

Сведения об авторах

Жубатханова Камшат Кажымуканкызы* – докторант Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: Zhubathanova@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6130-4445>.

Курманбайулы Шерубай – доктор филологических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: sherubaykurmanbaiuly@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4587-4452>.

Шахин Ибрахим – доктор философии (PhD), профессор Эгейского университета, Измир, Турция, e-mail: ibrahim.sahin@ege.edu.tr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0167-2568>.

Received 21.07.2026

Accepted 26.09.2026

[https://doi.org/10.53360/3080-3861-2026-3\(7\)-6](https://doi.org/10.53360/3080-3861-2026-3(7)-6)

IRSTI: 16.21.47

A.N. Akhmet^{1*}, I.S. Nasipov²

^{1*}Shakarim University,

071412, Republic of Kazakhstan, Semey, 20A Glinka Str.

²Bashkir State Pedagogical University named after M. Akmulla,
Russian Federation, Ufa

*ORCID: 0000-0002-9464-0070

*e-mail: a.nurlankyzy@shakarim.kz

HYBRID TERMS IN KAZAKH: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR CLASSIFICATION

Abstract. The article examines the theoretical foundations of hybrid terms in Kazakh and the criteria needed to distinguish them from borrowed terms and morphologically adapted loanwords. The study aims to clarify the relationship between etymological heterogeneity, word formation, and specialised naming, while retaining the distinction between the Kazakh designations *будан* and *гибрид*. A critical narrative review is combined with comparative and structural-semantic analysis of theoretical accounts and illustrative examples from Kazakh and other linguistic traditions. The comparison identifies three recurrent sources of disagreement: the treatment of borrowed bases with native affixes, the classification of formations imported as complete lexical units, and the relationship between morphological structure and terminological function. English, German, French, Turkish, and Russian approaches are considered alongside the development of Kazakh terminology studies. The analysis supports a recipient-language perspective in which component origin, formation history, structural pattern, degree of integration, and specialised function are recorded separately. On this basis, a working classification distinguishes recipient-language hybrid formations, borrowed terms of hybrid origin, and a boundary class of derivatives based on loans. The historical discussion connects these distinctions with changing practices of translation and adaptation in Kazakh. The proposed framework provides a basis for consistent terminographic description; it is an analytical proposal rather than an empirically validated classification or a new estimate of hybrid-term frequency.

Keywords: hybrid term; lexical hybridisation; Kazakh terminology; borrowing; morphological adaptation; word formation; terminography.

Introduction

The concept of a hybrid term occupies an intermediate position between borrowing, translation, and word formation. In Kazakh terminology studies, it is commonly applied to designations that combine a borrowed component with a Kazakh element. However, this apparently straightforward definition conceals several different objects: a newly formed compound, a partially translated foreign designation, a derivative built on a borrowed base, or a term already composed of elements from different languages before entering Kazakh. Kurmanbayuly's discussion of the

internal and external resources of terminology provides a starting point for examining these relationships, but their interaction does not itself establish a single, unambiguous category [1].

The difficulty is therefore not simply the presence of material of different origins. It concerns the analytical perspective from which a designation is classified. A historical account asks where its components originated; a synchronic account asks how they function in the receiving language [2].

A word-formation analysis identifies the constructional relationship between the components, whereas a terminological analysis establishes which specialised concept the whole designation names. Kortas's treatment of lexical hybrids and the models discussed by Momynova and Anessova demonstrate that different combinations of these questions produce different boundaries for the category [3].

This distinction is particularly important when Kazakh material is compared with findings from other languages. A count of etymologically mixed dictionary entries is not equivalent to a count of terms created through the combination of Kazakh and borrowed elements. Nor does a list of international combining forms show that every designation containing one of them was formed in Kazakh. Earlier work on the study of Kazakh hybrid terms has already identified problems of definition and classification [4]. The present article develops these problems into a comparative account of the criteria that underlie competing classifications, rather than treating the existence of hybrid terms as a new discovery.

The purpose of the study is to clarify the theoretical foundations of hybrid terms in Kazakh and formulate a transparent basis for their description. Three objectives guide the analysis: to distinguish the metalanguage of hybridity from the processes it describes; to compare the treatment of lexical hybrids across the research traditions represented in the material; and to relate the resulting distinctions to Kazakh terminology history and word-formation patterns. The proposed contribution is an analytical synthesis that separates component origin, formation history, structural organisation, integration, and specialised function. It does not offer a new prevalence estimate or claim that the proposed classification has already been empirically validated.

Materials and Methods

The material comprises selected theoretical accounts of lexical hybridisation, studies of Kazakh terminology, and linguistic examples discussed in these sources. Nineteen publications and resources are used in the article. They include general accounts of terminology and word formation, language-specific discussions, domain-oriented studies, and an earlier review of Kazakh hybrid terms. The selection is purposive: sources are included because they address a relevant definitional distinction or provide an identifiable formation pattern. The study is a critical narrative review, not a systematic review of all publications on hybridity. No claim of bibliographic exhaustiveness is made.

The analysis proceeds through three connected operations. First, definitions are compared to establish whether hybridity is attributed to the origin of components, their combination within the recipient language, or both. Second, the examples are examined for structural differences between affixal derivatives, compounds, formations containing international combining forms, and multiword terms. Third, these distinctions are related to the history of borrowing and partial translation described in Kazakh scholarship. Historical positions are examined through the published accounts assembled for this study; the analysis does not constitute a new archival investigation or establish the earliest attestation of individual forms.

A concept-oriented perspective is retained throughout. ISO 704:2022 addresses the relationships between objects, concepts, definitions, and designations and includes principles of designation formation [5]. Here this perspective is used to keep the classification of a linguistic form separate from the identification of its specialised meaning. It is not treated as evidence that a particular Kazakh equivalent is obligatory, or that mixed-origin terms are intrinsically unsuitable. The preference for a consistent Kazakh metalanguage is presented as a terminological proposal, distinct from a claim about the requirements of the standard.

Kazakh examples are retained in Cyrillic, with English glosses where necessary. These glosses explain the examples and are not presented as officially approved English equivalents. Structural segmentation is restricted to what is needed to demonstrate a pattern; it does not substitute for a complete etymological investigation. Quantitative totals reported in the preparatory

material are not recalculated into research findings, because the underlying inventories and uniform inclusion rules are unavailable. In particular, dictionary-entry totals, variant spellings, and terms imported as complete units cannot be assumed to represent the same counting unit.

Results and Discussion

The concept of hybridity and the Kazakh metalanguage

The comparison first requires a distinction between the name of the phenomenon and the linguistic objects assigned to it. In the Kazakh material, *будан* and *гибрид* refer to the same general idea of a formation involving heterogeneous components. The former supports the terminological series *будан сөз* ‘hybrid word’, *будан термин* ‘hybrid term’, and *будандастыру* ‘hybridisation’. Maintaining this series makes it possible to distinguish the resulting unit from the process of its formation without multiplying equivalent labels. The preference for *будан* follows the position developed in the Kazakh discussion, while *hybrid* remains the appropriate English designation [1].

The extension of the hybrid metaphor from biological to linguistic discussion does not transfer all the properties of the original concept. Bolton’s examination of language and hybridisation is relevant precisely because the term carries a broader intellectual history than any one morphological definition [6]. For lexical analysis, the necessary question is which elements are combined and under what linguistic conditions. Neither the biological metaphor nor the cultural associations of hybridity establish that a lexical formation violates language norms. Such an evaluation requires evidence about meaning, structural compatibility, usage, and integration, not the metaphor alone.

A further distinction concerns the transfer of an existing designation between specialised domains. The Kazakh account describes this as *ішкі терминдену*, or internal terminologisation [1]. It concerns the development of terminological meaning and is not identical to combining components from different languages. A designation can acquire a new specialised meaning without undergoing morphological hybridisation. Conversely, a mixed-origin word may remain part of general vocabulary and never become a term. Lexical hybridity and terminological status must therefore be described separately, even when both properties occur in the same unit.

For the purposes of this article, a hybrid term is approached as a specialised designation whose formation in Kazakh involves an identifiable borrowed element and a Kazakh linguistic resource. The latter may be an inherited element or an established, previously assimilated resource of the language. This recipient-language orientation is a working delimitation, not a claim that broader etymological definitions are illegitimate [4, 5]. It places formations borrowed as complete units outside the core class of hybrid term formation in Kazakh. Derivatives based on borrowed stems are retained as a boundary class, because the reviewed literature does not consistently distinguish their derivational and assimilative properties [6].

International approaches: shared questions and different units of analysis

The English-language tradition connects hybridity with the historical development of the lexicon and the interaction of inherited and borrowed word-formation resources. Jespersen’s account provides the historical background for considering how contact affects the structure of English vocabulary [7]. Sazanets’s analysis organises English derivatives around four possibilities: a native prefix with a borrowed base, a borrowed prefix with a native base, a borrowed base with a native suffix, and a native base with a borrowed suffix. These patterns make the direction of combination explicit [8]. They do not, however, resolve whether all historically mixed derivatives should retain hybrid status after the borrowed component has become an ordinary productive resource.

German scholarship offers a more differentiated discussion of foreign word formation. Fleischer and Barz, Müller, and Munske address the relationship between borrowed lexical material and the productive mechanisms of the receiving language [9; 10; 11]. The examples represented in the material include *Luxuswohnung*, where a borrowed lexical element combines with a German one; *Glasmanufaktur*, with the reverse order; and *Ex-König*, in which a borrowed prefix combines with a native base. Forms such as *abmontieren* and *Autorschaft* also show why borrowing and derivation cannot be treated as mutually exclusive descriptions. A borrowed component may participate in a construction whose organisation belongs to German.

The distinction between endogenous and exogenous formations requires particular care. It may refer to the place where a word was formed, but it can also be used to describe the origins of its components. These are different criteria. A combination of two foreign-origin elements is not necessarily a word created abroad; the combination may have been made within the recipient language. Equally, a term whose components have different remote origins may be borrowed as a single unit. The German discussion is useful for Kazakh precisely when the relevant meaning of endogenous or exogenous is stated, rather than imported as an unexplained classificatory label [10, 11].

French research foregrounds the delimitation of the category and the status of learned elements. Kortas considers lexical hybridity in relation to competing morphological and etymological approaches [2]. The discussion includes formations with Greek and Latin elements as well as combinations involving contemporary French resources. The central difficulty is that a combining form is not always equivalent to either an autonomous word or an ordinary affix. Consequently, the analysis of a hybrid cannot be reduced to counting roots. For Kazakh terminology, the parallel is methodological: an international element such as *био-* or *микро-* should be identified by its function in the formation, not assigned to an undifferentiated category of foreign words.

Turkish research provides a related but not identical point of comparison. Erkınay Tamtamış examines 1,839 hybrid formations selected from dictionary material and classifies combinations of elements from different linguistic sources [12]. This is a reported result of that study, not a new count in the present article. Its methodological relevance lies in the relationship between the selected dictionary unit and the resulting classification. The Turkish and Kazakh materials cannot be compared quantitatively merely because both are described as hybrid: the inclusion of derivatives, compounds, and formations involving two foreign-origin components must first be made equivalent. Typological proximity does not remove the need to specify these boundaries.

Russian discussions further illustrate the difficulty of treating origin, derivation, and writing as a single property. Marinova's work addresses the etymological interpretation of hybrid words [13]. The wider material reviewed here includes formations such as *аппаратчик*, *ультразвук*, and *читабельность*, as well as units combining abbreviations with lexical components. For comparison with Kazakh, it is important to ask whether a designation is mixed in its component origins, its graphic representation, or both. A change of script does not necessarily constitute a new word-formation operation. Similarly, writing every component in Cyrillic does not erase a difference in their linguistic histories.

The comparison is summarised in Table 1. The rows represent emphases in the selected literature, not homogeneous national schools or mutually exclusive theories. Their shared contribution is to show why an explicit unit of analysis is indispensable. Their differences concern whether the primary object is a lexical history, a productive construction, a learned combining form, a dictionary entry, or a specialised designation.

Table 1 – Analytical emphases in the research traditions represented in the review

Literature considered	Main emphasis	Implication for the Kazakh analysis
English [7; 8]	Historical interaction of inherited and borrowed word-formation resources.	Distinguish component history from the current productivity of a construction.
German [9; 10; 11]	Foreign word formation; affixes, lexical bases, and combining forms.	State whether endogenous/exogenous refers to component origin or formation location.
French [2]	Concept delimitation; synchronic and etymological approaches.	Make the boundary between hybridity and adaptation explicit.
Turkish [12]	Dictionary-based classification by the origins of components.	Specify the dictionary unit and inclusion rules before comparing totals.
Russian [13]	Etymological interpretation of mixed-origin formations.	Keep component origin separate from graphic representation and derivation.
Kazakh [1; 3]	Partial translation, borrowing, adaptation, and specialised naming.	Distinguish formation in Kazakh from the importation of complete terms.

Note: analytical synthesis of the cited literature; the rows do not represent mutually exclusive schools.

Borrowing, adaptation, and the boundary of hybrid formation

The most consequential disagreement concerns the pattern «borrowed base + native affix». Under a broad etymological definition, this pattern is hybrid because the components have different origins. In a more restrictive interpretation discussed by Kortas, native affixation can instead indicate the assimilation of a borrowed base [2]. The Kazakh literature also recognises derivatives among hybrid formations [3]. These accounts should not be collapsed into a single conclusion. They describe partly different questions: the historical composition of a derivative and the process by which a borrowed item becomes available to the receiving language's morphology.

For example, *газандыру* 'gasification' and *электрлендіру* 'electrification' contain borrowed lexical material and Kazakh derivational resources. This observation is sufficient to identify a mixed-origin structure under the broad definition. It is not sufficient to establish whether a particular attested form arose through partial translation, productive derivation within Kazakh, or the adaptation of an existing foreign term. These pathways may converge in a similar surface form. The appropriate response is to record the structural facts and the available formation evidence separately, leaving the historical pathway unresolved where documentation is absent [1, 14].

A second boundary separates a hybrid formed in Kazakh from a borrowed term that was already hybrid in another language. The distinction is relative to the receiving language. An etymological description can identify components from different languages inside a borrowed designation, while a borrowing history can show that the whole designation entered Kazakh without being assembled there. Both descriptions may be correct, but only the former concerns remote component origins. The latter determines whether the example provides evidence of hybrid term formation in Kazakh. Treating every imported mixed-origin term as a locally formed hybrid obscures this distinction and can inflate the apparent productivity of a pattern [4].

A third boundary concerns the relation between linguistic hybridity and specialised naming. Research on computer terminology and bionics demonstrates that relevant units are not necessarily confined to single-word compounds [15, 16, 17]. Ivlieva's Spanish material includes multiword formations such as *error de hardware* and *herramienta de filtrado de cookie*, in which a borrowed component is embedded in a recipient-language construction [16]. These examples show why the internal organisation of a specialised designation matters. They do not justify treating every ordinary phrase containing a loanword as a hybrid term: the phrase must also function as a designation within a specialised conceptual system.

The resulting distinction is threefold. Core hybrid formations involve the combination of differently sourced resources within the recipient language. Borrowed terms of hybrid origin enter that language as complete designations. Loan-based derivatives form a boundary class whose treatment depends on the declared relationship between derivation and adaptation. This arrangement preserves the competing positions represented in the literature while preventing an ambiguous example from silently determining the scope of an entire dataset. It also makes future comparisons possible: researchers can report the core class and the boundary class separately rather than presenting a single total based on undisclosed assumptions.

The Kazakh tradition: historical continuity and changes in adaptation

Kazakh scholarship relates hybrid formations to the broader development of scientific vocabulary. Kurmanbayuly distinguishes four major periods in the development of Kazakh terminology: the emergence of a terminological basis in the later nineteenth century, the expansion of national scientific naming in the early twentieth century, the development of terminology through Russian-mediated models during the Soviet period, and renewed attention to Kazakh resources from the 1990s onwards [1]. Table 2 uses this periodisation as a framework for interpreting the practices discussed in the source literature. It does not imply that one formation mechanism disappeared when another became prominent.

Table 2 – Hybrid-term formation in the periodisation of Kazakh terminology

Period	Processes emphasised in the literature	Question for hybrid-term research
Later nineteenth century–1910	Emergence of scientific and educational naming in print; borrowing and translation.	How are specialised meanings distinguished from general vocabulary?
1910-1930	Debates over translation, adaptation, and the use of Kazakh affixes with borrowed material.	Which components were translated or adapted, and which were retained?
1930-1990	Russian-mediated terminology, partial calques, and combinations with international elements.	How does the mediation language affect form and the route of formation?
From the 1990s	Renewed attention to Kazakh naming resources and explicit study of hybrid formations.	How should locally formed hybrids, derivatives, and complete borrowings be separated?

Note: adapted from Kurmanbayuly's periodisation [1]. The periods describe historical emphases, not mutually exclusive formation mechanisms.

The early discussions are significant because they address questions that later became central to the definition of hybrid terms, even when the modern label was not used. The material considers the translation of parts of foreign designations, the adaptation of borrowed forms, and the attachment of Kazakh suffixes. Historical examples such as *сақтық капитал*, *мемлекет бюджеті*, and *дөңес лінзі* preserve the coexistence of a Kazakh component and a borrowed one. Their historical spelling should remain visible when they are used as evidence. Replacing it with contemporary spelling would remove part of the information needed to study adaptation [1].

Zhubanov's discussion of international elements is particularly relevant to the status of recurring components in Kazakh [14]. Examples such as *аэрошана*, *ультракүлгін*, and *микротаразы* illustrate the combination of an international element with a Kazakh base. The theoretical question is not merely whether the international component was once borrowed. It is whether repeated participation in Kazakh formations gives it a productive role within the language. This question connects the historical practice of partial translation with the synchronic analysis of word-formation resources. It also explains why the same element may be perceived differently at different stages of integration.

In contemporary descriptions, the range of patterns extends beyond borrowed components in initial position. The material includes *автожол*, *аудиокітап*, *биоотын*, and *фотоқұжат*, but also *әуебилет* and *бейнекамера*, in which a Kazakh resource precedes a borrowed lexical component [1, 3]. This variation is important because hybridity is not a fixed order of components. The same general relation between local and borrowed resources can be realised in different structures. Whether an individual formation is established, productive, or normatively preferred must be investigated separately from its structural classification.

Domain-based work also demonstrates the need to distinguish the object of description from the method of counting. Kulmanov analyses the quantitative and qualitative composition of Kazakh terminological dictionaries, while Kenes examines hybrid terms in information technology terminology [18, 19]. Such studies provide relevant materials and classification questions, but dictionary entries are not automatically comparable with corpus tokens or unique concepts. Repeated entries, variant designations, and imported complete terms can affect totals. Accordingly, the present synthesis does not combine figures from these studies into a general percentage for Kazakh terminology. The immediate task is to make inclusion criteria comparable before interpreting numerical differences.

The historical discussion therefore supports a distinction between continuity of mechanisms and change in their treatment. Partial translation, borrowing, and the use of Kazakh derivational resources recur across periods, but the preferred degree of adaptation and the status assigned to international elements vary in the scholarly accounts [14]. Digital publication and electronic term collections make the material more accessible; by themselves, they do not establish a new word-formation mechanism. A periodisation of terminology should therefore explain a change in naming principles or practices rather than rest solely on the introduction of a new storage or retrieval technology.

Structural patterns and the scope of the proposed classification

Table 3 brings the structural observations together without claiming to provide an exhaustive inventory. The examples are drawn from the Kazakh material discussed in the literature and are used to illustrate component relations. A structural label does not certify a term's official status, establish its frequency, or identify the language in which the complete designation first arose. The separation of these questions is particularly important for elements that recur in international scientific vocabulary: their recognisability does not remove the need to examine the formation as a whole [14].

Table 3 – Illustrative structural patterns and their classification limits

Pattern	Kazakh examples and explanatory glosses	Analytical qualification
Borrowed lexical base + Kazakh base	<i>газқұбыр</i> – gas pipeline	Mixed-origin compound; formation history still requires documentation.
Kazakh resource + borrowed lexical base	<i>әуебилет</i> – air ticket; <i>бейнекамера</i> – video camera	Component order differs from the preceding pattern.
International combining form + Kazakh base	<i>биоотын</i> – biofuel; <i>аудиокітап</i> – audiobook; <i>микродеңгей</i> – microlevel	Identify the bound element's function, not only its remote origin.
Borrowed base + Kazakh derivational resources	<i>газдандыру</i> – gasification; <i>электрлендіру</i> – electrification	Boundary class: hybridity in the broad account, adaptation or loan-based derivation in a narrower account.
Multiword partial translation	<i>мемлекет бюджеті</i> – state budget; <i>дөңес лінзі</i> – convex lens	Historical forms retained; termhood and formation pathway must be established for the complete designation.

Note: examples from the material discussed in [1; 3; 14]. Glosses are explanatory; the table does not establish frequency or official approval.

The distinction between a borrowed lexical base and an international combining form also has practical consequences. In *газқұбыр*, the first component is identifiable as a lexical item used in Kazakh. In *микродеңгей*, the first element functions as a bound modifier within a productive series. Both formations can be described as mixed-origin, but their component status and derivational behaviour are not identical. Grouping them together may be useful at one level of classification, provided that the next level retains the structural difference. Otherwise, the label «hybrid» explains too little about how a designation is organised [1, 10].

The same caution applies to the treatment of established loans. A synchronically integrated element may be available to speakers as part of Kazakh vocabulary even when its remote origin is known. A classification based only on remote etymology would continue to treat such an element as foreign indefinitely. A purely synchronic classification, on the other hand, could conceal the historical conditions of its incorporation. The proposed solution is not to discard either perspective, but to keep separate descriptions for component history and present linguistic status. Their relationship can then be investigated rather than predetermined by the choice of one label [2, 13].

For multiword terms, the unit of classification must be the specialised designation as a whole, not an isolated component removed from its construction. The presence of a borrowed word may be structurally relevant, but it does not establish that the surrounding phrase is a term. The concept named, the stability of the designation, and its function in the relevant domain remain necessary considerations. This condition links morphological analysis to terminology work without reducing the latter to word formation. It also allows a term to be classified as structurally mixed while its precise route of formation remains an open historical question [5, 16].

Implications for terminographic description

The comparative analysis supports a descriptive framework with five separate fields. Component origin records the linguistic sources that can be established. Formation history distinguishes a designation assembled in Kazakh from one borrowed as a complete unit. Structural pattern identifies the relationship between lexical bases, affixes, combining forms, and multiword constructions. Integration records the evidence for the component's current role in Kazakh, without equating remote origin with present foreignness. Specialised function identifies the concept and domain in which the complete designation operates. These fields are an analytical proposal derived from the preceding comparison, not a validated annotation standard.

Such a description would make uncertainty visible at the appropriate point. A term may have a clearly identifiable structural pattern but an undocumented formation history. A borrowed component may be well integrated into Kazakh while the complete designation remains variable in specialist usage. A multiword designation may have a stable concept but competing spellings. Recording these properties separately avoids a forced choice between an entirely native term and an entirely foreign one. It also allows researchers who adopt broad and narrow definitions of hybridity to retrieve different subsets from the same documented material without changing the underlying observations.

The proposal also separates classification from recommendation. A structurally transparent hybrid is not necessarily the preferred designation of a concept; conversely, an established specialist term is not invalidated by its heterogeneous origin. Terminographic decisions should consider the concept expressed, consistency with related designations, the possibilities of further derivation, and documented usage. The preference for *бұдан* in the Kazakh metalanguage serves consistency in describing the phenomenon. It should not be confused with a universal prescription to remove every borrowed component from every terminological system [1, 5].

Limitations and directions for further research

The conclusions are limited by the nature of the material. The review draws on selected accounts and illustrative examples rather than a newly compiled representative corpus. It does not establish the proportion of hybrid terms in Kazakh, the productivity of every listed pattern, or the degree to which specialists accept individual forms. It also does not determine the earliest attestation of the examples or independently resolve every etymological disagreement. Historical periodisation is used as an interpretative framework, while the proposed boundary between hybridisation and adaptation remains a declared analytical choice.

Further work should test the framework on a documented set of dictionary entries and specialised texts. Each item would need a source, a clear counting unit, an explicit structural analysis, and evidence for the proposed formation pathway. Separate annotation of core hybrids, loan-based derivatives, and borrowed terms of hybrid origin would permit comparison between broader and narrower definitions. Independent classification of the same material would then show which distinctions can be applied consistently. Until such testing is undertaken, the framework is best regarded as a basis for corpus design and terminographic analysis, not a demonstrated solution to all problems of hybrid-term identification.

Conclusion

The study has examined the theoretical foundations of hybrid terms in Kazakh through a critical narrative review and comparative structural-semantic analysis. The principal result is that etymological heterogeneity, formation in the recipient language, and specialised naming are related but distinct properties. A definition that relies on only one of them cannot adequately distinguish a locally formed hybrid from a borrowed term of hybrid origin, a loan-based derivative, or a general-language phrase containing a borrowed component. The comparison of research traditions explains why these categories are treated differently and makes the source of the disagreement explicit.

For Kazakh, the working classification gives priority to formation within the recipient language while retaining loan-based derivatives as a boundary class. It recognises that a component may have a foreign history and an established synchronic role at the same time. The historical discussion connects this distinction with recurring practices of partial translation, morphological adaptation, and combination with international elements. The consistent use of *бұдан* is proposed for the Kazakh metalanguage, with a clear separation between the resulting term and the process of hybridisation.

The practical outcome is a framework that records component origin, formation history, structural pattern, integration, and specialised function separately. Its value lies in making classification decisions and evidential limits inspectable. It provides a basis for selecting material, comparing alternative definitions, and designing future termbase descriptions. Empirical validation requires a documented corpus and independently applied criteria; no claim of such validation or of newly established frequency is made here. The next stage is therefore not the expansion of undifferentiated hybrid-term lists, but the systematic documentation of how particular designations are formed and function in Kazakh.

References

1. Kurmanbayuly Sh. Qazaq terminologiyasy: zertteuler, oqulyq, sözdik, bibliografiya [Kazakh terminology: studies, textbook, dictionary, bibliography]. – Almaty: Sardar, 2014. – 928 p., 16 p. of plates. – ISBN 978-601-7174-41-5 (In Kazakh)
2. Kortas J. Les hybrides lexicaux en français contemporain: délimitation du concept // Meta. – 2009. – Vol. 54, No. 3. – P. 533-550. – DOI: 10.7202/038313ar (In French)
3. Momynova B., Anessova U. Qazaq tilindegi gibriddik sözder (massmedia materialdary negizinde) [Hybrid words in Kazakh: a study of mass media materials] // TILTANYM. – 2019. – No. 4. – P. 14-20 (In Kazakh)
4. Akhmet A. Qazirgi qazaq tilindegi budan terminderdiñ zerttelui [Research on hybrid terms in contemporary Kazakh] [Electronic resource] // Termincom.kz. – 2025. – 24 February. – URL: <https://termincom.kz/articles/?id=196&lang=qaz> (accessed: 23.09.2026) (In Kazakh)
5. ISO 704:2022. Terminology work – Principles and methods. – 4th ed. – Geneva: International Organization for Standardization, 2022. – 80 p
6. Bolton K. Language and Hybridization: Pidgin Tales from the China Coast // Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies. – 2000. – Vol. 2, No. 1. – P. 35-52. – DOI: 10.1080/136980100360788
7. Jespersen O. Growth and Structure of the English Language. – 10th ed. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982. – 244 p
8. Sazanets I.M. Angliyskiy gibrizizm: proizvodnye gibridy [English hybridism: derivative hybrids]: dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences, 10.02.04. – Tula, 2008. – 166 p. (In Russian)
9. Fleischer W., Barz I. Wortbildung der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. – 4th ed. – Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2012. – 484 p. – DOI: 10.1515/9783110256659 (In German)
10. Müller P.O. Foreign word-formation in German // Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe / ed. by P.O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen, F. Rainer. – Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2015. – Vol. 3. – P. 1615-1637. – DOI: 10.1515/9783110375732-004
11. Munske H.H. Was sind eigentlich ‘hybride’ Wortbildungen? // Studien zur Fremdwortbildung / ed. by P.O. Müller. – Hildesheim; Zürich; New York: Georg Olms, 2009. – P. 223-260 (In German)
12. Erkinay Tamtamiş H.K. Türkçede Hibrit (Melez) Sözcükler // Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı – Belleten. – 2021. – No. 72. – P. 253-290. – DOI: 10.32925/tday.2021.70 (In Turkish)
13. Marinova E.V. Problema etimologicheskoy interpretatsii slov-gibridov (na materiale sovremennogo russkogo yazyka) [The problem of the etymological interpretation of hybrid words: evidence from contemporary Russian] // Vestnik Rossiyskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Lingvistika. – 2008. – No. 4. – P. 75-82 (In Russian)
14. Zhubanov Q. Qazaq tili jöindegi zertteuler [Studies on the Kazakh language]. – 3rd ed., rev. – Almaty: Atamura, 2010. – 608 p. (In Kazakh)
15. Kerber E.V., Belikova I.A., Kosterina Yu.E. Yavlenie gibrizatsii vtorogo i tret'ego poryadka v angliyskoy terminologii komp'yuternykh standartov i mikroelektroniki [Second- and third-order hybridisation in English terminology of computer standards and microelectronics] // Sovremennaya nauka: aktual'nye problemy teorii i praktiki. Seriya: Gumanitarnye nauki. – 2020. – No. 5/2. – P. 80-85. – DOI: 10.37882/2223-2982.2020.05-2.05 (In Russian)
16. Ivlieva E.A. Klassifikatsiya terminov gibridnogo tipa v ispanskoy komp'yuternoy terminologii [Classification of hybrid-type terms in Spanish computer terminology] // Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. – 2017. – No. 4-2 (70). – P. 109-111 (In Russian)
17. Sharapova T.N. Vozniknovenie nemetskikh gibridnykh terminov bioniki kak sledstvie protsessa globalizatsii [The emergence of German hybrid terms in bionics as a consequence of globalisation] // Omskiy nauchnyy vestnik. – 2009. – No. 3 (78). – P. 117-119 (In Russian)
18. Kulmanov S. Qazaq tili terminologiyalyq qorynyñ äleueti (sandyq jäne sapalyq körsetkişterdi taldau) [The potential of the Kazakh terminological stock: analysis of quantitative and qualitative

indicators] // Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Philology Series. – 2021. – Vol. 136, No. 3. – P. 50-62. – DOI: 10.32523/2616-678X-2021-136-3-50-62 (In Kazakh)

19. Kenes B. Qazaq tiliniñ aqparattyq tehnologiyalar terminologiyasyndaǵy budan terminder [Hybrid terms in Kazakh information technology terminology] // Bulletin of Toraighyrov University. Philological Series. – 2023. – No. 3. – P. 169-180 (In Kazakh)

А.Н. Ахмет^{1*}, И.С. Насипов²

^{1*}Шәкәрім университеті,

071412, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей қ., Глинка к-сі, 20 А

²М. Акмулла атындағы Башқұрт мемлекеттік педагогикалық университеті,

Ресей Федерациясы, Уфа

*ORCID: 0000-0002-9464-0070

*e-mail: a.nurlankyzy@shakarim.kz

ҚАЗАҚ ТІЛІНДЕГІ БУДАН ТЕРМИНДЕР: ТЕОРИЯЛЫҚ НЕГІЗДЕРІ МЕН ЖІКТЕУ ӨЛШЕМДЕРІ

Аңдатпа. Мақалада қазақ тіліндегі будан терминдердің теориялық негіздері және оларды кірме терминдер мен морфологиялық тұрғыдан игерілген кірме сөздерден ажырату өлшемдері қарастырылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – этимологиялық әртектілік, сөзжасам және арнаулы ұғымды атау арасындағы байланысты нақтылап, «будан» және «гибрид» атауларының арақатынасын терминтанымдық тұрғыдан түсіндіру. Зерттеуде ғылыми әдебиеттерге сыни шолу жасау, салыстырмалы және құрылымдық-семантикалық талдау әдістері қолданылды. Материал ретінде қазақ және өзге тіл біліміндегі теориялық тұжырымдар мен сол еңбектерде келтірілген тілдік мысалдар алынды. Салыстыру барысында пікір алшақтығын туғызатын үш мәселе айқындалды: кірме негізге төл қосымша жалғанған тұлғалардың мәртебесі; өзге тілде жасалып, дайын күйінде қабылданған атаулардың жіктелуі; морфологиялық құрылым мен терминдік қызметтің арақатынасы. Ағылшын, неміс, француз, түрік және орыс тіл біліміндегі бағыттар қазақ терминтануының дамуымен сабақтастырыла қарастырылды. Талдау нәтижесінде компоненттің шығу тегін, атаудың жасалу тарихын, құрылымдық үлгісін, тілге игерілу дәрежесін және арнаулы қызметін жеке сипаттау қажеттігі негізделді. Осыған сәйкес қабылдаушы тілде жасалған будан терминдер, шығу тегі будан кірме терминдер және кірме негізден жасалған туынды тұлғалардың шекаралық тобы ажыратылды. Тарихи талдау аталған айырмашылықтарды қазақ тіліндегі аудару және бейімдеу тәжірибесімен байланыстырады. Ұсынылған үлгі терминографиялық сипаттаманы біріздендіруге бағытталған; ол тәжірибемен расталған жіктелім немесе будан терминдердің жиілігін жаңадан есептеу нәтижесі ретінде ұсынылмайды.

Тірек сөздер: будан термин; лексикалық будандастыру; қазақ терминологиясы; кірме сөз; морфологиялық бейімделу; сөзжасам; терминография.

А.Н. Ахмет^{1*}, И.С. Насипов²

^{1*}Шәкәрім университеті,

071412, Республика Казахстан, г. Семей, ул. Глинки, 20 А

²Башкирский государственный педагогический университет им. М. Акмуллы,

Российская Федерация, Уфа

*ORCID: 0000-0002-9464-0070

*e-mail: a.nurlankyzy@shakarim.kz

ГИБРИДНЫЕ ТЕРМИНЫ В КАЗАХСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ: ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ И КРИТЕРИИ КЛАССИФИКАЦИИ

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются теоретические основы гибридных терминов казахского языка и критерии их разграничения с заимствованными терминами и морфологически освоенными заимствованиями. Цель исследования – уточнить соотношение этимологической неоднородности, словообразования и специальной номинации, а также определить отношение между казахскими обозначениями «будан» и «гибрид». Критический нарративный обзор сочетается со сравнительным и структурно-семантическим анализом теоретических положений и языковых примеров, представленных в казахском и зарубежном языкознании. Сопоставление выявляет три основных источника разногласий: статус заимствованных основ с исконными аффиксами, классификацию образований, заимствованных в готовом виде, и соотношение морфологической структуры с терминологической

функцией. Подходы английского, немецкого, французского, турецкого и русского языкознания рассматриваются во взаимосвязи с развитием казахского терминоведения. Результаты обосновывают необходимость отдельного описания происхождения компонентов, истории образования наименования, структурной модели, степени освоенности и специальной функции. На этой основе предлагается рабочая классификация, разграничивающая гибридные термины, созданные в языке-реципиенте, заимствованные термины гибридного происхождения и пограничную группу производных от заимствованных основ. Исторический анализ связывает данные различия с изменением практик перевода и адаптации в казахском языке. Предложенный подход предназначен для последовательного терминографического описания. Он имеет характер аналитической модели, а не эмпирически проверенной классификации или нового количественного исследования частотности гибридных терминов. Практическая значимость работы заключается в уточнении оснований отбора и описания материала для последующих корпусных и лексикографических исследований.

Ключевые слова: гибридный термин; лексическая гибридизация; казахская терминология; заимствование; морфологическая адаптация; словообразование; терминография.

Information about the authors

Akzhibek Akhmet* – PhD, Head of the Department of Kazakh Philology, Shakarim University, Republic of Kazakhstan, Semey, e-mail: a.nurlankyzy@shakarim.kz, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9464-0070>.

Ishat Nasipov – Doctor of Philology, Professor, Bashkir State Pedagogical University named after M. Akmulla, Ufa, Russian Federation, e-mail: nasipov2021@yandex.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7611-3026>.

Авторлар туралы мәліметтер

Ахмет Ақжібек Нұрланқызы* – PhD, Шәкәрім университеті Қазақ филологиясы кафедрасының меңгерушісі, Қазақстан Республикасы, Семей, e-mail: a.nurlankyzy@shakarim.kz, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9464-0070>.

Насипов Илшат Сахиятуллович – филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, М. Ақмұлла атындағы Башқұрт мемлекеттік педагогикалық университеті, Ресей Федерациясы, Уфа, e-mail: nasipov2021@yandex.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7611-3026>.

Сведения об авторах

Ахмет Ақжибек Нурланқызы* – PhD, заведующая кафедрой казахской филологии Шәкәрім университета, Республика Казахстан, Семей, e-mail: a.nurlankyzy@shakarim.kz, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9464-0070>.

Насипов Илшат Сахиятуллович – доктор филологических наук, профессор, Башкирский государственный педагогический университет им. М. Ақмұллы, Российская Федерация, Уфа, e-mail: nasipov2021@yandex.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7611-3026>.

Received 02.08.2026

Accepted 28.09.2026