

PHRASEOLOGICAL TERMS IN THE ENGLISH ECONOMIC DISCOURSE

*Mansurova Nodira Anvaronva**Tashkent University of economics, PhD*Email: nodira_anvarovna@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-4636-10777

Abstract: This study focuses on the phraseological expressions found in English texts related to economics. It examines the lexical-semantic, cognitive, pragmatic, and linguistic-cultural characteristics of these phraseological units. The research identifies 50 phraseological expressions sourced from linguistic studies, media content, and economic literature. These were categorized into four semantic fields: “financial interactions,” “transactions,” “corporate practices,” and “economic production relations.” The key term identified was “money,” which carries a conceptual significance reflected in both positive and negative connotations. Phraseological units represent abstract concepts that gain meaning through their specific contexts. This study also discusses the inclusion of toponyms, anthroponyms, and zoonyms within these expressions, along with the occurrence of unique lexemes. Other topics explored include the primary sources of economic phraseological units, such as mythology, actual events, literary characters, religious influences, and the cultural, psychological, ethnic, and socio-political elements found within the English economic domain.

Key words: English language, phraseology, phraseological unit, professional communication, economic discourse, idioms

Introduction

Figurative language gradually integrates into the realm of business communication, making its presence felt through economic journalism, news articles, interviews, and the analysis provided by top economic authorities, as seen in television broadcasts and economics literature (Kazakova, 2012). The overt incorporation of figurative language has historically been characteristic of journalistic discourse. However, in economic discussions, the use of expressive language was limited until economic journalism adopted a more modern and rule-defying approach (Handford – Koester, 2010; Gleicher, 2011). We believe that the infusion of idioms and metaphors into various sectors of professional economic communication results from the current relaxation in English business discourse. Idiomatic expressions, derived from metaphors, are employed not just to depict present economic realities (O'Halloran, 1999) but also to convey personal expression within professional contexts (Kunin, 2005; Di Giovanni, 2008; Erl – Rigney, 2006).

Fixed phrases serve as an intrinsic way of understanding the world. Metaphorical reinterpretation or metaphorization is a key method for developing phraseological vocabulary, not to mention the emergence of numerous new abstract ideas arising from metaphorization (Hadian – Arefi, 2016; Sasina, 2006; Sommer, 2004).

Taking this into account, examining the phraseological units present in English economic communication not only helps in identifying these lexemes but also facilitates the exploration of unique aspects of the English mindset, the specific characteristics of English socioeconomic and

socio-political dynamics, and the distinct features of English lifestyle (Skandera, 2007). From the viewpoint of scholars, economic discourse represents a highly broad phenomenon. Some researchers do not differentiate it from business or professional discourse (Boylan – Foley, 2005; Samuels, 2013). Thus, the functional role, components, and linguistic limits of economic discourse remain insufficiently explored. Economic discourse arose via communication within the economic sector influenced by various factors: extralinguistic, pragmatic, sociocultural, and so forth. Like other discourse forms, economic discourse is shaped not only by the situational context and communicative/pragmatic intentions of the participants but also by extralinguistic influences (socio-psychological and cultural-historical) (Shchyokina, 2001).

In terms of phraseological characteristics, economic discourse boasts several defining traits, including logical clarity, precision, argumentative strength, and informativeness (Anderson, 2006; Shybika, 2003). These traits are characteristic of the terminological framework in any language.

Phraseological units are comfortably situated within English economic discourse, as this form of communication exhibits as much adaptability as any other discourse type (Kolotnina, 2001; Bondi, 2010).

Overall, the English phraseological meaning system is a complex, intricately woven substructure that has developed over centuries alongside human society and continues to evolve (Apalat, 1999). Consequently, this system contains numerous elements that can be identified in economic literature, offering a reservoir of significant ethnocultural insights (Gumovskaya, 2012; Adolphs – Carter, 2007).

For this reason, it makes sense to examine phraseological meanings as distinctive culture-bound linguistic units that represent the shared perspective of a nation based on various traits, connections, associations, and more (Brody, 2003; Dirven, 2004; Taylor, 2002). Indeed, every language encompasses concepts that articulate stereotypical values. These concepts can manifest within the phraseological unit system. At this juncture, phraseological units can serve as a pertinent subject for studies that meld linguistics and culture.

On the other hand, a significant characteristic of phraseological units is their stereotypical nature. This is also relevant to the axiological aspects associated with phraseological meanings (Sinelnikov, et al., 2015).

While frequently utilized in business environments, fixed phrases and collocations with terminological significance have been largely overlooked in specialized research for a long period. They were not regarded as linguistic expressions within the national framework. Nevertheless, there has been substantial advancement in this field recently. This shift in attention enables a broader exploration of the phraseological categories across various languages for analysis (Sasina, 2006; Safina, 2002; Nerubenko, 2013).

In the realm of English economic discourse, a variety of phraseological units are employed. However, their semantic and structural properties, classification, and intended usage have not been thoroughly investigated. Thus, a new area of focus is to examine the English phraseological domain within economic terminology, considering functional, lexical-semantic, and structural semantic aspects (Kolotnina, 2001).

This study aims to evaluate the form and significance of the phraseological units that are prevalent in English economic writings. The research encompasses an examination of lexical-semantic, cognitive, pragmatic, and cultural-linguistic characteristics of established terminological phrases. The objectives of the research include: - investigating the internal and

external influences that have defined and influenced English phraseological units; - identifying the dominant lexemes based on the lexical-semantic relationships among the phraseological units in economic discourse; - describing the context of phraseological units within economic communication; - analyzing phraseological units and identifying the ethnic, psychological, socio-political, and cultural constants within the English economic domain.

Research

This investigation focused on the idiomatic expressions utilized within the economic language of English. The subject of this study, idiomatic expressions, was sourced from English economic writings from the past five years, including documents, online content, journals, and newspapers such as "The Economist," as well as works of fiction. The characterization of English idiomatic expressions was further enhanced by references from lexicographic materials, which encompassed phraseological, terminological, and etymological dictionaries, in addition to dictionaries featuring specialized English vocabulary. This latter group includes resources like the English-Russian Economic Dictionary, the Longman Dictionary, and a dictionary from Slovar-vocab.com.

This study identifies 50 idiomatic terms derived from academic articles in linguistics, media sources, and literature related to business and economics. These terms were categorized into four phraseological and semantic domains: "monetary relations," "purchasing and sales," "business and management," and "economic and production relations."

The investigation employed various methods of linguistic analysis:

componential analysis. This method describes the semanteme, helps to understand the meaning of the phraseological unit denoting an ethnic group, and investigates the lexical-semantic structure of phraseological macro-groups of words;

- linguistic-cultural and ethnolinguistic analysis. This method allows determining the cultural and axiological side of the phraseological content of terminological units;

- structural-semantic modelling. This method determines the regularities and concrete mechanisms of the phraseological unit formation in the English language;

- functional analysis. This method is used to determine the relevant meaning of fixed terminological units in the context of economic communication;

- continuous sampling. This method is aimed at obtaining the factual phraseological material that prevails in the economic discourse;

- interpretation. This method is used to understand the meaning of phraseological units and how they interrelate with each other in the context of a discourse.

Outcomes

The application of a phraseological unit within an economic document is influenced by both external and internal elements. On one side, the evolution of language has resulted in the formation of novel phraseological pairings in the realm of economics, such as:

to play economics – to resort to dishonest methods in economic activity; to play a dishonest economic game;

Conversely, the field of economics frequently incorporates phraseological units that have their roots in historical events, cultural customs, and similar sources. Certain phraseological units are not entirely established, meaning that their key terms can vary. This arrangement of words enables the modification of one part without compromising the overall meaning, as illustrated by:

to enter into a contract – to enter into an agreement.

Phraseological units act as finished language units with a stable structure and meaning, for example, to catch the wind means to catch a wave, be successful at a certain time. Those

phraseological units that are used in economic discourse refer to non-abstract things and are close to the people's everyday life. This, in turn, explains the presence of a considerable number of figurative nominations among the phraseological units in the terminological field. These phraseological units include metaphoric meanings that denote economic realities, for example, cats and dogs (speculative stocks) or lame duck (a company or businessperson facing financial difficulties). Economic texts contain phraseological units that define money as an economic unit: purse full of money, the root of all evil (money), money burns a hole in my pocket, nor for love or money, to be stony-broke – to have no money, fry the fat out of (fry out fat) – obtain money by pressure or extortion. The term ‘money’ in phraseological collocations is frequently used in the context of illegal economic actions, for example: “trade-based money laundering” - the misuse of commerce to get money across borders. Sometimes the aim is to evade taxes, duties or capital controls; often it is to get dirty money into the banking system.

The ‘money laundering’ means the process of washing money obtained from criminal activity. Phraseological units that denote money obtained from criminal activity are the following:

- black money - But big rich countries still like to portray themselves as leaders in the fight against black money (Dirty money. Rich smell, The Economist);
- dodgy money – Big rich countries often accuse small offshore financial centres, such as Jersey and the Cayman Islands, of acting as willing conduits for dodgy money (Dirty money. Rich smell, The Economist);
- bloody money - Blood money from terrorism in the North Caucasus to the boardrooms of Moscow, corruption is Russia's biggest problem (Corruption in Russia. Blood money, The Economist).

The expression refers to the “bouncing off a dead cat,” which describes a quick increase in the price of a financial asset following a time of decrease. This usually happens when losses are reduced; it is temporary and does not suggest a reversal in the ongoing trend of falling stock prices.

The expression is derived from the idea that even a dead cat will bounce if it falls from a great height; - to smell a rat (someone who has been disloyal to you or deceived you): On the face of it, this move seems sensible. But critics smell a rat. They point out that even the biggest democracies, including America, have not always felt a need to increase the numbers of representatives in line with the population (What’s Malay for gerrymandering? The Economist).

Discussion

The exploration of phraseological terms within economic discourse was analyzed through examples from the German language. In German, the term for “money” is interpreted through analogical or metaphorical shifts in language (Shybika, 2003; Fedyanina, 2005). Additionally, the word “money” is often viewed in light of associated moral values (Kamyshanchenko, 2012; Nerubenko, 2013). The overall communicative and pragmatic impact of widely recognized economic literature relies on how thoroughly phraseological terminology is utilized (Patseyevskaya, 2010). The findings can also be associated with Kunin's concept of phraseology (Kunin, 2005). His viewpoint on phraseological identification posits that establishing a phraseological meaning as a linguistic category is complex, given the varying interpretations of the term, along with its component structure and breadth.

In this paper, phraseological units are regarded as an expression of cognitive processing, highlighting a resemblance between two distinct linguistic situations; one serves as the denotatum, whereas the other acts as a reference point. This is evidenced by the notion that a phraseological unit denotes the existence of a stable, generalized idea that it represents (Potebnya,

2011). This implies that the potential of a phraseological unit is also geared towards challenging ineffective stereotypes. Researchers adopt various perspectives on the issues, aims, and functional foundations of phraseological units (Fedulenkova, 2015; Hunston – Francis, 2000; Wierzbicka, 2009; Leroyer, 2013; Cheng, 2007; Taylor, 2002). Confusion frequently arises concerning either specific terms or broader groups of terminology. There remains no unified understanding of the conceptual framework of phraseological terminology within any particular domain, including economics. Investigators are tasked with developing and enhancing the qualitative aspects of the terminological meta-language.

Our study identified certain groups of phraseological units in the field of economics, which will not only contribute to the lexicon of contemporary English but also enhance the research potential within English economic discourse. The significance of this topic underscores the need for further investigations into phraseology and its relationships with terminology and cognitive studies.

Conclusions

The phraseological aspect of any language offers abundant material for linguistic investigation, as it not only captures an individual's perception of the surrounding world but also serves to convey the essential values and stereotypes inherent in national culture. Consequently, phraseological terminology embodies the “axiological world image.” Examining its ties to ethnic experiences and the intrinsic representation of culture, traditions, customs, and the environment helps identify how ancient archetypal human concepts are embedded within language (Teliya, 1996).

Phraseological and terminological units in language convey two forms of information: one that humanity has collectively acquired, and another that is specific to particular nations. We argue that the knowledge found in the analyzed terminological phraseological units represents the language and culture as semiotic elements that form a cohesive world image. Users of the language interpret phraseological units as historical meanings that are context-bound. However, they continue to exist as a societal phenomenon utilized for social functions.

The lexical-semantic significance of terminological phraseological units mirrors conceptual micro-fields manifested in areas like individuality, space and time, fauna, objects and their conditions, biology, medicine, and evaluative categories, among others.

In economic discourse, phraseological terminology pertains to currency types, participants involved in market and stock exchange activities, economic relations among entities, and evaluative economic indicators (for instance, a success rate), etc. The meanings of phraseological units found in economic texts arise from diverse sources such as mythology, scripture, historical contexts, and the unique cultural characteristics, habits, and traditions of a given ethnic group. The primary aim of phraseological units in economic literature is to influence reader perception. This is feasible due to the emotional and expressive nature of these units.

The economic phraseological units encompass various lexical-semantic micro-fields, including banking and finance, industry and production, and economic policy. Research has shown that the categorization of these semantic micro-groups is somewhat arbitrary, as a single phraseological unit with a specific terminological meaning may fit into multiple fields.

In economic discourse, the overarching notion of “money” carries an expressive conceptual meaning linked to both positive and negative attributes. The lexical-semantic field associated with negative implications features phrases like “black money,” “dodgy money,” and “blood money.” Positive associations are typically represented by terms such as “white money”

and “honest money.” The concept of “electronic money” is particularly prevalent in contemporary discussions.

Toponyms, anthroponyms, and zoonyms frequently appear within English economic phraseological units. These units represent abstract ideas that materialize in particular contexts.

The primary sources for economic phraseological units include mythology, historical occurrences, characters, literary works, and religious texts, including narratives from the Bible. The examination of these phraseological units reveals the psychological, socio-political, and cultural characteristics specific to the English economic context.

Bibliographic References:

1. Adolphs, S. – Carter, R. 2007. Beyond the word: new challenges in analyzing corpora of spoken English. In: European journal of English studies, vol. 11, n. 2, pp. 133-146.
2. Anderson, W.J. 2006. The Phraseology of Administrative French: A Corpus-Based Study. In: Language and Computers, 57 p.
3. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
4. Apalat, G.P. 1999. English Legal Terminology in Economic Texts. Foreign Philology. In: Ukrainian Scientific Collection, vol. 111, pp. 208-212.
5. Bondi, M. 2010. Arguing in economics and business discourse: Phraseological tools in research articles. In: Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée, vol. 2, pp. 219-234.
6. Boylan, T. – FOLEY, T. 2005. Political Economy and Colonial Ireland: The Propagation and Ideological Functions of Economic Discourse in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Routledge.
7. BrodY, J. 2003. A linguistic anthropological perspective on language and culture in the second language. In: Culture as the Core: Perspectives on Culture in Second Language Learning, pp. 37-52. North Carolina: IAP.
8. Cheng, W. 2007. Concgramming: A corpus-driven approach to learning the phraseology of discipline-specific texts. In:
9. Corell: Computer Resources for Language Learning, vol. 1, pp. 22-35. XLinguae, Volume 12 Issue 1, January 2019, ISSN 1337-8384, eISSN 2453-711X 235
10. Hadian, a.S. – Arefi, M. 2016. Metaphor, analogy, and the discourse of originality: five Iranian case studies. In: Social Semiotics, vol. 26, n. 5, pp. 541-562.
11. Handford, M. – Koester, A. 2010. It's not rocket science": metaphors and idioms in conflictual business meetings. In: Text & Talk-An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language Discourse & Communication Studies, vol. 30, n. 1, pp. 27-51.
12. Hunston, S. – Francis, G. 2000. Pattern grammar: A corpus-driven approach to the lexical grammar of English, 4. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
13. Kamyshanchenko, Y.A. 2012. Associative images in phraseological units that represent the concept of “Money” in the German and English language. Furs, L.A.(ed.). In: Cognitive Linguistic Studies: International Congress on Cognitive Linguistics Tambov, vol. 11 pp. 446-448.
14. Kazakova, E.P. 2012. Ways to enhance the transparency of the internal form of the phraseology of the English business discourse, 1.
15. Kolotnina, E.V. 2001. Metaphoric modelling of reality in Russian and English economic discourse. Yekaterinburg.
16. Kozy, J. 2013. Economics and Armchair Psychology. Global Research.



17. O'halloran, K. L. 1999. Interdependence, interaction and metaphor in multisemiotic texts. In: Social Semiotics, vol. 9, n. 3, pp. 317-354.
18. Patseyevskaya, Y. 2010. Phraseological terms as markers of coherence in the Polish scientific discourse. In: Kyiv Polish Studies: Collection of Research Papes, vol. 23 pp. 469–476.