Semantic and Functional Features of Lexical Units in the Field of Architecture and Construction in English and Uzbek

Mukhayyo Muydinjanovna Kambarova
Tashkent Institute of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract---This article is dedicated to the study of one of the historically and more slowly folded boards of modern lexicon and terminology of architecture, which plays a special role in the life of society, both ancient and modern. The architectural term system is also investigated, namely: the processes of deformation, transformation, and the specifics of functioning in the language of poetic texts, i.e. outside the scope of the scientific context. The architectural lexicon is an independent segment in the naive scientific picture of people, speakers of the language, and therefore it is of interest to both linguists and non-specialists in the philological sphere.

Keywords---architectural lexicon, independent segment, lexical-semantic, morphological, poetic, prosaic, semantic relations, suffixation, syntactic.

Introduction

In this research, the term architectural lexis is understood as linguistic units that nominate the concept of architecture and function as in the scientific sphere, so in the artistic (poetic, prosaic) text, where it becomes a part of the general literary language. That is why the units of architectural lexis become a means of expressiveness and the meaning of the text.

Until now, there are no definitively established principles and methods for differentiating the named semantic groups, and F.F. Filin, expressed by him back in 1957, and then in 1982, that the existing studies remain "unclear the boundaries between the thematic classification of the vocabulary and lexico-semantic groups of words". Summarizing the results of available research on this issue, we will try to establish some of the main distinguishing features of lexical-semantic and lexical-thematic groups. In this case, the basis for generalization in the work is the research of N.I. Tolstoy, F.F. Filina, D.N. Shmeleva, M.V. Nikitina,

Yu.N. Karaulova, N.S. Novikova, A.M. Kuznetsova, and others, devoted to general issues of semantic analysis of vocabulary and especially to the specific study of thematic and lexico-semantic groups in various languages.

The analysis of hierarchical semantic relations in a separately taken lexical-semantic group of construction terminology makes it possible not only to reveal systemic relations in the vocabulary of each individual language, but also systemic relations of identity and differences in lexical-semantic phenomena in compared languages, which is important for comparative-typological studies. Terms are characterized by special relationships in the structure of terminology, defining them as units of a set of terms in terminology that has a special systemic organization due to the specifics of the reflection of hierarchical relations between the concepts of a certain branch of science and technology. The set of relationships between units of terminological vocabulary is due to systemic relationships between conceptual categories and the system of representations of the branches of science and technology. As a reflection of the concepts of systems of sciences, the terminology is characterized by a special systemic organization and systemic relationships between the components that organize its structure.

Methods

The study of the term in modern science continues, and the achievements of both domestic and foreign term studies determine the main definitions of the main concepts of this science. The sub word term is understood as "a stable word or a combination of words that precisely denotes a certain concept. The word originates from the Latin terminus, that is, the limit, the border. In Roman mythology, terminus was", the deity of the border signs that separated the land parcels, and each parcel was its terminus, not personified.

In Roman mythology, terminus was", the deity of the border signs that separated the land parcels, and each parcel was its terminus, not personified.

- Architectural vocabulary constitutes an independent segment in the naive and scientific picture of the world of native speakers; it forms a ramified term system of architecture, combining general literary vocabulary and special terms that call the concepts of architecture and architectural activity. Architecture plays a special role in the life of both ancient and modern society: as the art of designing structures, architecture is symbolic and reflects not only the culture of a civilization of a certain period, the religious and cult symbols of the people, but also the spiritual intention of its creator;
- As modern science is rapidly entering the world of social and information space, scientific information begins to play a key role. Taking into account the fact that the media are the field of realization of multiple discourses, we can talk about a potential tendency for the emergence of architectural discourse, which also serves as a representation of a certain area of human knowledge;
- The architectural discourse includes texts (scientific works on architecture, travel guides, travel memoirs, literary texts, etc.) and participants in this extensive conversation (architects, artists, critics, political and spiritual

leaders, journalists, thinkers, writers, etc.) in certain social-historical conditions;

- The lexical composition of the special language of architecture is heterogeneous. The lexico-semantic core consists of three terminological blocks: general scientific, inter-scientific, and highly specialized terminology. Determining the boundaries between these blocks is not always explicit.
- In a scientific speech that uses language to nominate architectural activities, there is an interpenetration of highly specific and general literary vocabulary.

In the process of researching the material in Uzbek, English, the following structural types of architectural terms were identified: abacus, apse, dentils, drip, exedra, iconostasis, pendentive, rosette, rotunda, sole. In English, the following grammatical (part-of-speech) models are more common:

Table 1
The grammatical (part-of-speech) models

adj. + noun	triumphal arch
noun + noun.	clover arch
noun + noun + noun	half barrel vault
Gerund + + noun.	relieving arch
participle + noun	stilted arch
noun - participle + noun.	rock-cut church
Adj. + noun	inner narthex
noun + preposition + noun	basilica with dome
noun + union + noun	bead-and-reel
adj.-participle + noun	many-foiled arch
n-participle + n.	barrel-vaulted basilica
number-participle + noun	seven-aisled church

In this regard, S.L. Mishlanova believes that the term as a linguistic category should be considered in the unity of two aspects - classification and functional, or static and dynamic: the classification direction makes it possible to study only a part of systemic relations, but this approach is limited by the fact that it alone cannot fully illuminate such properties term as procedurally, dynamism, and inconsistency. Consideration of such aspects of the term is possible only within the framework of functional terminology (Mishlanova 2003).

Such consideration requires taking into account, in addition to the known types of knowledge (linguistic and extralinguistic factors, special and everyday concepts), and such phenomena as measuring social knowledge horizontally and vertically, scientific, professional, cultural, and other parameters of the term, etc. The terms necessary for communication between different areas of knowledge act as special cognitive structures - frames, and therefore it is important to identify which concepts determine the terminological nomination and serve to fix, store and transfer scientific knowledge. L. S. Rudinskaya identifies the following methods of term formation, due to which terminology is replenished: lexical-

semantic, morphological, syntactic, as well as mixed methods: in lexical-semantic term formation, the semantic development of a word is the most important means of creating a new concept. In terminology, there is polysemy, synonymy, antonymy, which are general linguistic processes. When the formation of terms occurs morphologically, a new term arises based on one or several stems with the help of derivational affixes: suffixation, prefixation, prefix-suffix method, etc (Babenko & Kazarin, 2005; Balabanov, 2001).

With the syntactic method, multicomponent means of nomination (term combinations) are formed. As for borrowings, they are potential sources of replenishment of the original terminological vocabulary. By "terms of internationalism" we mean terms that are similar in form and content and are present in at least three languages (Rudinskaya 1997). Moreover, L.V. Ivina emphasizes that borrowing occurs not only from other languages: borrowing from common vocabulary and other terminological systems are also often observed. It should be noted that terms that come from mixed disciplines often undergo such transformations as narrowing, incrementing evaluative connotations, or even a complete semantic transformation, without losing their sound and graphic form (Ivina, 2003; Arshinov, 1999; Arutyunova, 1999). So, in the process of borrowing, the recipient language does not passively acquire the desired word, it gives it a new form, a new content - thus, we can talk about creating a new word.

According to M.A. Popova, the formal side of this process is determined by the genetic relationship or typological similarity of languages. In other words, the more similarities the contacting languages have, the fewer changes the word undergoes in order to adapt to the new system, or, otherwise, the more features of the original language will have to be included in the system of the recipient language (Popova, 2007; ApalkoI, 2005; Apresyan, 2004). Moreover, M.A. Popova, the process of expanding or narrowing the semantic meaning of borrowed words is determined by the social structure of a given nation, science, technology, contacts of peoples, as well as human consciousness. These external reasons "fit" with internal, conservative forces that prevent the uncontrolled penetration of foreign words into the language and thus maintain a natural balance between the old and the new, which is necessary for the normal functioning of the language.

Results and Discussion

Terminological nesting is characterized, according to T.S. Kondratieff, as an organizing ability, which makes it possible to both study and vividly present the statics and dynamics of term-formation processes, and their results. As noted by A. Lykov and G.A. Klechkovskaya, the term nest is a fundamental and most complex element of term formation. In this regard, it should be noted that the units that form the structure of a particular nest (morpheme, word, syntagma, chain, paradigm, etc.), in an obvious or hidden way, reflect all three fundamental types of relations existing in the internal structure of the language: relations of a syntagmatic, paradigmatic and hierarchical order (Popova, 2007; Achkasov, 2005; Akhmanova, 1966). And further, the structure of the term-forming nest is formed from the interrelation of elements both at the syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels. So, the nest is syntagmatically a set of derivational chains, and paradigmatically, a set of term-forming paradigms. Derivative words in the nest

are characterized, as noted by M.R. Mironova, in a certain sequence. In this regard, the graduated nature of the terminological derivational process is observed, in which various parts of words are attached to the generating initial stem in a fixed sequence (Mironova 2007). For architectural vocabulary, the formation of lexical nests is not typical, due to the specific, material, and, mainly, descriptive nature of the architectural activity, where nouns dominate at the grammatical level.

Word-formation features of the formation of architectural vocabulary

Since the content side of terms cannot be directly observed, it becomes necessary to study them from the side of the form. In this regard, through the study of the material structure of terms, which are instruments of scientific communication in a certain area of knowledge, conditions for penetration are also prepared for their meaningful level. The task of researching the formal side of the terms is to determine the main composition of morphemes used in the architectural terminology system, to establish their terminological significance. The tables show examples of prefix, suffix, prefix-suffix distribution of architectural terms - first of all, nouns, and, secondarily, adjectives and participles, recorded in architectural dictionaries. Adjectives and participles are studied, because, often, nouns are replaced in speech. Very important, in our opinion, is the noun, which, according to Mr. Mironova, being a functional analogue of matter, naturally finds herself at the top of the hierarchical structure of the system of parts of speech and is an autonomous entity, for it is the matter underlying the universe that is the focus of properties and is capable of creating relatively independent complex wholes. For a noun, "the core of which is really made up of words denoting objects, the expression of something material is completely optional" (Mironova, 2007; Vowel et al., 2017; Chemmel & Phillipe, 2018).

Prefixed way of forming architectural terms

In architectural terminology, as the study of our material shows, there is a certain number of terms formed using prefixes. Based on the results of a careful selection of prefixed English, terminological units, we compiled summary tables. In total, we have noted four (4) prefixes, which are found with low frequency in terms used in special literature. In total, we noted eight (8) prefixes, which are found with varying frequency in terms used in special literature. Table 2 shows the prefixed way of forming architectural terms.

Table 2
Prefixed way of forming architectural terms

Prefix	Example
Ante	antefix
Archi	architrave
Com	compartment room
Dis	discoperta (basilica)
En	entablature
In	inlaid (work)
Trans	transverse (arch)

tre-	trefoil (arch)

Of the above prefixes, the following are the most common: ante- (=before), com- (=jointly), in- (=inside), trans- (=transitional or transverse), tre- (=three).

Suffix education of architectural terms in English

In this section, we will consider the features of the suffix term formation of architectural vocabulary in English. In total, we noted seventeen (17) suffixes, which are found with varying frequencies in terms used in special literature. Table 3 shows suffix education of architectural terms in English.

Table 3
Suffix education of architectural terms in English

Suffix	Example
-able	Factable
-al	segmental (apse)
-an	Ionian (capital)
-ation	foundation
-ed	coupled (columns)
-ent	monument
-er	springer
-ery	monastery
-ian	Corinthian (capital)
-ical	spherical (dome)
-ing	cladding, paneling
-less	aisleless (church)
-ory	Celestory
-ress	Buttress
-ter	Pilaster
-y	Sacristy
-ey	storey

It should be noted that the suffix -ery refers mainly to the premises (monastery), -ian to the origin (Corinthian), -ical to the shape (spherical), -ing to the procedure (paneling) and -less means "absence" (aisless = no naves).

Taking into account the research carried out, it can be concluded that among the four studied languages, the most productive way of morphological architectural term formation is suffixation in English and Uzbek. The phenomenon is explained by the fact that the prefixation in them is, in general, the more common way in the formation of nouns. The logical continuation of the chain of variants of derivational models can be considered the prefix-suffix way of forming terms.

Prefix-suffix way of forming architectural terms As a result of our research of empirical material, we have identified the most common prefix-suffix types that are found in architectural terms. For this purpose, we have studied a fairly large number of terminological units that are most often found in scientific speech. The

following summary tables show the main prefix-suffix types of word formation in, English and Uzbek.

Prefix-suffix formation of architectural terms in English, in total, we noted six (6) variants of the prefix-suffix combination, which are found with different frequencies in terms used in the special literature. Table 4 shows the prefix-suffix formation of architectural terms in English.

Table 4
Prefix-suffix formation of architectural terms in English

Prefix	Suffix	Example
Ad-	-ent	adjacent(structure)
Dis-	-ing	discharging(arch)
En-	-ure	Enclosure
in-	-tion	Incrustation
semi-	-ar	semicircular(apse)
un-	-ed	unfluted(column)

Summing up the above, it must be said that the use of derivative terms is not so productive in architectural terminology in English and Uzbek languages, but, despite this, they still perform a very important function, i.e. denote concepts that have specific characteristics that are inherent in this particular field of activity.

Semantic relations of the architectural term system

Synonymy

The existence of synonymous relations in terms as a feature of the language of science can be explained, according to K.M. Klimovich, in connection with several factors, for example, with an incompletely formed terminological apparatus of science, the existence of fundamentally different concepts, historical changes in the language of science, borrowing of foreign language terms and parallel existence several of their translations (Klimovich, 2006; Lewis et al., 2011; Meunier & Segui, 1999). In addition, as noted by A.G. Anisimova and I.N. Fomina, with an ever-increasing increase in work on the terminology of words in the common language, much less attention is paid to the further development of the meaning of the term. The word continues to evolve in the terminological system, undergoes changes, its outdated form acquires new content, even returns to the general literary language with a new meaning or meanings (the process of determinologization) (Anisimova, 2006).

Synonymy is widely developed in architectural terminology. The reason for the use of synonyms in architectural vocabulary is explained by its nature, which is close to both scientific and technical terminology and to art, which is not characterized by accuracy and rigorous scientific character. By synonymy, it is customary to understand, according to the definition of B.N. Golovin and Yu. N. Kobrin, "coincidence in the basic meaning of words, morphemes, constructions, phraseological units" (Golovin, 1987; Sachs et al., 2008; Beauvillain, 1996), According to A.N. Baranov, "synonyms in speech are used:

- For a more accurate expression of thoughts;
- To express emotional color;
- As a means of overcoming unjustified repetition of the same word;
- As a way of connecting adjacent sentences in the text "(Baranov 1987: 24).

There is lexical and syntactic synonymy in architectural terminology, in English: astragal - bead-and-reel, pedestal — socle, cushion - pillow - pad - bearer - saddle, taenia — fascia, altar — bema -chancel - sanctuary - presbytery, onion — bulbous - pointed - segmental arch, blind/blank arcade, icon screen - iconostasis, cubic/block capital, historiated/figured capital, demi-column - half column, esonarthex - inner narthex. Moreover, synonyms differ both in origin and in structure.

In architectural terminology of this kind, there is a significant number of synonymous series, whose members are English in origin: runningdog/Vitruvian scroll, dentil course/ sawtooth course, drystone masonry/loose masonry, paneling/ incrustation, tomb/sepulcher, enceint/ precinct, pier/respond/skewback, peg/pale, counterbrace/strut.
These are also cognate words that differ:

- With their affixes: opus vermiculatum/ vermiculadornament, kufic pattern/kufesque ornament, check-pattern/checker-work, jamb/jambeau, closure/enclosure
- Additional word: saddle/saddleback (roof), stairs/stairway. Synonyms in architectural terminology also differ in structure: Word and word enter into synonymous relations: belt/girdle, pedestal/socle, cushion/pillow, cancel/closure, castle/fortress, flos/fleuron, apse/conch, taenia/fascia,pilaster/respond, portal/pylon, altar/mensa, gallery/tribune, hospital/infirmary, ridge/comb,gudgeon/tongue.
- The word and phrase are synonymous: altar/chancelclosure, meander/key pattern, ossuary/charnel house, tie/tie-beam/ (water) spout/drain pipe, string/tie-bar, key-brick/key stone, ridge/ridgebeam/pivot stone/door socket/swivel hole.
- Phrases are often synonymous: aislelesschurch/single nave church, discharging arch/relieving arch, down pipe/drain pipe, onion arch/pointed arch, flat arch/segmental arch, blind arcade/blank arcade, tie-beam/tie-rod, tie-bar/tie-beam/collar beam/draw bar.
- Phrases of different structures can be synonymous: domed octagon, church on squinches, capital with blown leaves/capital with wind-swept acanthus leaves, Athonite type/type with side apses, ovolo molding/eggs-and-darts, round gallery/by-pass gallery.

Conclusion

Summarizing the results of studying the above data, we can say that the lexical composition of a special architecture language includes the non-special vocabulary of general scientific order and there is an interpenetration of highly specific and general literary vocabulary. As modern terminologists argue, due to

the convergence of heterogeneous sciences, it is becoming increasingly difficult to single out general scientific and highly specialized terminology. In addition, one can also refer to the words of V. Leichik that "without a theory, there are no terms, and without terms, there are no theories" (Leichik 2006).

The term system, as an abstract way of organizing a specific sphere of knowledge and human activity, has its theory, which defines both its main objects and the relationship between them. The analysis data show that the characteristic of architectural vocabulary in Uzbek, English is the complexity, the ambiguity of relations, closeness to the vocabulary of the general literary language, developed synonymy, limited derivation, extensive coexistence of own and borrowed terms, extensive use of sequential subordination of words (chain relations) in multicomponent terms and a significant number of words in a metaphorical sense. In theory, the qualities of an ideal term include stylistic neutrality, systematicity, and monosemanticity (unambiguity). However, a phenomenon is repeatedly observed in which more than one meaning is related to one sound shell (Peters & Fernández, 2013; Oflazer & Inkelas, 2006). Becoming a term, the word loses its former connotative shades of meaning and serves as a tool for cognitive activity and the organization of areas of human knowledge. However, it should be noted that paradoxical language expressions are not uncommon in the scientific literature. This is evidenced by mathematical axioms, linguistic paradoxes, etc.

Against this background, it is explained and, at first glance, incompatible with the rule of "term neutrality" use as a term of vocabulary in a figurative sense by metaphorization ("pillow", "crackers", "teeth"). The consistency in the language is reflected in the organization of specific scientific vocabulary in general, and in particular, in the field of architecture (the addition of terminological systems). In the subject area of architectural vocabulary, there are lexico-thematic groups such as "temple architecture", "public buildings", "fortification", "urban planning", "decorative elements", etc. Groups of this classification are anthropocentric. The classification itself bears the imprint of human activity and ideology of a particular time (religion, politics, etc.). Due to the fact that architecture is not a homogeneous system, but consists of many groups of concepts, it is advisable to analyze also the names of buildings (Parthenon, Artemis' palace, etc.), figures (architect, builder), techniques, tools, and materials, the basis, the international core, on the basis of which the architectural terminology system has developed in English (Obleser & Eisner, 2009; Nation & Snowling, 1999). On the basis of the borrowed word, an extensive group of tokens is formed. The predominance of the noun over the verb in lexicographic sources indicates that architecture is considered more as a result than a process.

As is widely known, architecture is the vehicle and subject of the study of history, since history reconstructs the past with the help of architectural remnants, which activate shared memory and often serve as a symbol. Indeed, such different buildings as the Halicarnassus Mausoleum and the Lenin mausoleum on Red Square can be classified as symbolic, iconic architectural structures (Rips et al., 1973; Hollink et al., 2007). This example shows that symbols separate events, space, and time they bear the stamp of time. However, today scientists note a certain anachronism of architectural symbols, the expansion of the meanings of symbols, or the loss of their relevance.

Acknowledgments

References

Achkasov V.A. (2005). From the linguistic image to the artistic, *3*, 25-29.

Akhmanova, O. S. (1966). Slovar'lingvisticheskikh terminov [Dictionary of linguistic terms]. *Moscow, Sovetskaya entsiklopediya publ, 608.*

Anisimova A. G. & Fomina I. N. (2006). Problems of semantic derivation and the formation of political terms // Philological sciences, 6, 113-121.

ApalkoI, Y. (2005). *Terminological vocabulary of the field of boxing and the dynamics of its development on the material of the Russian and English languages: Author's abstract.* dis. ... Cand. philol. sciences. Krasnodar.

Apresyan, Y. D. (2004). *Actuality and staticity as secret meanings // Secret meanings: Word. Text. Culture. Sat. articles in honor of N.D.* Arutyunova. Moscow.

Arshinov, V. I. (1999). Event and Meaning in Synergetic Dimension. *Sobytie i smysl (Sinergeticheskii.*

Arutyunova, N. D. (1999). Human Language and World. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture. *Google Scholar.*

Babenko L. G. & Kazarin, Y. V. (2005). *Linguistic analysis of literary text.* Moscow.

Balabanov A. T. (2001). *Pragmalinguistic parameters of translation // Language in the world and the world in language: Mat-lymezhd.* scientific. conf. Sochi-Karlsruz-Krasnodar.

Beauvillain, C. (1996). The integration of morphological and whole-word form information during eye fixations on prefixed and suffixed words. *Journal of memory and Language, 35*(6), 801-820. https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1996.0041

Chemmel, U., & Phillipe, R. (2018). The role of pragmatics in cross-cultural. *Linguistics and Culture Review, 2*(1), 45-59. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v2n1.11

Golovin, B. N., & Kobrin, R. Y. (1987). Linguistic basis of the doctrine of terms. *Moscow: Vishaja shcola.*

Hollink, L., Schreiber, G., & Wielinga, B. (2007). Patterns of semantic relations to improve image content search. *Journal of Web Semantics, 5*(3), 195-203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.websem.2007.05.002

Ivina, L. V. (2003). Linguo-Cognitive Bases of Analysis of Branch Termosystems (By the Example of the English Terminology of Venture Financing): Guidance Manual. *M.: Akademproekt.*

Klimovich, N. V. (2006). About Definition of Biblical Expressions in Linguistics. *Journal Of Krasnoyarsk State University. The Humanities*, (3), 2.

Leichik, V. M. (2006). Terminology studies. *Subhect, methods, structure/VM Leichik.*

Lewis, G., Solomyak, O., & Marantz, A. (2011). The neural basis of obligatory decomposition of suffixed words. *Brain and language, 118*(3), 118-127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2011.04.004

Meunier, F., & Segui, J. (1999). Frequency effects in auditory word recognition: The case of suffixed words. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *41*(3), 327-344. https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1999.2642

Mironova, M. R. (2007). *Lexical-semantic and linguocultural features of the formation of theatrical lexicon in English and virus languages:* Dis … Krasnodar.

Mishlanova, S. L. (2003). The Cognitive Aspect of Metaphorization in Medical Discourse. *Scientific and Technical Terminology*, 30-36.

Nation, K., & Snowling, M. J. (1999). Developmental differences in sensitivity to semantic relations among good and poor comprehenders: Evidence from semantic priming. *Cognition*, *70*(1), B1-B13. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(99)00004-9

Obleser, J., & Eisner, F. (2009). Pre-lexical abstraction of speech in the auditory cortex. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, *13*(1), 14-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2008.09.005

Oflazer, K., & Inkelas, S. (2006). The architecture and the implementation of a finite state pronunciation lexicon for Turkish. *Computer Speech & Language*, *20*(1), 80-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csl.2005.01.002

Peters, P., & Fernández, T. (2013). The lexical needs of ESP students in a professional field. *English for specific purposes*, *32*(4), 236-247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2013.05.002

Popova M. A. (2007). Osemantic aspects of borrowing / Russian language, *6*, 53-55.

Rips, L. J., Shoben, E. J., & Smith, E. E. (1973). Semantic distance and the verification of semantic relations. *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior*, *12*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(73)80056-8

Rudinskaya, L. S. (1997). The use of problem and searching method of foreign languages teaching in universities. *Редакционная коллегия*, 230.

Sachs, O., Weis, S., Zellagui, N., Huber, W., Zvyagintsev, M., Mathiak, K., & Kircher, T. (2008). Automatic processing of semantic relations in fMRI: neural activation during semantic priming of taxonomic and thematic categories. *Brain research*, *1218*, 194-205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2008.03.045

Vowel, G. E., Gorray, D. K., & Audrey, N. (2017). Stylistics on the linguistics text applied in a social approach to get a certain goal. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *1*(1), 38-49. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v1n1.4