



THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF THE HYPHENATED COMPOUND NOUNS IN THE STANDARD MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE AND THE JOURNALISTIC SUB-STYLE

Violeta Januševa¹ⁱ, Jana Jurukovska²

¹Faculty of Education, University "Sv. Kliment Ohridski",
Bitola, Republic of Macedonia

²Master in teaching the Macedonian and English Language,
Bitola, Republic of Macedonia

Abstract:

The orthography provides the basis for formation of a written text and its correct implementation guaranties the stability of the standard norm. At the same time, the development of society implies development of the language, because it has to address the needs of its users. New words permanently enter the language, so the orthography has to provide explanations and precise rules that will regulate their correct use. Thus, the orthography should constantly be updated with new examples and rules, which will contribute to decrease the possibility for ambiguous orthographic solutions. After almost a period of 20 year of using the same edition of the Orthography from 1998, it is a pleasure to announce the presence of the new edition of the Orthography, published in 2015. This edition is undoubtedly important for all speakers of the Macedonian language, especially for the Macedonian linguistic experts.

Taking into account that the orthography of the compound nouns evokes many dilemmas in the late edition of the Orthography it is very useful to notice whether the new edition of the Orthography has introduced some significant changes in their orthography. Hence, the paper provides an analysis of certain rules that refer to the hyphenated compound nouns in the edition of the Orthography from 1998 that are not clear and precise enough and leads to the possibility of dual interpretation. Then, these rules are compared with the same rules in the new edition of the Orthography from 2015 in order to get an insight into the changes and supplements. Finally, the rules from the new edition are analyzed regarding their preciseness and possibility for ambiguity.

ⁱ Correspondence: email violetajanuseva@gmail.com, jana_juruk@yahoo.com

The research has qualitative paradigm (content analysis) and descriptive design. The data processing and concluding employs analysis, comparison and synthesis. The results indicate that the new edition of the Orthography provides a great deal of clearness and new information in comparison with the previous edition. Still, new dilemmas and different interpretation of the rules are present. This encourages the idea of more frequent changes and modifications of the already existed rules, as well as frequent appearances of new orthography editions.

Keywords: Macedonian language, orthography, hyphenated compound nouns

1. Introduction

The language is an essential tool for all human beings, thus it is of a great importance to understand its value. Each language needs to be respected, and keep its uniqueness. This can be achieved by following the rules that have already been established with the standardization of the language's norm. This standardization comes because of the effort to have a stable language system in the oral and written form and it is expressed through the orthoephy and orthography, the grammatical rules and the standard vocabulary (Bojkovska, Minova-Gjurkova, Pandev, Cvetkovski, 2001).

The development of the society implies changes in all spheres of life, including the language. The language constantly changes, thus the orthography should constantly be updated with new examples and rules that will respond to the users' needs. The rules that are not very clear should be made more precise. This will decrease the ambiguity, which leads to differences in the written form of the language.

After almost 20 years of using the same edition of the Orthography, in the Macedonian language, in 2015 the new edition of the Orthography was published. It was welcomed by the Macedonian speakers and especially by the Macedonian linguistic community with the hope that it will provide additional and new information and make some of the rules in previous edition, which were imprecise and unclear, more clear and precise. This refers particularly to the orthography of the hyphenated compound nouns, which shows many dilemmas and different solution in the written practice. Thus, the paper compares the two editions of the Orthography regarding certain rules that regulates the orthography of the hyphenated compound nouns. It is very useful to see whether the new edition provides answers for the dilemmas and impreciseness present in the late edition. In the same time, it is of great relevance to reveal whether the rules in the new edition regarding their orthography are precise and understandable for the users.

2. Review of the literature

In the Macedonian language, there are several papers elaborating this topic. Some of the Macedonian authors provide contrastive analysis by comparing and translating certain category of the Macedonian compound nouns with their counterparts in other languages. Cvetkovski in Makarijoska (2009, no. 531) makes a comparison with the English language. Simoska (2010) gives a contrastive analysis of the Macedonian and the German language. Lainović-Stojanović and Karanfilovski in Bibliography (1987 – 2006, no. 258) employs comparison with the Serbian and the Russian Language.

Some of the authors address the need for additional explanation in the already established orthographic rules regarding the hyphenated compound nouns. Jurukovska (2016) in her master thesis, relies on the Orthography from 1998, and emphasizes the necessity for further explanation and preciseness of these rules and for introducing new rules. She believes that this will contribute the decreasing of the impreciseness and the equaling of the written practice. Januševa and Jurukovska (2017), taken into account the two editions of the Orthography (1998 and 2015), analyze the deviations of the rules that regulate the closed compound nouns in the written practice. They conclude that some of the rules are ambiguous and imprecise even in the new edition, that they also introduces dilemmas regarding their orthography and this leads to different solution in the written practice.

3. Methodology of the research

The paradigm of this research is qualitative and the design is descriptive. Analysis, comparison and synthesis are used for processing the data and the conclusion. Primarily, there is an analysis of certain rules that refer to the hyphenated compound nouns present in the Orthography from 1998, (Pravopis – Orthography, 1998, p. 51–53). The analysis will give an insight into their impreciseness and ambiguity and various examples with different orthographic solutions are provided. Then, these rules are compared with the same rules from the Orthography from 2015, (Pravopis – Orthography, 2015, p. 62–65). This comparative approach gives the opportunity to perceive the similarities and differences between the rules as well to understand whether the new rules are more precise and clear and whether they are open to dual interpretations. Finally, examples of dual orthographic solutions are given. The examples are excerpt from the following daily Macedonian newspaper: “Nova Makedonija” (NM) [New Macedonia], “Dnevnik” (D) [Daily newspaper], “Utrinski

vesnik" (Uv) [Morning newspaper], "Vest" [News], and "Večer" [Evening]. There are also examples from other reliable online sources.

4. Results and discussion

In the Orthography (1998, p. 52,109 v), there are two main rules that contain several sub-rules regarding the orthography of the hyphenated compound nouns.

A) First rule, says that two nouns that complement each other to signify a single idea or item (Orthography, 1998, p. 52, 109 v) are written with hyphen. Ex.: *spomen-ploča* [memorial plaque], *nacrt-zakon* [draft law, (bill)], *general-major* [major general]. This rule has no explanation about the character of the components, even though the examples demonstrate that the words can be native but also they can have foreign origin.

B) Second rule, implies that the following compound nouns should be written with a hyphen, (Orthography, 1998, p. 52, 110 b). Ex.: *bit-pazar* [flea market], *soda-voda* [club soda]. This rule, as the previous one, does not contain detailed information about the components, because there is only a list of several hyphenated compound nouns with no further explanation.

C) According to this sub-rule, compound nouns with foreign origin that signify a single idea or item should be written with a hyphen (Orthography, 1998, p. 52, 110 v). Ex.: *pres-biro* [press bureau], *sparing-partner* [sparring partner], *fiks-ideja* [fixed idea], *džez-muzika* [jazz music]. In this rule, it is only indicated that the components have foreign origin. Accordingly, it is not clear why the hyphenated compound noun *general-major* [major general] is listed in the first rule and not in this one, because its components have foreign origin.

D) This sub-rule states that the compound nouns whose second component is native word should be written with a hyphen (Orthography, 1998, p. 52, 110 g). Ex.: *gala-pretstava* [gala performance], *gama-zraci* [gamma rays], *rang-lista* [ranking list]. Here it should be emphasized that in some of the examples listed in the section A, for instance, in *spomen-ploča* [memorial plaque], *nacrt-zakon* [draft law, (bill)], *žiro-smetka* [drawing account] and *solo-pejač* [solo singer] the second component is a native word. Consequently, it is not clear why they are listed in the section A and not in this one.

E) In accordance with this sub-rule, certain abbreviated expression should be written with a hyphen (Orthography, 1998, p. 53, 110 d). For ex.: *A-vitamin (vitamin A)* [*A-vitamin (vitamin A)*]; *A-bomba (atomska bomba)* [*A-bomb (atom bomb)*], *TV-antena (televiziska antena)* [*TV-antenna (television antenna)*]. Again, the information about the components that are part of the abbreviated expressions is not clearly defined and the manner in which they are formed is not clear.

As it could be noticed, these two rules and the several sub-rules are not very clear because there is not a noticeable distinction among them. The distinction can be seen only in the given examples. Even though some of the examples are listed only in one rule, it is evident that they can be used as a demonstration for more than one rule. Thus, the impreciseness of the rules is the reason for many incorrect examples in the written practice, i.e. without a hyphen, though the scarce concern of the speakers of the Macedonian language cannot be neglected. For ex.: *džez festival* [*jazz festival*], *džez muzika* [*jazz music*] (Vest, 8.7.2011), *džez muzikata* [*the jazz music*] (Večer, 21.9.2014), *džez festivali* [*jazz festivals*] (Uv, 26.1.2015). This leads to the conclusion that the explanations must be done in a more precise manner so that the difference can be clearly understood. Moreover, there should also be detailed information about the components that are part of this kind of compound nouns and the manner of their formation.

In the new edition of the Orthography (2015), these two rules and their sub-rules are modified and clarified with additional new information.

A) In the first rule, it is said that a hyphen should be used between those compound nouns that cannot be linked with the vowels *-o/-e-*. The first component of the compound noun cannot change its form, thus the second component is subjected to change and it provides information about the grammatical gender and the number. This rule contains two sub-rules (Orthography, 2015, p. 62, 116 a, b).

In the first sub-rule, there are examples in which the first part complements the second part. In this situation, as already mentioned, the first part cannot be grammatically modified, but only the second part. For ex.: *biznis-zaednica* [*business community*], *biznis-zaednicata* [*the business community*], *biznis-zaednici* [*business communities*]. In this edition, same as in the previous edition, the authors do not explain the origin of the components. Thus, again, from the rule, it is not clear whether the words are native or they have foreign origin, but from the examples, it is noticed that they are native as well as foreign words (Orthography, 2015, p. 62, 116 a). For example, *brejk-topka* [*breaking ball*], *veb-diskusija* [*web discussion*], *koktel-bar* [*cocktail bar*], *lanč-paket* [*lunch package*], *marketing-menadžer* [*marketing manager*], *pop-muzika* [*pop music*], *sendvič-bar* [*sandwich bar*], *džez-muzika* [*jazz music*], *šoping-centar* [*shopping center*], *šou-biznis* [*show*

business]. The Orthography lists numerous examples of hyphenated compound nouns to clarify their correct orthography and to equal the written practice. Still, the written practice is overloaded with examples written without hyphen, which is incorrect. For ex.: *brejk topki* [*breaking balls*] (NM, 20.9.2016), *brejk topka* [*breaking ball*] (Večer, 25.7.2016).

This first rule interferes with the rule for the orthography of the closed compound nouns. It says that certain compound nouns whose components have foreign origin (mainly from the English language) should be written according to the rules for transcription of words with foreign origin, and also the rules for forming and pronunciation of compound nouns in the Macedonian language. Many examples are given: *oldtajmer* [*old-timer*], *primabalerina* [*prima ballerina*] (Orthography, 2015, p. 62, 114). This rule also lists the example: *fiksideja* [*fixed idea*]. As it could be noticed in the section C, the authors have made some significant change in the new edition, because, according to the previous edition of the Orthography, this example should have been written with a hyphen, as *fiks-ideja* [*fixed idea*] (Orthography, 1998, p. 52, 110 v). However, the authors do not explain the reason they have made this decision, thus this change evokes a dilemma about the difference between the rule for the orthography of the closed compound nouns (Orthography, 2015, p. 62, 114) and the rule for the orthography of the hyphenated compound nouns (Orthography, 2015, p. 62, 116 a). For instance, the components in the compound noun *koktel-bar* [*cocktail bar*] are written with a hyphen, and the components in the compound noun *oldtajmer* [*old-timer*] are written together, even though both of the compound nouns are transcribed from the English language. Additionally, if analyzed the closed compound noun *primabalerina* [*prima ballerina*] it could be notice that the first component complements the second component. This is the same information from the first sub-rule in the section A, i.e. the first part complements the second, and thus the difference between these two rules is not very clear.

In the second sub-rule, there are examples that show that the second part complements the first part. In this situation, as in the previous one, it is said that the first part cannot be grammatically modified. Only the second part is subject to modification. For ex.: *vagon-restoran* [*wagon restaurant*], *vagon-restoranot* [*the wagon restaurant*], *vagon-restorani* [*wagon restaurants*]. Again, the origin of the components is not explained. Some of the examples include *general-major* [*major general*], *zamenik-direktor* [*deputy director*], *zamenik-pretседател* [*deputy president*], *nacrt-zakon* [*draft law, (bill)*] (Orthography, 2015, p. 62, 116 b). The examples indicate that the words may be native or they may have foreign origin. The problem with some of the examples in this rule is that there is the possibility for the first part to be grammatically modified. In the written

practice, there are examples where the first part is modified: *generalot major* [*the general major*], (Reporter, 11.2.2016), *generalot polkovnik* [*the major colonel*] (Točka, 8.1.2016, Faktor 17.8.2016), *zamenikot director* [*the deputy director*] (Uv, 12.7.2016). It is evident that the examples from the written practice are not written with a hyphen, unlike the examples from the Orthography. Consequently, in order to have a deep insight in this issue, one must address one of the rules for the orthography of the open compound nouns that is closely connected to this problem. This is a new rule because it is not present in the Orthography from 1998. This rule says that in the compound nouns in which one component complements the other, and both have the possibility to be grammatically modified, the subject of modification is the first component. That is why the components are written separately and not with a hyphen. For ex.: *žena borec* [*female fighter*], *grad heroj* [*hero town*], *zemja kandidatka* [*candidate country*], *lekar specijalist* [*medical specialist*], *nastavnik mentor* [*mentor teacher*] (Orthography, 2015, p. 65, 66, 127). The difference between the rule for the orthography of the hyphenated compound nouns and the rule for the orthography of the open compound nouns is in the modification of the elements. However, as it could be noted from the written practice, there are examples from the rule for writing hyphenated compound nouns whose first component is subjected to modification, i.e. *zamenikot director* [*the deputy director*]. On the other hand, in the written practice there are also incorrect examples that refer to the rule for the orthography of the open compound nouns. The following examples are not correct because they are written with a hyphen. For ex.:

žena-borec [*female fighter*] (D, 11.10.2016; Uv, 8.9.2016, 21.10.2016, 21.11.2016); *ženata-borec* [*the female fighter*] (D, 7.3.2016, 17.10.2016); *žena-premier* [*female prime minister*] (D, 12.7.2016, 23.1.2017; Uv, 14.7.2016); *žena-pretседател* [*female president*] (D, 28.4.2016, 13.5.2016); *angel-čuvar* [*guardian angel*] (Uv, 25.10.2016); *avtomobil-bomba* [*car bomb*] (D, 6.10.2016, 4.11.2016, 10.1.2017; Uv, 9.10.2016, 4.11.2016, 10.1.2017); *avtomobilot-bomba* [*the car bomb*] (D, 3.7.2016; Uv, 6.7.2016); *bombaš-samoubiec* [*suicide bomber*] (D, 11.11.2016, 20.11.2016, 10.1.2017; Uv, 25.7.2016, 8.8.2016); *bombašot-samoubiec* [*the suicide bomber*] (D, 5.7.2016, 21.8.2016; Uv, 13.1.2016, 25.3.2016); *profesor-gostin* [*visiting professor*] (Uv, 6.4.2016); *grad-domakjin* [*host city*] (D, 10.5.2016; Uv, 4.5.2016, 16.8.2016), *gradot-domakjin* [*the host city*] (D, 13.3.2016; Uv, 4.8.2016); *zemja-členka* [*member country*] (D, 2.10.2016, 17.10.2016; Uv, 7.8.2016, 20.9.2016, 11.2.2017); *zemjata-členka* [*the member country*] (D, 14.7.2016; Uv, 5.2.2016), *lekar-specijalist* [*medical specialist*] (Uv, 7.4.2016); *lekarot-specijalist* [*the medical specialist*] (D, 25.9.2016, 20.11.2016.); *misla-vodilka* [*thought guide*] (Uv, 4.2.2016); *ptica-preselnica* [*migratory bird*] (Uv, 26.5.2016).

These differences in the written practice are a result of the ambiguity of the rules in the edition of the Orthography from 1998 because all of the examples were listed in

one rule with no further specifications. In addition, it could be concluded that the new edition of the Orthography (2015) does not solve the dilemma because it is not specifically indicated which category of words should be written in the defined manner. The situation is still doubtful because of the lack of precise indicators, which would make the distinction more evident.

B) The next rule in the new edition of the Orthography is precisely defined. It says that the compound orientalisms, whose components are not linked with a vowel, and are used to signify a single idea or item, should be written with a hyphen (Orthography, 2015, p. 64, 117). This is also a newly defined rule because the examples in the previous edition of the Orthography (1998, p. 52, 110 b) were only named as compound nouns with no further clarification of their character. Even though it is not easy for a native speaker to determine which terms should be considered as orientalisms, this is a significant improvement in contrast to the previous edition.

C) The character of the hyphenated compound nouns is also clearly defined in the next rule in the new edition of the Orthography. Namely, it is said that the compound nouns with two components (rarely more than two) that are exactly same or phonetically opposed should be written with a hyphen: *fifti-fifti* [*fifty-fifty*], *voki-toki* [*walkie-talkie*] (Orthography, 2015, p. 64, 118). This is also a new rule with clearly defined examples, which is not present in the previous edition of the Orthography (1998).

D) In the Orthography from 2015 in the section for hyphenated compound nouns, there is one more rule that is not present in the Orthography from 1998. The rule refers to the orthography of compound words written with a hyphen whose first component is a trademark. For ex.: *adidas-patiki* [*Adidas sneakers*], *bešamel-sos* [*Bechamel sauce*], *vord-dokument* [*Word document*], *kinder-jajce* [*Kinder egg*], *paloma-maramče* [*Paloma pocket tissues*] (Orthography, 2015, p. 64, 119). Regarding the word order, which is in fact taken directly from the English language, in this case, it could be said that the first component complements the second component. Consequently, if one takes into consideration the first sub-rule of the first rule in section A, (Orthography, 2015, p. 62, 116 a) in which the first component supplements the second one, then we could confirm that the use of the hyphen in this situation is justified. In addition, according to this, the grammatical modification should be done on the second component, and not on the first component. On the other hand, if one changes the order of the words, then the trademark should be written in double quotations: *patiki „Adidas“* [*sneakers “Adidas”*] because it is a name of a

brand (Orthography, 1998, p. 142, 389 a). Moreover, it is interesting to mention that, in the Macedonian language, there is a tendency to equate the word for the item with the name of the brand. For instance, the item “pocket tissues” is equated with the name of the company “Paloma”. When one goes to a store and asks for *paloma* the salesperson instantly knows that one is looking for pocket tissues. That does not mean that the tissues must be of the specified brand, but people tend to use the trademark as a synonym for the item “pocket tissues” regardless of the brand. Before the appearance of the new edition of the Orthography, the authors were writing these compound nouns differently, that is, with or without a hyphen: *bešamel sos* [*Bechamel sauce*] (Večer, 16.11.2014), *bešamel-sos* [*Bechamel sauce*] (Uv, 3.7.2013), *bešamel-sosot* [*the Bechamel sauce*] (Uv, 28.7.2014), *kinder jajce* [*Kinder egg*] (Uv, 7.1.2010; Večer, 18.5.2014); *kinder jajcata* [*the Kinder eggs*] (Uv, 1.3.2013). Since this is a new rule, which was not present in the previous edition of the Orthography, there are still incorrect examples in the written practice, i.e. without a hyphen. For ex.: *bešamel sos* [*Bechamel sauce*] (Uv, 15.11.2016); *Kinder jajca* [*Kinder eggs*] (NM, 6.1.2017). The correctly written examples, which are currently rare, for ex.: *bešamel-sos* [*Bechamel sauce*] (NM, 5.9.2016; Uv, 25.8.2016) are an indication of the necessity for more time so that this rule could become well established in the written practice.

E) The following rule is new because it is not present in the edition of the Orthography from 1998. Namely, in the new edition of the Orthography, it is clearly stated that when two closed compound nouns that have the same second component are written, the second component of the first closed compound noun should be omitted, and instead there should be a hyphen. The two parts should also be linked with the conjunction *and*, as *audio- i videooprema* for *audiooprema i videooprema* [*audio- and video equipment for audio and video equipment*], *bio- i bibliografija* for *biografija i bibliografija* [*bio- and bibliography for biography and bibliography*] (Orthography, 2015, p. 64, 121). Since this is a new rule, it evokes the dilemma of whether it could be applied in other situation by analogy. For this rule, it is said that it is applied to closed compound noun, but what if one wants to use two hyphenated compound nouns that have the same second component. Firstly, one has to address the two examples from the first rule with the two sub-rules in the section A (Orthography, 2015, p. 62, 116 a, b). Let us assume that one wants to use *pop-muzika* [*pop music*] and *džez-muzika* [*jazz music*] in a same statement. It is obvious that the second component is equal. Thus, the question is whether one should write: *pop-muzika* and *džez-muzika*, or it is allowed to write *pop-* and *džez-muzika*. Moreover, let us mention the rule in this section that refers to writing compound nouns with numerals. Some of the examples are the following: *18-godišnik*

(*osumnaesetgodišnik*) [an 18 year old], *100-godišnina* (*stogodišnina*) [a 100 years anniversary] (Orthography, 2015, p. 65, 126). As it could be seen from the examples, if the number is written with a numeral, then the linking should be done with a hyphen. Consequently, the question is the following: What happens if one wants to write two compound nouns with numerals in the same expression? Is it possible to use this rule as a guide, and instead of writing: *18-godišnik and 19-godišnik*, one could write: *18- and 19-godišnik*, or this is a construction that is wrong regarding its orthography?

F) In the Orthography from 2015 in the section for hyphenated compound nouns, there is one more rule that is not present in the Orthography from 1998. This rule is about complex compound nouns that are formed with more than two nouns, and whose first component is a compound noun that has a function of an attribute. Some of the examples include *koktel-šou emisija* [cocktail show program], *rols-rojs avtomobil* [Rolls-Royce car], *hip-hop zabava* [hip-hop party], *Bi-bi-si programa* [BBC program] (Orthography, 2015, p. 64, 122). This rule only confirms the above stated conclusion for the examples with the trademark, i.e. that the first part complements the second part and it functions as an attribute. For instance, the first part of the complex compound noun *rols-rojs avtomobil* [Rolls-Royce car] is the name of the brand, and as such, it provides specific information about the type of the car. This rule also provides a step forward in the orthography of these nouns.

G) The last two rules that are subject of analysis in this paper are also new and are not present in the Orthography from 1998. One of the rules is about complex compound nouns whose first element is an abbreviation: *AДCЛ-мoдeм/ADSL-мoдeм* [ADSL-modem/ADSL-modem], *HATO-мyцyja/NATO-мyцyja* [NATO-misija/NATO mission], *HBA-лигa/NBA-лигa* [NBA-liga/NBA league] (Orthography, 2015, p. 65, 125). The first part of these examples is written with Cyrillic but also with Latin letters because both versions are allowed in the written practice. The other rule is for hyphenated orthography of “certain abbreviations that are written according to the manner in which the letters are pronounced with the Latin alphabet (mostly from the English language): *Be-em-ve* [BMW], *En-be-a* [NBA], *Bi-bi-si* [BBC]” (Orthography, 2015, p. 65, 125). If taken into consideration that these rules are not present in the edition of the Orthography from 1998, it could be confirmed that they provide valuable information for solving the dilemmas in regard of the orthography of this type of compound nouns.

However, these rules also evoke new dilemmas. Firstly, the section in the Orthography that refers to writing abbreviations has to be addressed. In the edition of 1998, it is stated that the abbreviations from foreign languages should stay the same but

they only need to be written with Cyrillic letters: УНЕСКО (UNESCO), ФИФА (FIFA), УНИЦЕФ (UNICEF). This means that the original name is not translated into Macedonian, but the original abbreviation is used and it is only written with Cyrillic letters (Orthography, 1998, p. 71, 140 v). Furthermore, in the new edition of the Orthography the explanation about the abbreviations is enriched with new information. The abbreviations from foreign language are divided into two categories. In the first category are the already mentioned abbreviations that are only written with Cyrillic letters and are pronounced with the Latin alphabet: НБА (ен-бе-а – National Basketball Association) [NBA (en-be-a)]; СМС (ес-ем-ес – Short Message Service) [SMS (es-em-es)]. In the second category, it is specifically stated that the abbreviations are from the English language. Namely, it is implied that “these abbreviations, which are names and not common nouns, are not read according to the pronunciation of the letters with the Latin alphabet, but they are read according to the pronunciation of the letters with the English alphabet”. Consequently, they should be written as they are pronounced with the English alphabet, so that everyone could read them, even though they may not know the English language: ЕМ-ТИ-ВИ (Music Television) [Em-ti-vi], Би-Би-Си (British Broadcasting Corporation) [Bi-bi-si], Си-ен-ен (Cable News Network) [Si-en-en]” (Orthography, 2015, p. 150, 337). The problem here is that the difference between these two categories is not clearly defined. As it could be seen, the examples in the first category are also from the English language. For instance, it is not clear why НБА (ен-бе-а – National Basketball Association) [NBA (en-be-a)] should be written according to its pronunciation with the Latin alphabet and ЕМ-ТИ-ВИ (Music Television) [Em-ti-vi] should be written according to its pronunciation with the English alphabet, that is, why they should be differently written when they are both from the English language. The contradiction in the second rule of the section G could be found in the statement in contrast to the examples. In the statement it is said that this rule refer to “certain abbreviations that are written according to the manner in which the letters are pronounced with the **Latin alphabet** (mostly from the English language): *Be-em-ve* [BMW], *En-be-a* [NBA], *Bi-bi-si* [BBC]” (Orthography, 2015, p. 65, 125). The problem here is that the example *Bi-bi-si* [BBC] belongs to the category of abbreviations that are written as they are pronounced with the English alphabet, and not the Latin alphabet. Additionally, in the parentheses it is stated “mostly from the English language”, which indicates that this rule mostly refers to the second category of abbreviations, i.e. the ones that are written according to the pronunciation with the English alphabet, and not the Latin alphabet. Consequently, for the examples in this rule it could also be said that they belong not only to those examples that are written according to the pronunciation with the Latin alphabet, but also with the English alphabet.

Moreover, one complex compound noun is listed in both of the rules for writing hyphenated nouns in different form. In the rule about complex compound nouns whose first element is an abbreviation, there is the example: *НБА-лига/NBA-лига* [*NBA-liga; NBA league*] (Orthography, 2015, p. 65, 125). In addition, the other rule is for hyphenated orthography of “certain abbreviations that are written according to the manner in which the letters are pronounced with the Latin alphabet (mostly from the English language)”, there is the same example only in different form: *En-be-a* [*NBA*], (Orthography, 2015, p. 65, 125). This indicates that there are two possibilities for writing this example. In the second variant, if the first part is used as an attribute, than the complex compound noun should be written according to the orthography of the complex compound nouns that are formed with more than two nouns, and whose first component is a compound noun that has a function of an attribute (Orthography, 2015, p. 64, 122). If the example *Bi-bi-si programa* [*BBC program*] is written in this manner, than *En-be-a liga* [*NBA league*] should also be written in the same manner.

Finally, it is interesting to mention the name of the Irish rock group “U2”. As it could be noticed, the name is not an abbreviation, but a combination of an English letter and a numeral. In the Macedonian language, it is rarely written in its original form. Most often, the authors write it with Cyrillic letters according to the pronunciation of the letter and the numeral in the English language. The problem with this example is that, when authors write the Cyrillic version, some of them write it with a hyphen. For ex.: *Jy-Ty* [*Ju-Tu; U2*] (Uv, 18.7.2016; Vest, 2014: 26, 25.11.2015), *Jy-ty* [*Ju-tu; U2*] (D, 8.1.2016; Uv, 27.1.2016), and others do not use a hyphen and they write them separately: *Jy Ty* [*Ju Tu; U2*] (D, 2.4.2016; Uv, 27.12.2016; Vest, 27.12.2016, Večer, 27.12.2016); *Jy ty* [*Ju tu; U2*] (Uv, 4.10.2015, Wikipedia). In addition, it is not clear whether the second part should be written with a capital letter. If taken into consideration the rule for writing abbreviation from the English language that are written according to their pronunciation with the English alphabet, then it could be said that the most correct form would be the one written with a hyphen, on which the second part is written with a small letter: *Jy-ty* [*Ju-tu; U2*]. However, if taken in consideration that it is a personal noun, then the second part, though a numeral should be written with a capital letter.

5. Conclusion

The quality of thinking closely relates to the degree of language development because there is not a possibility for expression of a clear thought without the language. Thus, the consistent implementation of the rules that are established with the standardization of the language in the process of writing could be regarded as a guarantee for

expressing a stable statement. That is why it is extremely important for the users of the Macedonian language to have clearly defined explanations for the rules so that there are not any dilemmas while using the language in the written form.

The analysis of the section that refers to the writing of hyphenated compound nouns, demonstrates that there is a great difference between the two editions of the Orthography. The results lead to the conclusion that the information in the previous edition of the Orthography (1998) is rather scarce and ambiguous. In other words, the rules lack a great deal of preciseness because there should be detailed information about the components that are part of this kind of compound nouns and the manner of their formation. The evidence of their ambiguity is seen in the differences among the examples in the written practice. Consequently, it could be concluded that the lack of preciseness of the orthographic rules for writing hyphenated compound nouns in the edition of the Orthography from 1998 leads to incorrect examples in the writing practice. On the other hand, the comparison with the Orthography from 2015 allows the conclusion that the need for new examples and rules was justified. This new edition comprises rules that give answers to certain dilemmas that could not have been solved with the previous edition. Additionally, it also has many new examples that are in accordance with the lifestyle of the modern man. However, the analysis of the rules in the newest edition also demonstrates that some of the explanations evoke new dilemmas. It is a fact that the language is constantly modifying as a response to the needs of its users. Consequently, large part of the problems that were present in the edition from 1998 is solved with the new edition of the Orthography (2015), and that is an indisputable evidence of the effort to make the ambiguous rules less confusing. The most important thing here is to indicate that the linguists should not wait another twenty years to solve the problems, but we strongly encourage that process to be shorter so that the users could have the needed information on time. That way there would not be so many differences in the written practice.

Bibliography

1. Bojkovska, S., Pandev, D., Minova-Gjurkova, L., Cvetkovski, Ž. (2001). *Makedonski jazik za srednoto obrazovanie* [Macedonian language textbook for secondary education]. Skopje: Prosvetno delo.
2. Cvetkovski, V. (1973). *Za preveduvanje na angliskite složenki na makedonski* [For the translation of the English compounds in the Macedonian language]. *MJ*

- XXIV, pp. 185–194. In Makarijoska, L. (2009). Bibliography, no 531, Skopje. Retrieved on 29.10.2015 from <http://bit.ly/2sf5lKL>.
3. Group of authors. (2015). *Pravopis na makedonskiot jazik* [The Orthography of the Macedonian language]. Skopje: Institute for Macedonian language “K. Misirkov”.
 4. Januševa, V., Jurukovska, J. (2017). The orthography of the compound nouns in the Macedonian language – implications in teaching orthography. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, v. 2, i. 1, pp. 1–21. doi: [10.5281/zenodo.229753](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.229753)
 5. Jurukovska, J. (2016). *Crtata i crtičkata vo pišanata praktika na makedonskiot standarden jazik* [The dash and the hyphen in the written practice of the Macedonian standard language]. Bitola: Faculty of Education (unpublished master thesis).
 6. Lainović-Stojanović, N., Karanfilovski, M. (1996). Složenite imenki vo oblata na elektronikata i elektrotehnikata (rusko-srpsko-makedonski paraleli) [Compound nouns in the area of the electronics and electrotechnics (Russian-Serbo-Macedonian parallels)]. *ND XXIII*, pp. 41–51. In Bibliography 1987–2006, no. 258. Retrieved on 29.10.2015 from <http://bit.ly/2tlwb42>.
 7. Simoska, S. (2010). *Kontrastivni proučuvanja: Složeni imenki vo germanskiot i vo makedonskiot jazik* [Contrastive studies: Compound nouns in the German and the Macedonian language]. Skopje: Filološki fakultet “B. Koneski”. Retrieved on 15.12.2016 from <http://bit.ly/2mhJ7Av>
 8. Vidoeski, B., Dimitrovski, T., Koneski, K., Ugrinova-Skalovska, R. (1998). *Pravopis na makedonskiot literaturnen jazik* [Orthography of the modern Macedonian language]. Skopje: Prosvetno delo.

Excerpts

29.10.2016

D., Dnevnik: 7.3.2016 <http://bit.ly/2gxR7uf>; 13.3.2016 <http://bit.ly/2g9lDxE>; 28.4.2016 <http://bit.ly/2lJyoC9>; 13.5.2016 <http://bit.ly/2gAZwhM>; 3.7.2016 <http://bit.ly/2g9hx8M>; 5.7.2016 <http://bit.ly/2fHl11u>; 12.7.2016 <http://bit.ly/2fr70GV>; 14.7.2016 <http://bit.ly/2g9pued>; 21.8.2016 <http://bit.ly/2gmImEe>; 25.9.2016 <http://bit.ly/2fDrvLO>; 2.10.2016 <http://bit.ly/2mjTfZr>; 6.10.2016 <http://bit.ly/2fHl11y>; 11.10.2016 <http://bit.ly/2k9kvo>; 17.10.2016. <http://bit.ly/2gxOO1Y>; 17.10.2016 <http://bit.ly/2m5FbXr>; 4.11.2016 <http://bit.ly/2gNMAYR>; 11.11.2016 <http://bit.ly/2gAWdXT>; 20.11.2016 <http://bit.ly/2lE1TVI>; 20.11.2016 <http://bit.ly/2l5ATLA>; 1.1.2017 <http://bit.ly/2lsKrB7>; 10.1.2017 <http://bit.ly/2lkIJnj>; 23.1.2017 <http://bit.ly/2mjoBzw>

UV., Utrinski vesnik: 13.1.2016 <http://bit.ly/2l5Gphl>; 5.2.2016 <http://bit.ly/2l5BcG4>;
25.3.2016 <http://bit.ly/2lirzq5>; 25.3.2016 <http://bit.ly/2ftyc7G>; 6.4.2016
<http://bit.ly/2gCyjeC>; 7.4.2016 <http://bit.ly/2g9ojLC>; 6.7.2016 <http://bit.ly/2gyV6uj>;
14.7.2016 <http://bit.ly/2kJzcHt>; 25.7.2016 <http://bit.ly/2fj94sc>; 4.8.2016
<http://bit.ly/2gAXuhL>; 7.8.2016 <http://bit.ly/2lkXA0K>; 8.8.2016 <http://bit.ly/2kHwfY9>;
8.9.2016 <http://bit.ly/2gAQotE>; 20.9.2016 <http://bit.ly/2m9UIHV>; 9.10.2016
<http://bit.ly/2gbprhT>; 21.10.2016 <http://bit.ly/2fVxHiR>; 25.10.2016
<http://bit.ly/2gNN4OA>; 4.11.2016 <http://bit.ly/2fHqcP4>; 21.11.2016 <http://bit.ly/2gNNIvu>;
10.1.2017 <http://bit.ly/2l5o1oz>; 11.2.2017 <http://bit.ly/2m5Xgov>

30.10.2016

Faktor: 17.8.2016

Reporter: 11.2.2016

Točka: 8.1.2016

Uv., Utrinski vesnik: Jovanovska, S. 6.4.2016 <http://bit.ly/2livi67>; Todorovska, V.
4.2.2016 <http://bit.ly/2livZgL>; Zdravkovska, Ž. 26.5.2016 <http://bit.ly/2kUHQ15>

15.2.2017

NM. Nova Makedonija, 20.9.2016 <http://bit.ly/2mhXnt6>; 5.9.2016 <http://bit.ly/2kUCFyf>;
6.1.2017 <http://bit.ly/2lqPrXf>

Uv. Utrinski vesnik, 7.1.2010 <http://bit.ly/2lHynyC>; 1.3.2013 <http://bit.ly/2kHwZfD>;
3.7.2013 <http://bit.ly/2lC7uMb>; 28.7.2014 <http://bit.ly/2l3eYey>; 26.1.2015
<http://bit.ly/2m8rfj9>; 4.10.2015 <http://bit.ly/2mhJlpy>; 8.1.2016 <http://bit.ly/2m4hlLP>;
27.1.2016 <http://bit.ly/2lr67Oe>; 2.4.2016 <http://bit.ly/2kV0QNa>; 18.7.2016
<http://bit.ly/2m8fFxt>; 25.8.2016 <http://bit.ly/2m3Ytwn>; 15.11.2016 <http://bit.ly/2m3Wp7r>;
27.12.2016 <http://bit.ly/2m7Y9JU>

Vest, printed edition: Vest, 11.11.2014, no. 4319, year XV; electronic editions: 8.7.2011
<http://bit.ly/2l48bdW>; 25.11.2015 <http://bit.ly/2m8i3EE>; 27.12.2016 <http://bit.ly/2kVbfZ6>

Večer: 18.5.2014. <http://vecer.mk/makedonija/demos>; 25.7.2016 <http://bit.ly/2m7ZyQL>;
21.9.2014 <http://bit.ly/2lIjADL>; 16.11.2014 <http://bit.ly/2mi07Xh>; 27.12.2016
<http://bit.ly/2kHLKzi>

Wikipedia <https://mk.wikipedia.org/wiki/U2>

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).