

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
WORLD LANGUAGES

ДОБРЕДОЉОВТЕ WÈLLKOMM स्वागत छ
VÄLKOMMEN FÀILTE VÍTEJTE HERZLICH ΚΑΛΩΣ ΗΡΘΑΤΕ
Laipni lūdzam ك ب ال ه أ WILLKOMMEN
BEM VINDA ÜDVÖZÖLJÜK 歡迎 환영
आपले स्वागत आहे 歡迎 ようこそ
WELCOME DOBRODOŠLI स्वागत हे
BIENVENUE HOŞGELDİNİZ FÀILTE
BENVENUTO VELKOMINN Tuhiŋga o mua SELAMAT DATANG
wilujeung sumping
SALUTATIO வரவறேல் BI XÊR HATÍ
BINE ATI VENIT ಸೆವಾಗತೆ

International Journal of World Languages

Volume 1, No. 2, June 2021

Internet address: <http://ejournals.id/index.php/IJWL/issue/archive>

E-mail: info@ejournals.id

Published by ejournals PVT LTD

Issued Bimonthly

Requirements for the authors.

The manuscript authors must provide reliable results of the work done, as well as an objective judgment on the significance of the study. The data underlying the work should be presented accurately, without errors. The work should contain enough details and bibliographic references for possible reproduction. False or knowingly erroneous statements are perceived as unethical behavior and unacceptable.

Authors should make sure that the original work is submitted and, if other authors' works or claims are used, provide appropriate bibliographic references or citations. Plagiarism can exist in many forms - from representing someone else's work as copyright to copying or paraphrasing significant parts of another's work without attribution, as well as claiming one's rights to the results of another's research. Plagiarism in all forms constitutes unethical acts and is unacceptable. Responsibility for plagiarism is entirely on the shoulders of the authors.

Significant errors in published works. If the author detects significant errors or inaccuracies in the publication, the author must inform the editor of the journal or the publisher about this and interact with them in order to remove the publication as soon as possible or correct errors. If the editor or publisher has received information from a third party that the publication contains significant errors, the author must withdraw the work or correct the errors as soon as possible.

OPEN ACCESS

Copyright © 2021 by Thematics Journals of Applied Sciences

EDITORIAL BOARD

Ambreen Safdar Kharbe,
Najran University,, Saudi Arabia

Erdem Akbaş,
Erciyes University, Turkey

Oksana Chaika,
National University of Life and Environmental
Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine

Fatma Kalpakli,
Selçuk University, Turkey

Zekai Gül,
University of Minnesota, Islamic College of
Languages and Translation

Birsen Tütüniş,
Kültür University, Turkey

Nurdan Kavakli,
Izmir Democracy University, Turkey

Anette Ipsen,
University College Copenhagen, Denmark

Lotte Lindberg,
University College Copenhagen, Denmark

Miriam Eisenstein,
New York University, United States

Boudjemaa Dendenne,
University of Constantine I, Algeria

Ismail Hakki Mirici,
Hacettepe University, Turkey

Lily Orland Barak,
University of Haifa, Israel

Maggie Sokolik,
University of California, Berkeley, United States

Manana Rusieshvili-Cartledge,
Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Maryam Zeinali,
Urmia University, Iran Islamic Republic

Mehmet Demirezen,
Ufuk University, Turkey

Sejdi M. Gashi,
Institute of Albanology-Pristina(Kosovo), Albania

Priti Chopra,
The University of Greenwich, Greece

Rome Aboh,
University of Uyo, Nigeria

Salam Yusuf Nuhu Inuwa,
Kano State College of Arts and Sciences, Nigeria

Zelege Arficho Ayele,
Hawassa University, Ethiopia

Mustafo Zhabborovich Bozorov
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Martaba Numonovna Melikova
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Mastura Mizrobovna Oblokulova
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Erkinov Sukhrob Erkinovich
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Eko Susanto
Menegment of journal Indonesia

Shirinova Inobat Anvarovna
Guliston State University

Akramjon Abdikhakimovich Shermatov
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Akhmedova Shoira Nematovna
Professor of the Department of Uzbek Literature,
Bukhara State University

THE RELATIONS OF COMPOUND WORDS BETWEEN DERIVATIONAL COMPOUNDS AND FREE WORD COMBINATIONS, THEIR DIFFERING PECULIARITIES

Umarova Nigora Amirjon Qizi

Teacher, Uzbek State World Languages University

E-mail: nirnazarova1991@gmail.com

Abstract: The article is devoted to the study of compound words, and it analyzes the correlation and differing features of compound words between derivational compound words and free word combinations. Just as there are similarities between compound words and phrases, there are also some differences between them. An important peculiarity of compound words is that in some cases a compound word expresses a meaning that a combination of auxiliary and base words cannot convey.

Key words: Derivational compound words, free words, identity, difference, correlation, opposition, word combination, structure, meaning, idiomaticity.

According to M.D. Stepanova all compound words in English are divided into two, that is, whole-directed and separate-directed compound words, and this makes the difference between them when comparing derivational compound words with free word combinations.

Different compounds have different relations with free word combinations, i.e., some are synonymous with the phrase, while others have meanings from the root-morphemes i.e. it is not given by word combinations consisting of root-morphemes.

We illustrate the above points with the following example, a derivational compound word of the type "noun + past participle". The main part of such words is directed, and they are synonymous with free word combinations "past participle + preposition + noun":

factory-made - made at the factory, rain-swept - swept by the rain, air-actuated - actuated by air, police-escorted - escorted by police.

Very few words do not match the meaning of free word combinations. Furthermore, free word combination that are obtained by separating these words will never participate in the speech, for example:

punch-drunk (showing signs of concussion from repeated blows); hell-bent (recklessly-determined, doggedly, with reckless determination); earth-fed (contended with earthly things).

With the exception to separately oriented words, there are cases in which derivational compound words are synonymous with free word combinations in one of its meanings, i.e. in the lexical sense. However, in a different sense i.e. completely far from the meaning of free word combinations in the figurative sense, e.g. iron-clad ship = ship clad with iron, but "iron clad rules" never can be "rules clad with iron". The same moss-grown rock and moss-grown legislation: tailor-made suit and tailor-made escape.

The semantic correlation between a compound word and free word combinations is obvious. In addition to the interrelationship between derivational compound words and free word combinations, it is possible to cite their structural connection. In this regard, there is an idea that at the base of each pattern of a compound word lies a certain type of free word combinations and that any compound word determines its relationship with free word combinations. Here it is clear that free word combinations can express any derivational compound word.

Explaining the meaning of a derivational compound word through free word

combinations is a common method in lexicology and word formation research. In the book "A Course in Modern English Lexicology" [Ginzburg, 1966, b-194] compound adjectives are expressed as word formation that interacts with free word combinations: snow white - as white as snow; care-free - free from care; snow-covered - covered with snow; two-day - two days.

Of course, this relationship has its place, but there are two things to consider, 1. Not all patterns of formation of derivational compounds are related to free word combinations, in fact, such free word combinations are based on the following compound words: first-ever, then-president, ever-after, class-conscious, 1000 - strong? 2. A structural-semantic type can be characterized when there is no similarity between the structural-semantic type of a particular free word combinations within the boundary of the compound word pattern.

In general, any action that expresses a derivational compound word in the form of free word combinations is not always approved. However, under the free word combinations we have pre-formed on the base of conditional rules, a compound word indicating the relationship between the components of a derivational compound word and an auxiliary word consisting of words expressed in the form of root morpheme we meant a certain combination of words. Observing such rules reveals that some compound words are not divided into parts, in particular, that the reason for their indivisibility is not in their lexic idiomaticity, but in the fact that their semantic relations are not expressed. This is mainly the case with the N + N pattern of many compound words in English.

For a more comprehensive analysis of the existing disproportion between the patterns of compound word and free word combinations, the template of phrases A + Prep + N and compound word template N + A are carefully considered in the world of theory of "synchronous relationship of derivational compounds and free word combinations".

E.V. Nikoshkova in this regard expressed the idea of a disproportion as follows: "Mutual asymmetry refers to the orderly, patterned, legal, structural-semantic relationship between certain types of derivational compound words and certain types of free word combinations" [Никошкова, 1969, b-396]

The connection between derivational compound words and free word combinations is not a new issue. Of course, it is true to associate a free word combination with the emergence of particular type of derivational compounds. In this regard, S.S. Hidekel writes: "In the system of compound word, word-forming patterns are determined by their structural-semantic interaction with a system of patterns of free word combination. Interrelationships assume that a particular free word combination is not directly similar to a word, nor does it necessarily possess such a definite free word combination in speech, for example, like heart-free, smile-wrinkles compounds and other compounds are not assumed in the below given free word combinations in real speech communication: free at heart from attachment, wrinkles caused by smiling." [Хидекель, 1969, b-14]

The very notion of interrelationship of compound words and free word combinations is not adequate for us. According to this concept, the components of derivational compound words and the elements of free word combinations that have full meaning do not have to possess a definite phenomenon of similarity. We fully agree with this opinion. Objection to this leads to the notion that a compound word is written as a whole by its own pattern, with a correlation corresponding to the pattern of the free word combination.

The compound word pattern N + A is understood to interact with the free word combination A + Prep + N.

In fact, when we see the pattern as an abstract scheme that predetermines the structure and order of formation of auxiliary words and full meaning of free word combinations, we can discuss about the relationship between free word combinations

A + Prep + N and compound words N + A.

However, there is an undeniable fact that the pattern of free word combinations A + Prep + N includes a number of structural-semantic types, i.e. all the different and very complex relations that determine the exact realization of the three elements of free word combinations. If we take it into consideration, it is necessary to note that the following fact: the structural-semantic types represented only by A + Prep + N pattern interact with compound word pattern N + A when the other part is characterized only by external, schematic, standard similarities.

However, it can be argued that a free word combination pattern includes a larger number of structural-semantic types than a compound word pattern, although, on the other hand, a compound word pattern possesses the function that cannot be in the pattern of free word combination.

We can see this with a clear example below. Consider the free word combination Free + Prep + N and the compound N + free.

The pattern of free word combination A + Prep + N is realized in the following structural-semantic types by A=free. [Горелик, 1967]:

1. A) free for N (smth): He was now free for the task;
- B) free for N (smb): In our country medical treatment is free for the people.
2. Free from (smb, smth): He was at last free from his pursuers. He was free from fear. Pursuersfree. Fearfree
3. Free to N (smb): The parks in our towns are free to the public.
4. A) free with N (smb): She is too much free with people;
- b) free with N (smth): He is free with his money.
5. free in (smth): She is free in all her gestures and movements.
6. free of N (smth): He was free of the chain at last. Entrance is free of charge. Charge free. Chain free.

Thus, it was found that the relationship between free word combination pattern A + Prep + N and the compound word pattern N + A is much more complex through specific discussions.

The structural-semantic boundary of free word combination pattern and its low capacity compared to the compound word pattern, the lack of formal expression of the relationship between components of compound words are related to the lack of formal expression in the relationship between components of compound words. The relationship between the components of a compound word is determined not by the elements represented by the form, but by the "solid conditionality".

According to the above analysis, such conditionality is strengthened in structural-semantic types only by two N + A and A = free, which creates the basis for understanding it as free N or free of N.

If we take into consideration the semantic closeness of Free from N vs free of N structure, of the 6 structural-semantic types of the A + Prep + N pattern through free word combination A = free, it can be said that in practice only two semantic types interact with the N + A pattern of the compound word.

Hence, by having a "standard" A + Prep + N and N + A correlation, we must emphasize that at the structural-semantic level these correlations are in very limited interactions. Typically, the structural-semantic capacity of free word combination is greater than or equal to the capacity of the compound word within that pattern.

Just as there are similarities between compound words and free word combinations, there are also some differences between them. This distinction is as difficult to define as in analytical languages, especially for English, as well as for other languages that do not have a clear analogy in the "root morpheme". It is important to note that the

difference between compound words and free word combinations also exists in languages that are quite different from English. Japanese language researcher A.A. Pashkovskiy states: "If the basis of component of the compound word that belongs to the category of nouns and the word element of the free word combination that corresponds materially to the noun, according to the morphological sign it is hard to differ compound word from free word combination." [Пашковский, 1980, б-11].

This is also the case for Tagalog, one of Indonesia's languages, where the "integrated structure" does not play a significant role in the limited use of the form-forming means. [Макаренко, 1970, б-139]

We can find this in Turkish as well: "Some researchers do not always correctly distinguish a compound word from free word combination. Of course, distinguishing them is one of the most difficult issues, and it is probably impossible." [Маматов, 1980, б-192]

As we observe the relationship of different lexical combinations to compound word and free word combinations, we witness two: global and individual relationships. In the first relation, the general criterion of the spread of the whole volume of the artificial word of this type determined, the second, that is, the individual relation examines each lexical combination examined by means of the object by adding compound word and free word combinations to one of its classes.

As an example of the first relationship, we can present the idea encountered in V.I. Shadrin's work: "The complexity of the Stone Wall word formation the issue is explained by the specificity of the line, which requires the possibility of an attributive function for the prepositional word in the English general agreement, while the quality is not pragmatic. The inability to distinguish between the noun in the prepositional determinative function and the adjective performing the same function leads to the fact that the noun, which is the determinative component of the attributive word formation that we can include in compound words consisting of complex substantive bases. If we define that component as a quality, we have to think of this attributive word formation as free word combination." [Шадрин, 1977, б-15]

For the identification of compound words and free word-combinations are included to the semantic, morphological, and phonetic-orthographic symbols and their various combinations based on the principle of "integrity" introduced by A.I. Smirnitskiy.

Individual identification can be very complex. Its use requires, in particular, the development of such concepts as the interaction of characters and their hierarchy, as well as their interaction with this logical-operational analysis.

There is no unifying emphasis in the orthographically independent lexical unit of the word back market. However, if there is integrity of the term in the semantic criterion, the operational test to the complement cannot determine whether this unit belongs to the compound word, i.e. a very back market. Therefore, the question arises as to which criterion or criteria is more important here.

In general, we could assume that in order for a lexical unit to have the status of a compound word; it must meet all the criteria of a compound word, i.e., phonetic, spelling and semantic criteria. When referring to a highly variable spelling criterion, the semantic and phonetic criteria must much it, i.e., words with a unifying stress must also have semantic integrity, or vice versa. But the actual language material denies this.

P. Mateus refers to word formation that belongs to a compound word according to the semantic criterion, but does not have unifying emphasis, however, belongs to word combinations according to the phonetic criterion. He made the following remarks: "Unfortunately, while the semantic criterion provides a lot of compound words, the phonetic criterion gives very little of them."

L. Blumfield's very interesting and important comments on compound words are certainly related to his descriptive place. It finds expression in the fundamental indistinguishability of full-meaning words, word-forming elements, and word-changing elements.

Moreover, L. Blumfield's views on the question of word formation are directly related to constitutive analysis, i.e., although it represents the word formation, it does not influence on the derivation history of words. [Блумфилд, 1968, б-249]

The difference between compound words and complex compound words can have an activity that is difficult to unveil at the base and requires careful analysis. Forming with -ed formant is an example of it. In the construction of any two-base word formed by the -ed formant, when the first component is represented by a noun and the second component by a verb and a noun, it can belong to one of the following types:

1) the first component of the compound word - noun and the second is participle II: $n + pII$ - State-financed = financed by the state;

2) two noun rooted, are complex compound words formed by the simultaneous formation of compound words and the act of making a free word combination by the suffix forming a word: $(n1+n2)+ed$ - metal-edged = having a metal edge. This group includes word-building bases that are more or less free combinations of two words, blue eyes - blue-eyed and stable word-formation bases: it can be noticed the difference between grass widow - grass-widowed;

3) Compound nouns consisting of a base, transformed into a verb, and formed by suffix, i.e., suffix words derived from an act that forms three words:

a) $n1+n2=N$, b) $N \rightarrow N$, c) $V+ed$, for example: *atom + bomb = atombomb*, *atombomb N* → *atombomb V*, *atombomb+ed*.

Thus, in a structure that is externally identical, it is necessary to distinguish between words derived from different derivational histories and distinguished by significant features at the level of existing words, i.e., it is important to determine the difference between the relations of words that are interconnected by the relationship between components of compound words.

Used literature.

1. Ахманова О.С. - Словарь Лингвистических терминов. М., 1966
2. Арнольд И.В. - Лексикология современного английского языка. М., 1986.
3. Арнольд И.В. Лексикология современного английского языка, - М.: высшая школа, 1973
4. Азарх Н.А. - Сложные прилагательные в современном английском языке
5. Амосова Н.Н. - Этимологические основы словарного состава современного английского языка. М., 1956.
6. Ахеро А.А. - Сложные прилагательные в современном английском языке, Автореф. Канд. Дисс. Рига, 1958
7. Арутюнова Н.Д. - Сложные имена существительные и способы их образования в современном испанском языке. Канд. Дисс. М., 1953
8. Ахманова О.С., А.И. Смирницкий - Образования типа *stone wall*, *speech sound* в английском языке, 1952
9. Банкевич Л.В. - Способы образования сложных глаголов в современном английском языке. 1959
10. Болховитинов В.В. - Семантика образований, состоящих из двух основ и суффикса - в современном английском языке. Канд. Дисс. Л., 1967