



**JOURNAL OF ADVANCED
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

ISSN: 0976-9595

Editorial Board Members 2024-2025 years

Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali

Country: University of Baghdad , Abu-Ghraib , Iraq.

Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.

Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.

Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi

Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

Specialization: Politics and International Relations.

Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh

Country: Mashhad Iran.

Specialization: Agricultural Sciences.

Dr. Yuldasheva Nasiba Alisherovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State Dental Institute

Specialization: medicine, Education

Dr. Boltayev Shavkat Sharipovich

Country: Uzbekistan, Bukhara State University

Specialization: medicine, Education

Dr. Ergasheva Nigora Nasriddinovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent Pediatric Medical Institute

Specialization: medicine, Education

Dr. Nasirova Gulmira Ramzitdinovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent Pediatric Medical Institute

Specialization: medicine, Education

Dr. Nishonov Patxiddin

Country: Uzbekistan, Uzbek State World Languages University

C/O Advanced Scientific Research,

8/21 Thamocharan Street,

Arisipalayam, Salem

THE ISSUES OF NON-EQUIVALENT VOCABULARY IN LINGUISTICS

Zulxumor Xatamovna Bannopova

**Senior teacher of the philology faculty of Uzbek State World Languages
University**

Abstract: The following paragraph raises the question of the need to improve the structural diversity and operational capabilities of the modern dictionary (bi- or multilingual) to avoid laciness in the transmission of cultures and non-equivalent words into another language. Without it the dictionary is incomplete and languages are unequal. The article deals with various options of asymmetry reflection of the cultureless in the context of social and ethno-psychic reality of a native-speaking community. The specifics of lexicographical transmission is observed in order to emphasize the need of further investigation of the linguistic map of the world. Linguistics of the recent years is a good illustration of general trends in the modern humanitaristics: we witness an increasingly obvious inclination to interdisciplinarity and interparadigm in approaches to such complex objects as a language, deep understanding of it as an anthropological phenomenon in the immanent relationships with psychological and behavioural matrices, with ethno cultural origins of the linguistic picture of the world.

Keywords: linguistic and mental pictures of the world, non-equivalence and lexical gaps, semantics and pragmatics of language signs, Classification of culturemes, In modern linguocultural research, linguocultural material by means of another language, lexicographers aims at a dictionary to become as efficient and nonideological tool as possible, Equivalence (or its absence) is a marginal phenomenon, “Translation starts with establishing equivalence on the word level” the experience of modern lexicographers clearly shows that in the process of compilation of any bilingual or more lingual translation dictionary, the issues of conveying culture specificity,

Cultures’ and non-equivalent lexis

Therefore, linguoculturology is one of the most dynamically developing fields of linguistics and linguocultural studies which develops both traditional (the relationship of culture and language, speech and language, comprehension of meaning-making rules) and new (conceptology and culture, linguistic and mental pictures of the world, non-equivalence and lexical gaps, semantics and pragmatics of language signs) issues. Indeed, the ability to speak and think in a certain language largely defines a cultural identity. Individual understanding of the world is connected with the linguistic group, which we belong to. Since the speakers of different languages perceive the world differently, it is impossible to learn a particular language without simultaneously examining its cultural context (Hall, 2002). The linguocultural works of recent years have accumulated a lot of terminological concepts which in one way or another reflect an important cultural meaning and appeal to the national, cultural specificity of meaning-making: cultural component, culture-related vocabulary, the national-authentic language, linguo-specific vocabulary, ethno-cultural vocabulary, lexical gaps, non-equivalent lexis, culture-carrying vocabulary, background knowledge, realia, culturemes, culturonym, linguocultural environment, the national specificity of verbal communication, lexical background, linguistic episteme, national concept, national symbol, etc. The research of similar phenomena is moving divergently as well – both by means of language clichés analysis and the study of phraseological units, stylistically marked vocabulary and identification of stereotypes of linguistic consciousness, as well as examination the underlying word semantics.

Classification of culturemes

The term “cultureme” itself was created outside the boundaries of linguistics, in the cultural theory of S. Lem, in which it describes, first of all, the minimal, indivisible units of culture: rituals, values, and stereotypes. In modern linguocultural research the term “cultureme” is a hotly debated topic and demonstrates various approaches to its content. V. Gak considers cultureme “as a sign of culture that also has a linguistic

expression” (Gak, 1998). A. Vezhbitskaia regards cultureme as “an integrated interlevel unit, the form of which is the unity of a sign and language meaning, while the content – the unity of language meaning and cultural value” (Vezhbitskaia, 1999). V. Vorob’ov singles out a linguistic cultureme along with a cultureme, given that “a cultureme” is considered to be an element of reality (an object or a situation), attributed to a particular culture, while “a linguistic cultureme” is the projection of the culture element into a language sign” (Vorob’ov, 1997). However, this approach is linguistically restricted and ignores the immanent asymmetry of the meaning and the implementation, as semantic load of cultureme is much higher than that of realia, since it appeals to culturally significant information, it is extrapolated to other levels of the ethno-cultural picture of the world. Various languages differ from one another in the way of organizing informative differences (perception and conceptualization of the world), and not in separate cultureme, although it’s worth noting that the national specificity of cultureme content most fully reveals itself only in comparison with the possible units of implementation in another language, interculturemes and intraculturemes reveal namely in the asymmetry and lexical gaps. Therefore, the attempts to convey the linguocultural material by means of another language is constantly associated with difficulties of reconstruction of all the linguistic consciousness and, in this way or another, doomed to struggle with the lexical gaps to overcome the natural asymmetry of languages. A. Bukhonkina suggests the classification of cultureme (Bukhonkina, 2002), based on the specific characteristics of their inner form and specificity of interlinguistic asymmetry; however, this approach is more applicable to the realia, since the cultural significance and immanent signification is often ignored. So, the researcher singles out (as the examples Ukrainian and Polish cultureme were used, both taken from traditional ethno-culture and modern ones, with semantic layers, and shifts in the inner form) and in general (the branch of non-verbal communication studies that examines the cultural role of taste sensations, rituals and traditions, associated with food, cuisine as a reflection of national mentality).

Linguocultural competence (N. Alefirenko), therefore, does not depend as much on the mastery of the language laws as it does on the extralinguistic information field (the semiotic code), which hampers the transmission and perception of another culture-bearer. A great importance in the process of intercultural interaction in the reception of cultureemes, obviously, is given to lexicography as a field dealing with professional commitment to solving the problems of cross-linguistic asymmetry and overcoming the problem of lexical gaps. It should be noted that modern lexicography also reflects modern tendencies of convergence of linguistics with other fields of humanitaristics. Consequently, linguocultural studies is an important and topical issue in the theory and practice of compiling dictionaries. Lexiografication of linguoculture (particularly, the intercultural one) involves both the traditional problems of linguistic material and the new ones, related to the evolution of forms and ways to transmit semantics.

Reflecting culture in lexicography

Given the long history of compiling and functioning of dictionaries, just recently, that is, more or less since the 1950s, the efforts of some lexicographers have been focused on the theoretical aspect of this work. The work of lexicographers aims at a dictionary to become as efficient and no ideological tool as possible. Nowadays, no one doubts that the so-called “corpus revolution” (Hanks, 2012; Krishnamurthy, 2002; Rundell, 1992) has helped to better reflect how the language really functions within a specific group of its users. For instance, it was noted that pre-corpus dictionaries usually contained rare meanings of some same lexical units (and their equivalent translation), but they lacked other important common units. Sometimes the words which are frequently used do not appear in the dictionary macrostructure; in other cases, the words are included in the macrostructure, but their definition leaves a lot to be desired. Nowadays the measurement of frequency is part of the standard of lexicographical work. But the keyword concordances and the frequency of elements have become not only an indispensable resource for lexicographic documenting of the statistic content, but also increasingly often on the web-sites of online

dictionaries, the statistic content of the headwords is complemented (or even replaced) by dynamically generated content, based on corpus information. It is natural that the primary task of the adequate reflection of pragmatics which lexicography faces is an adequate understanding of a linguistic sign, overcoming ethno linguistic barrier, which is obviously based on the asymmetry of ethno-mental cultureme. This means dealing with two (or more) linguistic pictures of the world and with mastering non-equivalent vocabulary. The problem of equivalence lies in the area, in which an interdisciplinary consensus has been achieved: lexico-semantic structures of lexis of a particular language are peculiar, specific to this language and, therefore, they are partially unique. It means that the lexical semantic structures of two (or more) languages are non-isomorphic. Non-isomorphy of lexis forms the theoretical and observed empirical circumstances, examination of which leads to concrete manifestations of the problem of equivalence in different disciplines. In this case, we are only interested in the metalexicographic aspect of this issue. We believe that the notion of equivalence in the lexicographical research should not be constructed anti-intuitively, away from its use in the common language sense, but must be more precise, and also must be different from the concept of equivalence in related disciplines, especially if we refer to contrastive linguistics and translation theory. Equivalence (or its absence) is a marginal phenomenon, if lexicological studies are related to only one language. For example, you can refer to the lexical synonyms within the limits of designator lexis. They are extensionally equivalent, which means they have the same number of meanings. The notion of equivalence, on the other hand, plays a crucial role in contrastive or confrontational lexicology. There are also various lexicological manifestations of the problem of equivalence.

Comparative lexicology is regarded as a partial discipline with an emphasis on langue. Accordingly, the notion of equivalence in lexicology is concentrated on the language system, but, in general, is relatively vague. The basis of the designator lexis is polysomic understanding of the language signs. Therefore, the elements of the lexis can be several times polysemantic. While correlating one element of language A with

another element of language B, their denotative relationship is generally accepted as a basis for the comparison. Thus, there appears equivalence, commonly referred to as semantic equivalence, under the conditions that, firstly, the number of sameness in language A equals the number of sameness in language B (and they have the same meaning) and, secondly, their denotation (in pairs of sameness) is the same. It is necessary to remember about various approaches to the definition of the equivalent and equivalence in translation studies. Equivalence of translation is defined as the common content of the original text and the translation. A. Ivanov regards an equivalent as “functional compliance in a target language, transmitting expression on the similar level (words, collocations) to all relevant components within the given context, or one of the variants of meaning of the original unit in the source language” (Ivanov, 2006).

A classical sentence from the textbook on translation studies is as follows: “Translation starts with establishing equivalence on the word level” (Ivanov, 2006). Undoubtedly, the problems of translation begin at the level of a separate word or collocations, when there appears non-equivalent lexis, i.e. lexical units which do not have their equivalents in the target language. We believe that non-equivalent lexis (as a phenomenon both in translation studies and lexicography) presents a range of problems. In translation it is connected with what is commonly referred to as “untranslatable”; as for lexicography, the problem is more complicated, because a dictionary does not provide as many possibilities as a text does for different types of lexical transformations, with the help of which a nonequivalent notion can be identified. The term itself is common for many authors, who understand it in a different way: some authors regard non-equivalent lexis as a synonym of realia, the others see just words, which due to cultural differences do not exist in the other language. S. Vlahov and S. Florin in their book *The Untranslatable in Translation* give the most complete description of types of lexical units, which can be regarded as non-equivalent ones (Vlahov, Florin, 1980). It seems that non-equivalent lexis, as well as lexical gaps (composing a significant part of the national specificity in any

language) are the terms on the junction of various academic disciplines, which complicates the approach to their definition within the framework of lexicography. However, the experience of modern lexicographers clearly shows that in the process of compilation of any bilingual or more lingual translation dictionary, the issues of conveying culture specificity, absent in another language, do not lose their importance:

“...in every culture there exist concepts or phenomena not to be found elsewhere in the world. Such discrepancies between cultures, or cultural gaps, give rise to lexical gaps in the vocabularies of the concerned languages, manifesting themselves most vividly in the process of establishing interlingual equivalence. This, in turn, makes life difficult for both bilingual lexicographers and translators. Vocabulary items denoting concepts characteristic of a particular culture are referred to by a number of names in the literature on the topic enumerate such labels as cultural or culture-bound words, culture-specific concepts, realia, culture-bound phenomena and terms and culture-specific items. However, the proposed labels call for a certain disambiguation. As has been remarked, culturespecificity is not as easy to pinpoint as it may seem. There are those who argue that in fact very few – if any – vocabulary items are culture independent: “As language is created and used in context, it is inevitable to be tinted with the color of cultural idiosyncrasies” (Podolej, 2009)

Translation in the process of intercultural communication (recoding of linguocultural material by means a different language system) and the application of various translation techniques create a special linguistic and translation meaning of a cultureme, based on various relationships of equivalence (Gusarov, 2002): signification (methods of transcription), semantisation (a method of descriptive translation), reference (a method of elimination of national cultural specificity, descriptive translation), syntagmatics (a method of translation periphrasis) and functionality (a method of approximate translation, descriptive translation).

Naturally, all the suggested variants of equivalence search are peculiar solutions of the problem of lexical gaps elimination, their thinking, re-semantisation and the new language implementation. Understanding of the empirical material leads first of all to the usual problems, while implicitness of culturemes reveals quite different lexicographical problems – an inclination to cognition of processes of implicit meanings interpretation.

Translation in regard the cultural nuances of the language

The process of translation is often hindered by structural, lexical and contextual constraints. Rhythmical, alliterative and onomatopoeic aspects have been hurdles at the lexical level. Cultural nuances of the language constitute the congenital merits of any literary work. They tend to resist translation and make translation unpoetic. Puns, equivocations and idioms constitute the lexical problems that literary translators encounter. Most of the lexical problems arise from the problems of equivalences. There are four types of equivalences: (1) one-to-one equivalence; (2) one-to-many equivalence; (3) many-to-one equivalence; and (4) one-to-none equivalence or null equivalence. The first type of equivalence is relatively unproblematic as a word in the Source language has only one equivalent in the Target language: for instance, the word amor (Latin) has love (English) as its equivalent. But it becomes problematic when the lexical gap between the two languages widens due to cultural, social and historical differences. The second type of equivalence is inherently problematic due to alternatives of equivalents offered: the word amor (Latin) offers three alternative meanings-erose, filia and agape- in Greek. Here the Source language covers a wide range of contextual meanings. When such words are translated, the translator has to choose the potent and vital meaning most appropriate to the context. For instance, when divine love is referred to, agape is the meaning appropriate to the context.

The third type is also problematic as the exactness or precision of meaning changes in translation. The fourth type leads to the problem of untranslatability.

While translating idioms and proverbial expressions the translator confronts an obvious dilemma: whether he should transfer the items from the Source language and transcribe them in the Target language. The transfer of the untranslatable words and their transcription in the target language provide a local colour to the translation. Thus, translation is a creative process at every level of which the translator makes a choice. The choice of the translator is political as well as aesthetic, though they are more or less synonymous. In the matter of equivalence, the translator's choice is not between alternative yet exact equivalents, but between equivalents more or less inexact. So the choice depends on the ideology of the translator and the aesthetic that he follows. As any literary text is a synthesis of politics and aesthetics of the writer, the translator's choice of equivalents depends on the requirements of his textual politics. All types of translation involve loss or gain off meaning. Translation also causes skewing of meaning while decoding and encoding ideas. This results from the choice of the nearest equivalent. In this regard, J.C.Catford remarks: "In translation, there is the substitution of TL meanings for SL meanings; no transference of TL meanings into SL. In transference, there is an implantation of SL meanings into the TL text. These two process must be clearly differentiated in any theory of translation" (1965:27).

The distinction between translation and transference is essential to define linguistic untranslatability. J.C.Catford defines translation as a uni-directional process which involves "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)" (1965:20). It is primarily a linguistic act as it involves an operation performed on languages. Though the definition seems to be simple, it calls for comment on two terms, namely "textual material" and "equivalent." The use of the term "textual material" underlines the fact that in normal conditions of translation it is not the entirety of a SL text that is replaced by TL equivalents. At one or more levels of language there may be replacements by non-equivalent TL material there is replacement of SL grammar and lexis by equivalent TL grammar and lexis. There is also replacement of SL graphology by TL

graphology. But, the TL graph logical form is in no way a translation equivalent of the SL graph logical form. Hence, the central problem of any translation practice is that of finding translation equivalents. Several theorists speak on the problems of equivalence in translation. Roman Jakobson, Eugene Nida and Anton Popovic have contributed to the theory of equivalence. In his essay “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation” (1959), Roman Jakobson approaches the problem of equivalence as a linguistic problem: “Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics” (Brower, 1962: 239). He argues that the translator recodes and transmits the SL messages into TL messages and thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes. In Jakobson’s discussion, the problem of equivalence focuses on the differences in the structure and terminology of languages rather than on the inability of one language to render a message written in another verbal language. He emphasizes that the problem of equivalence is related to the structure and syntax of the language. The conventional terms such as literal, free and faithful translation became outdated with the publication of Eugene Nida’s two major works *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964) and *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969), which he co-authored with Taber. Nida, who has applied a communication model for his theory of translation, distinguishes between Formal equivalence and Dynamic Equivalence. Nida explains: “Formal Equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content...One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language” (1964:159). Formal equivalence or formal correspondence is thus oriented towards the SL structure. The most typical of this kind of translation is “gloss translation,” with a close approximation to SL structure, often with footnotes, to gain close access to the language and customs of the source culture (Nida and Taber, 1969:24). In such a translation, a translator is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. This kind of translation allows the reader to understand as much of the source language context as possible.

Dynamic or functional equivalence is based on what Nida calls “the principle of equivalent effect,” where “the relation between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message” (1964:159). Here the message is tailored to the receptors’ linguistic needs and cultural expectations, aiming at complete naturalness of expression. Nida defines the goal of dynamic equivalence as to seek “the closest equivalent to the source-language message” (1964:166; Nida and Taber 1969:12). This receptor oriented approach considers adaptations of grammar, lexicon, and cultural references essential to achieve naturalness, to minimize the foreignness of the SL setting. The emotive impact of the message is the same for the audience irrespective of the fact that whether they belong to the source culture or target culture. Yet another theory of equivalence is mentioned by Anton Popovic, who, in his Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation (1976), identifies four types of equivalence- Linguistic equivalence, Paradigmatic equivalence, Stylistic or Translational equivalence and Textual or Syntagmatic equivalence. In linguistic equivalence there is homogeneity on the linguistic level of both SL and TL texts. It closely resembles word for word translation. Paradigmatic equivalence aims at equivalence of the elements of a paradigmatic expressive axis: elements of grammar which Popovic regards as a higher category than lexical equivalence. In stylistic equivalence, there is functional equivalence of elements both in the source text and the translation, aiming at an expressive identity with an invariant of identical meaning. When there is equivalence of the syntagmatic structuring of a text, an equivalence of form and shape exists and this is called textual equivalence. Translation is far more than replacement of lexical or grammatical items; the process also involves discarding the basic linguistic elements to achieve the expressive identity. Koller describes five different types of equivalences. They are Denotative equivalence, Connotative equivalence, Text-normative equivalence, Pragmatic equivalence and Formal equivalence. The denotative equivalence is related to the equivalence of the extra linguistic content of the text. The connotative equivalence is related to the equivalence of the connotative

dimensions of a text. The text – normative equivalence is related to text types, with different kinds of texts behaving in different ways. The pragmatic equivalence is quite similar to Nida's dynamic equivalence. It is oriented towards the receiver of the text or message. It is also called communicative equivalence. The formal equivalence is related to the form and aesthetic of the text.

Theorists like James Holmes think that the use of the term equivalence is perverse. Dionye Durisin argues that the translator of a literary text should not be concerned with establishing equivalence of natural language, but of artistic procedures. The procedures cannot be considered in isolation, but must be located within the specific cultural- temporal context within which they are used (Bassnett, 1991:28). Equivalence in translation should not be approached as a search for sameness, but as dialectic between signs and structures within and surrounding the Source language and the Target language text. As complete equivalence is not possible, there is always the question of loss and gain. Nida discusses in detail the difficulties encountered by the translator when faced with the terms or concepts in the Source language that do not exist in the Target language. This leads to the question of untranslatability. The complexity of languages makes one infer that literary art is untranslatable, both linguistically and culturally.

Crawford distinguishes two types of untranslatability, linguistic and cultural. Linguistic untranslatability occurs when there is no lexical or syntactic substitute in language for the Source language item. This is the result of the differences between the Source language and the Target language. Cultural untranslatability is due to the absence in the target culture of a relevant situational feature for the Source language text. Translation is not an isolated endeavour; it is a part of an ongoing process of intercultural transfer: a transfer across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The translator has to present the aspects of social culture that is unfamiliar to the receiving audience. They consists of elements of the material culture like food, dress and tools, factors of social structures like customs and law, features of the natural world like weather, flora and fauna, and social functions like festivals, rituals and ceremonies.

Such elements of the source culture have no equivalents in the receptor language. The translator may transfer the source culture item untranslated into the Target language; he may transcribe the item in the Target language and provide an explanatory footnote for the readers of the receptor culture. Popovic also distinguishes two types of untranslatability without making a separation between the linguistic and the cultural. The first is defined as the problem of connotation: A situation in which the linguistic elements of the original cannot be replaced adequately in structural, linear, functional or semantic terms in consequence of a lack of denotation or connotation. (Gentzler, 1993: 85)

The source culture item eludes translation due to the failure of target culture items to denote it in the target language. The second type goes beyond the purely linguistic; it reflects the inadequacy of language itself: A situation where the relation of expressing the meaning, i.e., the relation between the creative subject and its linguistic expression in the original does not find an adequate linguistic expression in translation. (Gentzler, 1993:85-86) The creative subject finds appropriate expression in the source language, but it fails to find appropriate expression in the target language. Since language is a modeling system within a culture, cultural untranslatability is inevitably implied in any process of translation. The types of untranslatability Catford and Popovic define correspond to each other.

Conclusion. Linguistic untranslatability arises mainly due to the problem of suggestive meaning. A word attains different shades of meaning through its context, etymology, appropriation, time and place, association, contrast, gender, and collocation. While English does not distinguish between the words used for greeting someone face to face or when answering the telephone, French, German and the Italian all do make that distinction. The Italian *pronto* is used as telephonic greeting like the German *hallo*. The Italian *ciao* is used equally on arrival and departure, and not to the specific context of arrival or initial encounter. Moreover, German and French use as forms of greeting brief rhetorical questions, whereas in English rhetorical questions like *How are you?* or *How do you do?* are used only in formal

situation . So, the translator, who is faced with the task of translating hello into any language, should first extract a core of meaning which is applicable to his translation of the word hello. Jakobson has described this as interlingual transposition, while Ludskanov, in his A Semiotic Approach to the Theory of Translation, calls it Semiotic transformation. It is the replacement of the signs encoding a message by signs of another code, preserving invariant information with respect to a given system of reference. In the case of hello the invariant is the notion of greeting.

References

1. Holmes J. S. The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, Department of General Studies, 1975.
2. Комиссаров В. Н. Слово о переводе. – М., 1973; Швейцер А. Д. Перевод и лингвистика. – М., 1973; Федоров А. В. Введение в теорию перевода. – М. 1958.
3. Newmark P. Approaches to Translation. – New York a.o.: Prentice Hall, 1988. – P. 19.
4. Catford J. C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. – London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
5. Миньяр – Белоручев Р. К. Теория и методы перевода. – М.: Московский лицей, 1996. – с..29.
6. Nida E., Taber C. Theory and Practice of Translating. – Leiden: Brill, 1969.
7. Benjamin W. Illuminations. – New York, 1955. - p.75.
8. Encyclopedia Britannica. Version 1997. CD-ROM.
9. Бархударов Л. С. Язык и перевод. – М.: Международные отношения, 1975; Ревзин И. И., Розенцвейг В. Ю. Основы общего и машинного перевода. – М.: Высшая школа, 1964. –с.64.
10. Кузьмин Ю. Г. К вопросу о предмете и месте теории перевода. Вопросы теории и практики научно-технического перевода. Л., с.19