

Stylistic Functions of Phraseological Units in German and Uzbek Languages

IMYAMINOVA SHUKHRATKHON
National University of Uzbekistan, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article provides an overview of phraseology, one of the relatively young fields of linguistics, with particular emphasis on its comparative study in the German and Uzbek languages. It examines the scholarly research conducted by German and Uzbek linguists in the field of phraseology, as well as their theoretical perspectives and approaches. The article analyzes the specific features of phraseological units and their formation in language, including semilexicality, stability, and idiomaticity. In addition, the principles of translating German phraseological units into Uzbek are comparatively analyzed, and relevant conclusions are drawn regarding the linguistic and semantic challenges involved in their translation.

Keywords: Phraseological unit, phraseological synonyms, equivalent, translation, literary translation, German language, Uzbek language, semantics, stylistics, translator's creative approach.

INTRODUCTION

The development of a nation's spiritual and intellectual potential is undoubtedly measured by the richness of the consciousness and worldview of its generations. The more educated, intellectually capable, and broad-minded the younger generation is, the more successfully the nation develops and flourishes. A spiritually advanced society never ceases to produce great thinkers and outstanding individuals. Therefore, enhancing the

spiritual and intellectual potential of the people has consistently been recognized and implemented as one of the most important priorities of society.

Learning foreign languages and acquiring a high level of proficiency in them has undoubtedly become one of the most important requirements of the present day. The fact that the government of Uzbekistan has identified foreign-language education as a priority in the development of young people serves as clear evidence of this tendency. In the context of contemporary globalization, there is a growing demand for specialists who possess a broad worldview and have mastered several foreign languages at an advanced level. The preparation of such specialists requires providing them with solid knowledge, introducing them to different cultures, encouraging comparative linguistic analysis, and developing their logical and critical thinking skills. In this regard, studying examples of the literary works of the country whose language is being learned, as well as being able to understand and interpret them, plays a particularly important role.

Literary works provide valuable information about the culture and history of the language in which they were written, as well as about the distinctive characteristics of that language. Among these characteristics, the richness of vocabulary occupies a particularly important position. The use of words with subtle semantic distinctions, word combinations, and various fixed expressions in speech contributes not only to making discourse more expressive and attractive but also to conveying ideas with greater precision, imagery, and vividness. For this reason, the present study focuses on phraseological units in the German and Uzbek languages and analyzes their stylistic functions in literary discourse.

Phraseology is considered one of the most figurative and expressive subsystems of language. Unlike the lexical system, it is less susceptible to linguistic change and preserves obsolete words, archaic forms, and syntactic constructions. This ability to retain elements of the linguistic past is particularly evident in the semantic content of phraseological units. A significant proportion of fixed expressions are closely associated with various aspects

of German life, historical events, ancient folk beliefs, customs, and rituals. Therefore, studying phraseological units in relation to the culture of their speakers gives particular relevance to the presentation and analysis of phraseological material containing culturally significant information.

In recent years, phraseology as a linguistic category has been studied extensively. This has contributed to the establishment of phraseology as an important branch of linguistics and has considerably expanded the scope of its investigation.

The comprehensive and in-depth study of the grammatical, syntactic, and stylistic characteristics of phraseological units has always attracted the attention of linguists. Since phraseological units represent a complex linguistic phenomenon in terms of their structural, semantic, functional, and stylistic properties, they possess specific patterns of formation and development. Phraseological units emerge from the need to express objects, phenomena, events, and human characteristics in an imaginative and emotionally expressive manner. Their emergence and formation are closely associated with particular historical processes, the social environment, realities of everyday life, and the conceptual representations arising from them. During the process of formation, phraseological units, like lexical items, become subject to the internal laws of a particular language as well as its phonetic, lexical, and grammatical requirements. They are predominantly used in figurative meanings and acquire emotional and expressive properties through their function as means of artistic representation. Consequently, phraseological units influence not only the cognitive sphere of human consciousness but also the emotional and affective sphere, thereby contributing significantly to the expressive and aesthetic impact of speech.

METHODS

Regardless of the number of words involved in their structure, phraseological units are united by a single integral meaning and convey an emotional and expressive function. In literary

discourse, phraseological units are widely used as figurative and stylistically effective means of expression [1].

Phraseology, either as a major branch of lexicology or as an independent linguistic discipline, occupies a special place in language studies because it investigates stable word combinations and fixed expressions that function in language similarly to individual lexical units and perform specific semantic and communicative functions.

The linguistic understanding of phraseological units remains terminologically ambiguous. In general, three major approaches can be distinguished:

1. The so-called narrow approach limits the object of phraseological research to semantically transformed words or groups of words.
2. The broader approach includes all combinations of lexical units, regardless of whether they are fixed or free, within the domain of phraseology.
3. The third approach, which has gained increasing acceptance in recent years and is supported by many phraseological scholars, considers all types of fixed word combinations in language as objects of phraseological investigation.

Modern phraseological research is characterized by several important directions:

1. The nominative aspect, which investigates what fragments of reality are represented through fixed expressions in a foreign language, as well as the mechanisms and models of their formation.
2. The semantic autonomy of phraseological units in comparison with ordinary linguistic signs.
3. The communicative and pragmatic functions of phraseological units in texts.
4. The processes of idiomatization and metaphorization in phraseological formations.

Phraseological units serve as an important means of enriching vocabulary and naming objects, phenomena, and events of reality. Fixed expressions are not created anew in each act of communication; rather, they are reproduced in speech as ready-made lexical units. In this respect, they resemble words and are therefore sometimes referred to as lexical units. Unlike single words, however, phraseological units possess not merely a form but a specific structural organization.

Phraseological units are secondary linguistic signs formed on the basis of primary linguistic units. Structurally, they consist of groups of words or sentences built according to productive syntactic patterns. In this regard, one may speak of free and phraseological meanings of expressions, corresponding to the concepts of literal and figurative meanings in lexical semantics. Some expressions convey only one meaning in discourse, whereas others may function in both literal and figurative senses.

Unlike free word combinations, phraseological units possess the following characteristics:

1. **Idiomaticity:** The semantic reinterpretation or transformation of components gives rise to a new integral meaning. The degree of idiomaticity is generally high, and the meaning of the phraseological unit differs significantly from the meanings of its individual components.
2. **Stability:** Phraseological units exhibit semantic and syntactic cohesion:
 - a. Lexical-semantic stability, meaning that components cannot usually be replaced by synonyms.
 - b. Grammatical stability, implying that their grammatical structure remains fixed.
3. **Reproducibility:** Due to lexicalization, phraseological units exist as ready-made semantic entities available to language users.
4. **Realization:** Phraseological units function as ready-made nominative units of the lexicon.
5. **Conventionality:** They are not individual or occasional formations but socially established linguistic phenomena.

6. **Lack of motivation:** The original motivation of many phraseological units can often be explained only through historical knowledge.

According to semantic classification, phraseological units may be divided into the following groups:

1. **Idioms (phraseological fusions):** completely non-motivated expressions, for example: *badengehen* (“to fail”).
2. **Phraseological unities:** expressions that may also occur as free combinations in a similar form, for example: *das Fest abschöpfen* (“to enjoy the best part”).
3. **Phraseological collocations:** combinations consisting of a support verb and a noun, for example: *etwas zur Diskussion stellen* (“to discuss something”) [2].

The well-known linguist Thea Schippan proposed a lexical-syntactic classification of phraseological units [3]:

1. **Phraseological fusions:** These are reinterpretations of expressions that may also exist as free combinations, for example: *jmdm. einen Korb geben* (“to reject someone”), *ein Kuckucksei ins Nest legen* (“to cause trouble for someone”).
2. **Stable combinations:** These are fixed expressions in which one or several components have figurative meanings, while others retain their literal sense. Schippan further subdivides them into:
 - a. Stable verbal combinations: *Antwort geben*, *in Aufregung geraten*;
 - b. Stable nominal combinations: *schwarzer Tee*, *sauberer Charakter*.

Phraseological units possess a grammatical structure similar to that of phrases. Their meaning emerges from the semantic reinterpretation of all components, for example: *etw. an den Nagel hängen* (“to give up hope”). Phraseological units constitute one of the most important categories within phraseology.

According to their correlation with parts of speech, the following types may be distinguished:

- Verbal phraseological units: *den Mundhalten*, *jmdm. den Kopf waschen*;
- Nominal phraseological units: *das schwarze Gold*, *einunbeschriebenes Blatt*;
- Adverbial phraseological units: *unter vier Augen*, *um ein Haar*.

The semantic categories of phraseology include polysemy, homonymy, synonymy, and antonymy.

- **Phraseological polysemy** differs quantitatively from the polysemy of ordinary lexical items. Since phraseological units themselves often arise through metaphorization, further semantic derivation is limited. New meanings may emerge through parallel metaphorization of the same syntagmatic structure, giving rise to phraseological homonyms.
- **Phraseological synonymy** is one of the most productive categories of German phraseology. Similar to lexical synonyms, phraseological synonyms may be absolute, ideographic (conceptual), or stylistic.
- **Phraseological antonymy** refers to phraseological units with opposite meanings, for example: *ein warmes Herz haben* ("to be kind-hearted") versus *ein kaltes Herz haben* ("to be insensitive"); *ein weites Herz haben* ("to be generous") versus *ein enges Herz haben* ("to be ungenerous").
- **Phraseological units** should be distinguished from ordinary word combinations and free collocations. Their most important feature is reproducibility: unlike free combinations, they are not created anew in speech but are reproduced as fixed expressions existing in the language system.

RESULTS

Phraseological units constitute one of the most distinctive and expressive components of the lexical system of a language.

Although they are structurally composed of two or more words, they frequently function as semantically integral units whose overall meaning cannot always be directly derived from the meanings of their individual components. The structural complexity, semantic integrity, stability, reproducibility, and expressive potential of phraseological units distinguish them from free word combinations and make them an important object of linguistic research. In both German and Uzbek, phraseological units occupy a significant position in the lexical and stylistic systems of the language, serving not only nominative purposes but also expressing emotions, evaluations, attitudes, imagery, and culturally significant meanings.

A characteristic feature of phraseological units is their ability to convey a single integral meaning despite consisting of several lexical components. In many cases, the semantic content of a phraseological unit corresponds functionally to that of a single lexical item. For example, the German expressions *unter die Armegreifen* ("to help"), *große Augen machen* ("to be astonished"), and *sich auf die Beine machen* ("to set off; to leave") illustrate the process through which an originally concrete combination of words acquires an abstract and figurative meaning. The semantic transformation of the constituent elements results in a unit whose meaning is perceived as a whole rather than as a simple combination of the meanings of its components. This semantic integrity is one of the fundamental properties that distinguish phraseological units from freely constructed word combinations.

Another essential characteristic of phraseological units is their structural stability. Unlike free combinations, whose lexical components can generally be replaced according to the communicative needs of the speaker, phraseological units tend to preserve a relatively fixed lexical composition. The replacement of one component by a synonymous or semantically related word may result in the loss of the conventional phraseological meaning or may transform the expression into a free combination. At the same time, structural stability does not necessarily imply absolute immutability. Certain phraseological units may occur in variant forms, while retaining their basic lexical and semantic identity.

Thus, phraseological stability should be understood as a relative phenomenon that permits limited formal variation within established linguistic patterns.

The fixed composition of phraseological units also contributes to their predictability and reproducibility. Speakers generally reproduce such expressions as ready-made linguistic units rather than constructing them anew in each communicative situation. In particularly stable idiomatic expressions, the possibility of modifying the lexical composition is extremely limited. In other cases, however, phraseological units may permit the insertion of certain modifiers, the omission of particular components, or minor grammatical changes. Such modifications do not necessarily destroy the phraseological character of the expression, provided that its conventional semantic identity remains recognizable. Consequently, phraseological units occupy an intermediate position between completely free combinations and entirely fixed lexical items.

Grammatical stability represents another important characteristic of phraseological units. Their grammatical structure is generally reproduced in a relatively stable form, although certain expressions may demonstrate variation in grammatical categories or forms depending on the syntactic environment. Word order is likewise frequently fixed, particularly in highly idiomatic constructions. Nevertheless, some phraseological combinations permit a certain degree of permutation, especially constructions consisting of a verb and its nominal dependent. Such structural variation demonstrates the heterogeneous nature of phraseological language and confirms that phraseological units cannot be described according to a single rigid structural model.

The complexity and heterogeneity of phraseological structures have contributed to continuing discussion concerning the boundaries and scope of phraseology as a linguistic discipline. Phraseology has traditionally been treated either as a branch of lexicology or as an independent field of linguistic investigation. Within phraseological studies, different approaches have been developed concerning the range of units that should be included in the phraseological inventory of a language. A narrow

approach primarily includes idiomatic and semantically indivisible expressions, whereas a broader approach also encompasses stable combinations, collocations, and other reproducible multiword structures. Contemporary approaches tend to consider phraseology as a multidimensional field in which semantic, structural, functional, pragmatic, and stylistic criteria must be taken into account.

From a semantic perspective, phraseological units may be differentiated according to the degree of semantic cohesion between their components. In traditional classifications, idiomatic fusions represent the highest degree of semantic indivisibility, since the meaning of the whole expression is largely independent of the meanings of its constituent words. Phraseological unities are characterized by a figurative meaning that remains to some extent motivated by the meanings of their components, while phraseological collocations demonstrate a comparatively greater degree of semantic transparency. Such classifications reveal that phraseological units form a continuum rather than a completely homogeneous category.

The lexical and syntactic classification proposed by Thea Schippan also emphasizes the internal diversity of stable multiword expressions. From this perspective, phraseological units may be divided into phraseological fusions and stable combinations, with further differentiation according to their grammatical and lexical structure. Depending on their dominant grammatical function, phraseological expressions may be verbal, nominal, or adverbial. They may also demonstrate semantic relations such as polysemy, synonymy, antonymy, and, in certain cases, homonymy. These characteristics indicate that phraseological units participate actively in the general semantic organization of the lexicon and cannot be regarded as isolated or peripheral linguistic phenomena.

An important criterion for distinguishing phraseological units from free word combinations is reproducibility. Free combinations are generated productively in speech according to grammatical and semantic rules, whereas phraseological units are generally reproduced from the existing linguistic repertoire of a speech community. Their conventional character means that

speakers recognize and understand them as established expressions. This reproducibility is closely related to their stability and conventionality and contributes to the preservation of their semantic and stylistic identity.

The functional-stylistic dimension of phraseology is particularly significant because phraseological units occur in different functional varieties of language and possess different degrees of stylistic markedness. In this respect, phraseology demonstrates a considerable degree of internal stratification. Colloquial phraseology constitutes one of the largest stylistic layers. Such expressions are primarily characteristic of oral communication and literary texts that reproduce informal speech. They frequently possess a familiar, conversational, humorous, ironic, or emotionally marked character and therefore contribute substantially to the naturalness and expressiveness of communication.

Another important stylistic layer is represented by bookish phraseology. Such expressions are characteristic of written forms of communication and may occur in scientific, journalistic, official-business, and other formal styles. Compared with colloquial phraseological units, bookish expressions often possess a more formal, elevated, solemn, or standardized stylistic character. Nevertheless, the distinction between bookish and colloquial phraseology is not absolute, since some phraseological units can function successfully across several functional styles depending on the communicative situation and the intentions of the speaker or writer.

Phraseological units may also be classified according to their emotional and expressive characteristics. Some expressions are stylistically neutral and perform primarily a nominative function, whereas others possess strong emotional and evaluative connotations. Emotionally expressive phraseological units can communicate familiarity, affection, irony, humour, contempt, disapproval, indignation, or other attitudes. Bookish phraseological expressions, in contrast, may contribute to an elevated or solemn tone. Thus, the stylistic value of a phraseological unit is determined not only by its lexical meaning but also by its emotional, evaluative, and pragmatic potential.

Stylistically neutral phraseological combinations generally perform a more restricted nominative function. Some of them are closely associated with terminological or professional vocabulary and may be characterized by a comparatively transparent relationship between their constituent elements and their overall meaning. Such expressions are often used to designate concepts, processes, phenomena, or objects in a precise and relatively unambiguous manner. Their principal communicative function is therefore informational rather than strongly expressive.

Journalistic discourse represents another important sphere in which phraseological units demonstrate considerable functional flexibility. Journalistic texts frequently employ established expressions as well as modified, expanded, and creatively transformed phraseological units. Such modifications enable authors to adapt conventional expressions to particular communicative contexts and to attract the reader's attention. Expressive phraseology is especially frequent in analytical articles, interviews, problem-oriented publications, and emotionally charged journalistic texts, where the writer seeks not merely to transmit information but also to influence the reader's perception and evaluation of the described events.

The stylistic potential of phraseological units becomes particularly evident in literary discourse. Language constitutes the primary material and instrument of literary art, and writers carefully select lexical items, grammatical structures, and established expressions in order to convey ideas accurately, clearly, concisely, and expressively. The individual manner in which a writer employs linguistic resources contributes to the formation of an author's distinctive style. Phraseological units are particularly valuable in this respect because they combine semantic economy with figurative and emotional richness.

The use of phraseological units in literary texts contributes to the expressive capacity, fluency, and naturalness of literary language. They provide writers with ready-made linguistic resources through which complex ideas, emotional states, interpersonal relations, and evaluative attitudes can be conveyed in a compact and culturally recognizable form. Their presence may also contribute to the development and enrichment of

literary language, since writers can reproduce conventional expressions, modify them creatively, or place them in new contextual environments.

One of the most significant stylistic properties of phraseological units is their imagery. Literary speech is inherently figurative, and many phraseological expressions contain an underlying image associated with a concrete object, action, situation, or event. Through metaphorical reinterpretation, the original concrete image becomes a means of expressing an abstract concept or emotional state. This figurative basis significantly increases the stylistic potential of phraseological units and enables them to function as powerful expressive resources.

The expressive force of phraseological units is especially apparent when their figurative meanings interact with the broader context of a literary work. An expression that is relatively familiar in everyday communication may acquire additional contextual meaning when used by a particular character or narrator. Consequently, phraseological units may perform not only an expressive function but also a characterizing function. Their use can reveal the social background, emotional state, communicative intentions, and individual speech characteristics of a literary character. In this way, phraseology becomes an important instrument of literary characterization.

The frequency of phraseological units in different types of discourse is closely related to their stylistic properties. Literary texts constitute one of the most productive environments for phraseological usage, although phraseological expressions are also common in journalistic and popular-scientific discourse. The degree of phraseological usage depends on the communicative purpose, genre, stylistic norms, and emotional orientation of the text. Highly expressive phraseological units tend to occur more frequently in contexts in which the author seeks to create an emotional response or provide an explicit evaluation, whereas stylistically neutral expressions are more appropriate when precision and informational clarity are prioritized.

In literary discourse, phraseological units primarily function as expressive and evaluative means. Their semantic structure

enables writers to express positive or negative attitudes without necessarily stating those attitudes explicitly. Negative evaluative meanings may include irony, hostility, contempt, disgust, insult, disapproval, or other forms of negative emotional reaction. Positive meanings, on the other hand, may express affection, encouragement, sympathy, humour, approval, or emotional closeness. The same phraseological expression may therefore perform different pragmatic functions depending on the context in which it occurs.

The stylistic effectiveness of phraseological units also depends on the individual linguistic competence and creative skill of the writer. Different authors may employ the same phraseological resources with different degrees of frequency and originality. One writer may reproduce conventional expressions in their established form, while another may deliberately transform them in order to create a particular stylistic effect. Such transformations can involve lexical substitution, expansion, reduction, structural modification, semantic reinterpretation, or contextual reanalysis. The creative manipulation of phraseological units is therefore an important component of individual authorial style.

From a functional perspective, phraseological units can consequently be regarded as multifunctional linguistic resources. Their functions include nomination, expression of emotion, evaluation, creation of imagery, intensification of meaning, characterization of speakers or characters, and realization of communicative and pragmatic intentions. These functions are not mutually exclusive; a single phraseological unit may simultaneously perform several of them. For example, a figurative expression may nominate a particular situation while simultaneously expressing the speaker's emotional attitude toward it and strengthening the expressive impact of the utterance.

The stylistic study of phraseological units in German and Uzbek is therefore important for understanding the relationship between lexical structure, semantic organization, communicative intention, and cultural representation. Although German and Uzbek belong to different language families and have developed

within different historical and cultural environments, both languages employ stable multiword expressions as significant means of conceptualizing experience and expressing culturally shaped attitudes. Their phraseological systems reflect not only the structural properties of the respective languages but also patterns of figurative thinking, social experience, emotional evaluation, and communicative behaviour.

A study of phraseological units from a functional-stylistic perspective consequently makes it possible to identify the ways in which stable expressions operate in different communicative environments. It demonstrates that phraseological units should not be considered merely as fixed combinations of words. Rather, they represent complex linguistic formations in which semantic integrity, structural stability, reproducibility, stylistic markedness, imagery, emotionality, evaluation, and pragmatic function interact. Their ability to condense extensive semantic and cultural information into relatively compact linguistic forms explains their enduring importance in both everyday communication and literary discourse.

Thus, phraseological units constitute an essential component of the expressive resources of German and Uzbek. Their stylistic functions extend from neutral nomination to highly expressive representation of emotions, evaluations, attitudes, and figurative meanings. In literary texts in particular, they contribute to imagery, characterization, emotional intensity, and authorial individuality, while in colloquial and journalistic discourse they provide naturalness, expressiveness, persuasiveness, and communicative economy. The functional-stylistic analysis of phraseological units therefore provides valuable insight into the interaction between language structure and language use and creates a methodological basis for the further *chog'ishtirma* study of phraseological phenomena in German and Uzbek.

DISCUSSION

A substantial proportion of phraseological units used in speech serves a specific stylistic purpose, particularly that of creating expressiveness. For this reason, phraseological units represent

important linguistic resources in literary texts, where they contribute to the comprehensive portrayal of images, characters, and their individual traits, as well as to the figurative and often intensified representation of events, situations, and states. When writers employ phraseological units for such purposes, translators, in turn, must fully understand their communicative and stylistic functions and convey them accurately to speakers of another language. This requires translators to have a thorough knowledge of the language of the literary work, including its linguistic and stylistic characteristics, and to base their translation decisions on these features.

The study of the stylistic properties of idioms constitutes the subject of phraseostylistics. In assigning a stylistic characterization to idioms, their various meanings and, particularly, their connotative properties play an important role. Connotations may be understood as additional semantic and stylistic elements or features that influence the stylistic layer and emotional level of a phraseological unit, that is, its stylistic colouring (Fleischer 1982: 202). Owing to these properties, phraseological units are capable of performing a variety of functions within a text. They may intensify a statement, contribute to the vividness of a description, or increase the emotional and expressive character of a particular passage.

The stylistic interpretation of phraseological units is closely connected with their actual use in specific textual contexts and in oral communication. The stylistic evaluation of a phraseological expression is frequently context-dependent. It is often only within a particular context that its ironic, humorous, euphemistic, or otherwise pragmatically marked meaning becomes apparent. This aspect is directly related to the pragmatic functions of phraseological units. In this context, pragmatic functions may be understood as the specific effects that phraseological units can produce in supporting the communicative intentions of the sender (Fleischer 1982: 221). Thus, a speaker may use a phraseological expression ironically in order to distance themselves from a particular subject or proposition. Similarly, an expression may be employed euphemistically to describe an unpleasant situation or

event in a less direct and therefore socially or emotionally mitigated manner.

Some phraseological units are already marked in dictionaries or encyclopedic reference works as humorous, ironic, euphemistic, or otherwise stylistically characterized. Among the German phraseological expressions that may be associated with a humorous effect are *sich in die Höhle des Löwenwagen, eine gute Lunge haben, Neptunopfern, im Schweinsgalopp*, and *ein abgebrochener Riese*. Expressions such as *ein Ritter ohne Furcht und Tadel, ein wahrer Pracht sein, passen wie die Faust aufs Auge, jemand merkt aber auch alles!* and *jmdm. Laune machen* may be employed to produce an ironic or sarcastic effect, depending on the context. Euphemistic or indirectly veiled expressions include *über den Jordan gehen, nicht mehr unter uns sein, bei jemandem ist etwas unterwegs, ein leichtes Mädchen*, and *Nummer null*, the latter being used as a designation for a toilet. Phraseological expressions may also communicate a speaker's negative personal attitude. Examples include *kisser Vater, einen Türken bauen, einschräger Vogel, geschmückt wie ein Pfingstochse*, and *Schaumschlagen*. The precise pragmatic value of these expressions, however, depends on their contextual realization and communicative purpose.

Phraseological units are particularly frequent and functionally diverse in literary texts, where they are used to achieve specific artistic effects. One of their important functions is the characterization of persons and literary characters. As Wolfgang Fleischer points out, phraseological units, like other linguistic resources, may function in the speech of characters as a kind of "speech portrait," thereby contributing to the characterization of individuals (Fleischer 1982: 228). The selection and frequency of particular phraseological expressions can provide information about a character's social background, communicative behaviour, emotional state, worldview, and interpersonal relationships. Consequently, phraseology constitutes an important component of linguistic characterization in literary discourse.

Literary texts generally contain a higher proportion of phraseological units than ordinary everyday speech, and their use

contributes to the lexical richness and expressive potential of the text. Phraseological units may also undergo various forms of contextual transformation. Such transformations are particularly effective when an author does not intend to reproduce a conventional naming scheme in an entirely predictable form but seeks to revise or reshape it for artistic purposes. Fleischer emphasizes that the possible transformations of phraseological units provide especially suitable material for reconsidering traditional naming patterns that the writer does not wish to accept without modification and for creating a particular artistic effect [5: 230].

Phraseological units can also be connected with one another in such a way that one expression reinforces or complements another. In such cases, the subsequent phraseological expression may continue the “phraseologization” of the text, producing a chain of interconnected figurative expressions [5: 231]. Such relationships can create a deliberate play with phraseological expressions and contribute to the internal cohesion and stylistic organization of a literary passage. The interaction of several phraseological units may thus become a specific compositional and expressive device.

Harald Burger has drawn particular attention to the position of phraseological units within texts. According to his observations, idioms frequently occur at the beginning or at the end of a text or textual segment. When an idiom is positioned at the beginning, it may prepare the semantic and evaluative field of the subsequent passage, establishing either a positive or negative orientation before the actual description of a situation is presented. In journalistic discourse, phraseological units are also frequently found in headlines, where they may summarize, anticipate, or metaphorically represent the central idea of the article and simultaneously attract the reader's attention [6: 155-157].

According to Burger, the contextual integration of phraseological units is particularly characterized by two major criteria: cohesion and modification. Highly idiomatic phraseological units may behave differently from ordinary linguistic constituents in terms of their integration into textual

structures. Their internal components may resist certain processes that are otherwise typical of text formation, including pronominalization and anaphoric reference. In this respect, strongly idiomatic phraseological units may demonstrate a distinctive degree of internal cohesion that differentiates them from freely constructed expressions [6: 157].

Burger defines modification as a text-forming process based on the inherent semantic potential of a phraseological unit, which becomes manifest in a particular context and can be fully understood only within that context [6: 159]. From this perspective, phraseological modification is not simply an arbitrary alteration of a fixed expression. Rather, it represents a creative process in which the conventional structure or meaning of a phraseological unit interacts with the immediate textual environment.

Burger distinguishes between modifications affecting the external form of a phraseological unit and those affecting its semantic interpretation. On this basis, three principal combinations may be identified: (1) formal modification without semantic modification; (2) formal modification accompanied by semantic modification; and (3) semantic modification without formal modification [6: 159].

The first type, formal modification without semantic modification, involves changes to the external form of a phraseological unit while preserving its conventional semantic content. Such modifications generally produce a relatively limited rhetorical effect. Only a restricted number of phraseological units can undergo formal modification without affecting their established meaning. One example of this type is ellipsis, whereby part of the conventional expression is omitted while its phraseological meaning remains recoverable from the context.

The second type, formal and semantic modification, occurs when a formal alteration produces consequences for the interpretation of the phraseological unit. An important phenomenon in this regard is ambiguity, whereby the literal interpretation of the modified expression is activated alongside its conventional phraseological reading. As a result, the recipient

simultaneously processes the established idiomatic meaning and the newly created contextual meaning. Substitution represents one of the principal mechanisms of this type of modification: one component of the conventional phraseological unit is replaced by another, sometimes involving only a minimal formal alteration. Despite the small scale of the modification, the resulting expression may acquire a new semantic or stylistic effect.

The third type, semantic modification without formal modification, occurs when the formal structure of the phraseological unit remains unchanged but its interpretation is transformed by the context. In such cases, the conventional expression is reproduced in its established form, while the surrounding textual environment creates a contextual contrast or reinterpretation that gives the phraseological unit an additional or modified meaning.

Burger's classification raises an important theoretical question concerning the limits of phraseological modification: is the capacity for modification a characteristic of all phraseological units, or is it restricted to particular groups? Not all phraseological units demonstrate the same degree of flexibility. Some expressions are highly resistant to modification, particularly certain conjunctive and prepositional phraseological constructions. Their structural and semantic organization places considerable limitations on possible contextual transformations.

Phraseological units perform numerous functions in texts and provide specific possibilities for organizing textual meaning. Their actual realization in a particular text is determined by a range of communicative factors, including the intentions of the sender, the relationship between the communication partners, the distinction between oral and written communication, the external circumstances of the communicative act, the subject matter of the text, and the educational and social background of the sender. Consequently, it is difficult to provide a single universally applicable description of the functions of phraseological units without taking the specific text type and communicative situation into account. A phraseological expression that performs an expressive function in one context may serve primarily a

nominative, evaluative, persuasive, or cohesive function in another.

For this reason, contemporary phraseological research increasingly focuses on particular texts and text types. Burger considers attempts to establish an entirely general and context-independent system of phraseological functions to be problematic, emphasizing the importance of textual and communicative context [6: 146]. Nevertheless, based on the relevant theoretical literature, several major functions of phraseological units can be identified. Burger [6: 147-150], Fleischer [5: 216-232] provide a theoretical basis for distinguishing a number of such functions.

First, phraseological units, like other connotative linguistic elements, can function as indicators of social relationships between communication partners. The choice of a particular phraseological construction may signal social solidarity, strengthen interpersonal closeness, establish familiarity, or create an informal communicative atmosphere. Consequently, phraseological choice can provide information about the nature of the relationship between the participants in communication.

Second, phraseological units can express the sender's emotionally marked attitude toward the facts or events being communicated. They can indirectly convey positive or negative evaluations to the recipient and therefore function as effective emotional and expressive devices. Their use can intensify the emotional impact of a text and contribute to its persuasive force. This function is particularly important in media discourse, where phraseological expressions can influence the reader's perception and evaluation of events.

Third, phraseological units can contribute to the vividness and comprehensibility of descriptions. This function is especially noticeable in popular-scientific texts, where figurative expressions may make complex information more accessible, lively, and readable. Through familiar images and conventional figurative structures, abstract or complicated concepts can be presented in a more concrete and communicatively accessible manner.

Fourth, the use of phraseological units can strengthen the impact of an argument and make a particular idea more memorable. By emotionally emphasizing a concept or proposition, phraseological expressions can increase the rhetorical effectiveness of communication. This function is especially relevant in scientific discourse involving controversy and argumentation, as well as in political speeches, where linguistic expressiveness and memorability can contribute to persuasive communication.

Fifth, different forms of phraseological modification can serve as a basis for linguistic creativity and language play. Modified phraseological units can demonstrate the originality and creative abilities of a speaker, writer, or journalist. Language play based on phraseological expressions may produce satire, irony, humour, comic effects, or ridicule. Journalists frequently modify established phraseological expressions in headlines and articles in order to renew conventional linguistic patterns, avoid stereotypical formulations, and attract the reader's attention. Such transformations demonstrate that phraseology is not merely a repository of fixed expressions but also a productive resource for creative language use.

Sixth, phraseological units occur frequently in press headlines. Their presence in headlines serves to attract the reader's attention and encourage further engagement with the article. In this respect, their function is comparable in certain ways to that of language used in advertising. A familiar phraseological expression, particularly when creatively modified, can make a headline more striking and memorable and can help the recipient retain the central message of the text.

Seventh, phraseological units can contribute to textual cohesion. Together with tropes and other stylistic devices, they can establish semantic and thematic relationships between sentences or larger textual segments. The repeated use of related phraseological expressions, as well as their contextual modification and semantic interaction, may create continuity within a text. In this sense, cohesion refers to the semantic and meaningful relationships established between sentences or textual fragments. Phraseological repetition, variation, and

phraseological chains can therefore function as mechanisms of textual organization.

The analysis demonstrates that the stylistic potential of phraseological units extends far beyond the simple transmission of lexical meaning. Their semantic integrity and structural stability are combined with connotative, emotional, evaluative, pragmatic, and contextual properties. As a result, phraseological units can simultaneously characterize a person, express an emotional attitude, intensify a statement, create imagery, establish social distance or solidarity, organize textual cohesion, and contribute to the artistic structure of a literary work.

In German literary and journalistic discourse, these functions are particularly visible in the contextual modification of established phraseological expressions. The writer or journalist can rely on the recipient's familiarity with the conventional expression while deliberately altering its form or activating its literal meaning. This interaction between conventionality and contextual creativity creates additional semantic layers and enhances the expressive potential of the text. Therefore, the study of phraseological units requires attention not only to their dictionary meanings but also to their contextual realization, stylistic colouring, pragmatic purpose, and interaction with other linguistic elements.

From the perspective of German and Uzbek phraseology, the functional and stylistic analysis of phraseological units is especially significant. Phraseological expressions in both languages serve as important carriers of cultural experience and linguistic imagery, while their contextual use reflects the communicative norms and stylistic traditions of the respective speech communities. Their analysis can therefore reveal both universal functional tendencies and language-specific patterns of emotional expression, evaluation, characterization, metaphorization, and textual organization.

Consequently, phraseological units should be regarded as multifunctional linguistic resources that operate at the intersection of semantics, stylistics, pragmatics, and discourse. Their role in literary texts is particularly important because they enable authors to express complex meanings in a concise,

figurative, emotionally marked, and culturally recognizable form. At the same time, their pragmatic functions depend fundamentally on context, communicative intention, genre, and the relationship between the participants in communication. A comprehensive analysis of these features provides an essential theoretical foundation for examining the stylistic functions of phraseological units in German and Uzbek and for identifying the specific ways in which phraseological resources contribute to the expressive and communicative organization of texts.

To substantiate the theoretical considerations presented above, it is appropriate to examine several phraseological units occurring in the German translation *Kein Himmel auf Erden* of the famous Uzbek writer Utkir Hoshimov's literary work *Dunyoningishlari*, translated from Uzbek into German by Oybek Ostanov. The examples demonstrate how phraseological expressions function as important stylistic and expressive resources in literary discourse and how their semantic and pragmatic potential is reproduced in translation.

One of the examples is the following passage:

Vielleicht geht es Ihnen bisweilen ähnlich wie mir, dass Sie mitten in der Nacht plötzlich aufwachen, den Blick auf die Zimmerdecker richten und einfach nur liegen und liegen... [7: 6]

The repetition of *liegen und liegen* contributes to the emotional and stylistic organization of the utterance. The repetition creates a sense of duration and emphasizes the psychological state of the person described. Rather than merely conveying the physical act of lying, the expression participates in the representation of an extended emotional or contemplative state.

Another example is:

Wie schade... jemand hat seinen Geist aufgegeben, der Arme! [7: 9]

The expression *seinen Geist aufgeben* is a conventional German euphemistic phraseological expression meaning "to die." Its use makes the statement less direct and emotionally mitigated than an explicit reference to death. At the same time, the addition *der*

Arme! introduces an emotional-evaluative component, expressing sympathy and compassion toward the deceased. A further example is:

*Wie ich erfuhr, lag sie nicht ans Bett gefesselt nieder und
brauchte auch von niemand eine besondere Pflege....
Nicht jedem wird so ein stiller, schmerzloser Tod zuteil.* [7: 10]

The expression *ans Bett gefesselt niederliegen* conveys the state of being confined to bed as a result of illness or physical weakness. Its figurative structure provides a more vivid representation of the person's condition than a neutral lexical description would normally achieve. The expression *ein stiller, schmerzloser Tod* further contributes to the emotionally restrained representation of death.

The following example demonstrates the use of phraseological and figurative resources in the representation of emotional suffering:

*Aus Gram, die Söhne weder zu Versöhnung noch zum Frieden
bewegen zu können, wurde die Mutter krank und starb schließlich vor
Kummer.* [7: 13]

The expressions *vor Kummer sterben* and *aus Gram* emphasize the mother's profound emotional suffering. They create a semantic connection between psychological distress and physical consequences, thereby intensifying the emotional effect of the narrative.

Another expressive construction occurs in:

Warum stehst du da wie versteinert?“, sprach sie mich plötzlich an.
[7: 32].

The comparison *wie versteinert* (“as if petrified”) functions as a vivid figurative device for representing a person's psychological and physical state. The expression conveys astonishment, fear, shock, or emotional paralysis and therefore performs both an expressive and characterizing function.

The phraseological expression *auf dem Sprung sein* in the following passage also illustrates the close relationship between phraseology and communicative intention:

Setz dich dochhin, mein Kind! Bleibhiereinbisschensitzen! – “Nun, ich bin schon auf dem Sprung. [7: 41]

Here, *auf dem Sprung sein* means that a person is ready to leave or is about to depart. Its use is more vivid and conversational than a neutral expression such as *ich muss bald gehen*. Consequently, the phraseological unit contributes to the naturalness and colloquial character of the dialogue.

These examples demonstrate that stable combinations and phraseological units contribute substantially to the figurative and expressive character of speech. Their stylistic effect results from the interaction of conventional meaning, figurative imagery, emotional colouring, and contextual realization. Phraseological expressions are therefore particularly significant in literary discourse, where the author seeks to create vivid images and communicate not only factual information but also emotional and evaluative meanings.

The imagery underlying phraseological expressions is one of the major sources of their stylistic potential. Most phraseological units are based on a particular image, concrete event, object, action, or conceptual representation. This imagery increases their expressive capacity and turns them into powerful means of linguistic representation. Writers frequently exploit these underlying images in order to enrich descriptions, intensify emotional effects, and create new contextual associations. In some cases, the conventional image underlying a phraseological unit can serve as a basis for the creation of new expressions or for the creative transformation of established ones.

Phraseological units occur particularly frequently in literary texts, although they are also widely represented in journalistic and popular-scientific discourse. Their role in literary texts is especially significant because they enable authors to express events, objects, characters, and situations in a vivid and figurative manner. In literary discourse, phraseological units may

perform several major stylistic functions, including the figurative representation of events, evaluation of situations, expression of emotions, intensification of expressiveness, and creation of humorous or satirical effects.

One of the most important functions of phraseological units is the figurative representation of events and phenomena. Many phraseological expressions provide concrete and visually comprehensible representations of persons, objects, actions, and events. Uzbek expressions such as *tiliuzun* ('to be talkative or insolent'), *dunyonisuvbossa, to'pig'igachiqmaydi* ('to remain completely indifferent even in a very serious situation') demonstrate this function. Such expressions are particularly characteristic of phraseological units possessing a strong internal image. They do not simply provide an alternative designation for a particular concept; rather, they can spread a powerful figurative effect throughout the surrounding text.

For example:

Nima? Soatovninghozirginamayusboqiburganko'zlaridao 'tyonib ketgandekbo'ldi. [13: 212]

The phrase *ko'zlaridao'tyonibketgandekbo'ldi* creates a vivid visual image and conveys a sudden change in the character's emotional state. The metaphorical image of fire in the eyes intensifies the description and enables the reader to perceive the character's emotional transformation more vividly.

A second important function is the evaluation of various states and situations. Phraseological units frequently combine nomination with positive or negative evaluation. This evaluative potential is especially important in literary works because authors use phraseological expressions to communicate attitudes toward characters and events without necessarily expressing those attitudes through direct evaluative adjectives.

For example:

Uningko'zlariolayibo'rnidansapchibturdi; Soatningonasibirchekk adamung'ayibturar, odamlardanuyalgandekyu ziniqalinro 'molbilanto'sibolganmish. [13: 213-214]

The phraseological expressions in these sentences contribute to the evaluation and representation of the characters' psychological and emotional states. They allow the author to convey fear, distress, embarrassment, sadness, and other affective reactions in a vivid and contextually meaningful manner.

The third major function is the expression of emotionality. A considerable part of the Uzbek phraseological system expresses not only a particular conceptual meaning but also the speaker's emotional attitude, including joy, anger, hatred, regret, fear, irony, disgust, and other emotional states. This emotional potential makes phraseological units particularly effective in literary communication. For instance:

Kulganidachehrasidannurporlabketgandekbo 'ldi. [13: 30]

The expression *chehrasidannurporlabketgandekbo 'ldi* conveys happiness and emotional brightness. The metaphorical image of light radiating from the face intensifies the representation of the character's positive emotional state.

Similarly:

Xudogashukr, ko 'nglijoyigatushdi. [13: 280]

The phrase *ko 'nglijoyigatushmoq* expresses relief, reassurance, and the restoration of inner calm. Its use provides a compact figurative representation of a psychological transition from anxiety to emotional stability.

Another example is:

*Qo 'linitushirdi-yu, ko 'chaeshikoldidao 'zigaqarabturgan
Muqaddamniko 'ribxijolatdanyuzlarilovillabketdi.* [8: 468]

The expression *xijolatdanyuzlarilovillabketdi* conveys embarrassment and emotional agitation. The metaphorical representation of the face becoming intensely heated makes the emotional state immediately perceptible to the reader.

The following example demonstrates the expression of anger and strong negative emotional attitude:

Hozirhechkimni, hatto, onamniko 'rishgako 'zimyo 'qedi. [9: 31]

The phrase *ko 'rishgako 'zimyo 'q* expresses an intense unwillingness to see someone. In the given context, it communicates anger and emotional rejection. Thus, the phraseological unit conveys a psychological state more powerfully than a neutral construction would.

The fourth function is the creation of expressiveness in speech. The concept of expression, derived from the Latin *expressio*, refers to the capacity of speech to produce a strong emotional or stylistic effect. Expressiveness may be achieved through lexical, grammatical, phraseological, and other linguistic resources. Phraseological units are particularly effective in this regard because many of them contain an intensifying semantic component that strengthens the emotional force of the utterance.

Consider the following examples:

Daf' atankayfibutunlaytarqabketganini his etdi. [13: 64]

The phrase *kayfitarqabketmoq* conveys the sudden disappearance of a person's positive emotional state. The phraseological structure makes the psychological change more vivid and expressive. Another example is:

Cholimkunyozilgandaburnidantortsayiqilgudekbo 'libqaytibkeldi. [11: 179]

The figurative expression intensifies the representation of the person's extremely weakened or exhausted state and thereby contributes to the expressive character of the description.

A particularly expressive example is:

Onam kitobniko 'rishibilanko 'zlariquvonchdanporlabketar, uzundan -uzoq duo qilar; peshonamdano 'pib, yakkashbittagapnita krorla redi: Sen meningsuyangantog 'imsan, o 'g 'lim... [9: 34]

The phrase *suyangantog 'im* ('my mountain of support') contains a powerful metaphorical image. It represents the son as a source

of strength, protection, and emotional security. The expression simultaneously performs metaphorical, evaluative, emotional, and characterizing functions and contributes significantly to the emotional intensity of the passage. Another example is:

Onamningissiqnafasiurilibturar, u sirg'anib-sirg'anibborar, og'ir hansiraredi. [9: 18]

The lexical and grammatical organization of this sentence, together with the repetition of *sirg'anib-sirg'anib*, intensifies the description of the mother's physical condition. The combination of lexical choice and structural repetition produces a strong expressive effect. Likewise:

Ularningko'ngliniolaman, deb ikkio'rtadaonalaria doytamom bo'pti. [9: 9]

The expression *adoytamombo'lmoq* intensifies the representation of a person's exhaustion and complete depletion as a result of emotional or physical suffering. The intensifying semantic component embedded in the phraseological structure contributes directly to the expressiveness of the sentence.

The fifth function is the creation of satire and humour. Phraseological units occupy a special position among the linguistic resources used to produce humorous and satirical effects. This is related to their internal semantic structure, since many phraseological expressions contain nuances of humour, mockery, irony, sarcasm, or teasing. In literary discourse, such expressions can emphasize the humorous or satirical implications of a character's speech and reveal the speaker's attitude toward the described situation. For example:

Birovningdaydisigiri, birovningshaytongadarsberadiganech kisizu mo'tmayekinoralabketadi. [9: 40]

The expression *shaytongadarsberadiganechki* creates a humorous image by attributing an exaggerated characteristic to the goat. The hyperbolic image contributes to the comic

representation of the situation and demonstrates how figurative language can transform an ordinary event into an aesthetically and emotionally engaging description. Another example is:

Ariqqazibbo 'lmasa, yerchopibbo 'lmasa... o 'zimizniyampatagimiz gaqurttushibturibdi... [11: 189]

The figurative expression creates a humorous and simultaneously critical representation of a difficult situation. The phraseological image enables the speaker to communicate dissatisfaction indirectly while preserving the colloquial and expressive character of the utterance. A further example is:

Bir tonnalikbetonplitashunchakio 'zog 'irliginiko 'taraolmaychokida nuzilibketdi. Bir emas, uchqavatnibosibqoldi. [11: 6]

The description uses expressive linguistic resources to intensify the representation of the event and to increase its dramatic and perceptual impact.

Phraseological units are inherently figurative linguistic formations, which explains their extensive use by writers and poets. Among the linguistic resources available for representing imagery, phraseological expressions occupy a particularly important position because they are capable of conveying a broad spectrum of additional semantic and emotional nuances. Depending on context, they may express irony, hatred, disgust, insult, abuse, or curse, on the one hand, and affection, humour, encouragement, or approval, on the other.

The stylistic function of phraseological units is therefore closely related to their ability to reveal characters and represent events and situations in an expressive and figurative manner. When writers employ phraseological expressions, translators must understand not only their dictionary meaning but also the stylistic and pragmatic purpose for which they have been selected. In literary translation, the preservation of the expressive potential of a phraseological unit is often as important as the transmission of its denotative meaning. The translator must therefore take into consideration the linguistic characteristics of

the source text and identify the contextual function of each phraseological expression before selecting an appropriate target-language equivalent.

Phraseological units also contribute to the aesthetic value of a literary work. Writers and poets employ them to reveal the characteristics of literary characters, describe events, and create an aesthetic response in the reader. Their use is not accidental: phraseological expressions are closely connected with the everyday life, customs, traditions, historical experience, and cultural worldview of the people who use them. The origins and semantic development of phraseological units are therefore frequently associated with the mentality and cultural experience of a particular speech community.

The functioning of phraseological units in literary texts is consequently a complex process. Their semantic structure incorporates both phraseological meaning and stylistic meaning. The stylistic meaning of a phraseological unit can be viewed as comprising two principal components: a) expressive-evaluative colouring and b) functional-stylistic colouring. These properties remain relevant when phraseological units are incorporated into literary discourse. In determining the stylistic characteristics of such expressions, it is therefore productive to employ a combination of criteria, including the attractiveness and figurative potential of their internal form, semantic properties, phonetic or rhythmic features, quantitative distribution, and expressive-evaluative colouring.

The synonymic relationships among phraseological units also play an important role in the figurative representation of reality. Synonymous phraseological expressions can enable the author to present a particular characteristic or psychological state from different semantic and stylistic perspectives. Examples include *toqatitoqbo'lmoq* – *sabrkosasito'lmoq*, *burniko'tarilmoq* – *dimog'ishishmoq*, *yaxshiko'rmoq* – *ko'ngilbermoq*, *ikkioyog'inibiretikkatimoq* – *oyoqtirabolmoq*, and *og'zigatolqonsolmoq* – *mum tishlamoq*. These phraseological synonyms may differ in their expressive intensity, stylistic colouring, and contextual applicability.

When synonymous phraseological units are employed in a text, they can provide a more detailed representation of a particular characteristic or psychological state. Instead of merely naming an action or quality, they enable the writer to reveal its various nuances and to portray the character in greater semantic and emotional detail. Consequently, phraseological synonymy represents an important resource for literary characterization and contextual expressiveness.

The role of phraseological units in the figurative representation of reality is therefore considerable. They represent culturally established figurative expressions through which a speech community observes events, evaluates socially acceptable and unacceptable behaviours, and generalizes its accumulated life experience. Writers do not merely select phraseological expressions according to their conventional meanings. They may adapt, transform, or creatively restructure them in accordance with the character, psychological state, lifestyle, and communicative situation of the literary characters. Through such creative use, conventional folk expressions may acquire new semantic nuances and additional stylistic value.

The analysis of the German translation *Kein Himmel auf Erden* demonstrates the importance of considering phraseological units as context-dependent stylistic resources. The translator's task is not limited to finding formal equivalents. A successful translation should preserve, as far as possible, the figurative image, emotional evaluation, stylistic colouring, pragmatic intention, and communicative effect of the source expression. Where direct phraseological equivalence is unavailable, the translator may need to select a functionally comparable expression in the target language or reproduce the relevant meaning through another stylistic device.

In conclusion, the analysis of phraseological units in German and Uzbek literary discourse demonstrates their considerable lexical, semantic, stylistic, and pragmatic significance. Phraseological expressions occupy an important position in the lexical systems of both languages and represent a productive field for phraseostylistic and phraseopragmatic investigation. Their principal functions in literary discourse include figurative

representation, evaluation, emotional expression, intensification of expressiveness, characterization, and the creation of humour and satire. At the same time, their frequency in an individual literary work does not necessarily correspond directly to their overall distribution in the language, since individual writers differ considerably in their ability and manner of using phraseological resources.

The analysis further demonstrates that phraseological units substantially contribute to the attractiveness and expressive power of literary works. As linguistic units stored in the collective linguistic memory of speakers, they function as conventional signs or models that can be reproduced, modified, and creatively reinterpreted in discourse. Structurally, phraseological units may correspond to word combinations or complete sentences, while semantically and stylistically they frequently function as integral units.

Thus, phraseological units constitute an inseparable component of both language and speech and play a significant role in enriching the figurative, emotional, and expressive potential of communication. Their study and systematic transmission to future generations are therefore of considerable linguistic and pedagogical importance. Greater attention should be devoted to phraseological units in literary and spoken language, as well as to their systematic presentation in textbooks and teaching materials. The development of effective approaches to phraseological pedagogy can contribute to learners' ability to understand, interpret, and appropriately use phraseological expressions in authentic communicative situations.

REFERENCES

1. Mamatov, A. 1999. *O'zbek tili frazeologizmlarining shakllanish masalalari*. Toshkent.
2. Ольшанский, И. Г., Гусева А. Е. 2005. Лексикология: Современный немецкий язык. Издательский центр. Академия.
3. Thea, S. 1992. *Lexikologie der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Max Niemeyer Verlag GmbH, Tübingen.

4. Yo'ldoshev, B. 1993. *Hozirgi o'zbek tilida frazeologik birliklarning funksional uslubiy xususiyatlari*. Toshkent.
5. Fleischer, W. 1982. *Phraseologie der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Leipzig.
6. Burger, H. 1998. *Phraseologie. Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen*. Berli.
7. Hoshimov, U. 2014. *Kein Himmel auf Erden. Aus dem Usbekischen von Oybek Ostanov*. Taschkent, Akademnashr. Verlag.
8. Hoshimov, O'. 1970. *Bahor qaytmaydi*. Toshkent: G'.G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at.
9. Hoshimov O'. 1981. *Dunyoning ishlari*. Toshkent: G'.G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at.
10. Hoshimov O'. 1987. *Ikki karra ikki besh*. Toshkent: Yosh gvardiya,
11. Hoshimov O'. 1989. *Ikki eshik orasi*. Toshkent: G'.G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at.
12. Hoshimov, O'. 1981. *Nur borki, soya bor*. Toshkent: Yosh gvardiya.
13. Hoshimov, O'. 1992. *Tushda kechgan umrlar*. Toshkent: Sharq yulduzi.
14. Rahmatullaev, Sh. 1992. *O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati*. Toshkent: Qomuslar bosh tahririyati.
15. Qo'chqortoev, I. 1975. *Badiiy nutq stilistikasi*. Toshkent.
16. Karaboyev, J. A., Rozmatovna, U. O., Qosimjon qizi, X. N., Otabek qizi, O. S., Azamatovna, B. S., Rakhimovna, N. R., Polatovna, S. K. 2026. Nanostructure-inspired methods for efficient curriculum delivery in language and literary studies. *International Journal of Special Education*, 41/5, 348-372. Available online: <<https://internationalsped.com/index.php/ijse/article/view/2978>>.
17. Azamatovna, B. S. & Salijanovna, I. S. 2020. Classification of could words in German and Uzbek. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17/6, 7333-7339.
18. Bekmurotova, S. A. 2019. Grammatic features of double words in German and Uzbek languages. *Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology*, 1/5, 248-252.
19. Azamatovna, B. S. & Salijanovna, I. S. 2020. Classification of could words in German and Uzbek. *Pal Arch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17/6. 7333-7339.
20. Bekmurotova, S. 2024. Nemis Va O'zbek Tillarida Juft So'Zlarning Semantik Aspektida Lingvokuturologik Xususiyatlar. *Science and Innovation in the Education System*. 3/3, 222-227.

2012

IMYAMINOVA SHUKHRATKHON

21. Imyaminova, S. 2022. Немис Тили Фразеологиясида Терминологик Бетартиблик Масаласи. *Science and Innovation*, 1/5, 193-198.
22. Shukhratkhon I., Bekmurotova S. Grammar and stylistic characteristics of pair words in modern german and Uzbek languages //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2021. – T. 11. – №. 10. – C. 1953-1956.
23. Shukhratkhon, I. & Bekmurotova, S. 2021. Structural-semantic features of pair words in modern German and Uzbek languages. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12/9.

IMYAMINOVA SHUKHRATKHON

PROFESSOR,

DEPARTMENT OF GERMAN PHILOLOGY,

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF UZBEKISTAN,

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-4510-397X

E-MAIL: <RUMRREICH@MAIL.RU>