Abstract: This paper deals with non-equivalent vocabulary. It defines this concept, specifies what categories of lexis it includes. It considers the concepts of «reality» and «lacuna» in detail. For each of them it provides a definition, different views of specialists and classification. In addition, it considers the ways to render such vocabulary. The paper analyses the novel «The Master and Margarita» and its two English translations, examining several examples and how they were rendered.
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лексики оно в себя включает. Подробно анализируются понятия «реалия» и «лакуна». Для каждого из них даётся определение, приводятся различные взгляды специалистов, приводится классификация. Далее описываются способы передачи подобной лексики, а на материале романа «Мастер и Маргарита» и двух его переводов на английский язык проводится анализ, в ходе которого рассматривается несколько примеров и как они переведены.

Ключевые слова: безэквивалентная лексика, реалия, лакуна, «Мастер и Маргарита».

The interconnection of language and culture is expressed at all levels of the language, but it becomes most prominent at the level of vocabulary, in particular at the level of non-equivalent vocabulary. Non-equivalent vocabulary involves the lexical units of one language that «have neither full nor partial equivalents among the lexical units of another language» [1]. Those include: 1) proper names, names of organizations, institutions, etc.; 2) so-called realia; 3) accidental (lexical) gaps or lacunae. We will consider in a little more detail the last two classes of lexical units.

There are specific words and notions within each ethnic group, culture and nation that are unique to that particular group. In linguistics, such words and concepts are called «реалия» (from Latin realis, -e, pl. realia – «material», «real»). They reflect the close interconnection of language and culture: the emergence of new realia in this or that sphere of life leads to the emergence of new words in the language that correspond to them.

As E.M. Bozhko notes, there is a dual understanding of realia in philology:

1) As a subject, concept, phenomenon peculiar to the history, culture of a certain nation, country and not present in others. This view is shared by A. A. Reformatsky, J. I. Retzker, A. D. Schweitser and others;

2) As words or word combinations that denote such an object, concept, phenomenon (lexeme, phraseology, proverb, saying). This point of view is held by L.S. Barkhudarov, V.N. Komissarov, S. Vlakhov, S. Florin, etc. [2]

The Ukrainian researcher R.P. Zorivchak gives the most precise definition of «реалия»: «реалиа are mono- and poly-lixeme units, the main lexical meaning of which
includes (in terms of binary comparison) traditionally fixed complex of ethnocultural information, foreign to the objective realia of the target language» [5].

Many researchers suggested their own classifications of realia. However, the classification suggested by S. Vlakhov and S. Florin became the most developed one. Due to its extensiveness, we will consider a classification based on subject division:

- **Geographical realia** (Physical geography objects, including meteorology; Geographical objects related to human activities; Endemics (names of animals and plants);
- **Ethnographic realia** (Life; Labour; Arts and culture; Ethnic Objects; Measures and money);
- **Social and political realia** (Administrative and territorial organization; Bodies and carriers of power; Social and political life; Military realia) [4].

There are such lexical units in each language that, for some reason, have no equivalents in the lexical structure of another language. Foreign and domestic researchers call them different terms: lacunae (J. P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, V. L. Muravyov); zero lexemas (I. A. Sternin); accidental lacunae (L. S. Barkhudarov), etc. In this paper, we will use the term «lacuna».

The term «lacuna» was first introduced by Canadian linguists J.P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet. They define it as «a phenomenon that occurs whenever a word of one language has no equivalent in another language» [11].

Researchers have identified two main types of lacunae:

- **Intra-lingual** – the absence of a word in the language, distinguished against the presence of semantically similar words within a lexical paradigm;
- **Interlingual** – the absence of a lexical unit in one language if it is present in the other.

Nowadays there are many classifications of interlingual lacunae based on different principles, but we will turn to the classification suggested by V.L. Muravyov. In general, he identifies two large groups of lacunae:
1) **Linguistic** lacunae. Their existence depends on the fact that one language singles out and linguistically shapes one side and a certain amount of that reality, while another language singles out the other side and a different amount of that same reality;

2) **Ethnographic** lacunae. They are caused directly by the absence of this or that thing in a given civilization [6].

There are two main difficulties in rendering non-equivalent vocabulary: 1) the lack of equivalent (analogue) in the language due to the lack of the object (referent) denoted by the realia in the language, and 2) the need, along with the subject meaning (semantics) of the realia, to convey the connotation, i.e., its national and historical colouring [7].

There are the following ways of rendering non-equivalent vocabulary into the target language:

1) **Transcription** or **transliteration**. It assumes mechanical transfer of a word from the source language to the target language by graphic or sound means of the latter as close as possible to the original phonetic form;

2) **Translation** or **substitution**. It is usually used when transcription (transliteration) is impossible or undesirable for some reason;

3) **Neologism**. The most appropriate (after transcription) way to preserve the semantic content the translated word: by creating a new word (or word combination) it is sometimes possible to achieve almost the same effect. There may be options: **blueprint** – borrowing by literal translation – allows you to translate the word into the target language with the fullest possible preservation of semantics; **semi-blueprint** are partial borrowings of words and expressions consisting of elements of the source and target languages; **assimilation** – making a word look like a native translation based on material already existing in the source language; **semantic neologism** – a new word or word combination «composed» by the translator and allowing to convey the semantic content of the translated word. It differs from blueprint by the absence of an etymological connection with the original word;

4) **Approximate translation** allows you to convey the subject content of the word, but the flavour is almost always lost, because there is a replacement of the
expected connotative equivalent with a neutral style. There are also several options: **lexical substitution** allows to convey the content of the word to a unit with a wider (narrower) meaning; **functional substitution** – an element of the final statement, causing a similar reaction in the reader of the translated text; **description, explanation, interpretation** – the approximate translation technique is usually used when there is no other way;

6) **Contextual translation** is usually contrasted with «dictionary translation», thus indicating the correspondence that a word may have in the context as opposed to what is given in the dictionary. Its content is conveyed by the context transformed accordingly.

For further research we have turned to the novel «The Master and Margarita» by M.A. Bulgakov. It is of interest to us since it is very rich in non-equivalent vocabulary, which are difficult to render into another language. We have examined two translations of the novel into English: by Michael Glenny (hereinafter referred to as M.G.) and by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (hereinafter referred to as P/V). We found that the translators used different ways to render non-equivalent vocabulary, specifically proper names, geographical, ethnographic and military realia and linguistic and ethnographic lacunae. Here are some examples:

a) **Proper names:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Бездомный</th>
<th>М.Г.: «Bezdomny». The translator used only transcription to transfer the name of a character.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/V: «Homeless». Here the translators used functional substitution and gave the translation commentary. However, why did P/V not give the commentary when rendering the name «Бегемот»? They, as well as M.G., only used the transcription.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Бегемот</th>
<th>М.Г. and P/V: «Behemoth». According to В.М. Sokolov, М.А. Bulgakov gave the cat the name «Behemoth» for a reason: in demonological tradition, Behemoth is a demon of stomach temptations. Henceforth, his extraordinary gluttony, shown in some scenes of the novel [8].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>«Пиво и Воды»</th>
<th>М.Г.: «Beer and Minerals».</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/V: «Beer and Soft Drinks». Here, both translations used blueprint and lexical substitution to transfer the name of the kiosk. But M.G. uses the word «minerals» (water that is taken from the ground and contains chemicals that are good for your health) and P/V chose «soft drinks» (a cold, sweet alcohol-free drink). Both notions have narrower meanings than Russian word «ВОДЫ».</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Москва-река

M.G. and **P/V**: «the Moscow River». Here all the translators used the blueprint technique despite the translation match «the Moskva (River)». The translators probably used the blueprint since «Moscow» is more understandable for an English-speaking reader than «Moskva», i.e. they tried to make it easier for them to understand what the river it is and where it flows.

**Ермolaевский переулок**

M.G.: «Yermolaevsky Street» (a road in a city or town, usually with buildings along one or both sides). Transcription and lexical substitution are used here.

**P/V**: «Yermolaevsky Lane» (a narrow road in the countryside or in a town). Transcription and functional substitution are used here. However, the notion «переулок» means «a small, usually narrow street that connects the other two», which is not like «street» and "lane" in its meaning. Therefore, the translators had to use a lexical/functional substitution here trying to render «переулок» into English.

### b) Realia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>M.G.</th>
<th><strong>P/V</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Комсомолка (in relation to a woman, who is a member of Komsomol)</td>
<td>M.G.: «A member of the Komsomol». Here the explanation and transcription are used.</td>
<td><strong>P/V</strong>: «A Komsomol girl». It is an example of semi-blueprint again. The semantic meaning is rendered by means of transcription and belonging to the female gender by using the word «girl». Thus, it appears that the translators «created» a new word here, a neologism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Белогвардеец</td>
<td>M.G.: «White officer». Blueprint technique and lexical substitution are used here. It is noteworthy that M.G. also translated another Bulgakov's novel, «Белая Гвардия» («The White Guard»), but in rendering the words «гвардеец» (a member of a military compound) and «гвардия» (a type of military compound) he uses different words. We can assume that he wanted to differentiate these notions.</td>
<td><strong>P/V</strong>: «White guard». Here the translators used blueprint as well. It is possible that they chose one of the English-Russian dictionary meanings as L. Volokhonsky is of Russian origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Косоворотка</td>
<td><strong>P/V</strong>: «Side-buttoned shirt» / «Hand-rolled cigarette». It is noteworthy that M.G. simply omitted these realia in his translation, while <strong>P/V</strong> rendered them using a description.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c) Lacunae:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>M.G. and <strong>P/V</strong>: «About twenty-four hours». <strong>P/V</strong> as well as M.G. explained the given lacuna as «сутки» is exactly 24 hours.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Гривенник</td>
<td>M.G. and <strong>P/V</strong>: «Ten kopecks». Here the functional substitution was used, as «гривенник» is exactly ten kopecks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>«Да ну тебя к лешему»</td>
<td>M.G.: «Oh, go to hell». M.G. used the functional substitution, since the phrase «go to hell» has a connotation similar to the original one.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A brief analysis of two translations of «The Master and Margarita» by translators M. Glenny and R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky shows that the best ways to convey non-
equivalent vocabulary, as follows: transcription and transliteration, blueprint, lexical and functional substitutions, description, explanation or interpretation, since by using these transformations, it is possible to preserve not only the content of cultural marked units, but also their connotations.
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