

TERMINOLOGICAL COLLOCATIONS IN THE SPECIALIZED LANGUAGE OF CIVIL CONSTRUCTIONS

ROXANA JOIȚA

Universitatea de Construcții București, Facultatea de Inginerie în Limbi Străine

joita_roxana@yahoo.com

Keywords: *terminology, structural analysis, collocations, denotative collocations, terminological metaphors.*

Cuvinte-cheie: *terminologie, analiză structurală, sintagme, sintagme denotative, metafore terminologice.*

PRELIMINARY NOTES

In spite of the recent wide development of the reference domain – the domain of civil constructions (DCC) – which has lately become obvious, the terminology of civil constructions (TCC) is one of the specialized fields less investigated in the Romanian linguistics.

The inherent technical character of DCC, evinced in its specialized language, classifies TCC as *a closed code*¹. It also conditions and reduces the prevalence of T₂ (the language of *common speakers*) from T₁ (the language of *specialists*)².

TCC has a series of particularities regarding the relation *word/term*, i.e. common lexicon (CL)/specialized lexicon (SL)³, and the interdisciplinarity of DCC (the domain of reference).

¹ In TCC, the migration of the terms produces from the specialized lexicon (SL) towards the common lexicon (CL) by the phenomenon of *determinologization* (Gaudin 2003: 151)/*secularization of sciences* (Rastier 1995: 45). Therewith, the synonymy is unfrequent, the antonymy manifests especially in collocations, and hyperonymy and hyponymy have an important prevalence – being given the inherent taxonomies supposed by the specialized languages. These make TCC a *closed code* in the context of Romanian terminologies (Bidu-Vrănceanu 2007: 157).

² According to the model of terminological analysis proposed by M.T. Cabré, there are T₁ – *internal terminology*, used by *the specialists* in the scientific communication, and T₂ – *external terminology*, used by common speakers, who are not *specialists*, in the common communication (Cabré 1998: 32).

³ We consider that in TCC the CL/SL ratio is not stable (i.e. in general, common speakers get the meaning of the lexical units specific to DCC, but on different stages of rigour and precision, according to their profession and the sociocultural category they belong to).

Our article analyzes TCC from the structural perspective, according to the linguistic typology of the Romanian terminologies (see Angela Bidu-Vrânceanu 2000, 2007, 2010). We have focused on the terminological collocations, taking into consideration their prevalence in TCC and the inherent generated taxonomies (which are specific to the specialized languages). In TCC most of the lexical units develop various series of phrasal terminological units on the patterns *pivotal term/adjuncts* and *simple forming lexical element/complex forming lexical element*. We have registered the phrasal structures having a specialized meaning in TCC identified with high frequency and recurrence in the chosen corpus (see *Sources*), which respect the constraint of the word order and the restriction of the corroborated unitary meaning of the forming lexical elements as a whole. We have not been focused on differencing the levels T_1/ T_2 ⁴, but on identifying the general traits of TCC, from the structural perspective according to T_1 .

THE COLLOCATION IN THE SPECIALIZED LANGUAGE

The specialized language is an important part of the general lexicon. The most relevant particularities of it are revealed especially as a consequence of opposing it to the common language which is in an obvious relation with. Therefore, the extension of the terms beyond the specialized communication automatically determines a type of approximation of the conceptual and semantic values. This phenomenon occurs differently according to the prevalence of *closed code* traits, specific to a given terminology. That is why, the non-scientific texts within specialized lexical units appear and the contexts where they occur in have an essential role in the extension of SL towards the CL (Bidu-Vrânceanu 2010: 11).

M.T. Cabré notices that the specialized communication is a completely different form of communication from the general one, taking into consideration that the scientific knowledge is not homogenous, nor separated from the general knowledge. Thus, the difference general language – specialized language/ common language (i.e. lexical unit of the general language – term) is hard to be made, due to

⁴Angela Bidu-Vrânceanu (2007) emphasizes the interference CL/SL in terminologies, as the lexicon of any language has a general language, a part of the general language that slithers towards the specialized language and the specialized languages or the terminologies. Therefore, we come to the point where two types of specialized languages have been marking off: *the internal terminology* (usually abbreviated by T_1) and the external terminology (usually shortened as T_2). The former is the language used by the specialists in a professional scientific/technical-scientific field (T_1), and the latter is a variant of the specialized language of a professional scientific/technical-scientific field used by common speakers (T_2). Eventually, the external terminology has not as purpose the description of terms as conventional facts (as it happens in the internal terminology), but the description of terms as natural facts (in a similar way as it occurs to the words within the common lexicon). As a consequence, there is an opposition between *prescriptive/normative* (characteristic of the internal terminology) and *descriptive* (characteristic of the external terminology) dimensions of the terminology.

the interdisciplinarity of the implied domains, to the lexical dynamics (as a result of the various different concepts that are used) and their frequency in use (see Cabré 2000a, Cabré 2000b).

The general analysis of the language specific to the domain of civil constructions is not subdued to all these issues regarding the ratio general language/CL/SL, being given that TCC has an obvious technical character. In this case, the interference T_1-T_2 is not relevant for our study, as we have been focusing on the specialized language of the specialists used in the professional discourse.

Typology of linguistic unit conceptually placed between minimal unit and sentence (DSL:485), the collocation is linguistically treated from different perspectives. Generally, within the analysis of collocation the reference is done at the lexical level where it is identified (CL or SL) and at the morphological and syntactic status of the forming lexical elements.

In SL, the collocations imply, at least, two forming lexical elements, which have individual semantic and grammatical information. They have a stable position in the phrasal structure, and the unitary meaning of the entire lexical unit is given by corroborating their individual meanings. The prevalence of such structures in SL influences the status of *closed code/open code*⁵ specific to the terminology of a given field, as well. The contextual mobility of the forming lexical elements of the collocations shows the degree of interdisciplinarity of SL in a scientific/technical-scientific domain.

The terminological collocations are a structural lexical and semantic category very well accounted for at the level of the specialized languages. They denominate and also standardize with high rigour and precision the specific concepts of the domain of reference. From the perspective of the semantic analysis, the lexical unit belonging to SL (that is *the term*) has the unique meaning as a proper and inherent trait⁶, compared to the *word* – as the lexical unit that naturally belongs to CL – which has virtually more than one unique meaning (see Cabré 1998: 33-35).

TYPES OF COLLOCATIONS IN TCC. WORD ORDER AND STRUCTURE

The trait of SL type of TCC is provided by the prevalence of the collocations with a specialized meaning as well. They have been identified with high frequency in the language corresponding to DCC. We have noticed that they carry out precisely

⁵ The terminological collocations are an important factor in establishing the status of *closed code/open code* in SL. From this perspective, the status of a specialized language is strictly defined by a series of characteristics which are directly related to the ratio CL/SL, the migration of the lexical units from SL to CL or their prevalence within a given specific terminology.

⁶ This essential criterion is accomplished in an explicit way in TCC, by its inherent technical character.

the criteria of unitary stable word order⁷, unitary meaning and complex structure (see *infra*).

In the selected corpus we have identified complex noun structures which are built of two or five forming lexical elements based on some simple/complex lexical units from the *hard core*⁸ of TCC. The latter ones have the capacity of generating syntagmatic constructions with more forming lexical elements, in order to designate some various specific conceptual semantic subcategories from the position of *determined*.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE COLLOCATION IN TCC. DENOTATIVE COLLOCATIONS AND TERMINOLOGICAL METAPHORS

The specialization of the meaning as an essential phenomenon in SL, and in TCC as well, is done by creating complex lexical formations and updating some peripheral semes from the paradigm of the simple lexical units. Therefore they establish the conceptual and semantic hierarchies specific to SL.

Most of the collocations in TCC have a denotative⁹ meaning, taking into consideration the fact that, in general, denomination and standardization are the targets of the terminology overall (see Joița 2018).

TERMINOLOGICAL COLLOCATIONS WITH A DENOTATIVE VALUE

In TCC we have noticed the prevalence of the noun denotative collocations, formed on the patterns noun (N) + preposition (prep.) + noun (N)// noun (N) + adjective (A) + adjective (A)// noun (N) + noun in genitive (NG) + noun in genitive (NG)// noun (N) + prep. + noun (N) + prep. + noun (N).

This category includes collocations with two, three, four and multiple forming lexical elements¹⁰, as it follows:

a) The collocations made up of **two forming lexical elements** generally follow the morphological pattern N+A¹¹: *acoperiș portant* (Cotea 1971: 163), *beton*

⁷ The mobility of the forming elements in the binary lexical sequence of certain collocations does not affect the unitary meaning (*determiners* could interchange their position without modifying the lexical structure as a whole).

⁸ TCC has a hard lexical and semantic core consisted of a series of certain lexical units semantically specialized, with high frequency and recurrence, on which various taxonomies are generated.

⁹ The denotative value is specific to SL.

¹⁰ We understand by *collocations with multiple forming lexical elements* the lexical structures with a specialized meaning that are made up of more than four forming elements.

¹¹ In the selected corpus, we have identified as well collocations made up of two forming elements on the pattern N+NG which we consider insignificant as prevalence: *compartimentarea clădirilor*, *compartimentarea construcțiilor* (Proca 1999: 26, 28).

armat (Cotea 1971: 163, 167, 237, 242), *capacitate portantă* (Cotea 1971: 166), *carton bitumat/ carton perforat* (Cotea 1971: 165, 166), *construcție etajată* (Stoica 2014: 5, 6), *coordonare modulară* (Proca 1999: 20), *dală flotantă* (1971: 242), *dimensiune modulară/ dimensiune modulată/ dimensiune nominală* (Proca 1999: 21), *element metalic/ element portant/ element suport* (Cotea 1971: 163, 167, 168, 226, 232), *frontieră absorbantă/ frontieră vâscoasă* (Stoica 2014: 41), *fundație flexibilă/ fundație rigidă* (Stoica 2014: 46), *grindă principală/ grindă secundară/ grindă longitudinală/ grindă radială/ grindă transversală/ grindă compusă/ grindă continuă* (Stoica 2014: 49, 100), *hidroizolație bitumată* (Cotea 1971: 163–167), *încărcări cvasipermanente/ încărcări excepționale/ încărcări temporare/ încărcări variabile* (Proca 1999: 15–16), *model bistructural/ model discretizat/ model structural/ model tridimensional* (Stoica 2014: 41), *perete interior/ perete exterior/ perete omogen/ perete despărțitor/ perete structural* (Cotea 1971: 118, 229, 279), *placă acustică/ placă autoportantă/ placă fonoabsorbantă/ placă fonoizolatoare/ placă generală, placă izolatoare/ placă fibrolemnoasă/ placă prefabricată/ placă semirigidă* (Cotea 1971: 62, 71, 74, 235, 239, 242), *rezistență medie/ rezistență structurală* (Proca 1999: 10; Stoica 2014: 409, 411), *structură inițială/ structură învecinată* (Stoica 2014: 41, 442–443), *stâlp central/ stâlp marginal* (Stoica 2014: 406, 409), *tub riflât* (Cotea 1971: 118).

b) The subcategory of the collocations made up of **three forming lexical elements** includes lexical structures such as:

1) N + prep. + N: *acoperiș cu atice* (Cotea 1971: 163), *aerare la streășină* (Cotea 1971: 165), *cărămidă de argilă/ cărămidă cu goluri* (Cotea 1971: 234), *compartimentare pe înălțime* (Proca 1999: 26, 28), *element de construcție* (Cotea 1971: 226), *grindă cu articulații/ grindă cu zăbrele/ grindă de contur/ grindă de zăpadă* (Stoica 2014: 64–66), *pendul de frecare* (Stoica 2014: 104), *perete de umplutură* (Cotea 1971: 118), *rezistență la compresiune/ rezistență la întindere* (Proca 1999: 59), *structură de fundație/ structură de rezistență* (Stoica 2014: 6), *stâlp de colț* (Stoica 2014: 406, 409);

2) N+A₁+A₂: *beton celular autoclavizat* (Cotea 1971: 167, 237), *beton turnat monolit* (*idem*: 234), *material mineral fibros* (*idem*: 14), *material izolator refractar* (*idem*: 13), *material izolator semirefractar* (*ibidem*).

In this case, the latter two forming elements of the lexical structure manifest leeways of juxtaposition, the *determinant* on the second position could be replaced by the *determinant* on the first position without affecting the unitary meaning of the whole structure: i.e. the lexical construction N+A₁+A₂ is equivalent to the version N+A₂+A₁.

3) N+NG+NG: *cuantificarea siguranței structurii* (Proca 1999: 12), *reducerea deschiderii grinzilor* (Stoica 2014: 64).

This subcategory shows a specific trait of the complex lexical units with a specialized meaning, that is the invariable stable syntactic internal form of a lexical structure in order to express the unitary meaning of the given lexical structure.

c) The collocations with **four forming lexical elements** follow the morphological and syntactic pattern N+prep.+N+A: *construcție cu structură elastică/ construcție cu structură mixtă/ construcție cu structură rigidă/ construcție cu structură semirigidă* (Stoica 2014: 5, 6), *element de construcție despărțitor* (Cotea 1971: 226), *grindă cu secțiune simplă* (Stoica 2014: 65), *îmbrăcăminte de carton bitumat/ îmbrăcăminte de tablă zincată* (Cotea 1971: 210), *structură de rezistență mixtă* (Stoica 2014: 6), *structură fără stâlp central* (idem: 443), *zonă de comportare sigură* (Proca 1999: 13).

Between the forming lexical elements (+prep.) N and A, a ratio of semantic, morphological and syntactic dependence is established – A agrees in number and in genre with (+prep.) N.

d) In the fourth subcategory we include the collocations with more than four forming lexical elements, which we have called collocations with **multiple forming lexical elements** (see *supra*). These are made up on the pattern N+prep.+N+prep.+N and have the following morphological and syntactic demeanor:

1) [*determinee*] [(*determinant*)₁ (*determinant*)₂], where the forming lexical element on the position of *determinant*₂ is subordinated to the forming lexical element *determinant*₁ (and both *determinant*₁ and *determinant*₂ are subordinated to the *determinee*). We have noticed that, from the perspective of the meaning's interpretation, the lexical units *determinant*₁ and *determinant*₂ do not have mobility within the lexical construction (they can not replace each other within the structure of the collocation), the analysis of the forming lexical elements being unique:

rezistență la rupere prin compresiune = [*rezistență*] [(*la rupere*)₁ (*prin compresiune*)₂]; the interpretation [*rezistență*] [(*prin compresiune*)₂ (*la rupere*)₁] is not possible;

rezistență la rupere prin încovoiere = [*rezistență*] [(*la rupere*)₁ (*prin încovoiere*)₂]; the interpretation [*rezistență*] [(*prin încovoiere*)₂ (*la rupere*)₁] is not possible.

2) [*determinee*] [(*determinant*)₁ (*determinant*)₂], where between (*determinant*)₁ and (*determinant*)₂ does not exist a ratio of subordination. In the case of the collocations with multiple forming lexical elements made up on this pattern, we have noticed that changing the position of the two forming lexical elements within the sequence (*determinant*₁ + *determinant*₂) does not affect the unitary meaning of the whole (in use, the word order of the terminological collocations included in this subcategory remains stable; the mobility of the *determinants* is not only possible, but probable without modifying the semantic content of the entire lexical structure):

structură de rezistență din beton = [*structură*] [(*de rezistență*)₁ (*din beton*)₂] = [*structură*] [(*din beton*)₂ (*de rezistență*)₁];

structură de rezistență din lemn = [*structură*] [(*de rezistență*)₁ (*din lemn*)₂] = [*structură*] [(*din lemn*)₂ (*de rezistență*)₁];

structură de rezistență din metal = [*structură*] [(*de rezistență*)₁ (*din metal*)₂] = [*structură*] [(*din metal*)₂ (*de rezistență*)₁].

The collocations included in this subcategory have a unitary stable word order and are heterogeneous from the perspective of the mobility *determinant*₁/*determinant*₂.

TERMINOLOGICAL METAPHORS

Besides the concepts and hierarchies at the lexical level specific to a given specialized domain, the terminology – in a general perception – implies a component of expressiveness as well. The most important and common trope used in the specialized lexicons is the metaphor. The frequency of use varies depending on the characteristics of each terminology, taking into consideration the interdisciplinarity as a specific trait and the ratio T_1/T_2 , respectively $SL/T_1, T_2$.

According to William Croft (see Croft 2003)¹², the metaphor establishes a relation of correspondence between two domains which do not belong to a domain matrix. It does not occur in isolation, but in utterances of specific contexts – linguistic or extralinguistic ones. The semantic composition of a lexical structure determines the probability of the metaphorical or non metaphorical interpretation of its parts, according to the interpretation of the entire lexical construction within they (i.e. the parts) occur. This fact is influenced by the domain which they have been interpreted in. Therefore, the domains have an essential role in the process of understanding metaphor as a mapping of conceptual structure between different domains. W. Croft insists on “the unity of domain”, that is the domain mapping and the domain highlighting are to be interpreted in terms of predication (dependent/autonomous predication) in a unique domain.

As a mechanism of cognitive projection of an initial domain in another (a new one), the metaphor leads to the interpretation of the latter domain according to the interpretation of the former one. And, as a consequence, it supposes an obvious inherent process of conceptualization, which is highly illustrated within specialized languages, referring to scientific and/or technical-scientific domains of reference. Therefore, the conceptual metaphors are very productive due to a series of interferences of the structures that create various linguistic phrases (Lakoff, Turner 1989: 91). And this fact does not imply only the meaning of the lexical and grammatical components, but also the ability of the lecturer to comprehend and to reduce to a concept the same situation in different ways (Sanchez *et al.* 2012: 38).

G. Lakoff and M. Johnson emphasize the fact that the metaphor, besides the metonymy, is a central mechanism of the language and of the human thinking – which is essentially based on analogy (see Lakoff, Johnson 2003).

¹² Croft, William, 2003, “Il ruolo dei domini semantici nell’interpretazione di metafore e metonimie”, in Luraghi, Silvia; Gaeta, Livio (a cura di), *Introduzione alla linguistica cognitiva*, Roma: Crocci, 77–100.

P. Faber notices that studying the metaphor within the terminology is one of the most important elements in the terminological analysis, taking into consideration that it generates and develops further on the evolution of the meaning and, hence, the polysemy. On the other hand, the metaphor and the process of metaphorization influence the perception of the domain, from the perspective of the human experience (Faber 2012: 41).

According to Hoffman (Hoffman: 1985, *apud* Faber 2012:70), within the specialized languages the metaphor is used to describe a new entity of reference in order to comprehend and interpret already existing theories and in order to explain new phenomena and their consequences: “According to Hofmann (1985) metaphors in science are used for the following purposes: to describe novelty (i.e. propose, give meaning, or predict), to interpret existing theories (i.e. suggest or contrast), to explain consequences and new phenomena (i.e. provide explanations or describe)” (Faber 2012: 70). Thus, in the specialized languages the metaphor is highly important due to the conceptualization of some theories within specialized scientific and/or technical-scientific domains, where there are always lexical alternatives of denominating the new entities of references. In the same time, the metaphor creates a lexical background corresponding to a new domain and a basis of interference between the initial domain and the new one. This is, in fact, the point from which the trait of interdisciplinarity of different types of specialized lexicons is slightly established. In the scientific fields which operates with lexical/phrasal elements of T_1 , the terminological metaphor introduces an element of novelty, interprets already existing theories, explains the possible and/or probable consequences and describes a new phenomenon (*ibidem*).

In the terminologies of different scientific and/or technical-scientific domains, the metaphor has, first of all, a function of reference. It comprises information as it redepicts the reality and it designates a metaphorical truth (Ricoeur 1984: 380).

D. Roventă-Frumușani mentions that the use of the metaphor within the specialized languages is related to fundamental operations, forming concepts and defining terms. The terminological metaphor loses its expresiveness value and gets denotative value, focusing on designating new entities of reference, following the specific inherent precision proper to the scientific language overall (Roventă-Frumușani 1994: 75). In fact, within language – both CL and SL – the two elements (the cognitive dimension of the metaphorical interpretation and the expressive value of it) co-occur. But, in the specialized languages the metaphor is especially cognitive, while the metaphor in arts is essentially carrying out an expressive value/emphasis (*ibidem*).

The semantic analysis (highly important in T_2) shows up the generation and the development of semantic deviations or of metaphorical meanings, illustrating the transition from *term* to *word* (see Miclău 1981: 75–82). But in TCC, due to its inherent technical/ technical-scientific character, the metaphorical meaning gets a secondary function.

Up to the theory of cognitivism, comprehension is inherently implied in the process of perceiving and understanding the concepts. That is how the beliefs and acquisition of knowledge are formulated related to cognition (Jamet, Terry 2018: 4). This perspective does not focus on the objectivity of the preexistent extralinguistic world, but on the individual¹³ subjective perception that creates the linguistic system (Sweetser 1998: 2).

Thus, the metaphor is ‘‘primarily a matter of thought and action and only derivatively a matter of language’’ (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 153) and it organizes the process of thinking itself (Richards 1964: 94). In this way, we have come to an opposition towards the lexicalist theory of Aristotle, according to whom the metaphor regards only the word. In this situation, the cognitivist perspective opposes to the comprehension of the metaphor as a shortened comparison and reveals the metaphor as a result of overlapping different conceptual domains. Denis Jamet and Adeline Terry point out that the metaphor is, first of all, a cognitive tool as our conceptual system is metaphorical by definition. It creates linguistic metaphors and visual metaphors as well. They emphasize the idea formulated by Isabelle Oliveira¹⁴ according to whom the metaphor is not just an adornment, and they put forth the argument that the metaphor is used in different various types of discourse and it does not have only an esthetic, literary function. The metaphor is at the origin of our conceptual system of perceiving and representing the world (Jamet, Terry 2018: 6).

In the theory of cognitivism, the system is based on the conceptual metaphor and the linguistic one. On the other hand, the latter is based on the former and, as a consequence, their emergence is systematic (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 55). The conceptual metaphors represent the concepts on which the linguistic metaphors are generated, even if they are conventional/lexicalized, semi-lexicalized/accepted by the linguists or creative/‘‘vives’’¹⁵ (Crespo Fernandez 2008: 98, *apud* Jamet, Terry 2018: 7).

Therefore, the metaphor is the result of a transfer between two conceptual or notional domains. The two *terms* – which belong to different domains (the source domain and the target domain) – establish a relation that mutually affects the both domains which have been getting modified: ‘‘Metaphor operates between domains. It operates so pervasively that speakers find an inter-domain connection between knowledge and vision, or between time and space, to be as natural as the intra-domain connections between *finger* and *hand* or between *man* and *woman*’’ (Sweetser 1998: 19).

¹³ By *individual subjective perception* we understand the *cultural perception of the members of a linguistic group* (see Jamet, Terry 2018).

¹⁴ Oliveira, Isabelle, 2009, *Nature et fonctions de la métaphore en science: l'exemple de la cardiologie*, Paris: L'Harmattan.

¹⁵ The term ‘‘*métaphore vive*’’ was first used by the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur in his essay ‘‘*La Métaphore vive*’’ published in 1975.

The technical character of TCC restricts the category of the collocations with a metaphorical value. In this case, the expressive function is the prevalent one, and not the function of standardization/denomination.

In the selected corpus we have identified a series of terminological metaphors, where one of the forming lexical elements is bearer of the /+abstract/ trait at the level of TCC, while in CL or in another specialized languages the same lexical unit has the trait /+concrete/. The initial meaning of the entire structure is metaphorical, by the linguistic parameter /+abstract/. The terminological metaphors have an explanatory value.

In this category the following noun structures are included: *grindă cu inimă plină* (Stoica 2014: 64), *îmbrăcămintă de tablă zincată/ îmbrăcămintă din carton bitumat* (Cotea 1971: 210), *mustăți de sârmă* (*idem*: 219), *pinten de bitum* (*idem*: 165), *talpă inferioară/talpă superioară* (Stoica 2014: 67), *toleranța jocului* (Proca 1999: 22).

DETERMINEE AND DETERMINANT IN THE TCC COLLOCATIONS. SIMPLE FORMING LEXICAL ELEMENT/COMPLEX FORMING LEXICAL ELEMENT

In TCC, the ratio *determinee/determinant* in the form of the collocations is subdued to a series of restrictions related to the word order and the structure. The pivotal term admits multiple adjuncts, and the entire lexical formation can be analyzed as well in *simple immediate forming lexical element* and in *complex immediate forming lexical element*, as it follows:

[*material izolator refractar*]/ [*material*] [*izolator refractar*]/ [*material izolator*]
[*refractar*]
[*rezistență la rupere prin încovoiere*]/ [*rezistență*] [*la rupere prin*
încovoiere]/ [*rezistență la rupere*] [*prin încovoiere*].

PIVOTAL TERM/ADJUNCTS

Compared with the lexical constructions formed by juxtaposition¹⁶, based on equivalent forming lexical element (such as *medic-erou*, *erou-medic*) – where the reversibility of the ratio *determinee/determinant* without affecting the meaning is obviously noticed – the collocations in TCC have a stable word order due to the semantic restrictions. Therefore, we have noticed that the specialized meaning is proper to a certain invariable stable order of lexical elements. Furthermore, the collocations in TCC manifest – besides the recurrence of the primary forming lexical element in establishing the specific inherent taxonomies – one of the particularities of the compound words in current Romanian language (v. Dimitrescu

¹⁶ This phenomenon is a typological trait of Romance languages (Dimitrescu 1994: 144).

1994: 145), that is the recurrence of the secondary forming lexical element¹⁷ (*acoperiș portant, element portant, placă (auto)portantă/ rezistență structurală, stabilitate structurală*) (Cotea 1971: 10, 71, 163, 168).

Overall, in TCC there are some series of lexical units that function within the collocations as a pivotal term, identified in the selected corpus with high frequency and recurrence. They are **simple** and **complex lexical units**:

– **simple lexical units**: *carton bitumat/ carton perforat* (Cotea 1971: 165, 166), *dimensiune modulară/ dimensiune modulată/ dimensiune nominală* (Proca 1999:21), *element metalic/ element portant/ element suport* (Cotea 1971: 65, 163, 167, 168), *frontieră absorbantă/ frontieră vâscoasă* (Stoica 2014: 41), *fundație flexibilă/ fundație rigidă* (idem: 46), *grindă principală/ grindă secundară/ grindă longitudinală/ grindă radială/ grindă transversală/ grindă compusă/ grindă continuă* (idem: 49, 100, 103), *încărcare cvasipermanentă/ încărcare excepțională/ încărcare temporară/ încărcare variabilă* (Proca 1999: 15, 16, 66; Stoica 2014: 103), *model bistructural/ model discretizat/ model structural/ model tridimensional* (Stoica 2014: 41), *perete interior/ perete exterior/ perete omogen/ perete despărțitor/ perete structural* (Cotea 1971: 118, 229, 279), *placă acustică/ placă autoportantă/ placă fonoabsorbantă/ placă fonoizolatoare/ placă generală, placă izolatoare/ placă fibrolemnoasă/ placă prefabricată/ placă semirigidă* (idem: 62, 71, 74, 235, 242), *rezistență medie/ rezistență structurală* (idem: 25).

The simple lexical units on the position of pivotal term (simple forming lexical element of the structure) admit adjectival adjuncts.

– **complex lexical units**: *material izolator refractar* (Cotea 1971: 13), *material izolator semirefractar* (ibidem); *rezistență la rupere prin compresiune* (idem: 25)/ *rezistență la rupere prin încovoiere* (ibidem); *structură de rezistență din beton* (Stoica 2014:6)/ *structură de rezistență din lemn* (ibidem)/ *structură de rezistență din metal* (ibidem).

In the case of this type of collocations, the pivotal term (complex forming lexical element of the structure) admits adjectival adjuncts, or/and noun adjuncts preceded by prepositions.

According to the position **unique term – binary term**, that is $[A(a_1+a_2)] + B$ and $A + [B(b_1+b_2)]$, we have identified the next types of lexical constructions in TCC:

– $[A(a_1+a_2)] + B$: *element de construcție despărțitor* (Cotea 1971: 226), where *element* and *de construcție* function as a_1 , respectively a_2 , and *despărțitor* – as B; *structură de rezistență mixtă* (Stoica 2014:6), where *structură* and *de rezistență* function as a_1 , respectively a_2 , and *mixtă* – as B (ibidem); *structură de rezistență din beton* (ibidem), where *structură* and *de rezistență* function as a_1 , respectively a_2 , and *din beton* – as B; *structură de rezistență din lemn* (ibidem), where *structură* and *de rezistență* function as a_1 , respectively as a_2 , and *din lemn* – as B; *structură de rezistență din metal* (ibidem), where *structură* and *de rezistență*

¹⁷ The lexical element appears again, but with a qualifying value.

function as a_1 , respectively as a_2 , and *din metal* – as B; *zonă de comportare sigură* (Proca 1999: 13), where *zonă* and *de comportare* function as a_1 , respectively as a_2 , and *sigură* – as B;

– **A + [B (b_1+b_2)]:** *construcție cu structură elastică* (Stoica 2014: 6), where *construcție* functions as A, and *cu structură* and *elastică* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *construcție cu structură mixtă* (ibidem), where *construcție* functions as A, and *cu structură* and *mixtă* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *construcție cu structură rigidă* (ibidem), where *construcție* functions as A, and *cu structură* and *rigidă* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *construcție cu structură semirigidă* (ibidem), where *construcție* functions as A, and *cu structură* and *semirigidă* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *grindă cu secțiune simplă* (idem: 49), where *grindă* functions as A, and *cu secțiune* and *simplă* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *îmbrăcăminte de carton bitumat* (Cotea 1971: 210), where *îmbrăcăminte* functions as A, and *de carton* and *bitumat* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *îmbrăcăminte de tablă zincată* (ibidem), where *îmbrăcăminte* functions as A, and *de tablă* and *zincată* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *structură fără stâlp central* (Stoica 2014: 443), where *structură* functions as A, and *fără stâlp* and *central* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *rezistență la rupere prin compresiune* (Cotea 1971: 25), where *rezistență* functions as A, and *la rupere* and *prin compresiune* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 ; *rezistență la rupere prin încovoiere* (ibidem), where *rezistență* functions as A, and *la rupere* and *prin încovoiere* occupy the positions b_1 , respectively b_2 .

The validity of this type of interpretation is given also by marking the morphological and syntactic relations within the binary structure: the grammatical agreement in genre within the sequence N+A and the forepositioning of the preposition within the sequence N+N.

Overall, in TCC the prevalence of the noun type has been noticed.

Such complex lexical structures with a large number of forming lexical elements have a high frequency and recurrence in the specialized languages, so in TCC as well, by reasons of "internal coherence" and "necessity" (Phal 1969: 76, *apud* Dimitrescu 1994: 152).

CLASSES OF DISTRIBUTION DEPENDING ON THE RECURRENCE OF ONE OF THE FORMING LEXICAL ELEMENTS

The recurrence of one of the forming lexical elements (primary/secondary, simple/complex) is a particularity of the collocations which denominate conceptual and semantic divisions/subdivisions in TCC. This phenomenon illustrates the capacity of the lexical units with a specialized meaning to develop complex lexical units and, hence, multiple hyponymic/hypernymic categories, corresponding to the specialized languages used in different scientific/technical and scientific fields.

Based on the selected corpus, we mention the following classes of distribution according to the criterion of **primary forming lexical element** (simple/complex)¹⁸:

- **element de construcție** *despărțitor* (Cotea 1971: 226)/ **element de construcție** *neomogen* (*idem*: 232)/ **element de construcție** *omogen* (*ibidem*);
- **grindă** *principală* (Stoica 2014: 65)/ **grindă** *secundară* (*ibidem*)/ **grindă** *longitudinală* (*idem*: 49)/ **grindă** *radială* (*idem*:100)/ **grindă** *transversală* (*ibidem*)/ **grindă** *compusă* (*idem*:66)/ **grindă** *continuă* (*idem*: 65);
- **încărcare** *cvasipermanentă* (Proca 1999: 15)/ **încărcare** *excepțională* (*idem*: 16)/ **încărcare** *temporară* (*idem*:15)/ **încărcare** *variabilă* (*ibidem*);
- **material izolator** *obișnuit* (Cotea 1971: 13)/ **material izolator** *refractor* (*ibidem*)/ **material izolator** *semirefractor* (*ibidem*);
- **model** *bistructural* (Stoica 2014: 41)/ **model** *discretizat* (*ibidem*)/ **model** *structural* (*ibidem*)/ **model** *tridimensional* (*ibidem*);
- **perete** *interior* (Cotea 1971: 118)/ **perete** *exterior* (*ibidem*)/ **perete** *omogen* (*ibidem*)/ **perete** *despărțitor*(*idem*: 229)/ **perete** *structural* (*ibidem*);
- **placă** *acustică* (Cotea 1971: 74)/ **placă** *autoportantă* (*idem*: 71)/ **placă** *fibrolemnoasă* (*idem*: 239)/ **placă** *fonoabsorbantă* (*ibidem*)/ **placă** *fonoizolatoare* (*ibidem*)/ **placă** *generală* (*ibidem*)/ **placă** *izolatoare* (*ibidem*)/ **placă** *prefabricată* (*idem*: 242)/ **placă** *semirigidă* (*idem*: 235);
- **rezistență** *medie* (Stoica 2014: 409)/ **rezistență** *structurală* (Proca 1999: 10);
- **rezistență la rupere** *prin compresiune* (*ibidem*)/ **rezistență la rupere** *prin încovoiere* (*ibidem*).

According to the **second forming lexical element**, we mention the following classes of distribution:

- *acoperiș* **portant** (Cotea 1971: 163), *capacitate* **portantă** (*idem*: 166), *element* **portant** (*idem*: 168);
- *coordonare* **modulară** (Proca 1999: 20), *dimensiune* **modulară** (*idem*: 21), *sistem* **modular** (*ibidem*);
- *elemente* [...] **despărțitoare** (Cotea 1971: 232), *perete* **despărțitor** (*idem*: 229), *planșee* **despărțitoare** (*ibidem*);
- *membrană* **prefabricată** (Cotea 1971: 235), *panou* **prefabricat** (*idem*: 27);
- *perete* **structural** (Cotea 1971: 118), *rezistență* **structurală** (Proca 1999: 10).

We have noticed that the primary lexical elements influence the binary structure only one side, forming lexical constructions based on the semantic relation hyperonym/hyponym. These are part of the *hard core* of TCC. The secondary lexical elements have the role of modifying the primary element, of including it into a certain semantic¹⁹ subcategory from the same lexical paradigm.

¹⁸ The order is alphabetical.

¹⁹ The development of semantic relations of hyperonymy/hyponymy is a phenomenon specific to the taxonomies in the specialized languages (see Joița 2018: 137).

COLLOCATIONS ABBREVIATED BY INNIALISMS

Productive way of reducing a lexical unit/group of constituents to designate a complex lexical formation with a unitary meaning (DSL:11–12), the innitialism is an abbreviation with high frequency in specialized languages of the scientific/technical-scientific fields. The lexical units need to fulfill some criteria, in order to function as a unitary group. Among these given criteria, there are "frequency, unique reference, morphological and syntactic invariability, stable word order and the possibility of replacing the whole lexical constuction by an initialism" (Bidu-Vrănceanu 2007: 150). In the specific case of terminologies, innitialisms (those that abbreviate Romanian words and neological terms as well) have an important prevalence, for reasons regarding standardization, precision and scientific rigourousity (see Stoichițoiu Ichim 2006).

Due to the influence of Russian language and, later, due to the influence of French and English language as well, abbreviation by initialisms has been used in Romanian after The Second World War. And they have come to a significant growth as proportion in use in the latest decades of the last century. The innitialisms have been developing a various diversity of structures and even more, they have been increasing in number especially as a consequence of the political, economic and social changes brought by the moment 1990. All those reflected within the category of innitialisms (Pitiriciu 2004: 342).

The innitialisms we have identified in the selected corpus are part of the standard language in TCC and have denotative function, abbreviating the name of building materials. They abridge Romanian words and neological lexical borrowings with Anglo-American etymology.

In the first category, we have included the following innitialisms:

- BCA (Cotea 1971:106, ș.u) < Rom. beton celular autoclavizat;
- PAL< Rom. placă din aşchii lemnoase;
- PFL< Rom. placă fibro– lemnoasă.

The second category includes:

- HDF<Engl. high-density fibreboard;
- MDF<Engl. medium density fiberboard;
- OSB <Engl. oriented strand board;
- PVC (Cotea 1971: 153, 241) <Engl. polyvinyl chloride.

CONCLUSIONS

From the structural perspective, in TCC the noun collocations with multiple forming lexical elements and various possibilities of developing conceptual and semantic subcategories as taxonomies specific to LS are prevalent. Within their structure, the pivotal term is a noun, and the adjuncts follow the pattern prep.+N/A, respectively N/NG. Overall, we have noticed that the pivotal term is a simple

lexical element belonging to the *hard core* of TCC that generates some complex lexical units, having specialized meaning. They follow the pattern N/prep.+N/A.

The value of the collocational constructions is especially denotative, taking into consideration the technical character of DCC, where the expressive function is secondary.

The category of terminological metaphors includes noun structures with at least two forming elements, following the morphological pattern N+prepN+A/N+prepN/N+A/N+NG.

The lexical formations in TCC could be also analyzed in immediate forming lexical elements and in complex immediate forming lexical element, as shown: [material izolator refractar]/ [material] [izolator refractar]/ [material izolator] [refractar]. These lay out the recurrence of the primary/secondary forming lexical element in a series of specific classes of distribution – *grindă principală, grindă secundară; acoperiș portant, element portant*, and according to the position unique term – binary term they follow the patterns [A(a₁+a₂)] + B (*element de construcție despărțitor*, where *element* and *de construcție* function as a₁, respectively as a₂, and *despărțitor* – as B) and A + [B (b₁+b₂)] (*construcție cu structură elastică*, where *construcție* functions as A, and *cu structură* and *elastică* have the positions b₁, respectively b₂). The specialization of the language corresponding to the field of civil constructions is illustrated as well by the collocations abbreviated by initialisms (BCA, PAL, PVC).

SOURCES

- Cotea, I.; Dimitriu-Vîlcea, E., 1971, *Materiale termo și fonoizolatoare în construcții*, București: Editura Tehnică.
 Proca, Gabriela, 1999, *Construcții*, București: Editura MATRIX ROM.
 Stoica, Daniel, 2014, *Construcții civile. Probleme și soluții moderne*, București: Editura MATRIX ROM.

DICTIONARIES

- DET = Freeman, H.G.; Glass G., 2008, *Dicționar tehnic englez-român/român-englez*, București: Editura Niculescu.
 DTT = Titeica, R. et alii, 1972, *Dicționar de termeni tehnici*, București: Editura Tehnică.
 DEXI = Dima, Eugenia (coord.); Cobeț, Doina; Manea, Laura; Dănilă, Elena; Dima, Gabriela; Dănilă, Andrei; Botoșineanu, Luminița, 2007, *Dicționar explicativ ilustrat al limbii române*, Institutul Phillipide și Universitatea Alexandru Ioan Cuza din Iași, Iași: Editura Arc&Gunivas.

REFERENCES

- Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela (coord.), 2000, *Lexic comun, lexic specializat*, București: Editura Universității din București.
 Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela, 2003, "Dinamica sensurilor cuvintelor românești din 1990 până în 2002", in Pană-Dindelegan, Gabriela (coord.), *Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii române actuale*, vol. II, București: Editura Universității din București, 291–298.

- Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, 2007, *Lexicul specializat în mișcare. De la dicționare la texte*, București: Editura Universității din București.
- Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela (coord.), 2010, *Terminologie și terminologii*, București: Editura Universității din București.
- Cabré, María Teresa, 1998, *Terminology: theory, methods and applications*, Philadelphia: Benjamin North America.
- Cabré, María Teresa, 2000a, "Elements for Theory of Terminology: Towards an Alternative", in *Terminology* 6 (1), 35–57.
- Cabré, María Teresa, 2000b, "Terminologie et linguistique: La théorie des portes", in *Terminologies Nouvelles* 21, 10–15.
- Croft, William, 2003, "Il ruolo dei domini semantici nell'interpretazione di metafore e metonimie", in Luraghi, Silvia; Gaeta, Livio (a cura di), *Introduzione alla linguistica cognitiva*, Roma: Crocchi, 77–100.
- Dimitrescu, Florica, 1994, *Dinamica lexicului românesc*, București: Editura Logos.
- Faber, Pamela (ed.), 2012, *A Cognitive Linguistics View of Terminology and Specialized Language*, Berlin: Hubert&Co GmbH&Co KG.
- Gaudin, François, 2003, *Socioterminologie. Une approche sociolinguistique de la terminologie*, 2-ème édition, Bruxelles: De Boeck & Larcier, Edition Duculot.
- Jamet, Denis; Terry, Adeline, 2018, "Principes et fonctions de la métaphore en langue de spécialité dans un cadre cognitiviste", in *La métaphore dans les discours de spécialité*, 2/2018, ELAD-SILDA, Lyon: Université Jean Moulin.
- Joița, Roxana, 2018, *Terminologia mass-mediei în româna actuală*, București: Editura Universității din București.
- Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark, 1989, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark, 2003, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Luraghi, Silvia; Gaeta, Livio (a cura di), 2003, *Introduzione alla linguistica cognitiva*, Roma: Carocci.
- Miclău, Paul, 1981, „Dimensiunea semantică a limbajelor specializate”, in *Semantică și semiotică*, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 75–82.
- Oliveira, Isabelle, 2009, *Nature et fonctions de la métaphore en science: l'exemple de la cardiologie*, Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Pană-Dindelegan, Gabriela (coord.), 2002, *Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii române actuale*, București: Editura Universității din București.
- Phal, 1969, "La recherche en lexicologie au C.R.E.D.I.F.", in *Langue française*, 2, mai, 76.
- Pitiriciu, Silvia, 2004, *Abrevierile în limba română*, second edition, Craiova: Editura Scrisul Românesc.
- Rastier, François, 1995, "Le terme entre ontologie et linguistique", in *Banque des mots*, n.7, 35–65.
- Richardson, I., 1964, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, London, Oxford&New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul, 1984, *Metafora vie*, București: Editura Univers.
- Sanchez, Maribel et al., 2012, "Metaphor and Metonymy in Specialized Languages", in Faber, Pamela (ed.), *A Cognitive Linguistics View of Terminology and Specialized Language*, Berlin: Hubert&Co GmbH&Co KG, p. 64–103.
- Stoichițoiu Ichim, Adriana, 2001, *Vocabularul limbii române actuale. Dinamică, influențe, creativitate*, București: Editura ALL.
- Stoichițoiu Ichim, Adriana, 2006, *Creativitate lexicală în româna actuală*, București: Editura Universității din București.
- Sweetser, Eve, E., 1998, *From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SINTAGME TERMINOLOGICE ÎN LEXICUL SPECIALIZAT AL CONSTRUCȚIILOR CIVILE

Rezumat

Terminologia construcțiilor civile (TCC) constituie unul dintre limbajele specializate puțin investigate în lingvistica românească, deși dezvoltarea recentă a domeniului de referință este evidentă. Caracterul tehnic se manifestă explicit la nivelul limbajului aferent și clasează TCC drept *cod închis*, cu trăsături de interdisciplinaritate și lexicalizare.

Trăsătura de limbaj specializat este dată și de sintagmele terminologice, preponderente în TCC fiind sintagmele nominale denotative în care termenul-pivot admite adjuncți multipli. Formațiile lexicale pot fi analizate atât în constituenți imediați, cât și în constituent imediat simplu și constituent imediat complex de tipul *[material izolator refractar]/ [material] [izolator refractar]/ [material izolator] [refractar]*. Acestea manifestă repetabilitatea constituentului primar/secundar în anumite clase de distribuție – *grindă principală, grindă secundară; acoperiș portant, element portant*, iar după poziția termen unic – termen binar urmează tiparele $[A(a_1+a_2)] + B$ (*element de construcție despărțitor*, unde *element* și *de construcție* funcționează ca a_1 , respectiv a_2 , iar *despărțitor* – ca B) și $A + [B(b_1+b_2)]$ (*construcție cu structură elastică*, unde *construcție* funcționează ca A , iar *cu structură* și *elastică* ocupă pozițiile b_1 , respectiv b_2). Specializarea limbajului aferent domeniului construcțiilor civile este ilustrat și de sintagmele abreviate prin siglare (BCA, PAL, PVC).

TERMINOLOGICAL COLLOCATIONS IN THE SPECIALIZED LANGUAGE OF CIVIL CONSTRUCTIONS

Abstract

The terminology of civil constructions (TCC) is one of the specialized lexicons less investigated in the Romanian linguistics, even if the recent wide development of the reference field has been obvious. The technical character manifests in an explicit way at the level of the corresponding specialized language and clasifies TCC as a *closed code*, with traits of interdisciplinarity and lexicalization.

The character of specialized language is given by the terminological collocations as well, the noun denotative collocations (where the pivotal term admits multiple adjuncts) being prevalent in TCC. The lexical formations could be analyzed in immediate forming lexical elements and in complex immediate forming lexical element, as well: *[material izolator refractar]/ [material] [izolator refractar]/ [material izolator] [refractar]*. These manifest the recurrence of the primary/secondary forming lexical element in a series of specific classes of distribution - *grindă principală, grindă secundară; acoperiș portant, element portant*, and according to the position unique term – binary term they follow the patterns $[A(a_1+a_2)] + B$ (*element de construcție despărțitor*, where *element* and *de construcție* function as a_1 , respectively a_2 , and *despărțitor* – as B) and $A + [B(b_1+b_2)]$ (*construcție cu structură elastică*, where *construcție* functions as A , and *cu structură* and *elastică* have the positions b_1 , respectively b_2). The specialization of the language corresponding to the field of civil constructions is illustrated as well by the collocations abbreviated by initialisms (BCA, PAL, PVC).

