

TERMINOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF SPORTS VOCABULARY

Iqboljon Yoqubjonov

Teacher, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT: Possession of sports vocabulary and terminology is one of the conditions for the developing communicative competence not only for specialists on this field, but also for an ordinary native speaker. The article discusses topical issues of general sports terminology, which requires assimilation and the usage of correction. The opinions of linguists on the terminological status of sports vocabulary have been explained.

Keywords: sports vocabulary, terminology, terms of sports, linguistic phenomena, field of activity, classification.

At the present stage, sports lexemes are divided into three groups: sports terminology, sports vocabulary, professionalism. In sports vocabulary, as a rule, there are: special terms, argotisms and non-terms. Some linguists also propose to distinguish sports vocabulary of a terminological and non-terminological nature. However, this theory remains little studied.

When studying sports terminology, the main way to differentiate terminology is to consider it for different sports. Within a particular sport, terminology can be structured by the names of processes (techniques), equipment, quantities, characteristics and properties.

At the present stage of linguistic creative activity, both in our country and abroad, active processes are taking place in the sports terminology of most languages of the world associated with the formation of new terms, semantic drift of old terms, adaptation of foreign language lexical units, etc.

Sports vocabulary is a special part of the language, whose stratification and status have long occupied the minds of linguists. It is also one of the large subsystems of general language terminology, so the sports vocabulary will always need research and updating classifications. As A. A. Elistratov notes: "Sports vocabulary is only partially professional, since physical culture and sports as types of human activity go beyond narrow professional interests."

A detailed classification of terms according to the object of naming within individual areas can be considered a good basis for considering sports terminology, since a certain sport is a special field of activity. The identification of logical categories helps when considering special aspects of various sports; based on this, linguists have identified five subgroups of sports terms: terms of various sports; terms used to refer to special equipment in sports; terms used to refer to various sports processes; terms used to denote quantities and their units in sports; terms used to denote characteristics and properties found in different sports.

However, opinions vary as to whether lexical units of sports can be considered special terminology or whether it is more correct to attribute them to commonly used or professionally limited vocabulary.

The first researchers of sports terminology N.I. Zelinskaya and E.A. Moldytaev in their works pointed out the heterogeneity of this layer of language. As a result, N.I. Zelinskaya proposed her own division of sports vocabulary. She began to highlight sports terminology and separately sports vocabulary, which includes special terminology, argotisms and non-terms. E.A. Moldytaev, analyzing the language used in the field of sports, identifies two groups of words. Terms with a wide scope of use, i.e. units of language found in the media and the language of fiction. And accordingly, terms of a narrow scope of use, including lexemes used by persons involved in sports.

In order to determine whether sports vocabulary really has terminological status, it is necessary first of all to turn to the very concept of "terminology". In his works A.A. Reformatsky gives the following definition: "terminology" is a set of terms for a given branch of production,

activity, knowledge, forming a special sector of vocabulary that is most accessible to conscious regulation and ordering.” Also, he notes that ideally terminology is a strict and “smart” part of the vocabulary, i.e. based on the purely intellectual aspects of the word, and it is not characterized by expression.

It is generally accepted that one of the important properties of a term is its clarity and limited content, which is established by its definition. Such semantic boundaries play an important role in identifying terms within the language.

However, A.V. Avakova questions the terminological nature of sports vocabulary. Pointing out that its main difference is duality: on the one hand, it belongs to sports terminology, and on the other, it can be attributed to general literary vocabulary. Therefore, she calls for dividing the next layer of vocabulary into normative terminology and non-terminological vocabulary within the microlanguage of a certain sport.

With a more detailed analysis of these two lexical groups, it can be noted that sports vocabulary of a terminological nature, as a rule, is collected in sports terminological dictionaries. Non-terminological sports vocabulary usually includes sports professionalisms, words with an uncertain lexicographical status, obsolete words, etc. This part of the sports vocabulary is more extensive and less studied, so some linguists are of the opinion that the following stratification can be considered conditional.

In his work, R.V. Popov, noting the lack of a universal definition of the concept of “terminology,” classifies sports vocabulary as terminology, based on the fact that sports language units are called professional scientific, not naive, concepts and function as units of a special language.

A.A. Elistratov, in his work devoted to the stratification of sports vocabulary, talks about the problem of identifying sports terminology and sports professionalism. Indicating that the boundary between these two groups is very weakly defined due to the impossibility of giving clear criteria for their separation. The complexity of this issue lies in the fact that sports terms and sports professionalism interact very closely, both with each other and with units of general literary language. Semantic neutrality, which is one of the characteristics of the term, can also be inherent in professionalism, and in itself is a changeable concept. The situation is exactly the same with another feature of the term - compliance with regulatory requirements. It is as vague as the general concept of norm in sports vocabulary. This feature of the units of the language of sports is due to its focus on using the needs of not only a narrow professional circle of interests, but also a wide range of people.

CONCLUSION. Guided by this judgment, we can say that, being words used to describe a certain type of activity, and strictly corresponding to logical concepts, sports vocabulary is a special type of terminology.

Moreover, it must be remembered that sports terminology does not stand still and is constantly evolving. Thus, sports terminology is characterized by the fact that the terms included in its composition constantly change their content.

REFERENCES:

1. Asranova, M. M. (2019). FRAZELOGIYA LINGVISTIK TADQIQOT OB'EKTI SIFATIDAGI O'RNI. In *МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ* (pp. 338-340).
2. Saidahmadovna, I. M. (2022). Deictic Features of Verbs in French and Uzbek Languages. *Journal of Pedagogical Inventions and Practices*, 10, 35-37.
3. Munosibxon, I., & Risolat, O. (2023). DEYKSIS VA ANAFORA. *Scientific Impulse*, 1(8), 257-259.
4. Saidahmadovna, I. M., & Madaminovich, K. U. (2022). Expression Of Personal Deixis In Uzbek And French Languages. *Journal of Pedagogical Inventions and Practices*, 5, 140-143.

5. Yaqubjonov, I. O., & Normatov, A. A. (2021). TAKRORIY ISH-HARAKATI MA'NOSINING LEKSIK GRAMMATIK MAYDONI KONSTITUENTLARI. *Интернаука*, (21-5), 98-99.
6. Oripovna, A. I. (2021). The Repeated Nomination as a Unit of Consistency Category. *International Journal on Orange Technologies*, 3(3), 178-182.
7. Anorboyeva, I. O. (2019). FRANSUZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA SEMANTIK DISLOKASIYA. In *МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ* (pp. 334-337).
8. Вазира, М. М., Мамадалиев, А., & Ирода, А. О. (2015). К методике определения персонификации, анимализации и одушевления-как стилистических приёмов. *Евразийский Союз Ученых*, (4-8 (13)), 86-89.
9. Xabibullayevna, A. M. (2023). Phraseology of French Literature. *Texas Journal of Medical Science*, 19, 50-51.
10. Xabibullayevna, A. M. (2023). COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOMATIC PHRASEOLOGY IN FRENCH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. *Journal of new century innovations*, 20(2), 20-23.
11. Xabibullayevna, A. M. (2022). FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIK HAQIDA TUSHUNCHA. *World scientific research journal*, 10(1), 48-52.
12. Qurbanovna, Y. M. (2022). FRANSUZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA FE'L SO'Z TURKUMINING QIYOSIY JIHATLARI. *Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities*, 10(12), 448-452.
13. Barakaho'jayevna, Q. Y. (2023). LES MEDIAS COMME LA SOURCE DES NEOLOGISMES DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT DU FLE. *Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities*, 11(2), 31-35.