

## Artículo de investigación

**TYOLOGICAL FEATURES OF WORD FORMATION IN  
LANGUAGES OF DIFFERENT SYSTEM****CARACTERÍSTICAS TIPOLOGICAS DE LA FORMACIÓN DE PALABRAS  
EN LENGUAS DE DIFERENTES SISTEMAS  
ТИПОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЯ НА ЯЗЫКАХ  
РАЗЛИЧНЫХ СИСТЕМ**

Recibido: 10 de febrero de 2019. Aceptado: 30 de marzo de 2019

Written by:

Marzhan U. Suleibanova<sup>3</sup>[https://elibrary.ru/author\\_items.asp? Authorid = 445134 & pubrole = 100 & show\\_refs = 1 & show\\_option = 0](https://elibrary.ru/author_items.asp?Authorid=445134&pubrole=100&show_refs=1&show_option=0)Kheda R. Salmurzaeva<sup>4</sup>Inna B. Bachalova<sup>5</sup>Birlant R. Zakrailova<sup>6</sup>**Abstract**

The article investigates the Nakh composites in typological perspective. Based on the linguistic material of various languages, the authors identified similarities and differences in the structure of languages that are of a general nature and, therefore, cover a wide range of homogeneous features. Studies of word formation in the Nakh and languages of different systems allow to conclude that the following general methods are used to form new lexical units (words): a) the derivation, б) compounding.

**Keywords:** derivation, compounding, composition, typology, Nakh languages, languages of different systems.

**Resumen**

El artículo investiga los compuestos de Nakh en perspectiva tipológica. Basándose en el material lingüístico de varios idiomas, los autores identificaron similitudes y diferencias en la estructura de los idiomas que son de naturaleza general y, por lo tanto, cubren una amplia gama de características homogéneas. Los estudios de formación de palabras en Nakh y lenguajes de diferentes sistemas permiten concluir que los siguientes métodos generales se utilizan para formar nuevas unidades léxicas (palabras): a) la derivación, b) composición.

**Palabras claves:** derivación, composición, composición, tipología, lenguajes Nakh, lenguajes de diferentes sistemas.

**Абстракт**

В статье исследуются соединения Нахских языков с типологической точки зрения. Авторами делается попытка на конкретном языковом материале различных языков показать те случаи сходств и различий в структуре языков, которые носят общий характер и, следовательно, охватывают широкий круг однородных признаков. Исследования словообразования в нахских и иноструктурных языках позволяют сделать вывод о том, что используются общие способы образования новых лексических единиц (слов): а) словопроизводство, б) словосложение.

**Ключевые слова:** словопроизводство, словосложение, композиты, типология, нахские языки, разносистемные языки.

<sup>3</sup> Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Russian Language Department, Chechen State University mail@chesu.ru

<sup>4</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Chechen Philology, Chechen State University

<sup>5</sup> Candidate of Philology, Acting Chair of the Russian Language, Chechen State University

<sup>6</sup> Senior Lecturer of the Russian Language Department, Chechen State University

## 1. Introduction

As noted by T.P. Lomtev, any language consists of a set of features, "common to some subset of a common set of languages" (Lomtev, 1967), and is a stable set of features. The question arises: what are these signs, which of them should be recognized typologically significant, important? Such signs can and even must be taken into account in the number of signs that make up the typological characteristic of this particular language. Although these signs are marked as signs of the structure of the language, they are not sustainable, and therefore cannot be taken into account when establishing a stable set of typological signs, in other words, they have no typological significance, i.e. cannot be considered typological.

All languages transmit certain information, otherwise the main purpose of the human language disappears. Language serve as the most important means of human communication.

There are differences between individual languages; for example, between Chinese with its immutable root words and Arabic with its system of expressing grammatical meanings with the help of strictly fixed changes in vowels, between Russian and English. However, these languages have a deep inner similarity: they are variations of the same particular social phenomenon - the human language in general. Consequently, common features are repeated in every single, concretely existing language. These features belong to a number of languages and act as a common; they are peculiar to all languages in general and each language in particular. It follows from the above that the individual and the general do not exist separately from each other, but form an inseparable unity. We see confirmations everywhere, including in the sphere of our consideration.

Linguistic typology examines those cases of similarities and differences in the structure of languages that are of a general nature and, therefore, cover a wide range of homogeneous features, based on the fact that "common structural features are found in various languages that have no genetic affinity" (Arakin, 1989). To understand the essence of the concept "type" it is important to remember that there is a unity of the general and the individual in a given phenomenon. This unity is the essence of the concept, which we call abstractly "type". A.S. Chikabava wrote about this "variants of a common basis, but not different foundations of languages" (Chikobava, 1952). J. Vandriez noted

that "the language is both one and diverse, it is one for all nations and different in the mouth of the speaker" (Vandriez, 1937).

Therefore, it is important in the study of each language, its units and categories, to consider them against the background of the characteristics of other languages: "Some properties of language units, categories that we study in one particular language, to a certain extent, get their expression or display in other languages. A linguist engaged in researching a system of one language or an element of this system will facilitate the task and achieve the best result if he considers the language along with similar facts of other languages" (Skalichka, 1963).

This means, besides everything else, that in order to clarify the type of language, the researcher must cut off all the specifically individual things that exist in a given language or group of languages. All that remains after such an operation will have a general character and can be used as reliable material that determines the structure of the language in general terms. I.I. Meshchaninov, characterizing the common that is found in languages, noted: "Not only are the relations between words as a part of a sentence common for all languages, but also concepts such as objectivity and action, subject, predicate, object, attribute with their modal shades, etc. The common for all languages forms the basis of typological comparisons because the grammatical form of its identification in a specific linguistic material does not provide a unified scheme" (Meshchaninov, 1940)

## 2. Materials and methods

Research Methodology:

We used the classification method, the descriptive method, the opposing method, the modeling method, translation techniques, linguistic experiment and other methods and techniques of linguistic analysis, which are widely used by all researchers working with material from specific languages or language groups.

At the same time, the typological comparison method used in this study should be highlighted.

## 3. Results and discussion

The effectiveness of the research is determined by the very orientation of the goals and objectives set: a comprehensive and multidimensional study of the composition in the

unity of their content and form, language and reality, language and speech.

Composite word formation in the development (replenishment) of the vocabulary of a language can play a much more significant role than affixation and other word-formation methods. And this, in principle, is not the specificity of the Nakh or Caucasian languages in general, but a feature of many other languages, including, for example, Indo-European. For example, in Germanic languages, composite word formation, judging by the results of research on the corresponding word formation subsystem in these languages, composite word formation significantly prevails over word production itself. According to P.V. Tsarev, among the neoplasms of the English language, derived words make up 37% of all words, and complex - 63%, indicating a twofold increase in the number of words formed by adding two or more bases in comparison with the number of words formed by proper word production. Approximately this picture, according to the testimony of researchers, is also observed in the German language.

The validity of this statement is easy to show with concrete examples: the speech units of age in different languages have a different linguistic (grammatical) structure:

Russian - ему двадцать лет. French - O a vingt ans. English - he is twenty years old.

German language demonstrates a complete match with English: Er ist zwanzig Jahre alt.

Chechen language is structurally closer to Russian: Цуьнан ткъа шо ду «Ему двадцать лет (есть)» (dative case of the owner of the age sign and age designation in the nominative case), differing only in the fact that the auxiliary verb, which is obligatory in Chechen throughout time paradigm, not used in the Russian language in the present tense; the similarity is already complete in the past tense: Ему было двадцать лет – Цуьнан ткъа шо дара (Khalidov, 1998).

Selection of common features in languages of different origin naturally implies a deeper insight into their structure, which is expressed in systematization and inventory of phenomena, facts of these languages based on their structural features, since each language consists of different microstructures.

Determining the type of language based on certain structural features is a serious problem for linguists. Different approaches and methods are

used.

Very often, scientists use the system developed by the Czech scientist V. Skalichka, who dealt with the problem of linguistic typology and offered his own doctrine about the relationship between phenomena of a language (Skalichka, 1989). He showed that between the phenomena of language there are the following types of relationships:

1. if there is A, then there is B, i.e. if there is agreement on gender in a given language (большой город – большая деревня), then there is a grammatical gender;
2. if there is A, then there probably is B. Relationships of this kind in terms of their expression are divided as follows:
  - a) isomorphism, i.e. the similarity in one phenomenon of a language with another, for example, if in a language there are many declination classes, then in the same language there are many conjugation classes; we find a similar phenomenon in the ancient languages - Gothic, Old Slavonic, Ancient Greek, Latin, etc.;
  - b) compensation: if there are two means in a language for expressing one grammatical phenomenon, then it is likely that one language uses no more than one of these means.

For example, if there are many consonants in the language, then there probably are few vowels. This attitude is confirmed by the example of many languages: Russian - there are 35 consonants and only 6 vowels; Ukrainian - there are 44 consonants and also 6 vowels; Armenian - there are 30 consonants and only 8 vowels, and a number of others;

3. if there is A, then it may be both B and non-B, that is, if the language has a large number of vowels, then the number of cases may be large and small.

This relation, which V. Skalichka called the "relation of chance" (Skalichka, 1963), is also important from the point of view of typology.

The establishment of certain relations between the phenomena of a language indicates that the concept of "type of language" encompasses the presence of some kind of connections and interrelationships between the attributes forming a particular type. The definition of the term "type

of language” is unexpected and puzzling. This definition is found in the same work of the author, where it is said: “The combination of such phenomena favorable to each other we call the type” (Skalichka, 1989). It should be clearly distinguished:

1. the type of language, which is understood as a stable set of leading signs of the language, which are interconnected in certain relationships, moreover, the presence or absence of any one sign determines the presence or absence of another sign or signs; in the context of the topic of our research, we can talk about the possibility of identifying the type of language by word-formation, for example, as follows:

a) the method of connecting components in a complex whole (derivational composite):

in the Nakh languages, this is a junction, peculiar to agglutination, without connecting vowels (except for individual cases of the presence in the outcome of the first component of a case formant, which can hardly be attributed to interfixes); in Russian, for example, connections are possible with and without interfix:

a) functionality of parts of a compound word: components of a compound word can be used as independent words in almost all structural types in the Chechen language, whereas it is not always possible in Russian;

b) the truncation of the first basis of the structural type is an adjective + noun in the Russian language, whereas additions of this type in the Chechen language are fully complex;

2. the linguistic type, which is understood as a stable set of leading signs of the language, which are interconnected in definite connections, apart from any connection with a specific language;

3. type in language, i.e. the presence in one language of signs corresponding to the characteristics of a language of another type; For example, the common word-formation properties of the Chechen and Russian literary languages are:

a) the presence of structural models of noun + noun, adjective + noun, numeral

+ noun;

b) the presence of derivatives and non-derivatives of the forming bases;

c) use as motivating elements of phrases, derived words;

d) the possibility of suffixing derivatives and non-derivatives bases (Suleybanova, 2009).

Research in the field of linguistic typology leads us not only to the similarities and to differences between the compared languages, but also to generalizations concerning a large number of languages or even all languages. Exploring various, sometimes distant from each other languages, we easily find in them a number of common features found in almost all languages or in many languages. Thus, we find a system of vowels and a system of consonants in all languages, there are phrases in all languages, there are super-segment means of stress and intonation in all languages, etc. (all this with the known differences in the manifestation of these units and means). These facts lead us to what is commonly called linguistic universals. In one or another volume, in one degree or another, universals are contained (manifested) in any language, and at the same time, each languadókuge has its own individual features along with such universal features.

A typological study of any language implies, firstly, the consideration of those or language units, phenomena within the corresponding group, the type of language, and the consideration of the same units against a common language background.

For example, junction as one of the main types of syntactic connection acts as a common typological feature for the Nakh languages, characterizing the sentence. This common feature, included in the complex ontological characteristics of the Nakh language, manifests itself in the form of single sides of the structure of this language, in particular, in the formation of derivational composites, in which one component explains, defines another: Chechen - хлусамнана, Ingush- фусамнана “housewife”, literally “mother’s house” (“mother in the house”); йоІсгар "girl", Ingush - йоІсар (immaculate, virgin; literally "girl-man"), ІаържабІаърг, Ingush - ІаържабІарг, Bats - ІарчІибІаркІ "furuncle; boil "(literally black eye”).

There are additions in the Batsbi language that do not find correspondences in the Chechen and Ingush languages, which are clearly related to the

type under consideration, but include components with which it is difficult to relate the entire composite by value: for example, *кохмаз* "izba" clearly relates to *кох* "hut" but the meanings of homonymous *маз* "price" and *маз* "needle" are difficult to consider in the semantic structure of the motivating base; However, there is no other word *маз* (with different meanings) other than the homonyms given in the Bats language.

The components of additions in the Nakh languages are simply adjacent to each other as part of a compound word, and this is also manifested in the fact that the first component (definition) in the inflectional paradigm of such words does not change: *хIусамненан, йоIстеган, IаьржабIаьрган*. Preservation of the form of the first component can be considered as one of the most important differential features when distinguishing complex words and related phrases with them, which can and should be taken into account when establishing or refining spelling rules regarding spelling of complex words.

In other words, we must recognize that a feature that is perceived as having a general character or reflecting a category of a general necessarily covers all individual elements or appears in all individual elements (components, words of the corresponding language), i.e. is "massive" in nature.

This can be easily illustrated by the example of any language, the typological characteristics of which are the above-mentioned structural types of additions.

If we take into account that there are hundreds (or even millions) of thousands of words in any modern developed language, then it is obvious that this feature (in languages such as Slavic, German, Icelandic, Latin, Turkic, Finno-Ugric, etc..) must, of necessity, be of a "mass" nature, i.e. peculiar to very many languages.

Since ancient times, compounding was one of the main ways of word formation in the Nakh languages. However, it turns out that the same thing was characteristic of many other languages, including even those in which other methods are leading in their present state. So, one of the most common ways to form new words in the Old English period (VII - XI centuries), for example, was compounding. The main models of compound words, witnessed in the ancient Germanic languages, continue to function in modern languages, despite the fact that Germanic

languages have undergone significant changes in the structural order.

Studies of compound words in Germanic languages showed that the transformation of the synthetic system into analytical in English did not significantly affect the typology of compound words, although the functional load of individual types of compound words in modern Germanic languages has changed significantly. Despite all the changes that have occurred in the system of word formation, compound words hold their positions. However, the structure of a compound word has changed: complex polynomial words appeared instead of binomial words; instead of extinct structural types, new ones have appeared, but the complex word model occupies a leading place in the derivation of Germanic languages.

When a new word is formed by the word composition method, the complementary morpheme may be located before the MAIN morpheme or after it. This fact provides the basis for the second criterion of the typological characteristic of the word-formation system: the positions of the main and complementary morphemes in the preposition or in the postposition one to another.

When a derivative word is formed, affixal morphemes, joining the root morpheme, may not cause any changes at the point of attachment of affixal morphemes, in the so-called morpheme boundary:

Chechen - *пондар+ ча* "Harmonist", base *пондар*, suffix *-ча*,  
English - friend + ship = friend-ship,  
Swedish - *van + skap* = *vanskap*, German - *Freundschaft*.

In this case, it is possible to speak of a simple contiguity of an affixal morpheme. In the word composition, we can also observe the phenomenon of simple adjacency of the complementary morpheme to the main one:

Chechen - *дега+баам* "offense",  
Swedish - *flyg "aircraft" +fait "field"* = *flygfait "airfield"*;  
Danish - *rund "radio"+kaste "throw, cast"*=*rendkaste "broadcast"*;  
English. *house+work* =housework.

This technique is most consistently presented in the languages of the agglutinative system, for example,

in Chechen - *буц "grass"+ апе "field"* =*буц-апе "steppe"*, *туьха-берам "salt – sauce"*,  
in Ingush - *тух-берхIа*; (Aganin, 1959).  
in Turkic: Turkish – *ак "white"+yuvар*

“ball”=aluvar “white blood ball”; al “red” + yuvar “ball”= alyuvar “red blood ball”.

This technique also exists in Germanic languages, where it is widely used as a method of word formation.

New words in Nakh, as well as in Germanic languages, can be formed by staging one of the components in one of the case forms possible for a given language.

The most common in the Nakh and Germanic languages was the form of the genitive case, characterized by morphemes: in the Nakh languages - nasal ан, ен, ин, уон (ун) etc., or (non nasal) а, е, и, аь, ув in Ingush, etc.

Chechen нена+май-ра “stepfather”, literally “mother’s husband”;

Ingush - наьнамар (same), бӀаьргацӀоцкъам "eyelash", Ingush - бӀарг- цӀацкъам;

in Germanic -s,-o,-a;

Swedish -. moder + s +mal= mo-dersmal “native language”, kvinn+o+arbete = kvinnoarbete “female labor”;

Icelandic - viking + a + skip = vikingaskip "Viking’s ship".

However, throughout the history of the development of languages due to the loss of case forms in a number of these languages, for example, in Germanic ones, the listed case morphemes - s, -o, - a are rethought, their functions changed, and now they are usually viewed as special connecting morphemes included between the two components of a compound word.

In Russian, the use of connecting morphemes in the formation of complex words is also widespread: сад +о+вод, стал+е+вар.

There are no such morphemes acting as connecting elements in the Nakh languages. The connection of lexical units into composites takes place with the help of the form of one of the joined components, as a rule - the first.

We further call this method as control by the former function of these morphemes in the Germanic and Russian languages;

Swedish -. kvinnoarbete “female labor”= kvinnors arbete;

Russian - сталевар = make steel; вод+о+провод= conduct water, etc.

In some Germanic languages, in particular, in English, you can find words that are like a frozen segment of a sentence, turned into an

independent lexical unit, for example:

English. wiii-o'-the-wisp;

a good-for-nothing "Idler, worthless man";

compare also Swedish -. iseensatta “to put on the stage” from the phrase satta i seen “to stage”;

panytt-fodelse “rebirth” from the phrase fodas pa nytt “to be born again, be reborn”;

Danish - . i gangsaette “start the car” from the phrase same i gang "start the car".

This method can be called connection using the service words.

The morphemes joining the compound, the components of a compound word, are arranged in a certain sequence, corresponding to the syntactic relations existing in the given language. Analysis of complex words in the studied languages shows that their components can be in relations of different types of syntactic connection:

1. predicative, if the relations of the components during their transformation reveal a predicative connection, for example:

Chechen - латта+ лело+р "farming" is transformed as латта лела+дар as "the cultivation of the land",

English - sunrise transforms like the sun rises;

Swedish -. solnedgang – like solen gar ned;

Icelandic - . sola uppraus like soiin risur upp "the sun rises”;

2. attributive relationship, if the relationship of the components reveal an attributive determinative relationship, for example:

Chechen - муьста-биерам,

Ingush - мистибиерхӀа “whey pickle”,

English - red-breast,

Swedish -. rodhake “red-breast”, hoghus "skyscraper”;

Danish - .Gron-saget “vegetables”;

Russian - краснобай, красноречие;

3. an object relationship if the component relationships reveal an object relationship, for example:

English. turascREW «отвертка» (that turns the screw);

Swedish -. rok fang “chimney”, which can be transformed as som fanger toket etc.

The basic composites in the Nakh languages and

in the Russian language are correlated, but the corresponding composites do not coincide, for example, in German, where linguists usually distinguish

1. full syllable compounds;
2. incomplete compounds
3. shifts.

#### 4. Conclusion

The above-mentioned features of word-formation makes it possible to draw the following conclusion: the type of word-formation should be understood as a stable set of interdependent signs that satisfy the criteria discussed above:

1. the presence of a certain finite number of components (morphemes or bases) that make up the newly formed word;
2. the position of the main and complementary morphemes (in the preposition or postposition one to another);
3. the type of syntactic relationship in which the components of the neoplasm are located - predicative, attributive, objective.

These general criteria give us a solid scientific basis for the selection in the system of word formation of two classes of neoplasms - derived words (derivatives) and complex words (composite).

New words in Nakh, as well as in Germanic languages, can be formed by staging one of the components in one of the case forms possible for a given language.

The most common in the Nakh and Germanic languages was the form of the genitive case, characterized by morphemes: in the Nakh languages - nasal ан, ен, ин, уон (ун) etc., or (non nasal) а, е, и, аь, ув in Ingush, etc.

#### References:

- Aganin R.A. (1959) Povtory i odnorodnye parnye sochetaniya v sovremennom tureckom literaturnom yazyke [Repetitions and homogeneous pair combinations in modern Turkish literary language]. Moscow, Oriental Literature Publishing House. pp. 20-26.
- Arakin V.D. (1989). Sravnitel'naya tipologiya anglijskogo i russkogo yazykov [Comparative typology of English and Russian languages]. Moscow. pp. 6.
- Chikobava A.S. (1952) Vvedenie v yazykoznanie [Introduction to linguistics]. Part I. Moscow. pp. 35.
- Khalidov A.I. (1998) Verbs of multiple actions in Chechen language. Russkoe slovo MAPRYAL [Russian word (MAPRYAL)]. No. 1, Tbilisi. pp.4.
- Lomtev T.P. (1976). Obshchee i russkoe yazykoznanie [General and Russian linguistics]. Moscow.
- Meshchaninov I.I. (1940). Obshchee yazykoznanie K probleme stadialnosti v razvitií slova i predlozheniya [General linguistics. To the problem of stadiality in the development of words and sentences]. Leningrad. pp. 51
- Skalichka V. (1989) Tipologiya i sopostavitelnaya lingvistika. Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike [Typology and Comparative Linguistics. New in foreign linguistics]. Issue XIV. Moscow, Progress. pp. 26-27.
- Skalichka V. (1963) O sovremennom sostoyanii tipologii. Novoe v lingvistike [On the current state of typology. New in linguistics]. Issue 3. Moscow. pp. 19-35
- Suleybanova M.U. (2009) Kompozitnoe slovoobrazovanie v nahskih yazykah. Dokt.Diss. [Compound word formation in Nakh languages. Doc.Diss.]. Makhachkala. pp. 303-306,320.
- Vandriez J. (1937) Yazyk [Language]. Moscow. pp. 216.  
[https://elibrary.ru/title\\_items.asp?id=60075](https://elibrary.ru/title_items.asp?id=60075)