

ARTICLE

Cultural-Connotative Meaning in the Semantic Structure of Words in Different Languages, Its Types and Methods of Representation

Aiman Nurgazina¹ , Yevgeniya Zhuravleva¹ , Bauyrzhan Yessimseitov² , Yrusgul` Shakaman³ ,
Zamira Nurzhanova¹ , Ainur Karipzhanova^{4*} 

¹ Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana 101302, Kazakhstan

² Faculty of Philology, NAO National Scientific and Practical Center “Til-Qazyna” Named after Sh. Shayakhmetov, Astana 010000, Kazakhstan

³ Faculty of Philology, A. Margulan Pavlodar Pedagogical University, Pavlodar 140000, Kazakhstan

⁴ Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Toraigyrov University, Pavlodar 140008, Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the analysis of cultural-connotative meanings and senses of words in different languages, considered as cultural information revealed in the course of interpretation. The aim of this article is to identify the cultural meanings contained in the word “blue,” to conduct a directed associative experiment (both chain and thematic types), and to describe and classify the types of cultural associations as well as the modes of representation of cultural meanings. The research design reflects the author’s intention to give an overview of the cultural connotations of the concept, to experimentally verify the divergence of cultural associations among speakers of different languages, to perform a multi-layered analysis of the concept “blue” across various cultures, and to relate the cultural understanding of this concept to evaluative categorization. As a result of the analysis (associative experiment, interpretation of cognitive-semantic analysis, evaluative categorization), the features of cultural-connotative meaning were identified: differences in cultural associates elicited by stimulus words in different languages; inadequacy of cultural senses and connotative meanings. Types of cultural associations and their paradigmatic and thematic relations are considered. Ways of representing such meanings in

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Ainur Karipzhanova, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Toraigyrov University, Pavlodar 140008, Kazakhstan; Email: v-taisova@mail.ru

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 4 September 2025 | Revised: 4 November 2025 | Accepted: 13 November 2025 | Published Online: 31 December 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i12.11948>

CITATION

Nurgazina, A., Zhuravleva, Y., Yessimseitov, B., et al., 2025. Cultural-Connotative Meaning in the Semantic Structure of Words in Different Languages, Its Types and Methods of Representation. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(12): 1984–1996. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i12.11948>

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/>).

knowledge formats are examined. The novelty of the study lies in establishing the commonality of the cumulative functions of cultural connotations in different ethnic societies, their national-cultural differences, and in identifying inadequate cultural senses of the same lexemes and concepts that are significant in one culture but have no significance in another.

Keywords: Cultural-Connotative Meaning; Cultural Senses; Cultural Interpretation; Associative Experiment; Conceptualization; Categorization

1. Introduction

The relevance of the study is due to the fact that, to this day, the interpretation of the essence of the connotative components of meaning, their types, their place in the semantic structure, and the cultural senses in national cultures remains a problematic issue in the development of the theory of word meaning. The problem of the connotativity of linguistic units, as a property determined by the specificity of ethnamental activity and the socialization of the linguistic personality within the “ethnosphere,” is of interest in terms of determining the linguistic status of connotation and its typology within the semantic space of the language. The need to study connotative meaning in the semantic structure of a word is associated, first, with the fact that, until now, attention in the semantic structure of a word has been focused on its direct and figurative meanings. Meanwhile, the question of identifying the primary and additional meanings of a word remained open for a long time, until within the framework of a new science—cognitive semantics—the task was set to study the meaning of a word in the aspect of language and speech. Within this scientific field, a broader approach was applied based on the cognitive principle, incorporating cognitive, anthropocentric, and functional approaches. The cognitive principle is aimed at the functional interpretation of linguistic units, in particular, the meanings of words in the aspect of cognitive changes. In this context, the study of connotation from a cognitive perspective is based on its understanding as “a phenomenon of cognitive order”^[1]. Connotation, interpreted as the evaluative component of linguistic units, is examined with regard to “the extralinguistic features of the speech situation, the emotional state of the subject, the sphere of communication, and the system of values shared by the speakers”^[2]. Burukina notes that “in the cognitive aspect, connotation manifests itself at the levels of the word, text, and discourse, both in the individual and in the collective consciousness of the ethnos”^[3]. An analysis of connotation

within an individual speaker’s consciousness demonstrates that the subject expresses their attitude toward the object of thought through linguistic means. The study of connotation in the individual consciousness of a native speaker reveals that the subject not only reflects but also actively constructs their attitude toward the object of thought by means of language, thereby confirming the cognitive nature of connotative meanings. It arises in the course of the speaker’s semantic activity as a result of the following actions: (1) selecting certain lexical units through the process of selection; (2) gathering historical and cultural facts that provide information about the lexical and cultural background of the selected units; (3) carrying out the actual selective activity by expressing a particular attitude (positive or negative) and a particular evaluation of the object of thought^[4].

In the psycholinguistic aspect, connotation is viewed as the subjective, evaluative part of a word’s meaning—a psychological meaning that contributes to the generation of personal sense, manifested through the emotional coloring and evaluation of a particular object^[5]. The psycholinguistic approach to the study of connotation is also associated with the concept of the associative and emotional organization of speech. In linguistics, connotation is regarded as an additional part of lexical meaning. Borisova, in this regard, points out two key properties of connotation as part of a lexeme’s meaning. First, it is variability—both in the degree of manifestation (cf. differences in the intensity of emotional coloring) and in specific aspects of content. Second, it is the evident connection with that sphere of mental activity which is not fully reflected in the fixed linguistic meaning of a word, a meaning that receives a rational interpretation, emotional experiences, and subjective perceptions associated with evaluation and forming the content of associations. This does not preclude the possibility that the same elements may also be conceptualized in the rational, denotative part of a word’s meaning^[6].

The linguoculturological aspect of studying connota-

tion focuses on the core concept of this field—“cultural connotation,” understood as the interpretation of the denotative or figuratively motivated aspects of the meaning of a linguistic sign in terms of culture. Farkhutdinova and Kieu understand cultural connotation as the ability of a word’s meaning to reveal, in the process of interpretation, the cultural senses of the word determined by the nature of the texts in which linguistic units are realized, the situation of their use, the personalities of the communicants, their communicative goals, as well as the degree of their familiarity with the cultural background and their background knowledge^[7].

It should be noted that, among all the analyzed aspects of studying connotation, the linguoculturological approach to this problem appears to be the least explored. Despite the numerous studies devoted to examining cultural connotation, it still remains unclear whether it differs from cultural and pragmatic meanings in the semantic structure of a polysemous word, whether it conveys only cultural information in the course of expressing connotative meaning, and how connotation is related to the cultural sense of connotative meaning. This is particularly significant when considering Sapir’s idea that “language is a symbolic guide to the understanding of culture”^[8]. In this regard, the aim of our study is to examine the problem related to cultural connotation as the cultural meaning of a word, which also conveys cultural senses in the process of subjective speech-and-thought cognitive activity of individuals representing different cultures. To achieve the stated aim, the following tasks must be addressed: (1) to examine the main areas of the linguoculturological approach that study cultural communication; (2) to conduct an associative experiment and study the cultural associations of representatives of different cultures; (3) to carry out a survey in polyethnic student groups to identify the cultural senses of words in various national cultures; (4) to apply the contrastive-comparative method to reveal differences in cultural senses across different cultures.

2. Literature Review

In the study of cultural connotation within the linguoculturological aspect, several approaches have emerged:

- 1) The framework that considers cultural connotation within the semantic structure of words and phraseological units (in their meaning), where cultural information

is identified and regarded as ethically marked cultural senses as well as cultural connotation. Farkhutdinova and Kieu believe that cultural information is embedded in linguistic units and various texts, enabling the formation, transmission, and realization of the linguistic view of the world, which reflects both the unique and the universal in the worldview of the people who are native speakers of the language and their perception of their place in it^[7].

- 2) The approach that focuses on the basic characteristics of cultural connotations, such as cultural bearing and cultural interpretability. No particular emphasis is placed on the cultural nature of linguistic signs across different languages in this article. Yet, it is precisely the culture-bearing capacity and cultural interpretability of such signs that facilitate the understanding of their cultural meaning.

Cultural interpretability involves interpreting the meaning and sense of cultural connotation in accordance with the cultural and linguistic competence of the speakers of particular linguistic signs, along with their knowledge of the “language of culture” as a link between the meaning of linguistic units of a natural language and the concepts of culture (symbols, rituals, mythologemes, standards, stereotypical representations, etc.)^[5].

- 3) Representative of the cognitive—linguoculturological strand, Chanysheva, notes that the procedure for interpreting cultural connotations would be successful if approached from the perspective of their content in relation to the codes of culture^[9]. By cultural codes, Maslova and Pimenov understand “a set of methods of social practice specific to each culture, a set of values and rules of the game of collective existence, a developed system of normative and evaluative criteria through which people comprehend the world”^[10].
- 4) Kislitsyna, a representative of the linguo-cognitive approach draws attention to the ways in which cultural meanings are mentally represented (through concepts and evaluative categorization), arguing that the concept, as a fundamental notion of cognitive linguistics, can reflect not only the categorical and value-related characteristics of certain fragments of reality, but also manifest features that are functionally significant for the corresponding culture^[11]. Kislitsyna also asserts

that, in addition to concepts which, when their mental content is objectified, represent not only connotative-cultural meanings but also the cultural senses of a word, there is another key notion essential for understanding connotation—namely, the process of categorization. The necessity of examining connotation in relation to categorization is grounded in the symbiosis between connotative meaning and the category of “evaluation”^[11].

- 5) This approach—ethnoculturological and linguoculturological, is associated with the study of the types of connotation. One of the types of cultural connotation is ethnoconnotation. Bykova defines ethnoconnotation as a type of cultural connotation, which constitutes a special form of presenting the heterochronicity and heterofunctionality of the units of a person’s lexicon. The researcher argues that the structure of ethnoconnotation includes an ethnocultural component (EC), “which encompasses an imagery element marked by inherent features—specifiers of a cultural-historical nature (locus/tempus); an ethnomotive (EM); as well as features associated with its functioning (sociolect) within a specific linguistic community and in a particular sphere of use (funlect)”^[12].

Chanysheva and Bykova, in examining types of connotations distinguished by ethnocultural meaning, do not provide an account of the methods by which such connotations can be identified through cultural codes. They study ethnocultural connotation as a linguo-cognitive and ethnocultural manifestation of deep extra-linguistic content that encodes value-laden cultural meanings associated with the specific ways in which a people perceive, conceptualize, and accumulate cultural experience^[9,12].

The cultural-cognitive-semantic approach implemented in our study allows us to consider cultural connotation in the aspect of language and speech, according to the principle of conceptual unity of language and speech, which implies interpretation as a single object of analysis. This is explained by the dependence of language on the objective world, thought processes and speech use in their unity and interrelation^[13].

The cultural-connotative meaning of a polysemantic word can function as a macrocomponent manifested at both the linguistic and the speech level. At the linguistic level,

the cultural-connotative meaning of a word expresses values marked from the perspective of ethical affiliation, whereas in the course of the subject’s speech-thinking activity, emotionally evaluative meanings arise that convey personal sense. The cultural-connotative meanings of a word and its culturally shaped personal senses, identified through cross-cultural comparison, are examined as interrelated phenomena in accordance with the principles of multifactoriality and the conceptual unity of language and speech^[14]. Such personal meanings are connected with the categories of significance and value. According to Gusserl, meaning is an actual value, the significance of an object for a subject^[15]. It follows that meanings are functional: an object, an act, an action, a statement acquire meaning within the framework of a life situation, a person’s life activity. Value and significance underlie the definition of meaning; by evaluating a particular thing, by showing a significant attitude towards it, a subject expresses his/her evaluation, emotion, value attitude. Since values in different societies are not equivalent and hold varying degrees of significance for the individual, one can speak of cultural meanings. Cultural connotation, as the embodiment of culture in a linguistic sign (meaning), and cultural sense (in speech) are interrelated, as they exist both within the antinomy of “language/speech” and simultaneously demonstrate their unity. The meaning of a linguistic sign and the senses it expresses in the subject’s speech activity form a unity that reflects the nature of a person’s knowledge about the world, which is not fixed.

3. Methodology

The methodological framework of the study is grounded in the fundamental provisions (concerning the dynamic and ontological nature of conceptualization, which makes it possible to view conceptualization both as a process and as a result of the cognitive processing of information by an individual)^[16] and in the principles of cognitive semantics, namely the principles of anthropocentrism, interdisciplinarity, and the conceptual unity of language and speech^[17]. In the course of the study, a range of methods was employed, including empirical (associative experiment) and theoretical (conceptualization) approaches, categorization, metaphorical modeling, and ethnolinguosemiotic analysis of the empirical material aimed at examining the interpretability

of cultural and ethnocultural meanings by various cognitive structures and their fixation in the process of nomination within cultural codes^[6]. Additionally, interpretative analysis was applied, involving both linguistic and cultural interpretation of fragments of the linguistic worldview of different peoples; conceptualization, characterized as a cognitively powerful operation whose essence lies in interpreting incoming information and forming concepts; evaluative categorization, defined as “the interpretation of acquired knowledge, secondary conceptualization, and secondary categorization within an alternative frame of reference—a system of opinions, evaluations, values, and stereotypes carried out by an individual”^[18]. The material for the article also included associative words drawn from the *Educational Dictionary of the Russian Language* (2017), from which 200 linguistic units bearing cultural meanings were selected.

The use of associative experiments is driven by the need to identify cultural associations in the linguistic consciousness of speakers of different languages and cultures. For the associative experiment, 100 respondents were selected—students majoring in translation at a university. Among the participants were 65 female and 35 male students, aged between 20 and 25.

According to Gorina, the associative experiment is the most effective “well-developed experimental method for studying the structure of linguistic consciousness.” It allows for the reconstruction of various connections between linguistic units in the mind and helps to identify the nature of their interaction in different processes of understanding, storing, and producing speech works^[19].

4. Results and Discussion

To identify national and cultural associations using a directed chain associative experiment both implicit and explicit methods were employed. For the purposes of this experiment, a program was developed comprising 80 stimulus words, which were distributed across four questionnaires in a random order. The informants were instructed to read the stimulus words and respond with the first associative word that came to mind. The informants represented different cultural backgrounds, including students of a university translation program, as well as individuals of Kazakh and Russian nationality who possessed a good command of En-

glish and other languages. The directed-chain associative experiment imposes specific (semantic) constraints on the selection of responses. Respondents were instructed to provide, in response to the stimulus words, exclusively cultural associations. Furthermore, the participants were encouraged to produce multiple responses to each stimulus word. They were asked to first provide cultural (verbal) associations, followed by their synonyms and antonyms (paradigmatic associative pairs), and subsequently thematic associations (related to the respondent’s cultural experience). Thematic relations include culturally specific associations that reflect universal concepts but which, in different languages, possess varying significance, expressed in differences in frequency as well as in the presence of nationally distinctive connotations^[20]. **Table 1** is a sample questionnaire containing stimulus words. It contains ten stimulus words, for which the respondents, in the course of the cultural associative experiment, were required to provide reaction words in the following sequence: 1) stimulus word–reaction (providing a cultural associate); 2) with the connotative-cultural meaning of the stimulus word in different languages (Kazakh, Russian, and English).

Cultural associations can also be revealed using a directed chain experiment, when subjects respond to a stimulus word with several associations at once. For example, such associations can be considered in the process of paradigmatic (synonyms, antonyms) and syntagmatic (phraseologisms), thematic, related to the speech experience of the subject and the consolidation of situational, objective and other subject non-logical connections (see **Table 2**).

In thematic relations, cultural associations enter on the basis of associations based on contiguity. If cultural associations enter into paradigmatic relations on the basis of similarities and differences of meanings, then they enter into thematic relations on the basis of syntagmatic associations, which are built on the basis of the joint use of words in one syntagmatic row. According to Borisova, thematic associations that arise when conducting an associative experiment are pragmatic, they are directly related to the verbal experience of the subject, therefore, such reactions are the most psychologically oriented^[21].

Table 3 presents cultural associations that are in thematic relations.

According to the method of association, we distinguish

such types of cultural associations as direct, indirect and complex. In direct associations, the stimulus and the reaction to it are directly related, because the reaction of the native language is an interpretation or characterization of the stimulus. Mediated cultural associations belong to the type

of associations when the stimulus and the reaction to it are connected either directly or through an intermediate representation. Complex cultural associations also include those that cannot be attributed to one and the same type, compared to the type of cultural associations in **Table 4**.

Table 1. Cultural associations for stimulus words provided in the course of the directed associative experiment.

Questions	Stimulus Words	Cultural Connotation-Associates			Evaluation of the Experiment	
		Kaz.	Rus.	Engl.	Positive	Negative
Which cultural associations can you provide for the stimulus words?	house	<i>Päter</i> (apartment), <i>Kiiz üi</i> (a yurt, portable home)	<i>Kvartira</i> (apartment); <i>Terem</i> (a tower or mansion in folklore); <i>Izba</i> (traditional wooden house); <i>Lachuga</i> (a shack, hovel)	Cottage	+	
	geese	<i>Qonyr qaz</i> (lit.: brown goose)	<i>“Ekij gus”</i> (archaic: “what a goose!”—silly); <i>“Vazhnyj gus”</i> (important goose—a self-important person); <i>“Kak s gusja voda”</i> (like water off a goose’s back—indifferent to criticism)		+	
	ram	<i>Qara qoj</i> (black sheep; a sacrificial animal in tradition)	<i>“Kak baran na novye vorota”</i> (like a ram staring at a new gate—to look blankly or incomprehendingly)		+	
	horse	<i>Tülpar</i> (a winged steed in epic legends); <i>Säjgülik</i> (a beloved horse); <i>Tıraq</i> (hoof, holds sacral meaning)	<i>Skakun</i> (steed); <i>Kljacha</i> (a nag, old worn-out horse—derogatory)		+	–
	rat	<i>Egejqūiryq</i> (literal: rat-tailed)	<i>Nichtozhnyj chelovek</i> (a despicable person)			–
	pig	<i>Shoshqa</i> (a symbol of dirt and gluttony)	<i>“Podlozhit’ svin’ju”</i> (to play a dirty trick on someone)			–
	dog	A symbol of loyalty; <i>“It ölgen jer”</i> (lit.: the place where a dog died – an idiom for a place of ingratitude or no return)	A symbol of devotion, intelligence; <i>“S’est’ sobaku”</i> (to know something inside out, lit: to have eaten a dog on it)		+	
	birch	A symbol of love	A symbol of innocence, purity, femininity; <i>“Boginja-Bereginja”</i> (Goddess-Bereginya)			
	lime	-	A symbol of poverty, spinsterhood, fraud; <i>“Obodrat’ kak lipku”</i> (to fleece someone, lit.: to strip [bark] like a lime tree); <i>“Lipovyj”</i> (fake, counterfeit)			
	oak	<i>Emen-ağash</i> (oak-tree: strong, resilient)	Strong, a symbol of longevity; stupid (<i>dub</i> —colloquial for a dull person)			

Note: “+” indicates predominantly positive cultural connotations; “–” indicates predominantly negative cultural connotations.

The systematization of the questionnaire results allows us to note that the cultural associations provided by the respondents in response to stimulus words reveal cultural associations that embody various national meanings in Kazakh, Russian, and English (**Table 1**). The directed chain associative experiment, in which the stimulus word elicited synonyms, antonyms, and phraseological units, made it possible

to represent a chain of cultural connotative associates within paradigmatic relations (synonyms and antonyms) and idioms entering into syntagmatic relations (**Tables 2 and 3**). Results were also obtained concerning the types of cultural associations (**Table 4**). The outcomes of the study include: (a) the analysis of phraseological units reflecting culturally marked meanings that bear cultural significance; (b) the identification

of factors that realize cultural meaning—living in different ecological niches, historical events, the specifics of economic activity, cultural stereotypes of various peoples (customs and rituals), non-equivalent markers, and descriptions of human appearance; (c) a layered analysis of the concept “blue” in different languages, including the examination of cultural associations with this word in various cultures; and an evaluative categorization of the concept “blue,” which revealed discrepancies in evaluation across cultures and clarified the evaluative categories of “good–bad” associated with the cultural associative categories of the word “blue.”

As can be seen, the results obtained in the course of the experimental comparative study have led us to the follow-

ing theoretical conclusions: the cultural and ethnocultural meanings of words in different languages contribute to identifying their national markedness. To reveal the cultural and ethnoconnotative meanings of words, it is necessary to employ linguocultural, linguo-cognitive, and psycholinguistic approaches, which make it possible to draw attention to the relativity of cultures, to differentiate the cultural components of words, and to apply cognitive methods such as conceptualization, categorization, and associative experimentation. The contribution of our research to linguocultural theory lies in expanding the boundaries of this approach by emphasizing the connection between culture and cognitive linguistics and by applying the methods developed within this field.

Table 2. Paradigmatic, syntagmatic and thematic relations of stimulus words in different languages (cultural associations).

Questions	Stimulus Words	Paradigmatic Relations		Syntagmatic Relations
		Synonyms	Antonyms	
Provide cultural associations with the stimulus word.	stupid	dunce cap; as stupid as a goose	smart/intelligent	<i>Glup kak sivyj merin</i> [Rus.] (lit.: stupid as a grey gelding); <i>Glup kak pen'</i> [Rus.] (lit.: stupid as a tree stump)
	good-natured	<i>Aldar Kose</i> [Kaz.] (a trickster hero in Kazakh folklore, often good-natured); kind; cordial		
	cruel	<i>Qara bauyr</i> [Kaz.] (lit.: black liver; hard-hearted); <i>Qara jürek</i> [Kaz.] (lit.: black heart); sadist; merciless	soft/gentle	<i>Volk v ovcej shkure</i> [Rus.] (a wolf in sheep's clothing)
	stingy		generous/charitable	
	cunning	<i>Lisa Patrikeevna</i> [Rus.] (a folkloric name for a fox, symbolizing cunning)		<i>Vokrug pal'ca obvedet</i> [Rus.] (lit.: [she/he] will lead [you] around a finger; meaning: to deceive someone easily)
	compe-tent	<i>Qolyna beri keledi</i> [Kaz.] (lit.: everything comes to his/her hand); <i>Master na vse ruki</i> [Rus.] (a jack of all trades); skillful [Eng.]		<i>Vsjo valitsja iz ruk</i> [Rus.] (lit.: everything falls out of [his/her] hands; meaning: to be clumsy); <i>Martynkin trud</i> [Rus.] (lit.: Martyshka's labor; meaning: futile effort, from a fable about a monkey)
	beautiful	<i>Sulu</i> [Kaz.]; <i>Ädemi</i> [Kaz.]; beautiful; pretty	ugly	
	arrogant	<i>Maqtanshaq</i> [Kaz.] (boastful); boastful; conceited		
	talkative	<i>Bejpil auyz</i> [Kaz.] (lit.: loose-tongued); <i>Köbik auyz</i> [Kaz.] (lit.: frothy-mouthed); verbose; loquacious		<i>Bejpil auyz, Köbik auyz</i> [Kaz.]; <i>Kak vody v rot nabral</i> [Rus.] (lit.: as if [he/she] filled [his/her] mouth with water; meaning: suddenly fell silent); <i>Rot na zamke</i> [Rus.] (lit.: mouth is locked; meaning: to keep a secret)
	rich		poor	<i>V sapozhkakh hodit</i> [Rus.] (lit.: to walk in little boots; meaning: to be rich/well-off)
	strict	<i>Qatal</i> [Kaz.] (harsh); responsible; disciplined		<i>Derzhat' v ezhyjovykh rukavicakh</i> [Rus.] (lit.: to hold in hedgehog gloves; meaning: to rule with an iron fist, to be very strict)

Table 3. Cultural associations entering into thematic relations across different cultures.

Correlation	Object	Cultural Domain	Kazakh	Russian	English
Correlation	Object—its location	Music	dombra	balalaika	guitar
Correlation	Object—Action	Gastronomy, Dish	beshbarmak (to eat, to drink)	pelmeni, bliny (to eat)	saddle of lamb, pudding (to eat)
Correlation	Object—Attributes	Clothing	shapan (velvet), saptama, etikteri	sarafan (brocade), safyanovyye sapogi	tweed suit, leather shoes
Correlation	Object—Cause-Effect	Holidays, Rituals	toi (feast)	svadba (wedding)	wedding
Correlation	Object—Cause-Effect	Guest, Hospitality	abundant treats	abundant table	drinks (tea, coffee)

Table 4. Type of cultural associations.

Types of Cultural Association	Types of Cultural Associations in Different Cultures		
	Kazakh	Russian	English
Direct word-stimuli <i>Конь</i>	<i>baiga, qyz quu, qymyz, soğym, salburyn</i>	<i>sani</i> (sleigh), <i>kareta</i> (carriage), <i>vozok</i> (cart), <i>gruz</i> (cargo), <i>plug</i> (plough)	horse racing, hippodrome, hunting, betting
<i>game</i>	<i>togyz qumalaq</i> (traditional board game)	<i>salki</i> (tag), <i>khorovod</i> (circle dance), <i>zhmyrki</i> (blind man’s bluff)	Halloween, ping-pong, croquet, golf
Mediated <i>Name</i>	<i>Aldar</i> (male name), <i>Aldar-Kose</i> Generous/charitabletrickster hero of Kazakh folktales, <i>Toqtar Aubäkirov</i> Generous/charitablecosmonaut, national hero	<i>Ilya</i> (male name), <i>Ilya Muromets</i> Generous/charitableepic bogatyr hero, <i>Ivan</i> (male name), protagonist of Russian fairy tales	<i>Salty Joe</i> : Generous/charitablecomputer game character, <i>John Bull</i> : Generous/charitablenational personification of England
Complex, polysemic <i>mineral resource</i>	<i>Jez</i> (copper), <i>mys</i> (ore, metal), <i>Jezqazağan</i> (city name), <i>dütovoi instrument</i> (wind instrument, e.g., copper horn)	<i>Samovar</i> (traditional copper tea urn), <i>mednye trubyy</i> (copper pipes), <i>Mednaya Gora</i> (folklore “Copper Mountain”), <i>mednaya ruda</i> (copper ore), <i>kresty</i> (copper crosses), <i>ikony</i> (copper icons)	Copper, brassware, copperware, copper carpets, pottery

There are two ways of identifying national-cultural associations: explicit and implicit. When using the explicit method, cultural associations are revealed as certain mental formations based on the connection of two phenomena, representations, objects, which correspond or do not correspond to their linguistic representations, for example, phraseology in different languages. Thus, phraseological units of different languages have national-cultural semantics, because in their base there are replicas, and such idioms reflect the national mentality. Teliya distinguishes two types of such culturally marked units: units in which culturally significant information is embodied in the denotative aspect of the meaning of a word (words denoting the realities of material culture or concepts of spiritual and social culture) and units in which culturally significant information is expressed in the connotative aspect of meaning (figuratively motivated base of phraseological units)^[22]. Mikhailova points to the following causes of phraseological differences: 1) inadequacy of geographic conditions; 2) residence of nations, differences in the historical development of each country; 3) differences in religious beliefs; 4) dissimilarity of cultural experience and

customs; differences in values and ways of thinking^[23].

Let us examine the culturally connotative meanings of Kazakh, Russian, and English phraseological units whose figurative meanings are determined by: habitation in different ecological niches and specific natural conditions. For instance, the Kazakh people have historically inhabited a vast, arid steppe where climatic conditions permitted only animal husbandry and a nomadic lifestyle. Consequently, the phraseologisms of this people reflect images of animals (both domestic and wild), plants, and elements specific to the steppe’s flora and fauna, compare: *alty qyrdyñ astynda* (lit.: *under six ridges*) meaning “far away”, *atqa miñer* (lit.: *one who mounts a horse*) “young man, a lad”, *at miñgizip, toñ kigizdi* (lit.: *gave him a horse to ride and a fur coat to wear*) “offered a warm, hospitable reception”, *qasqyrdaı antalady* (lit.: *like a wolf lunging*) a “sudden attack”, *qasqyr jürekti* (lit.: *wolf-hearted*) “brave, fearless”, *tüie qomynda jürrip* (lit.: *walking in a camel’s footprint*) “under any conditions, no matter the circumstances.” Realia associated with animal husbandry also carry culturally marked meanings within idioms: *qymyz muryndy, qurt zhegen quba söñkel sekildi* (*bent*

over from grief or worry). The Russian population historically resided in the forest-steppe zone, adjacent to dense pine forests and woodlands, and primarily engaged in agriculture. The realia of a sedentary lifestyle are also reflected in the phraseological units of this people: *dremuchiy (temnyy) les* (a dense dark forest) (“something unclear”), *za derev’yami ne videt’ lesa* (unable to see the forest for the trees) (“to miss the main point”), *volkov boyat’sya—v les ne khodit’* (if you are afraid of wolves, do not go into the forest), *ne v svoi sani ne lezt’* (do not get into someone else’s sleigh), *slovo griby posle dozhdya* (like mushrooms after rain), *v kapustu porubit’* (to chop into cabbage), *berëzovaya kasha* (birch porridge), *trishkin kaftan* (Trishka’s caftan).

The living conditions of the English are different, as Great Britain is an island nation with extensive coastlines along the sea. 1) The primary occupations of the English have historically been shipping and fishing, which is why the English language contains many idioms that include realities associated with the sea, seafaring, and fishing: *teach a fish to swim, like a fish out of water, to be (all) at sea, to put to sea, a high heavy sea, a sea struck, all is fish that comes to his net, to have other fish to fry, a cold fish*; 2) Historical events reflected in idioms across different societies and their semantic incongruity: *eñsesi buk boz orda, Esimxannyñ eski joly qara qazan bai, shapka Monomakha, Shemyakin sud, Kazanskaya sirota, Mamaevo poboishche; to push the boat, to fall on smb’s sword, as swell be hanged for a sheep as a lamb, in a month of Sundays, William Rufus*; 3) Phraseological units reflecting the religious beliefs of peoples: *Qadyr tüni* (Night of Destiny/Power in Islam), *Patǵambardyñ jol yñdamyz* (We are on the path of the Prophet), *Allaǵa jalbarynyp raqymyn tiledi* (Begging Allah for mercy), *Táñir jazǵyrady* (Tengri wills it / Divine decree), *Khristianskaya dusha* (Christian soul *Bozhya blagodat* (God’s grace), *Iisus voskres* (Jesus is risen), *God gives every bird its food, but they must fly for it, God helps those who help themselves; Wars of the Roses*. 4) Phraseological units reflecting the customs and rituals of peoples possess national specificity: *bata oqyr* (to recite a blessing), *bauyzdau quda* (to formalize a marriage alliance), *besikke salu* (to place in the cradle), *sündetke otyrghyzu* (to perform circumcision), *Verbnoe voskresene* (Palm Sunday in Orthodox tradition), *ne zhit’e, a Maslenitsa* (not life, but Maslenitsa), *Paskhal’nyy den’* (Easter day), *otmechat’ krestiny* (to celebrate a christening), *bit’vo vse kolokola* (to

sound all bells), *Morris dancing, Halloween, Bonfire Night, fireworks, Eisteddfod, Five o clock tea, oat meal porridge in the morning, jockeys’ races at the racetrack; the day of the moon*; 5) Have the peculiarities of describing a person’s appearance through phraseological comparisons: *bäishešek betti* (with a face like a flower), *baltyry besikte* (with cradles for calves), *bes biiniñ sabasyndai* (like the whip for five horses), *biik bätterek* (tall poplar tree), *kosaia sazhen v plechakh* (a diagonal fathom in the shoulders), *kolomenskaia versta* (Kolomna verst), *kak makov tsvet* (like a poppy flower), *kiseinaia baryshnia* (muslin young lady), *sobolinye brovi* (sable eyebrows), *a poker face, like a million dollars, as white as sheet, Tom Thumb, whiter than white*.

Representatives of cultural-connotative meaning and cultural sense also include concepts, as they express and objectify mental content as operational units of knowledge. Kislicyna argues that a concept has the “property of encompassing diverse extralinguistic information, which is one of the factors contributing to the formation of derivative connotative and non-connotative meanings in corresponding words”^[11]. Extralinguistic cultural information is contained in such a component of a concept as the cultural-mental constituent. It is this component that facilitates the realization and interpretation of cultural information, although other constituents of the concept (notional, figurative, emotional, evaluative, nominative) also contribute to the disclosure of the connotative meaning of a word. Thus, during the objectification of the mental content of a concept through linguistic units, both figurative and cultural-connotative meanings as well as cultural senses are verbalized. Let us examine how certain meanings and senses are objectified within the structure of the concept “blue”/“синий” *siniy* (lit.: blue). Within the notional constituent of the concept “blue”, the cultural meaning of the denotative reality manifests itself in the incongruity of perceiving universal concepts under different environmental conditions and in the non-coinciding names for these concepts: in the Kazakh language, the color blue and its shades are perceived as *көк kök* (lit.: blue) and *көгілдір kögildir* (lit.: blue), while shades of the concept *жасыл jasyl* (lit.: green) can shift towards the blue spectrum: *көк шай kok shai* (lit.: green tea). In the Russian language, “синий” *siniy* (lit.: blue) has shades such as “голубой” *goluboi* (lit.: light blue), “лазуревой” *lazurevoj* (lit.: azure), “сизый” *sizyj* (lit.: bluish-grey), “сивый” *sivyy* (lit.: grey,

of hair), “иссиня-черный” *issinja-chernyj* (lit.: blue-black), among others. In the English language, the color “blue” is perceived as encompassing both “blue” (dark/navy blue) and “light blue”, cf. blueberry, blue heaven, as well as true blue, navy blue.

The figurative constituent of the concept “blue” is described by us through metaphorical and metonymic analysis. In the course of this analysis, emphasis is placed on the transfer of concepts from one domain to another. In this case, a figurative meaning of the word arises. In the Kazakh word “көк” *kök* (lit.: blue), when transferring by similarity of form or function, the following figurative meanings appear: көйлек көк *köilek kök* (lit.: a blue dress) a simple, everyday dress, тамақ тоқ *tamaq toq* (lit.: full stomach) rich, көк жамбас *kök zhambas* (lit.: blue hip) thin, scrawny, көк жиек көтерілді *kök zhiiek köterildi* (lit.: the blue edge has risen)—dawn has broken, көк күмбез *kök kümbez* (lit.: blue dome), көк өрім *kök örim* (lit.: blue shoot), көк сақал *kök saqal* (lit.: blue beard) old. In the Russian language, the word “синий” *siniy* (lit.: blue) has the following figurative meanings: “синие штаны” (*siniye shtany*—blue trousers) referred to gendarmes; “синий чулок” (*siniy chulok*—lit.: blue stocking) describes a dry, unattractive woman; “синенькая” (*sinen'kaya*—lit.: little blue one) was a colloquial term for a five-ruble banknote from the Tsar era; “синенькие” (*sinen'kie*—lit.: little blue ones) denotes eggplants. In English, figurative meanings of the word are also formed through metaphorical and metonymic transfers, such as the expression “(to be) between the devil and the deep blue sea”, and “blue-eyed boy” referring to a favorite.

As Wierzbicka observes, “the meanings of words in different languages do not coincide (even if they are, for lack of a better option, artificially matched to one another in dictionaries); they reflect and convey a way of life and a mode of thinking characteristic of a given society (or linguistic community) and constitute invaluable keys to the understanding of culture”^[24].

The cultural-mental constituent provides an understanding of the extralinguistic factors that determine the cultural-connotative meanings of a word, as well as the associative representations linked to the same concept across different languages. In the Kazakh language, the color of the sky, “көк”, is associated with: the God Tengri (Тáñри), who is referred to as “Көк”. “Көк” can be benevolent, bestowing

well-being (*Kök zharýlqasyn!*—May Heaven bless you!), or punishing (*Kök soqsyn!*—May Heaven strike you!; *kök soqqan*—heaven-struck; *kök káriese ushyra*—to face Heaven’s wrath); with the sky: *kökke atyldy* (shot into the sky/vanished without a trace), *kökke zhetti* (reached the sky/achieved the highest level), *kökke köterdi* (raised to the sky/extolled highly), *kökten tústi* (fell from the sky/appeared unexpectedly). Alongside positive cultural associations, the color blue also carries negative connotations in Kazakh: *kök zhasýq* (lean meat, lit.: blue/green meat), *kök tiñ* (a kopeck, a trivial amount of money; lit. blue/green coin). In the Russian language, this color is also associated with negative connotations: *gori vse sinim plamenem* (may it all burn with a blue flame—expressing extreme frustration or a wish for complete destruction), as well as positive connotations-associations: *sine more* (the blue sea), *sin'kamen'* (a blue stone possessing magical power), *sinyaya ptitsa* (the blue bird—a symbol of happiness and luck), *golubaya mechta* (an azure dream—a cherished, ideal dream). In the English language, the color blue is also associated with both positive and negative associations. Positive associations are primarily linked to the sky: *to be over the moon* (to be overjoyed), *to be in the seventh heaven* (to be in a state of bliss), *to laud (exalt) to the skies* (to praise excessively), *in the open air* (outdoors); *under warmer skies* (in a warmer climate), *blue-sky thinking* (creative and visionary ideas), *to have the wrong sow by the ear* (to be mistaken, to misunderstand something fundamentally), *to find a mare’s nest*. Negative connotations and associations are linked to negative emotions: *blue devils* (melancholy, depression), *to feel blue* (to feel sad), *to be between the devil and the deep blue sea* (to be caught in a dilemma between two equally dangerous or undesirable alternatives).

The evaluative component of the concept “blue” contributes to the expression of pejorative meanings: Kazakh: *kök esek* (stubborn, lit. “blue donkey”), *kök mi* (foolish, lit.: “blue brain”), *kök malta* (a chatterbox, lit.: “blue axe”); Russian: *sinec* (an association with an evil spirit); English: *to drink till all’s blue* (to drink to excess), *blue devil* (a state of depression), *to drink till all’s blue* (to drink excessively). Within the nominative constituent of the concept “blue”, synonyms, antonyms, and phraseological units that convey the connotative meanings and senses of the concept are presented. Synonyms for the word “blue” include: Kazakh: *kögildir* (light blue, azure), *kök dala* (steppe, lit.:

“blue steppe”); Russian: *goluboy* (light blue), *lazurevyy* (azure), *sivyy* (greyish-blue, of hair or animal fur), *siniy* (dark blue); English: *true blue*, *navy blue*, *Indian blue*.

The cultural meanings of the concept “blue” are revealed only through comparison. For example, whereas the concept *kök* is associated with both positive and negative meanings-associations in Kazakh and English, in Russian the concepts *siniy* (dark blue) and *goluboy* (light blue) are in most cases associated with positive meanings.

The implementation of evaluative categorization of the concept “blue” in different languages facilitates the identification of the connotative-evaluative meaning embedded within it. It is precisely in the process of evaluative categorization that the subjective evaluative senses of this word are recognized. Let us examine the procedure for the evaluative categorization of the word “blue” in different languages, according to the methodology described by Abisheva et al.^[25], adapted for the evaluative categorization of the concept “blue”: 1) selection of the object: the concept “blue”

and its corresponding words and phraseological units; 2) selection of the subject: an individual as a member of society or society as a whole; 3) identification of a color-ethical feature based on the speaker’s evaluative attitude toward the object of their verbal-cognitive activity, expressed verbally in terms of “good” or “bad”; 4) determination of cognitive classification features that allow the concept “blue” to be assigned either to the class of words denoting color perception or to the class of “connotatively marked vocabulary possessing figurative meanings”^[26]. Identification of differential features of categories containing the word “blue,” enabling the distinction of the nature of subjective evaluation of this category across different languages; 5) correlation of words and phraseological units with a color component with the evaluative predicates “good-bad” as the basis for evaluation and as a component of the utterance expressing the essence of the ethical judgment; 6) identification and characterization of prototypes of the evaluative categories “good-bad”; 7) construction of categories, see **Table 5**.

Table 5. Evaluative categories “good-bad” in different languages.

Good	Bad
<p><i>Kaz.:</i> <i>kök zharylqasyn!</i> (<i>May Heaven bless you!</i>), <i>kökke zhetti</i> (<i>reached the sky; achieved the highest level</i>), <i>Rus.:</i> <i>siniya ptitsa</i> (<i>blue bird—symbol of happiness</i>), <i>sin’ kamnen’</i> (<i>blue stone – magical talisman</i>), <i>Eng.:</i> <i>to be overjoyed, to be in the seventh heaven, to laud exalt to the skill, once in a blue moon, blue and the Gray, till all is blue, once in a blue moon, out of the blue</i></p>	<p><i>Kaz.:</i> <i>Kök zhelkesine mindi</i> (<i>To have mounted the blue/sky’s neck, to become extremely arrogant</i>), <i>kök esek</i> (<i>blue/green donkey, a simpleton, a foolish or naive person</i>), <i>kök mi</i> (<i>blue/green brain, inexperienced, naive</i>), <i>kök malta</i> (<i>lit. blue/green axe, a chatterbox</i>), <i>Rus.:</i> <i>sinec</i> (<i>an association with an evil spirit</i>), <i>Eng.:</i> <i>to drink tile, all s blue, гори все синим пламенем, feeling blue, blue devils, between the devil and the deep blue sea, blue stock, blue fear, be in the blues, out of the blue, blue in the face</i></p>

The results of this categorization are reflected in the connotative meanings and senses of the word “blue” across different languages. A distinctive feature of this object of study is its ability to signify not only the results of color perception within a linguistic unit but also a specific moral situation or an action (deed) evaluated as “good” or “bad” depending on the nature of the act, whether it is condemned or approved. The concept “blue,” in its connotative meaning, can possess a set of axiologically relevant properties, whereby in one context it is evaluated positively and in another negatively. In this regard, the ethical-evaluative categories identified in the process of evaluative categorization are classified by us according to the “good-bad” evaluation.

5. Conclusions

The study aimed at identifying the cultural meanings of different languages belonging to various cultures has enabled us to summarize the results of the research: 1) the analysis of the semantic structure of nationally specific words has shown that these words differ both in their culturally connotative meanings and in their evaluative components, connotations, and cultural associations; 2) the cultural associations revealed among respondents who know several languages or are native speakers of different languages during the associative experiment with stimulus words differ (by 30%), both in the positive and negative associates produced and in the positive or pejorative evaluations expressed by the participants; 3)

it has been established that the associate words elicited by stimulus words in different cultures enter into paradigmatic relations based on semantic similarity (synonymy) as well as on semantic opposition (antonymy); 4) the verbal associates elicited by stimulus words in different languages may also enter into thematic syntagmatic relations according to the following correlations: object, its location; object-action; object and its attributes; cause and effect. Thematic associations are directly connected with the cultural experience of the subjects; 5) various types of associations were identified, including direct, mediated, and complex ones; 6) the causes of culturally connotative differences in phraseological units were revealed, and the factors underlying the inadequacy of their cultural meanings were described; 7) the conceptualization of the word “blue” and its evaluative categorization were carried out, with the corresponding evaluative categories identified. The study is limited to the framework of the linguocultural and cognitive approach. Further research is expected to focus on the study of ethnocultural meanings from a cultural-cognitive perspective.

Author Contributions

Writing—review and editing, A.N., Y.Z., and B.Y.; data curation, Y.S., Z.N., and A.K.; methodology, A.N., Y.Z.; data supervision, Z.N.; writing—original draft preparation, A.N. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

We confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Berestnev, G.I., 2008. Towards the philosophy of the word (linguocultural aspect). *Voprosy Yazykoznaniiya*. 1, 37–65. (in Russian)
- [2] Kazaryan, S.E., Grigoryan, A.E., 2023. Cognitive-connotative component in teaching a foreign language. *Pravo i Praktika*. 1, 110–113. (in Russian)
- [3] Burukina O.A., 2010. A study of connotation from the perspective of cognitive linguistics. *Voprosy Kognitivnoy Lingvistiki*. 3(24), 35–40. (in Russian)
- [4] Morris, C., 1938. *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*. Academic Project, Business Book: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [5] Matyushina, V.V., 2015. Psycholinguistic interpretation of the connotative aspect of word meaning. *Nauchnye Issledovaniya i Razrabotki: Sovremennaya Kommunikativistika*. 4(6), 20–25. (in Russian)
- [6] Borisova, E.G., 2023. Connotations: Part of Lexical Meaning in the Activity Model of Language. *Fundamental'naya Lingvistika*. 1(1), 31–43. (in Russian)
- [7] Farhutdinova, F.F., Kieu, A.V, 2023. Cultural information and cultural meanings in the semantics of words and phraseological units. *Vestnik Ivanovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta (Seriya: Gumanitarnye Nauki, Special'nyj Vypusk)*. 83–94. (in Russian)
- [8] Sapir, E., 1949. *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality*. University of California Press: Berkeley, CA, USA.
- [9] Chanysheva, Z.Z., 2019. Cultural connotation in meta-language linguocultural studies. *Vestnik Bashkirskogo Universiteta*. 24(1), 247–251. (in Russian)
- [10] Maslova, V.A., Pimenova, M.V., 2018. *Codes of Linguistic Culture: A Textbook*. Flinta & Nauka: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [11] Kislicyna, N.N., 2007. The Problematics of the Linguistic Worldview in Contemporary Polish Linguistics. *Kul'Tura Narodov Prigerkomor'ya*. 107, 28–31. (in Russian)
- [12] Bykova, O.I., 2001. A linguacultural approach to the study of ethnoconnotation. *Vestnik Voronezhskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta*. 2, 25–30. (in Russian)
- [13] Besedina, N.A., 2010. Methodological Aspects of Contemporary Cognitive Research in Linguistics. *Nauchnye Vedomosti (Seriya: Filosofiya, Sociologiya, Pravo)*. 20(14), 31–37. (in Russian)
- [14] Abisheva, K.M., Karimova, K.K., Nurgazina, A.B., et al., 2023. The structure of a polysemantic word in the cognitive-semantic aspect. *XLinguae: Scientific Language Journal*. 16(1), 17–36. DOI: 10.18355/XL.2023

- .16.01.02, Available from: http://xlinguae.eu/2023_16_1_2.html
- [15] Gusserl', E., 2009. Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy. Akademicheskij proekt: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [16] Dem'yankov, V.Z., 1996. Reprocessing. In: Kubryakova, E.S. (Ed.). A Brief Dictionary of Cognitive Terms. Faculty of Moscow State University: Moscow, Russia. pp. 63–64. (in Russian)
- [17] Boldyrev, N.N., 2012. Theoretical Aspects of Linguistic Categorization. *Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka*. 10, 17–120. (in Russian)
- [18] Boldyrev, N.N., 2002. Compositional semantics as a consequence of the evaluative categorization of the world. In *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Cognitive Linguistics*, Tambov, Russia, 18–20 September 2002; pp. 10–13. (in Russian)
- [19] Gorinova, N.S., 2009. Associative Experiment as a Method for Studying Linguistic Consciousness. *Al'manah sovremennoj nauki i obrazovaniya*. 8(27), 52–53. (in Russian)
- [20] Shevchenko, S.N., 2017. The problem of identifying cultural associations in the structure of an associative field (Using the example of stimuli-lexemes of minerals). *Vestnik MGLU, Gumanitarnye nauki*. 7(779), 133–142. Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/articl>
- e/n/problema-vydeleniya-kulturnyh-assotsiatsiy-v-strukture-assotsiativnogo-polya-na-primere-stimulov-1-eksem-poleznyh-iskopaemyh/viewer (in Russian)
- [21] Borisova, Y.A., 2019. Associative experiment in modern psycholinguistic research. *Psychology. Historical-Critical Reviews and Current Researches*. 8(1), 265–275. (in Russian)
- [22] Teliya, V.N., Oparina, E.O., 2011. Cultural connotation as a way of embodying culture in a linguistic sign. *Vestnik kul'turologii*. 1, 145–1148. Available from: <https://rucont.ru/efd/472129> (in Russian)
- [23] Mihajlova, A.V., 2022. Cultural connotation of Chinese and English phraseological units. *Vestnik SVFU*. 4(90), 98–107. (in Russian)
- [24] Wierzbicka, A., 1997. *Understanding Cultures through their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, Japanese*. Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA.
- [25] Abisheva, K., Shaharman, A., Nurgazina, A.B., 2023. Evaluative categorization of phraseological combinations expressing ethical concepts (cognitive-ethical and linguosynergetic aspects). *Vestnik Torajgyrov universiteta. Filologicheskaya seriya*. 4, 50–64. (in Russian)
- [26] Czyan, L.E., 2022. Connotatively Marked Lexicon and Its Role in the Development of Linguistic Personality. *mir nauki. Pedagogika i psihologiya*. 10(2). (in Russian)