

CLASSIFICATION OF PRAGMATIC PHRASEOLOGIES IN THE GERMAN LANGUAGE AND PROBLEMS OF THEIR APPLICATION

G.M.Umarjonova,

Senior lecturer of Fergana State University

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD)

N. Aliyeva

Student of Fergana State University, group 20.93

***Abstract.** This article discusses the issues of studying pragmatic phraseological units, which are considered a new direction in phraseology. Of particular interest is the scientific terminology associated with the study of pragmatic phraseological units and the terminological diversity of their description.*

***Keywords:** linguistics, phraseology, pragmatic phraseological units, terminology, oral speech, written speech,*

Pragmatic phraseological units are pragmatic expressions of oral and written speech that are used to perform various speech actions and communication functions. Pragmatic phraseological units belong to the branch of phraseology and can be called a new subject of phraseology. In various fields of linguistics, they were sometimes actively studied, and sometimes they did not arouse much interest.

Pragmatic phrases are used more or less consciously every day by all members of our society. Although they play an important role in courtesy towards other people, in self-description of various social groups, and in expressing personal attitudes to linguistic and non-linguistic situations, they are critical to success in certain areas. Given the wide range of functions of pragmatic phraseological units, it is important to study them, although it is clear that there are certain difficulties associated with their distortion.

At about the same time, there are common aspects of phraseological research and pragmatics that have established themselves as a scientific science in linguistics, i.e. there are many classifications in both areas of research and there are no clear boundaries. These discussions continue to this day. "As in the field of phraseology, regardless of the language or culture of the theoretical dispute, there is a terminological diversity in the field of pragmatic phraseological units" [6. 12].

The term pragmatic phraseological units was first introduced by Burger, Buhofer and Sialm in "Pragmatic Phraseological Units" and "Pragmatic Phraseological Units" and "Pragmatic Phraseological Units" as a theory of the function of language and speech situation" [1. P.110]. H. Bürger previously described "rows that do not have a meaning in the first place (the equivalent of a lexeme or sentence), but mainly act as a sign in certain pragmatic situations" - "Ketten, die nicht primär eine (lexem und satzäquivalente)". Signale in bestimmten pragmatischen Situationen fungieren" [2, 58] spoke about the pragmatic meaning of idioms. G. Burger argues that pragmatic phraseology can only be studied with the inclusion of human behavior, which implies their consideration within the framework of pragmatics, and not as part of a "semantically oriented phraseology" [2, 59].

In "Einführung in der Phraseologie", written later by H. Burger, he rethought this type of phraseology. In his opinion, pragmatic phraseologies are, first of all, phraseologies that do not have "meaning", but serve as repetitive communicative situations. "Accordingly, they do not define either objects, or facts, or processes, or relationships" [3. 28]. The so-called pragmatic shift in linguistics occurred in the early 1970s. Pragmatic turn to phraseological research [5. 76-88], more precisely, the theoretical change in phraseology and its pragmatization [4. 41-64] also showed its effect. "Interest in pragmatics helped pragmatic phraseological units to take a special place in the field of phraseology" [7. 9-44].

In linguistics, one should not lose sight of the importance of pragmatic phraseological definitions and especially issues related to their functional classification. Native speakers do not usually face problems with pragmatic

phraseology, but foreign language learners or translators face sharp differences between languages. Perhaps this is due to the difficulty of using pragmatic phraseology, in which case bilingual phraseological dictionaries can help.

Having studied research on the creation of phraseological dictionaries, we are convinced that in the development of phraseological dictionaries, researchers have managed to achieve a high level of lexical mastery. This was done, in particular, by solving theoretical problems in a practical way. For example, in phraseological dictionaries in various areas of life, theoretical recommendations are used, such as the organization of macro- and microcomponents of dictionaries given by leading scientists, the placement of a phraseological source in the dictionary, and the selection of phraseological expressions.

Examples are a number of foreign and Uzbek scientists who paid attention to the theoretical issues of phraseological dictionaries and gave their recommendations, including: A.I. Molotkov, N.T. Bukhareva, A.I. Fedorov, R.I. Yarantsev, E. Brewer, Roberta J. Dixon, A. McKay, M. I. Umarkhojaev. , A.M. Bushuya, M.T. Botner, Sh. Rakhmatullaev. Among lexicographers-phraseologists, the studies of M.I. Umarkhojaev. He approached the problem of phraseology in the field of lexicography and developed a number of concepts for the formation of dictionaries. Examples include monolingual, bilingual, multilingual, and mixed dictionaries; general (dictionary for all native speakers) and special (for speakers of other languages) dictionaries; dictionaries 100-1000 and 1000-5000 depending on the number of units; divided into annotated and ideographic dictionaries based on an internal semantic system.

In addition, M. I. Umarkhodzhaev drew attention to the following principles for the selection of phraseological expressions:

- each type of fixed expression;
- phraseological confusion, phraseological units, phraseological units, proverbs and sayings with a figurative meaning;
- Only proverbs and sayings.

The principle of compiling phraseological dictionaries differs from the principle of compiling simple lexical units. When compiling phraseological dictionaries, it is necessary to pay attention to their macro- and micro-components. Phraseologists-lexicographers identified denotative-motivational, evaluative, emotional, stylistic and grammatical systems of dictionaries. Phraseological dictionaries also include the study of the internal form of phraseology, i.e. cultural connotation, evaluative and methodological expressiveness. In terms of methodological expression of phraseological units, Guo Ningning was guided by the principle of their use in literary, colloquial, colloquial languages [10, 163]. The researcher also approached the grammatical system of phraseological units when forming a dictionary, taking into account the grammatical and semantic dependence of the word, morphological changes.

When forming a dictionary of phraseological units, one should also take into account their grammatical structure, grammatical and semantic dependence of the word, morphological changes. To monitor the expression of phraseological units in different layers of the language, it is recommended to take examples from the dictionary from various newspapers, magazines, works of art, colloquial speech. This emphasizes the ease of use of phraseological units and their diversity.

References:

1. Burger H, Buhofer A, Sialm A. Handbuch der Phraseologie. Berlin/New-York: de Gruyter, 1982. – S. 110.
2. Burger H. Idiomatik des Deutschen. Tübingen: Niemeyer (Germanistische Arbeitshefte 16), 1973. – S. 58.
3. Burger H. Phraseologie. Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen. 4.neu. bearb. Aufl. Berlin: Schmitd, 2010. – S. 28.
4. Feilke H. Kontext – Zeichen – Kompetenz. Wortverbindungen unter sprachlichem Aspekt. Helmut, 2004. – S. 41-64.
5. Fleischer W. Zur pragmatischen Potenz der Phraseologismen. In: Linguistische Studien. Reihe A.80. Sprechhandlung, Satz und Text. Berlin, 1981. – S. 76-88.

6. Hyvärinen I. Zur Abgrenzung und Typologie pragmatischer Phraseologismen. S.12.

7. Hyvärinen, Irma (2011a): Zur Abgrenzung und Typologie pragmatischer Phraseologismen – Forschungsüberblick und offene Fragen. (Hg.), S. 9–44.

8. Umarxodjaev M.E. Основы фразеологии. – Tashkent: Fan, 1983.

9. Ninnin G. Лексикографическая разработка русской фразеологии: для толково-переводного русско-китайского фразеологического словаря. Diss. na soisk. uch.step.kan.nauk. Moskva, 2013. –163-bet.

10. Mukhtorovna, U. G. (2022). Somatic Phraseologies with “Hand” – “QO ‘L’ Component, Expressing Diligence in German and Uzbek Languages. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 14, 68-71.

