

EXPANDED LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF OLYMPIC SPORTS TERMINOLOGY

Marupova Gulnaz Umarjonovna

a second-year doctoral student of Bukhara State University

Terminology Formation Processes

From a linguistic perspective, Olympic sports terminology is formed through several productive word-formation processes:

1. Compounding

Many Olympic terms are compounds that combine two or more lexical units, for example scoreboard, timekeeper, start list, and medal table. Compounding enhances semantic transparency and functional clarity.

2. Derivation

Derivational morphology plays a key role in forming agentive and process-related terms such as qualification, elimination, judging, and officiating. These terms reflect procedural aspects of competition.

3. Conversion

Conversion is frequently observed in sports discourse, where nouns function as verbs, e.g. to medal, to score, to qualify. This phenomenon contributes to linguistic economy and discourse efficiency.

4. Abbreviation and Acronymization

Olympic terminology relies heavily on abbreviations (IOC, IF, WR, DQ), which function as fully lexicalized units within professional communication. Their frequent use reflects the institutional nature of Olympic discourse.

Olympic Sports Terminology and Discourse Types

Olympic sports terminology operates across several discourse domains, each with distinct linguistic features:

Institutional discourse

Used in official documents, regulations, and protocols. Characterized by high terminological density, formality, and prescriptive language.

Media discourse

In television commentary and journalism, terminology is adapted for accessibility. While core terms remain unchanged, explanatory paraphrasing is often employed for a general audience.

Educational discourse

In coaching manuals and academic texts, terminology is accompanied by definitions and contextual explanations, reinforcing its didactic function.

This variability demonstrates that Olympic sports terminology maintains semantic stability while adapting pragmatically to different communicative contexts.

Intercultural and Sociolinguistic Aspects

As a global sporting event, the Olympic Games represent a unique site of intercultural communication. Olympic terminology functions as a linguistic bridge between cultures, minimizing misunderstanding through standardization.

However, sociolinguistic variation arises when English Olympic terms are borrowed into other languages. Borrowing strategies include:

- direct borrowing (final, record);
- calque translation;
- hybrid formations combining native and borrowed elements.

These processes illustrate the impact of globalization on national sports lexicons and raise questions about linguistic dominance and language policy within international sport.

Translation and Terminological Equivalence

For linguistics and translation studies, Olympic sports terminology presents a challenge due to the need for absolute terminological equivalence. Many terms carry legal and procedural significance, leaving little room for interpretive translation.

A mistranslation of terms such as disqualification, appeal, or technical deduction may result in serious communicative or institutional consequences. Therefore, translators must rely on officially approved glossaries and terminological databases.

Expanded Discussion

The expanded analysis confirms that Olympic sports terminology functions as a controlled linguistic system within the framework of specialized discourse. Its features—standardization, monosemy, and codification—align it closely with legal and technical languages.

From a linguistic standpoint, Olympic terminology provides valuable material for studying language standardization, discourse regulation, and the global spread of English as a lingua franca. Its dynamic nature, shaped by new sports and evolving rules, ensures its continued relevance for linguistic research.

References

1. International Olympic Committee. Olympic Charter. Lausanne: IOC.
2. Cabré, M. T. (1999). Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
3. Crystal, D. (2003). English as a Global Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Bowker, L., & Pearson, J. (2002). Working with Specialized Language. London: Routledge.
5. World Athletics. Competition and Technical Rules.

6. Fédération Internationale de Gymnastique (FIG). Code of Point.
7. Cabré, M. T., & Feliu, J. (2001). Terminology and Specialized Discourse.
8. Gotti, M. (2011). Investigating Specialized Discourse. Bern: Peter Lang.
9. Mauranen, A. (2012). Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-Native Speakers. Cambridge University Press.
10. Марупова, Гулноз Умаржоновна. "ЛЕКСИКО СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ТЕРМИНОВ ОТНОСЯЩИЕСЯ К МЕЖДУНАРОДНОМУ ТУРИЗМУ." *Worldwide Cross-Disciplinary Research* 1.1 (2024).