HISTORY AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE EQUIVALENT-LACKING FORMS AND STRUCTURES

Julia ABBAS

CZU: 81`25   ladyjul01@gmail.com

The article is a study of controversial structures lacking equivalence in the target language. In our case, the English-Russian language pair differs greatly in terms of lexical, semantic, grammatical, historical and cultural structure. Moreover, the reflection of the author's individual view of the world requires a further analysis of the issues at hand.

Many scholars use the term "equivalent-lacking vocabulary" and each understand it differently. Some academics make use of this phrase as a synonym for "realia", yet some use it more widely as terms that are missing from the culture and language of translation. Mona Baker defines an equivalent-lacking vocabulary as terms that are untranslatable into another language [1, p.48].

Nevertheless, scholars have attempted to categorize non-equivalence in this context. All linguists agree on the categorization shown below.

Proper Names: Proper names are a type of language that has a clear relationship with real-world phenomena. As a result, they are capable of describing a subject not just as linguistic phenomenon, but also as a unique, extraordinary, non-generalizable occurrence in the world.

Realia: All lexical units with strong national-cultural themes are related to reality. As linguistic phenomena, realias are of great relevance in establishing the relationship between language and culture. Many translators are becoming increasingly interested in the social aspects of language, reflecting its connection with the actions of those who speak it.

Linguists associate realias with the concept of equivalent-lacking vocabulary. According to, Susan Bassnett "a word might be real in relation to all or most languages, and the list of realias of a given language will generally be more or less consistent, while the vocabulary of the non-equivalent vocabulary will vary for various pair of languages" [2, p.43].

Some scholars investigate realities as connotations, or parts of objective reality that are mirrored in consciousness. Several linguists offer various forms of connotations. The reference typology of В. Н. Комиссаров separates three major kinds of connotations [3, p.111]:

1. *Universal referents* – referents that are identical in all aspects of the cultures being compared. For example, the terms *sky, love, joy,* and *bird* all have Russian counterparts. It is worth noting that the degree of identity between tangible and abstract referents varies.

2. Quasi-realia – this group includes referents that are identical in essential features, but different in secondary ones. For example, *a house, a hut, a mansion, a palace*.

3. Unique-realias – this category comprises connotations that are not similar in any sense; such referents are culturally distinct. For instance, *"The Prancing pony" or "Golden Perch"* [4, p. 24].

Mona Baker defines non-equivalence at the word level as "the target language having no direct equivalent for a term that occurs in the source text". Furthermore, while deciding which tactics to employ, the context and goal of the translation must be considered. Mona Baker's research of equivalent-lacking forms and structures at the word level is significant and valuable since she provides a list of typical sorts of non-equivalence at the word level as well as some ways that translators may use to cope with them [1, p.25].

Nevertheless, there are several examples where different languages do not have word-for-word equivalency. Mona Baker mentions some more common non-equivalence difficulties in equivalent-lacking forms and structures:

1. **Culturally distinctive means.** The source language term can convey an idea that is completely foreign to the cultural context and the notion in issue might be conceptual or real, and it could refer to a religious belief, a social habit, or even a sort of cuisine. Such ideas are frequently referred to as "culture-specific".

2. **The idea from the source language is not lexicalized in the target language.** The source language term may convey a topic that is well-known in the target culture but has not yet been lexicalized, that is, it has not been 'assigned' a target language word to describe it." When you develop a language, you more or less catch it out of the air." "When you say boo-hoo, it implies something that cannot be lexicalized in the target language and if we were to explain the meaning of this word in Russian it would be translated as "громко рыдать" [5, p.231].

3. **The source language term has a high level of semantic complexity.** The semantics of the source language term could be complicated. We can say that this is a rather typical translation issue.

4. **There is no particular term in the target language (hyponym).** Because each language develops only certain differences in meaning that seem important to its unique context, languages typically contain generic terms but lack specialized ones (hyponyms). As example, the English term 'house' contains certain hyponyms that do not have an equivalent in other languages: mansion, cottage, villa, and bungalow.

5. **The usage of borrowed (loan) terms in the original text.** Loan terms, which differ in their original meaning, are typically employed to demonstrate distinction. This issue is frequently limited in terms of translation because there are no similar words we can use for the target language.

6. **Distinctions in expressive meaning.** Expressive meaning refers to the speaker's sentiments or attitude rather than the words themselves. Many words may have the same predicate meaning but have different emotive meanings.

7. ***Differences in form.*** Usually, there is no equivalent in the target language for a certain form in the source text. Most suffixes and prefixes in English that communicate propositional and other forms of meaning have no exact counterparts in other languages.

8. ***There is no superordinate in the target language.*** The target language may have specific words (hyponyms) but no general word (superordinate) to head the semantic field.

9. ***Distinctions in physical or interpersonal perception.*** Physical perspective is maybe more significant in English than in any other language. Physical perspective describes a situation in which objects or individuals are positioned in respect to one another or to a location, as indicated in pairs of words such as come-go, take-bring, arrive-depart, and so on.

10. "***Occasional Lacunas***". Another categorization in the equivalent-lacking structures is the so-called "occasional lacunas," which are lexical units from one language that have no correspondences in the lexical composition of the other. The term "lacuna" refers to a gap or omission.

To summarize what has been mentioned above, it is critical to assess the categorization and history in the equivalent-lacking structure in order to determine which strategies should be employed. Any language may express any idea: the absence of a particular designation for any concept in the form of a word or a set phrase in the language's vocabulary does not imply that it is impossible to convey that conception notion using the means of the given language.

Bibliography:

1. BAKER M, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 8, London and New York: Routledge, Last edited: August 2020, 897 p.
2. BASSNETT S, *Translation-Studies-New-Accents*, London: Boydell and Brewer, 2000, 142 p.
3. КОМИССАРОВ В. Н., *Современное переводоведение*. – М.: Изд-во «ЭТС», 2002, 135 с.
4. TOLKIEN J.R.R., *The Lord of the Rings* (in 3 vol.), New York:Ballantine Books, 1975, 786p.
5. ТОЛКИЕН Дж.Р.Р., *Властелин колец* (в 3 томах), Пер. с англ. А.А.Грузберга. Нью-Йорк: Ballantine Books, 1975, 786p.

Recomandat
Svetlana CORCODEL, *lector univ., master în Studii Europene*