G.A. JAILIKHANOVA[1✉], N.N. SALIMOVA[1*]

[1]*Lecturer of S. Yessenov Caspian University of Technologies and Engineering*
(Kazakhstan, Aktau), e-mails: gulnar.jailikhanova@yu.edu.kz; nataly17.lion@gmail.com

FEATURES OF ZOOMORPHISMS IN THE COMPARATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND KAZAKH LANGUAGES

Abstract. This article is devoted to the analysis of zoomorphisms in the composition of comparative constructions and their comparison in different system languages. The article analyzes the most common examples of the use of zoomorphisms in comparative constructions of the English, Russian and Kazakh languages. For linguistic research, the analysis of zoomorphisms in comparative constructions and their comparison in languages of different systems seems to be very relevant. The mysterious nature of zoomorphisms has attracted more and more researchers over time. Zoolexics, which is brighter than any other area of language, reflects the peculiarities of comprehending extra-linguistic reality, when images and names of animals in different languages are projected onto a person. These images go back to the depths of human consciousness and beliefs. The names of animals projected onto humans are often associated with folk and mythical symbols. The roots of this phenomenon go far back in centuries, when tribes worshiped images of animal totems. Zoomorphisms are characterized as comparative expressives with diffuse semantics, i.e. they represent speech forms with double correlation: they link the spheres "animal" (as a function of origin) and "man" (as functional means of creating a characteristic). The study of zoomorphisms in various languages contributes to a vivid description of linguistic imagery, and in the comparative aspect of the study it makes it possible to identify typical associations, recognize and describe the national-cultural specifics of each language. Zoomorphisms in comparative constructions reveal the originality of the historical development of the people, spiritual culture, the peculiarities of everyday life, the specificity of the associative-figurative thinking of native speakers. Zoomorphisms as an object of research deserve special attention also because, obeying the laws of language, they form a specific subsystem, within which their own laws arise that require a special description.

Keywords*: zoomorphism, cultural linguistics, picture of the world, ethnocultural specificity, lexical and semantic variants, comparative structures.*

Г.А. Джайлиханова[1], Н.Н. Салимова[1]

[1]*Ш. Есенов атындағы Каспий технологиялар және инжиниринг университетінің оқытушысы (Қазақстан, Ақтау қ.), e-mails: gulnar.jailikhanova@yu.edu.kz; nataly17.lion@gmail.com*

Ағылшын, орыс және қазақ тілдерінің салыстырмалы құрылысындағы зооморфизмнің ерекшеліктері

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақала салыстырмалы конструкциялар құрамындағы зооморфизмдерді талдауға және оларды әр түрлі жүйелік тілдерде салыстыруға арналған. Мақалада зооморфизмдерді ағылшын, орыс және қазақ тілдерінің салыстырмалы конструкцияларында қолданудың кең таралған мысалдары талданған. Лингвистикалық зерттеулер үшін салыстырмалы құрылымдардағы зооморфизмдерді талдау және оларды әр түрлі жүйелердегі тілдерде салыстыру өте маңызды болып көрінеді. Зооморфизмнің жұмбақ табиғаты уақыт өте келе зерттеушілердің назарын аударды. Тілдің кез келген саласына қарағанда жарқын зоолексика тілден тыс шындықты түсінудің ерекшеліктерін бейнелейді, бұл кезде әртүрлі тілдердегі жануарлардың бейнелері мен атаулары адамдарға проекцияланады. Бұл бейнелер адам санасы мен нанымының тереңіне оралады. Адамға проекцияланған жануарлардың атаулары көбінесе халықтық және мифтік белгілермен байланысты. Бұл құбылыстың тамыры ғасырлардан, тайпалар жануарлар тотемдерінің бейнелеріне табынудан басталады. Зооморфизмдер диффузды семантикасы бар салыстырмалы экспрессивтер ретінде сипатталады, яғни олар сөйлеу формаларын екі жақты корреляциямен бейнелейді: олар «жануар» (шығу тегі ретінде) және «адам» (сипаттаманы құрудың функционалды құралы ретінде) сфераларын байланыстырады. Әр түрлі тілдердегі зооморфизмдерді зерттеу лингвистикалық бейнелеуді айқын суреттеуге ықпал етеді, ал зерттеудің салыстырмалы аспектісінде типтік ассоциацияларды анықтауға, әр тілдің ұлттық-мәдени ерекшеліктерін тануға және сипаттауға мүмкіндік береді. Салыстырмалы құрылымдардағы зооморфизмдер халықтың тарихи дамуының, рухани мәдениетінің өзіндік ерекшелігін, тұрмыстық ерекшеліктерін, ана тілділердің ассоциативті-бейнелі ойлау ерекшелігін ашады. Зооморфизмдер зерттеу объектісі ретінде ерекше назар аударуға тұрарлық, өйткені тіл заңдарына бағына отырып, олар белгілі бір ішкі жүйені құрайды, оның шеңберінде арнайы сипаттаманы қажет ететін өз заңдары туындайды.

Кілт сөздер: зооморфизм, мәдени лингвистика, әлемнің суреті, этномәдени ерекшелігі, лексика-семантикалық нұсқалары, салыстырмалы құрылымдары.

Г.А. Джайлиханова[1], Н.Н. Салимова[1]
[1]преподаватель Каспийского университета технологий и инжиниринга имени Ш. Есенова (Казахстан, г. Актау), e-mails: gulnar.jailikhanova@yu.edu.kz; nataly17.lion@gmail.com

Особенности зооморфизмов в сравнительных конструкциях английского, русского и казахского языков

Аннотация. Данная статья посвящена анализу зооморфизмов а составе сравнительных конструкций и их сопоставление в разносистемных языках. В статье проанализированы наиболее распространенные примеры употребления зооморфизмов в сравнительных конструкциях английского, русского и казахского языков. Для лингвистических изысканий весьма актуальным представляется анализ зооморфизмов в составе сравнительных конструкций и их сопоставление в разносистемных языках. Загадочная природа зооморфизмов с течением времени все более привлекает многих исследователей. В зоолексике, представляющей ярче, чем в любой другой области языка, отражаются особенности осмысления внеязыковой реальности, когда образы и названия животных в разных языках проецируется на человека. Эти образы восходят к глубинам человеческого сознания и его верованиям. Названия животных, проецируемых на человека часто связаны с народной и мифической символикой. Корни этого явления уходят далеко в глубь веков, когда племена поклонялись изображениям животных-тотемов. Зооморфизмы характеризуются как сравнительные экспрессивы с диффузной семантикой, т.е. они представляют речевые формы с двойной корреляцией: они связывают сферы «животное» (как функцию по происхождению) и «человек» (как функциональные средства создания

характеристики). Изучение зооморфизмов в различных языках способствует яркому описанию языковой образности, причем в сопоставительном аспекте изучения дает возможность выявить типичные ассоциации, распознать и описать национально-культурную специфику каждого языка. Зооморфизмы в сравнительных конструкциях раскрывают самобытность исторического развития народа, духовной культуры, особенности бытового уклада, специфичность ассоциативно-образного мышления носителей языка. Зооморфизмы как объект исследования заслуживают особого внимания еще и потому, что, подчиняясь законам языка, они образуют специфическую подсистему, внутри которой возникают свои закономерности, требующие специального описания.

Ключевые слова*:* зооморфизм, лингвокультурология, картина мира, этнокультурная специфичность, лексико-семантические варианты, сравнительные кострукции.

Introduction

For linguistic research, the analysis of zoomorphisms in comparative constructions and their comparison in different system languages seems to be very relevant. The mysterious nature of zoomorphisms has attracted more and more researchers over time. Many works have been devoted to the disclosure of the concept of zoomorphisms, one of which in linguistics is the work of Y.L. Lyasota. In his work, Y.L. Lyasota puts forward the idea that zoolexics, which is brighter than any other area of the language, reflects the peculiarities of comprehending extra-linguistic reality, when images and names of animals as part of comparative constructions of different languages are projected onto humans. These images and fantasies go back to the depths of human consciousness, its beliefs and mythology [1, p. 12].

It should also be noted the dissertation research of zoomorphism's by T.V. Linko in English and A.A. Kipriyanova in Russian. T.V. Linko noted the fact that the role of animals in human life has always been exceptionally great, especially at the early stage of human development, ideas about the origin of this collective from an animal lived in human society. The inclusion of knowledge about the animal world in the system of figurative means of characterizing a person, expanding and deepening knowledge about a person himself through comparison, searching for similarities with images of the realities of the natural world is a natural stage in the development of human knowledge about himself as a special object [2, p. 33].

According to A. Kaidar, man, being an integral part of the animal world, since he was born, interacts closely with the surrounding fauna [3, p. 37]. In the first written sources of any nation, there are repeated references to certain representatives of the animal world, comparisons of the heroes of the ethnos with various animals. Animal names are often associated with folk and mythical symbolism. In a later period, individual animals became the personification of qualities that a person would like to possess or from which he sought to get rid of: the snake is a symbol of wisdom, but also the personification of cunning and deceit; lion - the personification of strength and nobility; bear is a symbol of strength, etc.

Among the numerous studies on the nature of zoomorphisms, the most famous is the work of two authors – M.I. Cheremissina and F.A. Litvin. They developed a special methodology for the textual study of zoomorphisms. M.I. Cheremissina in her dissertation "Structural types of synthetic polypredicative constructions in languages of different systems" asserts that the zoocharacteristic of a person, arising on the basis of a figurative representation of a particular animal, most vividly and directly reflects the national identity of languages through a system of evaluative images - standards characteristic of a given ethnos.

M.I. Cheremissina defines zoomorphisms as figurative, lexico-semantic variants of the names of animals, which are based on real or imaginary qualities of animals, which are attributed to them by the fantasy and creative thinking of the people [4, p. 147]. Starting from the idea that zoomorphisms are predicative-characterizing types of meaning, M.I. Cheremissina and F.A. Litvin

investigated their syntactic functioning as part of comparative constructions and showed that they widely function not only as predicates, but also as conversions, applications, definitions, subjects and additions.

Zoomorphisms are figurative uses of animal names in relation to people. For example: "Well, he's like a ram!", And also about what is directly or indirectly related to this, like the use of animal names in comparisons: "Like a bull on a string", proverbs and sayings, as well as in phraseological units. Zoomorphisms as an object of research deserve special attention also because, obeying the laws of language, they form a specific subsystem, within which their own laws arise that require a special description.

It should be noted that zoomorphisms used to compare a person with the qualities, habits and character of animals have repeatedly become the subject of special research. Thus, it is only in recent years that the works of Ya.L. Belitsyna, V.D. Devkina, V.I. Zhelvis, N.A. Ilyukhina, E.A. Katsitadze, A.A. Kipriyanova, V.V. Morkovkin, T.T. Ogdonova, and others, in which this layer of vocabulary is specially considered.

According to T.T. Ogdonova, human thinking tends to reflect the world anthropomorphically or zoomorphically. The results of this reflection are recorded by many lexical units, among which a special kind of words stand out, which she calls zoomorphisms. Zoomorphisms are characterized as comparative expressives with diffuse semantics, i.e. they represent speech forms with double correlation: they connect the spheres "animal" (as a function of origin) and "man" (as functional means of creating a characteristic) [5; 38-p].

We believe that the most convenient in identifying the ethnocultural specificity of zoonymic vocabulary that characterizes a person is the traditional term "zoomorphism", which we understand by as a lexico-semantic variant of the word, acting as a generic name for an animal, and as a comparison of a person with an animal. Zoomorphisms were considered from a functional point of view, providing for the analysis of the syntactic potencies of zoological characteristics. It was found that the figurative meaning of the names of animals is realized in three main ways: in comparisons with the various modules by which the comparison is carried out, the names of animals are used here in their direct meaning; in metaphorical use; derived from the names of animals, which also usually retain the dichotomy of direct and figurative meanings. It is in this sense that figurative nominations that evaluate the actions and properties of a person through comparison can be called a system of national stable figurative characteristics of a person, or anthropocharacteristics.

Methods

The study of zoomorphisms in the composition of comparative constructions reveals much more than a comparative analysis of other aspects of the language, since zoomorphisms are the main source of expression of culture and self-awareness of the people. As Panfilov A.K. wrote, comparative constructions are subdivided into thematic groups that characterize the external appearance of a person in comparison with animals. So, in particular, various zoomorphisms require identification and comprehension with a comparison indicator as in different structures (for example, in the mind of a Russian person, such a quality as stupidity is associated by association with the designation of a donkey: someone is stupid as a donkey), which will give the ability to specify that the comparison is carried out using a comparison indicator like [6, p. 888].

In our study, we will consider zoomorphisms as part of the comparative constructions of the English, Kazakh and Russian languages. Of the whole variety of forms and ways of expressing the category of comparison of zoomorphisms in the field of view of this work, there are proper syntactic constructions with the comparison indicator as, using adjectives or adverbs before the union, as when comparing a person with an animal, with his behavior, habits, as well as identifying the specifics and ways of expressing zoomorphisms with a comparison indicator of shine and a case ending – give in Kazakh and a comparison indicator like in English.

F. Litvin noted the fact that zoomorphisms are systemically organized, included in the linguistic picture of the world as a structured fragment of the evaluative characteristics of a person. They form opposing and synonymous series, correlated in symbolic meaning. The same zoomorphic image, when compared, can develop several symbolic meanings (dominant and additional), which leads to the intersection of the meanings of zoomorphic nominations both in the same and in different languages. Zoomorphisms have national specificity, which is revealed during their comparative analysis, taking into account ethnocultural propositions [7, p. 147].

Results

Studies of zoomorphisms in the comparative constructions of the Russian, English and Kazakh languages show that based on the active creative nature of the cognition process as a socio-historical act aimed at reflecting objective reality in the human mind, the faunistic or zoosemic lexical subsystem can be defined as a distinctively distinguished area of vocabulary based on social realities (names of animals) of the world around us. The trait on the basis of which the symbolic significance of zoomorphisms is formed is often not essential for a given animal, and sometimes is just an imaginary trait. This explains the fact that one and the same object of reality – one and the same animal - in different linguistic communities can be attributed to different signs. The closer the culture and living conditions of the three peoples are to each other, the more points will coincide with their language-fixed representations about animals. The dialectic of the description of zoomorphisms is to determine the ways of dividing this unity into parameters that can be re-combined in the description without losing the integral meaning as a linguistic phenomenon.

Most of the zoomorphisms that make up the comparative constructions of these three languages have similar meanings. The coincidences can be due to certain similarities in the natural conditions of life of the three peoples, including fauna, as well as the same perception and rethinking of reality. However, zoomorphisms with a comparison index do not coincide in the three different-structured languages. For example, the zoomorphism fox in English denotes cunning, skill, dexterity and is used with a comparative union like:

For example, in English:

Edgar Bedford was *cunning like a fox*. [1, p. 11].

"Mary is *like a fox*, she can cheat us" [2, p. 181].

– What's up? – asked Roger.

Somebody is winding us round his little finger.

Why you think so? – said Roger.

Because a detective is *like a fox* knows where we are [3, p. 103].

So, in English, the animal fox is associated with such character traits as cunning, dexterity, skill. In the Russian and Kazakh mentality, this animal is also the standard of "cunning, dexterity".

For example, in Russian:

1) Этот старый человек *хитрый как лис*, создаст нам ещё много проблем [1, p. 75].

2) Будь осторожнее, Лёша! Она очень *хитрая как лиса*. [2, p. 35].

3) Вон идет, *хитрая как лиса*, чтобы выманить хоть какую-то информацию у нас [3, p. 352].

In Kazakh language:

1) "Мұндай *түлкідей адамды* талай көргенбіз – Иса батыр айтты" [1, p. 23].

2) Боржабай орта бойлы, жуантық денелі *түлкі сияқты* адам [2, p. 256].

3) "Қарасақ, көп адамдар *түлкі сияқты* қу және икемді боп жүр" [3, p. 125].

Having considered the examples, we can conclude that the zoomorphism of the fox in the three compared languages has similarities, the three linguistic groups are known as the same character traits of this animal. The example with the zoomorphism of the fox fits completely into the comparison model, which, as indicated earlier, consists of three parts: "what is being compared", "what is being compared with" and "on the basis of what is being compared". For example: This old man, cunning as a fox, will create many more problems for us (Sydney Sheldon

"If Tomorrow Comes". The first part – "what is being compared" – an old man. The second part – "what they compare with" – the fox. The third part – "on the basis of what they compare", "module" – tricky.

The two peoples in the traditional reference comparison to zoomorphism
the bear is attributed to qualities like "clumsiness, strength".
For example, in Russian:
1) "Дима *неуклюжий как медведь*" [4, p. 235].
2) "Блэк, думаю, не справиться с этим заданием, ведь он у нас *неуклюжий как медведь*" [4, p. 236].
3) – Где Ники? Я его сегодня не видела
    – Вон, он идет *вразвалочку как медведь* [5, p. 255].
In Kazakh language:
1) – Айша, сен жігітіңді көрдің бе?
    – Иә, ол *аю сияқты* ірі денелі [4, p. 226].
"Менің құрбым өте жақсы адам және *аю сияқты күшті*" [5, p. 456].
"Ләйлі, қарашы, ана балапан – *аю баласы сияқты,* келе жатыр" [6, p. 15].
In Russian, the bear is the standard of "clumsiness, strength" and when comparing the union is used as, and in the Kazakh language, for comparison with the animal, the case ending is used - give. In English, a bear is a rude, tactless person. At the heart of rudeness is an irresponsible attitude towards other people, selfishness. In English, like is used to compare and determine similarity.
Example:
1) "Peter is *like a bear*, he can't conduct himself" [4, p. 88].
The employer was *rough like a bear* at the conference [5, p. 326].
"The baby was coming *like a small bear*", he is so sweet [5, p. 365].
In this example, the child is characterized as clumsy.
A healthy, physically strong person is identified in the Russian mind with a bull.
Example:
1) "Андрей *здоров как бык* и справится с этой работой" [6, p. 22].
2) – Я слышала, Пит в больнице
    – Да, но с ним ничего не случилось. Он *здоров как бык* у нас и справиться со всеми болезнями [7, p. 255].
3) "Больше ешь, больше пей, занимайся физическим трудом и будешь *здоровым как бык* – дал отец совет сыну" [8, p. 235].
In the Kazakh language, such qualities of zoomorphism, the bull is projected onto a person as strong, strong, healthy.
Example:
1) Серік – *өгіз сияқта ірі денелі*, оны шақырмай-ақ қой [7, p. 23].
2) "Орақ – *өгіз сияқты үлкен* болғанына қарамай өкіріп отыр" [7, p. 53].
In English, the zoomorphism bull symbolizes a stubborn person.
Example:
1) "Peter is *like a stubborn bull*" [6, p. 35].
2) "What's up with him?"
Don't hurry he is *like a sound bull* [6, p. 245].
3) "I have never met such person. He is *like a stubborn bull*. It' is very difficult to make him change his mind" [7, p. 15].
So, the zoomorphism bull in the three compared languages is an animal strong, strong and healthy, and in English it is also stubborn.
As he wrote, A.V. Afanasyev, there are many examples with negative evaluative connotations related to the concept of a donkey. The paradox of the interpretation of this image in the Russian and English ethnoculture is that in ancient times the donkey was considered a sacred animal by both

peoples. Certain rituals related to the glorification of the donkey have come into use in both the Catholic and Orthodox churches. But despite this, the donkey is a symbol of stupidity, stubbornness, laziness [8, p. 45]. The Russian zoomorphism "donkey" invariably has a negative evaluative connotation and is a standard of stubbornness.

Example:

Его невозможно переубедить, он *упрямый как осёл* [9, p. 35].

"Девочки, не слушайте его. Он *чванлив как осел*" [9, p. 232].

– Что ж мы ничего не можем поделать. Мистера Твика очень трудно переубедить, он *упрямый как осёл* [10, p. 262].

In Kazakh and English, a donkey means a stupid person – a fool.

Example:

"Әкім *есек сияқты ақымақ*. Ол қашан келеді екен-ай?" [8, p. 523].

Мұның не қатын? - Сен *есек сияқты ақылсыз*! – деді Әбен, Шалабай сияқты қашқынға? қанішерге Шәкен мөр беріп құтырып па? [8, p. 53].

3) Байғұлдың Әкімі саудагер, қара жұдырықтау болса, біздің Демеу – *есек сияқты ақылсыз*! [3, p. 63].

In English language:

1) "You are *like an old ass*! You don't understand how important it is for me" [7, p. 333].

2) "– I want to say you that I'm not going to rumor about every thing!

– Don't listen to him. He is *like a pompous ass*!" [3, p. 25].

3) "– Harry you are *like an ass*, you don't understand the matter" [3, p. 265].

It is well known that the same extralinguistic given is refracted in different ways in different systems. In the examples considered, the zoomorphism of the donkey has a discrepancy in meanings in Russian, in English, in Kazakh. Discrepancies are inevitable, since zoomorphisms in their composition reflect the mentality of the nation, its fantasy, worldview.

In the Russian linguistic consciousness, the *horse* is associated with stupidity, but for the British and Kazakhs, the horse is identified with freedom, will, unbridledness.

Example:

1) Стёпа *как лошадь* пьет много воды [5, 56-p].

2) Вчера *как лошади* работали в огороде допоздна [5, 92-p].

The horse has meaning as a working, hardworking person.

3) "– Юра, чем *ржать как лошадь*, помог бы закончить работу, – сказала Юлия" [10, p. 100].

In English language:

1) "Jack Pete is *like a horse*. He can't behave himself" [2, p. 95].

"Jeremy is impolite *like a horse*" [1, p. 12].

"The lesson was over and children *like horses* ran home quickly" [8, p. 56].

In the Turkic languages, the horse is a symbol of "freedom, will".

In Kazakh language:

1) "Исатай *ат сияқты* ізін салмады" [1, p. 9].

2) "Менің інім *ат сияқты* жүгіріп жүреді" [4, p. 98].

Discussion

Considering examples of zoomorphism horse, we can conclude that the same zoomorphism in different languages has different meanings. In Russian, such character traits as hard work are projected onto a person, and in English and Kazakh languages it is associated with a free, reckless person. An interesting fact is that in such multi-system languages as English and Kazakh, identity is traced in imagery. In comparative constructions with zoomorphism, the horse is a conjunction "like" in English, it is used with a verb describing the habits and behavior of an animal. The predominantly positive characterological paremia of the "horse" in the English and Russian

ethnoculture, confirmed by examples of contextual implementation, apparently goes back to the ancient archaic trickster, enshrined in literary tradition. Man and horse have passed many periods of their evolutionary development together, in spiritual and physical harmony with each other. World history has documented numerous cases of an elevated, grateful and respectful attitude of the owner to his horse. Sapozhnikova L.M. asserts the fact that according to the testimony of Pliny the Younger, horses "sat" in the legislature, such as, for example, the horse of the Roman emperor Caligula, who was "promoted to senators and consuls" [9, p. 29].

Comparative analysis of zoomorphisms in the composition of comparative constructions showed that in the "zoosymbols" of the three compared languages there are both similarities and differences. As Timoshenko I.Ye. asserted, the prescription of common sense and the conclusions of empirical observations of the nature of animals are more or less the same for all peoples [10, p. 17]. The content of zoomorphisms in one language may differ significantly from the content of similar zoomorphisms in another language, which gives reason to see them as a reflection of the national specificity of the culture of peoples speaking these languages. The specificity of the similarity lies in the fact that the natural living conditions of the two European peoples - Russian and English, including the fauna, are the same, as well as the same perception and rethinking of reality. The perception of the world and rethinking of reality, the natural conditions of the Turkic speaking people the Kazakh are somewhat different from the European. The above-mentioned zoomorphisms reflect both positive and negative properties, traits of a person's character. The above-mentioned zoomorphisms reflect both positive and negative properties, traits of a person's character. The number of negative characteristics prevails.

Taking into account the specifics of each nation, it is necessary to take into account the fact that for comparison in three different system languages different unions are used, in the Russian language the union is like, in the Kazakh language – sights and the case ending - give and in English like, and also that to compare a person with habits , with the appearance, behavior, character traits of the animal, adjectives, adverbs and verbs are used before alliances.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Лясота Ю.Л. Роль метафорических слов и выражений в развитии словарного состава языка: на материале современного английского языка: диссертация кандидата филологических наук. – Л., 1954. – 244 с.
2. Линко Т.В. Зооморфизмы в английском языке: диссертация кандидата филологических наук: 10.02.06; 10.02.01 / АН КазССР. Ин-т языкознания. – Алма-Ата, 1989. – 171 с.
3. Кайдар А. Тысяча метких и образных выражений: казахско-русский фразеологический словарь с этнолингвистическими пояснениями. – Астана: ТОО «Білге», 2003. – 368 с.
4. Черемисина М.И., Бродская Л.М. Структурные типы синтетических полипредикативных конструкций в языках разных систем. – Новосибирск, 1986. – 200 с.
5. Огдонова Ц.Ц. Зооморфные метафорические номинации в сопоставительном аспекте. Сборник научных трудов. Вып.4. – Екатеринбург, 2005. – С. 38.
6. Панфилов А.К. Предложенные способы выражения сравнения. – Москва, 1973. – 888 с.
7. Литвин Ф.А. Сопоставительный анализ зооморфных характеристик (на материале русского, английского языков). – М.: Наука, 1977. – 200 с.
8. Афанасьев А.В., Бажанов В.С. Звери Казахстана. – Алма-Ата: Изд-во АН Казахской ССР, 1953. – 535 с.
9. Сапожникова Л.М. Семантика референциально однозначных собственных имен и их адъективных дериватов. В кн.: Коннотативные аспекты семантики в немецкой лексике и фразеологии. – Калинин, 1987. – 250 с.
2. Тимошенко Е.И. К происхождению фразеологизмов. Кондрашка хватил / Русский язык. Межведомственный сборник. Вып 11. – Мн.: Университетское, 1991. – С. 144.

REFERENCES

1. Liasota Ju.L. Rol metaforicheskih slov i vyrazhenii v razvitii slovarnogo sostava iazyka: na materiale sovremennogo angliiskogo iazyka: dissertaciia kandidata filologicheskih nauk. – L., 1954. – 244 s. [in Russian]
2. Linko T.V. Zoomorfizmy v angliiskom iazyke: dissertaciia kandidata filologicheskih nauk: 10.02.06; 10.02.01 / AN KazSSR. In-t iazykoznaniia. – Alma-Ata, 1989. – 171 s. [in Russian]
3. Kaidar A. Tysiacha metkih i obraznyh vyrajenii: kazahsko-russkii frazeologicheskii slovar s etnolingvisticheskimi poiasneniiami. – Astana: TOO «Bilge», 2003. – 368 s. [in Russian]
4. Cheremisina M.I., Brodskaia L.M. Strukturnye tipy sinteticheskih polipredikativnyh konstrukcii v iazykah raznyh sistem. – Novosibirsk, 1986. – 200 c. [in Russian]
5. Ogdonova C.C. Zoomorfnye metaforicheskie nominacii v sopostavitelnom aspekte. Sbornik nauchnyh trudov. Vyp.4. – Ekaterinburg, 2005. – S. 38. [in Russian]
6. Panfilov A.K. Predlozhennye sposoby vyrazheniia sravneniia. – Moskva, 1973. – 888 s. [in Russian]
7. Litvin F.A. Sopostavitelnyi analiz zoomorfnyh harakteristik (na materiale russkogo, angliiskogo iazykov). – M.: Nauka, 1977. – 200 s. [in Russian]
8. Afanasev A.V., Bazhanov V.S. Zveri Kazahstana. – Alma-Ata: Izd-vo AN Kazahskoj SSR, 1953. – 535 s. [in Russian]
9. Sapojnikova L.M. Semantika referencialno odnoznachnyh sobstvennyh imen i ih adektivnyh derivatov. V kn.: Konnotativnye aspekty semantiki v nemeckoi leksike i frazeologii. – Kalinin, 1987. – 250 s. [in Russian]
10. Timoshenko E.I. K proishozhdeniju frazeologizmov. Kondrashka hvatil / Russkii iazyk. Mezhvedomstvennyi sbornik. Vyp 11. – Mn.: Universitetskoe, 1991. – S. 144. [in Russian]