

## Artículo de investigación

# Authentication of Composites in Different Structural Languages

### Аутентификация композитов в разноструктурных языках

Recibido: 25 de octubre del 2019

Aceptado: 9 de diciembre del 2019

Written by:

**Marzhan U. Suleybanova**<sup>160</sup>

Spin-code: 5915-3340

**Marifa M. Sulygova**<sup>161</sup>

Spin-code: 5737-9041

**Zulfira H. Kieva**<sup>162</sup>

Spin-code: 5482-8844

**Lyudmila M. Dudarova**<sup>163</sup>

Spin-code: 8024-7074

**Marziyat M. Bidanok**<sup>164</sup><sup>165</sup>Spin-code: 9009-2617

#### Abstract

At first glance, the problem of distinguishing complex words from similar free syntactic combinations does not exist.

But compound words are a reflection of "the diversity of linguistic activity." Therefore, one or more features sometimes is not enough to establish the identity of a compound word. And sometimes this is simply impossible, as some units correspond to all signs, while others do not. There are other units in the language, consisting of two or more words and outwardly similar to complex words. Sometimes it is very difficult to distinguish complex words from outwardly similar syntactic combinations and phraseological units.

It is natural that you need to draw a line between complex words and free combinations, because if we take all units of two or more words that designate one concept (with varying degrees of semantic integrity) as complex, we will make a huge confusion in definition of complex words and phrases.

#### Аннотация

На первый взгляд, проблемы разграничения сложных слов от сходных свободных синтаксических сочетаний не существует.

Но сложные слова являются отражением «многообразия языковой деятельности». Поэтому одного или нескольких признаков иногда оказывается недостаточно для установления тождества сложного слова. А иногда это бывает просто невозможно, так как одни единицы отвечают всем признакам, а другие - нет.

В языке есть и другие единицы, состоящие из двух или более слов и внешне похожие на сложные слова. Иногда очень трудно бывает отличить сложные слова от внешне похожих на них синтаксических сочетаний и фразеологических единиц.

Естественным является то, что нужно провести грань между сложными словами и свободными сочетаниями, так как, если мы примем все единицы, состоящие из двух или более слов, обозначающие одно понятие (с разной степенью семантической цельности), за сложные, то внесем огромную путаницу в

<sup>160</sup> Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Russian Language Department, Chechen State University,

<sup>161</sup> Doctor of philological sciences, professor, head of the Department of Teaching and elementary education methods of the Ingush State University

<sup>162</sup> Doctor of philological sciences, associate professor of the Department of Teaching and elementary teaching methods of the Ingush State University; Head of the Ingush Language Department of the Ingush Scientific and Research Institute for Human Sciences named after Ch.E. Akhriev

<sup>163</sup> Candidate of philological sciences, professor, head of the Russian language department of the Ingush State University

<sup>164</sup> Doctor of Philology, Deputy Director for Science Adygeya Republican Institute of humanitarian studies named after T. M. Kerashev

**Keywords:** compound words, free syntactic combinations, the problem of delimitation, phraseological units.

определение и сложных слов, и словосочетаний.

**Ключевые слова:** сложные слова, свободные синтаксические сочетания, проблема разграничения, фразеологические единицы.

## Introduction

Recognition of composites and their associated structures is not only a theory problem. The ordering and spelling of complex words, the sequence in identifying complex words with the corresponding syntactic constructions, depends on how it is solved.

“A compound word, being a successful means of compressing semantic and syntactic information into the most compact form, especially clearly shows the complexity of the relationship of different levels of units. The peculiar arrangement of the compound word in the general language system (between morphology and syntax, grammar and vocabulary, speech use and the language system) determines the difficulties that arise in determining the status of a compound word” (Sadykova, 2002). Moreover, for well-known reasons, the so-called fused, spliced, that is, fused complex words, like paired ones, do not cause difficulties in their identification. We are talking about the difference between compound words from syntactic or phraseological combinations. And the definition of Sadykova A.G. most suitable for compound words. Other authors also draw attention to such an intermediate position of compound words. I.V Nikitenko (Sadykova, 2002) calls them "crap-free, super-verbal nominative means" and "synplexes".

The need to distinguish between composites and similar syntactic constructions is dictated not only by theoretical considerations. The non-distinction of complex words, which takes place at present, leads to inadequate reflection and description of language units both in theoretical works and in dictionaries creates great difficulties in spelling complex words, which in turn affect the quality of teaching Chechen and Ingush languages regarding spelling of complex words and related syntactic units.

## Research Methods

We used the classification method, methods of linguistic analysis, which are widely used by all

researchers working with the material of specific languages or language groups.

In this case, it is worth highlighting the method of typological comparison used in this study, which has proved its effectiveness not only when comparing languages of different genetic and structural affiliations, but also in studies devoted to one language or group of languages, consideration of which against the background of as many other languages as possible makes it possible to identify and explain such facts and features of the language being studied that could not be detected without such a background.

## Research results

At first glance, the problem of distinguishing complex words from similar free syntactic combinations does not exist. In any case, this problem is considered in sufficient detail in a theoretical sense. Shcherba L.V. considered this on the example of the Russian language, Bozhev A.Yu. - on the example of Karachay-Balkar, Mamatov N.M. - on the example of the Uzbek, Muratov S.N. - on the example of the Bashkir, Ganiev F.A. - on the example of the Tatar language; This problem is considered in various aspects. Some authors elaborate in sufficient detail the criteria for distinguishing complex words from similar constructions and give arguments, different in their degree of persuasiveness, that justify these criteria. However, researchers often evaluate the importance of individual criteria differently or overlook some of them.

So, Sadvakasov G.S. (Sadvakasov, 1956) offers 5 criteria that distinguish complex words from other constructions: 1) integral semantics and idiom; 2) integrity (moreover, we are talking about graphic design, although this is not specified); 3) a single syntactic function; 4) phonetic changes in the composition of the word; 5) one centralizing stress. The criteria are true; however, it should be noted that Sadvakasov G.S. is talking about fused (his term), that is, actually complex words. However, their identification is

not a problem. The problem is represented by compound, that is, separately formed words. The goal is precisely to recognize them in order to fulfill a two-fold task: 1) to determine the nature and place of complex words in the language system and 2) the correct spelling of these units. These tasks are interdependent, and it is not known which of them is more important. It is no accident that the problem of distinguishing composites and phrases by many scientists is considered in close connection with the problems of spelling.

Boziev A.O. enumerates such features as graphic integrity, accentuation and semantic unity and idiom, and then rejects them one by one, the first as not at all acceptable, the second as characteristic also for phrases, the third as characteristic for phraseological units, and concludes: "A compound word differs from a phrase only in its nominative function, in the ability to act as a specific part of speech, that is, correspond in its grammatical functions to a simple word, and hence a clearer semantic integrity and close structural-morphological adhesion of their constituent elements" (Boziev, 1965).

Sadykova A.G. puts forward a "comprehensive set of criteria for distinguishing between composite and word combinations", consisting of ten points (Sadykova, 1992): 1) semantic integrity; 2) criterion of nominative integrity; 3) the impossibility of free substitution of the first and second components; 4) morphological integrity; 5) accent integrity; 6) impermeability, inability to separate the components of a compound word by the third; 7) the nature of semantic relations between the components of a compound word: a) attributive; b) predicative; c) circumstances; d) object; 8) relevance to one or another part of speech; 9) the ability to be formed according to certain structural and semantic models; 10) the ability to serve as a basis for the formation of new words.

However, we can not agree with all the distinguished features, since the unifying rather than differentiating features are indicated in paragraphs 7 and 9.

Approximately the same criteria are proposed by Mamatov N.M. (Mamatov, 1976). One of the criteria he distinguishes can be considered a single logical stress (as opposed to power) and one more: the components of a complex word can also be non-significant parts of speech, and both components in phrases should belong to significant parts of speech.

In general, the conclusion made on this subject by Semenova G.N. seems very correct to us: "To establish the criteria for distinguishing complex words in the Chuvash language, as in many Turkic and non-Turkic languages, it is not sufficient to single out as a reliable any separate attribute. Obviously, these criteria are in a certain relationship with each other, and, therefore, only with simultaneous consideration of the indicated signs of a complex word, it is possible to correctly solve the problem of specific features and features of the units under consideration" (Semenova, 2002).

In our opinion, all these criteria are systematized and most accurately identified in the work of Bobrik G.A. She approaches the problem of distinguishing complex words from the position of the word in general: "... a compound word is also a word. It is characterized by the presence of various signs of integrity, manifested in grammatical, phonetic, graphic design, in impermeability, in the strict order of components" (Bobrik, 1974).

Of the most famous features of the word is called: 1) a sign of integrity. First of all, we are talking about grammatical integrity, that is, the word as a whole, the compound word is also formed by one suffix. For instance: Russian конькобеж-ец; Chechen босбуу-р; Ingush босбуа-р «pimple, acne on the face». There is no direct match for the Bazbi language.

She (the person) includes in the concept of integrity phonetic and graphic design, that is, a single stress and continuous writing.

Bobrik G.A. writes about this sign: "the centralizing stress of the word creates in most cases the prerequisites for spelling integrity. But the rules in any language are conditional, and the integrity of vocabulary education may or may not be reflected in the graphic means of the language. Therefore, graphic wholeness, as well as grammatical, cannot be the main features of a compound word, although it is significant" (Bobrik, 1974).

The immobility of the components of the word, that is, the impossibility of inversion, is also included in the concept of integrity. In other words, the components of a compound word must follow each other in a solid sequence, otherwise they turn into either free combinations or a meaningless set of words. For example: a Russian конькобежец with an impossible бежец коньков; бӀаӀрахьесап with the impossible

хьесап бӀаьра, босбуург - a free combination бург бос.

The semantic content characterizing the designated subject or phenomenon can be distinguished in words, except for a simple nomination, that is, it is possible to distinguish between denotative and significative meaning.

For example, the Russian words ледорез, водонагреватель, Chechen шабохориг, хидохдийриг contain a certain focus on some unit, device, and the words даьхнилелориг in Russian животновод, коневод; Chechen хьелийозархо “milkmaid”, дойлелорхо “horse breeder”, etc. indicate occupation. At the same time, they contain characteristic information. Moreover, the meaning of these words, as well as the meaning of the bulk of complex words, does not follow from the meaning of the individual components, from the simple sum of their meanings, that is, the semantic idiom is also characteristic of a complex word.

Shcherba L.V. wrote: “Any syntactic group can turn out to be a complex word, which should differ from the group only in that it means more than the sum of the values of the words that form it, thus phrases like railroad, general notebook, toothpaste, red wine (where the word red connects a number of qualities of wine, etc.) should be considered complex words” (Shcherba, 1945).

In morphological terms, a compound word is one part of speech, and the components of the phrase refer to different parts of speech. For example, Russian железнодорожник, платежеспособность; for Nakh languages: хӀусамнана, Ingush фусамнана, “housewife”, пондарлоккхург “harmonist; performer on any musical instrument” - a noun. ЦӀена хӀусам “clean, tidy dwelling” (цӀена “clean, tidy” - an adverb, хӀусам “dwelling, housing” - a noun). The components of a compound word cannot independently enter into syntactic relations, and the components of the phrase can form any other phrases. For example: цӀена, хаза хӀусам “clean, tidy dwelling”, хаза, йоккха хӀусам “neat, spacious dwelling”.

There are many more signs that are put forward by different researchers as criteria for distinguishing complex words and phrases. The main, in our opinion, are the aforementioned, which essentially reduce to signs of semantic, nominative, morphological, phonetic and functional (syntactic) integrity, impermeability and stability.

But compound words are a reflection of “the diversity of linguistic activity.” Therefore, one or more features sometimes is not enough to establish the identity of a compound word. And sometimes this is simply impossible, as some units correspond to all signs, while others do not. “There are no absolute boundaries anywhere in nature,” L. Shcherba considered. There are none of them in the language, and precisely because the language is constantly evolving, it is very difficult to delimit the delineating units in contact. There have always been and are many transitional forms. It should be taken into account that there are units that possess the attributes of both complex words and phrases, and in terms of the number and importance of these signs they can be “more” words and “less” phrases, and, conversely, more phrases and less words.

It is natural that the line between complex words and free combinations needs to be drawn, because if we take all units of two or more words that designate one concept (with varying degrees of semantic integrity) as complex, we will make a huge confusion in definition of complex words and phrases.

Many researchers, basically correctly revealing the essence of complex words, do not establish their boundaries and differences from other, outwardly similar linguistic units.

Compound words in the modern Chechen language, as you know, consist of two, less often - three words. There are other units in the language, consisting of two or more words and outwardly similar to complex words. Sometimes it is very difficult to distinguish complex words from outwardly similar syntactic combinations and phraseological units. The difficulty is that, according to the laws of the Chechen language, combinations of both names and verbs can represent complex words and free syntactic combinations. L.V. Shcherba once pointed out that “it is necessary to emphasize in every way that, in the absence of a clear formal expression, in each case, define “speech” (“parole”), with which we are dealing with morphological word formation, with a complex word or with a syntactic group, “Sometimes it is unusually difficult” (Shcherba, 1945). Thus, in the modern Chechen language, many complex words are outwardly similar to free syntactic combinations and phraseological units. Therefore, at the moment, it is advisable to identify the differences of complex words from free syntactic units and thus establish the specific features of complex words.

A criterion in determining the boundaries of a word by scientists is proposed its integrity.

So, A.I. Smirnitsky points out that “precisely with its whole-structured nature, which, generally speaking, expresses a well-known semantic wholeness, a word, even a complex word, differs from a free phrase, in particular from an “idiomatic” phrase, that is, from the so-called phraseological units, etc.” (Smirnitsky, 1952).

This is also indicated by O.S. Akhmanova: “On the contrary, words, no matter how complex they are, always appear as integrally formed units — their technical monolithicity, their wholeness, naturally, is an external expression of their semantic monolithicity” (Akhmanova, 1954).

F.A. Ganiev (Ganiev, 1982) identifies the following features that give the word integrity in contrast to separately formed syntactic combinations:

1. The constituent components of compound words denote one lexical meaning and appear as one member in a sentence. For instance:

Ненанана хьоме хуьлу муьлххачу а стега.  
“Grandmother is always adored by all”;  
ИссблӀаьргах дозуш дара хӀинца шадерг а.  
“Now everything depended on the nine”.

In the above examples, the compound words ненанана “grandmother”, иссблӀаьрг “nine” express one lexical meaning and act as one member of a sentence: the words in the above sentences are respectively subject to and complemented.

Unlike complex words, the components of free syntactic combinations express two different lexical meanings and appear in the sentence as two members of the sentence, for example: ХӀума лачкӀийначунна – цхьа къа, яйначунна - исс къа “one sin to stole, and nine sins to lost” (Chechen proverb). In this proposition, the members of the combination of essa express different lexical meanings and act as different members of the sentence: definitions and additions

2. The components of a compound word in the Chechen language cannot be shared by a third word having an independent meaning, i.e. they cannot be located distantly. So, for example, it is impossible to separate by any word the components of the compound word

къоракхокха “gorlinka”,  
ӀаьржабӀаьрг “furuncle”, хӀлусамнана  
“housewife”, etc.

With the distant arrangement of the components of a complex word, it either decomposes into syntactic units, or loses its integrity and turns into an artificial set of words without a specific meaning.

I.V. Arnold (Arnold, 1959) speaks of the indivisibility of a compound word, i.e. about the inability to insert another word or phrase in the English language between the components. If, for example, there is “sunbeam”, then you can insert another word between the article and the noun - and “bright sunbeam”, and “bright and unexpected sunbeam”, since the article is a separate word, but it is impossible to insert any word between the basics of “sun” and “beam”, since these are not independent words, but morphemes.

Unlike complex words, the components of free syntactic combinations can be located distantly, while their integrity as a combination is not violated, the meaning is not lost. Thus, when a third word separates it by a third word, there is no violation of integrity and meaning: in Chechen, чеч.сийна кхокха (Сийна хаза кхокха бара корехь Ӏаш “A beautiful gray pigeon was sitting on the windowsill”).

The nature of syntactic relations Sacks refers to the external signs of the integrity of the compound word. He writes: “Everyone knows that the components of complex words cannot enter independent syntactic relations: for example, in the phrases (a factory) financed by the government“, both full-meaning words can be defined: and factory generously financed by the British government. In the case of the complex word government-financed, none of its components can be expanded. Unable to say generously government-financed. The expansion of the first component is possible only through the formation of a three-component compound word: Labor-govern-ment-fiinance. Accordingly, the components of a compound word can enter into syntactic relations not independently, but as part of the entire compound word.

E.B. Cherkaskaya (Cherkaskaya, 1956) gives an example for this case: a good schoolgirl, where good refers not to the first and not to the second component, but to the whole combination.

In the Chechen language, a compound word with the first component is an adjective, you can add a defining word, for example, хьарсахъач, but цӀиен хьарсахъач "red cherry plum", беха Ӏаржахъач "long prune", etc. These definitions will apply to the whole complex. When the phrase is the same, where the first part is an adjective, the defining word can act as a homogeneous member next to the first part of the phrase - the adjective. For example: къена йоккха куотам "the old big chicken", доккха буърса жӀаьла and "big scary dog", etc.

This criterion is of great importance, especially with regard to verb composites, whose components are less monolithic. Therefore, the question of whether the defining word is assigned to the first part of the verb composite or to the whole complex of the composite has an important distinctive meaning.

For example, the adjective adverb чӀорӀа "strong, strong" in referring to муохътуоха composite "shout" ("cry to hit") stands for the adverb (circumstances of the course of action): чӀорӀа муохътуоха "strongly shout" - and, therefore, refers to the whole complex, and not to one (first) component - the noun as a qualitative adjective-definition.

The same can be said for the following combinations: дика сатуоха "tolerate well", вуо катуоха "badly grab", etc.

If the defining words are assigned not to the whole verb complex, but to only one first component - the name as defined, we would have separately designed combinations of the complement + predicate type, and not a composite that is distinguished by its integrity. In addition, the phrase as a nominative unit acquires meaning in a sentence, that is, its nominative function relies on the context, while the similar function of a compound word is independent of context.

For example, the compound word хьарсахъач has a meaning outside the sentence, while the phrase does not have such a meaning outside the sentence, that is, the phrase as a syntactic category usually realizes its nominative function in the context, and the composite performs this function out of context, like a lexical unit.

It is known that the context also contributes to the differentiation of a complex word and phrase, consisting of the same components; see, for example, Суна Ӏаржабаьрг йаьлла. "I had a

boil (sore)," but Ӏаржа бӀаьрг бу Ахьмадан "Ahmad has a black eye," etc.

In addition, the difference between nominal compound words and the corresponding phrases appears when answering the question хӀун? (what?) or мила? (Who?). The fact is that in this case the whole compound word is called, while only the main (usually second defined) word is taken from the combination for such an answer. For example, compound words: ХӀун ю иза? "What is this?" Хьарсахъач бара иза-м "This is Alycha". БуочабӀар дара иза-м "This is a walnut". КӀалдаьтта дара иза-м "This is cheese (cottage cheese) with butter (the name of the dish)." Ботьха хӀума ю "There is a snake", etc. To answer these questions, the use of a phrase is optional. For example, take the phrase кӀай куотам "white chicken". The first part - the adjective-definition - doesn't have to be given to answer the question хӀун ю иза? "what is it?". Suffice it to say: Котам ю иза. "The chicken is this." At the same time, it is necessary to note the possibility of transient cases when the first components of other complex words can also be omitted when answering the question posed.

This criterion as a whole is also suitable for all other types of nominal, verbal composites that answer the same question.

Otherwise, the question is posed in relation to verb composites and related phrases. Here, when answering the question: ХӀун дан? "What to do?" In the phrase, as a complex verb, the first component will not be omitted, for example: Ахь хӀун до? "What are you doing?" - гӀаж туху "I hit with a stick", тӀулг кхуссу "throw a stone" (phrases) or "turn away" to a rooster, "bite off" a цегуху (difficult words), etc.

This is how any concrete action is expressed in the Nakh languages. In a non-specific sense, a verb will be used, and the object-name will be omitted: ХӀун дан? "What to do?" - туоха "hit", кхуосса "drop", etc. Thus, it is impossible to establish the criterion for distinguishing a complex verb and the corresponding phrase in this method, since using a verb with an object name to indicate a specific action in Nakh languages - a common occurrence.

The composition of a phrase, in contrast to the composition of a compound word, can also vary while maintaining the same primary or secondary term - кӀай куотам "white chicken", кӀай цӀа "white house" or Ӏаржа куотам "black chicken", Ӏаржа цӀа "black house" (the second part varies); тӀулг кхуосса "throw a stone," Ӏаж

кхуоцца “throw an apple” (the first part varies)” (Chokaev, 1963).

3. Between the components of complex words there is interdependence and interpenetration, due to which it is impossible to omit any component without losing the meaning and wholeness of the word. For example, in the Chechen language in the words хлусамнана “housewife” and ненанана “grandmother”, in English words schoolgirl and toothbrush, when omitting any component, their integrity and meaning are violated.
4. There are phonetic-prosodic differences between complex words and loose syntactic combinations. Firstly, free syntactic combinations that look like complex words usually have two independent stresses. Complex words resembling loose syntactic combinations, with the exception of pair words, have only one independent stress, while the first component may have auxiliary stress. For example, a single stress in the compound word ненанана “grandmother” that falls on the first syllable of the first component. If we consider a phrase similar to this complex word, then in prosodic terms you can observe a completely different picture, i.e. in this phrase there will be two independent stresses (исс къа “nine sins”) or three independent stresses: сийна хаза кхокха “blue (blue) beautiful dove”. Secondly, there is no pause between the components of a compound word that we meet between the individual words that make up the syntactic phrase. The absence of a verbal pause is a differentiating feature of a compound word and syntactic phrase. For example, we do not find any noticeable pause in the complex word къоркхокха “neck” that takes place in a phrase composed of the same units: сийна хаза кхокха.

I.P. Ivanova also highlights the phonetic sign in English as a sign of the integrity of the compound word. She writes: “Speaking of a phonetic attribute, it should be noted that a compound word usually acquires a unifying stress, in contrast to equal stresses in the members of a phrase. The damage to this feature is that “... along with a really large number of indisputable cases where there is a single emphasis, there are

many entities for which questions and perplexities arise” (Ivanova, 1977).

However, it is not only a matter of controversial cases when applying this feature. After all, a phonetic trait can only be applied to complex words recorded in lexicographic, research and other sources that inform us about the nature of stress in a particular word. The modern language is constantly replenished with lexical units that both readers and researchers meet for the first time, and often only in print, which eliminates the use of a phonetic attribute. Obviously, the opposite: the stress in the speech of native speakers is a derivative of how they understand one or another sequence of lexical units - as a close semantic unity (uniting stress) or as two independent units (two equal stresses).

G. Marchand has a remark on this subject: “Many complex words such as man-made, however, are often pronounced with emphasis on the first part of the word (for example: moth-eaten, spell-bound, frostbitten, homespun, heartfelt, heart-broken). For linguistic instincts, they probably seem more cohesive than words such as home, made, home, bred, custom-built, factory-packed, which are more the random nature of the formation and therefore pronounced with two stresses (in a dictative position). Compound words such as crest-fallen always receive emphasis on the first part” (Marchand, 1960).

### **Purpose of the Study**

1. To continue the scientific discussion on the problem of composite word formation in languages of different grammatical structures and in the Iberian-Caucasian in particular.
2. To pay attention to the fact of the development of this method of word formation in languages of different grammatical structures and in the Iberian-Caucasian in particular.

### **Findings**

Along with the above signs of the integrity of the compound word, other signs should be distinguished: these are spelling and morphological signs, as well as the sequence of the components of the compound word, the nature of the compatibility of the components of the compound word and the presence or absence of service elements.

Scientists note: “Speaking of the spelling feature of the integrity of a compound word, it should be

noted that the spelling of compound words in modern English is not uniform, they are written: separately, together, through a hyphen" (Meshkov, 1976).

At the same time, one can agree that "cases of consistent, uniform spelling are essential features by which one can judge the linguistic nature of a given education" (Ivanova, 1977).

Spelling complex words usually indicates a closer relationship between components and semantic structure. Therefore, it is customary to talk about the stages that a compound word passes in order of increasing semantic and structural unity between its components: separate writing - writing through a hyphen - continuous writing.

From this we conclude that separate spelling cannot serve as a sign of a phrase (in contrast to a compound word), while fused spelling can serve as a sign of a compound word (in contrast to a phrase). In other words, phrases are unlikely to be written together. Therefore, the spelling feature can be used as additional in determining the integrity of.

The morphological feature, however, establishes the morphological unity of the compound word in contrast to the phrase. It consists in the fact that complex words combine morphologically unformed basics. However, due to the fact that the morphological design of the English word is represented very poorly, this feature, although very reliable, is applicable only to a limited number of types of complex words. The most obvious application of this feature is to establish the integrity of words such as toothbrush, in which the first component is morphologically unformed, although it is clear that the brush is not for the tooth, but for the teeth, i.e. it is not a word, but a basis. The same is in the word book-filled and others. Consequently, a morphological feature can unambiguously indicate the integrity of the analyzed word, but this feature is applicable to a limited number of types of formations.

In the Chechen language, a morphological trait also takes place.

This feature relates to proper compound words, the first component of which loses the derivational affix of the adjective name, for example: хлусамнана (хлусаман нана) - "Housewife", денваша (ден ваша) - "uncle (according to the father)", денана (ден нана) - "grandmother (according to the father)",

маърйиша "the sister-in-law", маършича (маъран шича) - "cousin, cousin of her husband", ненанана (ненан нана) - "grandmother (by mother)", etc.

The first component of such composites is made out in the genitive case and in the Ingush language: даьда "grandfather (father, letter. Father father)", даьнана "grandmother (father, father's mother)", маьрда "father-in-law", маьрйиша "sister-in-law", маьрвоша "brother-in-law", маьрйоI "stepdaughter", уствоша "brother-in-law", усда "father-in-law", устыиша "sister-in-law", устнана "mother-in-law" is recognized.

In the Batsbi language there are no obvious signs of correlation of the first component with the form of the dative case, this is due to the fact that during the formation of case forms of nouns there is no alternation of vowels in the root (in Chechen and Ingush, the usually vowel root indicates that the first component of the composite belongs to the dative case), however, this is still the basis of the genitive case: мардад "father-in-law", дадвашо "uncle (according to his father)", даднан "grandmother (according to his father)", нанвашо "uncle (according to his mother)." Moreover, it is interesting that the value of the composite may depend on the order of the same components: for example, даднан is "grandmother on the father's side", and нандад is "parents (father and mother)" (Suleibanova, 2008).

It is well known that any sequence of lexical units isolated from the stream of speech that makes up one syntagma can be either a complex word or a phrase. Each language has a certain set of allowed phrases, so if the selected sequence of lexical units is outside the given set, it is a complex word. For example, it is obvious that in English a quantitative numeral cannot determine an adjective, and therefore the sequence 10,000 - a strong demonstration of "ten thousand people" is a compound word.

In other words, any sequence of lexical units actually observed in speech that does not meet the norms of collocation in a given language is a compound word, but not every sequence that meets the norms of collocation is not a complex word. For example, there are a number of complex words "adjective + noun," although such a sequence is typical of a phrase.

Speaking about the sequence of components of a compound word, it should be noted that for some types of complex words, the reverse order of



components may serve as an indicator of integrity. This refers to words with second components expressed by an adjective or participle, for example: oil-rich, man-made. In synonymous phrases, the word order would be: rich in oil, made by man.

Different linguists in the English language also distinguish other signs of the complexity of the compound word. So, E.B. Cherkaskaya and I.R. Halperin (Halperin and Cherkaskaya, 1956) note that phonetic, morphological and semantic features in modern English are used as indicators of the integrity of complex words.

The phonetic indicator is usually the unifying stress. A compound word with a unifying stress differs from the corresponding phrase in that one of the bases of the compound word (usually the second) is unstressed. For example: bla'ckboard "board", broa'dway "Broadway", etc. In some cases, however, the second component of the compound word does not lose stress completely, but partially, keeping it as secondary to the main unifying stress, for example: letter - paper, lion - hunter, 'table - cloth, etc.

We, agreeing with E.B. Cherkaskaya and I.R. Halperin, however, note that the unifying stress is not a mandatory feature of a compound word in modern English. The unifying stress can appear in a compound word both independently and in combination with other signs. The presence or absence of it in a compound word depends on the structural type of the word and on the nature of the semantic connection of the components.

### Conclusion

Morphological indicators of the integrity of the compound word by E.B. Cherkaskaya and I.R. Halperin are:

- 1) connecting elements - vowels "o", "i", consonant "s" in English, for example: gasometer "gas storage", sportsman "athlete", handicraft "manual work", etc.; there are no such words with connecting elements in the Chechen and Ingush languages; they are most likely not in the Batsbi language, not in all its grammatical features coinciding with the Vainakh languages: in any case, they are not found in the dictionary of N. and D. Kadagidze.
- 2) word-building suffixes - in English «ed», «er», for example: housekeeper, one - eyed and etc.; in the Tatar

language -лы/-ле, for example: беркатлы; -кыч/-кеч, for example: коточкыч, искиткеч and etc. (Suleibanova, 2008).

Based on the foregoing, we can distinguish the following signs of the integrity of the compound word in the Nakh languages:

1. The components of compound words denote one lexical meaning and appear in the sentence as one member.
2. A compound word is indivisible, ie it is not possible to insert another word or phrase between the components of a compound word.
3. The structural unity and integrity of the compound word depends on the unity of stress.
4. The unity of a compound word is formed by a single and integral meaning.
5. Indicators of the integrity of a compound word can serve as word-building suffixes.
6. The unity and integrity of a compound word also depends on the order of the components of the compound word and the nature of the compatibility of its components.

### References

- Akhmanova O.S. (1954) To the question of the difference between compound words and phraseological units (based on English and Swedish). Proceedings of the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, V. 4. P. 50-73.
- Arnold I.V. (1959) Lexicology of modern English. Moscow: Publishing house of literature in foreign languages, 1959. 352 p.
- Bobrik G.A. (1971) To the definition of the signs of a compound word. Philological collection Issue 10. - Alma-Ata, P.88-93.
- Bozиеv, A.Yu. (1965) Word formation of nouns, adjectives and adverbs in the Karachay-Balkar language. Nalchik: Kabardino-Balkars book publishing house, 88 p.
- Chokaeв K.Z. (1963) Morphology of the Chechen language. Word formation of parts of speech. Part I. -Grozny, 120 p.
- Ganiev F.A. (1982) The formation of complex words in the Tatar language. Moscow: Nauka, 150 p.
- Halperin, I.R. and Cherkaskaya, E.B. (1956) Lexicology of the English language. Publishing House: Moscow: State Central Courses of Foreign Languages "IN-YAZ", 298 pp.

- Ivanova, V.F. (1977) Principles of Russian Spelling. Leningrad: Publishing House of LGU, 230 p.
- Mamatov, N. (1976) About the classification of complex words in the Uzbek language. Council, Turkology, No. 4. P. 38-45.
- Marchand H. (1960) Substantive bahuvrihi compound of the anthroposemic field in English.
- Meshkov, O.D. (1976) Word formation of modern English. Moscow: Nauka, 245 p.
- Sadvakasov G.S. (1956) Word formation of nouns in the modern Uyghur language: PhD thesis. Ata, 16 p.
- Sadykova A.G. (2002) The system of substantive word composition in Turkic and Germanic languages in a comparative typological aspect. PhD thesis. Kazan, 492 p.,
- Sadykova, A. G. (1992) Comparative and typological study of nominal composites in different system languages (based on the material of the Tatar and English languages): abstract. dis. ... Cand. Philol. Sciences / A. G. Sadykova.- Kazan, 19 p.
- Shcherba L. V. (1945) "The next problems of linguistics. Izvestia of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Vol. 4, vol.5.- Moscow.
- Semenova, G.I. (2002) To the interpretation of the interaction of word composition and affixation as the main ways of word formation. Actual problems of the Chuvash language. Cheboksary,. P. 27-29.
- Smirnitsky A. I. (1952) On the Question of the Word (The Problem of "Separation of the Word"). Questions of the theory and history of language. Moscow: Nauka, P. 184-187.
- Suleibanova, M.U. (2008) Nominal and verbal composites in Nakh and foreign structural languages. Grozny. -165p.