JURGITA LIUTKUTĖ

THE PROBLEM OF IDIOMATICITY AND PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS’ TRANSFORMATIONS

MA Paper

ACADEMIC ADVISOR: Assoc. Prof. Izolda Genienė

VILNIUS, 2007
THE PROBLEM OF IDIOMATICITY AND PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS’ TRANSFORMATIONS

This paper is submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of the MA in English Philology

By Jurgita Liutkutė
I declare that this study is my own and does not contain any unacknowledged work from any source.

Date:
Signature:

Academic advisor: Assoc. Prof. Izolda Genienė

Date:
Signature:
CONTENTS

Abstract .................................................................................................................. 4
Introduction ........................................................................................................... 5

Chapter 1 The Theoretical framework of PhUs .................................................... 7
  1.1 The Problem of terminology ......................................................................... 7
  1.2 The Problem of Definition .......................................................................... 9
  1.3 The Problem of Classification .................................................................... 12

Chapter 2 The Problem of Idiomaticity .............................................................. 16

Chapter 3 Transformations of PhUs ................................................................. 20
  3.1 Grammatical Transformations ...................................................................... 22
     3.1.1 Changeability of the Grammatical Tense Form .................................. 22
     3.1.2 Changeability of the Pronoun .............................................................. 26
     3.1.3 The Process of Passivization ............................................................... 28
     3.1.4 Changeability of Grammatical Number .............................................. 29
     3.1.5 Changeability of Article ..................................................................... 31
     3.1.6 Verbal PhUs’ Reversal into Nominal .................................................. 32
     3.1.7 The Case of PhUs’ Splitting ................................................................. 33
  3.2 Lexical Transformations ................................................................................ 35
     3.2.1 Lexical Changeability ......................................................................... 35
     3.2.2 Lexical Additions .............................................................................. 38
     3.2.3 Lexical Deletions .............................................................................. 40

Chapter 4 PhUs that do not Allow any Transformations ................................. 43

Conclusions ........................................................................................................... 42
Summary in Lithuanian .......................................................................................... 45

Appendix .............................................................................................................. 48

Bibliography ......................................................................................................... 63

References ............................................................................................................ 63
Sources .................................................................................................................. 64
The purpose of this research was to explore two associated problems in the sphere of phraseology: idiomaticity and possibilities to transform phraseological units. In discussing idiomaticity the main aspect was to compare the degree of it in single idiomatic words and in phraseological units, while in discussing transformation possibilities the purpose was to show how phraseological units can be changed in grammatical and lexical terms. For the analysis of phraseological units’ transformation several A. Christie’s and W. S. Maugham’s literary works were chosen. The total number of the analyzed examples of phraseological units was 286. The research demonstrated that the most frequent types of transformation were the change of the grammatical tense form and the variation of pronouns. A large number of infinitival forms of the verbal phraseological units was also observed. Other ways of transformation, namely lexical additions and deletions, changes of number and article, as well as phraseological unit’s reversal and splitting were not so frequent in my analyzed examples.
INTRODUCTION

Phraseological units (PhUs) (or “idioms” as some linguists suggest) and the figurative meanings that they carry on have drawn the attention of many linguists. PhUs make up an important part of the English lexicon for they exist in both: literary and everyday languages. They also play a great role in language for they make it more vivid and more “colourful”. It has been said that “If natural language has been designed by a logician, idioms would not exist” (P. N. Johnson-Laird in a foreword to a “Collection of Works on Idioms”; 1998).

The linguistic interest in PhUs was developed extensively only in the first half of the 20th century. From then on, various linguists have studied and investigated PhUs and their properties. Russian and Anglo-American scholars made a great contribution in the field of PhUs, as well as French and German linguists, who have also made some significant research in this sphere of language. The first researchers were mostly interested only in the motivation and the structural properties of the PhUs. Nowadays, besides motivation and structure, scholars pay attention to other qualities, one of which is the transformation of the PhUs. The transformation is the process during which PhUs change their lexical or grammatical form, but still retain the same figurative meaning that the initial form carries on. In spite of all the researches that were done, the field of transformation of PhUs still leaves space for investigation.

PhUs are inseparable from the concept of idiomaticity, which is also an important issue in the field of linguistics. Idiomaticity is a mechanism that provides the figurative meaning to a certain phrase thus turning it into a PhU and separating from the ordinary compositional phrases.

For the research I have picked up 286 examples from the literary texts and analyzed them according to their grammatical and lexico-semantic properties.

Aims of investigation

The main focus of this paper, as it was stated above, is the transformation of PhUs. The sphere of PhU transformation is not analyzed in a particularly deep way, so this paper will disclose various ways in which different PhUs could be transformed. As a matter of fact, PhUs do not appear in language and literature in the form they are presented in dictionaries. The changeability of form is one of the reasons that makes it difficult, especially for those people to whom English is not a native language, to recognize a PhU in a piece of literature.

One more important focus of the paper is the problem of idiomaticity. The term idiomaticity should not be confused with the term idiom. Though both terms are lexically
connected, they do not denote the same linguistic item. The term “idiom” exists as a synonym to the term PhU, while the term “idiomaticity” is the mechanism that provides figurative meaning to the word or a phrase. As it was mentioned before, I will not treat single words and compounds as PhU for the reason that the very term “phraseological unit” indicates that the item in question is a unit, i.e., consists at least of two constituents. Still while discussing the mechanism of idiomaticity, some examples illustrating it would be in the form of single words, for idiomaticity affects not only phrases, but also the single words. As idiomaticity is a problematic issue, it would be contrasted with compositionality in order to emphasize the difference between the two terms.

The present paper focuses on the concept of idiomaticity and transformation of PhUs in the English language. As English possesses two terms to denote the phrases with figurative meaning, it should be stated that British, American, and Western Europe linguists mainly use the term “idiom”, whereas the linguists from Russia and Eastern Europe prefer the term “phraseological unit”. In this paper I will use the term “PhU” because I will analyze the phrases that carry on a figurative meaning and the term PhU itself denotes that the focus is laid on the unit, i.e., a phrase. Besides, in modern linguistic works the two terms are often treated as synonyms.

In this paper I will exclude phrasal verbs, even though they are idiomatic. Phrasal verbs can be treated as PhUs if we take into consideration the fact that they consist of two lexical items – a verb and a preposition, and this construction has a different meaning than the meanings of each constituent taken separately. The reason for excluding phrasal verbs form the category of PhUs in this paper is that they are used very widely in the English language and their meanings can be found in every dictionary.

The material for the research was idioms’ dictionaries, namely a) Chamber’s Dictionary of Idioms and Catch Phrases (editor B. Kirkpatrick), Edinburgh, Chambers, 1995, b) Longman Idioms Dictionary, Harlow, Longman, 1999, and c) F. T. Wood’s Dictionary of English Colloquial Idioms, London, Macmillan, 1979. Besides the dictionaries, the works on idioms, written by various linguists were studied and the examples were taken from literary texts: a) short stories and novels of Agatha Christie and W. S. Maugham’s novel “The Moon and Sixpence”.
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The structure of the paper

This MA paper consists of seven divisions: the introduction, four chapters, the conclusion, and the summary in Lithuanian:

1. In the introduction the general information about PhUs, the aims of investigation, and the structure of the paper are presented.
2. The first chapter takes up the theoretical framework of PhUs, which includes the problems of terminology, definitions, and classifications of PhUs.
3. The second chapter takes up the problem of idiomaticity.
4. The third chapter deals with transformations of PhUs and includes such divisions: grammatical transformations (such as variability of tense, number, article, pronoun, and ways of conversion, passivization, and splitting).
5. The fourth chapter takes up PhUs that do not allow any transformations.
6. The conclusion presents the overall view of the analysis of PhU transformations.
7. The summary in Lithuanian.
CHAPTER 1

The theoretical framework of PhUs

A number of linguists have put their effort in analyzing the field of idiomatic structures. The first difficulty which one can face in the field of PhUs is the problem of terminology. Thus in the first division of this chapter I will try to present the terms that are most frequently used in the sphere of idiomatic expressions. Later in this chapter will be presented various definitions worked out by linguists. They all tried to define what a PhU is and what are the qualities that make the phrase a PhU. It was observed that the degree of idiomaticity among PhUs is not the same in all cases, thus the problem of classification appeared. As different linguists have slightly different opinions about what a PhU is, it became necessary to classify those expressions in order to see what kind of lexical structures are treated as PhU by different scholars. Different linguists provide different classifications of PhUs. In the last division of this chapter the different classifications based on different criteria will be presented.

1.1 The Problem of Terminology

Before analyzing PhUs, a clear definition of the terms ‘idiom’ and ‘phraseological unit’ should be given. These two terms should be signposted to avoid ambiguities in the overall work. The most important question at this point is whether the terms ‘PhU’ and ‘idiom’ can be treated as synonyms. In the linguistic literature both terms are used and the reader can sometimes encounter problems in understanding them. In this division the problem of the usage of terminology will be analyzed.

The term ‘idiom’ is mostly used by Western linguists, namely Ch. Fernando, A. Makkai, J. Strassler, etc. Eastern Europe and Russian linguists, such as A. V. Koonin, N. N. Amosova, prefer the term PhU. The very term ‘idiom’ comes from Greek lexeme ‘idios’, which means own, peculiar, private. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2000) defines an idiom as “a group of words with a meaning of its own that is different of the meaning of each separate words put together”. An idiom, as it becomes clear from the given definition, is a phrase, which means that it must consist of at least two words. The majority of linguists agrees with this idea and treats an idiom as a multiword expression.
The term ‘phraseological unit’ was introduced by Russian linguists and is mainly used in Russia and Eastern Europe. PhUs are usually defined in the linguistic literature as non-motivated word groups, “that cannot be freely made up in speech but are reproduced as ready-made units” (Ginzburg, 1966:74). More definitions, which are more precise, will be introduced in the next chapter.

One more important problem, which will be discussed in this paper, is idiomaticity. This term also requires clarification. Idiomaticity is the mechanism that enables phrases to take on meanings that go beyond the meaning of their parts. Fillmore (1988:41)[in Strassler; 1982:36] claims that idiomaticity is “something which one has to know over and above rules and words”. This definition denies the opinion that language consists of words and grammatical rules only. The term idiomaticity could be applied not only for certain phrases but also for single words. Though single words can in no way be accepted as PhUs, they can be idiomatic to the certain extent. The term “idiomatic” means that a word can to the certain extent be understood figuratively, but is not accepted as a separate PhU. Idiomatic word can be accepted only as a part of a certain PhU.

Speaking about idiomaticity, one more term should be introduced: compositionality. Compositionality, according to R. Racevičiūtė (1998:70), is the property that the meaning of the phrase is derived from the meaning of the words in the phrase and the grammatical relation that joins them. To put it plainly, compositionality is the antonym of the term idiomaticity. The reason we need an understanding of compositionality in discussing idiomaticity is that some arguments against the treatment a PhU as a PhU are that we are dealing merely with polysemy. For instance, if in the PhU “to spill the beans” (= to reveal secrets), one of the meanings of ‘spill’ would be ‘divulge’ and one of the meanings of ‘beans’ would be ‘secrets’, then ‘to spill the beans’ would be not an PhU: it would be the compositional product of special meanings of each of the words.

1.2 Different Definitions of PhUs

The majority of the linguists agree that a PhU is a sequence of words, or in other words a phrase and a single word could not be treated as a PhU. But on the other hand, there are some scholars, for instance, Katz and Postal, who consider one word to be a PhU (their term is “idiom”). Katz and Postal (1963:37) make a distinction between lexical (one word) and phrasal (two and more words) idioms [in Strassler; 1982:42].
Ch. F. Hockett (1958) also accepts single words as idioms. He even claims that any morpheme has in idiomatic status:

Let us momentarily use the term “Y” for any grammatical form the meaning of which is not deducible from its structure. Any “Y” in any occurrence in which it is not a constituent of a larger “Y”, is an idiom. A vast number of composite forms in any language are idioms. If we are to be consistent in our use of the definition, we are forced also to grant every morpheme idiomatic status, save when it is occurring as a constituent of a larger idiom, since a morpheme has no structure from which its meaning could be deducted.

(Hockett, 1958:172)

If we look closer in the definition quoted above, we will see that Hockett regards every morpheme and every grammatical form of the language either as a PhU or as a part of the PhU. This point of view is very debatable, for it causes a number of problems. First of all, if all the linguists adopt this theory, the language would become a mere collection of PhUs. What is more, if every morpheme was a PhU or at least a part of it, the linguists would not be able to explain the behaviour of the language, for all the words would carry an idiomatic meaning and should be understood figuratively.

However, as it was already mentioned, most linguists agree that a PhU is a polylexemic unit. A. Makkai, who follows the theories of Soviet linguists, defines a PhU as “multi-morpheme or multi-word sequence whose meaning does not follow from the standard lexical meaning of the parts when occurring in other environments” (Makkai; 1993:46). A German scholar J. Strassler in his book “Idioms in English: A Pragmatic Analysis” (1982) gives a general overview of theories of PhUs of such scholars as A. Makkai, U. Weinreich, B. Fraser, etc. According to J. Strassler, a PhU is a concatenation of more than one lexeme whose meaning is not derived from the meanings of its constituents (Strassler, 1982: 6).

As it was mentioned above, scholars from Eastern Europe and Russia prefer to use the term ‘phraseological unit’ rather than “idiom”. N. N. Amosova considers PhUs to be fixed context units, i.e. units in which it is impossible to substitute any of the components without changing the meaning not only of the whole unit, but also of the elements that remain intact (Amosova, 1963: 10). This idea is supported by A. V. Koonin (1970), who also claims PhUs to be stable. V. V. Vinogradov claims that a phraseological unit is an expression in which the
meaning of one element depends on another, irrespective of the structure and properties of the unit, and this supports the above presented ideas about PhUs.

If we compare various definitions of PhUs and idioms, we will see that both terms define almost the same linguistic items. For this reason I will mainly use the term ‘PhU’ (in some cases with the reference to the term “idiom”) to denote both: PhUs and idioms.

From the beginning of the 20th century, various linguists have studied and investigated PhUs and their properties. The first researchers indicated only the motivation and the structural properties. Much later Ch. Fernando (1996) provided the most frequently mentioned properties of PhUs which scholars use in their works. These properties are:

1) Compositeness (PhUs are commonly accepted as phrases and not as single words)
2) Institutionalism (PhUs are conventionalized expressions)
3) Semantic opacity (the meaning of the PhU is not understood literally)

Other scholars, such as G. Nunberg, I. Sag and T. Wasow (1994) offer a different list of properties, typical to PhUs:

1) Inflexibility (syntax changes are restricted)
2) Figuration (figurative meaning)
3) Proverbiality (description of social activity compared to concrete activity)
4) Informality (typically occur in informal speech)
5) Affect (usually have affective stance towards what they describe)

If we compare the two given lists of the PhUs’ properties we could see, that properties in both of them are the same. The semantic opacity, presented in the first list (suggested by Fernando) matches with Nunberg, Sag and Wasow’s term “figuration”, and the term “institutionalism” has a similar meaning as “inflexibility” presented in the second list. As different linguists have different opinions of what a PhU is, they indisputably have different opinions about the classification of PhUs as well.
1.3 Classifications of PhUs

PhUs are usually classified by taking into consideration two aspects: semantical motivation and structure. Still some scholars, as for instance, J. Strassler (in his book “Idioms in English: A Pragmatic Analysis”) present 12 categories of idiomatic expressions which are based on both – structure and motivation:

1. Sayings: to let the cat out of the bag
2. Proverbs: a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush
3. Phrasal verbs: to give in, to look up
4. Prepositional verbs: to look after, to look for
5. Tournure idioms: to kick the bucket
6. Binomials: hammer and tongs
7. Frozen similes: as cool as a cucumber
8. Ungrammatical (according to prescriptive normative grammar), but generally accepted and widely used expressions: it’s me, to try and go
9. Logical connective prepositional phrases: on the other hand
10. Phrasal compounds: dead-line
11. Incorporating verb PhUs: to baby-sit
12. Formula expressions: goodness gracious!

(Strassler; 1982:15 – 16)

If we look to the presented list of idiomatic structures we will face some terms that really need clarification. First of all, let us take the terms “prepositional verbs” and “phrasal verbs”. The difference between them is very slight: prepositional verbs have a structure of \( \text{verb + preposition} \), while phrasal verbs have the structure of \( \text{verb + particle} \). One more term is tournure idioms. This term refers to the PhUs that have a fixed structure and usually allow only very minimal changes (as for instance, grammatical tense shifts). Into the similar category fall frozen similes, which, according to Strassler, always have the structure \( \text{as...as} \text{ or } \text{like} \) and a fixed lexical content. The last term to be clarified in this list is binomials. Binomials are certain pairs of words that are connected with a conjunction and always appear in the fixed order. For instance, the binomial \( \text{bread and butter} \) cannot be reversed into \( \text{butter and bread} \), for it would lose its idiomaticity.

Probably not a single linguist would accept all the twelve categories as idiomatic. Some scholars would accept more of them, some – less. The majority of linguists’ classify PhUs either
on the basis of structure (transformation possibilities) or on the basis of semantical motivation. I will first present the classifications that are based on the semantical motivation basis.

The **lexico-semantic classification** was first introduced by Ch. Bally and later developed by V. V. Vinogradov. This classification was based on the degree of motivation, i.e., the relationship existing between the meaning of the whole and the meaning of its components. The degree of motivation depends on the degree of idiomaticity that the PhU carries. Thus, according to the degree of idiomaticity, PhUs could be classified into 3 groups: **phraseological fusions**, **phraseological unities**, and **phraseological collocations**.

**Phraseological fusions** are completely non-motivated units, such as, for example, *to kick the bucket* (= to die). The meaning of the separate components of this PhU has no connection with the meaning of the whole unit. The lexical and grammatical structures of non-motivated units (or fusions) are completely stable and this ensures the high degree of idiomaticity.

**Phraseological unities** are partially non-motivated and their meanings could be understood through metaphorical meaning of the whole idiomatic expression. For example, *to break the ice* (= to make the beginning of something) if understood literally would mean to break the frozen water, but this PhU is very popular in various languages and the understanding of it makes no difficulties. Phraseological unities are usually comparatively stable and allow only relatively few changes.

**Phraseological collocations** are motivated but they usually have specific lexical components, which can represent the whole group and are tend to become clichés. For instance, *for God’s sake, or thanks goodness*. Phraseological collocations allow more variations in lexical and grammatical structures if compared to phraseological fusions or unities.

The similar, but a little wider classification was later introduced by A. Makkai. He divides the PhUs into two big groups and grounds his division on the basis of semantical motivation as V. V. Vinogradov does. Makkai distinguishes PhUs (his original term is “idiom”) as those of **decoding** and those of **encoding**. PhUs of decoding are such phrases that “display constructional homonymity with their literal counterparts” (Makkai; 1972:26). The example of such PhUs can be *to spill the beans* (= to reveal the secrets). This phrase can be easily understood both: literally and figuratively. PhUs of encoding, on the contrary, do not show the homonymity with their literal counterparts. They represent the irregularities (or as Makkai calls them idiosyncrasies) of the language, such as, for instance, *nothing loath*.

Later, other scholars, such as for instance, G. Nunberg (1978) classified the PhUs as decomposable or non-decomposable, again taking into consideration the criterion of lexico-
semantics. The classification of this scholar was later followed by N. P. Nayak and W. R. Gibbs (1990). These linguists claim that decomposable PhUs are transparent and syntactically flexible. They are understood as literal language through literal-figurative links. The examples of decomposable PhUs are: to button one’s lips (= to keep secrets) or to follow one’s nose (= to mind one’s own affairs). The figurative meaning of the decomposable PhUs can be elaborated by logical thinking and usually is foreseen without great difficulties. The other type of PhUs, which is suggested by G. Nunberg and followed by N. P. Nayak & W. R. Gibbs, is non-decomposable PhUs. Such PhUs do not provide any explanation by performing compositional-literal analysis. The speaker has just to memorize their meanings. For example, to kick the bucket (= to die).

The other type of PhUs classification is based on the syntactical (transformational) properties. Such a classification of PhUs was accepted by S. Glucksberg and C. Cacciari (1991). Glucksberg and Cacciari have classified the PhUs in pretty much the same way as Bally and Vinogradov did, but they took into consideration the aspect of compositionality as well. The classification that these linguists proposed is as follows:

1) Compositional-opaque PhUs (matches with Vinogradov’s phraseological fusions)
2) Compositional transparent PhUs (matches with phraseological unities)
3) Quasi-metaphorical PhUs (this group of PhUs has the criterion of metaphoricity)

Compositional-opaque PhUs to the mentioned linguists are those that do not allow transformations (or allow just the minimal) and usually retain their original syntactical and lexical form. For instance, between the devil and the deep blue sea (= to face two equally unwelcome alternatives). Compositionally transparent PhUs have the structure which matches with the structure of their literal equivalents’ syntactical structure and allows various transformations. For instance, to put one’s cards on the table (= to declare one’s intentions). Quasi-metaphorical PhUs in Glucksberg’s and Cacciari’s classification are peculiar. According to them, in such PhUs “the literal referent of the idiom is itself an instance of the idiomatic meaning; for example, ‘giving up the ship’ is simultaneously an ideal or prototypical example of the fact of surrendering and a phrase that can refer to any instance of complete surrender” (Glucksberg & Cacciari; 1991:117). In other words, the metaphorical meaning of such PhUs takes place not on the level of each component of a PhU, but on the level of the phrase as one unit.
Not only have the linguists given the classifications of PhUs, but dictionaries as well. For instance, Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English (vol. 2; 1984) classifies PhUs according to the criterion of transformation into four big groups:

1) **Pure idioms.** They are such PhUs that are very stable and allow no transformations or just minimal. For example, the PhU *to kick the bucket* (= to die) allows no transformations except the change of tense form *he kicked the bucket*. In this group of PhUs no lexical or syntactical transformations are allowed.

2) **Figurative idioms.** These PhUs are also comparatively stable, but differently than pure PhUs, they allow some minor lexical transformations. For example, the PhU *to act the part* can be normally used as *to act the role*.

3) **Restricted collocations.** They are sometimes called semi-PhUs one part of which has a figurative meaning and the other appears in its literal sense. For example, *to jog one’s memory* (= to forget). The majority of restricted collocations allow various transformations.

4) **Open collocations.** They are such idiomatic expressions that their both members can be used in a literal sense. For example, *to spill the beans* (= to reveal secrets) can be understood both: literally (to pour out the vegetable beans) and figuratively (to disclose/reveal a secret). Open collocations allow maximal transformations.

To sum the classifications of PhUs up, it should be said that different scholars prefer to classify PhUs in two ways: either they distinguish 3 – 4 major groups (as Vinogradov or Gluckberg) or they give a more detailed classification (as, for instance Strassler).
CHAPTER 2

The problem of idiomaticity

Before looking deeper into the concept of idiomaticity, is should be once again stressed that the terms “idiomaticity” and “idiom” are not the same issues. Idiomaticity, according to A. Wray (2005) is ‘a preferred way of saying things’. This scholar grounds the definition on A. Pawley and F. H. Syder’s research in the field of formulaic expressions. Formulaic expressions, as understood by Pawley and Syder are the speech formulas which have a more or less fixed structure and are to a certain extent idiomatic. The already mentioned formulaic expressions are idiomatic, but they are not all of them are treated as PhUs. Let us look at the example provided by Pawley and Syder, who note that telling the time in English subject to idiomatic patterns. English speakers use the formulaic expressions ‘a quarter past two’ or ‘half past two’ when referring to time, but they never use the phrase ‘a third past two’ in the same context. Even though the lexical items ‘a quarter’, ‘a half’ and ‘a third’ belong to the same semantic level, ‘a third’ is never used in time expressions. Thus the formulaic expressions ‘a quarter past two’ and ‘half past two’ are idiomatic, but their equivalents (which are also used in telling the time) ‘fifteen past two’ and ‘thirty past two’ are not.

A. Wray concentrates on the psycholinguistic perspective of the phenomenon of idiomaticity. She considers language processing to be very demanding for the reason that ‘humans are multi-taskers, with many competing demands on our attention. The less we have to tie up our brains with language processing, the more we can focus on other things. We reduce the load that language places on our processing by taking short cuts. Short cuts are achieved by not having to unpack linguistic input right down to its smallest components, and by not having to create output by starting with the smallest components’ (Wray; IATEFL Conference; 2005). This means that the language users just use the ready-made language patterns (or formulaic expressions) without looking deeper into their semantic structure. The example could be a phrase ‘perfect stranger’ in which the word ‘perfect’ does not mean ‘ideal’, but it means ‘complete’ in spite of the overall meaning of the phrase (= total/complete stranger).

A. Wray also presents her own system of criteria according to which certain phrases take the status of being Idiomatic. The scholar excludes morphemes and single word from her analysis.
and pays attention only to the multi-word expressions. According to her presentation in the IATEFL Conference (2005), the phrases become idiomatic if:

a) they have a special meaning different from their components (e.g. a perfect stranger; stock in trade; bullet point)

b) they are more common as an expression of their meaning than (some) other potential expressions of that meaning (e.g. quarter past two; get a move on)

c) they have an unusual structure that would be difficult to generate by rule (go the whole hog; director general)

d) they have a specific functional role that is partly realised by their (precise) form (e.g. I now pronounce you man and wife; don’t you dare)

e) they have a preferential internal associations (e.g. run a business; conduct an experiment; hold an audition)

f) they constitute partially fixed, partially open frames (e.g. And the winner is X; Hello, can I speak to X please?)

This model, introduced by Wray, extends the scope of formulaic expressions beyond the concept of mere PhU. “The model proposes that we are engaged in a balancing act between (a) the creation and comprehension of new messages – for which we must have flexibility – and (b) the avoidance of unnecessary processing where forms are familiar and predictable” (Wray; 2005).

I would not agree with the whole list of the properties that make a phrase idiomatic. For instance, the (f) property seems to be very debatable, for the examples that A. Wray has presented (And the winner is X; Hello, can I speak to X please?) to my opinion are completely compositional phrases that do not carry any idiomatic meaning. I do agree that these examples are speech formulas and have a fixed structure, but all their lexical items are used in their literal senses.

Other scholars, such as for instance, R. Glaser, (1988) accept not only phrases, but also single words as idiomatic. This scholar provides several words, such as blackboard, greenhouse, bluebird, and softball, which he claims to be idiomatic. The mentioned words compounds and in a certain sense they carry an idiomatic meaning. There are aspects of the meaning that cannot be predicted from the semantic parts and the grammatical combination rules. Let us take the word greenhouse. Even though the word is single, it clearly consists of two semantic parts of ‘green’ and ‘house’. The word greenhouse has a different meaning than the two separate words ‘green’ and ‘house’. A greenhouse is a building of glass for growing plants that need warmth and light, while a green house is a building (which is not made of glass at all) of green colour in which
people live. The point is that even though the word *greenhouse* has two meaningful parts, the whole word would not be fully understood only by figuring out the meanings of the components ‘green’ and ‘house’. This word (and other similar words) goes beyond pure compositionality and must be placed in the lexicon so that the speaker would be able to produce it in an appropriate situation and the hearer would be able to understand it.

R. Glaser also claims that idiomaticity is a matter of degree: “In all cases, the aspects of meaning that are not derivable from the parts of the phrase and that Speakers and Hearers are expected to know must be stored in the lexicon. That is, they are linguistic conventions. The extent to which languages are idiomatic, that is, the extent to which they deviate from pure compositionality, is a matter of considerable controversy” (Glaser; 1988). With this statement the scholar claims that idiomatic expressions are not equal (according to the degree of idiomaticity) among themselves. Single words have the lowest degree of idiomaticity while pure PhUs have the highest.

Speaking about the idiomaticity of the phraseological units, it should be mentioned, that PhUs also vary in the degree of it. The highest degree of idiomaticity can be found in proverbs and sayings, for their meaning is usually completely unpredictable from their lexical constituents from the semantical point of view. Let us take the proverb *Birds of the feather flock together* (= people with similar behavior usually make friends among themselves). If we analyze this proverb semantically, we will find that an approximate meaning of it could be “a group of warm-blooded, feather-covered vertebrates with wings gathers in a crowd”. The literal and the figurative meanings of this proverb do not even resemble each other. This great inconsistency between the meanings makes PhUs highly idiomatic.

The lowest degree of idiomaticity is typical to the phraseological collocations, which usually have the easily predictable meaning. For instance, the PhU *as good as gold* (= particularly good) has a very predictable meaning even for the person who hears it for the first time. Semantically, “gold” is a precious metal and people automatically categorize it as “something positive”, thus the PhU *as good as gold* automatically evokes the association with a positive quality. The mentioned PhU carries by no means a figurative meaning, but its degree of idiomaticity is low, for the reason that its figurative is easily predictable.

Idiomaticity can cause a number of problems, especially for the non-native speakers. First of all, if a person is not a native speaker of the language (in our case English), he or she may find it difficult to understand the figurative meaning of the certain PhU. If trying to analyze the first time heard PhU literary the result is often disappointing, for the worked out meaning is usually
completely different for what it should be. This almost always happens in the cases the PhUs with the highest degree of idiomaticity (i.e. proverbs and sayings). The situation is a little simpler with the PhUs that have a low degree of idiomaticity, for the meaning of them can be worked out with a help of general knowledge. Even the non-native speakers of the language are able to correlate certain notions of PhU’s lexical items.

Summing the issue of the idiomaticity up, it should be said that it can affect both: single words and lexical units. It is the mechanism that creates a figurative meaning, which does not correspond with the literal meaning, of the lexical unit. The whole branch of linguistics, namely phraseology, is based on the mechanism of idiomaticity.
CHAPTER 3

Transformations of PhUs

Phraseology, or the study of idiomatic expressions, is the branch of linguistics dealing with stable word-combinations characterized by a specific transference of meaning. As it is defined by Koonin, PhU is “a stable combination of words with a fully or partially figurative meaning” (Koonin 1970:210). This definition stresses two distinctive and inherent features of PhUs: their stability (lexical and grammatical) and integrity (or transference of meaning), which differentiate them from stable word combinations of non-phraseological character and free word groups.

Even though Koonin and other scholars stress the lexical and grammatical stability of PhUs, the figurative expressions are not completely frozen and usually allow certain structure transformations. PhUs can appear nearly as any element of syntax – from a phrase up to a full sentence, thus they have the syntactic structure similar to non-idiomatic elements. In fact, not all the PhUs allow transformations, but the majority of them are transformable to a certain degree. The field of PhUs’ transformation still lacks linguists’ attention. The scholars usually mention that possibility of transformation in their works, but only mentioning is not enough. Still, some scholars speak about ways of PhUs’ transformation more extensively.

Perhaps the most widely known classification of PhUs’ transformations is that which is presented by Ch. Fernando. Ch. Fernando distinguishes four major groups of PhU transformations, which are in their turn divided in subgroups. Fernando’s PhU transformation system is as follows:

1. Replacements and substitutions
   1.1 Tense changes (variability of the grammatical tense form)
   1.2 Number changes (variability of the grammatical number)
   1.3 Article changes (variability of articles)
   1.4 Lexical Changes (variability of pronouns and synonymy of lexical items)
2. Additions (addition of certain lexical items to the original structure of PhU)
3. Deletions (absence of certain constituents of a PhU)
4. Permutations (variability of the word order within the structure of PhU)
   4.1 Particle shift
   4.2 Verb + object predicate into nominal predicate
4.3 Passivization

4.4 Subject – Object Reversal

Even Fernando’s presented system of transformations is extensive, in my opinion, it still lacks consistency. The scholar mixes syntactical and lexical transformations together. One more debatable aspect is that this linguist provides a large proportion of the examples from the newspaper headlines. The purpose of the headlines is to attract readers’ attention thus they do not reflect the natural process of transformation. In my opinion, the style of the newspaper headlines does not reflect the general grammatical rules on which the language is based and thus the newspaper headlines’ examples are most suitable only in discussing the processes of addition and deletion of PhUs.

One more system of PhUs’ transformation was presented by T. Ifill. In his work “Seeking the Nature of Idioms: A Study in Idiomatic Structure” (2002) he gives such a classification of PhUs’ transformation:

1. Morphological transformation (includes variability of tense form and number)
2. Synonymy of idioms (lexical variability of PhU’s constituents)
3. Passivization and division in structure (usage of the passive voice and variability of the word order)
4. Modifications within idioms (additions of the certain lexical items within the structure of PhU)

Ifill’s system of transformations is interesting, and differs from that of Fernando’s in the respect that he does not speak about the variability of pronouns and lexical deletions. The latter are not so widely used in the language, thus perhaps they might be omitted, but the variability of the pronoun is a natural process of any language and PhUs often undergo it.

I would like to suggest the system of PhUs’ transformations, which in my opinion covers all the most frequently occurring changes that PhUs can undergo. My system of PhUs transformation is as follows:

1. Grammatical transformations
   1.1 Changeability of Grammatical Tense Form
   1.2 Changeability of Pronoun
   1.3 Changeability of Grammatical Number
   1.4 Changeability of Article
   1.5 Passivization
1.6 Verbal PhUs’ Reversal into Nominal
1.7 The Case of PhUs’ Splitting

2. Lexical Transformations
   2.1 Lexical Changeability
   2.2 Lexical Additions
   2.3 Lexical Deletions

This system is based on the two general linguistic categories: grammatical and lexical, and each general category consists of several more precise divisions. Both categories with their divisions will be presented separately and exemplified. The examples (total number 286) were collected from the novels and short stories of A. Christie and from W. S. Maugham’s novel “The Moon and Sixpence”.

3.1 Grammatical transformations

The grammatical category of PhUs transformations comprises the following elements: changeability of tense form, number, article, the cases of passivization, splitting (I have attributed this kind of transformation to the category of grammar, because syntax is a part of it) and verbal PhUs’ reversal into nominal. The grammatical transformations occur very often in the usage of PhUs in literature. 254 examples (out of 286) were changed grammatically. Speaking about the grammatical tense, the nominal PhUs in dictionaries are normally presented in the infinitival form in the active voice. In my studied examples only 23 appeared in the infinitive. The nominal PhUs are normally presented in singular form and with an indefinite article (the exception is the case when certain PhUs exist only in plural). The grammatical transformations in this chapter will be presented in the following sequence: changeability of the tense form, pronoun changes, the process of passivization, changeability of number, changeability of the article, verbal part’s of PhUs conversion into nominal, and the splitting of PhUs.
3.1.1 Changeability of the grammatical tense form

Changeability of the grammatical tense form is the most frequently occurring type of PhUs’ transformation. 159 examples did not appear in the infinitival form, but possessed the tense form which reflected the discourse situation. Verbal PhUs in all the dictionaries are presented in the infinitive form. As we use the language in various situations, we cannot speak or write using infinitives only. Thus here comes the grammatical category of tense, which helps the reader or the speaker to perceive the temporal situation. Tense form in verb PhUs usually reflects the time frame of the discourse. Let us consider such examples:

1) *It is true. I have the head of a sieve. However, the other young lady was most kind and showed me everything in the kindest way.* (A. Christie *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*, p. 51)

2) *But like all specialists, Bauerstein’s got a bee in his bonnet. Poisons are his hobby, so, of course, he sees them everywhere.* (A. Christie *The Mysterious Affair at Styles*, p. 71)

In the example (1), the verb in the PhU *to have a head of a sieve* (= to forget things easily) is presented in the present simple form. The same is in the example (2): the infinitive form *to have a bee in one’s bonnet* (= to have a fixed idea about something) is changed into the present simple form. Present simple forms of verbs are used to create the scene of the discourse in the present time. This form of verbs is usually used in dialogues or monologues.

The similar cases are also found with the present continuous and the present perfect forms:

3) *She’s the one who’s throwing her weight about. I suppose. Better see her first before she goes right off the handle and gets a question asked in the House about the brutal methods of the police.* (A. Christie *Death in the Clouds*, p. 49)

4) *Oh, poor dear, she has been very much under the weather lately. She can’t help it, of course, but it really makes things a little difficult sometimes.* (A Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 122)
The example (3) and (4) present the present continuous and present perfect forms of the verbs in the PhUs to throw one’s weight (= to give orders to others) and to be under the weather (= to be slightly ill) respectively.

As the present tense is used to express the present-time discourse, the past tenses are used to express the past-time discourse. Past tense forms are usually used in the narratives, but they can also appear in dialogues when the speaker refers to the past events.

5) My heart thumped against my ribs, and, I don’t know why, I flew into a temper. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 81)

The above presented example (5) shows the tense shift from the infinitive form into past simple tense form. In the mentioned example the original PhU is to loose one’s head (= to loose self-control). The transformations into the past tense are possible not only for the past simple tense, but also to past continuous form (6) and past perfect forms (7):

6) He felt he’d be happier if he knew that some responsible person with expert knowledge was keeping an eye on her. (A. Christie Murder in Mesopotamia, p. 102)

7) Colonel Melchett stared at him subordinate coldly. His feeling was that slack had taken leave of his senses. (A. Christie The body in the library, p. 107)

The presented examples show the past (continuous and perfect) forms of the verbs within the PhUs to keep an eye on (= to look after) and to fly into a temper (= to start behaving irrationally).

As it was mention above, the past tense of the verb in a verbal PhU is used to disclose the past time discourse/retrospection of the events.

Future tense forms of verbal PhUs do not appear in literature as often as present or past forms (especially future continuous and future perfect). The reason for this, in my opinion, is that future continuous and perfect forms are not used too often in the language in general. Still, I have found one example of the future present form:
8) *If the crash comes it will be a big one! If I can stave it off, it will be the other way round – I shall come out on top (= to win fame, success) and be a very rich man.* (A. Christie *The Body in the Library*, p. 269)

The change of tense includes not only the purely grammatical forms of tenses, but also the grammatical moods and conditional sentences, which are also connected with the usage of tenses. The following examples present the different moods of the verbs in verbal PhUs (9) subjunctive mood, (10) imperative mood, and (11 – 13) conditional sentences:

9) *I’d take your word, (= to believe sb.) but there’s others over me who’ll be asking what the devil I mean by it?* (A. Christie *The mysterious Affair at Styles*, p. 13)

10) *If anything unpleasant happens, if you are asked what you know and who put you to what you are doing – don’t try to be heroic. Spill the beans (= to reveal a secret) at once.* (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 109)

11) *If it downs on him little by little he will suddenly be horrified and cut to the soul.* (A. Christie *The Body in the Library*, p. 18)

12) *I have no patience with you. Do you think if you were ill he would stir a finger (= to bother, to put efforts) to help you?* (W. S. Maugham *The Moon and Sixpence*, p. 72)

13) *If anyone had told me a week ago that I should be investigating a crime where a woman was killed with a poisoned dart with snake venom on it – well, I’d have laughed in his face! (= to show the disbelieving in an open way)* (A. Christie *Death in the Clouds*, p. 307)

The above-presented examples show the infinitival verb form transformations according to grammatical moods and conditional sentences used in the original text. Every change of the verb form has its own meaning which reflects the time frame of the discourse the PhUs appear. For instance, the example (9) (the infinitival form is *to take one’s word*) expresses the subjunctive mood, which means that the presented situation does not actually exist. The example
(10) (the infinitival form is *to spill the beans*) presents the imperative mood of the verb and presents the situation in which the orders or commands are given. The examples (11 – 13) (the infinitival forms are *to be cut to the soul, to stir one’s finger, and to laugh in one’s face*) show the conditional sentences (types 1 – 3 respectively), which present the situations as being real present, unreal future, and unreal past, accordingly.

The verbal PhUs, by no means, can also appear in the infinitival form, as they are presented in the dictionaries. This form also depends on the time frame of the discourse. On the other hand, the infinitival forms if PhUs are not as common as those with the transformed tense form. Still we can encounter the latter in literature works:

14) *I should say the widow found it difficult to make both ends meet* (= to balance one’s income to one’s expenditure) and *set her son to a good school*. (A. Christie *The body in the Library*, p. 281)

15) *I felt it myself, too, that desire to get the whole thing out of my mind* (= to try to forget). (W. S. Maugham *The Moon and Sixpence*, p. 22)

The variations in tense forms and grammatical moods are permitted in the majority of verbal PhUs and are therefore common. These variations, as it was mentioned before, depend on the time frame of the discourse, used in the written or spoken text, thus the verbs of PhUs, which appear in certain texts, behave according to the rules of the grammatical tense.

3.1.2 The problem of pronoun changes

It is true that the majority of PhUs do not appear in the language with the impersonal *one/one’s* or *somebody/somebody’s* as they are given in dictionaries. The usage of the particular pronoun in the PhU is a widespread phenomenon and practically every PhU in the dictionary, which contains *one/one’s* in its original form, is presented with a particular noun in a sentence. For instance, the PhU *to cast one’s mind back* (= to remember the past) can acquire different personal pronouns instead of *one’s* when used in a sentence:
31) Poirot cast his mind back dimly to what he seemed to remember as large quantities of bright-coloured tropical birds in a forest. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 104)

32) Casting my mind back I could recall the days spent in her; not happier, though. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 41)

33) They have been casting their minds back for quite a time trying to find any evidence to shake each other’s fear of being guilty. (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 201)

The above given examples present the change of person within the same PhU. The pronoun change can be explained grammatically, for the pronoun determines the subject of the sentence. As the subject in every example is different (Poirot, I, they) the pronoun behaves consequently. The same happens with the word somebody in the original form of the PhU. For instance, the PhU to make sheep’s eyes at somebody (= to look at in an amorous but foolish way) has the pronoun “somebody”, which is replaced by a suitable pronoun when used in the sentence:

34) He’d like to choke the life out of her! He’d like to murder the fellow in cold blood! Who was it? That young fellow? Or that stick Mercado? Both of them were making sheep’s eyes at her. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 141)

This set of examples of the pronoun change is applicable for the PhUs that possess one/one’s or somebody in the original form. The different case is with PhUs that already have a particular pronoun in the initial form.

There are some PhUs in the English language that are used with a fixed pronoun, as for instance, to pay the devil his due. In this PhU, independently on the subject of the whole sentence, the pronoun his is used. If, for instance, we take sentences “She had to pay the devil his due” and “He had to pay the devil his due”, we will see that the subjects in the sentences are different: he and she, but the pronoun his remains the same in both of them. This happens for the reason that the pronoun his refers to the devil, which is always masculine. Such PhUs with the fixed pronoun are very rare, for the majority of idiomatic expressions are impersonal in their initial form.
3.1.3 The problem of passivization

The passivization is not a frequent phenomenon (2 examples out of 286) in English still some PhUs are allowed to undergo this kind of transformation. Similarly as it will be discussed in the case of lexical changes, the passivization is directly related to the transparency of PhUs. Transparent PhUs can undergo the process of passivization and those that are not transparent – not. Perhaps the clearest example could be the PhU to kick the bucket (= to die). This PhU is non-transparent and if passivized it would loose the idiomatic status and become an ordinary phrase. It is acceptable to say, for example, “The bucket was kicked by John”, but this sentence would not be accepted as being idiomatic. The meaning of such a sentence would be literal: an open – top vessel was hit by the foot of a person called John. A different situation is if the PhU is transparent, as, for instance, to sweep of one’s feet (= to make sb. feel insecure/confused). The paraphrasing of this PhU can be passivized (“sb. was made to feel insecure/confused”) thus the PhU itself can also be passivized:

16) Alix, who had always considered herself “not the falling-in-love kind”, was swept clean off her feet. (A. Christie The Listerdale Mystery, p. 60)

One class of PhUs is syntactically transparent, providing a one on one mapping between the syntax of the idiomatic phrase and the syntax of its non-idiomatic paraphrase. Such PhUs retain their idiomatic status when passivized. Syntactically opaque PhUs lack this mapping, and thus they also lack the ability to remain idiomatic in the passive voice. It is unclear whether transparency is the only condition necessary for a PhU to be able to undergo passivization, but it certainly plays an important role in this sphere.

The passivization is not, as it was mentioned above, a frequent process of PhU transformation, still, it is encountered in literature, for instance:

17) Anyway, he had a bad day; and was brought down to earth. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 233)
The examples from literature prove that passivization is only possible in transparent PhUs. The example (17) to bring somebody down to earth can be paraphrased as “to make somebody to return to a normal way of thinking after a period of excitement” and the paraphrasing in its turn can be passivized – “somebody was made to return to a normal way of thinking after a period of excitement”. The example suggests that only transparent PhUs can undergo the process of passivization and at the same time retain their idiomaticity. The opaque PhUs can only be used in the active voice.

3.1.4 The ways of changing number

As the English language possesses the grammatical category of number, it cannot be ignored in the case of PhUs either. In the dictionaries PhUs are usually presented in the singular form (except those which exist only in the plural). Still, the number of a noun within a PhUs can be changed according to the discourse situation (I found 4 cases or number changing). Let us consider an example of the number change in the PhU a round peg in a square hole/a square peg in a round hole (= a person unsuitable for the position he/she fills):

18) In England and France he was the square peg in the round hole, but here the holes were any sort of shape, and no sort of peg was quite amiss. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 11)

19) There are not so many round pegs in square holes as one might think. Most people, in spite of what they tell you, choose the occupations that they secretly desire. (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 2)

The process during which the PhU of originally singular form is presented in the plural is called pluralization. One more example illustrating pluralization could be an idiomatic expression dark horse. Originally this phrase is in the singular form and means “the one whose chances of success are not known or have been overlooked”, but according to the situation it can be used either in singular or in plural form:

20) “Seat 13,” said Japp. “Lady Horbury. She’s a bit of a dark horse. I know something about her I’ll tell you presently. I shouldn’t be surprised if she had a guilty secret or two” (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 21)
21) But of course dark horses like she often tend to be fast workers. (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 21)

From the first sight it could appear that every PhU that contains a noun in singular can be pluralized. It is not quite true. In English there are some PhUs that can be used only in a singular form, and if pluralized, they lose their idiomatic status, for the reason that they do not exist in plural. The examples of such PhUs could be to kick the bucket (= to die) or to smell a rat (= to suspect that something wrong is being done). The two PhUs exist only in singular and the pluralized versions like *to kick the buckets or *to smell the rats are not accepted.

If the pluralization of the verbs in PhUs (with several exceptions) is quite an ordinary and natural process, the opposite of it can cause many problems. The PhUs that exist in plural forms are usually not transformed into singular. Let us consider an example:

22) Mr. Edward Palgrove negotiated a crisis with a horrible grinding sound that would have set a true motorist’s teeth on edge. (A. Christie The Listerdale Mystery, p. 30)

In the given example the PhU to set somebody’s teeth on edge (= to make somebody feel nervous) is used. This PhU exists only with the plural noun “teeth” and it is not correct to use it with the same noun in plural (to set somebody’s tooth on edge). Even though the word “teeth” has the singular form “tooth”, the phrase *to set somebody’s tooth on edge would not have the status of PhU.

Other examples of this phenomenon are the PhUs are (23) to spill the beans (= to reveal a secret) or (24) to twiddle one’s thumbs (= to be idle):

23) I anything unpleasant happens, if you are asked what you know and who put you to what you’re doing – don’t try to be heroic. Spill the beans at once. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 109)

24) There’s a difference, perhaps, to working in one’s own house and in a public place. But he must understand, I can’t sit still and twiddle my thumbs when it’s necessary to do something! (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 13)
The above-presented examples have nouns, which exist only in plural to form PhUs. If the nouns in question (beans and thumbs) were used in the singular form, the PhUs would lose the idiomaticity and become a mere product of compositionality. For instance, “to twiddle one’s thumb” would be understood literally and would mean “to move one of one’s fingers”, while the phrase “to spill the bean” does not exist, for the verb “spill” requires either an uncountable or a plural noun.

The numbers shifts in PhUs do not function with the same freedom as the grammatical tense forms or pronouns do, thus they are not very common.

3.1.5 The ways of changing article

The English language has three articles: indefinite, definite, and zero. A number of PhUs can take one or another article depending on the grammatical rules. The noun in the PhU takes, for instance, the zero article when it is used in plural or together with a pronoun, as any other noun in the language. The grammatical rules can be applied not only in the cases of plural form or pronoun usage, but for other cases as well. For instance, the set phrases such as bit by bit, step by step, or day by day, always appear with a zero article. The grammatical rule that the unique objects always take the definite article is also applicable for PhUs. For instance, the sun (Nothing new under the sun (= nothing new happens)), the world (The man of the world (=one with wide experience of business and society)), the weather (To be under the weather (=to be unwell)), the wind (To get the wind up (= to get frightened)), etc. Other nouns in the PhUs take only the indefinite article, when the noun means any (as in the case of any countable noun in the English language). For instance, as poor as a church mouse (= completely poor), as vain as a peacock (= completely vain), a little bird told me (= unnamed informant), etc. The zero article in PhUs is also used according to the grammatical usage of it, i.e., with the plural and uncountable nouns: to take pains (= make a great effort, work hard), to eat dirt (= humiliate oneself), or proper nouns, as for instance, double Dutch (= unintelligible language), Jack of all trades (= a person who can manage a lot of different works), etc.

The articles in the case of PhUs can be used not only according to the grammatical rules, and the same PhU can appear with a different article in different situations:
25) But to people like Ralph Paton to turn over a new leaf is easier in theory than in practice. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 59)

26) Now that he was going to live in Africa there was a chance for him to turn over the new leaf! (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 512)

Or:

27) Poirot finally broke the silence. “I think you should better leave, Mr Evans. This young man has a lot of question to your wife.” (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 91)

28) She was a useful guest among persons to whom small talk did not come easily, for she was at a loss with a new topic and could be trusted immediately to break an awkward silence with a suitable observation. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence)

The above-presented examples in a dictionary are presented as follows: the phrase to turn over a new leaf (= to start something in a different way) in the examples (25 – 26), is presented with an indefinite article, while the PhU to break the silence (= to stop the silence by starting to talk or make noises) in examples (27 – 28) is presented with a definite article.

The variation of article in PhUs is not as free as variation of tense form or number. It behaves more or less according to the grammatical rules. In the majority of cases the article remains stable (I found only 4 examples of the article changes) in the PhU (in the form it is presented in the dictionary).

3.1.6 The verbal PhUs’ conversion into a nominal part of the sentence

The conversion of verbal structures into nominal is applicable for both: idiomatic and non-idiomatic constructions. This type of transformation is used to convert verbal PhUs into nominal (I found only 2 examples). Let us take a verbal PhU to poke one’s nose into somebody’s affairs (= to interfere with what does not concern one). This PhU in its structure contains the verb (poke) + object (one’s nose) construction, but it can be changed into a nominal construction in literary texts. Consider the example:
29) Don’t you dare to blame me for this kind of gossip. Nose poking into the affairs of other people is not my style. (The collection of Agatha Christie, p. 332)

As it could be seen from the given example (29), the verb + object construction is converted into nominal (nose poking) but the PhU still retains its idiomaticity and is accepted as such. This kind of transformation in PhUs is used for the stylistic and grammatical purposes. Another example where verbal PhU is converted into nominal is this:

30) Let us say, for the sake of argument, that Rosemary was murdered. Do you really wish to rake up the whole thing? It may mean a lot of unpleasant publicity, a lot of washing of dirty linen in public, your wife’s love affairs becoming public property. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 152)

The above-presented example discloses how the verbal PhUs (30) to wash one’s dirty linen in public (= to discuss the unpleasant family affairs in the presence of other people) is converted into nominal, for in the example the word “washing” goes as an object. On the other hand, not all verbal PhUs can be converted into nominal. For example, the PhUs such as to throw up the sponge (= to admit defeat or failure) or to stick in the mud (= to be unprogressive) are not likely to tolerate the conversion into nominal PhUs, thus the phrases such as “sponge throwing” or “sticking in mud” (taking as nominal parts of the sentence) would not be accepted as being idiomatic.

3.1.7 The case of the PhU splitting

The final aspect of PhU transformations is the process of splitting. While analysing the literary examples, I have noticed that some of them have a kind of parenthesis, which does not enhances the meaning of the PhU, but gives some additional information. The splitting of PhUs is similar to the process of addition; still it is in a certain way different. As we will see in the case of lexical addition, some words are added to the PhU in order to make the meaning of
the PhU stronger. In the case of splitting, the PhU retains its structure, but certain pieces of
text (usually they function as parenthesis) split it into parts (I found 4 examples in literature).
For instance:

35) She’s a kind of female Jago. She must have drama. But she doesn’t want to be
involved herself. She’s always (as I’ve noticed) pulling strings – looking on – enjoying
it. (A. Christie Murder in Mesopotamia, p. 28)

In the above-presented example we can observe the splitting of the PhU to pull strings
(= to influence other in a secret way) (35) is transformed in several ways: the grammatical
tense is changed (from the infinitive to the present continuous) and the PhU itself is split into
two parts. At this point the most important aspect is the process of splitting. The PhU, if taken
as the whole entity, would make a phrase “is pulling strings” but the parentheses “as I have
noticed” divides the PhU into two parts. On the contrary to the process of addition, the
mentioned parentheses does not enhance the meaning of the PhU but is used to give additional
information. Other similar cases of PhU splitting could be as follows:

36) The old man wasn’t at all pleased to see him. They were at it, in no time, hammer and
tongs. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 176)

37) Mr. Alfred Ingelthorp that astute gentleman would have – in your so expressive PhU –
smelt a rat! And then, bonjour to your chances of catching him. (A. Christie The
Mysterious Affair at Styles, p. 299)

38) Victoria resolved to give his lady as wide a berth as possible. (The Collection of
Agatha Christie, p. 299)

The original infinitival forms of the PhUs used in the examples (36 – 38) are such: (36)
to be/get at something hammer and tongs (= to fight or argue with a lot of energy or noise),
(37) to smell a rat (= to suspect that something wrong is being done), and (38) to give
somebody a wide berth (= to keep at a safe distance).

All the above-presented examples disclose the process of PhU splitting and this
process is worth considering for the reason of PhU perception in the literary text. As the PhUs
seldom appear in literature in the infinitive forms (as they are presented in dictionaries), it is
important to recognize and perceive them in the context they appear in language: both written
and spoken.
3.2 Lexical transformations

The category of lexical transformations takes into consideration the notional lexical items, such as pronouns, nouns, and verbs. The lexical transformations are not as frequent as the grammatical (the exception is only the changeability of the pronoun). Out of 286 examples 16 were transformed lexically and the most frequent type of transformation was the lexical variation (changeability of a certain lexical item).

The lexical transformations in this division will be presented according to the frequency of their occurrence in literary examples. The sequence will be as follows: lexical changeability (nouns and verbs), lexical additions, and lexical deletions.

3.2.1 Lexical changeability

Although the majority of linguists define PhUs as fixed and stable expressions, they are not completely frozen or unchangeable. Although in a broad sense PhUs have fixed lexical parts, some of them allow synonymy. In general, if we change one lexical part of the PhU with its synonym (even a very close one), the PhU would lose the idiomaticity and would become only an ordinary phrase made up on the principles of compositionality. For instance the PhU *to smell a rat* (= to suspect that something wrong is being done) exists only with lexical items *smell* and *rat*. If we replace any lexical item of it with the synonym (e.g. *to scent the rat* or *to smell a mouse*), the idiomaticity will be lost and the new phrases would be recognized only literally. The similar cases are with other PhUs as well. For instance, *to tighten one’s belt* (= to pull oneself together before confronting a difficulty) or *to see red* (= to be or become angry) exist in the presented lexical items and do not allow any synonymic changes. Thus the phrases *to tighten one’s girdle* or *to see scarlet* would not be accepted as PhUs.

On the other hand, there are PhUs that allow synonymy. Some PhUs do not lose their idiomaticity even though one lexical item is changed to its synonym. For instance the PhU *to escape/slip somebody’s memory* (= be forgotten):
39) The exact words of their conversation have, I am sorry to say, escaped my memory. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 72)

40) Has it slipped your memory that I’m meeting him tonight? (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 63)

The two above presented set of examples show the synonymic variations within PhUs. The synonymy of the lexical parts of PhUs is a problematic issue, for, as it was already mentioned above, not all the PhUs allow the synonymic variations. Even though the synonymy is possible in some PhUs, the choice of the suitable words is usually limited to only several options.

On the other hand, there is a group of PhUs that allow lexical variations even beyond the boundaries of synonymy. In some cases the PhU can retain its idiomatic status and its meaning even when one of its lexical items is changed by another (not a synonym). For example, the PhU old cat/cock/bean (used in addressing people intimately or in a joking style) provides three options (cat, cock, or bean):

41) How I wish the old cat could see me now. She and her James! (A. Christie The Listerdale Mystery, p. 198)

42) “That’s all right, old cock,” said Japp, slapping him heartily on the back. (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 27)

43) She was amused now. An eccentric old bean, this. (A. Christie The Body in the Library, p. 12)

The examples (41 – 43) show only a minimal range of options for lexical changes, but there are PhUs, which allow much more options. For instance, the PhU not care a rap (= not care at all) has at least 11 options for changing the lexical item rap:

44) She gave a deep sigh. “You don’t care two hoots for me. That’s what that means”. That’s not fair. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 54)
45) Your only quarrel with me really is that I don’t care a twopenny damn what you think about me. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 62)

46) I do not believe the people who tell me they do not care a row of pins for the opinion of their fellows. It is the bravado of ignorance. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 7)

47) “An’ I bet,” Martin dashed on, “that he’s solemn and serious as an old owl, an’ doesn’t care a rap for a good time for all his thirty thousand a year.” (J. London Martin Eden)

48) Now the bulbs would be out in the square garden, and I didn’t care a damn. (G. Greene The Quiet American)

49) He walked to the edge of the terrace, and looked down into the darkness; And there came the moon, who, saw all, young and old, alive and dead, and didn’t care a dump. (J. Galsworthy Indian Summer of a Forsyte)

50) Of course, there are Chauvins and Junkers and Jingoes, but who cares a hang about them? The people don’t want war. (R. Aldington Death of a Hero)

51) Old Jolyon watched him, feigning sleep. The fellow was a sneak… A slug! Fat too! And didn’t care a pin about his master. (J. Galsworthy The Man of Property)

52) June slid down to his knee, and she in her turn began her tale. She thought it would all go splendidly; she did not see any difficulty, and she did not care a bit what people thought. (J. Galsworthy The Man of Property)

53) “Soames knows the house, well – he’ll tell you it’s too dear – his opinion is worth having.” “I don’t,” said old Jolyon, “care a fig for his opinion.” (J. Galsworthy The Man of Property)

54) “You don’t think I’m running after any other woman, do you?” he asked. “How do I know? It’s quite obvious that you don’t care two straws for me.” (W. S. Maugham Theatre)

I found only three examples (44 – 46) in literature, and in order to indicate the whole range of the lexical variability, I used some other examples (47 – 54) collected by A. Alekhina (A. Alekhina, Idiomatic English, 1982)

The range of lexical options in this PhU is really wide and the substitutes of the lexical item rap are not semantically similar among themselves. The words rap, damn, dump, bit, pin
etc. do not belong to each other’s synonymic range, but when used as the substitutes in the already mentioned PhU *not care a rap*, do not change the meaning of it. Not all the PhUs that allow lexical variations are so prolific in the substitutes as the above presented one. Most of the PhUs offer 2 – 3 options of lexical substitutes.

The reason for which some PhUs allow lexical changes is connected with their transparency. The term transparency in the field of PhUs means that syntactically the parts of the PhU directly correspond with the parts of the literal meaning of the PhU. For instance, the PhU *to spill the beans* (*V + N*) syntactically corresponds with its meaning *to reveal the secrets* (*V + N*). The idea of transparency was suggested by Jackendoff (1997). Due to this phenomenon the lexical changes within PhUs take place. As it is suggested by T. Ifill (Seeking the Nature of PhUs: A Study in Idiomatic Structure; Haverford College; 2002) PhUs, which allow lexical changes in their literal meanings, allow changes within themselves as well. For instance, *to turn/twist somebody round one’s finger* (*V + NP + Obj.*) corresponds with its literal meaning *to cajole/dominate somebody with ease* (*V + NP + Obj.*). On the other hand, if the PhU does not allow synonymy in its paraphrasing, it does not allow any lexical changes within itself, too. Consider the PhU *to kick the bucket* (*V + N*) and its literal meaning to die (*V*). The syntactical structures of the PhU and its paraphrasing do not correspond, thus according to Ifill, such PhU cannot undergo any lexical changes.

The fixedness is one of the main features characterizing PhUs; still this fixedness is not so strict that would not allow any variations. Some PhUs allow various kinds of lexical variation, some to a higher – others to the less degree.

### 3.2.2 Lexical additions

Additions are considered to be all the extraneous lexical elements, which do no appear in the original form of the PhU. Normally additions are not allowed within the structure of PhUs, but in literature and especially the press, they are used often enough. The additions to the PhUs are usually adjectives and adverbs, which intensify the meaning of the PhU. For instance:
55) “Were they on very friendly terms?” “Not specially, I should say. Not that I knew anyway.” (A. Christie The Body in the Library, p. 60)

56) Old Mr. Lee was delighted with her. He took a tremendous fancy to her. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 32)

57) Oh, poor dear, she has been very much under the weather lately. She can’t help it, of course, but it really makes things a little difficult sometimes. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 122)

58) Poirot kept the conversational ball rolling some little time longer, but when it seemed certain that Mrs. Fowler had told all that she knew not once but many times over, he terminated the interview. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 44)

All the above-presented examples show the cases of addition within the PhUs. The original PhU in (55) is to be on friendly terms (= to keep good relationship) and the addition of the word “very” enhances the meaning of the PhU, which can be paraphrased as “to keep especially good relationship”. The similar paraphrasing could be done with the examples (56), (57), and (58): he took a tremendous fancy (= he started liking her very extremely), she has been very much under the weather (= she has been feeling extremely unwell), and to keep the conversational ball rolling (= to keep the conversation going on). However, not all the PhUs tolerate the addition. The fixed, or as some linguists call frozen, PhUs, as for instance, to kick the bucket or to smell a rat, are not tend to tolerate any additions, even very innovative.

Ch. Fernando in her book Idioms and Idiomaticity presents some very interesting examples of additions to PhUs collected from the newspapers. The newspaper style is very rich with innovative expressions and additions to PhUs among them. For instance:

59) Rudyard Kipling took the art bull by the horns when he wrote, “It’s clever, but is it art?” (The Sydney Morning Herald 4 December 1978: 1)

60) It is very easy for those academics to look out of their carpeted ivory towers across the quagmire of business stagnation. (The Australian 8 December 1975)

61) One of his examiners said that this was a feather in his cap but he said it was a small feather. (The Australian 8 December 1975)
Innovative additions in the newspapers is a very tricky issue as it requires a certain intuitive feel which sets the limits beyond which the idiomaticity is not accepted. The same as in literature, in newspapers the additions to the PhUs are used to enforce the meaning.

3.2.3 Lexical deletions

The process of deletion is natural for all spheres of the language, but in different spheres different terms are used to define this phenomenon: ellipsis, elision, contraction, abbreviation, etc. In the sphere of PhUs the term “deletion” is used to the phenomenon when a part of PhU appears instead of the full form.

There are some cases in the English language when parts of PhUs are used so often that they gradually become as if separate PhUs. The PhUs red herring (= something that distracts attention from important things) and rolling stone (= a person who is not steady) once used as to draw/trail a red herring across the track/path (= to do something that would distract a person from important things) and a rolling stone gathers no moss (= a person who is not steady does not do well in life) today can easily function in the language in their short forms.

Besides the deletions that are already accepted as PhUs, there exists another kind of deletions – the deletions that are used in a particular situations or discourses. This kind of deletions is used for stylistic purposes in the literary text. Consider the following examples:

62) I mean with us – our tempers and our nerves. All on edge. (A. Christie Murder in Mesopotamia, p. 4)

63) In England and France he was the square peg in the round hole, but here the holes were any sort of shape, and no sort of peg was quite amiss. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 11)

64) I suppose that little writer chap hasn’t suddenly gone off his onion and decided to do one of his crimes in flesh instead of on paper? (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 91)

65) “Sooner or later he’ll be quite ready to come back to London, and no great harm will have been done.” “I wouldn’t do that,” said Mrs. MacAndrew. “I’d give him all the
rope he wants. He’ll come back with his tail between his legs and settle down again quite comfortably. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 18)

The example (62) presents a part of PhU to set the nerves on edge (= to make feel nervous) in conversation. The phrase “all on edge” refers to the word “nerves” which was presented in the previous sentence. “All on edge.” is an elliptical sentence which represents the part of the mentioned PhU. The example (63) also presents only separate elements (in the second part of the sentence) of the PhU a square peg in a round hole (= a person unsuitable for the position he fills). The phrase “in flesh” (64) in this case stands for the PhU in flesh and blood (=in reality). The example (65) is more interesting, for it has only one word from the original PhU. The word “rope” represents the PhU to give somebody enough rope to hang himself (= allow somebody enough freedom of action in the expectation that one will overreach oneself).

The PhUs that enable the process of deletion are usually longer that a phrase (they usually are of the sentence type), thus they can loose a part and still retain their idiomatic meanings. The shorter the PhU the less possibilities it has to undergo the process of deletion. There is number of PhUs in English that do not allow the process of deletion. According to Fernando, the PhUs that in their structure have verb + particle/preposition construction: see through sb, bring the house down, get in touch with sb, so much so, you’re telling me, etc, do not allow deletions. (Fernando; 1987:52).

The deletions of PhUs is quite a problematic issue, for one must know the language very well in order to grasp the full meaning of the PhU from only a part or the only word of it. For the native speakers of English, the process of deletions in PhUs is not as problematic as it is for those who speak English as a second language only. A non-native speaker must have a linguistic feeling to recognize fully understand the deletions of PhUs.

The deletions of PhUs are particularly typical to newspapers’ and magazines’ headlines. Ch. Fernando has collected the following examples in the newspapers’ headlines:

66) Hold up guns all bark, no bite (The Australian 10 September 1975)
67) Norman Sherry is the epitome of the no-stone-unturned school of biographers… (The Sydney Morning Herald 10 June 1989: 85)
68) Thatcher waves trade carrot (The Australian 6 August 1988: 3)
In the Fernando’s examples, the full forms of the PhUs are: (75) *barking dogs seldom bite* (= the one who talks much usually does not take any actions), (76) *to leave no stone unturned* (= to try every possible action in order to find of achieve something), and (77) *to dangle a carrot before a donkey* (= to order somebody something good in order to persuade them to do something). The reasons for PhU deletions in the press could be, first of all, space saving and then the trial to catch the eye of the reader.
CHAPTER 4

PhUs that do not allow any transformations

There exists a group of PhUs in the English language, that always retain their original meaning and do not allow any transformations, even minimal. To this group belong some proverbs, nominal sayings, and conversational formulas. For instance, the saying the last straw (= an addition or a burden to a task making it intolerable) always retains the presented form and does not allow any transformations:

69) Who should one leave one’s money to except one’s own flesh and blood? Blood is thicker than water; and Madame had no friends. (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 62)

If this PhU is transferred into the phrases as, for instance, *blood was thicker that water or *blood is denser than water they would not be accepted as PhUs. The same is with the saying Jack of all trades (= a person who manages to a lot of woks at the same time):

70) Oh, I suppose she was after your time. She’s the matter’s factotum, companion, Jack of all trades! (A. Christie The Mysterious Affair at Styles, p. 18)

Not a single transformation of this saying would be accepted as a PhU. Similarly behave and some conversational phrases, such as by Jove! (= an exclamation of surprise), thank goodness! (= an exclamation of relief), good Heavens! (= an exclamation of surprise), or great guns! (= an exclamation expressing worry, discomfort or unpleasant surprise) are also used in the forms they are presented in the dictionaries do not tolerate any transformations. For instance:

71) Thank goodness she wasn’t the sort of woman who asked questions about a man’s correspondence. (A. Christie Sparkling Cyanide, p. 72)
72) Whoever it was must have taken the most stupendous chances. Yes, by Jove, they must.

Lord, the fellow must have been an absolute lunatic. (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 28)

One more category of PhUs that cannot be transformed in any way is a group of proverbs, as for instance, *if wishes were horses beggars would ride* (= if all the wishes came true, all the people would be wealthy), or *there is no smoke without fire* (= there is always some reason for the rumour) and other proverbs that make full sentences and do not contain the words like one/one’s, somebody/somebody’s. To this category also belong the proverbs and sayings, which express general truths. For instance, *a watched pot never boils* or *if wishes were horses, beggars would ride*. If any part of these PhUs is changed, they will lose the idiomatic status. For instance, *if wishes were horses, mendicants would ride* or *a watched pot never boiled*, are not accepted as PhUs.
CONCLUSIONS

The important features of PhUs are their compositeness (syntactical aspect) and lexical stability (lexical aspect). All the PhUs have their internal lexical and syntactical structures, for they consist of particular lexical items, which are related among themselves in syntactical relationships. Still, both the aspects are not completely fixed and can undergo certain transformations in different types of discourses.

The various ways of transformations can be divided into two major groups: (1) grammatical (including morphology and syntax) and lexical. Grammatical transformations within PhUs can appear in terms of grammatical tense form, article, number, passivization, splitting, and reversal. As the verbal PhUs in their original form are usually the infinitives, the verbs can be transformed in all the grammatical tense forms as well as the conditional sentences. The impersonal pronouns can be in most cases personalized. The number of the noun and verb of PhUs (with certain exceptions) can also undergo the process of transformation and can be shifted from singular into plural and visa versa. The article in PhUs behaves similarly to the number: it can vary among definite, indefinite, and zero (with certain exceptions).

The lexical variations in the structure of PhUs are more complicated than the already presented grammatical variations. Lexical variation includes all the parts of speech and depends on the transparency of the PhU. The more transparent the PhU is the greater possibility of lexical variations appears. The PhUs that are opaque usually do not allow any substitutions and retain their original lexical structure. The processes of addition and deletion can take place for the natural linguistic reasons and for the innovative reasons, which usually are encountered in press (newspapers and magazines). The process of lexical changes also requires great attention, for some idioms allow lexical variation and others – not.

It can be stated that transformational processes of PhUs are natural as the PhUs like the non-idiomatic structures behave according to the grammatical and syntactical rules. PhUs are not isolated units thus they accept grammatical rules and appear in language according to them. The grammatical aspect is very important in the transformations of PhUs because all the variations appear under the rules of grammar and syntax.
Another important aspect in that determines the process of PhU transformations is the discourse of the literary or spoken text. This aspect is especially distinct in the newspaper style, which is prolific in innovative and rule-breaking transformations. On the contrary to the newspaper discourse, in literature PhUs behave more or less according to the grammatical rules and in most cases retain the form similar to their original.

A transformation of PhUs is an important aspect of the language studies, for PhUs do not behave the same as non-idiomatic structures do. If the non-idiomatic structures can be transformed freely enough, PhU transformations must be regarded with a great caution. The main and the most important requirement in transforming PhUs is that they must retain the idiomatic status in the transformed form, i.e., the transformed form must be accepted as a PhU or its variant.

After analysing 286 examples from various literal texts I would like to present such results:

- Changes of the tense form 56%
- Pronoun changes 28%
- Passivized PhUs <1%
- Changes of the number 1,3%
- Changes of the article 1,3%
- Verbal PhUs conversion into nominal <1%
- Split PhUs 1,3%
- Lexical variations 3%
- Lexical additions 1,3%
- Lexical deletions 1,3%
- PhUs in the infinitival form 8%

The results show that the greatest part of transformations is that of the changes of tense form, and the cases of splitting and converting the PhUs are very rare. All the examples that I found in literature are added to the appendix of this research.
SANTRAUKA

Frazeologizmai ir jų metaforinė reikšmė jau nuo seno traukia mokslininkų dėmesį, tačiau plačiau juos nagrinėti imtasi tik pirmoje 20 a. pusėje. Nemažai mokslininkų tyrinėjo ir tebetyrinėja įvairius frazeologijos aspektus, tačiau idiomatiškumo ir transformacijų sritis vis dar yra atvira tyrinėjimams.


Frazeologizmų analizei buvo pasirinkti A. Christie ir W. S. Maugham kūriniai, iš kurių buvo išrinkta 286 frazeologiniai junginiai. Originalios (netransformuotos) frazeologizmų formos bei jų atitikmenys pateikiami remiantis įvairiais frazeologizmų bei idiomų žodynais. Atlokus transformacijų analizę buvo gauti tokie rezultatai: dažniausiai pasitaikančios transformacijos rūšys buvo gramatinio laiko ir įvardžio variacijos, o rečiausiai pasitaikanti forma šiame tyrime buvo veiksmažodinės dalies keitimas daiktavardine.
APPENDIX

I. Changes of the grammatical tense form:

Collection of Agatha Christie Издательство “Менеджер”, Москва, 2004

1) I promised you that it should be preserved to you, and I have kept my word. You must permit to keep my little secret. (p. 67)
2) Old Mr. Snipes was delighted with her. He took a tremendous fancy to her. (p. 32)
3) David Snipes had himself well in hand. (p. 32)
4) “Captain Paton can be concerned in this crime. The mere fact that he was hard pressed for money –” “Was he hard pressed for money?” – interpolated Poirot quickly. (p. 65)
5) Anyway, he had a bad day; and was down on his luck. (p. 233)
6) “I’m fairly up against it this time,” he said soberly. This unusual ring of gravity in his voice told me that he spoke the truth. (p. 90)
7) Oh, poor dear, she has been very much under the weather lately. She can’t help it, of course, but it really makes things a little difficult sometimes. (p. 122)
8) “She appeared once – out of the blue,” said her husband “and then utterly vanished”. (p. 65)
9) I suppose you realize, Carrie Louise, that he’s in love with her. You were always up in the clouds, my dear. There’s not the least doubt about it. (p. 90)
10) Amy Durrant comes down in the world. Miss Barton engages her as companion and takes her to the Canaries and accomplishes her revenge. (p. 198)
11) The old man wasn’t at all pleased to see him. They were at it in no time, hammer and tongs. (p. 176)
12) Anyway, he had a bad day; and was brought down to earth. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 233)
13) Because he is rolling in the money that ought to have come to me. (p. 301)
14) Harry Laxton had “made good” as the saying goes. He pulled himself together, worked hard. (p. 71)
15) This new attraction seems to have broken the back of his infatuation for Miss Gregg. (p. 125)
16) Poirot kept the conversational ball rolling some little time longer, but when it seemed certain that Mrs. Fowler had told all that she knew not once but many times over, he terminated the interview. (p. 44)
17) We all laughed, but David, who was quick on the uptake, gave me a sharp glance. (p. 265)
18) There was that woman, went out that day like an avenging fury, she’d have shot down a regiment in cold blood without turning a hair just to get her child back. (p. 182)
19) I see that you don’t let the grass grow under your feet, Mr. Poirot. It will be a pleasure to work with you. (p. 172)
20) I don’t see how anyone else but Parker could have sent it. But keep it dark – we don’t want to alarm him just yet. (p. 141)
21) I think I see what you are driving at. What was Simon Lee like in his young days? (p. 191)
22) Victoria had an early meal in the dining-room with Hamilton Clipp, the latter talking nineteen to the dozen on every subject under the sun. (p. 305)
23) The chief constable said: “You’d better make a clean breast of it, Mrs. Lee, and leave us to judge”. (p. 189)
24) If anything unpleasant happens, if you are asked what you know and who put you to what you’re doing – don’t try to be heroic. Spill the beans at once. (p. 109)
25) He had dared to speak scathingly of E. A. Poe, he had complained of the lack of method or order in the romantic outpourings of W. Collins, but he had lauded to the skies two American authors who were practically unknown. (p. 192)
26) George was a delicate social recorder. He had been uncertain of the visitor’s status but had given her the benefit of the doubt. (p. 91)
27) I don’t know how we came to be talking about detectives – unless, yes, perhaps it was she who broached the subject. (p. 53)
28) We’ve had Montgomery and Alanbrook and Auchinleck all shooting their mouths off in print, mostly saying what they thought of the other generals. (p. 602)
29) Well, Norma’s a bit off her onion, I’d say. I mean she might be one of those kleptomaniacs who take people’s things without knowing they are taking them. (p. 29)
30) Had he dealt with it all right? Kept a stiff upper lip? Difficult to tell. (p. 73)
31) Second possibility: she lost her nerve and took an easy way out of herself. (p. 498)
32) You lost touch with the world – an island was a world of its own. (p. 387)
33) He could afford it financially, of course, but he couldn’t afford to drop out. No, now that he had arrived, he must keep his nose to the grindstone. (p. 188)
34) Poirot cast his mind back dimly to what he seemed to remember as large quantities of bright-coloured tropical birds in a forest. (p. 104)
35) The exact words of their conversation have, I am sorry to say, escaped my memory. (p. 72)


36) When I found that they were making a fuss about my disappearance, I arranged that a letter should come form me in East Africa. (p. 198)
37) For some reason or other, Mrs. Merrowdene was showing her hand. Was she speaking of all this so as deliberately to prepare her alibi beforehand? (p. 100)
38) She spoke with a positive assurance which impressed the barrister. “A good witness. She’d carry weight.” (p. 68)
39) The idea of bathing was accepted shrilly. James fell into line with them. He even managed to draw Grace a little behind the others. (p. 90)
40) Alix, who had always considered herself “not the falling-in-love kind”, was swept clean off her feet. (p. 60)
41) Nobody could tell, and the jury very properly gave her the benefit of the doubt. (p. 167)
42) Come, let us not beat about the bush. Where is Her Highness? (p. 89)
43) He is – one of us. He’s very well off, also, but that I don’t mine about so much. (p. 81)
44) Mr. Edward Palgrove negotiated a crisis with a horrible grinding sound that would have set a true motorist’s teeth on edge. (p. 30)
45) “You can put your foot on it till kingdom comes,” said Mr. Palgrove. “But nothing happens”. (p. 33)
46) Of course he followed us, and we were at our wits’ end what to do, because he’d have made most fearful scene, and anyway, he’s her guardian. (p. 99)
47) It means keeping my head, and thinking of the right words, and not faltering for a moment, but I believe I could do it. (p. 50)
48) It makes me mad thinking of these swells who can walk into a place and buy a couple of Rolls-Royces without turning the hair. (p. 5)
49) All unwittingly her words, spoken at random, touched him in the raw. (p. 91)
50) As a result, my income has diminished. If anything were to happen to me, my wife would be left very badly off. (p. 23)
51) She looked sharply sideways at her husband as though she feared that he might read her mind. (p. 8)


52) Here is a man, let us say, who sets out to poison his wife. He has lived at his wits as the saying goes. (p. 302)
53) As long as I might be thought to be pursuing him, the criminal would be off his guard. (p. 159)
54) Yes, time is an advantage if – if – there has been foul play. (p. 81)
55) “We are at one then,” said Poirot, “for I, too, want to hang the criminal”. (p. 110)
56) From the evidence at the inquest, Mr. Inglethorp murdered his wife as sure as I stand here, and if anyone but you hinted the contrary, I’d laugh in his face. (p. 159)
57) “One might take that fact with a grain of salt”, I remarked skeptically. (p. 49)
58) She is the very person. But I am in her black books, since I cleared Mr. Inglethorp. Still, we can but try. (p. 180)
59) Poirot came to the point at once, with a business-like briskness. “Can you tell me any of the names and addresses, Annie?” (p. 81)
60) Poirot looked crest-fallen. I could not help rejoicing that, for once, one of his “little ideas” had come to naught. (p. 109)
61) Cynthia is a protégée of my mother’s, the daughter of an old schoolfellow of hers, who married a rascally solicitor. He came a cropper, and the girl was left an orphan and penniless. (p. 20)
62) One could save time by taking a narrow path through the long grass, which cut off the detours of the winding drive. (p. 93)
63) And quite spontaneously the thought flashed across my mind: “She is gaining time!” (p. 124)
64) No, no, you are on a wrong track there. There is nothing weak-minded or degenerate about Miss Howard (p. 150)
65) Don’t ask me to help you, because I won’t. I wouldn’t lift a finger! (p. 200)
66) I’d take your word, but there’s others over me who’ll be asking what the devil I mean by it. (p. 13)
67) Mrs. Cavendish, however, was a lady who liked to make her own plans, and expected other people to fall in with them, and in this case she certainly had the whip hand, namely: the purse strings. (p. 179)
68) But like all specialists, Bauerstain’s got a bee in his bonnet. Poisons are his hobby, so, of course, he sees them everywhere. (p. 71)
69) It is true. I have the head of a sieve. However, the other young lady was most kind and showed me everything in the kindest way. (p. 51)
70) “Not for poisoning Mrs. Inglethorp?” “Not unless our friend Japp has taken leave of his senses,” replied Poirot. (p. 82)
71) Mr. Alfred Inglethorp that astute gentleman would have – in your so expressing idiom – 
smelt a rat! And then, bonjour to your chances of catching him. (p. 299)
72) “Have you never suspected it?” “It never entered my head.” (p. 88)


73) Poirot hesitated and said “You are on the right track, yes, but go a little further; and do not 
forget the wasp. (p. 166)
74) He is of the type that makes the fortune of bead sellers in Egypt – that buys the most 
prosperous scarabs ever made in Czechoslovakia. (p. 187)
75) No, no, my friend. My mind is quite at ease on this point. (p. 90)
76) “In my opinion the important thing is to clear the innocent.” “Oh, naturally,” said Jane. 
“That goes without saying”. (p. 54)
77) Whoever it was must have taken the most stupendous chances. Yes, by Jove, they must. 
Lord, the fellow must have been an absolute lunatic. (p. 28)
78) They both looked at Poirot, who was absorbed in thought. “You going to take a hand at 
all, Mr. Poirot?” asked Japp. (p. 49)
79) “I have no certainty. I tell you, only a certain suspicion.” “I believe you’re just talking 
through your hat,” said Japp.
80) If anyone had told me a week ago that I should be investigating a crime where a woman 
was killed with a poisoned dart with snake venom on it – well, I’d have laughed in his 
face! (p. 307)
81) Within certain limits you were to go your own way. Why this sudden return? (p. 181)
82) It may be that – and it may be something else; but I can’t get a line on motive. (p. 40)
83) But keep your end up with Ikey Andrew. He likes you all the better for it, really. (p. 71)
84) She’s the one who’s throwing her weight about, I suppose. Better see her first before she 
goes right off the handle and gets a question asked in the House about the brutal methods 
of the police. (p. 49)
85) “I can fight for my own hand all right,” said Jane, her small chin lifting itself 
pugnaciously. (p. 55)
86) But I think you are one of those who would rather look truth in the face that live in the 
fool’s paradise. (p. 12)
87) “Go on – you’re pulling my leg!” “Not at all. I know them by sight perfectly…” (p. 65)
88) I suppose that little writer chap hasn’t suddenly gone off his onion and decided to do one 
of his crimes in flesh instead of on a paper? (p. 91)
89) They have been casting their minds back for quite a time trying to find any evidence to 
shake each other’s fear of being guilty. (p. 201)


90) It all rings true what you have told me, except for that. (p. 99)
91) She was constantly on her guard and uneasy. The uneasiness was for him – not for 
herself. (p. 92)
92) “You’ll laugh at me but there was something about her that was – well – unearthly.” “She 
could cast a spell – yes, I understand,” said Poirot. (p. 75)
93) When I got back to the house I followed Dr. Leidner into the office and broached the 
subject of my departure. (p. 26)
94) There’s a convention that one doesn’t speak ill of the dead. That’s stupid I think. (p. 86)
95) She’s a kind of female Jago. She must have drama. But she doesn’t want to be involved herself. She’s always (as I’ve noticed) outside pulling strings – looking on – enjoying it. (p. 28)
96) He felt he’d be happier if he knew that some responsible person with expert knowledge was keeping an eye on her. (p. 102)
97) Mercado was a poor fish, and I don’t suppose Mrs. Leidner really cared two hoots for his admiration – but his wife cared. (p. 54)
98) “Take your time and don’t hurry.” She began to speak slowly and deliberately. (p. 273)
99) Suspicion! Let us not make the bones about it. You are all under suspicion here in this house. (p. 69)
100) Well, she has a way with her. As for Leidner himself, he worships the ground she walks on – and the rest of expedition has to worship, too. (p. 38)
101) I’d as soon asked a surgeon if he thought he’d made a good job of an operation. (p. 32)
102) Where consciousness came in, she was essentially kind and would often go out of her way to do kind and thoughtful actions for other people. (p. 37)
103) Tonight it was particularly strong. Everyone was on edge – jumpy – on tenter hooks. (p. 119)
104) After a moment’s hesitation while I turned the matter over in my mind, I said: I really think I might try it. (p. 6)
105) She had good brains and singularly unbiased mind. (p. 177)
106) If his wife was in ignorance, and would cut up rough, that gives him an additional motive for wanting to silence her. (p. 91)
107) Look here, you’re in a tight place. But apart from anything else, there’s such a thing as truth. (p. 273)
108) Who was it? That young fellow? Or that stick Mercado? That’d both of them been making sheep’s eyes at her. (p. 141)


109) Josie will be all for Ruby breaking with any old friends she might have and who might queer the pitch, so to speak. (p. 7)
110) I’m not really accusing her of planning the whole thing. But I have no doubt she saw which way the wind was blowing and kept very quiet about it. (p. 12)
111) It will down on him little by little and suddenly he will be horrified and cut to the soul. (p. 18)
112) Well, of course, it sounded too wonderful! I was green with envy. (p. 22)
113) Her herbaceous borders are simply marvelous – they make me green with envy. (p. 31)
114) This adoption scheme, if he got wise to it, may just have put the lid on things. (p. 50)
115) Kill two birds with one stone. First the girl – and the fact of her death takes off Mr. Jefferson too. (p. 52)
116) “Were they on very friendly terms?” “Not specially, I should say. Not that I knew anyway.” (p. 60)
117) He must have seen a lot of her and he’d know more than Josie would. Likely enough she’d loosen her tongue a bit to him. (p. 60)
118) Look here, Bantry, got to get this off my chest. Is it a fact that you don’t know from Adam who this girl is? (p. 64)
119) I’ve got to make sure it is the girl, first, before we start raising the wind. (p. 101)
120) Colonel Melchett stared at his subordinate coldly. His feeling was that Slack had taken leave of his senses. (p. 107)
121) So I suggest you cut the cackle and come to the horses. Just what exactly do you know about the girl? (p. 119)
122) “That terrible peroxide blonde?” Miss Hartnell was slightly behind the times. (p. 139)
123) That’s the sort of silly things girls do and get the management’s backs up and then get a sack! (p. 175)
124) I won’t have the dear old boy go through hell for something he didn’t do. (p. 205)
125) She was a woman who never seemed to say anything remarkable but who succeeded in stimulating other people to talk and setting them at their ease. (p. 241)
126) It has been said, you know, that you can really get under anybody’s skin if you are married to them. (p. 248)
127) When she was still missing this morning one of the other girls got the wind up about her, or someone else did. (p. 250)
128) He told her about Hollywood and about Vivien Leigh – how she’d suddenly taken London by storm – and how these sensational leaps into fame did happen. (p. 267)
129) If the crash comes it will be a big one! If I can it off, it will be the other way round – I shall come out on top and be a very rich man. (p. 269)
130) She felt left out in the cold, though I don’t suppose for a minute he realized who put her up to it. (p. 289)


131) He had turned the tables on me adroitly. His manner towards me had changed, moreover. (p. 11)
132) “He’s got a little trouble of his own to attend to which is keeping him busy.” “Tell us about it.” “I mustn’t tell tales out of school.” (p. 21)
133) As a matter of fact I couldn’t help seeing what was written on the sheet of paper. There was just one sentence. “Don’t try to play a lone hand or it will be the worse for you.” (p. 40)
134) “Brachycephalic,” I murmured unwillingly. “That’s it. I thought that was what you said.” “Did I? It was a slip of the tongue. I meant dolichocephalic.” (p. 43)
135) You’ve no idea of what you might come up against – these men will stop at nothing. (p. 128)
136) “I suppose,” said Suzanne doubtfully, “that we’re not barking up the wrong tree? Supposing that, after all, he is a perfectly honest man?” (p. 132)
137) I’m rather afraid that Mrs. Blair may run amok. There is a primitive charm about these toys that I feel will appeal to her. (p. 152)
138) I met Reeves, my labour friend of the Kilmorden, last night. He has cold feet worse than any man I ever saw. (p. 160)
139) It is rather – upsetting for all of us. We are at a loose end, as it were. (p. 189)
140) All this work is Pagett’s idea. He works me to death. I’m looking forward to leaving him behind in Cape Town. (p. 231)


141) He’d be a bit surly sometimes, but when we hadn’t a bite since morning, and we hadn’t even got the price of a lie down at the Chink’s, he’d be as lively as a cricket. (p. 61)
142) That’s where he had been so artful. He’s been drawing in his horns for the last year (p. 30)
143) “There’s no harm in a kick in the hindquarters when your belly is full” said Captain Nichols, “and personally I never take it in bad part.” (p. 91)
144) Looking back, I think now that he was blind to everything but to some disturbing vision in his soul. (p. 207)
145) To me it was his broken spirit that expressed itself, and I rebelled against his renunciation. But I kept my own counsel. (p. 154)
146) “Sooner or later he’ll be quite ready to come back to London, and no great harm will have been done.” “I wouldn’t do that,” said Mrs. MacAndrew. “I’d give him all the rope he wants. He’ll come back and settle down again quite comfortably”. (p. 18)
147) I have no patience with you. Do you think if you were ill he would stir a finger to help you? (p. 72)
148) Do you think he’s done something that we don’t know about, and is lying doggo on account of the police? (p. 81)
149) There is a singular fascination in watching the eagerness with which the learned author ferrets out every circumstance which may through discredit on his hero. (p. 127)
150) I glanced at him with surprise. His cordial agreement with all I said cut the ground from all under my feet. (p. 99)
151) A love affair might fan into a bright flame a fire which I could have shown smouldering dimly in his heart. (p. 76)
152) You must be a little reasonable. You can’t live on air, you know. Strickland hasn’t got a penny. (p. 47)
1
1) I don’t think that Alec could have something on his mind for a year or more without my having a pretty shrewd idea of it. (p. 166)
153) My heart thumped against my ribs, and, I do not know why, I flew into a temper. (p. 81)
154) Woman had not yet altogether come into her own. (p. 211)
155) Your only quarrel with me really is that I don’t care a two penny damn what you think about me. (p. 62)
156) I do not believe that people who tell me they do not care a row of pins for the opinion of their fellows. (p. 7)
157) There’s a difference, perhaps, to working in one’s own house and in a public place. But he must understand, I can’t sit still and twiddle my thumbs when it’s necessary to do something! (p. 13)
158) Casting my mind back I could recall the days spent in her; not happier, though. (p. 41)
159) Has it slipped your memory that I’m meeting him tonight? (p. 63)

II. Cases of passivization
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1) Anyway, he had a bad day; and was brought down to earth. (The Collection of Agatha Christie, p. 233)

2) Alix, who had always considered herself “not the falling-in-love kind”, was swept clean off her feet. (p. 60)

III. Changes of the grammatical number

1) There are not so many *round pegs in square holes* as one might think. Most people, in spite of what they tell you, choose the occupation that they secretly desire. (p. 2)
2) “Seat 13,” said Japp. “Lady Horbury. She is a bit of a dark horse. I shouldn’t be surprised if she had a guilty secret or two. (p. 21)
3) But of course dark horses like she often tend to be fast workers. (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 21)

4) In England and France he was the *square peg in the round hole*, but here the holes were any sort of shape, and no sort of peg was quite amiss. (p. 11)

IV. Pronoun changes
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1) I promised you that it should be preserved to you, and *I have kept my word*. You must permit to keep my little secret. (p. 67)
2) Old Mr. Snipes was delighted with her. He *took a tremendous fancy to her*. (p. 32)
3) David Snipes *had himself well in hand*. (p. 32)
4) Anyway, he had a bad day; and *was down on his luck*. (p. 233)
5) I think you probably know as much as I do. And very likely you *have something up your sleeve*. (p. 11)
6) But his best, such as it was (which was not such) was only the best *according to his lights*, and not according those of his employer. (p. 198)
7) Harry Laxton had “made good” as the saying goes. He *pulled himself together*, worked hard. (p. 71)
8) I see that you don’t *let the grass grow under your feet*, Mr. Poirot. It will be a pleasure to work with you. (p. 172)
9) For over a week she had had safety, peace, time *to pull herself together*. (p. 39)
10) “You remember, madame, that I warned you not to do anything dangerous.” “Not to stick my neck out, in fact. That I suppose is just what I did do.” (p. 9)
11) George was a delicate social recorder. He had been uncertain of the visitor’s status but *had given her the benefit of the doubt*. (p. 91)
12) We’ve had Montgomery and Alanbrook and Auchinleck all *shooting their mouths off* in print, mostly saying what they thought of the other generals. (p. 602)
13) Well, **Norma’s a bit off her onion**, I’d say. I mean she might be on of those kleptomaniacs who take people’s things without knowing they are taking them. (p. 29)
14) He offered me a hundred guineas to come down here and keep my eyes open – said I’ve got a reputation for being a good man in a tight spot. (p. 199)
15) Second possibility: she lost her nerve and took an easy way out of herself. (p. 498)
16) He could afford it financially, of course, but he couldn’t afford to drop out. No, now that he had arrived, he must keep his nose to the grindstone. (p. 188)
17) Poirot cast his mind back dimly to what he seemed to remember as large quantities of bright-coloured tropical birds in a forest. (p. 104)
18) The exact words of their conversation have, I am sorry to say, escaped my memory. (p. 72)


19) For some reason or other, Mrs. Merrowdene was showing her hand. Was she speaking of all this so as deliberately to prepare her alibi beforehand? (p. 100)
20) Alix, who had always considered herself “not the falling-in-love kind”, was swept clean off her feet. (p. 60)
21) “You can put your foot on it till kingdom comes,” said Mr. Palgrove. “But nothing happens”. (p. 33)
22) Of course he followed us, and we were at our wits’ end what to do, because he’d have made most fearful scene, and anyway, he’s her guardian. (p. 99)
23) It means keeping my head, and thinking of the right words, and not faltering for a moment, but I believe I could do it. (p. 50)
24) All unwittingly her words, spoken at random, touched him in the raw. (p. 91)
25) She looked sharply sideways at her husband as though she feared that he might read her mind. (p. 8)


26) Here is a man, let us say, who sets out to poison his wife. He has lived at his wits as the saying goes. (p. 302)
27) As long as I might be thought to be pursuing him, the criminal would be off his guard. (p. 159)
28) Emily never could bear to put herself in the wrong. But I know her. She wanted me back. (p. 299)
29) From the evidence at the inquest, Mr. Inglethorp murdered his wife as sure as I stand here, and if anyone but you hinted the contrary, I’d laugh in his face. (p. 159)
30) She is the very person. But I am in her black books, since I cleared Mr. Inglethorp. Still, we can but try. (p. 180)
31) And quite spontaneously the thought flashed across my mind: “She is gaining time!” (p. 124)
32) I’d take your word, but there’s others over me who’ll be asking what the devil I mean by it. (p. 13)
33) But like all specialists, Bauerstain’s got a bee in his bonnet. Poisons are his hobby, so, of course, he sees them everywhere. (p. 71)
34) “Not for poisoning Mrs. Inglethorp?” “Not unless our friend Japp has taken leave of his senses,” replied Poirot. (p. 82)
35) “Have you never suspected it?” “It never entered my head.” (p. 88)
36) Is it necessary to run into debt, to live beyond your means, to run and borrow, and then expect to keep the money as a gift? (p. 17)
37) I know that letter wasn’t from your mother’s great-uncle. I wasn’t born yesterday. Who is he, Jane? (p. 27)
38) I beg of you, my friend, do not let this weigh upon your mind. (p. 110)
39) “Good for you, dear,” she said. “Ikey Andrew was no match for you that time.” (p. 222)
40) “I have no certainty. I tell you, only a certain suspicion.” “I believe you’re just talking through your hat,” said Japp.
41) If anyone had told me a week ago that I should be investigating a crime where a woman was killed with a poisoned dart with snake venom on it – well, I’d have laughed in his face! (p. 307)
42) Within certain limits you were to go your own way. Why this sudden return? (p. 181)
43) She’s the one who’s throwing her weight about, I suppose. Better see her first before she goes right off the handle and gets a question asked in the House about the brutal methods of the police. (p. 49)
44) “I can fight for my own hand all right,” said Jane, her small chin lifting itself pugnaciously. (p. 55)
45) “Go on – you’re pulling my leg!” “Not at all. I know them by sight perfectly…” (p. 65)
46) I suppose that little writer chap hasn’t suddenly gone off his onion and decided to do one of his crimes in flesh instead of on a paper? (p. 91)
47) They have been casting their minds back for quite a time trying to find any evidence to shake each other’s fear of being guilty. (p. 201)

48) She was constantly on her guard and uneasy. The uneasiness was for him – not for herself. (p. 92)
49) He felt he’d be happier if he knew that some responsible person with expert knowledge was keeping an eye on her. (p. 102)
50) “Take your time and don’t hurry.” She began to speak slowly and deliberately. (p. 273)
51) He is an adept in the art of making-up. He has the whole technique at his fingertips. (p. 200)
52) Well, she has a way with her. As for Leidner himself, he worships the ground she walks on – and the rest of expedition has to worship, too. (p. 38)
53) So that was that, and I promised to do my best. (p. 77)
54) Where consciousness came in, she was essentially kind and would often go out of her way to do kind and thoughtful actions for other people. (p. 37)
55) After a moment’s hesitation while I turned the matter over in my mind, I said: I really think I might try it. (p. 6)
56) Who was it? That young fellow? Or that stick Mercado? That’d both of them been making sheep’s eyes at her. (p. 141)

57
57) Her herbaceous borders are simply marvelous – they make me green with envy. (p. 31)
58) He must have seen a lot of her and he’d know more than Josie would. Likely enough she’d loosen her tongue a bit to him. (p. 60)
59) Look here, Bantry, got to get this off my chest. Is it a fact that you don’t know from Adam who this girl is? (p. 64)
60) I advise you to keep a civil tongue in your head, young man, or you’ll let yourself in for trouble. (p. 65)
61) She was the apple of his eye. He adored her. (p. 89)
62) Colonel Melchett stared at his subordinate coldly. His feeling was that Slack had taken leave of his senses. (p. 107)
63) I thought she’d turn up all right – and I was going to give her a good dressing down when she did. (p. 144)
64) She was a woman who never seemed to say anything remarkable but who succeeded in stimulating other people to talk and setting them at their ease. (p. 241)
65) He told her about Hollywood and about Vivien Leigh – how she’d suddenly taken London by storm – and how these sensational leaps into fame did happen. (p. 267)


66) “He’s got a little trouble of his own to attend to which is keeping him busy.” “Tell us about it.” “I mustn’t tell tales out of school.” (p. 21)


68) That’s where he had been so artful. He’s been drawing in his horns for the last year (p. 30)
69) To me it was his broken spirit that expressed itself, and I rebelled against his renunciation. But I kept my own counsel. (p. 154)
70) “Sooner or later he’ll be quite ready to come back to London, and no great harm will have been done.” “I wouldn’t do that,” said Mrs. MacAndrew. “I’d give him all the rope he wants. He’ll come back and settle down again quite comfortably”. (p. 18)
71) I glanced at him with surprise. His cordial agreement with all I said cut the ground from all under my feet. (p. 99)
72) I don’t think that Alec could have something on his mind for a year or more without my having a pretty shrewd idea of it. (p. 166)
73) My heart thumped against my ribs, and, I do not know why, I flew into a temper. (p. 81)
74) I felt in myself, too, that desire to get the whole thing out of my mind. (p. 22)
75) He’ll come back with his tail between his legs and settle down again quite comfortably. (p. 5)
76) Woman had not yet altogether come into her own. (p. 211)
77) There’s a difference, perhaps, to working in one’s own house and in a public place. But he must understand, I can’t sit still and twiddle my thumbs when it’s necessary to do something! (p. 13)
78) Casting my mind back I could recall the days spent in her; not happier, though. (p. 41)
79) Has it slipped your memory that I’m meeting him tonight? (p. 63)

V. Article changes
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1) But to people like Ralph Paton to turn over a new leaf is easier in theory than in practice. (p. 59)
2) Now that he was going to live in Africa there was a chance for him to turn over the new leaf! (p. 512)
3) Poirot finally broke the silence. “I think you should better leave, Mr Evans. This young man has a lot of question to your wife.” (p. 91)


4) She was a useful guest among persons to whom small talk did not come easily, for she was at a loss with a new topic and could be trusted immediately to break an awkward silence with a suitable observation. (p. 115)

VI. Cases of conversion
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1) Don’t you dare to blame me for this kind of gossip. Nose poking into the affairs of other people is not my style. (p. 332)
2) It may mean a lot of unpleasant publicity, a lot of washing of dirty linen in public, your wife’s love affairs becoming public property. (p. 152)

VII. Cases of splitting
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1) The old man wasn’t at all pleased to see him. They were at it, in no time, hammer and tongs. (p. 176)
2) Victoria resolved to give his lady as wide a berth as possible. (p. 299)
3) Mr. Alfred Ingelthorp that astute gentleman would have – in your so expressive PhU – smelt a rat! And then, bonjour to your chances of catching him. (p. 299)

4) She’s a kind of female Jago. She must have drama. But she doesn’t want to be involved herself. She’s always (as I’ve noticed) pulling strings – looking on – enjoying it. (p. 28)

VIII. PhUs used in the infinitival form

1) So that’s the way your enthusiasm runs! You would have liked to cross swords with the man who sneaked the Liberty Bonds? (p. 8)

2) Then, again, if the kidnappers are holding him secretly somewhere, they have the advantage of being able to make terms with both sides. (p. 220)

3) But to people like Ralph Paton to turn over a new leaf is easier in theory than in practice. (p. 59)

4) But I don’t suppose I need to sing Edward’s praises to you, young lady. (p. 118)

5) For over a week she had had safety, peace, time to pull herself together. (p. 39)

6) “You remember, madame, that I warned you not to do anything dangerous.” “Not to stick my neck out, in fact. That I suppose is just what I did do.” (p. 9)

7) “Now then, there are a lot of things I want to know,” said Mrs. Oliver. Her voice was accusatory. Poirot hastened to pour oil on troubled waters. (p. 172)

8) Now that he was going to live in Africa there was a chance for him to turn over the new leaf! (p. 512)

9) At five-thirty that afternoon, Mr. Leadbetter was informed that his nephew had called and would like to see him. “Called to eat humble pie,” said Mr. Leadbetter to himself. (p. 27)

10) Alix was forced to give way to him, but his insistence surprised and alarmed her. (p. 54)

11) Emily never could bear to put herself in the wrong. But I know her. She wanted me back. (p. 299)

12) Is it necessary to run into debt, to live beyond your means, to run and borrow, and then expect to keep the money as a gift? (p. 17)

13) I suppose that little writer chap hasn’t suddenly gone off his onion and decided to do one of his crimes in flesh instead of on a paper? (p. 91)

14) Somehow, I fancy, this is not a true explanation. Don’t you think it might perhaps be better to make a clean breast of the matter? (p. 77)

15) I am going to lay bare the underlying structure of this place.

16) So that was that, and I promised to do my best. (p. 77)

17) I thought she’d turn up all right – and I was going to give her a good dressing down when she did. (p. 144)

18) I shall say the widow found it difficult to make both ends meet and set her son to a good school. (p. 281)


19) “I consider it unchristian to bear a grudge,” said Mr. Chickerster coldly. “But the pursuer has distinctly promised me that cabin.” (p. 27)

20) I did my best to put a bald face upon the matter. (p. 165)


21) I find myself in a position to throw light on just that part of his tragic career which has remained most obscure. (p. 5)

22) I think I should have emphasized his patience with the unsuitable mate, and the compassion which made him unwilling to throw off the yoke that oppressed him. (p. 181)

23) She was a useful guest among persons to whom small talk did not come easily, for she was at a loss with a new topic and could be trusted immediately to break an awkward silence with a suitable observation. (p. 115)

IX. Lexical changes

*The Collection of Agatha Christie* Издательство “Менеджер”, Москва, 2004

1) The exact words of their conversation have, I am sorry to say, escaped my memory. (p. 72)


2) How I wish the old cat could see me now. She and her James! (p. 198)


3) “That’s all right, old cock,” said Japp, slapping him heartily on the back. (p. 27)


4) She was amused now. An eccentric old bean, this. (p. 12)


5) Has it slipped your memory that I’m meeting him tonight? (p. 63)

6) She gave a deep sigh. “You don’t care two hoots for me. That’s what that means”. That’s not fair. (p. 54)

7) Your only quarrel with me really is that I don’t care a twopenny damn what you think about me. (p. 62)

8) I do not believe the people who tell me they do not care a row of pins for the opinion of their fellows. It is the bravado of ignorance. (p. 7)
X. Lexical additions

The Collection of Agatha Christie Издательство “Менеджер”, Москва, 2004
1) Old Mr. Lee was delighted with her. He took a tremendous fancy to her. (p. 32)
2) Oh, poor dear, she has been very much under the weather lately. She can’t help it, of course, but it really makes things a little difficult sometimes. (p. 122)
3) Poirot kept the conversational ball rolling some little time longer, but when it seemed certain that Mrs. Fowler had told all that she knew not once but many times over, he terminated the interview. (p. 44)

4) “Were they on very friendly terms?” “Not specially, I should say. Not that I knew anyway.” (p. 60)

XI. Lexical deletions

1) I suppose that little writer chap hasn’t suddenly gone off his onion and decided to do one of his crimes in flesh instead of on paper? (A. Christie Death in the Clouds, p. 91)

2) I mean with us – our tempers and our nerves. All on edge. (A. Christie Murder in Mesopotamia, p.

3) In England and France he was the square peg in the round hole, but here the holes were any sort of shape, and no sort of peg was quite amiss. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 11)
4) “Sooner or later he’ll be quite ready to come back to London, and no great harm will have been done.” “I wouldn’t do that,” said Mrs. MacAndrew. “I’d give him all the rope he wants. He’ll come back with his tail between his legs and settle down again quite comfortably. (W. S. Maugham The Moon and Sixpence, p. 18)
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