

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69722/1694-8211-2024-59-245-253>

УДК: 81'367:81'373

Sagymbaeva E. Zh., senior lecturer
e-mail: elza.sagymbaeva@iksu.kg
ORCID: 0009-0000-3712-0725
K. Tynystanov Issyk-Kul state university
Karakol, Kyrgyzstan

THE GRAMMATICAL CORRELATION BETWEEN SEMANTICS AND PRAGMATICS

This article explores the interplay between the cognitive, physical, and linguistic worlds of human experience, focusing on the triangle formed by IDEA, ITEM, and LABEL. These elements interact through mutually defining correlations: ideas are represented by labels, labels signify items, and items realize ideas. The concept of meaning arises from this interaction, which is shared within speech communities. Geoffrey Leech's seven types of meaning conceptual, connotative, stylistic, affective, reflected, collocative and thematic are discussed, particularly in relation to how meaning is constructed and understood in different contexts.

Further, the text examines different sources of meaning, including lexical, grammatical, phonological and sociocultural meanings, distinguishing between code-based meanings (sememes) and user-based meanings (pragmemes). The role of grammar in determining meaning through functional relations and sentence structure is also addressed.

Additionally, meaning relations among words are analyzed, following John Lyons' classification into descriptive, expressive, and social meanings. Synonymy, polysemy, homonymy, metaphor, and metonymy are explained, alongside semantic phenomena like ambiguity, antonymy, hyponymy, and valency. Pragmatics is discussed through concepts like performatives, presuppositions, and speech act theory, including locutions, illocutions, and perlocutions. The analysis highlights how meaning is shaped by these relations and contexts, integrating both semantics and pragmatics into the broader understanding of language and communication.

Keywords: Semantics, Pragmatics, meaning, correlation, grammar, collocation, signs, referents, users.

Сагымбаева Э. Дж., ага окутуучу
e-mail: elza.sagymbaeva@iksu.kg
ORCID: 0009-0000-3712-0725
К. Тыныстанов ат. ЫМУ
Каракол ш., Кыргызстан

СЕМАНТИКА МЕНЕН ПРАГМАТИКАНЫН ОРТОСУНДАГЫ ГРАММАТИКАЛЫК БАЙЛАНЫШ

Бул макалада когнитивдик, физикалык жана лингвистикалык тажрыйбанын өз ара аракетин талданып, идеяны, затты жана белгини түзгөн үч бурчтуктун мааниси каралган. Бул элементтер бири-бирин аныктоочу мамилелер аркылуу байланышат: идеялар белгилер аркылуу чагылдырылат, белгилер заттарды белгилейт жана заттар идеяларды камтыйт. Мындай өз ара аракеттенүү сүйлөө жаатындагы сөздүн маанисинин калыптанышына алып келет. Макалада ошондой эле Джеффри Лич баса белгилеген маанинин жети түрү каралат: концептуалдык, коннотативдик, стилистикалык, аффективдүү, чагылдырылган, colloкациялык жана тематикалык, алардын мааниси кырдаалдарга жараша ар кандай калыптанат жана кабыл алынат.

Ошондой эле макалада лексикалык, грамматикалык, фонологиялык жана социалдык-маданий аспектилерди камтыган ар кандай маанидеги булактарга талдоо жүргүзүлөт.

Коддук маанилери (семема) менен колдонуучунун маанилеринин (прагмема) ортосундагы айырмачылыктарга өзгөчө көңүл бурулган. Функционалдык байланыштар менен сүйлөмдүн түзүлүшү аркылуу грамматиканын ролу каралган. Мындан тышкары, Джон Лионстун классификациясына таянып, сөздөрдүн ортосундагы семантикалык байланыштар талданган жана синоним, полисемия, омонимия, метафора жана метонимия сыяктуу лексика-семантикалык кубулуштар талкууланган. Жалпысынан, семантика менен прагматиканын байланышы тил менен коммуникацияны кененирээк түшүнүүгө жардам берет.

Түйүндүү сөздөр: семантика, прагматика, маани, корреляция, грамматика, коллокация, белгилер, референттер, колдонуучулар.

Сагымбаева Э. Дж., ст. преподаватель,
e-mail: elza.sagymbaeva@iksu.kg
ORCID: 0009-0000-3712-0725
ИГУ им. К. Тыныстанова
г. Каракол, Кыргызстан

ГРАММАТИЧЕСКАЯ ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ МЕЖДУ СЕМАНТИКОЙ И ПРАГМАТИКОЙ

В данной статье анализируется взаимодействие когнитивного, физического и лингвистического опыта, сосредотачиваясь на треугольнике, образованном идеей, предметом и знаком. Эти элементы связаны через взаимопределяющие отношения: идеи выражаются через знаки, знаки обозначают предметы, а предметы воплощают идеи. Такое взаимодействие приводит к формированию смысла, который разделяется внутри речевых сообществ. В статье также рассматриваются семь типов значения, выделенных Джеффри Личем: концептуальное, коннотативное, стилистическое, аффективное, отраженное, словосочетательное и тематическое, особенно в контексте того, как значение формируется и воспринимается в различных ситуациях.

В статье также проводится анализ различных источников значения, включая лексические, грамматические, фонологические и социокультурные аспекты. Особое внимание уделяется различию между кодовыми значениями (семемами) и пользовательскими значениями (прагмемами). Рассматривается роль грамматики в формировании значения через функциональные связи и структуру предложения. Кроме того, анализируются смысловые связи между словами, опираясь на классификацию Джона Лионса, которая включает описательные, экспрессивные и социальные значения. В статье объясняются такие лексико-семантические явления, как синонимия, полисемия, омонимия, метафора и метонимия, а также обсуждаются двусмысленность, антонимия, гипонимия и валентность. Прагматика исследуется через такие понятия, как перформативы, пресуппозиции и теория речевых актов, включая локутивные, иллокутивные и перлокутивные акты. В целом, анализ демонстрирует, как эти отношения и контексты формируют значение, объединяя семантику и прагматику в более широкое понимание языка и коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: семантика, прагматика, значение, корреляция, грамматика, коллокация, знаки, референты, пользователи.

Introduction. Human life encompasses three worlds of experience: the cognitive, the physical and the linguistic. Here we include both 'real' and 'imaginary' experience as part of the physical experience. corresponding to these worlds we have three concepts which constitute a triangle: IDEA, ITEM and LABEL.

The *physical* world gives us *items*, actions, responses, qualities, etc. The cognitive world conceives them in terms of *ideas* and also associates them with other items. The linguistic world *labels* the *items* as conceived by our cognitive world. The *idea* is represented by the *label* and the *label signifies* the *item*. The *item realizes* the *idea*. The idea *manifests* itself in the item and the idea is fixed in our minds by the label; the use of the label is

reinforced by the item. These are mutually defining correlations among the three different but complementary worlds of experience. *Meaning* subsumes our *conceptualization* of these correlations. It is important to note that meaning cannot be assumed to exist independent of the conceptualization which is shared by the members of a speech community.

1. Elements of meaning. Meaning in a general sense takes care of almost everything that transpires between the encoder (sender) and the decoder (receiver) of a message through seven types: a code (medium, i.e. language). Geoffrey Leech breaks clown 'meaning' into 7 types [5]:

- (i) conceptual meaning
- (ii) connotative meaning
- (iii) stylistic meaning
- (iv) affective meaning
- (v) reflected meaning
- (vi) collocative meaning
- (vii) thematic meaning

Conceptual meaning (or *denotation*) deals with the core meaning of expressions. It refers to the correlation we have mentioned above between the three worlds of experience. Conceptually 'cow' is 'an adult female bovine animal'.

Connotative meaning is the meaning which is attributed to a given expression by its users. So it is not part of what is *conceived*; it is part of what is *perceived*. For example, the fact that a cow is a sacred animal is part of connotative meaning.

Stylistic meaning is the meaning conveyed by an expression regarding the sociocultural backdrop of the users of a language. It is the sum total of the social circumstances in which a piece of language is used. For example, 'the informality' associated with the word 'buck' for a dollar or rupee is the stylistic meaning of the word.

Affective meaning comprises the personal feelings of the encoder including his/her attitude to the decoder and to the topic of discourse.

Reflected meaning is the effect of one meaning on another meaning of the same word. Let us take the word 'simple' which has several meanings; for example 'natural, naive (easily deceived)'. In a sentence like his responses are simple and straight, the encoder may be using 'simple' to mean 'natural' but the other meaning, i.e. 'naive' may be reflected on the intended meaning.

Collocative meaning consists of the meaning acquired by a word under the influence of word(s) which it co-occurs with. For example, the meaning of 'strong' gets specified by the word it co-occurs with: e.g. 'strong coffee' and 'strong argument'.

Thematic meaning is the meaning conveyed by the structure of the discourse where concepts like *topic* of discourse and *focus* of discourse are identified. *Topic* or *theme* is what or who we talk about. *Focus* is the new information we give to the learner (See also Unit 6 of Block V of **Modern English Grammar and Usage**). For example, in the following sentences 'dog' is the *topic*(T) of the discourse and 'died' is the *focus*(F) of discourse:

1. The dog (T) died (F).
2. It was the dog (T) that died (F).
3. The dog (T) it was that died (F).

Leech uses a core term for reflected meaning, collocative meaning, affective meaning, stylistic meaning, and connotative meaning, viz. *associative meaning*, because they are all open-ended in character and lend themselves to discussion in terms of ranges.

2. Sources of meaning. Let us now have a look at the different sources of *meaning*. The major part of the meaning of what we say or write is located in the words we use. This

type of meaning is called *lexical meaning*. The choice and organization of a sentence. This type of grammatical items also contribute to the meaning of meaning is called *grammatical (syntactic) meaning*. When we utter a sentence, we use specific intonation patterns to convey meaning, which is known as intonational meaning. Sometimes, phonological features such as nasalization can also encode meaning, which is referred to as phonological meaning. This includes intonational meaning. In writing, punctuation plays a significant role in reflecting intonational meaning [15].

When we use language we also draw upon the *sociocultural meaning* which we share with other members of the speech community. Let us take an example:

1. *Lalita slapped Hari?*
2. *Hari slapped Lalita?*
3. *Lalita slapped Hari.*
4. *Hari slapped Lalita.*

Sentences (1) and (2) are questions. This information we get from the question mark (?) in writing and a rise tone in speech. The meaning so encoded in the form of a rise tone is intonational meaning. The difference between sentences (1) and (2) and sentences (3) and (4) is reflected in their different word order. This kind of meaning is grammatical meaning. The words used in these sentences give us lexical meaning. Sentences (1) and (2) can also express 'disbelief' and 'disapproval'. This kind of meaning is sociocultural meaning, where the speaker and hearer share the information that neither Hari nor Lalita is supposed to 'slap' the other person.

Lexical, syntactic and phonological meanings have their source in the *code* (language) itself. Sociocultural meaning has its source in the *coder* (language user). This distinction is significant. The minimal unit of code-based meaning is called *sememe*. The minimal unit of coder-based meaning is *pragmeme*. Look at the following examples:

MAN [+HUMAN] [-FEMALE] [+ADULT]	WOMAN [+HUMAN] [+FEMALE] [+ADULT]	GIRL [+HUMAN] [+FEMALE] [-ADULT]	BOY [+HUMAN] [-FEMALE] [-ADULT]
[CHAUVINISTIS]	[POSSESSIVE]	[TALENTED]	[MISCHIEVOUS]

The meaning features displayed in vertical boxes represent sememes, which are integral to the lexical meaning of English words. In contrast, the features shown in horizontal boxes are pragmemes, assigned to referents by language users. These pragmemes pertain to the users' perceptions, shaped by their 'nature' and 'nurture' while sememes relate to the 'users' conceptions [1].

The sememes listed above form the lexical meaning of the mentioned words. Next, let us explore the details of grammatical meaning, which consists of two types: (i) the functional relations between the constituents of a sentence and (ii) the role of these constituents within the structure of a larger unit (refer to Unit 3 of Block I in Modern English Grammar and Usage). To illustrate these concepts, consider the following sentences:

5. *She called him a fool.*
6. *He called her a taxi.*

In sentence (5), the grammatical function of 'him' is as the direct object, and 'a fool' serves as its complement. If 'fool' refers to a character from a historical play (e.g., the Fool in "King Lear"), then 'a fool' would be considered the direct object, provided there are multiple fools in the court. Similarly, sentence (6) can be interpreted in two distinct ways:

He called her a taxi. – Here, 'a taxi' functions as a direct object complement.

He called her a taxi. – In this interpretation, 'her' is the indirect object and 'a taxi' is the direct object.

Grammatical choices often serve multiple semantic functions. In English, variations in word order can reflect functional differences that lead to changes in meaning. For instance:

9. *Mohan slapped Rakesh* — Here, "Mohan" is the subject (doer) and "Rakesh" is the object (affected).

10. *Rakesh slapped Mohan* — In this case, "Rakesh" becomes the subject (doer) and "Mohan" the object (affected).

Though sentences (9) and (10) use the same words, their different sequences result in entirely opposite functional roles.

3. Meaning relations. We examined the different meaning relations that existed among various words. To discuss these relations, we utilized the classification proposed by John Lyons, which simplified Geoffrey Leech's seven types of meaning discussed earlier. Lyons classified meaning as follows:

- (i) social meaning
- (ii) expressive meaning
- (iii) descriptive meaning

Social meaning refers to the use of language to establish and maintain social roles and social relations. This kind of meaning is also called phatic communion, which meant 'communication by means of speech.' For example, greetings like 'Good Morning' do not provide any information; they just established a rapport between interlocutors. *Expressive meaning* referred to what is reflected as the speaker's feelings, attitudes, beliefs, and personality. This meaning includes what literary critics call emotive meaning. When we associate 'compassion' and 'sacrifice' with the word 'mother,' what we have expressive meaning. *Descriptive meaning* refers to *propositional* or *experiential meaning*. The experience can be real or imaginary. 'The gods drank ambrosia' express imaginary experience, whereas 'the sun rose in the east' express real experience.

Lyons said that lexemes were completely or absolutely synonymous if they have the same descriptive, expressive, and social meaning. This kind of absolute synonymy is actually very rare. *Descriptive synonymy* is quite common. For example, 'father', 'daddy', and 'dad' were descriptively synonymous. However, they can not be used in all contexts as substitutes. That's why it was said that they were partially synonymous [6].

Synonymy refers to the phenomenon of more than one form having the same meaning. For example, 'prison' and 'jail' are synonyms. Polysemy, on the other hand, refers to the phenomenon of the same form having more than one meaning. For example, 'eye' refers to a part of an animal's body and to the hole of a needle. These two meanings constituted the polysemy of 'eye'.

Polysemy differs from homonymy, which refers to the similarity of different words in pronunciation and spelling. For instance, "bank" (meaning "the side of a river") and "bank" (meaning "financial institution") are homonyms, as they are both spelled and pronounced the same. However, when two words sound the same but are spelled differently, they are called homophones, such as "quay" and "key" (/ki:/) or "sweet" and "suite" (/swi:t/). Conversely, words that are spelled the same but pronounced differently are known as homographs, like "lead" (verb) and "lead" (noun, the metal).

Metaphor illustrates how a particular meaning feature of a word is extended to refer to the quality of another referent. That's why sometimes we hear people adding 'metaphorically speaking'. For example, 'gold' is metaphorically used to mean anything valuable or genuine.

Metonymy is the use of an item to refer to some other item by association. For example, the chair is used to refer to the person who is in the chair' [12].

Ambiguity can have its source in homonymy or polysemy, and can be syntactic or lexical.

1. She saw me near the *bank*. (lexical)
2. Visiting professors can be expensive. (syntactic)

In sentence (1) ambiguity is due to lexical homonymy: 'bank,' and 'bank2'. On the other hand, in sentence (2) ambiguity is due to what is called structural homonymy.

- a. Visiting (the) professors $\left\{ \begin{matrix} \text{can be} \\ \text{is} \end{matrix} \right\}$ expensive.
- b. (The) visiting professors $\left\{ \begin{matrix} \text{can be} \\ \text{are} \end{matrix} \right\}$ expensive

Sentences (3) and (4) are ambiguous due to polysemy.

3. "Shooting is prohibited in Nehru Zoological Park." (lexical)
4. "He painted a car." (syntactic)

In sentence (3), the ambiguity arises from the polysemous word "shooting," which could refer to either "film shooting" or "firing a gun." In sentence (4), the ambiguity lies in the direct object "car" which may refer to the "result of a process" (painting a picture of a car) or the "affected of a process" (applying paint to a physical car). The ambiguity is considered polysemous because the same functional element (the direct object "car") holds two different semantic roles: one as the resultant of an action, and the other as the entity affected by the action.

Antonymy refers to the "oppositeness of sense." Absolute antonymy can be seen in pairs like "tall" vs. "short." However, antonymy can also vary depending on the context or dimension in which it is considered. For example:

- (i) man x boy [± adult]
- (ii) man x beast [± human]
- (iii) man x woman [± female]

Some linguists consider **incompatibility** a more comprehensive term and prefer it to antonymy.

Incompatibility refers to 'meaning exclusion,' whereas **hyponymy** refers to 'meaning inclusion.' A specific term is considered hyponymous to a more general term. For instance, 'mango' is a hyponym of 'fruit,' meaning that the specific item (mango) is subordinate to the more general category, which is referred to as a *hypernym* or *superordinate* term.

Valency or valence, refers to the expectation that one category in language has for the presence of another. For example, the semantic feature "female" typically expects the feature "animate" to co-occur with it. When people refer to a train or ship as "she," it is considered a special use of the word "she" because both "train" and "ship" are inanimate. Similarly, certain words have expected associations: the word "rubbish," for instance, is expected to co-occur with actions like "throw," while "food" is commonly associated with actions like "cook" or "eat." This type of expectation in word correlations is known as "collocation" [8].

Inconsistency represents a form of semantic contrast, characterized by 'meaning exclusion' across different words.

Look at the following sentences:

6. His *uncle* is a *rich person*.
7. His *uncle* is a *woman*.
8. His *uncle* is a *man*.

Sentence (8) illustrates **tautology** because the term "uncle" inherently implies a male, making it redundant to state that he is a "man" (i.e., a male human being). However, if "man"

is interpreted metaphorically to mean something like "heroic," then the sentence could be acceptable. On the other hand, Sentence (7) is *inconsistent* because the term "woman" (female) is incompatible with the male characteristic of "uncle." Yet, if "uncle" is metaphorically seen as possessing "feminine" qualities, the sentence might be considered acceptable [14].

Based on this discussion, we can conclude that the meaning of a lexeme is shaped by its antonymous, synonymous, hyponymous, and collocational correlations with other lexemes in the same *lexical field*.

For example, consider the word 'dog'. 'Dog' has synonyms such as 'cur' and 'mongrel', and 'bitch' can also be a synonym when 'dog' is used generically. However, when 'dog' is specifically referring to a "male animal," 'bitch' becomes its antonym. Words like 'cat', 'fox', and 'wolf' are both antonyms and members of the same lexical set of flesh-eating animals. 'Dog' serves as a hypernym, while 'bitch', 'pup', 'cur', and 'mongrel' are hyponyms. Additionally, terms like 'bark' and 'smell' collocate with 'dog', contributing to the conceptual image we have of the word.

4. Elements of pragmatics. Syntactic, semantic and pragmatic constitute the core components of semiotics, which is the study of sign systems. In semiotic, a 'sign' consists of a form (the signifier) and what it denotes (the signified). All linguistic items are considered signs.

- Syntactic examines the correlation among signs.
- Semantic explores the correlation between signs and their referents in the physical world.

- Pragmatics investigates how signs are used by people, focusing on how users interpret or add additional information to linguistic signs. Under pragmatics, key phenomena include performatives and presuppositions.

Performatives are utterances that perform actions rather than merely conveying information. For example, when someone says, "I call you a fool," they are performing the act of calling the other person a fool. In contrast, statements that merely provide information are called *constatives*; for instance, saying "You are a fool" is an act of informing rather than performing. *Performatives* are also referred to as illocutionary acts in speech act theory. Speech acts are categorized into three types:

- (i) locutions
- (ii) illocutions
- (iii) perlocutions

Locutions are necessary for initiating a communicative act, while perlocutions are responsible for producing the intended effects. The following examples illustrate the three types of speech acts:

(i) "*He said to me 'Go away'*" demonstrates a locutionary act, as it simply involves the verbal expression of the command.

(ii) "*He urged me to go away*" exemplifies an illocutionary act, as it conveys the speaker's intention behind the command.

(iii) "*He persuaded me to go away*" represents a perlocutionary act, reflecting the impact of the speaker's urging on the listener.

In these sentences, (i) shows the verbal act itself, (ii) conveys the intention behind the verbal act, and (iii) illustrates the effect of the verbal act on the listener.

Presuppositions are assumptions made about the context of a sentence that are necessary to make it verifiable or appropriate or both. Look at the following examples:

- (i) Chandran has a sister.

- (ii) Chandran has a female sibling.
- (iii) Chandran's parents have more than one child.
- (iv) Chandran exists.

The correlations between the following statements are as follows:

–The correlation between (i) and (ii) is one of assertion, because if (i) is true, (ii) is true as well; if (i) is false, (ii) is also false.

–The correlation between (i) and (iii) is one of entailment, as the truth of (i) guarantees the truth of (iii), but if (i) is false, (iii) may not necessarily be false (e.g., Chandran may have a brother).

–The correlation between (i) and (iv) is one of presupposition, because (iv) remains true regardless of whether (i) is true or false. Presupposition refers to any information implied by a sentence that remains unaffected by its negation. Here, assertion denotes the immediate meaning (ii) derived from (i), entailment means (iii) must be true if (i) is true, though (iii) and (i) do not share identical meanings. All these correlations are contingent upon a specific background context (iv).

Conclusion. In conclusion, this study highlights the intricate correlation between semantics and pragmatics in the construction and interpretation of meaning. Semantics focuses on the inherent meanings of words, phrases, and structures, while pragmatics considers the context in which language is used and how meaning is influenced by the speaker's intentions and the listener's interpretation.

By examining various types of meaning such as conceptual, connotative, and grammatical alongside pragmatic elements like speech acts, performatives, and presuppositions, the analysis provides a comprehensive understanding of how meaning is generated in communication. The study demonstrates that meaning is not static; it evolves depending on the interaction between linguistic structures, cultural contexts, and the correlations between speakers.

Ultimately, the interplay between semantics and pragmatics reveals that meaning is dynamic, shaped by both language conventions and the social contexts in which language operates. Understanding these processes is crucial for grasping the full complexity of human communication.

Reference:

1. Ary D. Jacobs L. C., Sorensen C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). Introduction to Research in Education Eighth Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth.
2. Crystal D. 1987. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 100-7, 1204, 408-9.
3. Fiske J. 1982. Introduction to Communication Studies. London: Methuen. Chapter.
4. Leech G.N. 1983. Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman. Chapters 1, 8 and 9.
5. Lyons J. 1977. Semantics Vol I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2 and 7.
6. Lyons J. 1995. Linguistic Semantics - An Introduction Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
7. Palmer F.R. 1981. Semantics. (second edition) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4 and 5.
8. Prakasam V. and A. Abbi. 1986. Semantic Theories and Language Teaching. New Delhi: Allied Publishers. pp. 56-92.
9. Creswell J. W. (2012) Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research fourth edition. Boston: Pearson.

10. Fraenkel Jack R., and Norman E. Wallen. 2012. How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education 8th Edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
11. Garcia P. (2004). Pragmatic Comprehension of High and Low Level Language Learners. Arizona: Northern Arizona University.
12. Katz J. J. (1972). Semantic theory (Studies in language). USA: Harper & Row
13. Katz J. J & Fodor J. A. (1963). The Structure of a Semantic Theory, Vol. 39, No 2- (Apr. - Jun., 1963), pp. 170-210. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
14. Алыбекова, Б. Э. Особенности перевода реалий с кыргызского языка на английский / Б. Э. Алыбекова // Вестник Бишкекского гуманитарного университета. – 2014. – № 2(28). – С. 70-72. – EDN DMSJMV.
15. Ногоева, Ч. А. Выражение синтаксических концептов в языках разного строя / Ч. А. Ногоева, Г. С. Абдуллаева, Б. Э. Алыбекова // Бюллетень науки и практики. – 2024. – Т. 10, № 1. – С. 485-493. – DOI 10.33619/2414-2948/98/65. – EDN LXMAIN.