



Education Quarterly Reviews

Matlab, R. L. (2025). Contextual Application of Phraseological Units. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 8(3), 67-73.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.08.03.593

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

Contextual Application of Phraseological Units

Rustamova Lala Matlab¹

¹ Azerbaijan, Mingachevir State University. Email: Incisultanrustemli14@gmail.com
Orcid id:0000-0001-7542-6215

Abstract

The article discusses the contextual application of phraseological units. The problem of studying the contextual implementation of phraseological units is not new and has been highlighted to one degree or another in a number of works. Researchers such as R.A. Budagov, G.V. Kolshansky, N.N. Amosova, M.T. Tagiyev have made the greatest contribution to the development of the theory of context. The article notes that context is the environment in which a word occurs. Context does not determine the meaning of a word only within a sentence, this is only the simplest case. Determining or clarifying the meaning of a word, its general or specific meaning can be determined by sentences, periods, and even entire chapters. Context is understood as a set of formally stable conditions under which the content of any language unit is unambiguously revealed. It determines the micro context within the boundaries of a sentence, the macro context within a paragraph, and the thematic context, which is the entire content of the material.

Keywords: Phraseological Unit, Context, Intra-Phrase Context, Supra-Phrase Context, Contextual Changes

1. Introduction

Phraseologisms can be used regularly (normatively) and occasionally both in oral and written speech. The routine meaning of a phraseological unit (PU) is the meaning indicated in the dictionary. The accidental meaning is the meaning that a phraseological unit acquires in a certain context, accompanied by a deviation from the usual, generally accepted. The possibility of random transformation of phraseological units is associated with their two main properties: isolated composition and systemic-linguistic stability. In addition, for phraseological units with a complex semantic structure, the role of connotative components is great. All these factors make phraseological units an extremely interesting material for research in terms of their "behavior" in context. One of the first to study in detail the periodic changes of PU was the Russian scientist A. V. Kunin (1996). He was the first to introduce the terms "usual use" and "random use" into scientific linguistic speech and analyzed various types of random transformation of phraseological units in context, using the English language as material. Context is a part of the text, isolated and combined with a linguistic unit or a unit of speech, which can be transformed into a linguistic unit defined by the actualizer in the process of everyday or casual use. The current stage of development of phraseology as a linguistic discipline is characterized by a comprehensive approach to the study of phraseological units. One of the relatively new areas of phraseological research is phraseological contextology.

1.1. Objective of the study

The purpose of the article is to study the contextual application of phraseological units and their contextual implementation in sentences.

1.2. Methodology

The main method used in the dissertation is the contextual analysis method. Associated methods are the method of phraseological identification and phraseological description developed by A.V. Kunin (1996), the comparative method and the method of dictionary definitions.

2. Presentation and Discussion

The main problem of phraseological contextology is the inclusion of phraseological units in speech, their actualization in context. For the future development of phraseological contextology, it is undoubtedly of interest to study the actualization of phraseological units in context depending on the purpose and function of a specific context. The problem of studying the contextual implementation of phraseological units is not new and has been covered to one degree or another in a number of works. A. M. Budagova(2017) understands context as the environment in which a word occurs. she emphasizes that context determines the meaning of a word not only within a sentence, which is only the simplest case. The definition or clarification of the meaning of a word, its general or particular meaning, can be determined by sentences, periods, and even entire chapters. A. M. Budagova (2017) distinguished between narrow and broad contexts and emphasized the importance of dialogic speech as a broad type of context .

G.V. Kolshansky (1959) considers the context to be a set of formally stable conditions under which the content of any linguistic unit is unambiguously revealed. He distinguishes between microcontext within a sentence, macrocontext within a paragraph, and thematic context, which represents the entire content of the material. G.V. Kolshansky (1959) argues that without context it is impossible to realize the expressive and communicative function of language . In our opinion, the concept of context in Kolshansky's work is not formalized enough and requires clarification. Let us pay attention to the definition given by G.V. Kolshansky(1959). The three types of context include any linguistic unit in which the content of essentially any other linguistic unit of a lower level is unambiguously revealed without explanatory division . In this regard, a compound word is a context, since the meaning of the roots included in it is unambiguously realized. The possibility of such a broad understanding of context, based on the definition itself, is reflected in the types of context presented by G.V. Kolshansky (1959). In addition, micro- and macrocontexts are communicative speech units, and thematic context is a literary work or a relatively complete part of it and should be considered more as a text than as a context, since it is impossible to distinguish between themes. In our opinion, the statement that the context unambiguously reveals the content of any linguistic unit is not entirely true, since recent studies have shown that phraseological units (called phraseological units by the authors) based on direct and figurative combinations are possible. For example: *wave a hand* - *wave*, *wave a white flag* - *raise a white flag*. Both meanings are realized simultaneously in one context. There are contexts where two meanings of a word or the meaning of a phraseological unit and the literal meanings of its components are played out through wordplay. Of course, such a play on meanings is a random technique, but still, the context in which this event occurs does not become out-of-context.

N. N. Amosova(1963) distinguishes four types of context : variable context, constant context, conditionally limited context and fixed context. She distinguishes two types of variable context: broad context or speech situation and narrow context. Narrow context means a variable sentence.

Agreeing with N.N. Amosova (1963), A.M. Budagova (2017) notes that N.N. Amosova distinguishes a special form of broad context - dialogic speech. She distinguishes two main types of variable context: lexical and syntactic. Lexical context is understood as a context containing such an indicative minimum that helps to realize the meaning of a word through the semantics of a word or a complex of words that make up this indicative minimum. N. N. Amosova (1963) considers the phraseological unit itself as a constant context. Such formations as *pay attention* - *to care*, *to call* (or *visit*) - *to visit* belong to the usual limited context. In a fixed context, N. N. Amosova (1963)

understands stable expressions that do not have the semantic properties of a constant context. For example, by expectations, internal secretion, etc. It should be noted that the type of context, which is the phraseological unit itself, completely hides the development of phraseological units in various types of changing contexts. The allocation of a phraseological unit as a constant unit creates serious difficulties. The constant allocation of a phraseological unit encounters significant difficulties, since many phraseological units reflect a completely rethought nature of phraseological units, the presence of semantically empty words, etc. Many phraseological units that do not have an indicative minimum cannot be considered contextual if we approach it from the point of view of understanding the context proposed by N. N. Amosova(1963). M. T. Tagiev(1966) studies the external connections of phraseological units and introduces the concept of configuration: a formation based on the actual structural connection between a phraseological unit and an element associated with it is called a configuration. A configuration consists of the phraseological unit itself and its environment. M. T. Tagiev(1966) believes that a combination is phraseological if it has a certain environment that does not follow from the valence relations of the component words, and vice versa, if the combination is applied to its valence relations, it is free. We understand the importance of studying the speech environment of phraseological units, but M. T. Tagiev(1966) clearly pays too much attention to the significance of compatibility, not recognizing other ways of contextual realization of phraseological units. In M. T. Tagiev's(1966) understanding, the environment does not allow him to separate phraseological units from compound words. For example, compound words are blue-eyed, dark-haired, heartbreaking, etc. In paragraph B, it is also characterized by the environment, based not on a separate consideration of its components, but on the interrelation of the whole. When defining different types of context, we see that A.V. Kunin(1996), believing that it can be a word, claims that it is a group of words within a sentence, a sentence as a whole and a larger formation, that is, a supra-phrase unity. With this approach, three types of context are distinguished: intra-phrase, phrasal and supra-phrase: Intra-phrase context is an actualizer of a phraseological unit expressed by a word or a group of words of a simple or complex sentence. Let's pay attention to this example: *Here is realism as life*. The expression realism as life is in a phraseological configuration. The phraseological unit as life, when combined with the word trace, actualizes one of its full meanings.

Here is a trace as life on the rear left wheel. In this example, the phraseological unit "as large as life " is used in the meaning "noticeable, large in size" in combination with the words "mark", "sign". The intra-phrase context actualizes the phraseological unit expressed by words and groups of words of a simple or complex sentence. The compound context actualizes the phraseological unit expressed by a simple or complex sentence. The phraseological-compound context is typical for a phraseological unit that is in independent use, for example, to repeat the previous expression.

For example: *And how did little Tim behave? asked Mrs. Gratchit. As good as gold, said Dick*.

The superphrasal context is a situational actualizer of phraseological units expressed by two or more sentences. The phraseological context often does not provide enough information for the speech implementation of phraseological units. In this case, a broader context is needed. This can be seen in the following example. *But here it is, in all its glory*.

If we take into account the two previous sentences illustrating the situation, the meaning of phraseological units becomes clear. *How did you cut your knee, Rey? – I didn't cut it, – he said. "I didn't do it," he replied*. In this example, the phraseological unit refers to a broken knee, is used jokingly and means "to fall from grace". In this case, the phraseological unit is implemented in a superphrasal context. Knowing examples of speech implementation of phraseological units is very important both in the practical study of the English language and in interlingual relations, since the behavior of phraseological units in speech allows us to determine the relevance and contextual modeling of phraseological units, and their communicative potential as linguistic units in phraseological configurations is realized in speech. The use of phraseological units as a component of phraseological configurations can lead to the emergence of new phraseological units. Knowing the patterns of speech implementation of phraseological units is also very important in teaching, practical study of any language, as well as in translating from one language to another. From the point of view of everyday and casual use, A.V. Kunin (1996) distinguishes four types of phraseological configurations:

1. Everyday configuration of the first degree. In this configuration, phraseological units retain their traditional structure and component composition. At the same time, maintaining stylistic compliance with the vocabulary, it implements color.
2. The second-degree usual configuration is characterized by an increase in stylistic effect within one stylistic tonality. In this case, the increase in expressiveness occurs due to a change in the position of phraseological units or the use of two (or more) phraseological units within one configuration.
3. The first-degree random configuration. In this configuration, phraseological units are sometimes realized through the use of transformed numerous stylistic devices (insertion, addition, double actualization, replacement of components, break, ellipsis).
4. The second-degree random configuration. This configuration includes complex stylistic devices.

Kazan linguists L.K. Bayramova(1982) and E.F. Arsenyeva (2006) continued to study this problem in a comparative aspect, using materials from distantly related and unrelated languages. In the monograph "Phraseology and phraseography in a comparative aspect (based on the Russian and English languages)", published in 2006, E.F. Arsenyeva (2006) presented a study of the use of phraseological units of the Russian and English languages that were not subject to contextual changes, paying much attention to phraseological combinations. When studying phraseological units that were subject to contextual changes, the following types of transformations were analyzed:

1. Change of lexical component/components.
 2. Inclusion. Violated use of phraseological units.
 3. Addition of a variable component.
 4. Ellipsis. Phraseological allusion.
 5. Phraseological repetitions.
 6. Extended metaphor. He attributes the following to structural-semantic ones:
contextual use of phraseological units with semantic focus...
 - expansion of component composition;
 - reduction of component composition (ellipsis);
 - replacement (substitution) of a component;
 - breakage and complete deformation (fracture)(split use according to A.V.Kunin or according to the English terminology of A. Nachisione).
- The researcher attributes the following to semantic transformations:
- phraseological play on words;
 - explanation of the internal form (figurative basis).

Separately, A. O. Zholobova (2005) considers such creative contextual transformations of phraseological units as the author's aphorisms based on phraseological units and phraseological saturation of context (instantaneous phraseological saturation of speech according to the terminology of A. Nachisione) (1976). As for aphorisms, they can be based on the comparison or expansion of the component composition of phraseological units, as well as on the use of a parallel construction with the repetition of individual elements of a phraseological unit. Moreover, an aphorism can be a completely deformed (transformed) phraseological element. In some cases, a complete defraseologization of a phraseological unit is observed. I. P. Kudryavtseva (2007) analyzes the contextual use of phraseological units with components denoting time, based on the material of phraseological units of modern English and pays close attention to such techniques of random transformation of phraseological units as stylistic inversion and graphic highlighting of a phraseological unit. The author notes that the most common technique of the latter is italics. The problem of studying phraseological units in context is the subject of research by domestic and foreign scientists. A significant contribution to the study of contextual transformations of phraseological units was made by the monograph of the Latvian scientist Anita Nachisione(2001), published in 2001. The linguist identifies four main types of transformation of phraseological units in speech: extended metaphor, phraseological pun, distorted use of phraseological units and phraseological allusion. The author also studies phraseological repetition and repeated phraseological saturation of the context.

Thus, all types of transformations can be divided into three groups:

1. Transformations that change the substantive form of phraseological units without violating their structure. These include phraseological puns and rare violations of stylistic distribution.
2. Transformations that change the structure of phraseological units and thereby introduce innovations into their content. These include replacement, addition of component/components, wedge, omission, ellipsis, component/component.
3. Complex transformations: extended metaphor, phraseological repetition, phraseological allusion and phraseological richness of context.
4. Phraseological richness of context.

L.K. Bayramova considers the following types of accidental transformations (1982):

1. Inversion.
2. Replacement.
3. Wedge (called by the author the insertional dissection technique).
4. Contamination carried out in four ways.
5. Ellipsis.
6. Marking.

The features of random transformation of phraseological units are the subject of dissertations completed in the last decade by A. R. Abdullina (2007), D. N. Davletbaeva (2006), E. V. Ryzhkina (2003), and others. In addition, a number of works examine the types of contextual transformation of multilingual phraseological units. In this regard, the third chapter of the dissertation research by A. O. Zholobova (2005) is of considerable interest. The researcher describes the classification of random transformations by A. Melerovich and V. Mokienko, the concept of N. Shadrin, the models of random use of phraseological units by A. Nachisione, and also presents the types of random transformation of phraseological units of biblical origin in English, Spanish and Russian fiction, journalism and periodicals.

Most scholars are of the opinion that the replacement of a lexical component (less often components) is one of the most common types of contextual transformations, for example: E. F. Arsenyeva (2006), A. R. Abdullina (2007). The replaced lexeme can be a synonym, antonym or belong to the same semantic (thematic group) in relation to the occasionally varied component. The need for replacement is conditioned by the context and is a means of achieving the desired stylistic effect. Let us turn to examples from our material: *A modern court will not recognize this and will turn everything into a reproach and slander to an unrecognized writer; without sharing, without an answer, without participation, like a familyless traveler, he will remain alone in the middle of the road*. *"The veil was so impenetrable that it resembled a burqa. - A bald spot in the head - a devil in the ribs! - the girl sternly corrected the veiled lady, making it clear by her tone that their conversation with Foma Fomich was their personal business and she would not allow the uninitiated into their intimate circle"*.

In the first example, we observe the replacement of the component "bachelor" with "traveler" and in the second example the replacement of several components, namely "gray hair in the beard" with "bald spot in the head". In this way, the authors achieve an enhanced stylistic effect by updating the images.

It is not surprising that this loss of childhood would catch up with her and that at fortysomething a parent substitute would come along in the guise of a knight in shining sedan, "someone", she writes "I couldn't take off" [23].

"Sire, do not talk to me of small projects," said the Great Cham of baroque architecture, Gian Lorenzo Bernini, to Louis XIV after the Sun King lured him to Paris [24].

Don Quixote, very lean and egoistic and honest and foolish, a veritable knight of the Woeful Countenance... [25].

Examples from the English language illustrate the replacement of the components "armour" and "literature" with "sedan" and "baroque architecture" respectively. It should be noted that the replacement of a component is typical for nicknames-phraseologisms. The author, exploiting the model of a well-known nickname, substitutes the necessary components-substitutes.

A synonymous replacement of “rueful” in the phraseological unit “the knight of the Rueful Countenance” with “woeful” was also found. The meaning of the phraseological unit does not change. Wedging also refers to common types of occasional transformations of phraseological units. The main function of this type is to clarify or strengthen the meaning. The following examples illustrate the strengthening of the meaning and the increase in expressiveness of the phraseological units “burning brunette” and “prodigal son” by wedging in the components “fiery” and “bitch”.

3. Conclusion

Over the past decades, the interest of linguists in the study of phraseological units in real speech use has increased significantly. A number of domestic and foreign scientists study the use of phraseological units in context, with considerable attention being paid to the study of contextual transformations of phraseological units. Along with the usual (normative) use of phraseological units, common-occasional and occasional (speech) transformations of phraseological units are widely used for certain stylistic purposes. Being separately formed units of language, phraseological units are easily transformed. All contextual transformations of phraseological units can be divided into three groups:

1. Transformations that change the content of phraseological units, but do not violate their structure.
2. Transformations that change the structure of phraseological units and thereby introduce some innovations into their content.
3. Complex transformations, which are a combination of two or more techniques of occasional transformations of phraseological units.

Both English and Russian are characterized by different types of contextual transformations of phraseological units, such as: replacement of a component/components, insertion, addition of a variable component/components, ellipsis, break or broken use of phraseological units, extended metaphor, phraseological repetition, phraseological pun and context saturation.

The study of the types of contextual transformations of phraseological units clearly demonstrates the similarity of the mechanism of such transformations. The most common types are replacement of a component/components, insertion, addition, truncation, a combination of several techniques at the same time, i.e. phraseological saturation of the context.

The differences, as a rule, are of a secondary nature. For example, it was found that in Russian, unlike English, conjunctions, particles and introductory words can act as components added to the beginning of a phraseological unit, while the addition of a variable component/components to the end of a phraseological unit is more often observed in English.

The functions of occasional stylistic devices for transforming phraseological units coincide in both languages, and the “goal” of the impact of any type of transformation of phraseological units in each specific case is motivated by the author’s intention, his communicative and emotive attitude. The following functions of the considered stylistic devices for transforming phraseological units are distinguished: strengthening the meaning, clarifying the meaning, increasing the emotional and expressive content of the phraseological unit and the entire context in which the occasionally used turn of phrase is used, acquiring an unusual meaning by the phraseological unit, introducing humorous or satirical content into the statement, etc. The conducted experimental study convincingly proved that the metaphors underlying the figurative rethinking of phraseological units are alive not only for native speakers, but also for people at a sufficiently high level of proficiency in the language. The results of the experiment indicate the formation of the mechanism of metaphorical transfer also by non-native speakers, which, in turn, is a clear proof of the commonality of cognitive mechanisms for generating various kinds of transformations of phraseological units and their perception by representatives of different nations. Just as in the experiments of American scientists, we have proven that with various transformations of phraseological units, this unit remains understandable in the presence of a sufficient pragmatic context. Thus, we can conclude that the mental perception of phraseological units is similar both by native speakers and by people who are at a sufficiently high level of proficiency in it.

During the second experiment, it was confirmed that the structure of each phraseological unit, indeed, contains the so-called key components / components that carry the main part of the meaning of the entire phraseological unit, while the remaining components provide only additional information. The identity of the procedure for determining these components in the English and Russian languages and the similarity of the cognitive process of their recognition and recreation of a complete image based on these key components, which underlies the phraseological units of both compared languages is revealed. Thus, it can be stated that the mechanism of contextual occasional use of phraseological units in English and Russian is common.

Funding: Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Informed Consent Statement/Ethics Approval: Not applicable.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies: This study has not used any generative AI tools or technologies in the preparation of this manuscript.

References

- Abdullina A, R. (2007). Contextual transformations of phraseological units in English and Russian: dis. ... cand. philological sciences. Kazan, 167 p. PHILOLOGY
- Arsentyeva E, F. (2006) Phraseology and phraseography in a comparative aspect (based on Russian and English languages). Kazan: Kazan. state University, 172 p.
- Amosova N, N. (1963). Fundamentals of English phraseology. - L., - 208 p.
- Bayramova L, K. (1982). Phraseology and translation (based on the works of V. I. Lenin and their Tatar translations) // Phraseology and syntax. Kazan, 42 p. Bezelyansky Yu, N. (1999) Faith, Hope, Love ... Women's portraits. M.: OAO Raduga, 480 p.
- Budaqova, A, M. (2017). Functional Study of English-Language Media Texts in Philology /PhD dissertation in philology. / Baku, – 28 p
- Gogol N, V. (1985). Dead Souls: a poem. M.: Art. lit., 368 p. Davletbaeva D, N. (2006). Phraseological Occasionality in English and Turkish: dis. ... Cand. Philological Sciences. Kazan, 264 p.
- Du Maurier D. (1994) Sin and Atonement / trans. sang. M.: Krugozor, 336 p.
- Zholobova A, O. (2005). Phraseological Units of Biblical Origin in English, Spanish and Russian:.. ... Cand. Philological Sciences. Kazan, 267 p. Konetsky V, V. (1990). Yesterday's concerns: A story-journey. L.: Sov. pisatel, 400 p.
- Kolshansky G, V. (1959) On the nature of context // Questions of linguistics. - No. 4.
- Kudryavtseva I, P. (2007). Phraseological units of modern English with components denoting time: time, hour, minute, moment, second: diss. candidate of philological sciences. M., 178 p.
- Kunin A, V. (1996). Course of phraseology of modern English: textbook for institutes and faculties of foreign languages. 2nd ed., revised. M.: Higher. school, Dubna: Phoenix, 381 p.
- Leskov N, S. (1991). On knives: a novel in 6 parts. Parts I–III. Tula: Priok. kn. Publishing House, 368 p.
- Mamin-Sibiryak D, N. (1983). Gold: a novel, stories, a novella. Minsk: "Belarus", 432 p.
- Nagibin Yu, M. (1980), Collected Works: in 4 volumes. Moscow: Art Literature, Vol. 1. Stories, 559 p.
- Naciscione A, S. (1976). Occasional stylistic use of phraseological units (based on the works of J. Chaucer): Abstract of Cand. Sci. (Philology). Moscow, 21 p.
- Naciscione A. (2001) Phraseological Units in Discourse: towards Applied Stylistics. Riga: Latvian Academy of Culture, 283 p. Reunova O, I. (2000). Ellipsis as a linguistic phenomenon. Pyatigorsk: Pyatig. state lingv. univ, 229 p.
- Ryzhkina E, V. (2003). Phraseological occasionality in English: Cognitive and communicative aspects: diss. cand. philological sciences. Moscow, 236 p.
- Tagiev M, T. (1966) Verbal phraseology of the modern Russian language. – Baku, – 251 p.)
- Chitra F. (1996). Idioms and Idiomaticity. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 168 p.
- Corpus of Contemporary American English. URL: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,974691,00.html>
- Corpus of Contemporary American English. URL: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0.9171.752731.00.html>