



**ACADEMICIA**  
**An International**  
**Multidisciplinary**  
**Research Journal**  
 (Double Blind Refereed & Peer Reviewed Journal)



**DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2021.01494.4**

## STYLISTIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS DENOTING HUMAN INTELLECTUAL ABILITY

**Tursunova Gulchehra Norboboyevna\***

\*Uzbek State World Languages University,  
 Tashkent, UZBEKISTAN  
 Email id: guli2578@mail.ru

### ABSTRACT

*The article attempts to classify English phraseological units, denoting the intellectual abilities of a human, according to functional - stylistic features. We consider three broad groups of phraseological units: bookish, neutral and colloquial phraseological units from the point of view of expressive - stylistic coloring. The main feature of a phraseological unit related to a certain style is the nature of the lexical units used in it, as well as the emotionally expressive connotation of the phraseological unit. And the functional - stylistic component of connotation is defined in the article as a stylistic characteristic of a phraseological unit from the point of view of its functional, historical and territorial affiliation, which has an ordinary status.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Expressive-Stylistic Coloring, Bookish, Colloquial, Interstyle, Functional-Stylistic Component, Stylistic-Status, Informal Speech, Familiar / Rude Speech, Stylistic Component Of Connotation, Territorial Affiliation, Etymological Labels.*

### INTRODUCTION

Phraseological units, like any lexical units, can refer to different language styles. They can be both neutral in their use and colloquial, slang, bookish, etc. The scope of use of some of them is strictly limited, while others are gradually falling out of use altogether.

I. B. Golub believes that phraseological units are not stylistically equivalent: “when stylistic characteristics are taken into account, firstly, the phraseological unit belongs to one of the functional styles or the lack of functional and stylistic fixation, and secondly, emotional coloring and expressive possibilities” (Golub, 2004 : 218).

In this regard, it is important to analyze the stylistic differences in the linguistic implementation of “phraseological units representing human intellectual ability” that allow us to describe a part

of the linguistic picture of the world in English linguistics. In this study, phraseological units denoting human intellectual ability are the main linguistic material for analyzing the specific features of stylistic expression in the linguistic consciousness of English. The aim of the study is to investigate the differentiations of phraseological units representing human intellectual ability from the point of view of expressive - stylistic coloring.

From the point of view of expressive-stylistic coloring, all phraseological units can be divided into three large classes: bookish, colloquial and interstyle (phraseological units that do not contain any assessment, stylistically neutral) (Golub, 2001).

Bookish phraseological units are used in fiction, journalism, scientific and official-business styles. It is used in functional book styles, mainly in writing.

As part of bookish phraseology, it stands out:

- Scientific, representing compound terms: *center of gravity; thyroid gland; school-leaving certificate;*

- Journalistic: *people of good will;*

- Official-business: *take place; presumption of innocence; put into operation.*

There are fewer bookish phraseological units in English than colloquial ones.

Interstyle phraseological units functionally do not contain any assessment, they are not expressively colored. For them, the presence of special marks in dictionaries is uncharacteristic; they can be used both in the book and in the oral form of the language. There are few neutral phraseological units: *open meeting; New Year; each other, All day long, easy money* and others. They are part of the commonly used phraseology, which is not functionally fixed. Therefore, interstyle phraseological units always appear as stylistically neutral, they lack stylistic "elevation" and "decline".

Colloquial phraseological units, referring to stylistically reduced linguistic means, are distinguished predominantly by emotive decline, vivid imagery and a narrower sphere of use. Colloquial phraseological units are the largest stylistic layer of phraseology and are used, as a rule, in oral speech and in written speech - in fiction. In terms of functional, stylistic and stylistic properties, proverbs and sayings can be attributed to them: *Up one's sleeves; to live in clover.*

The phraseological units belonging to it are often given in explanatory dictionaries without stylistic marks, but nevertheless they stand out against the background of common phraseological units with a bright colloquial color, a slightly reduced, familiar tone in sound. Colloquial phraseological units, as a rule, are figurative, which gives them a special expression, liveliness, brightness. Their use in speech serves as a kind of counteraction to speech clichés, clericalism. Vernacular phraseology, generally close to colloquial, is distinguished by a greater decline, for example: *to peek up one's nose;* the rude vernacular phraseology sounds even sharper; it includes abusive stable combinations that represent a gross violation of the linguistic norm.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to A. V. Kunin's definition, the functional-stylistic component of the connotation is "the stylistic affiliation of phraseological units" (Kunin 1986: 157).

I. V. Arnold emphasizes: "A word has a stylistic component of meaning, or stylistic connotation, if it is typical of certain functional styles and spheres of speech, with which it is associated even when used in atypical contexts for it" (Arnold 1990: 114)

Following I.B. Golub, we understand the following as functional style: a functional style is a historically developed and socially conscious system of speech means used in a particular area of human communication (Golub 2001: 57).

Let us give the definition of M. N. Kozhina: "Functional style is a peculiar character of speech of one or another social variety, corresponding to a certain sphere of social activity and a form of consciousness correlated with it, created by the peculiarities of functioning in this sphere of linguistic means and a specific speech organization, creating a certain general stylistic coloring" (Kozhina 1983: 49).

A review of works examining the stylistic differentiation of words and phraseological units allows us to conclude that most researchers, when determining stylistic status, use as a rule, division by types of speech activity. Here are just some of the statements:

- V. Kunin in his work "Course of phraseology of the modern English language" distinguishes the stylistic component of the connotation into functional and stylistic (the actual stylistic affiliation of phraseological units) and communicative-stylistic (the potential for using phraseological units in a particular sphere of communication). Moreover, describing the communicative-stylistic labels that determine the communicative spheres, that is, the spheres of functioning of phraseological units, he gives examples that also differentiate phraseological units by types of speech activity: (Kunin 1986).
- I. V. Arnold: "Neutral style, two main groups are opposed to the style possible in a speech situation of any character: the first of them - colloquial styles - corresponds to the unprepared speech of everyday communication, and the second - book styles - to a premeditated speech of communication with a wide range of people (public speech). In the English style, a slightly different terminology is adopted: they distinguish between spontaneous casual (non-formal) and non-spontaneous non-casual (formal). "According to I.V. Arnold, these terms more accurately reflect the essence of the matter (Arnold 1990: 249).
- NF Alefirenko: "The vocabulary is stylistically heterogeneous. It distinguishes:
  - a) Words that are commonly used and inherent either only in oral speech, or only in written speech;
  - b) words of the whole people and words, geographically or socially limited;
  - c) words of active and passive stock. ... The vocabulary used in all styles of speaking and writing is called common (interstyle). This vocabulary is stylistically neutral. Colloquial vocabulary is contrasted with the vocabulary of written speech, which is subdivided into bookish, "high" and official-business"(Alefirenko 2004: 242).

## III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND MATERIALS

During the work, the following research methods and techniques were used:

- Descriptive method;
- Method of stylistic characteristics;
- Methods of stylistic characteristics and quantitative calculations, as well as the reception of a continuous sample of linguistic material from phraseological dictionaries of the English language.

The material for the research was the data of phraseological dictionaries of the English language, English-Russian phraseological dictionary and dictionaries of phraseological synonyms of the English language, as well as data from the National Corpus of the English language.

#### IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

So, following the traditional stylistic differentiation (i.e. from the point of view of the scope of their use), we carried out a stylistic analysis of phraseological units that express the intellectual abilities of a person. It seems possible to distinguish the following three classes among the corpus of the studied PU:

- Book PUs make up a very small amount (“14 units). Book PU includes PU, mainly or exclusively used in written speech, ie, in poetic, journalistic, scientific, official-business spheres of communication, etc.: a depository of learning (ERPhD); addle one's brain with sth (ERPhD). Let's give the following example:

When your great uncle Marvin became infirm in his later years, trying to distinguish between you and your cousins tended to addle his brain. (<https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/addle>)

- To colloquial phraseological units, that is, to those that are used in oral speech, this study includes 246 units. Let's list some of them: be off the beam (ERPhD); be (have) a shingle short (ERPhD), be (go) off one's chump (ERPhD), for example:

What with the shock of him going in this awful rash way, and thinking myself a made man by that chance, I was nearly off my chump for a week. But no fear. (<https://books.google.co.uk/books>. Joseph Conrad. Lord Jim. Ch.6, .65);

- phraseological units used in all styles of speech are considered to be neutral or interstyle phraseological units. In total, 170 such phraseological units were allocated: put on one's thinking cap (ERPhD), have (got) one's head screwed on right (ERPhD), make sense (ERPhD). Here's an example:

Guillimot was a very thoughtful boy, and one bright summer 's day he put on his thinking - cap, that he might find something to do by which he could help his mother.... . (American Agriculturist, Vol. 31. – New York: ORANGE JUDD & CO, 1872, p.307)

Thus, most of the phraseological units expressing the intellectual abilities of a person are colloquial phraseological units.

It should be noted that the definition of the stylistic status of phraseological units is complicated by "insufficient elaboration of phraseological stylistics, mobility of the boundaries of various

stylistic categories, such as, for example, neutral and book, colloquial and jargon, as well as a change in the phrase use rate" (Kunin 1986: 157)

At the same time, recently there has been a refinement and addition of the very concept of "stylistic differentiation".

I.V. Arnold, summarizing the opinion of many scientists, points out that "the division into "colloquial" and "book" styles does not necessarily correspond to the division of speech by types of speech activity into written and oral forms. The conversational style is widely used in fiction, and samples of the book style can be used in oral forms of communication" (Arnold 1990: 249).

V. N. Telia puts forward a hypothesis that the basis of stylistic differentiation is the knowledge about the appropriateness / inappropriateness of the choice of this layer-meaning in certain socially marked conditions of speech. As a consequence, speech situations should be classified.

In support of his hypothesis, V. N. Telia cites the statement of G. N. Sklyarevskaya, who also singles out the situation of speech as the main factor of stylistic marking: "Linguistic competence of speakers (ie, language proficiency) is the ability to choose the one out of numerous ways of expression, which most fully corresponds to the type of speech, situations, social relations of speakers, tasks of expressiveness, etc. " (Sklyarevskaya 1988: 52).

V. I. Karasik proposes to consider the stylistic-status meaning, paying special attention to the expression of the sign of a person's social status. According to V. I. Karasik, one of the indicators of social status is language competence. From the point of view of stylistic and status meaning, the author distinguishes standard communication, as well as substandard and superstandard uses of speech units. The means of standard communication, therefore, include words of a neutral style. Substandard communication is communication at a reduced social distance, and superstandard communication is understood as communication at an increased social distance (Karasik 2002: 263).

In our opinion, all of the above factors are taken into account by S.I. Lubenskaya when determining the criteria for stylistic marks proper in the "Russian-English phraseological dictionary" (1997). The author highlights:

- Situations in which phraseological units are usually used (friendly conversation or letter, official meeting, etc.);
- Age and ratio of social status of the speaker, his interlocutor and a third person (or persons).

As a basis for the stylistic classification of the studied phraseological material, we take the basic parameters for the social-role typology of speech situations, highlighted in Telia (1996: 125).

Neutral speech situation, or speech standard: social relations of partners are insignificant and do not make any "traces" in the type of speech - *collect one's thoughts* (ERPhD), *have a good head on one's shoulders* (ERPhD), *occupy sb 's mind* (ERPhD), for example:

*Permit me, Jasper. Mr .Neville, you are confounded; collect your thoughts; it is of great importance that you should collect your thoughts; attend to me. "I will try, sir, but I seem mad"* (Charles Dickens. The Mystery of Edwin Drood: Complete – Published by T. P. James, p.135).

Informal speech situation: social relations of speakers are defined as extra-social –*not all there* (Informal), *as smart as a fox* (Informal):

*You can't depend on Paul for much help. He's really not all there.*  
(<https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/not+all+there>).

Familiar / rude familiar speech: role status is defined as a "close acquaintance" attitude (close acquaintance gives rise to "familiar" relationships, usually expressing disregard for the individual) –*thick as shit* (very rude), *a proper Charley* (negligible), *sb is talking out of their arse/ass* (rude), for example:

*We can only conclude that these people are either thick as shit, blinded by racism, or both.*  
(<https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/thick+as+shit>).

The situation of intellectual communication (labeling "bookish"): the role statuses of speakers are defined as "educated people, bookish people" who show respect for the individual: *a depository of learning* (bookish).

Sphere of official / business communication: role statuses are rigidly defined by the "terms of reference", role positions are associated with the hierarchy of relationships between business partners - *Perish the thought* (Formal), *put something to bed* (used in business/politics), eg:

*We thought we'd put the issue to bed, but it was brought up again at the next meeting.* (<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/словарь/английский/put-sth-to-bed>).

The stylistic component of connotation is based primarily on the knowledge about the appropriateness / inappropriateness of the use of phraseological units in certain socially significant conditions of speech (Telia 1996: 124). The cognitive basis of stylistic connotation is the speaker's / hearer's attitude to speech conditions.

It seems to us appropriate to touch upon one more aspect concerning the stylistic marking of the phraseological units under study.

“15 PU have labels indicating their temporary (in relation to modern use) status, for example: *Cousin Betty* (obsolete), *have bats in one's belfry* (old-fashioned).

Labels denoting the territorial affiliation of phraseological units are found in 106 PU, for example: *(as) balmy as a bandicoot* (Australian), and *mind like a steel trap* (original Amer.), *Be of two minds* (AmE), *be off one's nut* (BrE), *be off one's saucer* (Australian).

Etymological labels have 13 PU, and 9 of them contain an indication of literary sources: *(as) mad as a March hare* (L. Carroll), *chew the cud* (Shakespeare), *take thought* (etymological bibl.).

According to the theory of the "block" organization of the meaning of phraseological units, the block of information, reflecting the stylistic marking, acts as the final one. But this position of stylistic information is conditional, this component of connotation, as it were, frames the general structure of meaning.

## V. CONCLUSION

Summing up the analysis of the stylistic component of the connotation, we note the following points:



1. The stylistic classification of the studied phraseological material was carried out according to the basic parameters for the social-role typology of speech situations.
2. The stylistic connotation is based on the attitude of the speaker / listener to the conditions of speech, as well as the knowledge about the appropriateness / inappropriateness of the use of phraseological units in certain socially significant conditions of speech.
3. The stylistic component of the meaning of phraseological units, expressing the intellectual abilities of a person, contains information about their temporary status, territorial affiliation and etymology.

## REFERENCES

1. Alefirenko N.F. Teoriyazyazika: vvodnykurs [Theory of language: an introductory course].- M.: Akademiya,2004.—368p.
2. Alyokhina A.I. Issledovaniyesistemnoorganizatsiifrazeologiisovremennogoangliiskogoyazyka (problemafrazeologicheskikhhotnosheniifrazeologicheskikhstruktur): avtoref. diss. ... d-rafilol. nauk [Study of systematic organization of phraseology of modern English (the problem of the relations of phraseological and phraseological structures): abstract of PhD thesis in Philology]. – L., 1986. p. 33.
3. Arnold I.V. Stylistics of the modern English language. 3rd ed. – M.: Prosveshenie, 1990. - 300 p.
4. Golub I.B. Stilistikasovremennogoruskogoyazyka. [Stylistics of the Russian language] - M.:Visshayashkola, 1986.-336p.
5. Golub, I. B. Stilistikaruskogoyazyka. [Stylistics of the Russian language]. – Moskva: Ayris-Press, 2004. – 448 s.
6. Kojina M.P. Stilistikaruskogoyazyka.[ Stylistics of the Russian language] - M.: Prosveshenie,1983.-223p.
7. Kunin A.V. Kursfrazeologi I sovremennogoangliyskogoyazyka [Modern English phraseology course] - M.: Visshayashkola, 1986. – 336p.
8. Karasik V.I. Yaziksosialnogostatusa.[The language of social status] - M.: ITDGK «Gnozis», 2002.-333 p.
9. Sklyarevskaya G.N. Leksikograficheskayastilistika: sostoyanieiproblem [Lexicographic stylistics: state and problems] -M., 1988. - pp.49-62.
10. Teliya, V.N. Russkayafrazeologiya. Semanticheskii, pragmaticheskiiyilingvokulturologicheskiiyaspekti[Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects] - M.: Shkola «Yazikirusskoykulturi», 1996.-288p.

## DICTIONARIES

1. Kunin A.V. English-Russian phraseological dictionary. M .: Ruskiyyazik, 1984. 944 p
2. Longman Idioms Dictionary: Over 6000 Idioms.-USA: Longman,2000.-398p.

3. Lubenskaya, S. I. Russian-English Phraseological Dictionary – M.: Language and Russian culture, 1997.-1056s.

**INTERNET DICTIONARIES**

1. <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/not+all+there>
2. <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/thick+as+shit>
3. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/словарь/английский/put-sth-to-bed>

**LIST OF SOURCES USING MATERIAL for ANALYSIS**

1. American Agriculturist, Vol. 31. – New York: ORANGE JUDD & CO, 1872, p.307
2. Charles Dickens. The Mystery of Edwin Drood: Complete – Published by T. P. James, p.135
3. <https://books.google.co.uz/books>.Joseph Conrad. Lord Jim. Ch.6, .65