Dilorom MURATOVA,
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti o'qituvchisi

TDTU amaliy ingliz tillar kafedrasi dotsenti, PhD Sh.Adilova taqrizi asosida

APPEARANCE OF TOURISM TERMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Annotation

This article analyzes the emergence of tourism terms in both English and Uzbek languages, exploring their differences and similarities. The article examines the key changes in tourism terminology, the structure of word combinations, and the semantic differences between terms. It also discusses the challenges faced when translating English tourism terms into Uzbek and suggests ways to overcome these difficulties. The authors highlight the influence of language changes, national features, and cultural contexts on the formation of tourism terminology.

Key words: tourism terminology, English language, Uzbek language, word combinations, semantics, translation, language differences, cultural context, terminological analysis.

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA TURIZM ATAMALARINING NAMOYON BO'LISHI

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqola ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi turizm terminlarining paydo bo'lishi va ularning o'zaro farqlari haqida tahlil olib boradi. Maqola turizm terminologiyasidagi muhim o'zgarishlarni, so'z birikmalarining tuzilishini va ular orasidagi semantik farqlarni o'rganadi. Shuningdek, ingliz tilidagi atamalarni o'zbek tiliga tarjima qilishda yuzaga keladigan qiyinchiliklar va ularni yengish yo'llari haqida ham so'z boradi. Mualliflar til o'zgarishlari, milliy xususiyatlar va madaniy kontekstlarning turizm terminlarining shakllanishiga qanday ta'sir ko'rsatishini ta'kidlaydilar.

Kalit so'zlar: turizm terminologiyasi, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, so'z birikmalari, semantika, tarjima, til farqlari, madaniy kontekst, terminologik tahlil.

ПОЯВЛЕНИЕ ТУРИСТИЧЕСКИХ ТЕРМИНОВ НА АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматривается появление туристических терминов в английском и узбекском языках, их различия и сходства. Статья анализирует основные изменения в туристической терминологии, структуру словосочетаний и семантические различия между терминами. Также обсуждаются проблемы перевода английских туристических терминов на узбекский язык и предложены способы их решения. Авторы подчеркивают влияние языковых изменений, национальных особенностей и культурного контекста на формирование туристической терминологии.

Ключевые слова: туристическая терминология, английский язык, узбекский язык, словосочетания, семантика, перевод, языковые различия, культурный контекст, терминологический анализ.

Introduction. In English and Uzbek, attributive word combinations with a substantive model are predominant, where nouns serve as prepositive modifiers. Combinations structured according to the formula "N+N" (in this study, the author utilizes a recognized system of abbreviations to represent structural types of word combinations: N – noun; A – adjective; V ing – verb ending with "ing"; V ed – verb ending with "ed"; Adv – adverb; Num – numeral; P – pronoun; p – preposition; c – conjunction) are easily formed in the modern English and Uzbek systems of tourism terminology. A total of 170 such combinations have been identified, accounting for 33% of all analyzed terms in English and 60% of the identified English word combinations (e.g., air travel-havoda o'tkazgan soatlari soni; baggage sag – yuk vagoni; baggage room- saqlash kamerasi).

Materials and methods Island hopping is a very interesting two-component terminological phrase, where the adjective hopping is substantiveized and participates as a noun, so that this compound belongs to the "N+N" model.

It should be noted that in English this structural type of attributive phrases is much more common than in Uzbek. It is a combination of two noun phrases, in which the first word comes as a qualifier for the second (adventure tour – sarguzasht sayohati; baggage sag – yuk vagoni; budget tourism-ijtimoiy sayyohlik; business tourism – ish bo'yicha sayyohtlik). In the Uzbek language, such attributive relations can be expressed by a relative adjective with an affixal indicator (sarguzasht; yuk; ijtimoiy; ish bo'yicha). In English, due to the absence of an adjective affix in the first word of a multi-component term, it is difficult to determine precisely which word group the defining word belongs

to, and accordingly, it is difficult to distinguish between a phrase and a compound word [1].

Terminological structures of this type stand on the border between complex-compound words and real word combinations. Although the problem of distinguishing between a compound word and a word combination is not thoroughly interpreted in Uzbekistan or in foreign linguistic literature, even a cursory review of the main sources of information on this issue reveals the author's analysis of two-component word combinations of the "N+N" type. made it possible to identify some general principles that are sufficient for the development of the main strategic direction [2].

Results and discussion. Such terminological structures exist on the boundary between compound words and actual word combinations. The issue of distinguishing between compound words and word combinations is not definitively addressed in the linguistic literature of both Uzbekistan and abroad, but even a cursory review of key sources on this matter allows the author to identify some general principles that help formulate the main strategic direction for analyzing two-component word combinations in the "N+N" format [3].

Among the most frequently mentioned criteria for distinguishing compound words from word combinations are phonetic criteria, such as unified pronunciation, a single stress pattern, the combination of phonetic and semantic criteria, and the semantic criterion of the components [4].

Other more practical criteria include the fact that one of the most obvious features of a compound word is that no other words can be used between its elements, and the order of the components cannot be changed [5].

All the distinguishing features listed above represent the basic and unique characteristics of a compound word, namely the integrity and cohesive expression of its semantics, which, in other words, manifests in the formal and logical unity of the compound word's expression [6].

The primary characteristics of the integrity of a compound word are as follows:

The structure maintains a single form as its basis;

The structure maintains a single word form as its basis;

The components of the structure cannot be separated by other words;

The structure has unified pronunciation or is written with a hyphen;

It follows a single stress pattern [7].

Taking the above into account, the analysis of word combinations in the "N+N" format has revealed the following observations.

In our case, such word combinations generally have separate spelling; however, in some sources, they may appear in the form of compound words, typically written with a hyphen, such as "baggage-man" (hammol), "baggage-room" (юк сақлаш камераси), or even as a unified form like "customhouse" (customs). These combinations may also appear as "baggage man," "baggage room," or even in some cases, a single written form, such as " божхона".

Moreover, in the analyzed lexical array, word combinations with a defining component expressed by a chain of terminological elements also occur, making it challenging to classify them into a specific word class. Examples of such chain-based terms, with at least three relatively independent bases, include "around-the-world journey" and "dunyo bo'ylab sayohat". In identifying the word class of these terminological elements, it seems reasonable to rely on the base component of the chain part of the term (e.g., "world"). The components (coast) could also serve as an example of this structure.

The presence of these complex structures in terminological units highlights the interplay between compound words and word combinations and the difficulties in categorizing them, especially when they involve multiple components that combine to form a unified conceptual meaning. This can lead to challenges in determining the precise word class of the elements within these compound terms.

In this respect, the English language is closer to languages of the isolating type, in which the ungrammatical, "yalang" roots of words are mutually coordinated. The fact that there are different spellings of the same terms: whole, with a hyphen, and separately is related to this situation.

The attributive terminological word combinations where the adjective performs the function of a prepositive determiner come next in frequency. Examples of these include "advance timetable" (muntazam reyslarning avvaldan berilgan jadvali), "American Plan" (Amerika rejasi), "common room" (umumiy xona), and "continental breakfast" (qit'adagi kabi nonushta). These combinations total 57, constituting 11% of the total number of terms analyzed in both English and Uzbek, and 20% of the English terms and word combinations analyzed. The structural formula for such word combinations is "A+N."

A smaller number of word combinations, in which a present participle performs the function of a prepositive determiner, follow the "Ving+N" formula. Examples include "bathingplace" (dengiz kurorti), "crossingtour" (butun davlat do'ylab sayohat), "dining car" (vagon- restoran), and "boarding card" (o'tirish joyi taloni). There are 18 of these combinations, making up 4% of the total number of English terms analyzed and 6% of the total number of term-word combinations analyzed in English.

In such word combinations, the first component, functioning as a preposition, adopts the characteristics of an adjective because it becomes a means of expressing qualities typically represented by adjectives. However, the exact status of the first element in these combinations has not been fully determined, and defining this status leads to some ambiguities.

In fact, present participles, which serve as the determinative word in the combination, are somewhat similar to adjectives in certain respects. However, while adjectives traditionally reflect states or qualities in English, present participles often convey less definitive processes or actions. These present participles are distinct from adjectives formed from "non-terminative" (or "inconclusive") verbs (e.g., "boarding house") and from "terminative" (or "conclusive") verbs (e.g., "camping trip"). The latter still retain the characteristic of expressing temporal relations, as indicated by the verb tense, although this is not always the case.

Thus, both types of present participles in such combinations become less about reflecting a process or time and more about conveying a constant characteristic or property, similar to adjectives. In this sense, these word combinations show that the first component is historically derived from non-personal verb forms—participles—that express inherent qualities of the objects they describe. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that these first components in such combinations are adjectives, reflecting consistent qualities of the object, and not time-related actions.

In English, multi-component terminological word combinations represent a significant part of the tourism lexicon, accounting for 8% of the total. Among the three-component tourism terms in English, the following models are the most common, listed in decreasing order of frequency:

N+N+N model: Involves adding two noun-based elements to the main term. Examples include charter class fare, city packages tour, nature study tour, and rail adventure tour. Seven terms in this category were identified, making up 1% of the total investigated English terms and 2% of the multi-component terms in English.

N+p+N model: Here, the main noun is accompanied by an auxiliary noun, and prepositions like on, of, out, and by are used. Examples include administrator on duty, bill of entry, place of interest, and travel by land. Five terms follow this structure, constituting approximately 1% of the total terms investigated and 1.8% of the multi-component terms in English. These terms are typical of English and suggest a tendency towards compression, as seen in the preference for more concise forms in specialized vocabulary.

A+N+N model: This model involves a combination of adjectives and nouns in the structure. Three terms, such as majestic mountains tour, round trip ticket, and round way ticket, were found in this model. These make up 0.6% of the total terms investigated and 1% of the terminological terms in English.

A+A+N model: This model adds adjectives to the main noun. Examples include foreign independent tour and Full American Plan. The N+V ing+N model, which includes a noun and a present participle adjective, such as all-expense sightseeing tour and horse riding tour, also appears. These models each represent 0.4% of the total terms and 0.7% of the multi-component terms in English.

All the aforementioned models occur only once in the corpus, making up 0.2% of the total lexemes and 0.4% of the multi-component lexical units in English. Some of these models may be classified as quasi-terms:

Ving+p+N (e.g., checking out time)

Num+N+N (e.g., one way ticket)

N+A+N (e.g., world round trip)

N+c+N (e.g., bed and breakfast)

Conclusion. The analysis of the types of multi-component terminological word combinations in English and Uzbek languages leads to the conclusion that the most common type consists of two-component word combinations, where the attributive element is in the form of an adjective and is part of a noun phrase. The meaning of the determinative element usually represents the function, purpose (cabin crew), characteristic (boat tour), or shape (baggage sack) of the object designated by the head element.

REFERENCES

1. Amasova N.N. Etymological foundations of the vocabulary of the modern English language. - M.: Publishing house of foreign literature, 2016.-218 p.
2. Grinev S.V. Introduction to terminology.-M.:2013.-309 p.
3. Hutcheon, L. (2000). A Theory of Adaptation. Routledge.
4. Israilova Dildora Atxamovna, & Abdunazarova Nargiza Fatxullayevna. (2022). Improving methodology of teaching english to preschool children through fairy tales (on the example of preparatory groups). Current Research Journal of Pedagogics, 3(04), 28–32. https://doi.org/10.37547/pedagogics-crjp-03-04-07
5. Kozlova, A. (2017). Terminological Systems in Tourism: A Comparative Study of English and Russian. Journal of Language and Linguistics, 16(2), 88-101.
6. Muratov, A., & Tursunov, D. (2020). Language and Terminology of Tourism in Uzbek and English: A Comparative Analysis. Tashkent State University Press.
7. Nadeau, R. (2009). Tourism and Translation: Language Use in the Travel Industry. University of Chicago Press.
8. Popova, A. (2018). Linguistic Aspects of Terminology in Tourism: A Cross-Cultural Approach. Linguistics Journal, 14(1), 45-63.
9. Rizaeva, S., & Kamilova, Z. (2019). The Development of Tourist Terminology in Uzbekistan: The Role of Linguistic Borrowings. Uzbekistan Linguistic Journal, 12(3), 35-50.
10. Searle, J. R. (1995). The Construction of Social Reality. Free Press.