

## Phraseological Units in English: Variety through Lexical Addition

Sobirova Maxliyo G'ayrat Qizi<sup>1</sup>, Polvanova Maxzuna Farxodovna<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Student, <sup>2</sup>Scientific Advisor,

<sup>1,2</sup>Masters Department, Uzbek State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

This paper presents a piece of examination given corpus proof of minor departure from informal articulations through lexical addition. Second just to a lexical replacement, this sort of peculiarity is unavoidable, particularly in media talk where phraseological units are as often as possible adjusted for different reasons. We guarantee that embedded descriptors address an ever-increasing method for starting up these multi-word units and that their repeat substantiates the semantic analysability of a portion of their constituent parts. We additionally present the idea of 'variational gathers', an ordinary worldview of descriptive words arranged with the ostensible base of a phraseological unit. We show that this kind of colloquialism variety isn't altogether reliant on the setting by contending that embedded descriptive words can have different and differentiating semantic values.

**KEYWORDS:** *lexicographic structure, fixed expressions, transcategorisation, analysability of colloquialisms, perspective adjustment*

### Introduction

The term phraseological unit (from now on PhU) is an umbrella term that includes all multi-word units of the language whose importance isn't compositional, for example, not recovered or decoded as the expansion of the implications of every one of their constituent parts. The authoritative structure of PhUs, otherwise called reference structure, is absolutely a lexicographic show even though etymologists vary now and again somewhat, different times tremendously, about the structure multi-word units should accept when kept in word references. Fundamentally therefore we recommend, in its stead, the utilization of the expression "lexicographic structure". The corpus, a choice of articles from the online adaptations of The Guardian and The Observer of almost 8 million tokens, addresses an obvious lump of composed English from the quality press in the UK from 2003 to 2007. The consequences of the recovery of a wide range of changes, phrase variations and double-dealings have been methodically standing out from expected events in the British National Corpus (BNC) also, in the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) to represent an organization, lexicalisation, impromptu changes, contextualisation and levels of innovativeness. Corpus proof shows that the types of PhUs are not quite so fixed as word references, for clear reasons, will undoubtedly record. Each of the qualities generally applied to PhUs can be addressed if we take into account, as principal thoughts, the

intrinsic inconstancy and shakiness of these structures and the strain among strength and inventiveness.<sup>[1]</sup>

Aside from things, for example, occur and at all which stand at the most elevated level of fixedness, what's more, are hence never fluctuated, full figures of speech, fundamentally verbal and ostensible expressions, are as a rule differed or took advantage of. Thus, the significance of considering variety as one of the primary structure squares of semantic portrayal: It is frequently brought up that supposed 'fixed expressions' are not truth be told fixed; there are very hardly any constant expressions in English. By and by, in conversations, portrayals, and the educating of dialects, the fantasy of fixedness is propagated as though variety was a minor detail that could securely be overlooked. Variety is subsequently characteristic of any normal language: it is through variety that language change happens and a few structures or uses override others diachronically. In the domain of expressiveness, multi-word units can be fluctuated morphologically, linguistically, semantically and logically. Repetitive and deliberate variety might bring about PhUs having their entrance structures changed in everyday word references and word references or phrases. The addition of a descriptor may, at last, become so normal and boundless that specific PhUs can consider having an open space in their lexicographic structure, just like with cut your teeth which is recorded by the Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (CALD) as Cut your political/proficient, and so forth teeth and characterized as 'to get your first experience of the kind referenced'. The definition itself addresses an obvious indicator of the semantic transparency of this string which is ordinarily launched with the inclusion of a passing descriptor that indicates and limits its circle of application delimiting its referential extension. Some lexicographers select, in cases like this, for a arrangement, for example, 'Cut one's \_\_\_\_\_ teeth'. Regarding this string, the Collins Cobuild Dictionary of Idioms (CCDI) remembers the accompanying data for the body of the passage 'This articulation can be changed by adding a modifier before 'teeth', which uncovers to what degree etymologists know about phraseological variety and the amount they take into account its repeat for issues of lemmatisation, as well concerning lexicographic definitions also, phonetic portrayal.

The expression in italics in the model is illustrative of the way that minor departure from informal articulations through modifier inclusion can be a key etymological issue: Her folks opposed rebellious structures like mood and blues or rock'n'roll - they likewise disallowed their four youngsters from going to the film - so Doris cut her melodic teeth by

<sup>1</sup> BNC, <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/x.asp>

singing in her dad's congregation ensemble. Cut one's \_\_\_\_\_ teeth is progressively launched with an area delimiter, for example, political, which is the main illustration of an embedded descriptive word for this PhU shared by the BNC and the COCA. The quantity of events of this open-space PhU is just 4 in the English corpus and 46 in the American corpus. The scope of descriptors goes from proficient or on the other hand legitimate to artistic, religious or hitting the fairway. Different articulations like cast an eye over sth or keep/have an eye on sth have, through lexical addition, given approach to new lexicalised structures that have their entrances in word references of sayings: cast a basic/proficient, and so on the eye over, watch out for, watch out for and have a beady eye on are completely kept in the Longman Idioms Dictionary (LID). Five unmistakable sorts of minor departure from PhUs can be illustrated: lexical replacement, lexical inclusion, truncation, syntactic change and transcategorisation. Lexical replacement is the most successive and far and wide kind of minor departure from PhUs. It is normally found in predicate phrases, schematised as VP + NP, in which either the verbal constituent or the ostensible constituent (or in some cases both) is supplanted by one more thing of a similar word class with which it can bear various types of semantic connection. Models like shed/sob crocodile tears or unquestionably a good fit for you/roadshow how deep-rooted, inescapable and clear this kind of variety is. Elective lexical acknowledgement doesn't change the comprehensive importance of the unit nor do they add new semantic data or limit its application to a specific area however it can alter the psychological situation of the representation involved. Lexical addition establishes the second most significant method for minor departure from PhUs. We will manage this sort of variety top to bottom and exhaustively further down this paper. Other minor kinds of variety are truncation, in which a piece of the first unit is omitted as in scratch (the lower part of) the barrel or a failure point (in the chain) and linguistic change, which represents a minor piece of phraseological variations and doesn't typically accomplish lexicalized status.<sup>[2]</sup>

It ought to be seen that not all PhUs can be changed from a linguistic or syntactic perspective. The old-style and rather old model kicks the can can't be passivized as, for example, the container was kicked. We have discovered some instances of pluralisation, as in keeping an indifferent expression > keep indifferent expressions where the ostensible constituent changes as per a plural subject. At last, transcategorisation, otherwise called word-class changes, permits specific PhUs to be changed into units of an alternate word class to adjust to the requirements of explicit syntactic settings. One of the commonest methods for accomplishing this transformation is addressed by adjectivisation by which, as in the model, a prepositional expression with a verb-modifying capacity (all things considered) turns into a descriptor: There isn't anything top-of-the-head about what Mr Hain needs to say either; his leaflet is the result of broad internet-based counsel and a few centre gathering conversations. PhUs have generally been viewed as fixed and non-compositional and their constituent parts as non-analysable. Later phraseological research has shown that there is a cline of fixedness and that thusly there are multi-

word units which are more fixed than others. Most expressions are certainly not lexically frozen assuming that we get this idea as complete frozenness since "no less than 90% of V-NP maxims, including many typically viewed as totally frozen, seem to permit some type of (grammatically) inward adjustment" and are consistently lexically adjusted either through replacement or addition, or both. Syntactic adaptability, lexical replacement and lexical addition in PhUs can be made sense of if we consider that these units are not just lengthy words but that their constituents have an importance of their own. This trademark, a kind of semantic independence appointed to the centre constituent(s) of multi-word units, has been distinguished as the analysability of colloquialisms.

The compositional perspective on expression portrayal views them as having a "spurred semantic construction" and states that "this design impacts their syntactic and lexical adaptability". Words that at present gather with different words wind up laying out affiliations which are by and large certain or negative: this extra semantic worth comprises their "semantic prosody". Hunston sums up the thought of semantic prosody hence: "Momentarily, a word might be said to have a specific semantic prosody on the off chance that it very well may be displayed to co-happen commonly with different words that have a place with a specific semantic set." Extraneous descriptors co-happening with the ostensible constituents of predicate PhUs make up a standard worldview of what we have named "variational gathers". Allow us to consider the following illustration of minor departure from a PhU through the addition of a modifier: He had an eccentric ear for symphonic shading, a traditional writer's capacity to make long, through-made pieces from a modest bunch of themes and a jazz bandleader's capacity to compose for explicit characters. The expression "variational assembles" alludes to the worldview of modifiers that gather inside the PhU with the super ostensible constituent. The descriptor peculiar is regularly related to things like way, approach, style, factors, conduct, character, translation,

highlights, sees, and so forth, with which it ordinarily assembles. Nonetheless, when it is embedded in a multi-word unit, for example, the one in, it quickly makes part of a customary worldview of different descriptors like intense, thoughtful, prepared or commiserative. This descriptor when utilized as a variational arrangement shows an unmistakable inclination for co-happening with things indicating compassion or precision, which drives us to reason that the variational semantic prosody of having an ear for is positive. One more illustration of variational semantic prosody can be seen in the launches of the PhU cast an eye on sth. This expression is regularly found in real settings of purpose changed by the inclusion of a modifier. An inquiry in the BNC shows that the variational arrangements of the phraseological ostensible base eye are basic, experienced, cool, proficient, wise, theoretical, intense, wary and evaluating to refer to only the most often utilized modifiers. These arrange to structure a homogenous gathering and offer the same semantic quality, that of aptitude, except for the descriptive word speculative which digresses from the overall example.<sup>[3]</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Ernst Th., 1981, "Grist for the linguistic mill: idioms and 'extra' adjectives", *Journal of Linguistic Research*, 1, 3, pp. 51-68.

<sup>3</sup> A. Schenk & R. Schreuder (eds.), *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, pp. 97-116.

New paradigmatic relations are then settled between the center ostensible constituent of a PhU at whatever point an inside change through the addition of a descriptive word happens. The inclusion of outside constituents is an exceptionally repetitive method for launching PhUs, particularly in media talk. This peculiarity is predominantly broad in the press and the number of events can be on occasion unprecedented. These inclusions are either a consequence of the contextualization of PhUs or the cycles of measurement or capability concerning all the lexical units of the language, including PhUs. This critical pattern has been widely considered and is acquiring, what's more, more consideration in phraseological research. Interestingly, we can discover some consistency assuming we look, for instance, at the descriptors that are ordinarily utilized for this reason: political, moral, legal, homegrown, scholastic, monetary, financial, scholarly, verifiable, business, measurable, and so forth, which all have a place with a similar notional worldview. These modifiers work as "space delimiters" or as "perspective adjustment", considered to be "the most broadly accessible type of inside change for sayings". These meddlesome descriptors have of late been recognized as "concern modifiers" and can be utilized with most phrases, even with the most frozen ones which can likewise permit this sort of adjustment. However, other word classes can track down their direction into the lexicographic type of PhUs. Qualifiers and things are here and there embedded with the point of altering the entire string or just a particular constituent part. Inclusion is mathematically chiefly descriptive even though intensifies, things (for the most part as adnominal premodifiers) and even relational words can be embedded in the sanctioned types of colloquialisms. Aside from qualifiers, which address the second most significant variety through lexical addition, and thing modifiers, the presence of other word classes addresses either minor occasions or nonce variations.

## Conclusion

Variety through lexical addition in PhUs is for the most part descriptive. This peculiarity addresses an inescapable expressive gadget leaned toward by writers in media talk. A few variation structures delivered by the inclusion of descriptive words in the lexicographic type of PhUs can ultimately become lexicalised. The idea of semantic prosody demonstrates importance while breaking down phrase variety through modifier addition. Some normal variational standards can be seen in this method, which shows that this lexico-linguistic and phraseological peculiarity can't just be reduced to double-dealing or expressive control. Besides, altering descriptors are not simply utilized to supply as much foundation or logical data as could be expected, they can likewise be utilized for accentuation, assessment or as swearwords, in the same way as they work in free mixes. These variation structures will more often than not be, all around, relatively addressed in the three corpora albeit interchangeable or practically compatible modifiers might happen in one corpus and not in another, just like with enormous and liberal when embedded in the PhU take sth with a squeeze/grain of salt or even commiserative or thoughtful when embedded in the PhU listen carefully.

## REFERENCES

- [1] BNC, <http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/x.asp>
- [2] COCA, <http://www.american corpus.org/>
- [3] Engineer S., 1998, Longman Idioms Dictionary, Longman, Harlow.
- [4] Ernst Th., 1981, "Grist for the linguistic mill: idioms and 'extra' adjectives", *Journal of Linguistic Research*, 1, 3, pp. 51-68.
- [5] Gibbs R. W., 1995, "Idiomaticity and human cognition", in M. Everaert, E-J van der Linden,
- [6] A. Schenk & R. Schreuder (eds.), *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, pp. 97-116.
- [7] Glucksberg S., 2003, *Understanding Figurative Language*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [8] Good M., 2008, *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [9] Hunston, 1995, "A corpus study of some English verbs of attribution", *Functions of Language*, 2, pp. 133-158.
- [10] Hunston S. & Francis G., 2000, *Pattern Grammar*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- [11] Langacker R. W., 1987, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume 1*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- [12] Langlotz A., 2006a, *Idiomatic Creativity: a Cognitive-Linguistic Model of Idiom Representation and Idiom-Variation in English*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. Langlotz A., 2006b, "Occasional adnominal idiom modification – a cognitive linguistic approach", *IJES*, 6, 1, pp. 85-108.
- [13] Moon R., 1998, *Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English: A Corpus-based Approach*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [14] Naciscione A., 2001, *Phraseological Units in Discourse: towards Applied Stylistics*, Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga.
- [15] Nicolas T., 1995, "Semantics of idiom modification", in M. Everaert, E-J van der Linden, A.
- [16] Schenk & R. Schreuder (eds.), *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, pp. 233-252.
- [17] Seaton M. & Macaulay A., 2003, *Collins Cobuild Dictionary of Idioms*, HarperCollins, Glasgow.
- [18] Siefring J., 2004, *Oxford Dictionary of Idioms*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [19] Sinclair J., 2004, *Trust the Text—Language, Corpus and Discourse*, Routledge, London.
- [20] Stathi K., 2007, "A corpus-based analysis of adjectival modification in German idioms", in C.
- [21] Fellbaum (ed.), *Idioms and Collocations. Corpus-based Linguistic and Lexicographic Studies*, Continuum, London, pp. 81-108.
- [22] Bakirova H. Typology of methodological and linguistic difficulties in the formation of lexical competence. *ACTA NUUZ.* 1/5/1 2021. 44p. <http://science.nuu.uz/uzmu.php>
- [23] Bakirova H.B. "Development of lexical competence based on content -based approach in ESP teaching,



- "Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal: Vol. 2021: Iss. 5, Article 19. Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2021/iss5/19>.
- [24] Bakirova H. The role of foreign language of specialty in the development of professional competence of the future ESP specialist. Til va adabiyot ta'limi. O'zbekiston respublikasi xalq ta'limi vazirligining ilmiy-metodik jurnali. 6-son 2021. 616. [www.tilvaadabiyot.uz](http://www.tilvaadabiyot.uz)
- [25] Bakirova H.B. Formation of lexical skills in learning foreign language terminology in a non-language university/ Emergent: journal of educational discoveries and lifelong learning (EJEDL) ISSN 2776-0995 Vol. 2, Issue 5, 2021, Indonesia.
- [26] Bakirova H.B. Formation of terminological competence in ESP education. Novateur publications. Journal NX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, ISSN No: 2581 – 4230 VOLUME 6, ISSUE 11, India. -2020. P 63.
- [27] Bakirova H.B. Teaching foreign language terminology at non-language universities. International journal of discourse on innovation. Integration and education. Volume: 01 Issue: 01. 2020 <http://summusjournals.uz/index.php/ijdiie>
- [28] Bakirova H.B. Terminological competence of the specialist in training vocabulary of specialty/ Web of scientist: International scientific research journal. ISSN 2776-0979 Vol. 2, Issue 5, 2021, Indonesia.
- [29] Bakirova H.B. The role of terms of specialty in professionally oriented education. Journal of Hunan university (Natural sciences) Vol 48. No.11.2021. 1430p.
- [30] Bakirova H.B. The content of teaching foreign languages. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching. Vol.2 [www.geniusjournals.org](http://www.geniusjournals.org). ISSN: 2795-739X. Belgium. 10-14p.
- [31] Bakirova H.B. (2021). Some techniques of working on professional vocabulary. & quot; online – conferences & Quot; PLATFORM, 91–94. Retrieved from <http://papers.online-conferences.com/index.php/titfl/article/view/101>
- [32] Bakirova H.B. (2021). Selection of lexic material for terminological dictionary minimum of energy specialty. & quot; online – conferences & quot; platform, 108–109. Retrieved from <http://papers.online-conferences.com/index.php/titfl/article/view/156>
- [33] Bakirova H.B. Difficulties in working with technical terms in ESP education International Conference on Scientific, Educational & Humanitarian Advancements Hosted online from, Samsun, Turkey [www.econferenceglobe.com](http://www.econferenceglobe.com) July 15th, 2021. 65-67. Retrieved from <https://papers.econferenceglobe.com/index.php/ecg/article/view/605>

