








Features of the Use of Colloquial Speech in German Language from the Expressivity Point of View

 **Dinara Radikovna
Kochemasova,**
 **Irina Germanovna
Kondrateva,**
 **Timur Ravilevich Usmanov,**
 **Sigal Natalya Germanovna,**
 **Olga Alexandrovna Danilova**

Institute of International Relations,
Kazan (Volga Region) Federal
University

Corresponding Author: Valentyna
Chernysh

e-mail: princessdinara@yandex.ru

Article citation: Kochemasova, D. R. &
Kondrateva, L. G. & Usmanov, T. R. &
Germanovna, S. N. & Danilova, O. A.
(2021) Features of the use of colloquial
speech in Features of the Use of Colloquial
Speech in German Language from the
Expressivity Point of View, *Applied
Linguistics Research Journal*, 5(1): 179–184.

Received Date: September 12, 2020

Accepted Date: September 21, 2020

Online Date: January 5, 2021

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2021 Applied Linguistics Research
Journal

E-ISSN: 2651-2629



This work is licensed under a Creative
Commons, Attribution-NonCommercial-
NoDerivatives 4.0 International

ABSTRACT

The article considers features of the use of colloquial speech in German language from the point of view of expressivity. The detailed analysis of interjections as one of expressive means in colloquial speech is given. Types of emotional and evaluative structures are also considered and analyzed in the work. The article deals with characteristics of the use of expressive means in the German colloquial speech. It reviews the means of expression evaluation from lexicological point of view in German and Russian languages. This study attempted to describe the full stylization of a spoken German language. Main attention was paid to the grammatical phenomena of a spoken language, common in the colloquial German in terms of expressivity.

Keywords: language education; student; university education; German language; colloquial speech; expressivity.

Introduction

Just as facial expressions and gestures are often an important point, accompanying communication, speech sometimes gets an appropriate "sound effect": it may be accompanied by involuntary cries, various reflex reactions to external irritants caused by psychological and physiological factors. Laughter, sighs, screams, cries, coughs, snapping, smacking, yawning etc. can follow speech and give it some connotation. While these sounds are unintentional, they are not the facts of language.

Another factor of the acoustic "effect" of speech is onomatopoeia. Various phenomena of objective reality perceived by the ear, including "sound gestures" of a human are consciously reproduced by a human speech apparatus. A human creates acoustic images of varying degrees of reliability by using simulation capabilities in different ways.

In cases when the simulation is based on language means together with the combinations of language phonemes, onomatopoeia from non-language phenomenon can turn into a linguistic fact. Moreover, if a created sound picture is easily understood and regularly reproduced to describe certain aspects of reality, it becomes even closer to language units. Sound images may be incorporated in a speech as additional illustrations, without affecting neither a structure nor even meaning of a sentence. Besides, they may be included in a sentence as its component parts. Sound pictures are not the same in different languages, despite their obvious imitative nature, for example: "pengl" - trah!; "bim-bim" - din-din, and so forth [3].

In addition to all sorts of involuntary cries and simulation of sound patterns, speech to some extent may involve deliberately delivered cries and exclamations, expressing emotions, sentiments, feelings and wills of a speaker. Such phenomena are usually combined under the general name "interjections".

They are almost words. Their composition is heterogeneous. The validity of combining them in one term has been contested more than once, perhaps with some reason. However, they do not dispense with the term "interjection". Its replacement would require the use of a number of new specialized terms which probably would accurately describe the subtleties of different interjections description, but at the same time would deprive the grammar of a single convenient term used for a group of secondary phenomena though not devoid of common features contrasting to regular ones. The essence of interjections is that, without being words, they are included in the language system, and are in one line with the phenomena of a language itself. Therefore, they are described phonetically, lexically, morphologically and syntactically, that is by the same means as all actual linguistic resources.

From a phonetic point of view interjections are similar to words, because they have phonemic composition and can be distinguished in the flow of speech. Most interjections are monosyllabic in many languages, including German and Russian. In contrast to the words not all the interjections are articulated clearly enough. Some have options (*tja, tjii, tscha, tcha; bah, pah; pst, bst*), many interjections depend on the intonation much stronger than words. There are interjections (Ah, Oh, Eh, Uietc.), in which the intonation is the basis of their nature. This is one of the rare occasions when the tone isn't accompanying, but acting in its "purest form". Here the intonation from expressive means approaches to the meaningful one.

Methods

2.1. Research objectives

- to find out features of the use of colloquial speech in German language;
- to justify language methods of its representation;
- to determine the features of the use of spoken German in various language situations.

2.2. Theoretical and empirical methods

Our research is based on the following key methods:

- empirical methods including linguistic observation and selection of research data, which was examined in the light of comparative analysis.
- theoretical methods of analysis and synthesis, including the analysis of the theoretical literature devoted to the research problem and generating the reviewed linguistic knowledge into the relevant research approach;

2.3. Body of Data

Interjections sometimes include sounds alien to words of the language, for example, in the German non-syllabic [r], [m], [s] as syllable-building in *brr, hm, pst*, in Russian bilabial [p] in "tpru", non-syllabic [y] in the "myau". Sometimes, there are interjections with unusual sound combinations: in German: *koax, hui* (diphthongs [oa] and [ui] in the German language are not present), in Russian: "dzin", "au" and others.

From the lexical point of view interjections are not catagorematic - they do not have any notion and like the intonation are "expressive", but not "meaningful". Being deprived of sense, they express the feelings and the will, and like words are involved into the communication process.

Morphologically interjections have zero description. They are non-derivative and immutable. Their composition is similar to the root morpheme of the words. These "roots" for the most part do not correlate with the roots of real words. This derivational isolation of an interjection is one of its peculiarities [5]. This feature of interjections is underestimated by many grammarians, who excessively expand their composition at the expense of desemantised notional words (*Gott, Himmel, Donner, vernucht, behiite, horch, auf, fort*, and so on). On the other hand, the word-formative nature of interjections does adhere to definite regularities of word formation system of the language. Interjections give life to many words. They are easily substantivized and verbalized (*das Ach, das Au, piepsen, klatschen*). Besides, it should be noted that the number of interjections increase due to notional words, which have completely lost touch with words. This can be seen in borrowings (*avanti, bravo, bis, dalli*) in German.

From the syntactical point of view interjections do not have control, coordination and joining links, they are not members of a sentence, but they act as sentences: either as a separate mononuclear sentence or any preceding or a summarizing element that enhances the expressivity of a message. Thus, interjections combine the features of words and characteristics that distinguish them from words. Interjections are still included in the actual language system ignoring the fact that they are not full words. This fact explains their identity and the "peripheral" position in the language.

When determining the specific features of a particular class of words, it is especially important to highlight the most typical and characteristic ones. It is quite complicated to distinguish primary properties from minor in the process of interjections analysis due to their relatively few number and versatility. The contradictory nature of interjections does not limit their features as words and not words. In addition to the basic properties, interjections have a number of additional side characteristics, which are opposite to those mentioned above and gave cause for a contrast of interjections versus all parts of speech as taken together or separately. In lexical scope such deviation of

interjections from the typical characteristics results in their convergence with remarkability, in the field of word formation – in the ability to change into other parts of speech, in the syntax - the ability to become a part of a sentence.

Now let us discuss these peculiarities in more details. Deprived of conceptual content and lexical meaning, interjections are not indifferent to the communicative value in general. From the perspective of the communicative importance interjections could be classified into two types [4]. Interjections of the first type are optional. They accompany the main statement and give it only some expressive color, which, may prove to be very significant in certain conditions. However, the main minimum of communication without such interjections that is without taking into consideration the emotional side is possible. Their withdrawal from a sentence would switch expressiveness to intonation. Among these interjections are: *ach, och, ah, oh, na, nu, eh, ei, tja, hach*. In isolation from the context, they are completely devoid of any conceptual content. Their purpose can be compared with gestures. One can reach out his hand to show the direction, to support someone or something or in order to take an object, and so on. How unfortunate to think that an outstretched hand has any “meaning” comparable to the meaning of words, and in the interjections of this group, also speaking in their own way “sound gestures” unnecessarily to seek a specific meaning (semantics).

However, some linguists are inclined to believe they have different lexical meanings, stressing their polysemanticism. As an example, consider the interjection *ach*. It is a well-known fact that it signals a variety of feelings. According to some claims, the interjection *ach* reproduce such emotions and feelings as pain, grief, depression, pity, regret, disappointment, dissatisfaction, irritation, admiration, joy, satisfaction, desire, fear, speculation, neglect, ridicule, irony, request, gratitude, calm. It is obvious that the list may be continued. This once again demonstrates unremarkability of interjections. The following example can be very indicative: an excellent dictionary of the modern German language gives typical cases of interjections use, but not their meaning. So, it is said: “*Ausrufbeikörperlichem Schmerz, bei Überraschung, bei Verwunderung*” about the interjection *au*. The polysemy of common notional words and versatility of non-meaningful interjections are not the same.

While first type of interjections is rather optional (in terms of content) than required to achieve the goal of a statement, interjections of the second type are the basis for communication. They are:

- a) the appellations serving for address, call, hail: *hallo, he, heda, holla, ahoi* and adjoining them interjections for a call and chase away animals;
- b) emotional and evaluative: *hurra, bravo, pfui, nanu*;
- c) imperative: *pst, sch, kusch, bls, aiapopaia*;
- d) “picturesque”: *bums, krach, tiktak, kikeriki*;
- e) those that do not have common functions and purposes: *atsch, toitoitoi, ex, basta*.

Thus, we can note some specialization of interjections: some have more of an emotional component, others, in addition to emotion, have meaning. This characteristic brings them closer to the word [1]. Such interjections *ashurra, basta, bravo, nanu*, etc. little differ from the notional words and are certainly not devoid of lexical meaning. The presence of these two types of interjections should be seen as rather a tendency to the specialization than their strict division. The transition is possible. So, an emotional interjection can bear communicative stress via intonation and without the participation of other language tools, for example: *Hat Siedirgefallen? 1) Oh?! = Und ob! or 2) Oh = wo*.

Sound patterns tend to deliver a message, but taken by themselves without verbal explanations, might not be obvious and understandable enough. This is especially true if they are occasional, for example: *Tock-tock-tock. Einfestaufprallender Schritt. Sehreilig. Das mußersein or Bumbumbum! Das fahren die Kanonen auf*. These sound images are explained by comments.

The main syntactic function of interjections, if there is any, is the role similar to that of an independent sentence. Substitution of a sentence member is a sub-prime function of interjections.

The use of interjections as adverbial modifiers in German is considered the same as the use of words in this function, for example: “*Batsch! hatteereineOhrfeigeweg*” “*Plauz, pardauzfeletwasausdemKomposthaufenheraus; (Ibld.*” “*Schwipp -schwapp-schwupp !!! hatteerdreiBisseim Kopf. (Ibld.*” “*Plantsch, liegtJockelimWasser -... (Achen, Jockel) Ichbrauchenurhierzusitzen, einblichenaufzupassen und- schnapp -!! habeichihn*”. Besides the sound image, these onomatopoeic interjections show how the action proceeds (instantaneity, intermittence, consistency, duration, etc.).

The above mentioned characteristics of German interjections reveal their diversity and the combination of various properties within a single phenomenon. When analyzing the interjections within the bounds of one phenomenon, correlated with the concept of “a part of speech”, unremarkability, [well-formation](#), under viability should be considered as the most typical features of them. The presence of the contrary properties (convergence with nominatively, the acceptance of syntactic functions of the sentence and its parts, derivational connections with different parts of speech) is the exception rather than the rule.

Comparison of interjections in German and Russian languages reveals the most common essential features of this category in both languages, and the difference in details, that in turn denies the idea of international character of interjections.

Both German and Russian languages have interjections similar in sound, which, however, do not perform the same function. For example, the German *Bah* has the same function as Russian equivalent "podumaesh!", that is pejoratively, while Russian "Ba! Znakomyevselica!" expresses surprise, astonishment. The interjection *Aha*, despite being multifunctional, does not have confirmatory meaning "da" as Russian "aga". The German says *hoppla* stumbling, and the Russian - *goplya* ("oplya") after overcoming an obstacle, when jumping, leaping, picking up and putting a heavy object, catching something, etc.

Finally, it is necessary to emphasize that interjections, regardless of their difference from words, are not redundant in a language. They are constitutionally linked to the lexical and grammatical systems of the language and, moreover, constitute of natural and integral elements of emotional spoken language. Interjections make the language expressive and ensure more precise achievement of communication objective. They deserve the greatest attention when studying a foreign language due to national originality and frequent use in emotionally colored speech. Without their at least receptive assimilation, it is impossible to understand the virtuosity of live speech.

Category of estimation is a combination of language units of different levels, united by evaluative semantics and expressing positive or negative attitude of an author to the content of the speech. Category of estimation (CE), being a complex and multifaceted, is the object of study for different branches of linguistics, in particular stylistics, lexicology, etc. This paper reviews the means of expression evaluation from lexicological point of view in German and Russian languages.

It should be noted that different sources interpret the term "evaluation" in different ways.

In colloquial speech subjectivity is especially noticeable: speakers cannot get away from their "themselves" and include everything within the scope of interests, taking their own position. The circumstances, events, conditions, people surrounding them fall under the assessment.

They may be necessary, beneficial, desirable and, on the contrary, harmful and unpleasant. Despite the diversity of the speaker's positions to everything that gets its value, there are two types of evaluation: positive and negative in the broad sense of the word. More particular cases are clustered around these two types.

The object of evaluation is expressed within the evaluative statements or is implied from a situational or verbal context, e.g.: Ty molodec. Onahamka. Horosho, chtovsekonchilos' blagopoluchno. The whole situation and its individual components may be assessed: Kakoebezobrazie!; CHtodelaetsya!; Kuda smotritnachal'stvo!; Cirk!; Anekdot!; Smekh! The concepts that are part of the context proposals can also be evaluated: On ee brosil. Pravil'nosdelal. Takaya ehgoistka!

The semantics of the evaluative words either focuses on the expression of evaluation itself (as in the given examples), or subject and logical value together with estimation "povadit'sya" means start doing something frequently what is condemned by others; "sovatsya" - go anywhere or ask anybody in the way they somebody does not like.

Evaluation can switch from its denotation to an outsider, e.g.: Dajyatebevytrusopel'ki! The sympathy is addressed to the child, and not to what is expressed by a noun with diminutive! Qualification and evaluative statements have well known syntactic peculiarity: they are typical for the predicative position of a various type: *Alles, was du redest, ist groBer Unfug!; Ich schaffe alles allein. Dummes Zeug!; Ein Segen, da Bereherweg gefahren ist!*; for application: *Du, Schwarzseher, unkt schon wieder!; Wir Schafsofpehaber die Taschedort Liegen lassen!; Mit Klaus, diesem Rindvieh, gebe ich mich nicht mehr ab (jeden Umgang auf);* for address: *Rhinozeros! Hast wieder alles vermässelt! (salopp).*

In some cases, the positivity or negativity of evaluation may depend on the tone, so similar expressive sentences can be interpreted in different ways, for example: *Daß du da bist!* Good (or bad) you're here! *Was für ein Mensch!* What a beautiful (or odious) man! *Welch ein Mensch!* Such a good (or bad) man! *So ein Mensch!* *Solchein Mensch!* *Dieser Mensch!* *Wieviel Menschen!* It's surprisingly (well or annoying) that there is a lot of people!

If the semantics of a common noun in such phraseological syntactic constructions is clear in terms of evaluation (*Diese Sturheit! Welch ein Elan!*) then the dependence on intonation decreases. Certain kind of estimation is created through intonation in salutatory sentences. Their specific character in German and Russian has much in common: *Karl! (Schämenmußt du dich!) Aber, Kinder! (Das ist eine Schande!) Oh, Mutti! (Du hast meinen Wunscherfüllt!) Rudolf (Ich bin stolz auf dich).* Infinitive constructions can also be evaluative:

a) positive: *Immer meinen Wünschen voraussein, stets entgegenkommen und beistehen! Ist das nicht nett von ihm!;*

b) negative: *Dieser Stümper! Die ganzschöne Arbeit so verderben! Bei der Arbeit schlafen! Wer läßt sich so was gefallen! So was von mirzusagen! Ein Crikey fachhäßlich! Diesen Patzer übersehen!*

Echo sentences, made by repeating words, also express some degree of evaluation, e.g. : *Er hat das übersehen. - Übersehen!? Absichtlich keine Notiz davon genommen!; Er ist seine rechte Hand. - Reshte Nand!!! Ein Speichellecker ist! Such repetitions reproduce rather disagreement and rejection more than the evaluation itself.*

The evaluation can be expressed by means of:

a) special words, operating relatively autonomously: Vzdor!; Gluposti!; Idiot!; Prekrasno!; Nikudanegodnol in a combination with other non-evaluative words: vzdornayasekretarsha, glupayadevochka, idiotskoereshenie, prekrasnyj vyhod iz polozheniya, nikuda negodnaya rabota;

b) words with secondary evaluative meanings which become understandable in the relevant lexical surrounding and syntactic construction: tryapka, shlyapa, lapot', pustoemestoa, revealed in the appropriate lexical environment and in syntactical special construction;

c) word formation means;

d) inappropriate style (solemn, poetic vocabulary in everyday conditions express a sarcasm, mockery);

e) intonation, for example, when some words are used ironically with estimation that is quite opposite to the true semantics of the word: "Horosh" (ploh) drug! Pachkajsya, pachkajsya, tebe mat' spasiboskazhet!;

f) syntactic idioms. Fund of assessment tools is quite extensive and can be the subject of another research.

The examples of evaluative phrases relating to the whole situation and less typical for conventional predicative role within one sentence could be: Ivanovsetakiizvinilsyapered Petrovymprivsekh. Opyat' vsemvzbuchkabyla. In Russian this effect can be reached by use of infinitives and words of category of condition: Zdorovo!; Neslyhanno!; Nadozhe!; Obaldet!; S umasojti!

One of the features of the stereotyped evaluative phrases is absence of their clear differentiation by type and nature of the positive (or respectively negative) estimation. The main differences (within one type of evaluation) are pragmatic and determined by the sphere of use, style, register, the peculiarities of the age, sex, temperament, culture, personal tastes, and so on. For this reason it's quite complicated to give accurate bilingual parallels and therefore it should be limited to the following list.

Positive evaluation:

Schön! Wunderschön! Ausgezeichnet! Großartig! Tadellos! Wunderbar! Fabelhaft! Fein! Prächtig! Glänzend! Vortrefflich! Hervorragend! Ideal! Vlendend! Enorm! Epochenmachend! pyramidal! Schick! Patent! Schau! Toll! Süß! Nett! Lustig! Kolossal! Gewaltig! Sagenhaft! Prima! Zünftig! Pfundig! Wuchtig! Fetzig! Das fetzt! Super! Knorke! Dufte! Tipptopp! AusdemEffeff! Eins as well! Masche! Klasse! Wucht! Wolke! Da istallesdran! Es hat in sich! Das istein Ding (eineSache)! Dazukann tap Siesagen! Umwerfend! Zugabe!

Horosho! Zdorovo! Prekrasno! Velikolepno! Otlichno! (abuzzword of the 1970s); Normal'no! (abuzzword of the 1970s); Chudesno! Izumitel'no! Snogsshibatel'no! Umopomrachel'no! Divno! Pervoklassno! Krasota! Prelest! Vysshijklass! Lyuks! (fam.)Moshch! (fam.)Sila! (fam.)Blesk! Blestyashche!

Negative evaluation:

Schlecht! Abscheulich! Scheußlich! Häßlich! Widerlich! Ekelhaft! Abstoßend! Unappetitlich! Gemein! Dumm! Ungeheuerlich! Wieärgerlich! Unerfreulich! Miserabel! UnterallerKritik! Unsinn! Mist! (Salopp) So einGetue! Dieses Theater Affentheater!

Ploho! Skverno! Nikuda ne goditsya! Kudaetogoditsya?Nikudyshnyj! Negodnyj! Na chtoehtopohozhe?EHtoninachto ne pohozhe! Razveehtodelo?Nizhevsyakojkritiki! Glupo! Idiotizm! Bezobrazie!Hamstvo! Haltura! Komediya! Cirk! (fam.); Anekdot! (fam.); Strah! (fam.); Sram! Pozor! ZHut! (fam.); CHertehto! (fam.); bog znaethto! Nemyslimo! Uzhas! Koshmar! CHepuha! Erunda! Dryan! Barahlo!

Average evaluation:

Durchschnitt, durchschnittlich, in Maßen, mäßig, mittelmäßig, genügend, mittelpächtig, so lala, nichtrosig, durchwachsen, nichtbesonders, nichtweltbewegend, verträglich, teils, teils.

Sredne, ne ochen', taksebe, posredstvenno, dostatochno, udovletvoritel'no, ne bol'novazhno, taksebe, nichego, ne blestyashche, ne osobenno, nichegoosobennogo, nichegovydayushchegosya, terpimo, taksebe.

Besides more or less universal evaluative statements, there is a number of special words: regarding clothes they say tryapka, ne imet' vida, deryuga; a bad work - haltura; detskijlepet about something unconvincing; negodyaj about disreputable man, etc. Compare: In German: Ladenhüter - bad stale goods; Tinnel, Schund - stuff (about goods, products), Kitsch - cheap (about a work of art, crafts), Schnulze - cheap sentimental musical composition.

Expressions of indignation, discontent, and disappointment also correlate with negative evaluative sentences. They possess considerable synonymous potential, that's why they are large in number.

The research revealed that there are statements with positive, negative and neutral evaluation both in German and Russian languages. There is only a small difference in the number of sentences.

Results

This article reviewed the grammatical means typical for colloquial German language, which belong to the area of the morphology. These morphological means - interjections and particles - are combined by the similarity of their functions. Their main function is giving expressivity to statements. Interjections and particles express a subjective attitude of a speaker to the other party, to the content of the statements or to other elements of the language situation. A significant difference between operation of the particles and interjections is that particles are related to the whole statement and play an important role in division of a sentence. Interjections are also able to act as a

proposal expressing emotions or wishes. It should also be noted that among the particles and interjections there are synonyms that allow making speech more diverse.

As it was highlighted in this study, as a means of creating expressive in the German colloquial speech can not act only syntax but also morphological features of spoken language. A feature of conversation is the large number of different particles and interjections. Quite often, interjections and particles are found within the same sentence, and they can complement each other and interact. In addition, sometimes interjections can be accompanied by particles. In this case particles act as amplifiers of an emotion transmitted via interjections. An important place in the study is given to the consideration of the values of interjections and particles, their contextual conditionality, synonymy, among those and others. In general, the functioning of the various grammatical features of a spoken language, often acting as a means of creating expressions, is determined by the characteristics of the German spoken language, as well as the desire of authors to convey the specifics of oral speech.

Studying the language of German and Russian youth is becoming increasingly important in the context of expanding international contacts, helping students to better understand the features and uniqueness of the national picture of the world, to understand the nationally specific features of the mentality of youth in both countries. Understanding and knowledge of the youth language brings learners to the natural language environment, promotes the development of their communicative competence, represents a unique opportunity for students to be included in the active dialogue of cultures.

Conclusion

In this study there was made an attempt to determine the peculiarities of vocabulary in the colloquial speech of German language from the point of view of expressiveness. We analyzed the use of interjections in modern German speech, we can note that the interjections accompany the main statement and report only a certain expressive coloring, which, however, may prove to be very important for some conditions. However, the basic minimum of the message without such interjections, that is, after deducting the emotional side, is possible. With their withdrawal, the expressiveness would switch to the intonation of the sentence. They are completely devoid of any kind of conceptual content when taken in isolation from the context.

The study is aimed at studying and describing the stylization of the colloquial German language. In general, the functioning of various grammatical features of a colloquial language, often acting as a means of creating expressiveness, is determined by the peculiarities of German colloquial speech, as well as by the authors desire to convey the specifics of oral conversational speech.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- [1] 1. Prokhorov, Yu.(1999) Communicative space of the language personality in national and cultural aspect. Materials IX of the Congress of MARYaL. Bratislava, 281-286.
- [2] 2. Habirova, N.M. (2014). Phraseological units and proverbs as a way of impact on the interlocutor. Kazan federal university.
- [3] Voronina, E.B. (2012). Word-formation and syntactic features of advertizing texts in the Russian and English languages. Kazan federal university.
- [4] Kochemasova D.R (2012). language representation of a concept "work" in paremiological units of English and German languages. Chuvash state university. Cheboksaryi.
- [5] Lakoff G. (2004). *Metaphors We Live By*. Editorial.
- [6] Dundes A. (1975). *On the structure of the proverb*. New Jersey.
- [7] Krasavskiy N.A. (2001) Emotional concepts in German and Russian linguocultures. *Peremena pr.* Volgograd, 495.
- [8] Binovich L.E., Grishin N.E. (1975) *German-Russian phraseological dictionary*. 827.
- [9] Khisamova V., Khisimatullina L. (2015) Comparative-analysis Based Study of Synonymous Relational Adjectives in Tatar and English // *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 6 (3 S2): 395-400.
- [10] Khisamova V.N., Kochemasova, D.R., Usmanov T.R. (2017) Linguoculturological potential of the concept "work" of paremiological units in the world view constructing // *Astra Salvensis* pp. 157-167