



The Question of the Division of Parts of Speech in the Russian Language

Nematjonova N. B.

Supervisor, Teacher of FSU

Rahmonova Dilafuz

Student of FSU

Abstract: The article deals with the issue of distinguishing parts of speech into significant and auxiliary in the Russian language, and also gives classifications of linguists for the division of the Czech Republic.

Keywords: language, parts of speech, classification, linguist, significant, auxiliary.

Despite more than two thousand years of tradition of linguistic description, the key to solving the seemingly obvious problem of parts of speech has not yet been found. The description of parts of speech in various languages, the search for those bundles of grammatical properties, grammatical oppositions that characterize parts of speech in languages of various types, continues to be the focus of linguistic science. This is because the concept of parts of speech as an objective grammatical classification of words is extremely valuable for creating economical and adequate descriptions of languages. Ways to create objective dynamic characteristics of parts of speech lie in the study of specific, sometimes particular, grammatical properties of words, an idea of the entire complex set of which will make it possible to recreate a picture of parts of speech.

According to a number of scientists, since parts of speech are understood as groups of words in their relation to grammar, it can be assumed that the category of parts of speech is universal, at least for languages with any fixed functional characteristics of words (Suprun A.E., 1971, p. .216). This, of course, does not remove not only the unconditional difference between languages both in composition and specific definitions of parts of speech, but also in the role that individual criteria play in determining parts of speech in different languages. At the same time, the well-known axiom that the categories of thinking are reflected in parts of speech in one way or another makes it possible to assume the comparability of parts of speech in languages of various types, and, consequently, the admissibility of constructing some general typology of parts of speech.

Seeming, at first glance, inconsistency in the formulation of the question (parts of speech are units of language, while the functioning of words is a speech aspect) is not at all such, because the opposite of language and speech, very valuable and most obvious, has long been overcome with the help of other categories. One such category is text. Therefore, we explored HR primarily on the basis of the text, "language in action." [1] Language (according to the position of one of the modern major linguists Yu.N. Karaulov) is given to us in three hypostases: in the system, texts, the linguistic ability of individuals, - linguistic pictures of the world should be presented in perspective in all these hypostases. We tried to describe the parts of speech of the Russian and Tatar languages precisely in all these aspects: as a system, as the functioning of various classes of words in speech, in a text; several types of psycholinguistic research allowed us to find out a number of features of the perception of CR by native speakers. The main background of the study was the classification of PD, i.e. it was important for us to find out how (on what grounds) various classifications of PD arise and how the conceptual and logical, as well as functional features of



words influence their qualification. In a different way, how the functional characteristics of the CR are reflected in their classification.

In the "Russian Grammar" of 1755, Mikhail Lomonosov singled out two main, or significant parts of speech: the name and the verb, and six service parts of speech: pronoun, participle, adverb, preposition, conjunction and interjection.

"Russian Grammar" by Alexander Vostokov (1831) proposed a division into eight parts of speech and an adjective separated from the name, and participles are considered as a kind of adjectives.

Fyodor Buslaev in his 1858 work "The Experience of Historical Grammar" retains the previous number of parts of speech and their division into significant or independent (noun, adjective and verb, with the exception of the auxiliary, which is classified as function words) and service (pronoun, numeral, preposition, conjunction, adverb and interjection).

The course "Comparative Linguistics" by Philip Fortunatov (1901-1902) did not have the traditional division of words into parts of speech, and grammatical categories are distinguished there according to formal features:

- full words: verbs, nouns, adjectives, infinitives, adverbs, which are divided into conjugated, inflected and indeclinable;
- partial words;
- Interjections stand separately.

Alexander Peshkovsky's scheme is close to Fortunatov's: a verb, a noun, an adjective, a participle, an adverb, a participle and an infinitive are distinguished. Pronouns and numerals are not distinguished by Peshkovsky as independent parts of speech, function words are considered only in syntactic terms.

Aleksey Shakhmatov connected the doctrine of parts of speech with syntax and singled out 14 parts of speech:

- significant: noun, adjective, verb and adverbs, non-pronouns and non-numerals;
- non-significant: numerals, pronominal nouns, pronominal adjectives, pronominal adverbs;
- service: preposition, copula, union, prefix, particle;
- separate interjection.

Lev Shcherba distinguished significant words: nouns, adjectives, adverbs, quantitative words, category of state, verb; service words: connectives, prepositions, conjunctions; and interjections.

In the works of Viktor Vinogradov, parts of speech are distinguished as follows: noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun - in a state of decomposition, verb, adverb, category of state. In addition to them, Vinogradov defined particles of speech: particles in the proper sense, particles-bundles, prepositions, conjunctions; modal words; interjections.

The conclusions regarding the distribution of the PD by groups are as follows: when classifying parts of speech, one should undoubtedly be guided by the principle of multidimensional characteristics of parts of speech, i.e. PDs must be qualified on the basis of a set of differential features. But in difficult, controversial cases, when some criteria or features contradict others, the conceptual and semantic aspects (the word as a lexico-semantic unit) and functional (the word as an element of a phrase or sentence) should become decisive. Functional-semantic categories are the basis of the doctrine of parts of speech. [2]



We are deeply convinced that the marking of parts of speech should be carried out with the help of mental-conceptual and formal means, but primarily on the basis of the categorical semantics of words, superimposed on the lexical meaning of the word.

To once again demonstrate the primacy of general thinking categories in the characterization of words, let us dwell on the concept called names. There is not a single cross-cutting universal grammatical category characteristic of all names. Genus does not have the nouns *Pyria tantum*, as well as the pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person, and almost all numerals; numbers do not have numerals and some pronouns; a huge number of indeclinable foreign nouns, abbreviations, short adjectives do not change by case, and some pronouns also do not have a case. All these words are united by the common name "names" because they mean a certain entity, implied by native speakers as "something like that", interpreted as a generalized name (traditionally, their single name is not at all without reason). Native speakers "feel" the heterogeneity of the words stored in memory, and "recognize" these units as belonging to certain verbal groups, at the same time "feel" a certain commonality of certain classes of words (in this case, names).

List of used literature

1. Алпатов В.М. История лингвистических учений. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999. - 368 с.
2. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Спорные проблемы семантики. Волгоград: Перемена, 1999. - 274 с.
3. Нематжорова Н. Б. Концепт «Человека И Природы» В Литературе //Miasto Przyszłości. – 2022. – Т. 30. – С. 223-225.
4. Bohodirovna N. N., Khafizova D. The Connection Between Nature and Man in the Works of Isajon Sulton and Paulo Coelho //TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI. – 2021. – Т. 1. – №. 5. – С. 191-193.
5. Nematjanova N. Person as a subject of the world in literary criticism //Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research (AJMR). – 2021. – Т. 10. – №. 3. – С. 506-509.
6. Bohodirovna N. N. Symbolic and Mythological Interpretation of the Feminine Principle in the Novel by P. Coelho " The Witch with Portobello //International Journal of Development and Public Policy. – 2021. – Т. 1. – №. 4. – С. 34-36.
7. Nafisa N., Diana K. Analysis of Nabokov's " Lolita" //Vital Annex: International Journal of Novel Research in Advanced Sciences. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. 2. – С. 9-11.
8. Нематжорова Н. Б., Каримов Ж. ЯВЛЕНИЕ ГЛОБАЛИЗМА В РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ //GOLDEN BRAIN. – 2023. – Т. 1. – №. 3. – С. 281-284.