

УДК 81'42:811.512.122=581
DOI: 10.36979/1694-500X-2025-25-10-153-162

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНАЯ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА НАИМЕНОВАНИЙ КОЛИЧЕСТВЕННЫХ ПОНЯТИЙ НА КАЗАХСКОМ И КИТАЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Г. Махмут, Майлихаба Аолан

Аннотация. Анализируются лингвистические проблемы наименований количественных понятий в казахском и китайском языках. Количественная лексика формировалась на протяжении многовековой истории народа для выражения размеров предметов и явлений. По мере того как мировоззрение человека расширяется, его система мышления также становится более совершенной. Определяются такие понятия, как *мало* и *много*, *длинное* и *короткое*, *высокое* и *низкое*, *широкое* и *узкое*, *тяжёлое* и *лёгкое*, и т. д., и подразделяются на различные виды. Сегодня количественные понятия составляют значительную часть словарного запаса языка. По лексическому составу он охватывает различные сферы, связанные с жизнью и традициями народа, однако способы передачи этих понятий различаются в зависимости от специфики каждого языка. В казахском языке преобладает лексико-грамматический подход, а в китайском языке – лексико-семантический. В силу этих особенностей в казахском языке наименования количественных понятий включаются в состав различных частей речи, тогда как в китайском языке они группируются в отдельную часть речи. В статье основное внимание уделяется выявлению общих черт и особенностей наименований количественных понятий в казахском и китайском языках. Был проведён лингвистический анализ морфологической структуры имён существительных, прилагательных и числительных, выявлены их варианты и способы образования в китайском языке. На основе традиционного лексико-грамматического подхода к классификации основное внимание уделялось способам передачи количественных понятий в обоих языках. При подготовке статьи учитывались прикладные и практические проблемы.

Ключевые слова: квантификаторы; части речи; существительные; прилагательные; числительные.

КАЗАК ЖАНА КЫТАЙ ТИЛДЕРИНДЕГИ САНДЫК ТҮШҮНҮКТӨРҮНҮН АТАЛЫШТАРЫНЫН САЛЫШТЫРМА МҮНӨЗДӨМӨСҮ

Г. Махмут, Майлихаба Аолан

Аннотация. Бул макалада казак жана кытай тилдериндеги сандык түшүнүктөрдүн аталыштарынын лингвистикалык көйгөйлөрү талданат. Сандык лексика предметтердин жана кубулуштардын өлчөмдөрүн чагылдыруу үчүн элдин көп кылымдык тарыхында калыптанган. Адамдын дүйнө таанымы кеңейген сайын, анын ой жүгүртүү тутуму дагы өркүндөтүлөт. Аз жана көп, узун жана кыска, бийик жана төмөн, кең жана тар, оор жана жеңил ж.б. сыяктуу түшүнүктөр аныкталат жана ар кандай түрлөргө бөлүнөт. Бүгүнкү күндө сандык түшүнүктөр тилдин лексикасынын чоң бөлүгүн түзөт. Лексикалык курамы боюнча, ал элдин жашоосу жана каада-салты менен байланышкан ар кандай чөйрөлөрдү камтыйт, бирок бул түшүнүктөрдүн берилиши ар бир тилдин өзгөчөлүгүнө жараша өзгөрүлүп турат. Казак тилинде лексика-грамматикалык мамиле басымдуулук кылат, ал эми кытай тилинде лексика-семантикалык мамиле басымдуулук кылат. Бул өзгөчөлүктөрдөн улам казак тилинде сандык түшүнүктөрдүн аталыштары кептин ар кандай бөлүктөрүнүн курамына киргизилет, ал эми кытай тилинде кептин өзүнчө бөлүгүнө топтоштурулат. Макалада казак жана кытай тилдериндеги сандык түшүнүктөрдүн аталыштарынын жалпы өзгөчөлүктөрүн аныктоого багытталган. Зат атоочтордун, сын атоочтордун жана сандардын морфологиялык түзүлүшүнө лингвистикалык анализ жүргүзүлүп, алардын варианттары жана кытай тилинде пайда болуу жолдору аныкталды. Классификацияга салттуу лексика-грамматикалык мамиленин негизинде эки тилде сандык түшүнүктөрдү берүү жолдоруна басым жасалды. Макаланы даярдоодо колдонмо жана практикалык көйгөйлөр эске алынган.

Түйүндүү сөздөр: квантификаторлор; сөз түркүмдөрү; зат атоочтор; сын атоочтор; сандар.

COMPARATIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF NAMES OF QUANTITATIVE CONCEPTS IN KAZAKH AND CHINESE LANGUAGES

G. Makhmur, Mailhaba Aolan

Abstract. The article analyzes linguistic challenges in naming quantitative concepts in the Kazakh and Chinese languages. Quantitative vocabulary has developed over centuries to express the sizes of objects and phenomena. As a person's worldview expands, their system of thinking also becomes more refined. Concepts such as *little* and *much*, *long* and *short*, *high* and *low*, *wide* and *narrow*, *heavy* and *light*, etc., are defined and categorized into different types. Today, quantitative concepts constitute a significant part of a language's vocabulary. In terms of lexical composition, they encompass various aspects of life and traditions, but the methods of conveying these concepts differ depending on the characteristics of each language. In Kazakh, the lexical-grammatical approach prevails, while in Chinese, the lexical-semantic approach dominates. Due to these differences, in Kazakh, the names of quantitative concepts are distributed across various parts of speech, whereas in Chinese, they are grouped into a separate part of speech. This article focuses on identifying common features and characteristics of quantitative concept names in the Kazakh and Chinese languages. A linguistic analysis was conducted on the morphological structure of nouns, adjectives, and numerals, identifying their variations and formation methods in Chinese. Following the traditional lexical and grammatical approach to classification, the study emphasizes the ways in which quantitative concepts are conveyed in both languages. Additionally, applied and practical problems related to this topic were considered during the research.

Keywords: quantifiers; parts of speech; nouns; adjectives; numerals.

Introduction. The concept of measure is a term denoting units of measurement that characterize the quantity, volume, and scale of objects and phenomena. This concept is broad and is reflected in various linguistic structures. The precise measurement of objects and phenomena, along with their designation in language, is an indicator of linguistic culture. In the 21st century, as cultural and economic ties were established between countries around the world, the number of shared concepts and practices began to grow. The development of cultural ties between the Kazakh and Chinese peoples also created a need to study the common features and differences in the cultures of these two peoples. The traditions and culture of each nation can be expressed through its national language, since all the knowledge and worldview accumulated throughout the formation of a people are reflected in its language. A person names what he learns using the words of his language.

Historically, it took a long time for words denoting measures to develop in the language. Words underwent many changes before emerging from rudimentary forms, gradually growing in complexity and acquiring distinctive features. Concepts of measure associated with the work of peasants, craftsmen, farmers, and other aspects of everyday life gradually became more specific. They eventually came to be designated by various terms and fixed in the form of standardized names. At the same time, interactions and exchanges between

people from different regions and social groups led to the formation of a unified national language.

When an object that becomes integral to daily life is consistently used, its name enters the language's vocabulary. The formation of words denoting measures followed a similar process. Such words reflect a people's worldview and culture, as they encapsulate the accumulated body of knowledge regarding the quantity and measurement of objects and phenomena. A key aspect of understanding the world is the establishment of scales and measurements, which marks the evolution of human thought from generality to specificity and systematic organization. Consequently, research into the historical-etymological, ethnolinguistic, ethnological, and linguo-sociological foundations of names for quantities and measurements will continue to deepen, drawing on a complex array of interdisciplinary connections. Although linguists examining the concept of measure in the Kazakh and Chinese languages have conducted numerous studies on terminological meaning and historical development, there remains a shortage of practical, truly comparative works. Furthermore, the linguistic means for conveying the concept of measure differ between the two languages. For example, in Chinese, the measure and size of each object and phenomenon are expressed through specific lexical units, whereas in Kazakh there are only a few words that convey this meaning, and these are primarily found across various parts of speech. Accordingly,

this article focuses on the concept of measures in the Kazakh and Chinese languages, providing a comparative analysis of their similarities and differences.

Materials and methods. The article is based on the names of measures and sizes collected from works by Russian authors – such as M. Auezov [1], G. Musrepov [2], and G. Mustafin [3] – as well as from Chinese authors, including Mo Yan [4], Guo Moro (“Works of Guo Moro”) [5], Lao She (“Camel Xiyangzi”) [6], and “Lao She’s Works” [7]. Additional data were also gathered from various press publications. In analyzing the collected material, several reference works were used. For Kazakh, these included an explanatory dictionary [8], a dictionary of synonyms [9], and a dialect dictionary [10]. For Chinese, the study relied on Li Dyshiyang’s Explanation of Chinese Classifiers in Russian [11], Liu Xueming’s Dictionary of Combinations of Modern Chinese Nouns and Classifiers [12], He Ping’s Dictionary of Frequently Used Classifiers in Modern Chinese [13], Chu Peiru’s Definition of Chinese Classifiers [14], and Liu Ziping’s Great Dictionary of Chinese Classifiers [15]. Based on these sources, the meanings were classified into lexical and grammatical groups.

The research identified the main directions and key concepts related to words denoting measure in both the Kazakh and Chinese languages. A comprehensive lexical and semantic analysis was conducted on the thermogenesis process underlying these concepts. In analyzing the collected material, the traditional method of lexical and grammatical systematization was applied. Comparative studies examined how these measure-related terms are classified according to parts of speech – specifically, their meanings and functions within nouns, adjectives, and numerals. The study also highlighted both the distinct features and similarities of these terms in the two languages. For instance, Chinese employs specific measure words for each semantic group of nouns, effectively treating them as a separate part of speech, whereas the Kazakh language utilizes different methods for conveying the concept of measure.

Literature Review. The article is grounded in applied and practical approaches. It presents a comparative analysis of the concept of measure in

the Kazakh and Chinese languages, identifying their unique features. Consequently, scientific works and translations in both languages were also examined. In Kazakh linguistics, words denoting measure were first discussed in the early 20th century. Since then, numerous studies have been conducted in this area – vocabulary related to measure has been systematically classified, and many issues have been resolved. The historical origins and developmental features of “Ancient Kazakh Measures” [16, 79–80 pp.], the classification of measure concepts into various branches, and their adaptation to modern requirements [17], along with their scientific and theoretical substantiation, have provided the foundation for specialized studies.

In the Kazakh language, the term “category of plurality” has become well established. However, the interconnections among the various scientific works on this topic remain insufficiently articulated. In other words, although research has examined both historical and contemporary usage, a comprehensive approach and a consensus on the terminological designation of this lexical-semantic group have yet to be achieved.

In the language’s vocabulary, words denoting measure are referred to by various names among different scholars. For example, they have been described as “category of number and measure”, “words with numerical value”, “neutral phraseological units”, “count words”, “quantitative words”, “words of measure”, “measurement name”, “explanatory words” or “words used between numerals and names of objects”, “numeratives”, “count names” or “count words”, “measure values” or “measurement”, “words denoting number and measure”, “countable”, “uncountable”, “words that can be counted”, “words that cannot be counted”, as well as “lexicon of metrology”, “classifiers”, “mesuratives”, “count nomenclature”, “language units with a dimensional value”, and “measure words”. Despite this range of terminology, no single name fully encompasses the linguistic units with dimensional meaning or reveals their inner essence. In fact, the diversity of terms suggests that researchers approach this problem from different perspectives rather than following a unified sequence.

Although there is no consensus on the term, most researchers begin by focusing on the meaning of “measure” to understand the general nature of the concept. In reality, the potential of the concept of measure is much broader – it encompasses a wide range of information regarding quantities such as number, weight, scale, area, volume, length, quality, and more. When we compile all the language units that carry a dimensional meaning, their general and aggregating function suggests that the term “lexicon of the meaning of measure” is most appropriate. At the lexical level, various terms are used depending on the context, including “quantifiers”, “words with the meaning of measure”, “lexeme of measure”, “aggregative measure”, “units of measurement”, and “words denoting the concept of measure”. At the grammatical level, concepts such as “measured form”, “synthetic form”, and “analytical form” are employed [18, 34 p.]. Regarding the overall category, there is a growing tendency to refer to it as the “category of measure”, which encompasses both quantity and multiplicity, rather than merely “quantity” or “multiplicity”. Ultimately, measure is understood as a specific quantitative value obtained as a result of measurement.

The origin and formation of counters in the Chinese language, as well as their distribution across parts of speech, have been extensively studied by Chinese scholars. For example, researcher Liu Shi Ru (刘世儒) [19] hypothesized that during the Ying-Shang era (殷商时期 yīn shāng shíqī¹), singular counters did not exist in Chinese. It was only during the Two Han period (两汉时期 liǎng hàn shíqī) that such counters came into use, and later, driven by social needs, they evolved and developed [19, 1–5 pp.]. Similarly, the renowned Liu Shushiyan (吕叔湘) concluded that expressing the quantity of an object solely through counters – without additional words – is a defining feature of the Chinese language [20, 15 p.]. The unique development of measure-related vocabulary in Chinese can be attributed to the language’s nature as an isolating language, one that does not undergo morphological changes. As a result, a wide

variety of counters has emerged. It is important to note the differences between language systems: languages that rely on counters and those rich in the category of plurality each have their own distinct characteristics, which do not necessarily align with one another.

In the early 20th century, Chinese scholars began to observe that the study of the concept of “measure” was influenced by Western grammatical concepts. As one scholar noted, “Our research has been influenced by Western grammatical concepts” [21, 108 p.]. Unlike Chinese, Western languages did not have a category for “counter words.” Building on this perspective, Li Jinxi (黎锦熙) explored this area in his work *A New Grammar of Modern Chinese* (1998). In it, he introduced the term “counter word,” defining it as “a noun denoting number and measure, attached after a numeral to denote a unit of quantity of an object” [22, 84–85 pp.]. Subsequently, during the 1950s, the work *A Proposed Grammar System for Teaching Chinese* (暂拟汉语教学语法系统), written between 1954 and 1956, officially adopted the category “counter word” with the definition “a word denoting the quantitative measure of an object or action”.

There was no consistency in the original names for words with the meaning of measure among Chinese scholars. Data from that period show that before the term “measure words” (量词 liàng cí) was established, as many as sixteen different names were used in Chinese – for example, “unit noun” [20, 129 p.], “auxiliary noun” [23, 38 p.], and others [24, 4 p.]. After long debates, scholars eventually reached a consensus, and the term “measure words” (量词 liàng cí) was approved, clearly distinguishing these words from other parts of speech. This marked the complete formation of the concept of measure and its recognition as a distinct term. The work of Chinese linguists subsequently influenced researchers of the Kazakh language in Xinjiang, leading Kazakh scholars to propose that measure words should be considered a separate part of speech [25, 242 p.]. However, this view was not widely accepted outside the region.

Results and Discussion. *Features of the Representation of Concepts of Measure in the Kazakh and Chinese Languages*

¹ Yin-Shang era: refers to the period from approximately 1600 to 1046 BC “殷商时期: 约公元前1600年至公元前1046年”

In both Kazakh and Chinese, objects are divided into two main categories: *countable* and *uncountable*. In Kazakh, nouns can appear in both singular and plural forms. However, when expressing quantity for countable objects, the numeral is directly connected to the noun, which typically remains in its singular form. For example: *бір кіман* (one book), *бір қой* (one sheep), *екі алма* (two apples). In Chinese, numeral constructions also often preserve the singular form of the noun, regardless of the quantity indicated. For instance, “一万个学生” (ten thousand students) and “二十五本书” (twenty-five books) show that even as numerals vary, the noun remains unchanged in form. Other examples include 三本书 (three books) and 五十个学生 (fifty students). This pattern – where the noun remains in its singular form in numeral phrases – is a common feature in both languages, despite some broader grammatical differences between them.

Regarding the expression of noun quantities, the two languages exhibit notable differences. In Chinese, when indicating the quantity of countable items, a noun typically cannot be directly combined with a numeral. Instead, a measure word—also known as a counter word (量词 *liàng cí*)¹ [26, 981–985 pp.] – must be inserted between the numeral and the noun. For example, in 一本书 (one book), the measure word 本 is placed between the numeral 一 and the noun 书. With few exceptions, each noun in Chinese is paired with its specific counter word, following the standard structure of “numeral + counter word + noun.” In Kazakh, countable nouns are generally expressed using a direct “numeral + noun” construction. However, in some cases, less commonly used words (such as *tal*, *tup*, *tüyak*, *bas*, etc.) may be inserted between the numeral and the noun, forming a structure—“numeral + measure word + noun” – that is externally similar to the Chinese pattern. For instance, *бір тал шаш* (one strand of hair) and *екі түп ағаш* (two bushes of a tree) illustrate this usage.

In the Kazakh language, to indicate plurality, nouns typically receive one of the

suffixes *-лар*, *-лер*, *-дар*, *-дер*, *-тар*, or *-тер*. This morphological marker is analogous to the Chinese lexeme “们,” which serves to express plurality in nouns referring to persons, objects, phenomena, etc. However, in Chinese, the use of “们” is limited primarily to nouns denoting people – for instance, 同学们 (students) and 姑娘们 (girls) – and is seldom added to nouns in other semantic categories. In contrast, Kazakh applies its plural suffixes to all nouns – whether they denote people, animals, or objects – in accordance with the rules of vowel harmony. For example: *оқушылар келді* (the students came), *алмалар пісті* (the apples ripened), and *арыстандар ұйықтады* (the lions slept).

Researchers of the Chinese language categorize counters into three main groups: counters for objects, counters for actions, and complex counters. Counters for objects are further subdivided into five types: counters for individual objects (个体量词), counters for collective objects (集体量词), counters denoting uncertainty (不定量词), measurement counters (度量衡单位量词), and time counters (临时量词). Notably, the last four groups are also present in the Kazakh language. However, counters for individual objects (个体量词) are unique to Chinese – they are considered a national feature with regional variations and represent a special category not found in other languages [27, 31 p.].

Both languages employ counters to indicate the quantity or volume of countable nouns. However, Chinese features a distinctive set of individual counters (个体量词) with unique functions and usage patterns. Examples of these include 个 (*gè*), 位 (*wèi*), 件 (*jiàn*), 本 (*běn*), 把 (*bǎ*), 匹 (*pǐ*), 块 (*kuài*), 篇 (*piān*), 支 (*zhī*), and 家 (*jiā*).

When indicating the number of animals in Chinese, each type is paired with its own specific counter. For example, one cat is expressed as 一只猫 (using the counter 只), and one cow is expressed as 一头牛 (using the counter 头). These counters are fixed in their usage and order, and cannot be interchanged. For instance, saying *²我们家有三口牛 (using 只 for cows) would violate lexical-semantic norms. In Chinese, regardless of whether a noun is concrete or abstract, countable

¹ The explanation given for “量 *liàng*” in Chinese is: ① measurement; ② measurement, estimation, estimation; ③ quantity, amount, and “量词 *liàng cí*” is explained as a calculation definition.

² * – This symbol indicates that the sentence structure is incorrect in Chinese spelling.

or uncountable, the use of counters is essential for accurately conveying the quantity or size of the object.

In Kazakh, the concept of measure is expressed in ways that differ significantly from Chinese. For example, the system of individual measure words in Kazakh varies in both number and function compared to Chinese. Additionally, Kazakh uniquely employs six plural endings, which are directly attached to nouns to indicate a quantity of two or more. Unlike in Chinese, where specific counters are necessary, these plural endings can be applied to all types of nouns.

Relationship of Concepts of Measure to Parts of Speech

Conveying Concepts of Measure Using Nouns

In both Chinese and Kazakh, measure is conveyed through the use of counters—nouns that express the quantity and size of objects. In Chinese, collective counters are particularly common for denoting groups or sets. These include terms such as 群 [qún], 班 [bān], 帮 [bāng], 伙 [huǒ], 套 [tào], among others. For instance, the phrase 一帮土匪 (a group of bandits) is structured as follows: 一 (one) + 帮 (counter for groups) + 土匪 (bandits). This construction clearly illustrates how Chinese uses collective counters to indicate collective entities, efficiently conveying the notion of a group.

In Kazakh, the same concept can be expressed in several different forms. For example, to convey the idea of “a group of robbers,” you might use:

Қарақшылар – Robbers

Қарақшылар тобы – Group of robbers

Бір топ қарақшы – One group of robbers

Қаптаған қарақшы – A crowd of robbers

Kalyn karakshy – Numerous robbers

In the Kazakh language there are words of measurement expressing a collective concept, such as топ (group), қора (many, flock), шоғыр (crowd), etc., however, the methods of forming collective counters are varied. The size of a measure is expressed approximately by means of such expressions as: бір топ адам (one group of people), бір қора адам (colloquial: көп – many people), бір қотан ел (local: бір қауым ел – people, country), бір қос жер (local: territory equal to, for example, one hectare of land), etc. These expressions are used both in everyday and in local speech [28].

Most often, since they are based on ancient units of measurement, the meanings of collective counters are more approximate than precise. Words denoting a grouping or gathering, from a lexical-semantic point of view, form a synonymous series. For example, the Kazakh Dictionary of Synonyms provides the following examples:

– жиын, топ, тобыр, лек, топыр, шоғыр – p. 262;

– топ, сан, лек, группа – p. 547;

– қалың, ну, жиі, бітік, тығыз, қау, қаба – p. 347 [29].

In addition to using counters that express collective concepts, Chinese conveys plurality in several ways:

- Addition of 们 to Person-Denoting Nouns: When the affix 们 is added to a noun referring to people, it creates a plural meaning. For example, 朋友们 (friends), 同胞们 (compatriots), and 同学们 (students).

- Addition of 们 to Animal Names: Although this usage is more common in literary texts or fairy tales, animal names can also take 们 to indicate plurality. Examples include 山羊们 (goats) and 小猴子们 (monkeys). However, this form is not universally applied to all animal names.

- Inherent Plurality in Certain Nouns: Some nouns inherently convey a plural sense without any additional markers. Examples include 花草 (flowers and grass), 师生 (teachers and students), 姐妹 (sisters), as well as 森林 (forest), 人类 (humanity), and 蔬菜 (vegetables).

- Plural Meaning Through Demonstrative Pronouns: Demonstrative pronouns can also imply plurality, as seen in phrases like 那些茉莉花 (those jasmine flowers) or 一些干部 (some cadres).

- Repetition of Individual Counters: Repeating individual counters serves to emphasize plurality, as in 一棵棵树 (trees) or 一座座山 (mountains).

The analysis reveals distinct strategies for expressing the number of countable nouns in Kazakh and Chinese. In Kazakh, plurality is mainly indicated through morphological changes in the noun. When referring to a single object, the numeral and noun are combined directly (e. g., бір қой – one sheep; екі алма – two apples). For quantities of two or more, the plural form or a collective

measure word is used (e. g., қойлар – sheep; алма-лар – apples; бір қора қой – a flock of sheep). In contrast, Chinese relies predominantly on individual and collective counters to convey the number of countable objects. Because the use of the plural marker 们 is limited primarily to nouns referring to people, counters assume a leading role in the quantification process. This system allows Chinese to accurately express both individual and collective quantities through specialized lexical items.

Suffixes such as *-дай*, *-дей*, *-май*, *-мей* serve not only to express similarity and comparison but also to indicate measure when attached to nouns. For example, алақандай жер (“land the size of a palm”) shows how a suffix can convey a sense of volume. Although these suffixes were originally associated with comparison, they have gradually acquired an additional meaning related to volume. In Kazakh, such expressions are common: ұларақтай жер (“land the size of a shovel”), аядай бөлме (“a room the size of a palm”), таудай талап (“an aspiration as vast as a mountain”), and бармақтай бақ (“a bit of luck the size of a finger”), among others. While the primary meaning of comparison remains dominant, the size and shape of the object used for comparison allow us to infer the intended measure.

Suffixes such as *-дай*, *-дей*, *-май*, *-мей*, when attached to numerals, extend beyond their traditional grammatical role to also express an approximate quantity. For example, алақандай can mean “approximately the size of a palm”, елудей implies “about fifty”, жиырмадай suggests “around twenty”, and отыз түптей conveys “approximately thirty roots”.

In earlier discussions, we noted that words incorporating these suffixes are used to express comparison, equality, or similarity with another object. On closer examination, when comparing objects, aspects such as size, width, length, and thickness are evaluated – that is, whether one object is heavier than or lighter than a similar object, and to what degree. For instance, when the term “қаңбақтай” (like a tumbleweed) is used, it evokes the idea of something very light. Thus, these suffixes are not only markers of comparison but also carry measure-related meanings, facilitating the transfer of quantitative characteristics and analogies between objects. In the Kazakh language, these

suffixes, alongside standalone words, convey the notion of measure and size. The examples provided support the conclusion that such suffixes serve a dual function: they express both comparative similarity and aspects of measurement.

Expression of concepts of measure through numerals.

In the Kazakh language, numerals – including cardinal (**есептік сан есім**), approximate (**болжалдық сан есім**), and group (**топтық сан есім**) forms – can be used to express the concept of approximate measure.

This is achieved by adding the suffixes *-ay*, *-ey* to cardinal numerals from one to seven (**бір, екі, үш, төрт, бес, алты, жеті**), thereby indicating a collection or grouping. For example, in the sentences “Қарайып екеу келе жатыр” (Two are walking) and “Біз бесеу едік” (There were five of us), the collective numerals **екеу** and **бесеу** denote the number of people. In Chinese, the collective meaning of quantifiers is conveyed using the structure “numeral + measure word + noun”. For example, the collective meaning of “two” and “+ “five” is expressed as: 他们两个人正走过来/我们曾经是五个人.

Expression of Concepts of Measure through Compound Numerals. In the Kazakh language, combining two numerals (such as **екі-үш, төрт-бес, алты-жеті**) creates an approximate sense of measure while preserving the original order of the numbers. For example, “үш-төрт адам келді” (three-four people came) and “жеті-сегіз баласы бап” (there are seven-eight children) convey an estimated count. In Chinese, a different approach is used. Instead of explicitly combining two numerals, the second numeral may be omitted, resulting in a pair like “үш-бес” (three-five) that still conveys an approximate measure. For instance, 五六个人来了 (five or six people came) and 我有三五个朋友 (I have three or five friends) illustrate this method. The first example aligns with the numeral combination rules of Kazakh, while the Chinese approach exhibits its own unique characteristics.

In the Kazakh language, the suffixes *-лаған*, *-леген*, *-даған*, *-деген* are appended to numerals to denote relative quantities. For example, they form words like *ондаған* (tens), *жүздеген* (hundreds),

and *мыңдаған* (thousands), thereby expressing approximate groupings or scales.

As noted above, in Chinese – as in Kazakh – a single numeral cannot, through morphological changes alone, form the concept of approximate measure. Instead, Chinese relies on compound numeral constructions. In such cases, modifiers such as 左右, 约, 上下, 若干, and 近 (which convey meanings like “approximately,” “about,” “around,” “several,” or “nearly”) are placed before the “numeral + count word + noun” structure to impart an approximate quantitative sense. For example, 约两个小时 means “approximately two hours”.

In Kazakh, the suffixes *-лар, -лер, -дар, -дер, -тар, -тер* serve a dual function by indicating not only a plural form but also a collective meaning. For instance, in Auyezov’s (2013) examples: «Жи-реншелермен алғаш сөйлескен жерінде Абай бір сағатқа жуық отырған...», «Абайлар Бөжей үйінің сыртына кеп, аттан түсіп жатты». Here, “Абайлар” doesn’t simply mean “Abais” in the plural; it specifically refers to a group led by Абай, implying several people under his leadership. This multifunctional use of plural suffixes in Kazakh conveys both numerical plurality and a sense of collectiveness in context.

In Kazakh, by adding plural endings (*-лар, -лер, -дар, -дер, -тар, -тер*) and locative suffixes (*-да, -де, -та, -те*) to numerals, concepts of approximate measure are formed. For example: – «жирмалардағы жігіт» (a guy about twenty years old) – «отыздардағы адам» (a person about thirty years old) – «жасы қырықтарда» (about forty years old) In these cases, the use of plural and locative affixes adds an approximate sense of the measure or age, indicating a range or approximated quantity in relation to the number involved.

In contrast to the features observed in Kazakh, such characteristics are absent in the Chinese language. The agglutinative structure of Kazakh allows for the combination of plural and locative markers to convey concepts of measure. In Chinese, however, approximate meanings are expressed through specific words such as *тарта, жақын, шамасында, шамамен, мәлішермен, астам, артық* (“about,” “almost,” “approximately,” “more than”, etc.), which are paired with numerals. For

example: – 近三十次 (about thirty times) – 若干学生 (several students) These expressions in Chinese rely on modifier words combined with numerals to convey approximate quantities, a mechanism contrasting with the agglutinative nature of Kazakh in which suffixes directly modify numerals.

In Kazakh, the concept of measure can also be formed by adding the suffixes *-дай, -дей, -май, -мей* to numerals – a process not found in Chinese. When these suffixes are attached, the numerals change to convey an approximate value of measure. For example: *елудей адам* – approximately fifty people, *жиырмадай оқушы* – approximately twenty students, *жетпіс-сексендей қыз-жігіт* – approximately seventy to eighty girls and boys.

Expression of Quantitative Concepts Using Derivative Adjectives

Derivative adjectives formed from nouns by means of suffixes can also be employed to express concepts of measure:

Derivative adjectives in Kazakh are formed by adding suffixes such as *-лы, -лі, -ды, -ді, -ты, -ті* to nouns. These adjectives not only describe qualities but also convey concepts of measure. For example, *ордалы жылан* means “a snake gathered in large numbers”, *топты жан* refers to “many people in one house”, and *бұлтты күн* describes “a day when the sky is covered with thick clouds”. Similarly, phrases like *алалы жылқы* (“many horses”), *балалы-шағалы* (“has many children”), and *үбірлі-шүбірлі* (“has many descendants”) express quantitative meanings.

Relative adjectives in Kazakh are formed by adding suffixes such as *-лық, -лік, -дық, -дік, -тық, -тік* to nouns. These adjectives often express the concept of measure. For example: – “айшылық жол” (distance) – “қамшылық қайыс” (volume) – “көйлектік мата” (volume) – “көрпелік мата” (volume) – “күндік табыс” (numerical measure) – “жылдық жүктеме” (yearly workload / hour measure) These phrases each use the relative adjective form to convey varying units of measurement related to time, volume, or quantity.

Concepts of measure are also expressed through the suffixes *-дақ, -дек, -тақ, -тек*. For example, *құмдақ* denotes land with a large amount of sand, *тастақ* refers to land with a significant quantity of stones, and *шаңдақ* describes sandy land.

The concepts of measure expressed with the suffixes *-сыз*, *-сіз* convey an extreme degree or continuity of a quantity or phenomenon. For example, words like *шетсіз*, *шексіз*, *толасыз*, *тоқтаусыз* indicate boundlessness, infiniteness, or an unceasing quality.

Conclusion. While previous studies have often focused on the general examination of quantitative words in Kazakh and Chinese, this article has specifically explored how the concepts of measure, number, and quantity are expressed in both languages, highlighting their similarities and differences. Despite the long-standing geographical coexistence of these language communities, their structural systems remain fundamentally distinct: Kazakh is agglutinative, whereas Chinese is isolating. A comparative analysis reveals that in Kazakh, the grammatical expression of measure is predominant, relying on morphological markers such as affixes to convey quantitative nuances. In contrast, Chinese employs a lexical-semantic approach, using specialized measure words that vary according to the type of object – each object possesses its own distinct dimensional name. Over time, these measure words have become entrenched in Chinese as an independent part of speech. Conversely, Kazakh does not have separate measure words as found in fixed expressions like “бес тал ағаш”, “он түп ағаш”, “он бас ірі қара”, or “бес түяк ұсақ мал.” Instead, Kazakh expresses the concepts of measure through a combination of lexical and grammatical means, utilizing various parts of speech (nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, and verbs). Thus, the differing patterns in expressing quantitative concepts are a direct reflection of the core genealogical features of the two languages: Kazakh’s agglutinative structure versus Chinese’s isolating structure.

Despite the distinct characteristics of these two language systems, several general similarities can also be observed. This is because many objects and phenomena are common to all peoples, so every language, despite using different words, has terms for them. For example, water – a liquid intended for drinking – may be expressed by different words in Kazakh and Chinese, yet the measure words applied to it share many similarities. Furthermore, common international standards for weight, length,

volume, and similar measures have been established worldwide. Although the names of these standards differ from language to language, the underlying concepts they denote remain the same. The key difference between these features is that some reflect ancient concepts of measure that have been part of a language for centuries, while others correspond to terms that have emerged in response to modern needs.

A comparative study of the Kazakh and Chinese languages – that is, an examination of the similarities and unique features of each element of their systems – holds considerable practical significance. It plays a crucial role in analyzing and translating essential linguistic units, thereby facilitating effective intercultural communication.

Поступила: 13.08.2025;

рецензирована: 27.08.2025; принята: 29.08.2025.

References

1. *Auezov M.* Abai’s path: epic novel / M. Auezov. Almaty: Writer, 2021. Book 1. 373 p., Book 2. 414 p., Book 3. 381 p., Book 4. 397 p.
2. *Musrepov G.* Selected works by G. Musrepov. Almaty: KazInform, 2012. 1119 p.
3. *Mustafin G.* Roman. Stories / G. Mustafin. Almaty: An Arys, 2009. 375 p.
4. *Mo Yan.* Red Sorghum / Mo Yan. Beijing: China Youth Publishing House, 2003. URL: https://adebiportal.kz/kz/news/view/mo-ian-gauliian-aragy__22860 (10.03.2025).
5. *Guo Moruo.* Representative Works of Guo Moruo. Huaxia Publishing House, 2008. 598 p.
6. *Lao She.* Camel Xiangzi / Lao She. Writer Publishing House, 2017. 249 p.
7. *Lao She.* Works of Lao She. Yangtze River Literature and Art Publishing House, 2014. 298 p.
8. The dictionary of the Kazakh literary language. Vol. 1. Almaty: Daure, 2011. 752 p.
9. Dictionary of Synonyms of Modern Kazakh Language. Almaty: Aris Publishing House, 2005. 20 p.
10. Regional Dictionary of the Kazakh Language. Almaty: Aris Publishing House, 2005. 824 p.
11. *Li Dexiang.* Detailed Explanation of Chinese Classifiers in Russian [Z] / Li Dexiang. Hubei Science and Technology Publishing House, 1989. 275 p.
12. *Liu Xuemin.* Dictionary of Common Classifier Combinations in Modern Chinese [Z] / Liu Xuemin. Zhejiang Education Publishing House, 1989. 579 p.

13. *He Ping*. Dictionary of Commonly Used Classifiers in Modern Chinese [Z] / He Ping. Shandong University Press, 1991. 289 p.
14. *Chu Peiru*. Manual for Learning Chinese Classifiers [Z] / Chu Peiru. Peking University Press, 2002. 204 p.
15. *Liu Ziping*. Great Dictionary of Chinese Classifiers [Z] / Liu Ziping. Shanghai Lexicographical Publishing House, 2013. 347 p.
16. "Kazakhstan". National encyclopedia. Almaty: General Editorial Office of «Kazakh Encyclopedia», 1999. 720 p.
17. *Kemelbekova E.A.* Ethnolinguistic character of applied geometry terms of «measure», «dimension» / E.A. Kemelbekova, G.O. Syzdykova // BULLETIN of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. PHILOLOGY Series. 2022. № 4 (141). 55–66 pp.
18. *Maralbek E.* Historical paradigm of the Category of Quantity (in the linguistic aspect). A dissertation prepared for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) / E. Maralbek. Almaty, 2020. 220 p.
19. *Liu Shirou*. Study of Classifiers in the Wei, Jin dynasties, Southern and Northern Dynasties [M] / Liu Shirou. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1965. 289 p.
20. *Lü Shuxiang*. Outline of Chinese Grammar [M] / Lü Shuxiang. Beijing: Commercial Press, 1982. 482 p.
21. *Wang Li*. Modern Chinese Language Lectures (parts of speech) / Wang Li. Beijing: Knowledge Publishing House, 1983. 362 p.
22. *Li Jinxi*. Newly Written National Language Grammar [M] / Li Jinxi. Beijing: Commercial Press, 1998. 373 p.
23. *Lu Zhiwei*. Vocabulary of Single-Syllable Words in Beijing Dialect [M] / Lu Zhiwei. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1956. 318 p.
24. *Lü Fengrui*. Cognitive Study of Individual Classifiers in Modern Chinese [D] / Lü Fengrui. Master's Thesis, Liaoning Normal University, 2013. 40 p.
25. *Rametuly M.* Modern Kazakh language / M. Rametuly. Urumqi: People's Publishing House of Xinjiang, 2003. 525 p.
26. *Na Yiman*. Chinese-Han Dictionary [Z] / Na Yiman. Urumqi: Xinjiang People's Publishing House, 2006. 2314 p.
27. *He Jie*. A Study on Measure Words in Modern Chinese [M] / He Jie. Beijing: Nationalities Publishing House, 2000. 237 p.
28. Kazakh Dialect Dictionary, 2005. 169 p.
29. Kazakh Dictionary of Synonyms. 2005.