

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
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: 2019 Issue: 06 Volume: 74

Published: 22.06.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Dilbar Abduraxmanova

Namangan Institute of Engineering Technology
Russian language teacher of

Nilifar Ibragimova

Namangan Institute of Engineering Technology
Russian language teacher of

Ra'no Sherg'oziyeva

Namangan Institute of Engineering Technology
Russian language teacher of
Uzbekistan, Namangan

**SECTION 21. Pedagogy. Psychology.
Innovations in the field of education.**

FEATURES OF MODERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Abstract: This article discusses the features of the development of modern Russian language. The development of the vocabulary of the Russian language is discussed. Considered phraseological units, their main features.

Key words: Language, Russian, Phraseology, Phonetics, Methodology, Linguistics.

Language: English

Citation: Abduraxmanova, D., Ibragimova, N., & Sherg'oziyeva, R. (2019). Features of modern Russian language development. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 06 (74), 374-378.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-74-46> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.06.74.46>

Introduction

The problem of the word in linguistics can not yet be considered fully illuminated. There is no doubt that the understanding of the category of a word and the content of a category of a word have historically changed. The structure of the word is heterogeneous in languages of different systems and at different stages of language development. But even if we ignore the complex issues of the history of a word as a language category, correlative with the category of a sentence, there is still a lot of unclear in the description of the semantic structure of the word itself. Linguists avoid giving a definition of a word or an exhaustive description of its structure, willingly limiting its task to indicating only some external (mainly phonetic) or internal (grammatical or lexical-semantic) features of a word. With a one-sided approach to the word, the contradictory complexity of its structure immediately appears and the general concept of the word is divided into many empirical varieties of words. There are "words phonetic", "words grammatical", "words lexical". Phonetic word boundaries, marked in different languages by special phonological signals (for example, in Russian language stress and the related phenomena of pronunciation, stunning final voiced consonants and the lack of regressive

assimilation of softness at the end). Accented in some languages are not as sharply defined as the boundaries between morphemes (i.e. significant parts of words — the root or grammatical elements of speech).

Materials and Methods

On the other hand, the phonetic line between a word and a phrase, i.e. a close group of words, in many cases also seems to be unstable, mobile. For example, in French, "words are not phonetically distinguished by anything," and "groups of words expressing a single semantic whole", so-called "dynamic, or rhythmic groups," are singled out in the audio flow. If we consider the structure of the word from a grammatical point of view, then the integrity and unity of the word also turn out to be largely illusory. "The word is one of the smallest completely self-contained pieces of an isolated" Meaning ", to which a sentence comes down," formulates Sapir. However, not all types of words with the same convenience fit into this formula. After all, "there are so many words that are only morphemes, and morphemes, which are sometimes still words." A word can express both a single concept, a concrete, abstract, and a general idea of a relation (as, for example, prepositions from or about or a union and), and a thought concluded (for

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

example, Kozma Prutkov's aphorism: "Strike!"). True, the profound difference between words and morphemes seems to be found in the fact that only a word can move more or less freely within a sentence, and morphemes that make up a word are usually fixed (however, cf., for example, licorite and sauteolysis, toby and chipper or wise and wise; but the quill-driver and hackles are heterogeneous). The ability of the word to move and change places within a sentence is different in different languages. Consequently, this criterion of independence and isolation of the word is shaky, fluid. In languages such as Russian, the difference between a word and a morpheme is supported by the impossibility of wiring other words or phrases into the same word. But all these signs have a different value when applied to different categories of words. For example, no one, but: no one; no one, but: no one; because, but: I did not write because I lost your address, etc. (cf.: there is where, but: there is nowhere; it is unhealthy, but: it doesn't very well with the absence of the word "hello", etc.) Such modal ("introductory") words and particles, who knows (Ai, pug, to know, she is strong, that barks at the elephant), they say, they are not able to be a potential minimum of the sentence and are deprived of independent meaning. In this regard, even alliances and prepositions are happier.

Thus, the grammatical (and also lexico-semantic) melancholy of sight reveals the diversity of types of words and the absence of common stable features in them. Not all words can be names, not all are members of a sentence. Even the forms of relationships and relationships between the categories of words and sentences in this language system are very diverse. They depend on language-specific methods of forming words and methods of linking words into larger units. "The more synthetic a language is, in other words, the more clearly the role of each word in a sentence indicates its own resources, the less need to apply, bypassing the word, to the sentence as a whole." But, on the other hand, in the structure of the word itself, the semantic elements are related, combined with each other according to strictly defined laws and adjoined to each other in a strictly defined sequence. And this means that a word consisting not of a single root element, but of several morphemes, "is the crystallization of a sentence or some passage fragment". Against the background of these contradictions, the idea arises that in the language system a word is only a form of relationship between morphemes and sentences, which are the basic functional units of speech.

It is "something in a certain way designed, taking something larger, smaller from the conceptual material of the whole thought as a whole, depending on the" spirit "of the given language." The convenience of this formula is that it is wide and vague. Under it fit the most distant grammatical and semantic types of words: the words are names, and

formal, connected words, and interjections, and modal words. It does not contradict the use of morphemes as words. When describing the semantic structure of a word, the differences between the main semantic types of words stand out more clearly and the role of grammatical factors in different categories of words is more widely understood. Understanding the structure of the word is often hampered by the polysemy of the term "meaning". The dangers associated with the undifferentiated use of this concept, make themselves felt in such a superficial and erroneous, but going from the old and very common definition of the word: "Words are sounds of speech in their meanings" (otherwise: "every sound of speech that has a meaning in language separately from other sounds, which are words, is the word "). If the structure of the word was only two-sided, consisted only of sound and meaning, then in language for every new concept and representation, for every new shade, special, separate words would have to exist or arise in thoughts and feelings. It is well known that, first of all, the word performs a nominative or definitive function, i.e. or is a means of clear designation, and then it is a simple sign, or a means of logical definition, then it is a scientific term. Words taken out of the system of language as a whole, only in their relation to things and phenomena of reality, serve as different signs, names of these phenomena of reality, reflected in the public consciousness. Considered only from this point of view, words, in essence, are still devoid of correlative language forms and meanings.

They come close to each other phonetically, but are not connected either grammatically or semantically. From the point of view of material relations, the relationship between the table and the dining room, between the guest, the present and treat, between the oak and the cudgel, between the vein in the direct nominative sense and the verbs to heal, trim, etc. turns out to be unmotivated and random. The meaning of the word is far from coinciding with the indication contained in it on the subject, with its function of the name, with its subject relatedness (gegenstan -dlische Beziehung). In so far as the word contains an indication of an object, it is necessary for the language to know the objects denoted by words, it is necessary to know the whole range of the relevant material culture. The same names in different epochs denote different objects and different concepts. On the other hand, each social environment is characterized by the peculiarities of its designations. The same subjects are interpreted in different ways by people of different education, different worldviews, different professional skills. Therefore, the same Russian word as an indication of the subject includes a different content in the speech of different social or cultural groups. The need to reckon with the study of the history of words with the history of the things they designate is generally recognized. As a name, as an indication of the subject, the word is a cultural-

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

historical thing. "Where there is a community of culture and technology, the word indicates the same subject; where it is violated, the meaning of the word is broken up. "However, it is easy to see that not all types of words perform a nominative, or definitive, function. It is deprived of all official words, in the semantic structure of which purely grammatical meanings and relations prevail. The nominative function is also alien to interjections and the so-called "introductory" words. In addition, pronominal words, although they may be names, are more often equivalent to names.

Thus, when analyzing material relations of a word, differences between different structural-semantic types of words sharply come out. The transition from the nominative function of a verbal language to the semantic forms of the word itself is usually associated with the communicative function of speech. In the process of speech communication, the real relationship and meaning of the word may diverge. This discrepancy is especially palpable when the word does not name the object or phenomenon, but it characterizes it (for example: living power, cap - as applied to a man, woman - in relation to a man, hat - in a figurative sense, etc.). In this regard, the word acts as a system of forms and meanings, correlative with other sense units of the language. A word considered in the context of a language, i.e. taken in the totality of its forms and values, often called a token. Regardless of its given usage, the word is present in the consciousness with all its meanings, with hidden and possible, ready to surface for the first reason. But, of course, one or another meaning of the word is realized and determined by the context of its use.

In essence, how many separate contexts of the use of a given word, so many of its meanings, so many of its lexical forms; at the same time, however, the word does not cease to be one, it usually does not break up into separate words-homonyms. The semantic word boundary is a homonym. The word as a single system of internally related meanings is understood only in the context of the entire system of a given language. Internally, the unity of the word is ensured not only by the unity of the system of its meanings, which, in turn, is determined by the general laws of the semantic system of the language as a whole. Language is enriched with the development of ideas, and the same outer shell of the word is overgrown with shoots of new meanings and meanings. When one member of the chain is touched, the whole responds and sounds. The emerging concept is consonant with all that is associated with individual members of the chain to the extreme limits of this relationship. The ways of combining and separating meanings in the structure of a word are conditioned by the semantic system of the language as a whole or its individual styles. The study of changes in the principles of combining verbal meanings in a "bundle" cannot lead to broad generalizations, to the

discovery of semantic laws, apart from the general problem of the history of social worldviews, the problem of language in thinking. With a different point of view, "the very meaning of the word would continue to remain dark and incomprehensible without perceiving it in the general complex of the entire worldview of the era under study. The scope and content of the concepts denoted by words, their classification and differentiation, gradually becoming clearer and taking shape, substantially and many times change as the language develops.

They are different at different stages of its history. A characteristic feature of the Russian language is the tendency to group words in large groups around the main centers of meaning. The word as a system of forms and meanings is the focus of connection and interaction of grammatical categories of a language. No language would be able to express each particular idea as an independent word or root element. The concreteness of experience is limitless, the resources of the richest language are strictly limited. A language is compelled to distribute an infinite number of meanings under one or another of the headings of basic concepts, using other specific or semi-concrete ideas as intermediary functional connections. Therefore, the very nature of the combination of lexical and grammatical meanings in the structure of different types of words is heterogeneous. The lexical meanings of a word are summed up under grammatical categories. The word is an internal, constructive unity of lexical and grammatical meanings. The definition of the lexical meanings of a word already includes indications of the grammatical characteristic of the word. Grammatical forms and meanings of the word then collide, then merge with its lexical meanings. The semantic contours of the owl, the internal connection of its meanings, its semantic scope are determined by the grammatical structure of the language. Differences in the syntactic properties of the word, in the peculiarities of its phrasal usage are in a lively connection with differences in the meanings of the word. Ways of semantic evolution of words are often determined by the laws of the development of morphological categories. It is well known that a word belonging to a circle of parts of speech with a rich arsenal of inflection is a complex system of grammatical forms that perform various syntactic functions. Separate forms can fall away from the structure of a word and turn into independent words (for example, noun forms become an adverb).

Grammatically, the laws determine the methods and principles of communication and morpheme ratios in the language system, the ways of their constructive association and word. The shift in the forms of word formation changes the whole system of vocabulary. Grammatical forms and relationships between elements of the language system define the line separating words, which are represented by

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

arbitrary, not motivated language signs, from words whose meanings are more or less motivated. The motivation of the meanings of words is connected with the understanding of their structure, with the living consciousness of the semantic relations between the verbal elements of the language system. Differences between motivated and unmotivated words are caused not only by grammatical, but also by lexical-semantic connections of words. Here opens the area of new semantic relations in the structure of the word, the area of the so-called "internal forms" of the word. The word as a creative act of speech and thought, - teaches Potebnya, - includes, in addition to sounds and meanings, another representation (or internal form), otherwise "sign of value". In the "internal forms" of the word reflects "the interpretation of reality, its processing for new, more complex, higher goals of life." Complicated verbal compositions of poetic creativity are connected with this circle of semantic elements of the word. The "inner forms" of words are historically changeable. They are determined by the characteristic of the language of a particular era, the style of a particular environment, the way of looking at reality, and the nature of the relationship between elements of the semantic system.

It is easy to see that "inner forms" in different categories of words appear differently. The types of words such as auxiliary words, modal words, until now, the concept of the inner form, in essence, did not extend, although the immense role of the inner forms affects their formation and use. In the internal forms of the word, it is not only the "interpretation of reality" that is expressed, but also its assessment. The word not only possesses grammatical and lexical, subject meanings, but at the same time expresses an assessment of the subject — collective or individual. The objective meaning of a word is formed to a certain extent by this assessment, and the evaluation has a creative role in the changes of meanings. The word transfuses expressive colors of the social environment. Reflecting the personality (individual or collective) of the subject of speech, characterizing his assessment of reality, he qualifies him as a representative of a particular social group. This circle of hues expressed by a word is called expression of the word, its expressive forms. Expression is always subjective, characteristic and personal - from the most fleeting to the most stable, from the agitated moment to the constancy of not only the person, his closest environment, class, but also the era, the people of culture. The subject-logical meaning of each word is surrounded by a special expressive atmosphere, fluctuating depending on the context. Expressive power is inherent in the sounds of the word and their

various combinations, morphemes and their combinations, lexical meanings.

Conclusion

Words are in continuous communication with our entire intellectual and emotional life. The word is both a sign of the speaker's mind and a sign of all other mental experiences that are part of the task and intention of the message. Expressive colors enclose the meaning of a word; they may thicken under the influence of emotional suffixes. Expressive shades are inherent in grammatical categories and forms. They abruptly appear both in the sound form of words and in the intonation of speech. The expressive saturation of an expression depends on its meaning, on the intrinsicity of its inner form, on the degree of its semantic activity in the general spiritual atmosphere of a given environment and a given time. The trend of expressive enriches the language with specific elements, products of affects and the speaker's subjectivity; she creates new words and expressions; intellectual trend, analytical eliminates emotional elements, creates from a part of their formal affiliation. All variety of meanings, functions and semantic nuances of the word is concentrated and united in its stylistic characteristics. In the stylistic assessment, a new sphere of semantic shades of words appears, connected with their individual "passport". The stylistic essence of a word is determined by its individual position in the semantic system of a language, in the circle of its functional and genre varieties (written language, oral language, their types, language of fiction, etc.). The fact is that a developed language is a dynamic system of semantic patterns that determine the relationships and connections of verbal forms and meanings in different styles of this language. And in this system of semantic relations, the functions and possibilities of different categories of words are more or less outlined and individualized. The individual characteristic of the word depends on the preceding speech tradition and on the modern correlation of semantic elements in the language system and in its stylistic variations. In this regard, the words and their forms receive new qualifications, undergo a new grouping, a new differentiation, breaking up into every day, solemn, poetic, prosaic, archaic, etc. This stylistic qualification of words is caused not only by the individual position of the word or the corresponding series of words in the semantic system of the literary language as a whole, but also by the functions of the word in the structure of active and living varieties, types of this language. A developed literary language is a very complex system of more or less synonymous means of expression, one way or another correlated with each other.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

References:

1. Vinogradov, V. V. (1972). *Russian language "High School"*. Moscow.
2. (2001). Edited by Lekanta P.A. *Modern Russian language*. The bustard. Moscow.
3. Shansky, N. M., & Ivanov, V. V. (1981). *Modern Russian (Part I) Enlightenment*. Moscow.
4. Vershinina, N. A. (2004). *Pedagogy as a socio-humanitarian scientific discipline: scientific and methodological materials*. T.1. (p.220). SPb.: Publishing house SPSU.
5. Dmitriev, Y. A. (2010). Fundamentals of legal pedagogy as a branch of pedagogy, science and academic discipline. *Education and law, No. 8*, pp.7-23.
6. (2010). *Law of the Russian Federation "On Education"*. (p.160). Moscow: Eksmo.
7. Kaynova, E. B. (2005). *The course of modern practical pedagogy*. (p.140). Moscow: AIC.
8. (2011). *Creative pedagogy. Methodology, theory, practice*. (p.320). Moscow: Binom. Laboratory of knowledge.
9. Popik, V. A. (2010). Qualification requirements for the modern teacher in the context of the competence-based approach. *Pedagogical Sciences, No. 5*, pp.91-92.
10. Muxiddinova, X. G. (2018). The role of information in the development of the society. *Ekonomika i sotsium, №. 9*, pp.45-47.
11. Dexqonova, S., & Muxiddinova, X. G. (2017). Relationship and interaction of rights and morals. *Teoriya i praktika sovremennoy nauki, №. 5*, pp.15-17.
12. Dexqonova, S., & Muxiddinova, X. G. (2017). Relationship and interaction of rights and morals. *Teoriya i praktika sovremennoy nauki, №. 5*, pp.15-17.
13. Urinboev, K. B., & Nurmatov, A. R. (2017). Novye pedagogicheskie tendentsii i problemy sovremennogo sotsiuma. *Teoriya i praktika sovremennoy nauki, №. 4*, pp.812-815.
14. O'rinboev, X. B. (2017). View of spiritual threats in the context of globalization. *Teoriya i praktika sovremennoy nauki, №. 4*, pp.34-37.