

UDC 811.512.1; IRSTI 16.21.49

<https://doi.org/10.47526/2023-4/2664-0686.13>A.K. KOLPENOVA¹ , G.SH. YAKIYAYEVA² ¹PhD Doctoral Student of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University
(Kazakhstan, Astana), e-mail: k.asiya_k@mail.ru²Senior Lecturer of Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University
(Kazakhstan, Turkistan), e-mail: gulmira.yakiyaeva@ayu.edu.kz**THE ROLE OF THE IMAGE IN THE SEMANTICS OF PHRASEOLOGISMS**

Abstract. Both external appearance and internal structure are complex units – the semantics of phraseological units is considered one of the most important issues in the world of phraseology. It is relevant from this point of view to describe the features of the image in the phraseological meaning by interpreting the meaning of phraseological units in the Kazakh and Turkish languages. The article concludes that special units in the language system – phraseological units perform all three functions of the language – communicative, cumulative, aesthetic, and this function of phraseological units is realized through the internal form – image. Based on this conclusion, the image motivates the true meaning of the phraseology; that it shows evaluation and emotionality in the phraseological sense; that it is a carrier of cultural connotation proven by comparing qualitative semantic phraseology in the Kazakh and Turkish languages. It is concluded that phraseologisms are motivated not by the meaning of their components, but by the associated image of the real world in the mind of the language owner. In some phraseological units, the initial base-image may not be clear, but it is said that it can be determined etymologically, because the image is an internal form, and without the internal form, it is concluded that the phraseology itself does not exist. The fact that the image shows components in the range of “good-bad”, “approve-disapprove” – evaluation and emotionality is confirmed by a comparative analysis of phraseological units in two languages. It is considered that the connotative content of an ethno-cultural nature is not an auxiliary meaning adverb in the structure of phraseological meaning, but a mandatory and main element, because the image base – internal form of phraseological units is formed on the basis of the national-cultural worldview. It is determined that the category of imagery is characteristic of all qualitative semantic phraseological units.

Keywords: image, imagery, qualitative semantics, cultural connotation, motivation, emotionality.

A.K. Колпенова¹, Г. Ш. Якияева²¹Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің PhD докторанты
(Қазақстан, Астана қ.), e-mail: k.asiya_k@mail.ru²Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университетінің аға оқытушысы
(Қазақстан, Түркістан қ.), e-mail: gulmira.yakiyaeva@ayu.edu.kz***Бізге дұрыс сілтеме жасаңыз:**

Kolpenova A.K., Yakiyayeva G.Sh. The Role of The Image in the Semantics of Phraseologisms // *Ясауи университетінің хабаршысы*. – 2023. – №4 (130). – Б. 150–160. <https://doi.org/10.47526/2023-4/2664-0686.13>

***Cite us correctly:**

Kolpenova A.K., Yakiyayeva G.Sh. The Role of The Image in the Semantics of Phraseologisms // *Iasauı universitetinin habarshysy*. – 2023. – №4 (130). – Б. 150–160. <https://doi.org/10.47526/2023-4/2664-0686.13>

Фразеологизмдер семантикасындағы образдың рөлі

Аңдатпа. Сыртқы тұрпаты да, ішкі құрылымы да күрделі бірліктер – фразеологизмдердің семантикасы әлемдік фразеологияда маңызды мәселелердің бірінен саналады. Қазақ және түрік тілдеріндегі фразеологизмдер мағынасын интерпретациялау арқылы фразеомағынадағы образдың ерекшелігін сипаттау осы тұрғыдан пайымдағанда өзекті болып табылады. Мақалада тілдік жүйедегі ерекше бірліктер – фразеологизмдер, тілдің коммуникативтік, кумулятивтік, эстетикалық – үш қызметін де атқаратындығы, фразеологизмдердің бұл функциясы ішкі форма – образ арқылы жүзеге асатындығы тұжырымдалады. Осы тұжырым негізінде образдың фразеологизмнің шынайы мағынасын уәждейтіндігі; фразеологиялық мағынадағы бағалау мен эмотивтілікті танытатындығы; мәдени коннотацияның тасымалдаушысы болып табылатындығы қазақ және түрік тілдеріндегі квалитативті семантикалы фразеологизмдерді салыстыра отырып, дәлелденеді. Фразеологизмдер өзінің құрамындағы компоненттерінің мағынасымен емес, ақиқат дүниенің тіл иесінің санасында ассоциацияланған образымен уәжделетіндігі түйінделеді. Кейбір фразеологизмдерде бастапқы негіз-образ айқын болмауы мүмкін, алайда оны этимологиялық жолмен анықтауға болатыны айтылады, өйткені образ – ішкі форма, ал ішкі форма болмаса, фразеологизмнің өзі де болмайтыны тұжырымдалады. Образдың «жақсы-жаман», «құптау-құптамау» диапазонындағы компоненттер – бағалау және эмотивтілікті танытатындығы екі тілдегі фразеологизмдерді салыстыра талдау арқылы дәйектеледі. Этномәдени сипатқа ие коннотациялық мазмұн фразеологиялық мағына құрылымындағы қосалқы мән үстеуші емес, міндетті және негізгі элемент болып табылатындығы, өйткені фразеологизмдердің образды негізі – ішкі формасы ұлттық-мәдени дүниетаным негізінде қалыптасатындығы түйінделеді. Образдылық категориясының барлық квалитативті семантикалы фразеологизмдерге тән екендігі қорытындыланады.

Кілт сөздер: образ, образдылық, квалитативті семантика, мәдени коннотация, уәждеме, эмотивтілік.

А.К. Колпенова¹, Г.Ш. Якияева²

¹PhD докторант Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева
(Казахстан, г. Астана), e-mail: k.asiya_k@mail.ru

²старший преподаватель Международного казахско-турецкого университета
имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави
(Казахстан, г. Туркестан), e-mail: gulmira.yakiyeva@ayu.edu.kz

Роль образа в семантике фразеологизмов

Аннотация. Семантика фразеологизмов, сложных как по форме, так и по внутренней структуре, является одной из важнейших проблем в мировой фразеологии. Описание характерных особенностей образа в фразеозначении через интерпретацию значения фразеологизмов на казахском и турецком языках является актуальным в этом аспекте. В статье делается вывод о том, что фразеологизмы выполняют все три функции языка: коммуникативную, кумулятивную и эстетическую, что эта функция фразеологизмов реализуется через внутреннюю форму – образ. На основании этого утверждения, через сравнения фразеологизмов на казахском и турецком языках доказывается, что образ мотивирует истинный смысл фразеологизма; демонстрирует оценочность и эмоциональность во фразеологическом значении; является носителем культурной коннотации. Резюмируется, что фразеологизмы мотивированы не значением составляющих его компонентов, а ассоциированным образом истинного мира в сознании носителя языка. В некоторых

фразеологизмах исходная основа – образ может быть не очевидным, однако её можно определить этимологическим путём, так как образ – это внутренняя форма, а без внутренней формы не может существовать и сам фразеологизм. Тот факт, что компоненты образа в диапазоне «хорошо-плохо», «приветствуется-не приветствуется» демонстрируют оценочность и эмоциональность, подтверждается сравнительным анализом фразеологизмов на двух языках. Формулируется вывод о том, что коннотативное содержание, имеющее этнокультурный характер, является в структуре фразеологического значения обязательным и основным элементом, а не придающим вспомогательное значение, поскольку образная основа фразеологизмов – внутренняя форма – формируется на основе национально-культурного мировоззрения. Заключается, что категория образности присуща всем качественным семантическим фразеологизмам.

Ключевые слова: образ, образность, качественная семантика, культурная коннотация, мотивация, эмотивность.

Introduction

Linguistic units that take a significant place in the vocabulary and testify to the beauty and richness of the language are phraseological units. Phraseologisms are language units created for the purpose of conveying a certain concept figuratively and thought in a particularly impressive way. This imagery, impressiveness is realized through an image inspired by a phraseological meaning. For example: in Kazakh: *jylannayn' aiyagyn korgen who saw the legs of a snake* “quick, cunning, nimble”, *jumyrtqadan jy'n qyrqu who cut wool from an egg* “found money from nowhere”, *bit ishine qan qyiu who poured blood into a louse*, *shaitannyn' artqy aiyagy, qoly men keudesinin' arasy qyryq jyldyq jol* “a cunning person who knows what others don't know” or in Turkish the meaning given by the phraseology: *seytanın art ayağı* 'very cunning', *eliyle koynunun arası kırk yıllık yol* 'very greedy' can also be given by individual words, however, the images such as: *seeing a snake's leg, cutting wool from an egg, pouring blood into a louse, the distance between the arm and chest of the devil is a forty year road*, more precisely, image-situations are relevant to the phraseological meaning and give a different character and meaning that distinguishes phraseological units from other language units. “That's why many reporters consider imagery as one of the most important features of idioms” [1, p. 45]. It is natural that imagery is the main feature of phraseology: “an image is an internal form of phraseology. Phraseology without internal form has no meaning, and without meaning, phraseology itself does not exist. Without an internal form, phraseological units cannot perform their communicative function” [2, p. 32]. G. Smagulova, a scientist who studied phraseologisms in various aspects, defines the phraseological internal form as follows: “The internal form of a phraseology is an image, a certain situation, a “gestalt”, a “picture”, a figurative representation of the situation described by a phraseology, which is the motivation of the meaning of phraseology” [3, p. 75]. The following conclusion: the main element defining phraseology as a linguistic sign is an image. The article aims to prove this conclusion by distinguishing and analyzing the role of the image in the semantics of phraseological units. The semantics of phraseological units is a complex phenomenon: it includes the properties and signs of the objective world determined by the language owner, and the language owner's assessment, evaluation of this objective world, emotions take place at the same time. Therefore, V.N. Telia states that “the structure of phraseological semantics is formed by an ordered series of macrocomponents, which are a “bunch” of properties, providing one type of information” [4, p. 34]. The differentiation of the role of the image in the semantics of phraseological units of the Kazakh and Turkish languages is highlighted by the definition of the essence of these components by means of interlinguistic similarities and differences. The goal sets out the tasks of sorting out qualitative

semantic idioms in two languages, including idioms, discussing the problems of image and internal form directly related to it.

Research methods

The image, which arises on the basis of the experience of the native speaker of the language of cognition and perception of the real world, imposes a variable meaning on the phraseological meaning that is motivated by it. The ways of creating phraseological variable meaning is differentiated in A.T. Sinan's following work : “Ad aktarması, Mecaz-ı Mürsel / metonümia (göze girmek, başında torbası eksik); deyim aktarması / metaphor (eleğini eleyip duvara asmak, ayaklı kütüphane); teşbih-benzetme (acem bahçesi gibi, tığ gibi delikanlı); kinaye (ağır başlı, yüzü ak); telmih (derdini Marko Paşaya anlatmak); abartma-mübalaga (iğne atsan yere düşmes, yumurtaya kulp takmak)” [5, p. 75]. All these methods are based on the image. “Phraseologisms are not depicted by the meaning of the words contained in them, but by the image” [2, p. 39]. The research is carried out by focusing and describing the role of the image thoroughly, that is the basis for the semantics of phraseological units. The method of component analysis was used to determine the significant meaning of the phraseology in the process of comparative description of the role of the image of the internal form of phraseology in the Kazakh and Turkish languages, the cognitive approach was used to show the properties and signs of the real world of the internal form based on of the image, and the etymological analysis method was applied to find out the motive underlying the image.

The first role of the phraseological image: *the image motivates the true meaning of the phraseology.*

“The purpose of phraseology is to express a certain concept in a special form, in an impressive, different sense” [6, p. 39], the image that motivated the phraseology adds an evaluative, emotional-expressive tone to the concept-comprehension, that is, evaluative in the phraseological sense, emotional components are determined by the image.

“Imagery is a lexical-semantic category that summarizes the structural-semantic features of phraseology in the linguistic system and it is formed by the combination of extralinguistic factors” [3, p. 79]. Ethnolinguistic meaning created on the basis of extralinguistic factors is based on cultural information. If we say that this ethnocultural information is fixed in the image, another role of the phraseological image is defined: the image is a carrier of cultural connotation.

“The figurative phraseme is enriched with semantic-stylistic and expressive properties based on its internal form” [7, p. 56]. The conclusion from this conclusion: the phraseological image determines the stylistic feature of the phraseology.

In summary, the role of the phraseological image, which determines the communicative, aesthetic, cumulative function of the phraseology, is as follows: the image motivates the meaning of the phraseology; the image shows appreciation and emotionality in the phraseological sense; the image is a carrier of cultural connotation; the image determines the stylistic features of phraseological units.

The phraseological image and its functions were analyzed and differentiated using phraseological units describing human behavior in the Kazakh and Turkish languages. This was caused by the exceptional number of phraseological units describing human behavior in both languages, especially in Turkish, and the fact that some of the phraseological units are used colloquially only in certain parts of Turkey. For example: Turkish phraseology *kırk gün kaynatsan bir damla balı çıkmaz* 'a bad man' has the meaning of *ağzının içi yumuş dolu* “a person who only knows how to give orders” in Alania and Antep, in Gaziantep it means *bir yüzü insan, bir yüzü köpek* “a two-faced man”, in Chankyri it has the meaning of is ‘famous’ [8, pp. 240, 276, 370].

As a source of material the following phraseological dictionaries were used: in Turkish O.A. Aksoi's, M. Hengirmen's, A. Pusküllüoğlu's phraseological dictionaries, the dictionary

“Bölge özülerinde atasözleri ve deyimler”, in Kazakh I. Kenesbayev’s “Phraseological dictionary”, G. Smagulova's “Phraseological dictionary of the Kazakh language” and “Meaningful phraseological dictionary”.

Analysis and results

The image motivates the meaning of the phraseology

Figurativeness is a dominant feature of regular phrases, especially phraseological units describing human behavior [9, p. 55].

We have already mentioned that factual objects and phenomena in reality, their properties and signs recognized by humans are imaged, and this image is a stimulus for the formation of phraseological units. The facts of the collection and grouping of quality-semantic phraseology in the Kazakh and Turkish languages showed that phraseology describing human behavior was often motivated by images based on somatic and zoomorphic names. For example: the phraseology *Aqyly alqymynan aspaghan* in Kazakh “a person who does not have more intelligence than himself, who does not have the ability to understand others”, in Turkish *aklı başından bir karış yukarı* “a person who does what comes to his mind without thinking”, Kaz. *auzy auyr* ‘hard-mouthed’ describes a person who ‘doesn’t gossip, keeps secrets, doesn’t like to talk’, Turkish: *ağzı killitli* ‘keep a secret’, Kaz. a bad mouth “a foul mouth that says whatever it is”, in Turkish this meaning is given by the phraseology *ağzı kalabalık*. The word “*kalabalyk*” in Turkish means “a group of people, a collection of unnecessary, disorderly things”. Similarly, the Turkish word *ağzının perhizi yok* ‘speaks whatever comes to mind’ gives the character of a person. Kaz. *auzynan sozi, koinynan bozi tusken* ‘a clumsy person who can’t form the beginning of two words, whose words fall from his mouth, *auzyn ashsa, zhuregi korinedi* ‘his heart is visible when he opens his mouth’ a sincere, open-minded man. In the Turkish phraseological units *eli bayraklı* ‘immoral, argumentative’, *gök gözlü* ‘dishonest, oppressive’, there is an image based on the words *mouth, heart, hand, throat, chest, eye*.

At the same time, we can see that in both languages, the image associated with the names of animals and birds is motivated by the phraseological meaning: Turk. *gemi aslány* with the meaning of the phraseological phrase ‘a man who thinks he is strong, but is incapable of doing anything’ because of the nature of the ship lion, which, no matter how strong he looks, can’t do anything, that is, if the lion is on the ship, he is in captivity. *Aslan yürekli* ‘a real guy, not afraid of anything’, this phraseology also exists in the Kazakh language *arystan jurekti*, it is used in this sense: lion-hearted ‘unfazed, unyielding, fearless’. Turk. *haymana öküzü* “lazy” in Turkish, haymana means a meadow where animals graze freely, i.e., a lazy person is characterized by the image of a grazing ox, who only knows how to eat and drink, *cênet öküzü* means “pure in heart, but naive as to be called a fool”. Turk. *it dişi domuz derisi* ‘dishonest person’, *yüzü eşek derisi* ‘shameful, disgraceful’, this meaning in Kazakh language is given by phraseological units *betin tilseng qan shykpaidy, beti qalyng*, if you cut his face, blood will not come out, his face is thick. Turk. *horoz ışıklı* ‘stupid, without character, blunt, dumb’, in Kazakh, this meaning is given by the phraseology *tauyqyng miyndai miy joq that*, an idiot, have no brain, like a chicken's brain. In Kazakh language: *qoi auzynan sho’p almas, shokken tuiyege mine almas, qoidan qongyr, jylqydan tory*, “one who can’t get grass from the sheep’s mouth, who can’t ride a sunken camel, more meek than a sheep, inconspicuous, will not muddy the water”, *murnyn tesken tailaktai, sylbyr*, ‘yielding, agreeable, complaisant’ phraseological units are used actively. We can see that the concept and understanding of the four food animals, which takes place in the life and experience of the people, is based on the meaning of phraseological units, because the meaning of the phraseological unit is an imaged fragment (situation) of real existence.

Prof. K. Akhanov says that various legends are the basis for the creation of some fixed phrases [10, p. 182], that is, the image that motivates the meaning of phraseological units can be born from a certain event. For example, in G. Mussabayev’s works on the history of language,

there are the following data about the phraseological units of the country that swallowed the heart *jurek jutqan, elden shyqqan alaiyaq*: “We call a brave and courageous person “the one who swallowed the heart”. In order to join the main troop, a young man first of all kills the first enemy he hits in a battle, and then swallows his heart. He cuts off the ear and uses it to count the number of people killed. This is where the expressions *qan isher, jurek jutqan, bastan quy’laq sadaga* садаға “blood drinker, heart swallower” and “sacrifice an ear for a head” come from those legends [11, p. 152]. Similarly, *elden shyqqan alaiyaq* what we call a rogue, can be understood only if we compare it with the tradition of the ancient Ghun tribes. At that time, the seriousness of the crime was stealing a show horse, and the seriousness of the punishment was deportation. People gather, cut the face of the accused, put two colored shoes on both feet and say “Get out of the country”. That's what he said, *elden shyqqan alaiyaq* “a spotted foot from the country” [12, p. 150].

In addition, the meaning of the phraseology *kös dinlemiş deve gibi* 'cold-blooded' is understood by the Turkish people who know the meaning of «kos», which is based on the image. There is also the following story of the origin of this phraseology: “Kos is a loud, big drum. It was transported from one place to another by horse or camel. For many years in the Ottoman Horde, when one of the camels carrying this “kos”, got old, a decree was hung around its neck saying “anyone who touches this camel will be punished”. One day, the camel entered a man's garden, and the owner of the garden, being afraid to touch him too hard, tried to scare him away by banging the lids of the dishes on each other, but the camel did not pay attention to this voice. Then the neighbor of that person said: - Don't bother, the sound of the lid of the dish is not for him, he has been listening to “kos” for many years” [13, p. 81].

The image that motivates the meaning of phraseology may not always be clear. According to it, “the phraseology cannot be said to have no internal form, the destruction of the image, that is the basis for the formation of the phraseology, may be unclear, which can be determined through etymological analysis” [14, p. 40]. For example, in the Turkish language there is an idiom *‘Ağzının ıçı yumuş dolu* a person who constantly gives orders, literally translated: *his mouth is full of work*. Image-forming word *work* in the Kazakh literary language: 1. *Business, service, work, labor*; 2. Active is used in the sense of *action, measure, activity* [15, p. 318], however, this word is one of the oldest words in the Turkish language. Today it is unique to some regions and has different meanings. For example, *yumuş* – 1. *Iş, hizmet buyruğu* in the sense of “business, service order” in Afion, Eskişehir, Urfa, Gaziantep, Ankara, Mugla, Adana; 2. In Afion and Manisa it is used in the sense of “meeting, society”; 3. *Vazife, hizmet, buyrulan iş, söz* 'duty, service, ordered deed' in Malatya; 4. *Vazife, vazife* 'task, duty' in Kyrşehir; 5. And the idiom *Ödünc alınan şey* is used in Ordu land in the sense of “temporarily borrowed thing” [16]. And the image forming the idiom of *Ağzının yumuş dolu* was inspired by the meaning of the word “command, order, task”: the given idiom describes a person who only knows how to give orders.

A phraseological synchronic or diachronic image not only motivates the semantics of a phraseology, but also shows its evaluative and emotional character.

The image shows appreciation and emotionality in the phraseological sense.

The components of the semantic structure of the phraseology are the assessment given by the speaker in the “good-bad” range, the emotivity determined by the “approve-disapprove” dimension, which corresponds to the emotional attitude of the subject, and is determined by the image.

In the meaning of phraseology, truth is not only an imaged fragment of existence, but also a positive or negative opinion of the speaker about this fragment, the situation, i.e., its assessment. “Evaluation is characteristic of idioms to fulfill their symbolic function” [17, p. 84]. “Evaluation is information that expresses the value of what is represented in the denotative content of the idiom” [2, p. 40]. Evaluation takes place in the context of feedback. For example: in Kazakh *auzyn aiga bilegen* “very brave, bold, fearless”, his inner world is open, “he does not think evil of anyone, friendly” or in Kazakh *tas bauyr* stone liver, in Turkish *bağrı taş* “merciless, does not feel sorry for

anyone". In the phraseology in Kazakh *shyk bermes Shygaibai, shyk tatyrmaz* in Turkish *taştan yağ çıkar, ondan çıkmaz, yumurtadan yonga soymak, cebinde akrep var* 'mean, greedy', *shar ainassy shalqasynan eken* 'very hostile, malicious' the good and bad characters of a person are evaluated.

Positive or negative evaluation depends on the world view of the language owner. For example: in the Kazakh language the image *qoyan jurek* has the meaning of a rabbit heart "fearful, timid" based on the cowardice of a rabbit, while in Turkish the meaning of "timid, very afraid" is given by the phraseology *deve yürekli*, meanwhile, it seems that the timidity of the camels was denoted, because the Kazakh language has also the phraseology *urikken tuye kozdendi*, "two eyes came out in a panic, and it was screaming". There is phraseology "two eyes staggered, shivered". In the same way, the Turkish language has the phraseology *gözü dar* 'a person who does not give anything to someone, greedy', however, in the Kazakh language *kozi tar* "narrow-eyed" is not used, the phraseology *ishi tar* gives the meaning "feeling an envious resentment of someone or their achievements, possessions, jealous".

One component of the structure of phraseological meaning - emotivity means the subject's emotional relationship. "Emotionality is measured by the "approving-disapproving" scale. Approving and disapproving are extreme points of the scale, among them are features such as hating, despising, scolding, mocking" [2, p. 43]. For example: Kaz. *murnyn//tanauyn ko'kke ko'teru, uzengi bauy alty qabat eken*, raise the nose // stretch the nose to the sky, the stirrup belt is six layers, Turk. *burnu yere düşse almaz, burnu kaf dağında, bıyığı yelli* describe a person's arrogant, haughty, arrogant character. From the meanings of these idioms, and the meaning of 'ridicule; mockery' can be noticed the emotivity, Kaz. *uy'a bo'riktey kisi* 'shy, timid, hesitant' is meant neglect, disdain, Turk. *dünya yıkılsa umurunda değil* 'irresponsible, carefree' is implied scolding, shouting, Turk. *cehennem kütiği 'tozaqta januga laiyk adam', yüzüne tükürseler yağmur yağıyor sanır* 'very rude, cheeky' can be noted intense hatred of the speaker.

In both languages, there are many phraseological units that have a negative value and express disapproval. The fact that there are a lot of phraseological units with a negative meaning in any of the common languages was noted by A.M. Emirova connecting it with the features of the human brain: "the right hemisphere of the brain is responsible for thinking and imagining the image, the left hemisphere is responsible for speech and logical thinking. Positive emotions occur in the left hemisphere of the brain, and negative emotions occur in the right hemisphere. The reason for the numerical superiority of negative phraseological units is explained by the fact that the "image-thinking" right condition of the sphere plays a key role in the formation of phraseological units" [18, p. 140]. This fact also indicates that phraseological units are the result of image thinking.

The evaluation and emotionality conveyed by the image in the sense of phraseology shows the experience of knowing and perceiving the world, the culture of the ethnic group. Therefore, the image is a carrier of cultural connotation.

Image is a carrier of cultural connotation

Connotation – Lat. con "together", notatio "notation" means secondary, additional, and complementary. "Cultural connotation is the interpretation of the meaning inspired by the image in cultural categories" [19, p. 214]. "The imagery of phraseology has an internal structure that provides cultural information" [20, p. 157]. This internal structure – the connotative content of an ethno-cultural character is not an auxiliary meaning in the structure of phraseological meaning, but a mandatory and main element, because the image base of phraseological units is formed on the basis of the national-cultural worldview. "The main characteristic of the image is its national identity, pronounced national colour" [21, p. 39]. For example: The phraseology Kaz. *jeti atasyn mal o'ltirgen* "a greedy man, miser" *ko'n ko'n'ildi*, "a hard-hearted, trembling, insensitive, cruel man", *qu bastan quyrdaq et alady* "a miser who grabs both heads and bites in the middle", *qynanin qynandai, taiyn ta'n'irindei ko'rgen* 'who saw his cattle like a god, "a very strong man". The motifs and images in the phraseological units "stingy", *qulygyna naiza boilamaidy* "a man with strong

cunning”, *kybidei isingen* “proud”, *qamshysynan qan sorgalagan* “evil, wicked” have cultural connotations specific to the Kazakh people.

One peculiarity of the life of the Turkish people is the variety of food, and in this regard, we can see that the names of food and drinks are the basis for the phraseological image related to behavior: *ögli açık ayran delisi* 'foolish person', *bağrı yufka* 'kind', *her köfteye maydanoz olmak* 'sticks his nose in each business and gets involved in everything', *ağzına ayran durmaz, ağızında bakla islanmamak* 'a person who can't keep a secret', *akıllısı değirmende yoğurt öğütüyor*, 'all are stupid', *süt anamın yoğurt oğlu* 'a pure, honest son of a noble mother', *suyuna pirinç salınmaz* 'a man cannot be trusted' in regular phrases “man” the connotative content is given by the names of national food and drink, and the phraseological units are finished with national-cultural coloring.

One of the most important cultural features of the people is customs, traditions and national ceremonies, which are reflected in phraseology. For example, in the Turkish language, *elinin kınası, yüzünün karası* meaning “dirty, lazy” was the main motif of henna smeared on a girl's hand, i.e., this phrase initially meant that a young bride turned out to be lazy, and then gave the general character of a dirty, lazy person. In general, the tradition of “smearing henna” is considered one of the most important traditions of the Turkish people. A “henna party” must be organized at the girl's wedding, henna was smeared on the girl's hand, at this party the girl says goodbye to her mother, sisters, and friends, and the crowd gives the girl a gift. “Since ancient times, in the knowledge of the Turks, the earth and the soil have always been blessed, and the henna that comes from this place is also considered sacred. That's why henna is applied to a girl who is going to be married off, and a boy who is going to the army, with the intention of “protecting them from calamities and slanders”. After washing and beautifying the deceased, sprinkling with henna is still preserved, and this is also born from the belief that “he should not have trouble in the afterlife, he should not fall into the fire of hell” [Durak, 2021, orally]. In this way, the preservation of traditions born from the beliefs of the people through language units and being the object of synchronous and diachronic researches, in turn, allows to widely introduce the national mentality and culture to humanity.

Another source of information preserved in the meaning of fixed phrases is related to the mythological and religious beliefs of mankind. Kaz. *shaitan kisi* a damn person “a person with unstable character, unlucky”; 'a sharp one that stabs someone's jinn', Turk. *shaytana papucu ters giydirir, shaytana yirgigi bilen* 'very cunning', *shaytan tüyü bulunmak* 'finds the language of others', *cin fikirli* 'very cunning', *cehennem kütüğü* 'a person who deserves to burn in hell' are the basis of the image in the phraseology of satan, demon, and hell which has clarified the connotative feature.

The image determines the stylistic features of phraseological units

O. Aitbaiuly, who studied Kazakh phraseology and paraphrases, sums up that the main feature of phraseological phrases is their stylistic meaning, “the meaning” is conveyed through an image, and thinks that “the object of study of stylistics is formed based on phraseology” [22, p. 67].

G. Sagidolda states that as the image supported by a constant phrase becomes clearer, the clarity, accuracy, and emotional-expressive power of the ideological meaning of the phrase increases [23, p. 286].

“When we talk about the place of phraseological units in the general language system, first of all, their stylistic function stands out. A characteristic feature of a thorough phrase in language and speech is a stylistic feature” [24, p. 601]. “The bookishness of phraseology or the simplicity of use in colloquial language, even the rudeness that goes beyond the limits of decency has stylistic significance” [25, p. 14]. A stylistic macro component takes place in the phraseological sense. A stylistic macrocomponent is, in simple terms, a sign of appropriateness/inappropriateness of using certain phraseology in linguistic communication. This sign is also determined by the image-motivational basis. In this regard, idioms are used depending on a specific field of linguistic communication: some idioms are specific to the literary language, while some are specific to the spoken language. For example: Kaz. *basqan izine sho'p shyqpaidy* grass does not grow on his

footprints. *baştığı yerde ot bitmez* 'cunning, dishonest, cruel person' phraseology and Turkish phraseological expressions “*burnunun bokunu yemiş*” or *kapısı kuş bokuyla sıvanmış* have their own context of use. Language units – phraseology which perform the function of figuratively conveying the speaker's thoughts to influence the listener, also differ in their use depending on a certain social environment.

Many idioms in the Turkish language have the character of being used in the people's life, and according to this character, are attributed to the heritage of folklore, such as proverbs. Another stylistic feature of phraseological units in the Turkish language is that they belong to a certain region, therefore a phraseological dictionary entitled “*Bölge ağızlarında Atasözleri ve Deyimler*” was published.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the main component forming a phraseology is an image or internal form. There is no phraseology without an image. The meaning of some phraseological units may not be synchronistically clear or even unknown, but it can be found etymologically. Phraseologisms are units born from the purpose of conveying thoughts concretely and figuratively, figuratively and impressively, so the image is a component that determines the main function of phraseology. The image motivates the meaning of the phraseology: it defines its character as a linguistic symbol. Through the image, the potential of communication becomes stronger, the aesthetic character of the language takes precedence through the clarification of the image that distinguishes the phraseology from other language units, the image that preserves the emic truth characteristic of the ethnos performs a cumulative function. The value of evaluative and emotive components in the phraseological sense of “good-bad”, “approve-disapprove” is determined by the image. The image is a carrier of cultural connotation, because the extralinguistic reality that testifies to the existence of the people, the Kazakh and Turkish people in our analysis, is based on the image. The stylistic coloring of phraseology is also transformed by the image. A phraseological meaning is formed through an image, and the process of interpreting this meaning is realized through an image. The process of interpretation of meaning brings up the problems of phraseosemiosis and sets the task of considering these problems in Turkic studies in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Алефиренко Н.Ф., Семененко Н.Н. Фразеология и паремология. – М.: Флинта, 2009. – 344 с.
2. Алефиренко Н.Ф., Зимин В.И., Василенко А.П и др. Современная фразеология: тенденции и инновации. – М.: Новый проект, 2016. – 200 с.
3. Смағұлова Г. Қазақ фразеологиясы лингвистикалық парадигмаларда. – Алматы: Елтаным, 2020. – 256 б.
4. Телия В.Н. Семантика идиом в функционально-параметрическом отображении // Фразеология в Машинном фонде русского языка. – М.: Наука, 1990. – С. 32–47.
5. Sinan A.T. Türkçenin deyim varlığı. – İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları, 2015. – 536 s.
6. Aksoy Ö.A. Atasözleri ve Deyimler sözlüğü-1. – İstanbul: İnkilap, 2021. – 1205 s.
7. Авакова Р. Фразеосемантика. – Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2013. – 246 б.
8. Bölge ağızlarında atasözleri ve deyimler. – Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2019. – 494 s.
9. Волошкина И.А. Фразеологический образ как отражение характера человека (на материале французского языка) // Вестник Новгородского государственного университета. – 2008. – №49. – С. 55–58.
10. Аханов К. Тіл білімінің негіздері. – Алматы: Санат, 1993. – 496 б.
11. Мұсабаев Ғ. Бір сөздің тарихы // Жұлдыз. – 1963. – №11. – Б. 153–154.
12. Мұсабаев Ғ. Жұмбақ сан – жұмбақ тіркестер // Жұлдыз. – 1965. – №11. – Б. 149–152.
13. Yüksel F. Deyimler ve ilginç hikayeleri. – Ankara: Egemen Yayınları, 2015. – 223 s.

14. Чой Юн Хи. Проблемы сопоставления внутренней формы фразеологизмов // Язык, сознание, коммуникация: Сб. статей. – М.: Макс Пресс, 2001. – С. 37–49.
15. Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі / ред. Т. Жанұзақов. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2008. – 968 б.
16. Türk Dil Kurumu (TDK) сөздігі. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>. (date of access 12.02.2023)
17. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1996. – 288 с.
18. Эмирова А.М. Русская фразеология в коммуникативно-прагматическом освещении. – Симферополь: Научный мир, 2020. – 228 с.
19. Қайдар Ә. Қазақ тілінің өзекті мәселелері. – Алматы: Ана тілі, 1998. – 304 б.
20. Смағұлова Г. Мағыналас фразеологизмдердің ұлттық-мәдени аспектілері. – Алматы: Ғылым, 1998. – 196 б.
21. Аймұхамбет Ж.Ә., Құрмамбаева Қ.С., Миразова М.Н. Көркем туындыдағы бейне мен таңбаның қызметі // Ясауи университетінің хабаршысы. – 2023. – №1(127). – Б. 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.47526/2023-1/2664-0686.03>.
22. Айтбайұлы Ә. Қазақ фразеологизмдері мен перифраздары. – Алматы: Абзал-Ай, 2013. – 400 б.
23. Сағидолда Г.С. Түркі-моңғол тілдік байланысы: топонимия және фразеология. – Астана: Кантана Пресс, 2011. – 355 б.
24. Кеңесбаев І. Қазақ тілінің фразеологиялық сөздігі. – Алматы: Ғылым, 1977. – 712 б.
25. Аристова Т.С., Ковшова М.Л., Рысева Е.А. и др. Словарь образных выражений русского языка / под ред. В.Н. Телия. – М.: Отечество, 1995. – 368 с.

REFERENCES

1. Alefirenko N.F., Semenenko N.N. Frazeologia i paremiologia [Phraseology and paremiology]. – М.: Flinta, 2009. – 344 s. [in Russian]
2. Alefirenko N.F., Zimin V.I., A.P. Vasilenko i dr. Sovremennaiia frazeologia: tendencii i innovacii [Modern Phraseology: Trends and Innovations]. – М.: Novyi proekt, 2016. – 200 s. [in Russian]
3. Smagulova G. Qazaq frazeologiasy lingvistikalыq paradigmalarda [Kazakh phraseology in linguistic paradigms]. – Almaty: Eltanym, 2020. – 256 b. [in Kazakh]
4. Teliа V.N. Semantika idiom v funkcionalno-parametricheskom otobrajenii [Semantics of an idiom in a functional-parametric representation] // Frazeografia v Mashinnom fonde russkogo iazyka. – М.: Nauka, 1990. – S. 32–47. [in Russian]
5. Sinan A.T. Turkchenin deyim varlygy [Turkish idiom existence]. – Istanbul: Kesit Yaiynlary, 2015. – 536 s. [in Turkish]
6. Aksoy O.A. Atasozleri ve Deyimler sozlugu-1 [Dictionary of Proverbs and Idioms]. – Istanbul: Inkilap, 2021. – 1205 s. [in Turkish]
7. Avakova R. Frazeosemantika [Phrase semantics]. – Almaty: Qazaq universiteti, 2013. – 246 b. [in Kazakh]
8. Bolge agyzlarynda atasozleri ve deyimler [Proverbs and sayings in regional dialects]. – Ankara: Turk Dil Kurumu Yaiynlary, 2019. – 494 s. [in Turkish]
9. Voloshkina I.A. Frazeologicheski obraz kak otrajenie haraktera cheloveka (na materiale francuzskogo iazyka) [Phraseological image as a reflection of a person's character (based on the material of the French language)] // Vestnik Novgorodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. – 2008. – №49. – P. 55–58. [in Russian]
10. Ahanov K. Til biliminin negizderi [Basics of linguistics]. – Almaty: Sanat, 1993. – 496 b. [in Kazakh]
11. Musabaev G. Bir sozdin tarihy [A story of a word] // Juldyz. – 1963. – №11. – B. 153–154. [in Kazakh]
12. Musabaev G. Jumbaq san – jumbaq tirkester [Mysterious number – mysterious phrases] // Juldyz. – 1965. – №11. – B. 149–152. [in Kazakh]
13. Yuksel F. Deyimler ve ilginç hikayeleri [Proverbs and interesting stories]. – Ankara: Egemen Yaiynlary, 2015. – 223 s. [in Turkish]

14. Choi Yun Hee. Problemy sopostovlenia vnutrennei formy frazeologizmov [The problem of comparing internal forms of phraseology] // Iazyk, soznaniye, kommunikacia: Sb. statiei. – M.: Max Press, 2001. – S. 37–49. [in Russian]
15. Qazaq tilinin tusindirme sozdigi [Explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language] / red. T. Januzakov. – Almaty: Daik-Press, 2008. – 968 b. [in Kazakh]
16. Türk Dil Kurumu (TDK). [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>. (date of access 12.02.2023)
17. Telia V.N. Ruskaia frazeologia. Semanticheski, pragmaticheski i lingvokulturologicheski aspekty [Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects]. – M.: Iazyki russkoi kultury, 1996. – 288 s. [in Russian]
18. Emirova A.M. Ruskaia frazeologia v kommunikativno-pragmaticheskom osvешenii [Russian phraseology in communicative and pragmatic education]. – Simferopol: Nauchnyi mir, 2020. – 228 s. [in Russian]
19. Qaidar A. Qazaq tilinin ozekti maseleleri [Actual problems of the Kazakh language]. – Almaty: Ana tili, 1998. – 304 b. [in Kazakh]
20. Smagulova G. Magynalas frazeologismderdin ulttyq-madeni aspektileri [National-cultural aspects of meaningful phraseological units]. – Almaty: Gylym, 1998. – 196 b. [in Kazakh]
21. Aimuhambet J.A., Kurmambaeva K.S., Mirazova M.N. Korkem tuyndydagy beine men tanbanyn qyzmeti [The Role of Image and Sign in a Artwork] // Iasau universitetinin habarshysy. – 2023. – №1 (127). – B. 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.47526/2023-1/2664-0686.03>. [in Kazakh]
22. Aitbayuly O. Qazaq frazeologizmderi men perifrzdary [Kazakh phraseological units and paraphrases]. – Almaty: Abzal-ai, 2013. – 400 b. [in Kazakh]
23. Sagidolda G.S. Turki-mongol tilinin bailanysy: toponomia jane frazeologia [Turkic-Mongolian language connection: toponymy and phraseology]. – Astana: Kantana Press, 2011. – 355 b. [in Kazakh]
24. Kenesbaev I. Qazaq tilinin frazeologialyq sozdigi [Phraseological Dictionary of the Kazakh language]. – Almaty: Gylym, 1977. – 712 b. [in Kazakh]
25. Aristova T.S., Kovshova M.L., Ryseva E.A. i dr. Slovar obraznyh vyrajeni russkogo iazyka [Dictionary of figurative expressions of the Russian language] / pod red. V.N. Telia. – M.: Otechestvo, 1995. – 368 s. [in Russian]