



LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD "NEGATIVE EMOTIONS" IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES: COGNITIVE- PRAGMATIC ASPECT

Bakhramova Zamira Rahimovna

Teacher of Bukhara Engineering Technological Institute

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14249736>

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 20- Noyabr 2024 yil
Ma'qullandi: 25- Noyabr 2024 yil
Nashr qilindi: 30- Noyabr 2024 yil

KEYWORDS

English language, Uzbek language, terminology, lexicon, semantics, words.

ABSTRACT

This study's importance stems from the need for a thorough examination of how negative emotion is conceptualized in Uzbek and English worldviews within the context of cognitive linguistics.

Introduction: When the following paradigms—communicative, cognitive, textual, pragmatic, cultural, categorization, etc.—come into touch, the problem of how human emotion is implemented in literature is addressed. As psychology is focused on linguistics, which has demonstrated that emotions encompass all human behavior, including the verbal and mental domains as well as bodily language, this polyparadigmality of the linguistics of emotions makes sense. V.I. Shakhovskiy asserts that there is a close relationship between language and emotions [Shakhovskiy, 2008, 34]. Emotions are replicated and formed, appearing in lexical and extralinguistic forms, although they are not necessarily semanticized because they are communicatively significant. As A. Vezhbitskaya notes, human emotion is a meaning-bearing factor that arises in the process of communication [Vezhbitskaya, 1995, 235]. This position has been confirmed by a huge number of works by conceptologists and etymologists.

Analysis: The scientific work consists in considering insufficiently studied problems related to the theory of the systematicity of vocabulary. Based on this, the principle of identifying and structuring special areas of vocabulary, in particular, the lexical-semantic field, is analyzed. In the work, the content of the microfields "anger", "fear" and "grief" is interpreted from the position of cognitive science, as well as in identifying and describing verbal and non-verbal means representing the corresponding content in the language (Uzbek and English).

The creation of national-specific linguistic images of the world is caused by national variances in how the world is divided and the quirks of portraying reality in particular languages. An expression of the world is given a unique form in each national tongue. Since emotion is a universal concept, it is present in people from all linguistic backgrounds and stems from the untamed mind, which is the only characteristic of humans. Every linguistic system has its own names for emotions, and behind each of these are societal beliefs about the emotion's characteristics, its role in other emotions, and its causes. All languages and cultures

share a common cognitive foundation for the examined microfields of "anger," "fear," and "grief."

Certain features that are determined by distinct cultural functions and forms of manifestation of specific ethno-mental content can be manifestations of the specificity of verbal/non-verbal representations of lexemes included in the microfields "anger," "fear," and "grief" that are determined by cultural factors. Language data revealed that speakers of various linguacultures have distinct ways of expressing emotions. L. Weisgerber concludes that linguistics will be founded on two primary categories in the future: 1) language as a "middle link" that enables the synthesis of an individual's inner world and the external reality around him, and 2) a worldview realized on the basis of the native language. This conclusion is based on the general theoretical premises of A. Humboldt's teaching. The "internal" and the "external" are synthesized by language,

Although language synthesizes the "internal" and the "external", it is the internal that is leading: the native language plays a decisive role in how a person perceives reality, what he sees in it.

Hence the three basic laws of language: 1) the law of linguistic community, 2) the law of the native language and 3) the law of being conditioned by language.

The task, from the point of view of neo-Humboldtian ethnolinguistics, is to compare languages as integral systems of a certain way organized "linguistic contents", as different "pictures of the world" revealing the differences in the "national spirit" of different peoples. Only on this basis can we understand and explain the peculiarities of different languages.

Lexical fields are the outcome of the verbalization of the world, according to L. Weisgerber. The lexical picture of the natural language world is formed by the systematic character of lexical fields. It should be mentioned that universal categories—part and whole, general and particular, internal and external—occupy the majority of the system of lexical fields. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity, which also aided in the creation of the contemporary idea of the linguistic picture of the world, is also pertinent in this context. E. Sapir observes in his paper "The Status of Linguistics as a Science":

"The functioning of language is largely unconscious; this unconsciousness should not be exaggerated, but it is nevertheless true that we almost never think about the countless ideas that arise in our heads, associating and combining, when uttering the slightest phrase; we choose words in conversation unconsciously, finding those that seem to us the most understandable and most expressive; just as unconsciously, the author continues, we sometimes create new words that we find thanks to obscure analogies; and unconsciously, spontaneous work unfolds to understand what the interlocutor has said" [Sapir, 1993, 263]. In other words, operations with language presuppose the presence of a collective mind; this consensus is a property of a given linguistic community. From the above it follows that Sapir-Whorf sees the source of cultural divergence in the national originality of languages. However, this hypothesis has been criticized. The main drawback of this theory, according to many researchers, is the following: 1) the main thesis turns out to be closed in a vicious circle: the assertion that people speaking different languages perceive the world differently is proven only by the fact that they speak different languages. One cannot help but notice the lack of necessary clarity in the formulation of the question. On the one hand, it seems that the thesis is really defended that people speaking different languages perceive the world differently and

that such a conclusion can be made based on the differences in languages. On the other hand, nowhere is a one-sided causal relationship between these two factors definitely indicated: it turns out that people perceive the world differently because they have different languages, and, on the contrary, the fact that people perceive the world differently turns out to be simply in a certain correlation with differences in their language [Vezhbitskaya, 2001, 89]; 2) this theory does not take into account the communicative function of language, reducing the issue to the processes of perception and formation of concepts [Vorkachev, 2003, 6].

Result: "In reality, language develops only in society, and not only because a person is always a part of the whole to which he belongs, namely his tribe, people, humanity, not only because mutual understanding is necessary for the possibility of social enterprises, but also because a person understands himself only after experiencing the intelligibility of his words on others," considers A.A. Potebnya, who was influenced by the ideas of V. von Humboldt, in his theory of anthropocentrism.

References:

1. Averina A.V. National and cultural specificity of the lexical and grammatical field // Bulletin of the Moscow State Linguistic University. 2008. No. 554. Pp. 61-
2. Vapnik N.A., Vergunova L.G. Theoretical and linguistic prerequisites for the semantic organization of phraseological units (on the example of the lexical and phraseological field "communication" in English, German and Russian) // Actual issues of modern linguistics. Moscow: Moscow State Regional University, 2020. Pp. 126-131.
3. Vezhbitskaya A. Understanding cultures through keywords / translated from English by A.D. Shmeleva. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2001. 289 p.
4. Vezhbitskaya A. Comparison of Cultures through Lexicon and Pragmatics, Moscow, 2002. 272 p.
- Rakhimovna, B. Z. (2023). THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE MAIN CHARACTERS IN "NICHOLAS NICKELBY" BY CHARLES DICKENS. SO 'NGI ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR NAZARIYASI, 6(6), 338-342. <https://bestpublication.org/index.php/sit/article/view/7172>
- Bakhramova Z. R. DEPICTION OF HUMAN TRAGEDY IN "NICHOLAS NICKELBY" BY CHARLES DICKENS //SCIENCE TIME JOURNAL. – 2023. – T. 1. – №. 4. – C. 62-67. SCIENCE TIME JOURNAL, 2023•uzresearchers.com
7. Etymology and History of Words of the Russian Language [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://etymolog.ruslang.ru/vinogradov.php?id=obshitelnij&vol=1> (accessed: 12.09.2021).
8. British National Corpus (BNC). [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/> (accessed: 13.09.2021; 15.11.2021).
9. Cambridge Dictionary [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/ru/> (dates of access: 22.12.2021, 23.12.2021, 25.12.2021).