

SUBSTANTIVE FORMS OF NOUNS IN THE KAZAKH LANGUAGE

*Ashinova K.A.¹, Ashinov R.B.²,

¹Cand.Phil. Sc., Associate Professor, Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

e-mail: kunipa_almaty@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6938-2092>

²Master of the chair of 'scenography' Kazakh National Academy of Arts named after T.K. Zhurgenov, Almaty, Kazakhstan

e-mail: killahpro_.88@mail.ru²

Abstract. This article examines the main part of root substantive nouns. They are generally not separated from their accusative pronouns, and they are used both in the original accusative form and also in the independent pronominal form that were formed later. Such substantive nouns, the meaning of which has reached the level of materialization are usually found in literary works. The degree of substantivization of adjectives and pronouns is generally not the same. Even one adjective word class itself has a different level of acquiring such a material character. Among such types of nouns, there are those that have generally reached the rank of a registered word through substantivization, as well as those that have not yet reached the rank of a registered word, those that are contextual (stylistic) and occasional. The task of the article is to study whether substantive nouns, like simple nouns, can be described in three forms: root, derivative and complex.

The scientific significance of this paper is the need for analysis in determining a derived noun, it is closely related to the word-formation meaning. The practical significance of the work can be an aid in the process of writing teaching methods, lectures, seminars, practical classes, courses. The component analysis, structural and semantic analysis, systematization methods were used as the research methods.

The main results of the research: the difference between linguistic phenomena on different linguistic natures is sometimes indistinguishable. The different substantivization depends on their own semantic structures.

Keywords: derivational suffixes, compound substantive nouns, ancient historical phenomenon, derivative word, substantive noun, accusative form, nominal words, meaning, pronominal form, compound substantive nouns, derived substantive nouns, semantic structure

Basic provisions

This study was based on the following **key points**:

1. The formal derivational nouns in the Kazakh language are certainly not uniform in terms of their meanings as in other Turkic languages.

2. The compound substantive nouns like the derived substantive nouns are also differ in appearances, personalities and usages. It is also possible to observe some differences between them. In both cases, compound substantive nouns with such roots are often proper nouns.

3. In terms of composition the complex substantive nouns do not always belong to noun types. The features of the formation in substantive nouns are determined by the meaning of the concept and composition of words.

Introduction

The complex substantive nouns in terms of their appearances and personalities are sometimes related to complex nouns created analytically, and in some cases they are bordered by phraseological composites. Substantive nouns are words that can be used to refer to the person, animal, place, thing, phenomenon, substance, quality or idea [1, p.38]. The adjectives and pronouns are substantiated, their meanings are materialized, and the objects become independent. Such words are declined and multiplied like nouns. If any adjective or pronoun can acquire such a substantive character in terms of its semantics, it can take accusative and plural case, then this indicates that it is suitable for the substantiation. Thus, the substantive nouns include adjectives and pronouns, the meanings of which have acquired certain material characters and which have the abilities to accept conjunctions. Therefore, they like simple nouns are described by three forms: root, derivative and complex.

The degree of substantiation of adjectives and pronouns, as a rule, is not the same. Even one type of adjectives has different degrees of acquisitions of such material characters. Among these types of nouns there are those that have reached the rank of nominal words through substantiation, as well as those that have not yet reached the rank of nominal words, they are contextual and stylistic. Their different substantiations depend on their own semantic structures.

The degree of substantivization is so high that its class origin is not even noticeable in its present state. Nobody doubts that it is a noun. As a rule, the main part of root nouns is not separated from its accusative pronominal stem: it is used both in the original accusative form and in the later formed independent pronominal form. As a rule, the main part of root noun is not separated from its accusative pronominal stem: it is used both in the original accusative form and in the later formed independent pronominal one. Such substantive nouns, the meaning of which has reached the level of materialization, are usually found in proverbs and phraseological expressions.

Whether roots are meaningless or rather have some sort of (abstract semantically-underspecified) meaning has been debated; for instance, Arad (2003, 2005), focusing on Hebrew consonantal roots, has argued for the semantic underspecification view, while Aronoff (2007, 822), after setting out the full set of nouns, verbs and adjectives (with their established senses) that are based on the root $\sqrt{\text{kbj}}$, concludes: 'It is logically impossible to show that underspecification is wrong, but trying to find a common meaning shared by pickles and highways brings one close to empirical emptiness' See also Panagiotidis (2014), who argues for the meaninglessness of roots quite generally [2, p.24].

Methods

The derived substantive nouns are more numerous than root substantive nouns. Basically, these are derived adjectives formed using only three or four suffixes [3, p.67]. For example, some constructions include derived substantive nouns with the suffix *-shy (-shi)*: *kanayshy*, *kanalushy*, *aiptaushy*, *mengerushi*, *zhattyktyrushy*, *tergeushi*. We can also add to this group *kaiyrshy*, *zhyrginshi*. Here the influence of a foreign language is noticeable. Especially in the last transitive noun *zhyrginshi*. It

appeared as the equivalent of the noun *prochozhii* in Russian, and the derivative substantive noun *kaiyrshy* is a synonym for the lowest substantive noun. The influence of the foreign language is manifested in substantive nouns formed by the suffix *-ker(-ger)*: *aipker*, *bapker*, *umitker*, *talapker*, *zhyldeger*, *zangger*, *dauger*. They are also called equivalents of Russian nouns: *obvinjaimyi*, *trener*, *pretendent*, *prizer*, *istets*.

Among the root nouns some historical lexical elements are revealed. For example: '*zhesir*, *tokal*' belong to the same lexical layer not only in Kazakh, but also in some other Turkic languages. Both of them were originally only adjectives. This group of root nouns was formed under the influence of the Russian language. For example, the lexemes '*auru*', '*ystyk*' appeared through translation in the practice of creating terms: they are equivalent to terms of a patient, which are usually used in the field of medicine, and the last word '*ystyk*' is the Kazakh equivalent of the term in temperature. Compared to the last word '*ystyk*', the term now dominates the activity of the preceding lexeme. In the meaning of this term of temperature in medicine, the lexeme '*ystyk*', on the contrary, was used more in the past. The Russian equivalent of the nominative '*auru*' (sick) is often used today, and there is a well-known reason for its frequent use. The fact is that the words '*auru*' (sick) as an equivalent of the term '*syrkat*' (ill) were personalized only in Soviet times. The lexeme '*auru*' is not like that, it had independence from the very beginning. This is proved from the very beginning, for example, by the proverb in our language '*auru azygyman*'. Its scope as a term expanded in Soviet times. Its meaning is currently activated, therefore the current term '*auru*' in the field of medicine was not directly translated using the example of the Russian term '*bolnoi*' (sick).

Discussion

In our language there are a number of adjectives formed from the mutual derivational relationship of the nominal stem and suffix *-las (-das, -mas)*. Among such nouns, the critical semantics of which has acquired a substantive character, we can include derivative words such as: *kyndes*, *kyrdas*, *karyndas*, *zamandas*, *zherles*, *ariptes*, *karsylas*, *basekeles*. Among them there are adjectives such as *kyndes*, *kyrdas*, *zamandas*, *karyndas*, today they are described as local nouns, the meanings of which were acquired very early. In the same way, the common birth *basekeles* can be called a noun of a root character. It became active only in Soviet times and received a further name. And the everyday noun "*basekeles*" is considered an ancient linguistic phenomenon that is not used today and has become historicism.

Some of the above mentioned words are often used in proverbs, sayings *zherles*, *ariptes*, *karsylas*, *basekeles* are alternatives to the Russian words *zemliyk*, *kollega*, *opponent*, *konkurent*, that is, they are nouns born in the process of searching for Kazakh equivalents of their meanings, and in connection with the termination of Kazakh words. Some of the above are often used in proverbs, sayings *zherles*, *ariptes*, *karsylas*, *basekeles* are alternatives to Russian words, they are nouns born in the process of searching for Kazakh equivalents of their meanings, and in connection with the termination of Kazakh words. The adjectives based on *-lyk* and *-gysh* and some derived substantive nouns are used on behalf of the first person.

Some of them are: *tustik, shaylyk, maylyk, sulyk, tungysh, mingish*, etc. *Shaylyk* usually means enough money for daily food and tea. The handkerchief with which they wipe the oil from the hands is called *maylyk*, and the handkerchief with which they wipe themselves after washing is called *sulyk*. Also, waterproof outerwear of shepherds is called *sulyk*. The type of vehicle most commonly used for daily commuting is *mingish*. Some derived adjectives, for example, *zhyrkysh, kemirushi* are not always in the singular, but sometimes they are substantiated in the plural, and the derived noun becomes a noun. Such adjectives related to various dogs, birds, insects, usually with the help of the suffix *-lar (-dar, -tar)*, firstly, acquire substantive characters, secondly, the plural value is added to them, and the substantive nouns of this structure usually have pronounced terminative characters.

Koshpendiler, zhaldamalyar, omyrkalylar, hordalyar and some other derived substantive nouns have the same model. All of these plural nouns mentioned above are creations that appeared during the Soviet era. The adjective-based nouns also include some other derivatives, such as *kerekesh, arbakesh, tuyekesh, beynetkor, aksha, alasy, beresi, shygasy*. Unlike the derivative nouns considered above, they differ greatly in their morphological structure, especially in the suffix part and in genetic features. For example, *tenge, som* from the very beginning were called money because of the color and whiteness of the materials from what they were made. This critical concept subsequently acquired a material character for him, it was materialized and eventually became a substantive noun. The form of the derivative substantive noun *kerekesh* as a whole came from the Arabic-Iranian languages. Derived substantive nouns *arbakesh, tuyekeshi* were later created after this lexeme *kerekesh*. The derivative word *beynetkor* is for the first time the Kazakhized equivalent of the term international proletariat. But later it fell into disuse. *Alasy, beresi, shygasy* first served as adjectives. But this critical meaning subsequently acquired a physical character, materialized, i.e., became a substantive name [4, p.179]. In general, there are not so many nouns with the structure *aksha, kirekesh, beynetkor*.

The linguistic nature of substantive nouns derived from adjectives, their basic linguistic features and numerical volume are generally similar. There are not so many such nouns with pronominal stems, there are a few of them. There are only three or four derived words, such as *zhasagan, zharatkan, algan*. The pronoun *algan* is an ancient historical phenomenon. It was often used in various earlier epic poems, historical works and folk poems. Today it is not used.

Some proper names, such as *Tileules, Kuygan, Konyr* can be classified as root and derived substantive nouns. The compound substantive nouns in their appearance and personality are sometimes related to complex nouns created analytically, and in some cases border on phraseological composites. The difference between these two linguistic phenomena of different linguistic nature is sometimes indistinguishable. For example, let's focus on the following linguistic phenomena: *akhsakal, boyzhetken, atkaminer, akhsarbas, kokzhal, kokkaska, bozkaska, sholak etek, karatayak, tik bakai, shuiké bass, kol zhaulyk* and etc. [5]. Outwardly, these are all nouns, but the degrees of substantiation of them are not the same. This is where the difficulty arises. If we compare and contrast them, we can see that the words

akhsakal, boyzhetken, atkaminer, akhsarbas, bozkaska, kokkaska, kokzhal have passed the highest level of substantiation and acquired the status of a compound noun at the level of a registered word. Because they have acquired a nominal quality as a result of substantiation. And in such things as *khol zhaulyq, sholak etek, atkha miner, karatayak, shuyke bas* phraseological feature dominates more than an explicit nominative concept, similar to those given above. Like the derived substantive nouns, the compound substantive nouns also differ in appearance, character, and usage. They usually consist of at least two parts. Both adjectives, both nouns and suffixes are used in different forms. In both cases, compound nouns with such roots are often proper names. For example: “*Kulager*”, “*Bozhorga*”, “*Kokbesti*”, “*Nazkonyr*”, “*Alasapyran*” and other ones.

In composition, the compound substantive nouns do not always belong to the nominal type. In addition, one of them, often the last one, appears in a personal pronoun. For example: *kolkeser, koluzdik, auyzashar, zhankuyer, naqsuyer, antturgan, Kisen ashkan, Kobik shashkan, Konil ashar* and others. Among complex substantive nouns a number of such formations can be named according to terminological convenience. They were formed in our language mainly in Soviet times. For example: *asyra silteushiler, artta kalushylar, tu ystaushylar, khosmekendiler, khos zhypanyakhtylar, bauyrymen zhorgalaushylar, kop ayakhtylar, khoyan tarizdiler* and others. As an independent level of the language, it has not yet been specially studied in the word formation system, which has begun to differentiate. Most likely, it should also be that the linguistic nature of adjective suffixes was not sufficiently disclosed in terms of word formation and not fully disclosed in terms of their numerical composition. In most cases, the meaning of the content was not associated with the root of the word, it was explained outside of it. Many unsystematic and structurally different aspects of derivational suffixes have appeared as a result. The derivatives with new meanings in the Kazakh language are formed from all nouns except for simple ones.

Results

The word-formation is expressed not only by the suffixes, but also by the combinations and word-forming bases. Therefore, it will not be possible to correctly distinguish and fully explain the meaning of the word-form until the compositional nature and structural features of the root that make up the derived noun can be accurately revealed. It is possible to systematically show the word-formative types only after the word-formative meaning is correctly determined. We see that the scientifically correct solution to numerous problems of noun composition depends on the determining the composition and structure of the roots that make up the derived noun. The difference between the root and suffix is clear, there are derived nouns that are clearly perceived from the outside as a derived noun, but the root is separated from the suffix and cannot be used independently. In the meantime, we would like to pay attention to the following law related to the problem for word formation. In order to recognize a word as a derived noun, its root belongs to the word class, its meaning and an attached suffix are not all mandatory conditions. According to our understanding, sometimes it is enough to recognize and find the

suffix in order to distinguish which language phenomenon is the derived noun. The majority of roots that form derivative nouns by means of suffixation are native words in the Kazakh language. They are not uniform in their composition. These roots, which form derived nouns, are both the main roots and derived roots. But both the main root and derived root are found in Kazakh language in different word classes.

The word-forming formant *-gak/-gek* can be classified as common productive suffixes in the Kazakh language. It can form a derivative noun only by attaching it to a verb base. Such a critical birth usually means a subject's tendency to a certain action. The word-formative formant *gıŝ/-ğıŝ* is one of the most productive suffixes in the Kazakh language. In its function, it is always connected to the verb base. Such structured creations with a critical meaning *-gyr/-gyr* are synonymous with personal creations, they mean the subject's tendency to certain actions. As in other Turkic languages, in our language, adjectives formed from the verb stem with the suffix *-gıŝ/-ğıŝ* are often encountered. *-das//-des//-tas//-tes*. This word formation formant is found in all Turkic languages except Yakut. But it is not uniform in performance. In the Kazakh language it is considered productive. In his word-making activity the noun is always connected to the base. The derived adjectives formed from nouns with the suffix *-das/-des* are often used in an attributive sense related to people, and they mean some commonality, exactly some common characteristic in their mutual relationship: *konildes zhigitter*, *tileules adamdar*, *azildes kurbylar*, etc. And the use of these structured critical constructions in an attributive relationship with something other than a person is rarely observed in our language.

There is no other phonetic variant of the word-artificial suffix in the Kazakh language. It is generally considered unproductive in Kazakh language. Only five or six nouns such as growth, feeling, taste and concept are connected to the base. In our language, the continuity between the meaning of the derived adjectives formed in this structure and the semantics of the underlying roots is clearly understood. A number of words from other languages also form derived nouns. At the same time we can name the phenomena of the Arabic-Persian languages. But not all of them are at the same level in terms of the adaptation and integration into the nature in the Kazakh language. They can be organized and displayed in groups. This is because the words of this field still have the clear origin, and the Arabic-Persian style is still clearly felt. In the field of derivation nouns, the nature of foreign roots cannot be separated from the native Kazakh words, they are completely absorbed and have reached such a level that their foreignness is not noticeable from the outside. Some of these derived nouns, which are derived from Arabic-Persian words, are established as terms in the Kazakh language today. Nouns are usually formed from the root nouns as well as the derived root nouns. These derivative root nouns, which create new nouns, are different in terms of their structures and meanings.

Conclusion

In most cases, the word formation of nouns is the basis of the entire system of word formation. Therefore, it is usually considered from the point of view of that whole word formation system. The words whose meaning and sound are connected with other homogeneous lexemes are the objects of studies of word formation. The

word formation is directly related to word structure. The structure of the word is usually the material shell of its origin and its long existence. Therefore, the word structure more or less preserves a shadowy, obscure trace of the word's original form, and development feature. What we want to say here is that both morphology and word formation are equally relevant to determining word structure. The question is about the interrelation of suffixes and roots of word formation in determining word structure. To be more specific: the suffixes and roots of word formation have the abilities to reveal the natures of each other. Determining the linguistic nature of the root, its word-forming function and its exact composition depends on the suffixes attached to them, and the real identity of the suffixes will be revealed only in close connection with the root. In general, the ability of any word in accepting a suffix, in choosing a word-forming formant, and analyzing is determined according to its lexical meaning. One thing that needs to be clarified here is the problem of word-formative suffixes. The word-forming formant usually refers to the smallest word-forming device in terms of structure and semantics. The above-mentioned bilateral dependence between the root and suffix, the word-forming formant, i.e., the feature of defining each other and presenting each other, born from their common word-forming function, comes from here. The two-way dependence between the root and the suffix (between the word-forming formants) is born from their mutual word-forming function, and their distinctiveness and expressiveness are determined from this point.

REFERENCES

- [1] Thomas Martin. An Explanation of the Accidence and Grammar to the End of the Syntax. – London: Sagwan Press, 2015. – 38 p. [In Eng]
- [2] Carston Robyn. Words: Syntactic structures and pragmatic meanings. – Synthese, 2022. – 24 p. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-022-03861-1>. [In Eng]
- [3] Oralbay N. Qazaq tilinin sôzžasamy (Word formation of the Kazakh language). – Almaty, 2002. – 67 b. [In Kaz]
- [4] Salkynbay A. Qazaq tili: Sozdik quram. Sozhasam (Kazakh language: Vocabulary. Word creation). – Almaty: Kazakh University, 2020. – 179 b. [In Kaz]
- [5] Suleimenova E.D., Madieva G.B., Shaimerdenova N.Zh. Linqvistika sozdigi. Til bilimi sozdigi (Dictionary of Linguistics). – Almaty: Nauka, 1998. – 544 b. [In Kaz]

ҚАЗАҚ ТІЛІНДЕГІ ЗАТ ЕСІМДЕРДІҢ СУБСТАНТИВТІ ФОРМАЛАРЫ

*Ашинова К.А.¹, Ашинов Р.Б.²

¹фил.ғыл. канд., қауымд.профессор, Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

e-mail: kunira_almaty@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6938-2092>

²магистр, кафедра «Сценография», Т.Қ. Жүргенов атындағы Қазақ ұлттық өнер академиясы, Алматы, Қазақстан

e-mail: killahpro.88@mail.ru²

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада түбір зат есімдердің негізгі бөлігі қарастырылады. Олар негізінен бастапқы септік түрінде де, кейінірек жасалған дербес есімдік түрінде де қолданылады. Мағынасы заттану дәрежесіне жеткен мұндай зат есімдер әдетте әдеби

тілдегі көркем шығармаларда кездеседі. Зат есімнің мұндай түрлерінің ішінде негізінен субстантивтену арқылы тіркелген сөз дәрежесіне жеткендері де, тіркелетін сөз дәрежесіне жетпегендері де, контекстік (стильдік) және окказионалдық түрлері де бар. Мақаланың міндеті субстантив зат есімдердің жай зат есімдер сияқты, түбір, туынды және күрделі сияқты үш түрде сипатталатындығын зерттеу. Бұл жұмыстың ғылыми маңыздылығы - туынды зат есімді анықтауда талдаудың қажеттілігі, оның сөзжасамдық мағынамен тығыз байланыстылығы. Жұмыстың практикалық маңыздылығы – зерттеу жұмыстарында, лекцияларды, семинарларды, практикалық сабақтарды, курстарды жазу процесінде көмекші құрал бола алады. Зерттеу әдістері ретінде компоненттік талдау, құрылымдық-семантикалық талдау, жүйелеу әдістері қолданылды.

Зерттеудің негізгі нәтижелері: әртүрлі лингвистикалық табиғаттағы тілдік құбылыстардың арасындағы айырмашылықтың кейде байқалмайтындығы, және семантикалық құрылымдарына байланысты өзіндік әртүрлі субстантивтену процесстер айқындалды.

Тірек сөздер: туынды жұрнақтар, күрделі зат есімдер, көне тарихи құбылыс, туынды сөз, зат есім, септік форма, атау сөздер, мағына, есімдік форма, күрделі зат есім, туынды зат есім, семантикалық құрылым

ФОРМЫ СУБСТАНТИВНЫХ ИМЕН СУЩЕСТВИТЕЛЬНЫХ В КАЗАХСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

*Ашинова К.А.¹, Ашинов Р.Б.²

*¹канд. фил. наук, ассоциированный профессор, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Алматы, Қазақстан,

e-mail: kunira_almaty@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6938-2092>

²магистр кафедры «Сценография», Казахская национальная академия искусств имени Т.К. Жургенова, Алматы, Қазақстан

e-mail: killahpro_.88@mail.ru

Аннотация. В этой статье рассматриваются типы корневых основ имён существительных казахского языка. Корневые существительные в основном употребляются как в начальной деепричастной форме, так и в форме личных местоимений, образованных путем полусуффиксации. Такие существительные часто встречаются в литературных произведениях. Среди этих типов существительных есть контекстуальный (стилистический) и окказиональный типы. Задача статьи – изучить, могут ли корневые существительные быть описаны в трех формах, как и простые существительные: простой (коренной), производной и сложной. Научная значимость данной работы заключается в необходимости анализа образования существительного и процессы субстантивации. Практическая значимость работы заключается в том, что она может быть вспомогательным средством в процессе написания научных работ, лекций, семинаров, практических занятий, курсов. В качестве методов исследования использовались компонентный анализ, структурно-семантический анализ, методы систематизации. Основные результаты исследования: разница между языковыми явлениями разной языковой природы иногда не заметна, и определяются разные процессы субстантивации в зависимости от их семантической структуры.

Ключевые слова: словообразовательные суффиксы, составные субстантивные существительные, древнее историческое явление, производное слово, субстантивное имя, винительный падеж, именное слово, значение, местоименная форма, составные субстантивные существительные, производные субстантивные существительные, семантическая структура

Статья поступила 25.03.2023