

**Compatibility of Linguistic and Pragmatic Factors in Grammatical Meaning Realization**  
(on the materials of Uzbek language)



**Linguistics**

**Keywords:** grammatical meaning, lexical and pragmatic factors, speech system, communication, speaker, literary speech, anthrop-pragmatic factor, communicant, phrase, meaning relations, speech act, communicative intention, author's intention, socio-pragmatic factor, cooperation of methodical and accentuate factors.

Ernazarova Manzura Saparbayevna

National University of Uzbekistan. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

**Abstract**

In the article expressed opinions on lexical and pragmatic factors compliance. Also characterized speech specialty of grammatical meanings displayed many internal (lexical) and external (non-lexical) factors. The author tried to substantiate the fact, that lexical factors are displayed in mutual assistance of lexical units, interference strengthening of each other, enhancement of accentuation events role, positions of method factors, expressing of various features of the word lexical meanings.

In the speech system, which is mixture of self-forming system and human factors, linguistic and pragmatic factors functions in a highest degree of interconnection, on the face of it, only in some degree can be detected scanty of limits, their contribution to consciously basis. Because, "... speech communication is systemic, which gives an opportunity to reasoning the verbal communication and interconnection among diverse talk spurt fragment rules. These are:

- 1) syntactical rule of creating and interpreting the sentences and larger pieces of speech;
- 2) semantic rules of word means and talk spurt expressions;
- 3) speech forming rules in specified speech act succession" (Бушуй, 2006, p. 8).

Interconnection of linguistic and non-linguistic factors are expressed in equivalence form and it could be mistake to disclaim any of them in the speech system analyzing process, in which complex analysis principle has priority. "Accurate characterization of speech constructions structure and essence are impossible without leaning on the contextual factors, or more exactly, on the factors, relating to using of these structures" (Nuyts, 1992, p. 68).

As was mentioned, heterogeneous interpretation of communication by various in terms, and will have an possibility of realizations features of linguistic opportunities on the assumption of it. On the basis of diverse scientists viewpoints, "... goal of communication act is to comprehending by communication participants each other. Then, what must be done to reach the comprehending by communication of each other? If we know and keep in mind the fact, that the reality and person, comprehended it are separately from each other, than how progresses processes of human comprehending the reality and cognition? In any event, comprehension about reality is not only just simple reflection of item or event, but also this comprehension is newly created reality and its interconnection with external world is moderate". The process of "comprehension" the external world is to be the active process. Human, trying to comprehend the reality, used to be "engrossed" to this reality, he will try to conceptually "digest of knowledge". Is comprehended new information will be separated, it loses its value and will harmonized with information system of person, adapts to (Сафаров, 2008, p. 59).

In communicative intentional activity, for his goal achievement, by speaker the priority has at the same time both of depending on the pragmatic factors and linguistic meanings in the events of trying to skilful adaption it to himself. By choosing the linguistic units, speaker depends on socialized lingual-speech norms, based on own lingual and social competence. "Norms are serves as criteria for choosing and using syntagmatic, sectoral, stylistic, periodical varieties and doublets of linguistic units. Notably, time affixe [-yap] in singular form of first party together with [-yapman] has varieties, specific to additional performance such certain tasks, as [-opman], [-vopman], [-votirman], [-yotibman], [-yotib tururman]". And, which of them will be used, is not

determined by paradigmatic relations (paradigm of time) (Неъматов 2006: 5). In this, non-linguistic factors are activated, that is, position and role in within the scope of their interconnection.

Linguistic factors in speech are regulated by speaker on the basis of the principle “compulsory-voluntary”. For example, on assumption of communicational intension and speech intension as its representative chooses one of the lingual meanings and corroborates with strengthening meanings – intellectually chooses complying with his purposes and propitious on the assumption of valent facilities of word and grammatical forms. He must, at the same time lean on the competence of considering the subconscious pragmatic factors and appropriate “using” of them, indeed. Consequently, there can be achieved harmony of linguistic and pragmatic factors. The position of grammatical forms in thought forming and structuring the sentences are individual for every language. On this issue scientist linguist Sh.Safarov was stated as following: “Difference among national-cultural screen versions can be also observed in the interpretation of general, universal notions for all nationalities. As is known, all of events are processes in certain place and time, but to this concept’s essence, standing the central place in human linguistic activity are diverse” (Сафаров, 2008, p. 243-245). As also stated the scientist, such foreign countries, as America, Swiss, Italy and Japan comprehension of “time notion” by people differs from each other. Especially, in America, where mind of people fully directed at growing rich, the most expensive good is the time. For Americans past time is level with expired good, as it is useless, but present time as like as the good in arms, and the main goal for them is the future time, which is similar to good. Because of this, mind of Americans accepts the “time” concept form as line appearance. Such mental world outlook surely makes mark on grammar forming of the language. For example, for Uzbek people higher-priority has learn from past experiences, leaning life experience of ancestries and become stronger from moral traditions. And this made mark on time forms of predicate (Сафаров 2008, p. 243-245). On the basis of this condition, ontological reasons of linguistic reality and presence ought to be searched from national-ethnic culture. And this is the result, fruit of not only realization of language, but non-lingual factors.

By the researching of cooperation issue of surfaces in speech realization of linguistic generalities, linguist B.Mengliev paid attention to priority linguistic factors. Below we will try to describe theoretical basics of interpretation of preceptors widely, on the basis of “linguistic and pragmatic factors cooperation” principle.

Anthropologic-pragmatic, as the main factor in speech using of grammatical form is interconnected with its central intension. For example, in the sentence *O‘zbekiston – vatanim manim [Uzbekistan – is my native land]*, (A.Oripov) by using the word in **genitive case** as basic is served speakers intension degree. Creating the poetic image and its literary interpretation – is the central intension of poet. In personification of this task also leans on following auxiliary intensions:

- a) displaying its worth in literary interpretation;
- b) repeatability avoiding;
- c) strong influence to readers feeling;
- d) consonance achievement.

Composition of limitedness and freedom, the characteristic for literary method – the methodic factor gives an opportunity for writer to choose the dialectical-literary variant of grammatical form. Therefore, here is can be observed cooperation of intentional and linguistic (methodical) factors. But, this cooperation is served to displaying only the variant of invariant form. Genitive case can mean hundreds of meanings in under the influence of variety factors. In due time, this phenomenon was in-depth analyzed by linguistic A.Choriev (Чариев, 1990, p. 190). Authors of substantive textbook “Modern Uzbek literary language” displayed diverse variability of genitive phrase by means of genitive case and possessive case in the following table: Derivative of  $[W^{g.c}-W^{p.c} = \text{genitive-definiendum}]$  ( $[W^{k.k}-W^{q.k} = \text{qaratuvchi-qaralmish}]$ ) displays variety of meaning relations:

No.	Word combination	Meaning relations
1.	<i>Halimning qalami</i>	“Owner – owned thing”
2.	<i>Odarning qo'li</i>	“Whole-part”
3.	<i>Ilmning tashabbuskori</i>	“Thing-related person”
4.	<i>Odarning yaxshisi</i>	“Type-sex”
5.	<i>Uyning tozaligi</i>	“Sign owner-sign”
6.	<i>Bolaning yig'lashi</i>	“Subject-his action”
7.	<i>Yashashning zavqi</i>	“Condition-its result”
8.	<i>Urushning asorati</i>	“Process-its consequence”
9.	<i>E'tiborsizlikning illati</i>	“Reason-result”

(Сайфуллаева ва б. 2009, р. 320)

As stated authors, these meaning relations can be long scores of times, also in the result of changing quantities and nature of joining words will be changed quantities and nature of these meaning relations. The reasons of this should be searched from without. Meaning relation between parts of phrase, reduced in table is not related to derivative of  $[W^{g.c}-W^{p.c} = \text{genitive-definiendum}]$ , but it's the self-contradiction of relations between their complementary lexemes and things/objects, naming by them, and mentioned relations can be variety in concordance with the quantity of lexemes. For example, in universe can't be relations type “owner-owned thing” among such objects as table and leg. Also, these meaning relations are not even the meaning of genitive case and possessive case affixes. There is whole-part relation among these objects, which is displayed in phrase. Variety diverse of meaning relations in phrases at first sight are seemed also as the meaning of genitive case and possessive case affixes. But genitive case serves for connecting the subordinate word to dominate word, and possessive case for connecting the dominate word to subordinate. Meanings, seemed as like as its cover, are related to the meaning essence of pattern complementing, and these affixes are only displaying meanings” (Сайфуллаева ва б., 2009, р. 321). In any event, from our point of view, seemed as like as it can't be out of traditional substantial interpretations. Because, as the last reason of meaning amounts, they show the meaning essence of syntactic pattern complementing and displays contradiction of personal opinion. Because, from our point of view, seemed as like as, there is no harmony among opinion “there is whole-part relation among these objects, which is displayed in phrase” and the point of “meanings are related to the meaning essence of pattern complementing, and these affixes are only displaying meanings”. Because, notion “relations among lexemes” and the notion “relations among objects” is characterized by its narrowness. Because, here is can be observed covering up factors beyond phrase, as following:

*first*, abstract analyzing of first-rated lexical unit essence, losing touch with the sentences structure (lexical factor);

*second*, in meaning realization, text (lexical factor) free separateness of phrases, which gives an opportunity to display the second-rate;

*third*, social-pragmatic (non-lexical), phrase meaning absolute determination factor free analyzing.

Because, lexical factors of sentence, giving an opportunity to first-rate working, can fully eliminate or qualitative drastically change essences of sentences, adduced in following table:

No.	Word combination	Essential relations
1	Salimning Halimdan olib turgan qalami	
2	Farzand odarning qo'li	
3	Ilmning soxta tashabbuskori botinan qanday shaxs?	
4	Odarning yaxshisini unutsa bo'ladi, yomonligini unutib bo'lmaydi	
5	Uyning ins-jinsdan tozaligi ruhiyatga ham bog'liq	
6	Bolaning na yig'lashi eshitildi, na kulishi	
7	Yashashning natijasiz zavqi zavq emas	
8	Urushning unutilgan asorati yodiga tushdi	
9	E'tiborsizlikning yo'q illatidan illat qidirardi	

Here can be observed, that some words in sentences are prejudicing in a manner absolute essences of some phrases in sentences. Here is the reason of emptiness of cell “Essential relations”, that yet second and third rate results have not been achieved, which are important for analyzing, of phrase essence and concluding. As stated Sh.Safarov, “...absolute subjection to the traditional research methods of linguistics, we ought to research the sentence phenomena as artificial abstract scheme-pattern. While its logical structure is being searched from of subject and predicative relation, it’s essential structure can be observed in transmitted information. But, there are not enough mentioned signs to introduce the sentence to the structure of speech units” (Сафаров, 2006, p. 4).

Innateness features of lexical generalities are interpreted in connection with speech act notion. “It should be found general and private features, characteristic for speech communication to confirmation the speech unity status of the structures, forming in the lexical activity process. Acceptability of secession of speech act as the least speech unit is in possibility existence of these signs. And consequently, general signifying meanings, which are general for such groups as statement (affirmative), directive (imperative) and commissive (promise) serves as the basis for introducing to these groups the speech constructions “It is snowing”, “Bring the book”, “I will bring to you the book”. And private features of these units are formed in the connection with speech state and communication condition. For example, by phrase “It is snowing” not only informs about speech state, but the meaning of “It is bad weather out there, you shouldn’t go out” can express the directive (imperative) meaning. The same way, such lexical constructions, which are impossible to include the structure of sentence scheme, as “It must like that”, “Never”, “Maybe”, “There” are included to the speech act groups, concerning characteristics of privacy and generality” (Сафаров, 2006, p. 4).

We will try to characterize system element role strengthening or weakening on the basis of some argues in the interconnection of various lexical factors in speech realization of grammatical form (lexeme to which is added grammatical form, subordinate or dominate wordform, grammatical form position in form succession, syntagma scale, demands of emphasis, method) and their pragmatic factors (lexical pragmatic factors (various features of speaker or listener) and non-lexical pragmatic factors):

*Bilmasman, qaydadir menga ibtido,  
Bilmasman, qaydadir menga intiho.  
Asrlar qa’ridan o’taman sokin,  
Menga bari biridir – kim qul, kim hokim.  
Sizning qutqu bilan zarra ishim yo’q,  
Shundoq salobatli karvonman ulug’.  
Mening qo’g’irog’im eshitolgan zot,  
O’zin baxtli desa, arzir umrbod (A.Oripov)*

In the text is used variant [-mas] of negative verb form. This variant is not characteristic for and often serves for toning of literary rising:

In both two cases as the variant of [-may] negative indicator forms “negating of verb-predicate action existence” are privatizing the general meaning. Privatizing is exists in both form and essence. Realization of poetic type [-mac] of negative form [-maï] is privatizing sign, and, it is important to carry out text analyze. We will try to swap places of this form and its invariant:

*Bilmayman, qaydadir menga ibtido,  
Bilmayman, qaydadir menga intiho.*

From our point of view, the poet has a yen to lay logical stress onto this negative word and on the ground, that to lay stress on grammatical vowel, being analyzed. In such instances, softness and inclination to

vowel, typical for consonant *s* in invariant form. In should be noted, that in this poem “Monologue of thought”, the speaker is acting as thought. As is known, categoricalness and sharpness are steady notions, typical for thought. But, sense and feeling here can’t live up. Consequently, for impressive expressing features of thought in “speech”, should to choose its appropriate meaning. And with it, there is a degree of comprehension, expressing in words *bilmayman* and *bilmasman* (don’t know). In word *bilmayman* can be understood stating of information about null information. Consequently, there is opposition in two word-form on the subject of uninformed and expressing of uninformed: word-form *bilmayman* (don’t know) expresses the meaning “I don’t know, and this demand of me, I am not sure, I want/don’t want to know it and I will not satisfied of unknowing”, word-form *bilmasman* means “I don’t know, I don’t want to know it and this is normal for me”.

Therefore, first of all, in using this form there is important the communicant quality. The fact, that here is being discussed thought and knowledge is consolidates this factor. In using of this form and bifurcation of general grammatical meaning communicative intention (certainly, it is distinctive factor the composition of intention “thought” and goal of lyric character) and authors intention are in cooperation with methodical and accentuation factors as socio-pragmatic factor. Existence of partial meaning “irrespective of me” in realized speech meaning can be observed in following poetic pattern:

*Men yo‘llarda tug‘ilganman,  
Ayrilmasman yo‘llardan.  
Umrin o‘tar yo‘llar bilan,  
Kezib-kezib o‘larman (U.Azimov)*

By using word-form *ayrilmasman* (part company with) also tried to show his own emotional state. If pay attention, he could inculcate in the text hidden meaning “if it depends on me” by using form [-*mas*] instead of form [-*may*] and displayed his admitted objective truth about human infirmity and his helplessness in many cases.

Apparently, strong alliance of poetic form, methodical norm and communicative intention with accentual radiance became a reason of origin of the lexical-logical-literary harmony.

In literary speech can be observed cases of distinctive using of grammatical forms for personage character expressing purposes of author. Here is too lexical factors alliances as external pragmatic factor. These examples can be commonly encountered in works of writer T.Murod:

- *Quloq sol, momosi, quloq sol. Qayerdandir odam ovozi kelyapti...  
Sayrak adirda yonboshlab yotmish bobomiz, momomizga shunday dedilar.  
Bobomiz og‘izlarini angraygannamo ochdilar. O‘ng quloqlarini yellar yelmish tarafga tutdilar.  
Yellar, ovozlarni olib kelmadilar.  
Bobomiz o‘ng kaftlarini quloqlari sirtiga tutdilar. Yelpana qildilar. Nafas olmadilar. Bor vujudlarini berib quloq soldilar.  
Bobomiz shunda-da bir nimani eshitmadilar. Chuqur tin oldilar.  
Bobomiz oydina tikildilar:*
- *Manovi yoqdan shekilli... - dedilar. – O‘zi vaqting xushmi, momosi? Eson-omon yuribsanmi? To‘rt muchang sog‘mi?...*

**Translation:**

— *Listen here, grandma, listen it. Somewhere is human voice...*

Grandfather, reclining on hillock, said to grandmother.

Grandfather widely opened his mouth at a loss. He turned his right ear to bearing of an apparent wind.

Winds didn't bring sounds clear.

Grandfather put his right hand to ear. Fanned with hands. Didn't breathe. Listened by whole body.

*Even after this grandfather listen up anything. Heaved a groan.*

Grandfather gazed intently to the bright side:

*— I think it's from that side... - he said. — Are you in happy mood, grandma? Are you safe and sound? alive and kicking?...*

As a matter of fact, using variant [-*mish*] of participle indicator [-*gan*] doesn't correspond to speech norm in literary method. Particularly, these occasional using of this nature in author speech is typical for T.Murod style, in creation of which can be observed breach of lexical norm "wall". Indeed, this is associated with social-moral condition of the time, when his novel has been written and it is an example of attempt to breach of ideological barrier. Therefore, non-lexical factor, serving as reason for using the singular grammatical form characterized by social-moral importance and this can be estimated as one of the "long" and main stimulates in using of lexical unit.

The second reason of form using is in the attempt by author to bring mental psychology of certain region into relief. We can't say, that using of this type of participle form is extended in Surkhon region (Рахимов 1985). This morpheme in sources on lexicology is used to be estimated as historical and survival. But, this is used in some places with some words, as *bo'l* (*kelin bo'lmish, kuyov bo'lmish*). Also, it should be noted, that the author used this grammatical form, generally in his speech (397 times) and this is not observed in personage communication in his works. Therefore, grammatical indicator using can be estimated as the result of intentional activity of author. And with it, also the fact, that third person in personal-quantitative [-*lar*], accompanying to this form used in valley dialect not so often, meeting in work only in authors speech works as lexical factor in speech realization of this participle form. Therefore, in speech realization of supernatural indicator [-*muu*] egestion of participle meaning of adjective together with "literary" meaning part is harmonizing of lexical factor the external – author intention factor with internal [-*lar*] form. Also, inversely, in using of personal-quantitative indicator [-*lar*] can be observed collaboration as stated above.

In formal personal-quantitative indicator [-*lar*], generally, stated in sources multiplicity of performers in formal method and its using in conversational method for representing of "respect" meaning, and neutrality of form to "respect" meaning (Зикриллаев, 1990). In exemplified novel its using also associated with authors intention – his treating with respect to own personages. This is proof for harmony of lexical factor (joint "quantitative-respect" meaning) with pragmatic factor. Therefore, communication ethics, displayed by the author serving as proof of his intention. Because, abidance by the rules of Eastern communication cultural traditions is one of the basic convictions of the author. As stated Koshifi: "if they ask, what rules must be abidance by high-ranking officials, answer, that they must keep in mind following rule: first, must to speak on the assumption of interlocutors state and relevant. Second, he must to speak without rough, in a polite and obliging manner. Third, to be smiling and gently during conversation. Fourth, not to talk tang. Fifth, to talk efficacious and wholesome words for people. Sixth, not to talk unworthy words, as the words of great men as like as seed, is it is hollow or sphacelated, wherever it has been sow, it will not give crops" (Хусайн, 1997, p. 227). Therefore, immortal traditions, serving as the basic of generations breeding, serves as fluctuation criteria in using of grammatical forms variants, expressing of their invariant general meaning division.

Factor in abovementioned grammatical indicators using and realized meaning strengthening, consist in the word types, as like as words *grandfather* and *grandmother* in possessive plural form, or in other words, possessive formed words *grandfather* and *grandmother*. This indicator of possessive category served for strengthening of "respect" meaning component, while totally suppressed of "relativity" and "belonging" meanings in the text. This is lexical factor, meaning strengthening of personal-quantitative indicators too.

From abovementioned can be concluded, that choosing of grammatical form variants, specificity of general grammatical meanings related with great number of internal (lexical) and external (non-lexical) factors. These lexical factors are displayed in mutual assistance of lexical units, interference strengthening of each other, enhancement of accentuation events role, positions of method factors, expressing of various features of the word lexical meanings. These fluctuating factors, in many cases can be cooperated by non-lexical factors – intention of the speaker, factors of place-time, national-mental, social status. Leadership of these factors are displayed in weakening of one’s status when others status is strengthened, because of this is result of not contradiction, but “conciliation”, and mutual adjustment, displaying of maximal cooperation be each others.

## References

1. Nuyts J. (1992) Aspects of a Cognitive-Pragmatic Theory of Language. On cognition, functionalism, and grammar. -Amsterdam / Philadelphia: J.Benjamins Publishing comp.
2. Бушуй А.М. (2006) Принципы лингвистического структурирования речевого высказывания // Нутк лингвистикаси. Халқаро илмий – назарий конференция материаллари. – Самарқанд.
3. Зикриллаев Ф.Н. (1990) Ўзбек тилида шахс-сон ва хурмат категорияси системаси. – Тошкент: Фан.
4. Неъматов Х. (2006) Нутқда эркинлик ва зарурият // Нутқ лингвистикаси. Халқаро илмий – назарий конференция материаллари. – Самарқанд.
5. Раҳимов С. (1985) Ўзбек тили Сурхондарё шевалари. – Тошкент: Фан.
6. Сайфуллаева Р., Менглиев Б., Қурбонова М. ва б. (2009) Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. –Тошкент: ФТМ.
7. Сафаров Ш. (2006) Нутқ лингвистикасининг текширув объекти нимадан иборат? // Нутқ лингвистикаси. Халқаро илмий – назарий конференция материаллари. – Самарқанд.
8. Сафаров Ш. (2008) Прагмалингвистика. – Тошкент: “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси” Давлат илмий нашриёти.
9. Хусайн Воис Кошифий. (1997) Футувватномаи султоний. Тўплам: Комил инсон ҳақида тўрт рисола (Н.Комилов таржимаси). –Т.: Маънавият.
10. Чариев А. (1990) Синтаксическо-семантические признаки родительного падежа в узбекском и английском языках. – Ташкент: Фан.