

LINGUISTIC CATEGORIES “GOOD” and “EVIL” IN RUSSIAN,  
ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES

*Amaniyazova Xurliman Paraxatovna*  
2<sup>nd</sup> course master’s degree student of  
*Linguistics (English language)*  
*Karakalpak state university*

**Annotation:** The article examines the concepts of “good” and “evil” on the material of different system languages (English, Russian and Karakalpak) as a psycholinguistic category to identify common characteristics and national-cultural features of linguocognitive categorization and conceptualization of linguomental axiological spheres. Studying in this aspect is important, since it is in key concepts that the worldview of native speakers is reflected.

**Key words:** GOOD and EVIL, linguistic experiment, linguoculture, linguomental spheres

In recent decades, there has also been a sharp increase in interest in their study on the part of linguists, and today we see a variety of interpretations of the concepts of “good” and “evil.” According to the philosophical encyclopedic dictionary, “good” and “evil” are normative and evaluative categories of moral consciousness. In their highest abstraction, they designate, on the one hand, what is due and morally positive, good, and on the other hand, what is morally negative and condemned in the actions and motives of people, as well as in the phenomena of social reality [1].

The purpose of this article is to describe the results of a linguistic experiment we conducted, the task of which was to identify general patterns and national characteristics of linguocognitive categorization and conceptualization of the linguomental axiological subspheres of GOOD and EVIL in the structure of the general linguomental sphere MAN in the naive linguistic pictures of the world of representatives of the Russian, English and Karakalpak languages .

We believe that evaluation as a semantic concept, which is understood as the value aspect of the meaning of linguistic expressions, is probably a universal category, since there is hardly at least one language in which there is no idea of “good - bad”. However, languages exhibit specificity in the ways they express evaluative meanings. Peculiarities in languages are explained not so much by semantic discrepancies themselves, but by the blurred nature of the scale of evaluative designations and the vagueness of evaluative stereotypes [2].

Let us note that the need for native speaker reflection to identify many conceptual features of various linguistic and mental spheres is recognized by many

leading cognitive linguists. For example, Z. D. Popova and I. A. Sternin emphasize that “the content of the concept includes not only the semantic components associated with the word that are actually realized and used in communication, but also signs that reflect the general information base of a person, his encyclopedic knowledge about an object or phenomenon, it may not be found in his speech and may not be immediately recognized upon presentation of the corresponding word, but is the property of personal or collective experience” [3].

The category of cultural values includes such phenomena of human existence as customs, stereotypes, norms of behavior, assessments, and ideals. Taking them into account, certain rules of human behavior in society are built. Therefore, for the most part, values are determined by ideology, institutions, beliefs and the needs of society. At the same time, rejection of values and actions that contradict them is condemned by public opinion.

To the questions of our questionnaire “What is, in your opinion, good and evil?” We received a variety of answers from respondents, which are further grouped separately for each universal-axiological subsphere and for each linguistic culture we studied.

Thus, respondents define *good* as follows:

In russian language: *добрые поступки* – 65,07 %; *приносит пользу (радость) другим* – 45,59 %; *бескорыстие (альтруизм)* – 26,47 %; *человеколюбие* – 12,50 %; *уважение к другим людям, любовь* – 8,09 %;

in English: *virtue* – 68,45 %; *kindness* – 44,05 %; *generosity* – 36,90 %; *helpfulness* – 30,36 %;

in the Karakalpak language: *jaqsılıq* – 64,02 %; *quwanış* – 38,51 %; *mehir-muhabbat* – 17,82 %.

Participants in our linguistic experiment define *evil* as follows:

In russian language: *умышленное нанесение вреда другим людям* – 59,56 %; *недобрые поступки* – 48,16 %; *ненависть* – 30,51 %;

in English: *doing something bad* – 63,10 %; *pitilessness* – 41,07 %; *injustice* – 22,02 %; *harmfulness* – 17,86 %;

in the Karakalpak language: *jaman* – 66,67 %; *kewilsizlik* – 47,70 %; *jamanlıq* – 37,93 %; *kórealmawshılıq* – 20,11 %.

The results of the psycholinguistic experiment we conducted allow us to draw a conclusion about the universality of the features of linguocognitive categorization and conceptualization of the axiological subspheres of GOOD and EVIL in the structure of the linguomental sphere MAN in the native language pictures of the world of representatives of the Russian, English and Karakalpak languages.

For example, good is assessed positively by representatives of all the linguistic cultures we study and is associated with positive concepts of kindness, mercy, goodness, and virtue. Data from a psycholinguistic experiment indicate that evil is also a universal category in the linguistic consciousness of representatives of related and unrelated linguistic cultures, associated with something negative, bad, disgusting: untruth, dishonesty, indifference, immorality.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Amaniyazova.H.P. Axiological categories “Good” and “Evil” in Russian, English and Karakalpak languages. Nukus
2. Wolf E. M. Functional semantics of assessment. M.: Librocom, 2009.
3. Popova Z. D., Sternin I. A. Cognitive linguistics. M.: AST: Vostok – Zapad, 2007.
4. A. P. Chudinov, N. A. Sergienko, V. M. Glushak GOOD, EVIL, TRUTH, FALSE in Russian, Ukrainian, British and American linguistic cultures: the experience of a psycholinguistic experiment.