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Abstract

Purpose of the Study: Research on the meaning structure of phraseological units representing the figurative richness of language has been central up to the present. Words and phraseological units of a language represent a universal basis for polysemy development, with virtually any language unit having enough potential for the development of new meanings. The subject of the study is polysemantic phraseological units of Yakut and Kazakh that have not been specifically studied before.

Methodology: We analyzed Yakut phraseological units with four meanings and their equivalents in Kazakh. Polysemantic phraseological units of Yakut and Kazakh with a wide range of structural arrangement and a rich figurative potential for the convergent and divergent direction of semantic transfer of linguistic units of indirect nomination have not been studied before. We analyze Yakut phraseological units with the highest number of meaning transfer and compared them to Kazakh phraseological units. Semantic reinterpretation in view of the separate formation of linguistic units of indirect nomination has always been interesting for scholars studying Turkic languages.

Main Findings: Semantics of Yakut and Kazakh polysemantic phraseological units is complex due to the fact that the meaning of the original free word combination is transferred in Yakut in four directions, which makes it extremely difficult to find their equivalents in Kazakh in view of the specific reflection of the world picture in the compared languages. The limit of development of convergent and divergent semantic transfer of linguistic units of indirect nomination in Yakut is the formation of phraseological units with four meanings, which is indicative of a rich figurative potential of Yakut linguistic units. Considering that phraseological units as semantically reinterpreted separate units and set word complexes already are linguistic units of indirect nomination, their further semantic reinterpretations and transformations must be reinterpreted to a greater extent.
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INTRODUCTION

Phraseology studies fixed word complexes of a language as a component of vocabulary. The expressive and pragmatic potential of phraseological units (hereinafter PU) is a highly complex phenomenon that is always considered as the basic source of figurative means of a language, its figurative wealth. Figurativeness of PU semantics results from non-additive combining of meanings; therefore, the picture of the world is not a mechanical reflection of reality in PU. Heterogeneity and connotative dominance of phraseological semantics allows to fill lacunas of lexical nomination and to denote individual and sets of elements of the conceptual picture of the world. Figurative designation of the semantics of PU components is related to the anthropocentric parameter and is relevant for producing PU. The heterogeneity of PU semantics based on the value picture of the world is determined both by the figurative meaning of the core PU component and global reinterpretation of the original free word group. Figurativeness of PU is created by an internal structure providing the figurative and associative perception of the original frame or situation. PU represents a considerable stratum of a language and provides an utterance with special figurative expressiveness due to the dominance of the connotative aspect of meaning.

PU are linguistic units of indirect nomination. The prototypes of PU are original free word groups. Since the interpretation of the term ‘phraseological unit’ is ambiguous both in Russia and abroad, it makes sense to clarify our understanding of PU. We share the opinion of scholars who refer to PU as “a set word group of different structural types … the meaning of which results from fully or partially transferred meanings of its component parts” (Černyševa, 1970, 29). The relevant characteristics of PU are semantic transfer, separate structural arrangement, and stability of its constituents. When analyzing the set of criteria for PU identification (fully or partially transferred meanings of components, separate structural arrangement, the stability of lexical components, reproducibility in a set form), the semantic criterion is prioritized.


Polysemy is an inherent component of a language, its constituent characteristic. PU is language units of indirect nomination. Polysemy is a semantic category most represented in lexical and physiographical resources. Traditionally,
Polysemy is referred to as the presence of several meanings, lexico-semantic variants. Unlike the lexical, the phraseological level involves deeper semantic processes due to the secondary nature of PU formation. We can distinguish the following types of semantic relations of polysemantic PU: 1) radial phraseological polysemy, 2) chain phraseological polysemy, 3) radial-chain phraseological polysemy, 4) phraseological homonymy (Prokopieva, 1995, 87).

Although the semantic structure of PU has been studied extensively, this problem still remains unsolved for the Turkic languages due to the semantic complexity of linguistic units of indirect nomination.


Polysemy of PU in the Turkish languages has been studied by S.K. Kenesbaev (1977, 2007), Sh. Rakhmatullaev (1966), E.R. Zhaysakova (1985), E. Zhanpeysov (1989), etc.

Kazakh phraseology first attracted great interest and closer attention in the 1950s owing to publications of the Academician S.K. Kenesbaev (1977) that determined the functions of phraseology and developed criteria for identification and classification of PU. Following V.V. Vinogradov (1986), S.K. Kenesbaev (1954) specifies the main characteristics of Kazakh PU, their semantic and grammatical classifications, also considering the problems of phraseological synonymy, variance, polysemy, and homonymy. The scholar says the following regarding polysemy: “Some idioms, PU, fixed expressions, being polysemantic, naturally form polysemy without destroying their internal structure” (Kenesbaev, 1977, p. 12).


Of great significance is the Kazakh-Russian Phraseological Dictionary edited by Kh.K. Khozhakhmetova (1988) that contains more than 2,300 PU and variants.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The general research method is inductive-deductive. The linguistic methods of research include phraseological identification, contrasting and componental analysis of PU. Figurative PU was selected from the following phraseological sources: Yakut-Russian Phraseological Dictionary (Nelunov, 2002) and Kazakh-Russian Phraseological Dictionary (Kozhakhmetova et al. 1988).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We analyzed Yakut PU with four meanings and their Kazakh equivalents. The convergent and divergent semantic transfer of units of indirect nomination in Yakut can form PU with up to four meanings, which indicates a great figurative potential of Yakut linguistic units. Being semantically reinterpreted and structurally separable units and fixed word complexes, PU already is linguistic units of indirect nomination, so further semantic reinterpretations and transformations feature an even greater degree of reinterpretation (Prokopieva, 2014). The purpose of the study is to compare the polysemantic PU of the Yakut language and their equivalents in the Kazakh language.

Polysemantic PU of both languages is characterized by a simple structure. Generally, these are two- or three-member structures formed as word groups. The analyzed phraseological units are verbal.

The analysis showed that polysemy develops in PU with the somatic components атак, бас, харах. These lexemes are polysemantic due to their complex semantic structure. The word атак has four meanings in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Yakut Language (Explanatory Dictionary of the Yakut Language 2004-2018), бас has seven meanings, and харах has three. There exists a certain dependence of a PU developing polysemy on the number of meanings a particular lexeme has. Thus, the lexemes атак, бас, харах demonstrate a high phrase forming activity, with атак forming 35 PU (5 of them polysemantic), бас – 41 PU (8 of them polysemantic), and харах – 77 PU (8 of them polysemantic).

When compared, Yakut and Kazakh PU correspond completely or partly. This phenomenon is also observed in polysemantic PU. The Yakut phraseologist атахар (сүүогохсү) typ has four meanings, all of them coinciding with the Kazakh phraseologist аныңың тұр. The only difference in components in that the Yakut phraseological component атахар has a lexical variant (сүүогохсү) resulting from the development of Yakut phraseology. Component variation of Yakut and Kazakh polysemantic PU is represented by intralingual lexical and grammatical variance. The lexical variance is represented by substitution of noun components in Yakut (атағар (сүүогохсү) турұр, атахар (сүүогохсү) тұр) and adjective in Kazakh (омір (тірі)мен өлім (өлі)арасында). The grammatical variance is represented by PU (тыныңың (тыныңың) ыбылыға, хараşı (хараға) ының) in Yakut that lacks in Kazakh.

Let us analyze the correspondence between Yakut and Kazakh polysemantic PU.

Атахар (сүүогохсү) тұр = аныңың тұр: 1) улаханың ыбылыға сығынақтың ыбылыға ұтып, өртүң қостық, бірнеше жаңа ұтып, қозғалыс болатып айналып, қозғалыс болатып айналып, қозғалыс болатып айналып, қозғалыс болатып айналып.
favorite daughter had been indisposed for about a month and just started to recover’. 1) аяғынан түрү ‘get a higher position in life, establish oneself, become rich’. 2) аяғынан түрүн ауызлаға басының болды (Коммунистический). 3) аяғынан түрүн ауызлаға басының болды (Коммунистический). 4) оро күүр, дәлүү, құққуң тұмун ‘get excited, worried, brace up’. 4) оро күүр, дәлүү, құққуң тұмун ‘get excited, worried, brace up’. 5) аяғынан түрү ‘at any time in life’. 6) аяғынан түрү ‘at any time in life’. 7) аяғынан түрү ‘at any time in life’. 8) аяғынан түрү ‘at any time in life’.

This meaning has an equivalent Kazakh phraseology аяғынан (тік) түрү ‘get on one’s feet, get excited, welcome warmly, focus’. Обылы нешік, құдайныңызқылықтың тік түркісімі (А. Токмагамбетов). 9) There is no denying, the in-laws welcomed us as dear guests’.

Semantically, the Yakut атасар (сүңүөхөр) түрүр and Kazakh аяғынан тік түркісімі phraseologies fully coincide.

The PU mentioned above develop polysemy due to parallel reinterpretation, i.e. semantic reinterpretation of the same original word combination: атасар (сүңүөхөр) түрүр, аяғынан түрү ‘put someone on their feet’.

The following PU partly coincides in the plane of content:

The first three meanings of the Yakut phraseologism бәйкеттін атасар дызы (дылы) correspond to Kazakh бастан-аң.

1. бүтүнчүү, тиләр ‘in all details, from beginning to end’. Косторач күрдүү, поэма байынын адамдарыны оро күүрүлгөн, кошулдуу элек бир түнгүн бийктерин эдилийт (Н. Тобуров). 2) аяғынан тік түркісімі ‘cure, relieve of an illness’. Алты ай сал болып жатқан Сәлімдің кызының тік түркісімі (А. Токмагамбетов). 3) аяғынан тік түркісімі ‘put someone on their feet’.

The PU mentioned above develop polysemy due to parallel reinterpretation, i.e. semantic reinterpretation of the same original word combination: бәйкеттін атасар дызы (дылы) ‘thank someone’. Ийэ Хотун Микин, толбоялык нүүрүн короору, байынын адамдарыны махтал-башымда этээри эркинде, Ийэ Хотун Микин, толбоялык нүүрүн короору, байынын адамдарыны махтал-башымда этээри эркинде, Микин.
'The woman turned to thank Nikita heartily, but he was not there anymore.'

'Excitement gleamed in one's eyes.'

'Attract one's (eyes) attention' corresponds to the Kazakh PU

'Attract someone's attention, affect' corresponds to the Kazakh PU

'Attract someone’s (eyes) attention' corresponds to the Kazakh PU

'Things that a person says or does to influence another are smell, odor.'

'I mean that the academician was gazing at me.'
correspond to the Kazakh PU with one meaning өлім аузында жату, өмір (тірі)мен өлім (ол)арасында, өлім-тірілгеніңің (тірі-тірілгенің) білім / (өлім-тірілгеніңің карамау), өлім аузынан қаду, қоз токкау, қоз айырмай, қозін қызықтыру, қозін қадуа. It was noted that a total correspondence of all meanings in the compared languages is a rare phenomenon that is true for languages with different systems. Such phenomena may occur in related languages with similar systems.

CONCLUSION
The analysis showed that polysemy develops in PU with the somatic components атас, бас, харах. These lexemes are polysemic due to their complex semantic structure. Polysemantic phraseological units of both languages are characterized by a simple structure. Generally, these are two- or three-member structures formed as word groups. The analyzed phraseological units are verbal.

The study of Yakut PU with four meanings as compared to their equivalents in Kazakh revealed that only two polysemantic Yakut PU have equivalents in Kazakh phraseology. All meanings rarely correspond in the languages under study, however, some unique examples can be found. Some Yakut polysemantic PU is partly equivalent to certain PU in Kazakh.

The results of the study of polysemantic phraseological units in Yakut and Kazakh will be used in teaching lexicology, general linguistics, contrastive phraseology and compilation of the Yakut–Kazakh Phraseological Dictionary. Studying polysemantic phraseological units of related and non-related languages is of great interest for future research due to complex multiple figurative semantic transfers of these units of secondary nomination and revealing common and unique features of compared linguistic units.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
The study was funded by the Ministry of Higher Education and Science of the Russian Federation, state project No. 34.3377.2017/ПЧ.

REFERENCES
