

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Lexical-Grammatical, Syntactic, And Pragmalinguistic Means of Expression in The Speech Genre Of "Invitation" (A Comparative Study of English And Uzbek)

 **Nasirdinov Oybek Abdubannonovich**

Teacher at Kokand University, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue06 2026

PAGE: 67-70

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

The present article examines the lexical-grammatical, syntactic, and pragmalinguistic means employed in the realization of the speech genre of invitation in English and Uzbek communicative cultures. Invitation is viewed as a multifunctional speech act that combines directive, commissive, and interpersonal functions. The study analyzes linguistic devices through which invitation meaning is encoded and interpreted in discourse. Particular attention is paid to performative verbs, modal constructions, interrogative and imperative structures, politeness markers, and contextual pragmatic mechanisms. The findings demonstrate that invitation strategies are realized through a complex interaction of lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and sociocultural factors. While English invitation discourse tends to prioritize optionality and individual autonomy, Uzbek invitations are characterized by hospitality-oriented expressions and solidarity-building mechanisms. The study contributes to the understanding of invitation as a speech genre and highlights the role of language-specific and culture-specific factors in shaping communicative behavior.

KEYWORDS

Invitation speech genre, pragmatics, pragmalinguistics, lexical means, grammatical means, syntax, speech act theory, English language, Uzbek language.

INTRODUCTION

The anthropocentric paradigm of modern linguistics has significantly increased scholarly interest in speech genres and communicative behavior. Among various speech genres, invitation occupies a distinctive position due to its social, cultural, and interpersonal significance. Invitations facilitate social interaction, establish solidarity, strengthen interpersonal relations, and maintain communicative cooperation.

Within Speech Act Theory, invitation is traditionally classified as a directive speech act because the speaker attempts to encourage the hearer to perform a future action. However, contemporary pragmatics recognizes the hybrid nature of invitations, which simultaneously contain directive and

commissive elements. The speaker not only requests the addressee's participation but also assumes certain obligations regarding hospitality, organization, or interaction.

The linguistic realization of invitation involves a variety of lexical, grammatical, syntactic, and pragmatic devices. These means vary across languages and cultures, reflecting differences in communicative norms, politeness conventions, and social values. The purpose of this article is to investigate the principal lexical-grammatical, syntactic, and pragmalinguistic means through which invitation meaning is expressed in English and Uzbek.

Theoretical Background

Speech Act Theory developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) provides the theoretical basis for analyzing invitation as an illocutionary act. According to Searle, invitations belong to directive speech acts because they seek to influence the future behavior of the addressee.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory further explains the linguistic choices involved in invitation-making. Since invitations potentially impose obligations upon the hearer, speakers frequently employ politeness strategies to reduce communicative pressure.

Cross-cultural pragmatic studies indicate that invitation strategies are highly dependent on cultural norms. Comparative research on English, Arabic, Persian, Indonesian, and other languages demonstrates that invitations may range from highly direct forms to highly indirect and ritualized expressions depending on sociocultural expectations.

Within Uzbek communicative culture, invitation discourse is strongly influenced by traditional values of hospitality (mehmondo'stlik), respect, and collectivism. Consequently, invitation expressions frequently contain emotional, evaluative, and solidarity-oriented components.

METHODOLOGY

The study employs a comparative-pragmatic and descriptive-analytical approach.

The research material consists of:

- conversational discourse;
- literary texts;
- authentic invitation expressions;
- examples from English and Uzbek communicative practice.

The analysis focuses on three levels: Lexical-grammatical means; Syntactic means; Pragmalinguistic means.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

One of the most explicit lexical indicators of invitation is the performative verb.

English: I invite you to attend our conference.

We would like to invite you to dinner.

Uzbek: Sizni konferensiyaga taklif qilamiz.

To'yimizga taklif etamiz.

The verbs invite, taklif qilmoq, and taklif etmoq directly encode invitation meaning and explicitly indicate the speaker's communicative intention.

Modal constructions represent another important grammatical resource.

English: Would you like to join us?

Could you come tomorrow?

You might want to attend the event.

The modal verbs would, could, and might soften the invitation and increase politeness.

Uzbek: Ertaga biz bilan bora olasizmi?

Kelsangiz yaxshi bo'lardi.

Ishtirok etsangiz mamnun bo'lardik.

These constructions reduce imposition and provide the addressee with greater freedom of choice.

Politeness Markers

English invitation discourse frequently employs lexical politeness markers: please; kindly; we'd be delighted; we'd be honored.

Uzbek invitations similarly utilize politeness formulas: marhamat; albatta; xush kelibsiz; tashrif buyuring.

These markers enhance the interpersonal and ceremonial dimensions of invitation.

Imperative sentences constitute one of the most common syntactic patterns of invitation.

English: Come and join us. Please attend the ceremony.

Uzbek: Keling. Mehmon bo'lib keling. Marhamat qiling.

Imperatives create a direct and explicit invitation while often retaining politeness through contextual factors.

Questions represent one of the most productive invitation structures.

English: Would you like to come?

Can you join us?

Why don't you come with us?

Uzbek: Biz bilan bormaysizmi?

Mehmon bo'lib kelmaysizmi?

To'yga kelasizmi?

Interrogative forms simultaneously perform questioning and inviting functions.

Conditional syntax frequently contributes to indirect invitations.

English: If you're free, we'd love to see you. If you have time, please join us.

Uzbek: Vaqtingiz bo'lsa, biznikiga keling. Kelsangiz, juda xursand bo'lardik.

Such structures reduce communicative pressure and increase politeness.

Invitation meaning may also be encoded in declarative sentences.

English: We are having dinner tonight.

There is always room for one more guest.

Uzbek: Bugun biznikida osh bo'ladi.

Mehmonlar uchun joy yetarli.

Although grammatically declarative, these utterances function pragmatically as invitations.

Direct invitations contain explicit invitation markers and require little contextual interpretation.

Examples: I invite you to participate.

Sizni taklif qilamiz.

Their communicative intention is transparent and unambiguous.

Indirect invitations rely on pragmatic inference.

Examples: We'd be happy to see you there. Siz kelsangiz juda mamnun bo'lardik.

The invitation force emerges through contextual interpretation rather than explicit performative language.

Positive politeness seeks to establish solidarity and group membership.

English: We'd love to have you with us. Everyone would be happy to see you.

Uzbek: Sizsiz davramiz to'liq bo'lmaydi. Kelsangiz, juda xursand bo'lamiz.

These expressions emphasize interpersonal closeness.

Negative politeness minimizes pressure on the hearer.

English: If you'd like. If you're available.

Uzbek: Imkoningiz bo'lsa. Vaqtingiz bo'lsa.

These forms protect the addressee's freedom of action.

The pragmalinguistic realization of invitation reflects cultural values.

English invitations prioritize: autonomy; optionality; individual choice.

Uzbek invitations emphasize: hospitality; respect; collective participation; sincerity.

Consequently, repeated invitations, emotional encouragement, and insistence often function as positive politeness strategies in Uzbek communication, whereas similar behavior may be interpreted as excessive pressure in English-speaking contexts.

CONCLUSION

The analysis demonstrates that invitation meaning in English and Uzbek is realized through a complex system of lexical-grammatical, syntactic, and pragmalinguistic means.

At the lexical-grammatical level, performative verbs, modal constructions, and politeness markers constitute the primary resources for expressing invitation meaning. At the syntactic level, imperative, interrogative, declarative, and conditional structures serve as productive patterns of invitation realization. At the pragmalinguistic level, directness, indirectness, politeness strategies, and sociocultural conventions determine the interpretation and communicative effectiveness of invitations.

The comparative study reveals that although English and Uzbek share many structural mechanisms of invitation realization, their pragmalinguistic organization differs significantly due to cultural values and communicative traditions. English invitation discourse tends to emphasize individual autonomy and negative politeness, whereas Uzbek invitation discourse prioritizes hospitality, solidarity, and interpersonal closeness.

The findings confirm that invitation should be viewed not merely as a grammatical structure but as a culturally embedded speech genre realized through the interaction of linguistic and extralinguistic factors.

REFERENCES

1. Isaacs, E. A., & Clark, H. H. (1990). Ostensible Invitations. *Language in Society*, 19(4), 493–509.
2. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
3. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
6. Mengliyev, B. (2018). *Hozirgi O'zbek Tili*. Toshkent.
7. Omonturdiyev, A. J., & Abduraimova, Sh. I. (2016). *O'zbek Nutqi Madaniyati va Uslubiyati*. Toshkent.
8. Ummatovich, K. M., Mirsultonov, M. I., Hudoyberdiyeva, B. Z. G. Z., & Ahmedovna, K. M. (2025). Determinants Of Effective School Governance: Participation, Reflection, Trust And Leadership Competencies. *The Review of Diabetic Studies*, 201-208.
9. Ahmadaliyeva, H. G., Ahmedovna, K. M., Muhitdinovna, A. D., Tokhtasinovich, A. S., Yakubovna, U. N., & Ahadovna, Y. M. (2024). A LINGUISTIC JOURNEY: MORPHOLOGY AND POLYSEMY IN ENGLISH TOURISM TERMS. *Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research*, 7(2), 242.
10. Axmedova, K. M. (2021). Sociolinguistic Features OF Everyday Discourse in English, Russian, Uzbek. *European Journal of Innovation in Nonformal Education*, 1(2), 259-261.
11. Isломov, U. (2026). SPEAKING ANXIETY IN ESP CLASSROOMS: EVIDENCE FROM TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY STUDENTS. *Advances in Science and Education*, 2(04), 58-66.
12. Rajapova, M. (2023). Study of discourse and specific characteristics of allegory. *Наука и технология в современном мире*, 2(17), 53-55.
13. Sobirova, N., & Rajapova, M. (2024). EASY TEACHING AND LEARNING STRATEGIES IN PRIMARY SCHOOL. *Models and methods in modern science*, 3(4), 122-124.
14. Rajapova, M. (2023). BADIY USLUB VA ALLEGORIYANING O'ZIGA HOS XUSUSIYATLARI TADQIQI. *Педагогика и психология в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования*, 2(9), 121-124.
15. Rajapova, M., & Mamadaliyeva, M. (2023). Interpretation Of Allegorical Means In Discourse. In *International Conference On Higher Education Teaching (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 15-19)*.