



THE COMMONNESS OF POSSIBILITY AND REALITY IN LANGUAGE

Saidov Olmas Rakhmatovich

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD)

Chirchik State Pedagogical University

saidov7502@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1413-9715>

Abstract

The article analyzes the phenomena of scientific research of the language system in Uzbek linguistics, the main stages of methodological exchange, issues of differentiation of formal linguistics and substantial linguistics. Opinions were also expressed about the methodology of Uzbek substantial linguistics, gradualistic linguistics, and the principle of transition from quantitative to qualitative changes in Uzbek linguistics.

Keywords: Speech realization of language possibilities, effectiveness of practical use of native language possibilities, substantive and pragmatic language research, pragmatics, practical approach.

TILDA IMKONIYAT VA VOQELIK MUSHTARAKLIGI

Saidov O'lmas Raxmatovich

filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti

saidov7502@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1413-9715>

Annotatsiya

Maqolada o'zbek tilshunosligida til sistemasini ilmiy tadqiq qilishning ko'rinishlari, metodologik almashinuvning asosiy bosqichlari, formal tilshunoslik va substansial tilshunoslikning farqi masalalari tahlil etilgan. Shuningdek, o'zbek substansial tilshunosligi metodologiyasi, graduonimik



tilshunoslik, o'zbek tilshunosligida miqdor o'zgarishlarining sifat o'zgarishlariga o'tish tamoyili haqida fikrlar bildirilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: lisoniy imkoniyatlarning nutqiy voqelanishini, ona tili imkoniyatlaridan amaliy foydalanish samaradorligi, tilni substansial-pragmatik tadqiq qilish, pragmatika, amaliy munosabat.

Аннотация

В статье проанализированы явления научного исследования языковой системы в узбекском языкознании, основные этапы методологического обмена, вопросы разграничения формальной лингвистики и субстанциональной лингвистики. Высказывались также мнения о методологии узбекского субстанционального языкознания, градуонимического языкознания, принципе перехода количественных изменений в качественные в узбекском языкознании.

Ключевые слова: речевая реализация языковых возможностей, эффективность практического использования возможностей родного языка, субстанционально-прагматическое исследование языка, прагматика, практический подход.

Demand and Need

In the 1980s, Uzbek substantial linguistics emerged as a leading field of study, focusing on the consistent differentiation between language (the system of possibilities) and speech (the realization of those possibilities). Within this framework, language was understood as representing universality, essence, potential, and cause (abbreviated as UMIS), while speech was seen as particularity, phenomenon, actuality, and consequence (abbreviated as AHVO). The main focus of this linguistic school was directed toward uncovering the UMIS — the fundamental potentialities inherent in the language system.

Phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, and patterns were studied as linguistic units (UMIS), while their realized forms — sounds, affixes, words, word combinations, and sentences — were regarded as speech units (AHVO), that is, as



manifestations of linguistic substance. Substantial linguistics also investigated linguistic paradigms, which are systems of homogeneous linguistic units, and the linguistic relations that maintain those paradigms.

In this field, around fifty candidate and doctoral dissertations were defended, and several monographs were written. The theoretical conclusions obtained were incorporated into the curricula and textbooks of higher and secondary education. Today, the progress of Uzbek linguistics requires a serious turn toward studying the realization of linguistic possibilities in actual speech and addressing the problem of ensuring the effective practical use of the mother tongue's resources. This emerging social demand calls for the exploration of language through a new principle — the **substantial-pragmatic approach**, summarized by the formula “from potentiality to actuality.”

The term pragmatics, included in the name of this new direction, originates from the Greek words *pragma* and *pragmatos*, meaning “action” or “deed.” In linguistics, pragmatics studies the features of language use. The substantial-pragmatic approach, therefore, examines how speakers consciously and practically relate to the linguistic system while employing its units in communication.

The idea of pragmatics was first introduced into science by the American scholar **Charles Peirce**, and later developed by **Charles Morris**. However, only in Uzbek linguistics is the study of language use deeply integrated with the investigation of linguistic potential, which is why this approach bears the distinctive name substantial-pragmatic linguistics.

Thus, the substantial-pragmatic approach, forming a new empirical trend in Uzbek linguistic science, explores linguistic potential in relation to non-linguistic factors such as the speaker, listener, their interaction in communication, and the situational context. A person's practical use of linguistic potential manifests through an interconnection of linguistic and non-linguistic elements: the speaker's and listener's personal characteristics, communicative purpose, the type of speech act (explicit or implicit), its forms (statement, question, command, request, advice, promise, greeting, farewell, apology, congratulation, complaint, etc.), as well as speech strategy and tactics, etiquette, communicative culture, worldview, level of knowledge, and interests.



The task before Uzbek substantial-pragmatic linguistics — to investigate the effectiveness of using the linguistic potential of the Uzbek language, revealed in the 20th century, in real communicative practice — is both a social necessity and a demand of the time. Fulfilling this task will raise the national linguistic science and mother tongue education of Uzbekistan to a new, practically effective qualitative stage.

The Essence of Substantial-Pragmatic Research. Language, as a complex whole, consists of linguistic potential, speech realization, and the levels that connect them — norms (the rules of using linguistic possibilities). Linguists who have studied the dichotomy of language and speech emphasize that linguistic potential is realized in speech through norms, yet remains “formless” and “lifeless” in relation to speech. The vividness and expressiveness of speech arise precisely from pragmatic factors — they “animate” linguistic potential, turning it into living communication.

It is well known that scientific research on the language system can proceed in three ways: . – studying language as a whole, without separating linguistic potential and speech reality, with the goal of formulating literary norms;. – investigating only linguistic potential, based on a strict distinction between potential and realization;. – analyzing speech as an integral phenomenon without differentiating between linguistic potential and realization.

It should be emphasized that studying speech reality apart from linguistic potential has only descriptive value and does not ensure the practical effectiveness of the discipline. Therefore, in Uzbek linguistics, the substantial-pragmatic approach undertakes the task of investigating speech reality on the basis of linguistic potential. It also aims to create a linguistic framework that serves to develop students’ communication skills and speech culture in mother-tongue education.

In human consciousness, linguistic units assimilated from the speech community exist in associative connection with each other. For example, just as phonemes are mentally linked to one another, morphemes also form a special system in the mind. Since phonemes, morphemes, and lexemes exist as separate groups in consciousness, these systems are called homogeneous systems in linguistics. Their homogeneity lies in two main aspects: first, all belong to the linguistic



nature; second, each group of linguistic units exists relatively independently from others.

In speech, however, linguistic units manifest in mixed combinations — for example, vowels with consonants, words with affixes, phrases, and sentences that appear sequentially or embedded within one another. They also intertwine with external, non-linguistic factors — the pragmatic ones mentioned earlier. When linguistic potential transforms into speech realization, it inevitably loses its linguistic “purity.”

Linguistic units are comparable to the chemical elements in Mendeleev’s periodic system. Just as chemical elements never occur in a pure form in nature, linguistic units cannot exist independently in speech. In speech, linguistic units are not simply connected in a linear sequence but also enter into unique relationships with pragmatic elements. In other words, the speech situation, environment, and the characteristics and condition of the speaker and listener act as factors that adapt and contextualize linguistic units in communication.

Whenever a linguistic unit is realized in speech, its general linguistic essence becomes defined through other linguistic units with which it co-occurs. For instance, the specific meanings of polysemantic words are determined by grammatical affixes and accompanying words—they prepare the word to enter speech. The communicative situation, in turn, adds extra characteristics, and when grammatical means or accompanying words fail to convey meaning, pragmatic factors assume their role, supplementing linguistic elements.

For example, the vowel [a] possesses a “low open” linguistic feature, but in the word muallim it becomes closer to a “high close” vowel under the influence of [u]. This change occurs due to a linguistic factor. In some dialects, however, because of the speaker’s ethnic background, the vowel [u] adapts to [a]; here, the cooperation of ethnic (pragmatic) and linguistic factors is observed. The communicative situation can also entirely alter the meanings of linguistic expressions. For instance, the greeting assalomu alaykum assumes different meanings in various contexts: when spoken by a teacher entering a classroom, it signals the beginning of a lesson; when uttered collectively by students, it conveys readiness for class; in religious discourse, combined with the linguistic expression rahmatullo, it means “I wish you peace and health.” The discursive



situation demands this interpretation, relying on the speaker's purpose, level of knowledge, and the communicative context. However, explanatory dictionaries usually define this phrase only as "peace," "health," or "a form of greeting," overlooking its many pragmatic meanings—all of which are manifestations of the substantial meaning "an expression signaling the beginning of communication." The interaction between linguistic and pragmatic factors is also clearly visible in the realization of grammatical meanings. In the sentence O'qituvchimizning kitoblarini maroq bilan o'qidim ("I read our teacher's books with great interest"), the suffix -lari in kitoblari may express either plurality or respect. It is difficult to determine whether the speaker refers to one book or several without considering the broader context and pragmatic factors. This demonstrates that the linguistic suffix -lari cannot fully reveal its meaning without the involvement of pragmatic elements.

Linguistic units cannot express their speech characteristics without pragmatic factors. Yet these factors are not equal in influence: when one becomes more dominant, the others diminish. Each speech realization of a linguistic unit involves three interrelated components—linguistic, personal, and pragmatic. They can be compared to the three corners of a triangle: as one expands, the others contract. Thus, in some cases, a linguistic unit is more closely connected to pragmatic influence, while in others, it requires less of it.

It is clear that the role and place of linguistic potential in speech cannot be understood or interpreted apart from pragmatic factors. The level of research on linguistic units and the relations among them requires that their speech realization be examined accordingly.

The main goal of native language education is to develop students' creative thinking, their ability to express the products of thought correctly and fluently in oral and written forms appropriate to the communicative situation, and to cultivate skills in understanding others' ideas. The substantial-pragmatic direction of Uzbek linguistics aims to ensure the practical efficiency of mother-tongue use by creating linguistic resources and databases that support this process. To achieve this, it sets out to conduct fundamental, innovative, and applied research encompassing all branches of linguistics as a unified whole.



Research Methodology

Each historical period defines the directions of scientific development and the corresponding methodological foundations based on social needs. The same can be said about the substantial approach to language phenomena and its methodological principles.

Uzbek substantial linguistics initially faced the task of revealing the systemic relations that constitute linguistic systems and, based on that, explaining the nature and potential of linguistic units. This was achieved through a special theoretical cognition methodology — the principles of dialectical logic. In the study of linguistic units and the systemic relations uniting them — that is, linguistic contradictions — priority was given to the dialectical categories of relation, as well as to the laws of the unity and struggle of opposites and the negation of negation. These laws largely reflected the antagonistic and class-based principles that dominated social life at the time.

The third dialectical law — the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative changes — was rarely applied in earlier linguistics, as it did not reflect social antagonism but rather a “compromise” between polarities, which was ideologically discouraged in a society built on conflict.

Over time, however, the focus of Uzbek linguistics shifted from examining linguistic contradictions and oppositions to exploring the connecting and neutralizing points between them. This change reflected the growing need to adopt the law of the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes as a methodological foundation, in accordance with new social realities. Indeed, one of the key principles of our country’s progress has been the gradual transition to new socio-economic relations through harmony and cooperation among social groups.

Philosophical Methodology

Today, in the study of open systems, dialectical methodology interacts with the philosophical methodology of the synergetic approach. Speech, as the realization of language, embodies both order and chaos.

Speech is, above all, a product of thought. Thinking processes external information and prepares ideas for verbal expression. This process can occur



either purposefully or spontaneously. Thinking guided by a specific goal is purposeful, while mere imagination without a clear aim is unintentional. Speech, as the communicative manifestation of thought, reflects both of these types. The process of thinking is rarely linear; more often, it takes on a nonlinear character. When the outcome of thought is known in advance, thinking proceeds linearly; when the outcome is uncertain, it becomes nonlinear. The existence of preformed concepts, their potential associations, and their mutual dependence according to certain laws demonstrate the linear aspect of thought and its linguistic expression — speech.

Speech, as it manifests according to linguistic laws, is a clear expression of order. The fact that semantically incompatible lexemes and morphemes cannot combine, and that not every linguistic unit can fit into a syntactic pattern, serves as evidence of this order. However, speech does not always follow this order. The use of words in figurative meanings, the emergence of occasional meanings and functions, the breaking of syntactic patterns through inversion, and the unexpected transformations in expression caused by communicative circumstances are all examples of the manifestation of chaos.

For any particular phenomenon to adapt to its situation or environment, it must partially deviate from its general regularity and reconcile with other phenomena, creating an apparent barrier between itself and its generality. This might seem like the collapse of order and the emergence of chaos. Yet any living system's interaction with its environment and with other systems naturally leads to such unpredictable outcomes. This phenomenon is observed in the study of all sciences when examining objects in real manifestation. Consequently, in addition to dialectical methodology, it becomes necessary to rely on synergetic methodology — one that explores the relationship between order and disorder within the object of study.

General Scientific Methodology. Speech is an open and self-organizing system. In science, systems are studied through system-based approaches, specialized system theories, and methods of system analysis. Regardless of form, a general (abstract) system is always related to consciousness — in a sense, it is a “product of thought.” This is explained by the fact that nothing in existence is entirely



universal; every phenomenon possesses individuality, uniqueness, and irreversibility. Nevertheless, the existence of both general and specific systems is recognized: one associated with human cognition, the other existing independently of it. The general system is a product of human cognition; it arises, develops, and evolves within thought.

The systemic approach in social and human sciences, including linguistics, has traditionally focused on studying the existence and functioning laws of abstract systems — general linguistic systems. However, the dichotomy between general and specific systems and their contradictory interrelations has often been neglected. For example, in linguistics, speech — the living realization of language — has rarely been considered as a system with its own structural nature and laws of existence. Yet linguistic systems and their elements sometimes lose their systemic “essence” in speech processes. Every speech product is a temporary, open system, in which both linguistic and non-linguistic components separate from their abstract systems to form a living, dynamic structure.

Like other dynamic systems, speech is open and composed of heterogeneous elements. Since open systems are evolving and self-organizing, their study requires reliance on the theory of open systems — a component of general systems theory — as a general scientific methodological foundation.

Linguistic Methodology. The shift of attention toward connecting opposite poles has elevated Uzbek substantial linguistics to a new qualitative stage. As a result, a linguistic methodology based on the law of the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes — known as graduonymic methodology (from graduonymy, meaning “gradation”) — has begun to take shape. Several doctoral and candidate dissertations have been defended on this issue, and the law discovered within Uzbek linguistics has been successfully applied in modern Western lexicography. The continuous (graduonymic) relationships among linguistic units correspond to the gradual, stage-by-stage nature of social development. Indeed, the smooth transition from one qualitative state to another — organizing consistent reforms in society on this basis — aligns with the interests of both the state and its citizens and represents the progressive path of development. For instance, in linguistics, an abrupt transition from the vowel [a] to [o] represents a revolutionary change,



while a gradual transition from [a] to [o] exemplifies evolutionary development. Gradual shifts through quantitative change do not abruptly eliminate the old quality; rather, they transform it into a new one over time. Distinguishing various linguistic units characterized by similar meanings and functions based on gradation, and applying these distinctions pragmatically in speech, significantly affects the quality of communication.

Thus, a correct understanding and practical application of this dialectical law has given rise to the linguistic graduonymic methodology, which possesses great theoretical and practical significance for the study of speech systems.

REFERENCES

1. Alimov, N. (1997). O‘zbek tilida diskurs tahlili: Metodologik asoslar.
2. Boshkova, T. F. Kognitiv tilshunoslik va uning asosiy nazariyalari (2000).
3. Hakimov M., Gaziyeva M. Pragmalingvistika asoslari. – Farg‘ona, 2020.
4. Mengliyev B.R. Hozirgi o‘zbek tili (kirish, fonetik sath, leksik-sementik sath)// darslik. –Toshkent: “Tafakkur bo‘stoni”, 2018. – 200 b.
5. Nurmonov A. Hakimov M. Lingvistik pragmatikaning nazariy shakllanishi. O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. 2001.
6. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. –Toshkent, 2008.
7. Sayfullayeva R.R., Mengliyev B.R., Boqiyeva G.H., Qurbonova M.M., Yunusova Z.Q., Abuzalova M.Q. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. O‘quv qo‘llanma. – T., “Fan va texnologiya”, 2009. – 416 b.
8. Sayfullayeva R.R. va boshq. Tilshunoslikka kirish [Matn]: darslik / – Buxoro: OOO “Sadridin Salim Buxoriy” Durdona nashriyoti, 2021. – 272 b.
9. Щерба, Л.В. Преподавание иностранных языков в средней школе: общие вопросы методики: учебное пособие//– Изд. 2-е. – Москва: Высшая школа, 1974.