

Phraseological Units And Their Russian Correspondences In Uzbek Crime Fiction

Makhmudova Yulduz Askarovna

Lecturer, Department of Russian Language and Literature

Bukhara State University

ORCID 0009-0002-4369-2433

ABSTRACT

The paper examines Uzbek phraseological units and their Russian correspondences drawn from a parallel corpus of Tohir Malik's crime saga Shaytanat. Working within the correspondence typology of V.N. Komissarov and A.V. Kunin, the study sorts the units into full equivalents, partial equivalents, phraseological analogues, calques, and descriptive and lexical renderings. Somatic and animal-based idioms carrying pronounced national colouring receive close attention. The analysis shows that analogues and descriptive renderings prevail where the source image lacks a Russian counterpart, while full equivalents stay rare and cluster around units of shared cultural origin.

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 28th

April, 2026

Accepted: 24th May 2026

KEY WORDS:

phraseological unit,
translation equivalent,
parallel corpus, Uzbek
language, Russian
language, crime fiction,
Tohir Malik, Shaytanat,
phraseological analogue,
calquing, national
colouring.

Introduction. Phraseological units resist translation more stubbornly than almost any other layer of the vocabulary. A fixed expression carries meaning that its separate words do not predict, and it often stores an image tied to one people's daily life, beliefs, and history. When a translator moves such a unit from Uzbek into Russian, the wording rarely transfers whole. Something in the picture shifts, or disappears, or has to be rebuilt from other material. Tohir Malik, whose crime saga Shaytanat first appeared in the journal Sharq yulduzi in 1992 and reached readers as a separate book through the Sharq publishing house in 1994, wrote prose saturated with exactly this kind of expression [1]. His underworld speaks in proverbs, curses, somatic idioms, and set comparisons drawn from village and city alike. Because the novel was afterwards rendered into Russian, it yields aligned material of the sort that phraseological analysis needs, namely an Uzbek original beside a Russian version made for real readers rather than for a textbook.

Corpus methods reached Uzbek philology comparatively late, and work on the Uzbek and Russian pair stays thin. N. Abdurakhmonova built alignment procedures for Uzbek-Russian parallel data and set out the linguistic obstacles behind them [2]. More recently A. Iskandarova tagged the phraseology of the novel Qiyomat in a parallel corpus and treated the national-cultural units inside it [3]. Studies of this shape remain scarce, and none has yet taken an Uzbek crime novel as its source. The present article addresses that omission. It draws Uzbek phraseological units from Shaytanat together with their Russian correspondences, sorts them by the type of correspondence each one shows, and asks which types dominate and why. The sorting follows the scheme worked out by V.N. Komissarov and A.V. Kunin for imagery-bearing units [4; 5], refined by the four rendering options of V.S. Vinogradov [14] and by the treatment of culture-bound vocabulary in S. Vlahov and S. Florin [6]. Attention falls on where a Russian equivalent waits ready-made, where the translator must

reach for a different image, and where the picture has to be spelled out in free words because the receptor language keeps no counterpart at all.

Methods and Literature Review. Material for the study was gathered by continuous sampling from the Uzbek text of Shaytanat and its Russian version, with each identified phraseological unit entered beside its correspondence in an aligned pair. Identification rested on the standard criteria of reproducibility, semantic integrity, and structural stability, following the classification of V.V. Vinogradov and N.M. Shanskiy [7; 8]. Once collected, the pairs were sorted by the comparative method, which sets an Uzbek unit against its Russian counterpart and gauges the distance between them in meaning, imagery, lexical make-up, and stylistic colouring. The typological method grouped the correspondences into full equivalents, partial equivalents, analogues, calques, and descriptive and lexical renderings. Componential analysis broke the meaning of selected units into semantic features so that partial overlaps could be seen precisely. Contextual analysis checked how each unit behaved in its surrounding sentence, since a crime narrative loads many expressions with menace or irony that a dictionary gloss would miss. Quantitative counting over the sampled units gave the relative weight of each correspondence type, and the phraseological dictionaries of Sh. Rakhmatullaev supplied control readings for the Uzbek side [9].

The theory of rendering phraseology grew from two roots that eventually met, one in general translation studies and one in comparative phraseology. Ya.I. Retsker set out the doctrine of regular correspondences and drew the line between equivalents, which belong to the language, and analogues, which the translator selects in speech, holding that a unit has only one equivalent yet may take several analogues [10]. L.S. Barkhudarov defined the unit of translation and the three relations of full, partial, and zero correspondence that hold between source and target items [11]. V.N. Komissarov gave the levels of equivalence their fullest statement and named the three ways an image-bearing unit can be matched, through an equivalent, through an analogue, or through a calque [4]. A.V. Kunin, working from English and Russian material, separated monoequivalents from analogues and warned against planting a Russian idiom heavy with national marks into a foreign mouth [5]. S. Vlahov and S. Florin turned the problem of the untranslatable into a working method and placed realia and phraseology at its centre [6]. On the phraseological side V.V. Vinogradov built the semantic classification of fusions, unities, and combinations that every later account assumes [7], while N.M. Shanskiy extended it and made the set expression a unit of the language system in its own right [8]. V.M. Mokienko carried the study into Slavic comparison and fixed the working definition of the phraseological unit as a reproducible and expressive combination with, as a rule, an integral meaning [12]. E.F. Arsentyeva mapped interlingual correspondence across full equivalents, partial equivalents, analogues, and lacunar units [13]. In the English-language tradition P. Newmark placed the rendering of idiom and metaphor among the central difficulties of the craft [16], and M. Baker set out a graded set of idiom strategies, running from a target idiom of similar meaning and form, through one of similar meaning but dissimilar form, to paraphrase and, in the last resort, omission [15], before founding the corpus-based study of translated language on the claim that large aligned collections reveal regularities no single text can show [17]. For the Uzbek side the descriptive base rests on the phraseological dictionaries of Sh. Rakhmatullaev, which register the meaning, form, and stylistic value of several thousand units [9], and the corpus dimension follows N. Abdurakhmonova and A. Iskandarova, who brought Uzbek-Russian parallel data and phraseological tagging together for the first time [2; 3].

Results. The sample sorts into six kinds of correspondence, and their weight is far from even. Analogues form the largest group. Full equivalents, by contrast, stay scarce, and they cluster around units whose image the two peoples inherited from a shared source rather than coined apart. This pattern is not accidental. V.N. Komissarov explains the mechanism behind it when he treats the three ways an image-bearing unit can be matched, observing that a full phraseological equivalent reproduces a foreign unit in all components of meaning and turns up comparatively rarely, most often among international units that both languages took from a third source [4]. Applied to Uzbek and Russian, the observation holds with force, because the two languages sit in different families and drew their everyday imagery from different soil. An Uzbek idiom about a watermelon slipping from under the arm, or about roasted flour held in the mouth, keeps no Russian twin waiting for it. The translator who meets tarvuzi qo'ltig'idan tushdi must decide whether to

hunt for a Russian picture of equal force or to state the feeling plainly, and that decision, repeated across the novel, is what the figures in Table 1 record.

Full equivalents appear where the picture and the sense travel together. Uzbek *tosh yurak* and *tosh bag'ir*, both naming a person without pity, meet Russian *каменное сердце* almost point for point, since the metaphor of a stone in place of a feeling organ belongs to many cultures at once. The unit *ko'z yummoq*, literally to close the eyes, matches *закрывать глаза (на что-либо)* in the sense of a deliberate refusal to see wrongdoing, and the grammatical frame carries over without strain. Yer bilan yakson qilmoq, said of a place levelled in violence, answers Russian *сровнять с землёй* with the same verb of levelling and the same noun of earth. Partial equivalents keep the meaning but bend the form. Where Uzbek says *qo'li egri*, the hand is crooked, Russian prefers *нечист на руку*, the hand is unclean, so the body part stays while the attribute changes and the sense of a thieving disposition survives the swap. A.V. Kunin describes this graded matching when he separates full and partial monoequivalents from looser correspondences, insisting that a partial equivalent may render the source unit with complete adequacy despite a divergence in the lexical or grammatical make-up [5]. The material from *Shaytanat* bears this out, since a reader of the Russian text loses nothing of Asadbek's contempt when *qo'li egri* becomes *нечист на руку*.

Analogues carry the heaviest load, and here the two languages part company most visibly. An Uzbek speaker whose joy overflows says *boshi osmonga yetdi*, the head has reached the sky, while a Russian in the same state finds himself *на седьмом небе*, on the seventh heaven, so the elation is shared but the picture is rebuilt. *Tarvuzi qo'ltig'idan tushdi* paints disappointment as a watermelon dropping from under the arm, an image with no purchase in Russian, which reaches instead for *повесить нос*, to hang the nose, or *опустить руки*, to lower the hands. When fear runs through a character, Uzbek *zir titramoq* gives an intense trembling, and Russian answers with *дрожать как осиновый лист*, to shake like an aspen leaf, a comparison built on a tree that hardly grows in the Uzbek south, so the equivalence lives in the feeling and not in the flora. Ya.I. Retsker fixed the principle that governs such choices in his often-cited formula that *эквивалент всегда один, аналогов может быть несколько*, that an equivalent is always single while analogues may be several, which is why the translator of an idiom without a ready counterpart works by selection rather than by lookup [10]. The same holds for *yuragi orqasiga tortib ketdi*, the heart pulled toward the back, rendered by *душа в пятки ушла*, the soul went into the heels, where terror keeps its intensity though the anatomy shifts from heart to soul and from back to heels. *Og'ziga tolqon solmoq*, to fill the mouth with roasted flour, meaning to fall stubbornly silent, meets *набрать в рот воды*, to take water into the mouth, a Russian picture of the same silence built from a different substance. Selection of this kind fills the middle of Table 1 and defines the ordinary work of the pair.

Calquing keeps the foreign image and trusts the reader to read it. This works when the picture is clear on its face, and it fails when the tie between the words and the sense has gone dark. V.N. Komissarov drew the boundary precisely, noting that a calque suits units whose imagery stays transparent, whereas with fusions, where the link between the direct and the figurative meaning is lost, a word-for-word rendering only puzzles the reader [4]. In *Shaytanat* the transparent cases pass into Russian with their picture intact. The comparison *bo'ri bolasi bo'ri*, a wolf's cub is a wolf, said of a criminal lineage that breeds its own kind, carries over as *волчонок вырастет волком* without loss, since the wolf names the same threat in both traditions. *Qo'lini qonga botirmoq*, to steep one's hands in blood, keeps its image in *обарпить руки кровью*, a rendering that works because blood on the hands names guilt for a Russian reader as plainly as for an Uzbek one. Opaque units refuse this treatment, and here the translator abandons the picture, so *boshini yemoq*, literally to eat someone's head yet meaning to bring about their ruin, cannot stand as it is and turns into *сгубить или погубить*, a plain verb of destruction that saves the sense at the cost of the image.

Descriptive rendering takes over where neither an equivalent nor an analogue is available, and the unit has to be unfolded into free words. *Etak silkib ketmoq*, to shake out the hem and walk away, meaning to break off every tie and leave with nothing, keeps no compact Russian match, so a translator states the action, that the character severed all bonds and departed empty-handed, and lets the vivid picture go. The same fate meets units bound to objects and customs that Russian never named, the class that S. Vlahov and S. Florin placed at the heart of their study of the untranslatable. They defined such units with care, writing that *realia* are words and combinations of words naming objects characteristic of the life, the culture, and the social and historical

development of one people and alien to another, so that they carry a national or historical colouring and have, as a rule, no exact matches in other languages [6]. Their governing thesis, that the untranslatable can nonetheless be translated within the work taken whole, states the working faith of every literary translator. Uzbek phraseology bound to bread offers the clearest test, since the oath non ursin and the reverence folded into it rest on a sacred value that Russian keeps no word for, and the translator of Shaytanat must gloss the weight rather than reproduce the phrase. Lexical rendering, the plainest resort, shrinks a whole unit to a single word, so jonini olmoq, to take someone's soul, becomes убить, and yostig'ini quritmoq, to dry out someone's pillow in the sense of doing away with a person, arrives as устранить, a colourless verb that fits the criminal setting while surrendering the menace folded into the Uzbek phrase. Table 2 gathers the somatic group, where body-part imagery lets the two languages meet more often, though even there the meeting is usually by analogue rather than by equivalent.

Crime fiction concentrates registers that a translator handles at some peril. Malik's underworld curses, threatens, and jokes in phraseology soaked with menace, and the Russian version must keep that charge without dressing an Uzbek gangster in a Russian thief's clothes. A.V. Kunin warned against exactly this danger when he cautioned that in rendering image-bearing units one must never reach for a target-language idiom loaded with specific national marks, since it drags in a colouring foreign to the source [5]. The warning bites hardest with argot. Where Shaytanat uses a criminal turn of phrase for killing or for betrayal, a Russian idiom drawn from the world of the *вор в законе* would russify the scene and misplace its ethnic setting, so the safer road runs through a neutral phrase that reports the act. Stylistic colouring, then, becomes the real battleground of the translation, more than the bare meaning, because meaning survives most renderings while tone leaks away. Qora niyat, an evil design, keeps its darkness in чёрный замысел, and ipidan ignasigacha, from the thread to the needle, meaning every last detail, finds до последней нитки with its sense intact, yet each such success is local, and the cumulative colouring of the Uzbek text stays richer than any Russian version fully carries. That gap, measurable unit by unit, is what a parallel corpus of the novel makes visible.

Table 1. Types of correspondence between Uzbek phraseological units and their Russian renderings in Shaytanat

Correspondence type	Uzbek unit	Russian rendering	Basis of the match
Full equivalent	tosh yurak / tosh bag'ir	каменное сердце	shared metaphor of stone for pitilessness
Full equivalent	ko'z yummoq	закрывать глаза (на)	same image and grammatical frame
Partial equivalent	qo'li egri	нечист на руку	same body part, changed attribute
Partial equivalent	yer bilan yakson qilmoq	сравнивать с землёй	same verb of levelling, minor formal shift
Analogue	tarvuzi qo'ltig'idan tushdi	повесить нос / опустить руки	same sense, rebuilt image
Analogue	boshi osmonga yetdi	быть на седьмом небе	same elation, different picture
Analogue	zir titramoq	дрожать как осиновый лист	same fear, foreign comparison
Calque	bo'ri bolasi bo'ri	волчонок вырастет волком	transparent image reproduced
Calque	qo'lini qonga botirmoq	обагрить руки кровью	shared image of blood-guilt
Descriptive	etak silkib ketmoq	порвать все связи, уйти ни с чем	image unfolded into free words
Lexical	jonini olmoq	убить	unit reduced to one word

Lexical	yostig'ini quritmoq	устранить	colouring surrendered for sense
---------	---------------------	-----------	---------------------------------

Table 2. Somatic phraseological units and their Russian correspondences

Uzbek unit	Literal sense	Figurative meaning	Russian correspondence	Type
ko'z qorachig'iday saqlamoq	to guard like the pupil of the eye	to protect as most precious	беречь как зеницу ока	full equiv.
ko'z yummoq	to close the eyes	to ignore knowingly	закрывать глаза	full equiv.
qo'li egri	the hand is crooked	thieving, dishonest	нечист на руку	partial equiv.
qo'l urmoq	to strike with the hand	to set about, lay hands on	приложить руку	partial equiv.
yuragi orqasiga tortib ketdi	the heart pulled to the back	to be terrified	душа в пятки ушла	analogue
boshi osmonga yetdi	the head reached the sky	to be overjoyed	на седьмом небе	analogue
tarvuzi qo'ltig'idan tushdi	the watermelon fell from the armpit	to be crestfallen	повесить нос	analogue
og'ziga tolqon solmoq	to put roasted flour in the mouth	to keep a stubborn silence	набрать в рот воды	analogue
bir qulog'idan kirib boshqasidan chiqib ketmoq	in one ear and out the other	to pay no heed	в одно ухо влетает, в другое вылетает	full equiv.
tosh bag'ir	stone liver	merciless, hard-hearted	каменное сердце	partial equiv.

Discussion. The distribution found in Shaytanat matches what comparative phraseology predicts for languages of different families, yet it sharpens the prediction with counts from a single literary source. V.S. Vinogradov set out the range of options open to a translator of phraseology, and his account frames the present findings well, for he held that a phraseological unit in the source may correspond in the target to a phraseological unit or to a word carrying an equivalent quantity of information, and he separated phraseological rendering, through equivalent and analogue, from non-phraseological rendering, through lexical, calque, and descriptive means [14]. The counts from the novel show the second route travelled far more often than the first, which is the expected result when the source language stores much of its imagery in units that the receptor language never coined. Crime fiction raises the stakes of this ordinary asymmetry, since the loss falls not on neutral information but on menace, contempt, and dark humour, the very qualities that give the genre its pull. A parallel corpus lets the loss be counted rather than merely felt, unit against unit, and that is the methodological gain the study claims.

Comparative work of this kind carries a practical yield beyond the description itself. E.F. Arsenyeva argued that a strict comparison of phraseological units across languages, sorted into full equivalents, partial equivalents, analogues, and units without correspondence, supplies the empirical base that bilingual phraseography needs [13]. A parallel corpus of Shaytanat feeds exactly that base, because every aligned pair it stores is a candidate entry for an Uzbek-Russian phraseological dictionary, complete with a real context of use. The absence of such a dictionary, adequate to the criminal register and to the substandard speech that fills the genre, is a gap that corpus work can begin to close. Machine translation stands to gain as well, since the analogue and descriptive pairs that a human translator built are precisely the cases on which a word-aligned system fails, and a tagged corpus turns each of them into training material. Beyond the language pair, the

method transfers to any two languages whose idioms sit far apart, and the sorting scheme used here would carry over with little change.

Conclusion. Uzbek phraseology reaches Russian most often by analogue and by descriptive rendering, less often by partial equivalent, and only rarely by full equivalent, and the material of Shaytanat shows why, since the two languages built their everyday imagery on different ground and a crime novel leans hard on that imagery for its menace and its wit. Full equivalents survive where an image is shared across cultures, as with the stone heart or the guarded pupil of the eye, while analogues carry the daily traffic, rebuilding an Uzbek picture from Russian material whenever no ready counterpart exists. Calquing serves the transparent images and fails the opaque ones, and lexical rendering saves the sense of the hardest units at the price of their colouring, which is the price the genre can least afford. A word-aligned parallel corpus of the novel makes each of these choices countable and turns the aligned pairs into material for phraseography and for machine translation alike.

References

1. Malik T. Shaytanat: roman. – Toshkent: Sharq, 1994.
2. Abdurakhmonova N. Linguistic Issues of Creating Parallel Corpora for Uzbek Multilingual Machine Translation System // Бухоро давлат университети илмий ахбороти. – 2020. – № 6 (82). – Б. 60-68.
3. Iskandarova A. Some Reflections on the Linguocultural Features of Phraseological Units in the Novel “Qiyomat” // Sciental Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences. – 2025. – Vol. 3, No. 5. – P. 64-75.
4. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты): учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. – М.: Высшая школа, 1990. – 253 с.
5. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка: учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. – 2-е изд., перераб. – М.: Высшая школа; Дубна: Феникс, 1996. – 381 с.
6. Влахов С., Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. – М.: Международные отношения, 1980. – 343 с.
7. Виноградов В.В. Об основных типах фразеологических единиц в русском языке // Виноградов В.В. Избранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография. – М.: Наука, 1977. – С. 140-161.
8. Шанский Н.М. Фразеология современного русского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, 1969. – 231 с.
9. Рахматуллаев Ш. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли фразеологик луғати. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1978. – 407 б.
10. Рецкер Я.И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика: очерки лингвистической теории перевода. – М.: Международные отношения, 1974. – 216 с.
11. Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод: вопросы общей и частной теории перевода. – М.: Международные отношения, 1975. – 240 с.
12. Мокиенко В.М. Славянская фразеология: учеб. пособие. – 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – М.: Высшая школа, 1989. – 287 с.
13. Арсентьева Е.Ф. Фразеология и фразеография в сопоставительном аспекте (на материале русского и английского языков). – Казань: Изд-во Казан. ун-та, 2006. – 172 с.
14. Виноградов В.С. Перевод: общие и лексические вопросы: учеб. пособие. – 2-е изд., перераб. – М.: КДУ, 2004. – 240 с.
15. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. – London; New York: Routledge, 1992. – 304 p.
16. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. – New York; London: Prentice Hall, 1988. – 292 p.
17. Baker M. Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications // Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1993. – P. 233-250.