



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ijscl.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

Phraseological Expressions in the Turkic Language: Comparative Analysis

Nuraisha Bekeyeva^{1a}, Akmaral Bissengali^{2b}, Zhamal Mankeyeva^{3b}, Bibaisha I. Nurdauletova^{4c}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received May 2021
Received in Revised form July 2021
Accepted August 2021
Available online August 2021

KEYWORDS:

Ancient words
Dictionary
Idiom
Linguistics
Historical development

Abstract

Turkic languages are based on the study of common spiritual foundations as well as proving the valuable works of the ancient Turkish era. Modern linguistics proves in accordance with the communicative and hereditary nature of culture, its preservation as an open system, its achievement, and the implementation of a new language. Therefore, in a certain ethnic (national) collective, the majority of means of cultural communication serves as language and characterizes culture as a historical and social process. The article describes how the kinship is demonstrated in the language of Turkic peoples based on the cumulative function of the language. This article considers cumulative function in the content similarities of phraseological units. Understanding of this issue lies in identifying and modernizing the Turkic peoples' historical, spiritual, and social worldviews, as well as the culture of each ethnic group in their language; therefore, the above issue is comprehended through the insight into the linguistic content.

© 2021 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

¹ Senior Lecturer, Email: bekeyeva7172@tanu.pro (Corresponding Author)
Tel: +7-727-2704314

² Junior Researcher, Email: bissengali@uohk.com.cn

³ Professor, Email: zh-mankeyeva@nuos.pro

⁴ Professor, Email: b.nurdauletova@ust-hk.com.cn

^a College of Humanities and Education, KIMEP University, Republic of Kazakhstan

^b Institute of Linguistics named after A. Baitursynuly, Committee of Science of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Republic of Kazakhstan

^c Caspian University of Technology and Engineering named after Sh. Yessenov, Republic of Kazakhstan

1. Introduction

Central Asia and Kazakhstan are home to the majority of the Turkic peoples. Here live the representatives of Kipchak, Karluk, and Oguz groups, which fully cover the three main groups of Turkic languages. The study of the similarities and phraseological system in the languages of Turkish peoples is key in exploring the “Turkic world”. For many centuries, phraseologies have been studied and preserved in the memory of the people, manifested in artistic language, and passed from generation to generation based on both communicative and cumulative functions of language. Language signs were collected in the fund of national knowledge of national life, worldview, spiritual and cultural values, professional and social value, business abilities, skills and behavior, wisdom, worldview concepts, customs, and traditions. They represent various everyday realities, ethnographic and religious terms, etc. Phraseological units manifest themselves in the language as components.

The modern historical and social period and the level of development of Turkic linguistics necessitate a typological generalization of the phraseological system of Turkic linguistics. Consideration of the meaning of the traditional Turkic vocabulary, which is defined as components of phraseological phrases based on cognitive-semantic correlation, allows reconstructing their commonality. In this regard, it is possible to define the modernization of the historical-linguistic and ethnographical features of etymology in the Turkic phraseological system as a linguistic-cultural reconstruction.

The need for typological, historical, and cognitive study of phraseological units relates to the fact that it constitutes the lexical approaches in word formation and semantic development because many of the oldest elements of lexicon have been preserved in these regular expressions. The indigenous content of phraseological units and concepts describes them as one of the forms of presenting the truth. Nominative phraseology, which serves as a historical vocabulary, is closely related to the history of the cultural, social, and political life of native speakers.

The purpose of this article was to cover the specific features of national culture and the

psychology of the Turkic nations by means of phraseological expressions and to conduct a comparative analysis of phraseological units in Turkic languages.

2. Theoretical Framework

The first book written in the Turkic language is “Compendium of the languages of the Turks” (al-Kashgari, 2017) which mostly consists of specimens of Old Turkic poetry. Al-Kashgari (2017) analyzed proverbs and phraseology, idioms which describe such virtues as “art”, “grace”, “tact”, “warmth”, “justice”, “humility”, studied poetry, ethnonyms and toponyms describing the virtues such as “adults”, “respect for the elders”, “keeping promise”, “courage”, and “humbleness”. It testifies to the existence of phraseological units which for many centuries have performed a communicative-social function and cognitive treasure function in the society, as well as the development of language content and the fact of “ancient” cumulative functions.

Modern linguists continue compiling phraseological dictionaries and vocabularies (Fedorov, 2008; Iskakov, 2019; Ivanov, 2005; Jorayev, 2011; Kenesbaev, 2007; Shoibekov, 1991; Subrakova, 2006; Taranov, 2012). Kenesbaev (2007) created the first phraseological dictionary of the Kazakh language, collecting, systematizing, and analyzing the examples of the unique creativity of the Kazakh culture. Fedorov’s (2008) dictionary contains about 13,000 phraseological units of the Russian literary language, including archaic expressions. Iskakov (2019) created a handbook translating and comparing English, Russian, and Kazakh idioms, phraseological units, and phrasal verbs.

Many studies on Turkic phraseology have been published (Galieva & Galiullina, 2015; Hasanli-Garibova, 2014; Karimova & Latypova, 2016; Mushaev & Abdullayev, 2017). Satenova (1997) investigated the linguistic and poetic features of the phraseological units in the Kazakh language. Gak (1998) studied the dialectics of semantic relations in the language. Turkic dialects in modern Turk and Azerbaijani languages were researched in the studies by Hasanli-Garibova (2014). Galieva and Galiullina (2015) studied the semantic and cultural potential concerning the emotive

idioms of Tatar language that describe Tatar psychology and mentality. The authors of “Complete dictionary of popular phraseology” (Mokienko & Nikitina, 2018) designed the terminology relating to the development of a dictionary and its structuring. Overall, there is a lack of studies that would cover the systematic typological, historical, and cognitive aspects of Turkic phraseology.

3. Methodology

The material definition of a language as a social phenomenon, the most important tool in communication and in real life, necessitates its study that goes beyond the dialectics and dynamics of human understanding of language. It also necessitates addressing the historical development, covering the specific requirements and types of manufacture, cultural and historical experience, which are reflected in the totality of lexical units. In this regard, phraseology is a treasure of language, which has preserved ancient words, obsolete grammatical features of the last century, and syntactic structures displaced by time and literary norms. It demonstrates the cumulative quality of the language.

When studying the nature of Turkic kinship, it was determined that the communicative function of the language is combined with cumulative properties. Language is not only a communicative tool but also a hereditary and cumulative manifestation of human existence. The “key” which opens its content proves that national ideas exist in the cultural background by means of the language. The main tasks of the modernization of the Turkic phraseological system as a linguistic-cultural reconstruction can be described as follows:

1. Turkic languages are commonly preserved as a component of phraseology. The lexicon belongs to the active vocabulary or peripheral language. This is because, during the historical development of the language, most obsolete words were considered the periphery of the vocabulary and part of phraseology.

2. It is necessary to observe the historical and cognitive consistency in the system of phraseology, which studies the structural features of phenomenological reality and unites (models, preserves) the structural peculiarities.

3. Phraseological units have alternative interpretations of words and add a second meaning. The second, phraseological meaning, is developed as an alternative to the original meaning and reveals connotation value as the result of the nomination.

4. According to the historical-typological study of phraseological units, the common elements emerge based on the interaction of Turkic languages.

The authors used the ethnographic method to identify the examples of the modern use of phraseological units that represent the Turkic peoples’ national identity. Culturological approach allowed establishing the cumulative meaning of phraseological units and the cultural background of national concepts. The communicative approach was combined with the qualitative analysis of phraseological expressions to establish the role of language in passing down information through generations. Cultural-cognitive reconstruction of the unconscious components in the sense of phraseology allowed the creation of the ethnocultural code. Equivalents in the Kazakh, Uighur, Tatar, Khakass, and Uzbek languages were cited as examples to identify the origin of common phraseology in these languages using the comparative method and internal reconstruction.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Linguistic and Cultural Reconstruction in the Turkic Phraseology

Phraseological combinations in modern Turkic languages are the result of a long historical development, which has been preserved based on the cumulative function of the language and passed down through generations. Some of them were recorded on written archaeological finds from various periods relating to the early history of the Turkic languages, for example, ‘batpan kuiryk’. In the modern Kazakh language, it is used in the meaning “unexpected riches”. A separate semantic meaning of “batpan” in this expression is not obvious in modern languages. Therewith, in the Dictionary of Ancient Turkic Language (Nasilov et al., 2016), “batpan” means a unit of weight. In the dictionary of al-Kashgari (2017), “batpan” is the weight from 180 kg to 300 kg. A value relative to the size of the land was indicated as

“about two acres in the valley of the Talas River”. The constants/meanings of the word “batpan” (батпан) have a new meaningful (business) tone in the modern business discourse. At present, it means “income and sudden gain unrelated to the expected income”.

There are enough examples in the folklore and literature of the Kazakh and other Turkic nations describing the “female beauty” based on metaphorical, poetic expression, such as Қолаң шаш-[Қолаңшәш]-[Qolañ shash].

Etindei jas balanyñ bilegi bar,
Ajymсыз аң саысағы iske yñgaily,
Qara qolañ shashy bar jibek taldy,
Torgyndai tolqyndyryp kóz tañdaidy
(Kunanbayev, 2006).

Her wrist is tender as a baby,
Smooth white fingers easily get to work.
Her dark brown hair is like silk,
Her eyes, like waves, beat (Translated by the authors).

In the ancient Uyghur language, the word “qolan” was used literally as waist, belt (al-Kashgari, 2017). The phraseological units describing the nation’s existence, original culture’s ethnic signs data perform the following functions: 1. aesthetic; 2. socio-functional approach in the context of time and space from the historical and ethnic standpoint; 3. cognitive-axiological.

For example, the word талқы-[талқы]-[talqy] in the modern Kazakh language is used as “to discuss” and “discussed”. While historically, in the traditional life of the Kazakh people, “талқы- [талқы]-[talqy]” was a wooden instrument that softens and stretches the animal skin (Iskakov, 2019). Consequently, it was a word historically used to describe a tool. Then, based on this meaning, the variable value (analysis of life, analysis of fate, etc.) originated. Its semantics is diminished, and the first reason for this is the obsolescence of the instrument. Secondly, the integral structural model of the linguistic consciousness emerged through the development of cognitive-social practice and phraseologization of the additional notions. Thus, the phrase “discussion” – connotational applications “analysis of fate” – is the name of the work of material ethnic culture of the Kazakh people. Linguo-cultural analysis revealed to people the meaning

unknown in modern language. As a result, “талқы-[талқы]-[talqy]” is often heard from the academy tribune and is actively used at the business meetings according to business customs. For example, “discuss the issues”, “discuss the draft law”, “discuss the main issues”, etc. In Turkic phraseology, the results of a comparative typological and historical etymological analysis are based on the components of phraseological units in terms of proving phraseological units. These results determine that phraseological units consist of free phrases. This proves that the culture and its distinguished internal content are preserved through each ethnos’ language, and that the key to discovering that content lies in the cultural background of national concepts preserved by language as mentioned above.

Phraseologists (Karimullina et al., 2019; Şimşek, 2020) justified the meaning of the components in the general meaning of the phrases that had originated. For example, in the Turkmen language “el govshur” (“to put the hands on the chest”) “қол қуыру-[қол ғуысұру]-[qol qýsyry]” (in the Kazakh language) is used to express dignity, respect for someone (a person with hands on the chest expresses their respect for someone – ellari goymak göwüs), in the course of the further development of the language, this phrase has begun to be used as “taking a bow”. It is a kind of gesture for Kazakh people, with a second bow in the neck. As a result of this comparison, the following conclusions can be made about the generality of fragmentary phrases of the modern Turkic languages: many phraseological expressions originate from one cultural source, while others represent a competing development. For example, “Киіз үй-[кййзүй]-[kijizy]”, the Yurt, is a manifestation of the modern, everyday life of the Kazakh people, the small world of nomads, their worldview, the symbol of the Universe. And the main components of its roots include the traditional respect for the shañyraq, bosaға, and kerege. The value of the national recognition is highlighted by language: шаñырағың биік болсын-[Shañyragyñ biik bolsyn!]-“become a good, happy family”, қара шаñырақ-[qara shañyraq]-“big house, parent house”; босаған берік болсын-[Bosağan berik bolsyn]-“let your family be strong”.

Although “bosaga” (the structural part of the Yurt) has a direct semantic meaning, with the mythical idea which distinguishes between the intermediate limits of the “outside world” and “inner world” (inside the house), the phrase “оң босағада отырған қыз-[bosagada otyrgan qyz]” means “a girl who has not married and who still lives with her parents”. According to traditional knowledge of the space of the Yurt, its right side is intended for women, and the left side is intended for men. Language is not only a means of communication in society but also the language where information about the world, truth, and symbolics is formed. The secret of the ability of language to be passed down through generations is a phraseological system, the main and distinct source of its linguistic evidence depending on the cumulative language. Phraseology is formulated by the linguistic philosophy, the linguistic model, or the linguistic imagination, as well as the recognition of the truth, the result of their life experience. As a result of such comparative research, common features of phraseological units of modern Turkic language can be proposed: the majority of phraseological units derive from cultural-cognitive data, and others derive from the development of phraseological units. “Such statements and definitions explain the meaning of the cumulative activity of phraseological units. As a result, phraseologists performed cultural connotation by identifying the meaning in the linguistic consciousness” (Satenova, 1997, p. 87). Phraseological unit кебеже қарын-[as kebezhe]-“a fat person” can serve as an example.

In the Kazakh language, the word “kebezhe” describes a wooden box for the foods and meals decorated with ornaments. In the ancient Kazakh culture, there was a “saptaak”, which meant “a wooden buckwheat pitcher”. Nomads have always carried it with them. Kenesbaev's “Phraseological dictionary” (2007) says that it was used in everyday life, but nowadays, this word has become part of the idiom: Саптаяққа ас құйып, сабынан қарауыл қарады-[saptajaqqa as quyp sabynan qarawul qarady]. It is a part of a phraseological unit with the meaning “cunning person, cruel behavior”. The idiom “той өткен соң даңғара-[to otken son dangara]” means “everything has its time”. And даңғара-[dangara]-[dangara] is a loud ancient musical

instrument (Gerasimova, 2020; Kurmanali et al., 2016; Shoibekov, 1991).

In nomadic phraseology, the original images include ancient national traditions, beliefs, historical legends, various non-standard variants and occasionalism, dialects, realities, ethnographic, and religious terms which prove the data of the ancient Turkic language, for example, Bader ajaq-bowl (bowl for feeding a “Buddhist monk”); çekčäk qara-fur coat, clothes of slaves; čuram oqi-light long arrow for archery on a long-range target; ötüg bilig-debt instrument (ötüg-request, plea); qara baš-slave, servant (Nasilov et al., 2016). The above examples demonstrate that the study of the meaning of the phraseological phrases in the context of linguistics, as well as the definition of the population's history, ethnography, archeology, literature, and folklore, can be explained by the cumulative activity of phraseology. Melikyan et al. (2017), Ryabchikova et al. (2019), Tukesheva et al. (2019), Bragina et al. (2020) believe that phraseology always reflects the worldview of the people, their social system, and ideology of the time.

Therefore, the connection between language acquired by the people's history allows making interesting and valuable judgments, creating a lot of words and linguistic phenomena, giving birth to components of phraseological combinations, proverbs, and idioms, etc. As a result, modern usage has been restored from the standpoint of historical cognition, and the linguistic data of the archetypal nature, which is based on the level of mythical knowledge, is preserved in the structure of the phraseological system. For example, in Kazakh cognition, every family cooks daily and is considered as one of the “seven treasures”. Thus, қара қазан, тайқазан-[қарағазан, тайғазан]-[qaragazan, tajyazan]-kazan (translated as “cauldron”) is recognized as a symbol of the continuity of tradition through generations. (Ualiuly, 2000). Therefore, as a means of everyday life, kazan is used in the meaning “sacred”, “holy”, and “blessed”, while “қазанын төңкеру/сындыру” (overturned/broken kazan) translates as “a ruined family” or “hunger”. The direct meaning of the phrase Сырға тағу [sryga tayow] is “to wear fashionable jewelry”, i.e., aesthetic activity, while in a mythical sense, this meant “holiness”, “dark forces”,

“protecting charm”, etc. A similar tradition is also found in Kyrgyz language (Ivanov, 2005).

Consequently, one should consider not only a historical and morphological reconstruction but also the cultural and cognitive reconstruction of the ethnic confessional system. The ethno-cultural code is revealed in the components of a phraseological system. As a result, the concept is not just manifested in the structure of phraseological units but also metaphorized and transformed into a figurative notion. Interaction of native speakers, the common world of things, and socio-historical experience, along with the idea of various notions and concepts, serve as the basis for the emergence of common and national content. Moreover, these two differences, which make up the dialectical unity of contradictions, play an important role in the change of the “ideal” image of something (Chen et al., 2020).

Therefore, phraseological units occupy a special place in the language vocabulary development, testify to high oratory skills as one of the means of figurative and artistic language. They represent the word-forming lexical means that have been used for centuries for the purpose of artistic representation of various phenomena against the background of comparative aspect, as ready models, structures that were passed down through generations. It was highlighted by many researchers at different times. “Phraseology is the treasure of the language, which has preserved ancient words and outdated grammatical forms, syntactic structures inappropriate to the time and literary norm” (Mokienko & Nikitina, 2018, p. 91). As Gak (1998) shows, they are the equivalents of words that can serve as phraseological units and are associated with expressiveness and emotional conveyance of ideas in need of reflection. Consequently, phraseological units are included in the indirect nominative structure of the language with an expressive image due to connotations. Therefore, Fedorov (2008, p. 21) argues that “one phenomenon can be interpreted using another phenomenon”. The preservation of the national culture is reflected in the culturally significant components in the phraseological units relating to labor. In particular, the specific feature of the national phraseological units lies not only in the distinction of the national culture but also in its content: extra-

linguistic meaning, which served as an expressive tool of the national characteristic. A manifestation of phraseological units as a phenomenon of the language consciousness is often used to describe relatively similar things, acquaintances, products, phenomena, and behavior.

Based on the cumulative ability of such language, much ethnocultural information stored in the well-known Turkic phraseological texts can be found in the Phraseological Collection of the Kazakh language, such as: көнектей болу-[көнектей болу]-[kønektej bølw] (to be old-fashioned), қалжа жеу-[қалжа жеу]-[qalʒa ʒew] (to eat junk food), etc. Similarly to the ethnocultural associations, the manifestations of the artistic thinking system are widely used in the form of phraseological units: айрандай ұйып отыр-[айрандай ұйып отыр]-[ajrandaɯ ʊjʊp ɒtɯr] (to be amazing), көбіс ауыз-[көбіс ауыз]-[købis awʊz] (many of drinking), etc. (Iskakov, 2019).

From the historical standpoint, one can see that the word пүшпак-[пүшпак]-[pʊʃpaq] has occurred in the Kyrgyz language in the meaning “below the knee” and was preserved in the following phraseological units: Пүшпағынан сабылды-[Пүшпағынан сабылды]-[pʊʃpaɣʏnan sabɯldɯ]-to be sick or tired; Пүшпағына түсті-[пүшпағына түсті]-[pʊʃpaɣʏna tɯstɯ]-very long clothing. The main meaning of the word “pushpak” (bottom of the foot) and its derivative is “one end, one part of the subject”. Thus, it is not the name for the entire leg and not the name for the skin, but only the name of its part. It can be seen in the Kyrgyz language as “Пүшпак ішік-[Пүшпак ішік]-[pʊʃpaq ɯʃɯk]-“cloth from the feet of the beast”. It can be concretized on the example of the Kazakh language. There are various meanings, such as Пүшпакта-[Пүшпакта]-[pʊʃpaqta]-“cloth of parts of tail”, Пүшпактай-[Пүшпактай]-[pʊʃpaqtaj]-“very small”, пүшпак-[пүшпак]-[pʊʃpaq]-“part of the homeland”, “one part of the story”, etc. In addition, it has a figurative meaning in phraseological units: pushpagynan ustady (“having the power”, but it is not the power itself, but only a sense of power); пүшпағын алдырмады-[пүшпағын алдырмады]-[pʊʃpaɣʏn aldɯrmaɯ]-“survivor”; пүшпағы қанамаған-[пүшпағы қанамаған]-[pʊʃpaɣʏ qanaɯmaɣan] (does not give birth); пүшпағына да

татымады-[пұшпағына да татымады]-[pʊʃpaɣyna da tatɪmadɨ] (does not have the same feature), etc. (Iskakov, 2019).

4.2. Phraseology as the Result of a Secondary Nomination Reflecting the Truth outside the Language

Phraseological units are those that emerge as a result of an expressive indirect concept created through specific signs. The nominal function of phraseological word combinations can serve as a basis for their consideration as a specific lexical method of word-formation. Since, in comparison with other words, these phraseological phrases have been used for centuries to depict various phenomena in the language, their application in the form of ready phraseological structures brings them to the periphery of vocabulary. As a result, many words, archaisms, etc., may be preserved in the active fund of the language. The basis for the emergence of many common

phraseological units in modern Turkic languages is the result of their development along with human history. It can be illustrated by the following examples:

1. In the Kazakh language: күн көру-[күн көрүү]-[kyn goryw] and in Uyghur: kun kormak- [kyn kormak]-“survive”.
2. In the Kazakh language: өгей қыз-[өгөйғыз]-[өгөйғыз] and in the language of the Khakas: ол қыз-[ол қыз]-[ol qyz]-“stepdaughter”.
3. In the Kazakh language: қаба сақалды-[қабасақалды]-[qabasaqaldɨ] and in the Tatar language: Kaba sakalli-[qabasaqallɪ]-“a person with a thick beard” (Mukhamadiarova et al., 2020; Palimbetova, 2020; Subrakova, 2006).

Their meaning is exactly the same. But sometimes, there are changes or other options in individual components (Table 1). Furthermore, some phraseological combinations have no Turkic equivalents (Tables 2-3).

Table 1

Comparison based on the Origin of Phraseological Units

Kazakh	Uigur
Жүрегі айну-[жүрөгү айнуу]-[ʒyrɔɣy ajnow]-(<i>upset stomach</i>)	<i>Konli oiainimok</i> -[kɔnli ɔjainimɔk]
екі аяғын бір етікке тығу-[екайағын біретікке тығуу]-[e kajaɣyn bɪretikke tɣɔw]-(<i>pressure</i>)	<i>Ikki putini bir otukka tikmak</i> -[ɪkki pʊtɪni bɪr ɔtukka tikmak]
түрі(келбеті) келіскен-[түрі(келбеті) келіскен]-[tʏrɪ(kelbeti) kelisken]-(<i>pretty</i>)	<i>Andasizi kelisken</i> -[andasızı kelisken]
аяққа басты-[айаққа басты]-[ajaqqa bastɨ]-(<i>humiliate</i>)	<i>Tavanga toshlimok</i> -[tavanga tɔʃɪmɔk]

Table 2

Phraseological Units not Found in Uigur

Kazakh	Uigur
<i>Босану</i> -[Босануу]-[bɔsanɔw]-(<i>to give birth</i>)	<i>Kozi iorumak</i> -[kɔzi iɔrwɪmak]
алдау, өтірік айту-[алдау, өтүрүг айтүү]-[aldaw, ɔtʏrɪg ajtɔw]-(<i>to lie</i>)	<i>Pahta atmak</i> -[pahta atamak]
Қуанышым ішіме сыймай тұр-[Қуанышым ішіме сыймай тұр]-[qɔwanɨʃɪm ɪʃime sɨjɪmaj tʊr]-(<i>to be overjoyed</i>)	<i>Zhenim ichingma patmaidu</i> -[Zhenim ichingma patmaidw]
Ол өлі мен тірінің арасында жатыр-[ол өлу мен тірінің арасында жатыр]-[ol ɔly men tɪrɪnɪɳ arasɪnda ʒatɨr], науқас адам туралы-[науқас адам тұралы]-[nawqas adam twralɨ]-(<i>humiliate</i>)	<i>Upildirlapla kaput</i> [wpildirlapla kapwt]

Table 3

Phraseological Units not Found in Tartar

Kazakh	Tartar
Сотқар-[сотқар]-[sɔtqar], төбелескіш-[төбөлөскіш]-[tɔbɔlɔskɨʃ], әтеш-[әтеш]-[ætɛʃ]- <i>naughty</i>	<i>Kalai atech</i> -[Kalai atech]
Мадақтау-[Мадақтау]-[madaqtaw]-(<i>fluttering</i>)	<i>Salpy yakka salam kystyru</i> -[Salpy jakka salam]
сұстану-[сұстануу]-[sʊstanɔw], қабақ шыту-[қабақ шытүү]-[qabaqʃɪtɔw], тыржию-[тыржыйу]-[tɨrʒɨjɔw]-(<i>to be ready</i>)	<i>Chyrai sytu</i> -[Chyrai sɨtw]
артық саналу-[артық саналуу]-[artɨq sanalɔw]-(<i>to value more</i>)	<i>Kara tarakan bolu</i> -[Kara tarakan]
жалқау-[жалқау]-[ʒalqaw], жұмыссыз-[жұмұссыз]-[ʒʊmʊssɔz], үйсіз-күйсіз-[үйсүз-гүйсүз]-[ɨjsɨz-gɨjsɨz], қараусыз жүру-	<i>At tibengecanda iorucha</i> -[At tibengesanda iorwcha]

[қараусыз жүруу]-[qarawsyz žyruw]-(<i>lazy</i>)	
саңырау-[саңырау]-[saŋɣɾaw], құлағы нашар есту-[құлағы нашар естүү]-[qulaɣɯ naʃar estyɯ]-(<i>deaf</i>)	<i>Tun kolak</i> -[Twn kolak]
<i>Zhyky buzyl'dy</i> -(to be upset)	<i>Zhilegen korytu</i> -[Zhilegen korɣtw]
Біреудің арқасында күн көру-[Біреудің арқасында күн көрүү]-[birew arqasında kün körw]-(<i>living at others' expense</i>)	<i>Zhilkesin kimeru</i> -[Zhilkesin kimerw]

4.3. The Changes of Phraseological Combinations Because of the Comparative Study

As a result of the comparative study of phraseological combinations in modern Turkic languages and ancient Turkic monuments, the following structural changes can be distinguished:

1. In modern Turkic languages, part of the phraseological units referring to the ancient Turkic words, fully preserved their semantic-structural correspondence to ancient Turkic phraseological units, for example, теке сақал-[теке сақал]-[tekesaqal]; Man with a sparse mustache and beard (al-Kashgari, 2017).

2. Some of the phraseological units contained in the ancient Turkic literary monuments were structurally breached, transforming into a simple word, for example, 1) tanil – таңғалу (surprise); tanla-таңғалу, есі кету, таңырқау surprise, bloating; Nowadays the meaning of the word таң қалу 2) tanla – таң ағару dawn. For example, tan tanladi “таң ағарды, таң шапақ атты” means “dawn” and in the use of modern languages, таң атты-[таң атты]-[taŋ atɣ] means “sunrise” (Nasilov et al., 2016).

3. On the contrary, part of phraseology of modern Turkic languages used to be described with a single word. The development of phraseological units is influenced by a certain period of time. Lexical units have been used since the language originated. That is, the

expression of phraseological meanings by certain separate words is more ancient than their phraseological combinations, for example, [qolqa salý]- (to do a favor). Its meaning in Kazakh is a request without raising a question. Its meaning given in the ancient Turkic language is represented by a separate word “*qol*”, for example, er tanrika soqusmis qut qolmis-(A man meets God and asks for happiness), Сүрөн салды-[сүрөн салдүү]-[syron saldow]-to banish, to exile, to expel, etc. In ancient Turkic literary monuments, one can observe the use of the verb “*sur*” in this meaning. In Altai language, “*sur*” means to exile, to expel. Many languages contain their respective derivatives. For example, in Uzbek-Surgun language, there are words meaning “to drive out”, “to excommunicate”, “to remove”, “to expel”, “to exclude” (Jorayev, 2011; Taranov, 2012). In Azerbaijan language, there are words *surkun*, *surmak* which mean “excommunicated”, “expelled” (Akif, 2013). In the Kazakh language, the word *qyǵyn-súrgin* (expelled) can be considered as a related word. That is, the meaning of *sur* in the Kazakh language is given only in the form of phraseology and through word combinations.

4. Another part of phraseological units has undergone structural changes, where one of the components has been replaced, for example, in Kazakh, *qulaq japat*-“have one’s ears flapping” is kulak turu (al-Kashgari, 2017) (Table 4).

Table 4

Comparison of Phraseological Units Replaced by One of the Components

Turkic	Kazakh
tus tusa	Түс көру-[Түс көрүү]-[tys körw]: “dream”
uminc kes	Үмігін үзу-[үмүтүн үзүү]-[ymytyn yzyw]-“break hope, lose hope”
topata tut	Құрмет тұту-[Құрмөт тұтүү]-[qymöt totow], Құрметтеу-[Құрмөтттеу]-[qymöttew], ардақтау-[ардақтау]-[ardaqtaw]-“respect, recognition”

5. Some phraseological units in ancient Turkic literary monuments are not found in modern Turkic languages. Their meaning can be

represented by other phraseological units, for example, qadas jaq jajuq means “distant and close relatives” (Table 5) (al-Kashgari, 2017).

Table 5

Absence of Some Modern Turkic Phraseological Units from the Ancient Turkic Language Manuscripts, Comparison of the Transfer of Meaning with Other Phraseological Units

Turkic	Kazakh
Jas bol (al-Kashgari, 2017)	қайтыс болу-[қайтыс полұу]-[qajɨɯs bɔlɔw], қаза табу-[қаза табұу]-[qaza tabɔw]-“die”
Arquq qilinc (al-Kashgari, 2017)	бірбеткейлік-[бірбеткейлік]-[birbetkejlik]-“stubborn”
Acijlis tut (al-Kashgari, 2017)	молшылықта ұстау, өмір сүргізу-[молшұлұқта ұстау, өмүр сүргүзу]-[mɔlʃɔlɔqta ɯstaw ,ɔmyɯ syɯɣɯzw]-“living in abundance”

Phraseological paradigms of the word “қамшы-[қамшы]-[qamʃɨ]” in the Kazakh language differ from their semantic paradigm. Words in Turkic languages such as Nogay, Kyrgyz, and Tatar have the same meanings. Қамшы-[қамшы]-[qamʃɨ] is a rider’s instrument made of leather and wood. Among the words for “kamshy” and its types (dyr kamcha, dyrau kamcha), Ualiuly (2000) associated the meaning of these words with the word “to birch”. The word “birch-rod” in Persian – “durra” – means “kamcha”. The following 16 phraseological units appeared in the entry for the word қамшы-[қамшы]-[qamʃɨ] in “Phraseological dictionary” (Kenesbaev, 2007):

- қамшы боп тиді-[қамшы боп тийді]-[qamʃɨ bɔp tɨjdi]-*wound sensibilities*;
- қамшы болды-[қамшы болдұ]-[qamʃɨ bɔldɔ]-*push for something*;
- қамшыдай қату-[қамшыдай қатұу]-[qamʃɨdaj qatɔw]-*to grow thin*;
- қамшы жеу-[қамшы жеу]-[qamʃɨ ʒew]-*to be punished*;
- қамшы жұмсау-[қамшы жұмсау]-[qamʃɨ ʒɔmsaw]-*defeat*;
- қамшы кесті шабан-[қамшы кесті шабан]-[qamʃɨ kesti ʃaban]-*sick*;
- қамшылар жақ-[қамшыларжақ]-[qamʃɨlarʒaq]-“*positive*” meaning;
- қамшы салмады-[қамшы салмады]-[qamʃɨ salmadɨ]-*walk without a whip*;
- қамшы салдыртты-[қамшы салдыртты]-[qamʃɨ saldyrtty]-*being tired*;
- қамшы салым жер-[қамшысалым жер]-[qamʃɨsalym ʒer]-*very close*;
- қамшы алып беруге жарамау-[қамшы алып берүүге жарамау]-[qamʃɨ alɨp berɯwge ʒaramaw]-*incapable person*;
- қамшысынан қан сорғалаған-[қамшысынаң ған сорғалаған]-[qamʃɨsɯnan qan sɔɣalayaŋ]-*cruel, terrible*;

- қамшысын үйіреді де отырады-[қамшысын үйірүді де отырады]-[qamʃɨsɯn ɯjɨɯɯdi de ɔɯɯɯɯɯɯ]-*violent, brutal man*;
- қамшы сілтесіп келді-[қамшы сілтесіп келді]-[qamʃɨ siltesip keldi]-*came to sow*;
- қамшы үйіру-[қамшыүйіруу]-[qamʃɨɯjɨɯɯɯ]-*frighten*;
- қамшы тигізбеді-[қамшы тийгізбеді]-[qamʃɨ tɨjɨzbedi]-*fast horse, impossible to give the dust to*;

In present-day business discourse, [қамшы тигізбеді] is often used in the meaning “self-esteem” and ‘forced to finish, give the motivation’. Cumulative features of some phraseological units have not been canceled, while their primary basis has been retained. Some phraseological units can still be actively used today and show the national identity, national color, and beauty of Kazakhs. They are as follows:

- тер төгу-[тер төгүү]-[ter tɔɣɯw]-*to work hard*;
- көз ілмеу-[көз ілмеу]-[kɔz ɨlmew]-*do not sleep*;
- сөз қозғау-[сөз қозғау]-[sɔz qɔzɣaw]-*to raise an issue*;
- тізгінді қолға алу-[тізгінді қолға алу]-[tɨzɨɨndi qɔlɣa alw]-*to manage*;
- зыр жүгіру-[зыр жүгүруу]-[zɨɯ ʒɯɣɨɯw]-*to move quickly*;
- дамыл көрмеу-[дамыл гөрмөу]-[damɨl ɣɔrmɔw]-*not to relax*;
- бағын сынау-[бағын сынау]-baɣɨn sɯnaw]-*to try luck*;
- тәуекелге бел байлау-[тәуекелге бел байлау]-[tɔwɔkelge bel bajlaw]-*to start one business, have a risk*;
- істі дөңгелетіп әкету-[істі дөңгелөтіп әкету]-[ɨsti dɔŋɣɔlɔtɨp ɔketɯw]-*to work very well*;
- істің көзін табу-[істің көзүн табұу]-[ɨstɨŋ kɔzɨn tabɔw]-*to work well, to work accurately*;

- ісі мақұл болу-[ісі мақұл болу]-[isi maqul bolow]-to be everything in order;
- жұлдызы оңынан туу-[жұлдузү оңынан туу]-[Zolduzo oñnan tow]-to have luck;
- асығы алшысынан түсу-[асығы алшысынан түсу]-[asygh alshysynan tysuw]-to have luck;
- айдарынан жел есу-[айдарынан жел есу]-[ajdarynan zel esuw]-to have a luck;
- тасы өрге домалау-[тасы өргө домалау]-[tasgh öрге dömälaw]-to have a luck;

5. Concluding Remarks

As a consummate linguistic structure, phraseological expressions occupy a special place in the creation of new interpretations, which find their active application in social activities confirming the state status of the modern Kazakh language. Meanwhile, the nominative activity of phraseological expressions gives reason to consider them as a lexical means of word-formation. Therefore, the figurative nature of phraseological expressions can serve as an alternative to regular words. In this regard, in accordance with the existing social, political, and economic circumstances, it is possible to indicate the data confirming the generation of new interpretations in the Kazakh and Turkish languages, which are mainly used in the media space.

For instance, expressions quirygy uzyn-qұрығы ұзын (long tail), urshyqtai iirildi-ұршықтай иірілді (spun like a squirrel), qyrgi-qabaq-qырғи-қабақ (cold war), etc. are based on the designation and metaphORIZATION of the expansion and updating of knowledge in accordance with the updating of modern society. Therefore, when creating new connotations, expressively describing the modern social space, phraseological units, including the nominative case, are of particular importance, such as Kazakh qursaқ ana-qұрсак ана (expectant mother) – taşıyıcı anne (Turkish), Kazakh qara piar-qара пияр (black PR), qara zhuma-qара жұма (black friday) – tatli Guma (Turkish), halyq qalaulysy-xалық қалаулысы (deputy) – millet vekli (Turkish), etc.

One of the goals of national interest, which has a special nature in the modern Turkic world, is the revival of the spirit of the peoples, their core culture. It describes Turkic people's culture, values, art, religion, customs. But in

the culture of nomads, including Kazakh culture, the characteristic basis of national culture, the psychology of the nation in a symbolic system, sacralization is mainly described by language. The results of the study allow summarizing its achievements as follows:

1. The ethnographic data representing national identity in Turkic phraseology was discussed through specific examples, their use at the present time was determined.
2. It was established that the cumulative meaning of phraseological units is preserved on the cultural background of national concepts, the code is revealed as a “key” in the internal content.
3. With the help of phraseological combinations, the function of language was identified not only as a means of communication but also figuratively passing down information about the culture and the worldview of people who use the language through generations.
4. The ethno-cultural code has been created by the cultural-cognitive reconstruction of the unconscious components in the sense of phraseology.
5. Using the equivalents in the Kazakh, Uighur, Tatar, Khakass, and Uzbek languages as an example, the study provided specific comparative examples and established that the origin of common phraseology in modern Turkic languages is the same.
6. Phraseological units, variants, and alternatives that are not found in other Turkic languages were also identified.
7. The authors offered sixteen Kazakh phraseological units which mean “kamshy” and have the same meaning in Kazakh, Nogai, Kyrgyz, and Tatar languages.

References

- Akif, M. S. (2013). Phraseological units with the core verb of movement in Azerbaijani and English: A comparative analysis. *Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice*, 4(1), 110–113.
- al-Kashgari, M. (2017). *Compendium of the languages of the Turks*. Almaty: LEM.
- Bragina, G., Fatkhutdinova, V., & Nikolina, N. (2020). Derived substantives in word-

- formation nests of auditory perception verbs: Ethnolinguistic aspect. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 8(3), 1–9.
- Chen, Z., Zha, H., Liu, H., Chen, W., Yan, X., & Su, Y. (2020). Global textual relation embedding for relational understanding. In A. Korhonen, D. Traum, & L. Màrquez (Eds.), *The 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 1324–1330). Florence: Association for Computational Linguistics
- Fedorov, A. I. (2008). *Phraseological dictionary of the Russian literary language*. Moscow, Russia: AST.
- Gak, V. G. (1998). *Language conversions*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture.
- Galieva, N. F. & Galiullina, G. R. (2015). Emotive idioms Tatar language as national mentality reflection. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 6(1), 273–276.
- Gerasimova, M. V. (2020). Culturological support of dictionary entries in the digital multilingual dictionary of metaphors. *Voprosy Leksikografii*, 2020(17), 90–110.
- Hasanli-Garibova, S. (2014). Reflection of XI–XII century Turkic ethnographism in the dialects of the modern Turk and Azerbaijani languages. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(22), 310–312.
- Iskakov, A. I. (2019). *English idioms, fixed expressions and phrasal verbs in translation into Russian and Kazakh languages*. Almaty: Ilgerlik.
- Ivanov, Yu. (Ed.). (2005). *English – Kyrgyz – Russian dictionary*. Bishkek: Raritet.
- Jorayev, L. (2011). *English – Uzbek – Russian dictionary*. Tashkent: Tafakkur Qanoti.
- Karimova, R., & Latypova, R. (2016). Written sources in the Bashkir language of the late XIXth - The early XXth century. *Ural-Altai Studies*, 20(1), 41–52.
- Karimullina, G. N., Sarekenova, K. K., & Karimullina, R. N. (2019). Presentation of the ethno-national worldview through phraseologism. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 10(4), 315–319.
- Kenesbaev, I. (2007). *Phraseological dictionary*. Almaty: Arys.
- Kunanbayev, A. (2006). *Selected works*. Moscow, Russia: Raritet.
- Kurmanali, A., Sametova, F., & Auelbekova, S. (2016). Linguacultural features of the concept of “Time” in the Kazakh, Russian and Turkish proverbs and idioms. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(4), 291–296.
- Melikyan, V., Melikyan, A., & Dzyubenko, A. (2017). Syntactic phraseological units: Syntactic phraseology. Phraseological subsystem of language. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 62(1), 23–47.
- Mokienko, V. M., & Nikitina, T.G. (2018). To the concept of a complete vocabulary of folk phraseology: Problems of macrostructuring. *Lexicography Issues*, 14, 80–106.
- Mukhamadiarova, A. F., Kulkova, M., Kobenko, Y., & Rakhimova, A. (2020). A comparative study on phraseological and paroemiological units with coloronyms black in German, Russian, and Tatar. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 8(3), 63–71.
- Mushaev, V. N., & Abdullayev, S. N. (2017). Aspects of polysemy in Turkic and Mongolic languages (Evidence from Kalmyk and Uighur languages). *Oriental Studies*, 34(6), 103–110.
- Nasilov, D. M., Nadelyaev, V. M., Shcherbak, A. M., Borovkova, T. A., Kormushin, I. V., Letyagina, ... Tugusheva, L. Yu. (Eds.). (2016). *Ancient Turkic dictionary*. Astana: Gılim baspası.
- Palimbetova, M. (2020). Problems of genre, artistic language and artistic methods in Karakalpak dramaturgy during the independence period. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 12(6), 1037–1042.
- Ryabchikova, V. G., Devizkaya, Z. B., Zlobina, I. S., & Rubleva, O. S. (2019). The use of national corpuses of languages when studying lexicology at the university (from work experience). *Perspektivy Nauki i Obrazovania*, 41(5), 203–214.
- Satenova, S. K. (1997). *Language and poetic nature of phraseological combinations in the Kazakh language*. Almaty: Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University.
- Shoibekov, R. (1991). *Kazakh dictionary of jewelry art*. Almaty: Nauka.

- Şimşek, Y. (2020). On Arabic-Turkish idiom copies. *Belleten Yearbook of Turkic Studies*, 2020(69), 101–114.
- Subrakova, O. V. (2006). *Khakas – Russian dictionary*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Taranov, A. (2012). *Russian-Uzbek dictionary*. Hong Kong: T&P Books Publishing.
- Tukeshova, N. M., Tarasova, F. H., & Luzenina, I. N. (2019). Lexical-grammatical analysis of the phraseological units with antonymous components in the Kazakh language. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10, 1066–1074.
- Ualiuly, N. (2000). Lexical and semantic background of some ethnographies. *Ult Taglymy*, 1, 7–14.