

Rayeva^{1*} , S. Eker² 

¹L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

²Bashkent University, Ankara, Turkey

*e-mail: asemgul.raeva@gmail.com

LINGUOCULTURAL SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF ZOO-PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN TURKIC LANGUAGES

The paper examines the linguoculturological semantics of Turkic zoo-phraseological units. The Turkic peoples' unique national and cultural vision of the universe is reflected in fixed terms related with the animal world. The article investigated the phraseological units which have horse lexeme in related languages. Because phraseology based on animal names in Turkic languages is a lexical unit that has gathered such complex categories as the nation's worldview, culture, and mindset. Although zoo-phraseologisms are studied fully in Turkology, we believe it is vital to compare zoo-phraseological units amongst related languages in terms of linguistic and cultural continuity. Since zoonyms (phraseological units, proverbs, etc.), according to the linguocultural data of the Turkic languages, currently piques the interest of scholars. In the content of the article the horses are characterized as an integral part of the Turkic culture and function as its primary symbol. The purpose of the study is to examine zoo-phraseology's semantic structure from a linguocultural perspective. By studying and partially analyzing the zoo-phraseology of related languages, the study identified and detailed the cultural aspects and areas of contact of the Turkic worldview. The findings of the research contribute to the definition of the zoonymic code of the representation of the Turkic world. As a result, we believe it is vital for the Turkic lexical fund to investigate the linguocultural semantics and motivational foundation of phraseological units generated by combining animal names.

Key words: linguoculturology, Turkology, Turkic languages, zoo-phraseology, linguoculturological semantic units.

А. Раева^{1*}, С. Экер²

¹Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана қ., Қазақстан

²Башкент университеті, Анкара қ., Түркия

*e-mail: asemgul.raeva@gmail.com

Түркі зоофразеологизмдерінің лингвомәдени семантикасы

Мақала түркі зоофразеологизмдерінің лингвомәдени семантикасын талдауға арналған. Түркі халықтарының дүние бейнесін қабылдаудың ұлттық-мәдени ерекшелігі жануарлар дүниесімен байланысты тұрақты сөз тіркестерінен көрінеді. Мақалада туыс тілдер бойынша ат лексемасымен қалыптасқан фразеологизмдер зерттеу нысанына алынды. Себебі түркі тілдерінде жануарлар атауына байланысты фразеологизмдер – ұлт дүниетанымы, мәдениеті, менталитеті секілді күрделі категорияларды бойына жинақтаған күрделі бірлік. Түркітануда зоофразеологизмдер жан-жақты қарастырылса да, туыс тілдер арасында зоофразеологизмдерді тіл мен мәдениет сабақтастығы тұрғысынан салыстыра зерттеуді маңызды деп есептейміз. Сондықтан бүгінгі күні түркі тілдерінің тілдік-мәдени деректері бойынша зоонимдік лексика (фразеологизмдер, мақал-мәтелдер т.б.) зерттеушілердің назарын аударуда. Мақала мазмұнында жылқы түркі әлемінің ажырамас бір бөлігі, түркілік дүниетанымның басты белгісі ретінде сипатталады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – зоофразеологизмдердің семантикалық құрылымын лингвомәдени тұрғыдан талдау. Зерттеу барысында туыс тілдердегі зоофразеологизмдерді қарастыру, ішінара талдау арқылы түркі дүние бейнесінің мәдени ерекшеліктері, ортақ тұстары танылып, сипатталады. Зерттеу нәтижесінде қол жеткізген тұжырымдар түркі дүние бейнесінің зоонимдік кодын анықтауға ықпал етеді. Сондықтан жануарлар атауының тіркесуімен жасалған фразеологизмдердің лингвомәдени семантикасы мен мотивациялық негізін зерттеу түркі тілдерінің лексикалық қоры үшін маңызды деп санаймыз.

Түйін сөздер: лингвомәдениеттану, түркітану, түркі тілдері, зоофразеологизм, лингвомәдени семантика.

А. Раева^{1*}, С. Экер²

¹Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, г. Астана, Казахстан

²Университет Башкент, г. Анкара, Турция

*e-mail: asemgul.raeva@gmail.com

Лингвокультурологическая семантика тюркских зоофразеологизмов

В статье исследуется лингвокультурологическая семантика тюркских зоофразеологизмов. Своеобразное национально-культурное видение мироздания у тюркских народов находит отражение в фиксированных терминах, связанных с животным миром. В статье исследованы фразеологизмы с лексемой конь в родственных языках. Это связано с тем, что фразеологизмы, связанные с названиями животных в тюркских языках, представляют собой лексическое единство, объединяющее такие сложные категории, как мировоззрение, культура, менталитет нации. Хотя зоофразеологизмы изучены в тюркологии в полной мере, мы считаем жизненно важным сравнение зоофразеологизмов между родственными языками с точки зрения языковой и культурной преемственности. Поскольку зоонимы (фразеологизмы, пословицы и др.), по данным лингвокультурологии тюркских языков, в настоящее время вызывают интерес ученых. По содержанию статьи кони характеризуются как неотъемлемая часть тюркской культуры и выступают в качестве ее основного символа. Цель исследования – рассмотреть семантическую структуру зоофразеологии с лингвокультурологической точки зрения. Путем изучения и частичного анализа зоофразеологии родственных языков исследование выявило и детализировало культурные аспекты и области соприкосновения тюркской картины мира. Выводы исследования способствуют определению зоонимического кода репрезентации тюркского мира. В связи с этим мы считаем необходимым для тюркского лексического фонда исследовать лингвокультурную семантику и мотивационную основу фразеологизмов, образующихся при сочетании названий животных.

Ключевые слова: лингвокультурология, тюркология, тюркские языки, зоофразеология, лингвокультурологические семантические единицы.

Introduction

Cultural information in zoonyms, as a linguistic feature, illustrates the way of life and manner of life of people using this language, respectively, cultural meanings are stored in the language community described in zoonyms. Animal names in our language are an important tool in the construction of national and cultural identity, as well as the picture of the linguistic world. From this perspective, it was discovered that the national and cultural distinctiveness of the perception of the image of the world, as portrayed in the language pictures of the world of each nation, is also represented in phraseological units generated based on animal names. Phraseological units are thoroughly investigated in general linguistics within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm. However, accurate phrases and zoonyms-components are not considered a specific object of study in the Turkic languages' phraseological lexicon. The consideration of phraseological units as a lexical system of the structural unity of the Kazakh and Turkish languages, in combination with zoonyms-components, enables in understanding the meaning of the zoonymic code of the Turkic languages conception of the world.

An ancient layer of wordstock in the Turkic language system – ability of zoonyms to support fixed

terms, a comparative analysis of the general and particular on the motivational basis of zoo-phraseology demonstrates the work's significance.

The general nature of the work is determined by the study of Turkic zoo-phraseologisms within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm from the perspective of language and culture continuity, the analysis of Turkic culture, which has deep roots in world civilization, the system of values shared by Turkic peoples, the Turkic worldview, and ideas about the common Turkic being through cultural and linguistic data.

Zoonyms are involved in the study of ethnographic and historical facts, determining national tradition and its historical development, and clarifying national knowledge. According to this, the exposure of the meaning of cultural knowledge of zoonyms in Turkic languages relates to the present linguistics direction of linguoculturology. The study of animal names in Turkic languages, as well as the research of phraseological units generated with the use of zoonym components, serves as the foundation for a cultural analysis of the Turkic peoples' essential values in the language. It should be mentioned that animal names in different languages have different aspects and attributes, alongside eliciting diverse associations. This fact states to the uniqueness of a particular people's figurative

system of thinking, as well as its complicated associative-psychological process, which generates a concept of the distinctions in the language picture of the world of different peoples. As a result, zoonyms are regarded on the one hand as a cultural feature; on the other, as a linguistic element. Most importantly, they can be the primary focus of linguistic and cultural research. The article compares and evaluates the proper sentences used as a study object in Turkic languages. The importance of a comparative study of zoo-phraseology arises from the perspective of the Turkic languages' linguistic and cultural continuity, even though zoo-phraseology in Turkic linguistics is comprehensively considered in scientific works from the semantic-structural, ethnolinguistic perspectives. The purpose of this work is to investigate the semantic-linguistic aspects of these linguistic units as a unit representing the image of the Turkic world from the perspective of "man-language-culture".

Materials and methods

The primary goal of studying Turkic zoonyms from a linguocultural standpoint is to identify cultural and linguistic features. The comparative and introspective methods are the most used methodologies for this aim. The comparative method compares Turkic language data and draws general and individual conclusions; the introspective analysis, due to the national and cultural features of one language are determined solely by data from that language, is also applied to the individual consideration of Turkic languages.

The study's goal is to compare the linguistic origins of animal names from different periods in Turkic languages, the semantic and structural analysis of zoonyms in individual languages, and the function of zoonyms in constructing figurative phrases. Therefore the study of zoonyms is thought to be significant for the development of the language's history, as well as the formation of individual groups and lexical models. Since zoonyms are rich in historical, cultural, and anthropological information, it is crucial to research them in linguoculturological, linguogeographical, and sociolinguistic aspects today. As a result, the study of zoonyms has become filled with the scientific value of research effort in this field.

Literature review

The study of zoonyms as a whole began in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

There was a wave of interest in the study of animal names when a list of all works on Slavic, Turkic, and Finno-Ugric zoonyms was released. A structural study of zoonyms was studied by K.N. Burakhov, N.K. Dmitriyev, Z.G. Uraksin, G.A. Arkhipov, V.I. Ivanov, V.V. Kochnev, O.M. Zharinova, L.V. Bairova, R. Rees, E. Dickenmann, P.P. Chuchka, E.S. Otin, and other scientists. The earliest works on the study of the structural properties of zoonyms were "The Turkic Elements of the Russian Dictionary and the essay Bashkirs' Dogs' Nicknames" by N.K. Dmitriyev. An analogue research about zoonyms in Turkic languages are broadly examined in such works: "Kyrgyz National Terms of Animal Breeding" (1969) by T. Duishenaliyeva, "Animals and Birds Names in the Bashkir and Mongolian languages" (1975) by E.F. Ishberdin, "Animal Lexicon of the Uzbek Language" (1975) by T. Khodjamberdiev, "Zoonymic Terms of the Tatar Language" by Z.R. Sadykova and particular attention was given to "Notes on the Etymology of Some Cattle Breeding Terms in the Karakalpak Language" (1980) by T. Begzhanov. For instance, the scientist Z.S. Sadykova's monographic paper "Zoonymic Terms of the Tatar Language" analyzes zoonyms and beekeeper names in both synchronic and diachronic contexts. The author of the present research compiles a substantial amount of data from historic Tatar monuments and dialects and contrasts them with other Turkic languages (Sadikova, 1994). Since the 1980s, publications in Kazakh linguistics have been making progress in this direction. In particular, A. Zhakypova's "Terms of Camel Breeding in the Kazakh Language" published in 1983 is devoted to the lexical-semantic classification of names linked with camel breeding in the Kazakh language, as well as etymology and name variation. The study also addresses the relationship of zoonyms with the Arabic, Iranian, and Mongolian languages. In total, 800 terms and phrases relevant to camel raising were evaluated in the study (Zhakypov, 1983). The issue of additional research into zoonymic vocabulary in Kazakh linguistics has been considered since the second half of the twentieth century, and has been reinforced by the works of science correspondents S.K. Satenova, B. Tlepin, B.S. Toktagul, Zh.D. Baytelieva.

In Turkish linguistics, the study of zoonyms directly tied to the name of Saadet Çagatay, whose work "Türk Halk Edebiyatında Geyie Dair Bazi Motifler" (Deer Motifs in Turkish Folk Literature, 1956) is valuable as one of the earliest works with outstanding scientific content. Further, the study of zoonyms was continued in the works of Turkish

scientists, in particular, Filolojide insan ve hayvan soybirligi (Human and animal genealogy in philology, 1968) by Ahmet Caferoglu, “Insan ve Hayvan – Insan ve Hayvanın Varlık yapısında ortaya çıkan zıt fenomenler” (Man and Animal – Opposite occurrences that arise in the framework of Man’s and Animal’s Being, 1979) by Takiyettin Mengusoglu, “Türkülerimizde Turnalar” (Cranes in Folk Songs, 1981) by Ekici Savash, “Folklorumuzda “Geyik” Motifi Üzerine” (Deer Motif in Folklore, 1982) by Mujgan Cunbur, “Aşiretlerimizde At” (Horses in Tribes, 1986) by Hayri Bashbug, “Yunus’ta Hayvan Adları ve Fonksiyonları” (Names and Functions of Dolphins, 1992) by Buran Ahmet, “Adlarımız” (Our Names, 1992) by Aydil Erol, “Türk folklorunda kuşlar” (Birds in Turkish Folklore, 1993) by L.S. Akalın, “Türk Halk İnançlarında Kurt Motifi” (Wolf Motif in Turkish Folk Beliefs, 1993) by Gonullu Ali Rıza, “Karacaoğlunda Hayvan ve Bitki Adlarının Fonksiyonları” (Functions of animal and plant names in Karakaoghlan, 1996) by Boyraz Seref, “Aristoteles’in zooloji eserlerinin ve Kemalüddin Demiri’nin Hayâtü’l-Hayevân adlı eserinin içerik ve yöntem açısından karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi” (Comparative analysis of the zoological works of Aristotle and “Khayatul-l-Khaivan” by Kemalüddin Demiri in terms of content and method, 2011) by Cakan Harun, “Tarihi Türk lehçelerinde hayvan isimleri” (Animal Names in Historical Turkish Dialects, 2004) and “Türkiye türkçesi ağzlarında bitki ve hayvan isimleri” (Plant and Animal Names in Turkish Dialects, 2012) by Kursat Efe, “Eski ve Orta türkçe hayvan isimlerinin etimolojisi” (Etymology of Old and Middle Turkic Animal Names, 2010) by Ertan Besli, “Eski Kıpçak Türkçesinde hayvan adları ve kavram alanı” (Animal Names and Concept Area in Old Kipchak Turkish, 2011) by Alagoz Ebru.

The study of zoonyms and lexeme-zoonyms in Uzbek linguistics are found reflection in the works of D.Kh. Bazarova “The history of the invention and evolution of Uzbek zoological terminology” (1978), Kh.A. Saidova «Ўзбек тилида ҳайвон номларининг шахс тавсифи вазифасида қўлланилиши» (The usage of animal names in the Uzbek language for the purpose of personal description, 1995), J. Metyakubov, “Characteristics of human zoonyms in different system languages: on the material of English and Uzbek languages” (1996), B.B. Abdushukurov «XI-XIV аср туркий ёзма манбалар тилидаги зоонимлар» (Zoonyms in Turkish textual materials from the 11th to 14th centuries, 1998), N.R. Nishonova «Ўзбек тилида “ҳайвон” архисемали лексемалар майдонининг

мазмуний таҳлили» (Content study of archisemical lexemes in the field of “animal” in Uzbek, 2000), B. Zaripov «Зоонимларнинг бадий санъат турларини ҳосил қилишдаги иштироки (Алишер Навоий асарлари асосида)» (The participation of zoonyms in the formation of artistic forms (based on the works of Alisher Navoi), 2002), B.M. Zhuraeva «Мақолнинг ёндош ҳодисаларга муносабати ва маъновий хусусиятлари» (The link and semantic aspects of the proverb to the connected events, 2007), D.M. Yuldasheva «Ўзбек болалар фольклори тилида зоонимлар» (Zoonyms in Uzbek children’s folklore language, 2007), G.E. Hakimova «Зооним компонентли фразеологик бирликларнинг структуравий ва семантик хусусиятлари (инглиз тили материаллари асосида)» (The structural and semantic properties of phraseological units with a zoonym component (based on English language sources), 2008), A.J. Omonturdiyev «Профессионал нутқ эвфемикаси (чорвадорлар нутқи мисолида)» (Professional speech euphemisms (in the example of cattlemen’s speech), 2009), Sh. Noraliyeva «Ўзбек фольклорида бўри образининг мифологик асослари ва бадий талқини» (The mythological basis and creative interpretations of the wolf motif in Uzbek folklore, 2013). These works deeply analyze zoonyms in Turkic written sources, stages of zoological term formation, semantic features of zoonyms, poetic character and zoonyms describing human behavior, semantic analysis of lexemes related to the arch-sememe “animal”. Moreover, issues of mythological interpretation of wolf image, the usage of animal names for human description in Uzbek folklore, anthropocentric interpretation of artistic texts, zoonyms in Uzbek folklore for children, as well as structural and semantic features of phraseological units with zoonymic components are considered in these scientific papers.

It is also worth highlighting D.A. Tosheva’s thesis “Linguoculturological characteristics of proverbs with a zoonymic component” (2017), which analyzes proverbs with a zoonymic component from a linguoculturological viewpoint. We can see from the general Turkic lexicon that the vocabulary related with animal names is very important in the Turkic languages. The research of Turkish scientists stated above reveal that zoonyms are thoroughly investigated in Turkic linguistics. These publications are highly scholarly and relevant research not only for Turkic studies, but also for Turkology in general.

Scientists like S.K. Sansyzybayeva, R.K. Smagulova, G. Sagidollaevna, S.K. Satenova, K. Kalybaeva, E.A. Gutman, E.N. Demesheva, O. Bicher, R. Peibonen, U. Ilyas, G.E. Khakimova have made sig-

nificant contributions to the study of zoonyms as an important part of the phraseological system, as well as to the comparison of metaphorical usage in relation to animals. In recent years, significant progress has been achieved in the study of Turkic language phraseological units in conjunction with unrelated languages. Despite the fact that works on the comparative study of related language vocabulary are partially reflected, the problem of comparative study of material from closely related languages in large groups of Turkic languages was manifested in the work of scientist K. Kalybayeva. The author investigated the comparative-historical fund of the Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogai, Tatar, Bashkir, Karachay, Balkar, and Kumyk Turkic languages, which are part of the Kipchak group. One chapter of this study is devoted to zoo-phraseology in the Kipchak languages and analyzes the function of animal names in the formation of set expressions (Kalybayeva, 2010). And one of the most important studies on the set expressions about animal names in Turkish is Levent Dogan's "Türk kültüründe hayvanlar ve hayvan İsimleri" (Animals and animal Names in Turkish culture, L. Dogan, 2001). There is little research in this area in Turkish linguistics because scientists are establishing the concept of "theological picture of the world", which is important in modern cognitive linguistics. However, zoonyms or zoomorphic units on Turkic languages, as well as its complete examination and comparison from the perspective of language and culture unity, are not yet the subject of special research. It is evident that the study of zoonyms is critical for the development of the language's history as a whole, as well as the development of individual groups and lexical models. Many linguists' works from many countries are devoted to the study of animal names. Some of the publications mentioned above are connected with each other in terms of semantic and structural analysis, etymological study, and assimilation of animal names in various regions. All scientists working on the theoretical side of zoonymy problems agree that animal names are the most valuable material for the general theory of onomastics, lexicology, as well as the study of language communication, word formation, motivation, and understanding the nominative specificity of a particular population and their cultural and historical customs and trends.

Results and discussions

Phraseologisms play an important role in the expression of a nation's culture through language. These language units act as the "cultural

element", or bearer of cultural information. The world of flora and fauna, which is the basis for the formation and existence of civilizations, has become the material of the word in all sorts of values. For centuries, the animal world, in particular, has played an essential role in people's daily lives; as a result, people's grasp of animal knowledge has generated many words and phrases in our language. The vast majority of terms that have entered the language can be classified as zootoponyms, zoo-phraseologisms, zooparemia, or zooanthroponyms. Academician A. Kaidar observes that when it comes to animal husbandry phraseology, an original technique of transferring thoughts about the animal world to human civilization emerges. According to the scientist, "most phraseologisms are created by comparing the external image, behavior, and behavior of a well-trained pet with the appropriate features of a person. One can find some commonality and similarity in these associative parallels, obtained on the one hand, on the basis of observations of the animal world, on the other hand, on the interaction of people in society and their behavior in different living conditions, which serve as a figurative framework for the formation of phraseology and motivations for changing and replacing their meaning" (Kaidar, 1998: 215).

Scientist B. Tleuberdiev believed that notions of a certain animal and bird are formed in folk knowledge. This national knowledge is transformed into cultural stereotypes, and is included in the background knowledge of an ethnic group and an individual linguistic person (Tleuberdiev, 2007: 162). The reason for the formation of phraseology is the zoomage, which gives rise to some concept in the human mind. The word-descriptor is used in the formation of a specific phraseologism. For example, if the word descriptor is the domestic animal's name, then information about the animals' place and importance in human life, as well as its appearance, behavior, acts, and other information is collected. Further, a set phrase is developed in accordance with the ethnic group's culture. The acquired information about the animal will have metaphorical significance as part of a set phrase. According to Professor A. Dybo, "zoonyms carry key information about cultural, psychological, social, and mental characteristics, which describe the specific language and its culture" (Dybo, 2009). As a result, the ethnocultural nature of zoonyms and cognitive content included in the scope of knowledge are kept in the formulation of phraseology. Such ethnocultural facts and conceptions are expressed in Turkic zoo-phraseologisms.

One of the layers of language that reflects the Turkic essence and cognition is phraseologisms related to domestic animals, especially horse cattle. Because horse has a special place in the life and culture of the Turkic people. “The horse is the wing of the Turk”, says Mahmud Kashkari, describing the role horses have in people’s lives. If there is one day of life, wish for a horse; if there are two days, wish for a wife,” the Turks ask from the Tengri. The Turks can’t imagine a happy life without a horse. Therefore, horses were considered as a special position in a man’s life, just as his beloved wife was. This opinion can be expressed in the following Turkish proverbs “*At ile avrat emanet verilmez*” (literally: a horse and a woman never give into trust); and *At ile avrat insanın bahtına* (literally: a horse and a woman are man’s happiness) and Kazakh people say “a good horse is a man’s ardor, a good woman is a man’s candle”. In Turkic phraseology, the term *жылықы* (horse) is more frequently used as part of a phraseology than the word *ат* (horse). S. Toktagul, a scholar who investigated the names of four main domestic animals in the Kazakh language, observes that there are many phraseologisms in our language made up of horse names. “Stable expressions originating from the concept of horse cattle rank first in terms of frequency of use when compared to the other four breeds. There are about two thousand stable expressions that are the origin of the names of four animals, including approximately thousand set expressions that are the origin of simply the name of horses” (Toktagul, 2005: 68). As a result, we may assert that this point of view is shared by all Turkic languages, as phraseology relating to the word horse is commonly used in all Turkic cultures. Here are the following examples:

- in the Kazakh language: *ат сауырсын берді, ат сауырына мінгізу (салу)* (becoming a man, being an adult, matured), *атқа жеңіл құдаша* (refers to a person who is flippancy and has light character), *ат көбең тартып қалды* (refers to a horse that gains weight over time), *ат жаңбырлығын жапты* (a fat horse), *ат байлады* (being respected, when the horse is presented as a gift), *ат қақты* (having a journey and getting tired), *ат қара тіл болғанда* (when spring comes, and the horse is full of grass), *ат құрғатпай қатысты* (frequently, constantly providing visits);

- in the Kyrgyz language: *ат чабым* (far), *ат арытуу* (having a long-distance journey), *ат жалын тартуу* (being an adult, matured), *ат жалына қазан асуу* (eating on horseback while traveling, having snack), *ат жалынан табуу* (easy prey, profit at someone else’s expense), *ат*

арытуу, *ат бороюн сыдыруу* (long-distance traveling), *ат жыгачтай* (a very skinny horse), *атқа жеңіл, майға чак, атқа минер* (the phrase “*atqa miner*” referred to a representative of the Soviet administration and a man of power), *ат қарат ил болгонла* (when spring comes, and the horse is full of grass);

- in the Uzbek language: *от айланиб қозигини монар* (the man finally returns to his home town), *от босмаган ерларни той босар* (the son is ahead of his father, and the pupil is ahead of his teacher), *озиқли от хоримас* (a well-fed horse will not tire out), *от кимники минганники* (the horse belongs to the one who rides it, and the robe belongs to the one who wears it), *от айланиб қозигини топар, от босмаган ерларни той босар, озиқли от хоримас, от кимники минганники*;

- in the Turkish language: *arkasından atlı kovalamak, at çalındıktan sonra ahırın kapısını kapamak* (locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen), *at gibi* (a big woman), *istediği gibi at koşturmak* (have it your way), *at koşturacak kadar, at izi it izine karışmak* (to be such a muddled community that one can’t differentiate the excellent from the useless), *at nalı kadar, at oynatmak* (1) to demonstrate one’s horsemanship skills. 2. Compete (with). 3. to rule, establish one’s dominance (over). 4. to carry out one’s wishes. 5. to be educated about (a subject), *ata et, ite ot vermek* (to distribute work or things without considering the needs and abilities of individuals involved), *atı alan Üsküdar’ı geçti* (it is too late now), *atını sağlam kazığa bağlamak, atla arpayı dövüştürmek, attan inip eşeğe binmek* (to descend into the world), *işi üç nalla bir ata kalmak, it izi, at izine karışmak*.

In relation to the horse, it can be claimed that the Turkic people have a unique philosophy and cultural system that is reflected in their perception, mentality, and language. The horse was revered by the Turkic peoples as a highly valuable and sacred animal. As a result, set phrases linked with a horse in Turkic languages reflect the people’s centuries-old history, national cognition, and traditions. We concur with experts that terms pertaining to horses have had such a profound impact on the nation’s language that they are also connected to our national code. (Alymbayeva, 2020: 175). For example, the meaning of the phrase *ат сауырына мінгізу [салу]* in the Kazakh phraseological dictionary is given as: capture and ride on a horse’s back. At the same time, historical facts show that this set phrase developed in connection with the people’s way of life: in ancient times, during *baranta* (cattle seizure without authority) times, a victorious hero took a girl or a

young woman from the same village on horseback as a sign of his victory. Furthermore, when a lady was divorced by a *talak*, she was saddled and brought to her parents' house on a horse's back. This situation was considered as an example of shame for the woman and all of her relatives. We see that this ancient, forgotten tradition, over time, has been preserved in a set phrase and today is interspersed with the meaning of "stealing against one's will". For example, "Қызыл аяқ" деген бір елді шауып, ат сауырына салып келген бір қызға аяқ салып, содан сауысқанның аласындай бір бала туады (ат сауырына салу – It was spent in the sense of being captured and mounted on a horse. It is also used in connection with the meaning "to kidnap, to abduct") (Kenesbaev, 2007: 76).

Any phraseology related with the term horse has absorbed the spiritual values of previous generations. One of them is that riding a good horse was a tremendous honor for the Turkic people, a sign of prestige in the eyes of the country. The widespread set phrase in Turkic languages in the form of "riding a horse" confirms our previous opinion. Bashkirs, for example, used the set phrase *ақ атқа атландыру* (literally: riding a white horse) to express praise. Furthermore, in the Bashkir people's cognition, when a person made his life easier, realized his ambitions, and reached his goal with the help of a horse, the set expression "at moratyna etkerer" was used (Urak-sin, 1989). The same meaning may be found in Kazakh proverbs, which states *жақсы ат ажалға ара тұрмаса да, жаудан құтқарар* (although a good horse does not rescue one's life from death, it will save from enemy) and *ат мұратқа жеткізер* (Horse takes you to your goal). In Turkish, there is a well-known set phrase: *atı eşkin, kılıcı keskin* (*Her bakımdan güçlü, dilediğini yapabilir*), (His horse is strong, his sword is sharp (he is strong in every manner and can do whatever he wants). For example, "Zalimlere karşı durmak mı istiyorsun? Atın eşkin, kılıcın keskin olmalı!", which means *May your horse be strong and your sword sharp. Therefore, Turkic people believed that if your horse is fast, you may achieve any goal, whereas falling from the horse is associated with disgrace and the loss of position in the society. To back up the previous statement, consider another set phrase in Turkish attan inip eşeğe binmek* (literally, getting off a horse and riding a donkey), and also *Bulunduğu dereceden, mevkinden, önemli görevden daha aşağı bir yere inmek veya alınmak*, which means *demotion from a specific rank, a career or a position. For example: "Aklını başına toplamazsan adamı işte böyle attan indirip eşeğe bindirirler".* (That's how a person who can't

get focused is taken off the horse and put on a donkey) (TDK Atasözleri ve Deyimler Sözlüğü).

Although Turkic people share a common cultural history, set phrases produced with the name of the same animal (for instance, a horse) rarely have the same meanings; yet, there are certain phrases whose meanings radically differ. These phraseological units with different meanings are identified as the distinctive characteristic of each nation, whereas the use of identical phraseological units in a similar, unified sense can be associated with the common cultural and traditional characteristics of whole Turkic nationalities. For example, there are Kazakh and Kyrgyz phraseological units such as *ат майы* (horse fat) or *ат майын берді* (to give horse's fat), *атқа мінер* (to get on a horse). In Kazakh, *ат майы* or *ат майын берді*, *атқа мінер* mean temporarily riding someone's horse. *Сараң байдан сұрасаңыз ат майын, Бермес үшін айта берер жоқ жайын* (*Sh.S.*). *Абай енді (төлеуге ұрының мүлкі жетпегенде) «ағайыны емес, ұрыға ат майын беруші, сүйеуші бай-жуан төлейтін болсын,-дейді* (*M.A.*) (Kenesbaev, 2007: 60). In Kyrgyz language the phraseological unit *ат майы* means аттын күчүн убактылуу алуу, убактылуу пайдалануу (referring to the temporary usage of horse power). *Пейли жаман кишиден, Аттын майын сурасаң, «Эртең кел» деп саалытат* (*Osmonkul*). (*If you ask an unkind person to borrow a horse for a bit, they will respond "come tomorrow"*). *Ат майына бір жылкы сурап, бирөөнүн мыкты атын минип, арттан жөнөйт* (*Osmonaliev*) (*Ат майын беру – temporarily riding someone's horse, borrow a horse*) (Osmonova, 2015). Therefore, it indicates that in Kazakh and Kyrgyz languages, the phraseological unit *ат майы* means temporarily riding on someone else's horse. Along with the set phrase "atqa minui" which means "becoming a man, growing up", another phraseological unit in Kazakh culture is "atqa miner", which signifies a representative of the authorities or an active, courageous person. In addition, among the Turkic people who were members of the Soviet government, the term "атқа мінер" referred to a representative of that government, a man of power. Let us look up the meaning of the word "атқа мінер" in Kazakh and Kyrgyz dictionaries:

Атқа мінер. In the past, it meant smart and active man. *Әр рудың, көп рудың адамдары ылғи атқа мінері ғана. Ішінде жұпыны киімді біреуі жоқ* (*Атқа мінер was used to describe an active and busy man in the past. People from "ru" (community), and many "rus" (communities) include government activists. There is no one who dresses*

poorly) (M. Auevov). *Қызығы кеткен ел бағып, Қисыны кеткен сөз бағып, Ендігі атқа мінгендер Күнде ертеңге тоймайды* (Abai) (*The current government of the country do not keep their promise and postpone everything till tomorrow*) (Kenesbaev, 2007: 58).

Атқа мінер 1. Советтик курулуштун активисти сыяктанып көрүнгөнү менен, иш жүзүндө ага ылайык келбеген, тескери иштерди жасаган киши. «Кошчу» уюму атқа мінер арамза куулар менен күрөшүп жатат. Анткени мурунку ячейканы атқа мінер шылуундун баласы деп ячейкалыгынан түшүрүп койгонбуз (Jantoshev). (*He is a person who, while appearing to be a Soviet power activist, actually acts in opposition to it. The organization “Kosshy” fights crooks as government activists. Because he was the son of a government activist, so we removed the front camera from the camera*) (Jantoshev). *Элет оторлоруна салынган оор салык атқа мінерлердин короктоп, ак падышанын атынан опузалап демитүүсү, зордугу менен аткарылууда* (*The high tax charged on country cattle is carried out by intimidating and blackmailing horsemen in the name of the King.*) (Beishenaliev). 2. *Эл ичинде бийликке аралашкандар. Башка уруулардын атқа мінерлери чыгым салышып, букара менен лектордү ич ара кайраштыра беришти.* (*People in positions of authority will continue to battle against ordinary people, by investing money in other ru activists*) (Sh. Umataliev). *Казанчы өз уруусунан чыккан атқа мінер-билермандарынын белең, бекер азыгы.* (*Kazanshy provided free food to the government activists of his “ru” (community)*) (Aaly). *Мен эмне силерге окшоп атқа мінер, жатып ичер белем?* (Abdukaimov) (*Would I ride a horse (be a government activist) and drink lying down?*) (Osmonova, 2015).

Furthermore, if we reveal the meaning of the phraseological unit *at oinatu* (horse play), which is used identically in Kazakh and Turkish, then the phrase *at oinatu* in Kazakh means showing arrogance, being dominant; also, getting on a horse, surrounded, and seized. In Turkish language *at oynatmak* (word for word translation: horse play) has four different meanings: To compete, Horseback performance. Be dominant. Act willingly.

The examples show that the semantics of Kazakh and Turkish phraseological units share a common motive and connection. For two related languages, the phrase *at oynату* means *showing arrogance, being dominant*. If we delve into and reveal the ethno-cultural code unique to the Kazakh nation, *at oynату* means riding a horse into a community

or one's property, and making an argument, shouting and scaring. Under customary law, *at oynату* was a criminal act. After all, such an infringement is a flagrant violation of ethical norms and riding rules in nomadic circles. Entering the community on a horse and having an improper disagreement was viewed as a disturbance of the village's tranquillity. When this happened, the troublemaker was severely punished by the village elders and even by the community. The prosecutor was sentenced to so called punishment as *at шапан* (horse cloak) or *бир тоғыз* (one nine), as well as a high fine (Encyclopedia I, 2011: 246). Thus, phraseological units provide evident notions about historical ethnographic processes, spiritual culture, customs, world perception, and folk mythology. They vividly demonstrate the tight relationship that exists between language and ethnicity, as well as language and spiritual culture (Baitelieva, 2007: 19). The Turkish phraseological unit “*yanlış ata oynamak*” means “making the wrong choice”, whereas the phrase “*at koşturmak*” means “behave as you want and act freely”. As previously stated, the Turkish people's understanding of horse riding meant a mistake in the choice, whereas in the Kazakh and Kyrgyz culture, horse riding could convey the image of a man who is very flexible, quick-witted, and fond of horseback riding, using such phraseological units as *at құлағында ойнау* and *аттың құлағыменен тең ойнау* (play on horse's ear). Furthermore, the Kazakhs had the tradition to tie a boy's umbilical cord to the mane of a horse with the wish *ат құлағында ойнасын* (play on horse's ear) at the birth of a child. When defining a person's freedom to act at will, the Turks used the word “*at koşturmak*” (literally: running a horse). Kazakhs employed the word *шабу* (to ride), which was related with horse movement, that is, *атпен шабу*, *ат шабу* (ride a horse). Thus, the phrase *ат шаптыру* (riding a horse) has two connotations in our language: 1. horse racing, baiga (horse racing); 2. sending a messenger to deliver information (Kenesbaev, 2007: 62).

Although the phraseological units that originated from “at” (horse) allude to the word “*jylqy*” (horse), they reflect a person's state, acts, behavior, good and bad attributes. Each nation's cognition-understanding has developed the evaluative connotation of phraseological units used for characterizing and describing the appearance, inner reality, and human action. When comparing the connotative semantics of animalistic phraseological units, scientist M.T. Zhubanyshkyzy observes that the use of animal names in interchangeability and uncharacteristic concepts can be explained by the fact that

the human race has been inextricably linked with the animal world for a long time. "It is well known that people express their understanding of various phenomena in the world through similar images, which are closely related to their knowledge of their surroundings. The more aspects that indicate the unique character of being, which is the object of cognition in the sense of a word, predominate in the language, the greater the possibility of depicting this being with the help of this word" (Zhubanyshkyzy, 2005: 31). Using the name of an animal in a metaphorical sense, researcher O.V. Galimova makes the following findings regarding its activity in sending information about a person: "Zoonyms give an associative expression in a person's mind, characterize his habits, character, gestures, and emotional assessment of their character by naming a specific animal. This data is examined and applied to characterize a person" (Galimova, 2004: 20). Consequently, using phraseological dictionaries in the language, it is possible to examine the predominance of zoo-phraseologisms in the macro group "man" and make conclusions about the "national character" of a certain nation. The Kazakh phraseological dictionary summarizes various set phrases constructed with the use of the *at* (horse) component used in characterizing human behavior, manifestation of appearance, and evaluation of vital activity. We made certain that the evaluation seme of zoo-phraseologisms gathered in accordance with the Kazakh language was always positive (favorable). This demonstrates how essential the horse is in our life. For example, the set phrase *жылқы мінезді адам* (a man with a horse character), which is exclusively available in Kazakh, defines a person from the positive side, and the meaning of this phrase is also complex. According to Academician A. Kaidar, the explanation for the complex meaning of such phrases is the presence of the notion about the entire people, its worldview, ethnolinguistic conceptions connected to the existence of life. In order to describe a man with a horse character, it is vital to understand the positive character features inherent in horses (Kaidar, 1998: 124). In the Kazakh language, there are many set expressions like this. Therefore, the nomads placed a high value on horse cattle and were able to thoroughly examine all of its characteristics. Kazakhs regarded horse features as positive and used them to depict human personality traits. For instance, according to the Kazakh language phraseological dictionary: *ат жақты*: a person with oval facial characteristics; *ат жалын тартып мініді*: referring to being a man, to mature, becoming an adult; *атқа мінер адам*: talking about a former, active person; аттай

желді: 1. a person who works hard; 2. A speaker, a person who talks eloquently and understands the value of the word. In addition, depending on the female type of horse, the terms *бие*, *байтал*, *сойтал* are used in Turkic languages to denote a large-bodied lady. These words also contain other semes such as "volume", "size", and "unsightliness". So, in Kazakh, "*қазақ тілінде байтал шауып, бөйге алмас сойталдай*", etc. They have the same meaning in Turkish: *at gibi, atlar anası*. If we look at it from an emotional standpoint, the seme "strong" in the word *horse* is *soğlom otdai*, which is only appears in the Uzbek language. In the Kazakh and Uzbek languages, the word *horse* is distinguished chiefly by the semes *the fastest*, *big*, and *graceful*. The Turkish word *horse* is distinguished by the characteristics as *large* and *gluttony*. Moreover, other phraseological units contain in Kazakh *ат жақты, ат құлағында ойнау*; in Turkish *at gibi, atın olumu arpadan*, in Uzbek *otning kallasidai*. In this regard, it is important to summarize our ideas by the statement of scientist A. Yildirim: "Zoocharacterists" are those who "most vividly and unlawfully determine the national identity of languages through a system of evaluative images" (Yildirim, 2016: 74).

We have seen that the content of some regular expressions composed with a horse component in Turkish, in some cases, is supported by a negative assessment. Turkish expressions like *at gözlüğü takmak* (literally, "wearing horse glasses") and *at kafalı* (literally, "the horse is the main one") are good examples of this point. As for the meaning of the phrase: *At gözlüğü takmak. Olayları dar bir bakış açısı ile değerlendirmek. "At gözlüğü takmışsınız, size ne desem faydası yok". At gözlüğü takanlar, yaşanan olayları anlayamaz.* (literally: wearing horse glasses. Assessment of events from a narrow point of view. "You wear horse glasses, and everything I tell you is useless. "Those who wear horse glasses cannot understand what happened"). *At kafalı: Aptal, ahmak, anlayışsız, akılsız, kıt zekâli* (literally: horse head: stupid, narrow-minded, thoughtless). There are unique opinions on the horse in Turkish communities that are geographically secluded. We can see this from the terms we just mentioned. Although in Turkic peoples in general stupidity is frequently conveyed through denotations of sheep, donkeys, pigs, and chickens, in certain instances we also find a persistent term that stupidity in Turkish through the zoonym of a horse. The fact that an animal occupies a place in peoples' lives, has a significant personality, leaves its "footprint" on the language, and creates an interlanguage identity despite living on opposite sides of the world is thus explained by the

shared historical and cultural connection. Second, even if zoophraseologisms based on the same term have the same figurative foundation, we do not rule out the presence of two additional semantics, namely the expressive and emotional characteristics of these units in related languages. We combine this quality with a manifestation, symbolic sign, and cognition-understanding that has emerged in the national consciousness. Every other idea that people have is related to variety and the unique natural characteristics of each type of living thing. Through linguistic evidence, it is made clear that the great majority of phraseological units that the Kazakh and Turkish languages developed on the basis of zoonymic units did so on a national basis.

Conclusion

When we investigate the underlying structures of the information content, we find parallels, commonalities, and characteristics in zoo-phraseologisms in Turkic languages. A common worldview is exhibited here on the basis of the creation of linguistic units, and the variation in pictures is due to the fact that the picture from each nation's everyday existence is different. This expertise of animal husbandry (horse culture) obtained by the Turkic peoples is equally expended among the Turkic peoples. As a result of the research, we can observe in concrete terms how the Turkic peoples established their unique attitude and worldview on horse cattle. We identified stable phrases with the 'horse' component as a linguistic indication that currently transmits vital information about the Turkic peoples' way of life, culture, and

life, among other things. Because we believe that zoo-phraseologisms in Turkic languages are directly or indirectly tied to the nation's spiritual and material culture, in which cultural knowledge is preserved. We were convinced that, in addition to the similarity inherent in Turkic languages, there are a number of variances by evaluating the aspects of the motivational foundation of zoo-phraseologisms, in which elements of our shared Turkic identity and culture have been preserved. The content and common metaphorical background of idioms connected to the name in Turkic languages were examined for similarities and differences.

In conclusion, zoo-phraseologisms are one of the indications of the national and cultural distinctiveness of each people's vision of the universe as reflected in the manifestations of the language world. As a result, zoo-phraseologisms on Turkic languages should be investigated as defining cultural characteristics, cultural marks, and linguocultural units in the picture of the Turkic globe. The unique features of the Turkic peoples in the image of the world, as well as the values of the shared Turkic culture, are expressed in zoo-phraseologisms, demonstrating the deep roots of the Turkic peoples' historical link. The linguocultural semantics of Turkic zoo-phraseologisms illustrates the link between language and culture, as well as linguocultural information about the Turkic peoples' way of life, customs, and beliefs. Nomadic animal husbandry and sedentary styles of culture influenced the meaning of animal names among Turkic peoples. As a result, zoo-phraseologisms on Turkic languages must be regarded as a coded cultural text.

References

- Садькова З.Р. Зоонимическая лексика татарского языка. – Казань, 1994. – 235 с.
- Жакипов А. Термины верблюдоводства казахского языка: автореф. дис. ... д-ра. филол. наук. – Алматы, 1983. – 35 с.
- Калыбаева Қ.С. Салыстырмалы түркі фразеологиясы (қыпшақ тобындағы тілдердің материалы бойынша): филол.ғыл. ... докт. дисс. – Алматы, 2010. – 314 б.
- Levent D. Türk kültüründe hayvanlar ve hayvan İsimleri // Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi. – 2011. – Vol.12. [Электронды ресурс]. – URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tdded/issue/12710/154689> (Kullanım tarihi: 22.08.2023)
- Қайдар Ә. Қазақ тілінің өзекті мәселелері. – Алматы: Ана тілі, 1998. – 304 б.
- Тілеубердиев Б.М. Қазақ ономастикасының лингвоконцептологиялық негіздері. – Алматы, Арыс баспасы, 2007. – 280 б.
- Дыбо А.В., Никуленко Е.В. Зооморфная метафора «медведь» в русском, английском и языках Южной Сибири // Язык и культура. – 2019. – №45. – С. 78-95
- Тохтагул Б.С. Этнолингвистический характер возрастных номинаций животных в тюркских языках: дисс. канд. филол. наук. – Туркестан, 2005. – 125 с.
- Алымбаева З.А., Рамазанов Т.Б., Сағатбек Е.Н. Жылқы концептісінің мәдени семантикалық сипаты // ҚазҰУ Хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. – 2020. – №1(177) – Б. 175-180.
- Кеңесбаев І. Қазақ тілінің фразеологиялық сөздігі. – Алматы, Арыс 2007. – 800 б.
- Уракин З.Г. Русса-башкортса фразеология һүзлегі / Русско-башкирский фразеологический словарь. – Москва: Рус. яз., 1989. – 404 с.

Atasözleri ve Deyimler Sözlüğü // Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlükleri. [Электронды ресурс]. – URL: <https://sozluk.gov.tr> (Пайдаланылған күні: 22.08.2023)

Осмонова Ж., Конкобаев К., Жапаров Ш. Кыргыз тилинин фразеологиялык сөздүгү. – Бишкек, 2015. [Электронды ресурс]. – URL: <https://el-sozduk.kg/frazeologizm> (Пайдаланылған күні: 10.09.2023)

Қазақтың этнографиялық категориялар, ұғымдар мен атауларының дәстүрлі жүйесі: Энциклопедия. – Алматы, ДПС, 2011. 1-том А-Д. – 736 б.

Байтелиева Ж.Д. Қазақ тіліндегі жылқы малына қатысты фразеологиялық тіркестердің этномәдени уәждемесі: филол. ғыл. канд. ... дисс. автореф. – Алматы, 2007. – 24 б.

Жұбанышқызы М.Т. Қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі анималистік фразеологизмдердің коннотативтік семантикасы: филол. ғыл. канд. ... дисс. автореф. – Алматы, 2005. – 31 б.

Галимова О.В. Этнокультурная специфика зоонимической лексики, характеризующей человека (на материале русского и немецкого языков): автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Уфа, 2004. – 22 с.

Yıldırım A. Anlambilim bakımından rusça zoonimler. Doktora tezi. – Kayseri, 2016. – 220 s.

References

Alymbaeva, Z.A., Ramazanov, T.B., Sagatbek, S.N. (2020). Zhylyk konceptisinin madeni semantikalyk sipaty [Cultural and semantic nature of the concept “horse”]. KazUU Habarshysy. Filologia seriasy. [Bulletin of KazNU. The series is philological]. Iss. 1 (177), P. 175-180. (in Kazakh)

Baiteliyeva, Zh. (2007). Qazaq tilindegi zhylyq malyna qatysty frazeologijalyq tirkesterdiñ jetnomádени uázhdemesi [Ethno cultural motivation of phraseological combinations, connected with a horse in the Kazakh language]. Filol. gyl. kand. ... diss. avtoref. [Abstr. Diss. ... Candid.Philol. Scien.]. Almaty. (in Kazakh)

Galimova, O.V. (2004). Jetnokul'turnaja specifika zoonimicheskoy leksiki, harakteriuuzujshhej cheloveka (na materiale russkogo i nemeckogo yazykov) [Ethnocultural specificity of zoonymic vocabulary characterizing a person (based on the material of the Russian and German languages)]. Avtoref. kand. ... filol. nauk. [Abstr. Diss. ... Candid.Philol. Scien.]. Ufa. (in Russian)

Dybo, A.V., Nikulenko, E.V. (2019). Zoomorfnaia metafora «medved'» v russkom, anglijskom i jazykah Juzhnoj Sibiri [The zoomorphic metaphor “bear” in russian, english and the languages of Southern Siberia]. Yazik i kul'tura [Language and culture]. Iss. 45. P. 78-95. (in Russian)

Kaidar, A. (1998). Qazaq tiliniñ ózekti máseleleri [Actual problems of the Kazakh language]. Almaty. Ana tili. (in Kazakh)

Kalybaeva, Q.S. (2010). Salystyrmaly tyrki frazeologijasy (qypshaq tobyndaǵy tilderdiñ materialy bojynsha) [Comparative Turkic phraseology (By the material of languages of the Kipchak group)]. Filol. gyl. doc. ... diss. [Diss. ... Doct. Philol. Scien.]. Almaty. (in Kazakh)

Kazaqtyñ jetnografijalyq kategorijalar, uǵymdar men ataularynyñ dástyryli zhyjesi: Ensiklopedia [Traditional system of ethnographic categories, concepts and names of Kazakhs: Encyclopaedia]. (2011). Almaty DPS. Vol.1. A-D. (in Kazakh)

Kenesbaev, I. (2007). Kazak tilinin frazeologijalyq sozdigi [Phraseological dictionary of kazakh language]. Almaty. Arys. (in Kazakh)

Jubanyshqyzy, M.T. (2005). Qazaq zháne aǵylshyn tilderindegi animalistik frazeologizmderdіñ konnotativtik semantikasy [Connotative semantics of animalistic phraseology in Kazakh and English languages.]. Filol. gyl. kand. ... diss. avtoref. [Abstr. Diss. ... Candid.Philol. Scien.]. Almaty. (in Kazakh)

Levent, D. (2001). Türk kültüründe hayvanlar ve hayvan isimleri [Animals and animal names in Turkish culture]. Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi [Journal of Language and Literature of the Turkic World]. Vol. 12. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tdded/issue/12710/154689> (Date of use: 22.08.2023) (in Turkish)

Osmonova, ZH., Konkobaev, K., ZHaparov, SH. (2015). Kyrgyz tilinin frazeologiyalyk sozdygy [Phraseological dictionary of the Kyrgyz language]. Bishkek. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://el-sozduk.kg/frazeologizm> (Date of use: 10.09.2023)

Uraksin, Z.G. (1989). Russko-bashkirskij frazeologicheskij slovar' [Russian-Bashkir phraseological dictionary]. Moscow. Russian Language. (in Russian)

Sadykova, Z.R. (1994). Zoonimicheskaya leksika tatarskogo yazyka [Zoonymic vocabulary of the Tatar language]. Kazan. (in Russian)

Toktagul, B.S. (2005). Jetnolingvisticheskij harakter vozrastnyh nominacij zhivotnyh v tjurkskih yazykah [The ethnolinguistic nature of the age categories of animals in the Turkic languages]. Diss. ... kand. filol. nauk. [Diss. ... Candid.Philol. Scien.]. Turkestan. (in Russian)

Tileuberdiev, B.M. (2007). Qazaq onomastikasynıñ lingvokontseptologijalyq negizderi [Linguoconceptological bases of Kazakh onomastics.] Almaty. Arys baspasy (in Kazakh)

Atasözleri ve Deyimler Sözlüğü [Dictionary of Proverbs and Idioms]. Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlükleri [Dictionaries of the Turkish Language Association]. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://sozluk.gov.tr> (Date of use: 22.08.2023) (in Turkish)

Yıldırım, A. (2016). Anlambilim bakımından rusça zoonimler [Russian zoonyms in terms of semantics]. Doktora tezi [Doctoral thesis]. Kayseri. (in Turkish)

Zhakupov, A. (1983). Terminy verbljudovodstva kazahskogo yazika [Camel breeding terms of the Kazakh language]. Avtoref. Diss. ... doct. filol. nauk. [Abstr. Diss. ... Doct. Philol. Scien.]. Almaty (in Russian)

Information about authors:

Assemgul Rayeva (corresponding author) – PhD student, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Kazakhstan, Astana, e-mail: asemgul.raeva@gmail.com);

Eker Suer – Professor, Doctor. Bashkent University (Ankara, Turkey, e-mail: suereker@yahoo.com).

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Раева Асемгуль (корреспондент автор) – PhD докторант, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті (Алматы қ., Қазақстан, e-mail: asemgul.raeva@gmail.com);

Екер Сүйер – профессор, доктор, Башкент университеті (Анкара қ., Түркия, e-mail: suereker@yahoo.com).

Date of receipt of the article: December 3, 2023.

Accepted: September 11, 2024.