

LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL CONCEPTS OF "GOOD" AND "EVIL" IN RUSSIAN, ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES

Amaniyazova Xurliman Paraxatovna

KSU named after Berdach

2course-Master's degree in English

Annotation: This article presents a comparative linguistic and cultural concepts "good" and "evil" as a subject of linguistic research" the problem of the relationship between Russian, English and Karakalpak languages and culture is considered, various points of view on the typology of linguistic and cultural concepts are given, a class of basic concepts of linguistic culture is distinguished and the basic characteristics of linguistic and cultural concepts are described. A step-by-step study of the linguistic and cultural concept is proposed, the conceptual, figurative and value components of the concepts are revealed.

Keywords: Linguistic concept, cultural concept, good, evil, russian language, english language, karakalpak language, comparative analysis.

Аннотация: В данной статье представлено сопоставление лингвокультурных концептов "добро" и "зло" как предмета лингвистического исследования. Рассматривается проблема взаимосвязи русского, английского и каракалпакского языков и культуры, приводятся различные точки зрения на типологию лингвокультурных концептов, класс выделены основные понятия лингвокультуры и описаны основные характеристики лингвокультурных концептов. Предлагается поэтапное изучение лингвокультурного концепта, раскрываются концептуальная, образная и ценностная составляющие концептов.

Ключевые слова: лингвистический концепт, культурный концепт, добро, зло, русский язык, английский язык, каракалпакский язык, сравнительный анализ.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada lingvistik tadqiqot mavzusi sifatida "yaxshi" va "yomon" lingvistik-madaniy tushunchalarining taqqoslanishi keltirilgan. Rus tili, ingliz va qoraqalpoq tillari va madaniyati o'rtasidagi munosabatlar muammosi ko'rib chiqiladi, lingvistik-madaniy tushunchalar tipologiyasiga turli nuqtai nazarlar beriladi, sinf lingvokulturaning asosiy tushunchalarini ajratib ko'rsatadi va lingvistik-madaniy tushunchalarning asosiy xususiyatlarini tavsiflaydi. Lingvistik-madaniy kontseptsiyani bosqichma-bosqich o'rganish taklif etiladi, kontseptsiyalarning kontseptual, majoziy va qiymat tarkibiy qismlari ochib beriladi.

Kalit so'zlar: lingvistik tushuncha, madaniy tushuncha, yaxshilik, yomonlik, rus tili, ingliz tili, qoraqalpoq tili, qiyosiy tahlil.

Annotatsiya: Bul maqalada lingvistikalıq izertlew teması retinde " jaqsı" hám " jaman" lingvistikalıq-mádeniy túsınikleriniń salıstırılwanıwı keltirilgen. Rus tili, inglis hám qaraqalpaq tilleri hám mádeniyatı ortasındaǵı múnasábetler mashqalası kórip shıǵıladı, lingvistikalıq-mádeniy túsınikler tipologiyasına túrli kózqaraslar beriledi, klass lingvokulturanıń tiykarǵı túsıniklerin ajratıp kórsetedi hám lingvistik-mádeniy túsıniklerdiń tiykarǵı qásiyetlerin xarakterleydi. Lingvistik-mádeniy kontseptsiyanı basqıshpa-basqısh úyreniw usınıs etiledi, kontseptsiyalardıń kontseptual, metaforalıq hám baha strukturalıq bólimleri ashıp beriledi.

Tayanış sózler: lingvistikalıq túsınik, mádeniy túsınik, jaqsılıq, jamanlıq, rus tili, inglis tili, qaraqalpaq tili, salıstırmalı analiz.

The most important category of linguoculturology is the linguistic cultural concept. Most scientists agree that the linguistic and cultural concept is a multidimensional mental education that has access to the culture of society. Differences of opinion on the definition of a linguistic and cultural concept are as follows: when studying concepts, more attention is paid to the data of etymology, history and cultural studies [1;432]; linguistic and cultural concepts are considered through the prism of value orientations fixed in concepts [2;390]; associative connections of the concept are considered significant [3;39]; the presence of ethno cultural specificity is noted [4;263]; the concept is recognized as a unit of a high degree of abstraction [5;375].

The concepts of "good" and "evil" are fundamental to human understanding of morality and ethics. However, the linguistic expressions of these concepts vary across different languages and cultures, reflecting diverse cultural values and perspectives. This study investigates how the notions of "good" and "evil" are articulated in Russian, English, and Karakalpak languages, aiming to uncover the underlying cultural and semantic nuances shaping their linguistic representations.

The conceptual content of the concepts "good" and "evil" is categorized into three thematic groups: the thematic group "inner and outer man" (*«человек внутренний и внешний»*) has a clear differentiation of cognitive features. The thematic group "secular ideas about good and evil" (*«светские представления о добре и зле»*) is characterized by syncretism of the polar signs of the nuclear zone, and the thematic group "religious ideas about good and evil" (*«религиозные представления о добре и зле»*) has a clearly polarized structure of cognitive signs.

The core of the conceptual component of the concepts of the thematic group "inner and outer man" consists of the following basic features of the concept "good":

"everything that corresponds to the norms of behavior in society" and "everything that benefits"; the concept "evil": "everything that contradicts the norms accepted in society" and "everything that harms."

As a result of the component analysis of the lexical units objectifying these concepts, five common features representing the nuclear zone were identified:

"character traits", "behavioral characteristics", "activity", "attitude", "physical condition"; and three the differential features in the structure of the "good" concept are: "features of appearance", "property status" and "social status relations".

Thus, the basic features of concepts are clarified in the characteristics of a person, his behavior, activities and relationships.

In the phraseological foundation, the concept of "good" is represented by an adjective good «добрый, хороший» and its derivatives: degrees of comparison better / best «лучший», an adverb well «хорошо»; and, to a lesser extent, tokens benefit «польза», advantage «польза, преимущество», luck «удача».

The concept of "evil" is objectified by adjectives *evil* «злой, нечистый, недоброжелательный», *ill* «злополучный, недоброжелательный», *bad* «плохой, злополучный», its derivatives *worse / worst* «хуже», *wrong* «грешный», to a lesser extent, nouns *evil* «зло», *devil* «дьявол». The analysis of phraseological material makes it possible to identify in the structure of the conceptual component of the concept "good" the nuclear sign "all that is useful", signs of the nuclear zone "good manifests itself in human character traits", "good manifests itself in activity" and a sign of the peripheral zone "human attitude to the surrounding reality". The conceptual structure of the concept of "evil" is formed by the nuclear sign "evil manifests itself in character traits and behavior" and the sign of the peripheral zone "human attitude to the surrounding reality", "evil as a result of circumstances".

The linguistic and cultural concept of "good" in parodies is represented explicitly by the following lexemes: *good* «добро», «хороший, добрый», *better* «лучше», *best* «самый лучший», *well* «добро», «хорошо», *kindness* «доброта», *kind* «добрый», *virtue* «добродетель», *right* «правильный, морально одобряемый», *godliness* «благочестие», *charity* «благотворительность» и *имплицитно*: *healthy* «здоровый», *fortune* «фортуна, удача», *wealthy* «богатый», *success* «успех».[6; 942]

Previous research has explored the linguistic categorization of morality in various languages, highlighting the influence of cultural and historical factors on semantic constructions. Studies have demonstrated that languages encode moral values differently, with lexical and grammatical structures reflecting unique cultural perspectives. However, there is a dearth of comparative analysis focusing specifically on the concepts of "good" and "evil" across Russian, English, and Karakalpak languages, necessitating further investigation into these linguistic phenomena.

This study employs a comparative linguistic approach to analyze the semantic and cultural dimensions of the concepts of "good" and "evil" in Russian, English, and Karakalpak languages. Utilizing a combination of corpus analysis, semantic mapping, and cultural interpretation, the research examines lexical items, collocations, and idiomatic expressions associated with these concepts in each language. Additionally, qualitative analysis of literary texts and cultural artifacts provides insights into the

cultural connotations and contextual usage of "good" and "evil" in the studied languages.

Each of these languages has its own unique characteristics and cultural influences that shape its linguistic categories.

The linguistic categorization of "good" and "evil" varies across languages and cultures, reflecting different societal values and belief systems. Let's explore how these concepts are expressed in Russian, English, and Karakalpak languages:

1. Russian (Русский):

- "Good": "хороший" is commonly used to denote something positive or morally right.

- "Evil": "зло" signifies something malevolent or morally wrong.

2. English:

- "Good": In addition to "good," English has various synonyms like "positive," "beneficial," or "virtuous."

- "Evil": Alongside "evil," synonyms include "wicked," "malevolent," or "sinister."

3. Karakalpak (Qaraqalpaq):

- "Good": "jaqsi" typically means "good" or "beneficial."

- "Evil": "jaman" is commonly used to describe something evil or malicious.[7;5]

It's essential to note that the nuances and cultural connotations associated with these terms may differ significantly across languages and communities. Additionally, interpretations of morality can be influenced by religious, philosophical, and historical factors unique to each culture.

The findings highlight the complex interplay between language, culture, and morality in shaping linguistic categories of "good" and "evil." The differences observed in the semantic representations of these concepts underscore the cultural specificity of moral discourse, emphasizing the importance of contextual understanding in cross-cultural communication. Moreover, the study elucidates the dynamic nature of language evolution, as linguistic expressions of morality continue to evolve in response to social, political, and cultural changes.

Conclusions and Suggestions:

In conclusion, this comparative analysis offers valuable insights into the linguistic categorization of "good" and "evil" in Russian, English, and Karakalpak languages. By elucidating the cultural and semantic nuances underlying these concepts, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of moral discourse across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. Future studies could explore additional languages and expand the scope of analysis to further enrich our understanding of moral semantics and cultural variability. Additionally, practical applications of this research may include cross-

cultural communication training and the development of culturally sensitive linguistic resources.

REFERENCES:

1. Stepanov Yu.S. Alternative world, Discourse, Fact and the principle of Causality // Language and science of the late 20th century. Collection of articles. Moscow: RGGU.- 1995.-432p.
2. Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. — Moscow: Gnosis, 2004.-390s
3. Slyshkin G.G. Linguistic and cultural concepts and metaconcepts: abstract. dis . Doctor of Philological Sciences. — Volgograd, 2004. — 39p.
4. Vorkachev S.G. Cultural concept and meaning // Proceedings of the Kuban State Technological University. Ser. Humanities, Vol. 17. Issue 2. Krasnodar, 2003a. - pp. 263-276.
5. Krasnykh V.V. "One's own" among "strangers": myth or reality? Moscow: ITDK "Gnosis", 2003. — 375p.
6. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Yu. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. — Moscow: 2006 – P 942
7. Qaraqalpaq tilinin tu'sindirme so'zligi. 4 tomliq. 1992-4-tom