

Linguo-Conceptual and Linguocultural Analysis of the Concept “Memory”: Semantic Typology of Kazakh-Russian-English Phraseology

Altyn Bakytzhanova

Institute of Legislation and Legal Information of the Republic of Kazakhstan under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana, Kazakhstan

Saltanat B. Bektukhambetova

Training teachers of foreign languages and literature, West Kazakhstan University named after M.Utemisov, Uralsk, Kazakhstan

Elmira K. Utemissova

Training teachers of foreign languages and literature, West Kazakhstan University named after M.Utemisov, Uralsk, Kazakhstan

Syrym Zhanzhigitov*

Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

Aigul Y. Alpysbayeva

Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh national University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Gulmira S. Omarbayeva

Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh national University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Svetlana S. Tatiyeva

Department of Languages, International Information Technology University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract—The present study is devoted to the linguo-conceptual and linguo-cultural analysis of the phraseological representation of the concept *memory* based on the material of Kazakh, Russian, and English languages. The trilingual language policy and approach in Kazakhstan promotes proficiency in Kazakh as the state language, Russian as the language of interethnic communication, and English as the language of international integration. The object of analysis is phraseological units that form the phraseosemantic macrofield *memory* within the structure of the intellectual conceptual sphere of the aforementioned linguocultures. The research is based on a comprehensive methodological approach, which includes etymological, componential, structural-semantic, comparative methods, and modeling. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the development of a semantic typology of phraseological units representing the concept *memory*, as well as in the identification of its cognitive structure, which includes three microfields: *processes of memory consolidation, forgetting, and reproduction of previously acquired information*. In addition, an analysis of linguocultural connotations and evaluative components was carried out, reflecting cultural values, archetypes, and mental model's characteristic of each of the examined language systems. The results obtained broaden the understanding of the ways memory is conceptualized as a cognitive and cultural phenomenon, contribute to the theoretical foundation of anthropocentric linguistics, and have practical applications in intercultural communication, translation studies, linguoculturology, and foreign language teaching.

Index Terms—memory, language, culture, phraseology, cross-cultural comparison

I. INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization and intercultural communication, there is a growing interest in the study of universal and nationally specific concepts that reflect the worldview of speakers of different languages. One of such key concepts is the concept of ‘memory’, which holds an important place in collective consciousness, cultural identity, and the linguistic picture of the world. The present study is focused on the linguoconceptual and linguocultural analysis of the concept ‘memory’ in the phraseology of Kazakh, Russian, and English languages, based on semantic typology.

The relevance of the topic is determined by the need for a deep understanding of the mental and cultural codes

* Corresponding Author.

embedded in set expressions, especially in the context of active cultural dialogue and growing interest in the cognitive aspects of language. Phraseology, as the most figurative and stable layer of language, serves as a unique tool for identifying cultural archetypes, attitudes, and value orientations. The study of the concept *memory* makes it possible to trace how the processes of storing, transmitting, and interpreting individual and collective experience are reflected in language across different linguocultures.

The scientific novelty of this study lies in the comparative semantic analysis of phraseological units (hence after PU) representing the concept of ‘memory’ in three typologically diverse languages, which contributes to identifying both universal and unique features of its linguistic representation. Based on the results of the analysis, a semantic typology of PU reflecting the concept is proposed, taking into account cognitive and cultural parameters.

The obtained results can be applied in linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, and translation studies, as well as in the practice of intercultural communication and foreign language teaching. This research contributes to a deeper understanding of the interaction between language, thinking, and culture, thus expanding the theoretical foundation of the modern anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics.

In scholarly literature, memory is defined as a cognitive ability of the individual to retain and preserve in consciousness information about the external world and one’s own self, as well as to accumulate life experience and knowledge in the form of stable neurophysiological traces (so-called engrams). This term encompasses both the ability to reproduce and actualize previously perceived impressions and knowledge in the process of speech and thought activity, and the totality of data preserved in consciousness. The primary function of memory is to ensure various processes of storing, processing, and transforming information (Popova & Sternin, 2007).

In other words, memory is a form of mental reflection, manifested in the processes of fixation, storage and subsequent reproduction of individual experience, which allows to reuse it in activity or actualize it in consciousness. Thanks to memory, a continuous connection between the subject's past, present and future is established, the integrity of his personality and its progressive development are ensured. Memory occupies a key place in the structure of human cognitive activity.

Modern sources of psychological science reflect ambiguous interpretation of the term memory. Nevertheless, as noted by the well-known psychologist B. M. Mescheryakov, all of them are reduced,

to four typical meanings: 1) memory is a set of information storages (reservoirs); 2) memory is very information that we store and retrieve as needed; 3) memory is a set of basic stages and processes that make up the mnemonic cycle: memorization, storage, and retrieval; 4) memory is considered as a diverse set of actions of a subject (or a group of subjects) associated with the solution of mnemonic tasks. (Meshcheryakov, 2004, pp. 5-6)

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Linguistics and related disciplines have developed an understanding that metaphor serves as a basic cognitive mechanism of conceptualization, linking linguistic expression to mental models (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). The theory of conceptual metaphor, laid out in the works of Lakoff and Johnson and developed further, allows abstract concepts to be explored through concrete imagery schemas, which is particularly important for cross-cultural concept analysis. This approach is widely used in linguoconceptual and linguocultural studies to identify universal and specifically cultural features of the semantic structure of concepts (Kövecses, 2005; Jesudas & Mohammed, 2024; Budiman, 2019; Zhang, 2021). Numerous studies demonstrate the effectiveness of the conceptual-metaphorical method in comparing linguistic worldviews: metaphorical models reflect general patterns of human thinking and simultaneously vary under the influence of national-cultural experiences (Hadidi & Zare, 2020; Akbulut, 2023; Al-Minawi, 2024; Đào, 2022). Researchers across languages and discourses show that concepts such as memory and other mental phenomena are conceptualized through similar images (e.g., through metaphors of space, path, container), although the content of these images may differ across cultures (Bullo, 2017; Chang, 2022; Tien, 2022; Lai, 2022; Quan & Huynh, 2024).

In cognitive linguistics and cultural studies, the conceptualization of memory is examined at different levels, from individual processes of remembering to collective forms of experience retention (Bull & Hansen, 2016; Kirik et al., 2018). Memory is studied as a phenomenon of individual consciousness and simultaneously as a component of collective and cultural memory, showing that personal memories are woven into shared community narratives (Ben-Aroia & Ebbrecht-Hartmann, 2020; Jamalpour & Yaghoobi-Derabi, 2022). Considerable attention has been paid to cultural memory, the set of traditions, rituals, and media practices through which a society stores and broadcasts past experiences; simultaneously exploring new, digital forms of memory in the modern era (Hoskins, 2016; Hagedoorn, 2019; Schliephake, 2016; Liu & Nie, 2023). The narrative nature of memory is emphasized: making sense of the past through stories, literature, and media links memory processes to identity and the creative reinterpretation of experience (Temple, 2021; Andersen & Ortner, 2019; Putri & McDermott, 2023). Thus, memory studies are interdisciplinary, combining cognitive, cultural and mediatic approaches, and reflect the relevance of studying memory in different contexts, from folklore to digital culture (Gülüm, 2023; Gaál, 2023).

The comparative analysis of phraseological units in Kazakh, Russian and English languages shows how the concept memory and related concepts are verbalized through stable expressions, revealing both universal metaphorical motifs and culturally specific images. A number of studies note the presence of common conceptual metaphors of memory in

the three languages - for example, the representation of memory as a storehouse, treasure, or burden that can be 'carried' or 'lost' (Radbil et al., 2020; Sedykh et al., 2023; Mamasheva et al., 2021). At the same time, unique phraseological phrases reflect the original historical and cultural experience of each nation, demonstrating national specificity in the linguistic expression of the processes of remembering and forgetting (Hasanbievna & Bizhoyev, 2021; Kozhakhmetova & Sagidolda, 2019; Savelyeva et al., 2019). The newest works devoted to the comparison of idioms related to memory confirm the presence of both universal figurative schemes and non-equivalent units: some phraseological phrases coincide in metaphor in different languages, while others have no direct analogs (Sopova, 2020; Alisoy, 2024; Pugach, 2024). These studies emphasize the importance of taking into account the cultural context when analyzing phraseology and show that metaphorical conceptualizations of memory serve both as a 'window' into universal cognitive mechanisms and unique worldviews of different cultures.

Thus, the literature review demonstrates that the study of the concept of memory at the intersection of cognitive linguistics, cultural studies and comparative linguistics has interdisciplinary significance and scientific novelty. Combining the ideas of the theory of conceptual metaphor with the studies of cultural memory and cross-linguistic phraseology allows us to comprehensively illuminate how language reflects and shapes our perceptions of memory. The analysis of metaphorical models in different languages reveals the universal foundations of human experience and simultaneously highlights the unique worldviews characteristic of individual cultures. The relevance and promise of this approach are due to the fact that the concept of memory provides researchers with valuable data on the relationship between language, thought, and culture, which has implications for a range of fields, from linguistics and anthropology to cognitive science and intercultural communication.

III. MATERIAL AND METHODS

In the present study, *memory* is of interest as a human cognitive ability, representing one of the fragments of reality - the human cognitive sphere. In this regard, it is interesting to reveal the specificity of reflection of this fragment of reality by figurative means of language – phraseological units (hereinafter - PUs).

This study holds particular methodological value in the aspect of describing phraseological material, as it realizes an integrated approach combining cognitive-semantic and contrastive analysis. The object of comparison is the phraseology of Kazakh, Russian and English languages – genetically and typologically dissimilar, but being in the conditions of cultural-linguistic interaction, which allows to reveal both universal and specific features of representation of the concept "memory".

At the same time, the comparative description of types of memory and PUs representing this semantic fragment of intellectual conceptsphere, as well as the peculiarities of verbal expression of memory *processes* in the phraseology of Kazakh, Russian and English languages seems to be significant. As rightly emphasized by Popova and Sternin (2007), the comparison of semantic spaces of different languages contributes to the identification of universal for mankind ways of reflecting the surrounding reality, while allowing to reveal the specificity – national, ethno-cultural, as well as group and individual - in the formation and structuring of conceptual content.

The assertion that memory occupies a central place in the human cognitive system and represents a complex phenomenon of cognitive activity is confirmed by linguistic data: in particular, in phraseology it is reflected through the variety of PUs forming a branched semantic field associated with the processes of remembering, storing and reproducing information.

The analyzed semantic fragment "memory" is integrated into a broader structure of the semantic field covering the sphere of cognitive activity or cognitive sphere of a person, within the framework of which *memory* performs the key function of ensuring the preservation and processing of information. From this point of view, in the present study we designate it as a semantic macrofield or phraseosemantic macrofield "memory".

In the process of defining the structure and stages of the research, the following methodology was developed, including the following key categories and methods:

- *Cognitive category*: concept as a mental-linguistic unit;
- *Linguocultural category*: phraseology as a reflection of cultural values;
- *Phraseosemantic macrofield* as an object of semantic structuring of the concept "memory" in the linguistic picture of the world;

Methods: etymological, component, structural-semantic, comparative and linguocognitive modeling.

The developed research algorithm included:

- 1) selection of PUs representing the concept "memory";
- 2) distribution of PUs into microfields on the basis of dominant semantic features;
- 3) identification of cultural-evaluative components and conceptual connotations;
- 4) comparative analysis of interlingual similarities and differences in Kazakh, Russian and English phraseological systems.

The conceptual structure of the phraseosemantic macrofield "memory" is represented as a cognitive-organized system including three semantic micropoles:

- microfield 1: processes of fixation in memory;
- microfield 2: forgetting processes;

- microfield 3: reproduction of previously acquired information.

These microfields reflect cognitive dynamics and psycho-emotional aspects of memory functioning through phraseological explication.

The component composition of PUs within the semantic macropoly “memory” demonstrates a high degree of imagery and cultural labeling. The following semantic components have been identified:

- temporal (the age/freshness of the memory);
- emotional (nostalgia, pain, joy);
- modal (unexpectedness, incompleteness of reproduction);
- metaphorical (fire, water, trace, light/darkness as memory images).

The typology of memory types and their representing PUs is based on functional and psychological criteria, including:

- involuntary memory (e.g., “popped into my head”);
- conscious memorization (e.g., “to carve it on one’s nose”);
- collective memory (e.g., “no one is forgotten, nothing is forgotten”);
- historical memory, fixed in stable national images; each type corresponds to a set of PUs, which makes it possible to build an interlingual typology on the basis of the functional-semantic approach.

Linguocultural peculiarities of phraseological modeling of memory represent nationally specific mental and cultural images:

- in Kazakh linguoculture, the dominant image is that of generational continuity and the sacralization of memory (e.g., *тәубесін есіне түсірді* – reminded (someone) of their repentance);
- in Russian – emotional-psychological states and dramatization of memories (e.g., *захлестнуло в памяти* – flooded/engulfed in memory);
- in English – rationality, individualization and technologization of memory (e.g., *have a photographic memory*).

The analysis of the linguoconceptual characteristic of PUs allowed us to identify - cultural, value-based and evaluative connotations reflecting:

- attitude to memory as a moral category;
- perception of memory as a keeper of truth, identity and experience;
- diversity of attitudes: from sacral ancestral memory to everyday forgetting.

The research material demonstrated that within the phraseosemantic macropoly “memory”, an *integrative concept* is formed, combining cognitive processes, cultural meanings, and linguistic means of explication in its structure.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As a result of the conducted study, a multi-level methodology for the linguistic-conceptual and linguocultural analysis of the phraseosemantic macrofield ‘memory’ in Kazakh, Russian, and English phraseology was developed. The methodological approach was based on a combination of principles: cognitiveness, comparability, cultural determinism, and semantic typologization, which ensured a comprehensive nature of the linguistic analysis.

The phraseosemantic fragment memory in the comparison of Kazakh, English and Russian languages demonstrates universal and specific features in the structural-semantic organization of PUs reflecting the processes of remembering and preserving information. In particular, in the Kazakh language there is an active use of abstract nouns denoting cognitive processes, such as *ой* (thought), *жады* (memory), *көңіл* (attention, mood), *көкей* (consciousness), as well as somatisms – *кеуде* (chest cavity, bust, torso) and *көкірек* (chest), as part of PUs associated with memory.

Examples of Kazakh PUs reflecting *the processes of memorization and retention*: *ойдан кетпеді* (lit. ‘does not leave the mind’) ‘is not forgotten’; *ойдан шықпады* (lit. ‘has not left the mind’) ‘is constantly present in the memory’; *ойында қалды* (lit. ‘remained in the thoughts’) ‘remembered’; *көкейіне сақтады* (lit. ‘kept in consciousness’) ‘firmly entered into consciousness’; *кеудесіне түйді* (lit. ‘tied in the chest’) ‘kept in memory’, etc. In Russian language similar memory processes are expressed through such PUs as: *держат в мыслях* (lit. ‘to keep in thoughts’) – to remember constantly about someone or something, *жить в памяти* (lit. ‘to live in memory’) – to remember constantly, *зарубить себе на носу* (lit. ‘to carve it on one’s nose’), *зарубить на стенке* (lit. ‘to carve on the wall’) – to remember firmly, forever, *не выходит из головы* (lit. ‘does not leave the head’) – is constantly present in one’s thoughts, is not forgotten, *врезаться в память* (lit. ‘to cut (or engrave) into memory’) – to remember firmly, firmly; to be imprinted, etc. The English language also contains a wide range of idiomatic expressions that describe various memory-related processes – from short-term retention to deeply ingrained recollections. For example, the expression *to stick in one’s mind* is used when something remains in memory for a long time and is not easily forgotten. It is comparable to the Kazakh expression *ойдан шықпады* and the Russian *не выходит из головы*. The idiom *to be etched in someone’s memory* resonates with the Russian *врезаться в память* and the Kazakh *кеудесіне түйді* – used when an event or image leaves an indelible impression on one’s consciousness. Another common phrase is *to commit to memory*, which refers to the deliberate act of memorizing something. This is similar in meaning to the Kazakh expression *көкейіне сақтады* (stored in consciousness) and the Russian *зарубить себе на носу*. The idiom *to bear in mind* refers to consciously keeping information in memory, and aligns with the Russian *держат в мыслях* and the Kazakh *ойында қалды*. Some English expressions emphasize the emotional intensity of memories. For instance, *to burn into one’s brain* or *to engrave on one’s mind* use metaphors of fire and carving to highlight how strongly something is imprinted

in one's mind. These metaphors correspond to the Russian *жить в памяти* or *врезаться в память*, and the Kazakh *ойдан кетпеді*. More neutral or formal expressions such as *to retain in memory* and *to keep in mind* are also widely used, both in everyday speech and in academic contexts.

The comparative analysis of PUs representing the concept “memory” provides an opportunity to reveal the specifics of its conceptualization in different linguistic and cultural systems. Such research contributes to a more detailed understanding of cognitive mechanisms and cultural determinants that determine the processes of formation, structuring and functioning of PEs reflecting mental processes associated with the preservation and reproduction of experience.

It should be emphasized that Kazakh PUs denoting the processes of remembering and preserving in memory, as a rule, have positive evaluative coloring. In other words, the subject fixes in consciousness or keeps in memory mainly significant and emotionally positive for him images, life moments or situations – conventionally labeled as “pleasant memories”. Such linguistic constructions are often found in fiction, as well as in everyday colloquial speech, which indicates the cultural specificity of value attitude to memory in Kazakh linguoculture.

At the same time the PU *өңіліне дiт сақтады* (lit.: keeps in the mood bad, unpleasant) in the meaning ‘to keep, to keep in memory an offense, to remember about an offense’ was found. In Russian, this PU is conveyed by the lexical unit *vindictive* (cf.: *злопамятный человек – кекшіл адам*) (translated from Kazakh - *vindictive person*).

Russian language PUs such as - *не выходит из головы* (*does not get out of one's head*), *не идет из памяти* (*does not leave memory*), *не выходит из ума* (*does not leave the mind*), *выбрасывать из головы* (*to throw out of one's head*), *выкидывать из памяти* (*to discard from memory*) (Stepanova, 2006), in most cases are used in the meaning associated with the *processes of memorization and retention* in memory, which occur contrary to the will or desire of the subject. These fixed expressions can denote attempts to *forget something/someone or not to remember something/someone*, but at the same time leave a trace in the memory, which indicates a discrepancy between the desired and the result, when a thought or image cannot be eliminated from consciousness.

The etymology of the Russian PUs *зарубить себе на носу*, *зарубить на лбу*, *зарубить на стенке* (literally, “to carve on one's nose/forehead/wall”) is an interesting phenomenon, which is connected with cultural and historical factors. These PUs reflect the “purposeful” process of fixing information in memory, which is carried out by the effort of the subject's will. The image of a nick as a physical mark on a body or surface symbolizes a deliberate, conscious imprinting of important information, emphasizing that the process of remembering is associated with an active effort to keep something in memory for a long period of time.

As the analysis of factual material has shown, PUs belonging to the semantic microfield “processes of fixation in memory” in Kazakh and Russian languages mainly reflect the processes of *long-term memorization*. This includes such types of memory as *short-term, operative and intermediate* memory, with the main emphasis being placed on memory providing *long-term preservation of information* with the possibility of conscious retrieval. It is important to note that long-term memory, as a rule, obeys the pattern of forgetting, in the process of which all unnecessary or secondary, as well as a certain proportion of important information is forgotten.

In Kazakh phraseology, *the process of forgetting* is reflected by such PEs as *ойдан шықты* (literally: “went out of the thought”) meaning ‘forgotten’, *есінен шықты* (literally: “went out of consciousness”) meaning ‘not retained in memory, forgotten’, *жанынан шықты* (literally: “went out of the soul”) and others. It is interesting to note that in this semantic group *the process of forgetting* is expressed by means of the verb component *шығу (шықты)*, which literally translates as ‘to come out’ (cf. Russian expressions like “*выпадать из памяти*” or “*из головы вон выскочило*” — ‘to fall out of memory’ or ‘popped out of the head’).

In Russian, such expressions occur with greater frequency compared to Kazakh. For example, we can single out the following PU: *вычеркнуть из памяти*, which means ‘to forget or forcibly get rid of memories about a person or event’; *выбрасывать из головы*, which implies an attempt ‘to get rid of thoughts or memories’; *выкидывать из памяти*, which denotes ‘to forget or ignore a thought about someone or something’; *выбивать из головы*, which means ‘to rid oneself of obsessive thoughts’; *унюскать из виду*, which expresses ‘forgetting or ignoring some information’ (Kunin, 2006).

In English, the processes of forgetting are also widely reflected in the phraseological system. Similar to Kazakh expressions containing the verb *шығу* (to go out) and Russian verb constructions such as *выбросить* (to throw out) or *вычеркнуть* (to cross out), English idioms often contain dynamic verbs conveying the idea of *removal, disappearance, or expulsion* of information from one's consciousness.

One of the most common expressions is *to slip one's mind*, which literally means “to slip out of the mind” (Ayto, 2010). This fixed expression is used when someone forgets something due to carelessness or absent-mindedness: “*It completely slipped my mind*” – meaning “I completely forgot”. In both meaning and imagery, it is close to the Kazakh “*ойдан шықты*” (“left the mind”) and the Russian “*выпало из памяти*” (“slipped from memory”).

Another typical expression is *to block something out*, which refers to the conscious or subconscious repression of a memory, particularly unpleasant ones: “*He tried to block out the memory of the accident*”. This is similar to the Russian “*вычеркнуть из памяти*” or “*выбросить из головы*” – to mentally eliminate a memory.

The idiom *to erase from memory* carries a similar meaning, referring to both spontaneous and intentional forgetting. This phrase is frequently used in emotionally charged or traumatic contexts – similar to the Russian “*выбросить из памяти*” and structurally close to the Kazakh “*есінен шықты*” (“left the consciousness”).

Another commonly used expression is *to forget all about*, which emphasizes total and complete forgetting: “*I forgot all about our meeting*”. This expression is more colloquial in nature, similar to the Kazakh “*жаньнан шықты*” (“left the soul”), which often carries an emotional connotation.

In conversational speech, one may also encounter metaphorical constructions such as *to go out of one's head*, which directly corresponds to the Russian “*вылетело из головы*” (“flew out of the head”). This expression conveys sudden and involuntary forgetting of some information.

Thus, English phraseology, like that of Kazakh and Russian, actively uses metaphors of motion or removal to describe the process of forgetting. In all three languages, memory and oblivion are presented as dynamic processes in which thoughts “exit”, “slip away”, “are erased”, or “thrown out” reflecting universal cognitive and cultural conceptions of memory.

The process of forgetting that takes place ‘without the subject's participation’ is also reflected in the conceptual semantics of PUs, for example: *захлестнуло в памяти*, which means complete forgetting; *улетучиться из памяти*, indicating ‘the complete disappearance of a memory’; *из ума вон выскочило*, expressing ‘complete forgetting of something’; *вылетать из головы*, which also means ‘complete disappearance from memory’.

The third component group of the macrofield ‘memory’ is made up of PUs representing *the process of reproduction of previously learned information*. The semantic microfield formed by these PUs is functionally opposed to the microfield reflecting *the forgetting processes*, but there is a dialectically complementary relationship between them, conditioned by the specifics of memory functioning as a cognitive mechanism.

Psychological science identifies various forms of information reproduction, each of which is characterized by specific cognitive mechanisms. These include: *recognition* – a process in which previously learned information is identified by repeated perception of an object; *recollection* – actualization of information without direct perception of the object, based on internal cognitive processes; *recall* – an active form of reproduction, requiring volitional effort and often associated with the search for information in memory; *reminiscence* – delayed reproduction of previously perceived material that seemed to be forgotten; *eidetism* – the ability to retain and reproduce vivid and detailed images of a previously perceived object.

In the context of Kazakh language phraseology there are peculiarities in designation of the process of *reproduction of previously learned information*. Most often there are PUs reflecting *recollection in the absence of the object of perception*. For example: *ойға оралды* (literally: “returned to thoughts”) – meaning “was remembered”; *көңілге түсті* (literally: “came to attention”) – meaning “came to memory, was recalled”; *ескі жараның аузын ашу* (literally: “to open the mouth of an old wound”) – used in the sense of “to recall the past” (Kenesbaev, 2007). These PUs emphasize the process of information reproduction initiated by internal cognitive mechanisms without external stimuli, which reflects the cultural and linguistic features of the Kazakh language.

Adjacent to the semantic micropole of reproductive memory processes is the PU *ойға салды* (literally, “put into thoughts”), whose semantics express the reproduction of previously perceived information under external influence – initiated by another subject or object. In this context, it denotes a form of memory conditionally interpreted as “reminder”, i.e. reproduction of information activated from the outside. The English expression “*to jog someone's memory*” serves as a counterpart to the Kazakh idiom *ойға салды* (literally, “to place onto one's thoughts”), which refers to recalling something under the influence of an external trigger. In English, this phrase implies that someone or something helps awaken a memory that had been forgotten or suppressed. For example, “*Seeing the old house jogged my memory of childhood summers*” suggests that the sight of the house unexpectedly brought back recollections from the past (Cambridge international dictionary of idioms, 1998).

Other commonly used expressions include *to bring something to mind* and *to remind someone of something*. Both of these idioms describe a return of memory prompted by an external stimulus. For instance: “*This smell brings my grandmother's kitchen to mind*” or “*This song reminds me of high school*”. In each of these cases, the memory does not emerge on its own but is triggered by something in the environment. These expressions highlight how, in both English and Kazakh, the process of remembering is often portrayed not only as an internal act but also as something that can be initiated from the outside.

In addition, in Kazakh and Russian, phraseology demonstrates pronounced evaluative aspects of memory through *regular mentioning of the subject* in a positive or negative way. Thus, the Kazakh expressions *сақтан саққа жүгірту*, *тоғыз саққа жүгірту* convey the meaning of frequent and typically critically colored mention of someone, whereas the constructions *аузынан тастамау*, *аузынан екі елі түсірмеу* indicate constant, more often positive, remembrance or mention. Analogous functions in Russian are performed by phraseological units such as *вспоминать добрым словом*, *вспоминать добром*, where memory is activated as an expression of respect, gratitude, or reproach.

In these PUs there is a combination of three semantic characteristics – *processuality* (to remember, to mention and to speak), *subjectivity* and *relations of subjects* to each other.

In English, just like in Kazakh and Russian, there are many idiomatic expressions that reflect not only the act of remembering but also the emotional tone attached to those memories. These expressions show how memory is not just a mental function, but a deeply human experience shaped by feelings and relationships.

Positive recollections are often expressed through phrases like “*to remember someone fondly*” or “*to look back with affection*”. These idioms highlight a warm, respectful remembrance of someone, much like the Kazakh expression

аузынан тастамау (literally “not letting out of one’s mouth”), which suggests constant and affectionate mention, or the Russian *вспоминать добрым словом* (to speak of someone kindly). For instance, when someone says, “*I always remember her fondly – she was so kind to me*”, it’s clear that the memory is cherished and emotionally significant. Similarly, the expression *to hold someone in one’s memory* conveys the idea of keeping someone close in one’s thoughts, as a sign of honor and respect – “*He will always be held in our memory*”.

But memory is not always kind. English also has many idioms that express the burdens of recollection, especially when memories are painful, obsessive, or carry a tone of criticism. These are similar in meaning to the Kazakh phrase *сақтан саққа жүгірту* (to keep bringing someone up critically) or the Russian idea of *вспоминать с упрёком* (to recall someone with reproach).

For example, when someone says “*That moment still haunts my memory*”, it evokes an experience that continues to trouble them long after it has passed – much like a ghost that lingers. Another expression, *to keep bringing someone up*, is often used when someone won’t let go of a topic or a person, usually in an annoying or negative way. A typical example might be, “*He keeps bringing up his ex – it’s getting annoying*”.

Through such idioms, English reveals a nuanced approach to memory – one that captures its complexity and emotional depth. These expressions draw clear lines between memories that return to us uninvited and those that are shaped by strong emotions, whether affectionate or bitter. In this way, English, like Kazakh and Russian, reflects the universal human tendency to treat memory as a living, emotional, and relational part of our lives.

The analysis revealed that these PUs are the most “active” components of the semantic field “memory”, occupy positions in the peripheral zones of the conceptsphere within two (sometimes three) semantic microfields.

In the Russian language, the semantic micropole reflecting *the processes of reproducing previously acquired information* is represented by a variety of phraseological units, each correlating with a specific form of memory described in psychological science. For instance, the PUs *всплывать в памяти* (to surface in memory) and *приходить на ум* (to come to mind) denote the *process of spontaneous recall*, corresponding to the actualization of long-term memory. Expressions such as *вертится в голове* (spinning in the head) and *крутится на языке* (twisting on the tongue) reflect a state in which the subject senses the presence of information but experiences difficulty fully reproducing it, which relates to the phenomenon of *reminiscence* (Teliya, 2006; Yarancev, 2006). The PU *вызывать в памяти* (to evoke in memory) indicates a purposeful effort to recall previously acquired information, corresponding to *the process of recollection*. Finally, the expression *вставить перед глазами* (to stand before the eyes) describes a vivid, detailed *memory* akin to *eidetic images* in psychology. Thus, the phraseological repertoire of the Russian language demonstrates a richness and diversity of means for verbalizing *the processes of memory reproduction*, reflecting both spontaneous and intentional acts of remembering.

In English, there is also a wide range of idiomatic expressions that denote the process of recalling previously acquired information, especially in situations where the memory arises spontaneously, without any external stimulus. These expressions, much like those in Kazakh, are often based on metaphors of return, awakening, or sudden appearance in the mind. One of the most common idioms is *to come to mind*, which means that a thought or memory suddenly appears in one’s head, as if it “returns” from memory without any outside trigger: “*When I saw the photo, her name suddenly came to mind*”. A similar expression is *to spring to mind*, literally meaning “to jump into the mind” which emphasizes the unexpected and spontaneous nature of the memory. This construction is analogous to the Kazakh “*о́йға оралды*” (“returned to the mind”) “*His face sprang to mind when I heard the song*”. The idiom *to flash back* is also used to describe the vivid and sudden recollection of past experiences, often emotionally charged. In psycholinguistics, it is associated with traumatic or significant memories, similar to the Kazakh *ескі жараның аузын ауы* (“to open the mouth of an old wound”): “*She suddenly flashed back to her childhood*”. Another interesting expression is *it popped into my head*, which suggests the image of a thought instantly surfacing from the subconscious without effort: “*Your name just popped into my head!*” The idiom *to bring back memories* is used in a broader sense, but in specific contexts it can also refer to involuntary recall, especially when something mentally transports a person to the past: “*That smell brought back memories of my grandmother’s house*”.

Thus, in English phraseology, as in Kazakh, the act of remembering is often conceptualized as a return or a sudden emergence of thoughts into consciousness, highlighting the internal and spontaneous nature of the process. These expressions vividly reflect the cognitive features and figurative thinking embedded in the language and culture, where memory is perceived as something alive, dynamic, and unexpectedly resurfacing.

V. CONCLUSION

As a result of the conducted research on the PUs constituting the phraseosemantic macrofield of “memory” in Kazakh, Russian, and English languages, it has been established that the concept of memory in these languages functions as a cognitive human ability related to the processes of memorization, retention, and reproduction of information. At the same time, forgetting is perceived as a deviation from the norm, indicating a decline in cognitive activity. In Kazakh phraseology, mnemonic processes are represented through the following conceptual metaphors:

- memory is associated with reason, consciousness, thought, and attention, which emphasizes its connection with the cognitive sphere of a person;
- memory is viewed as a repository where information can be “fixed,” “tied,” “held,” or “stored,” reflecting the

representation of memory as a physical space for storing knowledge;

- memory is correlated with the spatial code of culture, which manifests in the use of noun components in the nominative case (шығыс септігі), indicating the direction of information movement from inside outward;
- memory is identified with the somatic code of culture, which is expressed through the use of somatic terms such as *кеуде* (thoracic cavity, bust, torso) and *көкірек* (chest), emphasizing the bodily localization of memory.

It should be noted that in Kazakh phraseology, unlike Russian, the semantic macrofield of “память” (memory) is represented more extensively in quantitative terms. This may be explained by extralinguistic factors, such as the later development of literacy among Kazakhs compared to Russians. Consequently, the oral tradition has flourished in Kazakh culture, which is evidenced by a rich heritage of oral folk art: legends, epics, and tales passed down from generation to generation. Kazakh national traditions, including the upbringing of children using numerous proverbs and oral behavioral rules, also testify to the importance of memory and its verbal expression in the culture. Such linguocultural educational tools were transmitted from grandmothers to mothers, from mothers to daughters, and so on. They were neither read from books nor written down, yet Kazakh women know these admonitions and remember them throughout their lives; Kazakhs have a strong memory of their “genealogical tree”. It is believed that every Kazakh should remember their origins up to the seventh generation (*жети атасы*), their belonging to a particular род (ru), etc.

The aforementioned extralinguistic factors presumably influenced the formation and development of memory mechanisms among speakers of the Kazakh language and found their reflection in the phraseological stock, which represents one of the most original and representative layers of the language, serving as a mirror of the culture, mentality, and everyday life of the ethnos.

In Russian phraseology, the modeling of the semantic fragment “память” is realized through the following linguo-cognitive models:

- memory as an anthropic code of culture;
- memory as that which is stored in the head: correlated with the somatic code of culture;
- memory as a repository, a container where what is recalled spins, is stored, surfaces, pops out, evaporates, or falls out;
- memory as a material code of culture: that which can fall out, evaporate, pop out, surface, etc.;
- memory as a spatial code of culture, represented through the use of prepositions such as *из* (from), *в* (in);
- memory processes as a household code of culture: *зарубить на стенке* (to carve on the wall).

In Russian PUs, nominal components such as *память* (memory) and *голова* (head) are characteristic, whereas in Kazakh phraseology the components *ой* (thought), *ес* (attention, mind), *кеуде* (chest, torso), *жады* (memory) are prevalent.

English idioms display both universal cognitive metaphors and culture-specific features:

- cognitive and spatial models of memory: many English idioms conceptualize memory as a physical space or mental repository, from which information may emerge or disappear. This aligns with the repository metaphor common to all three languages;

- memory as an autonomous mental process. English also employs expressions that present memory as an internal cognitive mechanism that can function independently of the will. These idioms highlight the spontaneity and suddenness of recollection: to come to mind, to spring to mind, to pop into one’s head – depict involuntary recall; to flash back – conveys sudden recollection, often emotionally charged (comparable to Kazakh *ескі жараның аузын ашу*). This internal, automatic mechanism aligns with the Kazakh model where memory resurfaces without external prompting, emphasizing its deep cognitive embedding;

- forgetting as disappearance, evaporation, and ejection. Forgetting in English phraseology is often conceptualized through metaphors of evaporation, removal, or slipping away, indicating that memory can fade without conscious control: to slip one’s mind, to fade from memory, to vanish from memory, to escape one’s memory, to go out of one’s head – all reflect unintentional and sometimes complete forgetting. These expressions correlate closely with Russian metaphors such as *вылетело из головы*, *улетучилось из памяти*, and Kazakh expressions like *ойдан шықты* or *есінен шықты*, where the verb шығу (“to exit”) plays a central role in describing forgetting. In contrast, English also includes idioms for intentional forgetting: to block out and to erase from memory – imply mental effort to suppress or eliminate memories, often unpleasant ones. This matches Russian *вычеркнуть из памяти* and Kazakh *санасынан өшіру* (not present in the original sample but semantically close);

- memory triggered by external stimuli – English idioms also capture externally initiated memory retrieval, similar to the Kazakh *ойға салды* (placed on the mind): to jog someone’s memory, to remind someone of something, to bring something to mind – indicate that a person or event externally reactivates a memory. This illustrates the perception of memory as interactive and responsive to stimuli – a theme found across all three linguocultures;

- evaluative aspect of memory. Like Kazakh and Russian, English phraseology includes evaluative idioms that reflect positive or negative emotional attitudes toward remembered persons or events: to remember someone fondly, to look back with affection, to hold someone in memory – express respectful or loving remembrance (cf. *аузынан тастамау*, *вспоминать добрым словом*); to haunt one’s memory, to keep bringing someone up – convey intrusive or painful recollections, often critical or obsessive in tone (cf. *сақтан саққа жүгірту*, *вспоминать с упрёком*). Such idioms emphasize that memory in language is not merely a cognitive function, but a socially and emotionally embedded

phenomenon.

Thus, the study revealed specific features of the perception and expression of the concept “memory” in Kazakh, Russian, and English, allowing for a deeper understanding not only of the cognitive mechanisms but also of the cultural particularities associated with its linguistic representation. Special attention is given to identifying the cognitive structure of memory, which includes three key micropoles: “processes of memory consolidation”, “forgetting” and “reproduction of previously acquired information”. The results of the research emphasize the importance of considering linguistic and cultural differences in the study of phraseology and open prospects for further research in the fields of comparative linguistics and cognitive semantics.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akbulut, F. (2023). Cross-cultural pragmatics and conceptual metaphor theory: The translation of idiomatic expressions. *Söylem Filoloji Dergisi*, (Çeviribilim Özel Sayısı), 594–606. <https://doi.org/10.29110/soylemdergi.1184722>
- [2] Al-Minawi, R. (2024). Analyzing the rhetoric of the Aqsa flood war (2023–2024): A study of Hamas' official discourse through conceptual metaphor theory and critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Linguistics Literature and Translation*, 7(1), 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.1.17>
- [3] Alisoy, H. (2024). Semantic classification of phraseological units. *Acta Humanitatis et Linguarum*, 1(2), 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.01024064>
- [4] Andersen, T., & Ortner, J. (2019). Introduction: Memories of joy. *Memory Studies*, 12(1), 5–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698018811976>
- [5] Ayto, J. (2010). *Oxford dictionary of English idioms* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- [6] Budiman, A. (2019). *War metaphors in political contestation prior to 2019 presidential election*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iccd-19.2019.12>
- [7] Bullo, S. (2017). Investigating intertextuality and interdiscursivity in evaluation: The case of conceptual blending. *Language and Cognition*, 9(4), 709–727. <https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2017.5>
- [8] Bull, A., & Hansen, H. (2016). On agonistic memory. *Memory Studies*, 9(4), 390–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698015615935>
- [9] Ben-Aroia, B., & Ebbrecht-Hartmann, T. (2020). Memorials as discursive spheres: Holocaust and Second World War iconography in public commemoration of extremist-right violence. *Memory Studies*, 14(4), 797–818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698020959800>
- [10] Cambridge University Press. (1998). *Cambridge international dictionary of idioms*. Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Chang, K. (2022). Re-picturing the reception of the spirit with ritual experience: The role of baptism in 1 Corinthians 12:13. *Biblical Theology Bulletin Journal of Bible and Culture*, 52(3), 182–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461079221108371>
- [12] Đào, H. (2022). Conceptual “politics is war” metaphors in titles and sapos of Nhan Dan Online and The New York Times. *Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences S VSSR*, 210(4), 75–89. [https://doi.org/10.56794/vssr.4\(210\).75-89](https://doi.org/10.56794/vssr.4(210).75-89)
- [13] Gülüm, E. (2023). Folkloric memory: (Re)connecting the dots for broader perspectives. *Memory Studies*, 16(6), 1466–1483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17506980231204175>
- [14] Gaál, G. (2023). The city as memory in contemporary Polish women's literature. *Tudásmenedzsment*, 24(4. különszám), 128–137. <https://doi.org/10.15170/tm.2023.24.k4.10>
- [15] Hadidi, Y., & Zare, F. (2020). Exploring the metaphors of loyalty, courage and friendship in Harry Potter novels and their Turkish translations. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 23(4), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.5782/2223-2621.2020.23.4.5>
- [16] Hoskins, A. (2016). Memory ecologies. *Memory Studies*, 9(3), 348–357. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698016645274>
- [17] Hagedoorn, B. (2019). Cultural memory and screen culture. In *Cultural Memory and Popular Culture* (pp. 179–197). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19262-4_7
- [18] Hasanbievna, T., & Bizhoev, B. (2021). *Reflection of national consciousness in the emotiology of Kabardino-Circassian language*. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2021.11.203>
- [19] Jesudas, R., & Mohammed, Z. (2024). Eloquent metaphors: Leveraging linguistic tools for leadership in Biden's inaugural political rhetoric. *EJCEEL*, 2(2), 19–33. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2024.2\(2\).02](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2024.2(2).02)
- [20] Jamalpour, H., & Yaghoobi-Derabi, J. (2022). Cultural memory and neuro-critical reading of Ian McEwan's Atonement. *Revista De Investigaciones Universidad Del Quindío*, 34(S2), 436–442. <https://doi.org/10.33975/riurq.vol34ns2.1142>
- [21] Kenesbaev, I. K. (2007). *Frazeologiyalyq sozdik* [Phraseological Dictionary]. Almaty: Arys.
- [22] Kunin, A. V. (2006). *Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar'* [English–Russian Phraseological Dictionary]. Moskva: Russkiy Yazyk-Media.
- [23] Kozhakhmetova, G., & Sagidolda, G. (2019). Yurt as a micro model of the universe in the context of "language: culture" (Linguistic and cultural analysis on the material of the Kazakh and Mongolian languages). *Homeros*, 2(2), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.33390/homeros.2.005>
- [24] Kövecses, Z. (2018). *Metaphor, cognition, culture*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190879228.003.0002>
- [25] Kirik, V., Leshkevich, T., & Motozhanets, A. (2018). *Memory culture as the main priority of the modern education process*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icadce-18.2018.129>
- [26] Liu, W., & Nie, X. (2023). Cultural heritage game design based on the collective memory reconstruction model. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 167, 02004. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202316702004>
- [27] Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- [28] Lai, H. (2022). Metaphor in Hakka proverbs. *Language and Linguistics 語言暨語言學*, 549–576. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lali.00020.lai>
- [29] Mamasheva, O., Madmarova, G., Abytova, G., Berdibekova, B., Bolotakunova, G., Ormokeeva, R., & Abdullaeva, Z. (2021).

- Reflection of nations mentality in the Kyrgyz, Russian and English language phraseological units. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 11(1), 24–33. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2021.1111002>
- [30] Meshcheryakov, B. G. (2004). *Pamyat' cheloveka: Effekty i fenomeny* [Human Memory: Effects and Phenomena]. Moskva: OOO «Voprosy psikhologii».
- [31] Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). *Kognitivnaya lingvistika* [Cognitive Linguistics]. Moskva: AST: Vostok-Zapad.
- [32] Putri, W., & McDermott, S. (2023). Bridging a transnational mother-daughter's relationship through a memoir. *Enjourme (English Journal of Merdeka)*, 8(1), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v8i1.10373>
- [33] Pugach, Y. (2024). The verbalization of emotions in English phraseological units. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9: Current Trends in Language Development*, (27), 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.31392/npunc.series9.2024.27.04>
- [34] Quan, T., & Huynh, A. (2024). Modulation of moving conceptual metaphors in Vietnamese translation in economic discourse. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 40(1), 26–56. <https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.5208>
- [35] Radbil, T., Akhmetzhanova, G., Zhumagulova, Z., Seralieva, A., & Seralieva, G. (2020). Dusha (“soul”) and telo (“body”) in the aspect of contrastive analysis of cultural concepts: Materials for the linguo-culturological phraseological dictionary of Russian-Kazakh correlations. *Nauchnyi Dialog*, (3), 127–150. <https://doi.org/10.24224/2227-1295-2020-3-127-150>
- [36] Schliephake, C. (2016). Literary place and cultural memory. In *The Literary and Cultural Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe* (Vol. 2, pp. 569–589). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110314595-031>
- [37] Sedykh, A., Buzinova, L., Akimova, E., Pashkovskaia, N., Skvortsov, K., Shcherbakov, A., & Beshinskaya, N. (2023). Phraseological picture of the world and communication: Take “carpe diem” as an example. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(5), 1159–1166. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1305.08>
- [38] Savelyeva, M., Khomutnikova, E., & Borovykh, Y. (2019). Semantic classification of object phraseological units with zoonymic component in English. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 69, 00099. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20196900099>
- [39] Sopova, I. (2020). *Personal transformations of phraseological units in the discourse of politics*. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.12.04.102>
- [40] Stepanova, M. I. (2006). *Frazeologicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language]. Sankt-Peterburg: Poligrafuslugi.
- [41] Teliya, V. N. (Ed.). (2006). *Bol'shoy frazeologicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka: Znachenie. Upotreblenie. Kulturologicheskiy kommentariy* [The Big Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language: Meaning, Usage, Cultural Commentary]. Moskva: AST-Press Kniga.
- [42] Temple, C. (2021). Africana cultural memory in the Afro-European context. *Journal of Black Studies*, 52(4), 418–440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934721999296>
- [43] Tien, T. (2022). Universality vs. cultural specificity of anger metaphors and metonymies in English and Vietnamese idioms. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 26(1), 74–94. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-24951>
- [44] Yarancev, R. I. (2006). *Russkaya frazeologiya: Slovar'-spravochnik (ok. 1500 frazeologizmov)* [Russian Phraseology: Dictionary-Reference (approx. 1500 phraseological units)]. Moskva: Russkiy Yazyk-Media.
- [45] Zhang, X. (2021). Development and critiques of conceptual metaphor theory. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(11), 1487–1491. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1111.18>

Altyn Bakytzhanova is a Candidate of Philological Sciences, Lead Researcher at the Institute of Legislation and Legal Information of the Republic of Kazakhstan under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Kazakhstan. ORCID iD: 0000-0002-5305-8295 Email: altyn051275@gmail.com

Saltanat B. Bekmukhambetova is a Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer at the EP “Training teachers of foreign languages and literature”. ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8467-8544> Email: bekmukhambetovas@mail.ru

Elmira K. Utemissova is a Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer at the EP “Training teachers of foreign languages and literature”. ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9897-8661> Email: moka_1970@mail.ru

Syrym Zhanzhigitov is PhD, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Kazakh Linguistics. ORCID iD: 0000-0002-7814-1378 Email: syrymphd@gmail.com

Aigul Y. Alpysbayeva is PhD, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies. ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5947-6084> Email: Alpysbayeva.Aigul@kaznu.kz

Gulmira S. Omarbayeva is a Candidate of Philological Sciences, Senior Lecturer at the of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies. Email: omar.gulmira@gmail.com

Svetlana S. Tatiyeva is a Master of Humanities, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Languages. ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6784-4214> Email: statieva29@gmail.com