

STRUCTURAL COHESION AND INTEGRITY OF COMPOUNDS IN ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK

Seytjanova Luiza

Karakalpak State University, English language and literature department

Kuandikova Kamila

Karakalpak State University, English language and literature department

Abstract: *The article gives the information about structural cohesion and integrity of compounds in the English and Karakalpak languages. The analysis of compounds and some examples of compound nouns from both languages are presented below.*

Key words: *cohesion, integrity, compounds, determinant, idiom, semantic relationship.*

Compound words are words consisting of at least two stems which occur in the language as free forms. In a compound word the immediate constituents obtain integrity and structural cohesion that make them function in a sentence as a separate lexical unit [1].

The structural cohesion and integrity of a compound may depend upon unity of stress, solid or hyphenated spelling, semantic unity, unity of morphological and syntactic functioning or, more often, upon the combined effect of several of these or similar phonetic, graphic, semantic, morphological or syntactic factors.

The integrity of a compound is manifested in its indivisibility, i.e. the impossibility of inserting another word or word group between its elements. If, for example, speaking about a —sunbeam (English) *kokjotel* we can insert some other word between the article and the noun, e.g. a bright sunbeam, a bright and unexpected sunbeam, because the article *a* is a separate word, no such insertion is possible between the stems *sun* & *beam*-*qora* & *kul*, for they are not word but morphemes [2].

In describing the structure of a compound one should examine three types of relations, namely the relation of the members to each other the relation of the whole to its members, and correlation with equivalent free phrases.

Some compounds are made up of a determining and a determined part, which may be called the determinant and the determinate group. Thus, a blackboard in English and *tamarqa* in Karakalpak language is very different from the meaning of their components. A blackboard - its essential feature is being a teaching aid .

Tamarqa → *hawli atirapinda egin egiletugin maydan* - *tamarqa*- means kitchen garden in English.

Not every board of a black color is a blackboard.

“A blackboard” may be not a board at all but a piece of linoleum or some other suitable material. Its color is not necessarily black: it may be brown or something else. Thus “a blackboard” → is a board which is black. “A chatterbox” - is not a box, it is a person who talks a great deal without saying anything important: the combination is used only figuratively. The same metaphorical character is observed in the compound *slowcoach*.

It is also idiomatic as it does not name a vehicle but a person who acts and thinks slowly. A *fuss -pot* is a person easily excited and nervous about trifles. Thus, for the

original motivation of the idiomatic compound could be easily recreated. The following examples illustrate idiomatic compounds where it is not so obvious: —blackleg, —strike breaker, —blackmaill getting money or some other profit from a person by threats bluestocking —a woman affecting literary tastes and learning. [3]

The analysis of the semantic relationship existing between the constituents of a compound presents many difficulties. Some authors have attempted a purely logical interpretation distinguishing copulative, existential, spatial and other connections [2].

This scheme, however, failed to show the linguistic essence of compounds and was cumbersome and artificial.

A mistake common with many authors is treating semantic connections within compounds in terms of syntactic relations. Marchand, [4]. For instance, when analyzing the type house -keeping, backbiting, housewarming, book -keeping, sightseeing, etc. Writes: — In most cases the first word is the object. A subject/predicate relation underlies earth quaking, cock -crowing, cock -fighting, sun burning.

The first word is the predicate complement in well -being and short -coming.

We think very convincingly showed that such syntactic treatment should be avoided because syntactic ties are ties between words, whereas in dealing with compounds one studies relations within a word, the relations between the morphemes, its significant constituents. These two series of relations belong to different levels of abstraction and should not be mixed. In the compound “spacecraft”: space - is not an attribute to - craft. It cannot possess syntactic functions, being not a word but a stem [4]. So it is more convenient to consider it a determinant restricting the meaning of the determinate by expressing the purpose for which -craft -is designed or the medium in which it will travel. Surely, one could combine these two points of view using a more careful. Wording, and formulate it as follows: phrases correlated with compounds by means of transformational analysis may show objective, subject/predicate, attributive and adverbial relations.

E.g. house -keeping: to keep house, well -being: to be well. In the majority of cases compounds manifest some restrictive relationship between the constituents; types of restrictions show great variety. [5]

Some examples of determinative compound nouns with restrictive qualitative relations are given below.

The list is not meant to be exhaustive and serves only to illustrate the manifold possibilities.

Purpose of functional relations underlies such compounds as bathrobe, raincoat - yomg'irpush, classroom - sinfxona, notice - board, and suitcase.

Different place or local relations are expressed in dockland, garden - party, sea - front. Comparison is the basis of blockhead, butter - fingers, floodlight, and goldfish. The material or elements the thing is made of is pointed out silver wear, tin -hat, clay - pipe. Temporal relations underlie such compounds as night -club, night - duty, summer-house and day -train.

REFERENCES:

1. Taxirovna, S. L. (2023). LINGUA-STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF IDIOMATIC COMPOUNDS IN KARAKALPAK LITERATURE. Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке, 2(14), 331-333.
2. Barkema, H. (1995). Idiomaticity and terminology: a multidimensional descriptive model. *Studia Linguistica*, 5 (2), pp. 125 - 160.
3. Taxirovna, S. L. (2023). THE NOTION OF IDIOMATICITY. SO 'NGI ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR NAZARIYASI, 6(9), 154-158.
4. Marchand H. The categories and Types of Present -day English Word formation - Alabama:University of Alabama PRESS,1969-545p.
5. L.T. Seytjanova THE STRUCTURE OF COMPOUNDS IN THE KARAKALPAK LANGUAGE. ISSN 2311-2158. The Way of Science. 2023. № 10 (116).