



**LANGUAGE NORMS IN THE ASPECT OF TYPOLOGICAL COMPARISON AND  
INTER-LANGUAGE CONTRASTS  
(BY THE MATERIAL OF THE RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES)**

Komilova Sevara Usmonjon kizi

Kokand State Pedagogical Institute Uzbekistan, Kokand

**Annotation**

The article highlights the most contrasting with the Uzbek language aspects of Russian morphemics, word formation and morphology, which present particular difficulties for Uzbek students in mastering the norms of the Russian language.

**Keywords:** language norms, typological contrast, inflection, formant, word-formation method, grammatical category, word-formation category, phraseology.

The main goals of the culture of speech as an academic discipline seem to us to be the following: 1) the assimilation of language norms and 2) teaching language skills, the relevance of this option in a given situation, varying lexemes depending on the goals of communication. In the conditions of Uzbekistan, there is a serious difficulty in creating effective textbooks and manuals for this discipline: in student groups with the Russian language of instruction, the level of knowledge of the Russian language is often uneven - some students speak the vocabulary and norms of the Russian language freely and at a fairly high level, but in technical and There are also quite a few liberal arts universities with students with a weak level of training in the Russian language.

In such cases, we consider it necessary to modify the "Culture of Speech" curriculum and develop a system of exercises, taking into account the actual training of students and the difficulties arising from the typological contrasts of the Russian and Uzbek languages. The purpose of this article is to highlight aspects of Russian morphemics, word formation and morphology of the Russian language, which present particular difficulties for Uzbek students due to the presence of bright typological contrasts in their native language [1].



Uzbek morphemics is characterized by the stability of the phonetic composition of roots and affixes, a clear and relatively easy drawing of morphemic boundaries, and the stability of the semantics of formants. Russian morphemics is characterized by an asymmetric ratio of form and content of stems and formants.

Inflections of the Russian language are not only grammatical morphemes, they play an important role in the processes of word formation, as they are an obligatory part of the suffix formant or act as an independent formant during substantiation and zero suffixation. There are no morphemes of this class in the Uzbek language; inflectional and derivational morphemes are clearly distinguished in it. For the Russian language as an inflectional language, the widespread use of word-formation means to express stylistic assessment is natural. The Russian language has a rich fund of affixes, primarily suffixes and prefixes; many suffixes and prefixes are Old Slavonic in origin, which predetermines the stylistic differentiation of derived words, among which word-formation synonymy is widespread.

Derived nouns of the Russian language are formed by all these methods, with the exception of postfixal, prefixal-postfixal and suffixal-postfixal methods, which in Russian are methods specific to verbal word formation [3].

The methods listed and discussed in detail in the "Russian Grammar" are focused mainly on the usual word formation; I. S. Ulukhanov, who examined in detail both the usual and occasional word formation of the Russian language, identifies 79 ways that are divided into pure and mixed, ordinary and occasional.

In the Uzbek language, 4 ways of word formation are distinguished: suffixation, prefixation, addition, abbreviation, and the term "suffixation", widely used, for example, by A. A. Azizov, does not seem to be quite appropriate for agglutinative languages. In the light of the typological contrast between inflectional and agglutinative languages, the term "postfix" is more appropriate for the post-radical formants of the latter. Mixed methods of word formation are not typical for Uzbek word formation, varieties of the method of addition are less diverse. Such a discrepancy in the number and essence of word formation methods in the Russian and Uzbek languages is quite natural and reflects the specifics of the determinants of the compared languages: for the



inflectional Russian language, it should be noted the fundamental plurality of word formation methods, and the type of Russian word formation can be generally defined as inflectional, since the system of inflections is included in the majority formants. The limited number of ways of word formation in the Uzbek language is fully consistent with the determinant of the Uzbek language, the economical and compact use of formants in word formation processes. Due to the absence of inflections as a class of morphemes, Uzbek word formation can be characterized as purely affixal. Additional features of the typological contrast of the Russian and Uzbek word-formation systems are the presence in the Russian language of practically obligatory morphological transformations, zero suffix formants, unifixes, radixoids and uniradixoids, many lexemes of non-first degree of articulation, polysemy and variance of formants, which presents significant difficulties for native speakers with almost perfect the ratio of form and content [4].

Let us list the most problematic topics of Russian morphology for Uzbek students to master.

1. Grammatical categories of gender and animation, giving a projection on the syntactic norms of agreement, which is the reason for the high percentage of speech errors among Uzbek students.
2. The category of case due to the inflectional expression, the multi-type declension of nouns in Russian against the background of a strictly unambiguous expression of case meanings by a limited set of affixes.
3. Grammatical categories of aspect and voice, their semantics and formal expression.
4. Participles of the Russian language, since the participles of the Uzbek language are more of the same type.
5. The stylistic resources of morphology include the differentiation of variants of forms of a simple comparative degree, which form a stylistic paradigm: earlier - earlier, later - later - later. Forms with suff. -e (-she) can be qualified as neutral or colloquial, and forms on -ee as bookish [5].

It should be clarified that suff. -ee- is opposed to the colloquial variant -ee: stronger - stronger, more correct - more correct. In addition, the colloquial coloring of the adjective is attached to the forms of the comparative degree of the prefix po-, which means a slight increase in the degree of quality: more, less, better.



In the Uzbek language, the synthetic form of the comparative degree is stable and uniform: balandroq - above, pastroq - below. chiroylirok - more beautiful, etc. Due to the absence in the Uzbek language of the categories of gender and animation, the different structure in the Russian and Uzbek languages of the category of number and the specifics of motivational relations, allomorphic in relation to the Uzbek language are the derivational categories "femininity" (teacher, student, duty officer, blockade, foreigner, princess, poisoner, bear, eagle, hare), "immaturity" (owlet, goldfinch, wolf cub, chicken, Turkish cub, kangaroo, Negro, serpent, duckling, bastard), "singularity", (pea, grape, bead, snowflake, caramel, flake, carrot, crayon, charcoal, railsina), "substantiality" (wood, protein, pork, ox, venison, veal, hare, turkey, blueberries, blueberries, caffeine, vanillin) inek . etc. It is natural that all nouns with the meaning of femininity belong to the feminine gender, however, the assignment of derivatives with the meaning of immaturity and compatibility exclusively to the masculine gender is quite idiomatic; moreover, if from nouns with the meaning of compatibility in most cases it is possible to form with the meaning of femininity (accomplice, accomplice, cohabitant co-author), then the nouns of immaturity are strictly limited to the designation of young male beings.

Both the category of gender and nouns with the meaning of femininity and immaturity are clearly contrasting in relation to the Uzbek language and present significant difficulties for learning by Uzbek students [6].

Idiomatic for Uzbek students is the word-formation of animal names along with the names of persons (dove, turkey, grouse, wolf, lioness, tigress, camel; owlet, goldfinch, wolf cub, kangaroo, serpent, duckling). This does not correspond to the linguistic picture of the world of the Uzbek language, in which the names of animals are clearly distinguished from personal nouns and answer the question nim? (What?).

Thus, the abundance of typological contrasts at the morphemic, word-formation and morphological levels (with a projection onto the syntactic level) is associated with particular difficulties in mastering the norms of the Russian language and requires special attention when compiling programs for the discipline "Culture of Speech", as well as the development of thoughtful, compensating language contrasts exercise systems.



## Literature:

1. Алимova А. Т. Словоизменение и словообразование узбекского и русского языков в свете типологического контраста // Преподавание языка и литературы. — Ташкент, 2001. — С. 21-29;
2. Nuridinovna, K. N. (2022). Features of Word Formation of Various Parts of Speech in Modern Russian. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY*, 3(11), 155-159.
3. Kakharova, N. N. Features of word formation of significant parts of speech in the Russian language / N. N. Kakharova // НАУКА, ИННОВАЦИИ, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ XXI ВЕКА : сборник статей IV Международной научно-практической конференции, Пенза, 10 декабря 2022 года. – Пенза: Наука и Просвещение (ИП Гуляев Г.Ю.), 2022. – Р. 100-102. – EDN JKWBGC.
4. Кахарова, Н. Н. (2022). Морфонологические Явления В Отглагольных Словообразовательных Цепочках Современного Русского Языка. *CentralAsianJournalofLiterature, PhilosophyandCulture*, 3(11), 141-150.
5. Yusufovna, Y. S. (2023). GRAMMATICAL MEANS OF EXPRESSING THE CATEGORY OF TEMPORALITY IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. *GospodarkaiInnowacje.*, 33, 138-141.
6. Попова, Е. И. (2021). Контекстные основания транспозиции временных форм русского глагола. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 2(5), 150-155.
7. Popova, E. I. (2022). ON THE NATURE OF TRANSPOSITION OF CATEGORICAL FORMS OF THE RUSSIAN VERB. *Ann. For. Res*, 65(1), 7875-7882.
8. Kakharova, N. N. (2022). Verb Prefixes in Russian Language. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Review*, 5(8), 170-174.
9. Кахарова, Н. Н. (2016). О комплексных единицах русского словообразования. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 264-265).