Abstract
At first glance, the problem of distinguishing complex words from similar free syntactic combinations does not exist. But compound words are a reflection of "the diversity of linguistic activity." Therefore, one or more features sometimes is not enough to establish the identity of a compound word. And sometimes this is simply impossible, as some units correspond to all signs, while others do not. There are other units in the language, consisting of two or more words and outwardly similar to complex words. Sometimes it is very difficult to distinguish complex words from outwardly similar syntactic combinations and phraseological units. It is natural that you need to draw a line between complex words and free combinations, because if we take all units of two or more words that designate one concept (with varying degrees of semantic integrity) as complex, we will make a huge confusion in definition of complex words and phrases.

Аннотация
На первый взгляд, проблемы разграничения сложных слов от сходных свободных синтаксических сочетаний не существует. Но сложные слова являются отражением "многообразия языковой деятельности". Поэтому одного или нескольких признаков иногда оказывается недостаточно для установления тождества сложного слова. А иногда это бывает просто невозможно, так как одни единицы отвечают всем признакам, а другие — нет. В языке есть и другие единицы, состоящие из двух или более слов и внешне похожие на сложные слова. Иногда очень трудно бывает отличить сложные слова от внешне похожих на них синтаксических сочетаний и фразеологических единиц. Естественным является то, что нужно провести границу между сложными словами и свободными сочетаниями, так как, если мы примем все единицы, состоящие из двух или более слов, обозначающие одно понятие (с разной степенью семантической цельности), за сложные, то внесем огромную путаницу в
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Introduction

Recognition of composites and their associated structures is not only a theory problem. The ordering and spelling of complex words, the sequence in identifying complex words with the corresponding syntactic constructions, depends on how it is solved.

“A compound word, being a successful means of compressing semantic and syntactic information into the most compact form, especially clearly shows the complexity of the relationship of different levels of units. The peculiar arrangement of the compound word in the general language system (between morphology and syntax, grammar and vocabulary, speech use and the language system) determines the difficulties that arise in determining the status of a compound word” (Sadykova, 2002).

Moreover, for well-known reasons, the so-called fused, spliced, that is, fused complex words, like paired ones, do not cause difficulties in their identification. We are talking about the difference between compound words from syntactic or phraseological combinations. And the definition of Sadykova A.G. most suitable for compound words. Other authors also draw attention to such an intermediate position of compound words. I.V. Nikienko (Sadykova, 2002) calls them "crap-free, super-verbal nominative means" and "synplexes".

The need to distinguish between composites and similar syntactic constructions is dictated not only by theoretical considerations. The non-distinction of complex words, which takes place at present, leads to inadequate reflection and description of language units both in theoretical works and in dictionaries creates great difficulties in spelling complex words, which in turn affect the quality of teaching Chechen and Ingush languages regarding spelling of complex words and related syntactic units.

Research Methods

We used the classification method, methods of linguistic analysis, which are widely used by all researchers working with the material of specific languages or language groups.

In this case, it is worth highlighting the method of typological comparison used in this study, which has proved its effectiveness not only when comparing languages of different genetic and structural affiliations, but also in studies devoted to one language or group of languages, consideration of which against the background of as many other languages as possible makes it possible to identify and explain such facts and features of the language being studied that could not be detected without such a background.

Research results

At first glance, the problem of distinguishing complex words from similar free syntactic combinations does not exist. In any case, this problem is considered in sufficient detail in a theoretical sense. Shcherbuk L.V. considered this on the example of the Russian language, Boziev A.Yu. - on the example of Karachay-Balkar, Mamathov N.M. - on the example of the Uzbek, Muradov S.N. - on the example of the Bashkir, Ganiev F.A. - on the example of the Tatar language; This problem is considered in various aspects. Some authors elaborate in sufficient detail the criteria for distinguishing complex words from similar constructions and give arguments, different in their degree of persuasiveness, that justify these criteria. However, researchers often evaluate the importance of individual criteria differently or overlook some of them.

So, Sadvakasov G.S. (Sadvakasov, 1956) offers 5 criteria that distinguish complex words from other constructions: 1) integral semantics and idiom; 2) integrity (moreover, we are talking about graphic design, although this is not specified); 3) a single syntactic function; 4) phonetic changes in the composition of the word; 5) one centralizing stress. The criteria are true; however, it should be noted that Sadvakasov G.S. is talking about fused (his term), that is, actually complex words. However, their identification is
not a problem. The problem is represented by compound, that is, separately formed words. The goal is precisely to recognize them in order to fulfill a two-fold task: 1) to determine the nature and place of complex words in the language system and 2) the correct spelling of these units. These tasks are interdependent, and it is not known which of them is more important. It is no accident that the problem of distinguishing composites and phrases by many scientists is considered in close connection with the problems of spelling.

Boziev A.O. enumerates such features as graphic integrity, accentuation and semantic unity and idiom, and then rejects them one by one, the first as not at all acceptable, the second as characteristic also for phrases, the third as characteristic for phraseological units, and concludes: “A compound word differs from a phrase only in its nominative function, in the ability to act as a specific part of speech, that is, correspond in its grammatical functions to a simple word, and hence a clearer sem antico-syntactic integrity and close structural-morphological adhesion of their constituent elements” (Boziev, 1965).

Sadykova A.G. puts forward a “comprehensive set of criteria for distinguishing between composite and word combinations”, consisting of ten points (Sadykova, 1992): 1) semantic integrity; 2) criterion of nominative integrity; 3) the impossibility of free substitution of the first and second components; 4) morphological integrity; 5) accent integrity; 6) impermeability, inability to separate the components of a compound word by the third; 7) the nature of semantic relations between the components of a compound word: a) attributive; b) predicative; c) circumstances: d) object; 8) relevance to one or another part of speech; 9) the ability to be formed according to certain structural and semantic models; 10) the ability to serve as a basis for the formation of new words.

However, we can not agree with all the distinguished features, since the unifying rather than differentiating features are indicated in paragraphs 7 and 9.

Approximately the same criteria are proposed by Mamatov N.M. (Mamatov, 1976). One of the criteria he distinguishes can be considered a single logical stress (as opposed to power) and one more: the components of a complex word can also be non-significant parts of speech, and both components in phrases should belong to significant parts of speech.

In general, the conclusion made on this subject by Semenova G.N. seems very correct to us: “To establish the criteria for distinguishing complex words in the Chuvash language, as in many Turkic and non-Turkic languages, it is not sufficient to single out as a reliable any separate attribute. Obviously, these criteria are in a certain relationship with each other, and, therefore, only with simultaneous consideration of the indicated signs of a complex word, it is possible to correctly solve the problem of specific features and features of the units under consideration” (Semenova, 2002).

In our opinion, all these criteria are systematized and most accurately identified in the work of Bobrik G.A. She approaches the problem of distinguishing complex words from the position of the word in general: “... a compound word is also a word. It is characterized by the presence of various signs of integrity, manifested in grammatical, phonetic, graphic design. In impermeability, in the strict order of components” (Bobrik, 1974).

Of the most famous features of the word is called: 1) a sign of integrity. First of all, we are talking about grammatical integrity, that is, the word as a whole, the compound word is also formed by one suffix. For instance: Russian конькобеж-ец; Chechen босбуу-рг; Ingush босбуа-рг «pimple, acne on the face». There is no direct match for the Bazbi language.

She (the person) includes in the concept of integrity phonetic and graphic design, that is, a single stress and continuous writing.

Bobrik G.A. writes about this sign: “the centralizing stress of the word creates in most cases the prerequisites for spelling integrity. But the rules in any language are conditional, and the integrity of vocabulary education may or may not be reflected in the graphic means of the language. Therefore, graphic wholeness, as well as grammatical, cannot be the main features of a compound word, although it is significant” (Bobrik, 1974).

The immobility of the components of the word, that is, the impossibility of inversion, is also included in the concept of integrity. In other words, the components of a compound word must follow each other in a solid sequence, otherwise they turn into either free combinations or a meaningless set of words. For example: a Russian конькобежец with an impossible бежец коньков; байракъесап with the impossible
But compound words are a reflection of "the diversity of linguistic activity." Therefore, one or more features sometimes is not enough to establish the identity of a compound word. And sometimes this is simply impossible, as some units correspond to all signs, while others do not. “There are no absolute boundaries anywhere in nature,” L. Shcherba considered. There are none of them in the language, and precisely because the language is constantly evolving, it is very difficult to delimit the delineating units in contact. There have always been and are many transitional forms. It should be taken into account that there are units that possess the attributes of both complex words and phrases, and in terms of the number and importance of these signs they can be "more" words and "less" phrases, and, conversely, more phrases and less words.

It is natural that the line between complex words and free combinations needs to be drawn, because if we take all units of two or more words that designate one concept (with varying degrees of semantic integrity) as complex, we will make a huge confusion in definition of complex words and phrases.

Many researchers, basically correctly revealing the essence of complex words, do not establish their boundaries and differences from other, outwardly similar linguistic units.

Compound words in the modern Chechen language, as you know, consist of two, less often - three words. There are other units in the language, consisting of two or more words and outwardly similar to complex words. Sometimes it is very difficult to distinguish complex words from outwardly similar syntactic combinations and phraseological units. The difficulty is that, according to the laws of the Chechen language, combinations of both names and verbs can represent complex words and free syntactic combinations. L.V. Shcherba once pointed out that “it is necessary to emphasize in every way that, in the absence of a clear formal expression, in each case, define “speech” (“parole”), with which we are dealing with morphological word formation, with a complex word or with a syntactic group, “Sometimes it is unusually difficult” (Shcherba, 1945). Thus, in the modern Chechen language, many complex words are outwardly similar to free syntactic combinations and phraseological units. Therefore, at the moment, it is advisable to identify the differences of complex words from free syntactic units and thus establish the specific features of complex words.
A criterion in determining the boundaries of a word by scientists is proposed for its integrity.

So, A.I. Smirnitsky points out that "precisely with its whole-structured nature, which, generally speaking, expresses a well-known semantic wholeness, a word, even a complex word, differs from a free phrase, in particular from an "idiomatic" phrase, that is, from the so-called phraseological units, etc." (Smirnitsky, 1952).

This is also indicated by O.S. Akhmanova: "On the contrary, words, no matter how complex they are, always appear as integrally formed units — their technical monolithicity, their wholeness, naturally, is an external expression of their semantic monolithicity" (Akhmanova, 1954).

F.A. Ganiev (Ganiev, 1982) identifies the following features that give the word integrity in contrast to separately formed syntactic combinations:

1. The constituent components of compound words denote one lexical meaning and appear as one member in a sentence. For instance:

ненанана хьоме хуьлу муьлххачу а стега. “Grandmother is always adored by all”; иссб1аьргах дозуш дара х1инца шадерг а. “Now everything depended on the nine”.

In the above examples, the compound words ненанана “grandmother”, иссб1аьрг “nine” express one lexical meaning and act as one member of a sentence: the words in the above sentences are respectively subject to and complemented.

Unlike complex words, the components of compound words, e.g. кьоракхокха “gorlinka”, 1аьржаб1аьрг “furuncle”, х1усамнана “housewife”, etc.

With the distant arrangement of the components of a complex word, it either decomposes into syntactic units, or loses its integrity and turns into an artificial set of words without a specific meaning.

I.V. Arnold (Arnold, 1959) speaks of the indivisibility of a compound word, i.e. about the inability to insert another word or phrase in the English language between the components. If, for example, there is “sunbeam”, then you can insert another word between the article and the noun - and “bright sunbeam”; and “bright and unexpected sunbeam”, since the article is a separate word, but it is impossible to insert any word between the basics of “sun” and “beam”, since these are not independent words, but morphemes.

Unlike complex words, the components of free syntactic combinations can be located distant, while their integrity as a combination is not violated, the meaning is not lost. Thus, when a third word separates it by a third word, there is no violation of integrity and meaning: in Chechen, чеч.сийна кхокха (Сийна хаза кхокха бара корехь 1аш “A beautiful gray pigeon was sitting on the windowsill”).

The nature of syntactic relations Sacks refers to the external signs of the integrity of the compound word. He writes: “Everyone knows that the components of complex words cannot enter independent syntactic relations: for example, in the phrases (a factory) financed by the government", both full-meaning words can be defined: and factory generously financed by the British government. In the case of the complex word government-financed, none of its components can be expanded. Unable to say generously government-financed. The expansion of the first component is possible only through the formation of a three-component compound word: Labor-govern-ment-finance. Accordingly, the components of a compound word can enter into syntactic relations not independently, but as part of the entire compound word.

E.B. Cherkaskaya (Cherkaskaya, 1956) gives an example for this case: a good schoolgirl, where good refers not to the first and not to the second component, but to the whole combination.
In the Chechen language, a compound word with the first component is an adjective, you can add a defining word, for example, хьаьрсахьач, but ц1иен хьаьрсахьач "red cherry plum", беха 1ьыркхач "long prune", etc. These definitions will apply to the whole complex. When the phrase is the same, where the first part is an adjective, the defining word can act as a homogeneous member next to the first part of the phrase - the adjective. For example: къена йоккха 1уотам "the old big chicken", йоккха буьрса ж1аъла and "big scary dog", etc.

This criterion is of great importance, especially with regard to verb composites, whose components are less monolithic. Therefore, the question of whether the defining word is assigned to the first part of the verb composite or to the whole complex of the composite has an important distinctive meaning.

For example, the adjective adverb 1юор1а “strong, strong” in referring to 1уотынхох composite “shout” (“cry to hit”) stands for the adverb (circumstances of the course of action): 1юор1а 1уотынхох “strongly shout” - and, therefore, refers to the whole complex, and not to one (first) component - the noun as a qualitative adjective-definition.

The same can be said for the following combinations: дика саргохча “tolerate well”, аьо кагохча “badly grab”, etc.

If the defining words are assigned not to the whole verb complex, but to only one first component - the name as defined, we would have separately designed combinations of the complement + predicate type, and not a composite that is distinguished by its integrity. In addition, the phrase as a nominative unit acquires meaning in a sentence, that is, its nominative function relies on the context, while the similar function of a compound word is independent of context.

For example, the compound word хьаьрсахьач has a meaning outside the sentence, while the phrase does not have such a meaning outside the sentence, that is, the phrase as a syntactic category usually realizes its nominative function in the context, and the composite performs this function out of context, like a lexical unit.

It is known that the context also contributes to the differentiation of a complex word and phrase, consisting of the same components; see, for example, Суна 1аьркхабайтг 1аялла. “I had a boil (sore),” but 1ыркх 61аьрг бу Ахьмадан “Ahmad has a black eye,” etc.

In addition, the difference between nominal compound words and the corresponding phrases appears when answering the question х1ын? (what?) or мила? (Who?). The fact is that in this case the whole compound word is called, while only the main (usually second defined) word is taken from the combination for such an answer. For example, compound words: Хлун ю иза? “What is this?” Хьаьрсахьач бара иза-м "This is Alycha". Буочаб1ар дара иза-м “This is a walnut". К1алдаьтта дара иза-м “This is cheese (cottage cheese) with butter (the name of the dish).” Бөьха х1уму ю “There is a snake”, etc. To answer these questions, the use of a phrase is optional. For example, take the phrase к1ай 1уотам “white chicken”. The first part - the adjective-definition doesn’t have to be given to answer the question х1ын ю иза? “what is it?”. Suffice it to say: К1отам ю иза. "The chicken is this." At the same time, it is necessary to note the possibility of transient cases when the first components of other complex words can also be omitted when answering the question posed.

This criterion as a whole is also suitable for all other types of nominal, verbal composites that answer the same question.

Otherwise, the question is posed in relation to verb composites and related phrases. Here, when answering the question: Хлун дан? “What to do?” In the phrase, as a complex verb, the first component will not be omitted, for example: Ахь хлун до? “What are you doing?” - 1уор1 1уотынуму "I hit with a stick", 1уор1 1уотыму "throw a stone" (phrases) or "turn away" to a rooster, “bite off” a цетуху (difficult words), etc.

This is how any concrete action is expressed in the Nakh languages. In a non-specific sense, a verb will be used, and the object-name will be omitted: Хлун дан? “What to do?” - 1уотын "hit", 1уотыма "drop", etc. Thus, it is impossible to establish the criterion for distinguishing a complex verb and the corresponding phrase in this method, since using a verb with an object name to indicate a specific action in Nakh languages - a common occurrence.

The composition of a phrase, in contrast to the composition of a compound word, can also vary while maintaining the same primary or secondary term - к1ай 1уотам “white chicken”, к1ай 1уот "white house" or 1ьыркх 1уот "black chicken", 1ьыркх 1уот “black house” (the second part varies); 1уор1 1уотыма "throw a stone," 1ай
3. Between the components of complex words there is interdependence and interpenetration, due to which it is impossible to omit any component without losing the meaning and wholeness of the word. For example, in the Chechen language in the words х1усамнана “housewife” and ненанана “grandmother”, in English words schoolgirl and toothbrush, when omitting any component, their integrity and meaning are violated.

4. There are phonetic-prosodic differences between complex words and loose syntactic combinations. Firstly, free syntactic combinations that look like complex words usually have two independent stresses. Complex words resembling loose syntactic combinations, with the exception of pair words, have only one independent stress, while the first component may have auxiliary stress. For example, a single stress in the compound word ненаанана “grandmother” that falls on the first syllable of the first component. If we consider a phrase similar to this complex word, then in prosodic terms you can observe a completely different picture, i.e. in this phrase there will be two independent stresses (исс къа “nine sins”) or three independent stresses: сийна хаа къохха “blue (blue) beautiful dove”. Secondly, there is no pause between the components of a compound word that we meet between the individual words that make up the syntactic phrase. The absence of a verbal pause is a differentiating feature of a compound word and syntactic phrase. For example, we do not find any noticeable pause in the complex word къоркхокха “neck” that takes place in a phrase composed of the same units: сийна хаа къохха.

I.P. Ivanova also highlights the phonetic sign in English as a sign of the integrity of the compound word. She writes: “Speaking of a phonetic attribute, it should be noted that a compound word usually acquires a unifying stress, in contrast to equal stresses in the members of a phrase. The damage to this feature is that "... along with a really large number of indisputable cases where there is a single emphasis, there are many entities for which questions and perplexities arise” (Ivanova, 1977).

However, it is not only a matter of controversial cases when applying this feature. After all, a phonetic trait can only be applied to complex words recorded in lexicographic, research and other sources that inform us about the nature of stress in a particular word. The modern language is constantly replenished with lexical units that both readers and researchers meet for the first time, and often only in print, which eliminates the use of a phonetic attribute. Obviously, the opposite: the stress in the speech of native speakers is a derivative of how they understand one or another sequence of lexical units - as a close semantic unity (uniting stress) or as two independent units (two equal stresses).

G. Marchand has a remark on this subject: “Many complex words such as man-made, however, are often pronounced with emphasis on the first part of the word (for example: moth-eaten, spell-bound, frostbitten, homespun, heartfelt, heart-broken). For linguistic instincts, they probably seem more cohesive than words such as home, made, home, bred, custom-built, factory-packed, which are more the random nature of the formation and therefore pronounced with two stresses (in a dictative position). Compound words such as crest-fallen always receive emphasis on the first part” (Marchand, 1960).

**Purpose of the Study**

1. To continue the scientific discussion on the problem of composite word formation in languages of different grammatical structures and in the Iberian-Caucasian in particular.

2. To pay attention to the fact of the development of this method of word formation in languages of different grammatical structures and in the Iberian-Caucasian in particular.

**Findings**

Along with the above signs of the integrity of the compound word, other signs should be distinguished: these are spelling and morphological signs, as well as the sequence of the components of the compound word, the nature of the compatibility of the components of the compound word and the presence or absence of service elements.

Scientists note: "Speaking of the spelling feature of the integrity of a compound word, it should be
noted that the spelling of compound words in
modern English is not uniform, they are written:
separately, together, through a hyphen”
(Meshkov, 1976).

At the same time, one can agree that “cases of
consistent, uniform spelling are essential features
by which one can judge the linguistic nature of a
given education” (Ivanova, 1977).

Spelling complex words usually indicates a
closer relationship between components and
semantic structure. Therefore, it is customary to
talk about the stages that a compound word
passes in order of increasing semantic and
structural unity between its components: separate
writing - writing through a hyphen - continuous
writing.

From this we conclude that separate spelling
cannot serve as a sign of a phrase (in contrast to
a compound word), while fused spelling can
serve as a sign of a compound word (in contrast
to a phrase). In other words, phrases are unlikely
to be written together. Therefore, the spelling
feature can be used as additional in determining
the integrity of.

The morphological feature, however, establishes
the morphological unity of the compound word
in contrast to the phrase. It consists in the fact that
complex words combine morphologically
uniformed basics. However, due to the fact that
the morphological design of the English word is
represented very poorly, this feature, although
very reliable, is applicable only to a limited
number of types of complex words. The most
obvious application of this feature is to establish
the integrity of words such as toothbrush, in
which the first component is morphologically
uniformed, although it is clear that the brush is not
for the tooth, but for the teeth, i.e. it is not a word,
but a basis. The same is in the word book-filled
and others. Consequently, a morphological
feature can unambiguously indicate the integrity
of the analyzed word, but this feature is
applicable to a limited number of types of
formations.

In the Chechen language, a morphological trait
also takes place.

This feature relates to proper compound words,
the first component of which loses the
derivational affix of the adjective name, for
example: хусаманана (хусаман наана) –
“Housewife”, денваши (ден ваша) - “uncle
(according to the father)”, денана (ден наана) -
“grandmother (according to the father)”,
маьрйиша “the sister-in-law”, маьршиша
(маьран шича) - “cousin, cousin of her
husband”, ненанана (ненан наана) -
“grandmother (by mother)”, etc.

The first component of such composites is made
out in the genitive case and in the Ingush
language: даьда “grandfather (father, letter.
Father father)”, даьнаана "grandmother (father),
father’s mother”, маьрда “father-in-law”,
маьрйиша “sister-in-law”, маьрвоша “brother-
in-law”, маьрйош “stepdaughter”, устана
“brother-in-law”, уста “father-in-law ”,
устйиша “sister-in-law ”, устана “mother-in-
law” is recognized.

In the Batsbi language there are no obvious signs
of correlation of the first component with the
form of the dative case, this is due to the fact that
during the formation of case forms of nouns there
is no alternation of vowels in the root (in
Chechen and Ingush, the usually vowel root
indicates that the first component of the
composite belongs to the dative case ), however,
this is still the basis of the genitive case: мардад
“father-in-law”, даьнаана “uncle (according to
his father)”, даьнаанана "grandmother (according
to his father)”, нананана “uncle (according to
his mother)”. Moreover, it is interesting that the
value of the composite may depend on the order
of the same components: for example, даьнаанана
"grandmother on the father's side", and нананана
“parents (father and mother)” (Suleibanova,
2008).

It is well known that any sequence of lexical units
isolated from the stream of speech that makes up
one syntagma can be either a complex word or a
phrase. Each language has a certain set of
allowed phrases, so if the selected sequence of
lexical units is outside the given set, it is a
complex word. For example, it is obvious that in
English a quantitative numeral cannot determine
an adjective, and therefore the sequence 10,000 -
a strong demonstration of "ten thousand people"
is a compound word.

In other words, any sequence of lexical units
actually observed in speech that does not meet
the norms of collocation in a given language is a
compound word, but not every sequence that
meets the norms of collocation is not a complex
word. For example, there are a number of
complex words “adjective + noun,” although
such a sequence is typical of a phrase.

Speaking about the sequence of components of a
compound word, it should be noted that for some
types of complex words, the reverse order of
components may serve as an indicator of integrity. This refers to words with second components expressed by an adjective or participle, for example: oil-rich, man-made. In synonymous phrases, the word order would be: rich in oil, made by man.

Different linguists in the English language also distinguish other signs of the complexity of the compound word. So, E.B. Cherkaskaya and I.R. Halperin (Halperin and Cherkaskaya, 1956) note that phonetic, morphological and semantic features in modern English are used as indicators of the integrity of complex words.

The phonetic indicator is usually the unifying stress. A compound word with a unifying stress differs from the corresponding phrase in that one of the bases of the compound word (usually the second) is unstressed. For example: bla'ckboard “board”; broa'dway “Broadway”; etc. In some cases, however, the second component of the compound word does not lose stress completely, but partially, keeping it as secondary to the main unifying stress, for example: letter - paper, lion - hunter, 'table - cloth, etc.

We, agreeing with E.B. Cherkaskaya and I.R. Halperin, however, note that the unifying stress is not a mandatory feature of a compound word in modern English. The unifying stress can appear in a compound word both independently and in combination with other signs. The presence or absence of it in a compound word depends on the structural type of the word and on the nature of the semantic connection of the components.

Conclusion

Morphological indicators of the integrity of the compound word by E.B. Cherkaskaya and I.R. Halperin are:

1) connecting elements - vowels "o", "i", consonant "s" in English, for example: gasometer "gas storage", sportsman "athlete", handicraft "manual work", etc.; there are no such words with connecting elements in the Chechen and Ingush languages; they are most likely not in the Batsbi language, not in all its grammatical features coinciding with the Vainakh languages: in any case, they are not found in the dictionary of N. and D. Kadagidze.

2) word-building suffixes - in English «ed», «er», for example: housekeeper, one - eyed and etc.; in the Tatar language -лы/-ле, for example: беркатьы, -ыч/-кеч, for example: коточык, искиткеч and etc. (Suleibanova, 2008).

Based on the foregoing, we can distinguish the following signs of the integrity of the compound word in the Nakh languages:

1. The components of compound words denote one lexical meaning and appear in the sentence as one member.
2. A compound word is indivisible, ie it is not possible to insert another word or phrase between the components of a compound word.
3. The structural unity and integrity of the compound word depends on the unity of stress.
4. The unity of a compound word is formed by a single and integral meaning.
5. Indicators of the integrity of a compound word can serve as word-building suffixes.
6. The unity and integrity of a compound word also depends on the order of the components of the compound word and the nature of the compatibility of its components.
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