

e-ISSN 3060-5059

DOI: 10.67227



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNAL

Scientific and Innovative Research in
Social and Humanitarian Studies

Vol. 3 • Issue 9

2026



Founded in 2024



publishscience.uz



publish_science_journal@mail.ru



PEER REVIEWED • OPEN ACCESS

TIL ICHIDAGI VA TILLARARO LAKUNALARNING LINGVISTIK XUSUSIYATLARI

A'zamov Saybulbot Muhammadaliyevich

Namangan davlat chet tillari instituti, dotsent (PhD).

e-mail: sayfulbota@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4888-7966>

Annotatsiya.

Ushbu maqolada til ichidagi va tillararo lakunalarning lingvistik xususiyatlari chog'ishtirma tahlil asosida o'rganiladi. Lakunalarning leksik, semantik, grammatik va pragmatik turlari tavsiflanib, ularning shakllanish omillari yoritiladi. Tadqiqot lakunalarni til tizimidagi paradigmatic bo'shliqlar hamda tillararo nomuvofiqliklarni bevosita ifodalovchi muhim lingvistik birliklar va vositalar sifatida atroflicha baholaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: lakuna, lakunarlik, til ichidagi lakuna, tillararo lakuna, leksik bo'shliq, grammatik lakuna, semantik nomutanosiblik, chog'ishtirma tilshunoslik.

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ ВНУТРИЯЗЫКОВЫХ И МЕЖЪЯЗЫКОВЫХ ЛАКУН

Аъзамов Сайбулбот Мухаммадалиевич

Наманганский государственный институт иностранных языков, доцент (PhD).

Аннотация.

В статье на основе сопоставительного анализа рассматриваются лингвистические особенности внутриязыковых и межъязыковых лакун. Описываются их лексические, семантические, грамматические и прагматические типы, а также основные причины возникновения. Лакуны определяются как значимые единицы, отражающие парадигматические пробелы внутри языка и систематическую асимметрию между различными языковыми системами.

Ключевые слова: лакуна, лакунарность, внутриязыковая лакуна, межъязыковая лакуна, лексический пробел, грамматическая лакуна, семантическая асимметрия, сопоставительное языкознание.

LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INTRALINGUAL AND INTERLINGUAL LACUNAE

A'zamov Saybulbot Muhammadaliyevich

Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Associate Professor (PhD).

Abstract.

This article examines the linguistic characteristics of intralingual and interlingual lacunae. It describes their lexical, semantic, grammatical, and pragmatic types and identifies the principal factors underlying their formation. Lacunae are interpreted as meaningful indicators of paradigmatic gaps within a language system and structural asymmetries between different languages.

Keywords: lacuna, lacunarity, intralingual lacuna, interlingual lacuna, lexical gap, grammatical lacuna, semantic asymmetry, contrastive linguistics..

INTRODUCTION. The systematic comparison of languages occupies an important position in contemporary linguistics. Contrastive research reveals not only similarities and differences between languages but also linguistic units and categories that are present in one system and absent from another. Such absences are commonly described by means of the terms **lacuna**, **linguistic gap**, **zero correspondence**, or **non-equivalent unit**.

The word **lacuna** originates from Latin and literally means "a gap," "an empty space," or "a missing part." In linguistics, it refers to the absence of an expected lexical, grammatical, semantic, or pragmatic unit within a language or between two languages. Lacunarity is therefore not limited to the absence of a word. It may occur at different levels of the language system and may involve concepts, grammatical categories, semantic distinctions, speech formulas, cultural practices, and communicative strategies.

Contrastive linguistics is concerned with the systematic comparison of two or more languages or their subsystems. Its objectives include the identification of equivalence, contrast, correspondence, and directionality between the compared languages. According to J. Fisiak, contrastive linguistics has both practical and theoretical significance because it contributes to language teaching while also providing evidence for linguistic typology and language universals [3; 14–16-b].

The phenomenon of lacunarity is especially important for contrastive linguistics because languages do not divide and categorize reality in identical ways. A concept lexicalized by a single word in one language may require a phrase, explanation, or contextual substitution in another language. For example, the Uzbek words **mahalla**, **hashar**, and **andisha** do not have complete one-word equivalents in English. Similarly, the English words **sibling**, **privacy**, **commuter**, and **fortnight** usually require descriptive or contextual translation into Uzbek [4; 37–40-b].

However, lacunae may also be found within a single language. A language may contain an incomplete lexical, derivational, or grammatical paradigm in which an expected member has no conventional form. Therefore, it is necessary

to distinguish between intralingual and interlingual lacunae. Intralingual lacunae reveal gaps within one linguistic system, whereas interlingual lacunae become visible when two or more languages are compared.

The theory of lacunae was developed within psycholinguistics, contrastive linguistics, translation studies, and intercultural communication. I. Markovina and Yu. Sorokin treated lacunae as instruments for analysing the transmission of culturally specific meanings and the semantic losses or distortions that may arise in intercultural textual communication [5; 102–106-b.]. T. Anokhina further distinguishes among lacunae of language, speech, and cognition, showing that lacunarity extends beyond the lexical system and includes unexpressed elements in discourse and conceptual structures [1; 166–174-b.].

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe the principal linguistic characteristics of intralingual and interlingual lacunae. The research also aims to classify their main types, determine the factors that cause them, and explain their relevance to contrastive linguistics, translation studies, lexicography, and intercultural communication. In preparing this study, generative artificial intelligence tools were employed for stylistic text refinement and bibliographic citation formatting as a methodological aid.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The material of the research consists of theoretical studies on lacunology, contrastive linguistics, translation studies, and linguoculturology, as well as selected examples from English and Uzbek. The examples represent kinship terminology, social relations, national traditions, everyday activities, grammatical categories, speech etiquette, and culturally specific concepts [2; 147–150-b.].

The study employs descriptive, contrastive, componential, contextual, and semantic methods. The descriptive method is used to explain the nature and structure of individual linguistic units. The contrastive method is applied to establish cross-linguistic correspondences and identify non-equivalent items between English and Uzbek.

Componential analysis is used to break down the meaning of lexical items into smaller semantic features or semes, thereby identifying exact points of divergence between lexical systems. Contextual analysis is particularly important because the status of a unit as a lacuna often depends on its actual use. A dictionary equivalent may fail to reproduce the pragmatic or stylistic value of a word in a specific text.

The principle of **tertium comparationis**, or a common basis of comparison, is employed in the analysis. Units are compared according to a shared concept, semantic field, grammatical function, or communicative purpose. The analytical procedure consisted of: (a) selecting a semantic or functional field; (b) identifying relevant units in one language; (c) describing their semantic and functional features; (d) examining corresponding units in the second language; (e) distinguishing full, partial, and zero correspondences; and (f) determining the type and cause of each lacuna [6; 37–40-b.].

DISCUSSION

The distinction between intralingual and interlingual lacunae is essential because the two types are identified through different analytical perspectives. Intralingual lacunae are revealed through the internal organization of a single language. They occur within lexical fields, derivational patterns, grammatical paradigms, and semantic oppositions. Interlingual lacunae, by contrast, become apparent through the comparison of languages.

Nevertheless, the two categories are closely connected. An intralingual lexical gap in one language may appear as an interlingual lacuna when that language is compared with another language that has already lexicalized the concept. English **sibling** reveals an interlingual lacuna in Uzbek, but from the internal perspective of Uzbek, it also demonstrates the absence of a neutral superordinate term within its kinship vocabulary [5; 110–112-b.].

Lacunarity should not be equated entirely with non-equivalent vocabulary. Non-equivalent vocabulary usually refers to lexical units without regular dictionary equivalents, whereas lacunarity is a broader concept. It encompasses lexical, grammatical, semantic, pragmatic, cognitive, cultural, and discourse-related gaps. A language may possess a lexical equivalent but still show lacunarity at the level of connotation or communicative function.

Lacunae also should not be interpreted as deficiencies in a language. Every natural language has sufficient resources to express the communicative needs of its speakers. When a one-word equivalent is absent, the meaning can be conveyed through paraphrase, context, compounding, borrowing, grammatical constructions, or explanatory commentary [6; 37–40-b.].

The cultural dimension is especially significant in the interpretation of interlingual lacunae. Culturally specific units encode social institutions, values, behavioural norms, and collective experiences. The Uzbek concept **andisha**, for example, combines elements of consideration for others, modesty, restraint, social responsibility, and avoidance of inappropriate behaviour.

Translation is one of the main areas in which lacunae become practically relevant. A translator must determine not only what a lacunar unit denotes but also what cultural and pragmatic functions it performs. Borrowing or transliteration is useful when the original cultural term must be preserved, such as **mahalla**, **hashar**, and **sumalak** [7; 120–125-b.].

The study of lacunae also has implications for lexicography and foreign-language teaching. Bilingual dictionaries should include contextual notes, and language teaching should address pragmatic lacunae to foster intercultural communicative competence.

RESULTS

Intralingual Lacunae

An intralingual lacuna is an unfilled position within the lexical, grammatical, derivational, or semantic system of one language. It becomes apparent when an expected element is absent from a paradigm or field. One common type is the lexical intralingual lacuna, which arises when a concept is known to speakers but has no established one-word designation. For instance, English has no single word for “the day after tomorrow” (**overmorrow** being archaic), whereas

Uzbek has the word **indinga**.

Kinship terms also demonstrate intralingual lacunae. Uzbek possesses specific terms such as **aka**, **uka**, **opa**, and **singil**, but lacks a neutral, single-word hyperonym corresponding to English **sibling**. Intralingual lacunae can also appear in word-formation systems and grammatical paradigms, such as English modal verbs lacking regular infinitive or participle forms.

Interlingual Lacunae

An interlingual lacuna emerges when a unit or category in one language has no direct structural or semantic equivalent in another. Lexical interlingual lacunae are the most visible type. The English word **sibling** has no direct one-word equivalent in Uzbek. Similarly, the word **mahalla** expresses spatial, administrative, and social meanings that English **neighbourhood** does not fully encompass. Semantic interlingual lacunae occur when formally corresponding words have different semantic scopes. English **privacy** refers to personal space, private life, and confidentiality, which requires different Uzbek expressions depending on the context. Interlingual grammatical lacunae involve categories formally marked in one language but not in another, such as English definite and indefinite articles compared to Uzbek. Pragmatic lacunae arise when languages use different conventions for performing speech acts, greetings, requests, and refusals. The analysis demonstrates that interlingual lacunae can be full or partial. A full lacuna exists when the target language lacks both a direct linguistic equivalent and a corresponding cultural phenomenon. A partial lacuna occurs when an approximate equivalent exists but differs in semantic scope or pragmatic function.

CONCLUSION. Intralingual and interlingual lacunae represent different but interrelated manifestations of linguistic incompleteness and asymmetry. Intralingual lacunae are empty or unfilled positions within the structure of one language. Interlingual lacunae arise when a unit in one language lacks a complete equivalent in another. The principal linguistic types include lexical, grammatical, semantic, phraseological, and pragmatic lacunae. Lexical lacunae involve the absence of a conventional word; grammatical lacunae appear in incomplete paradigms; semantic lacunae result from differences in meaning scope; and pragmatic lacunae reflect different communicative conventions. Lacunae are relative, directional, and context-dependent. The absence of a direct equivalent does not mean that a concept cannot be expressed. Languages employ descriptive expressions, context, borrowing, and functional analogues to fill or compensate for gaps. The analysis of lacunae reveals the distinctive ways in which languages categorize reality and encode cultural experience. It is therefore important for contrastive linguistics, translation studies, lexicography, foreign-language teaching, and intercultural communication.

REFERENCES

1. Anokhina T. The Linguistic Lacunicon: Cognitive Mapping in Schemes and Terms // *Journal of Education Culture and Society*. – 2013. – Vol. 4, No. 1. – P. 166–174. – DOI: 10.15503/jecs20131.166.174. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs20131.166.174> e-methodology.eu
2. Khasanov E., Komilov J., Ixtiyorov A., Akbarova X., Meliboyeva M., Ergashova M. A Comparative Study of Word Stress in English and Uzbek Languages // *Advances in Science and Education*. – 2026. – Vol. 2, No. 7. – P. 147–150. – DOI: 10.70728/edu.v02.i07.033. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.70728/edu.v02.i07.033> Научное Образование
3. Enghels R., Defrancq B., Jansegers M. (eds.). *New Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics: Empirical and Methodological Challenges*. – Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2020. – 317 p. – DOI: 10.1515/9783110682588. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110682588> biblio.ugent.be
4. Hasanov E. Understanding Stress and Intonation in Phonetics // *Multidisciplinary Journal of Science and Technology*. – 2024. – Vol. 4, No. 10. – P. 324–326. – URL: <https://www.mjstjournal.com/index.php/mjst/article/view/1963> MJST Publications
5. Markovina I. Yu., Sorokin Yu. A. *Culture and Text: An Introduction to Lacunology*. – Moskva: GEOTAR-Media, 2010. URL: aynan shu inglizcha bibliografik yozuvning ishonchli ochiq katalog nusxasi topilmadi; manbani asl ruscha nashr rekvizitlari bilan qayta tekshirish kerak.
6. Khasanov E. O. Assimilation in English and Uzbek Phonetics: A Comparative Study // *Advances in Science and Education*. – 2026. – Vol. 2, No. 3. – P. 37–40. – DOI: 10.70728/edu.v02.i03.009. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.70728/edu.v02.i03.009> Научное Образование
7. Wierzbicka A. *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. – New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. – 328 p. – DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780195088359.001.0001. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195088359.001.0001> OUP Academic
8. Khasanov E. O. Phonological and Prosodic Analysis of Stress Systems in English and Uzbek // *International Conference on Social Sciences & Humanities*. – 2025. – DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17738168. – URL: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17738168> uniconflict.com