

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 01 Volume: 81

Published: 30.01.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Ruzikhol Sheralievna Khaidarova

Termez State University

Senior Lecturer,

Department of German Language and Literature

FEATURES OF PHRASEOLOGIES OF THE GERMAN LANGUAGE

Abstract: This article discusses the phraseological units of the German language and the features of the functioning of phraseological units.

Key words: Language, phraseological unit, thought, translation, vocabulary, expression.

Language: English

Citation: Khaidarova, R. S. (2020). Features of phraseologies of the German language. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 01 (81), 556-558.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-01-81-91> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.01.81.91>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

UDC: 10.02.20

Modern linguistic research is unthinkable without a comparison of the studied objects. The main task of linguistic comparison is to identify the identical and different signs of the studied facts of the language. The coincidence of phraseological units of different languages, including unrelated ones, is based on the commonality of logical and figuratively associative thinking processes of different peoples of the world. The study of the development trends of the modern German language applies to all linguistic levels, however, the vocabulary has always been the most responsive to extralinguistic factors. Along with narrowly focused research on the latest processes in the neologization of the lexical structure of the German language, there are fundamental works by E.V. Rosen, which became the basis for many interesting areas in the study of the lexical composition of the German language in general and German phraseology in particular. Phraseological units of the modern German language are being actively updated and, as P. Brown notes, primarily due to the activation of processes of contextually determined author's modification of phraseological units in the texts of the functional style of the press and journalism, as well as as a result of crowding out and changing traditional forms of phraseological units, the disappearance of dialects and replacement old family, community traditions influenced by the

media on more modern ones. A considerable group of phraseological units included in the above processes is formed by phraseological units with national cultural elements of semantics, i.e. phraseological units, the imaginative basis of which is based on any cultural and historical information. The relevance of the units of the phraseological foundation for the German language is constantly and successfully studied on the basis of material from both modern German fiction of various genres and the German press. Phraseologisms are a reflection of folk wisdom in a language, many of them exist for tens and hundreds of years, since people love accurate, figurative expressions, with the help of which you can convey a funny joke and an evil taunt. In all comparable languages, phraseological expressions reflecting tolerance have the same "patience". The analysis shows that the key lexemes of English, German and Russian phraseological units and paremias expressing the concept of "patience" do not have an etymologically related similarity, but have only a small similarity in their meanings, and only in German and Russian languages, showing the specificity of the national expression of patience. If in English patience is diligence, a manifestation of diligence, zeal, when this or that work is meekly performed, then in German this patience is die Geduld, die Duldsamkeit in the meaning of Christian patience and humility; die Toleranz, die Beharrlichkeit - patience, expressed in perseverance, in the ability to resist, and Russian patience - the desire

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHH (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

not to give in to circumstances - is connected with endurance in relation to moral stress. All that has been said once again confirms the idea that each nation in its own language reflects the surrounding world in its own way.

Features of the functioning of phraseological units expressing tolerance were considered on the basis of analysis of press texts. The expediency and relevance of addressing the comparative characteristics of the functioning of the phraseological units in the language of the press with national-cultural specificity is determined by the high frequency of their use in journalism. Studies of the linguistic and regional specifics of phraseological units in journalistic texts make it possible to identify the value orientations of a given linguistic collective, reflecting its social, historical and cultural experience. A comparative analysis of phraseological units expressing tolerance in modern journalistic texts of comparable languages shows a greater tendency to manifest differences. In journalistic texts in English, one can find the functioning of phraseological units and paremias to express the concept of "maintaining inner calm", as well as perseverance, less often - compassion, compromise. A distinctive feature of German journalistic texts is the use of phraseological units and paremias, emphasizing the speaker's detachment from what is happening, as well as the expression of a desire to get along with the surrounding reality. Having carried out a comparative analysis of the expression of concepts that reflect "tolerance" in phraseological units and paremias in modern journalistic texts in English, German and Russian, one can trace the percentage manifestation of both similarities and differences. Modern native English speakers, through the use of phraseological units expressing tolerance in speech, most often seek to show understanding of the interlocutor's actions, trying to maintain inner calm and at the same time showing resistance to negativity from the outside world. Native speakers of modern German, evaluating current events and using phraseological units in their assessment, show restraint of their own emotions. An important factor in this is the preservation by the native speakers of patience and often the expression of a desire to distance oneself from expressing one's own opinion about what is happening. Phraseologisms with animalisms continue to attract the attention of researchers, since they are one of the most numerous and internally diverse groups of a specific phraseological foundation and provide information on their encyclopedic (cultural-informative), social-informative, deictic, expressive and figuratively expressive functions. Animalistic phraseological units reflect centuries-old human observations on the appearance and habits of animals, convey the attitude of people to their "lesser brothers". Animalisms carry encyclopedic information both about typical features of an animal, and about less obvious signs that are not

reflected in dictionary definitions. The encyclopedic meanings of animalism, actualized in individual phraseological units, are quite common. So, phraseologisms with animal names can reflect: - physical qualities, capabilities: strong (hardy) like a horse, weak like a chicken, swims like a fish, sharp-sighted like a lynx, the scent like a dog, nimble like a monkey; - appearance: black as a raven, goatee, wasp waist, dry as a roach, with gulkin (sparrow nose), as thick as a hog; - mental qualities (character traits): stubborn like a bull, a donkey; rested like a ram, cocky like a cock, annoying like a fly, gloomy like a turkey; - intelligence: stupid like a gray gelding, staring like a ram at a new gate, cunning like a fox, this is a no brainer; - habits, abilities, skills: bursting like a magpie, cackling like jackdaws, dumb like a fish, ostrich politics, repeating like a parrot. Черты, которыми человек наделяет животных, могут совпадать в разных языках, ср.:

Немецкий Русский

Rot wie ein Krebs красный как рак

Stark wie ein Pferd сильный как лошадь

Schwimmt wie ein Fisch плавает как рыба

Schwarz wie ein Rabe черный как ворон

Storrich wie ein Esel упрямый как осел

Essen wie ein Spatz ест как воробей

Schlau wie ein Fuchs хитрый как лиса

Но эти черты могут и заметно отличаться.

Сравним:

Dastehen wie die Kuh vorm neuen Tor
установиться как баран на новые ворота

Hungrig wie ein Вдг голодный как волк
(собака)

В^е wie ein Wolf злой как собака

Sanft wie ein Lamm смиреннее теленка

Wie iene Ratte schlafen спать как сурок

The components of the animal's name easily go into the category of word-symbols reflecting the ideas that people have about different animals: hardworking like a bee, goose cinquefoil, cunning like a fox, cowardly like a hare, fearless like a lion, obedient like a lamb. Many animal names have become stable metaphors for the properties and qualities of a person, for example: a fox - "a cunning, flattering person", a goose - "about an unreliable or stupid person", a bear - "about an awkward, clumsy person", a cock - "about a fervent person". Thus, the names of animals here have an encyclopedic function - they provide data about the animal, necessary for the formation of phraseological meaning. From a large set of mental and physical qualities of the animal, its appearance, habits, one is selected, implemented in the context of phraseological unit. A socially informative function is performed by some animal names that have become symbols of negative qualities. In German and Russian, this is, first of all, Hund - "dog", Schwein - "pig", Ziege - "goat", Esel - "donkey", whose names have a negative connotation, based on both real observations and the prevailing stereotype ideas about the intellect,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

character and other features of the animal. Some of these ideas have very ancient origins. Thus, the idea of a dog as a persecuted creature is already known from the Bible, the name of this animal gives the greatest number of negative connotations in both German and Russian phraseology: kein Hund, auf den Hund kommen, wie ein Hund leben, jmden wie einen Hund behandeln (Dog canine death, died like a dog, drive to all dogs, canine son, canine weather, chase dogs). Many negative connotations associated with the names (names) of animals in German and Russian coincide, for example: Ein Wolf im Schlafpelz a wolf in sheep's clothing Den Bock zum Gdrtnr machen let goat in the garden Der Hund auf dem Heu dog in the manger Perlen vor die Sue werfen throw beads in front of pigs. General connotations based on observations of animals arise in different languages independently of each other and testify to the universality of human thinking. However, the "vision of the world" may be different for different (especially unrelated) peoples, and then the name of the same animal takes on different connotations. A classic example of such a discrepancy is phraseology with the noun "elephant", which in German and Russian has become a symbol of awkwardness and heaviness sich benehmen wie ein Elefant im Porzelladen - "behave like an elephant in a china shop" (rude, awkward), while among the Indians, the "elephant" is a symbol of grace.

Deictic function.

The essence of the deictic function is that common nouns can be successfully replaced by demonstrative pronouns (one, this), since they do not name the properties of a particular denotation, but only indicate its difference from another object, "hint" at its location, for example: German: Vom Pferd auf den Esel kommen, weder Fisch noch Fleisch (nicht Fisch, nicht Fleisch); Russian: methyl in a crow, and hit a cow; change cuckoo for hawks; neither pava nor raven; neither ear nor snout. For household names, this function does not appear in isolation from other functions - the phraseological context also takes into account encyclopedic information about the denotation, for example: know, cat, your basket; every cricket know your hearth. This once again indicates that in the real process of phrase-formation, as a rule, several functions interact, one of which plays a major role. So, in both Russian and German, the components of phraseological units perform various functions. The most common is an encyclopedic function, reflecting the different sides of the concept of denotation. Phraseologisms can reflect the maximum number of properties, traits and attributes of an object, realizing them in different contexts, so most component words are polyconnotative.

References:

1. Begasheva, Sh.N. (2019). *The use of phraseological units in Uzbek and German*. Eco-Economics and Society Magazine.
2. Voropaeva, V.A. (2007). Comparative characteristic of English, German and Russian parems and phraseological units expressing tolerance. Abstract.
3. Schippan, T. (n.d.). *Lexicology of the modern German language*. Retrieved 2019, from www.tspu.edu.ru
4. Soloduho, E.M. (1983). *Typology of phraseological units of the Romano-Germanic language group*. Moscow: Education.
5. Chernysheva, I.I. (1970). *Functional and stylistic affiliation of paired combinations in the literary and literary-colloquial spheres of communication*. Moscow: Education.
6. Shahodzhaev, M.A., Begmatov, Je.M., Hamdamov, N.N., & Numonzhonov, Sh. D. U. (2019). Metody jeffektivnogo ispol'zovanija informacionno-kommunikacionnyh tehnologij v obrazovatel'nom processe. *Problemy sovremennoj nauki i obrazovanija*, 10 (143).
7. Shahodzhaev, M. A., Begmatov, Je. M., Hamdamov, N. N., & Nymonzhonov, Sh. D. U. (2019). Ispol'zovanie innovacionnyh obrazovatel'nyh tehnologij v razvitii tvorcheskih sposobnostej studentov. *Problemy sovremennoj nauki i obrazovanija*, 12-2 (145).
8. Xudoyberdiyeva, D.A. (2019). Management of the services sector and its classification. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (10), 656-658.
9. Farxodjonova, N. (2019). Features of modernization and integration of national culture. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 1(2), 167-172.
10. Farhodzhonova, N. F. (2016). *Problemy primeneniya innovacionnyh tehnologij v obrazovatel'nom processe na mezhdunarodnom urovne*. In Innovacionnye tendencii, social'no-jekonomicheskie i pravovye problemy vzaimodejstvija v mezhdunarodnom prostranstve (pp. 58-61).