



**VOLUME 9, SEPTEMBER 2026**

ISSN: 3060-4958



**UZBEKISTAN STATE WORLD  
LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY**

**MORE INFO:**

[www.lingvospektr.uz](http://www.lingvospektr.uz)



[t.me/thelinguaspectrum](https://t.me/thelinguaspectrum)



## CONTENTS

| LINGUISTICS                                   |                                                                                                                                       | 4   |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Sapayeva B.R.</b>                          | The Artistic Interpretation of the Heroic Figure in Ancient Eastern Epics such as "Gilgamesh" and the "Shahnameh"                     | 5   |
| <b>Mamarasulova G.A.</b>                      | Translating Political Intent in Uzbek-English Presidential Discourse                                                                  | 11  |
| <b>Abdullaeva R.X.</b>                        | National-cultural specifics of reflecting the aesthetic assessment of a person in the proverbial linguistic worldview                 | 21  |
| <b>Ibragimova Sh.N.</b>                       | Why Does AI Understand Some People Better Than Others? A Linguistic Perspective on Human-AI Communication and the Changing Human Mind | 33  |
| <b>Khalliyeva G.I.,<br/>Bazarbayeva J.M.</b>  | The Scholarly Study of Bobojon Sanoiy's Works                                                                                         | 41  |
| <b>Rustamova D. M.</b>                        | Phraseology and the dynamics of suspicion: a comparative linguocultural framework for Uzbek and English detective novels              | 51  |
| <b>Usmanaliyeva S.R.</b>                      | Semantic structure of national-cultural scripts in English and Uzbek phraseological units: a comparative-cognitive analysis           | 62  |
| <b>Talibjanova A.L.</b>                       | The Specificity of Youth Slang in English Journalistic Discourse                                                                      | 71  |
| <b>Akhmedova G.Ya.</b>                        | Comparative-typological analysis of the concept "loneliness" in English and Uzbek lexicographical sources                             | 78  |
| <b>Khakimova D.I.</b>                         | Intensity and Typology of Hybridization within Digital Platforms (Materials from Telegram, TikTok, Instagram, Facebook)               | 85  |
| <b>Ismatov J.I.</b>                           | Contemporary Trends in the Development of English Cultural Linguistics: Insights from Recent UK Studies                               | 95  |
| <b>Borijonova G.Z.</b>                        | Jean Rhys's Postcolonial Feminist Response to Brontë's Jane Eyre                                                                      | 102 |
| <b>Nazarova G.A.</b>                          | The introduction and adaptation of English loanwords into the Uzbek language in the context of globalization                          | 111 |
| <b>Olimova M.X.</b>                           | Artistic interpretations of the symbol of seven in Uzbek national literary thought                                                    | 122 |
| <b>Kuchkarov Sh.A.</b>                        | Transformation of the information and communication environment under the influence of generative artificial intelligence             | 129 |
| <b>Djumabayeva J.Sh.,<br/>Atadjanova M.I.</b> | Classification of adverbs in English and Uzbek linguistics: similarities and differences in theoretical approaches                    | 138 |
| <b>Usmonov O.I.<br/>Mukhiddinova D.Sh.</b>    | Pragmatics of indirect speech in the Russian and Uzbek communicative space                                                            | 149 |
| <b>Sodiqova S.I.,<br/>Mukhiddinova D.Sh.</b>  | Beyond the proper name: secondary person nominations as markers of social identity in digital media discourse                         | 156 |

---

**Phraseology and the dynamics  
of suspicion: a comparative  
linguocultural framework for  
Uzbek and English detective novels**

**Rustamova Durdonaxon  
Muhammadsoli qizi**  
*durdonarustamova0728@gmail.com*  
Doctoral Researcher,  
Tashkent State Transport University

**Annotation** *This essay proposes a comparative linguistic framework for investigating how phraseological units shape suspicion in Uzbek and English detective novels. Suspicion is described as a temporary attribution of concealed wrongdoing that differs from ambiguity, fear, and an established charge. Using phraseology, discourse posture, and cultural linguistics, the paper ties conventional meaning to speaker position, evidential grounding, narrative perspective, and subsequent changes in investigative focus. The proposed approach classifies the initiation, intensification, redirection, suspension, and revision of suspicion as contextually determined functions. Constructed bilingual examples explain why identical meanings do not imply equivalent narrative consequences, and why emotional emotions require contextual validation. The article also lays out criteria for corpus selection, annotation, and culturally responsible comparison. Its contribution is a method for transitioning from expressions to suspicion trajectories without viewing language variations as proof of fixed national mentalities. The work serves as a foundation for future empirical research, literary interpretation, and cross-linguistic translation of investigative discourse.*

**Keywords** *Phraseology, dynamics of suspicion, detective novel, comparative linguocultural analysis, discourse stance, narrative perspective, cultural conceptualisation*

---

**Frazeologiya va gumon dinamikasi:  
o'zbek va ingliz detektiv  
romanlarini qiyosiy lingvomadaniy  
tahlil qilish modeli**

**Rustamova Durdonaxon  
Muhammadsoli qizi**  
*durdonarustamova0728@gmail.com*  
Doktorant,  
Toshkent davlat transport universiteti

**Annotatsiya** *Ushbu maqolada o'zbek va ingliz detektiv romanlarida frazeologik birliklarning gumon shakllanishi hamda o'zgarishidagi ishtirokini o'rganish uchun qiyosiy lingvomadaniy tahlil modeli ishlab chiqiladi. Gumon yashirin noqonuniy yoki nomaqbul xatti-harakat haqidagi dastlabki taxmin sifatida talqin qilinib, noaniqlik, xavotir, qat'iy ayblovdan farqlanadi. Frazeologiya, diskursiv pozitsiya, va madaniy tilshunoslik yondashuvlari asosida turg'un ma'no so'zlovchining pozitsiyasi, daliliy asos, narrativ nuqtayi nazar hamda tergovdagi e'tibor o'zgarishlari bilan bog'lanadi. Model gumonning paydo bo'lishi, kuchayishi, boshqa shaxsga yo'naltirilishi, vaqtincha to'xtatilishi va qayta ko'rib chiqilishini kontekstga bog'liq vazifalar sifatida ajratadi. Ikki tilli misollar ma'no yaqinligi narrativ ta'sir tengligini kafolatlamasligini ko'rsatadi. Shuningdek, korpus tanlash, birliklarni belgilash va madaniy tafovutlarni ehtiyotkorlik bilan talqin qilish tamoyillari bayon etiladi. Maqolaning ilmiy hissasi alohida iboralardan gumon rivojlanishiga otishning izchil tahliliy tartibini taklif etishdan iborat. Bunda til farqlari o'zgarimas milliy tafakkur belgisi sifatida talqin*

*qilinmaydi. Taklif etilgan yondashuv keyingi empirik tadqiqotlar, badiiy matn talqini va tergov diskursini tarjima qilish uchun asos yaratadi.*

**Kalit so'zlar** *Frazeologiya, gumon dinamikasi, detektiv roman, qiyosiy lingvomadaniy tahlil, diskursiv pozitsiya, narrativ nuqtayi nazar, madaniy konseptuallashtirish*

---

**Фразеология и динамика  
подозрения: сравнительная  
лингвокультурная модель  
анализа узбекских и английских  
детективных романов**

**Рустамова Дурдонахон  
Мухаммадсоли кизи**  
*durdonarustamova0728@gmail.com*  
Докторант,  
Ташкентский государственный  
транспортный университет

**Аннотация** *В статье разрабатывается сравнительная лингвокультурная модель изучения роли фразеологических единиц в формировании и изменении подозрения в узбекских и английских детективных романах. Подозрение определяется как предварительное предположение о скрытом неблагоприятном действии и разграничивается с неопределённостью, тревогой и категорическим обвинением. На основе фразеологии, теории дискурсивного позиционирования и культурной лингвистики устойчивое значение соотносится с позицией говорящего, доказательными основаниями, повествовательной перспективой и последующим перераспределением внимания в расследовании. Предлагаемая модель выделяет возникновение, усиление, перенаправление, приостановление и пересмотр подозрения как контекстуально обусловленные функции. Сконструированные двуязычные примеры показывают, почему семантическая близость не гарантирует одинакового повествовательного эффекта, а эмоциональные выражения требуют проверки в контексте. Определяются принципы отбора корпуса, аннотирования и обоснованного сопоставления культурных значений. Научный вклад статьи заключается в разработке прозрачной процедуры перехода от выражений к траекториям подозрения без отождествления языковых различий с неизменными национальными особенностями мышления. Модель предназначена для эмпирических исследований, интерпретации произведений и перевода следственного дискурса с учётом различий между языковыми средствами и повествовательными задачами текста.*

**Ключевые слова** *Фразеология, динамика подозрения, детективный роман, сравнительный лингвокультурный анализ, дискурсивная позиция, повествовательная перспектива, культурная концептуализация*

---

**Introduction**

Suspicion is a key organising element in the detective story because of the way the

inquiry evolves through opposing interpretations of insufficient facts. As comments, things and actions acquire new

significance, a person is suspicious, under consideration or provisionally cleared. Phraseological terms are involved in these shifts by making distrust recognisable, limiting commitment to an allegation and urging another character to share or resist an interpretation. So their contribution is more than just describing a psychological state. An expression can structure the shift of attention from an unexplained event to a probable agent and, subsequently, from that agent to an alternate explanation.

A comparison of Uzbek and English detective novels should acknowledge the difference between a term being available in a language and its purpose in a certain narrative. In one conversation, a common idiom may express scepticism; in another, it may report someone else's assessment; and later evidence may refute that judgement, making the idiom ironic. Conversely, an expression that would normally be linked with discomfort could have relevance to suspicion if the context signals possible lying. Merely listing idioms and providing them with translations cannot explain these disparities. The analytical difficulty is to relate conventional phraseological meaning to the shifting distribution of belief and responsibility in a story.

This article is a theoretical and methodological framing, and not a completed corpus examination. This raises three questions: which expressions are candidates for a phraseological analysis of suspicion, how the local discursive functions of these expressions can be connected to longer investigative developments, and under which evidential conditions the differences between Uzbek and English texts provide a basis for a cultural interpretation. The contribution is a process for relating expression, context, trajectory and comparison explicitly. Constructed examples illustrate how it works; they are not quotations taken from published novels and therefore give no foundation for making assertions about frequency in any literary tradition.

### **Literature review**

The phraseological expression of suspicion in detective fiction can be studied at the junction of phraseology, discourse position, narrative analysis and cultural linguistics. Each perspective speaks to a distinct aspect of the interaction between conventional phrases and the interpretation of probable misdeeds. Together they give a platform to examine the introduction, negotiation and modification of suspicion in Uzbek and English detective fiction.

Phraseological research indicates the necessity of differentiation of traditional multiword formulations from freely generated combinations. Moon's (1998) corpus-based study locates fixed statements in their textual contexts, showing the relevance of contextual analysis for their interpretation. This view is especially helpful in detective fiction, because the same expression can have several meanings depending on who is speaking, who is being addressed, and where one is in the inquiry. Thus, although the recognition of an idiom's conventional meaning is a crucial starting point, it is not sufficient to account for its narrative contribution.

As for the phraseology of the Uzbek language, there is an explanatory phraseological dictionary by Rahmatullayev (1978) as a lexicographic source for the search for set expressions and control of their meanings. Such resources allow to distinguish fixed phraseological units from restricted combinations and occasional figurative constructs. But dictionary description and literary interpretation are separate kinds of work. A dictionary can tell us if an expression is standard or not, but the narrative purpose of an expression can only be investigated by looking at the paragraph where it appears.

This technique is enriched through the notion of attitude which adds an interactional dimension. According to Du Bois (2007), taking a stand connects appraisal, positioning and alignment. In investigative discourse a character examines an explanation or a person,

states a degree of commitment, and may invite another participant to adopt that rating. Thus, suspicion can be seen not just as an internal psychological state, but as a stance negotiated between players. A tentative comment, a straightforward challenge and an ironic repeat may concern the same alleged act but set up various connections between speakers.

Cultural linguistics offers a framework to study the conceptual links that give meaning to such evaluations. Sharifian (2017) analyses linkages between linguistic and cultural conceptualisations. Within the domain of phraseology this view calls for a study of the assumptions that go with trust, inward sentiment, reputation, authority and interpersonal obligation. But the fact that a particular image exists does not, in itself, establish a distinctive national mentality. If it is a question of phrases which have to do with the heart, or seeing, or hiding, they are to be understood according to their usual significance and ordinary circumstances.

Genre study, too, emphasises the need for a precisely circumscribed comparison. Priestman's (2003) collected collection of crime-writing traditions suggests that detective fiction is part of a larger, internally heterogeneous literary realm. The way suspicion is built can differ between mystery narratives, police investigations and other crime-centred formats. A comparison of Uzbek and English novels must take into account the language, subgenre, period of publishing, narrative perspective and kind of investigator.

Taken together, these techniques provide support for a distinction between an expression's lexical status, its local discourse function and its broader narrative relevance. This article puts these factors together in a comparative context. Its main focus is on the interaction of conventional phraseological meaning and contextual evidence in the attribution and revision of suspicion. This analysis is followed by a cultural interpretation which requires support from more than isolated examples.

### **Research methodology**

The study is qualitative and conceptual in design. It constructs an analytical framework from a selective synthesis of relevant knowledge and demonstrates its use using created bilingual cases. It does not describe a finished corpus study, a quantitative frequency analysis, or a reader-response experiment. The aim is to present particular criteria which may lead the next empirical research on Uzbek and English detective novels.

The conceptual framework draws on studies in phraseology, discourse position, cultural conceptualisation and crime fiction. Conventional meaning is discussed with the help of lexicographic materials. The English idioms involved in the illustrative analysis enjoy the dictionary support; the Uzbek candidate expressions need further lexicographic verification before their inclusion in the empirical phraseological data set. Constructed examples are used to demonstrate analytical distinctions, and are not offered as citations from published literary works.

Methodology starts with the definition of suspicion apart from the forms in which it is communicated. Suspicion is the tentative assignment of possible deception or hidden wrong to a person, act, event, or explanation. It differs from generic ambiguity in that it introduces the possibility of misbehaviour. It is different from anxiety in that it entails an attribution, not only the feeling of unease or danger to come. A passage may have several of these stages, but analytic boundaries do not become blurred.

The second phase disentangles phraseological eligibility from suspect relevance. Phraseological eligibility is about conventionality, multiword structure, semantic specialisation and limits on lexical combination. Suspicion relevance is the contextual link between the expression and potential misbehaviour. An phrase may meet one requirement but fail the other. A direct expression of mistrust can be compositionally obvious. An established idiom of emotional

distress can express uneasiness without implying fraud.

The central unit of analysis is the suspicion episode. This includes an utterance and enough surrounding conversation to determine the holder of the suspicion, its target, its apparent trigger, and its immediate repercussions. Depending on the paragraph, the episode may be spread over multiple phrases or an exchange between characters. Its limits are not set by a definite number of sentences but by interpretive needs.

Each episode is analysed along six dimensions: phraseological form and conventional meaning; holder and target; offered evidential basis; degree of commitment; narrative viewpoint; and interactional uptake. Special attention is given to negation, questioning, hedging, reported speech and irony, which can affect the relationship between an utterance and the viewpoint assigned to its speaker.

Then the episode is tied into the unfolding investigation. Suspicion can be changed in five ways: commencement, intensification, redirection, suspension, and revision. Maintenance is recorded separately if an expression keeps an existing place without showing a perceptible difference. These are analytical options, not prescriptive steps, and an episode can execute more than one function.

Comparative interpretation moves from language form to discourse function and finally to possible cultural relevance. Rather of being judged by its exact translation, an expression is judged by what it does in context. The system requires verified source passages, transparent inclusion criteria, independently evaluated annotation, and a corpus that accounts for variance among authors, times, and subgenres for future empirical use.

### **Defining suspicion and Phraseological eligibility**

Suspicion is thus defined as the tentative attribution of hidden misbehaviour or deception to an identifiable or inferable person,

group, act, or explanation. There is an unworked out possibility of wrongdoing and a target to which that possibility relates, and there is an incomplete commitment. The target need not be a specific suspect: a character may think an apparently incidental event was prepared before deciding who arranged it. The definition is analytical, not legalistic. It also permits a character to intentionally express mistrust without privately believing the charge.

Uncertainty entails imperfect information but does not necessarily imply misbehaviour. Anxiety is anticipation of trouble or danger, and it need not include a trickster actor. An accusation is clearly laying the blame on someone, but it can still be made without sufficient evidence. These states can co-exist but they should not be blended in annotation. Fear following a violent event is not necessarily suspicion, and suspicion is relevant when the context of the discourse shows what is in dispute and what is at stake in the form of deception or hidden responsibility.

The admissibility of the phraseology and the pertinency of the suspicion are different questions. Eligibility is a traditional multi-word form, with possible attested grammatical and lexical variety, and semantic specialisation or restricted combination. Relevance requires contextual evidence that the remark introduces, maintains, adjusts or resists an attribution of prospective guilt. So, a simple remark like "I suspect the driver" can identify a suspicion event without being part of the phraseological dataset. Conversely, an idiom of worry can be present in the phraseological inventory and not included in the subset of suspicion.

Rahmatullayev's (1978) phraseological dictionary provides a well-established reference point for lexical verification for Uzbek. Before assigning a definition, variation or usage constraints to a corpus item, it is necessary to consult a genuine entry; bibliographic recognition is not sufficient. They can similarly support eligibility for English

dictionary resources. The Cambridge Dictionary defines the phrase “smell a rat” as an expression that means to suspect that something is wrong or someone is trying to deceive you (Cambridge University Press, n.d.-b). Such evidence is evidence of customary meaning, but it is not proof of occurrence in a particular novel, nor is it evidence of the expression’s role in that novel.

Separate candidate registry should be maintained for the borderline cases till their status is resolved. For instance, not all transparent pairings in Uzbek with *gumon* or *shubha* and in English with *suspicion* or *doubt* should be allowed on account of the presence of appropriate words. A replicable study notes the lexical source, reason for inclusion and any uncertainty. This prevents a more general definition for one language becoming deceptive, implying that its literature has greater phraseology of suspicion.

### **An analytical model of Suspicion dynamics**

The main contextual unit of the proposed paradigm is the suspicion episode. An episode is an expression with sufficient prior and subsequent discourse to recover its aim, trigger, attribution, and instantaneous uptake. Sentence boundaries are inadequate when a pronoun goes back to an earlier suspect or when a later reaction modifies the force of a speech. And at the same time the analyst should hold a local reading up to the end; subsequent knowledge cannot be transferred backward into what a character may know at the point of speaking.

Each episode is characterised in terms of six dimensions: The first one is the phraseological form and the usual meaning. The second is the object of suspicion and its subject. The third is the basis provided, e.g. observable behaviour, witness, contradiction, hearsay, intuition. The fourth is commitment: negation, questioning, hedging, emphasis and attribution to another speaker. The fifth is narrative access, which differentiates between spoken dialogue, reported thought, and

narratorial presentation. The sixth is uptake, whether another participant receives, challenges, dismisses, or acts on the evaluation. These dimensions refer to literary evidence, not numerical odds of guilt.

Five main functions are related to the examination of an occurrence. Initiation opens the door to the possibility of hidden evil. Intensification raises the salience or commitment to an existing suspicion in the conversation. Redirection alters the target of focus or changes the suspected act. Suspension is the suspension of unfavourable judgement in the face of ambiguity. The revision reconsiders a previous suspicion based on fresh facts, which may either restore trust or prove a seemingly convincing claim to be incorrect. An episode can execute more than one function. The primary function should be justified by a local consequence, a secondary label if needed.

These functions do not have to be done in succession. Suspicion is fleeting; one target can be cleared temporarily just to be replaced by another suspect. Not all idioms generate a transition, either. Some statements only reiterate a position already taken. Such cases should be labelled maintenance rather than being forced into one of the five change functions. If the study is to be understood as a study of dynamics rather than solely of the presence of suspicion vocabulary, it is important to differentiate change from maintenance.

We should annotate character posture and reader positioning individually. A witness can clearly clear a suspect, but the way the story is told may raise doubts about that dismissal. Ironically, an investigator may echo another character’s idiom and therefore undermine that other character’s authority without actually asserting the opposite. The analyst should indicate the textual basis for a predicted reader effect, e.g. a contradiction, a focalisation shift, a subsequent correction. Without the reader-response data, it is more accurate to speak about an invitation to infer, rather than to say that all readers actually become suspicious.

### **Illustrative bilingual analysis**

The location of characters and the arrangement of the reader must be recorded individually. A witness may firmly eliminate a suspect from suspicion, but the framing of the narrative may call that rejection into question. An investigator may ironically echo the idiom of another character and therefore undermine the authority of that other character without actually asserting the opposite. The analyst should note the textual basis for a potential reader effect, for example a contradiction, a focalisation change, a later correction. Without the reader-response data, it is more accurate to speak about an invitation to infer, rather than to say that all readers actually become suspicious.

For example, the English statement "When the witness changed his account again, the inspector smelt a rat." The trigger is a contradiction in testimony. The holder is the inspector. The target is the explanation or the honesty of the witness. The idiom hints at deceit as the possible explanation but does not establish the offence or guilt. Such attribution is suspected if the previous discourse has not offered it. If the inspector already has reservations about the witness, the same phrase could strengthen or maintain that assessment. This difference is based on the history of the occurrence, not on an imagined fixed force of the phrase.

An Uzbek illustrative parallel is "Guvoh gapini yana o'zgartirgach, tergovchini ko'ngliga g'ulg'ula tushdi" provisionally glossed as the investigator getting inwardly concerned as the witness changed his account again. A possibility for interior disturbance is suggested as here ko'ngliga g'ulg'ula tushmoq. The contradiction allows one to suspect foul play, although the term itself does not indicate any crime. Follow-up on the safety of the witness could be more anxiety-inducing instead. Therefore, it cannot be simply considered as a full equal of "smell a rat". Context must determine if the unease is toward suspected deception.

The distinction demonstrates an imbalance of procedure rather than a national psychological difference. In the English case the standard meaning already foregrounds possible untruthfulness. The proposed suspicion reading in the Uzbek case is more trigger- and continuation-dependent. The next phase in research would be to check the conventional senses of the Uzbek candidate and to investigate its real distribution in combination with more clear distrust expressions. From these two statements, it would be unwarranted to infer that English investigators are rational, whereas Uzbek investigators are emotional. Both sentences associate a reaction with the identical evidential disparity.

Suspension can be expressed by "For now I will give him the benefit of doubt. The phrase, Cambridge University Press (n.d.-a) notes, is liable to a positive reading even when a negative one is possible. It can suspend the adverse judgement in the midst of an investigation without removing the suspect from the picture. The Uzbek version "Hozircha uni ayblamay turaman" offers a similar statement of the temporary deferral of responsibility, but the phrase is a functional paraphrasing, not a stated phraseological match. A comparison that counted both as equivalent idioms would confuse similarity of goal of conversation with similarity of linguistic form.

Finally, consider a query with a suspicion idiom: "Do you smell a rat, or are we missing an ordinary mistake?" The inquiry provides an alternate explanation and solicits agreement without committing the speaker to deceit. To negate the idiom, as would be required to quote it to insult someone else's judgement, a different analysis would be required. These examples illustrate the unsoundness of looking for an expression and classifying every occurrence as increasing suspicion. The familiar phrase, depending on clause type, attribution, and surrounding alternatives, advances, tests, or resists a claim.

### **Principles for an empirical Uzbek and English comparison**

The application for the future must begin with a clearly demarcated corpus of novels initially authored in Uzbek and English. "English" must be understood as a linguistic category, a national literary category, or both. British and American literature should not be treated as a monolithic group and then labelled as one national culture. Publication time and subgenre. Narrative person and type of investigator. Approximate length. Works should be picked for their recognised investigative structure rather than for their commercial classification alone. As translator decisions can impact the phraseological distribution, a translation corpus should be examined individually.

Selection should be made for multiple authors in each language, so that preferences of one writer do not become evidence for a whole tradition. Where close historical matching is not possible this should be clear and interpretations correspondingly limited. A more limited, well contextualised comparison may be more illuminating than a wider body of novels that vary on every significant characteristic. The aim is not to destroy the literary distinctiveness but to separate it from patterns which repeat outside one author or narrative genre.

Extraction should be a combination of lexical searches and attentive reading of investigative scenarios. Searches for *gumon*, *shubha*, *doubt*, *suspicious* and variants of pertinent expressions may find initial locations but cannot return all indirect or modified idiom. Searches on Uzbek need to allow for inflection and uneven encoding of apostrophes. In both languages attention is needed to discontinuous or creatively modified forms. Each kept occurrence needs a solid source location, the precise wording, a record of the usual form, and suitable context. Where there may be inaccuracies in the digitised version, the search output should be checked against the published edition.

In the annotation record, lexical verification and narrative interpretation have to be distinguished. expression, source location, eligibility proof, holder, target, trigger, presented basis, commitment, narrative perspective, uptake, local function Another field links the episode with previous and subsequent episodes with the same aim. Another area notes the final outcome of the story, if the text offers one. Missing information must remain missing: an unexplained intuition must not be quietly recoded as an inference from evidence just because the investigator turns out to be right later on.

A shared pilot sample should be coded independently by at least two competent readers before full coding. Disagreement about phraseological eligibility should not be conflated with disagreement about the relevance or function of suspicion. Such disagreement can be resolved by revising the codebook to make the limits clearer, but then prior situations have to be rethought in a consistent way. Agreement statistics, if calculated, should be reported with the sample size, category distribution and a description of the way conflicts were handled. The present article does not claim to have undertaken this technique hence no agreement values are reported.

Proper denominators are needed for quantitative comparison. Textual density is delineated by the frequency of occurrences per a predetermined number of words, whereas the contribution of phraseology to the pertinent discourse is conveyed by the proportions within all identified suspicion episodes. These measures answer different questions, and should be reported individually. The expression types, the occurrence tokens and the functional categories have to be different as well. With enough texts, studies can control for diversity by novel and author; with a small corpus, descriptive comparisons and closely supported readings are better than broad statistical statements. Absence from a tiny sample means no absence from the language.

Cultural interpretation has to follow patterns of exhibited speech. A good parallel is to consider who can raise suspicion in public, whose intuition gets authority, how reputation impacts the receipt of an allegation and when interpersonal commitments urge its suspension. These questions can be applied symmetrically both English and Uzbek materials. Rather than pre-determining the relevance of concepts such as family standing, professional experience, neighbourhood knowledge, institutional trust and personal devotion to one language, they need to be introduced to the analysis when narrative evidence suggests their relevance.

Three levels of comparison should be distinguished: Formal comparison looks at the phrasing and imagery of expressions. Functional comparison considers the work done by such expressions in matching episodes. Cultural interpretation explores the societal assumptions that render the evaluations credible, offensive, constrained, or convincing. One level of similarity doesn't answer the others. Both of them may tentatively re-open an investigation, but with different body pictures. A closely translated expression can be confrontational in one encounter and confidential in another since the participant relationships are different.

Such a credible cultural claim thus demands repetition, contextual confirmation, and examination of alternatives. Where a pattern recurs across numerous authors, corresponds to an explicit narrative portrayal of social obligations, and continues in analogous scenarios, it is a candidate for cultural interpretation. But even so, counterexamples count. It might critique the suspicions of a community, expose the bias of a profession, or satirise the assumptions we inherit. Literary representation can reproduce a cultural model as much as it can challenge it. Thus, the narrator, character, author, and speech community must be kept separate as analytic categories.

For translation, the framework makes the degree and direction of suspicion an operational requirement in addition to conventional meaning. Even a competent phrase in the target language might warp a situation if it translates unease into accusation, tentative alignment into assurance, or resolves an ambiguity which the plot requires to maintain. When evaluating a translation, we need to ask whether the aim is identical, whether the evidential basis remains and whether further revision is understandable. A clear paraphrase may better sustain these relations than an idiom whose connotations are too strong.

Keeping track of phraseological recurrence in literary analysis might demonstrate how a study reuses known vocabulary, but alters its authority. An expression uttered by an unreliable witness may be repeated later by the investigator with a different focus or sarcastic force. The contribution is to link such repetition to observable shifts in perception and evidence. The approach thereby permits a close reading without limiting narrative progression to a counting of isolated idioms, and its annotation rules make the logic available for review by other academics.

### **Results**

The study is conceptual and not empirical and does not give any results on the frequency and distribution of phraseological units in the Uzbek and English novels. Its findings have implications for the distinctions and processes needed to assess suspicion in a consistent way.

The first outcome is the dissociation of conventional meaning from contextual function. A phraseological unit is able to make the distrust available as an interpretation without deciding if the suspicion is introduced, strengthened, maintained or challenged. To show its dynamic contribution, it has to be compared with the previous narrative state and checked for subsequent uptake.

The second outcome is an inclusion technique in two steps. Each expression must

be analysed individually for phraseological admissibility and suspicion relevance. This distinction ensures that transparent expressions of suspicion do not automatically fall into the category of idioms, and idioms of worry are not automatically read as proof of suspected crime.

Third, a functional description of the genesis of suspicion. Types of change in an investigative position are initiation, escalation, redirection, suspension and revision. Maintenance means to see continuity without change. Taken together, these categories permit a study of repeated and reversible processes without imposing a predetermined progression from ambiguity to accusation.

The fourth result is the difference between formal correspondence and functional correspondence. Two expressions may be used for the same investigative objective, but they may differ in imagery, conventionality, or explicitness. Expressions that have similar dictionary definitions, however, may operate differently depending on the relationship between speakers, grammatical framing, or narrative point of view.

Fifth, the evidential needs of cultural interpretation are considered. Such an individual utterance may be a matter for future inquiry, but it cannot characterise a whole language community. Cultural pattern claims should recur across texts, be supported by contexts and accommodate authorial and generic variation.

Thus, the framework offers an operational basis for future research. It describes what to identify, what contextual features to record, and how to link local expressions to larger suspicion trajectories. It is an empirical question if these categories adequately explain patterns of Uzbek and English detective novels, and one to be answered on the basis of confirmed literary facts.

### Conclusion

Phraseology adds to the detective story by assisting speakers and narrators to suggest, negotiate, maintain and reassess possible wrongdoing. Its function is seen in the association of conventional meaning with a bearer, a goal, an evidence base, a narrative viewpoint and a further uptake. The proposed framework separates phraseological eligibility and suspicion relevance, as well as local stance and longer investigative growth. It also differentiates linguistic comparison from cultural explanation which needs to be grounded in repeated contextual data. This approach may be used to promote a more accountable investigation of the ways in which common terms contribute to the changing attribution of suspicion when applied to Uzbek and English detective novels. Its empirical usefulness depends on the existence of confirmed examples in texts, on clear annotations and on comparisons that maintain the diversity between authors, periods and storytelling traditions.

### References:

1. Cambridge University Press. (n.d.-a). Give someone the benefit of the doubt. In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved September 9, 2026, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/give-the-benefit-of-the-doubt>
2. Cambridge University Press. (n.d.-b). Smell a rat. In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved September 9, 2026, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/smell-a-rat>
3. Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. 139-182. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.164.07du>

4. Moon, R. (1998). *Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach*. Clarendon Press.
5. Priestman, M. (Ed.). (2003). *The Cambridge companion to crime fiction*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL0521803993>
6. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (1978). *O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati* [Explanatory phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language]. O'qituvchi.
7. Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural linguistics: Cultural conceptualisations and language*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/clsc.8>