

Collocation and Idioms: Similarities and Differences**Ass. Lec. Iman Farhan Mohammed****College of Arts\ Al-Mustansiriya University****التلازم اللفظي والتعابير: التشابه والاختلاف****م.م. إيمان فرحان محمد****كلية الآداب/ الجامعة المستنصرية**

ii0309128@gmail.com

الملخص

يركز هذا البحث على كلا من التلازم اللفظي والتعابير. الغرض منه هو دراسة الآراء اللغوية المختلفة عموماً تجاه هذه الظواهر وتصنيفاتها. من ناحية، يشير مصطلح التلازم اللفظي إلى مجموعة من الكلمات التي تبدو بانتظام في نفس السياق. ومن ناحية أخرى، يعني المصطلح بكل بساطة أن التعبير الذي يعمل كوحدة واحدة والذي لا يمكن العثور على ذلك من مكوناته المنفصلة. من الضروري لجميع المشاركين في هذه الظواهر تسليط الضوء على أنواعها وخصائصها التي تشكل وجودها داخل اللغة. وهذا يساعد جميع المشاركين في هذه الأفكار على امتلاك وصف كامل لهم من وجهات نظر مختلفة تماماً.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التلازم اللفظي، التعابير، القيود.

Abstract

This paper focuses on both collocations and idioms. Its purpose is to survey totally different linguistic attitudes towards these phenomena and their categorizations. On one hand, the term collocation refers to set of words that regularly seem within the same context. On the opposite hand, the term idiom simply means that an expression that functions as one unit and whose meaning cannot be found out from its separate components. It is vital for all involved with these phenomena to shed lightweight on their sorts and characteristics that form their existence within the language. This helps all those involved with these ideas to keep a full description of them from completely different views.

Key Words: collocation, idiom, restrictions.

Conception of Collocation

This concept introduced by J.R.Firth in his linguistic theory to appoint distinctive term combos that have promoted an idiomatic semantic relation supported their frequent co-occurrence. Collocations are, therefore, primarily semantically (not grammatically) based mostly, e.g. *dog: bark, dark: night*, (Bussmann, 1996: 200).

For Matthews (2003: 530), collocation means a relation within a syntactic unit between specific lexical parts; e.g. *computer* cobbles with *hate* in *My computer hates me*; *blond* cobbles with *hair* in *blond hair* or *their hair is blond*; *drunk* with *lord* in *as drunk as a lord*; *run* with *riot* in *run riot*. During this regard, Meyer (2009: 223) defines collocation as words that generally happen along. For instance, the sentence *I strongly agree* composes two words, *strongly* and *agree*, that commonly co-occur in this context. Other words might obviously follow *strongly*, but are much less likely to do so than *agree* and other words, like *disagree* or *dislike*, expressing opinions.

Cruse (2006:27) illustrates that collocation is a sequence of words that is integrative (unlike a prototypical idiom, for example), however forms a unit in some way. This might merely be as a result of occurring along terribly often, however, sometimes the sequence additionally encompasses a linguistics unity. For example, one or a lot of the constituent words might have a special sense that solely seems in this combination, or in a very restricted set of connected combos. Subsequent expressions, for instance, square measure collocations during this sense: *a high wind, high seas, high office, have a high opinion of*. In every case, the word *high* has a (different) special meaning, and this meaning is different from default meaning present in, for instance, *a high wall*.

On the opposite hand, Saeed (2016:438) explains that collocation is employed in two ways in which the primary merely describes expressions occurring along grammatically and semantically in a very grammatical means, i.e. regular combination. The second describes the semantic effects on expressions of oftentimes occurring along, like, *high mountains*. During this regard, Müller (2008:4) mentions that collocation usually refers to the expression of words that are typically used like bitterly cold, rich imagination or closed friends. If you hear the primary word, the second will be expected, or a minimum of you will be able to have an inspiration what it can be. In the context with nouns and verbs, collocation means the syntactic relationship between the verb and the noun phrase such as to make a decision or to take a photo.

Finch (2003: 137), on this ground, notices the following:

If you research the adjective clear in a very smart wordbook of up to date English you'll most likely realize it'll list a minimum of ten completely different meanings, reckoning on the context of use within which it's used. In every instance the means that of clear is slightly different; clear conscience means 'without guilt', whereas *clear* in *clear case* means 'unmistakable'. At the same time, however, we should find it hard to say that in each instance, there was a separate conceptual sense. We can see enough commonality of meaning to assume an underlying sense. All the examples I have given have the meaning 'free from', whether free from complications (*a clear case*) free from guilt (*a clear conscience*) or free from clouds (*a clear sky*). The differences between them come from the words clear is put with, or, in other words, collocates with. 'Collocate' is a verb meaning 'to go with', and one of the ways by which we know the meaning of a word is.

Seretan (2011: 10), in his read, states that the foremost general understanding of the term collocation is that of relevance affinity that holds between words in an exceedingly language, and that is discovered by the typical co-occurrence of words, i.e., by the recurrent appearance of words in the context of each other. Linguists, who are interested in context, consider that in characterizing a word, its context plays the most important role. He (ibid.) affirms that the term collocation was constantly accompanied over time by confusion, and was used in different places for denoting different linguistic phenomena. The confusion was only augmented by the examples provided by various researchers, which are highly inconsistent and reflect the divergence points of view.

Consequently, Gledhill (2000:9) mentions that the semantic/syntactic tradition defines collocation as a lot of abstract relationship into words, without reference to frequency of prevalence or likelihood, shifting the stress so from the matter co-occurrence of expression to its potential for lexical combination. During this respect, Stranzy (2005:1187) and Odu & Odu (2009: 7), as linguists, have identical concept a collocation may be a cluster of words that are usually used along to make a natural-sounding combination. Whereas Bartsch (2004:11) confirms that collocations are often outlined as often repeated, comparatively fastened linguistic string combinations of two or more words.

In this association, Gelbukh and Kolesnikova (2013:90) state a value mentioning the subsequent quotation:

Collocation could be a combination of two words within which the linguistics of the bottom is autonomous from the mix it seems in, and wherever the collocate adds linguistics options to linguistics of the bottom. as an example, within the phrase *she fell to the ground*, all the words are used in their typical sense and also the verb fall means to drop oneself to a lower position, however once it's same she fell in love.

Finally, it is distinguished between free and bound collocation. Fischer (1998:44) comments that the parts of the free (or open) collocation can be free combined with words. Typically, the elements of collocation are virtually (e.g., fill the sink). Concerning bound collocation, Cruse (1986: 41) mentions that collocations like foot bill and curry favour, whose constituents do not like to be separate, are termed bound collocations. He (ibid.) adds that although they display some of the characteristic properties of idioms, bound collocations are nevertheless lexically complex.

Collocation range and restrictions

As a matter of truth, Richard and Schmidt (2010:95) show that collocation refers to the restrictions on how words will be used along, for instance which prepositions are used with specific verbs, or which verbs and nouns are used along. For instance, in English the verb *perform* is used with *operation*, but not with *discussion*, for instances:

-The doctor performed the operation.

-The committee held/had a discussion.

do collocates with *damage*, *duty*, and *wrong*, but not with *trouble*, *noise*, and *excuse*:

do plenty of harm, do one's duty, do wrong

make hassle, create a lot of noise, create an excuse

Lyons (1995: 62) points out that the collocational range of expression is the set of contexts in which it can occur (its collocations). It might be thought that the collocational range of an expression is altogether determined by its meaning. However, this does not appear to be so. *Big* and *large* can function as an example. There are several contexts in which *large* cannot be substituted for *big* (in the meaning which *big* shares with *large*) without violating the collocational restrictions of the one or the opposite. For example, *large* is not interchangeable with *big* in:

1. You are making a big mistake.

The sentence

2. You are making a large mistake

is presumably, not solely grammatically well-formed, but also meaningful. It is, however, unacceptable as a collocation expression. And yet *big* seems to have identical meaning in (2) as it does in phrase such as *a big house*, for which one could substitute *a large house*.

Additionally, Cowie (2009:50) explicates that with collocations, the range of choice tends to be a lot of tightly constrained. Though several collocations are simply understood, because of the literal meaning of one word in every case, a characteristic feature is restricted alternative. Take the pairs *light rain*, *heavy rain* and *light exercise*, **heavy exercise*. The existence of each *light* and *heavy* in collocation with *rain* is to be expected, but while a strenuous workout in the gym certainly seems to qualify for description *heavy exercise*, the particular collocation is rarely used. Additionally, he (ibid.) says that when a collocation such as *light exercise* catches on, repetitive use can follow, serving to fix the chosen form in the minds of speakers. But constant use also seems to have the effect in several cases of isolating the phrase from potential semantic neighbours which could otherwise get existence.

Palmer (1976: 97), on the opposite hand, elaborates that there are three types of collocational restrictions can be distinguished. First, some are based mostly entirely on the meaning of the item as in the unlikely *green cow*. Secondly, some are based on range-a word is also used with a whole set of words that have some semantic features in common. This accounts for the unlikelihood of *The rhododendron passed away* and equally of *the pretty boy* (*pretty* getting used with words denoting females). Thirdly, some restrictions are collocational within the strictest sense, involving neither meaning nor range, as *addled* with *eggs* and *brains*.

Nesselhauf (2005:24) differentiates five levels of collocational restrictions in depending on two criteria, specifically the amount of parts that are restricted in their commutability and also the degree of the restriction. These levels are described and exemplified as follows:

1. Freedom of substitution within the noun; some restriction on the selection of verb

an open set of nouns

a small number of synonymous verbs

adopt /accept/ agree to a proposal

2. Some substitution in both elements

a small range of nouns can be used with the verb in that sense, there are a small number of synonymous verbs

introduce/table/bring forward a bill/an amendment

3. Some substitution within the verb; complete restriction on the selection of the noun
no other noun can be used with the verb in that sense,
there are a small number of synonymous verbs

pay/take heed

4. Complete restriction on the selection of the verb; some substitution of the noun
a small range of nouns may be used with the verb in this sense,
there are not any similar verbs
give the appearance/impression

5. Complete restriction on the selection of both components
no other noun can be used with the verb in the given sense,
there are no synonymous verbs
curry favour

According to Lyons (1995: 125), the subsequent lines are worth quoting:

it is necessary to notice that certain lexemes are so extremely restricted with relevance collocational acceptability that it is not possible to predict their combinatorial relations on the basis of an independent characterization of their sense. Classical examples from English are the adjectives rancid and addled. It is clearly a crucial part of knowing their sense to understand that rancid combines or collocates, with butter and addled with egg. The view taken here is that the sense of any linguistic unit, whether or not it is extremely restricted with relevance collocational acceptability or not, includes each its combinatorial and substitutional relations.

Types of Collocation

Numerous classifications of collocations are approachable through investigations of various criteria which form the basis for the classifications. Nevertheless, Kurosaki (2012:77)'s divisions are adopted during this study. He (ibid.) classifies collocation according to the two criteria: collocation categories and collocation types. Collocation categories indicate grammatical structure of collocations, such as, "verb + noun", collocation types are semantic types of collocations (lexical collocations).

In sum, grammatical collocation may be a phrase consisting of a dominant word (a noun, an adjective, a verb) and a preposition or grammatical structure, like an infinitive or a clause. In distinction, lexical collocations usually do not contain prepositions, infinitives, or clauses, (Binza and Bosch, 2012: 184). In this respect, Lu (2017: 66) mentions that grammatical collocations are different from lexical collocations in the following ways. First, components of grammatical collocation include function words such as preposition and adverb. Moreover, almost all grammatical collocations are fixed collocations such as *bring up* and *depend on*, whereas all lexical collocations are restricted collocations such as, *close*, *good friend*, *old friend*, etc.

Familiar samples of collocations, are *gain entry*, *concede defeat*, *suffer a shock*, or to vary the pattern, *a blind alley*, *a golden opportunity*, *a narrow escape*, illustrate the two most vital facts concerning this type of set phrase. A collocation is memorized as a lexical unity, however at the same time it is generally divided in two, each semantically and grammatically. The semantic division is evident from the very fact that nouns in both sets of examples are used in a literal sense. In contrast, the verbs within the first set and also the adjectives in the second have a meaning that is typically figurative. The nouns, with their literal meanings, can occur independently, (Cowie, 2009: 49). However, six kinds of lexical collocations may be distinguished which are as follows:

1. A verb sometimes denoting creation, activation or eradication, nullification + a noun/pronoun, as in, *fly a kite*.
2. An adjective + a noun, such as, *best regards*; *a rough estimate*; *a formidable challenge*.
3. A noun + a verb, such as, *alarms go off*, *blizzards rage*.

4. A unit associated with a noun, like, *a pack of dogs, a pride of lions, a school of whales, a bit of advice, a lump of sugar*.
5. An adverb + an adjective, like, *strictly accurate, sound asleep, keenly (very much) aware*.
6. A verb + an adverb, as in, *amuse thoroughly, argue heatedly, appreciate sincerely*, (Internet Ref No. 1).

A vital purpose that should be mentioned here is that grammatical collocations are very similar to lexical collocations within the sense that they also correspond to arbitrary and recurrent word co-occurrences. In terms of structure, grammatical collocations are a lot of simpler; since several of the grammatical collocations solely embody one open category word. One open category word is the meaning bearing part, it is the base; and also the close category word is the one that collocates. For lexicographers, grammatical collocations less complicated than lexical collocations, (Wilkes, 1993:172).

As far as kinds of grammatical collocations are concerned, they fall into the following combinations:

1. Noun + preposition combos, such as, *apathy towards*.
2. Noun + to + infinitive: there are five syntactic patterns in which noun + to + infinitive construction is most frequently encountered, as illustrated below:
 - a. It was a pleasure (*a problem, a struggle*) to do it.
 - b. They had the foresight (*instructions, an obligation*) to do it.
 - c. They felt a compulsion (*an impulse, a need*) to do it
 - d. They made an attempt (*an effort, a promise, and a vow*) to do it.
 - e. He was a fool (*a genius, an idiot*) to do it.
3. Noun + that-clause, such as, *we reached an agreement that she would represent us in court*.
4. Preposition + noun combinations, for example, *by accident, in advance, in agony, etc*.
5. Adjective + preposition combinations, for example, *they are angry at the children, they are hungry for news*.
6. Predicate adjective + to + infinitive, such as, *she is ready to go*.
7. Collocational verb patterns, such as, *he sent the book to his brother*, (Internet Ref No. 2).

Characteristics of Collocations

Seretan (2011: 15) mentions several basic features associated with the notion of collocations that distinguish them from other expressions which are explained below:

1. **Collocations are prefabricated:** collocation is emerged from studies on language acquisition showing that children memorize not solely words in isolation, but also, to an oversized, sets (chunks) of words. These chunks are viewed because the building blocks of language. They are available to speakers as ready-made, or prefabricated units, contributed to conferring fluency ad naturalness to their utterances.
2. **Collocations are arbitrary:** also peculiarity, or idiosyncrasy as against regularity. Collocations do not seem to be regular production of language however arbitrary word usages, arbitrary word combos, or typical, a specific and characteristics combination of two words. This feature might not refer solely to the selection of a particular word in conjunction with another so as to precise a given meaning, but also to its syntactic and semantic properties.
3. **Collocations are unpredictable:** since the institutionalization of a collocation as a ready-made unit does not rely upon clear linguistic reasons, it is not possible to predict that collocation. First, the affinity of a word for a specific collocate, that is powerfully most well-liked over different words from identical synonymy set, cannot be predictable. Second, the morpho-syntactic properties of collocation cannot be predicated on the premise of the properties of taking part words.
4. **Collocations are recurrent:** it is the frequent usage of collocations that their repetition allows their recognition and learning supported expertise.

5. **Collocations are created of two or a lot of words:** despite the fact that the practical work cares virtually completely with collocations created of precisely two lexical items, in theory there is no length limitation for collocations. As a matter of truth, the bulk of definitions stipulate that collocations might involve over two items. Complicated collocations, like, major turning point, conduct a comprehensive study, abolish death penalty, become an progressively necessary concern, are massively a gift in language.

The conception of Idiom

Binza and Bosch (2012: 184) state that the term idiom has got to take into consideration two characteristic options viz. its fixed character and its unpredictability of which means. These fixed construction patterns are typical or peculiar of the language being represented. With relevancy the primary characteristic feature, idioms encompass words that are routinely used that along. Their meaning is unpredictable as a result of it cannot be gathered logically from its element components. During this regard, Binkert (2004: 71) views that this term is an extremely specialized expression whose meaning generally cannot be deduced from the sense of the words out of that it is composed. Expressions like, *shoot the breeze*, *be up tight*, and *so long* are samples of idioms. In most instances, idioms are fixed in usage and cannot be expanded or changed.

According to Philip (2011: 15), the conception idiom consists of two or a lot of writing words whose meaning, taken along, cannot be predicted from the meaning of the constituent components. In other words, there is a discrepancy between what the phrase as a full suggests that and what its constituents would refer if read in composition way. This, however, barely one of the features of idiomaticity. For an idiom to express the meaning that it does, it should even be institutionalized. Institutionalization of lexis implies that there is a received meaning that all understand.

Brinton (2000: 100), on the opposite hand, illustrates that an idiom may be a sequence of words that functions as one unit; it is syntactically fixed and semantically stylized. He (ibid.) exemplifies the subsequent instances:

spill the beans saw logs shoot the breeze
take stock of flog a dead horse hold your horses
sit tight find fault with take heart
take fright hit the road run the gamut
be under the weather let the cat out of the bag be dead to the world

He (ibid.) adds that the semantics of the idiom are sometimes not foreseeable from the meaning of the individual words; this is often what linguists name “non-compositionality”. For example, you cannot calculate the meaning of ‘being sick’ or ‘feeling ill’ from the meanings of *under* and *weather*. The meaning of idioms is usually thought to be figurative or proverbial; they are emotionally-charged instead of neutral in meaning.

During this affiliation, Richard and Schmidt (2010:270) describe idiom as an expression that functions as one unit and whose meaning cannot be discovered from its separate components. For instance, *she washed her hands of the matter* suggested that she refused to have anything more to do with the matter. They (ibid.) state that idiomatic is that the degree to which speech is not merely grammatical, however conjointly native-like in use. For example, *it pleases me that Harry was ready to be brought by you* (said by a host/hostess to a guest at a party) is grammatical, however, not native-like or expression, whereas *I'm so glad you could bring Harry* is both grammatical and idiomatic.

Types of Idioms

Cacciari and Tabossi (1993: 17) indicate that idioms can be divided into three sorts which are illustrated below:

1. **Opaque idiom:** refers to the relations between idioms' components and also the idiom meaning which do not seem to be apparent, but the meanings of individual words even so will constrain each interpretation and use. For the idiom *kick the bucket*, for instance, the semantic of the verb *to kick* constrain both interpretation and discourse productivity.

2. **Clear idioms:** in these idioms, there are one to one semantic relations between the idiom words and parts of the idioms' meaning, actually because of figurative correspondences between an idiom's words and constituents of the idiom's meaning. For the idiom *break the ice*, for example, the word *break* corresponds to the idiomatic sense of changing a mood or feeling.
3. **Quasi- figurative idioms:** in which the literal referent of an idiom is itself an instance of the idiomatic meaning; for example, *giving up the ship* is at the same time a perfect or prototypical model of the act of surrendering and a phrase that can refer to any instance of complete surrenders.

Characteristics of Idiom

According to Brinton and Akimoto (1999:113), the essential characteristic of an idiom is that the non-compositional nature of its meaning. An idiom is sometimes outlined as a phrase whose meaning is not a sum of the meaning of its constituents. Another characteristic is its syntactic fixity; within the case of *kick the bucket*, for instance the noun cannot be pluralized, nor changed by adjectival phrases, the word-order cannot be modified and the verb can take numerous inflected forms, but cannot be passivised. However, this fixity which these syntactic options show is relative, based on each idiom.

As a matter of truth, Yong and Peng (2007:176) affirm that idioms have the subsequent options that are:

1. An idiom is a fixed stylized phrase or sentence that is easy in form but compendious in sense.
2. An idiom is a phrase which implies something different from the meanings of the separate words from which it is shaped.
3. An idiom may be a range of words which, taken along, mean one thing totally different from the individual words of the idiom once they stand alone.
4. An idiom may be a cluster of words which, once they are used along in a very explicit combination, has a different meaning from the one they might have if you took the meaning of all the individual words within the cluster.
5. An idiom is an expression which functions as a single unit whose meaning cannot be discovered from its separate components.
6. An idiom is a term utilized in grammar and lexicography to take over with a sequence of words that is semantically and sometimes syntactically restricted, so they operate as one unit.

Bussmann (1996: 533), on the opposite hand, maintains that the term idiom can be defined as a set, multi-elemental group of words with the subsequent characteristics:

- (a) The complete meaning cannot be derived from the meaning of the individual elements, e.g. *to have a crush on someone* ('to be loving with someone');
- (b) The substitution of single constituents does not induce a scientific modification of meaning (which is not true of non-idiomatic syntagms), e.g. **to have a smash on someone*;
- (c) A literal reading leads to a homophonic non-idiomatic variant, to which conditions (a) and (b) no longer applies (figurative).

He (ibid.) says that regularly there is a diachronic affiliation between the literal reading and also the idiomatic reading (idiomatization). In such cases, the treatment of the idiom as an unanalyzable lexical entity is insufficient. Relying upon the theoretical preconception, sayings, figures of speech, nominal constructions, and twin formulas are all subsumed beneath idioms.

On this basis, Brinton and Akimoto (1999: 7) clarify the subsequent lines:

Of the various definitions of idiom, three criteria, both semantic and syntactic, emerge as predominant. The first is semantic opacity, the fact that the meaning of an idiom cannot be deduced from a sum of the meanings of its parts; in this sense, the meaning of an idiom is not motivated. Thus, the meaning of *die* cannot be produced from the sum of *kick + the + bucket*. Second criterion relates to the apparent morphological and transformation deficiencies of idioms, in not permitting the syntactic variability displayed in other, freer sequences of words; operations such passive (**The bucket was kicked by Sam*), internal modification (**Hold your*

restless horses), and topicalization (**The bucket Sam kicked*) cannot occur with the idiomatic meaning being retained. Finally, the lack of substitutability in idioms, as in *have a crush on*.

Differences and Similarities

From the lexicographic purpose of read, the main semantic difference between collocations and idioms is that idioms are single lexical items whereas collocations are combos of lexical items. What is more, a collocation differs from an idiom by the very fact that it is semantically clear. As already same, a collocation is that the relationship between two words or sets of words that often go along and form a common expression. Collocations illustrate the standard combos within which the lemma happens also as its typical use by first language speakers and, modify it to the language's expression phrase, (Binza and Bosch, 2012: 184).

Wouden (1997: 38) presents that collocations have evidenced to be the foremost difficult; thus, the critical drawback for the lexicographer has been the treatment of collocations. It has been way more tough to spot them than idioms or maybe compounds; as a result, their inclusion in dictionaries has been erratic. He (ibid.,11) argues that a sharp borderline between idioms and collocations is that the semantic aspects of idioms are perpetually expression, whereas the semantic aspects of collocations are solely subject to idiomaticity with respect to generation.

On this ground, Ding (2018: 29) indicates that the excellence between collocations and idioms is that an idiom resembles rather a root; it is a coalition or an assemblage of roots, non-productive in terms of the productivity of roots among it. It is a particular cumulate association, as a rule inoperable within the sense that its components unproductive in reference to the entire in terms of traditional operational processes, that of substitution specifically. The collocation *tear up* is not an idiom as a result of there is no such fixity of association between *tear* and *up*. *Lope, amble, shamle, race, etc.*, could also be substituted for *tear* and *down, across, onto, into, along, etc.* for *up*. An idiom is an entity whose meaning cannot be deduced from its components. For instance, *put down* in *he put down the book* may be a collocation whereas *he put down the rebellion* constitutes an idiom.

Concerning similarities, Brinton and Akimoto (1999: 7) mention that like idioms, collocations are sets of lexical items which repeatedly or generally co-occur, however, in contrast to idioms, their meanings will sometimes be deduced from the meanings of their components. In diachronic terms, the difference between idiom and collocation is usually tough to draw.

On the other hand, Ding (2018: 29) adds that it is tough to a sharp distinction between them. So, the similarities may be noticed as follows:

First, idioms can occur as part of collocations (e.g., [*the nose in your face*] in *as plain as [the nose in your face]*) or mix to make a collocation.

Second, both idioms and collocations typically correspond to a cognitively similar single type which can replace them either optionally or compulsorily in *certain (stylistic) contexts: idioms, make up=compose, make it up=(be) reconcile(d), make up to=flatter; collocations, put down (the book)=deposit, come down=descend*.

Third, collocations and idioms like the extent that both are usually related to grammatical generalizations and that both cut across syntactic categories, e.g., verb + object complement: *play tricks* (collocation), *kick the bucket* (idiom), verb + adverbial complement, *put on* (the coat) (collocation), *put off* (the meeting) (idiom).

Conclusion

It has been noticed that the results of the current paper involved with two of the problematic, grammatical and semantic areas for English learners, e.i., collocations and idioms. However, the very fact can be summarized as follows:

1. As far as collocations involved, it can be all over the following:
 - Collocation refers to a bunch of two or a lot of words that typically go along.
 - Collocation restrictions show how words can be used together, for example,, which prepositions are used with explicit verbs, or which verbs and nouns are used along.

- Collocational vary of expression is the set of contexts in which it can occurs (its collocations).
 - They may be classified into two basic sorts that are: lexical and grammatical collocations. Lexical collocation has six sorts, whereas grammatical collocations, English grammatical collocations make up eight combos.
 - They manifest several characteristic options that form its realization in the wide spectrum of language that are prefabricated, arbitrary, recurrent, unpredictable and two or more than two words collocations.
2. Regarding idioms, the subsequent points are noticed:
- The idiom is an expression that functions as one unit and whose meaning cannot be discovered from its separate components. For example, *kick the bucket*.
 - As for classification, three types of idioms can be distinguished opaque, transparency, and quasi-figurative idioms.
 - Features of idioms are:
 - a. The entire whih neans cannot be derived from the meaning of the - individual components, e.g. *to have a crush on someone* ('to be loving with someone');
 - b. The substitution of single components does not in a induce modification of meaning (which is not true of non-idiomatic syntagms), e.g. **to have a smash on someone*;
 - c. A literal reading leads to a homophonic non-idiomatic variant, to that conditions (a) and (b) no longer applies (metaphor).
3. With regard to variations and similarities, like idioms, collocations are sets of lexical items which repeatedly or generally co-occur, however, in contrast to idioms, their meanings will usually be deduced from the meanings of their parts. In sum, the distinction between idiom and collocation is often difficult to draw.

References

- Bartsch, S., **Structural and Functional Properties of Collocations in English: A Corpus Study of Lexical and Pragmatic Constraint on Lexical Co-Occurrence**, Berlin: [Gunter Narr Verlag](#), 2004, p.4
- Binkert, P., J., **A Glossary of Terminology used in the Study of Language and Linguistics**, Milford: The Langtech Corporation, 2004, p.11
- Binza, H. and Bosch, S., **Language Science and Language technology in Africa: Festschrift for Justus C. Roux**, African Sun Media, 2012, p.8, 11, 15
- Brinton, L. J. and Akimoto, M., **Collocational and Idiomatic Aspects of Composite Predicates in the History of English**, Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V., 1999, p. 13, 14, 16
- Brinton, L., J., **The Structure of Modern English: A Linguistic Introduction**, Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V.) , 2000, p. 11
- Bussmann, H., **Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics**, London: Routledge, 1996, p. 2, 14
- Cacciari, C. and Tabossi, P., **Idioms: Processing, Structure, and Interpretation**, [Psychology Press](#): Lowerance Erlbaum Association, Inc, 1993, P. 12
- Cowie, A., P., **Semantics**, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, P. 6, 8
- Cruse, A., **A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics**, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2006, P. 2
- Cruse, D., A., **Lexical Semantics**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, P. 4

- 1- Ding, J., **Linguistic Prefabrication: A Discourse Analysis Approach**, Springer Singapore Nature Pt. Ltd, 2018, P. 15, 16
- 2- Finch, G., **How to Study Linguistics: A Guide to Understanding Language**, London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, 2003, P.3
- Fischer, R., **Lexical Change in Present-day English: A Corpus-based Study of the Motivation, Institutionalization and Productivity of Creative Neologisms**, Berlin: [Gunter Narr Verlag](#), 1998, P. 4
- Gelbukh, A. and Kolesnikova, O., (2013), **Semantic Analysis of Verbal Collocations with Lexical Functions**, Berlin: [Verlagu](#) Heidelberg, 2013, P. 4
- 3- Gledhill, C., J., **Collocations in Science Writing**, London: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2000, P. 4
- Kurosaki, S., **An Analysis of the Knowledge and Use of English Collocations by French and Japanese Learners**, New York: Universal Publishers, 2012, P. 7
- Lu, Y., **A Corpus Study of Collocation in Chinese Learner English**, London: Routledge, 2017, P. 8
- Lyons, J., **Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, P. 5, 7
- Matthews, P., H., **The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics**, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, P. 2
- Meyer, C., F., **Introducing English Linguistics**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, P. 2
- Müller, y., **Collocation: A linguistic view and didactic aspects**, London: [Grin Verlag](#), 2008, P. 3
- Nesselhauf, N., **Collocations in a Learner Corpus**, Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V., 2005, P. 6
- 4- Odu, A. and Odu, J., **Idioms and Idiomatic Phrases, Correlatives, and Collocations**, Descent Hill, 2009, P. 4
- Palmer, F., R., **Semantics: A New Outline**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, P. 6
- Philip, G., **Colouring Meaning: Collocation and connotation in figurative language**, Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V, 2011, P. 11
- Saeed, J., I., **Semantics**, London: Wiley Blackwell, 2016, P. 3
- Seretan, V., **Syntax-Based Collocation Extraction**, Springer Science & Business Media, 2011, P. 3, 10
- Stranzy, P., **Encyclopedia of Linguistics**, New York: Taylor & Francis Books, Inc, 2005, P. 4
- 5- Wilkes, M., **Using Large Corpora**, New York: [MIT Press](#), 1993, P.9
- 6- Wouden, T., V., **Negative Contexts: Collocation, Polarity and Multiple Negation**, New York: Taylor & Francis, 1997, P. 15
- Yong, H. and Peng, J., **Bilingual Lexicography from a Communicative Perspective**, Netherlands: John Benjamins B.V, 2007, P. 13

Websites

1. <http://eldum.phil.muni.cz/mod/resource/view.php?inpopup=true&id=1080>
2. <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/jltr/vol05/03/20.pdf>