, 156.
27. Vinogradova, Ye.V., & Feoklistova, V.M. (2000). Contrast of semantic structures of exotisms (on the materials of Russian, English, French and German languages). In *Language of education and formation of the language* International Conference materials (p.190). Novgorod.
28. Voronkova, I.S. (2006). On notions of “exotisms” and “barbarisms”. *Vestnik of VSU*, 2, 77-79.
29. Watts, R. (2000). Translating Culture: Reading the Paratexts to Aimé Césaire’s *Cahier d’un retour au pays natal*. *TTR*, 13(2), 29–45. <https://doi.org/10.7202/037410ar>.
30. Yerbulatova, I., Gilazetdinova, G., Aminova, A. (2018). The national coloring as a part of the connotative meaning of realia. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(4), 102-108. <https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i4.1820>.