ISOMORPHIC AND ALLOMORPHIC FEATURES AND DEGREES OF LACUNARITY OF LINGUOCULTUREMES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH FILM DISCOURSE

Mamatkulova Markhabokhon Nuriddin kizi

Basic doctoral student (PhD candidate)

Kokand University, Uzbekistan

Abstract. The paper presents a contrastive linguocultural analysis of 180 linguoculturemes (100 English and 80 Uzbek) drawn from four national films: “Mahallada duv-duv gap” and “Suyunchi” (Uzbek) and “Four Weddings and a Funeral” and “A Private Function” (British). Four isomorphic features (conceptual, pragmatic, structural and lexical) and four allomorphic features (nominative-classificatory, cultural-semantic, structural and onomastic) are identified. Six factors that cause lacunarity are described, and on this basis four degrees of lacunarity are proposed: zero, partial, strong and absolute. Strong lacunae prevail in both languages, while absolute lacunae are far more frequent in the Uzbek material.

Keywords: *film discourse, linguoculture, linguocultureme, isomorphism, allomorphism, lacuna, lacunarity, non-equivalence, connotation, cultural concept, contrastive linguistics.*

National films are cultural texts that show how a people sees itself and how it presents itself to others. Everyday life, kinship relations, ceremonies, food, religious beliefs, humour and notions of shame enter the fictional world of a film and are verbalised through linguoculturemes – language units that carry culture-specific meaning. While a dictionary gives the general meaning of such a unit, film discourse shows its semantics in action: a line is understood together with the character’s voice, intonation, gesture, costume and setting. Film discourse therefore provides a rich field for identifying what is shared and what is distinct in the linguocultural systems of different languages, which is essential for intercultural communication and audiovisual translation.

The study draws on the theory of linguoculture (M. Agar), cultural key words (A. Wierzbicka) and linguoculturology (V.V. Vorobyov, V.A. Maslova) [1; 14; 13; 6], as well as on the theory of lacunae developed by Yu.A. Sorokin and I.Yu. Markovina [10] and on approaches to non-equivalence in translation by J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet

and by S. Vlakhov and S. Florin [12; 11]. The material comprises 180 linguoculturemes: 46 from "Mahallada duv-duv gap", 34 from "Suyunchi", 58 from "Four Weddings and a Funeral" and 42 from "A Private Function". Contrastive, componential, contextual-pragmatic and cultural analysis were applied.

Isomorphic features

Conceptual isomorphism manifests itself in shared cultural concepts. Marriage and wedding form the central conceptual field of all four films: in Uzbek it is verbalised by *kelin* (bride), *kuyov* (groom), *sarpo* (wedding gifts), *kuyovto'ra* (honoured groom), *yor-yor* (bridal song), *boshini ikkita qilmoq* (to marry someone off); in English by *bride, groom, fiancée, bridesmaid, best man, wedding march, Holy Matrimony, altar, veil*. Family and community also form shared fields: *mahalla, qo'ni-qo'shni, samovar, hashar* in Uzbek correspond functionally to *pub, church, parish, congregation, tea room* in English as markers of collective social space.

Pragmatic isomorphism lies in similar communicative functions: addressing, praising, announcing good news, irony, evaluation and reproach. Uzbek affectionate address forms (*girgitton bo'lay, o'zim o'rgilay, tasadduq bo'lay*) and the English ceremonial address *dearly beloved* both regulate interpersonal relations; Uzbek reproach is expressed by idioms (*tepsa tebranmas* "immovable even if kicked", i.e. indifferent), English social evaluation by units such as *posh voices, class, breeding*. **Structural isomorphism** means that both languages use simple (*kelin – bride*), compound (*kuyovto'ra – bridesmaid*) and derived (*ko'rpacha, sovchilik – christening, congregation*) linguoculturemes. **Lexical isomorphism** means that in both languages culture is encoded at the level of words, idioms and proverbs alike.

Allomorphic features

Nominative-classificatory allomorphism reflects the different segmentation of cultural reality. The Uzbek wedding is divided into *sovchilik* (matchmaking by family elders), *sarpo*, *kuyovto'ra*, *yor-yor*, *nikoh*, while the English wedding is structured around church roles: *bridesmaid, best man, usher, page boys, vicar, master of ceremonies*. Uzbek has no equivalents for *usher* or *page boys*, and English has no single word for *sarpo* or *yor-yor*.

Cultural-semantic allomorphism concerns units that are denotatively close but differ in connotation. *Kelin* and *bride* both denote a newly married woman, yet *kelin* also evokes the daughter-in-law's duties to her husband's family, the mother-in-law

relationship and continuation of the lineage. *Mahalla* includes mutual help, public opinion, social control and shame, whereas *neighbourhood* denotes mainly a residential area. Uzbek *sovchilik* and English *pop the question* both refer to the first step towards marriage, but the former is a family negotiation and the latter an individual romantic proposal.

Structural allomorphism reflects typology: English relies heavily on noun + noun combinations (*wedding coat, Sunday dinner, black market, Battenberg cake*), consistent with its analytic nature, while Uzbek concentrates cultural meaning in simple lexemes, emotive derivatives (*qurmagur, ko'rpacha*) and reduplication (*yor-yor, qo'ni-qo'shni*). **Onomastic allomorphism** is seen in proper names: English toponyms and personal names (*Knightsbridge, Eton, Downing Street, Wordsworth*) carry connotations of class and national history, while Uzbek names (*Qo'zivoy, Tursunboy, Oyposhsha*) carry their own lexical motivation and folk connotations.

Factors and degrees of lacunarity

Six factors were found to cause lacunarity: (1) limited equivalence; (2) the national specificity of rituals and customs; (3) institutional-cultural differences (church, mahalla, monarchy); (4) connotative-pragmatic divergence (respect, endearment, irony); (5) phraseological and paremiological imagery; and (6) the stabilisation of film-born expressions (kinoculturemes) in everyday speech, whose meaning presupposes knowledge of the film.

On this basis four degrees of lacunarity are proposed. **Zero lacunae** have stable equivalents whose core meaning is understood without comment: *bride – kelin, wedding – to'y, groom – kuyov, coffin – tobut, true love – chin muhabbat*. **Partial lacunae** have lexical equivalents that do not convey the full cultural meaning: *church, priest, mourners, toast, settle down* in English; *nikoh, hovli, qo'shni, bo'yiga yetib qolmoq* in Uzbek. **Strong lacunae** require extensive commentary because their cultural connotations dominate. **Absolute lacunae** denote realities, institutions or speech formulas that do not exist in the other culture: *Book of Common Prayer, fag, Battenberg cake, Austerity Britain, black pudding* in English; *mahalla, sarpo, yor-yor, A'zayimxon, o'zim o'rgilay, bemalolxo'ja, yetti qavat ko'rpachada o'tirmoq, majlis bahona-yu, diydor g'animat* in Uzbek.

Strong lacunae deserve special attention, as they form the largest group in both languages. A unit was classified as a strong lacuna if (a) the other language lacks an exact equivalent, or has a lexical counterpart that fails to convey the cultural meaning

without commentary; (b) its national specificity is so high that a foreign viewer cannot understand it without explanation; (c) its communicative effect, emotional colouring or pragmatic function changes or disappears in translation; and (d) a single source word may require a paragraph-length explanation in the target language. English examples include *vicar, pub, parish, christening, congregation, wedding service, best man, Holy Matrimony, pop the question, Knightsbridge, Wordsworth* and the biblical *If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels…*. Uzbek examples include *do‘ppi, osh, samovar, ko‘rpacha, ulfatchilik, kuyovto‘ra, o‘rgilay, qurmagur, boshini ikkita qilmoq, tepsa tebranmas* and the proverb *Yeganim oldimda-yu, yemaganim ketimda*. In film discourse, the visual channel partly compensates for these lacunae: the viewer sees the *do‘ppi*, the *samovar* or the church service on screen, but their symbolic, axiological and associative meanings remain inaccessible without verbal support.

The quantitative results are as follows. English: 5 zero, 39 partial, 51 strong and 5 absolute lacunae. Uzbek: 5 zero, 15 partial, 38 strong and 22 absolute lacunae. Strong lacunae prevail in both languages, which shows that most linguoculturemes cannot be fully rendered by a ready-made dictionary equivalent. The large number of partial lacunae in English indicates that many English units have Uzbek lexical counterparts but lose their religious, social and historical connotations. The high number of absolute lacunae in Uzbek is explained by national rituals, folk forms of address, ironic film lines, communal lifestyle and folklore that have no counterparts in English culture.

Conclusion

Uzbek and English film discourses share conceptual fields (marriage, family, community), communicative functions and structural types of linguoculturemes, which constitutes their isomorphic layer. At the same time, the segmentation of cultural reality, connotative content, structural patterns and onomastic associations differ, forming the allomorphic layer. The proposed four-level model of lacunarity, based on six factors, makes it possible to predict which units can be translated by direct equivalents and which require commentary, functional substitution or combined transformation. The results can be used in teaching linguoculturology, contrastive typology and translation, in compiling dictionaries of linguoculturemes and in subtitling and dubbing national films.

References

1. Agar M. Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation. – New York: William Morrow and Company, 1994.

2. A Private Function [Film]. Dir. Malcolm Mowbray. – United Kingdom, 1984.

3. Four Weddings and a Funeral [Film]. Dir. Mike Newell. – United Kingdom, 1994.

4. Mahallada duv-duv gap [Film]. Dir. Shukhrat Abbosov. – Uzbekfilm, 1960.

5. Kozloff S. Overhearing Film Dialogue. – Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

6. Maslova V.A. Lingvokulturologiya. – Moscow: Akademiya, 2001.

7. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. – Tashkent: O‘zbekiston, 2008.

8. Sharifian F. Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017.

9. Snell-Hornby M. Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988.

10. Sorokin Yu.A., Markovina I.Yu. Natsionalno-kulturnaya spetsifika khudozhestvennogo teksta. – Moscow: Nauka, 1989.

11. Vlakhov S., Florin S. Neperevodimoye v perevode. – Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, 1980.

12. Vinay J.-P., Darbelnet J. Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.

13. Vorobyov V.V. Lingvokulturologiya (teoriya i metody). – Moscow: RUDN, 1997.

14. Wierzbicka A. Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.