

Lexical Units of the Ingush Language Missing in the Chechen Language

Aza Sultanovna Tokaeva and Luiza Borzalievna Abdulvakhabova
Kadyrov Chechen State University, Grozny, Russia

Keywords: Genetic Kinship, Diminutive-Affectionate Nouns, Lexical Correspondences, Substantivized Adjectives and Participles, Lexical Discrepancies, Archaism.

Abstract. The study was undertaken in order to describe the lexicographic features of the basic vocabulary of the Chechen and Ingush languages. The work presents the result of the analysis of the main lexical fund of the Chechen and Ingush languages to identify discrepancies and correspondences in the basic vocabulary of two related languages. Despite the structural commonality and genetic kinship with the Chechen language, the Ingush language reveals quite significant lexical discrepancies with it, including at the level of vocabulary related to the primordial fund. The work also considers nouns in a diminutive-affectionate form, in the use of which each language demonstrates its own characteristics. It should be noted that in the Chechen language the suffixes for forming diminutive-affectionate nouns are not productive and the authors of on-line dictionaries confuse them with the similar in form and very productive suffixes of substantivized adjectives and participles.

1 INTRODUCTION

A linguist who is an expert on Chechen and Ingush languages can never doubt their genetic relationship, they are so close at all linguistic levels and in all grammatical forms. However, today there are scientists who deny the common origin of the Chechen and Ingush languages.

In Chechen and Ingush there is a very limited set of words that are missing in one of the related languages. Ingush linguist A.S. Kurkiev very carefully identified and recorded this list of 600 words (Kurkiev, 1978, 1979). Khalidov writes that A.S. Kurkiev included into this list those words that are available in the Chechen language, but in colloquial speech their synonyms are more often used as expressive vocabulary (Ing. borghal "rooster" - Chech. nlaena/borghal) (Khalidov, 2003).

The topic of our work is not the re-enumeration of lexical units that have no correspondences in one of their related languages, but we will briefly touch on this topic to supplement and clarify this list of words. Also, diminutive-affectionate nouns are more characteristic of the Ingush language as a distinctive feature of Ingush language, while they are rarely

used in the Chechen language. It should be noted that in the Chechen language the suffixes for forming diminutive-affectionate nouns are not productive and the authors of on-line dictionaries confuse them with similar in form and very productive suffixes of substantivized adjectives and participles.

Due to the fact that the native languages of the peoples of the North Caucasus are used, for the most part, only in the spoken and everyday sphere because they are not the languages of instruction at schools, office work is not carried out in native languages in state institutions, many words have become useless or have turned into archaisms. Over the past century, many archaic Chechen words had completely fallen out of use, and they have been lost by the language.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

In his recently published book "Comparative analysis in the study and teaching of language," I.P. Konopelko summarizes the goals and achievements of comparative studies: "At present, there is a steadily increasing interest of linguists and

methodologists in the problems of comparative study of languages, which is associated with the following main reasons:

- the needs of linguistic and cognitive research, that are increasingly clearly coming to the fore in modern linguistics;
- expanding studies of national specifics of thinking, mentality of peoples;
- the need to identify universal features of languages;
- the need to identify and describe the national picture of the world of speakers of different languages;
- the need to describe the national-cultural specifics of language systems;
- the need to improve bilingual dictionaries, where the task is to reflect the national-specific features of semantics of translation correspondences;
- expansion of the sphere of foreign languages teaching, etc." (Konopelko, 2019).

Hugo Schuhardt correctly noted that in the history of language the main attention should be paid to the history of the words meanings: "The substrate of a word is a thing, and the establishment of the words correct meaning depends on its knowledge. Ignorance of a thing often turns out to be a huge obstacle in the work of a linguist researcher. And therefore, the study of the words history should go in parallel with the study of the history of things" (Samarin, 2010). Today, before our eyes, we see how modern languages are changing. Similar synchronous language changes are described in detail by linguists of different countries in their publications in the international journal *Language Variation*.

For example, over the past two years we have been observing how the Chechen word *vuo* "trouble, misfortune" (Ismailov, 2009) is pronounced by modern speakers of the Chechen language with violation of the phonetic structure of the word: for example, instead of *vuo*, we hear *ghuo* everywhere. In contrast to Young Grammarians, we will not be able to explain this transition with any natural phonetic changes. The only explanation for this transition is the well-known provision adopted by many linguists of the world that one of the reasons for the change of language is the incorrect or inaccurate assimilation by the new generation of the language of their parents. The case of the phonetic transition [*vuo* > *ghuo*] can also be explained by the linguistic illiteracy of a new generation of the Chechen language native speakers.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As for examples of lexical discrepancies in the basic dictionaries of the Chechen and Ingush languages, they are not always missing in one of the related languages, but they are used in another meaning or included in the list of little-used words or archaisms (e.g.: Ing. *blaerchcha* "whole" - Chech. *dijna* "whole"). The Ingush word *blaerchcha* "whole" in the Chechen language is used only in the idiomatic phrase *baerchchie vakha* "put in a prominent or honorable place". In other meanings this word was most likely used earlier, but it was lost by the language, apparently because in its other meanings its synonym began to be used and it was no longer required. In other cases, if these are borrowed words, then each language could borrow them from different sources (e.g.: Ing. *dulkha* (pronounced *du:ha*) "meat" - Chech. *zhizhig* "meat" (Chech. *dilha* "body"; Ing. *q'ijle/ts'enjuq'e* "floor" - Chech. *ts'enq'a/laettie* (Ismailov, 2009)).

3.1 Ingush Words Missing in Chechen

In some cases, it happens that in addition to the Ingush and Chechen isogloss, there is another uncommon lexeme synonymous with commonly used words (for example, Ing. *toa-toarch/ustagh/ka* "sheep" - Chech. *ustagh/ka*), which creates a false idea of discrepancies in the designation of certain objects and concepts. For example, both of the following lexical versions of the "yawn" semanteme (Ing. *sottavar* "yawn" - Chech. *baga ghetajar* 'yawn') are present in both languages, but each language resorts to different lexical units to express the same concept.

Ing. *mekh* 'bread', *khallar* 'snack' – Chech. *bepig/khallar* (archaic) 'bread';
 Ing. *khij* 'barn' - Chech. *h'oevda*;
 Ing. *otar* 'cowshed' – *bozhal/bedin* (dial.);
 Ing. *Daehie* – *Dajmohk/Deghista*;
 Ing. *v1aella* 'quite, at all' – *janni jats*;
gi/fu 'seed' – *hu*;
dom 'dust' – *chan*;
kherilg 'jewel' – *zhovhar*;
k'oma "bilious" - Chech. *stiman/d'aevshie*;
zungat "mosquito" - Chech. *chyrk* (chech. *zingat* 'ant');
k'ormats "butterfly" - *polla*;
thovre "already" - *hintsale*;
 Ing. *tedar* "cutting" - *ha:dadar/ha:dayar* (*Batsb. tedar* "cut");
hangi "bowl" - *kad*;
fijg "grain" - *byrtig*;

sottavar "yawning" - бага ghetayar;
 Ing. sechol "marriage" - Chech. marie;
 ts'imhara "frowned" - wu:savella/khoelina;
 chopilg "button" - nyda;
 oarkhilg "saucer" - hedar/boshhap;
 Ing. dukhtavala "get to the bottom of it, inquire"
 – t'ach'akhia;
 tahkar "study, search" - tallar;
 loadam (boatsush) "insignificant" - paida
 boatsush;
 iqq' "boots" - Chech. machsii;
 ovla "root" - Chech. orum;
 Ing. ch'ega "lock" - Chech.dogha;
 beq'a "pole, stake" - b1oghun;
 t'elg/plelg (from t'a) "finger" - pl1elg, t'ara
 "udder, slap";
 yolhing "rake" - kagtuh (urg)/k'omsur (dial.);
 k'otargiy "shrubs" - koelsh;
 khalsag "woman" - zuda/khin "brother's-in-law
 wife";
 malasag 'man'- stag (boersha stag (common));
 Ing. k'uv "sealing wax" - baloz/pesht;
 ovrash etta "bite" - Chech. yunash etta;
 kinaza "church" - Chech. kils;
 mara "only" - Chech. bay;
 taka "line" - Chech. siz;
 toa-toarch/ustagh "ram" - Chech.ka/ustagh;
 shorttig "quietly" - Chech. mellash;
 t'arjuq' "palm" - Chech. kerayuq' (Chech. t'ara
 "slap in the face," "udder nipple");
 ph'uk'oag "nape" – k'esirak'ag (Ozdoev, 1980).

3.2 Diminutive-Affectionate Nouns in Chechen and Ingush

Diminutive-affectionate nouns as forms of subjective evaluation with suffixes -g, -lg, -ng, -rg are widely used in the Ingush language, while in the Chechen language their use is very limited. Malsagov Z.K. in the "Grammar of the Ingush language" gives only nine words in a diminutive-affectionate form.

Thus, Malsagov Z.K. writes: "Nouns of diminutive (derogatory) meaning are formed by ending -g (soft) or (a)-lg: govvr-govrg" "horse-horse", "ts'a-tslalg" "house-house", peshk - peshkalg "oven-stove". Some nouns are used only in a diminutive form: larg (from la) "ear", b'arg (from b'a) "eye", basalg (from buos 'color') "cheek", tserg (from tsa) "tooth", t'elg or p'elg (from t'a) "finger", kulg (from kug) "hand" etc." (Malsagov, 1963).

The last set of examples of Malsagov Z.K., in our opinion, should not be attributed to diminutive-affectionate nouns. The last nouns "used only in a

diminutive form", according to Malsagov Z.K., completely coincide in form and meaning with their Chechen equivalents – substantivized adjectives and participles, with the only exception that the Chechen p'elg "finger" does not have a second name t'elg, although its meaning is understandable to the native speaker of Chechen language, since t'ara is both "slap" and "nipple of udder", resembling a finger by its form. In addition, also in the Chechen language besni "cheek" (pl. besnish) does not have a diminutive form (Malsagov, 1963).

In online dictionaries of the Ingush language their number is excessively increased due to substantivized or nominalized independent adjectives and participles formed by adding suffixes like -nig and -rg, which have been simplified and transferred to -g both in Chechen and Ingush. In most of the following nouns, formants - **rg/-ig/-ag** go back to the variants of the suffixes -rg and -nig of independent participles and adjectives, in which, as a result of simplification, the sounds r, n dropped out, after which their complete substantivisation also occurred. In words such as (kyg "hand," b'arg "eye," lerg "ear," berge "hoof," ts'oga "tail"), the formant -g in the ending of the word was desemantized and is not recognized so far as a suffix of substantivized participles or adjectives, although this relation quite naturally suggests itself, especially if you consider single-root words with the word la "hearing," la dogha "listen" (lit. "prick up one's ears"), and **lerg** as a substantivized participle has a meaning "a listening device."

By the way, there is a very interesting parallel from the point of view of etymology. In the on-line dictionaries of Ancient Gaelic and Greek languages there is a verb **dark** "watch" (as well as the nouns dark "mouse," derk "hole" (MacBain, 1982); compare: Chech. dakhk "mouse," 'yrg "hole"), which means that ancient people considered the eye as a hole or a tubular organ. It seems that in the Chechen word b'arg "eye" there was a transition [d > b], i.e. the replacement of the plural class prefix with the singular class prefix, since b'aerg belongs to class b – b'arg bu "eye is" (in plural it is already class d: b'aergash du "eyes are").

3.3 Diminutive-Affectionate Nouns of Ingush Language in Comparison With Their Equivalents in the Chechen Language

e.g.: ing. z'amiga "small, young, small" - chech. zhima;
 ing. isting "colored felt" - chech. istang;

ing. Ts'alǵ "house" - chech. ts'a;
 ing. loalg "snowball" - lu "snow," lai chimash "snowflakes";
 ing. ph'agalǵ "hare" – ph'agal;
 ing. zh'alig "dog" – zh'aela;
 ing. goring "calf barn" - chech. k'aari;
 ing. h'aqing "ankle" - chech. h'aqorig;
 ing. 'inzharilǵ "spleen" - chech. 'onzhar;
 ing. gargilǵ "fragment" - chech. gerig (pl. giergash);
 tsiyletorgilǵ "match" (plural - tsiyletorgish) - чеч. sirmak (pl. sirmakash);

ch'egilǵ "a piece (bread, land, etc.)" - chech. ch'eshilǵ "small brushwood or chips"; chech. chemhilǵ "a piece of hay" (Ozdoev, 1980);
 ch'agarg "swallow" - chech. ch'eghardig (semantic decryption: ch'ogha g'ar diirǵ "making a big noise");
 ch'agargilǵ "swallow (diminutive)" – ch'eghardig;
 q'amarg "throat, larynx" – q'amq'arg;
 k'omarg "sore" – k'omar;
 akhkar "blister" - akhkar;
 t'echkilǵ - "bone" – da'ahk/modern dae'k;
 basalǵ (from bos) "cheek" - besnij;
 tsiskilǵ "cat" - tsisig/tsitsk;
 genarg "pit (fruit)" - lag;
 kulgilǵ "hand" - kyg;
 b'argilǵ "eye" – b'arg;
 baq'ilǵ "foal" – beq'a;
 galig "pouch" - pouch. galij;
 Ing. fetting "braided buttonhole" – Chech. veta;
 chopilǵ "button" - nyda;
 bumbarǵ "bug" - bumbarij;
 digilǵ "ax" - dig;
 yolh'ing "rake" - kagtuh (urg)/k1 omsur (dial.);
 giig (giigish) "stomach, belly" - gaj "belly";
 fashkarg "tick" - Chech. vechchalǵ (Ismailov, 2009);

hetolǵ "pod" - hu:tal;
 peshkilǵ "furnace" – qierch;
 pekhaskh "lungs" – pekhash (anat.);
 pkhida k'orig "frog" – pkhida k'orni;
 sai k'orig "young deer";
 saerg "wire" – sara;
 khabilǵ "pot" – khaba;
 hetolǵ "stalk" hetolǵ dola "creeping"- khutal;
 h'azilǵ "sparrow" – h'oza;
 tsargilǵ "teeth" – tserg;
 ni'ilǵ "door" door – ne';
 m'arga betta "kick", m'arga tohar "kick" - mira betta;

m'arilǵash ekhka "pinch" - mlarash jikhka "pinch" (Ozdoev, 1980).

But:

In Internet dictionaries, the following independent forms of substantivized participles and adjectives are ranked as diminutive-affectionate nouns.

Compare: ing. luttarg "sieve" - chech. lytturg (luttush yerg "a device that sieves");

nuvhashkhuvsarg "scoop (for garbage)" - nekhshosurg (nekhsh tosush yerg "the object that is used for garbage disposal");

ch'ondarg "violin" - chech. 'ad h'okhu puondar "instrument played with a bow";

becarg "cuckoo" - hutut (class verb - beca (deca, jeca, veka) "make noise", becarg "the (bird) that sings");

sinadarg "blue" - sinayerg/sinaderg (what is blue);

z'amigadarg "small" - zhimaerg/zhimaderg (what is small);

khoadarg "beautiful" (what is beautiful) - khazanig (substan. adjective);

zergiettag "fish breed" - zergiettag (biting - substan. participle);

dattadettarg "funnel" - dattaduttarg "oil lubricant or oil distribution device (Ismailov, 2009)".

At the same time, in the Ingush language, independent substantivized adjectives and participles have lost part of the suffix **-rg**, that is, the element **-g** and are used with the clipped form of the suffix **-r** (ing. baq'dar "what is truthful" - chech. baq'derg; ing. duvtsar "what is said by someone" - chech. dytsarg; ing. khalakhietar "unpleasant" - chech. halakhietar) (Ismailov, 2009). As can be seen from the examples, in the Chechen language there is no simplification of the suffix **-rg**.

4 CONCLUSIONS

As shown above, in the Ingush language, we have identified 41 lexical units that have no correspondences in the Chechen language. After splitting the previously single Pranakh language into several separate languages, natural changes began to appear in all links of its structure under the influence of many factors. With the exception of those 41 words that have no coincidence in the relative languages, in almost every word of both languages there has occurred a change in the phonetic structure of the word, primarily this affected vowel sounds

and the entire vocalism system, consisting in changing the timbre of vowels and their articulation.

Practical material demonstrates that in the use of diminutive-affectionate nouns the Chechen language lags far behind the Ingush language. It is known that formants **-ig**, **-g** (in a slightly changed form after simplification) in the Chechen language are dead suffixes of substantivized adjectives and participles **-nig**, and **-rg**, which were productive in the prehistoric era as well.

The suffixes of substantivized adjectives **-nig** and of participles **-rg** are very productive to this day, literally from each adjective or participle you can form a derivative using them, but they have nothing to do with diminutive-affectionate nouns, although they are outwardly similar to the formant of the last (a) **-lg**.

A comparative study of two relative languages was undertaken in order to describe the national specifics of thinking, the mentality of peoples, as well as the need to identify universal features of languages. It is a common knowledge that a language reflects the social experience and cultural values of a particular community, their pragmatic and subjective assessments. This indicates the individuality of the figurative thinking of each people.

REFERENCES

- Ismailov, A. T., 2009. A Word (*Dosh*). *Reflection on the native language*. p. 800.
- Kurkiev, A. S., 1978. On the original vocabulary of the Ingush language. pp. 172-204.
- Kurkiev, A. S., 1979. *The main issues of the lexicology of the Ingush language*. pp. 194-207.
- Konopelko, I. P., 2019. *Comparative analysis in the study and teaching of the language*. p. 226.
- Malsagov, Z. K., 1963. *Grammar of the Ingush language*. p. 160.
- Ozdoev, I. A., 1980. *Russian-Ingush dictionary*. p. 832.
- Samarin, D. A., 2010. *The problem of mixing languages in the concept of G.Schuhardt*.
- Khalidov, A. I., 2003. *Nakh languages in typological perspective*. p. 312.
- MacBain, A., 1982. *An Etymological dictionary of the Gaelic language*. 0901771. 68. 6.