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Abstract: This article focuses on how to identify lacuna, including hyponymic and hyperonymic lacunas occurring in semantic fields in comparison to Chinese and Uzbek languages. The article provides a comprehensive review and analysis of the scientific views of world linguists who have conducted research works on the semantic fields, hyponymy inclusion relations and the phenomenon of lacunarity. In particular, the article provides a quantitative analysis of lacunarity in the terms of clothing in Uzbek and Chinese languages.

Index Terms: lacuna, semantic field, semantic marker, hyponymy inclusion relation, hyperonymic lacuna, hyponymic lacuna.

1. INTRODUCTION

The term of “lacuna” was first introduced by Canadian linguists J.P.Vine and J.Darbelne in their scientific research, and for the first time, this term was translated into Uzbek linguistics and used widely by professor Sh.Usmanova in her research works. In English, the word “lacuna” is used in accordance with the terms “lexical gap”, “lexical hole”, “lexical vacancy”. In linguistics, the term lexical gap is often used. The word “gap” in this vocabulary, which is used as a reference to scientific circulation, means “space”, “hole”, and other words of the lacuna are added together with this word to identify different words: “Semantic gap”, “cultural gap”. Thus, the word “gap” is used synonymously with the word “lacuna” and we can say that the word “gap” with its determinant is consistent with the types of lacuna (grammatical lacuna, cultural lacuna, etc.). Italian linguists L.Bentivogli and E.Piantas make the following statement about lacuna: “Lexical lacuna occurs when a concept is expressed in a lexical unit, but in the second language it is the same concept with free speech combinations”. G.V. Bykova and O.B. Pylaev concludes that today there is insufficient concealed knowledge of the lexicon (complex of lacunas) and that there is no integrated view of this phenomenon in the world linguistics, and that research on lacunarity is not well-studied. Indeed, in terms of equivalence-free vocabulary, we see the different approaches, definitions, and dispersal terminology of world scientists in expressing this notion. As for the formation of the terminology of the lacuna, the study of the lacuna has become more intensive since the second half of the twentieth century. Although the term “Lacuna” has been introduced by Canadian linguists as mentioned above, this term is particularly improved in Russian linguistics and translation. As a result, there was appeared a special linguacultural study field – "lacunology" in Russian linguistics. As a result in Russian linguistics a special field of lacunology was created. At the same time, besides linguistic terms, words (realism, equivalence without equivalence, etc.), a number of linguistic categories, terms and concepts have also emerged. In particular, the number of scientific works in general, explanatory and analytical form has increased significantly on such concepts as lacunology, lacuna phenomenon, lacuna, lacunar unit, language background of lacuna. 2. Results and findings

According to Canadian linguists J.P. Vine and J.Darbelne, lacuna always occurs when a word in a language cannot find an alternative [1, 145]. Iraqi linguist Mehdi F. Al-Ghazali points out that the lacuna often occur in semantic fields, that is, "there is no lexeme in a particular semantic field structure" [2, 2]. Although semantic fields are also referred to as lexical fields in linguistics and are studied in lexical levels, they have a very broad scope. Therefore, it is desirable to study this method of detection of lacuna as a separate method. S.Lobner considers that most of the lexical items are organized into groups with other lexemes, with opposite words, such as pair words such as “father” and “mother” or "adult" and “child”, colors, numbers, household items. Or that it combines words and terms that represent other types of hierarchically high category [3, 94]. In S. Lobner's example, if we note that we cannot find the lexical form of the word “katta odam” (adult). Here, we can use the word “bola” (child) anonymously, such as “adult” and "grown man”In addition to the common elements that paradigmatically link the structural concepts that make up the semantic field, there are also private symbols. These are called "semantic molecule" by K.Goddard and A.Vierzbichka [4, 23], “a semantic share” by E.Vereshchagin and V. Kostomarov [5, 65], “semantic atoms” by D.Cruz [6, 243]. D.Kruz also uses several words in his work such as “semantic component”, “semantic property”, “semantic markers”. Here we find it necessary to use the term “semantic markers” (ie “semantic notes”) because of the relatively high level of accuracy, S.Lobner lists the lexical, that is, the semantic field as a group of lexemes that fulfill the following conditions: Lexemes belong to the same word category; their meanings have one thing in common; they are interconnected with a clear meaning relationship; the group is complete in terms of relevant meaning relationships [3, 94]. Speaking of the phenomenon of hyponymy that establishes the relationship between inclusion and identification in semantic fields, D. Cruz showed that hyponymy is a hyponymus of more than two interrelated concepts in a class of inclusion, and a more common sign is hyperonym [6, 247]. He also cites hyponemia as “X is Y” and gives examples such as “The apple is a fruit”, “The actress is a woman”. In this regard, the words “apple”, “actress” are hyponym, “fruit”, “woman” are hyperonym. Regarding the incidence of indirect hyponymy inclusion, the paradigmatic nature is that hyperonymic and hyponymic lacunas differ from the terms proposed by B.Khartitonova [7, 83]. These terms are used by I.A.Sternin in his work defines
species and sorts (rodovye and vidovye) [8, 207], G.A. Bykova relies on V.L. Muravyov and refers to those words as vector lacunas [7, 83]. Hyperonymic lacunas indicate that there is no common denominator for the class of subjects. In English, the common names of the words “buva” (“grandfather”) and “buvli” (“grandmother”) are represented by the word “grandparents”, and we do not find such a compilation concept in Uzbek and Chinese languages. Hyponymic lacunas mean that there is no specific name for a particular subject or event. For example, there is some confusion in the lexical distinction between the “colors” in the semantic field of the “ko’k” (dark blue) and the “moviy” (blue) in Chinese. In the expression “ko’k” 藍色 天蓝色 may be used. According to the examples given in the dictionaries, we see that the hyponymic lacuna is formed [9, 810; 1107] because there is no clear alternative to “ko’k”. Mehdi F.Al-Ghazzali’s lexical scope of any language is often found in semantic fields (e.g., kinship terms, color words, military positions, etc.), meaning relations (e.g., hyponymy, synonymy, antonymy, etc.), vocabulary, idioms, and relative terms. - builds on counter concepts [2, 2]. S.Lobner also divides semantic fields into terms such as household appliances, vehicles, clothing, musical instruments, animals, plants, food, or artifacts [3,96]. Indeed, due to the differences in intercultural and language development, it is natural that the phenomenon of lacunarity, in any language background or semantic field, is comparable. In the context of growing globalization, as a result of interstate economic cooperation, modern techniques and technologies, vehicles, various know-how being introduced into the social life, their nominative forms are also emerging and the emergence of various neologisms in languages. Therefore, interlingual lacunas are rare in these semantic fields. There are several exceptions. For example, the word “khontakhta” ("table") in the Uzbek language, which is part of a homogeneous semantic field, is a Persian word, and in the etymological dictionary of the Uzbek language it is a “short tablecloth to eat something on it” [10, 242], “khon” is made up of wood, and the explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language means “a wooden table with legs that serve to sit down” [11, 412]. The short leg table serves various purposes in the everyday life of different nations, such as eating, receiving guests, reading books, writing letters, putting flowers. In particular, the “khontakhta” ("table") is a reality of the Uzbek nation, and there is no substitute for the same word in Chinese. Because in Chinese also the tables according to their function 供桌 gōngzhúō (table used to offer sacrifices to deceased ancestors), 八仙方桌 bāxiān fāngzhúō (table used to meet the most important guests) 、月牙桌 yuèyáyāzhuō (vase, table for souvenirs) [12]. Although semantic markers are generally made of wood, in terms of short leg, specific semantic markers are also shown for their intended use. Here it is difficult to find an alternative, and hyponymic lacunas appear in both languages. In the case of bilinguals, hyponymic lacunas occur not only in noun words but also in semantic fields that represent action. For example, the term “qovurmoq” (roasting) in Chinese is expressed in a few words, depending on factors such as type of fodder, fat content, and roasting time: 炒 chǎo — fry in oil, 煎 jiān — fry in a little oil (cutlet, stretch), 炸 zhà — fry in large quantities of fat (chops, fries potatoes). These words create Uzbek lacuna in the background of Chinese language. It should be noted that in Chinese 炒 chǎo, 煎 jiān, 炸 zhà is used. Although the words "fat" and "fire" have common semantic markers, there is no word summarizing these words. Therefore, here we see the hyperonymic lacuna occurring in the language (Chinese). Let’s look at the quantitative analysis of the lacunar phenomenon in the semantic field of clothing names in Uzbek and Chinese. M.Asomiddinova points out that most of the names of Uzbek clothes are Western (Turkish) and non-Turkic Arabic, Persian-Tajik, Russian. She notes that many of these words are used in the Uzbek language in their vocabulary as their own words. Also, according to the linguistic scientist, the historical-synchrony of clothes lexicon: 1) stable (stable), historical-tradable names (chaplan (traditional coat), chakman, qalpaq (cap), lozim (women pants)); 2) archaic, that is, historical names (mursak, parani, chachwon); 3) classify new names (kostyum (suit), yubka (skirt), and kofta) [13, 13 and 16]. For this analysis, we received 60 key words that represent the names of clothing commonly used in Uzbek. From the names of these dresses based on the classification of the names of M. Asomiddinova, we could only include only historical traditional clothing names (HTCN), stable national names (HNCN), and modern names (CCN). Historical Traditional Clothing Names (HTCN) are names that have been used in the past folk lexical vocabulary, which are still in use today, that is, they have not lost their nominal unity and function. These types of clothing, regardless of their name, can be used extensively in the lives of other nations. Historical National Clothing Names (HNCN) are unique to just one nation, and such lexicon is also known in translation studies as realities, cultural words. Contemporary Clothing Names (CCN) result from different historical, social, and economic processes, not only in the new style of clothing, but also in the transliteration of names from other folk lexicons (mainly Uzbek through Russian and Russian through European languages). The translation also takes a constant place in the dictionary. In the process of globalization, the names that are used by different nations of the world are similar in many respects, so it is easy to identify them, and therefore interlingual lacunas are rare.
For example, the word "jacket" in modern clothing in Chinese is used as "西裝上衣" xīzhuāng shàngyī, that is to say, literally, "the upper part of the suit." As a result of data analysis, followings are possible: In the semantic field of clothing names, there were 14 Uzbek lacunar units representing one HTCN, 12 HNCNs and one CCN Lacunar units. In this semantic field, the Chinese Lacunariyu in the Uzbek language background was 6.25% in the name of the traditional dress, 85.7% in the traditional national clothing, 3.3% in the name of modern clothes, and 23.3% in total. If we exclude such words as the traditional national words from the analysis, taking into account that the semantic field in the Uzbek and Chinese languages is higher than that of the regular national names, 46 outfit names are 4.3%.

3. CONCLUSION
In conclusion, it is possible to point out that the likelihood of detecting lacunae in semantic fields is much higher in the process of comparing two languages. The gaps that occur in such areas are studied among the components of hyponymy inclusion. In comparative study, two types of paradigmatic features can be encountered: hyperonymic lacunas and hyponymic lacunas. Hyperonymic lacunas indicate that there is no common denominator for the class of subjects. Hyponymic lacunas mean that there is no specific name for a particular subject or event. In some semantic fields (semantic fields such as food, drink, clothing names), the high level of inter-linguistic coherence is attributed to the share of national-specific words. In intercultural communication, cases of misunderstandings arise due to the cultural gap between the hyponym and the lack of such national identity. Therefore, the in-depth study of the lacunae phenomenon, in particular the semantic fields, and the development of ways to compensate for those gaps, will serve to address the existing problems in intercultural communication.
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