eISSN: 2229-3213 pISSN: 2229-3205
The Journal of Applied Science and Social Science
Volume 16,Issue 04 April, 2026

SECONDARY INTERPRETATION AS A MECHANISM OF IDIOMATIC MEANING FORMATION IN ENGLISH

Karimboyeva Gulnoza Javlon kizi

Uzbek State World Languages University,
Masters department, Faculty: English linguistics,
E-mail: gulnozakarimboyeva@gmail.com

Abstract. Idiomatic expressions represent one of the most complex and culturally embedded phenomena in natural languages. Their meanings are often not predictable from the literal interpretation of their lexical components, which makes them particularly important for linguistic research in phraseology, semantics, and cognitive linguistics. This article investigates secondary interpretation as a key mechanism underlying the formation and development of idiomatic meaning in English. Secondary interpretation refers to the process through which literal expressions undergo semantic reinterpretation in particular communicative contexts and become conventionalized idiomatic units within the language system step by step. The study integrates theoretical perspectives from phraseology, cognitive linguistics, and discourse analysis in order to examine how idiomatic meaning emerges through the interaction of conceptual metaphor, metonymy, pragmatic context, and cultural knowledge. The research employs descriptive, semantic, cognitive, and contextual analytical methods to analyze idiomatic expressions as multidimensional linguistic structures. The findings demonstrate that idiomatic expressions are not arbitrary lexical anomalies but systematically motivated constructions that reflect conceptual patterns of human experience. Furthermore, the study shows that idioms frequently originate from literal expressions whose figurative meanings become stabilized through repeated discourse usage and collective linguistic practice. The results contribute to the understanding of phraseological systems and highlight the importance of cognitive and cultural factors in the interpretation of idiomatic language. By examining the mechanisms of secondary interpretation, the study provides a theoretical framework for understanding the dynamic relationship between literal meaning, figurative interpretation, and linguistic conventionalization.

Keywords: idiomatic expressions, phraseology, secondary interpretation, conceptual metaphor, cognitive linguistics, semantic reinterpretation, idiom formation

Introduction. Idiomatic expressions constitute one of the most expressive and culturally rich components of natural language. They play a crucial role in everyday communication by allowing speakers to convey complex meanings, attitudes, and emotional evaluations through relatively compact linguistic forms. Rather than relying solely on literal description, speakers frequently employ idiomatic expressions to capture subtle nuances of experience, social relationships, and cultural knowledge. In this sense, idioms represent an important interface between language, cognition, and culture. As many scholars have noted, idiomatic expressions enrich discourse by providing speakers with figurative resources that make communication more vivid, efficient, and socially meaningful (Fernando, 1996).

The distinctive feature of idiomatic expressions lies in the fact that their meanings cannot always be predicted from the literal meanings of their constituent words. For example, expressions such as *hit the nail on the head*, *let the cat out of the bag*, and *burn the midnight oil* convey meanings that extend far beyond the literal interpretation of their lexical elements. Because of this semantic non-compositionality, idioms have long attracted the attention of linguists who research to understand how figurative meaning emerges and becomes conventionalized in language. The study of idioms helps researchers better understand how

language reflects shared cultural experiences and the ways people organize and interpret concepts about the world. (Gibbs, 1994).

Historically, idiomatic expressions were often regarded as irregular or peripheral elements of language. Early structural approaches tended to treat idioms as lexical exceptions that did not conform to the systematic rules governing grammar and semantics. As a result, idioms were frequently discussed in dictionaries or stylistic commentaries rather than analyzed as objects of systematic linguistic inquiry. However, the emergence of phraseology as a distinct field of linguistic research during the twentieth century fundamentally changed this perspective. One of the earliest scholars to highlight the importance of phraseological units was Charles Bally, who argued that fixed expressions constitute an essential component of the expressive resources of language (Bally, 1909/1966).

After reasearching and studying Bally's pioneering work, Russian linguist Viktor Vinogradov developed a comprehensive theoretical framework for the study of phraseological units. Vinogradov demonstrated that idiomatic expressions are not random linguistic anomalies but rather stable lexical combinations with specific semantic and structural characteristics. His classification of phraseological units into phraseological combinations, phraseological unities, and phraseological fusions became highly influential and laid the foundation for subsequent developments in phraseological theory (Vinogradov, 1947). Later scholars such as Kunin (1984) further elaborated this framework by emphasizing the semantic cohesion and structural stability which characterize idiomatic expressions in various languages.

The study of idioms underwent another significant transformation with the rise of cognitive linguistics in the late twentieth century. Cognitive linguists challenged the traditional view that idiomatic meaning is arbitrary or opaque. Instead, they proposed that many idioms are motivated by underlying conceptual structures that reflect human embodied experience. In their influential work *Metaphors, We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) demonstrated that everyday language is structured by conceptual metaphors that map concrete experiential domains onto more abstract conceptual fields. From this perspective, idiomatic expressions are not merely conventional phrases but manifestations of deeper cognitive patterns that shape the way people conceptualize reality.

Research within cognitive linguistics has shown that figurative language often relies on systematic mappings between source domains and target domains. For instance, emotional states are frequently conceptualized in terms of physical orientation, movement, or temperature. Expressions such as *high spirits*, *boiling with anger*, or *cold-hearted* illustrate how metaphorical thinking organizes linguistic representation of emotional experience. As Kövecses (2005) observes, many idioms are grounded in embodied experiences that structure human conceptual systems and shape the metaphorical language used to describe emotions, relationships, and social interactions.

Despite these theoretical advances, an important issue remains insufficiently explored the process through which literal expressions gradually develop idiomatic meanings. Cognitive linguistics provides valuable insights into the conceptual motivations underlying figurative language, yet the mechanisms by which figurative interpretations become conventionalized within a speech community require further investigation. In particular, it is necessary to understand how speakers reinterpret literal expressions in specific communicative contexts and how these reinterpretations eventually stabilize into widely recognized idiomatic meanings.

One concept that offers a useful explanation for this phenomenon is secondary interpretation. Secondary interpretation refers to the process through which a linguistic expression acquires a figurative or extended meaning that goes beyond its original literal interpretation. This reinterpretation typically emerges in discourse when speakers creatively exploit contextual cues, cultural knowledge, or metaphorical associations. Over time, repeated use of such reinterpretations in similar communicative situations leads to the gradual stabilization of the

figurative meaning. Eventually, the expression becomes recognized as an idiomatic unit whose meaning is understood conventionally within the language community.

The development of idiomatic meaning can therefore be viewed as a dynamic process involving interaction between linguistic structure, cognitive mechanisms, and communicative practice. In many cases, metaphor and metonymy serve as cognitive tools that facilitate the reinterpretation of literal expressions. These conceptual mechanisms enable speakers to establish associative links between different domains of experience, with the result of generating new figurative meanings that can later become conventionalized within the lexicon (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Gibbs, 1994).

Furthermore, communicative context plays a crucial role in this process. Figurative reinterpretations often emerge in specific discourse environments where speakers aim to achieve particular pragmatic effects, such as emphasis, evaluation, humor, or emotional expression. When such expressions prove communicatively effective, they tend to be repeated and eventually integrated into the phraseological repertoire of the language. Thus, the emergence of idiomatic expressions cannot be understood solely in terms of semantic structure. It must also be examined from a pragmatic and discourse-oriented perspective.

Against this theoretical background, the present study seeks to explore the role of secondary interpretation in the formation of idiomatic meaning in English. The research focuses on the cognitive and pragmatic mechanisms through which literal expressions are reinterpreted and subsequently transformed into idiomatic units within the phraseological system of the language.

More specifically, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How does secondary interpretation contribute to the formation of idiomatic expressions?
2. What cognitive mechanisms motivate the reinterpretation of literal expressions?
3. How do conceptual metaphor and metonymy influence the development of idiomatic meaning?
4. What role does communicative context play in the stabilization of idiomatic expressions?

By addressing these questions, the study aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the processes that underlie the emergence and development of idiomatic expressions. The findings of this research are expected to contribute to ongoing discussions in phraseology, cognitive linguistics, and discourse analysis concerning the relationship between language, conceptualization, and cultural knowledge. Ultimately, examining idioms through the lens of secondary interpretation allows us to better understand how figurative meanings arise, evolve, and become embedded in the linguistic systems that shape human communication.

Literature Review. The linguistic investigation of idiomatic expressions has passed through significant development over the past century. Early linguistic descriptions primarily treated idioms as unusual or exceptional expressions that resisted literal interpretation. In traditional lexicographic practice, idioms were typically recorded in dictionaries or phrasebooks as fixed expressions whose meanings could not easily be derived from the meanings of their individual components. Although these early compilations recognized the distinctive character of idioms, they were mainly descriptive in nature and rarely attempted to explain the structural or semantic principles underlying idiomatic language. As a result, idioms were often considered marginal elements of language rather than central objects of linguistic research (Fernando, 1996).

The theoretical study of phraseological units began to develop more systematically in the early twentieth century. One of the earliest scholars to recognize the linguistic importance of fixed expressions was the Swiss linguist Charles Bally. In his influential work *Traité de stylistique française*, Bally introduced the concept of phraseology as a separate area of linguistic investigation and emphasized that certain combinations of words function as stable semantic units within the language system (Bally, 1909/1966). Bally argued that these expressions carry expressive and stylistic meanings that extend beyond the literal meanings of their components.

His work marked an important shift from viewing idioms as stylistic irregularities to recognizing them as an integral part of the lexical and stylistic resources of language.

Building on Bally's ideas, the Russian linguist Viktor Vinogradov developed one of the most influential classifications of phraseological units. Vinogradov proposed that phraseological expressions can be categorized into phraseological fusions, phraseological unities, and phraseological combinations based on the degree of semantic cohesion between their components (Vinogradov, 1947). Phraseological fusions represent expressions whose meanings are completely opaque and cannot be deduced from the meanings of their individual elements. Phraseological unities retain some degree of metaphorical motivation that allows speakers to perceive a semantic relationship between the literal and figurative meanings. Phraseological combinations, on the other hand, are relatively transparent structures in which one component retains its literal meaning while the other is used figuratively.

Vinogradov's classification demonstrated that idiomatic expressions exist along a continuum of semantic transparency rather than forming a strictly separate category within the lexicon. This insight significantly influenced later research in phraseology by encouraging scholars to investigate idiomatic expressions as part of the broader system of lexical and semantic relations within language (Kunin, 1984).

In the second half of the twentieth century, phraseological studies were further developed through the work of scholars such as Alexander Kunin and Chitra Fernando. Kunin emphasized the stability, reproducibility, and semantic integrity of phraseological units. According to Kunin, idiomatic expressions represent stable combinations of words with partially or completely transferred meanings that are reproduced in speech as ready-made linguistic units (Kunin, 1984). This perspective highlighted the role of phraseological units as an essential component of the mental lexicon and demonstrated their importance in everyday communication.

Fernando (1996) further developed the semantic classification of idioms by distinguishing between pure idioms, semi-idioms, and literal idioms. Pure idioms are expressions whose meanings are completely figurative and cannot be interpreted literally. Semi-idioms contain at least one lexical component that preserves its literal meaning, while literal idioms consist of relatively transparent expressions that nevertheless function as fixed phraseological units. Fernando's work emphasized that idiomaticity should be understood as a gradient phenomenon rather than a strict binary distinction.

In addition to structural and semantic perspectives, researchers have increasingly focused on the pragmatic functions of idiomatic expressions. Idioms frequently perform important communicative roles in discourse, such as expressing evaluation, intensifying emotional meaning, or reinforcing social relationships. Because idiomatic expressions are deeply embedded in cultural experience, they often reflect shared values, social attitudes, and culturally specific conceptualizations of reality (Gibbs, 1994).

The emergence of cognitive linguistics in the late twentieth century introduced new theoretical perspectives on the study of idiomatic meaning. Cognitive linguists challenged the traditional assumption that idioms are arbitrary linguistic units whose meanings must simply be memorized. Instead, they proposed that many idiomatic expressions are motivated by underlying conceptual structures grounded in human experience. One of the most influential contributions in this area was made by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), who demonstrated that everyday language is structured by conceptual metaphors that map concrete experiential domains onto more abstract conceptual fields.

For instance, the conceptual metaphor **LIFE IS A JOURNEY** motivates a wide range of linguistic expressions used to describe life experiences in terms of movement along a path. Expressions such as *reach a crossroads*, *move forward in life*, and *lose direction* illustrate how physical and spatial experiences are metaphorically extended to structure abstract reasoning about life and personal development (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Another important cognitive mechanism involved in the formation of idiomatic meaning is metonymy. While metaphor involves mapping between two distinct conceptual domains, metonymy operates within a single conceptual domain by allowing one element to stand for another related element. For example, body parts are frequently used metonymically to represent emotional or psychological states. Expressions involving the *heart*, *head*, or *hand* illustrate how metonymic relations contribute to the semantic condensation of idiomatic expressions (Kövecses, 2005).

In recent years, researchers have increasingly recognized that idiomatic meaning emerges through the interaction of multiple linguistic and cognitive factors. Idioms are not simply lexical items stored in dictionaries; they are dynamic elements of language that develop through repeated communicative use within specific cultural and discourse contexts (Gibbs, 1994). This perspective highlights the importance of considering both cognitive mechanisms and pragmatic processes in explaining how idiomatic meanings emerge and become conventionalized.

Despite the considerable theoretical progress achieved in phraseological and cognitive research, an important question remains: how do literal expressions gradually develop into conventional idiomatic units? While cognitive linguistics provides valuable insights into the conceptual motivations underlying figurative language, the processes through which figurative interpretations become stabilized within the language system require further investigation.

One concept that provides a useful framework for explaining this process is secondary interpretation. Secondary interpretation refers to the phenomenon in which speakers reinterpret a literal expression in a figurative sense within a specific communicative context. When such reinterpretations are repeatedly used in similar contexts, the figurative meaning may gradually become conventionalized and eventually recognized as the standard meaning of the expression. Over time, this process can lead to the emergence of idiomatic expressions that function as stable elements within the phraseological system of the language.

Thus, examining idiomatic expressions through the lens of secondary interpretation allows researchers to better understand the dynamic processes through which figurative meanings arise, evolve, and become integrated into linguistic systems.

Methodology. The present study adopts a qualitative linguistic approach in order to investigate the mechanisms through which idiomatic meaning develops from literal expressions in English. The choice of a qualitative methodology is motivated by the complex and multidimensional nature of idiomatic expressions. Idioms cannot be fully explained through purely quantitative methods because their interpretation involves semantic reinterpretation, conceptual structuring, cultural knowledge, and pragmatic context. Therefore, the research employs a combination of analytical methods that allow for a comprehensive examination of idiomatic meaning from structural, semantic, cognitive, and contextual perspectives.

The primary objective of the methodological framework is to explore how literal expressions undergo semantic transformation and gradually become conventionalized as idiomatic units within the phraseological system of the language. To achieve this goal, the study integrates several complementary analytical approaches, each addressing a specific dimension of idiomatic interpretation.

First, the descriptive method is employed to identify and classify idiomatic expressions in the English language. The descriptive method plays an essential role in linguistic research because it allows scholars to systematically observe and document language phenomena without imposing predetermined theoretical assumptions. In the context of this study, the descriptive method is used to examine the structural organization of idiomatic expressions, including their grammatical patterns, lexical composition, and degree of structural stability. Through careful description, the research establishes the formal characteristics that distinguish idiomatic expressions from free word combinations and other types of phraseological constructions.

Second, semantic analysis is applied to investigate the relationship between the literal meanings of the individual lexical components and the figurative meaning of the idiomatic expression as a whole. Semantic analysis is particularly important in phraseological research because idiomatic expressions often exhibit a complex interaction between compositional and non-compositional meaning. Some idioms display complete semantic opacity, meaning that their figurative interpretation cannot be predicted from the meanings of their components, while others retain a degree of semantic transparency that allows speakers to perceive a metaphorical connection between the literal and figurative interpretations. By analyzing these variations in semantic transparency, the study seeks to identify patterns in the process through which literal meanings are reinterpreted and transformed into idiomatic meanings.

In addition to semantic analysis, the research incorporates cognitive linguistic analysis, focusing specifically on the role of conceptual metaphor and metonymy in the interpretation and formation of idiomatic expressions. Within the framework of cognitive linguistics, idioms are not viewed as arbitrary linguistic constructions but rather as manifestations of underlying conceptual structures that organize human experience. Conceptual metaphor theory suggests that abstract concepts are frequently understood through metaphorical mappings based on concrete experiential domains. For example, spatial orientation, bodily experience, and physical movement often serve as source domains that structure metaphorical understanding of abstract concepts such as emotions, relationships, and life experiences. By identifying recurring metaphorical and metonymic patterns in idiomatic expressions, the study aims to demonstrate that idiomatic meaning is often motivated by systematic conceptual mappings rather than emerging randomly within the language system.

Another important methodological component of the study is contextual analysis. Idiomatic expressions rarely occur in isolation; instead, they appear within specific communicative contexts that influence how their meanings are interpreted. Contextual analysis therefore examines idioms within authentic discourse environments in order to understand how pragmatic factors contribute to their interpretation. This approach considers elements such as speaker intention, communicative situation, and cultural background knowledge. By analyzing idioms in context, the research explores how figurative interpretations emerge through pragmatic inference and how repeated usage within similar communicative situations contributes to the stabilization and conventionalization of idiomatic meanings.

Furthermore, the research employs interpretative analysis in order to investigate the phenomenon of secondary interpretation. Secondary interpretation refers to the process through which speakers reinterpret literal expressions metaphorically within particular discourse contexts. Over time, repeated reinterpretation of the same expression in similar communicative situations may lead to the gradual stabilization of its figurative meaning. Interpretative analysis therefore focuses on identifying instances where literal expressions undergo semantic reinterpretation and examining how these reinterpretations develop into conventional idiomatic meanings. This analytical perspective is particularly important for understanding the dynamic processes that contribute to the emergence and evolution of phraseological units.

The linguistic data analyzed in the study are drawn from multiple sources in order to ensure the reliability and representativeness of the research material. The primary sources include authoritative English phraseological dictionaries, linguistic corpora, and examples of idiomatic expressions found in contemporary spoken and written English. Dictionaries such as the *Oxford Dictionary of Idioms* and the *Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms* were consulted to identify idiomatic expressions with well-established meanings and recognized phraseological status. These reference works provide reliable documentation of idioms that are widely accepted within the English language.

In addition to dictionary sources, examples from authentic discourse were considered in order to examine how idiomatic expressions function in real communicative contexts. These

examples were selected from various types of contemporary texts, including journalistic writing, literary works, and spoken discourse. Analyzing idioms within authentic communicative environments allows the research to observe how idiomatic expressions operate pragmatically and how speakers employ them to achieve specific communicative goals.

The data selection process involved identifying idiomatic expressions that illustrate the transition from literal interpretation to figurative meaning. Particular attention was given to expressions whose figurative meanings appear to be motivated by conceptual metaphors, metonymic associations, or contextual reinterpretation. Once the relevant examples were identified, they were analyzed using the methodological approaches described above in order to uncover the cognitive and semantic mechanisms underlying their formation.

By combining descriptive, semantic, cognitive, contextual, and interpretative analytical methods, the research establishes a comprehensive methodological framework for examining idiomatic expressions as multidimensional linguistic phenomena. This integrated methodological approach makes it possible to analyze idioms not only as structural units within the phraseological system of the language but also as cognitive and communicative tools that reflect human conceptualization and cultural experience. Consequently, the methodology enables the study to address both the linguistic structure of idiomatic expressions and the cognitive processes that motivate their interpretation and conventionalization within the English language.

Results. The analysis of idiomatic expressions reveals that secondary interpretation plays a central role in the formation and stabilization of idiomatic meaning. Many idioms originate as literal expressions that undergo gradual semantic reinterpretation in particular communicative contexts.

One of the most important findings of the study is that idiomatic expressions often emerge through repeated metaphorical interpretation of literal phrases. For example, the idiom **“spill the beans”**, which means to reveal a secret, originally referred to a literal action involving the spilling of beans. However, through repeated contextual reinterpretation, the expression came to symbolize the act of revealing hidden information. Over time, the figurative meaning became conventionalized, and the expression is now recognized as a fixed idiomatic unit.

Another example is the idiom **“kick the bucket,”** meaning to die. The literal meaning of the phrase bears little relation to its idiomatic interpretation. The figurative meaning developed through historical usage and gradually became detached from the literal interpretation. Today, the expression functions as a fully opaque idiom whose meaning cannot be derived from its lexical components.

The results of the study also demonstrate the significant role of **conceptual metaphor** in motivating idiomatic meaning. Many idiomatic expressions are structured by metaphorical mappings that connect concrete physical experiences with abstract conceptual domains. For instance, idioms related to emotional states often rely on metaphors involving physical pressure or heat, such as **“blow off steam”** or **“boil with anger.”**

These expressions reflect the conceptual metaphor **ANGER IS HEAT**, which conceptualizes emotional intensity in terms of physical temperature. Such metaphorical mappings provide cognitive motivation for idiomatic meaning, making figurative expressions easier to interpret within a shared conceptual framework.

In addition to metaphor, **metonymy** plays an important role in idiom formation. Metonymy allows one element of a conceptual domain to represent another related element within the same domain. For example, idioms involving body parts often rely on metonymic associations between physical actions and psychological states. Expressions such as **“keep an eye on something”** or **“lose one’s head”** illustrate how bodily experiences are used to represent cognitive or emotional processes.

The results further indicate that pragmatic context significantly influences the development

and interpretation of idiomatic expressions. Idioms often emerge when speakers reinterpret literal expressions in specific communicative situations. When these reinterpretations become widely shared within a speech community, they gradually become conventionalized as idiomatic meanings.

Another important finding concerns the **gradual nature of idiom formation**. Idiomatic meaning does not emerge instantly; rather, it develops through a process of semantic reanalysis in which speakers repeatedly reinterpret expressions figuratively. Over time, this reinterpretation becomes stabilized, and the expression becomes integrated into the phraseological system of the language.

These findings demonstrate that idiomatic expressions are not arbitrary linguistic anomalies but systematically motivated constructions that reflect cognitive patterns, communicative practices, and cultural knowledge.

Discussion. The findings of this study support the view that idiomatic expressions represent a dynamic interaction between lexical structure, conceptual cognition, and communicative practice. The mechanism of secondary interpretation provides a useful theoretical framework for understanding how idiomatic meanings develop from literal expressions.

One of the key implications of this research is that idioms should not be viewed solely as fixed lexical units but rather as products of ongoing semantic reinterpretation within discourse. The process of secondary interpretation demonstrates how speakers creatively reinterpret literal expressions in ways that reflect shared conceptual and cultural knowledge.

The role of conceptual metaphor identified in the results aligns closely with the theoretical framework proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Their theory suggests that many linguistic expressions are structured by metaphorical mappings rooted in human experience. The present study confirms that idiomatic expressions frequently rely on these mappings in order to convey abstract meanings through concrete imagery.

The importance of metonymy in idiom formation further supports cognitive linguistic approaches to figurative language. Metonymy allows speakers to compress complex conceptual relationships into compact linguistic expressions. This mechanism contributes to the semantic efficiency of idiomatic expressions, enabling speakers to convey complex ideas through relatively simple linguistic forms.

Another significant implication of the study concerns the role of discourse context in idiomatic interpretation. Idioms are often stabilized through repeated usage in particular communicative environments. This observation suggests that idiomatic meaning emerges not only from cognitive mechanisms but also from social interaction and communicative practice.

The cultural dimension of idiomatic expressions also deserves attention. Many idioms reflect historical practices, cultural traditions, and shared experiences within a speech community. As a result, idiomatic expressions often resist direct translation into other languages. Understanding the cultural background of idioms is therefore essential for accurate interpretation and translation.

The findings of the present study contribute to broader discussions in phraseology and cognitive linguistics by highlighting the dynamic relationship between literal meaning, figurative interpretation, and linguistic conventionalization. Idiomatic expressions should therefore be understood as evolving linguistic constructions shaped by cognitive processes, communicative contexts, and cultural knowledge.

Conclusion. The present study has examined secondary interpretation as a mechanism of idiomatic meaning formation in English. By integrating insights from phraseology, cognitive linguistics, and discourse analysis, the research has demonstrated that idiomatic expressions emerge through processes of semantic reinterpretation in which literal expressions acquire figurative meanings through contextual usage.

The findings reveal that conceptual metaphor and metonymy play a crucial role in motivating idiomatic meaning. These cognitive mechanisms allow speakers to interpret abstract concepts through concrete experiential domains, thereby providing a conceptual foundation for figurative language.

Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of communicative context in the stabilization of idiomatic expressions. Repeated usage of metaphorically interpreted expressions within discourse gradually leads to the conventionalization of idiomatic meaning, transforming literal phrases into fixed phraseological units.

The research also emphasizes the cultural dimension of idiomatic expressions. Idioms often reflect historical practices, social values, and cultural knowledge shared within a speech community. This cultural embeddedness explains why idiomatic expressions frequently present challenges for translation and intercultural communication.

In conclusion, idiomatic expressions should not be viewed as arbitrary or irregular linguistic phenomena. Instead, they represent systematic constructions shaped by cognitive mechanisms, pragmatic context, and cultural experience. The concept of secondary interpretation provides a valuable theoretical framework for understanding how figurative meanings emerge and become integrated into the phraseological systems of natural languages.

Future research may expand this investigation by applying corpus-based methods to analyze large collections of idiomatic expressions or by conducting cross-linguistic comparisons to explore similarities and differences in idiom formation across languages. Such studies would further contribute to our understanding of the complex relationship between language, cognition, and culture.

REFERENCE

1. Amosova, N. N. (1963). Основы английской фразеологии. Leningrad: Leningrad University Press.
2. Baker, M. (2018). In other words: A coursebook on translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.
3. Bally, C. (1909). Traité de stylistique française. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
4. Burger, H. (1998). Phraseologie: Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
5. Burger, H., Dobrovol'skij, D., Kühn, P., & Norrick, N. (2007). Phraseology: An international handbook of contemporary research. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
6. Cowie, A. P. (1998). Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications. Oxford University Press.
7. Fernando, C. (1996). Idioms and idiomaticity. Oxford University Press.
8. Fillmore, C. J., Kay, P., & O'Connor, M. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions. Language, 64(3), 501–538.
9. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding. Cambridge University Press.
10. Gibbs, R. W. (2006). Embodiment and cognitive science. Cambridge University Press.
11. Gläser, R. (1986). Phraseologie der englischen Sprache. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
12. Grady, J. (1997). Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes. University of California.
13. Hockett, C. (1958). A course in modern linguistics. Macmillan.
14. Jackendoff, R. (2002). Foundations of language: Brain, meaning, grammar, evolution. Oxford University Press.

15. Johnson, M. (1987). The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason. University of Chicago Press.
16. Kövecses, Z. (2010). Metaphor: A practical introduction (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
17. Kövecses, Z. (2015). Where metaphors come from. Oxford University Press.
18. Lakoff, G. (1987). Women, fire, and dangerous things. University of Chicago Press.
19. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press.
20. Langacker, R. W. (1987). Foundations of cognitive grammar. Stanford University Press.
21. Langlotz, A. (2006). Idiomatic creativity. John Benjamins.
22. Makkai, A. (1972). Idiom structure in English. Mouton.
23. Moon, R. (1998). Fixed expressions and idioms in English. Oxford University Press.
24. Nunberg, G., Sag, I., & Wasow, T. (1994). Idioms. Language, 70(3), 491–538.
25. Palmer, F. R. (1981). Semantics. Cambridge University Press.
26. Panther, K. U., & Thornburg, L. (2003). Metonymy and pragmatic inferencing. John Benjamins.
27. Radden, G., & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. Metonymy in Language and Thought.
28. Saussure, F. (1916). Cours de linguistique générale. Payot.
29. Sinclair, J. (1991). Corpus, concordance, collocation. Oxford University Press.
30. Sinclair, J. (2004). Trust the text: Language, corpus and discourse. Routledge.
31. Taylor, J. (2002). Cognitive grammar. Oxford University Press.
32. Vinogradov, V. V. (1947). Основные типы фразеологических единиц в русском языке.
33. Wray, A. (2002). Formulaic language and the lexicon. Cambridge University Press.
34. Zykova, I. (2016). Conceptual metaphor in language. Cambridge Scholars.
35. Dobrovol'skij, D., & Piirainen, E. (2005). Figurative language: Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives. Elsevier.
36. Geeraerts, D. (2010). Theories of lexical semantics. Oxford University Press.
37. Dirven, R., & Pörings, R. (2002). Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast. Mouton de Gruyter.
38. Kövecses, Z. (2002). Metaphor and emotion. Cambridge University Press.
39. Barcelona, A. (2000). Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads. Mouton de Gruyter.
40. Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). Cognitive linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
41. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). Cognitive linguistics: An introduction. Edinburgh University Press.
42. Semino, E. (2008). Metaphor in discourse. Cambridge University Press.
43. Steen, G. (2010). A method for linguistic metaphor identification. John Benjamins.
44. Gibbs, R. W., & Colston, H. (2012). Interpreting figurative meaning. Cambridge University Press.