

37

SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION OF NEGATIVE PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN THE GERMAN AND AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGES AND THEIR NEGATIVE AFFIRMATIVE TRANSFORMATION

CLASIFICACIÓN SEMÁNTICA DE LAS UNIDADES FRASEOLÓGICAS NEGATIVAS EN LAS LENGUAS ALEMANA Y AZERBAIJANA Y SU TRANSFORMACIÓN AFIRMATIVA NEGATIVA

Aslanova Ulduz Boyukkishi¹

E-mail: uldus1@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0254-7678>

¹ Azerbaijan University of Languages. Azerbaijan.

Suggested citation (APA, 7th edition):

Boyukkishi, A. U. (2022). Semantic classification of negative phraseological units in the German and Azerbaijani languages and their negative affirmative transformation. *Revista Conrado*, 18(85), 316-325.

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the semantic features of negative phraseological associations and their denial-approval variability created in the pragmatic aspect. The main objective is to analyze and investigate the structural-semantic and communicative-style characteristics of negative phraseological units using materials of Azerbaijani and German languages, which have been compared with denier elements of affirmative phraseological associations. Therefore, the comparative interpretation and analysis of phraseological combinations with the absolute denial of German and Azerbaijani languages are addressed, and their communicative act explains the possibilities of denial-approval variability.

Keywords:

Phraseological units, comparative study, Azerbaijani and German language.

RESUMEN

El artículo trata sobre las características semánticas de las asociaciones fraseológicas negativas y su variabilidad de negación-aprobación creada en el aspecto pragmático. El objetivo principal es analizar e investigar las características estructurales, semánticas y de estilo comunicativo de las unidades fraseológicas negativas utilizando materiales de los idiomas azerbaiyano y alemán, que han sido comparados con elementos negadores de asociaciones fraseológicas afirmativas. Por tanto, se aborda la interpretación comparativa y el análisis de las combinaciones fraseológicas con la negación absoluta de las lenguas alemana y azerbaiyana, y su acto comunicativo explica las posibilidades de variabilidad negación-aprobación.

Palabras clave:

Unidades fraseológicas, estudio comparativo, lengua azerbaiyana y alemana.

INTRODUCTION

As pointed out by Singleton and Le niewska (2021, p. 48) the word phraseology has a lot of 'etymological appeal', as it is neatly composed of the Greek term *phrasia* ("way of speaking") and the well-known suffix *-logia* ("study of"). However, the meaning of this term is much less neat because in general diction diverges somewhat from its meaning in linguistics and worse still, the linguistic definitions of phraseology are also varied and at times vague. Granger and Meunier (2008, p. 27) attribute this to "the highly variable and wide-ranging scope of the field and the vast and confusing terminology associated with it". Broadly speaking phraseology is understood as the tendency for words to be co-selected by users to achieve meanings; is an area of great importance not only in general discourse but also in specialized language. This is due to the frequency of phraseological units, given that approximately 80% of the words in discourse are selected in combination with other units (Cabezas-García & Faber, 2018).

Beginning in the 1990s, most research on phraseological patterns has been empirical, utilizing corpus analysis. Weinert (1995, p. 182) identifies two basic issues for such research: the best way to define and identify fixed multi-word units, and analysis of the discourse functions that these multiword units perform. While there have been dozens of empirical studies carried out since then, these issues are still two of the most important considerations motivating current studies (Gray & Biber, 2015).

On the other hand, the comparative study of phraseological units of different languages has become one of the most intensively developed directions in phraseology and in the case of Soviet linguistics this field have been developed since late 1960s. For example, the work of V.D. Arakin in the field of linguistic typology led to new research in this direction and has left his mark on the writing of fundamental works on the problem of comparison (Bunyadova, 2020, p. 3734).

Negative phraseological units, which constitute the subject of the research, are analyzed and compiled based on numerous examples of their constituent parts. It should be noted that the term "negative phraseological units" was taken from Heinemann. Heinemann (1981, p. 472) referred for the first time to "negative phraseological units" implying the denial and negligible phraseological associations. However, studies on phraseological units showed that they are usually present in the process of communication, although significant phraseological combination of denial is never always effective if the judgement can't deny their meaning. This option allows playback of speech and

functional style. So, deny and confirm mutual relationships and dependence on the semantic cross-section of negative phraseological units and extensive options.

When conducting a semantic analysis of negative phraseological units, we find a number of difficulties arising from the national character of phraseological unit during the expression of negative phraseological unit, which is a special group of complex lexical units of the language, especially in expressions in Azerbaijani language. In this sense we agree with E.Vorbs when he writes in his article on semantic research of the phraseological compounds: "It is impossible to consider the problem of semantic inaccuracies (*Vagheit*) as a result of denotative-referential complexity "and" broad interconnection" (Worbs, 1994, p. 39).

Having established the above, the main objective of this work is to analyze and investigate the structural, semantic and communicative style characteristics of negative phraseological units using materials from the Azerbaijani and German languages, highlighting that this is not only to translate the negative phraseological combinations selected from German into Azerbaijani or to identify their equivalent. The object of the research is an important problem of targeted impact analysis as functional and semantic classification because the negative phraseological units in the German and Azerbaijani languages are studied in the context of structural-typological and structural-semantic analysis as a criterion for denying the role of the constituent in phraseological unit and its expression in the spoken language.

DEVELOPMENT

It is clear from previous analyzes that complexity and inaccuracies are evident in the description of the meaning of negative phraseological units in the identification and interpretation of their equivalent in the Azerbaijani language. Considering that the semantics of negative phraseological associations arose from the effects of solid colloquia between the meanings of phraseological units and their individual components, the denial is mainly referred to as a denotative meaning in the study of the constitutive phraseological unit, in other words, this research is based on the meaningful of phraseological negatives. Based on semantic analyzes the absolute disadvantages of negative phraseological units in the German and Azerbaijani languages can be divided into two groups:

1. Necessary denier, affirmed meaningful negative phraseological units
2. Negative phraseological units with denied content

In the semantic affirmation of negative phraseology compounds we agree with W. Fleischer's reference: "There is no denial in the sense of the phraseological units containing denial" (Fleischer, 1997). Let's see some examples of the German language:

1. aus seinem Herzen keine Mördergrube machen = seine Meinung offen sagen-open the idea
2. nicht von schlechten Eltern sein=beachtlich sein- be attentive
3. sich nicht lumpen lassen = jmdn. großzügig beschenken/ bewirten- To be generous\ generous
4. from Blatt vor den Mund nehmen=etw. offen aussprechen – speak openly
5. from Hals nicht vollkriegen =immer noch mehr von etw. haben wollen – Be angry
6. nichts als jmdn, / etw.im kopf halten=zu sehr an eine ganz best imte Person/ Sache denk-like/spin in the brain
7. mit etw, nicht hinter dem Busch halten =etw, direct sagen – to say the world
8. nicht auf den Mund gefallen sein=gut reden- not to be fooled by words
9. keine große Sprünge machen = wenig Geld haben – to be handy
10. keiner Fliege etw. zuleide tun (können) =einen sehr sanften Charakter haben – be moderate, do not find any ants, and so on.

It is clear that the denial of the phraseological units in German is not a denial, but rather an approved meaning. An interesting puzzle is revealed: what is their meaning in the Azerbaijani language? Is the negation of phraseological unit an approved meaning, or a negation? We see that all of the equivalents in Azerbaijani (8) and (9) have both the approved structure and the approximation semantics. (8) Denial is a meaningful phraseological combination, (9) and a liberal phraseological unifying implicit meaning of denial. Here is the result: It can be quite similar to the semantics of different structures in the German and Azerbaijani languages, which have a completely different typological structure.

Similarly, it is interesting to have such an analysis in the context of selected examples from Azerbaijani. True, such an analysis is not so easy. This is because the definition of meaningful or inaccurate negative phraseological units in the German language, or its correspondence, or rather its equivalent, requires rich knowledge and experience. Let's look at the comparison:

1. not to neglect = always keep in control-equivalent: jmdn nicht aus den Augen lassen
2. not to fall in the spirit= to preserve despite any difficulty –equivalent: den Mut nicht verlieren
3. unobtrusively beautiful, unstable flower = everything is defective- descriptive accuracy: in jeder Schönheit herrscht die Hässlichkeit or alles Gute hat auch Nachteile, exact equivalence: keine Rose ohne Dornen
4. angry head does not mind = everything can be expected from angered-equivalent: böser Kopf kann nichts Gutes reden
5. do not break your heart = fulfill your wishes – equivalents: die Zähne auf der Zunge haben
6. do not go wild jacket = everywhere is bad, but well – word-by-word: es gibt keinen Wald ohne Schakal (Goldwolf)
7. tongue not to sneeze = talk continuously-equivalent: die Zähre auf der Zunge haben
8. not to mention = to answer everthing-equivalent: Mundsteh nicht still
9. Do not do everything for others = Equivalents: sein Leben für jmdn./ etw. einsetzen
10. Do not fit into the mouth of a rabbit in the mouth, but to brag- equivalents: a) Mund aufreißen / vollnehmen, b) einen großen Mund haben.

We see that half of these negative phraseological combinations in the Azerbaijani language are in the German equivalent of the half (1, 2, 4, 6, 8) or in the meaning of the denominator as an essential component. However, although the denial occurs as an essential element of the element, these equivalents serve the testimony of a valid meaning. This also shows the semantic similarity of negligible phraseological units in the denial structure of the diversified the German and Azerbaijani languages. The other half equivalents are both meaningful in terms of meaning. Thus, this remarkable notion of negligible phraseological unit, which is regarded as the mirror of the life of different peoples, allows the German and Azerbaijani people get related in some ways in their thinking. This group of negative phraseological units is based on the phenomenon of transposition, that is, the element in the syntactic structure of the phraseological unit acts as a linguistic factor of neutralization.

Structural analysis revealed that only eight denial elements were found to have occurred in the German language of negative phraseological unit with fifty essential deniers analyzed in Azerbaijani. The semantic analysis has shown that 50 % of them are a meaningful combination. This structure, which draws attention to negative

phraseological units, is that semantic constriction is conditioned by their complex language unit and promotes the expansion of opportunities in the pragmatic moment.

The second group of negative phraseological units encompasses such phraseological units that the denial of the constituent does not function as a formal structural element, but rather constitutes an important part of the general semantic structure of phraseological unit. Hence, the negative phraseological units included in this group constitute a denial of meaning. In this case, the absolute denied meaning of phraseological units is that it is impossible to transform such phraseological units in a positive way. The analysis of documents show that this group of negative phraseological units is much greater than the negatively positive negative group of phraseological associations.

We encounter critical considerations in theoretical sources related to negative phraseological units. U. Fiks notes: "Undoubtedly, the unanimity of a merger can't be acknowledged without interfering with the composition of the existing unity, without damaging its characteristic features." (Eine Wendung, die als Negat existiert, kann nicht auf die, ohne dass die Wendung in ihrem Bestand angegriffen wird, ohne dass der Wendungscharakter gefährdet wird" (Fix, 1971, p. 70).

Let us note that semantic analysis of negative phraseological units is usually based on the description method. The semantic base structure of the negative phraseological compound studied at that time was described by another word or phrase. Here are some examples:

1. Kein Augen im Kopf haben = nicht aufpassen – not to believe in our eyes
2. Kein Bein auf Erde kriegen = nicht zum Zuge kommen – to be backless
3. die Katze lässt das Mäusen nicht = kann seine alten Gewohnheiten nicht ablegen – reddish grave
4. das kann kein Schwein lesen = das kann niemand lesen – that is not the case with God
5. keine Nerven haben = sich durch nichts nervös machen lassen – thickness of the heart
6. mir schwand nichts Gutes = ich ahne Unheilvolles – to sink into your heart
7. niemandem ein Haar krümmen = jmdm
8. etw. geht/ will jmdm. Nicht from Kopf = etw. ist so unerwartet, unlogisch, dass es jmd. nicht versteht – do not go to mind
9. nicht alle auf der Latte haben = nicht ganz bei Verstand non-minded

10. sich keinen Zacken aus der Krone brechen = sich nichts vergeben – do not despise yourself and so on.

Let's look at the semantic analysis of the negative phraseological combinations selected from Azerbaijani and the comparison of their German language equivalents:

1. not to wear hair = not to worry – nicht mit der Wimper zucken
2. not grabbing his hand – do not do anything- Finger rühren, nicht einen Finger fütren. Criminum
3. Not to lose branches = not to develop – auf keinen Zweig kommen
4. do not look at your net = do not pay attention to anything, auf's Gerate wohl machen
5. do not give peace to someone = to worry about someone – keine Ruhe lassen
6. do not try to get rid of ants = do not mess with anyone - keine Fliege zuleiden tun
7. does not have anything to do nor shafts = nothing is one of the lame – weder Haus noch Hof haben
8. do not scratch his hand – do not do anything – weder Hand noch Fuß rühren
9. hurt = not knowing what to do – das Geld nicht ansehen
10. do not count on the dog – jmdn. wie einen Hund behandeln.

Comparative analysis here allows us to come to such a conclusion on these languages, which have different typological structures:

- German negative equivalents of Negative Phraseology 2:3 in Azerbaijan, namely (1), (2), (4), (7), (8), (9) and (10), are negative phraseological combinations. These equivalents are not only denial, but also negatively significant. Examples above (3), except (5) and (6), confirm that.
- From the above examples, we can clearly see that negative phraseological associations analyzed in semantic aspect of Azerbaijan are negative phraseological unit of 4:5 in German: (8), (9). Only denials of (4), (10) are the plurality of signals, in other words, the liberal phraseological associations.

Based on the semantic analysis of negative phraseological associations in German and Azerbaijani, the following facts can be attributed to the fact that the ratio between the necessary denial and negative semantic phraseological unit equivalents is not 1:1. While the German language is rich in negative phraseological combinations, the relative limitation of these types of phraseological units is remarkable in the Azerbaijani language. If phraseological negatives in the German and Azerbaijani languages are examined in terms of absolute equivalence, their

morpho-syntactic and lexical approach is also required. However, the typological difference between the German and Azerbaijani languages leads to certain limitations in the structural and semantic sense of absolute equivalence. As the specimens confirm, the typological diversity causes the Azerbaijanis who study the German language to face serious difficulties in several cases.

Typological analysis of negative phraseological units in German and Azerbaijani shows that some important differences between languages are observed on the analytics – synthesis scale. Despite these differences, the overlapping of semantic equivalents or lexical components in both languages is explained by the historic existence of economic, political and cultural relations among the peoples and the general character of human thinking. Semantic similarity can be regarded as a symbol of the international character of negative phraseological units. It is known that the phraseological units of each language serve the symbolic language of the environment and form the treasury of that language. The meaning like that found in the German and Azerbaijani languages with different typological structures has universal logic, psychological and linguistic self. In the phraseological system of the language, the figurative expression of the environment is related to national character but also has international attributes.

Note that semantic analysis is based on a number of heuristic criteria in the German and Azerbaijani languages. It has been objectively oriented to the regularity of the phraseological system of the languages spoken here. Dobrovolsky (1990, p. 29) writes: *“Structural-typological parameters mean that intercultural communication is understood to mean that the languages studied by such research are either non-existent, developed or non-widespread, widespread or non-propagated, and so on, is a set of features”*

The imbalance in the above-mentioned result is because the fundamental differences in the structure of the German and Azerbaijani languages are distributed to the lexical constituents of fixed units operating in the phraseological system of the same languages. Therefore, the degree of involvement of different language levels in the realization of the invariant semantic load in different systemic languages, and their functional peculiarity, confirms the importance of typological research in the concrete language. Structural-semantic analysis of the object of the research on the comparative aspect of the negative phraseological unit, which forms the deep layers of the language structure is usually preferred by its relevance.

As a result of these analyzes, it is possible to make such a generalization: the meaning of several negative phraseological unit does not always mean the meaning of its constituent parts because the denying element in the composition is not reflected in the meaning of these combinations. Such denial of confirmation containing a significant negative phraseological unit has been attributed to the first group. As can be seen from the semantic analysis, the denial of the negligible phraseological units of this group does not serve as a denial of the meaning. Here are the categories of approved-negation and internal structural conditions which go beyond the surface level, which is neutrally manifested itself in the encounter.

We can see that the constants of the German and Azerbaijani languages, which constitute the frictional system in French language, are structurally different, and in both languages, there are many phraseological associations. Bayramov, a prominent researcher in the field of phraseology in the Azerbaijani language said: “Most phraseological compounds are paralyzed, and a small part is equivalent to other speech parts. Therefore, it is necessary to divide the phraseological units in Azerbaijani into two groups: 1. Phraseological associations 2. Non-phraseological associations (Bayramov, 1978, p. 71).

The study of negative phraseological compounds allows to say that 3:4 of the phraseological compounds forming the phraseological system of each of the two comparable languages are the phraseological associations which have a certified structure. But how can we deny the phraseological associations of the certified structure? And should a certain rule or principle be respected here? Studies have shown that the denial of phraseological unit with a certified phraseological unit has certain limitations, which means that not all the phraseological associations can be denied equally. In this case, there are several questions:

1. What subtle phraseological units can unite with denied elements?
2. Can all affirmative verbal phraseological associations be used with denying elements? Otherwise, there are certain limitations?
3. What are the laws of discrepancies?

These questions can be explained on the bases of German language material. Based on the analysis of separate phraseological associations, it is possible to say that the first and second questions depend on the dependence of the phraseological associations into denial elements and the specific and general denial of free expressions.

There are three articles in the German language literature related to this problem: V. Hayneman “Phraseologist

mit neg-Constituenten und NEG-Phraseologismen in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart" (Korhonen, 1988, pp. 470–477), Korhonen "Zur syntaktischen Negationskomponente in deutschen und Finnischen Verbidiomen" (Hyvärinen, 1996, pp. 7–23) and I. Zurück's "Zur Negierbarkeit von Finnischen Verbidiomen" (Militz, 1979, pp. 81–97). It should be noted that these articles are the primary sources of information on the problem that are waiting for their resolution.

It should be noted that the process of phraseological units with denial elements is not as simple as free syntactic compounds. V. Fisher puts forward such a hypothesis: "It is possible to deny phraseological units, which means that the denial element is not a phraseological combination in this case. That is, denying the element is not a component of phraseological unit. It should also be noted that not all phraseological units have the ability to deny words. Here, the dependence on the semantic and structural features of phraseological units and the semantic constraints of their constituents plays major role. The possibility of linkages with certain types of phraseological associations, which have different structures, also depends on the contextual relationship. Thus, some phraseological units can't be perceived as denier (negierungsfreundlich)" (Fleischer, 1997, p. 91).

Apparently, it is not an easy task to explore such a challenging problem on the bases of the material of two different languages. However, we also consider it necessary to make the first attempt here. It should be noted that, in the German language, phraseological units are denied, especially from the denial of nicht and the denial of denial. Along with these, various envelopes, pronouns and binders show themselves in the form of strengthening factors. Einfach, einmal, ganz, gerade, mehr and hachements can be added to denial of nicht and can lead to denial within the merger. Some of these intensity elements are optional. Let's look at some examples:

1. nicht (einfach) vom Himmel fallen=seine Vorbedingungen haben, nicht grundlos entstehen – Halva-halva is not a sweet mouth: Eine erfolgreiche Karriere fällt nicht einfach vom Himmel
2. nicht (einmal) piep sagen =kein Wort von sich geben, sich nicht äussern – Die Ziege von Schwiegertochter sagte den Weg nicht einmal piep (Kant, 2005, p. 147)
3. nicht (ganz) ohne sein = not too smooth: Der Weg über from Gletscher ist für Anfänger nicht ohne (Tagesschau Fernsehsendung).
4. nicht so schlecht sein, wie man annehmen könnte- not too bad: Der neue Lehrer ist nicht ganz ohne.

5. das Pulver (auch) nicht (gerade) erfunden haben=nicht besonders klug sein – yelbeyin: Dein Freund hat wohl auch nicht gerade das Pulver erfunden.
6. And he who walks in the wilderness, let him go. nicht interessiert sein – not to be interested in one or something: Erst war der Nachbarsjunge sein bester Freund, jetzt will er nicht mehr von ihm wissen.

It is understood during the study that in the German language there are a large number of phraseological associations formed by a name and a certain number, and nicht denial in denial of their use. Let's look at some cases:

1. die Flinte ins Korn werfen – nicht die Flinte ins Korn werfen
2. die Klappe halten – nicht die Klappe halten
3. sich an etw. die Zähne ausbeißen-sich an etw. nicht die Zähne ausbeißen
4. vom Himmel fallen – nicht vom Himmel fallen
5. sich mit fremden Federn schmücken – sich nicht mit fremden Federn schmücken
6. imdn.ins Grab bringen-jmdn. nicht ins Grab bringen
7. in die Binsen gehen - nicht in die Binsen gehen
8. jmdn. Mund fahren - jmdm.from Uber. nicht über den Mund fahren
9. sich in der hand haben – sich nicht in der hand haben
10. in einem Boot sitzen – nicht in einem Boot sitzen and so on.

The analyses of the material in the Azerbaijani language also shows that there are such verbal phraseological combinations. In other words, there is also a phraseological unit in the Azerbaijani language, which is a decentralize structure that can be denied. In the denial of such positive verbal phraseological units, the denominator draws a leading position. Let's look at the examples:

1. hope- not to give up hope
2. to give up – not to give up
3. to push a foot – not to walk
4. put his nose into his nose
5. mouthpiece – mouthpiece
6. close eyes – do not look eye
7. betrayal – betrayal
8. to come to the brink of misery
9. burn incense – not to burn
10. go to the heart – do not go to the heart and so on.

It is clear from the examples that it is possible to deny this phraseological compound of this certified structure. Also, the affirmative verb in German during phraseological negation *nichtkein* with an element of denial is used. The importance of the rejection of these elements depends on the elements that make up the phraseological compound. Thus, Germanic components like *nicht* in denial of phraseological associations composed of names and pronouns can be used. Next examples are interesting cases:

1. jmdm. von den Hacken gehen- jmdm.nicht von den Hacken zeigen
2. sein wahres Gesicht zeigen – nicht sein wahres Gesicht zeigen
3. mit rechten Dingen zugehen – nicht mit rechten Dingen zugehen
4. seinen Mann stehen – nicht seinen Mann stehen
5. Seine Finger / Hände von jmdm. / etw. lassen- nicht seine Finger / Hände von jmdm. / etw. Lassen
6. für jmdn. seine Hand ins Feuer legen – für jmdn. Nicht seine Hand ins Feuer legen
7. seine Klappe halten – nicht seine Klappe halten
8. seine Zunge im Zaum halten – nicht seine Zunge im Zaum halte
9. in die Binsen gehen- nicht in die Binsen gehen
10. jmdm. die Stange halten – jmdm. nicht die Stange halten and so on.

However, we see the use of the word denial to deny verbal phraseological units in the German language, which consists of names and indefinite sentences. For example:

1. jmdm. Schönen Augen machen – jmdm. keine schönen Augen machen
2. jmdm. einen Korb geben – jmdm. keinen Korb geben
3. einen hacken haben – keinen Hacken haben
4. bei jmdm. einen Stein im Brett haben- bei jmdm. Keinen Stein im Brett haben
5. jmdm. Einen Bären aufbinden – jmdm. keine schöne Auge machen
6. jmdm. einen Bären aufbinden – jmdm. keinen Bären aufbinde
7. einen Haken haben - keinen Haken haben
8. sich ein Herz fassen – sich kein Herz fassen
9. mit jmdm. ein Hühnchen zu rupfen haben - mit jmdm. kein Hühnchen zu rupfen haben
10. jmdm. einen Bären aufbinden - jmdm. keinen Bären aufbinden

The study shows that all verbatim verbal phraseological units associations within certain syntactic and semantic conditions. The most important of these conditions is the dependence of the rejection process on the degree of phraseological unit and idioms. It should be noted that the verbal phraseological units, which have a strong idiom, are inadmissible.

H. Militz said: “Certain compounds have been used in phraseology *nicht*, deny his name with an element of uncertain article or proposal is rejected, with the help of pronouns have been used to deny the *kein*” (Militz, 1979, p. 232). Let's look at this idea on the basis of language considerations:

1. in die Binsen gehen - nicht in die Binsen gehen = entzweigen, unbrauchbar werden
2. jmdm. from Mund fahren – jmdm. nicht über from Mund fahren=jmdm. auf ungehörige Weise beim Sprechen unterbrechen
3. sich in den Haaren liegen- sich nicht in den Haaren liegen = sich nicht straiten
4. ins Wasser fallen- nicht ins Wasser fallen= nicht zustande kommen
5. mit etw. hinter dem Berg (e) Busch halten-mit etw. nicht hinter dem Berg (e) Busch halten=nicht verheimlichen
6. jmdm. einen Bären aufbinden – jmdm. keinen Bären aufbinden etw, Unwahres sagen
7. einen Bock schießen – keinen Bock schießen = einen elementaren Fehler machen
8. einen Haken haben – keinen Haken haben = mit einer verborgenen Schwierigkeit vereinen sein
9. ein Hühnchen zu rupfen haben - Hühnchen zu rupfen haben= sich mit jmdm. auseinandersetzen haben
10. jmdm. schöne Augen machen – jmdm. keine schönen Augen machen=mit jmdm. flirting

However, semantic analysis shows that during the functional application of verbal phraseological units, this is the case. Thus, the name of vague phraseology compounds *keinarticle* or not the proposal is processed, can be negated through the particle *nicht* denied. It can be seen more clearly when using verbal phraseological unit in specific sentences:

1. Das ist nicht light ein Tropfen auf from heißen Stein
2. Die brauchst nicht gleich die flinte ins Korn zu werfen, beim nächsten Mal klappt es bestimmt.
3. Im gischt konnte konnte sie nicht die Klappe halten
4. An dem Rätsel hatten sich die meisten Leser nicht die Zähne ausgebissen

5. das Mittel, das ihm der Händler aufgeschwatzt hatte, war nicht einen blutigen heller wert.

As it can be seen from the examples, the denial of the negative transformation of negative verbal phraseologies serves to create a special denial within the phraseological unit. The content of the content parts is a sign of the existence of a general denial in verbal phraseology.

The study of the problem of denial of verbal phraseological units in German has once again demonstrated that this language is a comprehensive rich language. Also, it is remarkable how some of the verbal phraseological units are composed of any count. When denounced such phraseological associations are denial, the word kein is used. For example:

1. einen Gang / Zahn zulegen – keinen Gang / Zahn zulegen
2. eine Auge zudrücken – kein Auge zudrücken

It should be noted that the constitutive component of the combination of verbal phraseology ein complex character has. As a result, there are so –called affirmative verbal phraseological associations that can be used to deny nicht denials. For example:

1. Eine Sprache sprechen – nicht eine Sprache sprechen
2. Einer Sprache dienen – nicht einer Sprache dienen
3. etw. there is nothing wrong with it. Zum einen Ohr hinein und zum anderen hinaus – etw. there is nothing wrong with it. Nicht zum einen Ohr hinein und zum anderen hinaus and so on.

Observations indicate that phraseological associations with two numbers are not abundantly quantifiable, and denial of such compounds is also used in denial of nicht. Here are some examples:

1. zwei Eisen im Feuer haben – nicht zwei Eisen im Feuer haben
2. zwei Fliegen mit einer Klappe schlagen – nicht zwei Fliegen mit einer Klappe schlagen
3. zwei linke Hände haben – nicht zwei linke Hände haben

The study of the denial of verbal phraseological combinations in German revealed that it was an interesting situation. There is no affirmative character in verbal phraseological units to deny their particle of negation both kein deny that it is possible to use the word. This is what V. Flaysher explains when he writes: “Both denial carriers can be used equally in denying some phraseological units” (Fleischer, 1997, p. 91). The examples we found in

the search for many years allowed us to confirm this fact. Let's look at them:

1. reinen Wein einschenken – a) nicht reinen Wein einschenken, b) keinen reinen Wein einschenken
2. das Gras über etw. wachsen lassen – a) nicht das Gras über etw. wachsen lassenn, b) Take Gras over wachsen lassen
3. ein Aufheben vom jmdm./ etw. machen – a) nicht ein Aufheben vom jmdm./etw machen, b) Aufheben vom jmdm./ etw. Machen
4. Oberwasser undefined – a) nichtOberwasser unexpected, b) if you are Oberwasser
5. einen Finger krumm machen - a) nicht einen Finger krumm machen, b) keinen Finger krumm machen.

While analyzing the phraseological inventory of the Azerbaijani language from a structured perspective, it is possible to see here that the numbers are considered as a component of phraseological associations. As in German such verbal phraseological units is one of the components in the Azerbaijani language, although a different situation is seen in the German language. Because it is impossible to deny some of the phraseological units of this kind of affirmation in the Azerbaijani language; they are phraseological units with strong idiom and stability. Let's look at the examples:

1. to be in love with a thousand hearts – to be in love with a thousand heart
2. Quadruple-Quadruple
3. put a stone above the bottom of a stone – not to put a stone above the bottom of a stone

However, this situation can't be applied to all the phraseological units that have been included in the affirmative. Because it is possible to deny some phraseological units of some of the components. For example:

1. catch two watermelons-one to keep two watermelons
2. speak two-sided- not to speak a double
3. to be one of two hearts- not one of two hearts, and so on

Compared with the German language, the difference in the discrediting of the fraught-up phraseological associations in the Azerbaijan language comes from the clever nature of the Azerbaijan language. It is known that in the Azerbaijani language denominator (-m) is used to deny the verbs. Therefore, these correlations are also applied in the denial of phraseological associations. Many of the verbal phraseological associations used in authentication

in Azerbaijani can also be denied. Let's take a closer look at the examples:

1. open to open- do not turn open
2. to remove from the heart – not to remove from the heart
3. keep your tongue – keep your tongue
4. revenge – not to be revenge
5. to cut his foot – not to cut his leg
6. take exams- do not cry
7. being fluent in speech
8. bending head- do not bend
9. walk outside- do not go outside
10. grab the tail- not to tear the tail
11. to get rid of life – do not save yourself
12. to look eye to eye
13. pull the rope-do not pull the rope
14. to throw him on a horse
15. to fall into frustration - not to fall into the dull and the like.

The semantic analysis of optional verbal phraseological units show that the denialists used in denying them do not necessarily represent these components. It can be said that it is impossible to deny all the phraseological associations in the same way. Here, the individual structural and semantic features of each affective verbal phraseological unit must be taken into account. As it has been written in philosophical sources, negative and positive concepts are contradictory polarities, but at the same time, they are interconnected, conditional concepts. Therefore, there is a harmonious combination of negative and positive expressions. This harmony denies language – is one of the key factors that confirm the variability, and negative phraseological units are the language units serving this factor.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear from the analysis that the negatively phraseological units denying the effects of logical-semantic and linguistic factors can't be represented as they appear in the paradigmatic plane in the surface structure.

They act as negative paradigmatic background to create a specific communication environment. Hence, in the real sense, the negative phraseological units of denial work act as a result of the logic-semantic and structural factors. The positive expression of the negative aspect leads to the enrichment of the convention information and the additional feel of the communication act to the shades.

Undoubtedly, such polarized rich expression forms, which are derived from the expression of negative phraseological units, are the manifestation of the denial-proof variation.

REFERENCES

- Bayramov, H. A. (1978). *Fundamentals of Azerbaijani language phraseology*. Maarif Publishing House.
- Bunyadova, A. (2020). Comparative phraseological problems in modern linguistics. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9(5), 3732–3740.
- Cabezas-García, M., & Faber, P. (2018). Phraseology in specialized resources: An approach to complex nominals. *Lexicography*, 5(1), 55–83.
- Dobrovolsky, D. O. (1990). *Fundamentals of structural and typological analysis of phraseology of modern Germanic languages (based on German, English and Dutch)* [Authors dissertation to obtain the grade of Doctor in Philological Sciences].
- Fix, U. (1971). *Das Verhältnis von Syntax und Semantik im Wortgruppenlexem: (Versuch einer objektivierten Klassifizierung und Definition des Wortgruppenlexems)*. WEB Verlag Biologisches Institut.
- Fleischer, W. (1997). *Phraseologie der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. De Gruyter.
- Granger, S., & Meunier, F. (2008). *Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gray, B., & Biber, D. E. (2015). Phraseology. In *The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 125–145). Cambridge University Press.
- Heinemann, W. (1981). Phraseologisms mit Neg-Constitution and Neg-Phraseologismen in der deutschen Sprache der Gegenwart. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Und Sprachwissenschaftliche Gesellschafts*, 30(5), 470–477.
- Hyvärinen, I. (1996). Zur syntaktischen Negierbarkeit von finnischen Verbidiomen. *Studien Zur Phraseologie Des Deutschen Und Des Finnischen II*, 81–98.
- Kant, H. (2005). *Das Impressum*. Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Korhonen, J. (1988). Zur syntaktischen Negationskomponente in deutschen und finnischen Verbidiomen. *Europhras*, 88, 253–264.
- Militz, H.-M. (1979). *Zu Semantik und Syntax des Verbs in phraseologischen Wendungen. Konfrontative Darstellung des Französischen und Deutschen* (pp. 130–138). Erich Schmidt Verlag.

- Singleton, D., & Le niewska, J. (2021). Phraseology: Where Lexicon and Syntax Conjoin. *Research in Language and Education: An International Journal [RiLE]*, 1(1), 46–
- Weinert, R. (1995). The Role of Formulaic Language in Second Language Acquisition: A Review. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 180–205.
- Worbs, E. (1994). *Theorie und Praxis der slawisch-deutschen Phraseographie*. Liber-Verl.