INTERPRETATION OF OPINIONS ON SOCIAL AND POLITICAL TERMS IN QUTADGHU BILIG

Ostonov Utkir Yangiboevich*

*Senior Teacher,
Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: vatkan77@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This article uses the interpretation and lexical meanings of ideas about social and political terms in Yusuf Hos Hajib's Qutadghu Bilig to study words as a system and to classify words into specific groups. The interpretation of the terms is explained.

KEYWORDS: *Socio-Political Vocabulary, Community, Social Life, Image-Synchronous Direction, Historical-Diachronic Direction, Comparative-Typological Direction, Lexical Layer, Lexical Field, Genetic Group.*

INTRODUCTION

The lexicon of the language "Qutadghu bilig" is colorful, it contains lexical units specific to different areas of the ancient and old Uzbek language. In particular, it contains lexical knowledge and lexical-semantic groups specific to socio-political lexicon, which, if studied linguistically, will naturally play a special role in determining the historical development of socio-political lexicon of the Uzbek language.

Before thinking about the topic of socio-political lexicon in Qutadghu Bilig, it is important to cover social and political concepts and the study of this field, as well as the interpretation of terms (terms such as layer, field) used to classify words as lexical systems. At the present time in modern linguistics there are different views on the analysis of the socio-political lexical system, the use of "social" and "political" lexemes as terms, as well as the study and definition of lexical units. Interpreting the views in this area, we analyze the socio-political vocabulary and lexical units in the work "Kutadgu bilig" on the basis of the proverbial direction.

The term social is lexical, in general, in all dictionaries, including H.K. Baranov's "Arabic-Russian" dictionary, as follows: society serves to convey concepts. In general, the lexical scope of the social term is defined by the following relations.

1. The main differences between classes, their place in social production and their relation to the means of production;

2. Human activity in society, social movement, development of social thought, social thought, social attitude, social life, political, professional, cultural, etc., related to collective services;

3. Relationships related to common, common areas;

4. Relationships in non-individual, public, accessible institutions;

5. Organized by the collective, issues related to non-personal meanings were considered socially specific.

But in the process of analyzing the research, it becomes clear that there is no clear idea about the terms "social" and "political", including the socio-political lexicon, which are interpreted differently by scholars. According to some sources, the terms "social" and "political" can be interpreted as follows.

1. The terms "social" and "political" are a set of closely related fields in social studies, the object of its study, various spheres of social life;

2. Social sciences such as philosophy, sociology, social psychology, law, economics, political science as academic subjects;

3. Socialism, based on specialized knowledge, studies the social, economic, political and religious aspects of life;

In linguistics, however, there are different views on socio-political lexicon. These views can be divided into 3 groups:

1. Socio-political vocabulary in the descriptive-synchronous direction;

2. Socio-political vocabulary in the historical-diachronic direction;

3. As a socio-political lexicon in a comparative-typological direction.

Most of the research was done in the first direction.

It is known that the study of the socio-political lexeme in the historical-diachronic direction is left out of the view of our linguists. There is almost no special work in this area. In the present case, however, it is limited to the interpretation of the history of some words.

In the course of the analysis of the research, it became clear that there is no unity in the opinions of scholars on socio-political vocabulary and the terms "social" and "political", and no definite conclusion has been reached on this issue. However, summarizing the views expressed, they can be divided into three groups:

The first group of scholars add some of their political knowledge to the social structure.

The second group of scholars clearly distinguishes between social lexicon and social terminology and does not include political terms in the structure of social lexicon.

The third category of scholars use the term and the word as synonyms. Uzbek researcher A.Kh. Turakhodjaeva says that in her research, a lexeme and a term contradict each other in terms of generality (being understandable to the general public) and specificity (being understandable to a certain social circle). At the same time, he considers that units with the sign of specificity can be divided into terms (conference, diplomat), and units with the sign of common can be divided into lexemes (meeting, minister, reform).

Some linguists, including P.K.Milshin, I.F. According to Protchenko, much of the socio-political lexicon is known, understood by all, and refers to the relationship between the past and present of life processes. In some similar studies, socio-political lexicon does not refer to a system in a particular shell, it is considered to be specific to other categories of lexicon as well.Therefore, they do not include political terms in the socio-political lexicon. Finally, a third group of scholars does not add political science terms to the socio-political term.

A.A. Buryachok sees socio-political lexicon as a broader phenomenon than socio-political terminology.

Yu.Belchikov also added the terms of social sciences to the socio-political lexicon. This has broadened the scope of the socio-political lexicon. Such socio-political lexicons include some philosophical, legal, and literary terms, as well as some similar linguistic terms. The term socio-political lexicon is used in the scientific literature. From what has been said, it is clear that a lexicographic analysis of words in this context has not been carried out and they have not been studied on the basis of a certain terminological rule.

It can be concluded from the above. The question of defining the socio-political lexicon or defining its content has not been resolved. There is no clear distinction between social and political terms. Nevertheless, the views of some scholars are noteworthy. For example, according to L.A. Zhdanova, some political terms are also included in the social lexicon. Political reality gives us discrete just like any other reality. Linguistic analogues are manifested through existing structures. It is this linguistic process that shapes the linguistic system through its relationship to language, its internal connections, and its laws. Social lexicon is a lexical system that reflects the political structure and political life of a society.

Similar views have been interpreted in the research of scholars such as AH Turakhodjaeva. In defining the concept of socio-political lexicon, he first refers to the social essence, content and features of the concept of "politics". In the explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language, the lexical meaning of the word "politics" is "Implementation and management of forms of state power; the path of state power in governing the country and in international relations. For example, the concept of "politics" is used in a narrow and broad sense. In the narrow sense, it represents the changes that take place in a particular sphere of society, that is, in its political sphere, and is applied to the sphere itself. In a broad sense, it reflects the events and changes that take place in various spheres of society.

On this basis, A.Kh. Turakhodjaeva expresses the following views: Both the essence of the concept of "events" and the diversity of thematic classifications can be explained by the above-mentioned meanings of the term "politics". In particular, the inclusion of lexemes related to economic processes in the socio-political lexicon in various studies is, without exception, related to the broader meaning of the term politics. However, the fact that hundreds of branches are

developing in a particular field or science, and many new concepts and events are now operating as independent fields, suggests that the narrow definition of the term "politics" leads to the most accurate conclusions in defining the sum of socio-political vocabulary. In this case, it is appropriate to connect the essence of the word social in the lexicon of the term "socio-political" with the social phenomenal nature of politics. Therefore, Z. Isakova admits that "it is impossible to study the lexical units of the socio-political sphere separately, that is, by separating them into social and political lexicon."

Thus, based on the above ideas, A.Kh. Turakhodjaeva defines the socio-political lexicon as follows: It is a changing layer formed on the basis of economic, spiritual, enlightenment, cultural and religious factors.

We have also come to the conclusion from the interpretation of the above literature that the question of how to look at and define socio-political lexicon separately in social and political form, or whether the question of defining its content has not been resolved, is still debated in this area. There is no clear distinction between social and political terms. Therefore, it is clearly stated that the above-mentioned opinions are mostly interrelated socio-political lexicon, as L.A. Zhdanova said, social lexicon is a lexical system that reflects the political structure and political life of society. Hence, it is necessary to interpret the socio-political lexicon as a whole.

REFERENCES

1. [Turakhojaeva A.X. Development of socio-political lexicon of the Uzbek language in the conditions of independence.-T .: Philol. fan.nomzodi diss ... avtoref., 2012, 9-p. (P. 26).]

2. [Begmatoa E. Lexical layers of modern Uzbek literary language.-T .: Science, 1985.34-p.]

3. [Gak V.G. Theoretical terminology of the French language (translated by Ibodulla Mirzaev) .- Samarkand: SamDCHTI]

4. [Faxri Kamol. Modern Uzbek, -T.:,1953. Pages 21-45; Modern Uzbek.-T .: "Science", 1957, pp. 89, 96-99]

5. [Modern Uzbek literary language.1.-T .: 1966.164-188-p.]

6. [Modern Uzbek Literary Language, pp. 186-188.]

7. [Pinxasov YA. Modern Uzbek lexicon. T .: 1960, 50-p.]

8. [Tursunov U., Mukhtorov J., Rahmatullaev SH. Modern Uzbek literary language.-T .: 1975, pp. 47-50.]

9. [Tursunov U., Mukhtorov J., Rahmatullaev SH. Modern Uzbek Literary Language, p. 63.]

10. [Doniyorov H. Vocabulary of Kipchak dialects.-T .: 1979. 78-p.]

11. [Modern Uzbek literary language. -T.:1980.120, 121,124, 127-bb.nashri, 2002, 15-p.]

12. [Begmatov E. The work cited, pp. 34-47.]