

The Role Of Linguistic Factors In The Formation Of Grammatical Meaning

Qalandarova Dilfuza Satimboyevna

Independent Researcher, Renaissance Education University, Uzbekistan

Received: 22 October 2025; **Accepted:** 13 November 2025; **Published:** 19 December 2025

Abstract: This article analyzes the concept of grammar, which is considered one of the main branches of linguistics, its place in the field, the notions of grammatical and lexical meaning, and the stages of the formation of grammatical meaning.

Keywords: Grammar, grammatical meaning, grammatical form, grammatical category, lexical meaning, methods of studying the language system, substantial stage, formal stage.

Introduction: The progress of the era and science always imposes new responsibilities on the researcher. In our country, the achievements of national independence and the spiritual-ideological changes in society have placed certain demands on science, particularly on Uzbek linguistics. It is well known that the spirit of a nation is reflected even in the grammar of its language. With independence, examining the Uzbek language in accordance with its substantial nature has become one of the ways to study the national mentality, promote national ideology, and propagate national ideas. This requires approaching Uzbek grammar as a reality in which the national spirit is reflected. This is the first point. Second, advancing to a new stage in the study of grammar—that is, examining grammatical categories as an integral whole, consisting of various generalities, based on the principle of linguistic system unity in Uzbek linguistics—requires studying grammatical meanings by dividing them into structural components. The study of Uzbek grammatical categories has entered its third stage. In the first stage, grammatical categories were identified using a descriptive method based on formal-logical methodology. Under this understanding, primarily morphological and partially syntactic categories were investigated. The types of grammatical (morphological) categories were distinguished, and it was emphasized that the forms specific to each category were systematized, with various speech meanings they expressed in text and context identified and described. The work of linguists such as A.N. Kononov, A.

G'ulomov, G'. Abdurahmonov, F. Abdullaev, A.V. Bondarko, M. Asqarova, A. Hojiev, A.A. Koklyanova, J. Muxtorov, U. Tursunov, and G'. Zikrillaev played a significant role in creating a unified grammatical theory. Based on their research, formal academic grammar of the Uzbek language, textbooks, and manuals for continuous education were developed. The second stage of studying grammar is directly related to applying dialectical logic as a methodological basis in Uzbek linguistics and distinguishing language and speech consistently within the language system. In this stage, the general, particular, and intermediate grammatical meanings of grammatical categories, as well as oppositional relationships between forms, were examined, resulting in the creation of substantial Uzbek morphology. The contributions of linguists such as S.N. Ivanov, N. Mahmudov, A. Nurmonov, H. Ne'matov, G'. Zikrillaev, M. A'lamova, Sh. Shahobiddinova, Z. Qodirov, and their followers should be specially noted. This laid the groundwork for describing the structure of grammatical meaning.

It is known that sensory, cognitive, and practical knowledge—as well as theoretical knowledge—exists in all fields, and linguistics is no exception. Sensory and practical knowledge is realized through the sense organs; signals are perceived and synthesized, forming theoretical knowledge. Can various particular and general viewpoints be standardized, that is, instilled identically into multiple minds? In fact, what do “particular” and “general” mean? Scholars of linguistic philosophy answer this question as follows: These two

terms, “particular” and “general,” are crucial in dialectics and in Sufism, where they correspond to kull (whole) and juz’ (part). Without them, one cannot understand philosophy, Sufism, epistemology, or the essence of events. Anything perceivable—by seeing, hearing, or sensing—is a particular.

Three main characteristics of particularity are distinguished:

1. Materiality and immediate perceptibility.
2. Individuality and uniqueness.
3. Finiteness and infinitude.

Sh. Shahobiddinova illustrates these characteristics with the example of a “tree.” A particular “tree” exists at a specific time, in a specific place, under specific conditions, with a certain shape and development stage. We can see, smell, touch, or even move it. Any plant passes through stages of growth—sprouting, blossoming, fruiting, shedding leaves, etc.—which may repeat, but no plant is eternal. We understand that the tree is material, composed of specific organic and inorganic substances. Without these substances, the particular tree would not exist. Thus, in a particular tree, various elements of substance manifest along with the universal element of trees. These include color, chlorophyll, water, and various organic and inorganic materials. Distinguishing these particular features from “foreign” ones is extremely difficult, and imagination alone cannot accomplish it. A particular entity is always unique and individual. Suppose we plant two identical trees at the same time. They grow and blossom similarly, but can we call them identical? No—they are two distinct entities. Their individuality and uniqueness are determined by differences in growth, development, and location. Particularity is unlimited and innumerable; wherever on Earth, the number of trees corresponds to the number of unique particular trees. In Sufism, there is a saying that one cannot step into the same river twice—the flowing water cannot be stepped into again. This is another example of particularity. A phrase can be repeated two or three times, but each occurrence constitutes a separate particularity, happening at a different time. Particulars are direct and observable phenomena, referred to as accidents in philosophy and tajalli (manifestation) in Sufism. In Sufism, particularity primarily has an external aspect. Hazrat Navoi emphasizes that the manifestations of the Divine are spread throughout existence and may appear as Layli, a tangible form.

For example, in his poem Layli and Majnun:

"O, every manifestation of divine presence
Becomes manifest in the world as Layli. "

Or, in the first munajat of his first story Hayratul-abror from the Khamsa:

"At the beginning you were nothing,

At the end, you become everything;

To the Creator, you are both empty and full,

You were, and yet, you exist, you do not exist... "

In these lines, words like borcha (all), jilva (manifestation), ayn (self), sen (you), husn (beauty), manzur (desired) correspond to particulars, directly affecting the sensory perception of existence.

Like other Sufis, Navoi contrasts accidents (tajalli) with substance.

"No one can speak of His essence,

Yet all that exists is seen in every element. "

Substance is singular, while its occurrences are infinite. These occurrences manifest everywhere: in beings, animals, plants, and objects. Particularity, like manifestation, cannot exist in a pure form. Every event exists only in combination with others. Navoi, in Lisonut-tayr, describes how birds journeying to Semurg gradually rid themselves of extraneous marks (nafs, ego, and other devilish traits), leaving only the pure Semurg substance. This is analogous to a chemical process, separating one element from a mixture. The combination of various accidents multiplies entities and events. Understanding that these multiples are not always related to the substance under study is challenging. Otherwise, the various categories in Uzbek linguistics—ten or more temporal categories, seven or eight modes of adverbs, over fifty types of case forms—would remain indistinct. Correctly understanding the concepts of substance and accident, and their interrelationship, is of crucial methodological importance in linguistics, as in other sciences, for identifying the essence of directly observable phenomena. In conclusion, when examining the substance of an entity, the categories of generality and essence are often used without distinction. This leads to an inability to differentiate between essence and generality, which are purely linguistic properties of a language unit, and results in their being conflated. Generality is the linguistic value of a unit; it encompasses both the essence and the aspects that lie outside the essence but are dialectically connected to it. Understanding philosophical categories such as substance and accident, generality and essence in this way, and applying them consistently and correctly to the object of study, makes it possible to clarify more fully the nature of linguistic units. In identifying them, first, the pure linguistic particle of generality and the “foreign” meaning, which exist in a mixed form in the speech unit, are distinguished; then, in the second

stage, the essence and the adjacent aspect within linguistic generality are examined.

REFERENCES

1. Asqarova, M., Qosimova, K., Jamolxonov, H. Uzbek Language. Textbook. Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1989. – 274 p.
2. A'lamova, M. The Category of Voice in Uzbek Verbs. Tashkent: Fan, 1992. – 142 p.
3. Baskakov, A.A. et al. General Linguistics. Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1997. – 191 p.
4. Vohidov, R., Ne'matov, H., Mahmudov, M. The Enlightenment Within the Word. Tashkent: Yozuvchi, 2001. – 144 p.
5. Zikrillaev, G'.N. The System of Person, Number, and Honorific Categories of the Verb. Tashkent: Fan, 1990. – 111 p.
6. Zikrillaev, G'.N. Morphology of the Uzbek Language. Manual for Philology Specialties. Bukhara, 1994. – 163 p.
7. Ivanov, S.N. The Genealogical Tree of the Turks by Abul-Ghazi Khan. A Grammatical Essay: Noun and Verb. Tashkent: Fan, 1969. – 201 p.
8. Ivanov, S.N. The Category of Voice in the Participle of the Uzbek Language. In: Studies on the Cultural History of Eastern Peoples: Collection in Honor of Academician I.A. Orbeli. Moscow–Leningrad, 1960, pp. 123–134.
9. Ivanov, S.N. Essays on the Syntax of the Uzbek Language. Leningrad: Leningrad State University, 1959. – 151 p.
10. Ilyenkov, E.V. The Dialectics of the Abstract and the Concrete in Marx's "Capital". Moscow: Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1960. – 285 p.