








Culturally Marked Linguistic Units: Based on the Material of Cinemorphisms

Saule Bektemirova^a, Raushangul Avakova^{b*}, Yerbolat Bayat^c, Zhazira Abdrakhmanova^d, Sholpan Kudyarova^e, Saltanat Imankulova^f, Anargul Islamova^g

^a *Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.*
Email: saule.bektemirova77@gmail.com

^b *Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.*
Email: r_avakova@mail.ru

^c *Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.*
Email: erbolat.bayat@mail.ru

^d *Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.*
Email: zhaz.abd@gmail.com

^e *Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.*
Email: kudyarova.72@mail.ru

^f *Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.*
Email: isalta_69@mail.ru

^g *Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and Word Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan.* Email: shiliu777@mail.ru

Received: 20 February 2025 | Received in Revised Form: 20 April 2025 | Accepted: 25 April 2025

APA Citation:

Bektemirova, S., Avakova, R., Bayat, Y., Abdrakhmanova, Z., Kudyarova, S., Imankulova, S., & Islamova, A. (2025). Culturally Marked Linguistic Units: Based on the Material of Cinemorphisms. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 1-14.
Doi: <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.11201>

Abstract

Linguoculture reflects the interaction between language, culture, national codes, and mythological cognitive processes, using the example of cinemorphisms in various languages. The current research analyzes the theoretical foundations of the concept of cinemorphisms, their historical and cultural origins, and their role in languages, taking into account cultural connotations. Special attention is given to the comparative analysis of the semantic, pragmatic, and cultural characteristics of cinemorphisms to identify similarities and differences in their usage. The study also addresses key aspects of intercultural communication, the influence of language on worldview formation, and the preservation of cultural identity. It also examines the main tenets of linguoculture, ethnolinguistics, and cognitive linguistics. The identifies the relationship between language and culture, national code and mythological cognitive processes through the analysis of cinemorphisms, as well as to study the historical and cultural formation of linguistic units associated with the semantics of "dog". The following methods were used in the work: Lexicographic analysis: study of linguistic units and phraseological constructions associated with the dog's image based on dictionaries and encyclopedic sources. Comparative historical method: analysis of the historical formation of cinemorphisms, their mythological and cultural origin. Linguacultural analysis: identification of cultural

© 2025 EJAL & the Authors. Published by Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics (EJAL). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

*Corresponding Author

Email: r_avakova@mail.ru

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.11201>

connotations and symbolic load of linguistic units reflecting ideas about a dog. Cognitive analysis: determination of metaphorical and symbolic meanings conveyed through cinemorphisms. The research findings demonstrate that cinemorphisms play a crucial role in shaping the national linguistic worldview, serving as a bridge to extralinguistic reality. The study also revealed cinemorphisms, as a unique layer of linguistic units, symbolize deep cultural, historical, and mythological representations of the dog as a figure embodying loyalty, protection, vigilance, and other significant values.

Keywords: Cinemorphisms, Linguoculture, Cultural Identity, Intercultural Communication, Cognitive Linguistics.

Introduction

Among the living beings on Earth, the animal world is closely connected to humans. Human civilization and consciousness are intricately linked to the animal world. At the initial syncretic stage of human thought, there was no clear boundary between humans and animals. While worshipping the animal world (cult), humans never placed themselves on equal footing with animals. In mythology, animals are depicted as poetic images, and their representation varies across different cultures, influenced by each nation's perception, way of life, and mentality. The close relationship between humans and the animal world is associated with the historical development of civilization (Yoriyevna, 2023). Ancient people's helplessness in the face of nature and their misconceptions about it gave rise to animal cults. The perception of animals as cult figures is one of the oldest manifestations of human creativity. Maslova (2001), who studied the relationship between language and culture, argues: "The cult of animals is the first boundary that ancient humans drew between themselves and the natural world, acknowledging its dominance but no longer identifying themselves with it". Even today, the cognitive significance of the animal world in spiritual culture has not diminished. Therefore, animism continues to shape linguistic and cultural stereotypes as well as poetic imagery.

Language reflects reality and accumulates centuries of human cognition, understanding, and worldview. In early human societies, when the comprehension of the world's laws was in its infancy, myths emerged as a collective expression of people's imagination. A myth represents what ancient people thought about, and how emotionally they perceived the world. Meletinsky (1976) rightly states, "The myths and conditions expressed in myth are not manifestations of primitiveness but rather glimpses of a truth belonging to a different sphere of culture". Exploring the mythological origins of cultic units associated with the animal world provides an opportunity to delve into the depths of linguistic history. Mythical worldviews, intertwined with human existence since the dawn of civilization, are embedded in cinemorphisms, which are linguistic units representing national identity, requiring in-depth study to uncover their meanings and significance.

The necessity of conducting comprehensive, systematic research on cinemorphisms is closely related to modern linguistic trends. In this context, linguistic phenomena cannot be fully understood through internal linguistic principles alone; they must be examined in connection with other disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, philosophy, logic, mythology, and ethnography. Since language encapsulates national culture, identity, and religious beliefs, it must be studied in relation to history, cultural traditions, cognitive perceptions, and the psychology of a given people. This interdisciplinary approach has led to the emergence of ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguistic culturology, and linguistic country studies, which together contribute to a comprehensive understanding of linguistic structures and functions (Muminova, 2021).

Language serves as a medium through which cultural knowledge is transmitted (Kamalova, 2017). Every word in a language carry meaning in a cultural context, which can be considered its "soul." The aim of this study was, therefore, to examine cinemorphisms as reflections of national identity and culture, highlighting their crucial role in understanding the linguistic and cultural codes of people. The study introduces the term 'cinemorphisms' for the first time, defining it as a linguistic category encompassing all units and figurative expressions related to the semantic field of 'dog.' (Argynbayev, 2024; Bektemirov et al., 2025). In this study, we categorize all linguistic units and figurative expressions associated with the 'dog' *sema* as cinemorphisms. Cinemorphisms in the Kazakh language includes phraseological expressions, proverbs, onomatopoeia, similes, and terminologies rooted in mythology, cultural traditions, customs, psychology, and worldview. The linguistic units that refer to humans often embody the distinctive traits, behaviors, physical characteristics, voice, and temperament of dogs.

Cinemorphisms need to be investigated thoroughly, as it is used in the language in the form of phraseological expressions, which can be met in English, Kazakh, Russian languages. But the point is, the expressions given according to the traits or characters, behavior of the dog are different in these languages due to the influence of people's worldview of different continent. By using different methods of investigation such as: lexicographical analysis we examine the meanings and usage of linguistic units and phraseological expressions related to dog, by linguacultural analysis we investigate the lexical and cultural meanings of linguistic units. By cognitive analysis we identify the metaphorical and symbolic meanings of the word dog in different languages. It is hoped that by examining and analyzing linguistic units related to the 'dog' *sema* will help expand the study of cinemorphisms and deepen our understanding of their cultural and cognitive significance.

Literature Review

One of the key areas of linguistics is lexicology, which plays a crucial role in the study of language. Lexicology examines the vocabulary of a language, which represents the totality of all words, known as the lexicon or lexical stock. The vocabulary of any language consists of lexical units – words or lexemes. It is impossible to study language without considering its connection to culture. For effective development of communicative competence, it is essential to identify and analyze this relationship in the learning process. Unlike linguistic culturology, ethnolinguistics focuses on a comprehensive study of cultural values reflected in language, as well as their comparative analysis across different languages. This field is based on the theory of linguistic relativity proposed by E. Sapir and B. Whorf. [Potebnya \(1976\)](#) argued that language is the source of national culture and that oral folklore serves as the primary means of cultural representation. He emphasized that “language is the product of the national spirit; therefore, it reflects national identity. The national spirit is first manifested in language and then in customs, traditions, art, and folklore”.

Language is not only a means of representing culture but also its foundation. The spirit of language is preserved in a people's worldview, mentality, behavior, social life, and natural environment, all of which contribute to the formation of an entire cultural system ([Bobojonova, 2024](#); [Urayimova, 2022](#)). Various aspects of cinemorphisms can be explored through different research perspectives, as cinemorphisms in any language encompass figurative expressions such as phraseological units, proverbs, onomatopoeia, similes, and terminologies closely linked to mythology, culture, customs, traditions, psychology, and worldview. Language preserves the national consciousness, ways of thinking, and behavioral norms of a people. These cultural traits, customs, and literary heritage are transmitted from generation to generation through language.

Language serves as a bridge for the development of all areas of culture. Human society has progressed due to this unique characteristic of language. Any nation's language originates from its tribal and ethnic stages, evolving alongside the culture of each historical period and ensuring the continuity of cultural heritage. Language connects individuals to extralinguistic reality, expressing social culture and shaping the linguistic worldview. To fully utilize a language, it is necessary to understand its cultural context and be aware of the sociocultural facts behind it. The increasing interest in the “language-culture” relationship underscores the importance of an interdisciplinary approach, breaking down boundaries between human sciences, as it is impossible to study humanity without its language. Language serves as the primary form of expressing and sustaining national culture.

[Sapir \(1993\)](#) wrote, “Culture can be defined as what a given society does and thinks. Language also contains some of this thought.” Thus, language acts as a repository of cultural knowledge and a means of expressing it through its internal structure. The primary purpose of culture is to serve as a tool for the spiritual enrichment of individuals. By learning languages, people immerse themselves in global culture, encompassing both material and spiritual aspects. The national character of culture implies interaction and mutual enrichment between languages and cultures, eventually forming a unified “fundamental basis” – a global culture reflecting the achievements of humanity as a whole. Culture, as a creation of the people, represents a synthesis of the national (specific) and the international (universal).

The most profound understanding of the balance between language and culture is found in the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt. He stated, “A person lives with things as they are represented by their language. Each language forms a circle around the nation to which it belongs, and one can only step outside this circle by entering the sphere of another language” ([Humboldt, 2000](#)). Humboldt's followers, the Neo-Humboldtians, view the linguistic worldview as an intermediate reality created by the creative spirit of a nation. This worldview serves as both a representation of national culture and a means of comparative analysis of the mutual influences between different cultures, as reflected in their respective languages.

Language serves as the primary medium for expressing and preserving national culture. [Sapir \(1993\)](#) rightly emphasized that “culture can be defined as what a given society does and thinks. Language, in this sense, is not only a means of expression but also a form of thought. Thus, language functions as a bridge between culture and individuals, enabling them to assimilate their own cultural values and interact with the cultural heritage of other nations. For an objective, comprehensive, and holistic interpretation of a nation's culture, it is necessary to consider culture within the framework of its native language and its dialectical development. This requires the development of a conceptual framework that contributes to the formation of modern cultural thinking. Lexicology plays a crucial role in linguistic culturology. We must consider not only how sentences are structured but also the origins of words that constitute the entire linguistic system. Language acts as a mirror reflecting the thoughts and actions of society, making it a fundamental method for representing culture ([Whorf, 1960](#)).

Animals, which hold symbolic significance in myths and religions, often represent certain human qualities. The characteristics of animals, specially form some stereotypes which can be applied to people's behavior. These stereotypes exist in every culture or in the perception of each ethnic groups ([Lamazhaa, Tuimebaev, & Shagimgereeva, 2024](#)). In language, they are used as referential images that reflect historical and cultural experiences. For example, dogs, being close to humans, have acquired numerous symbolic meanings that have

been transformed into phraseological expressions. Zoonyms are lexical units associated with animal names, including both generic terms (e.g., fox, wolf) and individual names. They play a vital role in language and culture, as they reflect the mental, social, and cultural characteristics of a particular society. Moreover, zoonyms possess significant lexical-semantic potential and serve various functions, including (i) describing physical appearance: Examples include sable eyebrows, swan-like gait, monkey. (ii) evaluating intelligence: Expressions such as chicken brain, sheep or donkey as symbols of foolishness. (iii) characterizing behavior and personality: Examples include Dog (in a negative sense), fox (cunning), pig (rudeness). (iv) assessing agility in examples like elephant, bear (clumsiness), monkey (dexterity).

A comparative analysis of zoonyms across different languages helps to reveal cultural differences. For instance, the zoonym pig in Russian culture is associated with sloppiness, whereas in Chinese culture, it symbolizes wealth. In Kazakh (Turkic) culture, *shoshqa* (pig) represents gluttony, dullness, and filth. Similarly, donkey as a symbol of stupidity is present in Russian, Kazakh (Turkic), and Chinese cultures. A particularly interesting zoonym is dog. In both Russian and Turkic cultures, it symbolizes loyalty but also humiliation (e.g., the expression to grovel like a dog). In Chinese culture, there is a saying: "Buzz like a fly, grovel like a dog." Another example is "You cannot expect an elephant's tusk from a dog's mouth," meaning that nothing noble can be expected from an unworthy person. In Kazakh culture, the zoonym *it* (dog) carries an ambiguous meaning. In a positive sense, it signifies loyalty and endurance: *it – adamnyń dosy* (a dog is a man's friend), *it jandy* (persistent, strong-willed). However, in a negative sense, it denotes hardship and suffering: *it qorlyq kóru* (to be humiliated), *itşe jumys isteü* (to work like a dog), *it jekkenge aydalu* (to be exiled to a harsh place).

Thus, zoonyms are not only lexical units but also important carriers of national cultural meanings. Their study allows for a deeper understanding of the mentality and worldview of language speakers. Phraseological units containing zoonymic components have long been a subject of linguistic research, as faunistic terminology is closely related to fundamental aspects of linguistics, particularly nomination and metaphorical transformation of meaning. Fauna, as an extralinguistic foundation for lexicological analysis, manifests itself in language-specific characteristics, forming a distinct faunistic lexical subsystem. Animals have historically played a significant role in societal and linguistic development, becoming an integral part of cultural expression. However, the connotations associated with them vary significantly across different cultures, highlighting the uniqueness of their perception.

Evolution and Meaning of Cinemorphism

The term cinemorphism originates from the Ancient Greek *kyōn* (*kynos*) meaning 'dog breeds and their care' + *morph* (*morphos*) denoting 'form or structure' or "dog-like" behavior and having dog-like qualities (). In scientific literature and online sources, this term is interpreted as the projection of canine behavior onto other beings, including humans. Cinemorphisms encompass idioms and phraseological expressions associated with dogs, which describe human behavior, actions, or character traits. Despite the relevance of the term, many people remain unaware of its meaning and origins, underscoring the importance of its study and popularization. To analyze cinemorphisms in Kazakh, Russian, and English, it is essential to consider language as a phenomenon, its cultural connections, and historical development. The dog, as the first domesticated species, plays a crucial role in both linguistic and cultural spaces. In one belief, the domestication of wolves has also focused the attention on the when and where. The most accepted hypothesis generally situates this event in the Magdalenian, approximately from 16 to 12 Ka BP, although some researchers have suggested the presence of dogs in the Aurignacian or the Gravettian (Yravedra et al., 2021).

At the initial stages of coexistence with humans, dogs acted as "parasites," scavenging human waste near settlements, which laid the foundation for their complex relationship. Dogs became important domestic animals among Northern Arthabaskan groups and were differentiated from wild animals, which are destined for human consumption (Kondo, 2021). Throughout history, the perception of dogs has been ambivalent: on one hand, they are associated with loyalty and companionship, while on the other, they carry ominous or negative connotations. A comparative analysis of the word dog across Kazakh, Russian, and English offers insight into their respective cultural identity. The Kazakh Explanatory Dictionary provides multiple meanings for the word *it* ("dog"): (a) a domesticated animal from the canine family; (b) an animal used as a loyal companion for shepherds and guards; (c) a descriptor of undesirable human qualities; (d) a term related to dishonest or impure actions (Iskakov & Uali, 2011). S. I. Ozhegov's Russian Dictionary offers the following definitions for *sobaka* ("dog"): (a) a domesticated animal of the canine family; (b) figuratively, a cruel or rude person; (c) a term for certain wild canines (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1992). Similarly, the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines dog as: (a) a domesticated animal, a friend of humans, represented by numerous breeds; (b) a male of this species, as well as wolves and foxes; (c) (archaic) a contemptuous term for a person; (d) an informal term for a person in combination with adjectives; (e) a mechanical gripping device; (f) metal supports for firewood in a fireplace (Hornby & Cowie, 1995).

A comparison of the definitions of *dog* reveals that in all three languages, the word refers to a domesticated animal and a generalized representation of wild canines. Additionally, in all three languages, the word can be metaphorically applied to humans. Speakers of Kazakh, Russian, and English recognize similar behavioral traits in dogs: they bark, growl, wag their tails, and sometimes bite. A dog can be disobedient and prone to wandering, yet it remains a loyal friend and protector. The saying "A dog is a man's

best friend” exists in both Kazakh and Russian cultures. Cinemorphism is still a relatively new term and remains insufficiently studied. However, further exploration of this topic will help broaden our understanding of cinemorphisms in Kazakh, Russian, English, and other languages, contributing to lexical enrichment and cross-cultural comprehension.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative research design to identify the linguistic and semantic characteristics of cinemorphisms related to the word *dog* in different languages within their mythological and cultural contexts. A qualitative approach suited this study as it was based on a systematic exploration of the interrelation between language and culture, their historical development, and their contemporary usage. In addition, a comparative-historical method was used which allowed for identifying commonalities and differences in linguistic units related to the dog *sema* across different cultures, as well as comparing the cultural-historical contexts of phraseological expressions.

Data Collection Methods

To collect linguistic units associated with the dog *sema*, various lexicographical dictionaries, literary works, and oral folklore from different languages were used. The primary sources included Kazakh literary language dictionary (Iskakov & Uali, 2011); Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1992); Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms (Walter, 1998); Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (Hornby & Cowie, 1995). Additional sources included bilingual translation and phraseological dictionaries, folklore and oral literature of Turkic and Slavic peoples, including Kazakh proverbs, fairy tales, and legends, and literary works from Russian and English literature, such as Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. These sources provided a solid scientific foundation for the linguistic material used in the study. The collected materials enabled lexicological, semantic, cognitive, and linguacultural analyses. Additionally, the diversity of sources enhanced the objectivity of the study, allowing for an in-depth examination of the dog image and its national and cultural characteristics.

Data Analysis

Several analytical techniques were employed in this study to understand its findings. First, lexicographical analysis was applied to examine the meanings and usage of linguistic units and phraseological expressions related to dog based on dictionaries and encyclopedias. This method ensured the accuracy and consistency of data collection. A comparative-historical analysis helped in the historical formation of cinemorphisms, their mythological roots, and semantic transformations. Additionally, linguacultural analysis was employed to investigate the lexical and cultural meanings of linguistic units. This method helped reveal the national peculiarities of phraseological expressions associated with dog and their role in reflecting cultural values. The cognitive analysis method was also utilized to identify the metaphorical and symbolic meanings of the word dog, focusing on its cognitive role in shaping the linguistic worldview. This method was also applied to analyze mythological and folklore data. The mythological roots of the dog image, its role in legends and fairy tales, and its symbolic significance across various cultures were examined. A cross-cultural comparison of the symbolic and mythological roles of the dog was conducted to determine its importance in different cultural contexts.

Results and discussion

Clear expression of thoughts and structured speech have always been important aspects of human communication. The ability to use cinemorphisms, which include phraseological expressions, idioms, proverbs, and sayings, not only enriches vocabulary but also makes speech more expressive and demonstrates broad knowledge. Cinemorphisms hold a special place in linguistic and cultural heritage, serving as a tool for conveying cultural values and reflecting worldviews. Modern language speakers often use linguistic units without considering their origins and meanings. However, the study of cinemorphisms reveals the depth of cultural and cognitive processes, making communication more precise and multidimensional. The present study aimed to explore the role of cinemorphisms as an expression of a nation's nature and culture, examining their lexical, cultural, and mythological significance in different languages, as well as conducting a comparative analysis.

To achieve this goal, the following tasks were accomplished: (1) Considering language as a reflection of culture. Language serves as a means of accumulating and transmitting knowledge, reflecting cultural values. Lexicology, linguistic cultural studies, and ethnolinguistics provide insight into the connection between language and culture, which is particularly important when analyzing zoomorphisms. (2) Analyzing phraseological expressions with the component "dog." Dogs play an important symbolic role in languages, reflecting both positive and negative human qualities. In different languages, the dog symbolizes loyalty and friendship, but it is also associated with hardships or humiliation. (3) Examining the term "cinemorphism." This concept includes

linguistic units related to the image of the dog as a reflection of a nation's culture and worldview. (4) Exploring the mythological significance of dogs. Dogs hold a special place in myths, symbolizing loyalty, protection, and other qualities. These mythological representations serve as the foundation for the formation of cinemorphisms. (5) Conducting a comparative analysis of cinemorphisms. The study of phraseological expressions with the "dog" component revealed both similarities – due to calquing and borrowing – and differences, shaped by cultural characteristics.

Mythological Perception of the Dog Sema in Kazakh language

In Kazakh linguistics, the study of mythology has been considered a separate issue, yet research on word meanings rarely bypasses mythological elements. Various explanatory, etymological, and phraseological dictionaries of the Kazakh language, as well as ethnolinguistic studies, incorporate mythological aspects when defining and explaining word meanings. The empirical perception of animals, particularly the dog, requires a deep mythological understanding. Expanding the semantic potential of a word, enriching its cultural connotations, and comprehending its semantic imprint necessitate mythological and archetypal cognition. We fully support Sigmund Freud's statement that "human culture is built from the bricks of an ancient, forgotten perception of the world" (Freud, 1913). The source of life values is inherently connected to the spiritual world of any nation and correlates with the birth and development of humanity's cultural heritage. The ambivalent image of the dog is explained through different cultural lenses. From a mythological perspective, the dog is classified as a chthonic animal, frequently associated with the underworld and funerary rites. It is often depicted as a guide of souls to the afterlife and a guardian of the gates of hell. Historically, the dog was one of the first domesticated animals, living alongside humans and consuming their waste, initially forming a parasitic relationship with them. This early interaction shaped the dog's role in human societies.

The analysis covers the functional and symbolic aspects of the dog as well as the relationship between the dog and rituals associated with life cycles (Burnakov, 2012). The Indo-European written records preserve the religious role of dogs, portraying them as sacred animals (Trubachev, 1960). The dog is often regarded as a symbol of death, a lunar deity, and part of a "land-water-moon" triad (Makovsky, 1996). Due to this, the image of the dog appears in various cultural mythologies, albeit with different interpretations. For Turkic and Slavic peoples, the dog has a dual perception. Among Aztecs, it was considered a sacred creature—a companion for souls traveling to the afterlife, making it essential for a dying person to have a dog nearby. The dog has undergone a long process of domestication and in the mind of man has become a positive figure: people swore to dogs, composed eulogies to dogs and have created rules concerning the handling of dogs; dogs were even considered a means of delivering sacrificial gifts to the recipients (Salmin, 2011).

Dogs and wolves appear in myths and rituals across Eurasia. Near Eastern and Turkic-Altaic myths associated dogs with healing rather than death and generally also categorized dogs as impure. In Mesopotamia, the goddess Gula, associated with healing, was symbolized by a dog, and near her temples many dog graves were found (Anthony & Brown, 2017). As we can notice from different sources dogs were probably meant to serve as companions or guardians on the journey to the Underworld (Morey & Jeger, 2022). Among Iranians, the perception differs from that of Turkic and Slavic peoples. In Zoroastrian rituals, the dog was regarded as a pure animal. Contact with a dog was considered equivalent to ritual purification (Doroshenko, 1982). In Yakut, Tuvan, Even, Chukchi, and Nivkh myths, the dog is believed to have originated from the sky (Kopylenko, 1995). In contrast, Berber-speaking tribes in Africa consider dogs unclean, and those who kill a dog are regarded as sinners. Despite such variations, spiritual development stages across different cultures share typological similarities. For example, Kazakh and Russian phraseological expressions related to the dog *sema* demonstrate striking semantic parallels:

- *итишленіп кетті* – устал как собака ("dog-tired")
- *иттің (қанышықтың) балалары – сукины дети* ("sons of bitches")
- *құйрығын бұлғаңдату* – вилять хвостом ("wagging one's tail")
- *аш иттей бұралқы* – собачий голод ("dog's hunger")
- *ит өлген жер / ит арқасы қиян* – где собака зарыта ("where the dog is buried," meaning a remote place)
- *ит сияқты* – как собака ("like a dog," often with a negative connotation)

This underscores the mythological foundation of such expressions, emphasizing mythology as a profound cognitive layer of human consciousness. The dog thus played a central role in magical rituals among the Bashkirs, Turkmens, Chuvash, Kazan Tatars, and Yakuts. The domestication of dogs is also linked to the evolution of wolves. Among Kazakh and other Turkic peoples, if a firstborn child died shortly after birth, the next child would be given the name *It Köden* ("dog's anus") to protect them from misfortune. Similarly, newborns were dressed in an *It Köilek* ("dog shirt") forty days after birth to ward off evil spirits. In Middle Uyghur traditions, the term *yt saman* ("dog bedding") refers to an ancient custom where a newborn was placed in a dog's resting area, believing that if a dog did not harm the child, neither would evil spirits. Among Yakuts, families who had lost multiple children named their newborns *it ouoto* ("puppy") or gave them a dog's nickname for protection. Conversely, some families named their dogs after children to further shield their infants from misfortune (Tenishev, 2001). Zhanuzakov (1971) states that "the vast Kazakh steppe is a symbol of the unity of culture and language, customs, and traditions. Thousands of personal names reflect rituals,

beliefs, and customs. For example, dressing a newborn in a 'dog shirt' is a common Turkic tradition, and this belief has led to names such as *Itbai*, *Itbas*, *Kúshik*, and *Barak*. The Kazakh phrase '*itjandy*' (literally 'dog-souled') means 'strong, resilient person,' reflecting a deep-rooted respect for dogs in Kazakh culture"

Thus, the dog occupies a significant place in the mythological, religious, and cultural consciousness of various nations. It serves as a symbol of both protection and danger, embodying a complex interplay of meanings in Turkic, Slavic, and Indo-European traditions. We classify taboos and euphemisms as part of ethnographic lexicon because they contain ethnographic concepts, traditional beliefs, myths, customs, and cultural norms related to linguistic etiquette. In the worldview of any people, dream interpretation plays a significant role. For example, Kazakh dream interpreters state that if a person dreams of a dog biting or chasing them, it is a sign of impending danger. Russian dream interpreters, on the other hand, use the dog as a symbol. If, in a dream, a dog is waiting for something to be thrown or ignores you, it means that you will suffer a loss at the hands of your opponent. If a small puppy barks at you, it foreshadows a quarrel or temporary hostility. These interpretations are not merely figurative but are based on human observation and experience.

Taboo words exist in the languages of all peoples: If a dog howls at the sky, it is a sign of misfortune; *If a dog goes mad, something bad will happen; Do not pull a dog's tail; Do not keep a dog's offspring inside the house; Do not feed a dog with a ladle; Do not kick a dog or its feeding bowl. For example, the belief that if a dog howls at the sky, it means the death of the household owner leads people to curse the dog, chase it away, or even kill it.* In such cases, the dog is buried deep in the ground, seven people place heavy stones over the grave, spit on it, and walk away, believing that the dog's misfortune will be buried with it. Similarly, if livestock dies in a household, it was believed that allowing dogs to eat the blood would drive them mad. This belief may have led to the superstition *if a dog goes mad, something bad will happen*. Considering that the formation of linguistic concepts always involves artistic perception and figurative thinking, it becomes evident that mythological cognition plays a fundamental role in shaping language. Mythical archetypes, preserved in the deeper layers of human consciousness, continuously influence thought processes and linguistic evolution. Therefore, mythology is the foundation of language and the starting point of all spiritual development.

Akhmetov (2015) states that taboo words referring to *wolves* and *dogs* are widespread in Turkic languages. In Kazakh, Uzbek, Tuvan, Chuvash, and Turkmen, euphemisms have been used instead of direct references to wolves: *it-qus* (dog-bird) in Kazakh, *itqush* (dog-bird) in Uzbek, *yt* (dog) in Tuvan, *çer ydı* (earth dog) in Chuvash, *mesdan it* (steppe dog) in Turkmen. These euphemistic expressions have gained ethnographic meaning over time. Among Kazakhs, mentioning the word *böri* (wolf) was strictly forbidden, as it was believed that calling a wolf by its real name would attract it to livestock. Instead, people used euphemisms such as *qara qulaq* (black ear), *ulıma* (howler), *serek qulaq* (sharp ear), *teris ezu* (crooked mouth). These indirect names reflect the ancient belief in word magic. Many taboos and euphemisms developed in the Tuvan language. When greeting guests, Tuvans avoided mentioning wolves directly and instead used euphemistic expressions such as *Mal-mağanıǵar yt, kuş-tan sol-dur be?* (Are your livestock safe from dogs and birds?). In Tuvan, the word for wolf was taboo, and euphemistic substitutes included *çer ydı* (earth dog) and *Altay ydı* (Altai dog) (Akhmetov, 2015). A comparison of Kazakh and Tuvan euphemisms reveals that the etymology of *it-qus* (dog-bird) has become obscured over time. While today, Kazakh speakers understand *it-qus* as a single term referring to wolves, historical analysis suggests that *it* (dog) and *qus* (bird) were originally separate euphemisms for different animals, likely wolves and eagles, both of which were once taboo words.

Information about taboos, superstitions, and totemic beliefs among Turkic peoples is recorded in historical sources dating back to the 13th–14th centuries, particularly in the famous Jami' al-Tawarikh (Compendium of Chronicles) by Rashid al-Din, which documented the history of Turkic peoples before and during Genghis Khan's rule. Scientific data confirm that totemism and its associated prohibitions were widespread among Turkic peoples and that dogs and wolves held a central place in their superstitions and spiritual beliefs. Rashid Ad-Din (1952), in his study on tribals, found out that each of the twenty-four Oghuz tribes had its own totem. One of these was associated with the *itelgi* (a type of falcon), which was strictly prohibited from being hunted. Ethnographic materials also provide evidence of common beliefs shared between Kazakhs and Karakalpaks. This is evident in the Karakalpak tribal names such as *Kushik* (puppy) and *Itelgi*, as well as in the Kazakh custom of refraining from harming owls or swans, all of which are rooted in totemic beliefs and associated prohibitions.

There are also names that were forbidden to be mentioned directly and were replaced with euphemisms. For example, hunters refrained from directly naming their hunting dogs while out in the field. Among Yakut hunters, instead of calling a dog *yt* (dog), they used euphemistic substitutes such as *sys* ("useless") or *üñgäs* ("puppy"). Similarly, Shor hunters, when referring to a dog left at home during a hunt, called it *u aryk kuzruk* ("dirty tail"), another euphemistic expression. Therefore, just like individual words, some phraseological expressions carry euphemistic meanings. For example, if a person curses or insults another, the offensive words are often not repeated verbatim when retelling the incident. Instead, euphemistic phraseological expressions help to convey the intended meaning in a softened manner.

Examples of such euphemistic expressions in Kazakh include: (1) *it terisin basına qaptaı* (literally: "to cover someone's head with a dog's hide," meaning severe reprimand) (2) *auzynan aq it kirip, qara/kök it syqty*

(literally: "a white dog entered his mouth, and a black/blue dog came out," meaning to curse profusely) (3) *itti jumsaidı*, *it quyırğın jumsaidı* (literally: "a dog orders another dog, the tail orders the dog," meaning ineffective delegation) (4) *ash itting artın suq it jalaydı* (literally: "a hungry dog's backside is licked by a scavenger dog," referring to opportunistic behavior) (5) *it pen mysyqtai* (literally: "like a dog and a cat," meaning constant conflict) (6) *itting etinen jek köru* (literally: "to despise like dog meat," meaning intense dislike). These phraseological expressions function as euphemisms, softening coarse or offensive concepts and making them more acceptable in speech or writing.

Just like phraseological expressions, proverbs and sayings can also carry euphemistic meanings. This is especially true for figurative and idiomatic proverbs. Proverbs are generally divided into two groups: one, those used in their literal meaning, two, those that express an idea indirectly, often through euphemistic meaning. The second category includes euphemistic proverbs such as: (1) *qatyn köp bolsa, şömişti it jalaydı*, "If there are too many wives, the ladle will be licked by the dog," meaning disorder in a household; (2) *itti küşigim dese, auzyn jalaydı*, "If you call a dog 'my puppy,' it will start licking your mouth," meaning excessive familiarity may lead to disrespect; (3) *jaman itting atyn bori basar qoyady*, "A bad dog is named 'wolf killer'," meaning a person's flaws are often concealed by an exaggerated reputation; (4) *it bir surinse, qyryq surinedi*, "If a dog stumbles once, it will stumble forty times, meaning repeated failures; *itti küşiginde üyret*, "Train a dog while it's still a puppy," meaning start teaching or disciplining early.

The study of prohibitions, taboos, and euphemisms within Turkic culture, belief systems, mythology, traditions, and customs has long been a subject of scholarly interest. However, despite their common linguistic and cultural origins, Turkic-speaking peoples gradually dispersed over vast geographic areas, leading to linguistic and cultural divergence over the centuries. Although Turkic peoples once shared a common language, religion, and way of life, their descendants migrated in different directions, settling in distant regions. As a result, their customs, traditions, and languages evolved separately, developing unique characteristics. Thus, while traces of their shared heritage remain in their languages, customs, and belief systems, the principle of "*every country has its own laws, and every dog has its own coat*" (meaning cultural differences must be acknowledged) reminds us that significant variations and distinctions have also emerged between Turkic peoples over time.

Mythological Image of the Dog Sema in Russian and English Languages

The dog has played an important role in Russia since ancient times. It is not just a domesticated animal but also a companion, helper, and loyal friend of humans. It accompanied people in daily life, hunting, travel, war, and household activities, occupying a crucial place in various aspects of human life. As we have mentioned above by using cognitive analysis method, we can identify the metaphorical and symbolic meanings of the word "dog", focusing on its cognitive role in shaping the linguistic worldview. We can also demonstrate the connection between myths and language. Let us now examine the idiom "*Вот где собака зарыта!*", which has an equivalent in English: "That's where the shoe pinches!". Its meaning is "that's the real issue", "that's the true reason" (Phraseologisms, 2020). There are several versions of the origin of this idiom, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Versions of the Origin of the Idiom *Вот где собака зарыта!*.

Origin	Explanation
The Story of an Austrian Soldier	One of the well-known sources links this phrase to Austrian soldier Sigismund Altensteig. During his military campaigns, he was always accompanied by his beloved dog. One day, while traveling in the Netherlands, the dog saved his life. In gratitude, the soldier buried his faithful friend with honors, erecting a monument that stood for over two centuries until the early 19th century. Over time, tourists who were interested in this story could only find the monument with local help. This led to the phrase <i>Вот где собака зарыта!</i> , meaning "I have found what I was looking for", "I have uncovered the essence of the matter."
Ancient Greek Legend	Another version of the phrase's origin is associated with ancient history. During the war against the Persians, the Greeks, preparing for a naval battle, evacuated women, the elderly, and children to the island of Salamis. The dog of Xanthippus, father of Pericles, refused to leave its owner, jumped into the water, and swam to the island. However, exhausted, it died immediately after arrival. In memory of this loyal dog, a monument was erected, mentioned by the historian Plutarch.
German Version	Some German linguists believe that the phrase originated among treasure hunters. Due to superstition, they avoided mentioning the object of their search directly, replacing it with the image of a "black dog." As a result, <i>Вот где собака зарыта!</i> originally meant "That's where the treasure is hidden!"

Over time, this idiom lost its connection to specific historical events and acquired a figurative meaning. It is now used to denote a situation in which the essence of the matter is revealed or the true cause is found. Stories about phantom black dogs and demonic hounds play an important role in English folklore. These legends spread throughout the British Isles, from the stories of Black Shuck in East Anglia to Barghest in North Yorkshire. The frightening image of these creatures is reflected in English literature, such as in Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's novel *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (Trubachev, 1960). The black dog is traditionally associated with nighttime ghosts and is considered a harbinger of death. It is often linked to the devil and his

manifestations. It typically appears during storms, at crossroads, on ancient roads, and in places of executions. The origin of the black dog is difficult to determine precisely, as this image has many analogs in European mythology. One example is Puck from Celtic folklore, who was said to frequently take the form of a phantom dog. In European myths, black dogs are almost always associated with death (see [Table 2](#)).

Table 2: *The Image of the "Black Dog" in English Folklore and European Mythology.*

Origin	Description
Welsh Cŵn Annwn	Hellhounds
Scandinavian Garm	Bloodstained guard dog watching over the gates of hell
Greek Cerberus	Three-headed dog guarding the entrance to the underworld, preventing souls from escaping

British folklore likely inherited these images, though it retained local characteristics. In British legends, black dogs are often depicted as sinister creatures, though exceptions exist. For instance, in the legends of Gurt Dog from Somerset, this creature is described as compassionate and protective toward people. The image of the black dog has also entered the language through idiomatic expressions. For example: "Keep the black dog at bay" – meaning "to avoid bad moods or depression." The term "black dog" gained widespread recognition thanks to Winston Churchill, who used it to describe his depression. This expression emphasizes the struggle against inner fears and emotions. The mythological image of the dog in Russian and English languages demonstrates diverse cultural perceptions and symbolism. In Russian culture, the dog is portrayed as a loyal friend and helper, while in English folklore, the black dog is a symbol of death, fear, and inner struggles. These differences highlight the rich mythological heritage and linguistic creativity of different peoples. Dogs in different cultures are associated not only with everyday life but also with omens, dreams, and superstitions. Their behavior, appearance in dreams, or connection to certain events is given symbolic meaning, reflecting the cultural and mythological characteristics of Russian and English worldviews. The appearance of dogs in dreams is often perceived as a sign or warning. In Russian-speaking culture, several common interpretations exist (see [Table 3](#)).

Table 3: *Symbolic Meaning of Dogs in Omens, Dreams, and Superstitions.*

Dog in a Dream	Symbolic Meaning
Pack of dogs in a dream	Warns that a person is leading a chaotic lifestyle, preventing them from achieving their goals and leaving no time for rest
Dogs surrounding and not letting you go	A sign of the need for rest, indicating physical and emotional exhaustion
A pack of dogs chasing you but not attacking	A call to reconsider one's actions. Past grievances or mistakes may be preventing progress
A barking and jumping dog	Symbolizes obstacles in spiritual development. One must pause, resolve current issues, and perhaps uncover the true intentions of ill-wishers

These dream interpretations emphasize the importance of self-reflection and the need to pay attention to internal conflicts. On the other hand, in Russian culture, the dog, like other animals, is perceived as a harbinger of events, particularly those related to death or misfortune. Omens often carry a dramatic undertone (see [Table 4](#)).

Table 4: *Symbolism of Dogs in Russian Omens and Beliefs.*

Dog in Omens	Symbolic Meaning
A howling dog	Considered a harbinger of death, especially if the dog howls while looking downward. If it howls upward, it foretells a fire
A dog refusing to eat crumbs near a sick person	A bad sign that may indicate an imminent death
If a dog or cat jumps over a corpse	According to superstitions, the deceased may turn into a vampire
A dog pressing against its owner	Predicts misfortune, and if the dog sways while standing, it foretells travel troubles

These omens, based on observations and folk wisdom, show a particular focus on animal behavior, which is often perceived as a divine signal. Superstitions and omens related to dogs also resonate in English culture. For example: The black dog, as in the folklore of the British Isles, symbolizes death or something ominous. Its howl is often associated with tragic events. Similar to Russian traditions, where a dog's howl is linked to misfortune, the English expression "Keep the black dog at bay" refers to the struggle against depression and negative emotions ([Sakaeva, 2009](#)). The dog, in the cultures of different nations, is not only a loyal friend but also a symbol with deep mythological and emotional significance. Omens and dreams about dogs highlight the connection between humans and nature, spirituality, and hidden subconscious fears. These images form unique cultural codes, reflecting how different cultures perceive the world through animal symbolism.

In Russian and English folk traditions, the belief in human transformation into animals is widely spread. This phenomenon is common in many cultures worldwide, but transformations into rabbits, cats, and dogs are particularly frequent. In medieval times, such beliefs were reflected in witch trials. Animals that appeared suspicious were often persecuted as witches' familiars. If harm caused to an animal coincided with harm

suffered by a person, it could serve as grounds for accusing someone of witchcraft. It was believed that transformation could be achieved through magical forces or special ointments and spells. Such myths about dogs symbolize the boundary between human and natural realms, between the earthly and the supernatural.

An interesting example of dog-related imagery is the "@" symbol, known to all Internet users. Its history dates back several centuries to medieval monasteries, where it was used to represent the Latin preposition "ad" (meaning "to" or "toward"). Some researchers claim that an Italian monk invented the symbol, which was later adopted by merchants. One of the first recorded uses of "@" outside monasteries is linked to the Florentine merchant Francesco Lapi, who used it in a letter to denote a unit of volume—an amphora, approximately 26 liters. Over time, the "@" symbol acquired different meanings. For example, in Spanish, Portuguese, and French, it was used as an abbreviation for the word "arroba", an old weight measure equal to approximately 11.5 kg. In Russian texts, however, the "@" symbol can be found as early as the 16th–17th centuries, for instance, in Ivan the Terrible's Sudebnik (Code of Laws) of 1550. By the 19th century, the symbol was used to indicate the price per unit of goods. In the 20th century, "@" gained popularity due to its integration into computer technology. In 1963, it was included in the ASCII standard, and in 1971, programmer Ray Tomlinson proposed using it to separate the username and domain name in email addresses. The symbol became widely used in 1996, with the launch of the Hotmail service.

Interestingly, in different countries, the "@" symbol has various names: In Italy – *chiocciola* ("snail"); In Greece – *παπάκι* ("duckling"); In the Czech Republic and Slovakia – *zavináč* ("herring roll"); In Taiwan – 小老鼠 ("little mouse"); In Israel – *strudel*; – In Kazakhstan – *айқұлақ* ("moon ear"). The image of the dog, much like the "@" symbol, highlights its unique role in culture, language, and daily life. The dog is an essential element of Russian and English folklore, as reflected in omens, superstitions, dreams, and even digital vocabulary. This universality makes the dog a significant figure not only in mythology but also in modern culture, allowing it to appear in unexpected interpretations.

Connotative Meaning of the Dog Sema in Phraseological Units

The Kazakh people's perception of dogs demonstrates their deep understanding of canine behavior and ability to evaluate dogs objectively. According to Kazakh language dictionary, phraseological expressions and proverbs related to dogs predominantly carry a pejorative (negative) meaning. There are 859 proverbs including 30 positive examples and 429 examples of negative connotations. The negative meanings significantly outnumber positive ones. Also there are 700 linguistic units related to the "dog" (Iskakov & Uali, 2011). The origins of phraseological expressions in the Kazakh language (and other Turkic languages) are closely connected with the history, way of life, society, material and spiritual culture, and customs of the people. As society evolves, certain attributes fade into obscurity, leading to the blurring of literal meanings. However, within the collective memory of a people, figurative, metaphorical phraseological expressions serve as historical remnants, passed down from generation to generation. When studying linguistic wealth scientifically, all information preserved in folk consciousness, traditions, and oral literature must be considered within a systematic framework. Only then can the mysteries of culture and national identity be fully revealed. Linguo-cultural analysis is used to define the lexical and cultural meanings of linguistic units. The method helps to find out the national peculiarities of phraseological expressions associated with dog. On the other hand, phraseological expressions, as the mirror of national life, play an essential role in shaping the linguistic picture of the world. Their cognitive analysis allows us to uncover the nature of national culture in human civilization.

Table 5: *Phraseological Units Related to Human Nature and Character.*

Category	Example	Meaning
Personal insults	" <i>It balasy</i> "	A curse phrase meaning "son of a dog"
Verbal aggression	" <i>Auzynan aq it kirip, qara (kök) it shygady</i> "	"Cursing uncontrollably"
Disgraceful death	" <i>It ólim</i> "	A dishonorable death
Despised person	" <i>Buralqy it</i> "	"A disgusting person"
Weak-willed individual	" <i>Üi küşik</i> "	"A person who never leaves home" (a coward)
Resilient person	" <i>It jandy</i> "	"A tough person who endures suffering"

Table 6: *Phraseological Units Related to Social and Everyday Life.*

Category	Example	Meaning
Living conditions	" <i>It baylasa turǵysyz</i> "	"A place unfit for living"
Wealth and abundance	" <i>It basyna irkit tógildi</i> "	"A time of great prosperity"
Difficult life	" <i>It ómir</i> "	"A life full of hardship"

Phraseological expressions as an integral part of the national language, emphasize their role in enriching speech, strengthening meaning, and conveying ideas figuratively. Hence, phraseological expressions serve as linguistic reflections of material and spiritual culture, preserving the worldview, mentality, and attitudes of the people. Among these, the most common units are phraseological expressions, including: "*It – adamnyń dosy*" (A dog is a man's friend); "*It – zheti qazynanyń biri*" (A dog is one of the seven treasures); "*Jaqsy it ólimgin kórsetpeidi*" (A good dog does not show its carcass); "*It basyna irkit tógildi*" (There is an abundance of everything);

"Üi küşik" (Lapdog, meaning a homebody); "It – yrys" (A dog is a symbol of fortune). Similarly, in Russian and Belarusian, positive connotations can be found in expressions such as: "Собачья верность" ("Dog-like loyalty"); "Собаку съест" ("To have extensive experience"); "Дзе сабака зарыта" ("The core of the issue"); "Сабака не параскочыць" ("The highest standard"). However, most expressions involving "dogs" in Slavic languages have negative connotations. Phraseological units linked to the "dog" *sema* can be classified into several semantic groups to better understand their meanings and cultural significance (as seen in Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10).

Table 7: Phraseological Units Related to Measurement.

Example	Meaning
"Auzý itayaqty"	"A person with a large mouth"
"It múryni ótpeitin"	"A dense forest"
"It ölgen jer"	"A very remote place"

Table 8: Phraseological Units Related to Traditions and Customs.

Example	Meaning
"It yryldatar"	"A custom where a groom gives a gift to the bride's family"
"It júgirtyp qus saldy"	"To engage in leisure and festivities"

Table 9: Phraseological Units Related to Natural Phenomena.

Example	Meaning
"Suýqtyń küşigi talady"	Bitter cold weather"
"Itşe uly an alaqaşyq"	"Extremely loud or intense"

Table 10: Phraseological Units Related to Curses and Superstitions.

Example	Meaning
"Aulynan úrgen ittiń úni shýqpagyr!"	"A curse wishing someone to be left with nothing"
"It ishkir!"	"An insult expressing deep anger"
"Senen ayaǵandy it jesin"	"A curse meaning 'May what I withheld from you be wasted'"

The examples above clearly illustrate the linguistic uniqueness of the Kazakh people. Similarly, Russian phraseological expressions include structurally similar units, such as: "Собачья злоба" – "Extreme cruelty"; "Сдохнуть в подворотне" – "To die like a homeless dog"; "Как собака" – "To behave like a dog (ruthlessly)." In Belarusian, similar expressions exist: "З роту сабаки скачуць" – "A person who speaks badly"; "Што пан, то сабака" – "A bad person"; "Сабаке пад хвост" – "Wasted effort." These expressions typically carry negative connotations, reflecting the low status of dogs in traditional folklore. Despite cultural differences, Turkic and Slavic languages share many dog-related expressions with similar meanings, such as: "Құйрығын бұлғаңдату" → "Вилать хвостом" (To flatter); "Аш иттей бұралқы" → "Собачий холод" (Extreme hunger/cold); "Иттің балалары" → "Сукины дети" (An insult); "Итшіленіп кетті" → "Устал как собака" (Utter exhaustion).

All these expressions carry a negative connotation and contribute to a similar conceptual image in folk consciousness. Each nation shapes its understanding of the world through various linguistic facts and expressions. The linguistic picture of the world is primarily formed as a logical representation of reality in human consciousness. Similarities between phenomena contribute to the expansion of lexical categories, forming conceptual groups within language. These concepts serve as the foundation of language, allowing us to identify national characteristics through the linguistic representation of world phenomena. This is a crucial feature that distinguishes the cultural-national connotation of phraseological units.

Phraseological Expressions with the Image of a Dog in Russian and English: A Comparative Analysis

Dog-related phraseological expressions exist in both Russian and English and are used to create figurative expressions with specific meanings and cultural connotations. Let's categorize them into thematic groups. Phraseological expressions related to human nature and existence are listed in Table 11.

Table 11: Similar Phraseological Expressions, Idioms, and Figurative Sayings.

English	Russian	Meaning
Dog in the manger	Собака на сене	This phrase describes a person who prevents others from doing something they do not need themselves, referring to a dog lying on hay and not letting other animals use it. It expresses envy and senseless obstruction
To treat somebody like a dog	Обращаться с кем-то как с собакой	Describes a relationship where someone treats another person poorly, without respect. It carries the same negative meaning in both languages
To kill like a dog	Убить как собаку	Implies that a person's life was worthless or meaningless. In both cultures, killing a dog is often associated with cruelty or lack of value

These phraseological expressions share similar meanings, but in some cases, their contexts and shades of meaning may differ. For example: (1) Jolly dog (English) – "A cheerful person, playboy, ladies' man." Russian equivalent: There is no exact match, but expressions describing a carefree or unserious person, such as *жизнерадостный* (cheerful) or *несерьёзный* (frivolous), may be similar. The English expression jolly dog also implies a flirtatious nature, which is not always directly reflected in Russian. (2) In another example, a lucky dog (English) – "A lucky person." Russian equivalent: *Счастливчик* (Lucky person). The meaning is almost identical. (3) Lazy dog (English) – "A lazy person." Russian equivalent: Expressions like *ленивый как лень* ("lazy as laziness itself") convey the same idea. (4) Cunning dog (English) – "A cunning, crafty person," sometimes with a negative connotation (cheater, trickster). The Russian equivalents are expressions like *хитрить* (to be cunning), *клеветает* (to slander), *мошенничает* (to cheat) describe dishonest actions, making them closer in meaning. (5) Dirty dog (English) – "A mean, despicable person." The Russian equivalent: *Свинья* (pig) may be used to describe such people, though moral connotations may differ between cultures. (6) To die like a dog (English) – "To die like a dog." The Russian equivalent: Identical meaning, expressing the idea of dying in humiliation or without dignity. (7) Black dog (English) – "Depression, a heavy emotional state." The Russian equivalent: *Мухи мрут* ("flies are dying") does not fully convey the depth of depression, refers instead to melancholy or sadness. The English phrase carries a stronger emotional burden. (8) To have the black dog on one's back (English) – "To be in depression." The Russian equivalent: *Быть в депрессии* (To be in depression). The phrase is similar, but in English, it implies a constant emotional burden. (9) To dog one's footsteps (English) – "To follow someone persistently." The Russian equivalents: Expressions like *по пятам ходить* (to follow closely) or *преследовать* (to stalk) exist, but the English phrase emphasizes persistence and determination more strongly. (10) To go to the dogs (English) – "To deteriorate or decline." The Russian equivalent: The meaning is identical, describing the worsening of a situation. (11) The dogs of war (English) – "Mercenaries, soldiers who fight for money." The Russian equivalents: *Кровавые клыки* (bloody fangs) or *наёмники* (mercenaries) carry a similar meaning, but the English phrase emphasizes brutal, animalistic violence. (12) Dumb dog (English) – "A silent, secretive person." The Russian equivalent describes a quiet person, but in English, the phrase suggests hidden motives or potential danger. (13) Hangdog (English) – "A despicable, shamefaced person." The Russian equivalent: *Свидетель унижения* (a person who has experienced humiliation) conveys a similar sense of shame, but in English, "hangdog" implies an internal feeling of guilt and defeat. Thus, although many of these phrases have similar meanings, depending on the context, cultural differences, and nuances of usage in different languages, they may acquire slightly different shades of meaning. Phraseological expressions related to social, public, and everyday conditions (see Table 12).

Table 12: Unique Phraseological Expressions, Idioms, and Figurative Sayings.

In English	In Russian	Meaning
In the doghouse	<i>Быть в чёрном списке / в беде</i>	This phrase means that someone is in trouble or facing punishment. The Russian equivalents also describe being in an unfavorable situation
It rains cats and dogs	<i>Дождь из вил / пурпурный дождь</i>	This expression, meaning heavy rain, has several explanations. One theory relates to the muddy floods in 17th-century English cities, where dead animals could be found on the streets. Another version suggests that the phrase originates from a Greek proverb referring to an unlikely event, or from the French word "catadoupe," meaning "waterfall." In Russian, similar expressions include "дождь из вил" (rain of pitchforks) and "пурпурный дождь" (purple rain).
Dog's age	<i>Целая вечность</i>	Means a long period of time (10-15 years). The Russian equivalent "целая вечность" (an entire eternity) conveys the same idea
-	<i>Искать с собаками</i>	No direct equivalent in English, but the phrase "searching high and low" conveys the idea of an exhaustive search
To know the ropes	<i>Собаку съел</i>	This Russian expression means having great experience or deep knowledge in a particular field. The closest English equivalent is "to know the ropes," meaning to be well-versed in something
To have a nose for something	<i>Собачий нюх</i>	Used to describe a person with exceptional intuition. The English equivalent carries the same meaning
To stink to high heaven	<i>Воняет как собака</i>	Both expressions describe a strong, unpleasant odor

Dog-related phraseological expressions in Russian and English have much in common, although they reflect different cultural characteristics. Common themes include human behavior, moral qualities, and social conditions. The study of such expressions allows not only to identify lexical and semantic parallels but also to understand how dogs and associated symbols are perceived in different cultures.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that cinemorphisms play a key role in conveying emotions, values, and cultural

characteristics. They reflect universal qualities such as loyalty, protection, and vigilance, yet their national variations are shaped by cultural connotations. The study also confirms that language not only reflects reality but also shapes cultural and cognitive representations. Cinemorphisms exemplify how universal values find unique expressions in different linguistic worldviews. Studying cinemorphisms contributes to intercultural understanding, identifying both similarities and differences between cultures. Further research on the interaction between language and culture, especially in the context of mythological and cognitive processes, will allow for a deeper understanding of national languages and their role in global communication.

Thus, cinemorphisms not only reflect national cultural characteristics but also contribute to strengthening intercultural dialogue, preserving cultural heritage, and fostering global mutual understanding. By using cognitive analysis method, we defined the use of dog-related phraseological expressions as part of cinemorphisms in different languages. Dog-related phraseological expressions exist in Kazakh, Russian and English and are used to create figurative expressions with specific meanings and cultural connotations. It is evident that the emergence of phraseological expressions is strongly influenced by everyday life, interactions with the surrounding environment, and metaphorical perception. From this perspective, studying the linguistic worldviews of Kazakh and Slavic peoples allows for a deeper understanding of their worldview, mentality, and cultural uniqueness. Phraseological expressions play an important role in languages, expressing the cultural and mental characteristics of a nation. They reflect worldviews, attitudes towards the surrounding world, and can be used to describe social and personal relationships, emotional states, and everyday situations. The comprehensive application of different methods ensured the depth and objectivity of the study. The findings revealed that cinemorphisms related to the dog sema constitute a complex linguistic phenomenon that occupies a significant place in the cultural and mythological worldviews of various linguistic communities.

Funding Support

This study was funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant IRN AP19675130 "Lexicographic system of phraseological units common to Turkish languages").

References

- Akhmetov, A. (2015). *Taboo and Euphemisms in Turkic Languages*. Astana: Science. Retrieved from <https://kazneb.kz/bookView/view/?brId=1547616>
- Anthony, D. W., & Brown, D. R. (2017). The dogs of war: A Bronze Age initiation ritual in the Russian steppes. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 48, 134-148. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2017.07.004>
- Argynbayev, Y. (2024). The image of dog in Kazakh traditions and folk beliefs. *Turkic Studies Journal*, 6(1), 94-111. doi: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2024-1-94-111>
- Bektemirov, S., Avakova, R., Omirbekova, Z., & Akimisheva, Z. (2025). The Manifestation of the Mythical Image in the "Dog" Seme. *Bulletin of KazNU. Philological Series*, 197(1), 41-52. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26577/EJPh202519714>
- Bobojonova, S. (2024). Linguoculturology and Concept. *ACTA NUUZ*, 1(1.4), 296-300. doi: <https://doi.org/10.69617/uzmu.v1i1.4.2084>
- Burnakov, V. A. (2012). Traditional Perceptions of the Dog Among the Khakas People of the Late 19th–Mid-20th Century. *Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia*, 40(2), 114-123. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aee.2012.08.013>
- Doroshenko, E. A. (1982). *Zoroastrians in Iran*. Moscow: Science. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/162463836.pdf>
- Freud, Z. (1913). *Totem and Taboo. Psychology of Primitive Culture and Religion*. Petrograd.
- Hornby, A. S., & Cowie, A. P. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford Universiti Press. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=evZKPgAACAAJ>
- Humboldt, W. (2000). *Selected Works in Linguistics*. Moscow: Progress. Retrieved from https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/antropologija/gumboldt_v_fon_izbrannye_trudy_po_po_jazykoznaniyu/5-1-0-196
- Iskakov, A., & Uali, N. (2011). *Kazakh Literary Language Dictionary. Vol. 15*. Almaty: Arys. Retrieved from <https://kazneb.kz/kk/catalogue/result?flt=voc>
- Kamalova, D. A. (2017). Linguoculturology as a New Direction of Contemporary Linguistics. *Young Scientist*, 15(149), 700-702. Retrieved from <https://moluch.ru/archive/149/42202>
- Kondo, S. (2021). Dog and human from Raven's perspective: An interpretation of Raven myths of Alaskan Athabascans. *Polar Science*, 28, 100633. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polar.2020.100633>
- Kopylenko, M. M. (1995). *Fundamentals of Ethnolinguistics*. Almaty: Eurasia. Retrieved from <https://violity.com/ru/104093930-osnovy-etnolingvistiki>
- Lamazhaa, C. K., Tuimebaev, Z. K., & Shagimgereeva, B. E. (2024). "People of Central Asia" as a Scientific Source. *New Research of Tuva*, 1, 39-54. doi: <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2024.1.3>
- Makovsky, M. M. (1996). *Comparative Dictionary of Mythological Symbolism in Indo-European Languages. Image of the World and Worlds of Images*. Moscow: 'VLADOS'. Retrieved from https://rusneb.ru/catalog/000199_000009_001732586

- Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Cultural Linguistics. Educational Textbook for Higher Education Institute Students*. Moscow: Publishing center «Academia» (in Russian).
- Meletinsky, E. M. (1976). *Poetics of Myth*. Moscow: Science. Retrieved from https://biblio.imli.ru/images/abook/folklor/Meletinskij_E.M. Poetika_mifa_1976.pdf
- Morey, D. F., & Jeger, R. (2022). When dogs and people were buried together. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 67, 101434. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2022.101434>
- Muminova, M. A. (2021). The Solution to the Problem in Linguoculturology. *Academia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(8), 294-299. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2021.01814.0>
- Ozhegov, S. I., & Shvedova, N. Y. (1992). *Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language*. Moscow: Az. Retrieved from http://www.lib.ru/DIC/OZHEGOW/ozhegow_p_r.txt
- Phraseologisms. (2020). *Phraseologisms*. Retrieved from <https://frazbook.ru/2014/07/14/kak-sobake-pyatava-noga>
- Potebnaya, A. A. (1976). *Aesthetics and Poetics*. Moscow: Art. Retrieved from https://imwerden.de/pdf/potebnaya_estetika_i_poetika_1976_ocr.pdf
- Rashid Ad-Din, F. (1952). *Jami at-tawarikh. Collection of chronicles.: Vol. I*. USSR Academy of Sciences. Retrieved from <https://www.rulit.me/books/sbornik-letopisej-tom-i-kn-1-download-423326.html>
- Sakaeva, L. R. (2009). *Comparative Analysis of Phraseological Units of Anthropocentric Orientation: On the Material of Russian, English, Tajik and Tatar Languages* (Doctoral dissertation, Bashkir State University). Retrieved from <https://dspace.kpfu.ru/xmlui/handle/net/38658>
- Salmin, A. K. (2011). Dogs in the traditional worldview of the chuvash people. *Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia*, 39(1), 124-128. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aear.2011.06.016>
- Sapir, E. (1993). *Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies*. Moscow: Progress. Retrieved from https://platon.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/filosofija_jazyka/sepir_eh_izbrannye_trudy_po_jazykozna_niju_i_kulturologii/32-1-0-146
- Tenishev, E. R. (2001). *Comparative Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages. Vocabulary* (2nd ed.). Moscow: Nauka. Retrieved from https://altaica.ru/LIBRARY/turks/SIGTYA_Leksika.pdf
- Trubachev, O. N. (1960). *The Origin of the Names of Domestic Animals in Slavic Languages*. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences.
- Urayimova, B. M. K. (2022). Linguoculturology as a Discipline of Language and Culture. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 3(4), 802-806. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24412/2181-1385-2022-4-802-806>
- Walter, E. (1998). *Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/cambridge-international-dictionary-of-idioms/page/n2/mode/1up>
- Whorf, B. L. (1960). *The Relationship of Behavioral Norms and Thinking to Language*. Russian Philological Portal. Retrieved from <http://www.philology.ru/linguistics1/whorf-60.htm>
- Yoriyevna, U. N. (2023). Relationships Between Humans and Animals. *Confrencea*, 8(1), 123-126. Retrieved from <https://confrencea.org/index.php/confrenceas/article/view/909>
- Yravedra, J., Herranz-Rodrigo, D., Mendoza, C., Aragón-Poza, P., & Courtenay, L. A. (2021). The use of tooth marks for new research into identifying and understanding the first domestic dogs in Palaeolithic populations. *Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports*, 40, 103252. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2021.103252>
- Zhanuzakov, T. (1971). *History of Kazakh Names*. Almaty: Science. Retrieved from <https://kazneb.kz/kk/catalogue/view/94318>