

**SPECIAL LEXICAL UNITS: TERMS, NAMES AND PROFESSIONALISMS**

**Khaydarova Charos**  
Kokand University

**Abstract:** This article examines special lexical units—terms, names, and professionalisms—from a linguistic perspective. The study analyzes their semantic, functional, and stylistic features and identifies their role within the lexical system of language. Using descriptive, comparative, and contextual analysis methods, the research distinguishes between general and special vocabulary and highlights the significance of specialized lexical units in scientific and professional communication. The findings confirm that special vocabulary represents a structured and dynamic layer of language, closely linked to social, cultural, and technological development. The study contributes to terminological standardization and supports effective communication in academic and professional domains.

**Keywords:** special vocabulary, term, name, professionalism, terminology, lexical system.

**Introduction**

The lexical system of a language consists not only of commonly used words but also of special lexical units that function within specific fields of knowledge and professional activities. Such units form what is commonly referred to as *special vocabulary*, which plays a crucial role in scientific, technical, and professional communication.

In linguistic studies, special lexical units are typically categorized into three major groups: **terms**, **names**, and **professionalisms**. These units differ from general vocabulary in terms of semantic precision, functional limitation, and stylistic neutrality (Crystal, 2008). Their emergence and development are closely connected with the progress of science, technology, and professional specialization.

The purpose of this article is to provide a systematic analysis of special lexical units, to identify their defining features, and to clarify their functions within the language system. The study also aims to demonstrate the importance of such units for terminological standardization and professional discourse.

**Methods**

The research employs a qualitative linguistic methodology based on the following approaches:

**Descriptive analysis**, used to define and characterize special lexical units;

**Comparative analysis**, applied to identify similarities and differences among terms, names, and professionalisms;

**Contextual analysis**, which examines the actual usage of these units in academic and professional texts.

The research material includes linguistic and terminological studies, pedagogical literature, and authentic texts from various professional domains. This methodological combination ensures a comprehensive and systematic analysis of special vocabulary.

**Results**

The analysis reveals that special lexical units possess distinctive semantic and functional characteristics depending on their type.

**Terms**

Terms are lexical units that denote precise concepts within a particular scientific or professional field. Their main characteristics include semantic accuracy, monosemy within a given field, and

stylistic neutrality. Terms are standardized and widely used in academic discourse to ensure clarity and consistency (Temmerman, 2000).

Examples include *phoneme*, *morpheme*, *methodology*, and *terminology*. These units function as key elements in scientific knowledge transmission and conceptual organization.

#### **Names**

Names serve a nominative function and are used to identify institutions, organizations, technologies, and specific entities. Unlike terms, names do not necessarily define concepts but rather label unique objects or phenomena. They are frequently used in formal and institutional discourse.

Examples include *UNESCO*, *United Nations*, *Oxford University*, and *Microsoft*. Such names often become internationally recognized and may enter multiple languages without translation.

#### **Professionalisms**

Professionalisms are informal or semi-formal lexical units used by members of a particular profession. They facilitate efficient communication within professional groups but may not conform to standard language norms. Professionalisms are especially common in spoken language and internal professional communication (Šarčević, 1997).

Examples include *darслиkchi* (used by educators) and *temir* (used by journalists to refer to sensational news). These units reflect professional identity and pragmatic efficiency rather than terminological precision.

#### **Discussion**

The findings demonstrate that special lexical units constitute an independent and functionally significant layer of the language system. While terms ensure scientific accuracy and conceptual clarity, names perform an identificatory role, and professionalisms enhance efficiency in professional interaction.

Furthermore, special vocabulary is dynamic in nature and evolves in response to social change, technological advancement, and professional innovation. The continuous emergence of new concepts necessitates the creation and standardization of new terms (Kosaka, 2024). Consequently, the study of special lexical units is essential for effective translation, academic communication, and language planning.

#### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, terms, names, and professionalisms represent the core components of special vocabulary. Each type fulfills a distinct function within the language system and contributes to professional and scientific communication. A thorough understanding of these lexical units is vital not only for linguistic theory but also for practical fields such as education, translation, and terminology management. Further research may explore cross-linguistic comparisons and the impact of globalization on special vocabulary development.

#### **References**

1. Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
2. Kosaka, T. (2024). *Terminology and pedagogy: Cross-linguistic perspectives*. Springer.
3. Likh, G. (1974). *Semantika*. Penguin Books.
4. Šarčević, S. (1997). *New approach to legal translation*. Kluwer Law International.
5. Temmerman, R. (2000). *Towards new ways of terminology description: The sociocognitive approach*. John Benjamins.