

IRSTI 16.21.49

G.A. Jailikhanova¹ (ORCID 0000-0002-5863-3455)**B.A. Torekeyev**² (ORCID 0000-0001-7207-1711) – *main author*

¹Senior Lecturer, Master of Philology, ²Senior Lecturer, Master of Foreign Languages
M.Kh. Dulaty Taraz Regional University, Taraz, Kazakhstan
e-mail:²torekeyev333@gmail.com

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH A ZOONYM COMPONENT

Abstract. This article is devoted to the comparative analysis of phraseological units with a zoonym component. The article analyzes the most common examples of the use of zoonymx in comparative constructions of the English, Russian and Kazakh languages. For linguistic research, the analysis of zoonym component in phraseological units and their comparison in languages of different systems seems to be very relevant. The mysterious nature of zoonym components has attracted more and more researchers over time. The study of phraseological units with zoonyms in various languages contributes to a vivid description of linguistic imagery, and in the comparative aspect of the study it makes it possible to identify typical associations, recognize and describe the national-cultural specifics of each language.

Keywords: phraseological units, zoonym component, cultural linguistics, picture of the world, ethnocultural specificity, lexical and semantic variants, comparative structures.

Introduction. Language is considered by scientists today as a way by which a person penetrates not only into the modern mentality of the nation, but also into the views of ancient people on the world, society and themselves. Phraseological units are of particular value in this regard.

Recently, a broad understanding of phraseology as a science of various stable combinations of words, which includes words with figurative meanings, has become more and more widespread. I.I.Turanskiy gives the following definition of phraseological units: “phraseological units are separately formed stable combinations of words of various structural types with a single compatibility of components, the meaning of which arises as a result of the semantic transformation of the component composition” [1, p. 52].

Phraseology is a carrier of the richest information about representatives of a culture unknown to us, about cultural and ethnic color, and therefore phraseology is not the last in the hierarchy of linguistic sciences.

According to R.Kh. Khairullina, phraseological units are highly informative units of the language; they cannot be regarded as “decorations” or “excesses”. Phraseological units are one of the linguistic universals, since there are no languages without phraseological units. The stability of use is an indicator that a phraseological unit is a unit of language, a public property in a given language community, and not an individual phrase used by one or another author. The use of phraseological units does not have the character of quoting, and is always associated with phraseological abstraction. A potential phraseological unit can become a language unit only if it ceases to be “private property” and becomes “public property”, i.e. regularly reproduced education in the speech of the entire population or part of it, thus receiving social approbation [2, p. 5].

Many linguists are engaged in the study of phraseological units, such as A. Iskoz, A. Lenkova, V. Mider, V.V. Vinogradov, L.R. Zinder, T.V. Stroyeva, M.D.

Stepanova, I.I. Chernyshyev. All of them understand phraseological units as turns of speech, consisting of two or more words, having reproducibility, stability of composition and structure, as well as a holistic meaning.

Many linguists are united by a general idea of the system of phraseological units. And although each of them gives its own definition to groups of phraseological units, they are equivalent in their semantic and ideological content and carry the same characteristics. The peculiarity of phraseological units is that they make the language livelier and perform an important function in communication.

B.A. Larin rightly noted that “phraseologisms always indirectly reflect the views of the people, the social system, the ideology of their era” [3, p. 185].

In phrase formation, the human factor plays a huge role, since the vast majority of phraseological units are associated with a person, with a variety of areas of his activity. In addition, a person seeks to endow objects of the external world, including inanimate ones, with human features. A person’s ability to reflect objective reality is a necessary condition for the emergence and functioning of language, since communication is based on the need to report something about things that are usually outside the language. At the same time, it is important to emphasize that effective communication presupposes a more or less similar reflection and understanding of objective reality.

In this paper, we study phraseological expressions that have component-zoonyms in their composition, the meaning of which is transformed due to metaphorical and metonymic expansion, the transfer of meaning from the name of an animal to the image of a person or a comparison of a person with an animal.

The metaphorical nature of zoomorphic phraseological units, their inherent subjective-evaluative connotation, the specificity of their semantic parameters and syntactic structure are largely due to their referential sphere, the basis of which is the anthropocentrism implicitly expressed in them as a manifestation of the ancient folklore tradition of attributing certain traits of a human character to animals. In the ethnoculture of different peoples, phraseological units, including the names of animals, are primarily statements about a person, his spiritual and social traits, they reflect centuries-old observations of a person over the appearance and habits of animals, thus being a cultural and information fund in every language. One of the main elements of any national culture is the image of a person. The description of language assessments of a person's appearance, his aesthetic, emotional, moral and ethical ideas about him is an important component of linguistic research that studies this fragment of linguistic reality.

I.I. Turanskiy touches upon the issue of comparative phraseological units with zoonymic components that perform the function of reinforcement and proposes to call them as structures, including the names of representatives of the fauna, when the most typical features, habits, lifestyle, dominant physical qualities of animals serve as the basis for comparison: cunning like a fox, as obstinate/stubborn as a mule [1, p. 52].

In this regard, the study of zoonyms that are part of the phraseological units of three languages with different structures is of particular importance in order to describe and identify the system of associations and connotations associated with the notions of a particular animal in the projection of a person in the speakers of the three compared languages.

Methods and methodology. In our time, not enough research has been done on the topic of zoonyms in phraseology with a comparative component as in Russian, with the union *siyakty* and the case ending - *give* in the Kazakh language

and the union like and its exponent as in English. This gives us the opportunity for our own analysis of such lexical units. On the basis of independent research, we can conclude which phraseological units with a zoonym in a figurative sense are used to describe a person's appearance, his physical properties and behavior. With their help, we can characterize the intellectual and moral qualities of a person and identify the specifics of the use of the union as in three different system languages

However, due to the difference in cultural factors, ethnic characteristics, different linguistic pictures of the world and different literary sources, many zoonyms in the composition of phraseological units contain a certain element of meaning that is understandable only to the speakers of this culture served by this language. The closer the culture and living conditions of the three peoples are to each other, the more dots their language-fixed ideas about animals will coincide.

Comparative analysis of phraseological units with a zoonym component is to determine the ways of dividing this unity into parameters that can be re-combined in the description without losing the integral meaning of phraseological units as a linguistic phenomenon and to identify the specifics of zoonyms in the composition of phraseological units of three different system languages, to identify a feature use for comparison of the comparative component with the union as in Russian, case ending *-siyaқты* given in Kazakh language, the union like and its exponent as in English, determine the use of intensifiers (adjectives, adverbs, verbs) before the union to describe character traits, behavior human compared to animals.

Results. Most of the zoonyms that make up the comparative constructions of these three languages have similar meanings. The coincidences can be due to certain similarities in the natural conditions of life of the three peoples, including fauna, as well as the same perception and rethinking of reality.

For example, phraseological units with the zoonym *lion* in English:

1) "Let's get to this damned shelter, I'm scared stiff."

- I don't believe a word of it. You are as brave as a lion

"Let's go to that accursed asylum" I'm scared to death.

I don't believe a single word you say. You are so brave.

2) These people are like lions in the path and think they will have an easy job with Harold, they are mistaken

3) ...The Governor is like a lion in your path

Phraseological units *like a lion* in the path has the meaning of a terrible or difficult obstacle, often imaginary.

In English, the lion is perceived as a dangerous, brave animal, and the use of this zoomorphism in phraseological units has such a figurative meaning as something dangerous, some kind of difficulties, and also some traits of a person's character, such as courage, is compared with the character traits of this animal.

As Kunin A.V. notes, in Russian the lion is also a brave, courageous strong animal, and for comparison, the union is used as [4; p 110].

In Russian language:

1) Стивенс не боялся ничего, он был *храбрым как лев*.

2) - С Иваном Павловичем очень сложно иметь дело, его невозможно обмануть. Он *как лев* в делах и хватка у него львиная.

3) Этого человека надо уважать и почитать, он *храбрый как лев*.

In the Kazakh language, the lion is a symbol of courage, courage, determination

For example:

1) *Арыстансияқты* еді Исатай, бұл пәнидің жүзінде

2) Көркі де пілдей қуатты тағы *арыстандай батыл*

So, the analysis of phraseological units with zoonyms *lion* in three compared languages shows that this animal is a symbol of courage, courage, determination, inflexibility in the Kazakh and Russian languages, and in English it means difficulties, danger. It is necessary to take into account the fact that different conjunctions are used for comparison in three languages, and in the Kazakh language there is also a case ending.

When comparing the phraseological units of English, Russian and Kazakh texts, cases that differ in different figurativeness are interesting. The following example of a phraseological unit with a zoonym component a *horse* is an example illustrating the assertion that the cult of the horse, as you know, was widespread among many peoples of the world and occupied a prominent place in their spiritual culture, which is confirmed by numerous studies of ethnographers, folklorists, linguists and psychologists.

In English:

1) I can *eat like a horse*, did you notice? But I can also eat like a fly if I have to.

2) The price of the 800,000 shares was \$20 million. It was all loaned to the Texans by the Young forces. Furthermore, the Alleghany Corporation, top Young holding company, agreed to and did repurchase the entire 800,000 shares from Murchison and Richardson after the proxy fight. Obviously, the Texans were *like stalking horses* for the Young group, used to evade the ICC restriction and thereby to extend their centrally controlled railroad network.

Phraseological expression like and stalking horse in English means figurehead, screen.

3) If he is as good at his research work as some of us are inclined to think that he is *like a willing horse* and encumbered with more pedestrian activities.

In Russian language:

1) «Авось проснулся Меркулов», - подумал Морковников и пошел в гостиницу Ермолаева, но Меркулов, как говорится, *как конь не валялся*.

2) - А Фауст был ученый, а не аспирант. Можно сказать, академик. А у вас Ричард еще *как конь не валялся*.

3) Какой дикарь, но какой хороший дикарь! Жаль только, что *как не в коня корм*.

The phraseological expression as not in horse food makes sense that something cannot be properly evaluated, understood by anyone.

In the Kazakh language, on the contrary, zoomorphism *horse* gives a positive assessment of a person.

1) Бізде бұрын Марқымбайдың арбасына мініп алып балалар ауылда айналып жүретін. Марқымбай өте жақсы, *аттай желді* адам еді.

2) Ендігі ел *жылқы мінезді сияқты*. Аяз бен боранда, жауын-шашында тон не көрсе, соны көруге шыдаған, жанын аямаған, қар төсеніп, мұз жастанған кісі ғана бағады.

3) *Жылқы мінезді сияқты* кісілер көп.

So, comparing the phraseological unit with the zoonym *horse* in three languages, we can conclude that the concept of a horse is used in different senses, which gives reason to see in them a reflection of the national specifics of the culture of peoples and a rethinking of reality. An interesting fact is that in such diverse languages as English and Kazakh, the comparison of a person with habits, with the nature of this animal coincides, and when compared with a union, in most cases a verb is used to describe the habits of an animal.

In English and Russian, a large number of phraseological units with the zoonym *dog* are distinguished. The paradoxical nature of the interpretation of this image in Russian and English ethnic culture is that in ancient times, both peoples considered a dog to be a friend of man. But despite this, the dog is a symbol of anger, betrayal. In Russian and Kazakh languages, zoonym dog invariably has a negative evaluative connotation.

In English language:

1) Proteus- If his Majesty wants people like *dumb dogs* he will not get it from my party.

Phraseologism *dumb dog* has the meaning of a silent person.

2) It is my belief he was up to some game or other. Whatever it was, he was *like a dog with two tails* about it.

The stable expression *like a dog with two tails* means to be pleased, to be delighted.

3) He is *as lazy as Ludlam's dog* that leaned his head against the wall to bark.

In Russian language:

1) Я замерз *как собака* и, махнув Кате рукой, сделал два больших круга, чтобы согреться.

2) - Сочинитель? – переспросил он – Который? – А вон этот, что нос-то набалдашником и один глаз на вас косит. Здесь этих сочинителей *как собак нерезаных*.

Phraseologism *как собак нерезаных* means a lot

3) Я попрекнул его тем, что он не извлекает доходов с имения, и шутил назвал его божьим сторожем. Он пытливым взглядом заглянул мне в глаза и спросил: - Вы хотите сказать, что я *как собака на сене*.

The expression *как собака на сене* is compared to a dog that lies in the manger and does not let anyone in. This is an expression about a person who does not use himself and does not allow others to use.

N.I. Ilminskiy notes the fact that in the Turkic languages a person is compared with the negative qualities of zoonym *dog* /5; p 42/.

In Kazakh language:

1) Әрине, сөз сенікі келмей кетсең. Келер болсаң, *иттей қып* басқа тепсем арманым жоқ соған жетсем.

2) Сақшытың үсті-басы менің үстімнен де жаман, *ит талағандай* шоқпыт-шоқпыт деп, Есбике көзінің жасын тья алмай отыр.

3) Қойдың ба мені бүйтіп әуре қылып. Мен өлсем сен *қаларсың иттей ұлып*.

Discussion. The analysis of phraseological units with a zoonym component showed that the plan of expression of the majority of phraseological units does not contain an indication of the national-cultural content. However, these phraseological units contain a cultural connotation, a characteristic feature of which is figurative-situational marking, which is directly related to the worldview of the people - the native speaker. A comparative study of zoonyms used in a figurative sense and as part of stable combinations is of undoubted interest, primarily for describing the national linguistic picture of the world, since any comparison of languages results in the establishment of three main properties: universal, similar and distinctive. As W. von Humboldt rightly wrote, it is impossible "... to sufficiently know the character of one nation without simultaneously studying others that are in close connection with it, the contrasting

differences of which, on the one hand, actually formed this character, and with on the other hand, it is unique and allows you to fully understand it ... “ [6, p. 319].

Based on the analysis carried out, the following conclusions can be drawn. Despite the fact that the component composition of zoonyms in the languages under consideration is quite similar, there are many lexemes that are used exclusively or mainly in the phraseology of one of the languages. A comparative study of various linguistic pictures of the world allows us to establish common and different features in the comprehension of the world by different peoples.

References

1. Turansky I.I. “Nacional'no-kul'turnaya specifika rechevogo povedeniya” [National and cultural specificity of speech behavior], 1997., p. 52. [in Russian]
2. Khairullina R.Kh. “Nekotorye voprosy sintaksisa” [Some syntax issues], 1975 - p. 5 [in Russian]
3. Larin B.A. “Slovar' inostrannyh slov”. [Dictionary of foreign word]. Izdatel'stvo: “Vysshaya shkola”, 1980 - p.185. [in Russian]
4. Kunin A.V. Bol'shoj anglo-russkij frazeologicheskij slovar. [Large English-Russian phraseological dictionary]. M.: RusskijazykMedia, 2006. – p. 110. [in Russian]
5. Ilminsky N.I. Materialy dlya izucheniya kirgizskogo dialekta. [Materials for studying the Kyrgyz dialect]. - Kazan', 1860 - p. 42. [in Russian]
6. Humboldt von W. Predicative Comparisons and Comparative Turns. Ural Linguistic Readings - 1995 (№12) – p.319.

Material received 09.02.22.

Г.А. Джайлиханова, Б.А. Торекеев

М.Х. Дулати атындағы Тараз өңірлік университеті, Тараз қ., Қазақстан

ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ БІРЛІКТЕРДІ ЗООНИМИКАЛЫҚ КОМПОНЕНТПЕН САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ ТАЛДАУ

Аңдатпа. Мақала зоонимикалық компоненті бар фразеологиялық бірліктерді салыстырмалы талдауға арналған. Мақалада зоонимді ағылшын, орыс және қазақ тілдерінің салыстырмалы құрылымдарында қолданудың кең таралған мысалдары талданады. Лингвистикалық зерттеулер үшін фразеологиялық бірліктердегі зоонимикалық компонентті талдау және оларды әртүрлі жүйелердің тілдерінде салыстыру өте өзекті болып көрінеді. Уақыт өте келе зоонимдер компоненттерінің жұмбақ табиғаты зерттеушілерді көбірек тартады. Әр түрлі тілдердегі зоонимдермен фразеологиялық бірліктерді зерттеу тілдік бейненің айқын сипатталуына ықпал етеді, ал зерттеудің салыстырмалы аспектісінде типтік бірлестіктерді анықтауға, әр тілдің ұлттық-мәдени ерекшеліктерін тануға және сипаттауға мүмкіндік береді.

Тірек сөздер: фразеологиялық бірліктер, бионимикалық компонент, лингвомәдениеттану, әлем көрінісі, этномәдени ерекшелік, лексика-семантикалық нұсқалар, салыстырмалы құрылымдар.

Г.А. Джайлиханова, Б.А. Торекеев

Таразский региональный университет им. М.Х. Дулати, г. Тараз, Казахстан

**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ
С ЗООНИМИЧЕСКИМ КОМПОНЕНТОМ**

Аннотация. Статья посвящена сравнительному анализу фразеологизмов с зоонимическим компонентом. В статье анализируются распространенные примеры использования зоонима в сравнительных структурах английского, русского и казахского языков. Для лингвистических исследований представляется весьма актуальным анализ зоонимической составляющей во фразеологизмах и сравнение их в языках различных систем. Таинственная природа компонентов зоонимов со временем все больше привлекает исследователей. Изучение фразеологизмов с зоонимами в разных языках способствует четкому описанию языкового образа, а в относительном аспекте исследования позволяет выявить типичные ассоциации, распознать и описать национально-культурные особенности каждого языка.

Ключевые слова: фразеологизмы, бионимический компонент, лингвокультурология, картина мира, этнокультурная специфика, лексико-семантические варианты, сравнительные структуры.