






ARTICLE

## Functional and Pragmatic Potential of Phraseological Units and Authorial Intention

Marina Maretbayeva<sup>1</sup> , Olga Sorokina<sup>1\*</sup> , Tatyana Kabush<sup>1\*</sup> , Shapagat Zhalmakhanov<sup>2</sup> ,  
Ibodulla Mirzayev<sup>3</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Languages Development Center, NC JSC Karaganda Medical University, Karaganda 100008, Kazakhstan

<sup>2</sup>Department of Kazakh Linguistics, NC JSC Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda 100024, Kazakhstan

<sup>3</sup>Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Samarkand State University, Samarkand 140104, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

Modern linguistic research emphasizes the national and cultural aspects of language, recognizing it as an integral part of culture that reflects historical insights into a nation's mentality and the dynamics of linguistic community development. In this context, phraseological units serve as a significant source of cultural information, embodying traditions, rituals, and stable models of world perception. Their interpretation is a cognitive process of decoding that reveals deeper cultural meanings. This study aims to examine the pragmatic potential of phraseological units and their role in conveying authorial intentions in 20th-century Kazakh literature. The research focuses on uncovering the relationship between the systemic meaning of phraseological expressions and their situational interpretations within texts. It also analyzes their cognitive and cultural content. The methodological framework of the study includes the phraseological description method, discourse analysis, the cognitive-discursive approach, and pragmatic-stylistic analysis. The materials analyzed comprise literary works by Kazakh writers Magauin, Zhumadilov, and Bokey, who are renowned for their vivid and figurative language. The findings reveal that phraseological expressions in the texts perform both communicative and cultural functions. They reflect national identity, worldview, and the authors' individual styles. It was found that the transformation of phraseological units through context and modifications enhances their aesthetic impact. This transformation provides deeper insights into the

#### \*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Olga Sorokina, Languages Development Center, NC JSC Karaganda Medical University, Karaganda 100008, Kazakhstan; Tatyana Kabush, Languages Development Center, NC JSC Karaganda Medical University, Karaganda 100008, Kazakhstan; Email: [olga\\_sorokina0101@mail.ru](mailto:olga_sorokina0101@mail.ru) (O.S.); [tanya.kabush@mail.ru](mailto:tanya.kabush@mail.ru) (T.K.)

#### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 20 January 2025 | Revised: 10 March 2025 | Accepted: 18 March 2025 | Published Online: 27 March 2025  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8501>

#### CITATION

Maretbayeva, M., Sorokina, O., Kabush, T., et al., 2025. Functional and Pragmatic Potential of Phraseological Units and Authorial Intention. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(4): 155–165. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8501>

#### COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

authors' personalities and artistic intentions. The conclusions underscore the importance of phraseological units as tools of literary creativity. They not only enrich texts stylistically but also convey emotional and evaluative meanings, facilitating the understanding of the embedded cultural codes.

**Keywords:** Pragmatics; Literary Text; Authorial Intention; Phraseological Stylistics

## 1. Introduction

The anthropocentric focus of modern studies on language and the style of literary discourse has stimulated the development and consolidation of linguistic pragmatics. This field examines the relationship between linguistic units and the conditions of their use within a specific communicative-pragmatic space, where the sender (addresser) and receiver (addressee) of a text interact. As a result, we can talk about the emergence of communicative-pragmatic phraseology at the end of the 20th century. In this regard, the communicative-pragmatic properties of phraseological units differ from general phraseological expressions within the value-semantic space of literary discourse, as they possess a wide range of pragmatic functions. This includes the evaluation of the referent through marked units with evaluative, emotional, and stylistic components of lexical meaning<sup>[1]</sup>.

A phraseological unit is a unique linguistic sign: its semantics are intertwined with cultural connotations, which are created through its reference to cultural domains. This reference is realized during the perception and reproduction of a phraseological unit in speech by ordinary language speakers. Thus, a phraseological unit performs both linguistic and cultural functions. It conveys information about the world in an imaginative manner, while also transmitting cultural meanings and stereotypical representations<sup>[2, 3]</sup>. A distinctive feature of artistic communication is the collaborative discursive activity between the author and the reader. In this process, the addresser, through speech creation, constructs a specific communicative-pragmatic space, while the addressee (either the reader or an interlocutor-character) perceives the utterance and simultaneously engages in its semantic interpretation, uncovering the subjective intention embedded by the author<sup>[4]</sup>.

This article aims to identify and describe the pragmatic potential of phraseological units, determining their role in authorial intention within the functional-pragmatic space, using the literary works of 20th-century Kazakh writers as

the basis. The focus on 20th-century Kazakh literature is particularly significant, as this period marked a dynamic evolution in national identity, historical reflection, and linguistic expression. Writers such as Mukhtar Magauin, Kabdesh Zhumadilov, and Oralkhan Bokey played crucial roles in shaping Kazakh literary discourse, preserving cultural heritage, and exploring social and philosophical themes<sup>[5-8]</sup>. Their works are notable for their vivid and figurative language, making them an ideal foundation for analyzing phraseological units in a literary context. The objective is not to characterize each author's individual writing style but rather to identify various discursive situations in which the multifaceted potential of phraseological semantics is formed and revealed.

To achieve this, the study sets the following objectives:

- to establish the correlation between the systemic meanings and situational senses of phraseological units, reflecting both shared cultural traditions and subjective authorial perspectives;
- to identify the cognitive and cultural content embedded in the semantics of phraseological units.

This study extends previous research by emphasizing the interplay between phraseological meaning and contextual transformation, offering insights into the dynamic interaction of language, culture, and cognition in literary texts. By examining phraseological units in a pragmatic-stylistic framework, this research challenges conventional semantic approaches and highlights their role in constructing literary narratives.

## 2. Research Methods

### 2.1. Materials

The materials for this study comprised literary texts by 20th-century Kazakh authors, namely Magauin, Zhumadilov, and Bokey<sup>[5-8]</sup>. These works were selected due to their high density of phraseological expressions, which provide a rich basis for analyzing their functional and pragmatic potential and their cultural and national specificity. Beyond their

phraseological richness, these authors were chosen due to their significant contributions to national identity, historical themes, and rich use of language. Magauin is a prominent writer and literary scholar recognized for his historical novels and short stories that explore Kazakh national identity, folklore, and traditions<sup>[5, 6]</sup>. His works often highlight the resilience of the Kazakh people and their cultural heritage, particularly during times of political upheaval. Zhumadilov is renowned for his historical novels and depictions of Kazakh life in Kazakhstan<sup>[8]</sup>. His works provide insight into the experiences of Kazakhs in different geopolitical contexts, shedding light on themes of migration, exile, and cultural preservation. Bokey is celebrated for his lyrical and symbolic prose, often set against the backdrop of the Altai Mountains<sup>[7]</sup>. His writing explores human relationships, existential themes, and the tension between tradition and modernity. He is known for his poetic style and deep psychological portrayals of his characters. Together, these writers have played a crucial role in preserving and developing Kazakh literary traditions, offering profound reflections on history, identity, and cultural transformation<sup>[5-8]</sup>.

Phraseological units were selected based on their recurrent use in the works of Magauin, Zhumadilov, and Bokey. A total of 200 phraseological units were identified and analyzed using the method of linguistic text analysis. Frequency was determined using textual analysis, identifying expressions that appeared multiple times across different contexts within the selected texts. The selected phraseological units demonstrated distinctive stylistic features, such as metaphorical richness, expressive intensity, or syntactic complexity. Particular attention was given to units that contributed to the authors' narrative style, emotional impact, or artistic imagery. This was assessed through comparative stylistic analysis, contrasting their usage with conventional or neutral expressions. The phraseological units carried deep cultural connotations, reflecting Kazakh traditions, worldview, historical memory, or national identity. Cultural significance was evaluated by examining references to folklore, customs, and symbolic meanings associated with specific phrases.

## 2.2. Procedure

The research was conducted in several stages, ensuring a comprehensive approach to the analysis of phraseological expressions:

- First, reviewing the theoretical foundations of phraseology, pragmatics, and stylistics helped establish a conceptual framework for the study. This theoretical groundwork informed the subsequent selection of texts and guided the systematization of phraseological expressions.
- Next, selecting relevant texts and identifying phraseological units allowed for a structured and focused analysis. These units were categorized based on their frequency, stylistic uniqueness, and cultural significance, ensuring that the study concentrated on phraseological expressions central to the literary context.
- Following this, conducting an in-depth examination of the semantics and pragmatics of phraseological units provided insights into their contextual usage. This stage focused on uncovering the meanings and communicative functions embedded in these linguistic elements.
- To further deepen the analysis, applying discourse and cognitive analysis revealed the authors' intentions conveyed through phraseological units. By examining how these expressions function within different contexts, the study illuminated deeper cognitive and cultural layers of meaning.
- Finally, comparing the findings with theoretical sources validated the research hypotheses. This comparison ensured that interpretations of phraseological usage aligned with established linguistic theories and contributed to the broader academic discourse on phraseology.

## 2.3. Data Collection

The data for this study were sourced from original texts of 20th-century Kazakh prose<sup>[9-14]</sup>. Phraseological units were selected based on three key criteria: their frequency within the texts, their stylistic uniqueness, and their cultural significance. This selection process ensured that the study focused on expressions that play a crucial role in the linguistic and cultural landscape of Kazakh literature.

## 2.4. Data Analysis

To analyze the data collected, a combination of methodological approaches was employed, allowing for a multi-

faceted examination of phraseological expressions:

- The Phraseological Description Method was used to investigate the semantic structure and cultural connotations of phraseological expressions. This method provided insights into the underlying metaphorical meanings and historical roots of the expressions.
- Discourse Analysis was applied to explore modifications of phraseological units within the context of events described in the texts. By examining these modifications, the study aimed to understand how phraseological expressions adapt to different narrative structures and communicative intentions.
- The Cognitive-Discursive Approach facilitated the identification of associative and cultural connections embedded in the structure of phraseological expressions. This approach helped reveal the deeper cognitive mechanisms underlying the use of phraseological units.
- The Pragmatic-Stylistic Method was employed to determine the emotional, evaluative, and expressive characteristics of phraseological units. This method highlighted how phraseological expressions contribute to the overall stylistic impact of literary texts.

## 2.5. Research Limitations

Despite its comprehensive scope, this study has several limitations. First, it is confined to the analysis of prose by 20th-century Kazakh authors, which means that phraseological variability in other literary genres or time periods is not explored. Additionally, the study focuses on texts by only three authors, limiting the extent to which its findings can be generalized across Kazakh literature as a whole.

Moreover, this study primarily employs qualitative methods. While corpus-based research could provide statistical validation of phraseological frequency and contextual transformations, such an approach is beyond the scope of this work. Future research could integrate corpus linguistics to enhance the quantitative dimension of phraseological analysis in Kazakh literature.

It is important to recognize that phraseological units, as linguistic symbols, encapsulate enduring meanings – whether symbolic, exemplary, or stereotypical – that were embedded in their semantics at the time of their formation. These mean-

ings serve as a cultural foundation, shaping how phraseological units are interpreted and retrieved in speech. In this unique cultural function, phraseological units act as linguistic symbols (standards or stereotypes)<sup>[15]</sup>, reinforcing cultural identity and communicative norms<sup>[16]</sup>.

The role of phraseological units in communication is inherently shaped by culture and is largely determined by the cultural connotation of the linguistic sign<sup>[17–19]</sup>. Choices within a cultural context are always motivated, and the selection of phraseological units in communication to perform a speech act is a deliberate and culturally influenced process. This process is primarily guided by the cultural semantics embedded in these units<sup>[15]</sup>.

The theoretical foundation of this study is based on the works of both domestic and international scholars in the fields of linguistics, pragma-stylistics, and cognitive-discursive phraseology. Key contributors to this theoretical framework include Shalabayev, Kenesbayev, Sergaliyev, Smagulova, Kozhakhmetova, Syzdykova, Kovshova, Maslova, and Valgina<sup>[2, 3, 15–21]</sup>.

These limitations highlight the scope of this study while also presenting opportunities for future research. Despite these constraints, the analysis provides a valuable contribution to understanding phraseological units in Kazakh literature, particularly in terms of their functional and pragmatic significance.

## 3. Results

The use of phraseological units in speech and literary texts serves a communicative function, reflecting the speaker's or author's attitude toward language. These units convey emotional and evaluative meanings, making them integral to effective communication. The key pragmatic parameters of phraseological units include expressiveness, conceptual depth, and subtextual meaning. Each unit serves a distinct communicative role, enhancing the effectiveness of speech and literary expression<sup>[16]</sup>.

In this context, the author's idiolect holds particular significance, as it shapes the unique linguistic system of the work and influences the interpretation of its communicative meaning. According to the anthropocentric systemic-activity approach to the text, the concept of idiolect plays a crucial role in shaping communicative meaning. Idiolect reflects

the unique linguistic characteristics of an author, including their style, thematic focus, and pragmatic strategies. It encapsulates how the author's linguistic personality manifests in the structure, semantics, and pragmatics of the text.

Studying idiolect from a communicative perspective allows a deeper understanding of both the text and the author's worldview. It reveals how the author conveys meaning, advocates ideas, and stylistically distinguishes their work. The linguistic personality of the author is expressed through recurring themes, stylistic choices, and preferred rhetorical devices. Examining texts from this perspective helps identify unique features of an author's idiolect and their artistic vision<sup>[22]</sup>.

Since the goal is to understand the author's conceptual worldview in its artistic form, associative connections in the text become particularly significant. The interaction between the author's and the reader's associative thinking fosters co-creativity in communication, especially in literary works. The study of associative links – primarily shaped by lexical choices – offers valuable insight into an author's idiolect from a communicative standpoint.

Thus, idiolect is a complex phenomenon. It reflects the socio-historical context, cultural identity, and personal outlook of the author. It embodies the author's worldview, linguistic competence, and artistic expression, manifesting across the structure, semantics, and pragmatics of their texts<sup>[22–25]</sup>.

An important aspect of studying idiolect is its interaction with the stylistic characteristics of a text, which determine the organization of linguistic elements and their impact on artistic perception. The scholar Shalabayev highlights the nature of stylistic analysis of a text: “Stylistic analysis of a text involves uncovering the nature of its formalization, that is, revealing its structural characteristics. The methodology for such stylistic analysis should align with this aim: analysis is not about identifying individual linguistic units but rather about uncovering their interrelations and connections. This is because a literary text is not merely a sum of figurative linguistic elements. These elements do not carry significance in isolation but acquire meaning through their methods of organization and interrelations”<sup>[17]</sup>.

Drawing upon the assertion of academic Sergaliyev that “the distinctive feature of literary language lies in its multi-stylistic nature. This means that elements of various

functional styles appear within literary works. Considering that any literary creation (especially prose) typically involves multiple characters and events, it is evident that a wide variety of linguistic tools will be utilised”<sup>[18]</sup>. It becomes clear that phraseological units in literary prose exhibit a diverse range of stylistic nuances.

Linguistic devices in literary works are employed across various styles depending on the thematic, ideological, and generic characteristics of the work. Phraseological units play a significant role in portraying characters' personalities, inner worlds, and cultural identities. One of the natural qualities of phraseological units is their expressive undertones. Writers are often so intertwined with their characters that they create a vivid, inseparable bond between themselves and the figures they bring to life.

Authors also use phraseological units to shape characters and settings. As noted by Kozhakhmetova, vivid descriptions imbue characters with depth, often through satire, irony, or emotional contrast<sup>[20]</sup>.

Historical novels rely on phraseological expressions to depict era-specific traits, as seen in works of Magauin<sup>[9]</sup>. Such expressions not only reflect cultural heritage but also contribute to the narrative's authenticity and emotional impact<sup>[26]</sup>. For example, *Əkesi er deme – ozi ez shygar. Zhasy kishi deme, qara qanzhar shygar. Bi – khan barda gana zhuyrik, sultan – el barda gana kulik,-dedi Toman*<sup>[9]</sup>. [Do not call his father a hero – he may turn out to be a coward. Do not dismiss the young – he may prove to be a sharp dagger. A judge is wise only when the khan is present, a sultan is esteemed only when there is a nation, said Toman].

The phraseological units in the novel align with the historical narrative style and serve as tools for reasoning and drawing conclusions. Some evolve into authorial aphorisms. For example, the statement *Bi – khan barda gana zhuyrik, sultan – el barda gana kulik* [A judge is wise only when the khan is present, a sultan is esteemed only when there is a nation] can be seen as an original phraseological creation, shaped by the author's reflection<sup>[9]</sup>. Such expressions are common in prose and showcase a high level of poetic refinement. They are skillfully integrated into the narrative to depict historical figures.

Fictional language has a distinctive internal structure, where words interact to create an artistic “wholeness.” For example: *Olai bolatyny, Syrdariya alqabyndagy kenti mek-*

ender qazaqtarga qaitpaiynsha, sol aimaqtagy qurama zhurnynyn da beti beri qarauy eki talai (Zhumadilov)<sup>[14]</sup>. In this sentence, the phraseological unit *beti beri qarady* [to turn towards] has two meanings in phraseological dictionaries: (1) To begin recovering from an illness. (2) To relent, calm down, or comply. However, in this context, neither meaning applies directly. Instead, it conveys the idea of displaced communities returning to their homeland. This illustrates how phraseological units, beyond their dictionary meanings, acquire new stylistic and connotative nuances in literary texts. Here, “to turn towards” does not signify recovery, but the broader notion of improvement serves as the foundation for a new, contextually relevant meaning. Such transformations reflect the dynamic nature of phraseological units in literature.

This phenomenon shows how authorial phraseological units emerge in prose and later turn into aphorisms. It is important to analyze their stylistic purpose because fixed expressions are not just decorative. They help convey the writer’s perspective, ideas, and insights into characters’ inner worlds.

In this regard, Syzdykova notes: “Analyzing the language of a literary work from the perspective of linguistic stylistics does not merely involve cataloguing linguistic units but studying their usage and functional manifestation in the text. Specifically, it is not the researcher’s task to merely identify and list words and expressions but to understand what purpose their usage serves and what the writer aims to depict through them”<sup>[21]</sup>.

When discussing how Kazakh phraseological units develop, it is important to note that traditions and customs shape the national worldview. An author, as part of a nation, deeply understands stable expressions that have been preserved over centuries<sup>[27]</sup>. This worldview, combined with personal creativity, psychological state, and style, leads to the creation of unique authorial phraseological units.

The use of authorial phraseological units in historical contexts serves to vividly and accurately characterize the psychology and personalities of historical characters. This can be observed in the following examples: 1) – *Menin bar bilerim, qalmaq qatty khalyq, er khalyq. Iyip buqtyra almaisyn. Qorqytyp yqytyra almaisyn. Imendir de ikemge keltir. Oltir, biraq oshpendilik tugyzba*<sup>[9]</sup>. [All I know is that the Kalmyks are strong and brave. You cannot bend them. You

cannot intimidate them. Earn their trust, then subdue them. Kill, but do not enrage.] 2) – *Zhat imener alaman attan tusse ne bolmaq? Zhau aibunar aganyz uide buqsa ne bolmaq?*<sup>[9]</sup> [What would happen if the leader dismounted his horse? If your elder brother who initially instilled fear in the enemy buries his head in the sand, what then?] (Magauin). The expressions *Iyip buqtyra almaisyn. Qorqytyp yqytyra almaisyn, Zhat imener alaman attan tusse ne bolmaq? Zhau aibunar aganyz uide buqsa ne bolmaq?* These are examples of authorial phraseological expressions. They reveal character traits and motivations.

An author’s unique style comes from the deliberate use of these phraseological units. They add emotional and expressive depth to prose, shaping both meaning and aesthetics. This allows for the analysis of their artistic and stylistic function, thereby shedding light on their specific application patterns<sup>[28–31]</sup>.

As Kazakh literary scholar and academician Zhumaliyev observes: “The artistic methods employed to achieve specific goals are what determine a writer’s unique creative style”<sup>[32]</sup>.

In linguistics, phraseological units that are altered or creatively modified by an author are termed *invariants*. These expressions keep their expressive power but take on new, unique forms. Authorial aphorisms, invariants, and phraseological units are interconnected phenomena. Understanding these phenomena involves examining their interconnectedness, while appreciating that distinctions among them are relative.

Emotionally expressive phraseological units in prose can be both common or occasional<sup>[33]</sup>. An example would be the phrase *Samolettin bär-bärinde tort qubylasy ten, qaganagy qarq adamdar minip otyrgandai sezildi*<sup>[10]</sup> [It felt as if people on the plane were sitting in peace and plenty] (Bokey). A modified phrase (*tort qubylasy ten* is borrowed from the literary language, *qaganagy qarq, saganagy sarq* is frequently used in colloquial speech) demonstrates both expressive intent and the creative use of familiar phraseological expressions. The transformation enhances both meaning and stylistic intent.

The stylistic modification of phraseological units enhances literary prose. The occasional transformations of phraseological units can be grouped as follows:

- (1) Changing components to create new meanings:

Example:

*Sol zhyly Arshaly men Aqsai onirine zheti agaiyndy zhut qatar kelip, tort tulik maldan ozge kunkorisi zhoq koshpeli eldin bel omyrtqasyn uzip ketti*<sup>[11]</sup> [That year, misfortunes did not come alone to Arshaly and Aksai, breaking the spirit of the nomads who were already making ends meet] (Zhumadilov). The original phrase *zhut – zheti agaiyndy* [misfortunes never come alone] has been inverted and modified within the author’s creative context *zheti agaiyndy zhut qatar kelip*.

(2) Adding new words to intensify imagery:

Example:

*Qashanda Alakolge kozi tuskende koniline toqshylyq engendei zhany zhadyrap, arqasy kenip qalatyny bolushy edi, bul zholy uayim bulyt seyile qoimady*<sup>[11]</sup> [Whenever her gaze fell upon Alakol, her soul seemed to brighten with a sense of plenty, yet this time the clouds of doubt lingered] (Zhumadilov). The author creatively modifies familiar phrases with additional emotional and psychological undertones.

(3) Omitting elements for brevity:

Example:

*“Inisi bardyn tynysy bar” degen senderdin arqalarynda aitip-buitip zhurip zhatyrmyz goi* (Magauin). The given example shows a shortened phrase of *Inisi bardyn tynysy bar; agasy bardyn tynysy bar*<sup>[9]</sup> [The younger brother’s breath sustains the elder brother’s strength]. The shortened phrase retains its meaning through elliptic omission, streamlining expression for the audience.

(4) Combining multiple phraseological units for greater effect:

Example:

– *«Kozqaras» degen ne? Moinyn yrgaidai, bitin tor-gaidai bolyp, barar zher; basar tauyn zhoq, zhurtta qal-gan kushikte aidalada qynsylap ulyp qaksan korer edin «kozqarastyn» ne ekenin*<sup>[12]</sup> (Bokey) [What is “perspective”? From beneath these naively vivid colours, you look pitiable, with the yellowish hue of wrinkled temples, sinewy necks, and sagging chins, with nowhere to go, no one to turn to. Only then will you understand what “perspective” truly means, when, like a stray puppy, you find yourself stranded beyond the hills]. Multiple phraseological units are intertwined to express nuanced emotional undertones and observations.

The use of phraseological units extends to represent emotions, psychological states, and physical sensations.

They frequently connect to somatic references, as these link human psychology to physical metaphors. Examples given below evoke both physiological and emotional states:

*Biraq zhurek qurgyr atsha tulap, daualamagan*<sup>[13]</sup> (Bokey). *Tobe quiqam shymyrlap ketti* [However, the heart beat faster with an effort of will, but did not dare].

*Mynany korgende komissiya basshylarynyn kozderi atyzdai bolyp, sharasynan shygyp ketti*<sup>[11]</sup> [Having seen it, the commission’s eyes popped out of their heads] (Zhumadilov).

Phraseological units in prose are also used to portray physical appearance, particularly in character descriptions. These expressions not only depict external features but also reflect personality traits and emotions<sup>[34]</sup>. For instance, in Zhumadilov’s novel, the following passage illustrates the detailed use of phraseology in describing a character’s beauty:

*Ainanyn aldynda oz korkinen ozi koz ala almai suq-tanyp qaldy. Zhap-zhazyq appaq manaiy, zhana tugan aidai uilip bitken qigash qasy, zhaun shaigan moiyl dai moldiregen, uyal narkes kozi, qyzyl arailana shapaq atyp turatyn, at zhaqty, sulu zhuzdi, tup-tuzu piste muryny men uylzhyan oimaq erini, bari-bari de zhas aieldin korkin qaisymyz arttyrar ekenbiz dep zharysqa tuskendei butin airyqsha koz tartyp tur*<sup>[14]</sup>.

[She found herself unable to tear her gaze away from her own reflection in the mirror. Her smooth, flawless, pale forehead, her slanting eyebrows shaped like a new moon, her transparent, rain-washed sapphire-like eyes, her red-tinged blush radiating like a sunset, her heart-shaped face, her graceful features, her perfectly straight, refined nose, and her soft, rosy lips—all combined to create an image of extraordinary beauty, as if they were competing to highlight the allure of the young woman.]

These metaphorical expressions draw upon symbolic connotations rooted in cultural perception, aesthetic ideals, and linguistic tradition. The concept of the “new moon” holds particular significance in Kazakh culture, symbolizing reverence and beauty. The author’s choice to utilize it as a metaphor reflects a cultural appreciation for purity and elegance. Similarly, the phrase *zhaun shaigan moiyl* (literally “rain-washed bird cherry”) conveys clarity and depth in describing the character’s eyes.

Furthermore, the phrase *narkes koz* (“gazing eyes like a narcissus flower”) is expanded with *uyal* to emphasize

thoughtfulness and sensitivity. Another example, *at zhaqty*, is rooted in Kazakh equestrian culture, symbolizing a noble and well-defined facial structure. The phrase *piste* conveys delicacy and refinement, while *uyzhygan oimaq* evokes the youthful freshness of the character's lips. These carefully crafted expressions enhance both the artistic imagery and cultural depth of the text.

The lexical meanings of the components in phraseological expressions become unstable due to semantic deactualization. As a result of semantic and grammatical deactualization, the words that enter a phraseological expression take on new, distinct meanings in place of their original definitions. For instance, the phrase *kozdi zhumyp zhiberdi / kozdi tars zhumdy* [to close eyes] has shifted from its literal sense to imply "taking a bold risk without hesitation". The original meanings of the words within this phrase no longer retain their initial semantic value in this idiomatic usage<sup>[35]</sup>. Similarly, the expression *basyn qyrau shaldy* conveys the meaning of "his/her hair turned grey" or "he / she is getting old". Here, the figurative meaning arises from the association of *qyrau* with the whiteness of frost, signifying aging. In these examples, the components of the phraseological expressions have lost their original lexical meanings through semantic deactualization. This transformation reflects how context shapes their interpretation, resulting in new metaphorical or idiomatic associations.

While extensive research exists on the semantics of phraseological units in Kazakh linguistics, their grammatical characteristics remain underexplored. Classifying these units by grammatical category presents challenges, as they function both lexically and syntactically. Phraseologization involves the transformation of word combinations through metaphor, metonymy, and other rhetorical devices, resulting in semantic shifts. The grammatical structure of phraseological units mirrors their syntactic roles, often functioning as a single lexical entity.

Kazakh phraseological units exhibit a range of syntactic structures. Regardless of their composition, they function as cohesive linguistic elements. Their meaning derives from the interaction between words rather than from individual lexical components<sup>[2]</sup>.

The primary features of phraseological units are not found in the meanings of individual words but in their combined meaning as a whole<sup>[36]</sup>. The words within a phrase-

ological unit are interdependent and subordinated to one another, effectively functioning as a single lexical item. For instance, the phraseological unit *moiny zhar bermedi* [lit. his neck would not yield] conveys reluctance or laziness, and serves as a predicate. Similarly, *zhylqy minezdi* [lit. horse-like nature] carries two meanings: (1) patient and resilient, (2) disdainful or dismissive, akin to the behaviour of a horse. This unit functions as an adjective and is used attributively.

In linguistics, classifications of phraseological units according to grammatical categories have been proposed by scholars such as Saifullin, Bolganbayev, Kaidarov, and Zhaisakova<sup>[37-40]</sup>.

Professor Smagulova, in analyzing the grammatical classification of phraseological variants, states: "Thus, in addressing the issue of classifying phraseological units according to their grammatical category, one can conditionally group them based on three criteria: firstly, the meaning conveyed by their components; secondly, their morphological nature; and thirdly, their syntactic function"<sup>[19]</sup>.

The verb-based phraseological units exhibit a variety of forms. They can be conditionally categorized into two main types: (1) phraseological units that represent the psychological state of a character, and (2) phraseological units employed to denote specific actions or activities.

Phraseological units expressing character's psychological state: *Buryngy kuni zhaugan qara noserdin arty eri zhaugan zhylbysqa qarga ainalganda Bati zhaman yrymga zhoryp, ishin tartyp qalghan-dy*<sup>[12]</sup> [When heavy rain from previous days turns into slushy snow, Bati interprets this as an ominous sign and becomes wary] (Bokey). The phraseological units *zhaman yrymga zhoru* [to interpret as an ominous sign] and *ishin tartu* [to become wary] are used to convey the character's psychological states. In Kazakh culture, the concept of *yrymga zhoru* derives from beliefs in the influence of mystical forces, while *ish tartu* represents an inner emotional reaction.

When discussing the lexical and grammatical properties of fixed expressions, they are primarily classified according to their categorial features. Even within a specific category, variations among phraseological expressions can be observed. Some fixed expressions undergo morphological changes when their components connect, while others remain unchanged and are used in their unmodified forms. Additionally, context-dependent meanings should be considered

during classification, as certain expressions lose their original meanings when standing alone but take on new connotations in context. The structural features of phraseological units derived from nouns also demonstrate variation. For example, nominal phraseological expressions tend to take on the grammatical form of nouns. Consider the example “*Uzamai llenin argy betinen ana zhurty zhetken*”<sup>[9]</sup> [Not long after, the maternal relatives arrived from the other side of the Ili River] (Magauin). An analysis of the two-component expression *ana zhurty* [maternal relatives] reveals the grammatical roles that these words play in their combination. The phrase *ana zhurt* follows the structure of *ata zhurt* [paternal relatives] in Kazakh, consisting of *ana* (noun) + *zhurt* (noun). These two nouns combine morphologically and function as the subject of a sentence.

The application of fixed expressions in prose exhibits the following characteristics:

(1) Phraseological units are used without altering their semantic or structural form. For example: *Syryn bilmegen attyn syrtynan zhurme degen goi, aqsaqal*<sup>[12]</sup> [Do not underestimate the enemy or do not wander around a horse without knowing it] (Bokey). This phrase represents one of the most commonly used expressions in the Kazakh language and highlights a consistent meaning without modification.

(2) In folk language, established fixed expressions are stylistically modified to enhance their emotional or expressive impact while retaining their general meaning. For instance: *Sur kenepten tigilgen askeri phormasy bar, zhas molsherin aiyruga bolmaityn, qaiystai qatqan pakene sherik, bugin Damezhanga kundegidei uilip salem berudin ornyna, tusin suyqqa salyp, aldyn kes-kestei berdi*<sup>[14]</sup> [Dressed in a grey overcoat and expensive boots, the mysterious companion, unrecognisable by age, was cold and unapproachable during the meeting with Dameshan and did not greet her as usual with a bow] (Zhumadilov). The expression *tusin suyqqa salyp* [to turn cold in mood] represents a modified version of the common Kazakh expression *tusin suytti* [to become emotionally cold]. The change in components highlights how stylistic adaptation can alter expressions while retaining their expressive strength.

Examining the use of phraseological units in the speech of characters of the studied literary text in the aspect of pragmatics reveals their emotional and evaluative connotations. They shape the context, purposes, and communicative strate-

gies of the narrative. Phraseological units are an integral part of literature, enriching its imagery and allowing authors to establish complex representations. The ability of phraseological units to integrate seamlessly into prose illustrates their aesthetic and stylistic versatility. Any alteration in form and semantic variation is, moreover, artistically deliberate and serves the resolution of specific ideational and aesthetic objectives. Detailed observations of the system of phraseological usage contribute to an understanding of the distinctive features of an author’s style and language.

## 4. Conclusions

This study examined the functional and pragmatic potential of phraseological units in the works of 20th-century Kazakh authors, Magauin, Zhumadilov, and Bokey, highlighting their role in shaping authorial intention and literary discourse. They not only enrich literary texts but also act as carriers of national identity, historical reflection, and cultural values. This research, based on discourse analysis, cognitive-discursive methods, and pragmatic-stylistic approaches, highlights how phraseological units acquire new meanings and adapt to different narrative contexts.

The key findings of the research are as follows:

- Phraseological units serve as essential tools of literary expression, contributing to the stylistic, emotional, and evaluative layers of a text.
- The selected phraseological units reflect national identity, historical memory, and cultural traditions, reinforcing their role as linguistic and cultural symbols.
- The study identified various transformations of phraseological units, demonstrating how they adapt to different narrative contexts while maintaining their expressive power.
- A cognitive-discursive analysis revealed that these units function as carriers of conceptual meaning, reflecting the authors’ worldviews and communicative strategies.
- The pragmatic-stylistic approach emphasized how phraseological units enhance textual cohesion, affect reader perception, and convey implicit meanings beyond their literal interpretation.

While this study provides a comprehensive analysis, future research could integrate corpus-based methods to val-

idate phraseological frequency and transformation patterns on a larger scale. Expanding the scope to other genres and time periods would further enhance understanding of phraseological variability in Kazakh literature. Such studies would further enrich our understanding of how phraseological expressions contribute to meaning-making and cultural continuity in Kazakh prose. Additionally, the material of this article can be used in university-level Kazakh language teaching, particularly in courses such as Modern Kazakh Language (Lexicology and Phraseology), Speech Culture, and General Linguistics.

## Author Contributions

Conceptualization, M.M. and S.Z.; methodology, M.M., S.Z. and I.M.; formal analysis, M.M., O.S., T.K.; investigation, M.M., S.Z. and I.M.; resources, S.Z. and I.M.; data curation, M.M., O.S., T.K.; writing—original draft preparation, M.M., O.S. and T.K.; writing—review and editing, O.S. and T.K.; supervision, M.M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## Funding

This work received no external funding.

## Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## References

- [1] Abdullajonova, K., 2024. Pragmatic Analysis of Phraseologisms in Literary Text. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*. 5(3), 10–17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37547/mesmj-V5-I4-02>
- [2] Kenesbayev, I., 1977. *Kazakh Language Phraseological Dictionary*. Gylym: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 712.
- [3] Kovshova, M.L., 2009. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Phraseological Units: A Linguocultural Aspect* [Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation]. Moscow State University: Moscow, Russia. p. 48.
- [4] Belikova, G.V., 2021. Cognitive Semantics of Metaphor as a Reflection of Conceptual Structures in Language (Based on the French Language). *Prepodavatel XXI vek*. 3(2), 321–334.
- [5] Adaeva, Ye.S., Sultanova, A.A., 2022. Conceptual Field in The Literary Text (Based on The Novel “Miss Kipchak” By Mukhtar Magauin). *Bulletin of the Eurasian Humanities Institute*. 1, 49–60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55808/1999-4214.2022-1.06>
- [6] Abdikalyk, K., Alieva, Zh., 2020. The Problem of Hunger in the Stories of Mukhtar Magauin. *Bulletin of Abai KazNPU. Series of Philological Sciences*. 2(72), 395–400. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-2.1728-7804.64>
- [7] Karimova, G., 2020. Artistic and Ideological Peculiarities of Works by Oralkhan Bokey. *Bulletin of Abai KazNPU. Series of Philological Sciences*. 2(72), 373–377. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-2.1728-7804.58>
- [8] Dossova, A.T., Segizbayeva, K.K., 2024. Artistic Features of Kabdesh Zhumadilov’s Works. *Bulletin of Ablai Khan KazUIRandWL series “Philological Sciences”*. 4(75), 441–452. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48371/PHILS.2024.4.75.029>
- [9] Magauin, M., 2022. *Alasapyran: Historical Novel-Dilogy*. Vol. 1. Foliant: Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan. p. 504.
- [10] Bokeev, O., 1978. *An Salady Shagyldar: Stories and Novellas*. Zhalyn: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 280.
- [11] Zhumadilov, K., 2018. *Daraboz: Historical Novel-Dilogy*. Vol. 1. Mery Publishing House: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 488.
- [12] Bokeev, O., 1981. *Oz Otyndy Oshirme: Novel*. Zhazushy: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 383
- [13] Bokeev, O., 2013. *Works. Novellas*. Vol. 3. Elshezhire: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 384.
- [14] Zhumadilov, K., 2021. *Tagdyr: Historical Novel*. Mery Publishing House: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 624.
- [15] Valgina, N.S., 2003. *Theory of Text*. Logos: Moscow, Russia. p. 173.
- [16] Maslova, V.A., 2008. *Cognitive Linguistics*. TetraSystems: Moscow, Russia. p. 272.
- [17] Shalabayev, B., 1994. *The Language of Fictional Prose*. Bilim: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 128.
- [18] Sergaliyev, M., 2006. *The Language of Fiction*. Astana, Kazakhstan. p. 369.
- [19] Smagulova, G., 1996. *Variability of Phraseological Units*. Sanat: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 128.
- [20] Kozhakhmetova, K., 1972. *The Use of Phraseological Units in Fiction*. Mektep: Almaty, Kazakhstan. pp. 112.
- [21] Syzdykova, R., 1997. *The Power of Words*. Sanat: Almaty, Kazakhstan. p. 223.
- [22] Bolotnova, N.S., 1998. *Tasks and Main Directions of Communicative Stylistics of Literary Texts*. Tomsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin. 6(9), 6–8.
- [23] Shalkarbek, A., Kalybayeva, K., Shaharman, G., et

- al., 2024. Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Hyperbole-based Phraseological Expressions in Kazakh and English Languages. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*. 53(1), 4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-024-10052-1>
- [24] Sabirova, M., Kalibekuly, T., Jeldybayeva, R., 2024. Linguocultural aspect of phraseological units (Guanyongyu) in modern Chinese language. *Global Chinese*. 10(2), 155–173. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/glochi-2024-0016>
- [25] Turdiyeva, N., Mansurova, Z., 2023. Analysis of Idiolect and Idiostyle From the Point of View of Literary Genres. *International Scientific Journal “Science and Innovation”*. 12(2), 170–174. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10436232>
- [26] Zhakulayev, A., Takirov, S., Khassenov, B., 2024. Literary text and historical discourse: A questionnaire study. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*. 7(3), 1174–1181. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v7i3.3175>
- [27] Amirbekova, A., Talgatqyzy, G., Kulmanov, S., et al., 2024. Semantic Valence and Cultural Representation of Phraseological Units (Kazakh and English). *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 6(5), 65–82. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6865>
- [28] Zhakulayev, A.M., Takirov, S.U., 2022. Features of literary and historical discourse. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Philology series*. 105(1), 124–130. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2022ph1/124-130>
- [29] Söylemez, O., Ateş, Ö.F., 2022. The image of mangurt in the story ‘Grey Fierce’(Kokserek) by M. Auezov. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Philology series*. 108(4), 106–111. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2022ph4/106-111>
- [30] Altynbekov, A.M., Mazhitayeva, S., Kakzhanova, F.A., et al., 2024. Linguistic creativity of occasionalisms in Brandon Sanderson’s works. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Philology series*. 11429(2), 38–47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2024ph2/38-47>
- [31] Aubakir, S.S., Kitibaeva, A.K., Ospanova, Z.T., 2024. An analysis of figurative language in the interpretation of contemporary English poetry. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Philology series*. 11329(1), 16–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31489/2024ph1/16-23>
- [32] Zhumaliyev, K., 1966. *Style as a Feature of Art. Zhazushy: Almaty, Kazakhstan*. p. 228.
- [33] Pirniyazova, A., 2022. Stylistic Functions and Ways of Using Phraseological Units in the Karakalpak Literature. *Turkic Studies Journal*. 3(4), 61–69. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2021-4-61-69>
- [34] Turlybekova, I.A., 2022. Kazakh, Russian, and English Phraseological Units of Speech Behavior. *Proceedings of the XII International Scientific Conference on Current Issues of Romance-Germanic Philology and Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages; October 21, 2022; Gomel, Belarus*. pp. 282–287.
- [35] Baltabayeva, A., Bakenova, A., Amirbekova, A., et al., 2024. Semantic Features of the Word Qonyr (Brown): Conceptual Analysis of Two Separate Works. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 14(11), 3347–3354. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1411.03>
- [36] Gadzhieva, A.A., 2017. On Teaching Phraseology of the Kazakh Language in the Russian-Speaking Audience. *RUDN Journal of Language Education and Translingual Practices*. 14(3), 454–459. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8011-2017-14-3-454-459>
- [37] Saifullin, Ch.G., 1961. *Phraseological Units and Their Classification. Issues of Phraseology*. Samarkand: Samarkand University Press. pp. 27–36
- [38] Bolganbayev, A., Qaliuly, A., 1997. *Kazakh Language Lexicon and Phraseology*. Saltanat: Almaty, Kazakhstan p. 256.
- [39] Kaidarov, A.T., Zhaisakova, R.E., 1979. Principles of Classifying Phraseological Units and Classification Groups in the Kazakh Language. *Izvestiya AN KazSSR, Ser. Philol.* 4(122), 8–10.
- [40] Zhaisakova, R.E., 1980. *Semantico-Grammatical Structure of Phraseological Units in the Kazakh Language [Abstract of PhD Thesis]*. Candidate of Philological Sciences: Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan. p. 23.