

GRAMMAR CHARACTERISTICS OF DIFFERENT PARTS OF SPEECH

Abstract: This article examines the grammatical categories specific to various parts of speech in the Uzbek language. It explores how different word classes—such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and others—possess unique grammatical markers that determine their syntactic and morphological roles. The study outlines the functions of categories like tense, aspect, case, number, person, and mood within each lexical group. The analysis is grounded in contemporary Uzbek linguistics and aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the structure and systematization of grammatical forms.

Key words: parts of speech, grammatical categories, word classes, morphology, syntax, noun category, verb category, adjective, case, tense, number, mood, aspect

In Ancient Greece, issues of grammar did not arise solely from practical necessity but were closely related to logical categories. For example, Plato divided language or speech into two parts: noun (*onoma*) and verb (*rhema*). According to Plato's definition, a word about which something is affirmed is considered a noun. In other words, any word used as a subject was classified as a noun. The verb, on the other hand, refers to what is affirmed about the noun. In essence, the term "verb" originally referred to the predicate. Based on this principle, even adjectives functioning as predicates were classified under verbs.

Aristotle (384–322 BCE), the second major philosopher of antiquity, developed a more refined classification of parts of speech based on logical categories. He distinguished words into three main types: nouns, verbs, and connectives (*particles*). Later, a third group emerged, which also included pronouns and articles.¹

Ancient Indian grammarians such as Yaska and Panini (5th century BCE) identified four categories of words: nouns, verbs, prefixes/prepositions, and particles/connectives.

In his work *“Russian Grammar”*, Mikhail Lomonosov classified words into eight parts of speech: noun (including nouns, adjectives, numerals), pronoun, verb, participle, adverb, preposition, conjunction, and interjection. In reference to these word categories, the term “parts of speech” (*chasti slova*) was employed. A ten-level classification of parts of speech was developed by the Russian academician V. V. Vinogradov, using the Russian language as a basis. According to this classification, not all words are included among the parts of speech—only those that function as sentence components. Within this system, in addition to the traditional “parts of speech” (*chasti rechi*), the concept of “particles of speech” (*chastitsy rechi*) was

introduced, encompassing particles (modal words), copulative particles, prepositions, and conjunctions. Additionally, special structural-semantic word groups, such as modal and interjectional words, are also considered within this classification.

Academician L. V. Shcherba emphasized that the classification of word classes must be based on morphological, syntactic, and semantic features. He particularly stressed the primacy of semantic characteristics, asserting that the categories of objecthood, action, and quality. This viewpoint represents a promising direction in the study of word classes from a terminological and nominative-onomasiological perspective.

In general linguistics, there exist various approaches to the classification of parts of speech. Several suggestions and considerations have been made in relation to these differing perspectives. According to one scholarly source, *“Word classes are not separate segments of speech, sentence constituents, or different types of words. In this respect, the Russian term ‘parts of speech’ (chasti rechi) and the Uzbek term ‘so‘z turkumlari’ may appear semantically and conceptually distinct and somewhat limited in scope...”* The same source argues that *“dividing a word into purely lexical and grammatical components by form and content, and then reuniting them into so-called ‘lexical-grammatical categories,’ is theoretically incorrect.”* Instead, it emphasizes the distinction between general grammatical meaning and specific grammatical meaning, and presents the morphological and syntactic features of word classes using relevant examples. Word classes are a real and objective reflection of reality, formed through the continuous process of generalization in human consciousness and thinking. The concept of objecthood, which lies at the core of reality, and the nominative-onomasiological features of naming objects, serve as the basis for this. For example, the Uzbek word *“qishloq”* originally meant “a place for wintering”; *“ovloq”* referred to “a place for hunting”; *“qo‘rg‘on”* meant “an enclosed place”; *“sharshara”* denoted “a stream that flows with a rushing sound.” Similarly, *“ko‘kcha,” “qizilcha,”* and *“oqqush”* are names of various objects based on their color characteristics.

The concepts of existence that form in the human mind are broad in content, and the nominative-onomasiological aspect of a word only reflects a single perceivable feature—audible, visible, or tangible to a human being. This limited yet specific trait becomes the foundation for naming.

Therefore, the features of word classes—such as objecthood and its attributes (quality, action, quantity and order, state and process), as well as relational meanings expressed in sentences—represent a historically formed social and spiritual product. These features have been passed down from generation to generation, continuously enriched through diverse styles and expressions in languages around the world, including Uzbek. Changes in people’s lives and in their worldview, advancements in production, and the growth of material and spiritual culture are all crucial factors that drive linguistic development. For this reason, the traditional classification of word classes, which has been established since ancient times, remains a powerful system

that reflects the dynamic demands of social life. It does so through repeated processes of analogy, comparison, contrast, analysis, and synthesis rooted in reality, human cognition, and the spiritual realm.

The prominent Turkologist and one of the founders of modern Uzbek linguistics, Doctor of Philological Sciences and Professor Ayub Ghulomov, expressed a number of valuable and enduring ideas concerning the classification of word classes.

According to this distinguished scholar, words are classified into word classes based on interconnected morphological, lexical-semantic, and syntactic principles. He states:

*"When classifying words into word classes, we rely on all of the above-mentioned features. Therefore, words are grouped into lexical-grammatical categories based on a complex of features. Relying solely on one aspect in this classification process does not correspond to the full nature of words. For instance, if we base our classification only on the semantic feature of expressing a quality, then adjectives and adverbs would fall into the same category..."*⁵

In his view, while each of the defining features (morphological, syntactic, and semantic) is important, semantics holds a particular significance: In each word class, words are initially grouped by meaning, and their grammatical meanings are related to that semantic basis. (For example, the noun nature of the word 'og'iz' [mouth] is recognizable even when taken in isolation)."⁵

In his grammar studies, Professor A. G'. G'ulomov divides words in the Uzbek language into two main groups: content words and function words. In addition to these, he identifies a separate category comprising modal words, interjections, and onomatopoeic words, which form distinct lexical-grammatical groups.

Among the content words, nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs are considered the most important. For example, numerals express general quantitative meaning on their own, but when combined with nouns, they gain specific meaning: *o'nta* (ten — abstract quantity), *o'nta kitob* (ten books — specific quantity).

Pronouns serve as substitutes and can replace nouns, adjectives, and numerals. Their meanings become clear only in context.

Nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs are classified as open word classes, as they can continuously expand with new units while maintaining structural integrity. These categories occupy core syntactic positions in sentence construction. Among them, nouns stand out as the most dynamic and frequently updated category, sensitive to changes in social and everyday life.

From a functional-semantic perspective, these four categories (noun, adjective, verb, adverb) form the nucleus of the parts of speech system, while function words and

others occupy peripheral roles. The constant evolution of relationships among parts of speech reflects the dialectical nature of linguistic units, showing that language, like reality, develops gradually over time. The emergence of parts of speech is closely tied to the historical development of language. In the early stages of human society, nominative units appeared first, followed by syntactic structures. This process was accompanied by the development of connective and binding elements, such as intonation, agglutination, conjunctions, and particles.

Through these developments, the thematic fields of key parts of speech emerged, contributing to the formation of sentence structure patterns. F. de Saussure referred to such relationships as associative relations — the mention of one word activates a chain of related words in the speaker's mind.

For instance, the word *ko 'klam* (spring) evokes various images and concepts associated with that season in the speaker's consciousness. Similarly, the novel title *O'tgan kunlar* (Bygone Days) instantly brings to mind its author Abdulla Qodiriy, characters, and historical context. Such associative relationships create lexical fields, which then form larger macro-fields or thematic categories.

These connections manifest in two main ways:

- Syntagmatic (horizontal) relations — the sequence and combination of words in speech;
- Paradigmatic (vertical) relations — their place and function within the system of language.

Polish-Russian linguist Jan Baudouin de Courtenay identified two core aspects:

1. Horizontal relations (syntagmatics);
2. Vertical relations (paradigmatics).

This framework helps us understand the hierarchical order of linguistic units (phoneme → morpheme → word → phrase → sentence) and the rules of their substitution and combination.

N. V. Krushevsky, a member of the Kazan linguistic school, extended de Courtenay's view by identifying two types of associations:

1. Association by similarity — grouping words based on form or meaning (e.g., *bilim*, *bilamoq*, *bilag'on*);
2. Association by contiguity — grouping words based on their common usage in speech (e.g., *ot* — *kishnamoq*; *it* — *hurmoq*).

In contemporary Uzbek, there are frequent transitions between parts of speech: nouns can become adjectives, adjectives can become adverbs, and so on. These processes are known as substantivization, adjectivization, adverbialization, transposition, etc.

Each part of speech is structured through grammatical categories. For example, nouns are characterized by categories such as number, case, and possession. However, not all nouns express possession unless accompanied by a corresponding marker.

According to G'ulomov, a grammatical category is defined as a set of forms expressing a unified grammatical meaning. For instance, all case forms together form the category of case, where each form has its own meaning but functions within a unified system.

Grammatical (morphological) categories consist of grammemes — units that differ in specific meaning but are united by a common semantic core. In the category of possession, for instance, grammemes include 1st person, 2nd person, 3rd person, singular, and plural.

Morphological categories influence syntax but do not merge with it. For example, predicative categories — such as person, tense, modality, affirmation/negation — form the basis for syntactic organization in utterances.

Professor A. N. Nurmanov emphasizes that although both morphology and syntax belong to grammar, they should not be combined under a single paradigm, since each possesses its own system of models and functions.

References:

1. G'ulomov, A.G'. (1980). *The Modern Uzbek Literary Language: Morphology*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
2. Nurmanov, A.N. (2008). *Theoretical Grammar of the Uzbek Language: Morphology*. Tashkent: Fan.
3. de Saussure, F. (1977). *Course in General Linguistics*. Moscow: Progress.
4. Baudouin de Courtenay, I.A. (1963). *Selected Works on General Linguistics*. Moscow: Nauka.
5. Kruszewski, N.V. (1883). *On the Sounds of Speech*. Kazan: Kazan University Press.
6. Qurbonov, A., & Rahmatullaev, Sh. (1992). *The Modern Uzbek Literary Language: Lexicology and Phraseology*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
7. Bobojonova, Z. (2007). *Functional-Semantic Fields in the Morphology of the Uzbek Language*. Tashkent: Fan.
8. Begmatov, E., & Usmonova, M. (2005). *Introduction to Linguistics*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.

9. O.I.Aslanova, Formation and Historical Development of Morphological Paradigms. Texas Journal of Philology, Culture and History ISSN NO:2770-8608, Volume 24. 15-11-2023
10. O.I.Aslanova, Relationship of Morphological Paradigms and Functional-Semantic field. Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education. Berlin Volume1,Issue3,November,2023. 10785,Germany.