



# THE LINGUISTIC NATURE OF COMPOUND WORDS

**Turobov Abdurayim Malikovich**

*Docent, Department of Language Theory and Literature, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)*

## ABSTRACT

*In this article both syntactic relation and semantic relation among the components of compound word were observed according to small syntax issues. Moreover, this information about the linguistic nature was given. According to syntactic point of view, it was scientifically proven that the grammatical relation among the components of compound word remains in the static state both when it is used in the composition of the sentence and when it is taken independently.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Compound word, composition, syntactic method, word formation, component, grammatical integrity, idiomatic meaning, morphological instrument, semantic compression, univertial process, suffix, component, small syntax, internal structure, word components, syntactic relation.*

## DISCUSSION

Compound words constitute a certain part of word formation which is traditionally defined as a composition or syntactic method. In this term, it is worth mentioning that compound words are close to word phrases from the point of semantics, for this reason, in many cases we tend to hesitate while using a certain compound word. This is also discussed in a number of linguistic literatures. Paying attention to the following words of Smirnitkiy A.I.: "It is quite difficult to differentiate between compound words and word phrases in most cases. For instance, in the word *blackboard* the meaning of separate words 'black' and 'board' is not lost. However, since it is a compound word it delivers the meaning of '*the board used in an auditory*' and constitutes a concrete semantic unity. 'Blackboard' does not imply the notion of the board that is black in color, it is understood as '*the board used in an auditory*'. Even if the board used in a class or auditory is of others colors, except for black, as brown, green and so on, this word continues being applied in the meaning of the board of an auditory, in spite of the fact that the same compound word can be used as a word phrase in the form *black board*, but in this case the original meaning of the compound word *blackboard* is lost [1, 117].

The given compound word is distinctive from word phrase *black board* according to not only its form as a solid word, but also its constitution as certain grammatical unity. This compound word has a peculiar significance in accordance with its two

features. The first feature can be observed in its idiomatic meaning, whereas its second feature can be seen in the way how it forms definite integrality [1, 117].

Furthermore, it should be pointed out that not all the compound words possess an idiomatic meaning. For example, there is not observed any idiomatic meaning in the compound word *blue eyes*, as in this case both of these words are used in their original meaning, not idiomatic.

Apparently, the formation of compound words in languages is not the same, to exemplify, the components of compound words in the present-day English language can immediately combine either with or without certain morphological means: *angl-o-saxon, state-s-man, trade-s-people* [1, 118].

According to Y.S.Kubryakova, with the help of combination of two or more words with independent meaning a word with a new meaning is shaped. In this situation, a greater attributive relationship is formed between the components of those compound words. Apart from that, there appear relationships with different meaning between compound verbs. In this term, Y.S.Kubryakova claims that in some cases the whole meaning of one sentence can be observed in compound words [2, 283]. When it is approached to the characteristics of the situation from that viewpoint, it becomes obvious that compound words emerge owing to semantic compression, since compound words within their semantics are closely associated the process of univertation [2, 284].



Y.S.Kubryakova mentions that suffix is equal to basis of word formation in the compound word formed with the means of suffix, while the one formed with the means of prefix is formed with basis. The scientist affirms that the last component of a compound word is considered to be its basis [2, 287].

Also, it should be perceived that the second or last component of compound words is to be equal to their basis which implies every component of compound words is somehow independent, because a compound word is accepted in its whole form. The views of A.N. Gvozdev, in this term, are worth restating: «Сложные слова – это единые слова, а не сочетания слов, что получает и фонетическое выражение в наличии одного ударения» [3, 218].

Both syntactic and semantic relationships between the components of compound words are studied within the frames of characteristics of minor syntactic tasks. Particularly for this aim compound words might be discussed within word phrases and sometimes the semantic compression of sentences.

Even though in the majority of cases syntactic relationship between the components of compound words do not relate to semantic compression of word phrase, they differ from syntactic relationship between the components of word phrases. To prove this concept we address to the following examples given by A.N.Gvozdev: *раболовство-рыболов, сталеварение-сталевар*. It can be seen that the relationships of object and action find their implication in those compound words [3, 219]. However, it is worth pointing out that an object and an action cannot independently form a separate relationship. In this case, the hidden subject participates in the process and, subsequently, there appears the syntactic linkage *object-action-performer*.

There is given the analysis of formation words without any affixes in the work-book “The Russian language today” by V.A.Beloshapkova published in 1989. In the this work words forming without the participation of affixes are deeply studied in the following four ways:

1. Original integration of words.
2. Immediate connection.
3. Abbreviation.
4. Reduction [4, 313-316].

Observing these words forming without affixes, we, mainly, direct our attention to original integration of words and immediate connection, as most of compound words shape via those means of formation.

In the above mentioned work-book there is analyzed the process of original integration and immediate connection of words: *чёрно-белый, диван-кровать; водонепроницаемый, засухоустойчивый*.

As an example for immediate connection there are given the following compound words: *быстрорастворимый, долгоиграющий*. Usually the compound words forming in this way can be as alternatives for word phrases. [4, 313].

According to N.M.Shanskiy and A.N.Tikhonov, the compound words which form with the integration of two or more morphemes consist of words that are considered to be productive from the point of nouns and adjectives within the present-day Russian language, and new verbs are not shaped via this method [5, 68].

The concept of compound words is profoundly studied in the present Uzbek language as well. There is paid greater attention to the process of formation of compound words and compound adjectives. Particularly, the way of formation of syntactic (microsyntagmatic) relationship between the components of compound words and compound adjectives and its types are deeply analyzed in the work-books of M.Mirzayev, S.Usmonov and I.Rasulov.

As it is indicated in the work-book, there exist the following syntactic relationships between the components of the compound nouns:

1. Attributive – defining: *оққуш, учбурчак*
2. Subject – predicative: *Сойкелди, қорёғди*
3. Object – predicative: *муз ёрар, отбоқар*
4. Adverb – predicative: *босволди, олибсотар*
5. Predicative (sentence) – address: *уртўқмоқ, ёрилтош*.

In compound adjectives:

1. Subject - predicative: *Бахтиёр*.
  2. Attributive - defining: *НИМЖОН, нимранг*.
  3. Object – predicative: *тинчликсевар*.
  4. Adverb – predicative: *эртапишар*
- [6, 109-118].

In this turn, it is characteristic that there is paid more attention to the syntactic relationships as attributive-defining, object-predictive, adverb-predicative, predicative-address that are studied in lower branch of syntax. It is important that these type of syntactic relationships on the surface of the word, even the existence of the relationship between subject and predicative provide an opportunity to prove scientifically the syntax of the word.

Generally, these syntactic relationships are observed on the surface of the sentence as well – the object of investigation of the larger branch of syntax. However, the object of the investigation of lower branch of syntax is different according to its static



characteristic in compound words. The syntactic relationships of sentence components are always dynamic.

In accordance with the claim of A.Gulomov, the compound word is characterized on the basis of a definite lexical meaning – a certain complicated notion and a separate formation of grammatical and phonetic structure. This implies that it is one word and there is no grammatical connection between its components – parts. (but there is a semantic connection) [7, 3].

The view of A.Gulomov can be agreed with, particularly, it is essential that there exist a semantic connection between the components of compound words. The words which form certain relationships in the process of word formation are to be within the frames of semantic distribution. However, it seems that the scientist's view about absence of grammatical connection, namely, semantic connection, between the components of words needs a little proof, since when we address to the inner structure of compound words, we can observe the existence of above mentioned microsyntactic relationship as attributive-defining, object – predicative, adverb – predicative and others between their components. In our viewpoint, the meaning expressed in compound words is accepted in a certain separate state which cannot be divided into parts. From the point of syntax, it can be assumed that the components of compound words are in a hidden connection. In this turn, the term mentioned above as predicate can be used.

A.Gulomov presents the following view in his research: “ Semantic and formal connection – common features of formation of compound words remain the same. However, this connection can become unnoticeable as the result of different factors (for example, due to phonetic change, the process of simplicity): **ТОҒОЛЧА: то-ғол-ча – тоғ-олча...** [7, 33].

In our opinion, this idea of A.Gulomov is completely true, as it is undeniable that there is semantic and formal syntactic connection between the components of compound words. Even phonetic features of a word cannot prevent this connection. In this case we can observe both semantic and syntactic connections via the inner structure of a word. If the components of a compound word relate via the means of affix, the syntactic connection between them does not require explanation, but there is the presence syntactic linkage between the components of compound words which are connected without affixes. For instance, if we pay attention to the word **ЎҚ ИЛОҲ**, we can see that the components of this compound word are connected through the means of semantic valence. In other words, semantic distribution provides simultaneously syntactic connection.

## REFERENCES

1. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка. –М. 1956. – С. 117.
2. Кубрякова Е. С. Теория номинации и слово образование // Языковая номинация –М., 1977. – С. 283.
3. Гвоздев А. Н. Современный русский литературный язык. – М. 1973.-С. 218.
4. Современный русский язык. – М., 1989.-С.312-316.
5. Шанский Н. М., Тихонов А. Н. Современный русский язык. –М.,1981. –С.68.
6. Мирзаев М., Усмонов С., Расулов И. Ўзбек тили. – Тошкент, 1966. 109-118-бетлар.
7. Ғуломов А. Сўз ясалиши// Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. Морфология. –Тошкент, 1975. 33-бет.