

Safarova A.<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9569-8956>

Azerbaijan University of Languages

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC MODELING OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

This article is devoted to the structural-semantic modeling of phraseological units in modern linguistics. Its relevance and timeliness in modern cognitive linguistics are beyond doubt. A clear and precise understanding of the various forms, methods, and variants of lexical-grammatical and simultaneously structural-semantic modeling of English phraseological units is noted. Both critical and specialized linguistic literature are thoroughly considered, as it draws on a number of positions by leading Western European researchers. A reasonable conclusion is reached that this topic, like any similar work, is important from both theoretical and practical perspectives. Both aspects are clearly emphasized. The paths and methods by which structural-semantic modeling of English phraseological units occurs are demonstrated. It is established that much of the solution to this problem depends on the various parts of speech associated with them. Moreover, depending on the semantics expressed by the phraseological units, they are combined into models/schemes based on their specific features. These are also presented and analyzed. It is important to emphasize that the article does not draw a radical distinction between the semantics and structural organization of English phraseological units and their subordination to specific grammatical norms. This is an entirely appropriate approach to the chosen topic, as this triad is closely interconnected. One feature organically merges with the other. This becomes all the more noticeable when the author substantiates all the above theoretical propositions with factors, phenomena, or concepts such as the reflection of national realities and cultural factors in English phraseological units, while simultaneously citing the etymology of individual words, that is, the primary sources on which a particular set expression is based. As a result, readers and critics become aware of the close connection between the structural-semantic modeling of English phraseological units and lexicology, the organization of set expressions in general, grammatical norms, and syntactic models/schemes.

Keywords: phraseological units, word structure, idioms, lexicology, semantics, phraseological unit classification, phraseological unit unification.

Introduction. As we know, phraseology belongs to the section of cognitive linguistics that studies set phrases. Their fundamental meaning cannot be derived from the components of their internal components. The most important aspect of the linguistic analysis of phraseological units in virtually any language is their structural and semantic organization. This is because it is directly and immediately linked to grammar, functionality, and the consistency of their expression. Analyzing the internal structure of phraseological units allows modern scholars to systematize idioms and gain insight into the mechanisms by which they are generated. The former, in our view, is particularly important for theorists; the latter is most useful for practicing researchers. The objectives are varied, but the goal is the same. It follows that the structural and semantic modeling of phraseological

units in modern cognitive linguistics has both a purely theoretical and an applied nature. We will attempt to briefly examine these essential aspects using English as a reference.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications.

It is significant for our chosen topic that both aspects have been studied on an equal footing by such authoritative linguists by A. Cowie, W. Fleischer, H. Gläser, and several others. While basing their research on their individual positions, these researchers nonetheless agreed that the internal structure of phraseological units, including in English, is closely linked to its grammar, is generally subordinated to the primary meaning, and is simultaneously conditioned by the constancy of lexical units. In English “lexical cohesion ensures connection of the parts of the text in one lexical-semantic structure” [6, p. 98]. We have every



reason to believe that modern English complies with the above rules and norms, both theoretically and practically. We will demonstrate this with examples.

Outline of the Main Material of the Study.

Significantly, English phraseological units in this language can be modeled structurally and semantically. Researchers have noted that free combination patterns are most often reproduced, but they are usually characterized by semantic consistency. They can be classified based on the specific connection of the phraseological units with a particular part of speech in modern English [7].

A) With a verb in the infinitive: «*to burn the midnight oil*»; «*to kick the bucket*»;

B) With nominal phrases: «*a hot potato*»; «*a white elephant*»;

C) When combining adjectives with nouns: «*black sheep*»; «*cold war*», etc.

It is characteristic that English phraseological units can be modeled in the designated format not only in the form of phrases, but also as part of sentences. For example:

«*The squeaky wheel gets the grease*» or: «*When pigs fly*».

These two examples clearly resemble proverbs in their content. These examples could be multiplied if desired. The English language is rich in proverbs, sayings, catchphrases, and aphorisms.

Furthermore, phraseological units built on more complex grammatical constructions can be modeled structurally and semantically. Let's present a model/diagram constructed from various structures, including their verbal equivalents. For example, V + Art + N correspond to “break the ice” or “spill the beans”; ADJ + N – “black market” or “hot spot”; N + N – “baby room” or “brain drain”; N + Prep + N – “Pain in the neck” or “storm in a teacup”. Finally, as part of a phrase:

«*The grass is always greener on the other side*».

It's perfectly clear to us that if the above and similar models/schemes are systematized and used in an analysis of frequency of use using any text (purely scientific, linguistic, or fiction), then we can, with a greater or lesser degree of certainty, establish the regularity of phraseological units in their structural-semantic formation.

It's significant that the object of our study, despite its constancy, is subject to some transformation. We can propose, where necessary and possible, subordinating individual structural-semantic formations of English phraseological units to the rules of grammar. For example, if a phraseological unit is in the passive voice, it can take the following form: «*The beans were spilled*».

A reversal of words that does not violate the logic of the content of the statement as a whole is possible in the following phrase: «*Not until she spilled the beans did they realize the truth*». Inversion in this case is appropriate and justified. Furthermore, it's well known that the English language is rich in tense forms. Their correct connection to a specific phraseological unit is also logical. Moreover, in certain cases, a phraseological unit indicates a specific stylistic connotation. For example: «*He has been kicking the bucket for years*». Here the phraseological unit “kicking the bucket” is used in an ironic and humorous manner.

Phraseology can be loosely defined as the study of conventional phrases, where ‘phrase’ means any multi-word expression up to sentence level. Some scholars regard all conventional expressions as lexical units, although the fact that many such expressions are variable to some degree, and have their own special grammar, presents problems for this view [1]. If we can confirm the author's idea with phrases like “by and large” or “once in a blue moon”, we will try to continue the thought and make a brief conclusion: in terms of structural-semantic modeling, the two examples given clearly show a different “degree of idiomaticity”; in terms of grammar, we note that in these expressions, prepositions play a primary role, in this case standing in a preposition.

It should be noted, however, that the structural and semantic organization of phraseological units is not limited to the aforementioned features, as it is directly and immediately influenced by several other factors. For example, etymological factors. The essence of the matter is that linguistic analysis helps scholars identify this factor in each specific case. Specifically, the analysis shows that English phraseological units with various components most often reflect their etymology. At the same time, syntactic patterns/schemes naturally differ from one another.

For example, nouns in this language in the genitive case are usually typical of them. In short: this is generally characteristic of Romano-Germanic languages, but not Slavic ones. At the same time, it should be noted that the lexical and syntactic organization of English phraseological units fully corresponds to clearly defined structural and semantic features and characteristics. This refers to the origin from various sources, which must be taken into account during analysis. For example, the etymology of English phraseological units can be biblical, historical, cultural, literary, that is, artistic, etc.

Phraseological units of any language in a civilized country, including, naturally, English, bear the stamp of its culture to a certain extent. That is, they reflect

the everyday life, traditions, mores, customs, and rituals of a given nation. The stylistic coloring of phraseological units is also related to this factor. It can also vary: colloquial, scholarly, neutral, literary, and so on.

Some authors conclude that “Idioms are considered basic expressions and do not have meaningful subparts” [8]. This assertion implies that idioms do not normally generate a literal reading. This is particularly true of a great deal of idioms, including proverbs formed upon conceptual metaphors. Furthermore, these idiomatic categories differ in their pragmatic functions as well. For instance, while idioms and collocations are more independent and occur in multiple contexts such as informal discourse and speech interactions, fixed phrases are found to depend on a given context and sometimes function as discourse connectives [2].

When discussing the structural and semantic modeling of English phraseological units, one cannot help but note the degree of its orderliness. This orderliness, in turn, is very high and, moreover, is subject to both lexical-semantic and syntactic principles. Objectively speaking, without a thorough study of the structure of phraseological units individually and collectively, it is impossible to correctly understand and evaluate their nature. In this article, we will not discuss their role and significance in terms of communication. To summarize, classification by structure with subsequent unification based on characteristic features, in addition to the above, also serves methodological purposes. Specifically, it leads to the creation of models/schemes that facilitate the active development of the most productive forms, methods, and approaches to teaching phraseology. This fully applies to school and university practice in Azerbaijan.

The study of English phraseological units used in foreign media is both interesting and valuable from a scientific and theoretical perspective. According to a number of contemporary linguists, the American news channel CNN is particularly productive today. In this section of our article, we will briefly examine the structural and semantic modeling of some phraseological units that have gained the greatest popularity and prevalence in the national language in the 21st century.

From the work of leading British and American researchers (A. Cowie, R. Mackin, R. Courtney, R. Spears, and others), it is clear that the press is increasingly occupying a leading position in the mass information and communication space. This is confirmed, in particular, by the overall volume of publications in the native language. It turns out that phraseological units in the English-language press lit-

erally lead, compared to many other media, and also perform an emotionally expressive function. In practical terms, this brightens up the information to a certain extent, and in theoretical terms, it provides quite abundant material for studying the expressive-emotional side in the structural organization of English phraseological units.

Meanwhile, to better understand the issue we're analyzing, it's necessary, at our discretion, to adhere to certain approaches and classifications of phraseological units. Since the publication of various monographs, linguistics has accumulated a wealth of experience in this regard. For example, linguists Glucksberg S., McGlone M.S. believes that traditionally, figurative language, such as metaphors and idioms, was considered derivative of seemingly simple literal language and more complex than it [4]. Interestingly, Charles Bally also believed that “Man often thinks in set phrases, but not in individual words”. Much here depends on the contextual environment of phraseological units.

It's no coincidence that we've cited the opinions of several authoritative researchers in the middle of our article. They have different perspectives on the nature and functioning of phraseological units. But in light of the specific aspect we have chosen (phraseological units in English-language media), in our opinion, R.W.Gibbs's definition is most suitable. He notes: “Metaphor, metonymy, irony, and other tropes are not linguistic distortions of literal mental thought but constitute basic schemes by which people conceptualize their experience and the external world. Since ever mental construct reflects an adaptation of the mind to the world, the language that expresses these constructs attests to the continuous process of poetic thinking” [3, p.1].

Unlike the above interpretations (which are also, undoubtedly, absolutely correct), we can focus specifically on the semantic and structural features, traits, and characteristics of phraseological units. That is, on what interests us most. All phraseological units can be divided into four groups. The first includes “nominative” and “substantive” ones. In relation to modern English, they form the following chain: “noun” + “adjective”. The examples below are taken from the American press (from the aforementioned channel for the reason stated).

So: “This transition is the first step in delivering a path”. The essence of the structural-semantic modeling of the phraseological unit “the first step” lies in the metaphorical transformation of the entire sentence, as it denotes the beginning of a specific action, which is reinterpreted along the way to achieving the goal.

The second group includes adjectival phraseological units. This group's name is entirely justified, as its central element is an adjective. "Republicans engineered high-stakes battles with Democratic presidents over raising the debt limit". This is a case where the phraseological unit "High-stakes battle" is a structure with a subordination clause.

An example of such a structure with a subordination clause is the following phrase from the American press: "The conventional wisdom had been that they'd grapple with the debt ceiling". This is indicated by the phrase "The conventional wisdom". "The cognitive linguistic view of metaphor can provide new insights into how certain linguistic phenomena work, such as polysemy and the development of meaning" [5, p.X].

Of particular interest are those English phraseological units that compare one action with another in comparative form. For example: "As blessed as Trump". The use of this phraseological unit in the media is undoubtedly connected to contemporary politics. The phraseological unit "Lucky (or happy) as Donald Trump" appeared in the American press and then became established in other types of printed media shortly after the US President's victory in the election. We dare to assume that this phraseological unit will soon easily become a fixture on many news channels. If only for the simple reason that it was officially introduced during the speech celebrating the Spanish national team's victory at the FIFA World Cup on July 20, 2026. The reason for this was the fact that, for the first time in the history of world sports, the awards were presented by the President of the United States and the King of Spain. Finally, linguistically, it's worth noting the typical comparative phrase - "as...as". The structural and semantic modeling of phraseological units, as we can see, is closely linked to grammar.

We wrote above about phraseological units with a metaphorical reinterpretation of the entire sentence. Its structure can combine both prepositional and adverbial features: "A plan that's currently on hold due to litigation". Here, the phraseological unit with a main verb component ("To be on hold") expresses a prepositional feature in combination with an adverbial one and is completely reinterpreted.

Let's cite another aphorism featuring the name of an American leader, also widely used in the press: "President-elect Donald Trump flipped the government spending debate on its head". Socially, it's also connected to politics; linguistically, "To flip something on its head" - as in turning something upside down - is a "metaphorical reinterpretation" of the entire sentence.

The next group includes "nominative-communicative" phraseological units. While in the previous cases the structural organization of English phraseological units could be based on various parts of speech, here the scholar included only verbal ones. From the many examples provided by the linguist, we select for illustration two of the most striking, in our view, and productive in terms of frequency.

"One sighting will soon bring holiday cheer across the country" - The core of this phraseological unit ("to bring holiday cheer"), from the standpoint of its internal content, refers to people's festive mood; as a component of structural-semantic modeling, it uses a construction with a verb with a subordinate clause.

The second example: "Many lawmakers weren't happy with the measure, but it seemed they were willing to swallow it". Semantically, the second part of the sentence is preemptive. The phraseological unit "to swallow smth..." has a subordination clause. On the one hand, people familiar with the norms and laws remained dissatisfied with the imposed sanctions. On the other hand, they were forced to agree with them. (Literally: "ready to accept"). As a structural-semantic variant - a complete "metaphorical rethinking" of the phrase as a whole.

The third, "nominative-communicative", group includes the communicative ones proper. What's the fundamental difference, which, it would seem, shouldn't be noticeable due to a single omitted word? It primarily consists of the fact that this group includes only paroemias. They become the main catalyst for changes in the semantics of phraseological units. We would also like to add that modern English is quite rich in proverbial vocabulary. "These borrowers set out to pursue the American dream" - It is well known that any proverb or saying is a truncated sentence construction. This rule applies entirely to the English language. Therefore, in this case, the phraseological unit "to pursue the American dream" represents not a complete, but a partial metaphorical reinterpretation.

Finally, the fourth group includes interjections. They are literally titled as such in his work: "interjectional phraseological units". As meaning is transformed, these are the phraseological units that convey a person's feelings, or rather, transform their emotions into metaphorical statements. Clearly, expression is the prerogative of this structural-semantic modeling of phraseological units. For example: "We should never even get this close!" The main component of the proverb - "Get this close!" - is a phraseological unit with a pronounced emotional connotation. We would like to conclude this article by highlighting specific patterns within which English phraseolog-

ical units with a particular central component function. We were particularly interested in the component “put”. It turns out that most modern linguists claim that it is this component that is most frequently found in English phraseological units across various types of texts. That is, in linguistic discourse and in the annals of national fiction of various periods. Significantly, phraseological units with this component are typically constructed according to the pattern: “V + θ + Prep. + d + N”. Let’s expand and explain. This is a multi-component structural scheme that helps better establish the meaning of the structural-semantic modeling of English phraseological units. Its general functional purpose consists of a metaphorical reinterpretation of the generalized formula of phraseological units with the meanings “put somebody out of temper; “put something on ice” and “put something out of sight”. From the above, we already know that metaphorization can be complete or partial. In the first case, the meaning of the phraseological unit completely exhausts the object; in the second, it simply leaves room for further thought. In other words, the object of representation (expression) is not fully utilized. In the first two cases we’ve cited, the phraseological units are characterized by only partial metaphorical reinterpretation; in the latter case, it’s complete.

The following is of interest to us, as it closely leads to the main aspect of the research in our article, using only the example of the indicated component “put”. It turns out that the following types of structural-semantic modeling of English phraseological units are specific to them. Namely, it can vary within the boundaries of the vocabulary. For example, with a verb as the main component: “put call somebody on the carpet”. The latter has a double (though, read synonymous) meaning: “to give a scolding”, or “to reprimand someone”; “to call for the purpose of reprimand”, or “to call on the carpet”), that is, to a serious and unpleasant conversation. Further: “put somebody off the scent” also has a double meaning. A). “to throw someone off the scent”; B). Misleads someone. The following lexical options are also possible: “put keep somebody on countenance”. 1). “to encourage someone”; 2). “to add solidity”. But the last two

examples, as we can see, are no longer synonymous. However, this only further demonstrates the richness and diversity of the structural and semantic modeling of English phraseological units.

It is easy to conclude that the three-component model/scheme with a complete or partial metaphorical rethinking of the basic semantics of phraseological units, on the one hand, demonstrates the constancy of individual components. On the other hand, their variability is evident. This proves both their synonymy and their different lexical meanings. It seems to us that the main task of linguists in this regard includes the definition of the two theoretical positions indicated: 1) The unification of English phraseological units with the component “put” according to the main characteristic features; 2) Their separation according to individual and specific parameters. The above examples clearly show that such initial material is available for modern linguists. Only its expansion is the subject of research in a work of incomparably greater scope than the article.

Conclusions. This article examined a number of variants that allowed us to classify English phraseological units according to their specific functions. Firstly, it was established that their structural and semantic modeling directly depends on the connection of the phraseological unit with a given part of speech. These are primarily verbal, nominal, or adverbial phrases. Secondly, phraseological units can be combined into patterns/schemes according to grammatical features and semantics, which in turn possess constancy and, as a rule, cannot be broken down into separate parts. In both cases, characteristic examples are provided confirming this theoretical position. This same rule, as we demonstrated, can be fully utilized when we wrote about the connection of individual English phraseological units with grammatical norms and indicators. For example, voice forms, inversion, etymology, stylistics, and cultural factors. At the end of this article, necessary information is provided on some additional factors accompanying the lexical and structural-semantic modeling of English phraseological units. These include etymology, cultural studies, and others.

Bibliography:

1. Cowie A.P. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1998. Pp. xiv + 258
2. Fernando C. *Idioms and Idiomaticity*. Oxford University Press, 1996, 265 p.
3. Gibbs R.W. *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge University Press, 1994, 527 p., p.1
4. Glucksberg S., McGlone M.S. *Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphor to Idioms*. Oxford University Press, 2001, 134 p.
5. Kovecses Z. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2010, 400 p.

6. Mammadbeyli A.I. Lexical cohesion and the rhetorical structure of English fictional texts. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. Vol. 11 Issue 2, Special XXI. 2021, p. 98-102.
7. Nunberg G., Sag I., & Wasow T. Language: Companions to Ancient Thought, Vol. 3. *Cambridge University Press*, 1994, pp. 491–538.
8. Schenk A. Idioms and Collocations in Compositional Grammar. Holland: Utrecht Dissertation Series, 1994.

Сафарова А. СТРУКТУРНО-СЕМАНТИЧНЕ МОДЕЛЮВАННЯ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИХ ОДИНИЦЬ У СУЧАСНІЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ

Ця стаття присвячена структурно-семантичному моделюванню фразеологічних одиниць у сучасній лінгвістиці. Її актуальність та своєчасність у сучасній когнітивній лінгвістиці не викликають сумнівів. Відзначається чітке та точне розуміння різних форм, методів та варіантів лексико-граматичного та одночасно структурно-семантичного моделювання англійських фразеологічних одиниць. Ретельно розглянуто як критичну, так і спеціалізовану лінгвістичну літературу, оскільки вона спирається на низку позицій провідних західноєвропейських дослідників. Дійшов обґрунтований висновок, що ця тема, як і будь-яка подібна робота, є важливою як з теоретичної, так і з практичної точки зору. Чітко підкреслено обидва аспекти. Продемонстровано шляхи та методи, за допомогою яких відбувається структурно-семантичне моделювання англійських фразеологічних одиниць. Встановлено, що значна частина вирішення цієї проблеми залежить від різних частин мови, пов'язаних з ними. Більше того, залежно від семантики, що виражається фразеологічними одиницями, вони об'єднуються в моделі/схеми на основі їхніх специфічних ознак. Ці ознаки також представлені та проаналізовані. Важливо наголосити, що у статті не проводиться радикальної різниці між семантикою та структурною організацією англійських фразеологічних одиниць та їх підпорядкуванням конкретним граматичним нормам. Це цілком доречний підхід до обраної теми, оскільки ця тріада тісно пов'язана між собою. Одна ознака органічно зливається з іншою. Це стає ще помітнішим, коли автор обґрунтовує всі вищезазначені теоретичні положення такими факторами, явищами чи концепціями, як відображення національних реалій та культурних факторів в англійських фразеологічних одиницях, одночасно наводячи етимологію окремих слів, тобто першоджерела, на яких базується певний усталений вираз. В результаті читачі та критики усвідомлюють тісний зв'язок між структурно-семантичним моделюванням англійських фразеологічних одиниць та лексикологією, організацією усталених виразів загалом, граматичними нормами та синтаксичними моделями/схемами.

Ключові слова: фразеологічні одиниці, структура слова, ідіоми, лексикологія, семантика, класифікація фразеологічних одиниць, уніфікація фразеологічних одиниць.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 10.07.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 31.07.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 09.10.2026