

1 БӨЛІМ.

ТІЛ БІЛІМІ ЖӘНЕ ӘДЕБИЕТТАНУ

РАЗДЕЛ 1.

ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ И ЛИТЕРАТУРОВЕДЕНИЕ

SECTION 1.

LINGUISTICS AND LITERARY STUDIES

UDC 811.512.122:811.161.1.
SRSTI 16.21.33

[DOI: 10.52301/2957-5567-2025-4-1-9-25](https://doi.org/10.52301/2957-5567-2025-4-1-9-25)

A.K. Bakytzhanova

*Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan
Astana, Kazakhstan*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5305-8295>
email: altyn051275@gmail.com

**PHRASEOLOGICAL EXPLICATION MENTAL ACTIVITY
IN THE LINGUISTIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF KAZAKHS AND RUSSIANS**

Abstract. The article analyzes the features of the phraseological explication of the cognitive picture of the world of Kazakhs and Russians, represented in the intellectual conceptual sphere. The purpose of the study is to determine the specifics of the phraseological explication of mental activity in the Kazakh and Russian linguistic consciousness, represented through the semantic microfields of the intellectual conceptual sphere, based on the analysis of phraseological semantics.. The results of the study showed that phraseological units can serve as indicators of various forms of intelligence and reflect the cultural and social contexts in which they are used. A comparative analysis of the phraseological explication of mental activity in the linguistic consciousness of Kazakhs and Russians revealed the following results: three semantic microfields: "subject of mental activity" (possessor of intellect, thinking abilities), "processes of mental activity" (thinking abilities), "characteristics of thinking abilities" (qualities, properties of thinking abilities, intelligence); typology of phraseological models with the following productive components – abstract substantive components, somatic and zoonymic components; linguocultural factors that influenced the formation of FE; positive and negative connotative characteristics of mental activity at the level of three semantic microfields.

Keywords: phraseology, phraseological semantics, phraseological explication, cognitive sphere, mental activity, intellectual conceptual sphere.

Conflict of interests:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Article history:

Received: 09.12.2024

Accepted: 28.02.2025

Introduction

This study is devoted to the problem of explication of mental activity in linguistic consciousness by means of phraseological units (hereinafter referred to as FE), which form semantic microfields of the intellectual conceptual sphere of the Kazakh and Russian languages, which is relevant for modern linguistics, comparative linguistics and phraseology. Mental activity belongs to the cognitive sphere of a person, as well as emotional, spiritual, etc. The cognitive sphere includes all mental processes that perform the function of rational cognition, translated from Latin. *Cognitio* – knowledge, cognition, study, awareness (Kozlov, 2015, p. 27). As the scientist notes, the concept of "cognitive" (cognitive processes, cognitive psychology and cognitive psychotherapy...) became widespread in the 60s of the XX century, during the fascination with cybernetics and electronic modeling of intellectual processes, which grew into the habit of presenting a person as a complex biocomputer. In attempts to model all the mental processes that occur in a person, later researchers defined them as cognitive processes (Kozlov, 2015).

It should be clarified that we refer mental activity to the spiritual sphere of man. The concepts that form the macroconcept of intelligence are components of the value-based linguistic picture of the world, i.e. they have a value status.

Turning to the topic of phraseological explication of a cognitive phenomenon in language testifies to the most important methodological shift that has taken place in linguistic science, including phraseological semantics.

A characteristic feature of modern linguistics is the study of language not "in itself", but in close connection with man, his consciousness, thinking, spiritual and practical activity. Of particular interest in the anthropocentric aspect of modern linguistics are FE denoting the cognitive sphere of a person. The study of FE with semantics of intelligence was carried out mainly within the German, German-Russian, English, English-German, Russian-English and other phraseological systems, for example, this is evidenced by the dissertation research of R.T. Siraeva (Siraeva, 2015, p. 116), A.V. Lazarev (Lazarev, 2009), M.K. Abaeva (Abaeva, 2008), Trovati S.N. (Trovati, 2007), A.A. Mishin (Mishin, 2007), M.D. Samedov (Samedov, 2006) and others. The contrastive-semantic approach to the study of phraseological explication and phraseological modeling of mental activity on the material of the Kazakh and Russian languages, taking into account the national, cultural, social contexts, is carried out for the first time.

The phraseological image of a person can be described on the basis of biological, physical, mental, spiritual, religious, intellectual, and social parameters. Many researchers, when defining the concept of "person", refer to any particular aspect: gender, age, appearance, physical, mental or emotional state, profession, social status, character, moral attitudes, value orientations, etc.

However, linguists have always been most interested in the linguistic image of a person from the point of view of intellectual abilities and thinking processes, so vocabulary and phraseology with the semantics of intelligence are the object of close attention of researchers. Scientific research is carried out in relation to individual lexemes or expressions, groups of lexemes and FE identified on semantic grounds, part of the semantic field. The semantics of mental actions and states expressed by verbs of thinking and understanding has been thoroughly studied; semantics of the concepts of "mind", "reason", "reason", "intellect", "thought", "idea"; The conceptual content and historical changes in the semantic structure of nouns with the meaning "stupid person" are considered. Particular attention is paid to the metaphorical ways of expressing vocabulary and phraseology of the intellectual sphere, since it is distinguished by exceptional

metaphorical nature inherent in the internal form of words and the denotation of FE.

According to phraseologists, the study of linguistic conceptualization of one of the most important spheres of human life – the mental sphere – on the material of FE is multifaceted. The key components that nominate the concepts of the mental sphere are the lexemes *mind* and *mind* (Siraeva, 2015; Sergeeva, 2005). As the analysis of scientific literature shows, these lexical components are characterized by nationally conditioned content and participate in the representation of the basic concepts of Kazakh and Russian linguocultures.

In the opinion of modern researchers, the presence of similarity in phraseological systems not only in related, but also in languages of different structures leads to the conclusion that in phraseology there should be certain elements of semantic modeling, based on certain general logical and associative processes of human thinking, which, under equal material conditions, contribute to the emergence of identical or close stable verbal complexes of the language (Vaganova, 2021; Teliya, 2006).

The purpose of this study is to determine the specificity of the phraseological explication of mental activity in the Kazakh and Russian linguistic consciousness, represented through the semantic microfields of the intellectual conceptual sphere, based on the analysis of phraseological semantics. The object of this fragment of the research is the phraseological units explicating mental activity in the Kazakh and Russian linguistic consciousness. The subject of this research is phraseological semantics, which represents the subject of mental activity, the processes of mental activity and the characteristics of thinking abilities in the comparative aspect of the Kazakh and Russian languages. The choice of the subject of research is actualized by the following factors. First, the phenomenon of the intellectual conceptual sphere, which represents the cognitive sphere of a person, despite the growing interest of linguocognitive research, has not been fully studied, especially in a comparative aspect. Numerous studies in the field of the phraseological system of the language, however, do not reveal the contrastive and semantic features of the phraseological modeling of the intellect in the minds of native speakers of the Kazakh and Russian languages. In connection with the rapid growth of cognitive, psycholinguistic and other scientific directions of this order, the problems in the field of phraseological explication, including those based on the material of genetically distant, and at the same time closely contacting native speakers, demonstrate a comprehensive scientific interest. Secondly, the semantic fragment of the intellectual conceptual sphere under study is explicated by the figurative means of the Kazakh and Russian languages, which allows us to determine the linguocultural features and structural-semantic organization of the cognitive picture of the world in the linguistic consciousness of Kazakhs and Russians. Thirdly, the cognitive sphere and the intellectual conceptual sphere have not been fully studied both in linguistics and in special branches of science. At the same time, the cognitive sphere as a complex phenomenon of human essence, reflecting the intellectual nature of mental activity, is able to be explicated in linguistic consciousness through figurative means of language – FE, and in this aspect phraseological semantics requires a comprehensive study.

The theoretical significance of the work lies in the comprehensive description of phraseological semantics, explicating the cognitive picture of the world in the linguistic consciousness of Kazakhs and Russians, taking into account the identification of the typology of phraseological modeling and linguocultural factors of conceptualization of mental activity. The study develops the theory of phraseological explication in language, the theory of FE with the semantics of intelligence, determining the close relationship

between emotional, cognitive and social intelligence. The development of the theory of FE with the semantics of intelligence covers a wide range of problems that determine the complex methodological approach to the study of phraseological semantics, phraseological explication and the conceptual sphere. The practical significance of the study lies in the fact that the materials and the results obtained can be used in the further development of the theory of cognitive linguistics, phraseological semantics, in the compilation of lexicographic works, in the teaching of courses on comparative linguistics, methods of teaching Kazakh and Russian languages, on the theory and practice of translation.

Materials and methods

This study is based on the phraseological material of the Kazakh and Russian languages, reflecting the intellectual conceptual sphere of the speakers of these languages. FE explicating the concepts of mental activity were selected by the method of continuous sampling from phraseological dictionaries (Teliya, 2006; Kenesbaev, 2007; Kumin, 2006; Stepanov, 2006; Amanzholov, 1988). The use of lexicographic material makes it possible to obtain objective data in comparative terms. In addition, dictionary interpretations give key ideas about the semantics of FE, which provides mutual understanding in communication between native speakers of the Kazakh and Russian languages.

Phraseology, as the most original, idio-ethnic layer of the language, is of particular interest from the point of view of such modern areas of linguistics as psycholinguistics, ethnopsycholinguistics, linguocognitology. In connection with the development of these scientific directions, phraseological research based on the new methodology began to acquire special significance and relevance.

The development of a number of theoretical and experimental works conducted from the standpoint of linguistic, cognitive and psycholinguistic approaches to the study of phraseological semantics is associated with both the heterogeneous interpretation of the actual object of phraseology and the complexity of its semantic nature. The variety of concepts and trends that appeared in linguistics of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries led to a comprehensive and multifaceted study of phraseological semantics. Thus, the subject of phraseological research was concepts, images, model, modeling, etc.

Phraseological explication can give deeper and more imaginative ideas about the cognitive picture of the world, especially when the subject of the description is actually the intellectual sphere of a person.

The indisputable statement that phraseology is not only a mirror reflecting national culture, but also features of the systemic organization of the language, its structure, and idioethnic features, acquires special significance in the context of contrastive research. In this regard, it is necessary to emphasize the relevance of the study carried out from the point of view of the contrastive-semantic approach to the description of phraseological modeling of intelligence in the minds of native speakers.

The study was carried out in four areas:

- 1) within the framework of the first direction, the description and interpretation of the ways of expressing the concept of "mental activity" was carried out, which consisted in the analysis of the semantic structure of FE, the definition of nuclear and peripheral semantic and conceptual features;

- 2) the second direction was to build the structure of the concepts of semantic microfields and to identify the features of the phraseological explication of mental activity in the linguistic consciousness of Kazakhs and Russians;

3) the third direction was based on a comparative and typological analysis of the structure, composition, grammatical properties of FE, which form semantic microfields of concepts;

4) the fourth direction was carried out on the basis of a contrastive-semantic approach, taking into account the linguocultural analysis of the figurative semantics of FE.

The following methods were used in the study: the method of semantic determination (when interpreting the values of FE); component analysis (when identifying conceptual features represented in the meanings of FE); comparative method (when identifying universal and specific characteristics of the concepts "subject of mental activity", "processes of mental activity", "characteristics of thinking abilities" in the Kazakh and Russian languages); the method of continuous sampling of phraseological material, as well as elements of quantitative analysis. Within the framework of the traditional approach to the study of FE, the descriptive method is used. It makes it possible to identify the explicit contribution of the lexical and grammatical components of the FE to the semantics of the intellectual concept and to determine the meaning of the whole stable expression.

The following thesis should be accepted as the main theoretical position of the study. The meaning of FE is anthropocentric, since it reflects the general properties of human nature and at the same time ethnocentric, since the internal form of phraseology contains images understandable to an ethnic group with cultural background knowledge of a certain linguoculture (Siraeva, 2015). The image of a person in the anthropo- and ethnocentric paradigm of linguistics and humanities is widely studied in the work of Z.K. Temirgazina (Temirgazina, 2015).

Phraseology with the semantics of intelligence is an important area of research that covers both cognitive and emotional aspects of it. The research material showed that FE reflect various aspects of intelligence, including emotional, social, and cognitive intelligence, as well as their relationship to national-cultural and cultural-social contexts.

Fes containing the semantics of intelligence are often used to convey complex ideas and concepts. For example, the works of E. Valueva, E. Lapteva, and A. Grigoriev emphasize that text messages on social networks can reflect the level of intelligence of users, which opens up new horizons for the analysis of social interactions (Valueva et al., 2021). This is supported by research that shows that phraseological constructions can serve as indicators of emotional intelligence, especially in the context of stress and burnout (Polskaya & Mukhametzyanova, 2018). Thus, phraseology becomes not only a means of communication, but also a tool for assessing intellectual abilities.

Emotional intelligence, as emphasized by N. Polskaya and M. Mukhametzyanova, has a significant impact on a person's ability to cope with stress and burnout (Polskaya & Mukhametzyanova, 2018). This emphasizes the importance of emotional regulation in the context of phraseology, since many Fes can be associated with emotional states and reactions. For example, phraseological expressions reflecting "loss of control" or "emotional management" can be used to describe states associated with a low level of emotional intelligence.

Cognitive intelligence also plays an important role in understanding phraseology. Studies conducted by L. Chutko, S. Surushkina, E. Yakovenko, et al. show that cognitive impairment may be associated with a reduced level of emotional intelligence, which indicates a relationship between different forms of intelligence (Chutko et al., 2014, p. 17). This highlights the need for an integrated approach to the study of phraseology that takes into account both cognitive and emotional aspects.

Social intelligence, as O. Nikiforov notes, is also important in the context of phraseology. It is associated with the accumulation and assimilation of social experience, which is reflected in the use of Fes, which can convey social norms and expectations (Nikiforov, 2021). For example, expressions related to "social adaptation" or "mutual understanding" can be used to describe successful interactions between people, which is an important aspect of social intelligence.

The importance of phraseology in the context of intelligence is also emphasized in research concerning cultural semantics. Studies conducted by Z. Issyangulova and G. Issyangulova show that Fes in different languages can reflect unique cultural and historical realities, which in turn affects the perception of intelligence in different cultural contexts (Issyangulova Z. & Issyangulova G., 2020). This highlights the need to take cultural differences into account when analyzing phraseology related to intelligence.

A comparative analysis of FE of the Kazakh and Russian languages also reveals significant cultural and cognitive differences and similarities. For example, Mokienko's research on the image of the enemy in Russian phraseology illustrates how the concepts of confrontation and rivalry are reflected in language, reflecting broader social attitudes and mental models (Mokienko, 2022). In contrast, Kazakh expressions may place a greater emphasis on reconciliation and community, thereby demonstrating different approaches to conflict and thought processes. Such comparative studies are key to understanding how phraseological expressions shape cultural identity and cognitive processes.

The phraseological explication of mental activity in the linguistic consciousness of Kazakhs and Russians reveals a rich picture of cultural, cognitive and historical aspects, which can also be found in detail in the works of Y. Sairambay (Sairambay, 2021), C. Dan, M. Rozin, V. Svechkarev and others (Dan, et al., 2020). FE act as key linguistic markers that capture the thought processes and cultural values of each group. Comparative analysis reveals both significant differences in the ways of expressing mental activity and common features reflecting universal human experience. Understanding these nuances plays a key role in the study of linguistic consciousness and the role of phraseology in shaping cultural identity and cognitive processes.

In the context of Russian and Kazakh linguistic consciousness, FE often embody unique cultural values and cognitive models. For example, Russian phraseological expressions often reflect a collectivist mentality rooted in the Soviet past and dominant social norms focused on the priority of the group over individual interests. This is confirmed in the work of Grigoriev and co-authors, who examine authoritarian attitudes in modern Russia, emphasizing the influence of collective authority on individual thought patterns and social behavior (Grigoryev, et al., 2022). Such phraseological expressions often include ideas of loyalty, duty and conformity, which is the key to understanding the mental activity of the Russian-speaking society.

The methodological approach determines the scientific novelty of the study, which lies in the fact that FE with the semantics of intelligence are considered from the standpoint of the following directions: as structural components (constructs) of the conceptual field and as linguistic units proper (means of nomination), the formation of which is based on universal ways of nomination and various linguistic processes. Linguistic means that contribute to the creation of imagery and strengthening the linguocultural potential of FE with semantics of intelligence are considered in the article for the first time. The role of one or another linguistic means and linguocultures in the formation of FE in the Kazakh and Russian languages, the ways of explication of the concepts of mental activity, the share of participation of linguistic means (for example, somatisms, zoonyms,

etc.) in comparison with other figurative means are investigated. Also new is the complex approach to the contrastive-semantic description of linguistic and linguoculturological figurative means involved in the creation of FE, as well as the typological analysis of phraseological modeling of conceptual fields.

Results and discussion

The study and description of semantic features of FE of the mental activity of the compared languages led to the following conclusions. Thus, in this study, we have identified three main (nuclear) semantic microfields:

- 1) "subject of mental activity" (possessor of intellect, thinking abilities);
- 2) "processes of mental activity" (thinking abilities);
- 3) "characteristics of thinking abilities" (qualities, properties of thinking abilities, intelligence).

The FE of these microfields are interconnected by the following conditional relations: the subject of mental activity – the process of mental activity – the properties, the quality of mental activity. In this case, we did not set ourselves the research task of covering all semantic groups of FE covering the field of the concept of mental activity.

According to the research analysis, the semantic microfield "subject of mental activity" mainly includes phraseological units that characterize an educated, quick-witted person, for example: *uchonny muzh* ('scientist husband') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 319), *kuyma kulak* ('the absorbing ear') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 124), as well as FE of substantive meaning, reflecting abstract realities of thinking such as thought, mind, reason: *tochka zreniya* ('point of view') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 535), *vertitsya na ume* ('spinning on the mind') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 59), *uchonny bagazh* ('scientific baggage') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 15); *kelege kenes kirgizdi* ('made a good advice') (Kenesbaev, 1977, p. 246), *nurly akyl* ('a bright, radiant mind') (Kenesbaev, 1977, p. 408). In the Kazakh and Russian languages, there is a somatic component of the brain, which is used in the assessment of mental abilities with a negative connotation, for example: *kok mi* ('blue / green brains') (Kenesbaev, 1977, p. 269), *esek miyn zhegen* ('ate donkey brains') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 68); *kurinye / tsyplyachyi mozgi* ('chicken brains') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 314) – about a stupid, narrow-minded, stupid person.

As a result of the typological analysis, the following conclusions were made: the dominant role of the noun as a semantically dominant component in the compared phraseological systems was revealed; in the considered semantic microfield of the Kazakh and Russian languages, FE corresponding to the grammatical structure "adjective + noun" prevail, for example: *mar kaska* ('broad-minded') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 135), *kari kulak* ('the old ear') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 95); *khodyachiy universitet* ('a walking university') (Molotkov, 1968, p. 495), *svetlaya golova* ('a bright head') (Molotkov, 1968, p. 113), etc., as well as the use in the Russian language of the model "noun + noun": *bezдна премудрости* ('the abyss of wisdom') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 22), *uma palata* ('the mind chamber') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 380).

It is interesting to note that in the Kazakh language, the somatisms ear and forehead act as the main abstractions of thinking. The functioning of the FE *kuyma kulak* ('the absorbing ear') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 124), *mar kaska* ('broad-minded'), *mandayy kere karys* ('his forehead is a full span away') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 135) allow us to talk about the following specifics of the naïve picture of the world of the Kazakhs: the *ear* was considered an organ that perceives and stores information; a *forehead*, namely a broad one, is a sign of a great mind.

In the traditional culture of the Kazakhs, great importance is attached to the age of a person. It is enough to turn to the interpretation of the 12-year cycle of age (*mushel zhas*) to

realize the naïve picture of the Kazakh world, its sacred meaning, and cultural significance. It was believed that the older a person is, the more extensive his knowledge is, the richer his life experience. The Kazakhs especially revered aksakals – wise elders, whose voice was listened to by the whole people. This can be evidenced by the idioms *kari kulak* ('the old ear'), *kari tarlan* ('old Tarlan') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 95) and many other similar idioms.

In the Russian semantic microfield, the most active components are somatism, the head, and the abstract name mind. Thus, the idioms *bright head* (Molotkov, 1968, p. 113) and *golden head* (Stepanova, 2006, p. 118) are directly related to the traditional association of the mind, scholarship with *light* and *gold*, which is represented by the corresponding Russian folk sayings *Uchenie – svet, a neuchenije – t'ma* ('Teaching is light, and not teaching – darkness') (Dal', 2008, p. 231).

In the Russian language, the stock of knowledge, erudition of a person are reflected in such idioms as *bezdna premudrosti* ('the Abyss of Wisdom') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 22), *kladez mudrosti* ('a Fount of Wisdom') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 236), *bagage znanyi* ('the baggage of knowledge') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 34); in the Kazakh language – *Platonday bilimi* ('knowledge like Plato's') (Kenesbaev, 2007, p. 38), *oresi zhogary* ('high understanding') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 150), *duniyenin tilin biledi* ('knows the languages of the world') (Kenesbaev, 2007, p. 196), *keudesi askan* ('the chest cavity is superior') (Kenesbaev, 1977, p. 250), etc. This semantic fragment is reflected in the Russian language by phraseological units, the components of which are more often correlated with the gastronomic, material, socio-hierarchical codes of culture. For example: *tertyy kalach* ('grated kalach') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 227), *siniy chulok* ('blue stocking') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 585), *s tsarem v golove* ('with a king in his head') (Polskaya & Mukhametzyanova, 2018, p. 93), *smotret' so svoey kolokol'ni* ('watch from your bell tower') (Polskaya & Mukhametzyanova, 2018, p. 74).

The specificity of the FE of this microfield of the Russian language is manifested in the frequent transfer of zoomorphic features: *travlenyy volk* ('poisoned wolf') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 79), *strelyanny vorobey* ('shot sparrow') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 82), *knizhnyy cherv'* ('bookworm') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 577). In the Kazakh language, such phraseological units were not noted (it is found only in FE that characterize a stupid, stupid person, the absence of reason, consciousness: *Esektin miyn zhegensin be?* (Did you eat a donkey's brain?) (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 68), *Kutyrgan koidyn miyn zhedin be?* ('Did you eat the brain of a mad sheep?') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 127), in Russian phraseology, the meaning of FE *beleny obyelsya* ('beleni has eaten') (Amanzholov, 1988, p. 127; Stepanova, 2006, p. 22), that as a result, this group of FE expresses the meaning of "to go mad, to act unreasonably".

The next semantic group of FE "processes of mental activity" represents the most extensive microfield in the compared languages, which can be represented in the following percentage: in the Kazakh language – 56.8% of FE of their total number; in the Russian language – 48.5%. This statement (quantitative indicators) confirms the validity of the hypothesis about the interconnectedness and interdependence of thinking with other types of human mental activity. The semantic group "processes of mental activity" consists of FE, characterizing mental activity as a process. Since FE, which denote thought processes in various aspects and the volitional acts of consciousness accompanying these processes, for all their diversity, are united by the common meaning "to carry out the thinking process," the number of FE included in this group is the most extensive. This indicator is quite acceptable due to the fact that thinking is the highest form of human cognitive activity, characterized not by isolation from other components of cognitive processes, but also by coverage, a peculiar combination and interaction between them.

This microfield is a series of verbal designations of intellectual actions performed by a person, as well as the impact on the human intellect. In the analysis of the microfield under consideration, FE characterized by the following semantic features were revealed: *the process of acquiring knowledge, skills, experience; the process of thinking or mental processes.*

The core of this microfield in the compared languages is formed by phraseological units that reflect active mental activity: *kotelok varit* ('the pot is cooking') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 111), *shevelit' mozgami* ('move your brain') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 315), *lomat' golovu* ('the brain is racking') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 290); in Kazakh – *gylym bakty* ('was hunting for science') (Kenesbaev, 2007, p. 179), *akyl tarazysyna saldy* ('puts on the scales of the mind') (Kenesbaev, 2007, p. 37), *oiga saldy* ('put thoughts') (Kenesbaev, 2007, p. 543). To the periphery of the microfield of the Kazakh and Russian languages there are FE with the same to give wise advice, to guide on the right path, to teach, i.e. having the meaning of influencing the human intellect of an ideal substance from the outside, for example: *akyl uyretti* ('taught me the mind', lit.), *akyl kosty* ('added a mind'), *akyl aitty* ('the mind said'), *oy saldy* ('added thoughts'), *akyl berdi* ('mind gave') (Kenesbaev, 1977, p. 28); *nastavlyat' na um (razum)* ('to instruct the mind (reason)'), *uchit' umu-razumu* ('to teach the mind-reason') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 545).

In the analysis of grammatical structures, it was revealed that in these FE of the compared languages, the dominant component is the verb. In the Kazakh and Russian languages, the following similarity was noted: the FE of this microfield have a similar model "noun + verb". Also, in the Russian language, in most cases, it is possible to rearrange the components, for example: *to take up – to take up the mind, to think with the head – to think with the head, which does not lead to a distortion of the meaning.* In the Kazakh language, the rearrangement of the positions of the components is unacceptable (in rare cases, poetic texts may be an exception).

This microfield of the Kazakh language, unlike Russian, is characterized by FE that reflect the intellectual growth of a person. The concept of smartness in Kazakh phraseology means to become literate: *sauat ashu* ('becomes literate') (Kenesbaev, 1977, p. 456), *kara tanu* ('black recognition') (Kenesbaev, 2007, p. 425), *kozi ashylu* ('the eyes opened') (Kenesbaev, 2007, p. 333). In the Russian linguistic picture of the world, there is a slightly different understanding of the development of intelligence. In the traditional Russian understanding, the concept of becoming wise is equivalent to the concept of becoming aware and coming to one's senses. This is very figuratively traced in the idioms *vzyat'sya za um* ('to take up the mind') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 43), *dokhodit' svoim umom* ('to reach with one's own mind') (Yarantsev, 2006, p. 315), *ukhvatytsya za um* ('to grasp at the mind') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 561), *vkhodit' v razum* ('to enter the mind') (Molotkov, 1968, p. 88), *nabirat'sya uma* ('to gain mind') (Yarantsev, 2006, p. 362).

FE of the microfield "characteristics of thinking abilities" are used to express the assessment of intelligence, mental abilities of a person. As the typological analysis has shown, most of the FE of the microfields of the Kazakh and Russian languages are two-component. Almost all FE of this microfield of the compared languages contain somatic names. In 33.3% of the analyzed phraseological units of this microfield of the Russian language, there is the somatism "head" and the abstract name "um": *s golovoy na plechakh* ('with a head on the shoulders') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 119), *s tsarem v golove* ('with a tsar in the head') (Molotkov, 1968, p. 512), *imet' golovu* ('to have a head') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 118), *svetlaya golova* ('a bright head') (Molotkov, 1968, p. 113); *nabirat'sya uma* ('to gain mind') (Yarantsev, 2006, p. 362), *nastavlyat' na um* ('to instruct the mind') (Stepanova, 2006, p. 331).

As well as the phraseological units of the microfield "abstractions and subjects of mental activity", the FE of this microfield are very meaningful. For example, according to the idiom *omyrtkasy tuzu zhigit* ('a guy with a flat spine') (Kenesbaev, 1977, p. 416) in the meaning of 'literate, knowledgeable, smart; prominent; *Jack of all trades*' can be concluded that in the Kazakh worldview, an even posture, a stately figure characterized a reasonable person. Thus, in the naïve picture of the Kazakh world, an intelligent person (*akyly / basy bar adam* – 'a person has a mind / head') is always associated with a good, handsome, stately, prominent, kind, modest, intelligent, correct, savvy, versatile, businesslike, confident, decisive, physically developed person. This specificity of the Kazakh worldview is also indicated by the rich proverbial fund of the Kazakh language, which is a mirror of traditional culture.

A distinctive feature of the studied phraseology of the Kazakh language is the frequent use of somatic nominations, which allow us to see a kind of interpretation of the mental abilities of a person, i.e. the reflection in the linguistic consciousness of abstract processes of the spiritual (cognitive) sphere of a person through specific anatomical nominations. Thus, in the reflection of human thinking abilities, phraseological units with somatism components are involved: *kokirek* ('chest, chest cavity'), *bas* ('head'), *bet* ('face'), *koz* ('eyes'), *kulak* ('ears'), *manday* ('forehead'), *yyk* ('shoulders'), *omyrtka* ('vertebra, spine'), *tobe* ('crown'), *til* ('tongue'), *sausak* ('fingers'), *bakay* ('toes').

The saturation of the phraseology of this semantic field with somatic names is explained by ethno-cultural factors: the Kazakhs were engaged not in agriculture, but in animal husbandry, therefore, they were well acquainted with the names of all parts of the body (anatomical knowledge). All internal organs (tripe) were used for cooking, not to mention the head of the animal.

It should be noted that in the microfield "characteristics of thinking abilities" of the Kazakh language, there are isolated cases of using the somatic component *bas* (*head*). Perhaps this is due to the sacred understanding of the head not only as a vital organ, but also to a special conceptual interpretation: *head as a person, soul, source, head, beginning, upper part of something, initial period, etc.*

It is also worth noting the ritual of giving the head of an animal – *bas tartu* ('giving the head'), which is significant in the gastronomic culture of the Kazakhs. The head was boiled and served on a separate dish to the guest of honor on special occasions (more often to the aksakal – a respected elder, or the owner of the house), then butchered (the brains of the animal were also eaten) according to the ritual custom and passed from hand to hand to those sitting at the table. All parts of the animal's head (more often a ram's head) – *tongue, palate, ears, eyes* – were cut up and presented according to cultural and social stereotypes. When giving the head of the animal, all the traditional "rules" were observed: *ears* to the youngest, so that they would obey the elders of their family, *eyes* to the elders, so that they would look after the younger and younger of their family, etc. This ritual of hospitality (manifestation of honor and respect for the guest) and gastronomic tradition exists today in the modern Kazakh family, which has retained its sacred, cultural and social significance.

It is interesting to note that, in contrast to the semantic microfield of the Kazakh language, in Russian phraseology, stable phrases with the component "head" prevail, but there are isolated cases of the use of other somatic nominations.

If the Kazakh phraseology, reflecting the mental activity of a person, is distinguished by the use of somatic vocabulary, then in Russian phraseology there is a wide use of culturally marked vocabulary (compare: *with the tsar in the head, grated kalach, to see three arshins in the ground, uma palata*); active use of somatism head; zoonyms – *dog, sparrow, wolf, chicken*.

In the Russian worldview, an intelligent, quick-witted, reasonable, thinking person is correlated through the image of a person with his head, with his mind, with open eyes. In other words, the very fact of the presence and presence of a "head" and "mind" spoke of a high level of human intelligence. For comparison: in the Russian people, a person who had completely lost his mind and head, with a holey head, etc., was considered stupid.

A comparative analysis of FE with the semantics of mental activity revealed the following typology (Table 1), which draws attention to the differences between phrase-forming capabilities and productivity/non-productivity of phraseological components in the Kazakh and Russian languages. The identified typological characteristics are explained by the peculiarities of the origin of FE, linguocultural factors, as well as the specifics of the fragment of reality they designate. Each semantic microfield is characterized by certain phrase-forming models, which once again demonstrates the originality of the compared phraseological systems, the formation of which is influenced by the national-cultural worldview.

Table 1. Typology of the use of somatic and zoonymic components of FE with the semantics of mental activity (fragment)

Semantic microfields	The somatic component of FE		Zoonymic component of FE	
	Kazakh	Russian	Kazakh	Russian
Memory	–	+	–	–
Imagination	+	–	–	–
Thinking Processes	+	+	–	–
Intelligence	+	+	+	–
Understanding	+	+	–	–

Thus, the following similarities and differences in the modeling of human mental activity are revealed, in this case, by means of phraseology reflecting the subject, processes and properties of thinking with a positive connotation. Thus, in the compared languages there are differences:

- 1) in the composition of semantic microfields;
- 2) in the selectivity of the constituent components;
- 3) in structural models of FE;
- 4) in the formation of models of mental representation of the image of a "thinking, rational person".

Conclusion

Thus, phraseology with the semantics of intelligence is a multifaceted field that requires an integrated approach. Research shows that Fes can serve as indicators of various forms of intelligence, including emotional, cognitive, and social. This opens up new horizons for further research aimed at understanding how language and intelligence are interrelated in different contexts.

In general, the differences in the phraseological modeling of these semantic fragments of reality in the studied languages are due to the ethno-cultural representation and understanding of the value picture of the world, a peculiar representation of being.

Thus, it should be stated that this study does not exhaust all the topical issues of the study of linguistic consciousness, reflecting the features of the figurative nomination

of the mental activity of Kazakhs and Russians, but is only a fragment that sheds light on the specifics of the semantic organization of these microfields.

FE explicating the concepts of the semantic field of mental activity are distinguished by figurative semantics and are characterized by the function of representation worldview concepts conditioned by the national and cultural features of conceptual fields. The phraseological explication of the studied conceptual fields of mental activity is characterized by universal (universal structures of thinking) and national-cultural semantic structures of representation. Linguocultural features are manifested both in the component composition of FE and semantic fields, and in the semantic hierarchy of conceptual features. Ethnic connotations expressed by cultural traditions, gender norms and stereotypes, cultural and social context, as well as metaphorical ways of representing the characteristics of mental activity contribute to the further development of the theory and methodology of phraseological explication, which will lead to a systematic description of the semantic, cognitive and linguocultural content of conceptual fields.

References

- Abaeva, M.K. (2008). *Frazeologizmy so znacheniem intellektualnoy deyatelnosti s pozitsii kognitivnoy teorii* [Phraseologisms with the Meaning of Intellectual Activity from the Perspective of Cognitive Theory]. Diss. cand. philol. nauk. Almaty. (in Russ.).
- Chutko, L., Surushkina, S., Yakovenko, E., Is, N., Anisimova, T., & Bondarchuk, I. (2014). Cognitive and Emotional Impairments in Patients with Protracted Anxiety-Phobic Disorders. *Terapevticheskiy Arkhiv*, 86(12), 61–65. <https://doi.org/10.17116/terarkh2014861261-65>
- Dan, Ch., Rozin, M., Svechkarev, V., Mareev, V., & Aslanov, Y. (2020). Foreign student in a russian university: trends of choice, problems of adaptation and formation of relationships. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(3), 1106–1111. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.83114>
- Grigoryev, D., Batkhina, A., Conway, L., & Zubrod, A. (2022). Authoritarian attitudes in russia: right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation in the modern russian context. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(4), 623–645. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12523>
- Isyangulova, Z. & Isyangulova, G. (2020). Ethnocultural semantics of phraseological units in the Bashkir and Kazakh languages. *TDSE*, 22–25. <https://doi.org/10.18411/lj-07-2020-277>
- Kozlov, N. (2015). *Psikhologos: Entsiklopediya prakticheskoy psikhologii* [Psychologos: Encyclopedia of Practical Psychology]. Moskva: Eksmo Publ (in Russ.).
- Lazarev, A.V. (2009). *Kognitivno-fraymerovye osobennosti glagol'nykh i substantivnykh sredstva vyrazheniya ponimaniia (na materiale angliyskogo i russkogo yazykov)* [Cognitive and Frame Features of Verbal and Substantive Means of Expressing Understanding (Based on the Material of English and Russian Languages)]. Diss. cand. philol. nauk. Moskva. (in Russ.).
- Mishin, A.A. (2007). *Kontsepty «um» i «glupnost» v nemetskoy i angliyskoy yazykovoy kartinakh mira* [Concepts of "Mind" and "Stupidity" in German and English Language Pictures of the World]. Diss. cand. philol. nauk. Vladimir. (in Russ.).
- Mokienko, V. (2022). Image of the enemy in russian phraseology and paremiology. *Russian Language Studies*, 20(2), 203–216. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-2-203-216>

- Nikiforov, O. (2021). Various types of intelligence and professional success in human interaction professions (case study of salespeople). *Psychology in Education*, 3(3), 288–303.
- Polskaya, N. & Mukhametzyanova, M. (2018). Osobennosti emotsional'noy regulyatsii v svyazi so stressom i emotsional'nym vygoraniem [Features of Emotional Regulation in Relation to Stress and Emotional Burnout]. *Psikhologicheskoe issledovanie*, 11(61), 1–12. (in Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.54359/ps.v11i61.264>
- Sairambay, Y. (2021). Political culture and participation in russia and kazakhstan: a new civic culture with contestation? *Slavonica*, 26(2), 116–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13617427.2021.1983095>
- Samedov, M.D. (2006). *Frazeologicheskie ediny, obrazovayushchie emotsional'nye i intellektual'nye sostoyaniya cheloveka, v angliyskom i archinskom yazykakh* [Phraseological units denoting emotional and intellectual states of a person in English and Archin languages]. Diss. cand. philol. nauk. (in Russ.).
- Sergeeva, N.M. (2005). Um i razum [Mind and Reason]. In: V.I. Karasik & I.A. Sternin (Eds), *Antologiya kontseptov*, 1, 286–305. (in Russ.).
- Siraeva, R.T. (2015). *Reprezentatsiya mentalnoy sfery v russkoy i angliyskoy frazeologicheskoy kartine mira* [Representation of the Mental Sphere in Russian and English Phraseological Worldviews]. Diss. cand. philol. nauk. Ufa. (in Russ.).
- Temirgazina, Z.K. (2015). *Obraz cheloveka v russkoy tsennostnoy kartine mira: uchebnoe posobie* [The Image of a Person in the Russian Value Picture of the World: A Textbook]. Moskva: Flinta Publ. (in Russ.).
- Trovati, S.N. (2007). *Verbalizatsiya osnovnykh kontseptov, predstavlyayushchikh intellektual'no-emotsional'nuyu deyatel'nost' cheloveka: na materiale angliyskoy i russkoy frazeologii* [Verbalization of Main Concepts Representing Intellectual and Emotional Activities of a Person: Based on English and Russian Phraseology]. Diss. cand. philol. nauk. Pyatigorsk. (in Russ.).
- Vaganova, E.N., & Kharlamova, A.K. (2021). Фразеологическая экспликация базовых эмоций «Trauer / Sorrow» в немецком и русском языковом сознании [Phraseological explication of basic emotions "Trauer / Sorrow" in German and Russian language consciousness]. *Dnevnik nauki*, 4, 1–12. (in Russ.).
- Valueva, E., Lapteva, E., & Grigoriev, A. (2021). The intelligence of Russian regions through the prism of social networks. *Psychology Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, 18(1), 129–144. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1813-8918-2021-1-129-144>

Sources

- Amanzholov, A.S. (1988). *Kazakhsko-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar'* [Kazakh-Russian Phraseological Dictionary]. Alma-Ata: Mektep. (in Russ.).
- Dal', V.I. (2008). *Poslovitsy i pogovorki russkogo naroda* [Proverbs and Sayings of the Russian People]. Moskva: Eksmo. (in Russ.).
- Felitsyna, V.P. & Mokienco, V. M. (1990). *Russkie frazeologizmy: lingvostranovedcheskiy slovar'* [Russian Phraseologisms: Linguistic and Cultural Dictionary]. Moskva: Russkiy yazyk. (in Russ.).
- Kenesbaev, I.K. (1977). *Kazak tilinin frazeologiyalyk sozdigi* [Phraseological Dictionary of the Kazakh Language]. Almaty: Gylym. (in Kaz.).

- Kenesbaev, I.K. (2007). *Frazeologiyalyk sozdik* [Phraseological Dictionary]. Almaty: Arys. (in Kaz.).
- Kunin, A.V. (2006). *Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskii slovar'* [English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary]. Moskva: Russkiy yazyk, Media Publ. (in Russ.).
- Molotkov, A.I. (1968). *Frazeologicheskii slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language]. Moskva: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya. (in Russ.).
- Stepanova, M.I. (2006). *Frazeologicheskii slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language]. Sankt-Peterburg: Poligrafuslugi. (in Russ.).
- Teliya, V.N. (2006). *Bol'shoy frazeologicheskii slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Large Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language]. Moskva: AST-PRESS KNIGA. (in Russ.).
- Yarantsev, R.I. (2006). *Russkaya frazeologiya. Slovar'-spravochnik: okolo 1500 frazeologizmov* [Russian Phraseology. Reference Dictionary: About 1500 Phraseological Units]. Moskva: Russkiy yazyk, Media. (in Russ.).

Список использованной литературы

- Абаева М.К. Фразеологизмы с значением интеллектуальной деятельности с позиции когнитивной теории: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Алматы, 2008. 276 с.
- Ваганова Е.Н., Харламова А.К. Фразеологическая экспликация базовых эмоций «Trauer / Sorrow» в немецком и русском языковом сознании // *Дневник науки*. 2021. №4. С. 1–12.
- Козлов Н. Психологос. Энциклопедия практической психологии. Москва: Эксмо, 2015. 752 с.
- Лазарев А.В. Когнитивно-фреймовые особенности глагольных и субстантивных средств выражения понимания (на материале английского и русского языков): дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Москва, 2009. 209 с.
- Мишин А.А. Концепты «ум» и «глупость» в немецкой и английской языковых картинах мира: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Владимир, 2007. 150 с.
- Польская Н., Мухаметзянова М. (2018). Особенности эмоциональной регуляции в связи со стрессом и эмоциональным выгоранием. Психологическое исследование. Вып. 11. №61. С. 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.54359/ps.v11i61.264>
- Самедов М.Д. Фразеологические единицы, обозначающие эмоциональные и интеллектуальные состояния человека, в английском и арчинском языках: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Махачкала, 2006. 162 с.
- Сергеева Н.М. Ум и разум // *Антология концептов*: под ред. В.И. Карасик, И.А. Стернина. Волгоград: Парадигма, 2005. Т. 1. С. 286–305.
- Сираева Р.Т. Репрезентация ментальной сферы в русской и английской фразеологической картине мира: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Уфа, 2015. 205 с.
- Темиргазина З.К. Образ человека в русской ценностной картине мира. Москва: Флинта, 2015. 95 с.
- Тривати С.Н. Вербализация основных концептов, представляющих интеллектуально-эмоциональную деятельность человека: на материале английской и русской фразеологии: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Воронеж, 2007. 186 с.
- Chutko, L., Surushkina, S., Yakovenko, E., Is, N., Anisimova, T., & Bondarchuk, I. (2014). Cognitive and Emotional Impairments in Patients with Protracted Anxiety-Phobic

- Disorders. *Terapevticheskii Arkhiv*, 86(12), 61–65. <https://doi.org/10.17116/terarkh2014861261-65>
- Dan, Ch., Rozin, M., Svechkarev, V., Mareev, V., & Aslanov, Y. (2020). Foreign student in a russian university: trends of choice, problems of adaptation and formation of relationships. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(3), 1106–1111. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.83114>
- Grigoryev, D., Batkhina, A., Conway, L., & Zubrod, A. (2022). Authoritarian attitudes in russia: right – wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation in the modern russian context. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(4), 623–645. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12523>
- Isyangulova, Z., & Isyangulova, G. (2020). Ethnocultural semantics of phraseological units in the Bashkir and Kazakh languages. *TDSE*, 22–25. <https://doi.org/10.18411/lj-07-2020-277>
- Mokienko, V. (2022). Image of the enemy in russian phraseology and paremiology. *Russian Language Studies*, 20(2), 203–216. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-2-203-216>
- Nikiforov, O. (2021). Various types of intelligence and professional success in human interaction professions (case study of salespeople). *Psychology in Education*, 3(3), 288–303.
- Sairambay, Y. (2021). Political culture and participation in russia and kazakhstan: a new civic culture with contestation? *Slavonica*, 26(2), 116–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13617427.2021.1983095>
- Valueva, E., Lapteva, E., & Grigoriev, A. (2021). The intelligence of Russian regions through the prism of social networks. *Psychology Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, 18(1), 129–144. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1813-8918-2021-1-129-144>

Источники

- Аманжолов А.С. Казахско-русский фразеологический словарь. Алма-Ата: Мектеп, 1988. 224 с.
- Даль В.И. Пословицы и поговорки русского народа. Москва: Эксмо, 2008. 640 с.
- Кенесбаев І.К. Фразеологиялық сөздік. Алматы: Арыс, 2007. 800 б.
- Кенесбаев І. К. Қазақ тілінің фразеологиялық сөздігі. Алматы: Ғылым, 1977. 712 б.
- Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. Москва: Русский язык, Медиа, 2006. 571 с.
- Молотков А.И. Фразеологический словарь русского языка. Москва: Изд-во «Советская энциклопедия», 1968. 543 с.
- Степанова М.И. Фразеологический словарь русского языка. Санкт-Петербург: Полиграфуслуги, 2006. 608 с.
- Телия В.Н. Большой фразеологический словарь русского языка. Значение. Употребление. Культурологический комментарий. Москва: АСТ-ПРЕСС КНИГА, 2006. 784 с.
- Фелицына В.П., Мокиенко В.М. Русские фразеологизмы: лингвострановедческий словарь. Москва: Русский язык, 1990. 220 с.
- Яранцев Р.И. Русская фразеология. Словарь-справочник: ок. 1500 фразеологизмов. Москва: Русский язык – Медиа, 2006. 894 с.

А.К. Бакытжанова

ҚР Президенті жанындағы Мемлекеттік басқару академиясы

Астана, Қазақстан

ҚАЗАҚ ЖӘНЕ ОРЫС ТІЛДІК САНА-СЕЗІМІНДЕГІ ОЙЛАУ ӘРЕКЕТІНІҢ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ЭКСПЛИКАЦИЯСЫ

Аңдатпа. Мақалада зияткерлік концептосферада көрініс табатын, қазақ және орыс когнитивтік дүние бейнесінің фразеологиялық экспликациясының ерекшеліктері талдауға алынады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – фразеологиялық семантиканы талдау негізінде зияткерлік концептосфераның семантикалық микроәрістері арқылы бейнеленетін қазақ және орыс тілдік сана-сезіміндегі ойлау әрекетін фразеологиялық экспликациялау ерекшеліктерін анықтау. Зерттеу нәтижелері фразеологизмдердің интеллектінің түрлі формаларының индикаторы (көрсеткіш-белгісі) ретінде қызмет етіп, өздері қолданылатын мәдени және әлеуметтік контекстерді бейнелей алатындығын көрсетті. Ойлау әрекетінің фразеологиялық экспликациясын салғастырмалы талдау қазақтар мен орыстардың тілдік санасындағы келесі нәтижелерді анықтады: *үш семантикалық микроәрісті* белгіледі, олар – «ақыл-ой әрекетінің субъектісі» (зияткерлік, ойлау қабілетінің иесі), «ойлау әрекетінің процестері» (ойлау қабілеті), «ойлау әрекетінің сипаты» (зияткерлік пен ойлау қабілетінің сапасы, сипаттары); *фразеологиялық модельдердің* келесі өнімді компоненттері бар *типологиясы* анықталды – абстрактілі субстантивтік компоненттер, соматикалық және зоонимдік компоненттер; фразеологизмнің қалыптасуына әсер еткен *лингвомәдени факторлары* айқындалды; үш семантикалық микроәріс деңгейінде ойлау әрекетін бейнелейтін фразеологизмдердің *жағымды және жағымсыз коннотациялық сипаттамалары* белгіленді.

Түйінді сөздер: фразеология, фразеологиялық семантика, фразеологиялық экспликация, когнитивтік болмыс, ойлау әрекеті, зияткерлік концептосфера.

А. К. Бакытжанова

Академия государственного управления при Президенте РК

Астана, Казахстан

ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ ЭКСПЛИКАЦИЯ МЫСЛИТЕЛЬНОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ В ЯЗЫКОВОМ СОЗНАНИИ КАЗАХОВ И РУССКИХ

Аннотация. В статье анализируются особенности фразеологической экспликации когнитивной картины мира казахов и русских, репрезентируемые в интеллектуальной концептосфере. Цель исследования – на основе анализа фразеологической семантики определить специфику фразеологической экспликации мыслительной деятельности в казахском и русском языковом сознании, репрезентируемую через семантические микрополя интеллектуальной концептосферы. Результаты исследования показали, что фразеологизмы могут служить индикаторами различных форм интеллекта и отражать культурные и социальные контексты, в которых они используются. Сопоставительный анализ

фразеологической экспликации мыслительной деятельности в языковом сознании казахов и русских выявил следующие результаты: *три семантических микрополя* «субъект мыслительной деятельности» (обладатель интеллекта, мыслительных способностей), «процессы мыслительной деятельности» (мыслительные способности), «характеристика мыслительных способностей» (качества, свойства мыслительных способностей, интеллекта); *типологию фразеологических моделей* со следующими продуктивными компонентами – абстрактными субстантивными компонентами, соматическими и зоонимическими компонентами; лингвокультурные факторы, повлиявшие на формирование ФЕ; положительные и отрицательные *коннотативные характеристики* мыслительной деятельности на уровне трех семантических микрополей.

Ключевые слова: фразеология, фразеологическая семантика, фразеологическая экспликация, когнитивная сфера, мыслительная деятельность, интеллектуальная концептосфера.