

**THE USE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN
COLLOQUIAL STYLE****Yulduz Shakhobovna Rahmatova****Doctoral Student (PhD), Navoi State University****E-mail: yurahmatova2024@gmail.com****<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18052757>****ARTICLE INFO**Received: 22nd December 2025Accepted: 23rd December 2025Online: 24th December 2025**KEYWORDS**

Accordingly, linguists began to study evaluation in terms of content and to investigate it on the basis of philosophical-logical views

ABSTRACT

It should be emphasized that evaluation is a philosophical category, and all manifestations of human activity form evaluative relations, that is, they express one of the core values referred to as good or bad. Logicians study the category of evaluation in the form of logical thinking and result–conclusion. A human being is characterized not only by a simple understanding of the real features and specific properties of the objects surrounding them, but also by evaluating them according to a certain point of view, needs, desires, aspirations, and goals, as well as identifying their virtues and shortcomings.

It should be emphasized that evaluation is a philosophical category, and all manifestations of human activity form evaluative relations, that is, they express one of the core values referred to as good or bad. Logicians study the category of evaluation in the form of logical thinking and result–conclusion. A human being is characterized not only by a simple understanding of the real features and specific properties of the objects surrounding them, but also by evaluating them according to a certain point of view, needs, desires, aspirations, and goals, as well as identifying their virtues and shortcomings.

Linguistic features, such as the expression of language units in a specific form according to a particular purpose, the manifestation of the intended meaning, and the performance of cognitive-pragmatic functions, connect language with external activity—more precisely, with communicative situations and their conditions. Viewing language as an inseparable part of human activity and as a practical process led to the emergence of the communicative-pragmatic approach, which focused its object of study on issues such as interpersonal relations expressed through various linguistic means, the process of communication, context, and situation. As a result, this approach opened the way to analyzing problems of evaluative semantics from a linguistic-logical perspective.

The multi-level nature of the language system makes it possible, at the same time, to analyze both objective reality and the level of formed thinking of an individual or society, their cultural views, their ability to analyze the laws of life, their social-political and economic opportunities, and their spiritual energy—that is, human mentality. As A. Nurmonov notes: “...today it has become clear that in the process of communication it is impossible to correctly and fully study language without taking into account the speakers’ practical knowledge of language. As a result, linguistics began to be studied as part of the cognitive sciences. The study

of the knowledge used by speakers in the process of communication is considered the main direction of cognitive sciences” [1, 53].

The emergence of the category of evaluation has great practical significance for linguistics, and the issue of evaluation has found its expression in linguistic studies. Accordingly, linguists began to study evaluation in terms of content and to investigate it on the basis of philosophical-logical views. When discussing the category of evaluation, it became apparent that evaluation finds its essence in a semantic direction within the language system, and analysis began based on determining the correspondence of language units of various levels, used in colloquial style, to the speaker’s communicative purpose. When units and means belonging to all levels of language are used in accordance with the speaker’s internal intention, the formal and semantic integrity of communication is ensured.

Speech is a complex and multifaceted process, in which units of all language levels harmoniously serve to realize the speaker’s intention. Phraseological units, formed by the stable relationship of two or more words and stored in the memory of language users as potential units that enter speech in this ready-made form, play an important role in figuratively depicting reality and vividly presenting it before the reader’s eyes. In this regard, phraseological units are convenient for economy of expression, for conveying meaning concisely and precisely, and for avoiding the sequential use of long sentences in order to express thoughts effectively. Figurative expression helps facilitate the process of communication between two interlocutors and deepens the content of communication. It is well known that people use language in accordance with their purposeful activities and practical needs.

In Uzbek, sentence-pattern phraseological units consisting of a noun + verb structure always possess the category of tense. Therefore, they actualize temporal valency. In many cases, this valency may not be filled by lexical means, the main reason being the conjugation of the predicate with tense suffixes, for example: *sillasi quridi / sillasi qurigan / sillasi quriyapti* or *madori quridi / madori qurigan / madori quriyapti*, and so on. The temporal valency of verbal phraseological units is filled by various means, which allows them to be classified accordingly. The filling of a phraseological unit’s temporal valency by lexical means is the most common type. For instance, in the phraseological units *sillasi qurimoq / madori qurimoq* mentioned above, the object of the state expressed by the verb component is filled by a noun.

In the following example, the lexeme with the seme of “past time” fills the temporal valency of the phraseological unit expressed in the past tense: *Avval sillasi qurigan holda yurardi* (from colloquial speech). In this fragment, the phraseological unit *sillasi qurimoq* is used, and within its semantic structure there are semes of “state,” “intensification,” “degree (very),” as well as “time.” In this sentence, the adverb *avval* (“previously”) serves to fill the temporal valency of the phraseological unit.

“For example, in free syntagmas there is no pause between the modifier and the modified element; together they form one prosodic unit, as in *Kitobning muqovasi / yirtilibdi*. However, in phrases with possessive constructions involving phraseological units, a semi-pause occurs between the modifier and the phraseological unit, as in *Hammaning / sillasi qurigan*. If we considered this sentence a free syntagma, the semi-pause would have to be *hammaning sillasi qurigan*. The phraseological unit does not allow this, because as a language unit it achieves integrity not only semantically and grammatically, but also phonetically (in terms of

pronunciation). Therefore, in such phraseological units, the semi-pause correctly occurs between the modifier and the phraseological unit” [2, 27].

“Language does not exist by itself, but in combination with concrete thought and the individual activity of specific speech potential. Only through thought and sentence does language merge with communication, draw strength from its living forces, and turn into reality. The conditions, forms, and methods of differentiation of spoken communication are determined by the socio-economic conditions of the era” [3, 150].

The use of a phraseological unit functioning as an adverbial modifier of state in the past tense requires that the component filling the temporal valency also relate to the past. For example: *Doim unga ichim achiydi* (from spoken language). In this fragment, the phraseological unit *ichi achimoq* (“to feel pity”) is used, and within its semantic scope the semes of “state,” “compassion,” “pity,” and “time” are present. Here, the predicate expressed by a phraseological unit with a past tense marker requires that the dependent components also correspond proportionally to the meaning of the past tense. Accordingly, in this sentence, the adverb of time that serves to fill the temporal valency of the phraseological unit also acquires the seme of “past time,” as in *Doim ichim achiydi*.

Phraseological units with colloquial coloring are often identified on the basis of semantic criteria, since the semantics of such expressions are connected with human emotions, states, perceptions of the world, and the linguistic means used to convey them. Phraseological units reflecting diverse interpersonal relations (positive and negative, such as caution, deceit, trust/distrust, modesty, arrogance) are distinguished by the presence of evaluative coloring, which limits their use in bookish styles. Usually, component analysis is appropriate for identifying colloquial coloring, as phraseological units of spoken discourse are formed on the basis of lexical units and constructions characteristic of the conversational style. For example, the following sentence-pattern phraseological units are structurally typical of colloquial usage. In analyzing such phraseological units, we relied on the classification proposed by B. Yo’ldoshev [4, 53–54]:

I. Phraseological units based on simile: *paytavasiga qurt tushganday, kesakdan olov chiqqanday bo’ldi*, and others.

II. Sentence-pattern phraseological units used together with repetitive auxiliary elements: *na issig’iga ko’nadi, na sovug’iga; yo changim chiqadi, yo dong’im*, and others.

III. Simple sentence-pattern phraseological units: *ko’zi ketdi, qo’li uzun, qo’li kalta, tili qisiq, dumi qisilmoq, chakagi ochilmoq, ko’ngli yarim, ichi toza, tili osildi, qo’li yengil, do’ppisi yarimta, oshig’i olchi*, and so on.

IV. Phraseological units constructed as compound sentences with non-restrictive and conditional subordinate clauses: *“gah” desa, qo’liga qo’nadi; osmonga chiqqan bo’lsa oyog’idan, yerga kirgan bo’lsa qulog’idan tortmoq; yerga urasa, ko’kka sapchiydi; bersang yeyman, ursang o’laman; do’ppisini ol desa, boshini olmoq; tog’ni urasa, talqon qiladi; Ali desa, Vali demoq*, and others.

The primary reason for the association of phraseological units with the conversational style is explained by the predominance of evaluation in spoken discourse, a feature that is clearly manifested through phraseological units. “Introductory elements and evaluative words and devices related to the subjective modal aspect of expression are studied by linguistic

pragmatics. The use of introductory and evaluative means in a text plays an important role in determining the author's attitude toward the objective world and the information being expressed" [5, 19]. The lexical means of expressing evaluation are based on lexemes and phraseological units. The objective presence of evaluation in a phraseological unit enables the speaker to express evaluation through the choice of a particular phraseological unit. For instance, in some cases, expressing evaluation through a single lexeme may require the involvement of extralinguistic means, whereas phraseological units allow a general evaluative meaning to be transformed into an individual one. In the process of spoken communication, the evaluation conveyed by phraseological units shifts from generality to specificity. Accordingly, for correct interpretation of evaluative meaning, it is important to analyze the speech situation, context, the personal characteristics of the speaker and listener, social status, the environment to which they belong, and psychological state in their interrelation.

References:

1. Nurmonov A. A New Stage in Linguistic Theory // Uzbek Language and Literature, No. 6. Tashkent, 2008.
2. Rahmatullayev Sh. The Combinability of Verbal Phraseological Units in the Uzbek Language. Tashkent: Universitet, 1992.
3. Mahmudov N. The Golden Treasury of Our Language. Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom Publishing and Printing Creative House, 2012.
4. Yo'ldoshev B. Fundamentals of Phraseological Stylistics. Samarkand, 1998.
5. Pardayev Z. Pragmatic Stratification of Speech Acts with Evaluation in the Uzbek Language // Language, Education, Translation. Vol. 5, No. 3. Tashkent, 2022.