

ТІЛ БІЛІМІНІҢ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ

ПРОБЛЕМЫ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЯ

PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTICS

IRSTI 16.31.02

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2026/iss2pp9-23](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2026/iss2pp9-23)

B. Abilova¹, *A. Asenova², R. Panzarbekova¹, A. Kapanova¹

¹International Astana University, Astana, 010000, Kazakhstan

²Sh.Ualikhanov Kokshetau University, Kokshetau, 020000, Kazakhstan

SEMANTIC SIMILARITIES OF FIXED EXPRESSIONS IN KAZAKH, RUSSIAN AND TURKISH

This study examines fixed expressions, including phraseological units, proverbs, and sayings, in three languages: Kazakh, Turkish, and Russian. The aim of the research is to identify semantic parallels and differences among these languages and to explore the cultural and cognitive features reflected in their fixed expressions. Comparative analysis of such linguistic units makes it possible to reveal shared mental patterns, common cognitive processes, and aspects of the life experience of different peoples. Fixed expressions were selected as the object of study because they provide valuable material for comparing semantic content, stylistic features, and structural models of linguistic expression. They also serve as important carriers of cultural values, folk wisdom, beliefs, everyday practices, and elements of national identity.

The study employs a combination of research methods, including semantic, structural, and linguistic contrastive analysis of fixed expressions in the three languages, as well as an examination of their functioning in folk and literary discourse. To ensure the reliability of the findings, a survey was conducted among students studying Kazakh, Russian, and Turkish, and contemporary lexicographic sources were analyzed. The results demonstrate that fixed expressions preserve the expressive potential of national languages and continue to function as markers of cultural identity and national values. At the same time, they reveal universal patterns in the perception and evaluation of human character, behavior, and activity. The study highlights the relevance of comparative phraseological research in the context of globalization and growing intercultural contacts, particularly in light of the increasing international interest in the Kazakh language and culture.

Key words: fixed linguistic expressions, semantic meaning, comparison, mental similarity, universality, differences in connotation.

MAIN PROVISIONS

The relevance of our study stems from the growing interest in comparative linguistics, intercultural communication, and the study of the national and cultural characteristics of languages. Fixed expressions (phraseological units, idioms, proverbs, and sayings) are linguistic manifestations of a people's mentality, reflecting their worldview, historical experience, and cultural values. The study of semantic similarities in fixed expressions in Kazakh, Russian, and Turkish allows us to identify common and distinctive features of the linguistic worldview of Turkic and Slavic peoples. Furthermore, in the context of globalization and the active development of international contacts, there is a growing need for a deeper understanding of the peculiarities of translating and interpreting phraseological units. The relevance of this research also lies in the fact that some idioms shift their emphasis or take on new meanings depending on changes in the surrounding reality. The results of

this study may be useful in the fields of mental linguistics, translation studies, linguoculturology, foreign language teaching, and intercultural communication.

The focus of our study is the linguistic worldview in Kazakh, Russian, and Turkish, as reflected in fixed expressions.

Research topic: Semantic similarities and socio-cultural characteristics of idioms in the Kazakh, Russian, and Turkish languages as means of representing the linguistic worldview. We examine the structural-semantic similarities, types of equivalence, and socio-cultural distinctiveness of fixed expressions in the thematic group “Man as an agent” in the languages under comparison.

Research Objective: To identify and describe the nature of semantic similarities, as well as the specific features of national and cultural differences in fixed expressions that characterize a person as an agent of action in the languages under comparison.

In order to achieve this objective, the following tasks must be addressed:

1. Examine the theoretical foundations of the study of fixed expressions within the framework of cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology.

2. Using the method of exhaustive sampling from lexicographic sources, compile a corpus of fixed expressions from the thematic group “Human as an agent of action” in Kazakh, Russian, and Turkish.

3. Classify the collected material into semantic subgroups (hard work, laziness, skill, quality of work).

4. Conduct a comparative analysis of the selected units and determine the degree of their equivalence (complete, partial, relative).

5. Identify cognitive models and national-cultural markers that determine the specific nature of how each of the three peoples perceives activity.

The semantic similarity of fixed expressions in the thematic group “Man as an Agent of Action” in Kazakh, Russian, and Turkish is systematic in nature and is based on the universality of human experience (evaluations of labor, laziness, skill, and determination). We hypothesize that:

1. The highest degree of semantic and structural identity (full equivalents) will be found between the cognate Kazakh and Turkish languages.

2. The similarity between the Turkic languages and Russian (partial equivalents) is due to common cognitive models of activity perception.

3. National and cultural specificity (differences) will manifest at the level of images, metaphors, and the internal form of idioms, reflecting the unique historical and everyday experience of each people.

INTRODUCTION

First, let's turn to such stable expressions as phraseological units. While the term "phraseology" was first suggested by the Swiss linguist Charles Bally (1951), subsequent Western scholars have advanced the field through lexicographical, corpus-based, and cognitive approaches [1,2]. The Iranian scientist in his work "Comparative analysis of Persian phraseological units with a component of black and white colors and their Russian equivalents" wrote: "Phraseological units best show the connection between language, thinking and culture. Therefore, phraseological units can be considered as figurative expressions connecting language and culture. Thus, language and culture are inseparable" [3, p. 114].

In the phraseological units of the languages under consideration, the expression of a view of the surrounding world and relationships in it often acts as a universal phenomenon characteristic of understanding and understanding reality, which explains the equivalence of some of them. In related languages, Kazakh and Turkish, they include images characteristic of the nomadic way of life in the past and which helped explain the world, for example, heaven–earth (kok aspan/gökyüzü, zher/yer), stars – sun (moon) (yıldız, kun/güneş). For nomadic peoples, they were symbols of nature, by which they guided themselves and led a certain way of life. But they are also characterized by metaphor,

figurative expressiveness, through which the understanding of the concepts of eternity, the mysteries of the universe, and fate is expressed. For example, absolute equivalents:

Table 1. Full semantic equivalence

Kazakh phraseological units	Turkish phraseological units	General meanings
• <i>жер мен көктей (jer men koktei)</i> • <i>төрт дүние (tort dunye)</i> • <i>жер дүние (jer dunye)</i>	• <i>yer yüzü dünya</i> • <i>dört bir yan</i> • <i>yer yüzü/dünya</i>	• like earth and sky • four worlds • whole world

However, there are specific connotations of phraseological units in the conceptualization of the worldview, which is explained by differences in views and ideas about the meaning of life and death, about values, behavior and character of a person. Of course, different peoples perceive the world in different ways, reflect it through the prism of their ideas, and use different levels of lexical units. Therefore, there is partial semantic overlap in the languages under consideration or no overlap at all.

Each ethnic group has a huge stock of stable expressions, their study allows us to understand the formation of its linguistic picture of the world, mental behavior and understanding of phenomena or events. In such expressions, a certain experience of an individual or an entire community is recorded, stereotypes regarding the assessment of phenomena or qualities of an individual, external or internal traits, character. Phraseological units and paremic expressions have played a major role in the concentration of folk wisdom in concise, short-structured combinations or sentences. They additionally perform didactic tasks of educating a person and a community, which was especially important during the unwritten period of the ethnic group's development, and they are also a fact of each nation's talent to apply the word expressively and succinctly.

Proverbs and sayings, idioms are also an indicator of the richness of the language, the verbal memory of each ethnic group about traditions and customs, social and spiritual moments of development, moral principles. At the same time, we note that a large number of these stable expressions do not lose their relevance, but they can change accents or be filled with a new meaning depending on changes in the surrounding reality.

To achieve the purpose of the study, semantic groups of stable units of three languages (the thematic field of phraseological units, metaphorical units) were selected, defining the way of thinking, life and activity of a native speaker of the studied languages. Our field of interest also included evaluative stable expressions of three languages (human behavior, comparison of actions or character traits, spirituality and aspiration, etc.). Such a wide range helps to ensure the objectivity and representativeness of the results of the work. The stable expressions were selected from the main lexicographical works of three languages – Kazakh, Turkish and Russian. [4], [5], [6].

The topic of our work required a broad review of theoretical works on the research problem. The study of stable expressions (phraseological units and paremic units) in the studied languages was started in the 19th century, but in the contrastive aspect it was developed in the 20th century, most of all as a product of bilingualism. Bilingual explanatory dictionaries appeared: A.P. Cowie, Rosamund Moon, N.N. Amosova, Chitra Fernando, A. McKie. In the 19th century, Kazakh stable expressions were considered by such great scientists as Sh. Ualikhanov, I. Altynsarin, A. Divaev, and in the 20th century – A. Baitursynov, M. Auezoym, M. Gabdullin, M. Terentyev, V. Katarinsky, G. Smagulova, Kozhakhmetova Kh.K., Zhaysakova R.E. A significant work in the study of Kazakh phraseological units and lexicographic codification is the "Kazakh-Russian phraseological Dictionary" by S. Kenesbaev. Phraseological units were analyzed in the works of Abai Kunanbayev, Shakarim Kudaiberdiuly, Alimzhan Nurpeisov and others.

Linguists and lexicographers from far and near abroad studied the characteristic features by which one can determine whether a particular phraseological unit belongs to a certain semantic group (A.V. Kunin, N.M. Shansky, E.F. Arsentieva, etc.), associative links with the mentality and lifestyle of a particular people (English, French, Spanish, etc.), to systematize the main linguistic models of the organization of idioms, proverbs, as well as the search and grouping of similarities in other languages [7], [8], [9] and others. At the beginning of the 21st century, comparative analysis of gender ideology in paremic units in French and Spanish (Jose Luis Belmar), English and Spanish expressions (Bosch E. Fiol et al.), English and Sinhalese (J. Ling), etc. became popular.

As for Turkish phraseological units and proverbs, they were not separated into separate lexical groups until the middle of the twentieth century, but were studied in general lexicology, and phraseological dictionaries were not developed. "Every language has fixed phrases that are used figuratively." The structure and meaning of these phrases are not related, and to understand this meaning it is necessary to study the origin of the expression. In most cases, such expressions cannot be translated into another language. In addition, they reflect the peculiarities of the Turkish language. It is precisely such phrases that are called phraseological units" [10, p. 527]. There was also no comparative study of Turkish phraseological units; in dictionaries they were designated as paremic units in small numbers.

But already in the middle of the twentieth century, Turkish scientists began to widely develop theoretical issues of phraseological units, their functioning in speech, structures and cognitive groups. The problem of creating phraseological dictionaries has become acute. Scientific works on the study of paremic units and their separation into a separate lexico-grammatical group played a huge role. The first among such scientists was Omer Asim Aksoy, who published the Dictionary of Proverbs and Expressions in 1965. He introduced a distinction between phraseological units and proverbs, identified their structural components, and proposed that their semantic meanings be considered as indivisible. This period of Turkish linguistics is also characterized by the appearance of works on the comparative study of phraseological units and proverbs of the two languages to identify similarities and differences at the level of vocabulary and grammar, to establish linguistic correspondences. Most of the works consider zoomorphic phraseological units, mainly in comparison of Turkish and Russian [11,12].

At the end of the twentieth century, many works on Kazakh-Turkish contrastive linguistics appeared, which led to the emergence of a number of bilingual lexicographic works. In this regard, the work of Akas Tazhutov, who published the Turkish-Kazakh Dictionary in 1997, should be highlighted. This is a significant lexicographic work on the study of lexical units of the two Turkic peoples, as a huge selection of words and expressions has been made – 8289, including 428 phraseological units. Among the idioms, a number of lexico-semantic groups can be distinguished: a view of the world and its phenomena, an assessment of human behavior, character traits and attitudes.

As for Kazakh linguistics on the study of phraseological units and proverbs, many scientists in the twentieth century, continuing the scientific school of Sh. Ualikhanov, I. Altynsarina, M. Auezova, developed theoretical issues of the etymology of Kazakh stable expressions (A.T. Kaidarov), identifying common ancient lexical layers and features (G. Kaliev). Academician A.T. Kaidarov was the first to introduce the contrastive method into the study of synonymous and variant idioms and parodies in the Kazakh and Uighur languages, and proposed scientific criteria for their classification. The structural analysis of Kazakh phraseological units was conducted by G.N. Smagulova highlighted the typology of linguistic and semantic models, she also considered the cultural component of idioms, the scope of their use. She used the frame method and identified the core and periphery of the semantic field of idioms. The work "Magynalas phraseological units sozdigi" (2014) also makes a significant contribution to the study of stable expressions, there are more than 2000 of them in the dictionary, 335 idioms about a person's character and his assessment. Researchers have also looked into identifying anthropocentric idioms and proverbs in different languages, like Russian and Kazakh, Kazakh and English, and the types of emotions they contain [13].

A review of the theoretical material led to the following postulates: the phraseological picture of the world includes conceptual, mental, figurative and cultural components, represents a

metaphorically figurative understanding of the environment, the unity of knowledge and experience. Phraseological units that relate to the semantic field "man as a subject" reflect the verbalization of a person's character and his assessment, typical and ethnonational, individual manifestation of positive and negative emotions, his attitude to norms and values. At the same time, each of the languages under consideration has universal, typical connotations and structures of stable expressions, which allows us to speak about the general mental culture of human civilization. At the same time, the phraseological picture of the world is dynamically developing, a number of author's units of parody appear, fiction and its translations into different languages play a huge role in this.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

In this study, a set of scientific methods of cognition was applied, which is dictated by the nature of studying stable units of three languages. We used the theoretical method of linguistic description in the analysis of semantic groups of stable expressions, the practical method of sampling them from lexicographic works in three languages and in the discourse of students of Kazakh, Turkish and Russian, the structural analysis of linguistic models of stable expressions, the comparative method of analyzing the sociolinguistic reality of the use of stable expressions, while establishing absolute or partial correspondence between them in three languages, or lack thereof.

The research is based on the works and positions of prominent linguists of the languages under consideration on paremic units in diachrony and synchrony, such as Telia, Kopylenko, Arsentieva, Shcherbinin. The works of these and many other scientists have not lost their theoretical and practical significance to the present day. Among the Kazakh authors, it is worth noting Kenesbaev S., Akkoz, Smagulova G., Turkish linguists and dictionaries M. Ozon, K. Kenan, and others. Russian Russian dictionary analyzes the composition of paremic units with the meaning of a person's character and mentality in a number of significant dictionaries of three languages: "Russian-Kazakh phraseological dictionary" Balakaev M., Kenesbaev S., Kopylenko M., "Russian-Turkish dictionary" Chik Yu.V., "Turikshe-kazakshe chik" Tazhutova A., Synonymic dictionary of phraseological units Smagulova G.N. and others.

To obtain reliable results, methods of continuous and thematic sampling, the method of comparison, induction and deduction, and cognitive analysis of paremic units in the studied languages were used. The research was based on the fundamental principles of cultural studies, aesthetics, semiotics and philosophy.

The following questions were asked in the survey:

1. What is your native language?
2. Do you speak Kazakh/Russian/Turkish? Please tick the relevant answer.
3. Can you name any idioms in these languages that have similar meanings?
4. Which animals are used to describe stinginess, foolishness or cunning in your native language and the languages you are studying?
5. Do you understand the meaning of the idiom 'друг познается в беде', even if you are hearing it for the first time? What equivalents can you give in your native language?
6. Do you use borrowed idioms (Russian, Turkish) in Kazakh? Or Kazakh idioms in Russian? In Turkish? Give some examples.

The following tasks were also set:

1. Match the pairs: link a Kazakh idiom with its equivalent in Turkish and Russian: ойлы бас
светлая голова сломя голову akılsız baş parlak zeka
2. A comparison of cultural codes. Compare idioms related to hospitality:
a) қонақ келсе – құт келер b) misafir kısmetiyle gelir c) a guest in the house is God in the house.

Overall, the respondents (third and fourth year students) are fluent in Russian and Kazakh, and only 10 students are studying Turkish as a minor.

The majority of students (71%) completed all the tasks in full, 20% completed them partially, and 8% (third year students) were unable to complete them, as they had not yet reached the required level of proficiency in Turkish.

Thus, the main research methods were:

- 1) The comparative method – to identify similarities and differences between languages.
- 2) The component analysis method – to break down the meaning of an idiom into individual meanings (semes) and to find equivalents.
- 3) The method of linguistic and cultural analysis – to explain which national images and realities underlie each expression.
- 4) The method of cognitive modeling (conceptual analysis) – to describe mental structures (for example, the “LABOR” frame).

RESULTS

The idioms and paroemias we selected were divided into a number of lexical groups within one large semantic field "A person as a subject of activity" in the surrounding world. This semantic field represents a fairly extensive lexical layer, in which the most cognitive-semantic parallels have been identified in three languages – Kazakh, Turkish and Russian. These are primarily stable expressions that characterize the characteristics of human character or situations where the weaknesses or strengths of a person's character are manifested. This field also includes phraseological units, in which there is a popular assessment of a person's actions, their approval or censure.

The selection criteria were based on scientific criteria in the works of famous researchers V.V. Vinogradov, N.M. Shansky, Ya. Retsker, J. Trier, Balakaev M., Kenesbaev S., Kopylenko M. and others. Following Smagulova G., we identified the core and peripheral phraseological units. The core is "Man and the world", among the peripheral groups most represented in lexicographical works, the phraseological field "Man and character" has 360 units in the Kazakh dictionary, 226 units in the Turkish dictionary, 430 units in the Russian dictionary; Russian Russian dictionary: "Style/lifestyle" - 205 units in the Kazakh dictionary, 146 units in the Turkish dictionary, 251 units in the Russian dictionary; "Human abilities" - 103 units in the Kazakh dictionary, 76 units in the Turkish dictionary, 89 units in the Russian dictionary, etc.

When analyzing the semantic meanings of stable expressions of three languages, two microgroups within the same phraseomacropolis of "Personality qualities" turned out to be the most similar, making it possible to identify the most valuable, characterizing the moral, mental, spiritual, and creative qualities of a person. In terms of artistic expression, they are the most metaphorical, which indicates the property of the ethnic language to figuratively and accurately define. Also, when analyzing these phraseomicrogroups, we noted that the similarity is based on the universality of people's mental view of the world, the assessment of common values that unites people. So, this is an antagonistic micropole of "Positive qualities of people" / "Negative qualities of people" and "Human behavior", in which personality qualities are manifested.

Regarding proverbs, Baranov A. defines them as phraseologisms with a sentence structure, explaining the idea of universality, illocutionary semantics, recommendations or advice, and characteristics with relative discursive independence. Let us note the multifaceted nature of proverbs as signs and models of various life situations. W. Meader emphasizes the cognitive content and popular view of a situation in the conceptual definition of a proverb. He emphasizes the syntactic structure of a proverb as a short sentence with a metaphorical form [14, p. 5]. Some scholars believe that proverbs are dialogic phrases (F. Čermák, A. Dundes), clichéd units of the language of interpersonal situations (D. Cram, O. Lauhakangas), and have a cultural memory (M. Bredis). The study showed that Kazakh, Russian and Turkish proverbs are the most similar, praising universal virtues (positive qualities) - Table 1.

Table 2. Metaphorical expressions of a positive nature

Positive character traits	Kazakh proverbs	Russian proverbs	Turkish proverbs
Hard work.	Eñbek adamnyñ körki, jalqaulыq – sory. Kim jeidi köp uzamai, sol jūmys tez isteidi. Jüzine qaramai, isine qara.	Trud ukrashaet cheloveka, len portit. Kto est skoro, tot i rabotaet sporo. Ne tot horosh, kto litsom prigozh, a tot horosh, kto dlya dela gozh.	Akan su yosun tutmaz. Çok çalışın, çok yer.
Honesty and Honor	Malym – janymnyñ sadagasy, jany – arymning sadaqasy.	Beregi plat'e snovu, a chest' smolodu. Ne to dorogo, chto krasno, a to, chto chesno.	Dürüstlük en iyi yoldaştır Doğru söz yemin istemez.
Intelligence and wisdom	Aqyl azbaidy, bilim tozbaidy. Kisiniñ korki kiim emes – bilim.	Zvezdy yavlyatsya – nebo ukrasyat, znaniya poyavyatsya – um ukrasyat. Ne odezhda krasit cheloveka, a um. Umnyy ne skazhet, mudryy ne sprosit.	Akıl yolu birdir. Akıl yaşta değil, baştadır. Güzel olan insanın yüzü iç özü olsun.
Kindness and politeness	Jyly jyly söyleseñ, jylan da ininen şyğady. Jaqsy lebiz - jarym yrys.	Dobroe slovo – dushevnaia opora. Dobroe slovo lechit, a zloe kalechit.	Tatlı dil yılanı deliğinden çıkarır. İyi söz kömürü elmas eder.
Friendship and mutual assistance	Qimas dosyñ sūrasa, qimasynyñdy beresiñ. Ağaş tamyrymen, adam dosymen myqty.	Drug poznayetsya v bede. Derevo krepko kornyami, a chelovek – druz'yami.	İyi bir dost zor zamanlarda anlaşılır. Bir insan, arkadaşları tarafından belirlenir.
Desire for knowledge, learning	Okyğan – kūn, okymağan – tūn. Kūş bılımda, bılım - kıtapta.	Uchen'e – svet, a neuchen'e – t'ma. Znanie – sila. Ne znat' ne stydno, stydno ne uchit'sya.	Bilmemek ayıp değil, öğrenmemek ayıptır. Bilgi güçtür. Bilmemek ayıp değil öğrenmemek ayıp.
Patriotism, defense of the native land	Otan ūşın otqa tūs – kūimeisin; Otany birdiñ jūregi bir; Otansyz adam – ormansyz būlbūl.	Rodinu – mat' umey zashchishchat'. Rodnaya zemlya i v gorshchi mila. Chelovek bez rodiny, chto solovey bez lesa.	Būlbūlū altın kafese koymuşlar, "ah vatanım" demiş. Bu vatan bizim, Cumhuriyet hepimizin! Vatan sevgisi imandan gelir.
Talent	Önerlige esik aşyq. Erınbei eñbek qyl, jalyqpai öner bıl.	Pered masterom vse dveri otkryvayutsya. Talantlivyy chelovek – talantliv vo vsyom.	

Despite differences in language, all three cultures converge in expressing human value concepts, attitudes toward the environment, and personal qualities. The same is observed in assessing negative human traits. Kazakh and Turkish proverbs are more similar in their content regarding human vices:

- Lying: “Ötirik maqsatyna jetpeidi – *A lie will not achieve its goal,*” “*Bügin ayttı, biraq erteñ joqqa şığaradı.*
- *He agreed it today will retract it tomorrow*”;
- Stupidity: “Aqymaq berdi, biraq alaiaq jedi”.
- A fool gave, a cunning man ate it”;
- Laziness: Jalqaulыq adamdy būzady – *"Laziness spoils a man"*);
- Envy: *Meyve veren ağaç taşlanır*
- Stones are always thrown at a tree that bears fruit, means knowledgable, skilled and successful people are criticized and envied: “Temırdı tot basady, al körealmauşy körealmauşylyqtan öledı”.
- Iron is eaten away by rust, and the envious perish from envy);

- He smiles to your face, but digs a hole behind his back, İki yüzlü insanın dilinde tat, kalbinde ise fesat gizlidir.

- A two-faced person has sweetness on their tongue but malice in their heart. This means being nice to someone's face but gossiping about them behind their back.

Examples include the Kazakh proverb "*Anger ahead, intelligence behind*" and the Turkish proverb "*A fish begins to smell from the head*" (referring to corruption/depravity of leadership). Russian proverbs about human vices cover laziness, greed, stupidity, pride, and deceit, emphasizing that "*Work feeds a man, but laziness spoils him,*" "*Greed is not a vice, but destruction,*" "*The grave will correct a hunchback,*" and that lying and bragging are harmful, for example, "*Praise in the eyes is worse than corruption,*" demonstrating folk wisdom in condemning human weaknesses.

The semantic meaning, which can be single, unambiguous, or indivisible, is overlaid with a metaphorical meaning. It can be a conclusion, a judgment, and its meaning depends on the universal or distinctive mentality of nations. Mythological consciousness was characteristic of all the peoples of the world, which was reflected in ritual actions and oral verbal monuments. Scientists studying these ancient monuments identify, first of all, the cult of heaven and ancestors, their souls after death, and worship of the earth. It is known that nomadic peoples, both Turkic and European, in their worldview divided the world into two parts: heavenly and earthly. The ancient Turkic ancestors revered the supreme deity Tengri (Tänır), who ruled the Cosmos, the Sky and determined the fate of people. Therefore, there are idioms that have preserved this mythology and characterize people: *Tänır jarylqağan* (blessed is Tengri), *Er haqy – Tanır haqy* (a good man is God's grace). We see a positive connotation here. There are idioms with a negative one: *Tänır ürğan*, *atqan* (subjected to the wrath of Tengri).

In the Turkish worldview, the main symbol of light and purity is the Moon, in the Russian it is a Star. Let's show this with an example: *Ayı gördüm, yıldız itibarım yok – that is, I saw a bright moon, but the stars don't interest me.* A Russian proverb, similar in meaning to the Turkish one: *A hundred stars are not equal to one moon.* In the Kazakh language, as in Turkish, there are quite a lot of fixed expressions with the word star: *jūldyzy ystyq*, *jūldyzy oñynan tuğan* in the meaning of lucky, their antonymic pair is *jūldyzy qarsy* (unlucky), *jūldyzy jarasu* – created for each other, living in harmony.

Some Russian idiomatic expressions coincide with Turkish ones. For example, *being born under a lucky star* is *yıldızı parlamak*; *Güneş balçıkla sıvanmaz – you can't hide an awl in a bag.*

The Kazakh people were characterized by cosmogenic views, which was reflected in the idiom: *Jalğannyñ artysyndai – like half of the universe – meaning very large.* When describing a person, celestial narratives were often used, for example, the Russian expression how a person who does not understand the obvious and does not know the situation fell from the moon. Kazakh: *Ai beiinde de daq bar* (and there are spots on the moon), which matters, anyone can make a mistake. As you can see, there is no semantic similarity when comparing these stable units.

With a weak semantic similarity with Kazakh and Turkish, Russian stable units of human character expression can be noted: positive: to have a head on your shoulders – to be smart, quick-witted; quieter than water, lower than grass – a modest harmless person; to be in good standing - to have a positive reputation; keep your finger on the pulse, be aware of things – to be modern, knowledgeable; to possess a pen is to be literate. negative: Seven Fridays a week is a changeable person; living for pleasure is a selfish, selfish person.

To what extent can some of these be described as 'gaps', i.e. expressions that carry meanings which are not understood in cross-cultural communication due to cultural differences or the lack of a direct equivalent, such as: *взять на перо* ('put pen to paper'). Examples of expressions with negative connotations include, for instance, *'бить баклуши'*, i.e. to idle; *'жаба давит'* – the extreme degree of a person's greed; *'вешать лапшу на уши'* – to deceive; *'душа в пятки ушла'* – to be frightened, etc.

Some gaps are linked to historical developments in the history of Ancient Rus', for example, the idiom *Вот тебе, бабушка, и Юрьев день!* ('There you go, Grandma, Yuryev Day!'), which expresses a person's surprise or disappointment. In Ancient Rus', peasants were allowed to switch to

a different landowner for a period of two weeks each year, but this practice was abolished in the 16th century. The date of the ban fell on what is known as Yuryev Day, i.e. 26 November. But to a speaker of another language, this expression would be incomprehensible: why Yuryev Day? It should be explained that this date is linked to the Orthodox feast day commemorating Saint George the Victorious. But again, why Yuryev Day and not Georgiev? In Old Russian, Yury (Yegory) is a phonetic adaptation of the Greek name Georgios. 'to beat about the bush', i.e. to idle; 'to be choked by greed' – the extreme degree of a person's greed; 'to pull the wool over someone's eyes' – to deceive; 'to have one's soul flee to one's heels' – to be frightened, etc.

Conversely, Kazakh: positive: *jūzıqtın közinen otkendei* in the meaning of lively, dexterous, elegant, impeccable; *jüreginiñ tügi bar* – fearless, *jyly jüzdi* – friendly, friendly. Negative: *Jel qūsyndai* is like a migratory bird, *jıby bos* is sluggish, indecisive.

Despite the differences in languages, all three cultures converge in expressing ideas about human values and their relationship to the environment, as well as in personal qualities.

DISCUSSIONS

Cognitive parallels in Kazakh, Russian, and Turkish paremiological units (proverbs and sayings) reveal significant intersections in worldview, mental structures, and cultural values. In this study, identifies these parallels through shared conceptual metaphors, moral-ethical codes, and the use of common symbols. This is particularly noticeable in the examples of idioms (phraseologisms) used by these peoples.

At the same time, the universal quality of people is explained by wisdom, intelligence and rationality. So semantic parallelism we can witness in Turkish and Kazakh sayings: *Bileği güçlü bir kişiyi yener bilgisi güçlü bin kişiyi yener* – strong man wins one man, educated one wins thousand men. Phraseological units and paremic units appear in opposite pairs: a crazy person comes screaming, a smart person just comes, he wants to notice the environment. You can't get enough of a stupid laugh, you can't get enough of a lazy sleep (Kazakh sayings).

The nomadic Turkic people associated their lives with cattle, among which an important place was occupied by a horse, which was not only a horse-drawn vehicle, but above all a companion of life, and in the national mentality often represented loyalty. Therefore, many fixed expressions about the manifestation of human character, especially men, had a connection with this animal.: *Ат өнері білінбес, бәйгеге түсін жарыспай. Ер өнері білінбес, қоян-қолтық алыспай.* (The horse's art is not known, if it does not compete in races. The art of men is unknown, if he does not compete hand-to-hand). *Джигит познается в беде, добрый конь – на скачках.* (A horseman is known in trouble, a good horse is known at the races).

There are proverbs that summarize the character of a whole people and a horse, emphasizing freedom and temper, loyalty to their foundations: *bız jylqy minezdi halyqpyz*, i.e. *we are a people with a horse temper*. The Russian people also have proverbs related to this animal with the connotation of human characteristics: *A well-mannered person is like a shod horse*.

For the Turkish people, proverbs have not become an archaic form of expression but are an actively functioning part of communication within discourse. In them, as in Kazakh proverbial expressions, such valuable human qualities as patience. *Allah sabırlı kulunu sever* (Allah loves a patient servant), hospitality (*kahvenin kırk yıl hatırı vardır* - coffee has a forty-year memory), self-esteem (*namussuz yaşamaktansa namuslu ölmek yeğdir* - it is preferable to die honorably than to live dishonorably), thrift (*damlaya damlaya göl olur* - drop by drop becomes a lake), humanity (kışilik – kishilik – being modest is intelligence), gratitude (*bir ye, bin şükret* - eat once, show appreciation).

The nomadic way of life of the Turkic people dictated its own conditions for evaluating human actions, accompanied the development of special norms and traditions, for example, a friendly attitude towards any traveler who was revered as a guest. Compare: *mısfır on kismetle gelir birini yer dokuzunu bırakır* (A guest comes with seven blessings and eats one but leaves nine behind.) – *qonaqpen erip qūt, yrys keledı* (luck and happiness comes with the guests).

Both Turkish and Kazakh proverbs have a mental similarity and a semantic parallel; the Turkish proverb says that luck, prosperity and well-being come to the host's house with a guest, while the Kazakh proverb says prosperity and well-being. Therefore, in the Turkic tradition, a respectful attitude towards the guest has been preserved to this day, making a reserve for the guest, all the best was served and is served on the table regardless of the wealth of the hosts themselves. In Russian reality, there is a saying for such a situation: how richer we are, how we are happy. In this situation, the Kazakhs have a proverb – *сыларға асың болмаса, сипарға тілің болсын* (syılarğa asyñ bolmasa, siparğa tiliñ bolsyn). If you have nothing to treat a guest with, then say kind words to him. But there is also an exact semantic equivalent – *барымен базар* (barymen bazar). The Kazakh proverb *құтты қонақ келсе, қой егіз табады* (qūtty qonaq kelse, qoi egiz tabady) says that if a welcome guest comes, then a sheep brings twins.

We observe semantic similarity in Turkish and Kazakh proverbs. пословицах *acele işe şeytan karışır* – асықан шайтанын ісі (*asyqan şaitanyn ısı*), which means: *снешка – дело черта*. In the Russian language, there is a proverb you hurry up, you make people laugh, which has an approximate meaning to Kazakh and Turkish, but differs in that it speaks more about haste as a character trait, i.e. rash haste. These differences are on a mental level, and for the Turkic peoples, rushing means wreaking chaos and can lead to mistakes. These proverbs teach the development of traits such as patience, calmness, and reasonableness. In the Turkic versions of the proverb, there is also a mythological understanding of haste as the tricks of evil spirits (shaitan, jinn), lying in wait for a person. In the Russian proverb, we observe a stylistic tinge of light irony, as well as edification.

The transition of faith from Tengrianism to Islam introduced new nominations and stable expressions about the qualities of a true Muslim into the language of both peoples: faith in predestination, compare *Tengri jazdy* – Tengri is predestined; *Alanyñ ısı, Alla jazdy* – the will of Allah, written from above). There are other proverbs about the destiny of human life: *Jazmyştan ozmyş joq* – Alın yazısı değişmez. These stable expressions have a Russian equivalent – You can't escape fate.

In Turkish proverbs, qualities such as generosity, nobility, justice, and reward for striving are associated with the image of Allah: *Allah verirse el getirir, sel detirir, yel getirir. Köpeğin duası kabul olsaydı, gökten kemik yağardı. Allah uçamayan kuşa alçacık dal verir. Allah gayret edenin yardımcısıdır*.

Sharia also brought certain norms for the manifestation of human character, for example, to be fair, especially ruling – Adil bidin elin dau aralamaida, Adil patshanyn elin zhau aralamaida. In the national tradition of the Kazakhs, there was respect for elders, for power: *handa kyryk kisin akyly bar* – the mind of a khan contains the mind of 40 people. There are semantically parallel stable expressions in all three languages when it comes to unfair power and governance: the fish rots from the head (Russian) = *balyq basynan şireidi* (Kazakh) = *balık baştan kokar* (Turkish). We find the same similarity in the idioms *Parçala ve hükmet* = divide and conquer.

The knowledge of their origin and their genetic roots played an important role among all peoples. For example, in the Kazakh language, the proverb: *jetі atasyn bilmegen – jetіsiz* speaks about the importance for a person to know their origin, genetic roots. A similar Kazakh proverb *tübin bilmegen - tübin bilmeidi* has a meaning: he who does not know his origins does not know anything. In Russian, it corresponds to the idiom with a pure ethnic flavor of Ivan, who does not remember kinship.

The Kazakh proverb *Minezi jaman adamğa endi qaityp juyspa, täuir körer adammen jalğan namys quyspa* teaches a person not to converge with a person with a bad character. You need to talk to an arrogant person like him, he is not the son of a prophet, but behave respectfully with a respectful person, because he is not your father's slave: *Şalqaiğanğa - Şalqai, Païğambardyñ üly emes; Eñkeigenge - eñkei, Äkeñnen qalğan qül emes*. The allegorical Turkish proverb about unpleasant human character traits *Sinek küçüktür Am mide bulandırır* is original and has no analogues – the fly is small, but it causes nausea (disgusting). A proverb is a generalization, the result of a simple observation or comparison. The metaphorization in the paremia is not didactic, since it is specific in content ("a small spool and a road").

Thus, comparisons between Kazakh and Turkish proverbs demonstrate a profound shared Turkic heritage, with many semantic similarities that reflect identical cultural codes, alongside differences shaped by their respective historical environments. During the research, the following groups were identified:

1. Complete semantic corresponsence

Many proverbs in both languages retain their original Turkic meaning and structure almost identically.

Table 3. Comparative assessment of proverbs Concept

Concept	Kazakh Proverb	Turkish Proverb	Russian Equivalent (closer meaning)
Patience	Sabyr tübi - sary altyn	Sabırın sonu selâmettir	Terpeniye i trud vso peretrut
Parental Influence	Anasyňa qarap qyzyn al	Anasına bak, kızını al	Kakova matka, takovy i detki
Child-Rearing	Jylamağan balağa emshek joq	Ağlamayan çocuğa meme vermezler	Ditya ne plachet - mat' ne razumeyet
Actions/Consequences	Ne ekseñ, sony orasyñ	Ne ekersen, onu biçersin	Chto posesh', to i pozhnosh'

2. Common Symbolic Codes

The Horse (At) Based on our research of this concept in proverbial units, we have found that the horse traditionally remains the most dominant animal symbol in both cultures. In the Kazakh language, a horse is called “a man's wing” (*Er qanaty - at*), while Turkish proverbs emphasize that a horse is a sacred possession that cannot be given away (*At, avrat, pusat emanet verilmez*).

Language (Til/Dil): In both languages, language is considered a source of extreme danger when used for negative purposes (slander, hypocrisy, malice, etc.). Compare:

- Kazakh: “outspoken, talkative” (*Basqa päle tilden*).

- Turkish: “although small, it causes a lot of problems” (*Dilin cirmi küçük, cürmü büyük*).

Whereas in Russian, the opposite meaning is expressed by the proverb: *Мал язык да дорог* (Small tongue, but dear).

3. Indirect/Subtle Communication

Proverbs in which the address is indirect, directed at third parties, but with complete semantic parallelism.

- Kazakh: *qyzym sağan aitam, kelinim sen tyñda* (Daughter, I speak to you; daughter-in-law, you listen).

- Turkish: A nearly identical version exists: *Kızım sana söylüyorum, gelinim sen anla*.

4. Key Differences

Geographical Influence Kazakh proverbs frequently feature nomadic-steppe symbols like the wolf and camel.

The wolf is a totem animal for both Kazakhs and Turks, which is reflected in common idioms such as *heavenly wolf – Kök börí (Gök börü)*, *Boz Kurt*. The wolf is considered the mythical totemic ancestor of the Turks, a guide who saved them and showed them the way. Therefore, in proverbs of both languages, the wolf symbolizes courage and independence: *Kurt yüreyi yiyen!* (He ate a wolf's heart! – about a person's courage and bravery). Kazakh proverb: *Börí aryktyğyn bildirmes, syrtka zhünín kampaytar* (A wolf will not show its thinness; it will fluff up its fur). Meaning: About pride and endurance; the ability to hide one's difficulties and maintain dignity.

A positive assessment is also given in the proverb *Kurt kurda arka çevirmez* (A wolf will not turn its back on another wolf), which means unity and loyalty in brotherhood. The same is true in the Kazakh proverb: *Qasqyr qas qylmaidy qasqyrğa, joldas joldasyn qas qylmaidy* (A wolf does not harm a wolf, a friend does not harm a friend) – about loyalty and the code of honor. However, there are expressions with a negative assessment of a person's character associated with the image of a wolf as a predatory, bloodthirsty animal in both languages:

Kazakh idiom *qasqyrşa qatu* – to bare one's teeth like a wolf (to become very angry). Turkish: *kuzu postuna bürünmüş kurt* – “wolf in sheep's clothing,” meaning to pretend to be innocent, harmless but in reality to be ruthless and cruel.

Phrases with the narrative “camel” mainly have either a positive emotional connotation, such as *Tüyesi tügel* – all his camels are intact, meaning that everything is in order and business is going well, or a negative one: *Tüyedey päle* - trouble the size of a camel, *Tüyeden түскендей* - as if fallen from a camel, meaning a sharp, rude, or inappropriate remark.

CONCLUSION

Our cognitive-contrastive study of stable units about human character qualities has shown semantic identity in many mental universals, emotively saturated expressions in all three languages. Of course, modern life is much different in its dynamics and the use of different languages in our country. Kazakh is the most widely used language today, and interest in learning it has increased by an order of magnitude than 20 years ago, not only by Kazakhstanis themselves, but also by representatives of other countries. The Russian language has not lost its importance, and Turkish is also becoming more and more popular. Many of our residents travel to Turkey not only on vacation, but also to study and work, which requires knowledge of linguistic culture and communication patterns. Fixed expressions make up a fairly large layer of vocabulary of the studied languages and are active in discourse. The results of our research show that knowledge of a person's character is important in communication, which often affects the result. Therefore, knowledge of phraseological units, proverbs and sayings that express character traits in a concise form is very relevant and helps to navigate in a foreign linguistic culture. In addition, these units reflect the nature of the ethnic group and are a marker of the national code.

Thus, we observe common conceptual metaphors and proverbial units in the languages being compared. In these languages, they have cognitive models that are both common and specific to each culture, which structure human experience:

1. Zoonymic Codes Human as Animal: All three languages use animals to conceptualize human character. Kazakh and Turkish share deep Turkic roots, using the horse as a symbol of nobility and lifestyle, while differences emerge based on historical habitats - for instance, Kazakh proverbs often feature the camel, whereas Turkish may use regional variants.

The Tongue as a Tool/Weapon: A striking cognitive parallel exists regarding the concept of "language" (Kazakh: *til*, Turkish: *dil*, Russian: *язык*). Across all three, proverbs conceptualize the tongue as a source of danger or a sharp instrument (e.g., "The tongue is small, but it can cause great harm"). Time and Space: Common metaphors such as "Time is Money" or "Time is a Changer" (Time heals) are present, though Kazakh cognition often links spatial relations to mental structures more deeply rooted in nomadic heritage.

2. Moral and Ethical Cognitive Codes

The fixed expressions in the languages studied serve as a cultural code for ethnic groups, reinforcing social norms and shared values. A study conducted in 2025 showed that character traits such as respect for elders, hospitality, and devotion to family are highly valued in the proverbial heritage of all three languages.

3. Ethical Lingua-Ecology

Comparative studies of Kazakh, Turkish, and Russian proverbs reveal that the most important human qualities are diligence, respect for traditions, and fixed patterns of behavior among the people (correct from the point of view of the people and morality). For example, proverbs from the three languages are analyzed for their “ecological” nature – whether they promote positive social harmony or contain “non-ecological” (negative) traits such as anger, aggression, manipulation, or threats.

4. Synergistic and Structural Connections

Semantic similarities between fixed expressions in Kazakh and Turkish demonstrate a high degree of cognitive and synergistic connection due to their common origin. A comparison of approximately 360 Kazakh and 226 Turkish proverbs revealed mental similarities in the perception

of the surrounding world. Many proverbs and idioms in these three languages are semantically similar, while a small number have their own characteristics and ethnic narratives and models.

REFERENCES

- 1 Vandeweerd, N., Housen, A., & Paquot, M. (2023). Comparing the longitudinal development of phraseological complexity across oral and written tasks. // *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 45 (4), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263122000389>
- 2 Paolo Brasolin, Arianna Bienati. Phraseology meets information theory: Going beyond the *bag-of-words* approach in complexity measures. // *JESLA* - Year: 2025. Volume: 9 Issue: 1. Page/Article: 103–123. <https://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.140>
- 3 Khademi Moghaddam M. Rezaei. Comparative analysis of Persian phraseological units with components of black and white colors and their Russian equivalents. // *Philological Sciences at MGIMO*. - M., 2018. - No. 16. - pp. 114-119.
- 4 *Kazakh-turikshe sozdik*. Koch Kenan. - Almaty: Turan, 2007.
- 5 *Kazakh-Russian phraseological dictionary*. Kozhakhmetova Kh. K., Zhaisakova R.E., Kozhakhmetova Sh.O. - Alma-Ata: Mektep, 1988. - 224 p.
- 6 Kenesbaev S. *Phraseological dictionary of the Kazakh language*. - Alma-Ata, 1977. - 711 p.
- 7 Cheek Yu.V. *Russian-Turkish dictionary*. 2nd ed., rev. - M.: Ast: Vostok-Zapad, 2006. - 473 pp.
- 7 Gencan Tahir. *Nejat Dilbilgisi*. - TDK Yay, 1979. - Ankara.
- 8 Smith L.P. *Phraseology of the English language*. / Smith L.P. - M.: Uchpedgiz, 1959. - 208 p.
- 9 Raichshtein A.D. *Comparative analysis of German and Russian phraseology*. - M.: 1980. - 143 p.
- 10 Arsenyeva E.F. *Comparative analysis of phraseological units*. - Kazan: Kazan University Publishing House, 1989. - 129 p.
- 11 Kalyuta A.M. *Russian and Turkish phraseological units with a zoonymic component*. Minsk: Publishing center of BSU, 2008. pp. 91-98.
- 12 Yilmaz Buyukkutlu. Lexical background of Russian and Turkish zoonyms. // *Scientific notes of the Tauride National University named after. V. Vernadsky. Ser. "Philological Sciences"*. T. 15(94). 2002, No.4.- pp. 88 - 93.
- 13 Anthropocentric Phraseological Units and Paremiological Units of Different Languages in the Aspect of Linguaxiology. // *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. Vol. 7, Iss. 8 (August 2025): 982–999. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i8.10213>
- 14 Mieder W. *Behold the Proverbs of a People: Proverbial Wisdom in Culture, Literature, and Politics*. University Press of Mississippi, 2014. 489 p.
- 15 Čermák F. *Proverbs: Their Lexical and Semantic Features* // *Proverbium in cooperation with the Institute of the Czech National Corpus (Supplement Series, Vol. 37)* / ed. W. Mieder. The University of Vermont. Burlington, Vermont 2014. 234 p.

Received: 28.12.2025

Қазақ, орыс және түрік тілдеріндегі тұрақты тіркестердің семантикалық ұқсастықтары
Б.Ә. Әбілова¹, А.Б. Әсенова², Р.З. Панзарбекова¹, А. Қапанова¹

¹АХУ, Астана, 010000, Қазақстан

²Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Көкшетау университеті, Көкшетау, 020000, Қазақстан

Осы жұмыс үш тілдің орнықты өрнектерін (фразеологизмдер, мақалдар және сөздер) зерттеудің нәтижесі болып табылады, олардың екеуі туыстық (қазақ және түрік тілдері) және біреуі семантикалық параллельдерді немесе айырмашылықтарды анықтау аспектісінде туыстық емес (орыс тілі) болып табылады. Орнықты тілдік бірліктерді мұндай салыстырмалы-салыстырмалы зерттеу ментальдық ұқсастықтарды, әртүрлі халықтардың танымдық процестерінің ортақтығын және олардың өмір тәжірибесін анықтауға мүмкіндік береді. Зерттеу пәні кездейсоқ таңдалған жоқ, өйткені тұрақты

өрнектер танымдық мәні мен стиліндегі ұқсастықтар мен айырмашылықтарды анықтауға ғана емес, сонымен қатар олардың тілдік өрнектерінің құрылымдық үлгілерін салыстыруға мүмкіндік береді. Сондай-ақ бұл тілдік бірліктер халықтың түсініктерін, қорытындыларын, мәдениет элементтерін, өмір салтының құндылықтары мен тұрмыстық жұмыстарды, жекелеген адамдардың немесе тұтас этностың өмірін бақылаудың даналығын нақты және қысқаша түрде көрсететін бай дереккөздік материал болып табылады. Мақаланың авторлары зерттеуде ғылыми әдістер кешенін пайдаланған, қарама-қарсы талдау үш тілдің семантикалық, құрылымдық-тілдік деңгейінде, олардың халық және көркем дискурстағы өзектілігі мен жұмыс істеу деңгейінде жүргізілген. Зерттеу нәтижелерінің дұрыстығын қамтамасыз ету үшін қазақ, орыс және түрік тілдерін оқытатын студенттік топтарға сауалнама жүргізілді, қазіргі заманғы лексикографиялық жұмыстарға терең талдау жүргізілді. Жұмыста жасалған қорытындылар осы тұрақты бірліктер халық тілінің мәнерлілігін, өзектілігін бүгінгі күнге дейін сақтай алғанын және ұлттық код пен өзіндік ұқсастықтың, сондай-ақ адамды, оның сипатын, қызметін әлемге қабылдау мен бағалаудағы әмбебаптықтың фактологиялық белгісі болып қызмет ететінін көрсетеді. Зерттеу әсіресе түрлі халықтардың мәдениетімен және тілімен танысуға, салыстыру мен салыстыруға, болашақ табысты байланыстар үшін ортақ және айырмашылықтарды табуға мүмкіндік беретін цифрлық жаһандану дәуірінде өзекті болып табылады. Оның үстіне, Түркияда және жалпы әлемде қазақ халқы мен тіліне деген қызығушылық едәуір өсті.

Кілт сөздер: тұрақты тілдік өрнектер, семантикалық мән, салыстыру, ментальдық ұқсастық, әмбебаптық, коннотациядағы айырмашылықтар.

ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

- 1 Vandeweerd, N., Housen, A., & Paquot, M. (2023). Comparing the longitudinal development of phraseological complexity across oral and written tasks. // *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 45 (4), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263122000389>
- 2 Paolo Brasolin, Arianna Bienati. Phraseology meets information theory: Going beyond the *bag-of-words* approach in complexity measures. // *JESLA - Year: 2025. Volume: 9 Issue: 1. Page/Article: 103–123.* <https://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.140>
- 3 Khademi Moghaddam M. Rezaei. Comparative analysis of Persian phraseological units with components of black and white colors and their Russian equivalents. // *Philological Sciences at MGIMO. – M., 2018. – No. 16. – pp. 114-119.*
- 4 Түрікше-қазақша сөздік. Кош Кенан. – Алматы: Туран. – 2007.
- 5 Қазақ-орыс фразеологиялық сөздігі. Қожахметова Қ., Жайсакова Р., Қожахметова Ш. – Алма-Ата: Мектеп, 1988. – 224 б.
- 6 Кенесбаев С. Казахско-русский фразеологический словарь. – Алма-ата, 1977. – 711 с.
- 7 Чеек Ю. Русско-турецкий словарь. 2-е изд., переп.. – М.: Аст: восток-Запад, 2006. – 473 с.
- 8 Smith L.P. Phraseology of the English language. / Smith L.P. – М.: Uchpedgiz, 1959. – 208 p.
- 9 Raichshtein A.D. Comparative analysis of German and Russian phraseology. – М.: 1980. – 143 p.
- 10 Арсентьева Е.Ф. Сравнительный анализ фразеологизмов. – Казань: Издательский дом Казанского университета, 1989. – 129 с.
- 11 Калюта А.М. Русские и турецкие фразеологизмы с зоонимическим компонентом. Минск: Центр издания БГУ, 2008. С. 91-98.
- 12 Yilmaz Buyukkutlu. Lexical background of Russian and Turkish zoonyms. // *Scientific notes of the Tauride National University named after. V. Vernadsky. Ser. "Philological Sciences". T. 15(94).*
- 13 Anthropocentric Phraseological Units and Paremiological Units of Different Languages in the Aspect of Linguaxiology. // *Forum for Linguistic Studies. Vol. 7, Iss. 8 (August 2025): 982–999.* <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i8.10213>
- 14 Mieder W. Behold the Proverbs of a People: Proverbial Wisdom in Culture, Literature, and Politics. University Press of Mississippi, 2014. 489 p.

15 Čermák F. Proverbs: Their Lexical and Semantic Features // Proverbium in cooperation with the Institute of the Czech National Corpus (Supplement Series, Vol. 37) / ed. W. Mieder. The University of Vermont. Burlington, Vermont 2014. 234 p.

Материал 28.12.2025 баспаға түсті

Семантические подоби́я устойчивых выражений в казахском, русском и турецком языках

Б.А. Әбілова¹, *А.Б. Асенова², Р.З. Панзарбекова¹, А. Қапанова¹

¹Международный университет Астана, Астана, 010000, Казахстан

²Кокшетауский университет им. Ш. Уалиханова, Кокшетау, 020000, Казахстан

Настоящая работа является результатом исследования устойчивых выражений (фразеологизмов, пословиц и поговорок) трех языков, два из которых являются родственными (казахский и турецкий языки) и один неродственным (русский язык) в аспекте выявления семантических параллелей или различий. Такое сопоставительно-сравнительное изучение устойчивых языковых единиц позволяет выявить ментальные подоби́я, общность познавательных процессов разных народов и их опыт жизни. Предмет исследования выбран неслучайно, т.к. устойчивые выражения позволяют выявить сходства и различия не только в когнитивном значении и стиле, но и сопоставить структурные модели языкового их выражения. Также эти языковые единицы являются богатым источниковедческим материалом, отражающим в меткой и лаконичной форме народные представления, умозаключения, элементы культуры, ценности образа жизни и бытовые работы, мудрость наблюдения за жизнью отдельных людей или целого этноса. Авторы статьи использовали комплекс научных методов в исследовании, контрастивный анализ проводился на семантическом, структурно-языковом уровне трех языков, уровне актуальности и функционирования их в народном и художественном дискурсе. Для обеспечения достоверности результатов исследования были использованы анкетирование студенческих групп, изучающих казахский, русский и турецкий языки, проведен глубокий анализ современных лексикографических работ. Выводы, сделанные в работе, показывают, что данные устойчивые единицы смогли сохранить выразительность народного языка, актуальность до наших дней и служат фактологическим маркером национального кода и самоидентичности, а также универсальности в мировосприятии и оценке человека, его характера, деятельности. Исследование особенно актуально в эпоху цифровой глобализации, позволяющей знакомиться с культурой и языком разных народов, сравнивать и сопоставлять, находить общее и различия для будущих успешных контактов. К тому же, в Турции и в целом мире заметно вырос интерес к казахскому народу и языку.

Ключевые слова: устойчивые языковые выражения, семантическое значение, сопоставление, ментальное подобие, универсальность, различия в коннотации.

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 28.12.2025