

MEANING FORMATION OF COMPOUND LEXICAL UNITS IN RUSSIAN, AZERBAIJANI AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

^aAIDA VAHID KIZI ISMAYILOVA

Ganja State University, 429, H. Aliyev Ave., AZ2000, Ganja city,
Azerbaijan
email: ^aaida-profit@yandex.ru

Abstract: After various types of information sent from outside are combined in our brains and adapted, they become compound words. Adaptation in this form results in the formation of compound words based on both synonymy and antonymy by combining words with different meanings. The other part of compound words are made up of words that are expressing opposite meanings. Man's cognitive activity has made it possible to distinguish between the things that exist in nature and, in general, this is about any concepts in certain features. Namely as a result of this activity of the brain, words have been formed that are opposite to each other in the language, and these words have been regrouped to form compound words. In cognitive linguistics, one of the components of compound words is considered to be the main one, and in general, it affects which part of speech the newly formed compound word is. In compound words, the first element takes a stress, but the second element defines a new class of compound words. The formation of compound words is closely related to conceptual factors. Mostly complex words are the result of the formation of a conceptual mixture. In this process, the elements of the two concepts are selected and "mixed" with a new, more complex concept. The article discusses the expression of compound lexical units' components with parts of speech in the Russian, English and Azerbaijani languages (which are hetero-system languages) and their cognitive features.

Keywords: Azerbaijani; English; Russian; meaning formation; cognitive linguistics; compound lexical unit; component.

1 Introduction

When various types of information sent from the outside are combined in our brains and adapted, after it, they become compound words. Adaptation here results in the formation of compound words within synonymy and antonymy. By combining different pieces of information about the word *it* (dog) being sent to our brains, by likening the fruit of the plant that we see with our eyes to the dog's nose, we create the word *itburnu* (dog rose or rosa canina), a new compound word with a new meaning. In English, the word *football* has also been formed by a combination of the words *foot-ayaq*, *ball-top*. Although the words *foot* and *ball* have different meanings in reality, by combining them in our brains, we can form a new and structurally different word. It is not accidental being given this name to it because football game is played with the feet. *Başağrısı* means *headache* in English. It has been formed by a combination of the words *head* and *ache*. Although both words have different lexical meanings, as a result of human cognitive activity, a new word has been formed that means a headache by creating a semantic connection.

"The other part of compound words are made up of words that expressing opposite meanings. For example: compound words in Azerbaijani such as *dost-düşmən* (*friend-enemy*), *yaxşı-yaman* (*good-bad*), *geə-gündüz* (*night-day*), *gec-tez* (*early-late*), etc. are of this kind. Man's cognitive activity has made it possible to distinguish between the things that exist in nature and, in general, any concepts in certain features. It is as a result of this activity of the brain words have been formed that are opposite to each other in the language, and these words have been regrouped to form compound words" [15, p. 116].

2 Materials and Method

The following methods of analysis and description of the studied material are used in the work: the method of synchronous comparison of data from various subsystems of compound words; elements of the linguistic-statistical method, which makes it possible to establish certain qualitative patterns of the dynamics of the development of word-formation subsystems behind the quantitative (share) ratios of the groups of objects under study; private methods of synchronous word-formation and morphemic analysis of the word developed in linguistics.

3 Results and Discussion

In cognitive linguistics, one of the components of compound words is considered to be the main one, and in general, it affects which part of speech the newly formed compound word is. "In compound words, the first element takes a stress, but the second element defines a new class of compound words. Thus, the second element (bird) in the word *blackbird* is a noun, and the compound word remains as a noun as a whole. This element is the main element of compound words. The main word of compound words belongs to three classes: noun, verb, adjective. The first word can also be any of these three words" [6, p.55].

The formation of compound words is closely related to conceptual factors. Mostly complex words are the result of the formation of a conceptual mixture. In this process, the elements of the two concepts are selected and "mixed" with a new, more complex concept.

"In the word of the spirit, V. von Humboldt meant everything that constitutes a nation: the traditions of the people, the morality of the people, the worldview of the people, the consciousness and thinking of the people, the people's perception, attitudes and seeing of the world, etc. [18, p.14]. A. Rajabli gave the following definition for a concept: a concept is an institution with a linguoculturally loaded specificity and in one way or another characterizes certain ethnocultural conveyors. The concept is the bricks to build a house, reflecting the ethnic worldview and marking the ethnic language landscape of the world. But at the same time, it is a quantum of knowledge that reflects the content of all human activity. As human thinking is the same, the conceptual landscape of the world created by different people is the same, but the national language landscapes of the world are different.

Since language is the most important method of formation and existence of knowledge about the world, namely language is the most important research object of cognitivists. The totality of this knowledge, which is reflected in the forms of language, is called either the "language model of the world" or the "linguistic landscape of the world" in various concepts. The best of these is the term "linguistic landscape of the world".

V. I. Karasik shows that the structure of the concept consists of the following components: 1. Image-perceptual component; 2. Comprehensive (information factual) component; 3. Evaluation, arrangement (evaluation, behavior) component [10, p.112].

The rapid and intensive development of cognitive linguistics, defining of the content of concept's notion and the study of the typology of concepts led to the conclusion that the term *concept* is a term which combines different forms of mental phenomena and its duty is structuring knowledge in the human mind.

In structural linguistics, the meaning of a word is defined in language internal context, between syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations and language signs in the internal system of language, so that the meaning of a word does not depend on what the speaker knows about an object in the real world. The origin of lexical field theory stems from here. "According to lexical field theory, words are grouped according to a certain semantic field. Such semantic fields cover the language like a net" [9]. Therefore, in order to know the meaning of a separate word, it is necessary to know both the place of the word in this field and the place of the words that surround it and enter that field.

Semes differ from meanings as parts of a whole. Semes are parts of meaning that are not expressed in its structure as part of that sign, they are derived from the comparison of meanings by net relation; if they are expressed in the structure of meaning, then they are used in a non-nominative language unit, for example,

grammatical semes are used through morphemes. Semes can be a simple and complex semantic sign. The only important thing that matters to it is that this sign is part of any word's indication - meaning.

The problem of the genesis of compound words within the structural-semantic approach has attracted the attention of many linguists. Traditionally, there are two ways in which compound words are formed: from expressions and from models.

Arnold notes from which expression the process of usage a compound word begins with a change in meaning. He considers that the development of compound words from expressions can occur in different ways. Thus, some expressions and compound words originally expressed the same or almost similar notions. After the formation of compound words, expressions ceased their existence (*breakfast, cupboard, waistcoat*). According to Arnold, other compound words are based on free expressions, "mentioning any particular object that serves to identify various random objects with certain characteristics" [2, p. 160]. As a result of isolating the meaning of these expressions, compound words have formed, while free expressions continue to function in parallel: a dark room - any dark room (free expression); dark-room - a special room for photography (compound word). The existence of another way of forming compound words is determined by the fact that sometimes compound words do not have their own prototype in the form of a phrase, because the structure of these words contradicts the norms of syntax. Many researchers note that the formation of compound words is often based on historically developed derivative patterns in the language. In this regard, Z. A. Kharitonchik is saying about word-formation model or word-formation type as "scheme, example, analog, everything that determines the order of word formation, forming the base, the type word-forming means, the generalized semantics of the same typed words formed as a result of their interaction" [11, p. 19]. According to Meshkov, word formation models differ from each other significantly in many respects. By compiling a matrix of parts of speech and determining their possible compatibility, he identified 196 models of compound words. O. D. Meshkov proposed three types of word-formation models: productive models in which hundreds and thousands of compound words are formed; models in which only a few, even a compound word, is formed; and closed models, so new compound words are no longer formed and won't be able to be formed [16, p.47]. Many researchers believe that the N + N model is one of the most productive models. O. D. Meshkov identified a number of reasons for defining the productivity of this model: The N + N model provides great opportunities for the nomination of real objects and phenomena; in English, putting of two nouns opposite, is possible in any semantic relation; the spread of compound words by N + N model is stimulated by the simple morphological structure of the English word; N + N typed construction is characterized by greater syntactic easiness compared to the expression "noun + preface + noun" [16, p.19]. L. Bauer, who researches within the psycholinguistic approach in the group of compound words formed on the N + N model, distinguishes the Gerund + N subgroup [5, p.89]. He puts forward two arguments to prove this point. First, unlike other compound words that contain a verbal component, the verbal component of these compound nouns has *-ing* ending. Second, the semantic relationships between the components of a compound word are more similar to the relationships between the components of compound words formed by N + N model than the Verb+N model. Therefore, after L. Bauer, in this study, we also consider that compound nouns formed according to the Gerund + N model form a special subgroup of compound words shaped according to the N + N model and are very productive. In addition to the above methods of forming compound words, Meshkov identifies the third way in which compound nouns are formed [16, p. 91]. According to him, compound words can be formed by analogy with existing compound words by replacing one of the components. With the help of this method, a large number of compound words can be formed, which can be neutral, figurative and conveying individual author character. For example, the compound word *starquake* has been formed by

analogy with the compound word *earthquake*; *comedywright* - *playwright* - by composite analogy; *peace-monger* - *war-monger* - by analogy with a compound word. Thus, the study of the genesis of compound words formed the basis for the further development of scientific thought in the field of word structure. As a result, it led to the study of the problem of identification of compound words, allow determining their lexical completeness, revealing their semantic features, and developing their classification.

Relations between the components of a compound word by consisting of "noun + noun"

The problem of the relation between the components of a compound word has also been the subject of research by many linguists. Within the structural-semantic approach to compound words, different names have been used to denote the relation between the components of compound nouns. Some linguists believed that there should be a syntactic relationship between the components of a compound word. Other researchers have identified logical relations between the components of a compound word. For example, N. D. Arutyunova believes that the relation between the elements of a compound word expresses the logical relations between the relevant realities more directly than the syntactic norms of sentence construction [4]. N. A. Azarkh, O. D. Meshkov, and others, developing O. Jespersen's idea, studying the relations between the first and second components of a compound word, talk about the existence of semantic relations between them [1, p.110]. For example, N. A. Azarkh notes that the components of a compound word can be in different meaning's relation. Thus, in the compound noun *ant-hill* - the first component represents the sign of the second, and the components of the compound word *peace-loving* express the semantic relation between action and object [1, p.29]. One of the most common types of semantic relations between the components of compound words is when the first component expresses some quality or feature of the second component. The third group of researchers stated the existence of semantic relations between the components of a compound word [3]. Thus, according to M. D. Stepanova, there must be a certain semantic relation between the components of a compound word. Often, the first component clarifies the meaning of the second, for example, *Grofstadt, Waterland* [20, p.76]. Supporting the idea of M. D. Stepanova, N. G. Guterman notes that the relation between the components of compound words is not syntactic, but conveying semantic character, because it does not take into account the syntactic relations between the individual members of the sentence, but the important parts of a word, the relations between the morphemes [8]. The onomasiological approach, which aimed to determine the relations between linguistic phenomena by defining the reality surrounding man, allowed for a different approach to the study of the structure of derivative words in general, and compound words in particular. Taking into account the process of formation of the derivative word, researchers suggest that the onomasiological structure of the derivative word has a two-part character and consists of an onomasiological basis which is given an onomasiological sign. Thus, according to M. Dokulila's terminology, the word "каменщик" is associated with the action of the sign conveyor of the word; the onomasiological sign is *камень* (*stone*) that is the subject of active effect of human. The expression of onomasiological basis is considered to be the suffix *-щик* in Russian, the indicator of the onomasiological sign in Azerbaijani is the base *day-* [7]. E. S. Kubryakova, who clarified M. Dokulila's concept, came to the conclusion that not only suffixes, but also other morphological features can act as units that form the onomasiological basis of derived words [13, p.45]. For example in Azerbaijani: *sükan* (steering wheel) — *sükan çarxı* (steering wheel); *pis* (bad) — *qəzəb* (anger), *uçmaq* (to fly) — *üstündən uçmaq* (to fly over); *səs* (sound) — *ultra səs* (ultra sound) and etc.

Moreover, by applying this concept characterizing the derivative meaning of compound words, as well as using the achievements of syntactic semantics and the method of propositional analysis, Kubryakova proposed the inclusion of another concept in the

onomasiological structure of the nominational unit - the concept of onomasiological relation or onomasiological predicate. Thus, in terms of derivative onomasiology, a compound word has a triple nominative structure. According to Kubryakova's theory, the onomasiological structure of a composite is formed through an onomasiological basis that is a decision made on the mind of a person to deal with which object - a substance, thing or process, action, situation or sign, property, attribute [13, p.15-18]. An onomasiological sign is expressing in one way or another the concept of the main content of determinant, limiting or changing it, and a hidden and real onomasiological predicate combines onomasiological basis and onomasiological feature with a certain type of relation: relevance, neighborhood, comprehensiveness etc. and concretizes it. Thus, *silk-dress* is a dress made of silk, and *silk-grass* is a grass reminiscent of silk.

Formation of meaning's features of "noun + noun" structurally based compound words

The formation of the semantics of compound words N + N denotes noun-forming words. Often the words that forming a noun indicate the potential for logical-object meaning. The role played by a particular productive noun depends on its semantics. According to E. S. Kubryakova, among the important notions that characterize the words that forming a noun, there are object, person, place, and other concepts [13, p.207]. Nouns denoting living environment are conceptualized as place, and special-purpose objects are conceptualized as means. This expression is confirmed not only by the mass of simple, non-derivative nouns with similar meanings, but also by the existence of special word-forming formatives that create the categories *nomina loci*, *nomina agentis* etc. E. V. Rakhilina notes that all nouns can be classified according to the role classification of nouns [14, p.114-115]. The first-class names she distinguishes are active. It, primarily, consists of tools and mechanisms, such as a needle - something that being stung, a hammer - something hitting nails, a knife - something that cutting, and so on. Objects that describe "patient" names have roles without means in situation of standard use. For example, a door - is something that is opened and closed, floor - is something one walks on it, a house - is a place one lives in, etc. When forming the meaning of a compound word, the notions that are conveyed with productive nouns are combined in a single conceptual structure. At the level of coordination of the concept, a connection is established between the two notions of the subject area, expressed by nouns, with the help of the concept, which expresses the procedural sign expressed by the verb. From E. V. Rakhilina's point of view, mereology, which is part of logic, describes the whole and the relation between its parts, the relation between the set, and its elements. Among the overlapping notions with the nouns, she reveals the part-whole relations, for example: heel - foot, ear - head; accompanying or being accompanied (Y and X accompany each other), for example, cornflowers with chamomile, an armed man; locative relations (from X to Y), such as a poster on the wall, a cup on the table, and so on [15, p.36-52]. Kubryakova believes that the notions represented by nouns can be constructed as a type of logical connection, such as concatenation, conjunction or separation, disjunction, as well as comparison, using a concept that expresses a procedural feature in the concepts [12, p.18-20]. Each of these logical operations implements its "own" predicate: conjunction - predicate "və - və" (and - and), disjunction - "dəyil" "dəyil" (not not), identification - predicate "olmaq, kimə olmaq / bir şey olmaq" (to be, to become someone / become something), comparison - predicate "bənzər, bənzəmək", "oxşamaq" (similar, to resemble, to look like). When X is somehow Y, logical classification or specification operations, and descriptions that differ from it by a certain feature, such as the type of sign grouped under a particular class, are not associated with a single predicate. Although they denote the diversity of attitudes, they create different associations in the human mind. In their compositional models, various such propositions are constructed with many more specific predicates, although their word structure models are quite generalized, such as "kiməsə xidmət etmək" (serving someone), "ibarət olmaq" (consisting of something), "kiməsə/nəyəyə aid olmaq" (belonging to whom / what) and so

on. Determining the type of relation between noun-forming concepts helps to define propositional forms that are connecting compound words related to structure. In cases where a compound word contains a verbal component, the predicate uses the previous act of derivation and does not need to be restored. In the absence of any verbal component in the structure of a structurally justified compound noun, the implicit atomic predicate, which determines the relation between the two concepts, is restored during word formation. It is associated with the formation of nouns. In this case, according to E. S. Kubryakova, it is necessary to decide which logical operation is the main for the forming of a compound word (identification, classification, etc.). Accordingly, it is important which of the possible predicates for these operations describes in the simplest way the relation between the names that are forming the nouns and the concepts represented [12, p.21]. E. M. Pozdnyakova notes that if the logical disjunction of identification or conjunction stands at the center of the formation of a compound word, then the reconstructed atomic predicate becomes *BE* linking predicate [17, p.106]. If the formation of a compound noun is based on a logical operational classification, the reconstructed predicates *BE TYPE OF* or *BE PART OF* are the atomic predicates. In cases where the formation of a compound word is based on an operational description, either *OPER*, *BE OPER* operational concepts are restored, or more specific but nevertheless very abstract atomic predicates compared to operational concepts *BE MADE*, *BE USED*, *BE USED FOR* etc. are used.

Formation of meanings of endocentric structural-unmotivated compound words "Noun + noun"

In endocentric compound words, the second component of the compound word plays a semantic and grammatical dominant role, which manifests itself at the conceptual level. Thus, the concept expressed by the second transformational noun undergoes a significant change in accordance with the concept associated with the first transformational noun. This is explained by the fact that coordinating of features of the two notions is not central and stable, but requires the perspective of variable features. Conceptual analysis of endocentric structurally unmotivated compound words is initially carried out as a conceptual analysis of structurally motivated composites, which do not show the logical-objective meaning potential of nouns. As mentioned above, due to the movement of the cognitive mechanism of "completion", variable features are restored from certain cognitive areas, which are more consistent with the perspective central features of both concepts conveyed by productive nouns. In the process of relating changing concepts with the perspective central features, the concept is harmonized, the concept of the first transformational noun is related with the second transformational noun. As a result of the placement, there is a significant change in the concept conveyed by the second transformational noun. In addition, based on the sequential central and variable characteristics of both concepts associated with transformational nouns, certain features and/or combinations of new features arise in connection with the movement of the cognitive mechanism of "development", which is related to the structurally unmotivated compound word N + N lead to the formation of a concept. It is known that the same transformational noun can act as both the first and the second component of a compound word. As an example of this we can show the noun *flu*, which is the first and then the second element of a compound noun in the following contexts [6]. "People talk about flu-days like snow days," he said, "and if it was just days or a week, that would be simple. But if it's weeks or months, that becomes another matter. Let us take look in detail at the process of forming the meaning of the compound word *flu-days*, which is unmotivated as an endocentric structure. The definition of the second transformational noun *day* in dictionary is as follows: one of the seven twenty-four hour periods of time in a week. In the process of forming the concept relating to a compound word, the central and stable feature is a period in a week, the feature - the transformational noun - is one of the seven concepts conveyed by the day, and the transformational noun corresponds to the characteristics of the concept associated with *flu*. This

noun has the following dictionary explanation: an infectious illness like a bad cold, causing a high temperature, pains and weakness; an infectious disease which is like a bad cold but more serious [19, p.494]. Influenced by the characteristics of a time period of the week, the property that produces the noun is one of the seven concepts transmitted by *day*. Infectiousness, similar to the common cold which are the central and stable features of the disease are emphasized, but the noun *flu* shows more important points than this concept. Then the perspective features of both concepts are compared. Subsequent formation of the meaning of a compound noun takes place taking into account contextual information.

4 Conclusion

As a result, we can say that the components of complex words in Azerbaijani and English, which are languages of different systems, have a cognitive nature, regardless of the part of speech in which they are expressed.

Information conveyed in context by such linguistic units as *like snow days*, *and if it was just days or a week*, *but if it's weeks or months* and also the sequential characteristic of concepts refers to the *TIME* cognitive field behind the concept associated with the second transformational noun. From this cognitive field, the changing characteristic of time completes. The sequential characteristics of both concepts and the varying characteristics of time refers to the cognitive area of the *DISEASE* behind the concept represented by the *flu* that creates the noun. In this cognitive field, changing characteristics are complemented, the disease spreads, causes epidemics, ways to prevent the development of the epidemic, ways to prevent the spread of the epidemic are completed. In the process of further relating the changing concepts with the central features, the conceptual noun changes according to the word *day* as a result of the placement. In particular, the central features of the week and one of the seven days lose their perspective, only the central feature of the time period remains as perspective. Negative connotation characteristics form on the basis of consistent features. As a result, the concept associated with the compound word *flu-days* includes the following features: duration of time, sustainability, ways to prevent the development of influenza epidemics, ways to prevent the spread of influenza epidemics, negative connotation. This concept defines the meaning of the compound word *flu-days* in the context under consideration: (negative connotation) a rather long period of time when different methods are used to prevent or reduce the epidemic spread of the flu.

Literature:

1. Azarkh, J. (1965). *Semjonovn Slovoobrazovanie sushhestvitel'nyh zhenskogo roda s nulevoj fleksiej v imenitel'nom padezhe edinstvennogo chisla (Na materiale pis'mennyh pamjatnikov russkogo jazyka s XI veka i dannyh dialektologii)* [Word Formation of Feminine Nouns with Zero Inflection in the Nominative Singular (Based on the Written Monuments of the Russian Language from the 11th Century and Data of Dialectology)]. Moscow. [in Russian]
2. Arnold, I. V. (2012) *Leksikologija sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka* [Lexicology of Modern English]. Moscow: FLINTA-Nauka. [in Russian]
3. Aronoff, M. (1976). *Word Formation in Generative Grammar. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 1*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. [in English].
4. Arutyunova, N. D. (1990). Diskurs [Discourse] // *Lingvisticheskij entsiklopedicheskij slovar'* [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary]. Moscow: Sovetskaja ensiklopedija. Pp.136-137. [in Russian]
5. Bauer, L. (1983) *English Word-Formation (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics)*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Dirven, R., & Verspoor, M. (2004) (Eds.). *Cognitive exploration of language and Linguistics*. John Benjamin Publishing Company.
7. Dokulil, M. (1962) *Tvoření slov v češtině: Teorie odvozování slov*. [in Czech]

8. Guterman, N. G. (1955). *Slojnyje suhcestvitel'nyje v sovremennom anglijskom jazyke*. Leningrad. 26 p. (in Russian).
9. Habibova, K. A. (2020). The Specificity of Everyday Discourses // First International Volga Region Conference on Economics, Humanities and Sports (FICEHS 19): In the book: *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*. Vol. 114. Pp. 335-344. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebm.r.k.200114.079> [in English].
10. Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Jazykovoj krug: lichnost', konsepty, diskurs* [Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse]. Volgograd: Peremena. [in Russian].
11. Kharitonchik, Z. A. (1992). *Leksikologija anglijskogo jazyka* [Lexicology of English]. Minsk: Vyshejschaja shkola. [in Russian].
12. Kubryakova, E. S. (1988). *Teoreticheskie osnovy slovoslozhenija i voprosy sozdanija sloznych leksicheskikh edinit* [Theoretical foundations of word composition and issues of creating complex lexical units]. Pyatigorsk. [in Russian]
13. Kubryakova, E. S. (2009) *Teorija nominatsii i slovoobrazovanie* [The theory of nomination and word formation]. Moscow: LIBROKOM. [in Russian].
14. *Lingvistika konstruktiv* [Linguistics of constructions] (2010) [editor E. V. Rahilina]. Moscow: Azbukovnik. [in Russian]
15. Memmedova, N. (2021) Murrekeb sozlerer koqnitiv yanaşma [Cognitive approach to complex words]. *Terminologija [Terminology]*, 2, 115-125. [in Azerbaijani]
16. Meshkov, O. D. (1976). *Slovoobrazovanie sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka* [Word formation in modern English]. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian].
17. Pozdnjakova, E. M. (2015). *Developing courses in English in the era of digital technologies: resources and recommendations*. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities. [in English].
18. Rajabli, A. (2021). *Koqnitiv dilçilik* [Cognitive linguistics]. Baku: Elm ve tehsil. [in Azerbaijani]
19. Shepeleva, D. A. (2008). *Kognitivnye aspekty semantiki slozhnogo slova "sushhestvitel'noe + sushhestvitel'noe" v sovremennom anglijskom jazyke avtoreferat dissertacii po filologii* [Cognitive aspects of the semantics of the compound word "noun + noun" in modern English dissertation abstract in philology]. Tambov.
20. Stepanova, M. D. (1953). *Slovoobrazovanie sovremennogo nemeckogo jazyka*. Serija: Biblioteka filologa [Word formation of the modern German language. Series: Philologist's Library]. Moscow: Nauka.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI