

## MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL



### MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL

<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>



### MEANS OF EXPRESSING COMPARATIVE RELATIONS IN THE MODERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

**Marlen Z. Dzhelyalov**

*Senior Lecturer*

*Jizzakh State Pedagogical University named after A. Kadiri*

*Jizzakh, Uzbekistan*

*E-mail: [dzelalovm@gmail.com](mailto:dzelalovm@gmail.com)*

---

#### ABOUT ARTICLE

---

**Key words:** comparative relations, lexical means, syntactic units, prepositional-case forms of names, syntactic constructions, linguistic personality, linguistic competence, conjunction, comparative turnover.

**Received:** 28.04.23

**Accepted:** 30.04.23

**Published:** 02.05.23

**Abstract:** This article discusses the means of expressing comparative relations in modern Russian. Based on the fact that comparative relations play a large role in human life and activity, they are used as a way of knowing reality, which helps to establish the peculiar features of an object; and also they are widely used as techniques of artistic speech, they serve as one of the means of describing the image. We have analyzed the literature on this issue. The analysis of the scientific literature proves that comparative relations in the Russian language have mainly syntactic and stylistic expression, which increases their communicative significance. In our article, we examined this problem on the basis of simple and complex sentences in modern Russian. We noted that comparative relations in a simple sentence have a weaker expression, since comparative conjunctions are double and are used mainly in complex constructions. Also in the article, we considered ways to use complex sentences with comparative clauses that explain the main part of the sentence by comparison, based on the associative connection of phenomena. Therefore, the classification of complex comparative structures is usually based on the differentiation of syntactic indicators of comparative relations. This factor is explained by the complexity of the grammatical nature of the corresponding syntactic phenomena and the lack of a unified point of view on them in linguistics.

## INTRODUCTION

One of the very strong requirements and basic capabilities of a person is his ability to self-development, obtaining new information, understanding the world around him. Having the necessary amount of knowledge, a person constantly increases it by analyzing the surrounding reality, comparing its new phenomena and images with those that he has long learned and realized. Finding common features in unrelated phenomena, or differences in close, related - a huge achievement of human thinking. This is an important feature of a person - "to categorize what is perceived." [9. p.69] Therefore, with absolute certainty, we can say that the mental operation of comparison with its subsequent verbalization underlies the cognitive activity of a person as a thinking being and personality.

Comparison is a universal concept of various sciences: linguistics, logic, mathematics, psychology, philosophy. And therefore, each science, studying the phenomenon of comparison, focuses on what is more significant only for it, and this factor proves the multidimensional nature of the phenomenon under study. We adhere to the philosophical interpretation of the concept of "comparison": "Comparison is a cognitive operation that underlies the judgment about the similarity or difference of objects. Comparison reveals the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of objects, arranges, classifies and evaluates the content of being and cognition" [15. p.25]. This definition interprets comparison as the criteria by which objects are compared.

Studying the category of comparison; A fairly large number of works have been devoted to Uzbek and Russian linguistics (S.B. Absamatov, V.V. Babaitseva, S.G. Barkhudarov, F.I. Buslaev N.S. Valgina, V.V. Vinogradov, N.I. (Grech, L.A. Novikov, N.Yu. Shvedova, N.A. Shirokova, G.A. Azizov, N. Bayazitova, K.A. Kissen, A. Kononov, M.A. Sadikova, etc.)

## THE RELEVANCE OF RESEARCH

Despite the breadth of coverage of the problem and the diversity of research approaches, comparison as a vivid linguistic unit is not yet a fully studied phenomenon, in addition, a review and comparison of works on this topic allows us to conclude that the unity in understanding the nature of comparative constructions, their semantics and conditions of functioning in modern grammar is still missing. There is also no single approach to the study of comparative constructions. Some scientists theoretically substantiate the functional-stylistic approach to the study of comparisons, which involves their evaluation against the background of other figurative language means, as well as identifying the specifics of this technique in the system of a literary text [6;7]. Another group of scientists believes that the phraseological approach is legitimate, focused on identifying, systematizing and theoretical understanding of stable, reproducible comparisons [11].

The discrepancy is also noted in the issue of distinguishing between incomplete comparative sentences and comparative constructions that are part of a simple sentence, in the grouping of

comparative constructions that are part of a simple sentence, and in determining their syntactic functions.

The purpose of our study is to establish an effective, theoretically substantiated work with the means of expressing comparative relations in modern Russian and the formation of linguistic competence in the Russian language of students in general education schools.

Comparative relations play an important role in human life and activity: comparative relations are used as a way of knowing reality, which helps to establish the peculiar features of an object, and they are also widely used as techniques of artistic speech, serve as one of the means of describing an image. In order to compare some objects, it is necessary: 1) to determine what the comparison is for, what is its purpose; 2) pay attention to the various features of the compared objects; 3) to determine the possible differences of comparison in accordance with the set goal and the established features; 4) establish the stage of importance of special features of comparison; 5) compare the data obtained by all features.

Comparative relations are implemented in the language in different ways: through an indication of the phenomena of similarity or difference in lexical means, as well as through the use of necessary syntactic units, such as prepositional case forms of names; genitive and instrumental cases of comparison; with the help of syntactic constructions introduced by comparative conjunctions into the composition of simple and complex sentences.

The following research methods were used in the work: descriptive-analytical method with its techniques (observation, generalization, typology); research method, contextual analysis.

### **THE MAIN PART**

The analysis of the literature on this issue gives grounds to establish the following: in theoretical terms, great difficulties are presented both in clarifying the grammatical nature of comparative constructions and in terms of establishing their syntactic functions. This is explained by the complexity of the grammatical nature of the corresponding syntactic phenomena and the lack of a unified point of view on them in linguistics. Differences begin primarily in the question of the difference between the comparative constructions of the modern Russian language.

In the works of Russian scientists of the 19th century, Academician Ya. K. Grot, Professor N. I. Grech, Professor F. I. Buslaev, there are no differences as such, and we are talking only about comparison.

But the heterogeneity of the comparative constructions of the Russian language is undeniable. For example, a comparison can be expressed in a language using a simple sentence and comparative conjunctions, which can only be used in a simple sentence with homogeneous members. This reason is one of the factors of controversy between many generations of scientists on the question of comparative constructions in a simple sentence and comparative constructions in a complex one, as

well as in the question of determining their syntactic functions in a sentence.

In the grammars of the first half of the 19th century, the comparative conjunction was considered as an absolute indicator of the subordination of sentences. The Russian linguist N. I. Grech characterized comparative constructions, noting that subordinate clauses in a complex sentence expressing comparison do not contain a predicate [8].

Scientist-linguist F.I. Buslaev attributed sentences with comparative conjunctions to subordinate clauses of the mode of action. F.I. Buslaev explains the complex comparative sentence as the addition of the main and subordinate comparative clauses. The scientist also clarified the possibility of allowing a subordinating conjunction as part of a simple sentence [4].

Professor S.G. Barkhudarov equated all comparative constructions and subordinate clauses and considered them as incomplete comparative clauses [2].

Russian professor A.M. Peshkovsky, citing a number of examples of the use of a noun in the predicate with the comparative union "how", argued that this union should not be considered as the beginning of a new sentence [12].

Academician A.A. Shakhmatov, there is no special presentation of the question of the types of comparative constructions, but individual statements of the scientist give the key to understanding the function of comparative conjunctions as part of a simple sentence [14].

We observe a new formulation of the question about the nature of comparative constructions in the studies

V.A. Beloshapkova, N.S. Valgina, N.Yu. Shvedova, N.A. Shirokova and other famous linguists.

With all the variety of ways to study the above problem, scientists agree to consider comparative relations mainly as a syntactic category, although scientists offer various ways of scientifically describing this type of relationship in modern Russian.

First of all, the fact is noted that comparative relations are not always amenable to study with the help of terms and concepts of syntax. There is no appropriate terminology for this, since a cumbersome polynomial combination such as "a complex sentence with a subordinate clause of comparison", a simple common sentence, complicated by a comparative turnover, introduced by the union "as". The lack of a precise description language makes it difficult to classify them.

Usually, simple comparative constructions are considered by scientists from the point of view of their morphological composition, i.e. in terms of the correlation of their components in terms of parts of speech. Such a basis is leading in the classification of comparative turns, a significant part of which is expressed by nouns in the nominative or indirect cases (He slept like a dead man; Take care of this thing like the apple of an eye), or a substantive group of two different-case forms (He rang medals like a horse harness) , or adjectives and participles with or without dependent words (For joy,

he laughed like a child), or gerunds (The guy stopped, as if stumbling over something big). The same terms describe the forms of comparative turns: A shirt as a bag is a noun; I am without tongues, like a bird without wings - a substantive group; The doctor seemed to be petrified by surprise - a verb with a dependent name, etc.

Complex comparisons are described in terms and concepts of a different kind. Their parts appear as "main" and "dependent" sentences. In the subordinate clause, a conjunction is distinguished, which can be actually comparative or modally comparative - exactly, as if, as if, etc. But such a division of a comparative construction leads to the indistinguishability of these constructions, the loss of criteria for their separation, and therefore to contradictions in the assessment of the same phenomena.

So, we can conclude that until now there is practically no consensus in the language for the description of comparative constructions. In addition, the morphological terminology used in syntax at the level of simple constructions, at the level of a complex sentence, does not correspond to its application, since lexemes of all morphological categories serve to connect sentences.

The absence of the description necessary in the language, which is common for comparative constructions of varying degrees of complexity, is also revealed in relation to the syntactic indicators of comparative relations in the modern Russian language. The data of these indicators are not yet fully determined, but still this factor can hardly be disputed. This applies to unions as, as if, exactly, as if, as if, just as, as if, as if, exactly, etc. Many of them freely attach both comparative turns and comparative clauses. In these cases, their role is assessed as allied. When they add not a comparative turn and not a subordinate clause, but a comparative predicate in sentences like He as (exactly) sick, they are already evaluated differently, and unequally. The indicator how is usually evaluated as a comparative-predicative link, and the indicators exactly, as if, as if, evenly, etc. - as modal particles [3;5; 15; 16].

At the same time, the degree of complexity of comparative constructions is related to the type of these relations. So, for example, compound conjunctions, like how and how, if they act only as part of complex constructions, and words like like, like, like, looks like, etc., which do not have a standard grammatical name, are used only in simple sentences.

Comparative relations in complex sentences have unions and allied combinations as connecting elements: *while; meanwhile; whereas; as; than ... those; if... then; let ... but; as soon as ... then, etc.*

The systematization of sentences with the meaning of comparison seems to be quite difficult, since conditional, adversative and concessive conjunctions are used in comparative syntactic constructions. An example is the subordinating conjunction *if... then*.

In comparative sentences, the function of this union is different than in complex subordinate clauses with a conditional clause: it has lost its conditional meaning and is used as a formal indicator

that combines two parts of the sentence, the content of which is compared. For example: *If not so long ago we were going to buy a car for a long time, then in the middle of the year we could easily invest a large amount on any car model.*

The analysis of the scientific literature proves that comparative relations in the Russian language have mainly syntactic and stylistic expression, which increases their communicative significance. And this, in turn, increases the formation of the linguistic competence of secondary school students. Let's analyze this problem on the material of simple and complex sentences in modern Russian.

### Expressing Comparative Relations in a Simple Sentence

Considering separate types of comparative constructions as part of a simple sentence, it should be noted that among them there are two types of syntactic units. On the one hand, these are constructions expressing a figurative, poetic comparison, and on the other, a purely logical comparison of two compared phenomena; constructions expressing comparative relations in modern Russian.

Russian linguist Professor L.A. Novikov [10], based on the concept of Professor B.V. Tomashevsky [14], highlights a figurative comparison of three elements:

- 1) what is being compared is a “subject”, and what is being compared with is an “image”;
- 3) that, on the basis of which one phenomenon is compared with another, becomes a “sign” [10]. For example, in the sentence *Face turned white as snow, the face is an “object”, snow is an “image”, and the “sign”, on the basis of which these concepts converge, turned pale (white).*

Constructions expressing comparative relations also have an additional connotation. They, as it were, serve as a transitional stage to comparative-opposite relations, but are formed by comparative unions. Here, the allied construction is involved with another task: in order to establish the similarity between the compared phenomena in any particular respect. For example, *Malika's dress is exactly the same as mine.* However, these structures have a three-member structure.

The methods of expressing comparative constructions in modern Russian can be divided into two types: 1) allied and 2) non-union. The allied way of expression is realized with the help of comparative conjunctions *as, as if, as if, exactly.* And the non-union - most often in the form of a non-union comparison in the form of an instrumental case. For example: *Early spring came as a young beauty.*

Varieties of structures of both types can be represented in the form of the following table  
Table 1.1.

#### Comparison constructions in a simple sentence

Union way of expressing comparison			
Subject	Sign	Image	Examples
Noun, pronoun in the		Conjunctions <i>as, as if,</i>	The river is like a

nominative case		<i>as if</i> + noun in the nominative case	mirror.
		Conjunctions <i>as, as if, as if</i> + noun in the nominative case	<i>It stands like a pillar; Shukhrat, like Timur, studied at the Pedagogical University</i>
	Personal form verb	Conjunctions <i>like, like</i> + personal verb	<i>Did he just stand there like he didn't understand?</i>
	Full or short form of the passive participle	Conjunctions <i>as, as if, as if</i> + noun in the accusative case	The eyebrow is curved (s), like a bow.
	Comparative	Conjunction <i>than</i> + noun in instrumental case	Lips redder than rubies.
<b>Non-Union Expression of Comparison</b>			
Noun in instrumental case		Noun in instrumental case	She looked - gave a ruble. smoke rocker
	Personal form verb	Noun in instrumental case	The road snaked.
Noun, pronoun in the nominative case	Comparative	Noun, pronoun in the genitive case	A blush brighter than a rose.

After reviewing the data shown in the table, we came to the following conclusions:

1) The semantic side of many constructions is the comparison of two subject concepts according to their common feature, named in the predicate. This type of comparative constructions is the most common;

2) The use of a comparative component is rarely noted in the short form of the passive participle of the present tense: beaten, dressed up, etc.

3) With a predicate expressed as a qualitative adjective in a short form, the comparison usually includes the moment of the degree of the attribute and indicates its highest degree. In this case, two subject concepts are compared from the point of view of their characteristic feature of quality, named in the predicate. For example: like a rose; red blood in veins.

4) The construction of the comparative component with a qualitative adjective of the full form has a slightly different meaning. The characterization of the trait is given here more qualitatively than quantitatively. For example: How beautiful she is, tender, like a rose.

5) The first (“object”) and the second (“image”) are members of comparative constructions and are transmitted in the form of the nominative case. Grammatical forms are necessarily parallel.

6) Comparative constructions in the role of a predicate convey a figurative comparison. The type of comparative construction under consideration is a kind of folk proverb; it is also widely represented in other genres of folklore. We have here the simplest form of thought, based on the comparison of phenomena by similarity. For example: People's rumor that the sea wave; An empty

bucket rattles louder than a full barrel (Russian proverb).

Comparative constructions do not give a metaphorical description of the phenomenon, their semantic function is completely different: the comparison here establishes the relationship of identity between the corresponding phenomena and thereby contribute to the most complete disclosure of the expressed thought.

The differences between these types of comparative constructions are also reflected in some introductory conjunctions: in constructions of figurative comparison, along with the conjunction that, conjunctions of modal meaning are used - as if, as if, like, etc. For example: *The moon, like a pale spot, turned yellow through dark clouds (A. Pushkin) ; A dark night fell, as if a velvet black veil fell over the whole world. The happiness of young years has disappeared, like your light trace in the meadows (A. Pushkin) (14).*

Comparative constructions can be divided into two groups according to the presence (absence) of a correlative word in the sentence. The most typical structural variations of these structures are presented in the following table

Table 1

**Constructions expressing comparison relations in a simple sentence**

<b>Comparative constructions without correlative word</b>			
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Sign</b>	<b>Image</b>	<b>Examples</b>
Noun, pronoun in the nominative case	Noun, pronoun in the nominative case	Conjunctions <i>as, as if, as if</i> + noun in the nominative case	He is a teacher, just like me.
Same	Personal form verb or adjective form	Comparative form of an adjective	He lived the best life.
	The personal form of the verb or the form of the adjective	Conjunction <i>as</i> + adverb	The young man works as always.
	Comparative	Conjunction <i>than</i> + noun in the accusative case	Oil is lighter than water.
<b>Comparative constructions with a correlative word</b>			
Noun in the nominative case	Correlative word + noun	Conjunction <i>as</i> + being-noun or pronoun in nominative case	<i>He walked like a drunk.</i>
Constructions with the comparative degree of the adjective and the genitive case of the comparison standard:	Comparative adjective + genitive noun	Comparative adjective + genitive noun	You won't find a better dog friend.
Same	Verb + related word	Same	He dressed worse than me.
	Correlative word + full or short form of the adjective		The girl is so (th) fair-haired (th), as (and) brother.



**After analyzing the presented comparative designs, we made the following conclusions:**

1. Comparative constructions are often represented by the accusative case of names. For example: The boat was thrown into the sea like a cork (K. Paustovsky) (14).

2. As part of a sentence with a comparative construction, correlative pronominal words can be used that highlight and emphasize the phenomenon or feature that serves for comparison. Such a pronoun is most frequently used among other pronominal words. For example: *And his friend is the same as himself, with a spark in his heart. (Aibek)*

3. Constructions are distinguished in which comparison is carried out on the basis of signs of adverbial significance - temporal or spatial. In this sentence, the compared members are expressed by adverbs or prepositional-case forms of the name. For example: *Her voice sounded muffled, broken and not as authoritative as before.*

4. Grammatically, constructions with the union *than* are distinguished. They compare two phenomena according to the number of their characteristic feature. Both phenomena approach in the process of comparison, but the result of the comparison leads to their opposition, since the feature is represented unevenly - one phenomenon is richer than the other. The superiority of a feature is indicated by the comparative form of an adverb or adjective: the opposition of phenomena is reflected in the use of conjunctions *than* and *than*, which are semantically equivalent and have only a different stylistic coloring "a touch of bookishness in the union *than*". For example: *At the age of nineteen, he was already a more passionate player than his father. (A. Herzen). A characteristic feature of the construction under consideration is its close correlation with the comparative degree of an adverb or adjective, with which it constitutes a kind of grammatical unity.*

5. Comparative phrases are equally possible in different stylistic contexts, while constructions of figurative comparison are limited in their use mainly by the style of fiction.

It should be noted that comparative relations in a simple sentence have a weaker expression, since comparative conjunctions are double and are used mainly in complex constructions. However, in a simple sentence, homogeneous members can be combined with the help of double comparative unions *not only ... but also; not so much... how much; if not then ... then; not that... but, like... For example: With cunning, you will catch not only a mouse, but also a lion. (Uzbek proverb).*

**Expressing Comparative Relations in a Compound Sentence**

Comparisons in a compound sentence are shown as "main clause" and "subordinate clause". Comparative clauses explain the main part of the sentence by comparison, based on the associative connection of phenomena. Therefore, the classification of complex comparative structures is usually based on the differentiation of syntactic indicators of comparative relations.

In complex sentences with comparative relations, the parts are connected by conjunctions *like, just like, as if, as if, as if, exactly, as if*, many of them freely attach both comparative turns and

comparative clauses. In both cases, their function is estimated as allied (15).

The bulk of complex comparisons is expressed by means of a complex sentence. Such comparative constructions have a tripartite structure, the first and second parts of which ("subject" and "attribute") are contained in the main clause, and the third ("situation") - in the subordinate clause. For example: *Delight ("object") is extinguished ("sign"), as a candle goes out. ("situation"). (A. Chekhov)*

For example: *Take care of your Motherland, as a son takes care of his mother.* In this case, the "situation" does not actually take place; it is arbitrarily constructed as a subjective, metaphorical interpretation of what is reported in the main part. Or for example: *The ringing and sad voices of the muezzins intertwined over the city as if they were silver threads. (L. Solovyov).* So, comparative unions are divided into proper comparative (unions of reliable comparison) and modal-comparative (unions of unreliable comparison).

“The shades of the meanings of comparative clauses are diverse (actual comparison, assimilation, correspondence, etc.) and are determined by the lexical meaning of conjunctions:

1) Clauses with conjunctions *as if, exactly, as if, as if, as if* they contain a comparison - a relatively conventional meaning:

- a) *As if they* accurately indicate the significant similarity of the compared objects or phenomena.
- b) *As if, as if* they indicate an approximate comparison.
- c) *As if* - emphasizes that the comparison is conjectural.

Comparative turnovers come close to subordinate comparative sentences in terms of means of communication and in value. But in comparative turns there is no pronounced predicativity” (15).

Unions like and what can express both reliable and unreliable comparison. The most common union is *as*: it is stylistically neutral and the least specialized semantically.

With an unreliable comparison, the conditionally hypothetical nature of the “situation” is expressed by conjunctions *as if, as if, as if, exactly, as if, as if, as if, anyway, as if, etc.*

In sentences with a union, on the contrary, the subject or feature referred to in the main clause is characterized by similarity to another subject or feature referred to in the subordinate clause. For example: *Snowflakes tingled the face like small needles prick (Aibek).* The comparison has the same meaning here.

Unions of unconfirmed comparison, in turn, are most often involved in the design of quantitative meaning - the highest measure of a sign of meaning. For example: *The glass is so clean, it's like it's not there at all.*

In sentences with a qualitatively characterizing meaning, two varieties are distinguished: sentences with a union, as well as sentences with unions of unconfirmed comparison. However, in contrast to the union, as a union of unconfirmed comparison, they form a qualitatively characterizing

meaning much less often than amplifying relations. Such a position of the subordinate clause can be indicated by the demonstrative words *so* (with a verb) and *such* (with a noun). For example: *We dug a ditch around the camp, set up fences and took such precautions as if the enemy were very close. (Babur)*

In sentences with a qualifying meaning, the subordinate clause, formed by a comparative conjunction, determines the action or state called by the supporting verb, according to its external manifestation or the method of its implementation. With the supporting verb, determiners are possible *so*, *thus*, *in such a way*. The connection between the main and subordinate clauses can be framed by any comparative union. For example: *All this was done as if Ekaterina Dmitrievna was not in the room (AN. Tolstoy).*

Based on the foregoing, we can state the following:

1. Complex comparative constructions are divided into two functional varieties - reliable and unreliable comparison.

2. Semantically, complex comparative constructions are distinguished: a) with the meaning of identification (identity); b) with the value of qualification (mode of action); c) with the meaning of intensification (measure and degree).

We recognize that such a classification of complex comparative constructions on a functional-semantic basis is rather arbitrary, since:

a) the valid comparison function can be mixed with the unreliable comparison function. For example: *And daisies withered in the eyes, like a swamp light goes out. (S. Yesenin)*

b) the meaning of the identity of phenomena merges with the meaning of the mode of action. For example: *If Agabek appeared now near the teahouse, everyone would bow to him as servilely as they bowed to him yesterday. (L. Solovyov);*

c) the qualifying meaning can merge with the meaning of intensification (measure and degree). For example: *The wind blew as if it decided to sweep everyone off the face of the earth.*

In these proposals; expressing comparative relations, two real-life situations are correlated with each other on the basis of difference or similarity, correspondence or inconsistency with one another. Comparative relations are formalized by unions *if ... then, while, meanwhile, how, then, as, as, than ... so, how much ... as much, as ... so much*.

The basic principle of comparison - this is correspondence (similarity) or inconsistency (dissimilarity, difference) - is expressed by a union with the participation of the context of lexical specific situations. In accordance with this principle, complex comparative constructions can be divided into groups: 1) with the value of compliance and 2) with the value of inconsistency.

The first group includes complex sentences with conjunctions *as, what ... so, how much ... as much, how ... so much*.

The second group includes compound sentences with conjunctions: *while, meanwhile, while, and compound sentences with adversative conjunctions a, but, yes.*

Table 2

### Semantic Meanings of Conformance/Inconsistency

Match value	Meaning of mismatch
An additional value of proportionality - Complex sentences with a union <i>as</i>	Additional meaning of simultaneity - Complex sentences with a union <i>while .... like</i>
Additional value of proportional correspondence - Complex sentences with the union <i>than ... the</i>	Additional meaning of opposition - Compound sentences with conjunctions <i>or, but, yes</i>
Additional meaning of equality of measure and degree - Complex sentences with conjunctions <i>how much ... so much, how ... so much</i>	Additional meaning of concession - Complex sentences with conjunctions <i>while, meanwhile</i>

Let us characterize each of the above groups separately.

1. At the heart of the comparison, drawn up by the union *than ...*, by that, is the value of a suitable match. This meaning is emphasized by a comparison, which is necessarily included in both parts as a supporting component. For example: *The less we love a woman, the easier they like us (Pushkin)*. The meaning of the corresponding correspondence is usually realized in combination with contextually determined information about the internal dependence of the correlated phenomena. For example: *The more transparent the prose, the more perfect its beauty and the stronger it resonates in the human heart. (K. Paustovsky)*

2. In sentences with unions, *how much ... so much, how much ... so much*, equality is emphasized in the measure of features. For example: *As far as the Geologist is indifferent to his appearance, Sahib Jelal is so graceful and majestic. (M. Sheverdin)*

3. With the help of the union, as information is transmitted about the proportionate and gradual deployment of comparable situations. For example: *As the sun rose, the day became warmer and more cheerful. (I. Bunin)*

4. Comparative relations in compound sentences with the union *a* are most often implemented in a context that confirms the comparability of the parts connected by the union. Therefore, in such sentences, the context, on the one hand, supports the meaning of the difference, on the other hand, indicates the meaningful commonality of the related parts. For example: *At eight o'clock we drink common tea in the dining room, and at twelve we have breakfast. (I. Turgenev)*.

5. In sentences with the union *before*, the comparison is concretized as a contrast; the meaning of this union is narrower than the meaning of the union *- but*. The union *but* shows the opposite and functionally relates to unions of concessive meaning. For example: *The clothes on the guest were coarse, clumsily sewn, but new boots shone on their feet. (Aibek)*.

6. A juxtaposition, formalized by unions between *while, while*, rather than based on showing

the differences between situations in one respect or another, their opposition. Conjunctions between while and while are inseparable. For sentences with these unions, a merger of comparatively concessive meanings is characteristic. For example: *A young man received from home more than he should have expected (Pushkin).*

### CONCLUSIONS

An analysis of the structural and syntactic aspects of simple and complex sentences in modern Russian from the point of view of the topic under study gives grounds to assert that comparative relations in Russian are a predominantly syntactic category and should be considered using syntax. Therefore, this factor implies great opportunities for the formation of the linguistic competence of students in secondary schools.

### REFERENCES

1. Balkina M.A., Nekrasova E.A. Evolyutsiya poeticheskoy rechi XIX- XX vv. Perifraza. Sravnenie (The evolution of poetic speech in the 19th-20th centuries. Paraphrase. Comparison.) M.: Nauka, 1986. - 192s
2. Barxudarov S.G., Kryuchkov S.E., Cheshko L.A. Russkiy yazik. 9 klass. (Russian language. 9 class) Uchebnik. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Prosvesheniye, 2021 g.-259 s.
3. Beloshapkova V.A., Belousov V.N. Sovremenniy russkiy yazik.(Modern Russian language) Uchebnik Moskva: AlyanS, 2017. - 928 s.
4. Buslayev, F.I. O prepodavanii otechestvennogo yazika (About teaching the national language)/ F. I. Buslayev. - Moskva: Izdatelstvo Yurayt, 2019.-266 s. - (Antologiya misli).
5. Valgina N.S. Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo yazika.(Syntax of the modern Russian language) - Moskva: Agar, 2000. - 416 s.
6. Vinarskaya E.H. Vinarskaya E.H. Virazitelnie sredstva teksta. M.: Visshaya shkola, 1989.- 136s. (Expressive means of the text. M.: Higher school,) 1989.- 136p.
7. Vinogradov V.V. Russkiy yazik (Grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove)/Pod. red. G. A. Zolotovoy. (Russian language (Grammatical doctrine of the word)) / Under. ed. G. A. Zolotova. - 4th ed. — M.: Rus. yaz., 2001;
8. Grech N.I. Kratkaya russkaya grammatika.(Brief Russian grammar) Moskva: Izdatelstvo Librokom 2011. – 158 s.
9. Kolesnikova S.M. Stepeni sravneniya prilagatelnix i virajaemaya imi intensivnost priznaka// Russkiy yazik v shkole. (Degrees of comparison of adjectives and the intensity of the feature expressed by them) // Russian language at school. 1998 - No. 5. - S. 69-74.
10. Novikov L.A. Semantika russkogo yazika.(Semantics of the Russian language) Moskva: Visshaya shkola, 1982. - 272 s.

11. Orlova V.I. (Frazeologicheskie oboroti so sravnitel'nmi soyuzami// Russkiy yazyk v shkole. 1966. - №3. - S. 83-90.) Phraseological units with comparative conjunctions// Russian language at school. 1966. - No. 3. - S. 83-90.
12. Peshkovskiy A.M. Russkiy sintaksis v nauchnom osveshenii, (Russian syntax in scientific coverage) Moskva: Yaziki slavyanskoy kulturi,(Languages of Slavic culture) 2001. - 544 s.
13. Sapir E. Izbrannie trudi po yazykoznaniiyu i kulturologii/ Perevodi s angl. pod red. (Selected works on linguistics and cultural studies / Translations from English. ed. A.E. Kibrika.) M.: Progress, 1993. - 656s.
14. Tomashevskiy B.V. Stilistika (Stylistics): Ucheb. posobiye. 2-e izd. L.: Izd. LGU, 1983. – 288 s.
15. Shaxmatov A.A. Sintaksis russkogo yazyka (Syntax of the Russian language) Moskva: Prosvesheniye, 2014. - 720 s.
16. Shirokova A.V. Sravnitel'naya tipologiya raznostrukturnix yazykov (fonetika, morfologiya) (Comparative typology of languages with different structures (phonetics, morphology)). Moskva: Dobrosvet, 2002. - 200 s.
17. Chesnokov P.V. Neogumboldtianstvo// Filosofskie osnovi zarubejnih napravleniy v yazykoznanii. M, 1977. - S. 20-62. (Neo-Humboldtianism // Philosophical Foundations of Foreign Trends in Linguistics.) M, 1977. - S. 20-62.
18. Tsivyan T.V. Oppozitsiya «mujskoy/ jenskiy» i yee klassifitsiruyushchaya rol v modeli mira// Etnicheskie stereotipi mujskogo i jenskogo povedeniya. (Opposition "male / female" and its classifying role in the model of the world // Ethnic stereotypes of male and female behavior) / Ed. A.K. Baiburin, I.S. Kon.-SPb, 1991.-S. 191-198.
19. Djelyalov M.Z. The problem of forming linguistic competence of students of grades 7-9 of schools with the uzbek language of teaching on the material of expressing comparative relations in the ...// Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal, 2023 volume 4, p.23-30
20. Djelyalov M.Z. Средства выражения сравнительных отношений в современном русском языке// Иностранные языки в Узбекистане 6// Министерство высшего и среднего специального образования Республики Узбекистан стр. 55-70
21. <https://russkiyazyk.ru/sintaksis/primeryi-slozhnopodchinennyih-predlozheniy-pridatochnym-sravneniya.html>
22. <https://scicenter.online/russkiy-yazyik-scicenter/slojnopodchinennyie-predlozheniya-vyirajayuschie-97145.html>