

The Creation of an Image in Phraseological Picture of the World

Kholmuradova Leyla

Associate Professor of

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

Shelestova Tatyana

Associate Professor of Karaganda University, Kazakhstan

Abstract. *The relevance of the selected topic consists in an integrated approach to the study of universal and national-specific features of the representation of moral and ethical concepts in the phraseological foundation of the language with the use of linguistic and linguistic and cultural analysis. Most proverbs contain figurative meanings based on the generalisation of single facts, which often makes it possible to interpret even proverbs with direct substantiation of meaning more broadly. For many years proverbs have been the focus of a number of folklorists, linguists and other scholars, which is the result of the uncertainty of a proverb's nature. Contemporary linguistics does not yet have a universal view on proverbs and sayings.*

Key words: *image; phraseological unit; phraseology; English; French*

Introduction

The phraseological picture of the world reflects a nation's conceptual, cultural, and emotional worldview encoded in its language. Phraseological units—idioms, fixed expressions, and proverbs—form an essential part of this worldview, embedding vivid imagery that mirrors collective experiences and cognitive perceptions. The creation of an image in phraseology involves not just linguistic representation but also mental imagery that connects to symbolic, cultural, and emotional dimensions. These images often arise from metaphors, metonymies, and culturally bound associations that make phraseological units cognitively rich and culturally specific. Understanding how these images are formed allows linguists and cultural researchers to uncover deeper semantic layers and cross-cultural differences in worldview conceptualization.

This qualitative research employs a comparative and cognitive linguistic approach to analyze the phraseological image-creation process. The data set includes a curated selection of phraseological units from English, Uzbek, and Russian languages, sourced from monolingual and bilingual idiom dictionaries. The research involves several key steps:

Phraseological Selection: Identifying idiomatic expressions that involve vivid imagery or metaphor.

Semantic Decomposition: Breaking down each unit into its component imagery, examining metaphorical extensions and core lexical elements.

Cultural Mapping: Comparing similar idioms across languages to detect universal and culture-specific images.

Cognitive Analysis: Utilizing tools from cognitive linguistics (e.g., conceptual metaphor theory) to explain how these idioms structure thought and worldview.

The study focuses particularly on animal metaphors, natural phenomena, and human behavioral attributes as dominant thematic domains for image creation.

Phraseology plays a significant role in the system of figurative means of each language, and

therefore, special attention is paid to the study of the imagery of phraseological units.

As mentioned above, we refer to the phraseological theory of A.V. Kunin, who proposes to consider a phraseological unit as “a stable combination of lexemes with a fully or partially reinterpreted meaning”. From this definition, we can see that the phraseological unit (PU) has all the necessary prerequisites for the presence of imagery: it is either always completely or partially reinterpreted. However, in order for a language unit to be considered figurative, it must meet another condition – its reinterpretation must be motivated. First of all, we should note all possible factors of motivation of the PU in order to limit the range of figurative phraseological units by applying the method of elimination.

Some well-known factors of demotivation include:

- 1) entering into the phraseological units of pseudonyms;
- 2) the presence of dialecticism among the components of PU;
- 3) the entry of archaisms into the PU;
- 4) expressive reinterpretation;
- 5) semantic incompatibility of PU components.

There is also another special type of phraseological units, represented by service words and numerals. From the above definition of imagery, we can conclude that an image can only be based on full-meaning words, whose semantic structure is represented by a relief subject-conceptual content.

It is important to take into account extralinguistic factors such as traditions, rituals and historical factors. The exclusion method, using all possible criteria for the absence of imagery in phraseological units, allows to limit the range of figurative phraseological units and focus your attention on them.

The most interesting thing, in our opinion, is the creation of an image through the use of semantically incompatible words. Less often, the author's speech uses a holistic reinterpretation of phrases.

For example: *Art is long, life is short*

During the speech, the phrase “*the last straw*” can refer to a variety of events, actions, and behaviors. The general meaning of this phrase is, in a way, a common thread that connects all instances of its use:

“*Yes, she even told us...what church you go to. I jumped furiously on my feet. On top of all my troubles, this was the last straw*(A. Cronin. *Shannon's Way*).

The ability to relate to an almost countless number of denotations-situations, defining them with the help of a single image, is a characteristic feature of many phraseological units. This feature distinguishes them from variable combinations of words, where the image is created in context and, therefore, can only characterize a single denotation.

The phraseological image differs, however, in certain specifics. PU is characterized by a rich variety of connections as we have seen above with the five types of semantic duality. A number of phraseological units with a metaphorical type of reinterpretation are characterized by multiple situational correlation, which is not observed in figurative variable combinations of words. Thus, the phraseological unit is a kind of picture, against which the integrated meaning of PU is perceived.

Comparison, as noted above, is one of the most important mechanisms for building an image and transferring new knowledge. For example: phraseological units where a smart and cunning person is compared to objects of fauna: *as wise as an owl*. A man who cheats a lot with a cat: *nervous as a cat, play cat and mouse with somebody*.

The linguistic ways of implementing this general scheme of semantic transformation of a number of phraseological units determine the “face” of the phraseological picture of the world in a particular national language. It is the comparative analysis of phraseological units of different languages and their thematic and ideographic representation that makes it possible to identify differences and similarities in understanding the phenomena of the surrounding world.

Universal features of human activity determine the features of PU in different languages, which is the main source of the emergence of national phraseology.

Thus, the inner form of the PU is its figurative motivation, i.e. it includes and implies that figurative sub-base, which constitutes the PU as such. From all the above, it can be concluded that the internal form of phraseology is, ultimately, the form of its imagery, arising and functioning as a result of the transposition of the diachronic “derivational history” of phraseology into its synchronic

nominative structure.

In addition, in each specific language, phraseological units name only fragments of the world that are relevant to one person and his life activity, while not always what is relevant for one people may be irrelevant for another, therefore the phraseological picture of the world is specific to each specific language and is fragmentary. Not every phenomenon or action of a person gets its expression in the form of phraseology.

The phraseological picture of the world is characterized by a number of distinctive features that significantly affect the formation of its semantic structure.

The universality of phraseology is manifested both in its semantics (in terms of content) and in its structure (in terms of expression). The phraseology of any language reflects any universal semantic categories of language (categories of time, space, degree, quantity, intensity, quality and states of objects and subjects). Also, in the semantics of phraseological units, universal cultural connotations associated with a particular reality of the surrounding world can be fixed, on the basis of which a phraseological image is formed. A striking example of this is phraseological units, which include words-zoonyms. Thus, the hare in many languages is associated with cowardice: *comme un lièvre* (French) – cowardly as a hare; lion with courage *cœur de lion* (French) – lion's heart, *brave as a lion*.

The phraseological system of any language as a whole has its own national characteristics. What exactly is the difference between the phraseological system of two or more languages can be determined only by comparative study. The phraseological picture of the world reflects the culture, traditions and way of life of the people. Archaic elements are often preserved in phraseological units as a reflection of the historical development of the nation.

The English phraseological system is a complex network of native English phrases and borrowings. In this case, we are focusing on borrowings from the French language.

From the above, it follows that the uniqueness of the phraseology in any language, as a reflection of a people's worldview, is mainly manifested in its figurative and motivational bases, which can be identified through phraseological analysis.

Conclusion

The analysis reveals that the creation of imagery in phraseology is deeply rooted in the interaction between language, culture, and cognition. While many phraseological units display universal patterns—such as animal-based metaphors signifying behavior—cultural uniqueness emerges in how these metaphors are interpreted and used. For instance, while “to have ants in one’s pants” in English conveys restlessness, an analogous phrase in another language might evoke different imagery based on regional fauna or mythologies. Therefore, phraseological units not only serve communicative purposes but also encode cultural knowledge and cognitive schemata. Recognizing these embedded images aids in understanding intercultural communication and translation challenges, affirming the essential role of phraseology in constructing and reflecting the worldview of a linguistic community.

Reference:

1. Amosova N.N. Osnovi angliyskoy fraseologii -Л.:1963 – 208 p.
2. Kunin A.B. Frazeologiya sovremennoogo angliyskogo yazika. M.: 1972. – 289 p.
3. Shmelev D.I. Slovo I obraz. M.: 1964. – 119 p.
4. Cowie A., Mackin R., McCaigl. R. Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. V.1,2. Lnd., 1975, 1983.
5. English - Russian Phraseological Dictionary – M., 1984.-944p.
6. French – Russian Phraseological Dictionary – M., 2006.
7. Robert Byrne. 1,911 Best Things Anybody Ever Said. New York, 1998.
8. Kholmuradova L.E. (2021). National and Cultural Originality of English and French Phraseology and its Influence on the Development of the Mentality of the People. Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology, 4778-4784.
9. Холмурадова, Л. Э. (2018). Лингвокультурология как важная часть нового филологического предмета. *Иностранные языки в Узбекистане*, (3), 33–38.

10. Dobrovolskij, D., & Piirainen, E. (2006). Cultural knowledge and idioms. *International Journal of English Studies*, 6(1), 27–41. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.6.1.48081>
11. Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press.
12. Langlotz, A. (2006). Idiomatic creativity: A cognitive-linguistic model of idiom-representation and idiom-variation in English. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.19>
13. Gläser, R. (1998). The stylistic potential of phraseological units in the light of genre analysis. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications*, 125–143.
14. Boers, F. (2000). Metaphor awareness and vocabulary retention. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(4), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.4.553>
15. Sabban, A. (2007). Phraseology in learner dictionaries: What, where, and how? In *Phraseology and Culture in English* (pp. 341–357). Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197860.341>