

**EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY
RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES**

VOLUME03 ISSUE11

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55640/eijmrms-03-11-20>

Pages: 109-111



**THE APPLICATION OF LINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY TO THE TASK OF TEACHING RUSSIAN AS
A FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND ITS FUTURE PROSPECTS**

Radjapova Nargiza Bekmuradovna

*A Teacher Of The Department Of "Uzbek Language And Literature" Of Karshi Engineering And
Economics Institute, Uzbekistan*

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: Language, typology, comparison, grammar, classification, and method.

Received: 06.11.2023

Accepted: 11.11.2023

Published: 16.11.2023

Abstract: This article's goal is to examine the potential applications of typological data for enhancing language teaching approaches. The article explores the relationship between typology and didactics and brings up current issues in language typological research. A special focus is placed on the interference issue.

INTRODUCTION

The current state of linguistic science's development in typological research is marked by the broadening of its purview, the creation of new objectives, and the advancement of techniques for analyzing linguistic data. There are generalizing works dedicated to the typology of entire language subsystems (language levels), such as phonetics, morphology, and syntax, in addition to traditional research in the fields of comparing the grammatical structures of individual languages and creating their morphological classification. The ability to consider interlayer connections when comparing languages is made possible by modern typological linguistics concepts and methodologies. Simultaneously, the task of morph syntax and morphology's establishment of typological features (a system of alternations of different types and the phonetic structure of morphemes) (syntactic properties of word forms) and syntactic semantics is very urgent.

Whether language type is related to thinking and culture type is a topic of continuous debate in theoretical linguistics. Russian language learners and language teachers are exposed to a multitude of instances demonstrating the intimate relationship between linguistic and extra linguistic thinking,

language proficiency, and extra linguistic data. In order to answer this question in its modern form, it is necessary to examine the nature and expressions of specific instances of these connections.

There has been a growing consensus recently regarding the close relationship between language and mentality, as well as spiritual culture. A. Vezhbitskaya observes: "The inventory of conceptual tools of society clearly influences its worldview, but it never 'determines' it entirely [Vezhbitskaya 1999, 269]."

Modern cognitive science puts forward a fundamentally new understanding of the very nature of thinking. J. Lakoff asserts: "Thinking is imaginative in the sense that those concepts that are not based directly on experience use metaphor, metonymy, and mental images – all this goes beyond literal reflection" [Lakoff 2004, 13]. J. Lakoff objects to classical philosophical the propositions that the mind is an abstract machine operating with symbols, that the human mind is a mirror of nature, that thinking is abstract and immaterial [ibid., 11]. These statements indicate that language is understood as a structure that organizes thought itself, but not according to the rules of formal logic, but with the help of gestalts (integral images). In the understanding of J. Lakoff's "language is characterized by symbolic models, that is, models that correlate linguistic information with models in a conceptual system" [ibid. 209].

The comparative approach is a crucial component of typology in language. By comparing a language's system to another, the comparative method seeks to shed light on the idiomatic qualities and specifics of a given language. "The comparative method makes it possible to determine not only facts and phenomena that have similar functions in the compared languages, but also the place they occupy in their micro-system," according to V.D. Arakin [Arakin 2000

Both quantitatively (covering a greater number of languages) and qualitatively (a systematic explanation of linguistic similarities and differences, equal attention to universal and specific features of languages), comparative linguistics has good prospects for development.

The grammatical structure of the language, which consists of a system of morphological categories, syntactic categories and constructions, as well as word production techniques, is the primary focus of comparison and typologization. The foundation upon which the language is built and operates is the grammatical structure. Put differently, the grammatical system is a way of organizing an utterance using vocabulary units.

Any language's grammar can be divided into two related categories: syntax and morphology. Morphology is particularly important in synthetic languages because it determines a word's syntactic

characteristics and sentence functions. The word form itself is produced syntactically in languages that are isolating and inflectional-analytical. Word forms are formed in inflectional-analytical and isolating languages.

Compiling bilingual and multilingual dictionaries; developing suggestions for text translation and assessing the quality of translations; linguistic analysis of the semantic content of texts; and developing suggestions for the avoidance of intercultural communicative conflicts are some of the applied tasks of comparative typological research.

The findings of typological research have broad applications in the field of foreign language instruction. Understanding the fundamentals and constraints of language comparison enables us to spot notable grammatical structure parallels and divergences, to develop a tailored language learning plan for a particular target audience, to anticipate potential problems and blunders, and to produce an accurate prediction of likely interlanguage interference.

The development of ethnically focused Russian language instruction and ethnically focused examinations is contingent upon the findings of comparative and typological research, as well as an accurate portrayal of intercultural and interlanguage disparities.

REFERENCE

1. Arakin V.D. English and Russian language typologies in comparison. Russia, 2000.
2. Methods of teaching Russian as a non-native, new language (Ballykhina, T.M.) Moscow: RUDN, 2007.
3. Zhao Yujiang and T.M. Balykhina From ethnomethodology to methodology. Problems and solutions in teaching Chinese to Russian speakers. Moscow: RUDN, 2012; 344 pages.
4. Vezhbetskaya A. Semantic universals and language description: interpreting cultures through keywords. M. (1999): Slavic language books.
5. Lakoff J. What the categories of language tell us about thinking about women, fire, and dangerous things: what the categories of language tell us about thinking. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2004.