

NATIONAL AND CULTURAL MARKEDNESS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN
RUSSIAN–UZBEK INTERLINGUAL TRANSFER

Nadira Kadamjanovna Ablaeva

Senior Lecturer, Department of
Russian Language and Literature Mamun University
nadiraablaeva@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

ARTICLE INFO:

Received: 14.10.2026

Revised: 15.10.2026

Accepted: 16.10.2026

KEY WORDS:

phraseological unit,
national and cultural
markedness,
linguoculturology,
Russian–Uzbek
translation, interlingual
transfer, phraseological
equivalence, linguistic
worldview, cultural
semantics.

This article examines the national and cultural markedness of Russian phraseological units and the specific features of their interlingual transfer into Uzbek. Phraseological units are analysed as fixed linguistic expressions whose semantics embody elements of national experience, cultural perceptions, historical realities, and the value systems of language communities. Particular attention is paid to the preservation of the figurative, evaluative, and cultural components of phraseological units in translation. Drawing on a contrastive analysis, the study identifies the principal strategies for transferring Russian phraseological units into Uzbek: phraseological equivalence, image substitution, calquing, descriptive translation, and contextual compensation. The findings indicate that the choice of translation strategy depends on the degree of national and cultural markedness of the source-language unit and the availability of functionally equivalent resources in the target language.

Introduction

Phraseological units occupy a distinctive position in the language system because their semantics reflect a people's historical and cultural experience, characteristic patterns of national perception, and traditional ways of evaluating phenomena in the surrounding world. Unlike free

word combinations, phraseological units possess an integral meaning that, in many cases, cannot be derived directly from the meanings of their constituent elements.

V. N. Telia regards phraseological units as one of the most significant sources of cultural information, since their figurative foundations are closely associated with the history, traditions, and perceptions of a linguistic community [Telia, pp. 214–227]. For this reason, phraseological units are of particular interest to linguoculturology and translation studies.

The national and cultural markedness of a phraseological unit manifests itself in a specific image, associative content, or cultural connotation that is primarily accessible to speakers of the language in question. In translation, such units become objects of interlingual and intercultural transformation.

Russian and Uzbek both possess rich phraseological systems; however, their figurative systems developed under different historical and cultural conditions. This accounts for the existence of both phraseological equivalents and cases in which the underlying imagery only partially corresponds or differs entirely between the two languages.

The aim of this study is to identify the principal manifestations of national and cultural markedness in Russian phraseological units and to determine effective strategies for transferring them into Uzbek.

Research Methods

The study employs contrastive, semantic, linguocultural, and contextual analysis.

The contrastive method is used to establish the nature of the correspondences between Russian phraseological units and Uzbek expressions.

Semantic analysis aims to identify the denotative, figurative, and evaluative components of meaning.

The linguocultural method is applied to identify the cultural knowledge and associations encoded in phraseological semantics.

Contextual analysis makes it possible to determine the specific function of a phraseological unit in a literary text.

In identifying translation strategies, the study also draws on V. N. Komissarov's principle that the communicative and functional orientation of the original should be preserved even when its linguistic form is modified [Komissarov, pp. 51–68].

Research Findings

1. The Phraseological Unit as a Carrier of Cultural Information

The phraseological inventory of a language constitutes an important component of its national linguistic worldview. Fixed expressions encode evaluations of human behaviour and perceptions of good and evil, work, wealth, poverty, interpersonal relationships, and other spheres of human activity.



For example, the Russian expression бить баклуши (bit' baklushi, literally, "to knock out wooden blanks") means "to idle" or "to do nothing." Modern Russian speakers perceive it as a single fixed expression, although its internal form is historically associated with the production of wooden blanks known as baklushi.

For Uzbek readers, this image is not automatically transparent. Consequently, a literal reproduction of the constituent elements does not guarantee the preservation of the phraseological meaning. A more functionally effective solution is to use the Uzbek expression ишёқмаслик қилмоқ (ishyoqmaslik qilmoq, "to be idle" or "to be unwilling to work") or another expression appropriate to the context.

In this case, the original figurative basis is replaced while its functional meaning is retained.

2. Full and Partial Phraseological Correspondences

The task of translation is most straightforward when Uzbek has a phraseological equivalent that corresponds closely to the Russian expression in meaning and function.

For example:

Russian: держать язык за зубами ("to keep one's mouth shut") — Uzbek: тилини тиймоқ (tilini tiymoq, "to restrain one's tongue") or тилига эҳтиёт бўлмоқ (tiliga ehtiyot bo'lmoq, "to be careful with one's words").

The Russian expression evokes the image of physically holding one's tongue in place, whereas the Uzbek expression tilini tiymoq also involves the idea of controlling one's speech. Despite the differences in their constituent imagery, both expressions serve a similar communicative function: they indicate the need to remain silent or refrain from disclosing information.

This type of correspondence may be defined as functional phraseological equivalence.

Another type involves cases in which the meaning is shared but the figurative structure differs. For instance, the Russian expression водить за нос ("to lead someone by the nose") and the Uzbek verb лақиллатмоқ (laqillatmoq, "to deceive" or "to fool") can convey a similar idea of deception or misleading someone, although their metaphorical models differ.

Thus, translation preserves the semantic and pragmatic components, while the nationally specific figurative component is replaced.

3. The National and Cultural Markedness of Internal Form

Phraseological units whose internal form is associated with nationally specific cultural realities present a particular challenge.

These include expressions containing references to historical objects, elements of everyday life, traditional occupations, or social realities.

For example, the Russian phraseological unit ломать копья ("to break lances") originates in the imagery of armed confrontation and is used figuratively to mean "to argue heatedly" or "to



vigorously defend a position.” Modern Russian readers primarily perceive it as a fixed figurative expression.

When translated into Uzbek, a literal rendering of its constituent elements may be semantically opaque or stylistically unnatural. It is therefore preferable to use an Uzbek phraseological equivalent or a descriptive expression conveying the meaning of an intense dispute.

Thus, the national and cultural markedness of a phraseological unit's internal form directly influences the choice of translation strategy.

4. Image Substitution as a Means of Intercultural Adaptation

One of the most productive strategies for translating phraseological units is image substitution.

This strategy is employed when the target language lacks a direct equivalent but has a phraseological unit with a similar meaning and function.

For example, the Russian expression как снег на голову (literally, “like snow on one's head”) refers to an unexpected arrival or an unforeseen event. In translating it, the essential task is to preserve the semantic component of unexpectedness rather than necessarily reproduce the image of snow.

This strategy helps avoid a literal translation that may sound stylistically unnatural while preserving the expressiveness of the original text.

From the perspective of translation theory, this transformation constitutes a form of functional equivalence because the primary concern is to preserve the effect produced by the expression on the reader [Komissarov, pp. 134–145].

5. Calquing and Its Potential

Calquing is an effective translation strategy when the image underlying the source-language phraseological unit is sufficiently transparent and can be reproduced naturally using the resources of Uzbek.

However, calquing must be employed with caution. The formal reproduction of constituent elements does not always result in a phraseologically natural expression.

Accordingly, the translator should determine whether the source-language phraseological unit is:

- culturally universal;
- partially culturally marked; or
- nationally specific.

The greater the degree of cultural specificity, the less likely a successful literal rendering becomes.

6. Descriptive Translation and Cultural Explication



When no corresponding phraseological unit exists in the target language, descriptive translation may be employed. This strategy conveys the basic meaning of the expression, although it generally reduces its figurativeness and expressiveness.

For example, a culturally specific Russian phraseological unit may be rendered through a free word combination that explicitly conveys its meaning.

This strategy is justified when preserving the original imagery would result in misunderstanding or distortion of the intended meaning. In literary translation, however, it is desirable to compensate for the loss of figurativeness elsewhere in the text.

For this reason, descriptive translation is often combined with contextual compensation.

Discussion

The contrastive analysis demonstrates that the interlingual transfer of phraseological units from Russian into Uzbek is a complex process of intercultural adaptation.

Three principal levels of correspondence can be distinguished.

The first level is **full correspondence**. A phraseological unit in the source language has a close equivalent in Uzbek in terms of meaning, imagery, and function.

The second level is **functional correspondence**. The meaning and communicative function are preserved, but the figurative basis changes.

The third level is **semantic transfer**. No phraseological equivalent is available in the target language; consequently, a free word combination or descriptive construction is used.

National and cultural markedness should not be regarded solely as an obstacle to translation. Rather, it constitutes an important source of information about a nation's worldview.

Phraseological units make it possible to reconstruct cultural perceptions, historical associations, and systems of evaluation encoded in language. Their study is therefore relevant not only to translation studies but also to linguoculturology.

In the Russian–Uzbek language pair, the principle of functional equivalence is particularly important: the translator should seek to preserve the meaning, emotional and evaluative characteristics, stylistic register, and communicative effect of a phraseological unit.

Conclusion

Phraseological units are among the most significant carriers of national and cultural information. Their semantics reflect the historical experience, traditions, values, and figurative patterns of thought of a linguistic community.

In Russian–Uzbek interlingual transfer, the principal strategies for rendering phraseological units are phraseological equivalence, image substitution, calquing, descriptive translation, and contextual compensation.



The choice of a particular strategy depends on the degree of cultural markedness of the source-language unit, the availability of a corresponding phraseological resource in Uzbek, and the function of the expression in its specific literary context.

Thus, an adequate translation of a phraseological unit requires the preservation not only of its denotative meaning but also of its emotional and evaluative, figurative, and pragmatic components. Its national and cultural specificity may be retained directly or conveyed through a functionally equivalent expression in the target language.

References:

1. Komissarov, V. N. Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty) [Theory of Translation: Linguistic Aspects]. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola, 1990. 253 pp.
2. Kunin, A. V. Kurs frazeologii sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka [A Course in Modern English Phraseology]. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola, 1986. 336 pp.
3. Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. Metaforiy, kotorymi my zhivym [Metaphors We Live By]. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2004. 256 pp.
4. Maslova, V. A. Lingvokulturologiya [Linguoculturology]. Moscow: Akademiya, 2001. 208 pp.
5. Telia, V. N. Russkaya frazeologiya: semanticheskiy, pragmaticheskiy i lingvokulturologicheskiy aspekty [Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic, and Linguocultural Aspects]. Moscow: Shkola "Yazyki Russkoy Kultury," 1996. 288 pp.
6. Telia, V. N. "Metaforizatsiya i eyo rol' v sozdanii yazykovoy kartiny mira" [Metaphorisation and Its Role in the Formation of the Linguistic Worldview]. In Rol' chelovecheskogo faktora v yazyke: yazyk i kartina mira [The Role of the Human Factor in Language: Language and Worldview]. Moscow: Nauka, 1988, pp. 173–203.
7. Shansky, N. M. Frazeologiya sovremennogo russkogo yazyka [Phraseology of Modern Russian]. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola, 1985. 160 pp.