

REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN

On the rights of the manuscript

ABSTRACT

of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**ACTUALIZATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS
IN THE DISCOURSE OF ENGLISH-LANGUAGE MASS
MEDIA**

Speciality: 5708.01 – Germanic languages

Field of science: Philology

Applicant: **Nargiz Elchin Karimova**

Baku – 2026

The work was performed at the Department of English Language and Literature of Khazar University.

Scientific supervisor: Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
Nigar Chingiz Veliyeva

Official opponents: Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor
Konul Elkhan Abdurahmanova

Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor
Lala Gadir Gurbanova

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology
Khayala Ramiz Ahmedova

Dissertation council FD 2.12 of Higher Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at Azerbaijan University of Languages.

Chairman of the
Dissertation council: Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor
Azad Yahya Mammadov

Scientific secretary of the
Dissertation council: Doctor of Philosophy in Philology,
Associate Professor
Aysel Ilgar Mammadbeyli

Chairman of the scientific
seminar: Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor
Fakhraddin Yadigar Veysalli



GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK

The relevance of the topic and degree of prior research.

Within the framework of the modern linguistic paradigm, the phraseological stock of a language is understood as a multi-layered and dynamic formation that extends beyond a mere collection of fixed expressive units. Phraseological units reflect the mental, cultural, and socio-communicative processes characteristic of a particular linguistic community, accumulating its historical and socio-cultural experience. Through phraseological units, ways of conceptualizing reality are verbalized, while evaluative orientations, cognitive stereotypes and pragmatic attitudes of language users are manifested.

Traditionally, the formation and functioning of phraseological units have been associated primarily with oral colloquial practice, folklore traditions and fiction. However, in the context of rapid digital development and the transformations in communicative forms, a significant expansion of the spheres of phraseological usage can be observed. Contemporary studies point out to the processes of semantic reinterpretation, structural modification, and functional adaptation of phraseological units resulting from their integration into mass media communication, which is characterized by dynamism, pragmatic impact and the need to retain the addressee's attention.

In this respect, mass media discourse acquires particular significance as a body of multi-genre oral and written texts disseminated through both traditional channels and the internet. Under modern conditions, mass media discourse represents one of the key forms of social interaction influencing the interpretation of events, the formation of public consciousness, and the modelling of social reality. The use of phraseological units in media texts is explained by their capacity for concise and figurative nomination, expression of evaluation, intensification of expressiveness and realization of the persuasive potential of the language.

English-language media discourse occupies a leading position in the global information space due to the considerable volume of

English-language media content and its broad thematic coverage, which includes social, political, economic, cultural, and ethnoreligious issues. Under these conditions, phraseological units perform an important interpretative function, contributing to the formation of the recipient's particular perception and evaluation of the transmitted information.

The relevance of the present study is determined by the sustained interest of modern linguistics – primarily media linguistics, discourse studies, and translation studies – in the investigation of linguistic mechanisms of mass media communication. Despite the existence of individual studies devoted to English phraseology, Azerbaijani linguistic scholarship has not yet developed a comprehensive approach to the analysis of functioning of phraseological units in contemporary English-language mass media discourse, while the issues of their interpretation and translation into Russian remain insufficiently explored. These circumstances necessitate further theoretical reconsideration of media phraseology and practical research into methods of interlingual transfer of phraseological units, which has determined the choice of the topic of present study.

The absence of a unified view on phraseological units and their features among linguists is due to the complexity as this object of research. The study of phraseological units of language has been widely addressed in the studies of numerous Russian and English linguists. They contain an overview of the specific ideas and concepts of V.V.Vinogradov, A.V.Kunin, A.A.Shakhmatov, A.I.Smirnitsky, N.M.Shansky, D.O.Dobrovolsky, A.A.Vasilyeva, V.P.Zhukov, B.Fraser, J.Katz and P.Postal, K.Felbaum, M Swenson, L.Smith and others.

The works of Azerbaijani linguists presented a broad perspective on the nature and functioning of phraseology. In general, the works of such Azerbaijani linguists as K.Aliyev, G.Bayramov, N.Veliev, Yu.Seyidov, A.Hajiyeva, M.Islamov, M.Surek, K.Guliyeva, T.Guliyev and others fully reflect all the complexity of the development of theoretical thought in the field of phraseology.

It should be noted that the study of discourse from various perspectives has been addressed by both foreign (E.Benveniste, Z.Harris and M.Foucault, R.Wodak, B.Gasparov, Yu.Karaulov) and domestic scholars (A.Mammadov, L.Ziyadova, F.Veysalli). Among younger Azerbaijani researchers P.Movsumova, E.Aliyeva, A.Shukyurova, A.Mammadbeyli and A.Mammadzade should be mentioned.

A complex analysis of mass media discourse is reflected in the works of such Azerbaijani and English linguists as A.M.Budagova, N.M.Imanova, A.Bell, G.McLuhan. Among Russian and Ukrainian scholars the scientific works of T.G.Dobrosklonskaya, A.V.Golodnov, E.O.Kozhemyakin, G.K.Solganik, G.K.Yatsymer-skaya, N.Dragan have become an important legacy for media discourse studies. Researchers direct their efforts toward defining of the essence of mass media discourse as well as its functional, pragmatic, cognitive, and linguistic features.

Object and subject of the research. The object of the research is the discourse of English-language mass media. The subject of the research is the study of the peculiarities of the actualization of phraseological units in the discourse of English-language mass media.

The aim and objectives of the research. The aim of the present study is to conduct a comprehensive linguistic investigation of phraseologization processes within the context of mass media discourse as shaped by the established linguistic reality of the English-language culture.

In accordance with the stated aim, the following tasks are proposed to be accomplished in the course of the research:

- to carry out a study and a comprehensive analysis of existing scientific and theoretical literature devoted to phraseology in English, Azerbaijani, and Russian languages;
- to describe the spheres of usage of phraseological units in the English language;
- to select and systematize discourse fragments from English-language periodical publications (magazines and newspapers) for their subsequent use and analysis in the research;

– to investigate aspects of the use of phraseological units in English-language mass media discourse, to analyse them and to generalize the results obtained;

– to develop a classification of phraseological units identified in the discourse of English-language mass media.

The research methods. The research methodology is based on a comprehensive approach, which is due to the multidimensional nature of the object of analysis. The study employed the method of critical discourse analysis, which made it possible to reveal the socio-ideological context of the functioning of phraseological units in media texts. The descriptive method was used for an detailed examination of their syntactic and semantic properties, while componential and contextual analysis ensured the precise identification of the internal structure and meanings of the units within a real communicative environment. A targeted sampling method was applied for selecting the material and quantitative analysis made it possible to determine the frequency and distribution of phraseological units across lexical-semantic fields.

The main propositions submitted for defense:

1. The actualization of phraseological units in the discourse of English-language mass media represents a complex linguistic phenomenon based on the cognitive-perceptual and affective collective experience of the language community. The specific features of the functioning of phraseological units are determined by their structural and semantic characteristics, which distinguish them from free lexical combinations.

2. The actualization of phraseological units in the discourse of the English-language mass media can be caused by both intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors that influence the linguistic consciousness of the individual. Phraseological units do not function in English-language mass media discourse outside of context.

3. There are various possibilities of occasional actualization for different types of phraseological units, and context plays an important role in this process. Structural types of occasional actualization of phraseological units and the limits of their formation are distinguished, as a result of which semantic

transformations of the meaning of the phraseological unit occur in the text.

4. The main types of structural and contextual-semantic transformations of phraseological units in the discourse of English-language mass media as well as their functions constitute a system serving a specific communicative purpose of the style under study.

5. The phraseological units under study possess a certain pragmatic potential, which is used in the contemporary discourse of the English-language mass media.

The scientific novelty of the research is determined by the fact that, for the first time in Azerbaijani linguistics, a systematic investigation of the functioning of phraseological units in the English-language mass media discourse has been carried out based on the discourse analysis method. The study examines various orientations of mass media discourse, including the political discourse during the 44-day Patriotic War in Karabakh, as well as economic and other thematic orientations. The research involves a comprehensive analysis of the semantic, structural, and stylistic characteristics of phraseological units in their discursive context. The lack, to date, of comprehensive studies of English-language mass media discourse as an environment for the functioning of phraseologisms in Azerbaijani linguistics determines the scientific novelty of present work.

Theoretical and practical significance of the research. The theoretical significance of the study is determined by its contribution to the development of linguistic theory concerning the phraseological representation in media discourse. The present research contributes to clarification of the conceptual framework of phraseology and discourse linguistics by revealing the specific features of functioning of stable word combinations within a media context.

The main propositions and the results obtained in this dissertation may be used in theoretical courses on general linguistics, English lexicology, English stylistics, as well as in the preparation of courses in cultural linguistics. The results of the study may also find its practical application in lexicography and phraseography in the process of compiling phraseological dictionaries, and in developing

of teaching and methodological materials.

Approbation and application. The main propositions of the dissertation are presented in scientific journals of various higher educational institutions of the republic, as well as in articles published in international academic collections. The research results were approbated and presented in reports at university, inter-university, republican, and international scientific conferences. Based on the dissertation materials, 9 articles were published. One of the articles was published in Poland in 2023 in the journal *Colloquium*.

The research material consists of 200 phraseological units functioning in the discourse of English-language mass media. The data for the study were selected using the method of purposive sampling from media texts in accordance with the identified thematic areas, based on English -language periodicals from 2020 – 2024 (the official website of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, BBC News, The Independent, The Economist, The Guardian, Azernews, The Times, The Indian Express, The Irish Sun, The Telegraph, The Washington Post, Metro, and Newsweek). In compiling the research corpus, data from the phraseological dictionaries Longman, the Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms, the Azerbaijani–English–Russian Phraseological Dictionary by N.Veliyeva (2016), and the English–Russian–Azerbaijani Phraseological Dictionary by K.Mammadzade (2008) were used.

Name of the institution where the dissertation research was carried out. The dissertation was carried out at the Department of English Language and Literature, Khazar University.

The structure and length of the dissertation, in characters, indicating the length of each structural section separately. The dissertation consists of an introduction (7 pages with 11004 characters), three chapters (the first chapter – 3 paragraphs, 37 pages, consisting of 60984 characters; the second chapter – 4 paragraphs, 44 pages, consisting of 72724 characters; the third chapter – 4 paragraphs, 53 pages, consisting of 84956 characters), a conclusion (3 pages, consisting of 5017 characters), a list of references and appendix. The total number of characters in the dissertation, excluding the references and appendix is 234685 characters.

MAIN CONTENT OF THE WORK

The “**Introduction**” of the dissertation substantiates the relevance and the degree of prior scholarly development of the topic, defines the object and subject of the research, formulates the aims and objectives, describes methods, the main propositions submitted for defence, the scientific novelty, and the theoretical and practical significance of the work, and also provides information on the approbation of the results and the structure of the study.

The first chapter of the dissertation, entitled “**Theoretical Foundations of the Study of Phraseological Units**”, consists of three paragraphs. The first paragraph is called “*The Origin of Phraseological Units in Modern English*”. This section examines the origin of phraseological units. The sources of the formation of phraseological units in modern English are highly diverse. According to their origin, English phraseological units can be divided into three main groups: phraseological units borrowed from foreign languages; phraseological units borrowed from the American variant of the English language; and native English phraseological units. In general, phraseologisms in English, as in other languages, represent a manifestation of the creativity of the people, their life experience, and linguistic intuition. One of the main sources of the formation of English phraseologisms is borrowing from other languages. According to the method of borrowing, phraseological units are subdivided into the following types:

1. Complete calque, which, in turn, is subdivided into two subgroups:

a) in English there are cases where a calque is used, while its prototype does not function in the recipient language. Examples: */baptism of fire/ – (derived from the Greek practice of immersion in water, a sacred rite in Christianity)*; b) In some cases both the calque and its prototype are used in English: */with a grain of salt/ – (with distrust, with doubt)*.

2. Phraseologisms that have undergone certain modifications in comparison with their originals. This is observed in cases where

there is a discrepancy in the arrangement of lexemes in the language: /softly lays, but hard to sleep/ – (someone as hard as he is soft).

3. A separate group consists of word combinations created on the model of a foreign word or phrase: /by all that's blue!/ – (damn it!). This expression is derived from the French *parbleu*, which is an euphemism used instead of *pardieu*.

4. This group also includes humorous pseudo-classical expressions: /*omnium gatherum*/ – (a motley collection, a mixture, all sorts of things). *Omnium* (Latin) means “all,” whereas *gatherum* is a pseudo-Latin formation derived from the verb *to gather*.

Phraseological units borrowed from the American variant of the English language differ from those borrowed from other languages in that they are, as a rule, untranslatable. They function within the framework of a single literary language, which fully or partially excludes the possibility of their calquing¹.

Many phraseological units are connected with ancient mythology, history and literature: / *the golden age*// – (a period of great happiness, prosperity, and achievement), / *the apple of discord*/ – (a subject of contention and envy)². It should be emphasized that most such phraseological units are intentional in character, since they are used in other languages as well.

In the second paragraph entitled “**Basic Principles and Features of Phraseological Units**”, it is noted that the theory of phraseology actually begins with F. de Saussure’s *Course in General Linguistics*. The study of phraseological units from a structural perspective is associated with the name of I.A.Baudouin de Courtenay. At the beginning of his academic career, Baudouin de Courtenay wrote an important theoretical article in which he evaluated non-syntactic expressions in the German language and considered language as a system: these include proverbs, sayings, and memorized poems. The author did not use the term “phraseology.”³

¹ Керимова, Н.Э. Происхождение фразеологизмов в современном английском языке // – Вакі: Elm və təhsil, Filologiya məsələləri, – 2022. № 2, – с. 90

² Ibid, – p.89

³ Бодуэн де Куртене, И.А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию / – Москва: Изд-во Юрайт, – 2024. – с.52-53

The role of the Russian scholar A.A.Shakhmatov in the development of phraseological theory is also significant. In his work *Syntax of the Russian Language*, he approached the problem of phraseology from a syntactic perspective, creating an original theory of indivisible word combinations⁴.

Further development of the theory is associated with the research of V.P.Zhukov, who identified similarities and differences between phraseological units and words at lexical, semantic, and syntactic levels, and distinguished the main features of phraseological units: reproducibility, semantic indivisibility (idiomaticity), separately formed construction, and specific combinability of components⁵.

The cognitive aspect of phraseology is explored in the works of A.N.Baranov and D.O.Dobrovolsky, who emphasize the importance of the internal form of a phraseological unit and the figurative motivation of its meaning. The scholars note that changes in the meanings of phraseological units are mainly associated with the processes of metaphorical reinterpretation of their components⁶.

In Azerbaijani linguistics, the comparative-typological approach is represented by the studies of N.Ch.Veliyeva, who for the first time conducted a linguistic analysis of phraseological units in languages of different systems, such as English, Azerbaijani, and Russian. Idioms reflect the way of life, religious beliefs, ethnopsychological characteristics, traditional occupations of the corresponding people⁷.

I.Hamidov, a specialist in Russian phraseological syntax, developed principles for the systematic classification of paremiological-phraseological predicative constructions, that is,

⁴ Шахматов, А.А. Синтаксис русского языка. / Изд. 2. – М.: Учпедгиз, – 1941. – с.278-279

⁵ Жуков, В.П. Русская фразеология: учебное пособие. / В.П. Жуков, А.В. Жуков. – М.: Высшая школа, – 2006. – с.6

⁶ Баранов, А.Н. Основы Фразеологии: (Краткий Курс): Учебное Пособие. / А.Н. Баранов, Д.О. Добровольский – М.: Флинта; Наука, – 2016. – с.130

⁷ Veliyeva, N.Ç. Frazeoloji birləşmələrin müqayisəli linqvistik təhlili (Azərbaycan, ingilis, rus dillərinin materialları əsasında). / – Bakı: Ünsiyyət, – 2001. – s.179

expressions known as proverbs and sayings, considering this issue as one of the key problems in modern paremiology⁸.

M.Hüseynzadə was among the first scholars to present information on Azerbaijani phraseology in academic literature⁹. A significant milestone in the history of studying phraseology was H.Bayramov's textbook *Foundations of Azerbaijani Phraseology*, in which such issues as the object of phraseology, its characteristics, types of meaning, their relationship with words and free word combinations, as well as methods of forming phraseological units, were elucidated for the first time¹⁰.

In his monograph, Y.Seyidov comprehensively analyzed the lexical and syntactic features of free and fixed word combinations functioning in the structure of the modern language. In his view, the emergence of various notions about free and fixed word combinations is explained by the similarity of these expressions, which, in turn, is related to their origin¹¹.

Thus, despite the large number of studies, a universal approach to defining the boundaries of phraseological units and determining their terminological status has not yet been developed. At the same time, existing interpretations converge in recognizing the systemic organization and functional specificity of the units, which makes it possible to distinguish them from free word combinations. Phraseological units are characterized by stability within the language; however, they remain dynamic, undergoing cultural and metaphorical changes, and perform both nominative and figurative-expressive functions. The main features – non-compositionality, institutionalization, and fixedness – form the theoretical foundation for understanding phraseological units as independent and culturally marked language units.

⁸ Həmidov, İ.H. Azərbaycan dilinin frazeologiya lüğəti / İ.H.Həmidov, M.Q.Qocayev, R.Ə. Məmmədova: [və b.]. – Bakı: TEAS Press. – 2020. – 1560 s.

⁹ Hüseynzadə, M. Müasir Azərbaycan dili. / M.Hüseynzadə. – Bakı: ADU-nun nəşriyyatı, –1954. – s.104

¹⁰ Bayramov, H. Azərbaycan dili frazeologiyasının əsasları. / H.Bayramov. – Bakı: Maarif nəşriyyatı, – 1978. – s.121

¹¹ Seyidov, Y. Azərbaycan ədəbi dilində söz birləşmələri. Bakı: Maarif, – 1966. – 340 s.

The third paragraph is entitled *“Debated Issues in the Classification of Phraseological Units”*. This section examines the problem of classification of phraseological units which represents one of the key issues at the stage of the formation of phraseology as an independent linguistic discipline. The works of the well-known Russian linguist V.V.Vinogradov are considered as a turning point in the study of the phraseological stock of different languages. The scholar identified three types of phraseological units: phraseological fusions (idioms), phraseological unities, and phraseological combinations¹². The drawback of this classification lies in the absence of a unified criterion for phraseologicality: for phraseological fusions and unities, the main criterion is semantic integrity, whereas for combinations, it is analyticity, at the same time the degree of authorial motivation is subjective in nature and is not taken into account.

Alternative approaches to classification are presented in the works of N.Ch.Velievaya. The researcher divides phraseological combinations into verbal and non-verbal types, emphasizing the leading role of the verb as the central component. In her view, non-verbal phraseological units are formed from two or more words and are classified depending on the type of grammatical relation between the components¹³.

The semantic-cultural aspect of classification is reflected in the studies of A.Hajiyeva, E.Najafov, and A.Jafarov, who distinguish five groups of idioms: those related to traditions, those containing proper names, those borrowed from other languages, figuratively reinterpreted idioms, and fully idiomatized units¹⁴.

A.Makkai noted that until 1972 most scholars limited themselves to presenting the meanings of phraseological units alphabetically, that is to listing them¹⁵.

¹² Виноградов, В. В. Об основных типах фразеологических единиц в русском языке. / В.В.Виноградов. – Москва: Высшая школа, – 1986. – с.33

¹³ Vəliyeva, N.Ç. Müxtəlif sistemli dillərdə feili birləşmələrin tipoloji təhlili. / N.Ç.Vəliyeva. – Bakı: Avropa, – 2008. – 862 s.

¹⁴ Hajiyeva, A. English Phraseology. / A.Hajiyeva, E.Najafov, A.Jafarov. – Baku, – 2009. – 228 p.

¹⁵ Makkai, A. Idiom Structure in English. / A.Makkai. – New York: Walter de Gruyter, – 2013. – p.27

It was only in 1963 that J.Katz and P.Postal, having conducted a comprehensive study of phraseological units, distinguished between lexical idioms and phrasal idioms. According to these scholars, a lexical idiom is a combination of two or more morphemes whose meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of those morphemes. Such idioms belong to lower – level syntactic categories (nominal, verbal, adjectival, etc.). In phrasal idioms, no component of a lower syntactic level dominates the others¹⁶.

M.McCarthy developed a semantic classification of idioms, distinguishing transparent idioms, semi-opaque idioms, and opaque idioms depending on the degree to which the meaning can be inferred from their components¹⁷.

Attempts to classify phraseological units on the basis of semantic and grammatical criteria are also undertaken in the works of M. Stubbs¹⁸.

In the framework of the present dissertation, we adhere to the classification of phraseological units according to the main component: (a) verbal phraseological combinations denoting actions or situations and typically functioning as predicates; (b) non-verbal phraseological combinations, whose components may consist of a noun, adjective, or a numeral.

Thus, the proposed classification takes into account the functional and semantic features of phraseological units, which makes it suitable for analysis within media discourse and other types of linguistic research.

The second chapter, entitled **“The Correlation between the Concepts of Text – Discourse – Media Discourse in Linguistics”**, consists of four sections. The first section, entitled **“General Theoretical Problems of Text Linguistics”**, examines the fact that the recent decades have been characterized by an increased interest in

¹⁶ Katz, J. Semantic Interpretation of Idioms and Sentences Containing Them. Quarterly progress report. / J. Katz, P. Postal. – 1963. № 70. – p. 275

¹⁷ McCarthy, M. Vocabulary. / M.McCarthy. – Oxford: Foreign Language Study, – 1990. – p.43-44

¹⁸ Stubbs, M. Words and Phrases: Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics. – Oxford: Blackwell, – 2002. – p.201

textual problems that have become the object and subject of linguistic research.

At the present stage in the development of linguistics, the treatment of text as an object of study was initiated in the fundamental works of I.A.Baudouin de Courtenay and further developed in the research of A.A.Leontiev, I.V.Arnold, I.R.Galperin, and many other scholars. As I.V.Arnold notes, in order to formulate a general definition that distinguishes a text from other language levels, it is necessary to answer a number of questions: 1) which factor plays a key role in the text; 2) what the boundaries of the text are; 3) what dimensions the text may have and what determines these dimensions; 4) what relationships exist between the text and other language levels¹⁹.

Concerning the nature of text, Azerbaijani scholar K.Abdullayev writes: “*A text represents such a syntactic complex that eliminates the relative infiniteness of other syntactic formations, that is, their semantic incompleteness in terms of meaning. Thus, the text demonstrates its absolute completeness.*”²⁰ Proceeding from this, it can be argued that the text is a key factor in the process of perception and interpretation of semantic information by the recipient. According to the scholar, it was precisely the limitations of traditional syntactic theory that led to the development of text linguistics, within which the sentence is treated as an intermediate, rather than a final, unit of analysis²¹.

A similar position is taken by A.Greimas, who asserts that “*a text is an unified whole divided into utterances rather than the result of their combination.*” According to him, a text has a dual nature, namely relevance and dynamism²².

¹⁹ Арнольд, И.В. Стилистика: современный английский язык: учебник / И.В.Арнольд; науч. ред. П.Е.Бухаркин. – 14-е изд., стер. – Москва: ФЛИНТА, – 2021. – с.191

²⁰ Abdullayev, K.M. Azərbaycan dilinin sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri. / K.M.Abdullayev. – Bakı: Maarif, – 1999. – s.13

²¹ Abdullayev, K.M. Azərbaycan dilinin sintaksisinin nəzəri problemləri. / K.M.Abdullayev. – Bakı: Maarif, – 1999. – s.19

²² Греймас, А.Ж. Структурная семантика: Поиск метода / Пер. с франц. Л.Зиминой. – М.: Академический Проект, – 2004. – с.56

N.Enkvist identifies text parameters in terms of topic, focus, and linkage²³.

A.Mammadov considers the text as a unit within the syntactic hierarchy, exceeding the sentence in terms of structural and semantic complexity²⁴.

F.Veysalli emphasizes the communicative nature of the text, noting that it determines the choice of syntactic means and ensures its communicative completeness. At the same time the text and the sentence are governed by different principles of organization²⁵. Lexical, grammatical, phonetic, and intonational means, as well as the connection of the text with a specific communicative situation, play a significant role in the formation of textual integrity²⁶. According to F.Veysalli, in oral communication paralinguistic means are employed (such as movements of the eyebrows and eyes, various body movements, gestures, etc.), whereas in written communication punctuation marks are used (the full stop, semicolon, exclamation mark, question mark, etc.)

According to N.Enkvist, *“the text must exist within the framework of certain real – life situation”*²⁷.

Thus, the text is viewed as a dynamic and multifaceted structure that simultaneously constitutes a product of the linguistic system and a socio-cognitive phenomenon. It represents a complex system where formal language elements intertwine with the communicative intentions of the author, interpreted by the addressee. Consequently, the text functions not only as an object of linguistic

²³ Enkvist, N.E. From Text to Interpretability: A. Contribution to the Discussion of Basic Terms in Text linguistics. / N.E. Enkvist // Connexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse. Ed. By W.Heydrich. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, – 1989. – p.377.

²⁴ Məmmədov, A. Mətn yaranmasında formal əlaqə vasitələrinin sistemi / A.Məmmədov. – Bakı: Elm, – 2002. – s.22.

²⁵ Veysəlli, F. Diskurs təhlilinə giriş. / F.Veysəlli. – Bakı: Təhsil, – 2010. – s.89

²⁶ Ibid. – p. 90

²⁷ Enkvist, N.E. From Text to Interpretability: A. Contribution to the Discussion of Basic Terms in Text linguistics. / N.E. Enkvist // Connexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse. Ed. By W.Heydrich. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, – 1989. – p.371

analysis but also as an active subject of communication, serving as a carrier of meaning in the process of social interaction.

In the second paragraph of the second chapter the concepts “*Metatext, Paratext, and Intertext*” are examined. Metatext was initially interpreted as an indefinite notion, as it encompassed various means of verbalization – words, phrases, and their sequences. Within the framework of text theory, stylistics, and pragmalinguistics, metatext is regarded as a component that introduces the subject of speech, reveals the principles of text organization, and indicates equivalent as well as hierarchical relationships between sentences.²⁸

In an utterance, the subject is identified as the sender and creator of the given text. The connection between the metaplane and the category of the sender (the author of the text) indicates a particularly distinct type of metatext represented in elements that delimit the utterance, such as title, introduction, index, notes, and so forth. Researcher P.Gross, analysing this phenomenon, argues that paratextuality refers to any relations that a text establishes with paratext, thereby contributing to a clearer orientation within the intertextual line²⁹. At the same time, another scholar G.Genette considers paratext to be a significant element in the discussion of the five types of transtextual relations³⁰.

A number of productive studies, including the works of Sh.Tahir-Gurçaglar³¹ and R.Watts³² pay particular attention to the paratext and the problems of its translation.

²⁸ Heinrich, Plett. ‘Intertextualities’ in Intertextuality. / Plett Heinrich, edited by Heinrich Plett. – Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, – 1991. – p.18

²⁹ Piegay-Gross, N. Poetika intertekstualitetit. / N.Piegay-Gross. – Parnas, Prishtinë, – 2011. – p.23

³⁰ Genette, G. Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation. / G.Genette. – Cambridge: University Press, –1997. – p.121.

³¹ Tahir-Gürçaglar, Şehnaz. What Texts Don’t Tell: The Use of Paratexts in Translation Research / Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçaglar // In Theo Hermans (ed.) Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues. – Manchester: St. Jerome, – Manchester. – p.44-60

³² Watts, R. Translating Culture: Reading the Paratexts to Aimé Césaire’s Cahier d’un retour au pays natal // TTR:Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction – 2000. 13(2), – p.29-46

A paratext does not necessarily have to be written or oral material. The variety of paratextual forms is extremely broad and includes authorial notes, external commentaries, and explanatory materials. G.Genette emphasizes that the paratext may differ significantly in the space between one text and another, and in the era of mass communication the discourses surrounding a text previously non-existent are rapidly multiplying. Typical examples of paratexts include titles, subtitles, prefaces, dedications, epigraphs, notes, epilogues, and after words³³.

Intertextuality, introduced by J.Kristeva in the 1960s, describes the way in which one text interacts with another regardless of direct reproduction³⁴. N.Piegay-Gros clarifies that, in J.Kristeva's conception, intertextuality does not amount to a mere distortion of a previous text but represents a dynamic process unfolding within the text³⁵.

G.Genette considers intertextuality as a relation of coexistence between two or more texts or as the actual presence of one text within another. Textual transcendence is designated by him with the term transtextuality, which includes five types of relations: paratextuality, architextuality, hypertextuality, intertextuality, and metatextuality³⁶.

In a broad sense, intertextuality is understood as connection between texts, primarily literary ones, in which some works influence others, reflect them, or set themselves in opposition to them. It is used for the analysis of literary genres, as marker of homage, as well as for parody or critical reinterpretation.

Thus, metatext, paratext, and intertext constitute interconnected levels of text organization, ensuring the structural and semantic integrity of the text, guiding the reader, enabling interaction with

³³ Genette, G. Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation. / G.Genette. – Cambridge: University Press, –1997. – p.2-3

³⁴ Kristeva, J. Against Intertextuality // Philosophy and Literature, – 1980. 28 /2 – p.227-242.

³⁵ Piegay-Gross, N. Poetika intertekstualitetit. / N.Piegay-Gross. – Parnas, Prishtinë, – 2011. – p.20

³⁶ Genette, G. Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation. / G.Genette. – Cambridge: University Press, –1997. – p.132

other texts. Taken together, these components emphasize the dynamic nature of the text as a communicative and cultural phenomenon, demonstrating its multi-layered character and its capacity for interaction within the discursive space.

The third paragraph of the second chapter is entitled ***“Differentiation between Text and Discourse from the Perspective of Modern Linguistic Theory”*** and is devoted to the consideration of the essence of text and discourse, as well as to their analysis from the point of view of modern linguistics. Discourse as a linguistic unit emerged in linguistics as a result of scholars’ increased attention to the human factor in speech. In the Anglo-American school of discourse analysis, discourse is identified with dialogue and is understood as a discursive practice that involves the production and perception of consecutive speeches and texts and is carried out in a broad social context. In the German school, the main focus is placed on the linguistic component of the communicative process, while discourse is viewed as a set of texts united by a single theme.

A.Mammadov emphasizes the role of formal means of communication in the creation of the text, paying special attention to its informational structure, correlation between new and given information, as well as to issues of translation in discourse³⁷.

English researchers R.Hodge and G.Kress consider text and discourse as complementary concepts, highlighting both their social and linguistic levels³⁸.

V.E.Chernyavskaya, generalizing the interpretations of discourse, reduces it to two main types: 1) a specific communicative event recorded in written texts and oral speech, carried out in a specific cognitive and typologically defined communicative space; 2) a set of thematically related texts³⁹.

³⁷ Mammadov, A. Discourse and Translation: functional- cognitive approach. / A.Mammadov, L. Ziyadova – Baku: Letterpress, – 2012. – p.98

³⁸ Hodge, R. Language as Ideology / R.Hodge, G.Kress. – London: Routledge, – 1993. – p.74

³⁹ Чернявская, В.Е. Дискурс как объект лингвистических исследований // Текст и дискурс: проблемы экономического дискурса: сб. науч. статей. – СПб.: Изд-во Санкт-Петербургского гос. ун-та экономики и финансов, – 2001. – с.11

F.Veysalli proposes the formula “discourse = text + context+ linguistic (stylistic) features, emphasizing that discourse encompasses both the process of text production and its interpretation by the addressee. In a broad extralinguistic sense, discourse is viewed as a form of manifestation of social experience and as a means of linguistic expression⁴⁰ .

Thus, discourse is understood as a multidimensional communicative phenomenon, representing a dynamic process of interaction among communication participants, within which linguistic resources serve to create, transmit, and interpret meanings within a specific social and cognitive context. In this process, discourse functions simultaneously as both the result and as the means of speech activity, integrating textual and extralinguistic factors, which allows to account for not only linguistic features but also the social, cultural, and pragmatic aspects of communication. The synthesis of these two approaches corresponds to the objectives of the present study and proves to be optimal for investigating the nature of mass media discourse.

The fourth paragraph of the second chapter is entitled “*Mass Media Discourse: Parameters and Varieties*”. A. Bell notes that the notion of media text is considerably broader and includes not only verbal but also auditory parameters, as well as visual images. Thus, media texts embody the technologies employed in their creation and dissemination⁴¹ .

E.O’Keeffe defines media discourse as a public, produced, and recorded form of interaction carried out through speech platforms⁴² . At the same time he relies on a communication model that includes the communicator, the addressee, the channel, feedback, the message, as well as processes of encoding and decoding,

Developing the communicative model, T.G.Dobrosklonskaya compares media discourse to a message that incorporates all

⁴⁰ Veysalli, F. Diskurs təhlilinə giriş. / F.Veysalli. – Bakı: Təhsil, – 2010. – c.22

⁴¹ Bell, A. Approaches to media discourse. / A Bell, P.Garrett. – Oxford: Blackwell, – 1998. – p.35

⁴² O’Keeffe, A. Media and Discourse Analysis // The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis by Gee, J.&Handford, M. – London: Routledge, –2011. –p.441

components of communication, whereas the media text is perceived as a message depending on the channel through which it is received⁴³.

The Azerbaijani researcher N.Imanova interprets mass media discourse as a public, institutionally conditioned, and non-spontaneous form of communication, characterized by formality and orientation toward a mass audience, which is of fundamental importance for its analysis and interpretation⁴⁴.

The omnipresence of the media has permeated the live of every individual and society as a whole: contemporary reality is inseparable from the media space. In this regard, the taxonomy of this type of discourse presents certain challenges, as it may be classified according to a wide range of parameters and criteria. The most general typology of mass media discourse is primarily based mass media types, that is, on channels of information transmission. Accordingly, the following types are distinguished: print discourse (print mass media discourse), radio discourse, television discourse, and internet discourse which encompasses all electronic forms of communication within the sphere of mass media⁴⁵.

According to E.A.Kozhemyakin, the functions of media discourse include the following: communicative, evaluative, cognitive, and constructive. The communicative function consists in the use of discourse for influence, persuasion, motivation, and informing the audience. The evaluative function makes it possible to assess reality and facts in terms of good/bad, acceptable/unacceptable. The cognitive function is aimed at the transmission of knowledge, explanation, and forecasting of information. The constructive function is associated with the formation of desired or necessary future situations as well as with the

⁴³ Добросклонская, Т.Г. Добросклонская Т.Г. Вопросы изучения медиатекстов (опыт исследования современной английской медиаречи) / Т.Г.Добросклонская. – [изд. 2-е.] – Москва: УРСС, – 2005. – с.200

⁴⁴ İmanova, N.M. Virtual kimlik və onun yeni media diskursunda linqvistik ifadəsi: /filologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru dis. avtoreferatı. / – Bakı, 2024. – s.129-133

⁴⁵ Керимова, Н.Э. Дискурс масс-медиа: параметры и разновидности. // – Баку, БСУ, Актуальные проблемы изучения гуманитарных наук, – 2022. № 3 – с.77-78

norms for their development⁴⁶. This is due to the fact that the language of media discourse must be communicatively clear, while also being expressive, vivid, and engaging⁴⁷.

We believe that mass media discourse is a public, constructed form of interaction that is neither accidental nor spontaneous (in contrast to everyday spoken or written speech). This type of discourse does not belong to either the private or the informal mode of communication. Despite the apparent obviousness of these characteristics, they are of fundamental importance for the analysis, description, and understanding of media discourse.

The third chapter, entitled **“The Functioning of Phraseological Units in the Discourse of English-Language Mass Media”**, consists of four paragraphs. It examines the specific features of the development of phraseological units in the discourse of English-language mass media. The first paragraph is entitled **“Phraseological Units in the Discourse of Politically Oriented Mass Media”**. Politically oriented mass media discourse represents a distinct type of discourse, combining characteristic features of both media discourse and political discourse. Frequently used personal pronouns in English political media discourse – such as *you*, *we*, and *they* – actualize different meanings (especially inclusiveness) and allow the creation of the illusion of positivity and objectivity of the presented information. Phraseological units serve as a powerful means of persuasion in political speech.

Below is a fragment of discourse that provides description of the governance of the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Azerbaijan.

/Armenian officials and Azerbaijan on Saturday accused each other of breaching a peace deal that ended six weeks of fierce fighting over Nagorno-Karabakh, with Azerbaijan’s leader

⁴⁶ Кожемякин, Е.А. Массовая коммуникация и медиадискурс: к методологии исследования. // – Белгород: Научные ведомости Белгородского государственного университета, – 2010. №2 (73). Вып. 11. – с.17-21.

⁴⁷ Васильева, Л.В. Исследование модусных категорий в эволюции медиадискурса: на материале американской прессы XX века: / автореферат дисс. канд. филол. наук / – Владивосток, 2010. – с.12

threatening to crush Armenian forces with an iron fist.// (12 December 2020, *The Guardian*)

Here, the phraseological unit *iron fist* is used, which in its literal meaning denotes an iron hand. Phraseological unit /iron fist/, traditionally associated with an authoritarian style of governance, undergoes semantic transformation in English-language political discourse in the context of Azerbaijan. In the rhetoric of President Ilham Aliyev, this image is reinterpreted as a metaphor for national unity, strength, and the restoration of justice as well as a symbol of a powerful army capable of repelling any hostile invasion at any moment.

In another example from media discourse related to U.S. politics, the following phraseological unit is used:

/Biden vows to ‘shut down the border’ if Senate immigration bill is passed. But the House speaker said deal involving border security and aid to Ukraine is ‘dead on arrival’ in its current form.// (24 January 2024, *The Guardian*)

The expression *dead on arrival* is used to denote something that is initially doomed to failure and has no chance of being implemented. By using this expression in relation to President Joe Biden’s questionable plans, the author enhances the expressiveness of the article’s headline and draws the reader’s attention to the stated issue.

Thus, phraseological units create vivid, emotionally charged images, enabling authors to express evaluations of events and influence the audience. They play a key role in shaping political identity by fostering a sense of unity and belonging among supporters. Vivid expressions, slogans, and set phrases function as markers of group identity, contribute to the consolidation and mobilization of the audience. Politicians strategically employ phraseological units to shape the perception of events and strengthen loyalty, thereby realizing their emotional and ideological potential.

The second paragraph of the third chapter is entitled “**Phraseological Units in the Discourse of Economically Oriented Mass Media**”. The analysis of phraseological units in English-language economic discourse makes it possible not only to classify

these lexical items, but also to identify characteristic features of the English mentality, as well as the specific aspects of socio-economic and socio-political relations. In addition to its phraseological component, economic discourse is characterized by a number of distinctive features, such as logical structure, precision, argumentativeness and informativeness.

In economic discourse, phraseological terminology encompasses the naming of monetary units, participants in market and exchange relations, objects and subjects of economic interaction, as well as evaluative economic characteristics (for example, degree of success, etc.). Economic phraseological units cover the following lexical-semantic microfields: banking and finance, the industrial and production sphere, and economic policy⁴⁸.

In the English-language economically oriented media discourse, the lexeme *money* frequently functions as part of phraseological units, evoking related moral and evaluative connotations, for example:

*“The ties between Wall Street financiers and politicians are the subject of a lot of scrutiny. Not for nothing is Goldman Sachs, a bank, sometimes nicknamed Government Sachs. But how important are the **moneybags** in New York to political success in Washington, dc?” (15 September 2020, The Economist).*

The phraseological unit *moneybags* is used in this fragment of media discourse to denote wealthy individuals and carries a negative evaluative connotation.

Thus, in English-language economic media discourse, phraseological units demonstrate high pragmatic significance: they contribute to the vivid description of economic processes and their participants, enhance the expressive and evaluative potential of information, and influence the formation of readers’ opinions, often in accordance with the journalist’s communicative intentions.

The third paragraph of the third chapter, entitled **“Phraseological Units in the Discourse of Mass Media of Various**

⁴⁸ Керимова, Н.Э. Фразеологические единицы в дискурсе англоязычной масс-медиа экономической направленности. // – Баки: Azərbaycan Dillər Universiteti “Dil və ədəbiyyat”, –2022. – s.62-67

Orientations”, examines the significant role played by phraseological units in English-language media discourse due to their specific communicative function. Phraseological expressions containing elements of colour symbolism are represented frequently in English-language mass media. The presence of colour – related lexemes within English phraseological units makes it possible to explain the emotional intensity and richness of the feelings conveyed. In some cases the colour components are used in its literal meaning, whereas in others the core meaning of the phraseological unit is associated with psychological aspects of perception⁴⁹.

“It started when he was telephoned out of the blue by Buckingham Palace. At the time, the years before and after the Coronation, he was the world’s best ...” (29 May 2022, The Sunday Times)

The full form of the idiom *out of the blue* originates from the expression *out of a clear blue sky*, in which the component *blue* symbolizes clear, cloudless sky that does not foreshadow unexpected events. This hyperbolic metaphor enhances the effect of suddenness and contributes to attracting the reader’s attention.

In the following excerpt, taken from an article published in the British newspaper *The Times*, the phraseological unit *pigs will fly* is used:

“Either way, even though I still own a miniskirt all those dead pigs will fly before I wear it.” (9 October 2021, The Times)

For a native speaker of English, such irony based on wordplay involving a well-known idiom is easily recognizable. This English-language adynaton conveys the meaning of “*never*.”

Consequently, phraseological units are commonly employed in headlines and texts of English-language mass media as an effective means of linguistic compression. They perform informative, expressive, stylistic and pragmatic functions, enhancing expressiveness of the text and facilitating its perception. At the same time, phraseological units possess considerable evaluative and

⁴⁹ Керимова, Н.Э. Фразеологические единицы в дискурсе англоязычной массовой медиа с элементами цветообозначения. // – Нахчыван: Научные труды Нахчыванского Университета, – 2022. №4(28), – с.143-146

persuasive potential, which makes it possible to regard them as an important instrument of verbal influence and potential manipulation within mass-media discourse⁵⁰.

In the fourth paragraph of the third chapter entitled *“Classification and frequency analysis of phraseological units in the discourse of English-language Mass Media”*, it is noted that a total of 200 phraseological units have previously been analyzed.

The conducted analysis demonstrated that most of the units under consideration can be classified according to the type of their main component into verbal and non-verbal units. In non-verbal phraseological units, the leading role is played by combinations of other parts of speech (noun, adjective, etc.).

1. Verbal phraseological expressions.

The main component of these expressions is a verb that denotes an action. Approximately 65% of the 200 phraseological units are verbal.

For example: */to burn bridges/ – to break off with someone or something decisively*

2. Non-verbal phraseological expressions

In these expressions, the main component is not a verb, but a combination of other parts of speech. Approximately 35% of the 200 phraseological units are non-verbal expressions.

For example:

Iron fist – a powerful force led by the President and a hundred-thousand-strong army ready at any moment to repel enemy occupation.

Of the 200 phraseological units analyzed 65%, that is, 130 phraseological combinations are divided into three groups: These are: a) object-oriented verbal phraseological units, b) non-object verbal phraseological units, c) idiomatic verbal expressions. These expressions were analyzed as follows:

a) Object-oriented verbal phraseological units – 40% of the 130 expressions (52 phraseological units).

⁵⁰ Керимова, Н.Э. Фразеологизмы в дискурсе масс-медиа различной направленности. // – Poland: Colloquium-journal, – 2023. №1 (160), – с.64

The meaning of these phraseological units is directed toward an object, indicating whom or what they affect.

For example: */to pull chestnuts out of the fire/ – to do a dangerous, hard, or unpleasant thing for someone else*

b) Non-object verbal phraseological units – 25% of the 130 expressions (33 phraseological units) denote an action or state without reference to an object.

For example: */to sit on his hands/ – to sit with folded hands, doing nothing*

c) Idiomatic verbal expressions account for 35% of the 130 expressions (45 phraseological units).

These phraseological units denote an action and possess a meaning that differs from the literal meanings of their constituent words.

For example:

/to bite the bullet/ – to bravely come to terms with a harsh necessity

Overall, the analysis of 200 phraseological units selected from the discourse of English-language mass media showed that 65% (130 units) belong to phraseological verbal, whereas 35% (70 units) are non-verbal.

A statistical analysis of the use of phraseological units revealed their key role in shaping the semantic and emotional structure of media texts. The most prevalent domains are socio-psychological states (29%), politics and power (13.5%), economic activity (17%), conflicts (16.5%), ethical values (17%), as well as intellectual and speech activity (7%). This indicates that contemporary English-language media discourse is focused on current social, political, and economic issues, that are significant for the formation of public opinion and the implementation of communicative strategies.

The main findings of the study are summarized in the

Conclusion:

1. English phraseological units, like phraseological units of other languages, are formed in the process of collective linguistic practice. They reflect the cognitive experience, cultural values and linguistic intuition of native speakers, preserve traditions, customs

and beliefs, and represent historical and social realities. A significant number of phraseological units have become firmly established in professional discourse, while the reinterpretation of fixed expressions serves as a source for the formation of new phraseological units. Among literary sources, the majority of borrowings are associated with the works of William Shakespeare; however, in terms of the number of units integrated into the English language, the leading position is occupied by the Bible which is one of the key sacred texts of Western culture.

2. In all definitions of phraseological units, common invariant features are identified. These include non-compositionality, which presupposes the semantic indivisibility of the expression whereby its meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of its individual components; institutionalisation, reflecting the widespread usage and entrenchment of the unit in the linguistic consciousness of speakers; as well as fixedness, manifested in the relative stability of structure and the limited nature of syntactic variability.

3. On the basis of the analysis of the views of domestic and foreign linguists, additional characteristic features of phraseological units were systematized: separate- form structure manifested in the presence of external grammatical separability; reproducibility in speech, reflecting typical use of expressions in a ready-made form; and the nominativity, consisting in the ability to denote objects, actions, properties and situations.

4. For text theory, the assumption of intentional orientation and integrity of textual communication is of fundamental importance. In this regard, particular attention is paid to indicators of utterance boundaries. Metatext not only helps to draw the reader's attention to the structure of the text, but also makes the information contained within it more accessible for perception. Metatext ensures the clarification of logical connections between different ideas, explaining to the reader how the text should be read and interpreted.

5. Paratexts constitute a special category that makes it possible to identify and describe various, including contradictory, modes of text representation. Their analysis is of particular importance in the study of biblical works, within which paratexts reflect traditions of

reception and interpretation of the text, as well as historically formed reading practices.

6. Textual transmission reflects the most direct forms of reception and exegesis. Paratextual elements perform the function of chronological markers, which makes it possible to trace the evolution of reading and interpretative traditions. Any linguistic work constitutes a text that functions as a means of human communication. Within a text there are elements of discourse, just as elements of text are found within discourse. Between these concepts relationships of interpenetration are observed and they may be considered as two sides of a single whole.

7. In the discourse of English-language mass media of a political orientation, the text performs a propagandistic function, conveying particular ideas and opinions. This presupposes an emotional influence on the addressee with the aim of encouraging specific political actions. Phraseological units that arise in political contexts partially perform a conceptual function, while simultaneously serving as elements of media technology and means of language play, including puns and other expressive devices.

8. In economic publications, phraseological units carry a significant pragmatic load. They help to describe economic situations and participants accurately characterize their activities and the state of affairs, highlight important information emotionally, and evaluate events. At the same time, phraseological units shape the reader's own judgement, which, however, often contribute to the formation of the reader's own opinion which however largely depends on the communicative intentions of the journalist employing expressive language means.

9. Phraseological units perform several functions simultaneously in media discourse: they may function as means of irony actualization, as an instrument for creating a dramatic effect or suspense, and as a way of drawing attention to key fragments of the text.

10. Journalists use figurative phraseological units to emphasize essential information, focus attention on key points, evaluate events, and create an emotionally expressive media text. Phraseological units

that contribute to the economy of linguistic space, ensure the conciseness of headlines while simultaneously attracting the reader's attention through a high degree of expressiveness of the speech.

11. The analysis of factual material indicates that fully original phraseological units are seldom encountered in media discourse. More frequently, authorial-individualized forms are used, which are adapted to the specific context and display a high degree of variability and undergo transformations at the lexical-grammatical, syntactic and semantic levels. The most in-demand function of phraseological units in English-language media discourse is the creation of imagery in the description of phenomena, predominantly through verbal constructions. The semantic dominance of phraseological units associated with social emotions, conflict and power correlates with the aims of the mass media–audience engagement, simplification of complex phenomena, the creation of effects of trust and manipulation and also contributes to the formation of imagery and emotional expressiveness of media text.

The main content and propositions of the dissertation are presented in the author's published articles and conference abstracts:

1. Трансформации фразеологических единиц в англоязычных средствах массовой информации. // Davamlı inkişaf strategiyası: qlobal trendlər, Milli təcrübələr və yeni hədəflər, I Beynəlxalq elmi konfrans, – Mingəçevir: – 10-11 dekabr, – 2021, I cild. – s.297-299.
2. Происхождение фразеологизмов в современном английском языке // – Bakı: Elm və təhsil, АМЕА, М.Фüzuli adına Əlyazmalar İnstitutu, Filologiya məsələləri, – 2022. № 2, – s.87-95.
3. Фразеологические единицы в дискурсе англоязычной масс-медиа экономической направленности // – Bakı: Azərbaycan Dillər Universiteti, Dil və ədəbiyyat, – 2022. № 2, – s.62-67.
4. Функционирование фразеологизмов в дискурсе масс-медиа. // – Bakı: Bakı Dövlət Universiteti, Dil və ədəbiyyat. Beynəlxalq elmi-nəzəri jurnal, – 2022. 2(119), – s.434-436.

5. Дискурс масс-медиа: параметры и разновидности // – Bakı: Bakı Slavyan Universiteti, Humanitar elmlərin öyrənilməsinin aktual problemləri, – 2022. № 3, – s.77-80.
6. Фразеологические единицы в дискурсе англоязычной масс-медиа с элементами цветообозначения // – Naхçivan: Naхçivan Universitetinin Elmi əsərləri, – 2022. № 4(28), – s.143-146.
7. Основные тенденции изучения фразеологии в отечественной и зарубежной лингвистике // The XXII International Scientific Symposium “Turkic World Between East and West”. – Turkey: – 29 January, – 2022, – p.87-90.
8. Исследование понятия дискурс в современной лингвистике. // “Yeni dövrdə təhsil və tədqiqat fəaliyyəti: reallıqlar və çağırışlar” Beynəlxalq elmi konfrans, – Mingəçevir: – 16-17 dekabr, – 2022, I cild. – s.537-540.
9. Phraseological units with the lexeme “money” in the English language discourse of mass media of economic orientation // Taras Shevchenko 9th International congress on social sciences. – Ukrayna, Lutsk: – 14-15 August, – 2023, – p.71-73.
10. İngilisdilli kütləvi informasiya vasitələrinin (KİV) diskursunda frazeoloji vahidlərin aktuallaşması // Ümummilli lider Heydər Əliyevin 100 illiyinə həsr edilmiş Doktorant və gənc tədqiqatçıların XXVI Respublika elmi konfransı (NASCO XXVI) – Bakı: – 17-18 noyabr, – 2023, – s.80-82.
11. Фразеологизмы в дискурсе масс-медиа различной направленности // – Poland: Colloquium-journal, – 2023. №1 (160), – p.61-66;
12. General theoretical problems of text linguistics // – Bakı: “ELMİ İŞ” Beynəlxalq elmi jurnal, – 2023. 17 (7), – p.24-29.
13. Медиатекст как дискретная единица дискурса масс-медиа // 6th International Latin American scientific research congress, – Cuba, Havana: – 1-3 February, – 2024, – p.487-490.
14. Подходы к классификации фразеологических единиц в английском языке. // V Международная научно-практическая конференция. Лингвистические и культурологические аспекты современного инженерного образования. – Томск: – 13-15 ноября, – 2024, – с.79-81.

15. Фразеологические единицы в англоязычном дискурсе масс-медиа спортивной направленности. – Gəncə: Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti, Elmi Xəbərlər: fundamental, humanitar və təbiət elmləri seriyası, – 2025. № 3, – s.211-214.
16. Mass-media diskursunda təbiətlə əlaqəli frazeoloji vahidlər. // Elmi İnkişaf: Uğurlar və Çağırışlar” – Gənc Tədqiqatçıların II Respublika Elmi Konfransının materialları, – Naxçıvan: – 03–04 aprel, – 2025, – s.601-603.
17. İngilisdilli mediada tibbi frazeologizmlərin istifadəsi.– Gəncə: Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti, Elmi Xəbərlər: fundamental, humanitar və təbiət elmləri seriyası, – 2026. № 1, – s.273-277.

The defense will be held on 22 May 2026 at 11:00 at the meeting of the Dissertation council FD 2.12 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at Azerbaijan University of Languages.

Address: AZ 1014, Baku, Rashid Behbudov Street, 134.

Dissertation is accessible at the Azerbaijan University of Languages Library.

Electronic version of the abstract is available on the official website of the Azerbaijan University of Languages.

Abstract was sent to the required addresses on 21 April 2026.

Uchev

Signed for print: 01.04.2026

Paper format: 60x84 1/16

Volume: 45373 characters

Number of hard copies: 20