

# ON WAYS OF EXPRESSING THE FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC FIELD OF MOTION IN THE RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

A.T.Nurmanov

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10702125>

**Abstract.** *The article is devoted to a functional-semantic comparative analysis of the field of movement in the Russian and Uzbek languages. As it is emphasized in it, the FSP of direction and frequency of movement in the Russian and Uzbek languages is implemented differentially, which affects the processes of their adequate perception and use in communication. A comparative study of the nature of movement and the method of movement in the Russian and Uzbek languages allowed the author to assert that the nature of the direction of movement expressed by the verbs of movement of the Uzbek language is fundamentally different than in the Russian language: they “express oriented movement: an object or person moves in the direction towards us or from U.S. And the semantic category of “mode of movement” is one of the main attributes of the semantics of Russian verbs of movement. It characterizes movement depending on the environment, on the use (non-use) of vehicles when moving. In the Uzbek language, the method of movement is expressed by various lexical-syntactic and contextual means.*

**Keywords:** *functional, functional-communicative approach, lexical-semantic group of verbs, verbs of movement, description, content, utterance as a unit of text, text, text linguistics, functional-semantic field, direction of movement, method of movement.*

## INTRODUCTION

In higher educational institutions of the republic, the main task at the present stage is to ensure the quality of training of future specialists based on the use of the results of research works of local and foreign scientists in the practice of teaching foreign languages. In foreign theory and practice of teaching foreign languages (including Russian), a functional-semantic approach to the study of lexical and grammatical phenomena of a non-native language is being actively introduced. It is the functional aspect of language learning that is of keen interest to many linguists and methodologists today.

The functional-communicative approach seems to be especially productive in teaching those microsystems that are communicatively relevant and at the same time specific to the language system. These include verbs of motion in the Russian language.

The lexical-semantic group of verbs of motion constitutes specificity not only in the Russian verb system, but also in the language system in general.

Being frequent in speech and used in many functional varieties of language, verbs of motion, due to the specificity of their lexical and grammatical properties, as well as due to significant differences with Uzbek equivalents, cause serious difficulties in learning them by students of schools with Uzbek and other languages of instruction, as evidenced by numerous errors when using verbs of motion in speech.

Verbs of motion as a specific group of lexical richness of the Russian language continue to attract close attention of modern foreign researchers. According to T. A. Maysak, verbs of motion

are among the most common diachronic sources of grammatical indicators [Maysak, 2005, p. 17]. In her work, Laura Yanda also points out the fact that verbs of motion are diachronic sources in the development of the Russian aspectual system from the 16th to the 18th centuries. In addition, based on research within the framework of cognitive theory, Laura Janda considers verbs of motion as a prototype for the verbal system [Janda, 2008, p. 3]. Verbs of motion, according to Maisak, are part of the core of the system of linguistic means denoting spatial relationships and belong to the most significant lexical units of natural language.

Comparing verbs of motion with other verbs, psycholinguists G. Miller and F. Johnson-Laird believe that it is this group of verbs that children remember and learn most easily. Verbs of movement are extremely frequent in speech and are significant for describing the process of movement, which allows us to call this group of verbs “the most verbal among verbs” [Maisak 2005: 101; Miller & Johnson-Laird 1976: 527]. According to Yarema, verbs of motion can be classified depending on what is to be described with their help, what phenomena or situations they reflect in their meaning. The lack of consensus on the principles of identifying verbs of this group creates difficulty in establishing its quantitative composition [Yarema, 2008, p. 1]. The lack of consensus on the principles of identifying verbs of this group creates difficulty in establishing its quantitative composition [Yarema, 2008, p. 1].

In modern theoretical Russian studies, significant progress has been made in the study of verbs of motion as a unique phenomenon in the Russian language (see the works of A.V. Isachenko, A.V. Bondarko, A.N. Tikhonova, etc.). Issues of methodology for studying verbs of this LSG in a foreign audience are covered in the works of G.I. Rozhkova, G.G. Gorodilova, L.S. Muravyova, T.A. Bitekhtina, etc. Significant experience has also been accumulated in the practice of teaching Russian verbs of motion in the national audience (see works by F.Yu. Akhmadullina, G.Zh. Khanov, I.M. Stepanova, A.T. Nurmanov, etc.). Intensive searches for the most rational ways and means of using functional grammar data, observed over the past decades in the theory and practice of teaching foreign languages, are also characteristic of the mentioned studies. However, this problem has not yet been the subject of special methodological research, at least in relation to the study of Russian verbs of motion in the Uzbek secondary school.

None of the above-mentioned authors addresses issues related to overcoming the contradictions between the traditionally established system of studying verbs of motion and modern methodological trends, most clearly expressed in the functional approach and communicative orientation of teaching the Russian language in schools with Uzbek and other languages of instruction.

This study, dedicated to the ways of expressing the functional-semantic field of movement in the Russian and Uzbek languages, is based on the achievements of modern functional-communicative linguistics and linguodidactics.

A review of the types of functional approaches shows that there is no single point of view on this issue in linguistics. Naturally, there is no single point of view in understanding the functional approach to language learning in methodological science. Among the representatives of this approach to teaching a non-native language there is no conceptual or terminological unity.

#### **LITERATURE REVIEW (Analysis and results)**

The essence of the functional approach to the study of linguistic phenomena is, according to some methodologists, that when teaching any type of speech activity, the components of the act of speech, their properties and connections between them should be considered from the angle of

their natural functioning in speech [Ilyin, 1986, p. .57]. This type of functional approach is widely used in teaching foreign languages both in our country and abroad. Its conceptual basis is the linguistic theory of the speech act. This theory reveals a number of common points with the theory of speech activity.

The most significant point of similarity is the rejection of the primacy of the language system and an attempt to consider language in the context of human activity. With this functional approach, the selection and grouping of linguistic material is carried out on the basis of speech intentions.

According to other researchers, the functional approach should be understood as the description and organization of educational and linguistic material from content to form of expression (Kostomarov V.G., Mitrofanova O.D., Korostelev V.S., etc.).

In the methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language, the functional approach is sometimes identified with the situational-thematic one. Here it determines the order and sequence of studying the grammatical material necessary for verbal communication.

In recent years, in connection with the development of the linguistic theory of text, both in Russian and in foreign methods, another type of functional approach to teaching foreign language speech has emerged. Representatives of this direction of the functional approach proceed from the idea of a speech action - an utterance as a unit of text, derivative and dependent on its communicative orientation and structural organization. The turn of linguistics towards text became a "revolution in linguistics" (V.A. Maslova).

The essence of the anthropocentric paradigm is most clearly manifested in textual studies, because a text cannot be studied outside of the person who is its creator and reader. A synergetic approach has come to text linguistics (N.F. Aliferenko): it is synergy that allows traditional science to open new perspectives on the study of text, which are both anthropocentrism and the cognitive approach, because now it is impossible to consider the text outside of its connection with cognitive structures and psychomental processes: perception, understanding, etc.

The methodology for teaching Russian as a non-native language is generally characterized by a traditional understanding of the functional approach, which is based on its linguistic definition and means what is the purpose of a particular language unit (what? for what?). This term was introduced into the methodology of teaching the Russian (native) language by M.T. Baranov. In "Methods of teaching the Russian language", when characterizing the principles of teaching, he classifies the functional principle as a general didactic one, i.e., to the principles that apply in the study of any branch of the science of language.

The content of this principle "is to show the functions (i.e., the role) of linguistic phenomena in language and speech." Thus, the key word "functional" in this term reflects the connection with the meanings of the word "function" and is its derivative in both word-formation and semantic aspects.

And as a methodological, the functional approach was first implemented in the monograph by L.A. Trostentsova "Teaching the Russian language at school as a purposeful process (morphological aspect)." Analyzing the traditional system of teaching morphology, the author states that the knowledge and skills acquired in morphology lessons (the ability to distinguish parts of speech, morphological categories, lexico-grammatical categories of words and formal classes of words, give morphological characteristics of word forms, etc.), do not in themselves develop the ability to use the literary language in various spheres of public life, but ensure the achievement

of the general goals of the course: “from the ability to recognize parts of speech and their inherent morphological features largely depend on the success of spelling, punctuation, syntactic and stylistic analysis, and, consequently, mastery of the relevant norms of the Russian literary language.” Consequently, morphology acquires practical significance due to its connections with other sections of the school course.

In the methods of teaching the Russian language, both native and non-native, today there has been increased attention of researchers to the substantiation of the functional approach in the current conditions of language teaching, the features of its implementation in the educational process (Rozhkova G.I., Kupalova A.Yu., Trostentsova L.A., Baranov M.T., Bystrova E.A., Alekseeva O.V., etc.).

Despite the different points of view in understanding and implementing the functional approach in language teaching methods, recently there has been a clear trend towards convergence of the positions of researchers. This is evidenced by the analysis of scientific and educational literature (E.V. Arkhipova, E.I. Litnevskaya, T.M. Voiteleva, R.B. Sabatkov, I.Yu. Gats), as well as materials of scientific and practical conferences (Functional approach in Teaching Non-Native Languages, 1993). In most of these sources, the functional approach is mainly considered as an implementation of the principle of communicability, which is reflected in the consideration of such problems as the functional-communicative approach, practical grammar of the functional-communicative type, functional-communicative description of the Russian language, etc.

Today, the “functional principle” in the Russian language methodology is defined as one of the priorities in connection with the formation of a new pedagogical paradigm. According to modern experts, the functional principle is in demand in the methodology, since it “serves as a bridge” from cognition of the language system (traditional aspect of teaching) to communication (new aspect of teaching), i.e., ensures the development of language as a functioning system.

It should be noted that the methodology also has a narrower definition of the functional approach, namely, as students’ understanding of the functions of the structures being studied in combination with their syntactic-semantic relationship and design.

Thus, at the present stage of development of methodological science, many definitions of the functional approach to learning language for communication have emerged. Consequently, this approach is implemented in different ways in practice.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

When justifying the methodological content of the functional orientation of teaching Russian verbs of motion to Uzbek students, we relied on these approaches and sought to use them taking into account the specifics of the language material being studied, the age characteristics of students, the level of their knowledge, abilities and skills, as well as communicative needs and motives for learning a second language.

Comparing the FSP of direction and frequency of movement in the Russian and Uzbek languages, we relied on the well-known works of V.G. Gak, A.V. Isachenko, A.V. Bondarko and other researchers [V. Gak, 1988; A. Isachenko, 1961; A. Bondarko, 1971], in which the idea is expressed that “the concept of a functional-semantic category can be applied in comparative research” [Bondarko, 1971, p. 12].

In the linguistic literature, quite a lot of attention is paid to the comparative study of verbs of motion. Noteworthy is the comparative coverage of this group of words in the Russian and Uzbek languages in the works of M.I. Khabibov and M.R. Sattorova.

A methodologically oriented comparison of verbs of motion requires not only the establishment of similar and different facts in the Russian and Uzbek languages (which was the main focus of the above-mentioned works), but also how these verbs are used in certain contexts and situations of real communication. “Languages differ not only in what they have, but, perhaps even more so, in how they use what they have” [Gak, 1989, p. 22].

Thus, our task is to compare the FSP direction and frequency of movement in the Russian and Uzbek languages to create a functional methodology for studying it in the Uzbek secondary school. Comparison in functional terms can be on two levels: 1. Semasiological level (how similar linguistic elements are used in speech in different languages, what meanings they express); 2. Onomasiological plan (by what means are meanings and functions expressed in different languages). In both cases, the comparison covers not only the facts of the language system, but also speech implementations, so texts in two languages can be effective material for comparison.

First of all, it should be noted that the Russian and Uzbek languages belong to different typological groups, which determines significant differences in the expression of action by verbs of these languages. Despite this, when comparatively characterizing verbs of motion in a functional aspect, it should be borne in mind that languages, no matter how genetically distant from each other, have much in common, since “all languages are built according to the same model” [Yakobson R.O., 1965, p.383]. This is confirmed by the fact that the verb (fe’l) in the Uzbek language, as in Russian, denotes the action and state of persons and objects and has the following categories: voice – fe’l nisbatlari, moods – fe’l mayllari, tense – fe’l zamonlari, transitivity - intransitivity – o’timli – o’timsiz, faces (numbers) – shaxs (sleep).

There are, undoubtedly, verbs of movement in the Uzbek language, because the movement of an object in space is an objective phenomenon. And the expression of phenomena and processes of reality by one means or another is inherent in every language. However, only indirect attention was paid to the study of the structural-semantic, morphological-syntactic features of verbs of motion of the Uzbek language, since it was believed that they “in their content are closely related to verbs of action and state... the identification of verbs of motion by their semantics is very conditional” [Tenishev, 1961, p.232].

In Uzbek linguistics, the term “verbs of motion” is used in a broad sense. A.G. Gulyamov wrote about this: “The word “movement” in the grammar of the Uzbek language is used in a very broad meaning. It denotes both dynamic movements: yugurmoq (run), o’qimok (read), yurmoq (walk), qimirlamoq (move), and various processes: eshitmoq (listen), ko’rmoq (see), eslamoq (remember), qarimoq (to grow old) ”[Gulyamov, 1954, p. 3].

In K. Khalikov’s study, the term “verbs of motion” is conventionally (according to the author) used in a narrow sense, and by verbs of motion the author understands one lexical-semantic group of verbs. At the same time, the researcher proceeds from the fact that the word “harakat” (movement) entered the Uzbek language from the Arabic language, and initially it denoted a specific movement-movement [K. Khalikov, 1967, p.5].

K. Khalikov divides verbs of motion in the Uzbek language into the following groups: 1. verbs of general meaning (bormoq, kelmoq, qaytmoq, kirmoq, chiqmoq, tushmoq, etc.); 2. verbs of private meaning (uchmoq, oqmoq, etc.). They, in turn, are divided into subgroups: a) verbs denoting methods of movement: uchmoq, suzmoq, dumalamoq; b) verbs denoting speed of movement: yugurmoq, chopmoq, qochmoq, yelmoq, etc.; c) verbs denoting movement to overcome an obstacle: kechmoq, oshmoq, o’tmoq, etc.

The FSP of the direction and frequency of movement in the Russian language, as noted above, is realized: a) by the semantics of the verbs of movement themselves and b) by various contextual means. In other words, the meanings of direction and frequency of movement are expressed in Russian by the semantics of contrasting verbs like go-go in interaction with various contextual elements.

In the Uzbek language there are no correlative pairs of verbs of movement such as go-walk, run-run, etc., that is, there is no opposition on the semantic grounds of unidirectionality - non-unidirectionality and one-time - multiplicity.

But this does not at all deny the presence of a component of “directionality/non-directionality of movement” in the semantic structure of Uzbek verbs of movement. The idea of direction of action is embedded in the very root of Uzbek verbs of movement, therefore among them the following stand out: “1. verbs indicating the direction of movement; 2. verbs denoting the method of movement. In addition, there are several verbs that occupy a kind of intermediate position” [Dmitriev, 1962, p. 596]. “The Uzbek verbal root itself specifies the action: in the cases keldi (came), ketdi (left), chiqdi (went out), kirdi (entered), the root of the word already indicates the direction of movement” [Mirtov, 1962, p. 10].

However, the nature of the direction of movement expressed by the verbs of movement of the Uzbek language is fundamentally different than in the Russian language: they “express oriented movement: an object or person moves towards us or away from us” [Tenishev, 1961, p. 233], i.e. indicate the approach or removal of an object (person) from the reference point, which is taken to be the speaking person or his place of stay: a) kelmok “приходить - прийти” - an action performed with approaching the speaker; b) ketmok – “уходить - уйти” - an action performed at a distance from the speaker.

A comparison shows that in the Uzbek language, Russian paired verbs of movement in their direct meaning (movement in space), as a rule, correspond to either one equivalent, or several synonymous verbs, or a complex verb consisting of a gerund with -ib (-b) + verb movements (see Table 2).

As can be seen from the table, the first type of interference occurs when students, in whose native language there are one or more equivalents to Russian paired verbs of motion, are faced with choosing one of two components of the pair. As a result, they make mistakes like Каждый год летом я еду (вм. езжу) в деревню к бабушке. Вчера мы шли (вм. ходили) на выставку и т.д.

The unidirectionality of movement in the Russian language is expressed by the semantics of the verbs of the group go and various contextual elements. In the Uzbek language it is implemented using:

Semantics of the verbs of motion themselves. For example. Петя бережно нес под мышкой свои драгоценности: банку с заспиртованными морскими иглами и коллекцию бабочек, жуков, ракушек и крабов. – Petya o’zining qimmatbaho narsalarini: dengiz ignalari solib og’zi yopilgan banksini, kapalak, qo’ng’iz, katta va kichik qisqichbaqalar... collectionsini qo’ltig’iga ehtiyot bilan qisib kelmokda edi (A. Zharikov). In this example, the root of the Uzbek verb “kelmoq” denotes movement towards the speaker; postpositions corresponding to Russian prepositions in combination with nouns. For example, Красная Армия разбила немецкие войска под Москвой и гонит их на Запад. – Qizil armiya nemis qo’shinlarini Moskva bo’sag’asida tormor qildi va ularni G’arbga qarab quvlamoqda.

*Table 2[1]*

***Russian paired verbs of motion and their equivalents in Uzbek***

| № | Русские парные глаголы движения | Эквиваленты в узбекском языке                    |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | идти<br>ходить                  | бормоқ, юрмоқ                                    |
| 2 | бежать<br>бегать                | югурмоқ, чопмоқ, қочмоқ                          |
| 3 | ехать<br>ездить                 | бормоқ, юрмоқ, қатнамоқ                          |
| 4 | лететь<br>летать                | учмоқ (парвоз қилмоқ, учиб юрмоқ)                |
| 5 | плыть<br>плавать                | сузмоқ (сузиб юрмоқ, суза олмоқ)                 |
| 6 | вести<br>водить                 | олиб бормоқ, етаклаб бормоқ,<br>бошқармоқ и т.д. |
| 7 | везти<br>возить                 | олиб бормоқ, ташимоқ, элтмоқ                     |
| 8 | нести<br>носить                 | олиб бормоқ, кўтариб бормоқ, ташимоқ<br>и т.д.   |

In this example, the semantics of the Uzbek verb “quvlaroq” does not in any way express the direction of movement. Movement in one direction is indicated by a postposition in combination with nouns in the form of the Uzbek directive case;

Case form of the noun. For example, После короткого боя противник бежал из деревни.— Qisqa jangdan so'ng dushman qishloqdan qochib qoldi. In this context, the direction of movement is indicated by a noun in the form of the initial case “qishloqdan”, answering the question from where?

The meaning of unidirectionality of verbs of motion in the Russian language can be successfully conveyed by means of the Uzbek language. For example, in Russian the verb “идти” denotes unidirectional movement both towards and away from the speaker. In the Uzbek language, a different point of view is established on the distribution of the process indicated by the stem of this verb of movement in space. Depending on the context (in relation to the speaker: to him or from him), this meaning of the verb “go” in the Uzbek language is conveyed by the one-word equivalent “bormoq” - (to go from the speaker), kelmoq (to go to the speaker): Анвар идет в школу. – Anvar maktabga boryabdi. Анвар идет из школы. – Anvar maktabdan kelyabdi.

As can be seen from these examples, if the direction of movement is expressed lexico-syntactically in the Russian language, then in the Uzbek language it is expressed lexically - by the very semantics of the verb.

The meaning of non-unidirectional movement is expressed in Russian by verbs of the group Walk and corresponding local means. It can be expressed in the Uzbek language by lexical-semantic means:

Долго ходил Володя по базару, но продать ботинки так и не успел (Л.Жариков). – Volodiya bozorda uzoq vaqt yurdi-yu, botbotinkasini baribir sota olmadi. Он паж, он слуга, он раб, он вечный кавалер ее в танцах, носит ее веер и платок, в одном мундирчике выскакивает на мороз звать ее лошадей (А.Куприн). –u ham xizmatkor, ham qul, ham mahram

bo'lib qoldi. Hamisha tansalarda unga hamroh bo'lib, yelpig'ichi bilan ro'molini ko'tarib yurardi, unga izvosh chaqirish uchun yolg'iz mundirida sovuqqa chiqardi.

As the above examples indicate, the meaning of non-unidirectionality, characteristic of verbs of the group *ходить*, in the Uzbek language is expressed by the semantics of the verbs of motion themselves. The Uzbek verb “*yurmoq*” is semantically equivalent to the Russian verb “*ходить*”. It clearly conveys the meaning of non-unidirectionality inherent in the Russian verb “*ходить*.” Therefore, when Russian verbs of movement of the group “*ходить*” correspond in the Uzbek language to complex verbs (gerunds in *-ib/-b + verb of movement*), the obligatory element in the complex verb is the verb “*yurmoq*” to denote the non-unidirectionality of movement.

A single complex movement (there and back) is expressed in Russian only by the past tense form of the verbs of the group *go*: We went to the theater yesterday. This meaning in Uzbek is expressed as: *Biz kecha teatrga bordik. (Biz kecha teatrd bo'ldik).*

The repetition of movement can be expressed in Russian by the form of the past tense of the verb only if there are special (lexical, grammatical) indicators: *По вечерам мы ходили в кино. Мы часто ездили за город.*

This meaning of Russian verbs of motion in the Uzbek language is conveyed by forms of the past multiple-long tense in *-p (-ar) + e (-dim, -ding, -di, etc.)*: *Kechqurunlari biz kinoga borar edik. Biz tez-tez shahar chetiga chiqib turar edik.* In addition, in the Uzbek language, repeated movement in the past tense is also signaled by various lexical and grammatical indicators. As can be seen from the above examples, the repetition of action is indicated by the lexical indicators “*kechqurunlari*” in the first case, “*tez-tez*” - in the second.

Thus, based on the analyzed material, we can conclude that the meanings of unidirectionality/single-recurrence and non-unidirectionality/multiple repetition of the movement of the Russian language can be successfully conveyed by lexical and grammatical means of the Uzbek language.

The semantic category of “mode of movement” is one of the main attributes of the semantics of Russian verbs of movement. It characterizes movement depending on the environment, on the use (non-use) of vehicles when moving.

The method of movement in the Russian language is expressed by the very semantics of the verbs *идти-ехать, нести-везти, ходить-ездить*. In the Uzbek language, verbs of movement are not differentiated by the method of movement; movement on foot and with the help of various means of transportation can be expressed by the same verbs. For example, «*День был жаркий. Утром я ездил в верховья реки, предмостному укреплению у Плавы*» (Э.Хемингуэй). – *Куп issiq edi. Men ertalab Paxlava tomondagi ko'prik oldi istehkomiga borib keldim. (буквально “ходил”).* Compare also: *ехать на метро – Metroda bormoq (буквально “Идти на метро”).* Riding a horse – *Otga minib yurmoq (буквально “ходить верхом”).*

The above examples once again confirm our idea that the Uzbek language does not convey the difference between walking and moving with the help of vehicles.

This feature of the Uzbek language causes interference in students when using Russian verbs of motion, as a result of which we encounter errors like: *Я пришел (вм. приехал) из Ташкента. Моя сестра учится в Ташкенте. Скоро она придет (вм. приедет) and etc.*

Significant differences in the semantic structure of Russian and Uzbek verbs of movement are manifested in the polysemantic nature of movement, denoted by the verbs *нести/носить, вести/водить, везти/возить* and the monosemantic nature of their Uzbek equivalents: *tashimoq,*



eltmoq, yetaklamoq, olib bormoq. The direct meaning of these Russian verbs of motion in the Uzbek language often does not differ, but is translated the same way - by one of the listed verbs. Колхозники едут на базар, везут огурцы, лук, кур (А.Жариков). – kolhozchilar bozorga bodring, piyoz, tovuqlarni olib bormoqda. «Под зелеными горами он шесть раз водил свою роту на турецкий редут, и у него от двухсот человек осталось только четырнадцать» (А.Куприн). – yashil tog'lar ostida u o'z rotasini olti marta turklarning dala istehkomiga hujumga olib brogan, uning ikki yuz soldatidan atiga o'n to'rttasi tirik qolgan edi.

These discrepancies in the semantic structure of Russian and Uzbek verbs of motion are also one of the reasons for numerous errors in the Russian speech of students when using these verbs.

Thus, in the Uzbek language, the verb bormoq denotes movement regardless of the method of movement (by train, on foot, by plane, etc.). To express the method of movement using any means of transport in the Uzbek language, combinations of the verb of movement “bormoq” with a noun denoting the type of transport with which the movement is made are most often used. Mashinada bormoq– ехать на машине, samolyotda bormoq– лететь на самолете. Piyoda bormoq – идти пешком.

It should be noted that the method of movement in the Uzbek language can be expressed by the very semantics of some verbs of movement. The semantics of such Uzbek verbs of motion as uchmoq - лететь, suzmoq - плыть, dumalamoq - катиться undoubtedly express different ways of movement.

A comparative analysis of verbs of motion in the Russian and Uzbek languages allows us to conclude that there are significant differences in their semantic structure. The semantics of Russian verbs of motion is multicomponent: in it, along with the nuclear seme “movement of an object in space,” the differential semantic features “unidirectional/non-unidirectional movement,” “multiplicity/multiplicity of movement,” and “mode of movement” simultaneously function in it. The semantics of verbs of movement in the Uzbek language is two-component: in it, along with the nuclear seme “movement of an object in space”, there is either a semantic component “direction of movement”, or a semantic attribute of “mode of movement”. In the act of communication, the semantic component of the “mode of movement” is usually neutralized. It is revealed mainly in context or implemented through adverbial words.

For example, uydan chiqdi (он вышел из дома). The movement here is carried out by someone without means of transport. It is clear from the context that the person from home «вышел», but not выехал. Биз Тошкентдан эрталаб соат еттида чиқдик (Из Ташкента мы выехали в семь часов утра). Here the context requires consideration of distance. Therefore, movement must occur through some kind of transport. In this case, the verb “chiqmoq” takes on the meaning of leaving.

### **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The Uzbek secondary school today is intensifying the search for more and more new approaches and technologies to ensure the quality of the education and training system. Over the years of independence, radical reforms of the system of lifelong education have been carried out in the republic; special attention is paid to the education and upbringing of the younger generation in secondary schools, where the intellectual and spiritual foundation for personal development is laid. Reforms carried out on the basis of Decrees of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan UP-4947 “On the strategy of action for the further development of the Republic of Uzbekistan”

dated February 7, 2017, UP-5313 “On measures to radically improve the system of general secondary, secondary special and vocational education” dated January 25, 2018 year, Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan PP-3775 “On additional measures to improve the quality of education in higher educational institutions and ensure their active participation in large-scale reforms carried out in the country” dated June 5, 2018, PP-2909 “On measures for the further development of the higher education system” dated April 20, 2017, contributed to a radical improvement in the human resources potential of the education system, the upbringing of a physically healthy, spiritually perfect, harmoniously developed young generation with high intellectual potential and modern knowledge, independent thinking, and the ability to freely, consistently and accurately express your thoughts, implement subject-subject relationships in educational institutions, modern personality-oriented teaching technologies, and also improve the language training of students as an important task.

Nevertheless, the task of preparing the younger generation with independent thinking, who can think freely and logically, communicate effectively, and solve social and life problems remains urgent. In solving these problems, a huge role is given to the language training of future specialists. Along with foreign languages, great attention is paid to the study of the Russian language in the republic. Today, new educational and methodological complexes are being created in 18 general education disciplines, including the Russian language, based on State educational standards that take into account global trends. Programs and textbooks aimed at developing and improving key competencies among students are being introduced into the practice of educational institutions

In these conditions, in our opinion, the consistent introduction into the practice of studying the Russian language in secondary schools of the achievements of functional grammar, most clearly manifested in the functional-communicative approach, aimed at improving the communicative competence of students, becomes particularly important.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Guan Lily. (2012) Verbs of motion in Russian and Chinese. Abstract. Bishkek - 2012. Access: <http://cheloveknauka.com/glagoly-dvizheniya-v-russkom-i-kitayskomyazykah#ixzz2wF1E6UAA>
2. Zimnyaya I. A. Key competencies - a new paradigm for educational results // Higher education today. – Moscow, 2003. – No. 5. – P.12.
3. Ivanova V.Ya. (2010) System of repetition and further study of verbs of motion: guidelines and assignments for foreign students. SPbGASU. Saint Petersburg.
4. Isachenko A.V. The grammatical structure of the Russian language in comparison with Slovak: Morphology. – Bratislava: Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1960. – Part 2. – 576 s.
5. Isachenko A.V. Verbs of motion in the Russian language // Russian language at school. –1961. No. 4. – P.12-16.
6. Ispiryanyan M.M. (2012) Dynamics of learning verbs of motion in a modern strategy for communicative teaching of the Russian language at school. Thesis. Kyiv.
7. Kononov A.N. Grammar of the modern Uzbek literary language. – M-L., 1960. – 446 p.
8. Karpova S. A, L. E. Raskhodchikova. (2008) Verbs of motion. Textbook for foreign students. Department of Ukrainian and Russian languages. Odessa National Academy of Communications named after. A.S. Popova. Odessa.

9. Kopchevskaya-Tamm M. (2007) Verbs of movement in water in Swedish. Access: <http://aquamotion.narod.ru/7-Koptjevskaja-Tamm.pdf>
10. Maysak T. A., Rakhilina E. V. (1999) Semantics and statistics: the verb GO against the background of other verbs of movement. Ed. Arutyunova N. D.
11. Maysak T.A. (2002) Typology of grammaticalization of constructions with verbs of motion and verbs of position. Thesis. Moscow
12. Maysak T.A. (2005) “Typology of grammaticalization of constructions with verbs of motion and verbs of position” - Moscow, Languages of Slavic cultures.
13. Muravyova L.S. Verbs of motion in Russian: For English speakers. language – 5th ed. – M.: Rus. lang., 1986. –238 s.
14. Nechaeva A.I. Semantic-word-formation groupings of verbs of motion in the Russian language // Semantics and typology of differently structured languages. – Tashkent: Tashkent Publishing House. University, 1986. – P. 30-35.
15. Nurmanov A. T. Functional approach to the study of verbs of movement of the Russian language in the national (Uzbek) school: Author's abstract. dis. ...cand. ped. Sci. – M., 1993. –19 s.
16. Nurmanov A.T. Preparing students for technology and techniques of effective communication. – Tashkent: “Fan Va Technologiya”, 2010. –114 p.
17. Nurmanov A.T. Selection and organization of educational and didactic material in language learning. // “Uzluksiz ta’lim”, Tashkent, 2010. – No. 4. – P.69-71.
18. Nurmanov A.T., Koroleva S.B., Alieva D.V. On the modern concept of teaching the Russian language in schools with Uzbek and other languages of instruction // Materials of the international scientific and practical conference “Problems of teaching language and literature in conditions of widespread digitalization.” Jizzakh, JSPI. – 2021. – P. 352-356.
19. Sattarova M.R. Comparative study of lexical semantic sphere of verbs of motion in Russian and Uzbek languages: Author's abstract. dis... cand. Philol. Sci. – Kazan, 1967. – 32 s.
20. Sokolova V.M. Verbs of motion in modern English: Author's abstract. dis. ...cand. Philol. Sci. – L., 1967. –14 s.
21. Chokubaeva A.K. (2007) Lexico-semantic analysis of verbs of motion in English and their comparison with Russian and Kyrgyz languages. Abstract. Bishkek.
22. Shamne N. L. (2000) Semantics of German verbs of motion and their Russian equivalents in linguoculturological coverage. Volgograd. VolSU Publishing House. Access: <http://libvuz.net/book/56-semantikanemeckix-glagolov>
23. Shchukin A. N. Methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language: textbook. manual for universities. M.: Higher. school, 2003. - 334 p.