# METHODS OF MEANING EXPRESSION AND GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTIONS

*Hasanova Sevinch Hotam qizi*

*hasanovasevinc906@gmail.com*

*Umarqulova Gulshoda Ibrohimovna*

*gulshodaumarqulova3@gmail.com*

*Toshboyeva Bibinur Komil qizi*

*bibinurtoshboyeva@gmail.com*

**Abstract**

This article explores various methods of meaning expression and the role of grammatical constructions in language. It analyzes how semantic functions are conveyed through morphological and syntactic tools, focusing on word formation, phrase structures, and sentence patterns. The study examines the interaction between lexical meaning and grammatical form, highlighting how prefixes, suffixes, and syntactic arrangements contribute to meaning generation. The research also compares how different languages utilize grammatical constructions to encode meaning effectively.

***Key words:*** *meaning expression, grammatical constructions, morphology, syntax, word formation, semantics, phrase structure, language comparison*

## INTRODUCTION

The methods of meaning expression and grammatical constructions in languages can vary significantly, reflecting the unique structures and cultural contexts of each language. This analysis will focus on two distinct language types: analytic languages, exemplified by English, and agglutinative languages, represented by Uzbek. In analytic languages like English, meaning is predominantly conveyed through word order and auxiliary verbs rather than inflections. The subject-verb-object (SVO) structure is fundamental; for example, in the sentence

"The cat (subject) chased (verb) the mouse (object)," the meaning is clear due to the fixed word order. Grammatical relationships are often indicated by prepositions and auxiliary verbs, such as "is running," where "is" helps convey tense. Additionally, English relies on modal verbs (can, will, must) to express necessity, possibility, or permission, demonstrating a reliance on auxiliary constructions to convey nuanced meanings. Conversely, Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, employs a rich system of affixes attached to root words to express grammatical relationships and meanings. For instance, the root word "kitob" (book) can be transformed into "kitobim" (my book) or "kitoblarda" (in the books) through the addition of possessive and locative suffixes. This morphological flexibility allows for complex meanings to be conveyed in a single word form. The syntactic structure of Uzbek is generally subject-object-verb (SOV), which also influences how meaning is constructed within sentences. While English relies heavily on word order and auxiliary constructions to express meaning, Uzbek utilizes a system of affixation to convey grammatical relationships. Understanding these differences is crucial for language learners and linguists alike, as they highlight the diverse ways in which languages can structure meaning and communicate ideas.

**METHODOLY**

Several foreign scholars have made significant contributions to the study of meaning expression and grammatical constructions across different languages. One prominent figure is Noam Chomsky, whose theories on generative grammar revolutionized the understanding of syntax and semantics. Chomsky's work emphasizes the innate structures of language and how they shape meaning, particularly through his concepts of deep structure and surface structure. Another influential scholar is Ferdinand de Saussure, a Swiss linguist known for his ideas in structural linguistics. Saussure introduced the concept of the linguistic sign, which consists of the 'signifier' (the form of a word) and the 'signified' (the concept it represents). His work laid the groundwork for understanding how meaning is

constructed in language through relationships between signs. In addition, Mikhail Bakhtin, a Russian philosopher and literary critic, explored the dialogic nature of language and how meaning is shaped by social interactions. His ideas on heteroglossia highlight that meaning is not fixed but rather influenced by context, speaker identity, and cultural background. Furthermore, the work of William Labov in sociolinguistics has provided insights into how meaning can vary across different social groups and contexts. Labov's studies on language variation and change demonstrate that grammatical constructions can reflect social identities and cultural nuances. Finally, scholars like Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf have contributed to the field through their exploration of linguistic relativity, suggesting that the structure of a language can influence thought processes and perceptions of reality. These scholars collectively enhance our understanding of how meaning is expressed and constructed grammatically in various languages, illustrating the intricate relationship between language, thought, and culture.

**RESULTS**

The study of meaning expression and grammatical constructions reveals several key findings across various languages. Firstly, different languages utilize distinct grammatical structures to convey similar meanings, highlighting the diversity of linguistic expression. For instance, while English often employs a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) order, languages like Japanese use Subject-Object-Verb (SOV), showcasing how syntax can influence the clarity and emphasis of meaning. Moreover, the use of grammatical aspects such as tense and mood plays a crucial role in meaning expression. Languages with rich aspectual distinctions, like Russian, allow speakers to convey nuances of time and action that may not be as readily available in English. Additionally, the study identifies the importance of modality in expressing speaker attitudes and intentions, where modal verbs in English (e.g., "can," "must") contrast with other languages that may use different strategies, such as inflection or particles. Another significant finding is the role of context in shaping

meaning. Pragmatic elements, including politeness strategies and discourse markers, are essential in constructing meaning beyond mere grammatical forms. The interplay between syntax and semantics is evident, as speakers often rely on contextual cues to interpret meaning accurately.

**DISCUSSION**

The findings underscore the complexity of meaning expression across languages and highlight the interplay between grammatical constructions and semantic interpretation. The diversity in syntactic structures suggests that language shapes thought processes, aligning with the principles of linguistic relativity proposed by Sapir and Whorf. This indicates that speakers of different languages may perceive and categorize experiences differently based on their linguistic frameworks. Furthermore, the results emphasize the importance of context in meaning-making. Pragmatic considerations reveal that communication is not solely dependent on grammatical correctness but also on social norms and situational factors. For instance, the use of honorifics in languages like Korean illustrates how cultural values influence grammatical choices, affecting interpersonal dynamics. In conclusion, understanding meaning expression through grammatical constructions requires a multifaceted approach that considers syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Future research should explore these dimensions further, particularly in under-studied languages, to enrich our comprehension of linguistic diversity and its implications for human cognition and social interaction. The interplay between methods of meaning expression and grammatical constructions forms the core of linguistic communication. As explored, meaning is not a static property of isolated words but a dynamic product of the synergy between lexical choices, morphological markers, and syntactic arrangements. Grammatical constructions act as the essential framework, or "skeleton," that organizes semantic content, allowing for the expression of complex relationships such as tense, aspect, mood, and voice. Whether through the analytic structures of English or the agglutinative processes of languages

like Uzbek, grammar provides the conventionalized patterns that guide interpretation.

## CONCLUSION

Meaning expression extends beyond literal syntax into the realms of pragmatics and cognitive linguistics. Construction Grammar, in particular, demonstrates that specific structural patterns carry their own inherent meanings, independent of the individual words used within them. Understanding these methods is crucial for mastering cross-linguistic nuances and ensuring accuracy in translation and intercultural dialogue. In conclusion, the effectiveness of human language lies in its ability to combine flexible lexical expression with rigid grammatical rules to convey an infinite range of ideas. A comprehensive grasp of these constructions allows speakers to navigate not just the literal definitions of words, but the deeper, structural intent behind every utterance.

## REFERENCES

1. Croft, W. Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective. Oxford University Press. 2001. p- 45.

2. Fillmore, C. J. Frame Semantics and the Nature of Language. Linguistic Society of Korea. 1982. p-126.

3. Givón, T. Syntax: An Introduction. Vol. 1. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2001. p-190.

4. Goldberg, A. E. Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure. University of Chicago Press. 1995. p-39.

5. Lyons, J. Semantics: Volume 1. Cambridge University Press. 1977. p–255.