

SOCIO-POLITICAL VOCABULARY AS A SYSTEMICALLY ORGANIZED SET

Bakhtiyar Dilshatovich Bekmatov

Teacher of the Chirchik State Pedagogical Institute of Tashkent region

b.bekmatoff@yandex.com

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.

Keywords: socio-political vocabulary, socio-political terminology, sociolinguistics, linguo-culturology, psycholinguistics, comparative and typological linguistics.

INTRODUCTION

Socio-political vocabulary (SPV) and socio-political terminology (SPT), as the researchers note, "covers an essential place in the linguistic representation of ideological concepts and attitudes...". The study of how the most relevant significant problems of the country's political life are implemented in the language system constantly interests linguists. In addition, political vocabulary, being a special macro system in the language's vocabulary, carries an enormous burden. Through this particular group of words, ideological propaganda of political views and beliefs becomes possible, mostly thanks to the SPV and SPT, "concepts related to the role of a person in society, the state, and the modern world" are named.

METHODOLOGY

One objective of this study is to identify the actual SPV and SPT of the beginning of the XXI century, through which the most significant aspects of the socio-political structure of the Republic of Uzbekistan of the considered period were reflected in the language. At the moment, a lot of work has been done on the study of the effects of extra linguistic factors on the development of language (Selishchev 1928; Vinokur 1939; Polivanov 1968, etc.). Chronologically, one of the first works on this topic in Russian linguistics was A.M. Selishchev's book "The Language of the

Revolutionary Era", in which the researcher, based on the analysis of extensive journalistic material, identified various directions of changes in the language of the political sphere. Here are just a few of them:

1) Changes in the communicative function of individual political lexemes because of their frequent use (for example, "if they talk about Menshevik socialists, later they are talking about social traitors, social traitors";

2) Changes caused by the activities of political parties, organizations, unions (for example, the appearance of the terms "for propaganda: to process the candidate, processing the candidate", etc. ;

3) Changes in the language of workers, in the village's language, etc. Further, the works of S.I. Kartsevsky, R.O. Jacobson and other linguists were published.

In general, until the end of the first half of the XX century, studies of socio-political vocabulary were handled within the framework of the functional aspect, i.e. the main attention was paid to the identification of socio-political names, the peculiarities of their existence in the language (without a detailed study of semantic changes) and their conditionality by extra linguistic factors. In the second half of the XX century, works appeared in which the revealed factual material was analyzed from the standpoint of a functional-semantic approach (Vinogradov 1972; Vinogradov 1994; Sorokin 1965; Kryuchkova 1989; Kryuchkova 1993; Kogotkova 1971, etc.).

For the last decades, the "functional-discursive approach to the study" of socio-political vocabulary has become relevant, the essence of which consists in simultaneously identifying the communicative functions of the lexemes under study and in analyzing the composition of the subsystem of socio-political vocabulary.

In foreign linguistics, the study of socio-political vocabulary was conducted in a slightly different direction. Fundamental works in this field appeared in the second half of the XX century (Blakar 1987; Van Dijk 1988; Serio 1999). Thus, R.M. Blakar believed that it was necessary to "explore language as an integral part of a social framework or matrix," and for this, in turn, it requires the involvement of data from related sciences - sociology, psychology, political science.

Russian linguists also hold a similar position regarding the interdisciplinary nature of the study of socially determined subsystems of the linguistic structure (in particular, the vocabulary of the socio-political sphere) (Russian 1968; Polivanov 1968, Selishchev 1928, Vinogradov 1982, Sorokin 1965, Kryuchkova 1989, Vorobyova 2001, etc.).

Exploring the mechanisms of the realization of power through language, R.M. Blakar came to the logical conclusion that "power can be exercised through language", while the "exercise of power" itself is understood by the scientist as "influencing the perception and structuring of the world by another person" In the same place.

In his work, the scientist focuses on the so-called basis of language - the linguistic basis that allows the use of language as an instrument of social power. As part of the basis, three levels are forming it:

- 1) A separate communication act;
- 2) A special, "individualized" way of conceptualizing reality;
- 3) Different languages and dialects that have different statuses even if they coexist on the same territory.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In general, the research conducted by R.M. Blakar allowed us to take a fresh look at the seemingly sufficiently studied phenomena. The researcher subdivided the act of communication into its constituent components and he focused attention on the complexity of each individual verbal unit. One of the key conclusions reached by the scientist is the position that language, being an open and generative system reflecting the expressions of existing power relations, acts not only as an object of influence from society (which has been repeatedly emphasized by sociolinguists), but also as a subject of such influence.

In practice, this means that the language system, initially depending on the development of society, determines, in turn, the evolution of this society. According to R.M. Blakar, such a bidirectional impact is characteristic of those linguistic means that serve the sphere of the socio-political life of society (in particular, for socio-political vocabulary).

Russian Language and Soviet Political Discourse: An analysis of nominalizations in P. Serio's work examines in his work several issues related to the study of various nominalizations, nominal and prepositional syntagmas in Russian political discourse. Raises the problems of preconstruction and syntactic formalism, inter-discourse and intra-discourse.

T.A. Deikwan and V. Kinch also studied political discourse. Their undoubted merit consists in the development of a fundamentally new interdisciplinary process-

oriented model of understanding discourse, which is based on considering the interaction of social and cognitive characteristics of discourse.

Political discourse, being a linked text taken in conjunction with extra linguistic - pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological, and other factors, is the object of research in modern political linguistics.

Researchers attribute the emergence and formation of political linguistics as a separate field of knowledge to the 20 - the 50s of the XX century. The sharply increased interest of the scientific community in the problems and the very essence of political communication, from the point of view of E.V. Budaev and A.P. Chudinov, were explained by the cardinal change in the worldview of humankind because of the First World War. Thus, in the post-war period, "the attention of researchers of the language of politics was directed to the study of ways of forming public opinion, the effectiveness of political agitation and military propaganda."

The subject of research in political linguistics may vary depending on the goals set by the linguist. Thus, units of various levels of language structure (vocabulary, phraseology, morphology, and syntax), text units, communicative strategies, tactics and roles can be studied.

The following directions are distinguished in the methodology of modern political linguistics: cognitive, rhetorical, and discursive. In the last ten years, complex research methods involving the use of methods of related sciences- sociolinguistics, linguo-culturology, psycholinguistics, comparative and typological linguistics, etc. have become especially relevant.

The largest scientists dealing with the problems of the language of the socio-political sphere of society are A.N. Baranov, O.S. Issers, Yu.N. Karaulov, M.V. Kitaygorodskaya, O.N. Parshina, P.B. Parshin, O.G. Revzina, A.V. Rudakova, A.I. Soloviev. Let's list the key areas of research conducted in this area.

Thus, in the works of A.N. Baranov over the past ten years, the subject of research has been the development of a corpus-oriented approach to thematic monitoring of political discourse, the problems of identifying and systematizing the types of compatibility of metaphorical models, etc.

Within the framework of the above works, the linguist created a methodology that "combines the properties of content-analytical study of political texts with linguistic and cognitive methods of modeling the content side of discourse using a thesaurus", identified and systematized patterns of using metaphorical models in the field of ontological compatibility, considered the combinatory of models of political

metaphor within the boundaries of discourse, concluded that "combinatory of models in speech is a way of self-tuning the cognitive system and an attempt to combat the ritualization of its own thinking". It developed criteria of representativeness of the material in the study of political metaphor in discourse.

The subject of research in the works of M.V. Kitaygorodskaya is political communication in its relation to the dialogical nature of modern political discourse, the issues of identifying and studying topical areas of modern political communication.

O.N. Parshina's works also study political discourse, but unlike other scientists, she used video recordings of the speech behavior of political leaders as research material, besides standard newspaper and magazine texts. Thus, one of her recent articles is devoted to the analysis of the representation of the concept objectified by the lexeme "alien" in political discourse.

Let us dwell in more detail on the consideration of such controversial issues as the problem of the status of socio-political vocabulary and terminology, the question of the structure and composition of the meaning of a socio-political term.

As is known, a term needs to have such characteristics as the fulfillment of the ratio of one term, one concept and vice versa, unambiguity, accuracy, absence of emotive and evaluative components, etc.

According to a similar, narrow view of terminology, only those units of the language that meet these criteria can be called terms. However, such requirements do not have strict compliance in all term systems.

Speaking about the terminology of different branches of knowledge, linguists note that such term systems are closed, and the conceptual content of the terms of these systems is available for understanding only a limited number of people, the term cannot be well known.

Extensive studies of factual material conducted by Russian linguists since the second half of the XX century have shown the fallacy of such a purely theoretical, detached from the living functioning in language, understanding of the nature and distinctive features of far from identical terminological systems.

We believe that there is a direct relationship between the degree of abstraction of a particular field of knowledge and the distinctive features of the terminology of this branch of knowledge. Thus, many terms of electrodynamics and semiconductor physics remain little known or generally unknown to a wide range of non-specialists in this field of knowledge (for example cascade switching, PWM controller, etc.).

The meanings of the overwhelming majority of terms of social sciences are generally known one way or another (for example, socio-political terms - monarch, democracy, tsar, etc.). According to T.S. Kogotkova, "the exit of several socio-political terms beyond the limits of highly specialized treatment is because of the very nature of these term spheres."

Thus, the terminology of the social sciences (for example, the special vocabulary of the socio-political sphere) is qualitatively different from the terminology of other branches of knowledge. Some researchers ignore even the term socio-political terminology itself, believing that the well-known nature of these units of the language prevents their qualification like terms. In our opinion, the approach is more correct, according to which "accessibility in the understanding of many of the socio-political terms is most likely a functional feature of them" and certainly such common knowledge cannot indicate in this case determinologization.

The main reason for the general intelligibility of the SPT is its active use in the language of mass propaganda and agitation, as well as a strong extra linguistic conditionality: "social science terminology is most sensitive to changes in public life."

The broad gradation of scientists' views in solving the problem of socio-political terminology (from recognizing the fact of its functioning in the language to completely denying the possibility of the existence of SPT) was the reason for the lack of a single definition of SPT. It also does not have a well-established, universally recognized definition and SPV. Therefore, the question of which units of the language system should be called socio-political terminology and socio-political vocabulary remains debatable.

CONCLUSION

Thus, V.N. Turkin believed that "a system of nominative units of different origin should be attributed to socio-political terminology, which are specialized lexically (terms-lexemes), semantically (seems of national words) and phraseological (stable names)." The researcher also stipulates that the functioning of these units is carried out in different spheres of communication of the population (oral and written) in order to indicate social realities in the field of political, economic, administrative relations.

T.S. Kogotkova understands SPT as a certain set of terms grouped according to the generality of content characteristics.

T. B. Kryuchkova defines socio-political terminology as "part of the terminology of social sciences", which has the property of idealization. In our opinion, such an interpretation is too general, since the concept of idealization is rather vague and can be considered both as an original component of the semantics of a word, and as a result of the influence of ideologically coloured conceptual units of the contextual environment.

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 контексте) [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., & Bozorov, 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 изследованиа 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.