Маkhazhanova L.M.[1], Aliyarova L.M.[2], Khalenova A.R.[3],

senior lecturers of al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Kazakhstan, Almaty,
e-mail: makhazhanova.leila@mail.ru, aliyarova.laura@mail.ru, ainagul-khalenova@mail.ru

CLASSIFICATIONS OF COMPOUND WORDS IN MULTI-LANGUAGE SYSTEMS

This article examines the different scientific approaches and classifications of compound words in multi-language systems, as well as the basic methods of word formation in German, the methods of writing compound words, features, difficulties and rules for translating complex, multi-part words on German vocabulary examples. The purpose of this work is defining relations of complex names and isomorphic free word combinations on the basis of existing most acceptable criteria for selecting complex words, as well as the analyzing the structure of complex names and the establishment of their basic structural types and word-formation models. The article reviews the domestic and foreign literature on the considered problem, including reviews of domestic scientists on grammatical categories. The studies examined allowed us to determine the main directions, ideas and concepts in the study of this conceptions and to determine the prospects for further research.

Key words: compound words, classification, interrelation of components, lexico-grammatical character, word formation, connecting elements.

Махажанова Л.М.[1], Алиярова Л.М.[2], Халенова А.Р.[3],

әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің аға оқытушылары,
Қазақстан, Алматы қ.,
e-mail: aliyarova.laura@mail.ru; makhazhanova.leila@mail.ru, ainagul-khalenova@mail.ru

Күрделі сөздердің тілдік жүйелердегі жіктелуі

Мақалада түрлі тілдік жүйелердегі әртүрлі ғылыми тәсілдер мен күрделі сөздердің жіктелуін, сондай-ақ неміс тілінде сөзжасамның негізгі тәсілдерін, күрделі сөздердің жазу әдістерін, ерекшеліктері мен неміс тілінен келтірілген күрделі және көпжақты сөздерді аударудағы ережелерін талқылайды. Мақаланың мақсаты күрделі атаулардың қарым-қатынастарын анықтау және изоморфты еркін сөз тіркестерінің ең қолайлы критерийлері негізінде күрделі сөздерді оқшаулау, сондай-ақ күрделі атаулар құрылымын талдау және олардың негізгі құрылымдық түрлері мен сөзжасау модельдерін құру болып табылады.

Мақалада қарастырылып отырылған мәселе бойынша, отандық және шетелдік әдебиеттерден шолу, сонымен қатар, грамматикалық категориялар туралы отандық ғалымдардың пікірлері беріледі.

Түйін сөздер: күрделі сөздер, жіктелу, қарым-қатынас компоненттері, лексикалық және грамматикалық сипат, сөзжасам, байланыстырушы элементтер.

Махажанова Л.М.[1], Алиярова Л.М.[2], Халенова А.Р.[3],

старшие преподаватели Казахского национального университета им. аль-Фараби
Казахстан, г. Алматы,
e-mail: makhazhanova.leila@mail.ru, aliyarova.laura@mail.ru, ainagul-khalenova@mail.ru

Классификации сложных слов в разносистемных языках

В этой статье рассматриваются различные научные подходы и классификации сложных слов в разных языковых системах, а также основные приемы словообразования в немецком языке, способы написания сложных слов, особенности, трудности и правила перевода сложных,

многосоставных слов на примерах из немецкой лексики. Целью данной работы является определение отношений сложных имен и изоморфных свободных словосочетаний на основе существующих наиболее приемлемых критериев выделения сложных слов, а также анализ строения сложных имен и установление их основных структурных типов и словообразовательных моделей.

В статье дан обзор отечественной и зарубежной литературы по рассматриваемой проблеме, в том числе рассмотрены отзывы отечественных учёных о грамматических категориях. Рассмотренные работы позволили определить основные направления, идеи и понятия в исследовании данного концепта, определить перспективы дальнейшего исследования.

Ключевые слова: сложные слова, классификация, взаимоотношение компонентов, лексико-грамматический характер, словообразование, соединительные элементы.

Introduction

In many ancient and modern languages, compounding plays an important role, both genetically and in purely synchronous terms, because of its exceptional productivity. Compositions often take a leading place among other ways of word formation. Compounding often occupies a leading place among other methods of word formation. At the same time, the specifics of this word-building method can not be considered established. Despite the fact that the main types of additions are marked and described in more ancient Indian grammarians and some models of complex words in different languages have been the subject of a detailed description, despite the fact that the special literature on compounding became literally boundless. The debate about the nature of compounding and its distinctive signs is considered to have not lost its relevance. When incorporating, the merging of several root words occurs, denoting one meaningful whole corresponding to the sentence. The merged parts of such an incorporated whole have their own lexical content, with which they appear in other combinations with other, equally semantically significant, words. Mergeable words can be phonetically changed, truncating their foundations and revealing the rules of harmony of sounds.

Experiment

A similar kind of integrated complex begins and ends with the complete content of the whole statement (actions, actants, adjuncts and circonstants), that is, the same proto-elements that are realized in parts of speech and sentence members in languages of the nominative type (let us compare Kazakh and German languages). Thus, in incorporation, we have an integral syntactic structure, which in one merged form resembles a word with one finished content in meaning, which corresponds to the sentence (Ulman S., 1977: 267).

Results and discussion

Composites and incorporating complexes are substantially different from the merged syntactic units of polysynthetic languages. To illustrate the incorporation, we give an example of the Chukchi sentence:*Ich nehme Hande aus der Tashe.* Here, the action, as well as the first and second actants are presented in a merged form, in which it is not necessary to talk about individual members of the proposal. Meanwhile, in all the resulted incorporated complexes the content of the whole sentence, constructed with exact observance of rules, is transferred by certain syntactic methods. There are already sentences that contain the basic elements of the statements (domestic situation), and these in turn require their syntactic processing. This design is expressed by the order of placing the components of parts in a single, syntactically integral construction, connected by the reception method of incorporation.

In the Kazakh language sentence, the first actant *du – (сен) – you* starts the entire incorporated complex, the second actant *қолдар – (Hande) – Hands* is put before the action, expressed by the words go out, ausgang, who then turned to the verb form. In the Koryak example, the first actant *sie – (они) – they* are at the beginning, the second actant at the end, and between them is placed the action around which the related words and particles *қазір – jetzt – now*, and meaning *the duration of the action*. Here is the reception of full incorporation.

Accepting full incorporation of allomorphs into German and Kazakh composites, as they contain a share, which is removed to eliminate the predication. In the case of partial incorporation, not all of the proposals merge, but only those parts of it that are most related to each other in terms of its semantic meaning. Such a method combines that its totality gives a complete syntactic expression that receives an independent meaning in the sentence. As a result, there are mergers that can be isomorphic composites. Here is formed an internal grouping in

the sentence, the component parts of which semantically gravitate towards each other (Benvenist E.H., 1974: 442], (Gak V.G., 1989: 15-17).

In Kazakh, German and English, isomorphic constructions are presented, for example: *жақсы бала, a good boy, ein gutter Junge.*

The adjoining definition of cases and numbers does not change, the corresponding number and case gets only *бала* is comparable: *жақсы балалар, good boys, gute Jungen.*

In Kazakh and German languages, the merging of the *«unformed accusative case»* takes place with the verb immediately followed by it, let us compare: *Ұйқы жастық сұрамайды.* This example is isomorphic to the Gilyak merging of the second actant with the action, let us compare by Gilyak merging: *A good person catches a fish. Жақсы адам балық аулайды. Ein guter* Mann fischt Fische. Presented in the example of the Gilyak language, the incorporated complex «completive» + «verb» – *балық аулау, catch a fish, Fische fischen* is isomorphic to the Kazakh sequence *«unformed accusative case + «verb» (балық, аулайды),* which is indivisible in meaning and can not change order of words, that is, can not change the position of the match (Stepanova M.D., 1960: 18-19).

Most linguists who have experienced the influence of the de Saussure school recognize the existence of two types of relations in languages – syntagmatic and paradigmatic. Homogeneous members should be considered as paradigmatic, but are connected syntagmatic. Being the same, they should occupy one place in the discourse, but they take two from the place (focus), and do not replace each other (substitutable). And in fact, different syntactic methods are used in different languages of the world to overcome the problem of homogeneous sentence members. Such methods include composites. Of course, another question arises: why do homogeneous terms exist? There are various explanations. Thus, the Indian linguist G. Guru considers homogeneous terms as the result of «bonding» several sentences (Katsnelson S. D., 1965: 63), (Kubryakova E.S., 1969: 45).

First of all, sentences with homogeneous terms are rearranged in type composites. In a compound word, two equal parts of the sentence, nouns, are combined. Words are related to each other by metonymy relationships or, in a particular case, synecdoche, compare with Germ. *Tischdecke – дастархан – tablecloth (*integer. + part = synecdoche); *Wasserflasche – су құйғыш ыдыс, water flew dish, association* by contiguity – metonymy *(жидкость и ее вместилище).*

Here are some examples from other Indo-European languages. Classical examples are given by the Vedic language: *(aya – жер), sky – land, Himmel-Boden, father-mother, Vater-mutter.*

The peculiarity is that both members are equal. This is what determines their specificity. They, therefore, do not form together with the syntactic construction in the proper sense of the word, but are united by the relation of the composition, the analysis of which would already apply to the theory of an all-union work. Therefore, it does not allow the information of two members to one or the primacy of one of the components over another, except for the relation of the precedence fixed by tradition, but, however, reversible: *parents* or *mother-father.*

Combining the two names implements the conjunctionless connection as a syntactic feature and, moreover, serves as a lexical way of expressing for the syntactic form of the so-called elliptic dual number (Lekomtsev YU.K., 1983: 28-30).

Here, the relation between the members of the composite and the sentence is not semantic, but tectonic. In the understanding of I.F.Vardulia tectonics is the structure of each unit of the language (in our case, the sentence and the composite) and their hierarchy in the tiered stratification of the language (the sentence is the emigram unit of the grammatical tier, that is, the overlying one, and the composite is the ethical unit of the grammatical tier, that is, the underlying one). These relations are outside the designatum, that is, beyond semantics. Of course, it is not possible for the two components of a complex name to retain all the richness of syntactic links that a free sentence can have (Ulman S., 1977: 268).

Another type within the «binom» is a complex name, combining two nouns and others. Between them and the type there is an essential difference: this type means not two, but one real thing. But it denotes it by two connected signs, of which both are nominal. It is necessary to identify the relationship between the two members, and then the syntactic structure to which the new unit is created (metaphor, relation by similarity).

Of the two members, the name always gives the first. The second term serves the species definition first, applying to it, the name of another class. But between the two referents there is a relation of strict negation. The being, designated hence, is by external attributes a member of two different classes, which, however, are both heterogeneous, and not symmetrical, or even similar. Object designated in this manner, differently linked to both classes. To one class it belongs by nature, another is attributed in a figurative sense.

Nevertheless, it is the paper, which has some analogy with the coin that replaces it. Thus, lexical signs such as paper, *қағаз – papier* carry in themselves two categories: one reflects the objective nature of things (the value of the referent), the other – the figure of thought (the meaning of signification). The designatum receives a sign function only in combination of each of the members of the composite; each member of the composite does not individually designate the designatum. The role of these complex is to combine in one distinguishing appellation the classification according to real characteristics and the classification by external similarity. This proves that the relation is established between things, and not between signs (between referents, and not between designata). Consequently, here we are not talking about semantics, but about tectonics (Meje A., 1968:264), (Stepanova M.D., 1960:367), (Benvenist E.H., 1974: 15-16).

We also see the syntactic structure that underlies these complex names. This is not a logical indicator of the identity between the two classes, because the conditions of use would require such a definition: it is a propositional form function that is applied here to the real object, and, however, the referents are incompatible, which would be inconsistent (Lekomtsev YU.K., 1983: 447), (Dokulil M., 1968: 264).

The relation established by the verb *«быть»* should rather be understood here as a relation of the semantic assimilation of two different concepts on the basis of some common trait that is implicit in them, but is not indicated between *«birds, die Vogel, құстар»* and *«flies – жәндіктер – die Fliege «* – this will be a semantic feature. As identification by similarity between the named object and the compared object, this construction, which does not correspond to any of the logical meanings of the verb *«to be – болу – sein»,* is reflected in the complex name through a simple superposition of two characters that form it – a descriptive and expressive way.

It can be concluded that this complex name and the free structure supporting, it can be an intuitively perceivable relationship between a named object and some other class object and express this similarity in the form of a double sign, the first member of which is identifiable-likened, and the second determinant – likening. So, in the nomenclature a new class is set up, in which the way of designating, combining two already known signs into a new unit, makes saving on a single sign, either leaving it as a spare only, or by crowding it out when it remains, differentiating it in a new way: so, from the original name of the French. Martin, in common speech denoting *воробья,* are formed *Martin – Fischer, Мартин – балықшы, Martin – Fisherman* (Benvenist E.H.,1974: 265).

The basis of the complex is named after a phrase in the genitive with the determining and determined in the nominative (in whatever way or carried out formally, it is the attitude, for simplicity indicated herein in terms of case inflections).

Of all the classes of addition of this class shows very clear and direct connection free syntactic base, to the point that sometimes complicated name and syntagma are apparently interchangeable as desired. If this is so, then to some extent the complex name and syntagma allow a free and indifferent choice, one can consider this type of complex name pleonastic and call into question its validity with respect to the syntagma. And, in some cases, it was also productive. It is about finding a criterion for the difference between the complex name and the syntagma on which the selection of the components of these complex names is based.

To find it, first should consider a list of complex names of this class and establish which categories make up the components of complex names of this type. Here, the ancient Indo-European languages are a particularly convenient field for observations. Originally, this type was rare and narrowly limited.

First of all, there is a component *бастық, иесі – head, manager – Ober wirt* very productive, having a whole paradigm: *head of household – үй иесі – Wirt der Familie.* Here, the components are incomplete, they need to be complimented: the son of that, the head of that, the king of that. Composites of the same class subsequently appear. Here, we are not talking about a wagon made of gold, but about a cart full of gold (in German *goldbeladener Wage – Ва-кернагель – ein Wagen voll Gold – Гельднер) to the same class belongs Eng. arrow-head (наконечник стрелы)* (Benvenist E.H., 1974: 267), (Helbig G., 1976: 51), (Benvenist E.H., 1974: 18).

Conclusion

The production of complex words and their functioning in a system of different languages has a different character, which manifests itself not only in the principle of simply attaching one word to another, but also in the morphological and lexical structure of complex words.

Comprehensive study of the forms of communication, the study of the components of complex words in the two named heterogeneous languages will help to establish their typological feature, and at the same time to form an idea of the general trend of their development at the level of word formation, which is of great importance in the theoretical study of a particular language.

Литература

Ульман С. Семантические универсалии. Русс. пер. Сборн. Новое в лингвистике. – Вып. Л. – М., 1977. – С. 267-269.

Бенвенист Е. Общая лингвистика. Под. ред. Ю.С. Степанова. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. – С. 242.447.

Гак В.Г. О контрастивной лингвистике / Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – Вып. ХХУ. Контрастивная лингвистика. – М., 1989. – С. 5-17.

Степанова. М.Д. Словосложение в современном немецком языке. Докторская диссертация. – М., 1960. – С. 63.

Кацнельсон С.Д. Основные задачи лингвистической типологии. Лингвистическая типология и восточные языки. – М., 1965. – С. 45-49.

Кубрякова Е.С. О словообразовательной системе языка и отношениях словообразовательной производности. – Рига, 1969. – С. 28-30.

Лекомцев Ю.К. Введение в формальный язык лингвистики. / Отв. ред. Зализняк А.А. // Институт литературы АН СССР. – 1983. – С. 123-127, 51, 264.

Мейе А. Введение в сравнительное изучение индоевропейских языков. / Русс. пер., 1968. – С. 361-367.

Лекомцев Ю.К. Введение в формальный язык лингвистики. / Отв. ред. Зализняк А.А. // Институт литературы АН СССР. – 1983. – С. 264.

Dokulil M. Zur Frage der Stelle der Wortbildung in Sprachsystem. – Sas., 1968. – C. 51.

Helbig G. Zur Rolle des kontrastiven Sprachverleichens fur den Fremdsprachenunterrricht // Deutsche Fremdsprache. –1976. – Nr.l. – C. 18-20.

References

Benvenist E.H. (1974). Obshhaya lingvistika [General Linguistics]. Pod red. YU.S. Stepanova, M. Progress, p. 242, 447. (In Russian)

2. Dokulil M.(1968). Zur Frage der Stelle der Wortbildung in Sprachsystem [Zur Frage der Stelle der Wortbildung in Sprachsystem]. Sas., p.51. (in German)

Gak V.G. (1989). O kontrastivnoj lingvistike. Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike [On Contrastive Linguistics]. [New in foreign linguistics]. Vyp. 26, Kontrastivnaya lingvistika, M., p. 5-17. (In Russian)

Helbig G. (1976). Zur Rolle des kontrastiven Sprachverleichens fur den Fremdsprachenunterrricht [Zur Rolle des kontrastiven Sprachverleichens fur den Fremdsprachen unterrricht]. Deutsch als Fremdsprache, No. l, p.18-20. (in German)

Katsnel'son S. D. (1965). Osnovnye zadachi lingvisticheskoj tipologii [The main tasks of linguistic typology]. «Lingvisticheskaya tipologiyi vostochnye yazyki» [Linguistic typology and oriental languages]. M., p. 45-49. (In Russian)

Kubryakova E.S. (1969). O slovoobrazovatel'noj sisteme yazyka i otnosheniyakh slovoobrazovatel'noj proizvodnosti [On the word-forming system of language and relations of word-formation production]. p. 28-30. (In Russian)

Lekomtsev YU.K. (1983). Vvedenie v formal'nyj yazyk lingvistiki [Introduction to the formal language of linguistics]. Otv. red. Zaliznyak A.A., AN SSSR In-t Vostokovedeniya, Nauka, Glav. red. vostoch.lit., p. 123-127, 51, 264. (In Russian)

Lekomtsev YU.K. (1983) Vvedenie v formal'nyj yazyk lingvistiki. [Introduction to the formal language of linguistics]. Otv.red. Zaliznyak A.A. ANSSSR Institut literatury, p.264. (In Russian)

Meje A. (1968). Vvedenie v sravnitel'noe izuchenie indoevropejskikh yazykov [Introduction to the comparative study of Indo-European languages]. Russ. per., p. 361-367. (In Russian)

Stepanova. M.D. (1960). Slovoslozhenie v sovremennom nemetskom yazyke [The composition in modern German language]. Doktorskaya dissertatsiya, Moscow, p. 63. (In Russian)

Ul'man S. (1977). Semanticheskie universalii [Semantic Universals]. russ. per., Sborn. Novoe v lingvistike, Vyp. 26, Moscow: p. 267-269. (In Russian)