LEARNING SOCIO-POLITICAL TERMS ON THE BASIS OF THEIR FIELDS OF MEANINGS

Torakhojaeva Adibakhan
Candidate of Philological Sciences
KSPI Associate Professor

Abstract
This article covers issues such as the systemic nature of the socio-political lexicon and the impact of national mentality as an extralinguistic factor on the lexical system.

Keywords: socio-political lexicon, OLM, linguistic field macrosystem, microsystem, partonymic, graduonymic, hyponymic.

Introduction
At the beginning of the 20th century, the strengthening of systematic studies in all sciences, the recognition that language also has a systemic nature, the recognition of the system as a whole consisting of the interaction of two or more elements [1:4; 2:34; 3:128] led the researcher to draw more attention to the relationship between them and the internal parts of the same object, rather than to the material side of the object being studied.

At the lexical level, the relationship between lexical units began to be studied in two directions. In the first direction, attention is paid to the mutual synonymic, antonymic, homonymic, partonymic, graduonymic, hyponymic, partonymic relations of lexemes and the relationship of semes within one lexeme, i.e., to the semitic composition of the lexeme, while in the second direction, attention is paid to revealing the genealogical relationship of the internal members that make up the system, gender-species relationship was involved.

Focusing on the genealogical nature of lexical units made it possible to interpret the lexical system as a totality of macro and microsystems, that is, as a system of systems.

The objective world surrounding us is conditioned by each other as a whole system consisting of the relationship of required elements has the characteristic of internal divisibility. According to Professor Sh.Iskandarov, this division is reflected in the human mind in a general way and is expressed in the language [4:5]. Conceptualization is the reflection of the universe in the human mind. Based on this, concepts such as the linguistic view of the world [LVW], the mythical view of the world [MVW], and the scientific view of the world [SVW] have appeared in philosophy. All these are the results of the perception of the world in the human mind and the linguistic landscape of the world means the expression of the system of the world through language.

According to LVW, the world around us is made up of a family relationship of macro and micro worlds. As the macrocosm of this genealogical nature is conceptualized in the human mind, these concepts are expressed in different ways in different languages. As a result, the

universe - man - name triad appeared. This triad became a proof of Sepir-Whorf's hypothesis that each language is characterized by its own worldview[5:19]. Because any linguistic differences are connected with national mentality differences. Prof. N. Mahmudov, who recognized this characteristic of the national language in his treatise "Language", quotes the following thoughts of the German linguist Wilhelm von Humboldt: "The diversity of languages is not only the diversity of sounds, but also the result of the difference in seeing the world in each nation" [6: 9] .

In the development of socio-political lexemes during the period of independence, the national mentality was manifested on the basis of the social factor of the creation of national statehood. it can be seen in the emergence and re-formation of vazir, divan, hokim, anthem and other obsolete lexemes.

The emergence of the concept of LVW led to the birth and development of the linguistic field theory in linguistics. Because the universe is reflected in the human mind divided into certain microcosms, i.e. paradigms. These paradigms in the world reflected in the human mind have their own linguistic expression and form lexical paradigms. The lexical system of any language consists of the interaction of several paradigms united on the basis of a common meaning. Linguistic field is a paradigm of linguistic units united in our memory on the basis of such commonality of meaning. In other words, a set of language units that reflect the conceptual, objective or functional similarity of the events that are united and defined based on a common meaning is defined as a linguistic field [7:380].

If the concept of LVW motivated the emergence of the theory of the linguistic field, the processes of globalization and integration that took place at the end of the 20th century caused this theory to be more actualized. According to Yo. Hamraeva, "The development of science and technology has dramatically changed the vocabulary of the world's languages. As a result of this, the focus on collecting all the lexical units in the lexical reserve or in a certain area of social life and explaining them within the paradigms (semantic fields) to which it belongs has increased" [8: 21]. Therefore, a number of works dedicated to the study of a number of fields such as the field of honor, the field of anemonims, the field of personality, and the field of kinship - genealogy of the Uzbek language have been published. In addition, a full explanation of the relationship of the lexical system of the Uzbek language to the system of the objective world is also what meaningful areas (paradigms) the lexicon of the Uzbek language is composed of in terms of content, the internal structure of LSGs and LSQs that are part of these meaningful areas, and the mutual relationship of structural units, and the integral connection of each area. is closely related to the study of such issues.

According to the associative relationship between LVM and the lexical-semantic system, the stepwise division of lexemes corresponds to the stepwise division of OLM. Therefore, forms of social consciousness of existence, such as politics, ethics, religion, law, create lexical-spiritual groups in the lexical system of the Uzbek language, such as socio-political lexicon, socio-ethical lexicon, socio-religious lexicon, socio-legal lexicon, etc., and "sociality" integrates into the microsystem.

References

1. Nurmonov A. Lingvistik belgi nazariyasi. – Toshkent: Fan, 2008.-B. 4.
2. Nurmonov A. Struktur tilshunoslik: ildizlari va yonalishlari. – Toshkent: Talim, 2009. –B. 34.
3. Ne'matov H., Rasulov R. O'zbek tili sistem leksikologiyasi asoslari. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1995. -128b.
4. Iskandarova Sh. Til sistemasiga maydon asosida yondashuv. – Toshkent: Fan, 2007. – B. 5
5. Апресян В.Ю. Опыт кластерного анализа: русские и англиские эмоциональные концепты // Вопросы языкознания. – Москва, 2011. – №1. – С.18-24.
6. Mahmudov N. Til. – Toshkent: Yozuvchi, 1998. – B. 9.
7. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. – M, 1990. – С.380.;
8. Hamraeva Yo. O'zbek tili ideografik lug'atini tuzish tamoyillari: Filol.fanlari nomzodi .... diss. avtoref. – Toshkent, 2009.– B. 21.
9. UMAROVA, N. R., & YIGITALIYEVA, S. (2021). Concept as a basic unit of cognitive linguistics. THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука,(9), 701-704.
10. Oripova, K.E. (2020). Semantic and semic analysis of antonyms. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 04 (84), 724-726
11. Sh. Abdurahmonov Umidjon, Meliyeva Xusnida Xafizaliyevna, and G'ofurov To'lqinjon. "MODERN DIDACTIC MEANS OF TEACHING MATHEMATICS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND PROBLEM EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY." Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal 10.4 (2022): 460-467.
12. 2M, Rajapova. "EFFECTIVE WAYS OF COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING ISSN: 2249-7137 Vol. 11." (2021).