

VERBS OF MOVEMENT IN ENGLISH IN COMPARISON WITH THE
RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Sultonova Yulduz Rustam qizi

Informational Technology and Management University

RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY

Verbs of movement in English and Russian constitute a fundamental lexical and grammatical category that defines the semantic structure and syntactic organization of sentences in both languages. The interaction of various forms and meanings of movement verbs reflects the peculiarities of spatial perception and conceptualization in English and Russian linguistic cultures. A comparative analysis of these verbs uncovers both universal patterns and unique aspects of their functioning, which is particularly significant for developing theoretical frameworks for cross-linguistic communication and practical methodologies for teaching foreign languages. An in-depth study of this topic aligns with contemporary linguistic objectives aimed at exploring semantic universals and language-specific features.

AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study is to identify the structural and semantic characteristics of movement verbs in English compared to Russian, analyze the mechanisms of their functioning in communicative processes, and develop scientifically grounded recommendations for integrating the results into educational practice, including the formation of linguistic competence among students in the context of intercultural communication.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study utilized linguistic units within the frameworks of lexical-grammatical and functional approaches, employing comparative-typological analysis. The materials included data from the National Corpus of the Russian Language, the British National Corpus, and the Corpus of Contemporary American English. These sources provided empirical data with examples of the use of verbs of movement in various syntactic constructions, including simple and complex forms, phrasal verbs in English, and prefixed verbs in Russian.

Lexical-semantic analysis focused on identifying invariant and variable meanings of verbs of movement, as well as uncovering their syntactic and pragmatic characteristics. Key categories such as unidirectionality, multidirectionality, repetitive actions, and figurative meanings were examined to establish functional and structural differences between the two languages.

Syntactic analysis involved the study of constructions with verbs of movement, enabling the identification of similarities and differences in their functioning in English and Russian. The comparison was based on criteria such as the directionality of the action, its duration, completion, and relationship to objects or spatial circumstances.

To explore the challenges of mastering verbs of movement, a pedagogical experiment was conducted, which included a survey of students learning English and Russian as foreign languages. The survey contained tasks aimed at recognizing and correctly using

verbs of movement in contexts requiring a precise understanding of their lexical and grammatical features.

The study's findings were supported by the analysis of data from academic and didactic materials, including modern textbooks and monographs. This provided a solid foundation for substantiating the proposed conclusions and recommendations for teaching verbs of movement.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The comparative analysis of verbs of movement in English and Russian revealed significant differences in their grammatical structures, semantic systems, and functional applications. In Russian, verbs of movement are systematically divided into unidirectional and multidirectional types, reflecting their lexical and grammatical distinctions. For instance, the verbs *идти* (to go in one direction) and *ходить* (to go in multiple directions) represent a clear dichotomy. In English, this distinction is absent, as the verb to go serves both functions, with nuances of directionality or repetition determined by context or additional modifiers.

The Russian language exhibits a highly developed system of prefixes, which significantly alter the meaning of movement verbs by adding spatial (e.g., *входить* - to enter, *переходить* - to cross) or temporal (e.g., *зайти* - to stop by briefly) characteristics. For example, the verb *войти* denotes movement into a space, while its English equivalent to enter relies on prepositions or contextual cues for spatial precision, as in to go into the room.

Conversely, English employs phrasal verbs extensively to convey subtle nuances of movement. Examples such as to move on (to proceed), to walk away (to leave), and to run out (to be depleted) combine lexical and grammatical functions. In Russian, these meanings are conveyed through separate lexemes or fixed expressions, such as *двигаться дальше* (to move on), *уйти* (to leave), and *закончиться* (to be depleted).

The semantic analysis indicates that Russian verbs of movement possess a more complex aspectual system, allowing for the expression of additional action characteristics such as duration and completion. For example, the verbs *ехать* (to be traveling) and *поехать* (to start traveling) distinguish between the process of movement and its initiation, whereas the English to go requires auxiliary phrases or contextual elements to convey such distinctions, e.g., to go and to start going.

In the domain of figurative meanings, both languages employ verbs of movement to describe abstract processes. For instance, the Russian *идти время* and the English time goes share conceptual similarities, but Russian offers a wider variety of constructions, such as *дойти до идеи* (to come to an idea) and *выйти из себя* (to lose one's temper), which require nuanced translations into English.

The comparative analysis highlights systemic differences and shared features, offering a foundation for developing effective methodologies for teaching verbs of movement in English and Russian.

CONCLUSION

The study of verbs of movement in English and Russian has demonstrated significant grammatical, semantic, and functional distinctions that reflect the conceptual and structural differences between these two languages. The results indicate that Russian verbs of movement exhibit a high degree of morphological and aspectual complexity, with a rich system of prefixes and aspectual pairs. These features allow for precise distinctions in directionality, duration, and completion of actions. Conversely, English relies on phrasal verbs and contextual markers to convey nuances of movement, emphasizing syntactic rather than morphological strategies.

The findings of this research contribute to the broader field of contrastive linguistics and have practical implications for language teaching methodologies. By highlighting the key differences and similarities, this study provides insights into common difficulties faced by learners of English and Russian and proposes strategies for more effective acquisition of these linguistic structures. Future research may further explore the diachronic development of movement verbs and their cultural implications in the cognitive frameworks of English and Russian speakers.

REFERENCES:

1. Apresyan, Y.D. (1995). *Lexical Semantics: Synonymy and Contrast*. Moscow: Nauka.
2. Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Croft, W. (2012). *Verbs: Aspect and Causal Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Dixon, R.M.W. (2005). *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Filip, H. (2012). *Aspect, Eventuality Types and Nominal Reference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Forsyth, J. (1970). *A Grammar of Aspect: Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Janda, L.A., & Clancy, S.J. (2002). *The Case Book for Russian*. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers.
8. Khrakovsky, V.S. (1985). *Typology of Iterative and Non-Iterative Verbs*. Leningrad: Nauka.
9. Langacker, R.W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
10. Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.