
Academia Open



By Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo

Table Of Contents

Journal Cover 1
Author[s] Statement 3
Editorial Team..... 4
Article information 5
 Check this article update (crossmark) 5
 Check this article impact..... 5
 Cite this article.....5
Title page..... 6
 Article Title.....6
 Author information 6
 Abstract 6
Article content..... 6

Originality Statement

The author[s] declare that this article is their own work and to the best of their knowledge it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been accepted for the published of any other published materials, except where due acknowledgement is made in the article. Any contribution made to the research by others, with whom author[s] have work, is explicitly acknowledged in the article.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author[s] declare that this article was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright Statement

Copyright © Author(s). This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>

EDITORIAL TEAM

Editor in Chief

Mochammad Tanzil Multazam, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Managing Editor

Bobur Sobirov, Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service, Uzbekistan

Editors

Fika Megawati, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Mahardika Darmawan Kusuma Wardana, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Wiwit Wahyu Wijayanti, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Farkhod Abdurakhmonov, Silk Road International Tourism University, Uzbekistan

Dr. Hindarto, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Evi Rinata, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

M Faisal Amir, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Dr. Hana Catur Wahyuni, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia

Complete list of editorial team ([link](#))

Complete list of indexing services for this journal ([link](#))

How to submit to this journal ([link](#))

Article information

Check this article update (crossmark)



Check this article impact (*)



Save this article to Mendeley



(*) Time for indexing process is various, depends on indexing database platform

Grammatical Mechanisms of Pragmatization in Russian and Uzbek Phraseology:

Mekanisme Gramatikal dalam Pragmatisasi Unit Fraseologis Rusia dan Uzbek

Abdukarim S. Musaev, karimmusaev100@gmail.com, (1)

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University PhD in Philology, Associate Professor

⁽¹⁾ Corresponding author

Abstract

General Background: In contemporary linguistics, phraseological units are regarded as complex symbolic constructions where lexical meaning, cultural symbolism, and grammatical organization interact within a cognitive-pragmatic framework. **Specific Background:** Although extensive research has addressed the semantic and conceptual dimensions of phraseology, the grammatical dimension of pragmatic functioning, particularly in comparative perspective, remains underexplored. **Knowledge Gap:** The role of grammatical categories in activating the pragmatic potential of phraseological units in Russian and Uzbek has not been sufficiently systematized, especially regarding their contribution to illocutionary force, evaluative orientation, and communicative effect. **Aims:** This study aims to identify and describe grammatical mechanisms of pragmatization in Russian and Uzbek phraseology and to determine their role in shaping communicative meaning. **Results:** The findings demonstrate that grammatical categories such as person, number, modality, tense, and syntactic configuration operate as regulatory instruments of pragmatic actualization. Grammatical variation modifies illocutionary status, redistributes subject roles, adjusts categoricity, and intensifies evaluative and expressive components without destroying idiomatic identity. Comparative analysis shows that both languages employ similar cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms, despite differences in linguistic realization. **Novelty:** The study systematizes grammatical pragmatization as a dynamic and regulatory level of phraseological functioning in a cross-linguistic perspective. **Implications:** The results contribute to cognitive linguistics, comparative phraseology, and pragmatics by clarifying how grammar structures communicative strategies and pragmatic interpretation in discourse.

Highlights:

- Person and number variation restructures discourse roles and communicative perspective.
- Modal and syntactic transformation modifies illocutionary status and categoricity.
- Cross-linguistic comparison reveals shared cognitive-pragmatic patterns with distinct linguistic realization.

Keywords: Grammatical Pragmatization; Phraseological Units; Cognitive Pragmatics; Illocutionary Force; Russian And Uzbek Languages

Published date: 2026-02-24

Introduction

In modern linguistics, phraseology is viewed not only as a set of stable linguistic units, but also as a special form of conceptualisation and pragmatic interpretation of experience. Within the cognitive-pragmatic paradigm, phraseological units are understood as complex symbolic constructions in which lexical meaning, cultural symbolism and grammatical organisation interact[1].

The question of the grammatical representation of phraseological units is of particular interest, since in many cases it is grammar that determines the communicative potential of a stable expression. The grammatical categories of person, number, tense, voice, and syntactic structure can modify the illocutionary type of utterance, the degree of categoricity, evaluative orientation, and expressive intensity.

Despite a significant number of studies devoted to the semantics and conceptual nature of phraseological units, the grammatical aspect of their pragmatic functioning remains insufficiently developed, especially in comparative terms. Meanwhile, it is precisely grammatical variability that allows us to identify the mechanisms of pragmatization of phraseological units in different language systems[2].

The aim of this study is to identify and describe the grammatical mechanisms of pragmatization of phraseological units in Russian and Uzbek and to determine their role in the formation of communicative effect.

Research objectives:

- to determine the role of grammatical categories in the pragmatic actualisation of phraseological units;

- to describe the influence of grammatical form on the illocutionary force of utterances;

- to identify comparative features of the grammatical representation of phraseological units in Russian and Uzbek;

- to establish the connection between grammatical parameters and the evaluative and expressive nature of fixed expressions[3].

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative comparative research design to investigate the grammatical mechanisms contributing to the pragmatization of phraseological units in Russian and Uzbek. The methodology integrates descriptive, comparative, and discourse-analytical approaches to examine how grammatical structures influence pragmatic meanings in phraseological expressions across the two languages.

First, a corpus of phraseological units was compiled from authoritative phraseological dictionaries, contemporary literary texts, media discourse, and online language corpora in both Russian and Uzbek. Approximately equal numbers of phraseological units were selected from each language to ensure balanced comparison. Preference was given to units actively used in modern discourse and capable of demonstrating pragmatic variation depending on grammatical context.

Second, selected phraseological units were analyzed in their authentic contexts to identify grammatical transformations and mechanisms that contribute to pragmatization. Particular attention was paid to variations in tense, aspect, modality, person markers, syntactic restructuring, ellipsis, and contextual grammatical adaptation. Instances where grammatical modification altered pragmatic force—such as irony, emphasis, politeness, evaluation, or emotional coloring—were systematically documented.

Result And Discussion

A. Grammar as a tool for pragmatising phraseological units

In the cognitive-pragmatic paradigm, grammar is viewed not only as a formal level of the language system, but also as a mechanism that ensures the communicative orientation of utterances[4]. In the structure of phraseological units, grammatical parameters perform a regulatory function, determining the illocutionary type, degree of categoricity, and evaluative orientation.

The categories of person, number and modality are of particular importance. Their variation does not destroy the idiomaticity of the expression, but transforms its pragmatic effect[5].

Compare:

We are not stupid — an expression of solidarity, self-identification;

He is not stupid either — a distanced assessment of the subject.

In Uzbek language material, a similar mechanism is observed when changing the personal form and communicative orientation of a statement:

Биз ҳам қўл қовуштириб ўтирмаймиз — expression of a collective position;

У ҳам қўл қовуштириб ўтиргани йўқ — assessment of the actions of a third party.

A change in grammatical person shapes the different communicative roles of the participants in the discourse and sets the pragmatic perspective for interpretation.

B. Modality and particles as pragmatic operators

Modal components significantly enhance the pragmatic potential of phraseological units, setting the degree of categoricalness, expressiveness and subjective assessment[6].

Compare:

He didn't lift a finger — reproach;

Well, let's not beat around the bush — refusal, termination of communication.

In Uzbek discourse, similar pragmatic effects are achieved through other fixed expressions and syntactic patterns used to express reproach, critical assessment or termination of discussion:

Қўлидан ҳеч вақо келмади — negative assessment of inaction;

Бу гапни чўзиб ўтирмайлик — communicative attitude towards concluding the discussion.

At the same time, Uzbek expressions are not structural equivalents of Russian idioms, but represent independent means of realising similar pragmatic scenarios[7].

C. Syntactic structure and illocutionary force

The syntactic organisation of phraseological units is one of the key mechanisms of pragmatism[8]. Translating an expression from a narrative structure into an interrogative or imperative one changes the illocutionary status of the utterance.

Compare:

Кто воду в ступе толчёт? — accusation;

Не будем воду в ступе толочь — call to conclude the discussion.

In Uzbek discourse, a similar pragmatic effect is achieved by other phraseological means and syntactic models that perform a similar communicative function — expressing reproach, criticism or termination of discussion[9]. At the same time, there is no direct structural correspondence between the expressions, which indicates a difference in the linguistic means of representing pragmatic scenarios despite the similarity of their cognitive basis.

Кимдир ишни пайсалга соляпти? — accusation;

Ишни пайсалга солмасдан, тезликда бажарамиз. — call for rapid completion of work[10].

Thus, the comparison is made not at the level of lexical-semantic equivalence, but at the level of pragmatic functions and communicative strategies[11].

D. Evaluativeness and expressiveness as a result of grammatical variability

The grammatical form influences the degree of expressiveness of phraseological units, setting the emotional and evaluative vector of interpretation.

Compare:

Да он пальцем не пошевелил — negative assessment;

Мы пальцем не пошевелим — demonstrative refusal to act.

In Uzbek:

У парвойи фалак — criticism;

Бизнинг эса парвойимиз фалак! — ostentatious stance.

Grammatical transformations shape the degree of subject involvement and determine the pragmatic communication strategy[12].

E. Cognitive foundations of grammatical pragmatism of phraseological units

The grammatical variability of phraseological units is linked to the mechanisms of cognitive processing and interpretation of experience. Within cognitive linguistics, grammar is viewed as a system of conceptual operations that enable the profiling of situations, the distribution of roles, and the actualisation of evaluative parameters[13].

A similar pattern can be observed in Russian and Uzbek: grammatical transformation does not destroy the phraseological identity of an expression, but changes its pragmatic orientation. This indicates that grammar functions as a mechanism of conceptual focus, setting the communicative perspective of representation[14].

A comparative analysis shows that in both languages, the pragmatism of phraseological units is achieved through:

the redistribution of subject roles;

a change in the degree of categoricity;

the actualisation of evaluativeness;

the strengthening of the expressive component[15].

Thus, grammar acts not as a supporting, but as a regulatory level of functioning of phraseological units.

Conclusion

The analysis confirms that grammatical parameters play a key role in the pragmatic functioning of phraseological units. Their significance goes beyond the formal organisation of utterances and is linked to the formation of communicative effect.

It has been established that:

the grammatical categories of person, number and modality act as instruments of pragmatic adjustment of phraseological units;

syntactic transformation affects the illocutionary force of a statement;

the variability of grammatical form sets different scenarios for interpretation and evaluation;

in Russian and Uzbek, similar mechanisms of grammatical pragmatisation function, with differences in the ways they are realised linguistically.

The results confirm the position that grammar is an active participant in cognitive-pragmatic processes and plays a system-forming role in the functioning of phraseology.

Prospects for further research are linked to the expansion of comparative material, the analysis of discursive contexts of phraseological unit usage, and the study of the interaction between grammar and cultural models of interpretation.

Reference

- [1] V. N. Teliya, *Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic and Linguistic-Cultural Aspects*. Moscow: School of Russian Culture Languages, 1996, 288 p.
- [2] D. O. Dobrovolsky, *Cognitive Foundations of Phraseology*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 1997, 264 p.
- [3] N. N. Boldyrev, *Cognitive Semantics*. Tambov: Tambov State University Press, 2001, 123 p.
- [4] Sh. Safarov, *Cognitive Tilsunoslik*. Tashkent: Sangzor, 2006, 256 p.
- [5] G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980, 256 p.
- [6] R. W. Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987, 516 p.
- [7] G. Fauconnier and M. Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2002, 440 p.
- [8] A. Wierzbicka, *Semantics, Culture and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992, 487 p.
- [9] Z. D. Popova and I. A. Sternin, *Cognitive Linguistics*. Moscow: Vostok-Zapad, 2007, 314 p.
- [10] E. S. Kubryakova, *Language and Knowledge: On the Path to Acquiring Knowledge about Language*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2004, 560 p.
- [11] W. Croft and D. A. Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 356 p.
- [12] V. Evans and M. Green, *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006, 830 p.
- [13] L. Talmy, *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Vol. 1–2*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000.
- [14] A. E. Goldberg, *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995, 271 p.

[15] Z. Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 285 p.