JOURNAL OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Volume: 4 Issue: 8 | Aug–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

Semantic Transparency and Opacity in English Phraseology

Muyinjonova Sabinabonu
Student of English faculty Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
muyinjonovasabina04@gmail.com

Abstract: Phraseology in the English language encompasses a wide array of fixed expressions, including idioms, collocations, proverbs, and phrasal verbs. A key dimension in analyzing these expressions is the continuum of semantic transparency and opacity, which refers to the extent to which the literal meanings of constituent words contribute to the overall figurative or idiomatic sense. Transparent expressions allow for straightforward deduction of meaning from parts, whereas opaque ones obscure this relationship, requiring cultural or contextual knowledge for interpretation. This article explores the theoretical foundations, classification schemes, cognitive implications, and pedagogical challenges of semantic transparency and opacity in English phraseology. Drawing on linguistic theories and empirical studies, it argues that understanding this spectrum enhances language acquisition, translation, and computational linguistics applications.

Key words: Semantic transparency, semantic opacity, English phraseology, idioms, fixed expressions, cognitive linguistics, language acquisition, phrasal verbs, collocations, figurative language

Introduction. English phraseology represents a rich repository of multi-word units that convey meanings beyond the sum of their individual components. Semantic transparency denotes the degree to which the idiomatic meaning can be inferred from the literal interpretations of the words involved. For instance, the collocation "make a decision" is highly transparent, as its meaning aligns closely with the semantics of "make" and "decision." In contrast, opacity occurs when the connection is tenuous or absent, as in "kick the bucket," where the literal action bears no direct relation to the idiomatic sense of dying.

This dichotomy is not binary but exists on a gradient, influenced by factors such as etymology, cultural embedding, and metaphorical motivation. The study of transparency and opacity has roots in structural linguistics and has evolved through cognitive linguistics frameworks, emphasizing how speakers process and store these expressions in mental lexicons. This article aims to delineate the concepts, provide classifications, discuss cognitive and psycholinguistic insights, and address implications for language teaching and natural language processing (NLP).

Literature Review. The concepts of semantic transparency and opacity have been extensively discussed in phraseological research. Early work by Ferdinand de Saussure highlighted the arbitrary nature of signs, laying groundwork for understanding opacity in idioms. In the 20th century, scholars like Charles Bally and Igor Mel'čuk formalized phraseology as a subfield, categorizing expressions based on their semantic decomposability.

Modern classifications often draw from the work of Rosemarie Gläser and Igor Mel'čuk, who proposed scales of idiomaticity. For example, Nunberg et al. (1994) introduced a tripartite model:

Idiomatically combining expressions (semi-transparent): e.g., "spill the beans," where parts map to aspects of the meaning (spill = reveal, beans = secrets).

Idiomatic phrases (semi-opaque): e.g., "pull strings," with metaphorical but not fully decomposable elements.

Volume: 4 Issue: 8 | Aug–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

Conventionalized expressions (fully opaque): e.g., "by and large," where historical origins (nautical terms) are lost to modern speakers .

Cognitive linguists like George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) argue that even opaque idioms may stem from conceptual metaphors, such as "kick the bucket" relating to death via bodily metaphors, suggesting underlying transparency at a deeper cognitive level . Empirical studies using eye-tracking and reaction time experiments support this, showing that transparent idioms are processed faster than opaque ones.

Cross-linguistic comparisons reveal that English phraseology exhibits higher opacity in idioms compared to more transparent languages like German, where compound words often retain literal ties .

Classification and Examples

To operationalize transparency and opacity, linguists employ a continuum model. Table 1 illustrates this with English examples.

Degree of Transparency

Description

Examples

Fully Transparent

Meaning directly inferable from parts; often collocations.

"Heavy rain" (literal weight metaphor for intensity); "Take a shower" (straightforward action).

Semi-Transparent

Partial decomposability; metaphorical extension evident.

"Break the ice" (initiate conversation, from literal ice-breaking); "Hit the books" (study, from physical action).

Semi-Opaque

Weak literal-figurative link; requires some cultural knowledge.

"Bite the bullet" (endure pain, from historical practice); "Let the cat out of the bag" (reveal secret, obscure origin).

Fully Opaque

No discernible connection; arbitrary or fossilized.

"Kick the bucket" (die); "Raining cats and dogs" (heavy rain, etymological debate) .

Factors influencing position on this scale include:

Motivation: Metaphorical (e.g., body-part idioms like "lend a hand") vs. metonymic (e.g., "white collar" for office workers).

Compositionality: Ability to substitute parts without altering meaning.

Frequency: High-frequency idioms may appear more transparent due to familiarity.

Cognitive and Psycholinguistic Implications

From a cognitive perspective, transparent expressions are stored as analyzable units, facilitating composition during comprehension, while opaque ones are holistic entries in the mental lexicon . Dual-route models in psycholinguistics posit that speakers attempt literal parsing first, falling back to

Volume: 4 Issue: 8 | Aug–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

idiomatic retrieval for opaque cases, as evidenced by ERP studies showing N400 effects for incongruent idioms.

In second-language acquisition, opacity poses challenges; L2 learners often over-rely on literal translations, leading to errors like interpreting "kick the bucket" physically. Pedagogical strategies include etymological explanations to enhance perceived transparency.

Applications and Challenges

In NLP, distinguishing transparency aids in machine translation and sentiment analysis. Opaque idioms often evade literal models, necessitating idiom-specific dictionaries like those in Word Net . Challenges include variability: transparency can shift diachronically (e.g., "red tape" from literal bureaucratic ribbons to figurative bureaucracy) or contextually. Translation equivalence is another hurdle; opaque English idioms may require transparent paraphrases in target languages, complicating fidelity.

Conclusion. The exploration of semantic transparency and opacity within English phraseology underscores the intricate interplay between literal meaning and figurative interpretation in multi-word expressions. Phraseological units range from fully transparent collocations to deeply opaque idioms, each occupying a unique position along a semantic continuum shaped by factors such as metaphorical motivation, cultural context, compositionality, and usage frequency. This gradience not only reflects linguistic complexity but also reveals key insights into cognitive processing, language acquisition, and communicative efficiency. From a theoretical standpoint, understanding transparency provides a framework for classifying idioms and identifying the mechanisms that govern their structure and use. Cognitively, it highlights how speakers mentally store and access phraseological units, supporting models that differentiate between analytical and holistic processing routes. Pedagogically, it emphasizes the importance of explicit instruction, particularly in L2 learning environments, where unfamiliarity with idiomatic opacity can hinder comprehension and fluency. In computational linguistics, accounting for degrees of transparency enhances the accuracy of machine translation and natural language understanding systems, particularly in idiom recognition and paraphrase generation.

Ultimately, semantic transparency and opacity are not static traits but dynamic characteristics that evolve with time, usage, and sociocultural change. As such, their study remains essential to both theoretical linguistics and applied domains, including translation studies, education, and artificial intelligence. Further interdisciplinary research—especially empirical and cross-linguistic—will continue to illuminate the cognitive, communicative, and technological implications of English phraseology in an increasingly globalized linguistic landscape.

References:

1. Gibbs, R. W. (1992). What do idioms really mean? Journal of Memory and Language, 31(4), 485-506.
2. Cacciari, C., & Tabossi, P. (1988). The comprehension of idioms. Journal of Memory and Language, 27(6), 668-683.
3. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press.
4. Saussure, F. de. (1916). Course in General Linguistics.
5. Nunberg, G., Sag, I. A., & Wasow, T. (1994). Idioms. Language, 70(3), 491-538.
6. Keysar, B., & Bly, B. (1995). Intuitions of the transparency of idioms: Can one keep a secret by spilling the beans? Journal of Memory and Language, 34(1), 89-109.
7. Titone, D. A., & Connine, C. M. (1999). On the compositional and noncompositional nature of idiomatic expressions. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 38(4), 495-512.

Volume: 4 Issue: 8 | Aug–2025 ISSN: 2720-6882
http://journals.academiczone.net/index.php/jiphr

8. Dobrovol'skij, D., & Piirainen, E. (2005). Figurative Language: Cross-cultural and Cross-linguistic Perspectives. Elsevier.
9. Ammer, C. (2013). The American Heritage Dictionary of Idioms. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
10. Sinclair, J. (1991). Corpus, Concordance, Collocation. Oxford University Press.
11. Swinney, D. A., & Cutler, A. (1979). The access and processing of idiomatic expressions. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 18(5), 523-534.
12. Laurent, J. P., Denhières, G., Passerieux, C., Iakimova, G., & Hardy-Baylé, M. C. (2006). On understanding idiomatic language: The salience hypothesis assessed by ERPs. Brain Research, 1068(1), 151-160.
13. Irujo, S. (1986). Don't put your leg in your mouth: Transfer in the acquisition of idioms in a second language. TESOL Quarterly, 20(2), 287-304.
14. Fellbaum, C. (1998). WordNet: An Electronic Lexical Database. MIT Press.
15. Baker, M. (2018). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. Routledge.