

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 04 Volume: 84

Published: 06.04.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



A.J. Jumaniyazov

Urgench State University
Professor, Foreign Philology Faculty,
Roman-German Philology Department,
Khorezm, Uzbekistan

D.O. Toshnazarova

Urgench State University
Second year master student, Foreign Philology Faculty,
Roman-German Philology Department,
Khorezm, Uzbekistan

A.O. Ibragimova

Urgench State University
Second year master student, Foreign Philology Faculty,
Roman-German Philology Department,
Khorezm, Uzbekistan

WORD COMBINATIONS, SOME ASSUMPTIONS ON THEIR NATURE AND ESSENCE

Abstract: It is well-known that speech is a communicative use of the language. In this sense, the readymade language units are always sable and available for a speaker in a particular language, and can use them freely at any time, having individual approach in order to express own thoughts depending on personal status. The speaker, of course, relies on the same vocabulary and vocabulary as well as sentence structures and text in speech act. By this article, we try to offer some thoughts and ideas on word combinations, the nature, and essence of them as the language units.

Key words: consistency, expression, related words, phenomena, dominant word, combination.

Language: English

Citation: Jumaniyazov, A. J., Toshnazarova, D. O., & Ibragimova, A. O. (2020). Word combinations, some assumptions on their nature and essence. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (84), 5-9.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-84-2> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.2>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

We know that according to their structure the word combinations are of two types, first, the word combinations consisting of two constituent, for instance, a *red apple* (first word *red*, the second *apple*), second type, the word combinations consisting of more than two constituent parts as in the syntactic connotation of *red apples with sweet flavor* (1-sweet, 2-flavor, 3-red, 4-with, 5-apple) made from words accompanying side by side.

Interestingly, so far this phenomenon (side by side accompanying of words) of language is named as

a word combination, and has been interpreted and defined in different ways by the linguists. The interpretations of word combination focus on and defines their order of consistency (consequence, successiveness) the nature of code and subordination (according to the position in syntactic relations), governance and dependence (in relation to the status in expression of thought), expressing and being expressed with the interrelated words, the relations of clarification and being elucidated, their power of expression (independent and auxiliary function), reflection or being reasoned (abstract or real) and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

harmony of words to mean the interrelationship of meaning of words in a message or information conveyed by a word.

Here, we focus on the specific attitude of interrelated words in a word combinations mentioned above, in the broad sense and more analytically, and try to explain their essence in a simple way:

1. The notion of mutual orders in syntactic relations means (consecutive, successive) the word order or the usage of them in initial or latter position. For example, in "*red apple*" construction the word *red* precedes the apple.

2. In the case of the code and subordination in the syntactic relationship, the word is evaluated according to the degree of importance to the listener or speaker, primary or secondary message is understood. For example, the word '*red*' in the syntactic construction "*red apple*", is important in speech. As it is important to show the color (red) of fruit (apple) by the speech and inform it to the listener. That is, there are many apples and they are in different colors, but the content of speech is focused on '*red*'. Or the purpose of the speech is to take into account the color of the fruit and to emphasize it as the message. Apparently the color of the apple is not the main thing for us, and first of all the color of the fruit is emphasized to the listener.

3. The next type of syntactic link is governance and dependence, interpreted according to the position of the combined words in the word combinations, and the words are interdependent and governed within the relation. For example, "*red apple*", the word '*apple*' governing, the word '*red*' is dependent in syntactic content.

4. Expressing and being expressed with the interrelated words in the expression; in a word combination *red apple*, the word *apple* is a fruit, and the expression emphasizes *the red color of the apple* fruit, i.e. the fruit with the word *apple* and its color with the word *red* are expressed, and as result the essence is being revealed.

5. The next type of interpretation is clarification and being elucidated, whereby what is said in a word combination becomes familiar to all, i.e., the audience are aware of exact information on it, and to what extent the substance is clarified and elucidated, it identifies clearly the reference of clarification to the substance or event. The substance nature becomes precise.

For example, the combination of "*red apple*", the *apples* are identified as substance, and *red* indicates the color and emphasizes the color differentiating it from other colors of apples.

6. The next characteristic of the link within word combinations is manifested by its reflection on mind. For example, in the word combination of "*red apple*" it seems *red* to be real specific (as we see it), however the red color does not exist in isolation, and this color is not real in nature. The fact is that, it is merely a

reflection of things and events, and considered as an abstract one. The apples is tangible and real object, it can be seen, eaten, and it tastes, smells, and toughed as soft or firm.

In our opinion, the interconnection of the above mentioned word combinations, the components, the interrelation between the meanings and the grammatical relationship between them are sufficiently described.

Now, in the article, we will focus on the essence of linguistic phenomenon word combination, the content of it so far in terms of linguistics, and what exactly these terms are interpreted and how our linguists have interpreted them.

As you know, the word combination is named in different languages differently, and it is called the word combination in English, словосочетание in Russian, and Wortverbindung (word links) in German, in the linguistics of Uzbek language, almost in all stages of language development, from ancient Turkic to modern Uzbek literary language, it has been called '*so'z birikmasi*' or the inter combination of independent words". The meaning and intonation of the words are also emphasized in it.

Before offering our personal thoughts and opinions on the different interpretations of the phenomenon of word combination in linguistics and the different definitions by linguists, we focus on what exactly the words '*word*' and '*combination*' as independent words mean in the language.

It is worth noting that "*word*" is primarily an objective, realistic description of all things and events in the real world, names them and at the same time informs about the reality. By this feature the word differentiates the thing from others of the class. This is the essence of it in communication. This is a philosophical feature of it. In linguistics this phenomenon is described as "the smallest, independent language unit used in the language system and owning the independent meaning in the language." Although this definition is not able to fully explain the essence of it, our linguists deal with the word exactly as it is described.

As for the analysis of the word "*combination*", it also uses the *word* in order to form a combination, which is the language unit (s) we have described above. It is understood that on the basis of this expression two or more independent words coincide with each other and they are interconnected in terms of lexical and grammatical meanings as analogy. More simply, it means that two or more words are interconnected in a particular sense not a single word.

At a sight, it is interesting that this phenomenon of language seems to have been interpreted and understood at different times by different linguists differently. There are some shortcomings in approach to the essence of the issue, the definitions are not complete. Here are some of them. For example, the famous Russian speaker O.S. Akhmanova, in her

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Dictionary of Linguistic Terminology (Moscow, 1969) wrote that "A word combination is a combination of any independent words". And as the interpretation suggests, the definition is an axiom (... a combination of words is a word combination)

M.S. Stepanova in her book *Theory of Valence and Analysis of Valence* (Moscow, 1973) noted that "Word combination means a grammatical relationship between two words." In this definition, the relationship of meaning in the interconnection of words is neglected.

Or M. Iriskulov, an Uzbek linguist in his book *'Introduction to Linguistics'* (Tashkent, 1992) wrote that "Independent word combinations are the word combinations of which its constituent parts are linked in equal ways." Unlike Akhmanova's interpretation, it contains only one side of the way in which the words are combined. And it is also the repetition of the same idea (the word combinations associated with the same link are the same word combinations. It does not mention the conciliation, governance, adaptation and the aspects of the subordination and dominance characteristics.

According to G. Abdurahmanov and S. Mamajonov's book *'Uzbek Language and Literature'* (Tashkent, 2002), "Word combinations consist of subordinate (good man, came fast) and equal (books and notebooks)". In addition to the above interpretations, it only considers the subordination and governance in the relation of constituent parts.

There are some other definitions of word combinations that do not seem to be understood by what and how they are interpreted, and it is immediately apparent that their interpretations are inconsistent with certain rules of the language. For example, F.F. Fortunatov, in his book "The Source of Linguistic Studies," the classification of word combinations into "grammatical" and "non-grammatical" types, or by T. Khojaev (*Foreign Philology Journal*, 2005, No. 3) wrote that "There is no subordinate or governor word, dependent or dominant word in the language, but there are independent words and auxiliary words in it." The concern of this definition to a word combination or other language unit is not interpreted clearly. If the opinions of scholars are about the definition of words, we believe that there are some controversial aspects of interpretation.

In fact, the existence of non-grammatical units in the language, especially in its syntax, is beyond the reach of those who are aware of the language in a certain sense. As well as, it seems that there is no need for long definitions such as which word precedes or follows, which word is subordinated to the other, which word is dependent or which one is governor. Since one of the components of the word combination is to "follow", and it is understood in oral speech, and it is evident in the written speech! The deeper consideration to the combination makes clear which

word is the more subordinate or dominant, it is felt when viewed from the position of the words. It is worth noting that these features of combinations are important both for the speaker and the listener. Their order in use (head, follower), the most importance of them in the message of information, their status (subordinate, governor), is neglected. In order to support the idea, see these sample word combinations in Uzbek 'ochiq yuz' and 'yuzi ochiq', 'yalang oyoq' and 'oyoq yalang'. It is obvious that the replacement of the compounds, the subordination, the power, the changes in their syntactic relationships, and the information that they provide are clearly different in each case. And so, 'oyoq yalang' not wrapped feet or without footwear, while 'yalang oyoq' or bare footed means a poor, poor man who has nothing to wear.

As a sample statement for the next expression 'ochiq yuz' means an open-hearted, tactful, impartial, and those who are committed to the duty of humanity. "The peasants came to this annual congress with *an open face*," as for the expression 'yuzi ochiq' (face opened), without shame, clamorous, loud mouthed without thought and consideration of surrounds. For example, *Bu ayol juda yuzi ochiq ekan.* (means *This woman is so vixen.*)

If you are interested in the opinions of other linguists on this topic, there are researchers who do not recognize some of the features of word combinations.

For instance, T. Khojaev, who diligently studied the definition and interpretation of word combinations and made remarkable critical remarks in this regard, offered his own viewpoints in the article "A Brief Commentary on the Interpretation of Word combinations" (*Foreign Philology, Language, Literature, Education*. №3, 2005) "There is no head word, subordinate word, dependent or governor word in the language, but there are independent and auxiliaries words.' This emphasis is on the fact that the associated and apparent relations in word communications (coordination, subordination; governor and dependent) are completely ignored. The role of the word combinations in the material and spiritual interpretation of the content is neglected. Now, according to the scientist's statement, "The word combinations consist of independent and auxiliary words." This interpretation causes confusion of thoughts who are interested in the matter. This is because, first of all, it is not a combination of words, but a distinction between the parts of speech. Since, the main topic of morphology is the parts of speech. It is unthinkable that the first word in a combination can be auxiliary and the second is independent for the investigator dealing with the word combination, as he has foreseen the independent meaning and independent use of all the words in the combination. There is no need for an "auxiliary" in the information to be transmitted through independent ones. Each

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

word (component) independently names, displays, and independently reports an object or event.

We try to support the ideas based on the personal examples recommended by the scholar himself. The complementary words in word combinations: **a red** book and **five-stored** building, *red*-an adjective (an independent word), **five**-a numeral (an independent word), they are independent words from morphological point of view.

Secondly, these words do not contribute to the literal meaning, but rather each of them has its own meaning, clearly expressing the quality of the red book and the number of floors.

It is worth noting that many Uzbek linguists are agreed on the peculiarities of the word combinations (principle and subordinate, dependent and governor) based on "specific" rules in the language. In this regard, M. Bakhtiyorov, U. Kholiyorov, N. Abdurakhmonova (in the 5th edition of the book "Universal Manual of Uzbek"), N. Rasulova, B.Supiyeva "Lectures on Native Language" (Tashkent 2016), M. Khamrayev "Mother Tongue" (Tashkent 2012) 4th edition of the 5th class textbook compiled by N. Mahmudov, A.Nurmonov, A.Sobirov, V.Sobirov, Z.Jurabaeva (Tashkent 2015), 6-7 form textbooks by N.Mahmudov, A.Nurmonov, A.Sobirov, D.Nabiyeva(Tashkent2017), 8th grade Native language textbook by the authors H.Nematov, M.Abduraimova, R.Sayfullaeva wrote that 'Two or more independent words combined in grammatically and semantically to form a word combination, and there is a consensus on the formation of its own compounds, the existence of the ruler and the subordinate, and the expression of all constituents as dependent or governor word in it'. Even in the 9th-11th form Textbooks, in particular for the 9th form textbook on Mother Tongue, there are only 5 exercises for practicing repetition of word combinations. No remarks or rules for explanation.

In the textbook designed for the students of higher education by F.Ikramova, A.Azizova, and D.Muhammedova, "The Uzbek language. For the faculties of Pedagogy and Psychology"(Tashkent 1983)The following common definition is given to the word combination and it is used in all textbooks and manuals recommended by Uzbek linguistics: 'The word combination is grouping of two or more independent words interrelated grammatically and semantically'.

At the end of our article, it is worth noting that Uzbek scholar T. Khojayev . recommended the term 'an expression of a common understanding' instead of the term "word combination", commonly used in

linguistics by all linguists. In order to have a clearer understanding of the recommendation basis in the researcher's interpretation of word combination, we quote the following lines from a scientist's proposal:

1. The combination of homogeneous parts, non-extended sentences and phrases is a combination of independent words, as well as it is the real source of the emergence of contradictory thoughts and interpretations, and defining the word combination ignoring its nature and essence, calling any syntactic unit currently referred to as the word combination.

2. Since the meaning and substance of the proposed syntactic unit is a universal concept, we now have to call it a 'universal expression' rather than a 'word combination'.

The researcher's interpretation of the word combination should be approached from philosophical point of view. However, the definition of a word combination as a unique phenomenon of language must be interpreted from the point of view of linguistics. Or else not only the language phenomenon in our view is related to the notion or thought but it should be related to call the language unit with appropriate name to its nature and essence. In this sense, the 'word combination' is in terms of the spelling and the meaning of the words, it is noteworthy that the compound is not always named, in its constituent parts being independent, it is worth noting that the name does not suit to the substance. The name "word combination" is used to name not combined words. Such antinomy phenomena are common in the language. At the same time, they need to be understood symbolically. Then there is no need to rename the word combination. In fact, under this term, "two or more words" are lexically and grammatically intertwined, suggesting exactly the same thing (represented by a ruler) and its symbols (represented by subordinate words). It should be noted that it provides, gives some information about it, and that the common meanings of the related words are in general. We would propose that, based on the above interpretations of our linguists, and all of those who are interested in our definition are: "Two or more independent words that are interconnected in terms of lexical and grammatical meanings are called word combination." In the context of the word "lexical meaning" it is possible to understand the meaning of naming, displaying and interpreting a particular word, and 'the grammatical meaning' of the words in the word combinations, conflict resolution in their relation, as the components are envisaged to change the forms and their categories and features specific to the word categories.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

References:

1. Akhmonova, O.S. (1969). *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms*. In Russian. Moscow.
2. Stepanova, M.S. (1973). *Theory of Valence and Analysis of Valence*. Moscow.
3. Irisqulov, M. (1992). *Introduction to Linguistics*. in Uzbek. Tashkent.
4. Abdurahmonov, G., & Mamajonov, S. (2002). *Uzbek Language and Literature*. In Uzbek. Tashkent.
5. Fortunov, F.F. (1956). *The Source of Linguistic studies*. In Russian. Moscow.
6. Khojaye, T. (2005). Foreign Philology. Journal in Uz.3rd Issue.
7. Ikromova, F., Azizova, A., & Mukhammedova, D. (1983). Uzbek Language. In Uz.
8. Bakhtiyorov, M., Kholyorov, O., & Abdurahmonova, N. (2013). A Universal Manual on Uzbek. In Uz. 5th issue.
9. Rasulova, N., & Supiyeva, B. (2016). *Lectures on Native Language*. Tashkent.
10. Hamrayev, M. (2012). *Native Language*. Tashkent.
11. Mahmudov, N., Nurmonov, A., Sobirov, A., Sobirov, V., & Zhoraboyeva, Z. (2015). *Native Language. Course book*. Tashkent.
12. Mahmudov, N., Nurmonov, A., Sobirov, A., & Nabiyeva, D. (2015). *Native Language. Course book of 6-7 form*. Tashkent.
13. Nematov, H., Abduraimova, M., & Sayfullayeva, R. (2014). *Native Language. Course book of 8th form*. Tashkent.