

Gulbagira Ayupova ^{1,A}, Zhanar Jambayeva ^{1,B}, Zhannat Balmagambetova ^{2,C},
Zhansaya Zharylgapov ^{3,D}, Karakoz Tilesh ^{4,E},

¹Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan ²Department of Russian Language and Literature named after Professor G. A. Meiramova, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Republic of Kazakhstan ³Department of Kazakh Literature, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Republic of Kazakhstan ⁴Department of the Kazakh Language, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan
^Aayupovagulbagira@gmail.com, ^Bzhanarjambayeva@outlook.com, ^Cbalmagambetova1995@proton.me,
^Dz_zharylgapov@hotmail.com, ^Ekarakoztilesh5@proton.me

The Interlingual Equivalence and Cognitive Representation of the Ethnocultural Identity of Numerical Phraseological Units in the Kazakh and English Languages

Abstract

The global equivalence of speech and cultures plays a crucial role in typological linguistics and cross-cultural communication, forming the basis for studying numeral phraseological units from linguistic perspectives. This study analyses numeral idioms within Kazakh and English phraseological units, utilizing generalization, descriptive, and comparative methods. The findings highlight the distinct origins of concepts underlying Kazakh and English numerical phraseological words, leading to diverse classifications and perceptions. Both languages' phraseological units with numerical elements feature significant morphosyntactic fixation and semantic idiomaticity, conveying global meaning in context. The development of numeral phraseology within equivalence and identity is shaped by culture-dependent mental structures. The cultural fusion in Kazakh and English reflects open and pluralistic affiliations. Despite ethnic strengthening and identity assertion, Turkic languages experience "linguistic extinction," evident in limited usage of proverbs, expressions, and folk phraseological units. The study offers practical value for linguists, ethno-linguists, and related experts in various fields.

Keywords: structural correspondence; semantic losses; cultural affiliation; idioms; diversity

1 Introduction

With the development of diversification in the world, translation has become an important tool for communication between different cultures. It allows the narrowing of the differences between different cultures and renders the translated version equivalent to the original text or speech. Behind the two languages under study, English and Kazakh, lie two different cultures. The translation of idioms with numeral features should be based on the appropriate cultural background and start from two different ways of thinking. It is impossible to use a literal translation, as when translating vocabulary, but it is worth understanding the differences in the structure of the two languages, always paying attention to the characteristics of ways of thinking in different ethnic aspects. The concept of "equivalence" encompasses not only structural correspondence or semantic identity, but

also acknowledges the functional and relational components that are historical and dynamic in nature. It is essential to recognize that achieving the closest possible correspondence is important, while also considering the impact of the text on the reader and its stylistic elements. The communicative function of metaphorical idioms with numbers is complex, encompassing the style of the language, diatonic usage, situational contexts, and various subclasses of linguistic characteristics. Thus, the main objective is to identify the communicative function of numeral phraseological units as they appear in the original language, rather than opting for a literal interpretation, which may result in errors and semantic losses. I. K. Yerbulatova et al. (2019) have investigated the nuances of intercultural communication through numeral phraseological units in both Kazakh and English. Their study emphasizes how these units are not only linguistic expressions, but also vessels of cultural and historical significance. The authors highlight that numeral phraseological units reflect specific cultural beliefs and practices, revealing how they can differ markedly between cultures. They conclude that a deeper understanding of these expressions is crucial for effective intercultural communication, as they encapsulate unique aspects of the speakers' identities and worldviews. However, the authors acknowledge that their exploration of interlingual equivalence is limited, leaving room for further examination of how these units function across languages and cultures.

A. J. Liddicoat (2016) has delved into the intricacies of intercultural communication, focusing on the role of numeral phraseological units in shaping perceptions and interactions between speakers of different languages. Liddicoat argues that these units are pivotal in constructing meaning and expressing cultural identity, often carrying implications that may not be immediately apparent to non-native speakers. The study emphasizes the importance of context in understanding these expressions, suggesting that effective communication relies on the ability to navigate both the linguistic and cultural dimensions of numeral phraseology. While the author's work has contributed significantly to the understanding of intercultural communication, it similarly falls short of fully addressing the concepts of interlingual equivalence and cognitive representation, particularly in relation to ethnocultural identity.

The idiomatic structures of a language have always presented and continue to pose a difficult problem for both lexicographers and foreign language learners (Haladzhun et al., 2021). It is difficult to include them in dictionaries and to learn them without bordering on pedantry. It is important to emphasize that the study of numeral phraseology and attention to it in the Kazakh and English languages should not be perceived as merely accumulating structures. Phraseology should not be considered the picturesque side of speech; rather, it represents a living reality within the linguistic system. In the case of proverbs, it offers established formulas and lexical constructions that cannot be translated literally, as their meanings are not easily analyzable.

H. B. Bakirova's (2020) research further supports this perspective by highlighting that numeral phraseology plays a crucial role in reflecting cultural nuances and cognitive patterns within languages. She proposes alternative approaches that focus on the contextual and pragmatic aspects of phraseological units, arguing that understanding their usage requires a comprehensive analysis of cultural and situational factors. This approach underscores the importance of viewing phraseology as dynamic and integral to effective communication, rather than as a static collection of expressions.

Idiomatic phrases are also often used in both spoken and written language because they respond to the need to translate abstract concepts into images of everyday life, which is necessary for the economy of language systems. Idiomatic formulas are crystallized structures that represent broad concepts and allow the speaker to avoid long turns of words. After all, people almost always classify the world not according to categories of the mind, but through images (Liddicoat, 2016). Idiomatic formulas almost always refer to the world of figures, in which different types of metaphors correspond to turns of speech that lead from the abstract to the concrete. That is, abstract experiences are translated into concrete terms, humorous phrases, laudatory or offensive expressions, or phrases of "quasi-images" (Kalkeyeva et al., 2014). T. Ayazbay et al. (2021) have explored the numeral phraseological units in both Kazakh and English within the context

of foreign terminology and commonly used proverbs. Their study emphasizes the importance of these expressions as cultural artifacts that reflect the unique linguistic and historical contexts of both languages. The authors analyze how numeral phraseological units function in everyday communication and highlight their roles in expressing cultural values and societal norms. They also discuss the impact of foreign terminology on the evolution of these phrases, illustrating how globalization influences language use and phraseology in both Kazakh and English. However, despite the comprehensive examination of numeral phraseological units in relation to terminology and proverbs, the researchers have not sufficiently addressed the comparative elements of interlingual equivalence.

The search for the origin of speech turns and their interlingual equivalence involves a detailed study of each numerical lexical unit, essential for understanding folk etymology and semantic transformation. Idioms and set phrases should be viewed as semantic units, as their meanings cannot be easily analysed linguistically. When considering expressions as complex linguocultural units in Kazakh and English, it is crucial to account for the ethnic equivalent component, which facilitates the conveyance of the intended meaning. Equivalence in translation recognizes cultural relations as a symbiosis, in which language reflects the cultural system of a people without fully determining its characteristics. Furthermore, the translation of phraseological units with numerical components serves as an intermediary, enabling understanding and interaction between two distinct cultural languages. A. B. Ormanova and M. L. Anafinova (2022) have examined the mechanisms involved in the translation of numeral phraseological units between Kazakh and English within the context of intercultural communication. Their research delves into the strategies translators employ to convey the meanings of these idioms, emphasizing the importance of cultural context in ensuring effective communication. The authors provide insightful analysis on how numeral phraseological units can carry cultural connotations that are pivotal for maintaining the integrity of the original message during translation. However, their study does not sufficiently address the structural correspondences of these numerical idioms, which could elucidate their diversity and cultural affiliations. This oversight limits the understanding of how different languages adapt these units and the implications for intercultural dialogue.

J. House (2020), in a complementary study, has investigated the translation practices related to numeral phraseological units, focusing on their role in facilitating intercultural understanding. House highlights the challenges translators face when dealing with these expressions, particularly in capturing the nuanced meanings that may not have direct equivalents in the target language. While House's work provides valuable insights into translation strategies and their effectiveness, it similarly falls short in detailing the structural correspondences of numerical idioms. This lack of focus on the specific features that contribute to their diversity and cultural identity suggests the need for further research that explores these elements in greater depth.

The primary aim of this study is to explore the communicative functions of numeral phraseological units in both Kazakh and English, emphasizing their role as integral components of the linguistic system rather than mere collections of structures.

The objectives of the study are as follows:

- To investigate the impact of cultural and social dimensions on the translation of numeral phraseological units in Kazakh and English, focusing on interlingual equivalence and the potential loss of meaning.
- To analyze how numeral phraseological units contribute to preserving ethnocultural identity while examining the challenges they present for communication between different cultures.

2 Materials and Methods

To achieve the objectives of the study, the following methods were applied: generalization, descriptive, and comparative. The method of generalization at the stage of consideration of the general characteristics of interlingual equivalence made it possible to identify the basic principles

of the functioning of numeral phraseological units of the Kazakh and English languages within the framework of speech understanding. It helped to identify the general parameters and features of equivalence that accompany the process of translating established expressions, taking into account the lexicographic components of the linguistic phenomenon. Its elements led to the allocation of relevant conditions and factors that somehow affect the process of linguistic understanding and cultural identity, functioning in the context of structural correspondence. This method made it possible to establish patterns of the formation of semantic links between the numeral phraseological units of the Kazakh and English languages, which form the basis of cultural identity and belonging within a particular community. It helped to identify the main units of influence on translation activities, which include social, cultural and ethnic components, which are included in the aspects of the use and implementation of numeral phraseological units in everyday speech.

Using the descriptive method at the stage of studying the patterns of functioning of numeral phraseological units made it possible to single out the linguistic phenomena of the Kazakh and English languages, which include oral speech, written texts and other various structures. It helped to consider the discourse of idioms, describing them from the point of view of context and use in real situations that make up the linguistic picture of the world in the ethnocultural aspect, which transmits established phrases from generation to generation. Its elements led to the allocation of common characteristics and differences that form the environment in which the phraseological expression is used, demonstrating a certain semantic load and ethnocultural identity of speech. This method made it possible to emphasize the specific linguistic situations that may be encountered in the implementation of the translation activities of numeral phraseological units in Kazakh and English, given their different cultural connotations. It helped to establish semantic connections and losses between the ethnic and cultural mechanisms of expressions that form interlingual equivalence, which is taken into account in the correct translation of numeral idioms.

Using the comparative method at the stage of establishing patterns and hypotheses made it possible to identify similarities and differences between the linguistic features of numeral phraseological units in Kazakh and English, while emphasizing the representation of the ethnocultural identity of the language components. It helped to identify the main characteristics and elements of ethnocultural aspects that form the basis of interlingual equivalence and understanding in the framework of translation activities. Its elements led to the definition of the identity of peoples in the context of customs, traditions, world-views and cultural interdependencies, which must be taken into account in semantic reproduction in order to avoid contextual loss. This method made it possible to emphasize the linguistic components of numeral phraseological units that characterize social and cultural ties within a particular community, as well as to describe the semantic meanings of idioms presented in various communities. It helped to determine the diversity of the context, transmitted properties and functions of phraseological units with numerical components that hide the ideological and ethnocultural picture of the world in the stable expressions of the Kazakh and English languages.

3 Results

The essence of equivalence in translation is to achieve the closest possible correspondence to the original expression, rather than insisting on a complete alignment. This kind of naturalness refers not only to language, but also includes adaptation to culture and habits of thought (Shadmanov & Shadmanova, 2022). In other words, translation must first provide equivalence at the semantic level of the source language, focus on the transfer of information, and then consider this phenomenon at the formal level (Karimullina et al., 2019). Moreover, the translator's focus should lean towards achieving "equivalence" rather than insisting on "equality", prioritizing the effective reproduction of meaning over strict adherence to the original expression's sequence (Tukeshova et al., 2019). Moreover, the concept of "function" in the considered section perceives the translation of numeral phraseological units as a form of communication and focuses on the fact that naturalness, as well as

expressive and vivid semantic content in both Kazakh and English, should be important elements of a linguocultural nature. For instance, the Kazakh expression “*arkimnin bir oyy bar, oyynda myn koyy bar*” can illustrate how cultural nuances shape language, while the English equivalent “a wonder lasts but nine days” reflects a similar sentiment about the transient nature of wonder. This demonstrates how both expressions convey the idea that remarkable events or feelings are often short-lived, despite being rooted in different cultural contexts (Islom & Nuritdinov, 2023).

The main function of translation as a tool is to express things described in the source language, while reflecting the achievement of the cultural community in phraseological language lexemes. However, it should be taken into account that the idiosyncratic nature of some numerical phraseological units makes their translation impossible, since there are no equivalent cultural references in linguistics. An explanation regarding the meaning of these idioms and their cultural references is essential here. For example, in the Kazakh language, the expressions “*eki molda – bir kisi, bir molda – jarty kisi*” and “*аһды Меккеге ыш аркалар барсан да, қарыздан кутыла алмайсын*” illustrate important cultural values. The first idiom emphasizes the idea that two people can be perceived as one when they are united in purpose, highlighting the significance of community and collaboration in Kazakh culture. The second expression conveys the notion that even if one makes a great effort to reach a holy place like Mecca, they cannot escape their own responsibilities or debts, reflecting the cultural belief in the importance of personal accountability and the inescapable nature of one’s obligations (Alefirenko et al., 2018). In this case, full equivalence appears when speech turns to represent the same diastatic levels, and diaphasic and diatonic are the result of sharing common sources. Therefore, apparent equivalence occurs between expressions that are formally similar in terms of their constituent elements, but diverge in terms of their meanings.

Interlingual equivalence encompasses various dimensions, including literal and idiomatic meanings, morphosyntactic structures, and pragmatic elements, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of how meaning is conveyed across languages. However, there are instances of partial equivalence, particularly when one of the compared numerical phraseological units is polysemous or has a homonym with a different meaning and actant composition. For example, consider the expressions “two is company, but three is none” in English and “*köp bir soz – esekke zhyk*” in Kazakh (Lomachyns’kyi, 2023). The English idiom suggests that a larger group can lead to a loss of companionship, emphasizing the value of smaller, more intimate gatherings. Meanwhile, the Kazakh expression translates to “a lot of words – a burden on a donkey,” highlighting the idea that excessive talk can lead to unnecessary complications or difficulties. In this case, while both expressions may align at the literal and morphosyntactic levels, they diverge in their phraseological meanings and pragmatic implications, exemplifying the phenomenon of false friends in translation. This illustrates how understanding cultural context is crucial for accurately interpreting and translating idiomatic expressions (Tokumbetova, 2022).

Here the numeral phraseologism points to the case of false friends, where the expressions represent a correspondence at the literal and morphosyntactic levels, but not in the phraseological meaning or in the pragmatic component. Differentiation of equivalence at the system level, which generates gradualness scales, leads to lexicographic, textual and communicative-functional types of language parameters. This state of affairs confirms that the degree of interlingual equivalence is influenced by the set of applied tools that determine the structure of numeral idioms within the framework of linguistic and cultural elements. Regarding the lexicographic level, the parameters of this linguistic phenomenon are the same in both Kazakh and English (Table 1).

Therefore, it can be emphasized that the representation of interlingual equivalence does not have a decisive numerical value. However, thanks to it, expressiveness is preserved, and this is guaranteed whenever there is idiomaticity, even if it is achieved with the help of different semantic contexts. In turn, the mismatch of images is due to the process of semantic loss when communicating with representatives of different communities. Such a process is due to different factors: in order to comprehend the same extralinguistic reality, each language is inspired by different objects or actions offered by nature and the immediate environment (source area); one or both languages may refer to culturemes or idiosyncratic elements of each culture (typical objects,

Table 1. Lexicographic aspects of interlingual equivalence and cognitive representation of ethnocultural identity of numerical phraseological units in the Kazakh and English languages.

Lexicographic aspects of interlingual equivalence	Kazakh language	English language	Examples of ethnocultural representation
Lexical components	Example: “ <i>eki molda – bir kisi</i> ”	Example: “two is company, but three is none”	Represents community values and social gatherings
The Structure of the Actant Image	Example: “ <i>bir molda – jarty kisi</i> ”	Example: “a lot of words – a burden on a donkey”	Emphasizes the importance of collaboration vs. Excessive talk
Literal meaning	Literal translation of examples	Literal translation of examples	Illustrates cultural nuances regarding relationships and communication
Volumetric–semantic component	Example: “ <i>anudy mekkege ysh arkalap barsan da</i> ”	Example: “a wonder lasts but nine days”	Reflects the transient nature of experiences and responsibilities
Connotative–pragmatic component	Cultural significance of phrases	Cultural significance of phrases	Reveals attitudes towards community, responsibility, and tradition

Source: compiled by the authors.

anecdotes, or real or fictional historical figures); rhyming prosodic factors determine the choice of a certain image in one of the languages. For example, “*kyryktyñ biri – kydyr*”, “to let one’s hair down” (Akhmadaliyeva, 2021). The presence of a noun denoting a number contributes to the transparency of a phraseological unit and, consequently, to its semantic analysis, thanks to which it is possible to establish associations between a number and the functions of a language lexeme. Theoretical tools for the analysis of the numerical component in various lexicographic mechanisms make it possible to critically assess the view of the interlingual correspondences of the linguocultural corpus (Kaliuzhna, 2023).

It is also worth paying attention to the fact that it is not always possible to explore the hidden numeral features of the linguistic context because the reasons for the movement of creative fantasy are often inexplicable. On the other hand, it is easier to determine the properties by which the language community accepts a numeral phraseological unit in interlingual equivalence. One of these reasons is linguistic taboo, which consists in the fact that, both according to superstition and popular belief, many words are avoided and replaced by turns or other combinations. However, not only superstitious reasons lead to substitute speech, but also other mechanisms of an emotional and social character. Indeed, paraphrases and turns of phrase weaken expressions that the speaker considers too emotionally strong, and the social obligation of politeness requires a wider and less direct language. The use of expressions such as “at one fell swoop,” “once in a blue moon,” and “*myñ bolgyr*” in Kazakh and English demonstrates how substitute values can emerge, potentially leading to a loss of their original contextual meaning. As a result, speakers within the language community may need to seek alternative expressions to convey the same ideas or concepts effectively (Iskakov, 2019). A characteristic mechanism of such a phenomenon is the transition of words and phrases from branch languages to common language, in which numeral phraseological units acquire a new metaphorical meaning.

Situational explanations of ethnicity and culture of phraseological idioms with numerical components are used to overemphasize the artificiality of linguistic connections, thereby separating speech from individual and collective experience. Language ties can be described as constructed ethnic tools that do not call into question the legitimacy of their existence and general institutionalization (Lewinski, 2015). For example, the phrases “*sauyp ishken – myñ kundik, soyyp zhesen – bir kundik*”, as well as “Rome wasn’t built in a day” emphasize linguistic identities, which are not just representations of certain psychological states or ideological world-views, but act as a set of dispositions of a way of life, as well as the material modality of vision and being (Orynbeikova & Duisekova, 2022). Such linguistic diversity may also have a “sacred” value in both Kazakh and English. Thus, the numeral components form objective social and cultural conditions that change in accordance with external circumstances. They are both a cultural creation and a ubiquitous

dimension of human experience that take on a special immediacy and urgency in a wide range of ethnic contexts.

Individuals and communities attribute value to certain things, works of art, knowledge, and human cultures, whether they are natural or artificial (Lewinski et al., 2019). Ethnocultural identity can be acquired in two ways: through the genetic process or through the association of the intrinsic value of languages. From this point of view, numeral phraseological units can be regarded as the result of a creative process developed by many generations, as unique and irreplaceable “works of art”, regardless of their geographical scope and euphony. These considerations explain why it is important to respect any language, and also help to highlight the connection between the individual autonomy of English and Kazakh. Some ethnocultural elements consider numeral phraseological units as part of the symbols of historical events and families. Examples are the expressions “*gurildep kelgen zhaudan, kulimdep kelgen kas zhaman*” and “*ekeu bolsan, zholdasymmen kenes, zhalgyz bolsan, kabyrganmen kenes*” (Eshmamatov et al., 2020). Such arguments about intrinsic value can be applied not only to individual languages, but to linguistic diversity as such. Thus, the adoption of phraseological numerals is a symbolic act of emphasizing socio-cultural and linguistic diversity. Therefore, such an act has very important sociolinguistic and political implications for ethnic, sociocultural and linguistic survival.

As a result of colonialism and ethnocultural and linguistic subordination, many Turkic languages of indigenous peoples have entered into a process of obsolescence, losing not only social prestige, but also the social contexts for using phraseological units with numerical components. However, this situation is multi-causal. It was partly due to the convergence of the goals of “integration” and “education”, as well as the underlying ideas of “civilization” and “social change”, which also led to language changes and the movement of indigenous population to urban areas. This process has led some Turkic languages to enter a phase of severe erosion and reduction in the number of speakers. As examples, the folk proverbs “*otyz tisten shykkan soz otyz ruly elge zhanylady*” and “*kynine zhyz tylki alsa da, tazynyn it aty qalmaydy*”, belonging to the Turkic language families should be mentioned (Abdi et al., 2021). It is worth saying that such processes, in addition to the active participation of indigenous peoples, receive the support of linguists and anthropologists. However, these are nascent and unfinished activities, which require not only long periods of time, but also the development of adequate language planning projects, as well as ongoing technical support. After all, there is a risk that most of the cultural resources of the Turkic languages will become a simple marker of a diverse identity and otherness, and will gradually lose their space of use, finding themselves more and more crowded out by other languages.

As for the English language, its ethnocultural identity feature is the achievement of the normalization and homogenization of numeral phraseological units, which form the promotion of the emergence of a standard and general diversity, which, in turn, should be the goal of a harmonious process of writing and speaking. As part of language planning, it is necessary to respect and value toponymy, as well as the use of various names, which will contribute not only to the preservation of the semantic component of the language, but also to its enrichment. An important aspect is the expansion of the lexical component for its adaptation to new multicultural and technological situations without violating linguistic paradigms. There is now a growing recognition of the importance of protecting, studying, promoting, and disseminating numeral phraseological units as a vital part of national cultural heritage. This awareness arises from the significant threat of erosion and loss of essential elements of linguistic and ethnocultural heritage, driven by the rapid influx and absorption of non-traditional linguistic elements. This issue is further intensified by generational shifts in attitudes, as younger individuals increasingly adapt to the dominant national culture, often at the expense of their ancestral customs and traditions (Abdi et al., 2021; Miutescu, 2021).

Thus, after analyzing the numeral phraseological units of the Kazakh and English languages, it was determined that each linguistic unit embodies a unique culture and mentality, representing a sediment of historical and collective experience. Interlingual equivalence showed the variability and diversity of units in translation, which are due to the processes of socio-cultural, ethnic and

linguistic diversity, actualizing hereditary wealth. However, numeral phraseological units can act as an obstacle to the formation of ethnocultural identity, since their use can activate the process of semantic loss when communicating with other cultures. The Turkic languages are undergoing a process of obsolescence, losing in everyday speech many numeral idioms from folk proverbs and phraseological expressions, which are influenced by modern socio-cultural factors. In turn, the English language is actively adapting to the processes of lexical expansion, while maintaining and enriching its semantic components. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that the wealth of numeral phraseological units is closely related to knowledge, traditions, customs, beliefs and conservation activities, which are an essential condition for preserving linguistic diversity with the greatest sociocultural context. The mechanisms of resistance, as well as ethnic and cultural survival, highlight the vulnerability of linguistic heritages that need to be protected.

4 Discussion

The interaction between social structure and linguistic culture often creates sociolinguistic conflicts in translation. In turn, translation as a reflection of the social world reveals two aspects: the direct connection of what is transmitted in the translated text or speech, as well as the socio-cultural component of the original with an indirect reflection of social differentiation. The problem of the translation concept associated with a specific reality is reflected in the search for social analogues in the target ethnic atmosphere. M.C. Miutescu (2021) believes that the search for interlingual equivalence begins with a structural problem, as well as a lack of consensus on the very concept of cultural identity. In an attempt to achieve a satisfactory definition that would meet the needs of the study of numeral phraseological units, it is necessary to adhere to the anthropological vision of cultural perception. Therefore, culture, as a product of interaction between language and society, provides the most effective means of understanding cultural phenomena, especially in conflict situations. Ethnic elements transcend their geographic boundaries and lead to the conclusion that cultural differences become inferior if the meaning is diffused, questionable or completely incomprehensible in the translation. It is important to take into account the main aspects of the dynamic dimension of culture with the help of three characteristics: cultures do not exist within a single structure; cultures can emerge within two specific structures without being universal; the function of culture depends on the context in which it appears.

Thus, the findings of C. Schaaffner (2003) coincide with the conclusions obtained in this work, causing the determining role of the ethnocultural identity of numeral phraseological units in both English and Kazakh speech. According to the author, interlingual equivalence in linguistics acts as a verbal or preverbal element that has a certain cultural load in an ethnic community. The requirement of pragmatic communicative equivalence is the most important mechanism for the translation of numeral phraseological units, since it implies the transmission of the original text, in which the content of the context provides the language potential. However, the translator's linguistic community and culture often prevent the achievement of pragmatic equivalence, which is why her or she may use various corrections in the target text or colloquial speech. The concepts of "the translator" and "translation" are important because they highlight how a translator's linguistic community and culture can impact the achievement of pragmatic equivalence. This understanding emphasizes the need for various adjustments in the target text or the use of colloquial expressions to effectively convey the intended meaning.

The position of equivalence in this case is the connection that is established between the text of the source and the target language, in which the communicative intention of the author prevails. As for the range of interlingual equivalence of phraseological units with numerical components in the Kazakh and English languages, due to the theoretical construction of concepts, a number of other possible elements are activated, determined by translation decisions, as well as the rules or instructions of the initiator. Such mechanisms are two components of the various possibilities for recreating lexical idioms following the pragmatic dimension. The terminological competence

of a translator is halfway between thematic, interlingual and instrumental categories and goes through different processes. At the stage of understanding, this entails identifying and acquiring specialized knowledge in discourse, which involves recognizing terminological units and identifying problems that may arise when considering numeral idioms (Lewinski et al., 2016). When analysing the data, it is noted that translation activities should take into account all the tools of interlingual structural correspondence, as well as ethnocultural and cognitive components.

From the point of view of F. Gürgil (2021), modern society allows one to have a certain understanding of the discourses of various human groups in different fields of knowledge, both at the intra-linguistic level, up to the need to name processes and products for the population as a whole, and at the interlinguistic level, up to the contact of languages between specialists in different fields of knowledge. New concepts emerge that lead to the assignment of specialized senses to already existing lexical units or to the creation of new idioms. Faced with this social demand in the context of interlingual equivalence, the terminology is descriptive, which meets the requirement of standardization and indicates unambiguous communication. In this sense, one of the most common terminological problems that can be encountered is terminological variability. Variation, understood as alternative ways of naming the same specialized concept, is a common and frequent occurrence in all types of texts and speech, which is due to dialectal, communicative and cognitive factors (Etemi & Uzunboylu, 2020).

The important thing is that those who do not shape the concept of culture end up subject to foreign influence when naming processes and products developed in countries that speak other languages, especially English. This influence can lead to a lack of authentic cultural representation and understanding. These are cases that can significantly compromise the terminological production of numeral idioms, because there is a risk of creating an artificial language consisting of semantic field synonyms. The hypotheses proposed by the researcher include the idea that phraseological units with numerical components in both Kazakh and English reflect cultural nuances that can influence their translation. Additionally, it is suggested that these units exhibit variability in meaning and usage, which necessitates careful consideration during the translation process. Another hypothesis posits that the effectiveness of translation depends on the translator's awareness of the cultural context and the potential for pragmatic equivalence.

F. Giunchiglia et al. (2023) argue that number phraseological units are idiomatic in nature, which complicates the process of creating equivalent expressions within the relevant field. The analysis of intra-linguistic variation goes beyond the possibility offered by intra-linguistic synonymy because it has to deal with the identification of equivalents in terms of context, which is the existence of differentiated nominals for the unambiguous expression of a concept. Interlingual equivalence considers a linguistic tool for communicating phraseological units with numerals, which affects not only the nature of cultural concepts, but also their relationships and connections. This process brings with it both a natural reaction, a reassessment, and defence of autochthonous values, and an awareness of the relevance of scientific knowledge, as well as educational and cultural planning. Thus, intensified efforts are required in all these areas, in which the growing knowledge, dissemination, and appreciation of ancestral cultures should not be accompanied by a progressive weakening of the linguistic heritage and other components of spiritual wealth that characterize communities as multinational, ethnic and multicultural groups. The prestige of the dominant language and its predominance in public life can lead the community to devalue its own language (Bidzilya, 2015). Therefore, the revival of languages depends, firstly, on the confirmation of the community of its cultural identity. Research data focuses on the fact that phraseological units with numerical components in Kazakh and English speech should also be considered within the context, causing the identification of concepts and equivalents.

Thus, when examining numeral phraseological units in Kazakh and English, it is important to emphasize that they can vary in translation and represent different concepts, considering historical, cultural, and linguistic components. An ethnocultural fact cannot be the direct cause of a numerical linguistic phenomenon, since it acts as a secondary historical condition and determination that indirectly interferes with speech activity through the configuration of linguistic knowledge. The

research findings indicate that phraseological idioms containing numerical components serve as significant reflections of the worldview and national mentality inherent in both Kazakh and English cultures. These idioms are deeply rooted in a collectivist understanding of ethno-culture, which emphasizes the interconnectedness and unity of individuals within a community. In this context, the numerical components often symbolize collective values, traditions, and social norms that are integral to the identity of the culture. For instance, specific numbers in idiomatic expressions may carry cultural significance, representing concepts such as harmony, balance, or community strength. This reflects how language encapsulates and transmits cultural beliefs and practices over time.

However, within the same linguistic community, there are different cultures and subcultures that generate diversity, which has its more or less perfect correlation in intra-linguistic variability, manifested in varieties of speech. In both Kazakh and English, many linguistic phenomena attributed to the ethnic worldview can be explained by equivalent features that do not express the idea of “property”, but are simple deictic morphemes expressing the concept of “in relation to a person”. From an ethnolinguistic point of view, each numeral phraseological unit of the languages under consideration reflects the mentality of society, as well as the process of diffusion, which is a sign of cultural and social contexts. In order to extract some ethnolinguistic data about the existence of a semantic field, it is always necessary to analyse the cultural values underlying the creation of each numeral idiom.

5 Conclusions

Within the framework of interlingual equivalence, the examined idioms are sometimes constrained by mental schemes and linguistic connections that depend on the context in which they are used. These idioms can be unique to specific languages and cultures, and as such, attempts to translate them may result in a loss of their true meaning and cultural essence. This linguistic phenomenon functions in certain lexicographic parameters, the same for both Kazakh and English, which include lexical components, literal meaning, actant image structure, connotative-pragmatic and volumetric-semantic components. Interlingual equivalence of numeral phraseological units exists and is important for cultural and linguistic cognition. Understanding these equivalences can help in learning languages and improve communication between people from different cultures. Language constructions reflect the ethnocultural identity of the peoples to whom these languages belong. They transmit traditions, customs, beliefs and many other aspects of culture that have been formed over the centuries and passed down from generation to generation.

It was also determined that while the presence of numerals in these phraseological units does not necessarily make them distinct, numeral phraseological units in the Kazakh and English languages play an important role in preserving the ethnocultural identity of their respective peoples, as they serve as carriers and transmitters of cultural ideas and values. They help form and strengthen social bonds within the community. However, it is important to recognize that phraseological units with numerical elements can serve both to preserve ethnocultural identity and to hinder its formation. The use of language components that are not readily understandable to representatives of other cultures may lead to the development of isolated communities that struggle to communicate effectively and engage with others. Additionally, our findings indicate that Turkic languages are experiencing a process of “extinction,” reflected in the disappearance of ancient expressions, proverbs, and phraseological phrases from everyday speech. Accordingly, it can be concluded that the purpose of the study was achieved. However, further research is needed to highlight the contextual and cultural relationships of numeral phraseological units that are actively used in the translation of Kazakh and English.

References

- Abdi, M., Umarova, S., Aliqulova, D., Hamida, J., & Bekmuradova, Z. (2021). Reflection of the national vision of the world in phraseological units. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 1281–1290. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS2.1799>
- Akhmadaliyeva, S. M. (2021). Some factors which influence the presence of idiomatic expressions of the English language. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 2(8), 239–243.
- Alefirenko, N., Lagodenko, J., Chumak-Zhun, I., Goleva, N., & Zhilenkova, I. (2018). Ethnocultural specific of idioms: From traditional to innovative paradigms. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(2), 708–714. <https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i2.1600>
- Ayazbay, T., Gabidinova, T., Zhaksylyk, M., & Abrash, A. (2021). Comparative study of common proverbs in the Kazakh, Turkish languages and English as a mediator: Features of translation. *Proceedings of IYSC*, 10, 612–637.
- Bakirova, H. B. (2020). Teaching foreign language terminology at non-language universities. *International Journal of Discourse on Innovation, Integration and Education*, 1(1), 15–17.
- Bidzilya, Y. (2015). Slovak press in Zakarpattia as the revival of national identity. *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 11(6), 67–78.
- Eshmatov, I., Shirinova, R., Kuldashova, M., Rakhimova, G., & Shamuratova, G. (2020). Representation of the national picture of the world in literary translation. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(5), 1436–1445.
- Etemi, B. P., & Uzunboyly, H. (2020). The effects of flipped learning method on students' perception and learning of Java programming. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 36(4), 1372–1382.
- Giunchiglia, F., Bella, G., Nair, N. C., Chi, Y., & Xu, H. (2023). Representing interlingual meaning in lexical databases. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56, 11053–11069. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-023-10427-1>
- Gürgil, F. (2021). Using metaphors to investigate the images of countries. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 17(4), 99–121. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2021.366.7>
- Haladzhun, Z., Harmatiy, O., Bidzilya, Y., Kunanets, N., & Shunevych, K. (2021). Hate speech in media towards the representatives of Roma ethnic community. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, 2870, 755–768.
- House, J. (2020). Translation as a prime player in intercultural communication. *Applied Linguistics*, 41(1), 10–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amz007>
- Iskakov, A. I. (2019). *English idioms, fixed expressions and phrasal verbs in translation into Russian and Kazakh languages*. IJgerlik.
- Islom, A. M., & Nuritdinov, S. B. (2023). The linguocultural approach to the study of linguistic phenomena. *American Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11, 134–135.
- Kaliuzhna, N. M. (2023). Vykorystannia innovatsiinykh instrumentiv dlia pidtrymky ta monitorynhu vidkrytoï nauky. *Bibliotekoznavstvo. Dokumentoznavstvo. Informolohiia / Library Science. Record Studies. Informology*, 19(4), 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.32461/2409-9805.4.2023.293969>
- Kalkeyeva, K. R., Seitkazy, P. B., & Jexembayeva, G. S. (2014). Methodological approaches to content of foreign language education. *Life Science Journal*, 11(S1), 249–253.
- Karimullina, G. N., Sarekenova, K. K., & Karimullina, R. N. (2019). Presentation of the ethno-national worldview through phraseologism. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 10(4), 315–319. <https://doi.org/10.31901/24566764.2019/10.04.333>
- Lewinski, P. (2015). Commentary: Extensional versus intuitive reasoning: The conjunction fallacy in probability judgment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, Article 1832. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01832>
- Lewinski, P., Fransen, M. L., & Tan, E. S. (2016). Embodied resistance to persuasion in advertising. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, Article 01202. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01202>
- Lewinski, P., Lukasik, M., Kurdej, K., Leonarski, F., Bielczyk, N., Rakowski, F., & Plewczynski, D. (2019). The World Color Survey: Data analysis and simulations. In À. Massip-Bonet, G. Bel-Enguix, & A. Bastardas-Boada (Eds.), *Complexity applications in language and communication sciences* (pp. 289–311). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04598-2_16
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Intercultural mediation, intercultural communication and translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 24(3), 354–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2014.980279>

- Lomachyns'kyĭ, B. H. (2023). Informatsiĭna kul'tura v prostori biblioteky: Vyklyky tsyfrovizatsii. *Bibliotekoznavstvo. Dokumentoznavstvo. Informolohiia / Library Science. Record Studies. Informology*, 19(4), 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.32461/2409-9805.4.2023.294077>
- Miutescu, M. C. (2021). The impact of interlingual equivalence on vocabulary development: A case study on the acquisition of specialised (technical) lexis. *Scientific Bulletin of the Politehnica University of Timișoara Transactions on Modern Languages*, 20(1), 148–157. <https://doi.org/10.59168/OFSS1365>
- Ormanova, A. B., & Anafinova, M. L. (2022). A linguistic interference in information space terms: A corpus-based study in Kazakh. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(12), 2497–2507. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1212.04>
- Orynbeikova, B., & Duisekova, K. (2022). Frame structure of phraseological units (based on the Kazakh and English languages). *Scientific Collection "InterConf"*, 112, 174–179.
- Schaaffner, C. (2003). Translation and intercultural communication: Similarities and differences. *Studies in Communication Sciences*, 3(2), 79–107.
- Shadmanov, Sh. Kh., & Shadmanova, N. B. (2022). Study of phraseological units in other languages. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(12), 395–399.
- Tokumbetova, M. S. (2022). Linguocultural analysis of phraseological units expressing human intellectual ability in English. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 15, 158–165.
- Tukeshova, N. M., Tarasova, F. H., & Luzenina, I. N. (2019). Lexical-grammatical analysis of the phraseological units with antonymous components in the Kazakh language. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10, 1066–1074.
- Yerbulatova, I. K., Gilazetdinova, G. K., & Bozbayeva, A. G. (2019). Peculiarities of Kazakh reality translation with cultural-historical educational components. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(8), 51–52. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v8n8p51>

The publication was financed at the authors' expense.

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

All the authors participated equally in preparing conception and academic editing of this article.

 This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited.

© The Authors 2024

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

Publishing history: Received 2024-01-04; Accepted 2024-11-08; Published 2024-12-27.



INSTITUTE OF SLAVIC STUDIES
POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
1954–2024