



## Inseparability Of Compound Words

**KarimovaUmida**

Scientific Advisor, the Department of English History and Grammar, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

**Poyonova Sadoqat**

Students of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
[mrs.karimova17@gmail.com](mailto:mrs.karimova17@gmail.com)

**Ohunjonova Ominaxon**  
**Saxaddinova Nilufar**

Students of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
Students of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

This article is depending on difference between words and stems even when they coincide morphemically is especially evident in compound adjectives proper.

**Keywords:**

grammatical, polysyllabic, solidly, word-groups, controversial problems, sufficient

**Structurally** the inseparability of compounds manifests itself in the specific order and arrangement of stems which stand out most clearly in all a syntactic compounds. Adjectives like **long, wide, rich** are characterized by grammatical forms of degrees of comparison **longer, wider, richer**. The corresponding stems lack grammatical independence and forms proper to the words and retain only the part – of – speech meaning, thus compound adjectives with adjective stems for their second components, e.g. **age-long, oil-rich**, do not form degrees of comparison the way words **long, rich** do. They conform to the general rule of polysyllabic adjectives having analytical forms of degrees of comparison. This difference between words and stems is not so noticeable in compound nouns with the noun stem for the second component, as the paradigm of the compound word coincides with the paradigm of the noun whose stem constitutes its structural centre.

**Graphically** most compounds have two types of spelling they are spelt either solidly or with a hyphen. Both types of spelling when

accompanied by structural or phonetic peculiarities serve as a sufficient indication of inseparability of compound words in contradistinction to phrases. It is true that hyphenated spelling when not accompanied by some other indications of inseparability may be sometimes misleading, as it may be used in word-groups to underline the phraseological character of combination as in, e.g. **daughter-in-law, father-in-law, man-of-war, brother-in-arms**, etc. which are neither structurally, nor phonetically marked by inseparability.

The two types of spelling typical of compounds, however, are not rigidly observed and there are numerous fluctuations between solid or hyphenated spelling on the one hand and spelling with a space between the components on the other, especially in nominal compounds built on the *n+n* formula. The spelling of these compounds varies from author to and author from dictionary to dictionary. For example, words—**war-path, war-time, money-lender**—are spelt both with a hyphen or solidly; **blood-poisoning, money-order, wave - length, blood-vessel, war-**

**ship**—with a hyphen end with a break; **underfoot, insofar, underhand**—solidly and with a break. This inconsistency of spelling in compounds, very often accompanied by a level stress pattern (equally typical of word groups) makes the outer indications of inseparability stand out less clearly and gives rise to the problem of distinguishing between compound words and word-groups.

The numerous borderline cases between compounds and word-groups are connected with one of the most controversial problems in word-composition, known in linguistic literature as "the stonewall problem", in other words the problem whether complexes like **stone wall, peace movement, summer days** regularly spelt with a break should be regarded as compound words or word-groups. The solution of the problem centers on the nature of the first member of such formations. There are two approaches to this problem and linguists, consequently, give different appraisals of the graphic and phonetic integrity of such complexes.

Some linguists class such complexes as a specific group of compound words on the ground that the connection between the members of such complexes cannot be regarded as syntactic, as the usual means of connection between two nouns typical of Modern English syntax is either the possessive case or various prepositions: "They consequently conclude that the connection in formation of the "stone wall" type is a syntactic hence the members of these complexes are not words but grammatically unshaped elements, i.e. stems. As a junction of two noun-stems they are referred to compound words. The a syntactic structure is taken for a sufficient proof of their inseparability and lack of graphic integrity is disregarded. The proponents of this point of view go on to state that these complexes may also be interpreted as combinations of an adjective with a noun, the adjective being formed from the noun-stem by means of conversion for the given occasion, in which case a compound word would remain primary and a word-group secondary. This brings the linguists to the conclusion that these complexes make a specific group of compound

words, often termed neutral. they are characterized by structural instability due to which they can be easily disintegrated into free word-groups under the influence of parallel attributive combinations, level stress and spelling with a break between the components.

The above-cited treatment of these nominal complexes and the disregard of the outer, formal manifestations of inseparability is open to grave doubts. On the one hand, the productivity of conversion in formation of adjectives does not seem convincing because there are very few adjectives' of the type in independent use in Modern English; on the other hand it is argued that Modern English nouns in the Common case, singular are used in the attributive function and a purely syntactic nature of the combination of two; full-fledged nouns has been almost universally recognized in the last few decades. If we share the opinion, we shall come to the obvious conclusion that there exists a nominal type of free phrases built on the formula N+N and a group of nominal compounds built on the  $n+n$  formula which stands in correlative relations to each other. The recognition of nominal free phrases deprives "neutral compounds" of theoretical validity. Nominal compounds remain a specific class of compounds but in this case the distributional formula even in the most indisputable cases has only a weakened distinguishing force and can by no means be taken for an overall criterion of their inseparability. It is evident that the hyphenated spelling or at least fluctuations between hyphenated spelling and spelling with a break become most significant in distinguishing nominal compound words from word-groups. Consequently nominal complexes which are regularly spelt with a space between the components and are characterized by level stress pattern can hardly be regarded as inseparable vocabulary units. It is noteworthy that occasional compounds of this type which have become-registered vocabulary units tend to solid or hyphenated spelling.

The component of Uzbek compounds are combined in this way: 1. phonetical changes in the 1<sup>st</sup> components of compound words. The consonants in the beginning of the

1<sup>st</sup> component may be changed into another component:

Ех: сичқончўп - тишқончўп (the names of plant)

чилонжийда – жилон жийда

сотупроқ – соғ тупроқ

In some compounds suffixes may be omitted and may form variants of the compounds words.

Ех: тугмачагул - тугмагул (“ча” is omitted)

гадойтахлит - гадотахлит (“й” is omitted.)

айта олмаслвк – айтолмаслик

бўла олмаслик - бўлолмаслик

In compound word is ended with “йо”, it must be written separately if it is ended with “ё” it must be written together as one word.

Ех: қишлай олмоқ - қишлаёлмоқ

ушлай олмоқ - ушлаёлмоқ

тўқий олмоқ - тўқиёлмоқ

To form a compound verb with the verbs “емоқ, демоқ” which have “е” sound in the root, one must add “я (й + а)” after “е, де” e. g.: де+я олмоқ – деяолмоқ, е+я олмоқ, ея олмоқ.

2. Phonetical changes in the 2<sup>nd</sup> components of compound words. Ех: итбурун - итмурун Туябўйин - Туямўйин.

“б” consonant in the beginning of the second component a changed into “в”

Ех: қорабой – қоравой, кўзибой - кўзивой

амакибачча - амакивачча, тоғабачча - тоғавачча.

Some suffixes maybe added to the second element of compound word.

Ех: The most productive suffix for this group is “ли” e. g.

In the book of A.P. Khodjiev’s “Compound and repeated word” “ли” suffix is given in brackets.

Ех: Such kinds of compound words are given in this book.

### The list of used literature

1. A course in modern English lexicology R. S Ginzburg, S. S Khidekel, G. Y. Knyazeva, A. A Sankin (1979)

2. Lee W. R. Language teaching: Games and Contests / W.R.Lee. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
3. Umida K. The Role of Teaching Compounds According to Types of Speech in Constructivism //Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching. – 2022. – Т. 8. – С. 4-9.
4. Umida K. The ways of using constructivism to teaching phraseological units and vocabulary for efl //Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research. – 2022. – Т. 3. – №. 4. – С. 1-6. Retrieved from <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejlat/article/view/1325>
5. Umida, Karimova. "The Role of Teaching Compounds According to Types of Speech in Constructivism." Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching 8 (2022): 4-9. Retrieved from ISSN: 2795-739X.
6. Ochilovna K. U., Sameyevna M. Z. IMPROVING SPEAKING SKILL WITH THE HELP OF MODERN TECHNOLOGIES //Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal. – 2021. – Т. 9. – №. 12. – С. 367-369.