



Specifics of the terminology of architectural and construction discourse

Saloydinova Nargiza Shukhratovna

Candidate of Sciences, Associate Professor

“ Foreign Languages ” Faculty

Architecture and Construction of Tashkent University

Abstract. This article architecture and construction in the field of related terms in the process of creating syntactic and morphological methods about illuminated English in the language in the field of related terminological units Uzbek language with comparison through was studied, in which each one terminological unity as from participants content found and which method through to be made accuracy included.

Key words: syntactic and morphological, extralinguistic and intralinguistic, intralinguistic, lexical units.

INTRODUCTION:

As in all languages of the world, in the two languages under study there are extralinguistic and intralinguistic factors, and these factors play their role in the development of the language. They in one way or another contribute to the further expansion of the sphere of expression of existing or new concepts in the language and the stabilization of terms in the terminological system of architecture and construction. The vocabulary of any language is enriched with simple and complex words, this is their intralinguistic process. In this process, two or more words with independent meanings can be grammatically combined to form a new unit or absolute term. Language performs its social function by using a syntactic tool — a sentence. At the language level, linguistic phenomena that form lexical units, in particular phonetic, lexical and morphological phenomena, serve precisely to form syntactic structures. Thus, in any syntactic phenomenon we can observe verbal and



morphological indicators. Therefore, when determining syntactic features, lexical and morphological factors of lexemes are taken into account. It is known from linguistic sources that a detailed description of any area cannot be expressed exclusively by using root and complex, artificial lexemes. Accordingly, a person also resorts to phrases in his communication. However, phrases also occur in different forms, and another aspect is that these languages allow a grammatical connection of two or more words with independent meanings to form new terms. This process leads to the stabilization of newly formed lexical units.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

When studying terminological units related to this area in the English language, by comparing them with the Uzbek language, it is advisable to find out what elements each terminological unit consists of and how it was formed. Therefore, we divided the methods of forming lexical units in the English language, recognized by such scientists as Newmark and J. Yull, into the following types and compared them with the Uzbek language. Some scientists in their works focused on syntactically related types of conjunctions. According to our analysis, since the architectural and construction industry is one of the global industries, we found that there are connections within the types.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The method that has a unique effect on syntactic connections in English and Uzbek is the method of assimilation. Although at first glance this method suggests a morphological feature in word formation, the presence of a syntactic feature in it becomes obvious only as a result of analysis. *Borrowings* in English are one of the active ways to expand and enrich vocabulary. Lexical units do not know the barriers and boundaries created by mankind. They seek a favorable environment for their formation. Their adaptation to the environment is due to syntactic features. We can observe this process using the example of *borrowings*. In most Uzbek literary sources, we find that this term is directly related to the term " *borrowed words*." B.



Bryson notes that many lexical units in English arose precisely through assimilation¹. We can consider the terms of this area in English using the following examples.

1 - table

Terms formed by the method of assimilation

<i>Languages</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>and sliati</i>	<i>meaning (uzbek)</i>
<i>Latin language :</i>	<i>cell;evacuate</i>	<i>cell;evacuated</i>	small room; move
<i>Norwegian language :</i>	<i>test ;sand</i>	<i>Moscow ; sand</i>	clean;sand
<i>Arabic language :</i>	<i>Amber</i>	<i>warehouse</i>	amber
<i>French:</i>	<i>screen; panel; brush ; palette ;</i>	<i>screen;panel ; brush ; palette ;</i>	wood, board; wooden bed;
<i>Dutch language :</i>	<i>peg; masterpiece</i>	<i>pegge; masterpiece</i>	wedge; masterpiece
<i>Italian language :</i>	<i>tube; base; garland</i>	<i>pipe;blockage; garland</i>	tube ; frame
<i>Danish language :</i>	<i>Stone</i>	<i>Steen</i>	stone
<i>German language :</i>	<i>Stamp</i>	<i>stamp</i>	stamp, seal

The vocabulary of the assimilation layer of the Uzbek language includes lexical units from Arabic, Persian, Russian, English, French and other languages related to this area. While words borrowed from European languages have mainly penetrated through intermediary languages, words borrowed from Asian languages are a product of diplomatic relations. Therefore, expanding the vocabulary is also considered one of the active methods of studying this language.

¹ Bryson B. Made in America . – William Morrow, 1994. – P. 27.



Table 2

Examples of familiar terms

<i>Languages</i>	<i>term</i>	<i>and sliati</i>	<i>meaning (uzbek)</i>
Latin	<i>gable;</i> <i>reinforcement;</i> <i>date</i>	<i>frontalis muscle;</i> <i>reinforcement;</i> <i>cone</i>	roof; steel iron; pointed geometric shape
French	<i>cement;</i> <i>filter ;</i> <i>tunnel</i>	<i>cementer;</i> <i>filter;</i> <i>tunnel</i>	hardener; cleaning agent; underground passage
English language	<i>block ; track</i>	<i>block;track</i>	concrete brick; sidewalk
Italian	<i>cardboard</i>	<i>cardboard</i>	waste paper
Arabic	<i>artist;</i> <i>fortification;</i> <i>tower</i>	mhour Control Minaret	artist; military fortress; lighthouse
Persian	<i>Street;</i> <i>Ganch;</i> <i>May be</i>	Street Plaster Mice	street, avenue; albast, chalk; lever
Dutch	<i>trap</i>	<i>trap</i>	ladder

Based on scientific sources, it can be noted that the emergence of borrowed terms in a language can be explained by the following factors: 1) as a result of people entering into multilingual communication; 2) as a result of the dominance of one language over another; 3) as a result of the need for the process of globalization and integration; 4) as a result of the general use of units that have a wide influence in other languages; 5) as a result of the use of a word from another language that is convenient for communication. The results of our analysis showed that in the English language, in the layer of acquisition of the language of architecture and construction, the most terms are borrowed from French and Latin. They are called syntactically basic terms, and their syntactic properties are manifested depending on their



combination in the structure of the sentence. It should also be noted that in the scientific works created by researchers, more attention is paid to the syntactic and paradigmatic connections of a particular area. However, it is not indicated what linguistic features borrowings have in these contexts.

CONCLUSION

In addition to logical and formal factors, texts are also an important tool in the process of analyzing the lexical and semantic properties of architectural and construction terms. This is explained by the syntactic and paradigmatic relationships between terms in a sentence. If their categorical classification is reflected in their morphological properties, then their semantic meaning is revealed precisely in the context. This linguistic phenomenon of the formation of lexical units includes two processes. First, a new word with one meaning arises from the basic root. In the compared languages there is also a semantic method that arises through the transfer of meaning at the level of the terminological system of the architectural and construction sphere, which forms not only lexical units, but also terms. These linguistic units in some languages are characterized as formal and informal linguistic units, and in others - as formal and informal speech units.

REFERENCES

1. Gulomov A., Askarova M. Modern Uzbek literary language. – Tashkent: Teacher, 1987. – 256 p.
2. Donyorov R. Uzbek language technical terminology some questions. -T.: 1977.- 262 p.
3. Khayutin A.D. Term terminology and nomenclature. - Samarkand: 1971. -214 p.
4. Brinton L.J., Brinton D.M. The Linguistic Structure of Modern English. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2010. p. 110.
5. Shukhratovna, S.N. (2022). Terminology in linguistics: approach, analysis and research. Vital Annex: International Journal of New Research in Advanced Sciences, 1(5), 375-377.