Linguacognitive and Linguoculturological Features of the Opposition Concept Good and Bad in Different Structural Languages (In English and Uzbek)

Hasanov Elyorjon Odiljonovich
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute
Faculty of English Language and Literature
Teacher of the Department of Interfaculty Foreign Languages

Annotation: The relevance of this study is due to its connection with the modern direction of language learning - cognitive linguistics, which makes it possible to identify the specifics of the representation of human knowledge, including evaluative ones, in the semantics of linguistic units. The prospect of the cognitive approach in studying the processes of evaluative conceptualization and evaluative categorization is explained by the fact that it makes it possible to assess the role of a person in the perception and evaluation of the surrounding reality and the formation of evaluative values, taking into account the interaction of cognitive and linguistic factors. Accordingly, the evaluative categories "good" and "bad" in this study are considered from the point of view of the mental processes of evaluative conceptualization and evaluative categorization and their refraction in linguistic meanings.
Keywords: concept, language, linguacultural study, linguacultural concept "bad", linguacultural concept "good", linguistic materialization of a concept, linguacultural research.

Turli strukturaviy tillarda "Yaxshi" va "Yomon" oppozitsion konseptining lingvokognitiv va lingvokulturologik xususiyatlari (ingliz va o'zbek tillarida)

Annotatsiya. Ushbu tadqiqotning dolzarbligi uning til o'rganishning zamonaviy yo'nalishi - kognitiv lingvistika bilan bog'liqligi bilan bog'liq bo'lib, u til birliklari semantikasida inson bilimlarini, shu jumladan baholovchilarni ifodalashning o'ziga xos xususiyatlarini aniqlash imkonini beradi. Baholash kontseptsiyasi va baholash toifalarini o'rganish jarayonlarini o'rganishda kognitiv yondashuvning istiqboli shu bilan izohlanadiki, bu insonning atrofdagi voqelikni idrok etish va baholashdagi rolini baholash va baholash qadriyatlarini shakllantirishga imkon beradi. kognitiv va lingvistik omillarning o'zaro ta'sirini hisobga olish. Shunga ko'ra, ushbu tadqiqotda "yaxshi" va "yomon" baholovchi kategoriyalari baholovchi kontseptualizatsiya va baholovchi turkumlashtirishning psixik jarayonlari va ularning lingvistik ma'nolarda sinishi nuqtai nazaridan ko'rib chiqiladi.**Tayanch so'zlar:** tushuncha, til, lingvomadaniyatshunoslik, lingvomadaniyat tushunchasi "yomon", lingvomadaniy tushuncha "yaxshi", kontseptsiyaning lingvistik materializatsiyasi, lingvomadaniy tadqiqotlar.

Лингвокогнитивные и лингвокультурологические особенности противопоставления концептов «хорошо» и «плохо» в разных структурных языках (английском и узбекском)

Аннотация. Актуальность исследования обусловлена его связью с современным направлением изучения языка - когнитивной лингвистикой, позволяющим выявить специфику репрезентации человеческих знаний, в том числе оценочных, в семантике языковых единиц. Перспективность когнитивного подхода в изучении процессов оценочной концептуализации и оценочной категоризации объясняется тем, что он дает возможность оценивать роль человека в восприятии и оценке окружающей действительности и формировании оценочных ценностей, принимая учитывать взаимодействие когнитивных и лингвистических факторов. Соответственно, оценочные категории «хорошо» и «плохо» в данном исследовании рассматриваются с точки зрения психических процессов оценочной концептуализации и оценочной категоризации и их преломления в языковых значениях.
Ключевые слова: концепт, язык, лингвокультурологическое исследование, лингвокультурологический концепт «плохо», лингвокультурный концепт «хорошо», лингвистическая материализация концепта, лингвокультурологические исследования.

By the end of the twentieth century, linguistics began to assume that "language is not only connected with culture, but also a means by which it has grown out of culture and expressed it." At the same time, language is a means of creating, developing, preserving (in the form of texts) of culture and its components, because through language the material and spiritual works of culture are created. It was in the 1990s that a new, specialized branch of linguistics, formed over thousands of years on the basis of this idea, emerged. Linguacultural studies is a product of the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics, which has been evolving over the last decade. According to V.N. Telia, "Linguacultural studies is focused on the human factor, more precisely on the cultural factor in man. The fact that the center of linguacultural studies is a cultural phenomenon indicates that the science of man is a phenomenon of the anthropological paradigm" [15, 53].

N. Alfenko describes linguacultural studies as follows:
1) Linguacultural studies is closely connected with linguistics and cultural studies, it has a synthesizing property;
2) Linguacultural studies focuses on cultural facts that are interpreted in language;
3) Linguacultural studies is a branch of linguistics, so the results of its research can be used in practice in the teaching of native and foreign languages.

The main directions of linguacultural research:
a) A linguistic person
b) Is a system of semiotic embodiment of language cultural values [6, 49].

According to researchers, the term "Linguacultural Studies" (Latin: Lingua- language, cultus-reverence, worship; Greek. "Science, science") was coined by the Moscow School of Phraseology under the leadership of V.N. Telia (Y.S. Stepanov, A.D. Arutyunova, V.V. Vorobyev, V. Shaklein, V.A. Maslova).

Professor N.Mahmudov writes about the study of concepts in linguacultural studies: "Linguaculturological research pays great attention to the problems of conceptual expression. . Even the vast majority of PhD dissertations defended in recent years have been devoted to the linguacultural study of the concept in one language or another".

Linguacultural studies can use linguistic, culturological, sociological (content analysis, frame analysis methodology), ethnographic (description, classification, etc.) methods. These methods complement each other with different principles and analyzes, allowing the study of the relationship between language and culture, which is a complex object of linguacultural studies.

According to T.A. Fesenko, a concept-based concept has its own characteristics, which can be distinguished: the simplest feature of this ability can be found in dictionaries in the form of different words. [16, 57].

V.I. According to Karasika, "a linguacultural concept is a multifaceted cultural, socio-psychological, general concept of spiritual education that is formed in a language and differs in terms of value, imagery, comprehensibility." The value of the concept is that in mental education it is both for the individual and for the group; personal, social, conceptual aspects are important [12, 65].

S.G. Vorkachev has a linguistic expression of the concept as a unit of collective knowledge (a concept focused on high spiritual values) and is defined by ethnic and cultural features [11,115]. According to researchers, such mental education is associated with a plan of lexical-semantic paradigm expression, that is, with a set of different meanings (lexical, phraseological, aphoristic) expressed in the language.

The study of linguacultural concepts is the integration of new theories, ideas of communication, into different concepts, values, cultural approaches, in the process of integration and in the context of successful intercultural communication. In this case, communicative competence and intercultural attitude Y.S. As Stepanov points out, "to combine the ability to select the most appropriate cultural concepts is to exert the necessary influence on the recipient and to provide a language tool appropriate to that cultural unit" [14,61].

The specificity of evaluative, or axiological categories is that they belong to the categories of the modus type, which, according to N.N. Boldyrev, are based on the interpreting function. This means that the semantics of words representing the evaluative structures of the mental level in speech is aimed not at reflecting real objects of reality, but at their assessment or interpretation by the speaker [7]. This feature of modus categories manifests itself in the formation of general evaluation categories "good" and "bad", which are also based on the interpreting function. The formation of these evaluation categories is due to the presence of a number of factors. As a consequence, the categories "good" and "bad" have a complex structure directly related to the study of the specifics of the evaluative concepts "good" and "bad", which constitute the cognitive basis of the studied evaluative categories and determine the features of their structure and content.

The evaluative concepts "good" and "bad" are a certain way of interpreting reality and reflect knowledge of the value picture of the human world. The specificity of these concepts lies in their meaningful ambiguity. This determines their non-independent, relational nature. In other words, evaluative concepts receive a specific interpretation only when correlated with another, evaluated structure of knowledge, which has a greater specific informative capacity. At the same time, the content of the evaluative concept, according to N.N. Boldyrev, determines a certain hierarchy of characteristics [10] inherent in the evaluated object. These characteristics can be of an individual, subjective nature, since each person can have his own set of distinctive features of an object, or they can be common to the cultural and linguistic community of people, that is, represent collective knowledge. At the same time, characteristics based on collective knowledge are hierarchically more are significant and have a central, prototypical or invariant character for the evaluative category. Individual characteristics are hierarchically less significant and occupy a peripheral position in the content of the evaluative concept and the corresponding category.

Analysis of the content of evaluative concepts "good" and "bad", according to explanatory dictionaries [18; 17; 19], allows us to highlight the following central characteristics:

"bad"

1) Morally and socially reprehensible, unstable, unacceptable (about a person, behavior, deed); low-skilled (about a person's professional skills);
2) low quality, standard (about objects of reality, work);
3) Unfavorable (about weather, conditions); unattractive, defective form; physically unhealthy, painful; inappropriate to personal expectations and ideas of a person (about abstract concepts) "good"
4) Morally and socially stable, living according to religious principles (about a person); socially and morally correct behavior; high quality or standard (about the subject, work); physically healthy;
5) Having an attractive appearance; highly qualified (about the professional skills of a person);
6) Favorable (about the weather, conditions);
7) Corresponding to the personal expectations of a person (about abstract entities).

The non-independent, relational nature of evaluative concepts determines the features of the structure and content of the evaluative categories "good" and "bad". It is likely that these scoring categories are structurally like a mosaic. This means that the general rating categories "good" and "bad" include a number of other, private categories or subcategories ("good / bad sag"; "good / bad weather", etc.). This becomes evident mainly in linguistic representation.

Linguacultural concepts "good" and "bad" on the material of small-form texts (paremias and aphorisms) are represented by 145 and 272 units, respectively. According to the method of objectification, three groups of paremias and aphorisms are distinguished, in which: 1) the linguacultural concept "good", 2) the concept "evil" [13, 98]; 3) both studied concepts simultaneously.

The linguacultural concept "good" in paremias is explicitly represented by the following lexemes: good "yaxshi", "good, kind (yaxshi, mehribon)", better, best, well, "kindness", kind "success good", virtue (yaxshi fazilat), right "correct, morally approved", godliness "piety", charity and implicitly: healthy "healthy ", fortune "fortune, luck", wealthy "rich", "success ". On the basis of aphorisms, the concept "good" is objectified by the key nomination, as well as the noun goodness "kindness". The lexical synonyms of the nomination good (virtue, morality, ethics, charity, righteousness virtue, value, morals, benevolence "favor", kindness), as well as contextual synonyms success "success ", fortune "luck".

The linguacultural concept "bad" is explicitly objectified by lexemes: evil, ill "evil, trouble", mischief "harm, trouble", misfortune "trouble", trouble, murder "crime" and implicitly: rotten "spoiled ", curse, foul "dishonest", misery "poverty". Based on the material of aphorisms, the concept of "bad" is represented by the key nomination "evil", which has different parts of speech, as well as by nouns: ill "evil", vice, harm, wrong "evil", mischief "harm, trouble", misfortune "trouble", immorality, crime, despot, trouble, malice, brutality "cruelty", violence "cruelty, violence", vulgarity "rudeness", outrage "violence", badness "immorality", tragedy, wretch "scoundrel", as well as adjectives: bad "evil, bad", wicked "evil", immoral, vulgar "rude", wrong "immoral"; as well as lexical units related to religious topics: sin, sinner, sinful. Consequently, both secular and religious ideas about evil are represented in paremias and aphorisms. Evaluative categorization based on abstract reference implies a reference to non-objective entities This determines the interaction of evaluative concepts and concepts of abstract categories The latter are formations reflecting abstract entities, natural phenomena, actions, behavior, etc., their refraction in human consciousness and linguistic expression Specificity This type of evaluative categorization is manifested in the fact that the elements of abstract categories do not have "natural" characteristics that can be verified. In this case, particular evaluative categories are built on a logical basis and reveal, rather, an invariant-variant principle of construction.

The distinguished types of evaluative categorization are heterogeneous in nature. Evaluative categorization based on a specific reference includes such subtypes as evaluative categorization of animate and inanimate objects. Within these subtypes, we have identified the following areas of evaluative categorization:

a) Human skills and abilities based on certain types of activities;

b) Social status of a person; physiological characteristics of a person; artifacts; natural objects.

Evaluative categorization, based on abstract reference, involves the allocation of the following areas of evaluative categorization: general abstract entities; natural phenomena; quality condition, events.

For each of the listed areas, on the basis of conceptual analysis, the most significant conceptual characteristics were identified. For example, for the evaluative categorization of human skills and abilities based on certain types of activity, as shown by the analysis of the content of the concepts "skill" and "ability" and the semantics of lexical units, representing these concepts, such conceptual characteristics are significant as: a) "professional competence" - Bad drivers cause most of the accidents (Webster), b) "non-professional activity based on a person's interest or ability to do something" It was a good thing, he was a good rider (L Cameron). The assessment of non-professional activities, as a rule, is provided in the language by grammatical constructions smb. is good / bad at smth. and smb is good / bad at doing smth.: I am really bad at chess (Longman); Lisa was perfectly good at sewing in the old days (C. Fisher). For the evaluative categorization of a person's social status, as J showed by analyzing the content of the concept of "social", the following characteristics are relevant: a) "attribution to a specific social group, people" "Good Germans as they die, go they say, to Carlsbad, as good Americans to Paris, (K. Jerome), b) "social position of a person in society": 'Mick is not just a bad man, he's a low trickier' (J. Edson); c) "performance of a social function": 'Was never the warrior, .. but he was a nice man, a good father until he married your mother' (C. Coulter). The analysis of the concept of "physiology" makes it possible to highlight such characteristics that are essential for the evaluative categorization of physiological characteristics of a person, such as a) "state of health": Not turned his good eye on me and laughed (COBUILD); b) "external data of a person" -Miss Elvin saw a tallish girl with a good figure and intelligent eyes (E. Blair).

The analysis of the content of the concept "artifact" showed that for the evaluative categorization of artifacts, such characteristics as'

- "Functional": Actually it was a bad car either, to drive (L. Short);
- "High quality": 'What is a bad book in your eyes' " - 'Well, it is not at all grasping or highly entertaining' (B.N.C).

Analysis of the concepts "plant" and "animal" allows us to single out the following characteristics that are significant for the evaluative categorization of natural objects' a) "belonging to the objects of the animal world" - A good sense of smell and an active intelligence were the factors which made a good dog (BNC); b) "belonging to the plant kingdom": She had ordered Leitis to stop giving all herbs, good and bad for her father (J. Taylor)

The analysis made it possible to establish that general abstract entities are represented, as a rule, by concept-containers, which are considered as certain containers filled with specific content. The assessment of these entities is carried out through the assessment of their specific content. So, for example, the conceptual characteristic of general abstract entities "time period" is estimated through the characteristic "eventful filling of the time period": Life is full of * ups and downs and I know that there are going to be bad times to go with the good ones (Sh . Henry).

For the evaluative categorization of general abstract entities, conceptual characteristics such as "territorial space" are also significant. " I would come here to think and to ponder. It's a good place, Taby '(C. Coulter) and' thought activity " Your fundamentally good advice is we should offer real aid, real goods' (B N C). The assignment of the object of thought to a certain evaluation category on the basis of the named characteristics is determined to a greater extent by the context of the evaluation.

Evaluative categorization of natural phenomena is based on the characteristic that constitutes the stereotypical knowledge about natural phenomena "phenomenon of the natural world, independent of human activity" We had a bad winter with a lot of snow (Webster). Evaluative categorization of the qualitative state involves the assessment of such characteristics identified on the basis of the analysis of the "quality" concept, such as: "the state of the object" 'Did not feel a kind of bad tense before her coming (J. Edson) and "the degree of the qualitative state" fingered the jagged scar on his face - 'The pain is bad, I know it' (C. Coulter).

Evaluative categorization of events is based on understanding the main characteristics of the concept of "eventfulness", such as "property", implemented by the verbs: 'I'm glad you ride so good, Stringer' (L Cameron), "procedurality" and "efficiency", conveyed by verbal nouns : We had a good sail last summer (B N C) A number of characteristics of the concept of "eventfulness" (for example, "phasing of an event", "localization in time", etc.) is realized by nouns of event semantics - Then we clean up, and put everything strait, and, at about ten, set out on what we had determined should be a good day's journey (K. Jerome).

The interaction of one of the above characteristics with the characteristics of the evaluative concepts "good" and "bad" highlighted above provides an evaluative categorization of the object and the formation on the basis of this definite evaluative meaning in speech. In short, the linguistic materialization of a concept is the product of a collaboration between the mind and the language system. The starting point for the formation of a concept is the formation of an image of a part of reality (object). This image is not a simple scheme or form, but a meaningful phenomenon. However, such a connection between reality-consciousness-linguistic sign should not be interpreted as a mere repetition. This is because consciousness does not simply reflect reality through a linguistic sign, but distinguishes the signs and features that are important to the subject, and on the basis of them creates a model model of the perceived object (object, event).

The concepts "good" and "bad" are key concepts in British culture. Typologically, they, on the one hand, are universal concepts, on the other hand, they are regulatory concepts. The studied linguacultural concepts are based on abstract concepts, thus it is not possible to give a complete and exhaustive list of meaningful characteristics of these concepts.

The nominative data fields of the concepts are represented by the key nominations good "good" and evil "bad", wide synonymous series, various part-of-speech units, phrases, phraseological units, as well as text fragments. On the basis of lexicographic marks, 238 representatives were identified (concept "good" - 78, concept "bad" - 160) belonging to the secular and 64 representatives (concept "good" - 28, concept "bad/evil" - 36) - to religious spheres existence of concepts.

The conceptual component of these concepts is formed on the basis of three thematic groups: 1) "inner and outer man", 2) "secular ideas about good and evil"; 3) "religious ideas about good and evil". The core of the thematic group "inner and outer man" is polarly correlated basic features of the concept "good": 1) "everything that corresponds to the norms of behavior in society", 2) "everything that is beneficial"; the concept of "evil": 1) "everything that contradicts the norms of behavior in society"; 2) "everything that harms." Depending on the research material, there is an actualization of one or another basic feature, so on the phraseological material the actual feature of the "good" concept is "everything that benefits" and "everything that contradicts the norms of behavior in society" - the concept "bad". The basic features of the core of the concepts are revealed in the following features of the nucleus zone that coincide for both concepts: "character traits", "behavioral features", "activity", "attitude", "physical state". Differential signs of the concept "good" are recognized as "features of appearance", "property status" and "social status relations".

REFERENCES

[1] Bessinger D. Good, Ethics and Evil. — электронный ресурс: http://members.aol.com/dbscriptor/scr.html

[2] Eberts J. The Concept of Evil. электронный ресурс: http://www.philosophypathways.com/essays/eberts4.html

[3] Evans V., Green M., Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction. — Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006. 857p.

[4] Fuller R. Understanding Good and Evil in Children's Literature. -электронный. ресурс: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conflictbetweengoodandevil

[5] Good and Evil versus Good and Bad // Struggles with Philosophy. -электронный ресурс: http://struggleswithphilosophy.blogspotcom/

[6] Алефиренко Н.Ф. Проблемы вербализации концепта: Теоретическое исследование. - Волгоград: Перемена. 2003. - 96 с.

[7] Болдырев, Н.Н. Категории как форма репрезентации знаний в языке / Болдырев Н.Н. // Концептуальное пространство языка: Сб. науч. тр. Посвящается юбилею проф. Н.Н. Болдырева. Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ им. Г.Р. Державина, 2005.-С. 16-40.

[8] Болдырев, Н.Н. Концептуальное пространство когнитивной лингвистики / Болдырев Н.Н. // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ им. Г.Р.Державина, 2004. -№1. - С. 18-37.

[9] Болдырев, Н.Н. Отрицание как модусно-оценочный концепт / Болдырев Н.Н. //Единство системного и функционального анализа языковых единиц: Мат-лы науч. конф. 8-9 октября 2003. Вып. 7. - Ч I. - Белгород: Изд-во БелГУ, 2003.-С. 4-5.

[10] Болдырев, Н.Н. Языковые механизмы оценочной категоризации / Болдырев Н.Н. //Реальность, язык и сознание: Между нар. межвуз. сб. науч. тр. - Вып. 2. Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ им. Г.Р.Державина, 2002а. - С. 360 - 369.

[11] Воркачев С.Г. Концепт счастья в русском языковом сознании: Опыт лингвокультурологического анализа. Краснодар: "КГТУ", 2002. - 142 с.

[12] Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: Личность, Концепты, Дискурс, Волгоград "Перемена", 2002. - 375 с.

[13] Кронгауз М.А. Семантика: Учебник для студ. Лингв, фак. Высш.учеб. заведений. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. - М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2005.-352с.

[14] Степанова Ю.С Константы: Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования.- М.: Языки русской культуры. 1997.- С. 47.

[15] Телия В.Н. "Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты". - М: "Языки русской культуры", 1996. - 288 с.

[16] Фесенко Т. А. Специфика национально культурного пространства в зеркалеперевода: учеб. пособ. – Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ им. Г. Р. Держаина, 2002. – 228 с.

DİCTİONARY

[1] CIDE Cambridge International Dictionary of English. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. - 1774 p.

[2] Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture with colour illustrations. Longman - Group UK Limited, 1992. - 1555 p.

[3] Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language. -New York: Gramercy Books, 1996. 2230 p.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Call : 08813907089 (24*7 Support on Whatsapp)