BILINGUAL PUBLISHING GROUP

Forum for Linguistic Studies

https://journals.bilpubgroup.com/index.php/fls

ARTICLE

The Form and Meaning of Words: A Linguistic Discourse

Md. Faruquzzaman Akan [1*] **, *Abdullah Al-Rezgi*** [1] **, *Salahud Din Abdul-Rab*** [1] **, *Anjum Mishu*** [1] **, *Irin Sultana*** [1] **, *Fozia Zulfiquar*** [2] **, *Mohsin Raza Khan*** [1] **, *Javed Ahmad*** [1] **, *Gaus Chowdhury*** [1]

[1] *College of Languages and Translation, King Khalid University, Abha 62521, Saudi Arabia*

[2] *Applied College for Girls, King Khalid University, Abha 62521, Saudi Arabia*

ABSTRACT

This paper is all about the fundamental facts and features of the *form* and *meaning* of words. It is a very intricate area of linguistics, as even native speakers often encounter a lot of difficulties and confusions when a word is in isolation. The term 'form' is the set order of words which may have various meanings depending on the context. On the other hand, 'meaning' refers to the semantic character of words that may have different forms such as synonyms. For example, the English word 'cat' denotes both a male and female creature (unless mentioned by any means) and the same is applicable for its Bangla synonym, i.e., 'বিড়াল' /biɽal/ which is also neutral of gender. Again, the English word 'deer' is both singular and plural (if not any numerical determiners are added to it), the word 'red' is either a noun or an adjective (without specification of whether it refers to a name of a colour or working as a modifier of a noun), and the verb 'read' may be a present /ri:d/ and past /red/ form of the verb (as it differs only in pronunciation). Moreover, the same word has different grammatical identity across some major languages of the globe. For instance, the Hindi adjective 'सुंदर' /sunḍ̪ər/ is used for both male and female. In Romance, the 'sun' is masculine and the 'moon' feminine whereas in German, the 'sun' is feminine and the 'moon' is masculine. To be more specific, English does not have any grammatical genders like some other languages, such as Spanish, French, German, or Arabic as English nouns do not need to agree with adjectives and/or determiners. However, English does use gender-specific pronouns like 'he' and 'she' when referring to people or animals, this is based on sex which is not a grammatical gender, rather a biological gender. So, this study would assist the readers as well as speakers of English, in particular, and also some other major languages understand the difficulties and possible solutions wherever needed for this very field of language.

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Md. Faruquzzaman Akan, College of Languages and Translation, King Khalid University, Abha 62521, Saudi Arabia; Email: f.akan@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 4 January 2025 | Revised: 24 January 2025 | Accepted: 27 January 2025 | Published Online: 28 February 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8305

CITATION

Akan, M.F., Al-Rezgi, A., Abdul-Rab, S.D., et al., 2025. The Form and Meaning of Words: A Linguistic Discourse. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(3): 177–185. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8305

Keywords: Word; Form; Meaning; Context; Grammar; Morphology; Semantics; Sex; Gender; Number; Tense

1. Introduction

The *form* and *meaning* of words are two of the most foundational fields of linguistics, and they often pose problems as well as confusions for speakers of certain languages around the world. In general, 'form' pertains to the shape or visible structure of word, while 'meaning' denotes its symbolic value, intention and so forth. By merely looking at the word, specially in isolation, it is difficult to say whether it is singular/plural, masculine/feminine, present/past, noun/adjective etc. For example, we cannot say that the English word 'black' is a noun or an adjective. When referring to the name of a color, it is definitely a noun. But if we use the word 'black' with another noun (i.e., a *black* pen), it becomes an adjective. Although there are a few words in English, such as 'sheep' which is both singular and plural (if not made clear by using any determiners), 'politics' is singular (though it has a regular/common ending of the plural marker '-s'). In addition to it, the English verb 'put' is also treated as either present or past form of the verb. Furthermore, 'baby', in English, refers to neither masculine nor feminine but to detect sex, we need to say, a *male* baby or a *female* baby. We have similar issues in other major languages like French, German, Latin, Bangla, Arabic and so forth. For example, some Bangla nouns, adjectives etc. have the same form for male and female: the Bangla word 'বিড়াল' /biɽal/ (i.e., a cat) stands for both male and female. To make it clear for the reader, we need to add some male/female marker to the word, e.g., '*হুলো* বিড়াল' /hulo biɽal/ (i.e., a *tom*-cat) *vs.* '*মাদি* বিড়াল' /maḍi biɽal/ (i.e., a *she*-cat). So, it is to be strongly noted that these problems are not only found in English alone but also in other languages of the world. However, we will try to examine a few grammatical issues, not all but specially of English and some other important languages. The whole paper aims to show the grammatical and semantic categories of words where we have reservations to notice an interrelation between syntactic and semantic categories, such as gender *vs.* sex, time *vs.* tense, number *vs.* counting and so on. We have at least four fundamental questions or issues to take under consideration in the current study to clearly understand:

1. What is the purpose and function of grammar, particularly in distinguishing between the structure or form of words (i.e., morphology) and meaning (i.e., semantics)?
2. How do languages grammatically distinguish between singular and plural forms?
3. What constitutes tense in languages, and how does it relate to time?
4. What are the distinctions between grammatical gender and biological sex in languages, and how do they manifest cross-linguistically?

These questions aim to delve into fundamental aspects of linguistics concerning the connection between form and meaning in word structure, providing insights into grammatical classes, such as number, gender, tense etc. Nevertheless, all these questions are a bit challenging to figure out in a short paper like the current one because form and meaning of words are a very extensive and important aspect of language.

2. Literature Review

Basically, language without context is difficult to understand. So, words in isolation may have a very misleading meaning in any languages. To address this issue, we have quite a bit of research in the domain of form and meaning of words, often related to linguistics. The meaning of words can be studied from various perspectives, such as linguistic, philosophical, and psychological. People typically think of dictionaries when they think about the topic of word meaning casually. They view dictionary entries as representing the definition of a word. They also regard the dictionary as the final authority on correct meanings; in any disagreements, they rely on the dictionary definition to determine what is to be considered correct. Therefore, they adopt implicit assumptions that word meanings belong to a language, as opposed to its users, and that there are experts who are the solely qualified authority to report the true meaning of each word. Haspelmath[1] says, we need to have a concept of a *required affix* since some roots and compounds stand alone as words (e.g., English *house, tree, flower-pot*), whereas the others are not and must be in combination with an affix. For example, Italian *alber-o* (i.e., a tree) must include the singular suffix *-o*, and German *geb-en* (i.e., to give) must contain the infinitive suffix *-en*. Now, we can mention Bloomfield's[2] (p. 156)

definition of a word as a 'minimal free form':

> A minimum free form is a word. A word is thus a form which may be uttered alone (with meaning) but cannot be analyzed into parts that may (all of them) be uttered alone (with meaning).

This description is too narrow because it does not include clitics, which are bound forms but which are generally regarded as words. Moreover, it excludes nouns that require an article to precede them, such as an English *tree* or *house*: by contrast, mass nouns, such as English *work* or *fire* can be used in isolation. So, existing literature lacks a precise definition of the term *word* (either in the sense of 'word-form', or in the sense of 'lexeme'), and textbooks and handbooks often overlook this topic, addressing various criteria without arriving at a definitive conclusion [3]. So, the form of words, in most languages, does not correspond to the meaning.

3. Research Methodology

The current study employs a multifaceted methodology that includes both theoretical analysis and empirical investigation across major languages of the world. The research applies a descriptive and comparative linguistic framework to examine grammatical categories, such as number, gender, and tense in English, German, French and some other major languages. This will involve compiling linguistic data from various sources, including linguistic corpora and native speaker judgments, to analyze the grammatical behaviors and semantic implications of words. Last of all, the study will draw on both synchronic and diachronic perspectives to analyze historical changes and contemporary usage patterns, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of how languages encode meaning through grammatical structures. The findings of this study are expected to enhance theoretical knowledge in linguistics and provide practical insights for language teaching and learning contexts.

4. Discussion

Although a word is defined as a single distinct meaningful unit of language used in speech and writing. However, it may, sometimes, have more than a single meaning. Moreover, there exist some words that have no dictionary meaning, such as prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, determiners etc. So, there are some misconceptions regarding grammar that it necessarily addresses and discusses meaning. In linguistics, we differentiate between grammar (i.e., the study of structure) and semantics (i.e., the study of meaning) and maintain them not to be identified. However, grammatical distinctions are very easy to demonstrate that they are not semantic ones by means of showing several instances having no one-to-one correspondence. In the words of Akan et al. [4], like some other languages, English does not have any grammatical gender. Although it has male and female distinctions, it is exactly what we call biological genders based on sex, for example, 'he' *vs.* 'she'. It has no grammatical concord with other parts of the sentence. So, it should be kept in mind that gender and sex are not the same thing. However, some Sematic language such as Arabic as well as the Indo-European language like Bangla has grammatical genders. They agree with the other words in a construction. There are a few words in English that are both singular and plural, e.g., *some, all* etc. However, the current paper focuses mainly on the three grammatical items of English, such as number, gender and tense along with some examples from other major languages of the world. Three issues have been discussed largely regarding the form and meaning of word: the 'interface issue' under which three different positions on teaching grammar are subsumed: the 'non-interface' position, the 'strong interface' position, and the 'weak interface' position. There have been extremist views to the effect that some language researchers (such as Krashen[5, 6]), have argued in favour of 'non-interface' position (i.e., explicit knowledge cannot convert to implicit knowledge) and some other (like DeKeyser[7]) has supported a 'strong interface' position (i.e., the explicit knowledge can convert to implicit knowledge). Nevertheless, the criticism levelled at both of these positions resulted in the emergence of an *instigative* view known as the 'weak interface' position (Ellis[8, 9]) that suggests explicit knowledge can actually convert to implicit knowledge with some constraints such as how and when it takes place. This research paper mainly focusses on English though it explores the syntactic and semantic features of words of some major languages.

5. Research Findings

A word is a linguistic component having some meaning which is not usually perceived either from its physical structure

or in isolation. An often-quoted example is that of *oats* and *wheat*. The former is clearly plural and the latter singular. This is partly indicated by the ending '-s' (though this is not an unambiguous marker of English plural) as a few words like *politics, news, civics* etc. are singular. Conversely, some words, such as *children, oxen, teeth* etc. are plural (without the common ending). However, number is obviously revealed since we state in "The oats *are* …" *vs.* "The wheat *is* …". It cannot be definitively stated that 'oats' are always plural and 'wheat' singular, as this depends on grammatical conventions rather than inherent meaning. This is only to say that *oats* is grammatically plural and *wheat* grammatically singular but some people might say that this is at least true for the English language. This has to be rejected as simply false if those people continue insisting that English people think of *oats* to be plural and of *wheat* to be singular. Moreover, there are examples to be found in *foliage vs. leaves*, or *bread vs. loaves*. English *hair*, which is singular *vs.* French *cheveux* is plural. So, these differences are grammatical and do not directly correspond to any categories of meaning. This point will be emphasized below by an old joke,

Teacher: Is 'pants' singular or plural?

Student: Singular at the top and plural at the bottom.

Then, here is no straightforward one-to-one connection between the grammatical categories of singular and plural and the concepts of 'one' and 'more than one'. Generally, there is a correlation between the grammatical distinction and meaning; without this, there would be no reason to use the terms 'singular' and 'plural'. However, we can only say that in languages where the plural grammatical category exists, it usually, but not always, refers to 'more than one'. As stated by Akan et al. [10], Arabic has three kinds of numbers: e.g., singular: 'معلم' /muʕllim/ (i.e., *a/one* teacher), dual: 'معلمان' /muʕlliman/ (i.e., *two* teachers), and plural: 'معلمون' /muʕllimun/ (i.e., *more than two* teachers). Moreover, there are some nouns in English which are always restricted as either singular, e.g., information, or as plural, e.g., innings. But all count nouns in Bangla have the same form for singular and plural determiner, e.g., 'একজন *শিক্ষক*' /ækdʒɔn ʃikkʰɔk/ (i.e., *a/one* teacher) *vs.* 'অনেক *শিক্ষক*' /ɔnek ʃikkʰɔk/ (i.e., *many/a lot of* teachers).

In the first place, we can see that the same type of standpoints holds for gender and sex. The Romance languages, in particular, French offer numerous examples where all nouns are classified as either masculine or feminine, for example, French *le livre* (i.e. the book) is masculine, *la porte* (i.e., the door) is feminine. In the same way in Italian, it has *il libro, la porta*, in Spanish, *el libro, la puerta* etc. The consistency of these gender forms in the Romance languages is influenced by their shared origin with Latin, their 'parent' language, although Latin includes a third gender, neuter and in Bangla– fourth one, the common gender). However, it would be gobbledygook if one says that French, Italian, and Spanish speakers categorize all objects as either masculine or feminine, although they do not. This occurs due to the grammatical structure of their languages, which categorizes all nouns into specific classes. The characteristic of the categorization is that members of each class determine the forms of their articles and adjectives that accompany them– *le livre vert* (i.e., the green book), *la porte verte* (i.e., the green door). The lack of relevance of any kind of meaning to gender is more evident if we compare the gender of words in one language with those in another. A well-known comparison is found in the gender of the words for the 'sun' and the 'moon' in the Romance and German languages. In Romance, the 'sun' is masculine and the 'moon' is feminine. We can cite more examples from French *le soleil, la lune,* Italian *il sole, la luna,* Spanish *el sol, la luna* etc. But in German, the 'sun' is feminine and the 'moon' masculine. For example, *die Sonne* (i.e., the sun) is masculine, *der Mond* (i.e., the moon) is feminine. However, some English nouns have no masculine, such as *prostitute*.

In the second place, there are many nouns in these languages that, despite being grammatically feminine, typically denote men, for example, French *la sentinelle* (i.e., the sentinel), *la vigie* (i.e., the night watchman), *la rercu* (i.e., the recruit). In fact, most occupational names are feminine, even though they often refer to men who are robust or young. The situation is even more striking in German. It has three genders– masculine, feminine and neuter– *der Tisch* (i.e., the table) is masculine, *die Tür* (i.e., the door) is feminine and *das Feuer* (i.e., the fire) is neuter, but the two commonly used words to refer to girls and young ladies are neuter– *das Mädchen* and *das Fräulein.* In this connection, Twain[11] makes use of this confusion regarding gender and sex in his *A Tramp Abroad:*

Gretchen: Wilhelm, where is the turnip?

Wilhelm: She has gone to the kitchen.
Gretchen: Where is the accomplished and beautiful English maiden?
Wilhelm: It has gone to the opera.

As the third issue, adjectives that indicate sex often follow nouns of the 'opposite' gender. For example, in French, 'the mouse' is *la souris* and 'the he-mouse' is *la souris mâle*– 'the male (feminine) mouse'. Similarly in Latin, *lupus* (i.e., a wolf) is masculine, and *lupa* (i.e., a she-wolf) but not generally feminine. 'She-wolf' is *lupus femina*, while *lupa* is 'a prostitute'. This is not unusual, as long as we do not equate grammatical gender with biological sex. Of course, this statement is not true in the European languages at all that gender has nothing to do with sex. For most creatures clearly identifiable as male or female will typically correspond to masculine and feminine words, respectively. Thus, *l'homme* (i.e., the man) is masculine and *la femme* (i.e., the woman) is feminine. We can compare it with Italian *l'uomo*, *la donna* and Spanish *el hombre, la mujer*. There may be a historical connection between gender and sex, with gender categories potentially originating in early forms of language as markers of sex. However, as gender evolved into a formal grammatical category, this connection has become increasingly tenuous.

Here, we will discuss the issues of number and gender, specially in reference with English. In this sense there is no gender in English at all, no grammatical gender [12]. There are words in English that refer to male and female creatures– *bull/cow, ram/ewe, boar/sow* etc.– but this is not a matter of grammar, but rather an issue of what we usually call biological distinction based on sex and needs to be addressed within the lexicon or dictionary. If we incorporate this into grammar, we should likewise make room for the names of the infant creatures– *calf, lamb, piglet*– for the language distinguishes between the young and adult in a manner akin to how it distinguishes between male and female, and there is, therefore, no clear-cut reason why one should think it to be grammatical, but not the other. The conventional grammarians have only addressed the gender distinction, yet the rationale behind this is quite clear. Although gender is considered a trait of all languages because it is found in Latin, it has no grammatical category relating to the distinction between young and adult. English also has some words that vary in the form with respect to a sex-based relationship, specially in the ending '-ess', for example, *actor – actress, tiger – tigress, duke – duchess* etc. So, the answer again must be 'no' to the question of whether this not perhaps gender. Having distinct endings for the word pair isn't sufficient; they must also encompass syntactic or restrictive grammatical features which means the word should be connected grammatically and logically to other words in a construction. Akan et al. [4] say, a few Bangla nouns and most adjectives and all Arabic content words have grammatical gender. Therefore, we have for Bangla nouns, such as 'ছাত্র' /ʧʰat̪ro/ (i.e., a student– male) *vs.* 'ছাত্রী' /ʧʰat̪ri/ (i.e., a student– female) and for Arabic nouns, such as 'طالب' /tˤɔlib/ (i.e., a student– male) *vs.* 'طالبة' /tˤɔlibah/ (i.e., a student– female) and then for Bangla adjectives, e.g,, 'সুন্দর' /ʃund̪ɔr/ (i.e., beautiful– male) *vs.* 'সুন্দরী' /ʃund̪ori/ (i.e., beautiful– female) and for Arabic adjectives, 'جميل' /ʤami:l/ (i.e., beautiful– male) *vs.* 'جميلة' /ʤami:lah/ (i.e., beautiful– female). In Hindi, the adjective 'सुंदर' /sun̪dɔr/ is used for both male and female: '*सुंदर* लड़का' /sun̪dɔr laɽka/ (i.e., a *beautiful* boy) *vs.* '*सुंदर* लड़की' /sun̪dɔr laɽki/ (i.e., a *beautiful* girl). How- ever, the form of the article and adjective in the Romance languages are determined by gender, English does not have any similar features. Again, if endings alone were sufficient, we would also expect similar approach to *pig – piglet, cat – kitten, goose – gosling* etc. This is not about the gender of English but rather a notable feature of the language. There is no doubt yet that some will still insist that English has gen- der. For example, English has some male/female distinctions in personal pronouns, such as *he/she/it,* and *him/her/it* and in possessive adjectives, such as *his/her/its* which is not grammatical but biological gender as they do not function grammatically. These are used for sex reference. We can show the following two pairs of examples from Palmer [12]:

The *man* has left *his* food.
The *woman* has left *her* food.

But also,

The *cat* has left *his* food.
The *cat* has left *her* food.

Here, it is not indicated if we are referring to a tom-cat (i.e., a male cat) or a she-cat (i.e., a female cat). But the first pair only shows the biological feature based on sex, not at all any grammatical gender. Thus, the choice of the pronoun in this context relies solely on the gender of the creature mentioned, leaving nothing further to be discussed in terms

of grammar. Of course, it is true that *ship* (even without any biological features) is occasionally referred to as *she*, and so sometimes are *car, country* etc. also. But there is no rule, and it would not be reasonable to postulate a grammatical category on this evidence alone. We can talk about another point that the relationship between nouns and pronouns does not involve a clear restriction as we can say "The girl lost *her* hat" or "The girl lost *his* hat". Therefore, the choice, depends on the meaning, not on grammar anyway. However, with *himself* or *herself*, there are strict restrictions – "The girl washed *herself*", not ". . . *himself*"– and here we might appear to be discussing grammar exclusively.

So, it is interesting that the close relationship between grammar and sex is primarily limited to languages like the Indo-European and Semitic groups with which scholars are most familiar. Nevertheless, in other languages, particularly in Africa, gender is strictly grammatical and unrelated to biological sex. Instead, it refers to the differentiation between animate and inanimate entities, and even between large and small ones.

Furthermore, the distinction between tense and time is less apparent than the distinction between gender and sex. The majority of European languages feature distinct verb forms that indicate tense, including past, present, and future. But if we consider a few universal characteristic of time markers in verbs, it would obviously be a mistake. In English, the position is rather complex with the English tense, but two points can be made here. First, if the English past tense refers to past time why do we say,

> If I *knew,* I *would tell* you.
> Or, I wish I *knew.* ([12], p. 38)

Here, *knew* is the past form of the verb *know*, for example, I *know* it now *vs*. I *knew* it all yesterday. However, we employ past tense verb forms in the two constructions depicted above, also we can compare this with, if I *loved*, if I *went,* I wish I *had,* etc. Note that these are not actually past tense forms; they are subjunctives or something like that and we say it is an escape which is cheating. We can then call it a pure terminological trick where pretending means that *stealing* is not a crime by calling it *borrowing*. The straightforward truth is that the past tense form does not necessarily indicate past time. For example, *would, could* etc. refer to both present and past tenses. Again, if we acknowledge tense wherever we have time relations, why not discuss tense in nouns as well? In this case, if we consider meaning, nouns may have tenses. So, we can say in this case,

> *fiancée* is the future tense.
> *ex-wife* is the past tense and
> *grandfather* is in the pluperfect tense (i.e., past perfect tense).

Finally, we ought to examine the traditional method of defining parts of speech or word classes, as it also relies partly on conceptual terms. As defined by Nesfield[13] a noun is 'a word used for naming anything' and notes that 'thing' stands for person, place, quality, feeling, action, collection, etc. in the definition. This is, at its worst, clearly a notional definition since how do we know what a thing is? Then the question arises whether fire, peace, intention or hope is a thing. Moreover, could we argue that *red* refers primarily to a color's name, rather than solely functioning as a noun? However, Nesfield discusses qualities as things, though typically, one would consider words for qualities to be adjectives– *brave, foolish, wise* etc. In actual fact, the definition is entirely vacuous as we can see if we ask 'how' on the basis of this definition can we find the nouns in *He suffered terribly* and *His suffering was terrible*? Does the last sentence have any relevance to tangible things differently than the first one? These sentences are semantically identical. Certainly, we can state that 'suffering' is a noun in this sentence as it denotes a thing, i.e., the act of suffering being 'treated' as a thing, but this is arguing in reverse.

There is an easy answer for how can we possibly identify 'thing'. We achieve this by employing an article or similar words as *his, this* (i.e., determiner) before the words. For example, *the fire, the suffering, the place*– and by making them the subject of the sentence. But this means that we identify 'things' by examining the grammatical features that nouns possess. In other words, 'things' are recognized as such because they are named by nouns. Then, defining nouns in terms of things becomes entirely circular. Although there is no confusion between semantics and grammar this time, it simply fails to acknowledge that there is no clearly defined, universally recognized standard for what constitutes a 'thing'. We should avoid exaggeration while grammatical categories should remain grammatical rather than semantic. We have two reservations here. First, we frequently observe connections between grammatical and semantic categories, e.g., between gender and sex, number and counting. This

comes as no surprise, as grammar serves a purpose; it would be more unexpected if it had no connection whatsoever to our everyday necessities and encounters. However, it should not be identified with semantics, and we should not anticipate a one-to-one correspondence. Second, as a linguist, we must write our grammar in such a way that it relates to semantics as well as to phonetics– our grammar must be 'sensitive' to semantics. This must be stated because there was once a strong school of thought that advocated formal grammar ([12], p. 100), i.e., grammar based exclusively on (phonetic and phonological) forms. This demand was excessively extreme. It proved to be impractical in any scenario; nobody ever managed to create a grammar that completely disregarded meaningful aspects. Moreover, do we desire such a grammar? Isn't the primary goal of describing a language to connect sounds with meanings? Former grammars were certainly useful, however, as a relation against older and conceptual perspectives on grammar.

6. Pedagogical Implications

The research findings discoursed in the study emphasize fundamental aspects of linguistics that have significant pedagogical implications. It underscores that linguistic components such as words are not merely defined by their physical form but are imbued with meaning within specific contexts. This challenges traditional notions of grammatical categories like singular and plural, illustrating that these distinctions do not always align neatly with numerical concepts. Moreover, the study explores the cultural and linguistic diversity seen in gendered language categories across different languages, highlighting how grammatical gender in languages such as the Romance and Germanic languages differ in structure and application. These insights encourage educators to foster critical thinking among students about the relationship between grammar and semantics, urging them to consider how language structures reflect and shape cultural perspectives. By incorporating such findings into language teaching, educators can enrich students' understanding of language complexity and diversity, promoting a more nuanced appreciation of how languages function and evolve. The study has provided an overview of the approaches to some important component of language, such as gender, number, tense etc. To learn a language means to be able to understand and use these different components of the language. As language is not exactly that has all the rules functioning equally all the times. It means we have a lot of exception in its application. The form and meaning are such an area for the teacher as well as the learner. As we cannot set any fixed rules for how to teach singular/plural or gender/sex, the students get confused to learn them properly. The teacher in his or her lecture should make these clear well so that the student gets rid of the possible confusion and the learner stop memorizing without understanding. Teachers need to hold an experimental attitude with different teaching approaches and activities in teaching these items and monitor the results to determine whether the learning goals are being achieved. For classroom teaching/learning, we can separate items which do not fall under regular rules of grammar as irregular. So, we may have regular and irregular: regular and irregular verbs, regular and irregular plural, regular and irregular past etc. Students who have difficulty with higher-order cognition problems will have to be helped to go to improve overtimes slowly. All the three interface positions have their pedagogical realizations– non-interactive position advocated the focus on meaning, the strong interface position focus on form and weak interface position posited the focus on form [14]. However, the weak interface position is now considered to be the optimal integrative solution to form-meaning debate. We have to appreciate that language rules are not universal and require contextual understanding. So, we also have to integrate diverse examples from various languages to illustrate grammatical diversity, teach grammar not just as rules but as dynamic patterns influenced by cultural and historical contexts as well as induce analytical thinking about language use beyond prescriptive rules, emphasizing pragmatic communication. By doing so, learners develop a nuanced understanding of language that enhances their communication skills and cultural sensitivity, preparing them for diverse linguistic encounters in global contexts.

7. Conclusions

In fine, it is crystal clear from the above discussion that *form* and *meaning* of words do not always have one-to-one relation, specially in isolation. Words are broadly divided into two classes—function words and content words. To understand this, we have to make two reservations. Firstly, we

will observe a connection between grammatical and semantic classifications of word. Although the earlier group has a fixed meaning, the latter one receives different meanings in isolation and context. Moreover, forms get more conscious and active attention than meanings when we write, but the reverse happens when we communicate with people, either in our mother tongue or in any languages. It is understandable that grammar serves a purpose, though it would be truly remarkable if it had no connection to our daily needs and experiences. Yet, it should not be equated with semantics, and we should not anticipate a direct correspondence or correlation. Secondly, we have to make up our grammar being a part of linguists in such a way that they relate to semantics—our grammar must be 'sensitive' to semantics. This is necessary to say because there was once a robust school of thought that supported 'formal grammar' that was based exclusively on forms ([15], p. 100). This was far too extreme a requirement since nobody ever managed to create a grammar that completely ignored meaningful aspects, it became evident that such an approach was ultimately impractical. Thus, would we require such a grammar or is it not the primary goal of defining a language to connect forms with meanings? However, earlier grammar undoubtedly served its purpose as a response to outdated and conceptual perspectives on grammar. This paper provides valuable theoretical insights as well as practical implications, specially in language education in brief. However, the comparative approach adds depth to the discussion and relevance to a broader audience. So, further research will reveal more issues in this field carried out by future scholars and find solutions for them.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, M.F.A.; methodology, A.R.; software, A.M.; formal analysis, S.D.A.R.; writing—review and editing, I.S. J.A., M.R.K and F.Z.; visualization, G.C.; supervision, G.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Haspelmath, M., 2023. Coexpression and synexpression patterns across languages: Comparative concepts and possible explanations. Frontiers in Psychology. 14, 1236853.
[2] Bloomfield, L., 1926. A set of postulates for the science of language. Language. 2(3), 153–164. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/408741
[3] Haspelmath, M., 2023. Defining the word. Taylor and Francis online. 69(3), 283–297.
[4] Akan, M.F., Almosa, A., Siddiqui, S., et al., 2023. On linguistic reviews of Arabic and Bangla: A comparative study. Theory and Practice in Language Studies. 13(9), 2375–2383.
[5] Krashen, S., 1981. Second language acquisition and second language learning. Pergamon: Oxford, UK.
[6] Krashen, S., 1982. Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press: Oxford, UK.
[7] DeKeyser, R., 1998. Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In: Doughty, C., Williams, J. (Eds.). Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK. pp. 42–63.
[8] Ellis, R., 1993. Second language acquisition and the structural syllabus. TESOL Quarterly. 27(1), 91–113.
[9] Ellis, R., 1994. The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
[10] Akan, M.F., Rab, S.A., Salafi, A.R., 2023a. Approaches to Bangla-Arabic translation: Subtleties and solutions. Journal of Language Teaching and Research. 14(3), 828–839.
[11] Twain, M., 1880. A tramp abroad. American Publishing Company: Essex, MD, USA.

[12] Palmer, F.R., 1971. Grammar. Penguin Group: Harmondsworth, UK.
[13] Nesfield, J.C., (Ed.), 1895. English grammar series. Macmillan and Company: Troon, Scotland.
[14] Long, M.H., 1991. Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In: de Bot, K., Ginsberg, R., Kramsch, C. (Eds.). Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, The Netherlands. pp. 39–52.
[15] Perini, M A., 2021. Function and class in linguistic description, The taxonomic foundations of grammar. Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK.