GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE AS A PRAGMATIC MARKER OF

PHRASEOLOGICAL MEANING IN A COGNITIVE-PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIV

Abdukarim S. Musaev

PhD in Philology, Associate

Professor

E-mail:

karimmusaev100@gmail.com

ABOUT ARTICLE

The article substantiates the idea that the grammatical structure of phraseological units functions as a pragmatic marker influencing interpretation, communicative intention and evaluative meaning. The study is carried out within the framework of cognitive-pragmatic linguistics and is based on the works of E. S. Kubryakova, V. N. Telia, V. I. Karasik, N. D. Arutyunova, Z. D. Popova and I. A.

Sternin, as well as on speech act theory developed by J. Austin and J. Searle and the pragmatic approach proposed by Sh. Safarov. The analysis of Russian and Uzbek material shows that grammatical organization is an essential component of pragmatic orientation rather than a neutral formal feature. The novelty of the research lies in developing a typology of grammatical models of phraseological units as pragmatic markers and in their contrastive analysis.

Annotatsiya: Mazkur maqolada frazeologik birliklarning grammatik tuzilishi talqin, kommunikativ niyat va baholovchi ma'noga ta'sir ko'rsatuvchi pragmatik marker sifatida faoliyat yuritishi asoslab beriladi. Tadqiqot kognitiv-pragmatik lingvistika doirasida olib borilib, E. S. Kubryakova, V. N. Teliya, V. I. Karasik, N. D. Arutyunova, Z. D. Popova va I. A. Sternin ishlari, shuningdek J. Ostin va J. Searl tomonidan ishlab chiqilgan nutq aktlari nazariyasi hamda Sh. Safarov taklif etgan pragmatik yondashuvga tayangan holda amalga oshiriladi. Rus va o'zbek tillari materiali tahlili grammatik tashkil etilish pragmatik yo'naltirilganlikning muhim tarkibiy qismi ekanini, ya'ni u neytral formal xususiyat emasligini ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqotning ilmiy yangiligi frazeologik birliklarning pragmatik marker sifatidagi grammatik modellar tipologiyasini ishlab chiqish va ularni qiyosiy tahlil qilishdan iborat.

Аннотация: В статье обосновывается идея о том, что грамматическая структура фразеологических единиц функционирует как прагматический маркер, влияющий на интерпретацию, коммуникативное намерение и оценочное значение. Исследование выполнено в рамках когнитивно-прагматической лингвистики и опирается на труды Е. С. Кубряковой, В. Н. Телии, В. И. Карасика, Н. Д. Арутюновой, З. Д. Поповой и И. А. Стернина, а также на теорию речевых актов Дж. Остина и Дж. Серля и прагматический подход, предложенный Ш. Сафаровым. Анализ материала русского и узбекского языков показывает, что грамматическая организация является существенным компонентом прагматической направленности, а не нейтральным формальным признаком. Научная новизна исследования заключается в разработке типологии грамматических моделей фразеологических единиц как прагматических маркеров и в их контрастивном анализе.

INTRODUCTION

Modern linguistics is increasingly developing within the anthropocentric paradigm, in which language is regarded not only as a system of signs but also as a means of knowledge representation and communicative influence. In this paradigm, linguistic structures are interpreted as reflections of cognitive processes and communicative intentions of the speaker. Language is viewed as a cognitive and communicative instrument that structures human experience and mediates interaction between participants of communication.

The cognitive approach to language emphasizes that linguistic units represent the results of conceptualization and categorization of reality. From this perspective, phraseological units occupy a special place in the linguistic system, since they reflect stable cognitive models and culturally determined meanings. Phraseology functions as a repository of collective experience and evaluative attitudes, fixed in linguistic form and reproduced in communication.

In contemporary linguistics, the study of phraseology is increasingly conducted within the cognitive and pragmatic framework. This approach allows researchers to analyze phraseological units not only as semantic or stylistic formations but also as communicative instruments functioning in discourse. Phraseological meaning is formed through the interaction of imagery, linguistic form, and communicative intention. Consequently, the grammatical organization of a phraseological unit cannot be considered secondary; rather, it constitutes an integral component of meaning construction and pragmatic interpretation.

Despite the growing number of cognitive and pragmatic studies devoted to phraseology, the problem of grammatical structure as an independent pragmatic marker of phraseological meaning remains insufficiently systematized. Most studies focus on semantic and figurative aspects of phraseological units, while the role of grammatical organization in shaping pragmatic interpretation has received less attention. However, grammatical form can function as a stable indicator of communicative orientation and evaluative perspective, guiding the addressee in interpreting an utterance.

The relevance of the present research is determined by the need to clarify the relationship between grammatical structure and phraseological meaning within the cognitive-pragmatic framework. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the interpretation of grammatical structure as a systematic pragmatic marker that influences the communicative potential and interpretation of phraseological units.

The aim of the article is to demonstrate that the grammatical organization of phraseological units functions as a stable pragmatic marker influencing the interpretation of meaning and communicative intention in Russian and Uzbek.

To achieve this aim, the following objectives are pursued:

- to analyze theoretical approaches to the cognitive and pragmatic interpretation of linguistic form;

- to determine the role of grammatical structure in the formation of phraseological meaning;

- to identify the pragmatic functions of grammatical models of phraseological units;

- to conduct a comparative analysis of Russian and Uzbek phraseological constructions.

The research is based on the cognitive-pragmatic approach, which considers linguistic form as a component of conceptual representation and communicative interaction. The comparative analysis of Russian and Uzbek phraseological units makes it possible to identify both universal and culture-specific pragmatic mechanisms reflected in grammatical structure.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The cognitive paradigm in linguistics proceeds from the assumption that language reflects the structure of human knowledge and participates in the conceptualization of experience. Linguistic form is viewed not only as a means of expressing syntactic relations but also as a component of cognitive representation. Within this framework, grammar is interpreted as a system that organizes conceptual content and structures communicative meaning.

The relationship between grammar and cognition has been widely discussed in modern linguistic research. Grammatical categories are regarded as means of representing conceptual structures and communicative intentions. Consequently, grammatical form can be interpreted as a marker of conceptualization and evaluation. This perspective allows researchers to consider grammatical organization as an active participant in meaning formation rather than as a purely formal component.

The pragmatic approach to language emphasizes the role of communicative intention and context in shaping meaning. The meaning of an utterance is not limited to its semantic content but is formed in the process of interaction between speaker and addressee. Linguistic choice depends on communicative goals, social roles, and discourse strategies. From this point of view, grammatical form becomes a means of expressing pragmatic orientation and communicative strategy.

Speech act theory provides an important theoretical foundation for pragmatic analysis. According to this theory, an utterance is considered an action aimed at achieving a communicative effect. The illocutionary force of an utterance is closely connected with grammatical form, which signals the speaker's intention and determines the interpretation of the message. Grammatical structures such as imperative, interrogative, and evaluative constructions function as markers of communicative intention and pragmatic orientation.

Within the cognitive-pragmatic framework, phraseological units are viewed as complex linguistic formations combining semantic stability with communicative functionality. Their grammatical organization contributes to the formation of pragmatic meaning and determines the direction of interpretation. Thus, grammatical structure may be interpreted as a pragmatic marker that guides the addressee's understanding of phraseological meaning.

The comparative perspective is particularly important for identifying universal and culture-specific features of grammatical and pragmatic organization. Russian and Uzbek phraseology demonstrate both similarities and differences in the correlation between grammatical form and communicative function. These features reflect general cognitive mechanisms as well as culturally determined communicative norms.

The theoretical foundations outlined above make it possible to consider grammatical structure as a key factor in the pragmatic interpretation of phraseological units and as an indicator of communicative orientation within discourse.

Methodology

The present study is carried out within the framework of the cognitive-pragmatic approach to language, which considers linguistic units as instruments of conceptualization and communicative interaction. This approach makes it possible to analyze grammatical structure not only as a formal component of language but also as a marker of pragmatic meaning and communicative intention.

The research employs a комплекс of methods, including descriptive analysis, cognitive-pragmatic interpretation, and comparative analysis of Russian and Uzbek phraseological units. The descriptive method allows for the identification of grammatical models of phraseological constructions and their structural features. The cognitive-pragmatic method is used to determine the role of grammatical form in shaping communicative meaning and pragmatic orientation. The comparative method enables the identification of universal and

culture-specific features in the functioning of phraseological units in Russian and Uzbek.

The material for analysis consists of phraseological units selected from Russian and Uzbek lexicographic sources and from contemporary speech practice. Particular attention is paid to phraseological constructions whose grammatical form demonstrates a stable correlation with pragmatic function. These constructions are analyzed in terms of their grammatical organization, communicative orientation, and evaluative potential.

The methodological basis of the study is determined by the assumption that grammatical structure can function as a stable indicator of communicative intention and pragmatic interpretation. The analysis focuses on identifying grammatical patterns that systematically correlate with specific pragmatic functions such as inducement, evaluation, and expressive characterization.

Grammatical Structure as a Pragmatic Marker of Phraseological Meaning

Within traditional linguistic analysis, grammatical form is often treated as a structural framework organizing lexical content. However, within the cognitive-pragmatic paradigm, grammatical structure is interpreted as an active component of meaning formation that participates in the transmission of communicative intention and evaluative perspective.

Grammatical organization signals not only syntactic relations but also the speaker's pragmatic position. It reflects the degree of categorical force of an utterance, its evaluative orientation, and its communicative purpose. In phraseology, where the stability of form correlates with the stability of meaning, grammatical structure acquires particular pragmatic significance.

Phraseological units are characterized by a fixed grammatical organization that contributes to their reproducibility and communicative effectiveness. This stability allows grammatical form to function as a pragmatic marker guiding the interpretation of the phraseological unit by the addressee.

Imperative grammatical model

The pragmatic role of grammatical structure is particularly evident in phraseological units with imperative form. Such constructions demonstrate a stable correlation between grammatical organization and directive communicative intention.

Russian phraseological units such as *держи язык за зубами, не вешай нос, заруби на носу* function as directive utterances expressing advice, warning, or inducement. The imperative grammatical form determines their communicative

orientation and signals the speaker's intention to influence the addressee's behavior or emotional state.

A similar pragmatic function is observed in Uzbek phraseological constructions *тилингни тий, кўзингни оч, йўлингдан адашма.* In these units, the imperative form grammatically encodes the directive orientation of the utterance and establishes its illocutionary force. The grammatical structure predetermines the communicative interpretation of the phraseological unit and reinforces its pragmatic effect.

In both languages, the imperative grammatical model functions as a stable pragmatic marker indicating inducement, advice, or warning. The correlation between grammatical form and communicative intention demonstrates that grammatical structure participates directly in the formation of phraseological meaning.

Impersonal and existential grammatical model

Another group of phraseological units demonstrating the pragmatic role of grammatical structure includes impersonal and existential constructions. These units create the effect of objectified evaluation and express emotional or psychological states.

Russian phraseological units such as *не по себе, не в своей тарелке* are characterized by impersonal grammatical structure. This form contributes to the representation of emotional state as an objective condition rather than a subjective evaluation. The grammatical model reduces the degree of personal agency and enhances the expressive and evaluative function of the utterance.

In Uzbek phraseology, a similar effect is observed in constructions such as *қўли калта/узун*, where grammatical organization contributes to the expression of evaluation and characterization. The structural features of these units create the impression of objective description while simultaneously conveying evaluative meaning.

Thus, impersonal and existential grammatical models function as pragmatic markers of evaluative interpretation and emotional characterization. They guide the addressee toward a particular understanding of the communicative situation and reinforce the expressive potential of phraseological meaning.

Nominative evaluative model

A third group of phraseological units includes nominative constructions characterized by strong evaluative semantics. Russian phraseological units such as *золотые руки, пустая голова* and Uzbek constructions such as *қўли гул уста* demonstrate the correlation between nominal grammatical structure and evaluative meaning.

The nominative grammatical model functions as a means of conceptualizing stable characteristics attributed to a person or object. The absence of verbal predication creates the effect of categorical evaluation and enhances the expressive force of the utterance. Such constructions present evaluation as an inherent and stable quality rather than as a temporary or situational attribute.

The grammatical structure of nominative phraseological units thus serves as a pragmatic marker of evaluative categorization. It directs the addressee toward interpreting the phraseological unit as a generalized and culturally fixed assessment.

Typology of Grammatical Models

The analysis conducted makes it possible to propose a typology of grammatical models of phraseological units functioning as pragmatic markers.

The first type includes imperative constructions expressing directive pragmatics. Their grammatical structure encodes inducement, advice, or warning and determines the communicative orientation of the utterance.

The second type includes impersonal and existential constructions expressing evaluative or emotional states. Their grammatical organization creates the effect of objectified assessment and enhances expressive meaning.

The third type includes nominative constructions with pronounced evaluative semantics. Their grammatical structure functions as a marker of stable characterization and categorical evaluation.

The novelty of this typology lies in interpreting grammatical structure as a system-forming parameter of pragmatic meaning rather than as a purely formal feature. Grammatical organization is viewed as an integral component of phraseological semantics and as a guide for communicative interpretation.

Results and discussions

The analysis conducted within the cognitive-pragmatic framework demonstrates that grammatical structure functions as a stable pragmatic marker of phraseological meaning. The grammatical organization of phraseological units is not limited to structural or syntactic functions but actively participates in shaping communicative orientation and evaluative interpretation.

The study shows that grammatical form determines the illocutionary force of phraseological constructions and guides the addressee in interpreting the communicative intention of the speaker. Imperative constructions systematically correlate with directive pragmatics, expressing inducement, advice, or warning. Impersonal and existential constructions contribute to the representation of emotional and evaluative states as objective conditions. Nominative

constructions function as markers of categorical evaluation and stable characterization.

The comparative analysis of Russian and Uzbek phraseological units reveals the presence of universal cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms reflected in grammatical structure. In both languages, grammatical models serve as indicators of communicative intention and evaluative perspective. At the same time, certain culture-specific features are observed. Uzbek phraseology more frequently emphasizes socially normative aspects of behavior and collective value orientations, whereas Russian phraseology tends to foreground individual evaluation and expressive emotional assessment.

These results confirm that grammatical structure operates as a system-forming parameter of phraseological meaning and as a pragmatic guide for interpretation. The stability of grammatical organization ensures the reproducibility of communicative effect and contributes to the effectiveness of phraseological units in discourse.

CONCLUSION

The research has demonstrated that the grammatical structure of phraseological units performs the function of a pragmatic marker systematically influencing the interpretation of meaning and communicative intention. Within the cognitive-pragmatic framework, grammatical form should be regarded as an integral component of phraseological semantics and as a means of transmitting evaluative and communicative information.

The analysis of Russian and Uzbek phraseological material confirms that grammatical organization correlates with pragmatic orientation and determines the communicative effect of phraseological units. Imperative, impersonal, and nominative grammatical models function as stable indicators of directive, evaluative, and expressive meanings.

The theoretical significance of the study lies in clarifying the relationship between grammar and phraseology within the cognitive-pragmatic paradigm and in substantiating the role of grammatical structure as a system-forming element of pragmatic interpretation. The results contribute to the development of cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, and phraseology by demonstrating the interdependence of grammatical form and communicative function.

The practical significance of the research is determined by the possibility of applying its results in courses on phraseology, pragmalinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and comparative linguistics. The findings may also be used in further studies devoted to the interaction of grammar, discourse, and communicative strategies.

The study confirms that grammatical structure is not merely a formal component of phraseological units but a key pragmatic marker guiding interpretation and shaping communicative impact.

REFERENCES

1.   Arutyunova, N. D. (1999). *Yazyk i mir cheloveka*. Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kultury.

2.   Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

3.   Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs*. Volgograd.

4.   Kubryakova, E. S. (2004). *Yazyk i znanie: Na puti polucheniya znaniy o yazyke*. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kultury.

5.   Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). *Kognitivnaya lingvistika*. Moscow: Vostok–Zapad.

6.   Safarov, Sh. (2006). *Kognitiv tilshunoslik*. Tashkent: Sangzor.

7.   Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8.   Teliya, V. N. (1996). *Russkaya frazeologiya*. Moscow: Shkola "Yazyki russkoy kultury".