

Grammatical Meaning And Its Formation

Qalandarova Dilfuza Satimboyevna

Independent Researcher, Renaissance Education University, Uzbekistan

Received: 23 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 interpretation of grammatical meaning can be considered as old as Uzbek linguistics itself. Therefore, its stages of study correspond to the developmental stages of linguistics. As a modern science, Uzbek linguistics has passed through its formal and substantial stages of investigation and is now stepping into a new stage — anthropocentrism. For this reason, it is appropriate to periodize the stages of interpreting grammatical meaning in the same manner. In each period, interpretations and descriptions acquire their own significance and characteristics due to the demands of the time and social needs. The goals and tasks, as well as the methodology, techniques, and methods of achieving them, proceed in harmony with social demand. The formal stage of studying grammatical meaning. The formal stage in studying grammatical meaning began with Fitrat's research and reached its highest level in A. Gulomov's teachings. This stage of studying grammatical meaning is associated with the tasks put before linguistics. When discussing the tasks of linguistics of that time, it is necessary to highlight two important aspects. First, Uzbek linguistics faced tasks arising from the fundamental goals of Soviet ideology. The tendency to emphasize similarities rather than differences between languages—based on the hypothesis that languages should be unified, a single nation and a single language should emerge, and national languages should merge into one another—became widespread in linguistic research. This was especially evident in interpretations of the grammatical level of language. Examples include: the classification of parts of speech in morphology, the identification of

grammatical forms, viewing the morpheme as a variant of a lexeme, the introduction of concepts such as word formation and inflection, the uniform recognition of the main sentence elements in national linguistics, the corresponding evaluation of sentence structure, and the disregard of interlingual differences in simple and compound sentences. All of this was fully reflected in the interpretations of grammatical meaning. Secondly, the social demand to develop and disseminate the norms of the Uzbek literary language placed the necessity of identifying every grammatical phenomenon, studying their semantic and syntactic functions, and applying the results in the educational process on the agenda. For this, it was necessary to classify words into parts of speech, determine the morphological characteristics and syntactic functions of each class, select the literary-standard forms of grammatical constructions typical for them, distinguish phonetic variants of forms from dialectal variants, and develop the norms of literary language concerning their usage. "In the history of Uzbek linguistics, these aspects were thoroughly studied separately using inductive methods, and rich factual materials were collected. Uzbek linguists, having honorably fulfilled the tasks of this stage, moved on to the next phase, where—based on these materials—like all linguistic units, the need and opportunity arose to solve many issues related to the study of morphological forms as well." The substantial stage of studying grammatical meaning.

By the 1970s, the formal (empirical) stage of Uzbek linguistics had come to an end. As mentioned earlier, linguistics of this period had successfully fulfilled the

great task assigned to it — the social demand to develop the norms of the literary language and to instill them in the public consciousness. Along with accomplishing these tasks, a strong foundation and solid groundwork were prepared for the new stage of linguistic research. The rich linguistic material accumulated on empirical bases created broad opportunities for scientific investigation relying on dialectical logic laws and categories — the methodology of theoretical study.

In 1984 and 1986, a group of Turkologists published in the central press several urgent tasks concerning the interpretation and investigation of Turkic languages in a new era. The ideas proposed there and the goals and objectives based on them were a logical continuation of the tasks of formal Uzbek linguistics. The issues raised can be conditionally grouped as follows: The tasks assigned to Uzbek linguistics in the 1940s and accomplished in the 1970s — the interpretation of units of Uzbek language levels based on formal analysis, the development of Uzbek literary language norms based on the norms of the Russian literary language, the creation of textbooks and teaching aids for various educational levels to popularize these norms, the formation of theoretical knowledge on the basis of empirical materials found in normative grammars, revealing the linguistic universality behind speech-specific features, the linguistic essence underlying language phenomena, and the linguistic potential manifested in speech realities. At the same time, due to the fact that, for nearly half a century, Uzbek—like other Turkic and non-Turkic languages within the former Soviet Union—had been studied and researched according to Russian and European linguistic models, it became necessary to investigate it scientifically based on its own Turkic nature. These tasks also found their expression in the interpretation of grammatical meaning. Research began to study grammatical meaning through the dialectical categories of generality and specificity. In the substantial stage of Uzbek linguistics, a new interpretation of morphological forms took shape. First of all, distinguishing and studying the general and specific aspects of grammatical meaning separately was set as one of the main objectives. This issue was raised in linguist H. Ne'matov's research devoted to the morphology of ancient Turkic monuments and the tasks proposed by a group of linguists were published in the press. The issue was defended as candidate and doctoral dissertations by several linguists. For example, linguist Sh. Shahobiddinova studied grammatical meaning from the perspective of the dichotomy of langue and parole: in her candidate dissertation, she researched the category of number in Uzbek, and in her

doctoral dissertation, she analyzed grammatical categories in general. Especially noteworthy is linguist B. Mengliyev's doctoral dissertation, in which the actualization of grammatical meaning in speech was examined from the standpoint of the integrity of the linguistic system. This research laid the groundwork for a new pragmatic stage in the study of grammatical meaning. The anthropocentric stage of studying grammatical meaning. Studying Uzbek linguistic phenomena on the basis of the "speech–language (nutq–lison)" principle has led to examining the realization of linguistic universals in speech not only from the perspective of interaction between linguistic levels, but also together with non-linguistic factors. Developing mechanisms for a person's rational and efficient use of these resources is one of the main tasks of pragmatic linguistics. When language is studied together with its speakers, naturally, an adequate description of it can only be given when it is viewed alongside the culture and mentality of the nation to which it belongs. Indeed, every unit of language reveals national and cultural characteristics to one degree or another.

Today, world pragmalinguistics is developing in three main directions. British pragmalinguistics was strongly influenced by M. Halliday's functional analysis of language. His research reflects such issues as the social function of language, content, and the analysis of formal, written, and spoken discourse. Linguists J. Sinclair and M. Coulthard also expanded the anthropocentric analysis of communication. In British anthropocentric analysis, artistic discourse—one of the specific forms of literary language—is often taken as material for study. American pragmalinguistics, on the other hand, focused primarily on the living form of literary language—spoken language—and relied heavily on ethnocultural factors and natural, real communication. Its basis lies largely in the analysis of live communication. In this school, linguistic system and its speech realization are not viewed as interconnected; instead, communication units, linguistic personality, and communicative situation are treated as a single object of study. The works of Goffman, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson are vivid examples of this. As can be seen, in Britain and America, pragmalinguistics—like other linguistic phenomena—limits itself to the speech aspect of grammatical meaning and does not pay attention to the conclusions of linguistic grammatical meaning developed for many years by structuralists. Overall, both approaches are characterized by the fact that they do not draw on the achievements of structuralism. Prague pragmalinguistics occupies a special place among these directions. In particular, this school, in

accordance with its tradition, strictly adheres to the principle of the langue–parole dichotomy even in the anthropocentric analysis of grammatical meaning. In this approach, linguistic units—particularly grammatical forms and grammatical meaning—are viewed as linguistic potential, and special attention is given to the consistency of the interplay between situational and personal factors in their realization in speech. Today, Uzbek substantial linguistics, having successfully passed the stage of analyzing grammatical meaning based on the “speech–language (nutq–lison)” principle, is experiencing the need to conduct research at a new qualitative stage of its development—based on the “language–speech (lison–nutq)” principle. Relying on the scientific and theoretical conclusions gained from studying linguistic structure—linguistic units and their relations—it has become urgent to analyze linguistic units discursively within the methodology of synergetic research. In conclusion, the current era demands that Uzbek substantial pragmalinguistics conduct discursive analysis of grammatical phenomena based on the principle of “generality–specificity.”

REFERENCES

1. Sayfullayev, R. Uzbek Literary Language.
2. Rakhmatullayev. Uzbek Language.
3. Ubaydullayeva, S., Hojiyev, A. Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms.
4. Sodiqov, A. et al. Introduction to Linguistics.
5. Nurmonov, A., Mahmudov, N. Theoretical Grammar of the Uzbek Language.
6. Usmonov, S. General Linguistics.
7. Tursunov, T., Aliev, A., Orinboev, B. History of the Uzbek Literary Language.
8. Sodiqov, A., Abduazizov, A. Introduction to Linguistics.