

Linguistic Essence as a Set of Generalities and the Integral Realization of Linguistic Potential in Speech

N. R. Musulmonova and M. B. Shodmonova

Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Keywords: Generality, Specificity, Language, Speech, the Great, Tajalli, Cognitive Knowledge, Empirical Knowledge, Philosophy of Linguistics, Mysticism, Thinking, Apparent Meaning, Substance, Accident, Category, Grammatical Category, Categorical Meaning, Relative Meaning, Accompanying Meaning.

Abstract: This article explores the linguistic essence, defined as a set of generalities and categories. It addresses the execution of language potential in speech, substance, and action, examining types and meanings, speech and language units, cognitive and practical knowledge, perceptual and theoretical knowledge, general and specific grammatical meanings, and the general conclusions influencing them. The perspective of linguistic philosophy is used to interpret some of the grammatical categories present in the grammar of the Uzbek language today. Given the central position of the concepts of universality and essence in dialectical categories, as well as their consistently different perceptions, there is an apparent need to emphasise the distinctions between categorical, relative, and incidental meanings in grammatical form. This need underlines the importance of focusing on the problem as a methodological foundation. In Uzbek linguistics, it is traditional to consider the linguistic aspect of a linguistic unit as universal and essential, while its verbal implementation is viewed as particular and a phenomenon. This approach is reflected in a vast amount of research, educational, and methodological literature underpinning this direction. In many cases, the categories of generality and essence are interpreted as being synonymous with each other, encapsulating the linguistic community and the linguistic essence.

1 INTRODUCTION

The emotional, perceptual, and practical knowledge that we understand, including perceptual or theoretical knowledge [10,7,1], has not been excluded from the sphere of linguistics, as is the case in all fields. Emotional and practical knowledge are actualised through the senses, where signals are perceived and synthesised to form theoretical knowledge. Is it feasible to standardise diverse private and general viewpoints, that is, to propose the same concept to several people? Indeed, what are privacy and commonality? Philosophical linguists provide the following answer to this question.

These two terms, often encountered throughout life, specifically, the particular and common in dialectics, and kull and juz in Sufism, are highly significant categories. Without them, it is impossible to

comprehend philosophy, mysticism, the theory of cognition, and the essence of various phenomena.

2 METHODS

Any object, sign-property, event or occurrence that a person can perceive, hear, feel, or observe is a characteristic.

There are three main tenets of privacy:

- Materiality and presentation in direct observation.
- Uniqueness and distinctiveness.
- Limitation and countlessness (Nurmonov A., Shahobiddinova Sh., Iskandarova Sh., Nabieva D., 2001).

* Corresponding author

Scientist Sh. Shahrobidinova, who considered these signs of privacy using the example of a "tree", describes it as follows: A specific 'tree' is a unique entity, situated before us at a certain time, in a specific place, under particular conditions, with a unique form and appearance, at a given stage of development; that is, it is a plant. We can see it, smell it, touch it, and even move it from one place to another or climb it. Any plant undergoes various stages of development, such as planting, greening, blooming, fruiting (if it is a fruit-bearing plant), drying, and shedding leaves, etc.

This process can be repeated multiple times, but no plant lasts forever. We are keenly aware that the tree, taken as an example, has a material form, i.e., it consists of certain (organic and inorganic) substances that form the root, trunk, branches, and leaves. The substance of the tree is also composed of these materials. Without these materials, the private tree wouldn't exist.

While a single tree exists as a characteristic, particles of various substances (entities) are intermixed with a part of the common tree. It includes colour, chlorophyll, water, and various organic and inorganic substances, making it difficult to distinguish the corresponding characteristic of the tree's substance from other 'foreign' characteristics. But when imagination falls short, thinking steps in. Generally, imagination is incapable of defining the essence of anything. Simultaneously, each characteristic is unique and distinctive. Suppose we planted two identical trees at the same time. They started to grow and eventually bloomed. But are they identical? No, they are two separate entities. Because if one of the trees dries up or is cut down, the other continues to grow.

The distinguishing and non-repetitive characteristic of the private 'tree' is that they are different, growing, developing, blooming, situated in different spaces, under different conditions, and do not replicate each other; hence, they are two separate trees.

Private "tree" - limitless and innumerable. No matter how many trees there are in the world, the more trees there are, the more private "trees" there are.

There is a saying in mysticism: you cannot step into the same river twice, meaning, you cannot step into the flowing water again. This is also an example of privacy. A phrase can be repeated two or three times exactly the same as the first time. But each utterance

is a separate characteristic because they occur at different times.

In philosophy, the unique instances presented by direct observation are denoted by the term 'action', and in mysticism, the term 'taghalli' [7, 1].

In mysticism, privacy possesses, above all, the property of manifestation. Hazrat Navoi states that the descendants of the Haka family have permeated the essence, and it has manifested, say, like Lili.

It seems that in the poet's eyes, all the words borcha, jilva, ayn, sen - you, husn - beauty, manzur - delighted, and adad - number are existences that directly affect the senses, akin to privacy.

For instance, if the essence of water is one, it extends to and exists in the whole world of beings, animals, and plants.

Implementation, like privacy, cannot exist in a pure form. Any implementation is multifaceted. Just as no chemical element can exist in a pure form, reality can exist only when it is intermingled with other realities.

In the masnawi "Lison ut-Tair" by Alisher Navoi, considering the presence of the substance of Simurgh, along with its sign in birds journeying towards Simurgh, as well as other foreign manifestations (such as 'me', 'self', and other satanic feelings), bird after bird aims to shed "begona" symptoms when passing symbolic valleys along the way. When the birds are freed, only the substance Simurgh remains. Then, there is no distinction, no impediment, i.e., a combined characteristic between the corresponding (Simurgh) substance and its manifestation. This is analogous to the chemical purification of a substance in nature and the extraction of the appropriate element from it.

In water (H₂O), two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom form a strong bond. If water is not chemically pure water, then it is mixed with an infinite number of other things - minerals, bacteria, salts, etc. How challenging it is to isolate the chemical water itself (H₂O). This is akin to the liberation of a person from vices that do not correspond to God in their consciousness.

If two elements in the chemical water are removed from the sample, either oxygen or hydrogen remains. Nothing remains to prevent them from connecting to their substance.

The combination of different accidents significantly increases the number of things and events. It is challenging to understand that these 'multiplicities' do not always belong to the essence of the subject under study. Otherwise, contemporary linguistics would not differentiate, for example, more than 10 categories of time, 7-8 forms of adverbs, and more than 50 types of indicative agreement.

The concept of substance and action, the correct understanding, and comprehension of their interaction, as in other sciences, acquire significant methodological importance in linguistics in the direct observation of the phenomenon and its underlying essence. Since the main objective of our research is to distinguish between categorical, adjuvant, and concomitant meanings in grammatical forms, the dialectic of gnoseological substance and randomness becomes our primary methodological content. It is also crucial to understand correctly the relationship of the categories of generality and essence, inherent in the substance, and to use it as a methodological factor in determining the relationship of the categorical and non-categorical value.

3 OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The systematic approach to language is based on dialectics and cognitive theory as a methodological foundation. The categories of dialectics, in particular, the concepts of universality and essence, occupy a central position. Focusing on the problem as a methodological basis is necessary given the importance of consistently differentiating our research source's perception - categorical, adjuvant, and concomitant meanings in grammatical form.

In Uzbek linguistics, it has become a tradition to regard the linguistic aspect of a linguistic unit as universal and essential, and its verbal implementation as particular and a phenomenon. This perspective is reflected in a substantial amount of research, educational, and methodological literature based on this approach's principles. In many cases, the categories of generality and essence are interpreted as synonymous with each other: linguistic community, as well as linguistic essence.

In studies of systematic linguistics, instances of differentiation of these categories are rare, and they mostly use these two categories as a semantic unit, permitting an epistemological error.

Let's consider the evidence. S.N. Ivanov, the founder of the subject study of Turkic languages, writes: "Dialectical materialism and dialectical logic reject the interpretation of generality as an abstraction contrary to a specific object and phenomenon. We observe this when analysing human understanding" (Ivanov S.N., 1969).

It appears that the scientist, when discussing the universal, cites about the essence and interprets the concepts of universality and essence as a phenomenon: "Dialectical logic asserts that in real existence, there is an objective (independent of the thinker) analogue of theoretical knowledge, which does not correspond to perceptual observation of facts. This analogue is such a generality, the essence of things that are perceived emotionally" [3, 19]. Because, according to the scientist, "when they talk about the 'concealment' of the essence, they do not mean that it is a purely inner substance, and the essence is such a universal that it is, as it were, hidden in these phenomena upon direct observation" (Zikrillayev G.N., 1994). However, in the methodological source upon which the scientist relied, the essence "appears not as a separate phenomenon but as a single basis of many phenomena and their connections."

In modern Uzbek linguistics, the application of the category of philosophical generality and essence to the linguistic phenomenon was consistently continued in the studies of H. Nematov, A. Nurmonov, N. Makhmudov, R. Saifullayeva, and their followers. The aim is primarily to restore the characteristic language unit of generality (general grammatical value, general syntactic model, general lexical value), and the essence of a linguistic phenomenon means its linguistic generality. "From the perspective of the attitude to the paradigmatic meaning of the grammatical form, the meaning of the grammatical category stands as generality. The paradigmatic meaning of a grammatical category comes from its relationship with another grammatical category. The essence of the grammatical form (category) manifests itself not only in direct but also in indirect relationships" [Nigmatov Kh.G. (1989)]. "PGM is evident for our observations, so it seems more precise. However, dialectics interpret abstract and specific concepts differently than usual. For dialectics, there is nothing more abstract than the idea of something unrelated. Because this imagination cannot yield an objective knowledge of things. And clarity is not an approximate, emotionally limited perception of a thing, but a system that encompasses

all its manifestations and unifies these phenomena. Because of this, an essence that seems extremely abstract and far-fetched at first sight (emphasis ours) becomes clearer and more apparent as the investigation deepens" (Shahobiddinova Sh., 1993). It appears that even in the works of linguists, the categories of essence and universality are not consistently differentiated.

There are numerous such examples. In Uzbek linguistics, for instance, the category of essence and generality is employed as an interchangeable term.

In philosophical literature, the categories of universality and essence are consistently differentiated (Tursunov U., Mukhtorov A., Rahmatullaev Sh., 1992). Therefore, in all philosophical literature dedicated to the nature of categories, particular attention is devoted to their mutual attitude and characteristics. To limit the analysis of a vast number of scientific sources on the problem's interpretation, let's direct the readers' attention to the most significant ones [1, 12, 9] and endeavour to clarify the main distinction. In philosophical literature, generality is "a collection of objectively existing aspects, properties, and characteristics of objective reality, shared by all or several things and phenomena, and the similarity of connections and relations between them," whereas essence is - the deep, relatively stable relationships occurring in various phenomena of the material world, concealed within the phenomenon. It is defined as the inner side of reality (Tulenov J., Gafurov Z., 1997). From the comments, it is apparent that the restoration of community is directly based on particulars. Therefore, the categories of generality and essence differ in terms of their inclusivity, and if the essence contains the most characteristic aspect, the universality distinguishes itself from it by "quantity".

It is known that commonality is restored by eliminating differences and generalising similarities in the given particulars with direct observation. The essence, as in all categorical meanings, is determined not based on the specifics provided by direct observation, but based on the consideration of the definable thing in its own system, and in the case of linguistic phenomena - based on their relationship with their paradigmatic analogues. Therefore, the definition of essence is based on universality, and one cannot proceed to the definition of essence without restoring universality. As the dialectic says, "All commonality is not directly part of the essence, but

the essence cannot be outside the universality" (Tulenov J., Gafurov Z., 1997). Commonality includes aspects that are essentially trivial but repetitive.

Let's propose that the generality of "tree" also includes the uniqueness of the fruit and body structure. However, the thick and solid trunk that distinguishes a tree from any other species of plant is its essence. Trees can also have common characteristics such as leaves, branches, fruits, colour, smell, etc. But none of these can be a sign of its shape because these properties can also be found in shrubs and grasses. It seems that the commonality is richer than the essence, but the essence is deeper than the generality. For instance, the lexeme "notebook" as a linguistic unit has a general meaning "the name of the educational manual from sheets, bound, designed for writing and expressions of the human heart's experiences." However, one facet of the two-sided commonality - the sememe "a textbook of sheets, bound, designed for writing" is the essence of this token, distinguishing it from paradigmatic analogues. The value of "expression of the experience of the human heart" is derived from the sememe and sememes adjacent to the previous sememe, which together make up the set of tokens "notebook." Although the second sememe is a component of token integrity, it is not part of the token substance.

In a formal-functional approach, it is known that it is necessary to reveal the essence of a linguistic unit in two stages. Sh. Shahrobiddinova recommends a two-stage method of restoring the total value of the morpheme: "At the first stage, you should observe the features. But observation of particulars alone cannot disclose to us the essence of the universal. Once the dialectical traits are noticed, they need to be considered as a whole. Particularity, in general, can only be considered on the basis of the essence of community. The essence of generality (highlighted by us - N. M.) can only be revealed in relation to the known commonality with similar and different commonalities" (Shahobiddinova Sh., 1995).

The value of a linguistic unit is revealed in relation to the total value of another linguistic unit in the paradigm.

In grammatical interpretation, the general grammatical meaning of the category of agreement is "linking a subordinate noun to a dominant noun and expressing various meanings of the subject, object, space, time, and tools", and the general grammatical meaning of the possessive category is "the connection

of the subsequent word with the preceding word for the expression of belonging". Based on the syntactic nature of the category and the fact that it is not alone in the expression of the second part of values, both categories are compared and examined relative to each other, and in comparison, appears "connecting the preceding word to the subsequent word (case), connecting the subsequent word to the preceding word (possessive case)". This symbol is a fragment arising from the community relationship, and, in reality, it is the essence of categories.

Thus, it transpires that, as in all linguistic units, in grammatical form, the general grammatical value consists of the essence and the extraneous aspect. If language is the essence of the categorical aspect in the general grammatical meaning, the part that is not related to the essence of the general grammatical meaning should be evaluated as a non-categorical phenomenon.

4 CONCLUSION

The philosophical basis of the complexity of the general grammatical meaning lies in the philosophy that studies the most general laws of the development of nature, society, and thought. It teaches that everything in existence is not pure, and that in every single, discrete entity, there are particles of commonalities: mixed particulars. It is possible that the form, appearance, and materiality of a thing are so conspicuous that they obstruct the view of its essence. Regardless, this situation misleads the observer. Therefore, the student, equipped with special techniques, mentally disregards "extraneous" phenomena and tends to focus on the essence. Regarding substance, the first two concepts, universality and essence, which engender various debates in philosophy itself, are in most cases expressed without distinction. This leads to a failure to differentiate between the essence and commonality of linguistic units, which are purely linguistic properties, and to their conflation. Universality is the linguistic meaning of unity, encompassing both the essence and the aspect which is outside the essence but dialectically connected with it.

Therefore, such an understanding and the consistent and correct application of the categories of philosophical substance, universality, and essence in linguistics allow us to fully elucidate the nature of linguistic unity. This is achieved in two stages. In the first stage, they distinguish a particle of pure

linguistic commonality and "extraneous" phenomena mixed in a linguistic unit; in the second stage, they differentiate the essence and the associated aspect of linguistic commonality.

REFERENCES

- Vahidov R., Nematov H., Mahmudov M. (2001). Enlightenment in the Bosom of Words. – Tashkent: Yozuvchi, – p. 13.
- Zikrillaev G.N. (1994). Morphology of the Uzbek language. Handbook for philological specialties. – Bukhara. – p. 19.
- Ivanov S.N. (1969). Genealogical tree of the Turks of Abdul-Ghazi-Khan. Grammar essay. Name and verb. – Tashkent: Fan, – p. 13.
- Mengliyev B. R. (2003). Structural Syntax of the Uzbek language. Study guide. – Karshi: Nasaf. – p. 3.
- Musulmanova N. (2012). Categorical, Adjunctive and Accompanying Meaning in Grammatical Forms (In the example of tense and Mood Categories). Monograph. – Tashkent.: Science, – p. 80.
- Musulmanova N.R. (2020). The Structure of the General Meaning of the Categories of Tense and Mood in the Uzbek Language. // Bulletin of Science and Education. No. 2 (80). – p. 36-40.
- Nematov H.G. (1993). Tajalli Sufism Theory of Cognition and Issues of Learning Syntax in Linguistics // Uzbek Language and Literature. No. 2. – p. 28.
- Nigmatov Kh.G. (1989). Functional Morphology of the Turkic-Speaking Monuments of the XI-XII Centuries. – Tashkent: Fan, – p. 5.
- Nurmonov A., Shahobiddinova Sh., Iskandarova Sh., Nabieva D. (2001). Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek Language. Morphology. – Tashkent: New Age Generation, – p. 20.
- Tulenov J., Gafurov Z. (1997). Philosophy. – Tashkent: Teacher, – p. 45.
- Tursunov U., Mukhtorov A., Rahmatullaev Sh. (1992). Modern Uzbek Literary Language. Textbook for Higher Educational Institutions. 3rd edition. – Tashkent: Uzbekistan, – p. 335.
- Shahobiddinova Sh. (1993). On the interpretation of grammatical meaning: Candidate of Philological. Diss. – Samarkand. – p. 19.
- Shahobiddinova Sh. (1995) Stepwise Abstraction as a Way of Uncovering General Grammatical Meaning. // Uzbek Language and Literature. #3. 12-13 p.