



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

PRAGMATIC STUDY OF THE CATEGORY OF RELATION: THE FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

Azamat Mehmonalievich Toshpulatov

Associate Professor of Kokand State University,

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology.

e.mail: azamatjonqdpi@gmail.com

Annotation

In this article studying necessity of pragmatic aspect of ratio category forms is analyzed. The views relating to this matter are critically studied. The author conception concerning studying of ratio pragmatics is narrated.

Keywords: ratio, category, pragmatics, semantics, speech act.

Annotasiya:

Ushbu maqolada nisbat kategoriyasi shakllarining pragmatik aspektini o'rganish zaruriyati tahlil qilingan. Bu borada qarashlar tanqidiy o'rganilgan. Nisbat pragmatikasini o'rganishga doir muallif konsepsiyasi bayon qilingan.

Kalit so'zlar: nisbat, kategoriya , pragmatika, semantika, nutqiy amaliyot

Аннотация:

В данной статье анализирована потребность исследования прагматического аспекта форм категории залога. Критически изучены точки зрения на проблему. Изложена концепция автора по исследованию прагматики залога.

Ключевые слова: залог, категория, прагматика, семантика, речевая практика



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

There is no doubt that the pragmatic description of a language reflects its typological classification. In particular, since the Uzbek language is an agglutinative language, it is also undoubtedly the case that morphological means are the leaders in performing any tasks, for example, in expressing pragmatic tone. However, although this pragmatic tone is actively expressed, due to the nature of morphological units, their analysis is much more complicated than the description of lexical and analytical forms. In Turkic languages, morphological categories have the quality of highly formed closed systems [see: 7,7-8]. This creates certain difficulties and certain eases in their study. The difficulty is that morphological categories in agglutinative languages \u200b\u200bsummary any immanent aspects inherent in this language. This leads to their extremely multifaceted nature. The ease is that the features revealed in the example of one category imply that similar features are also reflected in other morphological categories.

The study of the relational category, which occupies a special place in the system of morphological categories, will undoubtedly provide valuable material for the study of other categories. Because it is precisely in the nature of the relation that grammatical and lexical aspects are considered to be closely linked. At the same time, it is difficult to say that the debate about which aspects are grammatical and which aspects are lexical has reached an end [see: 7,82-83]. It is precisely the relation, in addition to having common features with other morphological categories in the formation of word forms, that has a special feature that is not found in any other morphological category: relational forms can be added to one basis several times, and the question of what grounds such an extraordinary situation exists has not yet been adequately resolved in its study. The study of these and other aspects of the nature of the relation is of particular importance for its pragmatic description. Pragmatic studies are scientific only if they are based on the results of grammatical studies. Before proceeding to the study of the pragmatics of the category of relation,



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

let us briefly familiarize ourselves with the views on the essence of this category and its place in the morphological system.

Considerable research has been conducted on the category of relation. However, views on the description of the category remain diverse. The older generation, from M.V. Lomonosov to V.V. Vinogradov, who conducted research on relation in Russian classical linguistics, which is the basis for Uzbek traditional-theoretical linguistics, presents extremely diverse views both in the classification and description of the members of the category of relation: there are 3-6 members of the relation, which have the following semantics:

1. The relation shows the relationship of the action to the subject.
2. The relation shows the relationship of the action to the object.
3. The relation shows the relationship of the action to the object and the subject.

Also,

1. Ratio is a lexical category (word-forming).
2. Ratio is a morphological category.
3. Ratio is a syntactic category[see: 2,495-510; 10,39-49; 13,125-135].

Of course, these are not the end of the existing views. In particular, A. Potebnya, who expressed his own attitude to words and word forms ("... the polysemy of words is a false concept: where there are two meanings, there are two words" [10,39]), considers each form of the verb in different ratios to be a separate word. He proposed a definition different from all the descriptions of ratios summarized above. Relation is "the relation of the subject to the object... This also includes the absence of the object. This is possible only through the presence of the subject" [10,201]. It seems that he extracts the meaning of action from the semantics of the relation. Of course, this does not mean that the scientist denies that the relation is a category inherent in the verb. But the change of the verb by the relation is not to change the verb, but to change the relationship between the object and the subject. Here it seems that A.



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

Potebnya paid more attention to the pragmatic realization of the relation than to the grammatical essence. A. Potebnya is not alone in this approach to the essence of the grammatical category. According to G. Paul, the author of the famous work “Principles of the History of Language”, “Any grammatical category arises on the basis of a psychological category” [8,315]. Relation, in his opinion, also serves to reflect various relationships between the psychological and grammatical possessors. G. Paul, it seems, correctly grasped the psychological-pragmatic aspects reflected in the essence of the ratio. However, he came to the conclusion that not only the ratio, but also any morphological category in general, pragmatic aspects are associated not with linguistic unity, but with psychological categories, because according to him: “The grammatical category is in a sense a frozen form of the psychological category; it is associated with a stable tradition. The psychological category, on the other hand, remains something alive and free, constantly taking on a new appearance, depending on individual feelings” [8, 315]. In his opinion, the “birth” of grammatical categories is associated with psychological processes. Psychological aspects that do not fit into the framework of existing grammatical categories lead to the emergence of new grammatical categories[8,315]. In modern world linguistics, including Russian linguistics, there have been many studies on the study of pragmatic aspects of grammatical categories, in particular, the nature of the relation. Views have been formed that the selection of relational forms in speech arises precisely from pragmatic moments[12;9]. However, within the framework of concrete analyses, even the most modern studies cannot get away from the triad of action - object - subject in the semantics of the relation and do not hesitate to note that the definitions given to the relation cannot fully describe not only its pragmatic nature, but also its grammatical nature[For example, see: 12].

If we look at the study of the relation in Uzbek linguistics, we see the same picture as above. A great many studies have been conducted on the genesis and development



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

of the category of relation and its synchronicity. In determining the essence of relation, the tendency to follow the views of the world linguists discussed above is dominant. At the same time, there are studies that go much further with their views on the essence of relation and delve into the essence of this category, taking into account the characteristics of the Uzbek language. In particular, M. A'lamova proposes a system of 12 different relations for the semantics of relation: subject, object, factor and predicate, and expresses an opinion on the performance of a specific grammatical function of each relational suffix in the layered use of relation (usually it is noted that only the last of the relational forms of the word is taken into account, and other relational forms in the series are ignored), in this regard, she distinguishes between the terms relation and degree, which are usually used without distinction [1,18-21].

Sh.Shahobiddinova also draws attention to this peculiarity in the use of relative forms in her research and connects this situation with the strong lexicalization of relative forms compared to members of other morphological categories: “The reason for such a situation (the abundance of indicators, as well as their use in layers) that is unusual for the Uzbek language is that, as a result of the increased lexicalization potential characteristic of the relative in general, another index of the degree of increase is added to the indicator, which begins to strengthen the lexical aspect, in order to increase the dominance of the grammatical aspect. For example, historically kay+t+ar, synchronously ishla+t+tir kabi” [16,111].

In general, the studies conducted in Uzbek linguistics to date have created a very diverse system of views on the grammatical nature of the ratio, but no single solution has been reached in this regard. Also, almost no research has been conducted on the practice of this category, which occupies a special place in the morphological system of the Uzbek language. In our opinion, the existence of any linguistic unit in a language is closely related to its necessity for practice. Representatives of



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

structuralism, who defined language as a system “in itself and for itself”, also emphasized that the systemic picture of the language is individual for each speaker of the language[11]. Of course, this individuality should not be understood in a primitive way. The so-called perfect system, the language, lives in the consciousness of the nation (or rather, organizes its consciousness). The relationship between the consciousness of the nation and the consciousness of the representative of the nation forms a system of requirements.

In our current science, the study of the ratio category from the perspective of stylistics, which is an expression of pragmatics, is very weak. In some of the not so numerous literature in this field, this large category is completely ignored[18], while in others very little information is provided[19,55-58]. In the pragmatic direction of world linguistics, which has been leading in the last few decades, no special research has been conducted on this category.

In our opinion, the need for a pragmatic analysis of the ratio category is justified by the following:

1. A pragmatic description of this category has not been created.
2. Ratio is a category that classifies verbs, one of the most numerous word classes not only in the Uzbek language, but also in all world languages. Given that the verb is the most active word class in speech, it is clear that ratio plays a large role in the characteristics of speech - pragmatics.
3. The ratio is distinguished among morphological categories in Turkic languages, including Uzbek, by the quantitative abundance of its forms and its uniqueness in terms of use. The pragmatic study of such a category will undoubtedly provide a great deal of material for the study of other morphological categories.
4. The ratio occupies a special place among the morphological categories of the Uzbek language, as it changes not only the morphological and syntactic characteristics of the word form, but also its lexical characteristics. The ratio changes



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

the valency of the verb base to which it is added, and can change its lexical characteristics, such as transitive-intransitive. In the system of form-formers, word-modifiers, and word-formers, the ratio is distinguished by the fact that it has aspects characteristic of each of the members of the system and its own individualization of these aspects. Therefore, the pragmatic study of this category is of particular importance in the pragmatics of the system of word formation and formation of the Uzbek language as a whole.

At the same time, the study of the pragmatics of the ratio category is undoubtedly complicated. There are several reasons for this:

1. As we have seen, the ratio category has not been given a description that is acceptable to everyone.
2. The study of concepts such as diathesis, casuality, and mediality related to ratio is not at the required level.
3. Research on the pragmatics of not only ratio, but also morphological categories in general has not been carried out at the level of modern requirements.

The solution of the problems indicated in the creation of the pragmatic description of this category will undoubtedly play a special place in the development of Uzbek morphopragmatics.

References:

1. A'lamova M. O'zbek tilidagi fe'llarda nisbat kategoriyasi. – T.,1992.-144 b.
2. Vinogradov V.V. Russkiy yazik. – M.: Visshaya shkola,1986. – 640 s.
3. Meshaninov I.I. Glagol. – M.-L.: Izd. AN SSSR,1949. – 198 s.
4. Mirtojiev M. Nisbat kategoriyalari formantlari va ular semantikasi genezisi. O'timlilik va orttirma nisbat kategoriyasi // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. -1982. -N4.-B. 6-10.



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

5. Mirtojiev M. Nisbat kategoriyalari semantikasi va ular formantlari genezisi. o'timsizlik va o'zlik nisbati // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. -1983. -N2. -B. 11-13.
6. Ne'matov H. Fe'l nisbatlarning munosabati haqida // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. -1970. -N3. -B. 37-39
7. Nigmatov X.G. Funktsionalnaya morfologiya tyurkoyazichnix pamyatnikov XI - XII vv. - T.: Fan, 1989. - 191 s.
8. Paul G. Prinsipi istorii yazika. – M.: Izdatelstvo Inostrannoy literaturi,1960. – 499 s.
9. Pestova N.V., Sumenkova Ye.M. Pragmaticheskaya napravlenost stradatel'nogo zaloga v politicheskoy kommunikatsii // Vestnik Yujno-Uralskogo goudarstvennogo universiteta. №25. 2009. – CyberLeninka.ru>article/n/pragmatic
10. Potebnaya A.A. Iz zapisok po russkoy grammatike.t.1-2. – M.: Uchpedgiz, 1956. – 536 s.
11. Sossyur F.de. Kurs obshey lingvistiki(izvlecheniya) // www.slovesnik.ru
12. Sumenkova Ye.M. Prosess usvoeniya pragmatiki kategorii zaloga na zanyatiyax po prakticheskoy grammatike v yazqkovom vuze//Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii. №1.2012. – Cyber Leninka. ru>article/n/pragmatic
13. Fortunatov F.F. Izbrannie trudi. t.2. – M.,1957. – 540 s.
- 14.Fozilov E. Fe'l daraja yasovchi affikslarining tarixi // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. -1960. -N3. -B. 54-58.
- 15.Shaykevich A.YA.i dr. Vvedenie v yazikoznanie. – T.: O'qituvchi,1989. - 312 s.
- 16.Shahobiddinova SH. O'zbek tili morfologiyasi. – Andijon: Andijon nashriyotmatbaa MCHJ, 2012. – 151 b.
- 17.Shahobiddinova SH.H. Tatbiqiy tilshunoslik tezislari.// ADU.Ilmiy xabarnoma.2016.№3. – 78-81 b.
- 18.Shomaqsudov A. va boshq. O'zbek tili stilistikasi. – T.:O'qituvchi,1983. – 248 b.
- 19.Qilichev E. O'zbek tilining amaliy stilistikasi. – T.:O'qituvchi,1992. – 160 b.



International Congress on Economics, Management and Business Studies

Hosted Online from New York, USA

Date: 23rd June , 2026

Website: <https://econferencia.com>

20. G‘ulomov A. Fe‘l. – T.,1954. – 128 b.

21.Hakimov M. O‘zbek pragmalingsistikasi asoslari. –T.: Akademnashr.2013. – 116 b.

22.Hojiev A. Fe‘l. -T.: Fan, 1973. -192 b.