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Abstract. The article has provided an analysis of the problem of parts of speech in modern linguistics, addressing the linguistic criteria for identifying parts of speech, the composition of parts of speech in specific linguistic types, and the grammatical categories inherent to particular parts of speech within specific linguistic types, and emphasizes the relevance and importance of their issues in the current field of linguistic research. The mention of prominent scientists and their contributions to the field adds historical context and demonstrates the development of the study of parts of speech over time. Recognizing the methodological challenge with describing faced in studying parts of speech, noting the three main principles used in linguistics: semantic, morphological, and syntactic. It is concluded that it is impossible to apply all these principles simultaneously and sets the stage for further exploring the intricacies of parts of speech in linguistic research.

1 Introduction

The study of parts of speech has long been central to the field of linguistics since these fundamental structural elements of language make a significant contribution to our understanding of grammar, syntax, and meaning. The scientific and linguistic study of the named range of issues has been attempted in the modern stage of linguistics, beginning in the middle of the last century, by remarkable scientists such as V.V. Vinogradov, L.V. Shcherba, R.A. Budagov, A.A. Reformatsky, V.I. Kodukhov, and others. All of them took as a basis for their particle study the three most relevant principles existing in the methodological-methodological apparatus of modern linguistics: 1) the semantic principle, 2) the morphological principle, and 3) the syntactic principle.

2 Method

In late 19th-early 20th-century Russian linguistics the study of the problems of identification and differentiation of parts of speech is usually associated with the names of A. A. Potebny, F. F. Fortunatov, and A.A. Shakhmatov.

Thus, A.A. Potebnya believes that parts of speech are associations of words in a language (in Russian), which are identified based on certain grammatical categories. In
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Turn, grammatical categories can be conceptual content, conceptual-grammatical content, and purely grammatical content. If any part of speech has all three of these types of grammatical categories, then we are dealing with basic parts of speech. For example, a Russian verb has three conceptual-grammatical categories: time (expressed by four verb forms), person (expressed by three persons) and number (expressed by two numbers), one conceptual-grammatical category of gender (in the singular form of the past tense: the bird flew away, the grandfather said, the sun shone) and three purely grammatical (or rather, morphological-syntactic) categories: kind (expressed by two kinds), inclination (expressed by three inclinations) and voice (expressed by two voices). And therefore the verb is undoubtedly the main part of speech [1].

On the contrary, the association of words in a language called "preposition" has only one morphological-syntactic category of correlation of two words from the main parts of speech. The preposition does not have any other purely conceptual categories. It does, however, have the rudiments of conceptual-grammatical categories, and therefore prepositions have definite meanings: spatial, temporal, causal, consequential, purposeful, and others. And therefore the preposition is a service part of speech [1].

In Russian, as in many other inflexional languages, the functionary parts of speech directly affect the choice of the grammatical form of both full-valued words that relate to each other through the function word. Thus, the function word preposition may influence the choice of grammatical form of the verb standing before it as well as of the noun standing after it: to clean before the house, to go to the world, to express through the book. If with the verb before it, the preposition enters into syntactic relations of adjunction, then with the noun after it, the preposition enters into morphological relations of control [1].

F.F. Fortunatov bases his particle classification of all lexical units of the Russian language mainly on the application of the grammatical (morphological) principle. Before coming to the classification of words by parts of speech, it is necessary to limit the morphology of the word from the syntax of the word combination, since they both express often the same conceptual content. The scientist puts forward the following rule for separation: "Any sound of speech that has a meaning in the language separately from other sounds that are words is a word". [2].

According to the scholar, there are three large groups of words in a language (in Russian): 1) full words; 2) partial words; and 3) interjection words.

3 Result

Complete words denote independent objects, phenomena, and relations of real reality, in the syntactic structure of a sentence they occupy the position of sentence members, and even more they can in Russian be entire sentences. Morphologically complete words are of two kinds: 1) words without forms of word change and 2) words with forms of word change.

Words without forms of word change are these: coat, depot, cockatoo, down, first, etc.

There are three kinds of words with forms of conjugation: A/ Words that are inflected; B/ Adjectives that are inflected with concordance in gender; and C/ Words that are conjugated:

A/ Words that are declinable are such personal nouns (I, you, me), nonpersonal nouns (mountain, forest, road), noun-nouns (Nicholas, Warsaw, Porechensk), nonpersonal pronouns (this, that, those);

B/ Adjectives declined with an agreement in gender (bold, cheerful, mine, yours, first, second) and B/ Conjugate words (say, write, draw, do).
Partial words are distinguished by the scientist based on articulated consideration of them with full words: "The difference between partial words and full words is that the values of partial words do not exist separately from the values of full words, as partial words denote something either 1/ in the values of full words, or 2/ in the values of sentences, which include full words". [2]. Partial words include conjunctive words (the verb "to be", conjunctions, prepositions), reinforcing words (for example, "that" in "I-too", "he-too"), negative words ("not", "neither") and presumptive words (of course, probably, mol, maybe).

Intermemeotic words are, according to F.F. Fortunatov, such words that "represent signs of language belonging to speech not as an expression of ideas, but as the expression of feeling, experienced by the speaker" [2]. The main difference between interjection words from full and partial is that they exist both outside of sentences and as independent sentences.

This particle classification of F.F. Fortunatov, being of great interest in scientific respect, however, is not used in the normative linguistic grammar of the modern Russian language because of its morphological and syntactic complexity [3].

A.A. Shakhatmatov bases his peculiar classification and identification of the main full- and non-main function words on the application of the psychological-syntactic principle. The sentence is, in the scholar's opinion, the realization of psychological communication. The psychological basis of the sentence is "the stock of our perceptions, which has given us previous experience and which is increased by current experiences" [4].

In a psychological sentence, the members of the sentence are realized, which also has a psychological basis. Thus, the basis of the subject is a psychological representation of some real or mental object; the basis of the predicate is a psychological representation of the activity of the psychological subject; the complement, the circumstance, and the definition are also psychological-language entities. The psychological positions of all five named members of a sentence are filled only with full-valued words from the main parts of speech. But in the proper grammatical structure of a sentence of a language (the Russian inflective language), the conjunction of the psychological members of a sentence is possible precisely through the use of any other short words that have no psychological filling. Such non-psychological short words performing purely connective-grammatical functions are service words: prepositions, conjunctions, particles, conjunctions, and others [4].

The modern interpretation of parts of speech is based on a more extended interpretation of the problems and questions which were posed in diachronic-historical linguistics by ancient Greek ancient and Alexandrian scholars, as well as by linguistic scholars in the second half of the 19th century in Germany and Russia. These are mainly three circles of questions: 1) the linguistic criteria for distinguishing parts of speech; 2) the composition of parts of speech in a particular linguistic type; and 3) the grammatical categories inherent in a particular part of speech in a particular linguistic type.

The expanded interpretation of the above range of questions on the interpretation of parts of speech from the perspective of the current state of linguistic science has led to a broad, comprehensive, and functional approach to the problem. Despite the apparent unambiguity in the understanding and classification of parts of speech, this issue is very complex and multifaceted. And that is why in the Linguistic Encyclopaedic Dictionary of 1990, the article "Parts of Speech" was compiled by three authors, rather than by one linguist, as it is practiced in the rest of this dictionary [5].

On the first circle of questions related to the linguistic criteria of singling out parts of speech, the same three criteria are discussed in modern linguistics: 1) the semantic criterion, which considers the general and private lexical meanings of words; 2) the morphological criterion, which considers the morphological features and markers of words; and 3) the syntactic criterion, which considers the syntactic features and markers of words.
in a sentence - but these criteria should, according to linguists, be considered based on a functional approach.

Thus, when applying the semantic criterion of identifying parts of speech, it is necessary to take into account the nominative function of language. As V.V. Vinogradov, a remarkable Russian Soviet linguist, writes in this connection: "Words taken outside the language system as a whole, only in their relation to things and phenomena of reality, serve as various signs, names of these phenomena of reality, reflected in the public consciousness". [6]. At that, it is noted, "that only words from the main denominative parts of speech can be names, serve as nominative names of objects and phenomena" [6].

When applying the linguistic morphological criterion, it is necessary, as it is considered in modern linguistic science, to proceed from the communicative function of the word and the language, namely what communicative load the morphological structure of the word carries: whether this morphological structure can cause in human consciousness the corresponding idea about the communicative purpose of the word. So, in the opinion of the Russian Soviet linguist-Romanist, a specialist in French, the morphological feature "Variability in cases is a feature of nouns and adjectives in Russian... Variability in persons in very many languages is a feature of the verb" [7]. The addressee recognizes both a noun and a verb in the Russian language, i.e. identifies the named parts of speech as the main, significant ones and separates them from the auxiliary words [7].

When applying the syntactic criterion of distinguishing groups of words into separate parts of speech, we should, as modern linguistics believes, proceed from the message function inherent in the word and the sentence. If a word form communicates something meaningful, relevant to the perception of the addressee, then we are dealing with a word from the main part of speech; if a word does not communicate something, but only points to something, you are dealing with an auxiliary word. For example, "the meaning of the preposition 'in' is to indicate that something is in something, the preposition 'at' means that something is near something, etc." [8].

As the theoretical and review study of linguistic works on parts of speech shows, the linguistic-functional approach to the application of linguistic criteria for identifying parts of speech does not provide a uniform picture even when classifying parts of speech in one particular language. Thus, in Russian, there are quite different points of view on the classification and composition of parts of speech. V.V. Vinogradov identifies six basic parts of speech: nouns, adjectives, numerals, adverbs, state names [for example: conscientiously, fearfully, painfully], verbs, - and five nonbasic parts of speech: particles of speech, preposition, union, modal word, and interjection. In this classification of parts of speech, the scientist still gives priority to the morphological criterion of distinguishing parts of speech: "Grammatical laws determine the techniques and principles of connection and correlation of morphemes in the language system, ways of their constructive association into words" [6].

The second and the third circle of questions related to the composition of parts of speech in a particular language and their grammatical categories are considered in modern linguistics in their close and relevant relationship. Thus, L.V. Shcherba distinguishes three classes of parts of speech: 1) significant, basic parts of speech: nouns (including pronouns), adjectives (including pronouns), adverbs, and verbs - a total of four significant parts of speech; 2) auxiliary parts of speech: verbal conjunctions "to be", "is", prepositions, conjunctions, particles - a total of four service parts of speech; and especially the scientist singles out interjections, immediately stipulating that this is a very complex category: "first of all a very vague category of interjections, whose meaning is reduced to "emotionality" and "lack of cognitive elements" [7].

In describing the linguistic classification of parts of speech offered by L.V. Shcherba notes that the division of words in the Russian language is complicated by many factors,
and first of all by grammatical features of words both morphological and syntactic in nature. And therefore the scientist considers the main task of his work only to wake up the linguists' "linguistic instinct and make them realize the categories that already exist" [7]. However, L.V. Shcherba still in his above classification of parts of speech in Russian puts to the forefront the grammatical aspects of the word, and, consequently, the morphological and syntactic criteria for distinguishing words.

I.I. Meshchchaninov generally refuses to allocate Russian words specifically to certain parts of speech, justifying it by the fact that all linguistic criteria for classification (semantic, morphological, and syntactic) cannot be applied equally and equally in different situations; thus, at first sight, the semantic-grammatical principle is sufficient to distinguish Russian-speaking nouns. But in the specific classification of Russian nouns with the identification of their grammatical gender (masculine, feminine, and neuter), this principle does not work. "The decisive point in relating a name to this or that gender will be its lexical side, formal or semantic, but not its syntactic side" [8].

The scholar suggested that the classification of parts of speech should be based on the conceptual (lexical) categories of a word. The author understood the conceptual categories as the presence in a word of lexical-semantic factors, which can classify the word into a broader class, such as the genus marker, as well as the substantive marker for nouns, the species marker, the axial marker for the verb, etc. The presence of such markers allows a word to be assigned to a particular major part of speech. And this provision is relevant, according to the scientist, for many flexible and agglutinative languages, because in this case "the dialectal unity of language and thought with all the ensuing consequences" is taken into account [7]. And, accordingly, the absence of such conceptual categories implies that the word in question belongs already to the service part of speech.

In the new period of the development of linguistics, namely from the middle of the twentieth century to the present, linguists began to pay more attention to functional words and functionary parts of speech. Before them, all those words and those parts of speech which did not belong to the main parts of speech and were full-valued, significant words, such as index and possessive pronouns, the article, connective verbs, particles, interjections, introductory and modal words, were implicitly considered as part of the functionary parts of speech. But a closer study of them has shown that their classification as function words is not quite provable. So, if the function words are characterized as short lexemes that have no independent lexical meaning and serve only to correlate and connect two independent words within a sentence, or even to correlate and link two sentences [9], then many classes of words that were previously classified as function words and as function parts of speech, cannot be considered as such. They, firstly, had, if not complete meanings, then such meanings that reflected a fragment of some extra-linguistic reality. Thus, personal pronouns can be classified as basic parts of speech, since they have the meaning of a person and appear in a sentence as subjects or complements. However, in the class of pronouns, there are indexical pronouns, which should be classified as function words, because they only accompany a full-valued name: this day, that street. But even these index pronouns cannot be classified as function words, because they still have a certain nuance of lexical meaning, especially when they are used in a stylistically reduced sentence with a touch of disdain: this [woman] or that [man].

This property of index pronouns in the Russian language is since they "in their historical development moved from more visual and real representations to more abstract and abstract meanings" [10]. Thus, the class of index pronouns seems to "hang" between the groups of main and service parts of speech.

Similarly, the function words "particles" also "hover" between full- and function words. If function words, such as an article, a preposition, or a union, should only show relations between members of a sentence or between sentences, and in grammatical respect they
should imply some grammatical meanings which in no way depend on the combination of words in a sentence, then particles do not fall under such criteria: they have a certain degree of semantic content and express both "modal meanings" and "non-modal meanings" [11].

As for interjections, they were classified from the very beginning of the classification of parts of speech in the second half of the 19th century as neither basic, significant parts of speech, nor as auxiliary, auxiliary ones. Like function words, they have no nominative function or lexical meaning, but at the same time, they are not functionary words because they do not express any relations between words and between sentences as functionary words. Interjections express only human feelings and emotions through lexicical word forms. "Therefore, interjections are sentence words: Ah!; Oh!; Well and well!" [12].

4 Discussion

The separation of parts of speech, as well as all the issues related to them, has a linguo-didactic basis and is oriented to school teaching. This tradition began as early as in ancient linguistics and was continued in 17th-century Russian linguistics in the grammars of Melentius Smotritsky, in which 8 parts of speech were distinguished: name, pronoun, verb, participle, adverb, preposition, union, interjection [4].


Russian linguists and lingo-methodologists already distinguish three groups of parts of speech: basic [1. noun, 2. adjective, 3. numeral, 4. pronoun, 5. verb, 6. adverb], service [7. preposition, 8. union, 9. particle], and as a special part of speech they distinguish 10. interjection [15].


5 Conclusion

Thus, the differences in the particle classification both in the scientific approach and in the linguistic didactics (teaching methods) approach are conditioned, first, by the structure,
system, and concrete typological belonging of the language, and, second, by those linguistic criteria for distinguishing parts of speech which are put forward by the authors of scientific linguistics and experts in linguistics teaching methodology works as the priority. And, by the way, the prevalence of one or another criterion does not have a free basis, it is due to the grammatical type of language, for example between the morphological inflective type of French and the morphological agglutinative type of the Kyrgyz language.
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