

## INTERLINGUAL PHRASEOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCES

**Mavlonova Nargiza Alisherovna**

*Associate Professor (PhD)*

*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

*e-mail: [mavlonovanargiza@mail.ru](mailto:mavlonovanargiza@mail.ru)*

**Abstract.** *This article examines phraseological calquing as the most productive mechanism for the formation of interlingual phraseological correspondences, with particular reference to English, Russian, and Uzbek. Drawing on the theoretical approaches of scientists the study defines phraseological calques as phraseological units formed through exact or approximate reproduction of the lexico-grammatical structure and semantic scope of foreign phraseological expressions.*

**Keywords:** *phraseological calquing; interlingual phraseological correspondence; phraseological borrowing; contrastive phraseology; socio-political phraseology.*

N. M. Shansky proposes the following definition of a phraseological calque: “a phraseological unit that appeared in the Russian language as a result of a literal, i.e. word-for-word, translation of a foreign expression” [1]. The same idea is expressed by U. Weinreich, L. A. Bulakhovsky, and A. A. Reformatsky, who define phraseological calquing as a literal translation of expressions by their constituent parts [2].

In particular, M. M. Kopylenko understands phraseological calquing as “the borrowing of combinability (coincidence of lexical combinability and violation of sememic combinability), as a result of which a lexico-semantic unit of foreign origin arises. The foreign element in the case of a phraseological calque is a particular sememe that is actualized in a given combination by the lexemes of the donor language and is in fact absent from the system of the recipient language. ... Such combinations appear in the Uzbek language as a result of the assimilation of new realities and the borrowing of the combinability of Russian lexemes that name them” [3].

In the present study, we understand phraseological calques in a broad sense and define them as phraseological units that arise as a result of exact or approximate reproduction of the lexico-grammatical structures and semantic volumes of originally foreign phraseological units by means of the borrowing language.

Possibly due to the frequency of use, familiarity, loss of foreignness of expressions, and in some cases the absence of etymological data concerning these linguistic units, many phraseological units were calqued into Uzbek as “originally Russian.” For example:

toshbaqa qadam — “черепаший шаг” (turtle step), ko‘z bo‘yamoq — “втирать очки” (to pull the wool over someone’s eyes), Hechdan ko‘ra kech bo‘lsa ham yaxshi — “Better late than never,” Haqiqat yaxshi, ammo baxt undan-da yaxshi — “Truth is good, but happiness is better,” Sariq chaqasi yo‘q edi, mana tillo ham bo‘ldi — “He had not a penny, and suddenly he has gold,” Er yigit elingni bil, oxirgi qo‘nar yeringni bil — “Every cricket should know its own hearth,” and many others.

The method of etymologization is the principal one in determining borrowed phraseological units. As an example, the following may be cited: English honeymoon — Russian медовый месяц — Uzbek asal oyi. In this case, the Russian phraseological unit медовый месяц penetrated into the Uzbek language as a result of phraseological calquing; however, as N. M. Shansky notes, this phraseological unit itself is a calque from French. It should be emphasized that the formation of many phraseological correspondences in the Uzbek language contributed to its integration into the world cultural heritage.

As N. M. Shansky rightly observes, “phraseological calquing in a number of cases leads to the emergence of such Russian word combinations in which syntactic relations and semantic connections between words do not correspond to the rules and laws existing in the Russian language. This circumstance may later affect the development of new figurative meanings and new models of word combinability” [4]. An example is the formation of the phraseological calque борьба за существование (“struggle for existence”) from the English struggle for life.

Among all other types of phraseological borrowings, calques constitute the largest proportion in the compared languages. In recent years, the formation of phraseological calques has been most productive in the socio-political sphere of language. In this regard, A. D. Reichstein comes to the following conclusion: “The highest degree of equivalence is characteristic of phraseological units typical of public communication styles — journalistic, scientific-technical, and official-business — and the lowest of those whose use is limited to colloquial speech and especially vernacular; in journalism, the proportion of phraseological units possessing structural-semantic equivalents in the compared languages reaches 40–45% (cf. the average indicator for German and Russian phraseology as a whole, about 27%)” [5].

He further writes: “In the modern period, the international character of political, economic, and scientific-technical development is directly reflected in the language of science and journalism, that is, in scientific-technical and journalistic styles of speech. It is precisely here that new information of international significance is most actively transmitted across national borders and receives similar linguistic expression in many languages. Moreover, interlingual contacts are not only realized most intensively and оперативно through journalism, but it is precisely in this sphere that they simultaneously generate a

need for expressive and evaluative means of nomination of new objective phenomena, including through phraseological units. ... Finally, from journalism, phraseological units gradually penetrate into fiction and everyday speech, increasing the degree of their interlingual phraseological equivalence” [6].

As noted by N. M. Shansky and F. P. Filin, in the process of international linguistic interaction, the main source of phraseological calques is the English language and its American variant [7].

Numerous phraseological calques present in the Uzbek language were borrowed not directly from English but through Russian as an intermediary language.

A contrastive study of Russian–Uzbek phraseological parallels with English phraseological units indicates that the analysis involves phraseological units of languages that are typologically unrelated.

Phraseological calques that are very similar in structural and semantic terms to English phraseological units occur relatively rarely, for example: English White House — Russian Белый дом — Uzbek Oq uy; Russian phraseological calque синие воротнички — Uzbek phraseological calque ko‘k yoqalar, from the English phraseological unit blue-collar worker, blue-collar; Russian phraseological calque новый курс — Uzbek phraseological calque yangi odimlar, whose source is the English phraseological unit New Deal.

In calquing or partial calquing, both the figurative meaning and the component structure of the phraseological unit may be preserved, for example: English the ship of the desert — Russian корабль пустыни (camel) — Uzbek sahro kemasi, tuya; English fire water (American colloquial) — “огненная вода,” alcoholic beverages — Uzbek ichni yondiruvchi ichimlik, spirtli ichimlik.

There are also identical traditions in the use of phraseological units with an adjectival component invariant: English the Third World — Russian третий мир; Uzbek phraseological calque uchinchi dunyo mamlakat — Russian calqued formation третьи страны; English Star Wars programme — Russian программа “звёздных войн” — Uzbek “yulduzli urush” dasturi.

Variants as well as synonymy in the field of phraseology were established as interlingual phraseological correspondences for specific linguistic units: English round table conference — Russian встреча / беседа за “круглым столом”, “круглый стол” — Uzbek davra suhbat, hangoma, dumaloq stol; English the Cold War — Russian холодная война — Uzbek sovuq urush.

The formation of phraseological units with the component cold, холодный, sovuq, which demonstrate different degrees of productivity, is one of the many reasons for the

impossibility of one-word transmission of calqued words in Uzbek phraseological units and lexico-semantic correspondences in Russian.

The terminological phraseological unit *sovuq qurol* (“cold weapon”) was formed in the Uzbek language relatively recently. Incidentally, it should be noted that even in such closely related languages as Uzbek and Kyrgyz, significant discrepancies are observed both in component composition and in historical origin. For example, the Kyrgyz phraseological unit *kansyz sogush* (literally “bloodless war”) corresponds to the Uzbek phraseological unit *sovuq urush* (“cold war”). It should also be noted that extralinguistic factors played a decisive role in the formation of the Uzbek phraseological equivalent *sovuq urush*.

Based on the study of phraseological correspondences in English, Russian, and Uzbek, we have arrived at the following conclusions:

In recent times, calquing from English as a source language has become the most intensive process and method of forming phraseological correspondences in Russian and Uzbek, particularly within socio-political vocabulary and phraseology.

The tendency to form phraseological calques according to foreign models is connected both with the general process of integration of language communities and with linguistic factors. It should be noted that certain changes in the component structure of phraseological units are conditioned by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors. This can be explained by the existence of linguistic units characterized by unequal phrase-forming productivity, as well as by differences in the semantic scope of words, among other factors.

As research materials show, in some cases phraseological calquing produces specific results that can be explained by differences in grammatical structures and word combinability of components within the structure of phraseological units.

The presence of variants of phraseological units in a particular socio-political context is explained by the ongoing process of formation of Uzbek terminological phraseological units whose components belong to socio-political vocabulary.

### Literature

1. Шанский Н. М. Фразеология современного русского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, 1985. – 160 с.; Шанский Н.М. О фразеологизме как языковой единице и предмете фразеологии // Проблемы устойчивости и вариантности фразеологических единиц. – Тула: 1968. -14 с.

2. Вайнрайх У. Языковые контакты. Состояние и проблемы исследования. Перевод с англ. и комментарии. Ю.А. Жлуктенко; вступит. ст. В.Н. Ярцевой. — Киев: Вища школа, 1979. — 264 с. Вайнрайх У. Одноязычие и многоязычие. /Новое в

лингвистике. - Вып. 6. Языковые контакты. - М.:1972. - С. 25-60. Булаховский Л. А. Введение в языкознание: Часть 1, 2 / Л. А. Булаховский, А. С. Чикобава. — М.: Учпедгиз, 1952-1953. 174 с. Реформатский А. А. Введение в языковедение. - 4 изд. испр. и доп.— М.: Просвещение, 1967. — 542 с.

3. Копыленко М.М., Попова З. Д. Очерки по общей фразеологии (фразеосочетания в системе языка). –Воронеж: ВГУ, 1989. – 191 с.

4. Шанский Н.М. Лексические и фразеологические кальки в русском языке / Н.М. Шанский Русский язык в школе. - М., 1955. - 201с.

5. Райхштейн А. Д. Сопоставительный анализ немецкой и русской фразеологии: Учебное пособие для институтов и факультетов иностранных языков. – М.: Высшая школа, 1980. – 143 с.

6. Шанский Н.М. О фразеологизме как языковой единице и предмете фразеологии // Проблемы устойчивости и вариантности фразеологических единиц. – Тула: 1968. 7-14 с.; Филин Ф.П. Очерки по теории языкознания. Избранные труды: к 100-летию со дня рождения Изд. 2, дораб. и доп. 2008. 416 с.

7. Mavlonova, N. On the Issue of the Typology of Phraseological Combinations. Foreign Philology: Language, Literature, Education, 2018, Vol. 3, No. 3 (68), pp. 1–73.

8. Alisherovna, M. N. On the Comparative Study of Phraseology at the Present Stage. Central Asian Journal of Mathematical Theory and Computer Sciences, 2021, Vol. 2, No. 9, pp. 4–8.

9. Mavlonova, N. Independent Emergence of Interlingual Phraseological Correspondences. Foreign Philology: Language, Literature, Education, 2019, No. 4 (73), pp. 59–63.