

SOCIO-POLITICAL VOCABULARY AND SOCIO-POLITICAL TERMINOLOGY

Bakhtiyar Dilshatovich Bekmatov

Chirchik State Pedagogical Institute of Tashkent region

b.bekmatoff@yandex.com

Rakhim Ayatov

Chirchik State Pedagogical Institute of Tashkent region

ABSTRACT

In this article, under the socio-political terminology, we will understand a special subsystem of the vocabulary of the literary language, the units of which are nominatively specialized in objectification by means of the language code of various kinds of phenomena, relations, events of the socio-political life of society.

We will consider the socio-political vocabulary as part of the dictionary of the general literary language, the lexical and phraseological units of which, having no absolute correlation with special concepts, are characterized by the presence of primordial or acquired ideologized micro-components of meaning.

It should also be noted that the composition of terminological vocabulary is structurally heterogeneous. Thus, V.P. Danilenko identifies three structural types of terms:

- 1) Terms-words (non-derivatives, derivatives, complex and abbreviations);
- 2) Terms of phrases (decomposable - free and not free and indecomposable - terms-phraseological units);
- 3) Symbols are words.

Keywords: socio-political vocabulary, socio-political terminology, sociolinguistics, linguo-culturology, psycholinguistics, special subsystem of the vocabulary.

INTRODUCTION

The division of terms-phrases into subtypes was carried out by the researcher on the basis of taking into account the degree of semantic cohesion of the component words. Speaking of compound terminological names, it is necessary to distinguish them from FE even despite the presence of a certain degree of isomorphism of

terminological and phraseological structures. We consider it unacceptable to identify a term-phrase and a phraseological unit (FE), since the latter is the product of a secondary nomination (separation from the original subject correlation and transfer to a new referential basis serves as the basis for the formation of phraseology) and is used for figuratively expressive naming of processes, phenomena, objects of the surrounding world.

FE, unlike a compound terminological name, is initially nominatively not specialized in objectification by means of a language code of special concepts within a separate field of knowledge. Phraseological units of the general literary language represent a separate subsystem in the vocabulary of the language and are studied, respectively, within a separate field of knowledge - phraseology. Terms and compound terminological names form their own separate subsystem in the lexical tier of the language, and their research is carried out within the framework of terminology as a science of terms and term systems. However, the consistent differentiation of FE and compound terminological names is not carried out by all linguists.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

In our study, we will use the following terms: composite (socio-political or terminological) name, socio-political (or terminological) combination (name), (socio-political) term.

Speaking about SPV and SPT, it is also necessary to consider the question of their relationship, since the issue of developing criteria for practical differentiation of units of the two above-mentioned subsystems of the lexical tier of the language structure is especially relevant for our study.

A well-established point of view in science is that terminology is an integral (and at the same time separate) part of the lexical system of a language. However, not all researchers adhere to this position. According to T.B. Kryuchkova, SPV and SPT are two independent subsystems, the units of which often have an identical plan of expression, but, as a rule, differ significantly from each other both in semantics and in functional aspects. Let's focus in more detail on the features of the SPT and SPV.

The terminology of the socio-political sphere is extremely heterogeneous in its composition. The units of this subsystem can perform different functions in the language. As a result, highly specialized terminology is distinguished in the SPT, known only to a small circle of specialists, and the terminology is well-known,

widely used in the media, in the speech of the population, in documents of political parties, etc.

In our study, SPT of the second type is analyzed. The boundary between the two above-mentioned varieties of wholesale is rather vague. The reason for this lies in the fact that "the terms of politics tend to go beyond the limits of highly specialized treatment by virtue of their nature. A highly specialized political term can become commonly used (for example, through the media), and, functioning in various styles, it can lose its inherent unambiguity, acquire many stylistic signs, acquire expressive shades of meaning."

Socio-political vocabulary is also heterogeneous in its composition. In this subsystem, the actual political vocabulary and potentially political vocabulary can be distinguished (for example, the vocabulary of the general vocabulary, linguistic phenomena bearing the character of slogan words, etc.).

The next difference between the SPV and the SPT is the degree of mobility of the units of these entities. Socio-political terminology is quite stable, which can partly be explained by the duration of the formation of new social and political concepts. The SPV is extremely mobile, since the rapidly changing political life of society dictates the need for an equally rapid change in the naming of relevant socio-political concepts and phenomena. It should also be noted that there is a variation in the degree of mobility of SPV units, which, in turn, is a combination of various TG and lexical subsets. Thus, lexemes naming institutions and organizations (for example, the State Duma) are characterized by significantly less mobility than units naming concepts and realities related to various social systems. In addition, the SPV and the SPT are closely interrelated in the sense that the well-known part of the socio-political terminology is due to the social.

RESULTS

In this paper, the unit of analysis is identified as a socio-political term (a composite socio-political terminological name) if it meets the following criteria:

- 1) Functioning in a special text (political programs, manifestos, open letters, appeals, etc.);
- 2) The presence of ideologization;
- 3) Performing a definitive function in the text;
- 4) Nominative specialization for the objectification of a specific concept within a particular branch of knowledge.

Nevertheless, "when a political term becomes commonly used, it is quite difficult to determine whether it is a term or not in any context." The analyzed lexeme is defined, respectively, as socio-political if it does not meet the 3rd and 4th criteria (the first two criteria are irrelevant for the SPV and therefore do not allow differentiating the SPV and the SPT). In addition, the term can remain so even when used in texts of a non-special nature (fiction, journalism, periodicals, etc.), provided there are no connotations and in order to create a certain stylistic effect (in this case, it is possible to combine the actual definitive function with the stylistic function).

Another important issue for this study is the question of the structure of terminological and lexical meanings. In the traditional sense, the terminological meaning is devoid of any expressive, emotive and evaluative meanings. But, as noted above, the structure of the meaning of a socio-political term is qualitatively different from the structure of the meaning, for example, of the term applied physics. The socio-political term, being the main means of political propaganda and agitation, carries a huge burden on bringing the position of a particular political force to the masses of the population. A.M. Selishchev noted that "party agitation, propaganda, oral and printed, affect the population ...".

Such an impact, as T.B. Kryuchkova, T.S. Kogotkova and other researchers believe, cannot be achieved by using only the "dry" semantic filling of the denotative content of the definition of the term. Any political propaganda always presupposes hidden, and more often explicit opposition (on a contrasting basis) to other political forces. Political parties brought to the public the rightness of their position by pointing out the mistakes of other political forces in the country. For the language system, according to several scientists, this means the obligatory presence of evaluative, emotive and expressive components in the meaning of those units through which political propaganda and agitation are carried out, i.e. in the meaning of terms. Nevertheless, we believe that the presence of connotations in the structure of the meaning of the term leads to determinologization, to the transition of a special name from the SPT subsystem to the SPV subsystem.

In the process of analyzing the identified political terms and lexemes, we will use the method of component analysis, in which denotative and connotative blocks of meaning are distinguished. Under the denotative content of the lexeme, we will, following M.V. Nikitin, understand the totality of these denotative macro-components, focused on the subject and conceptual series, under the denotative content of the term - its definition.

As part of the meaning of socio-political vocabulary, we will also, following many linguists, distinguish the connotative macro component of meaning, focused on expressing such an attitude to reality, which is based on the idea of the value of the designated (pragmatic, modal, emotive, subjective-evaluative and other information).

The very question of the micro-components of connotation, their connection with the denotative content of the lexeme is debatable in linguistics.

DISCUSSION

More than a century has passed since the appearance of the term connotation. Throughout this period, the content of the concept has repeatedly changed. In modern linguistics, the concept of connotation itself has various contents. Thus, there are two main approaches to the interpretation of this term: broad and narrow. Such researchers as V.I. Goverdovsky, N.G. Komlev and others adhere to a broad approach.

Therefore, N.G. Komlev believes that connotation is "a semantic modification of meaning, which includes a set of semantic layers, feelings, ideas about a sign, or about some properties and qualities of objects for which this word-meaning is used."

He identifies such types of connotation as representation, feeling, cultural component, field component, level of knowledge, worldview.

V.I. Goverdovsky's research is based on the views of N.G. Komlev, who, in turn, identified five types of connotation: emotional-evaluative, thematic, historical-linguistic, historical-cultural, which are divided into subtypes.

Yu.D. Apresyan understands the connotations of the lexeme as "insignificant, but stable signs of the concept expressed by it, which embody the assessment of the relevant subject or fact of reality accepted in this language collective."

By connotation, we will understand a set of additional semantic or stylistic shades superimposed on the main (denotative) meaning of the socio-political lexeme. Connotation is the totality of the information that expresses the attitude of the speaker (listener) to an object from the real world.

In the vast majority of cases, evaluation is an integral component of the meaning of socio-political vocabulary. Some linguists believe that the evaluative component is mandatory for terminological meaning. Thus, T.B. Kryuchkova writes, "that most socio-political terms have an evaluative component of meaning." Speaking about terminology, we adhere to the position that the presence of connotations translates the term into the category of common vocabulary.

By highlighting the evaluative component in the meaning of lexemes, we differentiate the conceptual assessment and the connotative assessment. The issues of theoretical substantiation of the differentiation of the vocabulary of the socio-political sphere with conceptual evaluative content and with evaluative connotations are analyzed in sufficient detail and in-depth in the dissertation research of A.A. Karamova and in the monograph of O.I. Vorobyeva. Thus, we consider it inappropriate to retell the already stated history of the development of this problem. Let's focus only on the key characteristics of rational and emotional assessment. The rational assessment "is based on logical judgments about the value of the object, while the second (emotional - our explanation - A.Z.) is associated with the expression of an emotional attitude to the object."

As a result, the two types of evaluation are differentiated by the methods of expression, by the functions performed and by the place in the semantic structure of the word. Thus, the rational evaluative component is part of the denotative macro component of meaning, and the emotional evaluative component is an integral part of the connotative block of meaning. The main property of emotional evaluation is considered to be its influencing potential. In the language of politics, "evaluation plays a leading role and is carried out at the level of absolute rational evaluation."

In general, when it is necessary to distinguish between conceptual and emotional evaluation, it is often necessary to take into account strong inter-component connections in the structure of the meaning of the lexeme, when there is a mutual determination of the macro-components of the lexical structure. Thus, the presence of a conceptual assessment in a socio-political lexeme often leads to the actualization of an emotive assessment as part of a connotative block of meaning. This is due to the fact that a logical judgment about the value of an object often coincides with an individual-personal attitude to this subject, which, in turn, follows from the universal humanistic value picture of the world (with a certain tolerance for interethnic variation).

CONCLUSION

In linguistics, there is an opinion according to which the processes of nomination and evaluation are simultaneous: "people understand and feel at the same time, i.e. evaluate and experience this assessment, express it (through connotation) simultaneously with the name (through denotation) of the object of evaluation ..." As a result, some linguists conclude that not evaluative vocabulary is a science fiction,

but "every word has an emotive aspect" expressed through the corresponding micro-component of meaning (even if potential).

Taking into account the sociolinguistic nature of the research, we note the significant influence of the contextual environment on the micro-component composition of the meaning of a socio-political term or lexeme. The fact of contextually deterministic variation of the seminal composition of the meaning of a lexical unit (actualization/de-actualization of conceptual, and more often connotative seems, over actualization of already existing seems, the phenomenon of micro-component redistribution, etc.) is recognized in modern linguistics and is confirmed by studies of lexicologists.

In this regard, T.B. Kryuchkova believes that "the main principle of the study of SPT and SPV is to take into account the broad social context," and by it is meant to involve social reality in consideration, that is, to analyze the political situation, the alignment of political forces in the period in which the functioning of the word in question is being investigated.

V. I. Shakhovsky noted that "the connotation of a word can be contextual, due to the situation".

R. M. Blakar claimed that "the words partially change their meaning and content, as used in constantly changing combinations and contexts".

O. I. Vorobyov was of the view that it is necessary to distinguish between "connotation inherent in the word and connotation of the text, which is acquired by the word through a text environment". Thus, in this study, we will identify contextually conditioned changes in the semantics of the analyzed units (and, in accordance with this, contextually deterministic changes in the system connections of lexemes), based on the general semantic background of the context, using methods of analysis of dictionary definitions and component analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Крючкова, Т.Б. Особенности формирования и развития общественно-политической лексики и терминологии [Текст] / Т.Б. Крючкова. - М.: Наука, 1989. С. 30-31.
2. Шаховский, В.И. Категоризация эмоций в лексико-семантической системе языка [Текст] / В.И. Шаховский. - М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2008. - 68 с.
3. Блакар, Р.М. Язык как инструмент социальной власти (теоретико-эмпирические исследования языка и его использования в социальном кон-

тексте) [Текст] / Р.М. Блакар // Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия: сборник статей / сост. В.М. Сергеева и П.Б. Паршина; общ. ред.

4. Воробьева, О.И. Политическая лексика. Её функции в современной устной и письменной речи [Текст] / О.И. Воробьева. - Архангельск: Изд-во Помор. гос. ун-та, 2000. - 59 с.

5. Бегматов, Б. Б. (2020). Роль и функции русского языка в условиях суверенного Узбекистана. *Наука и общество*, 1(65), 33-37.

6. Дилшатович, Б. Б. (2020). ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ ЛЕКСИКА. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 1(4), 1044-1050.

7. Говердовский, В.И. Диалектика коннотации и денотации (Взаимодействие эмоционального и рационального в лексике) [Текст] / В.И. Говердовский / Вопросы языкознания. - 1985. - № 2. - 75 с.

8. Апресян, Ю.Д. Избранные труды. - В 2 т. - Т. 2. Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография [Текст]. - М.: Языки русской культуры, 1995. - 159.

9. Шукурова, М. А., Эргашева, С. Б., & Бекматов, Б. Д. (2021). ЖАҶОН ТИЛЛАРИ ТИЗИМИДА РУС ТИЛИ. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 1041-1046.

10. Bekmatov, B. D., & Bekmatova, E. E. (2021). SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS METHOD. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 2(1), 1035-1040.

11. Bekmatov, B. D., & Vozorov, N. N. (2021). FORMATION OF SOCIAL COMPETENCE AT STUDENTS OF PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES. *ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES*, 2(3), 200-204.

12. Куликова, И.С. К определению лексико-семантической группы слов [Текст] / И.С. Куликова // XXI Герценовские чтения. Филол. науки. - Л.: ЛГПИ, 1968. - С. 28-30.

13. Полевые структуры в системе языка [Текст] / науч. ред. З.Д. Попова. - Воронеж, 1989. - 158 с.

14. Филин, Ф.П. О лексико-семантических группах [Текст] / Ф.П. Филин // Езиковедчески изследования в чест на академик Стефан Младенов. - София: Слово, 1957. - С. 523-538.

15. Уфимцева, А.А. Опыт изучения лексики как системы [Текст] / А.А. Уфимцева. - М.: АН СССР, 1962. - 288 с.