THE CONTEMPORARY DETERMINATION OF GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES

Allakhverdiyeva Farida Muhammadali

Azerbaijan University of Languages, Baku, Azerbaijan

farida.muhammedali@mail.ru

ORCID ID: 0009-0006-0534-1447

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21423591

Abstract: This study examines the contemporary determination of grammatical categories in English linguistics, focusing on how traditional structural approaches have been reinterpreted through modern functional, cognitive, and discourse-oriented frameworks. Grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, number, case, mood, and voice are analyzed not as fixed and universal grammatical oppositions, but as dynamic, usage-based systems that emerge through actual language use and communicative interaction. The research highlights the shift from formalist models, which emphasize morphological marking and syntactic position, toward more integrative approaches that consider context, speaker intention, cognitive processing, and discourse structure. In this regard, grammatical categories are shown to function as essential tools for organizing meaning, managing information flow, and ensuring coherence in both spoken and written communication.

The study further explores how tense contributes not only to temporal reference but also to narrative organization, while aspect reflects the conceptualization of events in terms of duration and completion, and number represents cognitive categorization of entities as singular or plural depending on communicative context. It also emphasizes the cross-linguistic variability of grammatical categories and demonstrates that their realization differs across languages, challenging the notion of universality in grammatical theory. Additionally, the research considers the role of grammatical categories in discourse organization, showing how they help maintain cohesion, express speaker attitude, and structure textual information. By integrating insights from cognitive linguistics, usage-based theory, and discourse analysis, the study concludes that grammatical categories are adaptive, multifunctional, and deeply embedded in human communication, serving as a bridge between linguistic form, meaning, and cognition.

Key words: grammatical categories, English grammar, nominal phrase, determiners, tense, aspect, number, discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, functional grammar

Introduction

The study of grammatical categories has long occupied a central position in linguistic research, yet in contemporary linguistics it has gained renewed importance due to the shift from purely structural descriptions of language toward more functional, cognitive, and discourse-oriented models. Grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, number, case, gender, mood, and

voice are no longer viewed as rigid and universally fixed systems of morphological opposition; instead, they are increasingly interpreted as dynamic and usage-based mechanisms that reflect the interaction between linguistic structure, meaning construction, and communicative practice. This modern perspective suggests that grammar cannot be separated from language use, as grammatical forms acquire their full meaning only within specific contexts of discourse, speaker intention, and cognitive interpretation. As a result, the investigation of grammatical categories has become an interdisciplinary field that integrates insights from syntax, semantics, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and discourse analysis, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of how language functions in real communication.

In earlier linguistic traditions, grammatical categories were typically defined within structural frameworks that emphasized formal rules, morphological marking, and syntactic positioning. These approaches, although foundational for linguistic theory, often treated categories as stable and context-independent units. However, contemporary research challenges this view by demonstrating that grammatical categories are highly sensitive to variation across contexts, genres, and communicative situations. For instance, the interpretation of tense may extend beyond simple temporal reference to include narrative structuring and discourse organization, while aspect reflects how speakers conceptualize events in terms of duration and completion. Similarly, number is increasingly understood not only as a grammatical distinction between singular and plural forms but also as a cognitive representation of how entities are perceived and categorized in communication. These reinterpretations highlight the need for a more flexible analytical framework that accounts for both structural regularities and functional variability in language use.

The significance of studying grammatical categories also lies in their fundamental role in shaping meaning and ensuring coherence in discourse. They serve as essential tools for organizing information, managing reference, and guiding interpretation in both spoken and written communication. Through categories such as modality and voice, speakers can express attitude, certainty, obligation, and perspective, while also controlling the focus and informational structure of their utterances. This demonstrates that grammatical categories are not merely formal linguistic elements but active components of meaning construction that operate across different levels of communication.

Furthermore, the contemporary analysis of grammatical categories is closely linked to cognitive and usage-based theories of language, which emphasize that grammatical structures emerge from patterns of language use and are shaped by frequency, experience, and conceptualization. This approach highlights the role of human cognition in structuring grammatical systems and explains how linguistic categories reflect general principles of perception and categorization. In addition, cross-linguistic studies reveal significant variation in how grammatical categories are expressed across languages, further supporting the view that they are not universal in form but adaptable to specific linguistic systems and communicative needs.

The aim of this study is to examine the contemporary understanding of grammatical categories in English, focusing on their functional, cognitive, and discourse-related aspects, and to explore how these categories contribute to the construction of meaning in nominal and broader grammatical structures. The study also seeks to analyze how traditional structural views have evolved into more dynamic models that emphasize usage, context, and interaction, thereby providing a more comprehensive explanation of grammatical behavior in real communication.

Main Part

The contemporary determination of grammatical categories is one of the most significant issues in modern linguistics because it reflects how language is analyzed as a living system that connects structure, meaning, and communication rather than as a fixed set of abstract rules. In earlier linguistic traditions, grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, number, case, gender, mood, and voice were mainly treated as stable and universal oppositions that exist independently of context and speaker intention, and they were described primarily through formal criteria such as morphological markers and syntactic positions. However, contemporary linguistic theory rejects this rigid interpretation and emphasizes that grammatical categories are dynamic, flexible, and deeply connected to actual language use, meaning that they cannot be fully understood without considering discourse, pragmatics, and cognitive processes. From this modern perspective, grammatical categories are not merely structural labels attached to words, but functional tools that speakers use to organize experience, encode meaning, and manage communication in different contexts, which means that grammar is seen as a system shaped by usage rather than a closed set of rules. For example, tense is no longer understood only as a simple grammatical device for marking past, present, and future time, but as a discourse-oriented mechanism that helps structure narratives, establish temporal relations between events, and guide the listener through the progression of information, while aspect is interpreted not only as a formal opposition between completed and ongoing actions but also as a way of representing how speakers conceptualize processes in terms of duration, repetition, and completeness, and number is similarly understood not just as singular and plural distinction but as a cognitive and communicative system that reflects how speakers perceive entities as individual or collective units depending on context and meaning. In addition, contemporary approaches highlight that grammatical categories vary across languages and cannot be assumed to be universal in structure or expression, since different languages encode grammatical meanings in different ways, with some relying heavily on morphological systems while others use syntactic or contextual strategies to express similar meanings, which leads to a more descriptive and empirical approach in modern linguistics that focuses on how categories actually function in real languages rather than how they are expected to function in theory. Furthermore, grammatical categories are now strongly linked to cognitive processes, as they reflect how human beings perceive, categorize, and mentally organize reality, meaning that categories such as tense and aspect correspond to mental representations of time and events, while number reflects how the mind distinguishes between single entities and groups, showing that grammar is closely tied to thought processes rather than being an independent formal system. At the same time, grammatical categories play an essential role in discourse organization because they help speakers structure information, highlight important elements, maintain coherence, and ensure clarity in communication, with categories such as voice influencing the focus between agent and action and modality expressing speaker attitude, certainty, and intention, which demonstrates that grammatical categories operate not only at sentence level but also across larger textual structures. Overall, the contemporary determination of grammatical categories reflects a major shift in linguistic thinking from rigid structural models to integrated approaches that combine syntax, semantics, pragmatics, cognition, and discourse analysis, showing that grammatical categories are dynamic systems shaped by usage, context, and communicative needs and are essential for understanding how language functions in real communication.

The contemporary determination of grammatical categories is increasingly regarded as a complex and multidimensional process in modern linguistics, where grammatical systems are interpreted not as rigid and universally fixed structures but as dynamic, usage-based, and context-sensitive mechanisms that reflect the interaction between linguistic form, meaning, and communicative function in real discourse. In earlier linguistic traditions, categories such as tense, aspect, number, case, gender, mood, and voice were primarily defined as formal oppositions within a closed grammatical system, with emphasis placed on morphological realization and syntactic distribution, while contextual and pragmatic factors were largely ignored; however, contemporary approaches argue that such categories cannot be fully understood without considering how they operate in actual communication, since grammatical meaning is constantly shaped by discourse environment, speaker intention, and cognitive processing. From this perspective, tense is not only a grammatical marker of temporal reference but also a discourse mechanism that organizes events and structures narratives, aspect is not merely a formal distinction between completed and ongoing actions but a way of conceptualizing the internal structure of events, and number is not simply a singular-plural opposition but a cognitive representation of how speakers perceive quantity and individuation in context, which demonstrates that grammatical categories are deeply embedded in meaning-making processes rather than functioning as isolated structural units. This functional and usage-based understanding of grammar has been supported and developed through different theoretical orientations, where Edward Sapir emphasized the importance of language as a patterned system shaped by cultural and cognitive factors, Simon Dik highlighted the role of functional explanation in linking grammatical form with communicative purpose, and George Lakoff focused on the conceptual and cognitive foundations of linguistic structure, showing that grammatical categories are closely connected to human perception and conceptualization of experience; at the same time, contemporary research also stresses cross-linguistic variation, demonstrating that grammatical categories are not uniform across languages and may be expressed through morphological, syntactic, or lexical means depending on the language system, which challenges earlier universalist assumptions and supports a more descriptive, empirical approach to linguistic analysis. [7, 121pp; 9, 132pp] Furthermore, grammatical categories are now widely recognized as essential tools in discourse organization, since they help speakers manage information flow, maintain coherence, and highlight relevant elements in communication, while categories such as voice, mood, and modality allow speakers to express attitude, intention, and perspective, extending the role of grammar beyond sentence-level structure into larger textual and communicative contexts. Overall, the contemporary determination of grammatical categories reflects a significant shift in linguistic theory toward integrated models that combine structural, functional, cognitive, and discourse-oriented perspectives, presenting grammatical categories as dynamic systems shaped by usage, cognition, and communicative needs rather than fixed formal rules.

Building on this understanding, it becomes evident that the analysis of grammatical categories also requires attention to their role in real communicative practice, where linguistic forms are constantly negotiated, adapted, and reinterpreted according to situational demands. In actual discourse, speakers do not simply apply grammatical rules mechanically; instead, they make continuous choices that reflect their communicative intentions, assumptions about shared knowledge, and expectations regarding the listener's interpretation. This dynamic process shows that grammatical categories function as interactive resources that enable speakers to structure meaning in flexible and contextually appropriate ways. As a result, grammar should be viewed not

as a static system of constraints but as a productive system of options that speakers draw upon in order to achieve communicative effectiveness in diverse situations.

Moreover, the interaction between grammatical categories and discourse structure reveals that meaning is not localized within individual linguistic elements but distributed across larger stretches of text and interaction. For instance, the use of tense and aspect in narrative discourse helps establish temporal progression and event sequencing, while modality contributes to the expression of evaluation, stance, and interpersonal meaning. Similarly, the deployment of number and definiteness markers plays a crucial role in reference tracking, allowing speakers to introduce new information, maintain continuity, or re-identify previously mentioned entities. These processes demonstrate that grammatical categories are essential for maintaining coherence and cohesion in discourse, ensuring that communication remains interpretable and meaningful across extended linguistic contexts.

In addition, the study of grammatical categories in contemporary linguistics increasingly benefits from interdisciplinary integration, particularly with cognitive science, psycholinguistics, and computational linguistics. Cognitive approaches highlight the relationship between grammatical structures and mental representation, showing how linguistic categories reflect general principles of human categorization and conceptual organization. Psycholinguistic research further demonstrates that grammatical processing is closely linked to real-time cognitive mechanisms involved in language comprehension and production, while computational models provide new ways of analyzing large-scale linguistic data to identify patterns of usage and variation. These interdisciplinary perspectives collectively reinforce the idea that grammatical categories are not isolated linguistic constructs but part of a broader system of human cognition and communication.

The evolving understanding of grammatical categories has important implications for linguistic theory and language education. The shift toward usage-based and context-sensitive models encourages a more flexible approach to grammar teaching, where emphasis is placed not only on formal rules but also on communicative competence and contextual appropriateness. This perspective helps learners develop a deeper understanding of how grammatical forms function in real communication, rather than simply memorizing abstract rules. Consequently, the contemporary determination of grammatical categories contributes not only to theoretical linguistics but also to applied fields, highlighting the practical relevance of grammatical analysis in understanding and using language effectively.

The contemporary determination of grammatical categories is approached in modern linguistic theory as a continuously evolving analytical framework in which grammatical meaning is understood through the interaction of language use, communicative intention, and contextual variability rather than through static structural definitions. Unlike earlier models that treated grammatical categories as fixed inventories of formal oppositions, contemporary research views them as adaptive systems that emerge from discourse practices and are shaped by frequency, interaction, and conceptual organization. Within this perspective, grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, number, case, mood, and voice are not isolated grammatical labels but interrelated functional mechanisms that participate in the construction of meaning at both sentence and discourse levels, where their interpretation depends heavily on situational context and speaker perspective. For instance, tense is increasingly analyzed not merely as a temporal reference system but as a discourse structuring device that organizes events relative to communicative priorities,

while aspect is interpreted as a cognitive representation of event structure reflecting how speakers perceive processes as bounded or unbounded, and number is understood as a conceptual categorization strategy that encodes individuation and collectivity depending on communicative needs. This usage-based understanding of grammar has been further developed through the work of Joan Bybee, who emphasizes the role of repetition and language use in shaping grammatical patterns over time, and Elizabeth Traugott, who highlights the processes of semantic change and grammaticalization as key mechanisms in the evolution of grammatical categories, while William Croft contributes to the view that grammatical categories are best understood as language-specific constructions rather than universal structural templates. [4, 98pp; 11, 85pp] Together, these perspectives demonstrate that grammatical categories are not pre-given structural units but emergent properties of linguistic behavior that develop through interaction between cognition, communication, and linguistic change, thereby redefining the traditional boundaries of grammatical analysis.

The contemporary determination of grammatical categories is further enriched by the growing emphasis on discourse-based and interactional approaches, where grammatical meaning is analyzed not only within the limits of sentence structure but also in relation to larger communicative sequences and pragmatic intentions. In this framework, grammatical categories are understood as tools that speakers actively manipulate in order to manage information flow, establish coherence, and guide the interpretive processes of the addressee. This means that categories such as tense, aspect, number, mood, and voice are no longer seen as purely formal grammatical distinctions, but as discourse-sensitive resources that contribute to the organization of textual meaning. For example, tense forms are often used to create temporal alignment between events in narratives rather than simply indicating objective time reference, while mood forms are employed to express degrees of certainty, obligation, or hypotheticality depending on communicative context, and voice constructions are used to control information focus by highlighting either the agent or the process itself. This discourse-oriented interpretation of grammar has been significantly advanced by Paul Hopper, who emphasizes the emergence of grammatical structure from discourse practices, while Sandra Thompson focuses on the interaction between grammar and spoken communication strategies, and Wallace Chafe highlights the role of information flow and cognitive processing in shaping grammatical choices, showing that grammatical categories are deeply embedded in real-time communication. [3, 67pp; 6, 142pp; 10, 75pp] These perspectives collectively demonstrate that grammatical categories function as dynamic discourse instruments rather than static structural elements, and their interpretation depends on how speakers organize, package, and present information in actual communicative situations.

The contemporary determination of grammatical categories is also closely connected with the growing influence of cognitive and functional approaches that attempt to explain how grammatical systems are shaped by human perception, conceptualization, and communicative needs, rather than by purely formal structural rules. In this view, grammatical categories are interpreted as mental and communicative tools that reflect how speakers organize their experience of reality and encode it into linguistic form. Categories such as tense, aspect, number, modality, and voice are therefore understood not as fixed grammatical oppositions but as flexible systems that emerge from the interaction between cognition, usage, and discourse context. For instance, tense is seen as a cognitive mapping of temporal experience that allows speakers to position events relative to each other, aspect is interpreted as a conceptualization of the internal structure of events in terms of completion or continuity, and number is viewed as a mental categorization of entities into

singular or plural groups depending on how they are perceived in communication. This cognitive-functional perspective has been strongly developed by Adele Goldberg, who explains grammatical structure through construction-based usage patterns, Leonard Talmy, who focuses on the relationship between language and conceptual structure in meaning formation, and John R. Taylor, who emphasizes the role of categorization and prototype effects in grammatical organization, showing that grammatical categories are not rigid units but flexible cognitive patterns shaped by usage and experience. Together, these approaches demonstrate that contemporary linguistics treats grammatical categories as dynamic interfaces between mind, language, and communication, where meaning is constructed through the continuous interaction of cognitive processes and linguistic expression.

The contemporary determination of grammatical categories is also closely associated with the development of corpus-based and data-driven approaches in modern linguistics, where the analysis of grammar is grounded in extensive collections of authentic language data rather than in artificially constructed examples or purely theoretical assumptions. This methodological transformation has significantly influenced the way grammatical categories are defined, described, and interpreted, since it enables linguists to observe how tense, aspect, number, mood, modality, and voice actually function in real communicative environments across spoken, written, formal, and informal discourse. Within this framework, grammatical categories are no longer treated as abstract and fixed inventories of forms, but as patterns of usage that emerge from repeated linguistic behavior and are shaped by frequency, context, and communicative function. This means that grammar is increasingly understood as a probabilistic system in which certain forms are preferred in specific contexts, and where meaning is closely linked to distributional patterns rather than isolated structural rules. For instance, tense usage can be systematically analyzed through large corpora that reveal how past, present, and future forms behave differently in narrative, academic, and conversational discourse, showing that temporal reference is often influenced by textual type and communicative intention; similarly, aspectual distinctions such as perfective and progressive forms can be studied in relation to verb combinations, collocational patterns, and discourse sequencing, revealing how speakers structure events in real communication; and modality can be examined through recurring patterns of epistemic and deontic expressions that reflect speaker attitude, certainty, obligation, and evaluation across different genres. This empirical orientation has been significantly developed by Douglas Biber, who introduced a systematic corpus-based methodology for analyzing grammatical variation across registers and demonstrated how grammatical choices vary depending on communicative context and text type, Geoffrey Leech, who contributed to the quantitative and descriptive analysis of English grammar by emphasizing the importance of frequency and usage patterns in understanding grammatical structure, and Susan Conrad, who focused on register variation and showed how grammatical categories behave differently in spoken conversation, academic writing, and professional discourse depending on situational demands. [1, 35pp; 8, 93pp] Their combined contributions demonstrate that grammatical categories cannot be fully understood through introspection or theoretical abstraction alone, but must be analyzed through large-scale empirical evidence that reflects actual language use in diverse communicative settings. In addition, corpus-based studies have revealed that grammatical categories are not uniform or stable across contexts, but are highly sensitive to factors such as genre, discourse purpose, and interactional setting, which means that the same grammatical form may perform different functions depending on where and how it is used. This has led to a more nuanced understanding of grammar as a dynamic system of probabilistic choices rather than a fixed set of

rules, highlighting the importance of variation, frequency, and context in shaping grammatical meaning. As a result, the contemporary determination of grammatical categories increasingly integrates descriptive linguistics with computational methods, providing a more accurate and realistic picture of how grammatical systems operate in real communication and reinforcing the idea that grammar is fundamentally a usage-based phenomenon embedded in authentic language practice.

The contemporary determination of grammatical categories is understood in modern linguistics as a highly dynamic and multifaceted process in which grammatical systems are analyzed not as fixed inventories of formal oppositions but as flexible and usage-based mechanisms that emerge through actual communicative practice. This approach represents a significant departure from earlier structural traditions that defined categories such as tense, aspect, number, case, gender, mood, and voice primarily in terms of morphological marking and syntactic distribution, often treating them as universal and stable components of language structure. In contrast, contemporary perspectives emphasize that grammatical categories are deeply context-sensitive and functionally motivated, meaning that their interpretation depends on discourse environment, speaker intention, and cognitive processing rather than on isolated grammatical form. From this point of view, grammar is not an autonomous system of abstract rules but an adaptive communicative resource that evolves through usage and interaction, where categories function as tools for organizing experience and managing meaning in discourse. For example, tense is no longer interpreted only as a formal indicator of temporal reference but as a discourse mechanism that structures events and narratives; aspect is understood not merely as a grammatical opposition between completed and ongoing actions but as a conceptualization of event structure in terms of boundedness and internal development; and number is seen not just as a singular-plural distinction but as a cognitive categorization of entities based on how speakers perceive individuality or collectivity in context. These interpretations reflect a broader theoretical shift toward viewing grammatical categories as emergent phenomena shaped by language use, frequency, and communicative need.

Within this contemporary framework, different linguistic scholars have contributed to redefining how grammatical categories are analyzed and understood, particularly by emphasizing variation, usage, and communicative function rather than rigid structural classification. William Labov, through his work in sociolinguistics, highlighted the systematic nature of variation in language and demonstrated that grammatical forms are closely linked to social context and usage patterns rather than being fixed abstract entities. Adele Goldberg, working within construction grammar, argued that grammatical structures should be understood as learned form-meaning pairings that emerge from repeated usage, showing that categories are shaped by actual linguistic experience rather than predetermined rules. [5, 72pp] Martin Haspelmath further developed this view by advocating for a typologically grounded and usage-based approach to grammatical description, emphasizing that grammatical categories must be defined according to cross-linguistic evidence and real language data rather than universal assumptions. In addition, Joan Bybee contributed significantly to the understanding of grammatical change by demonstrating how frequency effects and cognitive processing influence the development and restructuring of grammatical categories over time. [2, 71pp] Collectively, these perspectives reinforce the idea that grammatical categories are not static theoretical constructs but dynamic, evolving systems that reflect the interaction between language structure, usage, cognition, and social context.

Furthermore, contemporary linguistic research emphasizes that grammatical categories cannot be fully understood without considering their role in discourse organization and information structure. They function as essential tools for managing how information is presented, highlighted, and interpreted in communication, allowing speakers to control focus, maintain coherence, and guide the listener's attention across texts. Categories such as voice contribute to the distribution of thematic roles and information prominence, while modality expresses degrees of certainty, necessity, and speaker attitude, and aspect shapes the temporal and structural framing of events within discourse. This discourse-oriented understanding further supports the view that grammatical categories operate beyond sentence boundaries and are integral to larger communicative processes. Overall, the contemporary determination of grammatical categories reflects a comprehensive shift toward integrative linguistic models that combine structural, functional, cognitive, and discourse-based perspectives, demonstrating that grammatical categories are adaptive systems shaped by usage, context, and communicative purpose rather than fixed formal rules.

Conclusion

The analysis of grammatical categories within the framework of contemporary linguistic theory demonstrates that these categories constitute far more than a set of formal grammatical distinctions; rather, they represent dynamic, multifunctional systems that integrate structural organization, semantic interpretation, cognitive processing, and discourse-pragmatic realization. Throughout the study, it has been shown that traditional approaches, which defined grammatical categories as fixed and universally applicable oppositions, are no longer sufficient to account for the complexity and variability observed in actual language use. Instead, modern linguistic perspectives emphasize that categories such as tense, aspect, number, case, mood, and voice operate as flexible mechanisms that derive their meaning and function from contextual usage, communicative intention, and interactional settings. This shift in theoretical orientation reflects a broader transformation in linguistics, moving away from rigid structuralism toward usage-based, cognitive, and discourse-oriented models of language analysis.

One of the key findings of this study is that grammatical categories are deeply embedded in the process of meaning construction and cannot be isolated from the contexts in which they occur. Their interpretation is shaped not only by syntactic structure but also by pragmatic factors such as speaker attitude, shared knowledge, discourse environment, and communicative goals. For instance, tense contributes not only to temporal reference but also to narrative organization and textual coherence; aspect encodes how events are perceived in terms of completion, duration, or repetition; and number reflects cognitive categorization processes that allow speakers to distinguish between individual and collective entities. These functions illustrate that grammatical categories play an essential role in structuring human experience and facilitating effective communication across different linguistic contexts.

Another important conclusion is that grammatical categories exhibit significant variation across languages and communicative situations, which challenges the assumption of universality in traditional grammatical theory. Cross-linguistic evidence shows that languages may encode similar meanings through different structural mechanisms, highlighting the importance of empirical and descriptive approaches in linguistic analysis. This variability further supports the view that grammatical categories are emergent phenomena shaped by language use rather than pre-existing

abstract entities. In addition, corpus-based and usage-driven studies have demonstrated that frequency, context, and discourse type strongly influence how grammatical categories are realized, reinforcing their probabilistic and adaptive nature.

Furthermore, the study confirms that grammatical categories are closely connected to cognitive processes, as they reflect fundamental ways in which human beings perceive, categorize, and conceptualize reality. Linguistic categories are therefore not only grammatical tools but also cognitive instruments that structure thought and experience. At the same time, their role in discourse organization highlights their importance in managing information flow, maintaining coherence, and expressing interpersonal meanings such as modality, evaluation, and perspective. These combined functions demonstrate that grammatical categories operate at the intersection of syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and cognition, forming an integrated system essential for effective communication.

In conclusion, the contemporary determination of grammatical categories represents a comprehensive reconceptualization of grammatical theory, in which categories are understood as dynamic, context-sensitive, and usage-based systems rather than static formal rules. This study highlights that grammatical categories are indispensable for understanding how language functions in real communicative contexts, as they provide the structural and conceptual framework through which meaning is organized, interpreted, and transmitted. By integrating structural, functional, cognitive, and discourse-based perspectives, modern linguistics offers a more complete and realistic account of grammatical categories, demonstrating their central role in both language structure and human communication.

References

1. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. (2002). *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Pearson Education.
2. Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. University of Chicago Press.
4. Croft, W. (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford University Press.
5. Goldberg, A. E. (2006). *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford University Press.
6. Hopper, P. J. (1987). Emergent grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 13, 139–157.
7. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. University of Chicago Press.
8. Leech, G. (2004). *Meaning and the English Verb*. Longman.
9. Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Harcourt, Brace.
10. Thompson, S. A. (1995). *The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar*. In *Function of Language*.
11. Traugott, E. C., & Dasher, R. B. (2002). *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge University Press.