

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

## International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 06 Volume: 86

Published: 30.06.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Elvira Vitalevna Sadikova  
Termez State University  
Department of Russian Linguistics

## INTRODUCTION TO THE GRAMMAR OF THE WORD

**Abstract:** *The article discusses the grammatical system of the modern Russian language, it is necessary to make deeper use of the grammatical heritage and to draw more widely on the fresh facts of the living language.*

**Key words:** *grammatical, language, linguistics.*

**Language:** *English*

**Citation:** Sadikova, E. V. (2020). Introduction to the grammar of the word. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (86), 768-770.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-86-144> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.06.86.144>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1203.

### Introduction

Indeed, the compilation of the grammar of any language is fraught with the greatest difficulties - theoretical and practical. The scope and objectives of the grammar are not delineated with sufficient clarity. The methods of grammar research among different linguists are very heterogeneous. So, in the grammar of the modern Russian language, there are more disagreements and contradictions than in any other science. Why is that? Two general reasons can be pointed out. One is purely practical. The grammatical structure of the Russian language is poorly understood. The coverage of many grammatical questions is based on random material. The most important aspects of the grammatical structure of the Russian language, for example, the relative use of verb tenses, types of Russian verb, category of voice, preposition values, conjunction functions, types of syntagms, methods of combining and disseminating them, modal types of sentences, methods of concatenating sentences, problems of composition and submission in the sentence structure remain insufficiently examined. In fact, the linguistic material on which Russian grammars of various directions are based is poor and monotonous. Many bright ideas, discovered by the previous grammar or again put forward by general linguistics, do not find application in modern grammar teachings. Therefore, when constructing the grammatical system of the modern Russian language, it is necessary to make deeper use of the grammatical heritage and to draw more widely on the fresh facts of the living language. Another

reason for the wanderings of modern grammar is the lack of strong theoretical foundations, the absence of a definition or an accurate description of the basic grammatical concepts, especially the concepts of words and sentences.[1]

### Methodology

Grammar is usually understood as a system of linguistic norms and categories that determine the techniques and types of structure of words, phrases, syntagms and sentences, and the very department of linguistics that studies this system. In grammar as a doctrine of the structure of the language, three parts are most often outlined: 1) the doctrine of the word and its forms, of the ways of forming words and their forms; 2) the doctrine of the phrase, its forms and its types; 3) the doctrine of the sentence and its types, about the components (components) of sentences, about techniques for concatenating sentences, about a complex syntactic whole (phrase). The doctrine of the grammatical structure of words, of the forms of words, of the formation of words and forms of words is usually called morphology and is separated from the syntax as a doctrine of the phrase and sentence.

"Morphology represents, so to speak, an inventory of individual categories of words and their forms, and the syntax shows all these words and forms in their movement and life - as part of speech," - prof. V.A. Bogoroditsky [2].

There are serious objections to such a division of grammar, since the boundaries between morphology and syntax are very unstable and vague. Some

## Impact Factor:

**SIRA (India) = 4.971**  
**ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829**  
**GIF (Australia) = 0.564**  
**JIF = 1.500**

**SIS (USA) = 0.912**  
**PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126**  
**ESJI (KZ) = 8.997**  
**SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667**

**ICV (Poland) = 6.630**  
**PIF (India) = 1.940**  
**IBI (India) = 4.260**  
**OAJI (USA) = 0.350**

grammatical phenomena related to morphology easily find their place in syntax and lexicology. Syntax cannot do without the doctrine of the word as an integral part of a sentence. "Any change in the word given the proposal is understandable only against its general background and cannot be considered separately from it" [3].

Another part of morphology that studies and sets forth methods of word formation can enter lexicology, i.e. the doctrine of the dictionary, of the patterns of change in the lexical system of the language. Thus, the position of morphology as a science of the structure and formation of words and word forms is fragile. F. de Saussure wrote: "Separating morphology from syntax, they refer to the fact that the object of this latter is the functions inherent in linguistic units, while morphology considers only their form ... But this difference is deceptive ... forms and functions form a whole, and it is difficult, not to say impossible, to separate them. From a linguistic point of view, morphology does not have its own real and independent object of study: it cannot constitute a discipline different from the syntax" [4].

The idea that morphology should be reduced to syntax has become a commonplace in some areas of linguistics. So, for example, S.D. Katznelson states: "The illusion of independence and autonomy of the word form led to the separation of morphology from syntax. Surrendering to illusion, science has long considered the word as the starting point of grammatical analysis. Meanwhile, the word form is only a special case of collocation, manifested here only in a more complex and distorted form. The form of the word is therefore subject to reduction to the forms of collocation, just as morphology as a whole is subject to reduction to the syntax" [5].

On the same ground, there is a contrast between the syntax of lexicology. From this point of view, the relationship between syntax and lexicology is being revised. Some linguists tend to consider syntax and lexicology as parts of grammar.

I.I. Meshchaninov writes: "The doctrine of the word, allocated in a special section (lexicology), cannot be taken from the grammatical essay. It is impossible to separate the doctrine of the formal side of a word with its significant parts (morphemes) from the doctrine of the meaning of the word itself ... The removal of lexicology from the grammar essay is harmful to the historical understanding of language categories."

Therefore, I.I. Meshchaninov proposes to divide grammar (minus phonetics) into vocabulary (the doctrine of the word separately and phrases of the lexical order) and syntax (the doctrine of the word in the sentence and the sentence as a whole) [6]. The mere idea of a close connection between grammar and vocabulary is not new.

Shcherba thus drew a boundary line between a descriptive grammar and a dictionary: "In descriptive"

grammar "only more or less living ways of forming word forms and their combinations should be studied; the rest is a matter of a dictionary, which should contain, among other things, a list of morphemes" [7]. However, this scheme is too straightforward. It does not touch upon the general question of the interbreeding and interaction of grammar and vocabulary, but only outlines the autonomous areas of both.

This problem is covered more broadly in de Saussure's Course in General Linguistics. De Saussure pointed out the interpenetration of grammatical and lexical forms and meanings in a living system of language. "Is it logical to exclude lexicology from grammar? At first glance, it might seem that the words, as they are given in the dictionary, seem to defy grammar study, which usually focuses on the relationship between words. But many of these relationships can be expressed with the same success in words, as well as grammatical means."

In terms of function, the lexical fact can merge with the grammatical fact. Thus, the distinction between species (perfect and imperfect) in the Russian language is expressed grammatically in the case of ask - ask and lexicologically in the case of say - speak (cf. : take - take; catch - catch). "The many relationships denoted in some languages by cases or prepositions (or derivative adjectives) are expressed in other languages with complex words (French *royaume des cieux*, Church-Slavic kingdom of heaven, German *Himmelsreich*), or derivatives (French *moulin a vent*, Russian windmill, Polish *wiatr-ak*), or, finally, in simple words (French *bois de chauffage* and Russian firewood, French *bois de construction* and Russian forest).

"Every word that is not a simple and indecomposable unit does not differ significantly from a member of a phrase, that is, a syntactic fact: the routine of its lower-order units obeys the same basic principles as the formation of phrases." "The interpenetration of morphology, syntax and lexicology is explained essentially by the same nature of all synchronous facts." However, vocabulary does not cover the whole grammar.

Vocabulary and grammar "are, as it were, two poles between which the entire language system develops, two countercurrents along which the movement of the language is directed: on the one hand. The tendency to use a lexicological tool - an unmotivated sign, on the other hand, the preference for a grammatical tool - the rule constructions" [8].

Even more decisively the dependence of grammar on the dictionary was claimed by G. Schuhardt and N.Ya. Marr wrote: "Morphology ... includes not only the so-called grammatical categories, but also a dictionary ... The laws of semantics most closely affect the essence of morphology, because it would not be enough to say that morphology only reflects the state of social

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHII (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.997	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

organization, - the very state of formation of this organization and its social ideas is deposited in morphology "[9]. G. Schuardt spoke in the same vein, stating that the essence of grammar is the doctrine of meanings and that the dictionary is only an alphabetical index to the grammar [10].

Nevertheless, the undivided inclusion of lexicology in grammar seems insufficiently motivated. Lexicology, as a doctrine on the composition and system of the dictionary, on the laws of historical changes in vocabulary systems and their internal relationships with the conditions of life, production, with forms of material culture and social worldviews, has its own material, its own method and its own object of study. "The dictionary embodies the tendency in language and thinking to consciously embrace individual objects, properties, phenomena, processes; the grammar grows on the basis of those

general connections that unite objects, phenomena, etc. ... That's why such specific meanings as a house or tree, etc., by their very nature cannot be represented in grammar, but, on the other hand, general categories like being or essence are reflected in the word historically later than in grammar, at the stage when scientific thought reveals these categories as separate concrete moments of the universal connection of things and phenomena in nature "[11].

### Conclusion

However, in the real history of the language, grammatical and lexical forms and meanings are organically connected, constantly affect each other. Therefore, the study of the grammatical structure of a language without taking into account its lexical side, without taking into account the interaction of lexical and grammatical meanings, is impossible.

### References:

1. (1896). *A critical review of the work of A. Duvernois, "Materials for the dictionary of the Old Russian language."* (p.8). SPb.
2. Bogoroditsky, V.A. (1935). *General course of Russian grammar.* (p.207). M, L.
3. Meshchaninov, I.I. (1940). *General linguistics.* (p.35). Moscow.
4. De Saussure, F. (1933). *Course in General Linguistics.* (p.130). Moscow.
5. Katznelson, S. D. (1941). *A brief outline of linguistics.* (p.34). L..
6. Meshchaninov, I.I. (n.d.). *General Linguistics.* (p.37).
7. Shcherba, L.V. (1915). *Some conclusions from my dialectological puddle observations,* In the book: East Luzhitsky dialect. Pg..
8. De Saussure, F. (n.d.). *Course in General Linguistics,* (p. 129).
9. Marr, N.Ya. (1933). *Selected Works,* vol. 1. L., pp. 189-190.
10. (1928). Schuardt-Brevier H. Halle, (p.135).
11. Katznelson, S.D. (n.d.). *A brief outline of linguistics.* (p. 24).