

Features of the Concept of "Anger" in English and Uzbek Languages

Turgunov Dilshodbek Bakhodirovich

Teacher of the department of the integrated course of English language learning
at the Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract

This article examines the features of the concept “anger” in English and Uzbek languages. The purpose of the work is to systematically describe interlingual similarities and differences in the conceptualization of emotions using the material of the Uzbek and English languages, and in each cluster the bulk of linguistic means expressing different aspects of emotions are analyzed. It turns out that given the presence of numerous semantic contrasts between individual words in the Uzbek and English languages, as well as the frequent absence of an unconditional translation equivalent, the structure of emotional clusters largely overlaps.

Keywords: concept, emotions, anger, literal translation, equivalent.

In this regard, it may be typologically valuable to study not only conceptual differences, but also similarities between languages. In particular, the example of emotions shows that despite all the typological and cultural dissimilarities between languages, there are certain common tendencies that are partly biological, partly conceptual and cultural, partly purely linguistic, semantic in nature. Thus, our goal in this work is to construct a semantic typology of emotions that takes into account both similarities and differences between languages. The work was carried out on the material of emotional concepts in the Uzbek and English languages. Since these languages are not typologically and culturally distant, the typology obtained as a result of our research in no way claims to be complete. However, it can be considered as the beginning of a more general work on creating a semantic typology of emotions, during which the results we obtained can be supplemented and corrected.

For example, if we compare the English word anger with the Uzbek words “jahli” and “g’azab” in isolation, without considering other words with the meaning “angry”, we conclude that the English and Uzbek conceptualizations of anger are radically different. The fact is that the English word anger describes a very wide range of situations and feelings, but in the Uzbek language there is no similar word with a broad meaning, which requires a variety of translation equivalents depending on the context. Compare:

- the professor’s anger at the student who cheated on a test – literal translation: «Testda aldagan talabaga professor g'azablandi», translation according to meaning: “Professorning talabadan jahli chiqd”;
- the country’s anger at the raise of taxes – literal translation: “solliqlarning ko'tarilishidan mamlakatning g'azabi”, translation according to meaning: “fuqarolarning soliqlar oshishidan noroziligi”;
- the country’s anger at a foreign invasion – literal translation “chet el bosqinidan mamlakatning g'azabi”, translation according to meaning: “Xalq g'azabi”

- The dog's anger was apparent – literal translation “itning jahli sezilib turardi”, translation according to meaning: “Itning g'azabi aniq edi”.

However, if the “centers” of the field “anger” in the Uzbek and English languages are indeed very different (more precisely, in the Uzbek “jahli, g'azab” there is no central common word as such), then much more parallels are found on the periphery. Thus, in both languages, the following “subtypes” of “anger” are distinguished as separate emotions, among many others: – strong, uncontrollable “anger” (see also below) – fury, rage (g'azab, jahli); – superficial and, possibly, caused by the character traits of the experiencer “anger” – irritation, irritation; – “jahli” caused by failure to achieve a set goal (and perhaps not having a specific object) – annoyance, frustration.

Thus, if we consider and compare the entire field of “anger” (“jahli”) as a whole and see the whole system, and not its individual parts, then (although this may not be expected from the example of every pair of languages) many more systemic similarities are discovered than when comparison of individual words. Comparing entire systems, rather than their individual elements, makes it possible, it seems, to avoid another danger: the absolutization of individual linguistic features of individual words as indicators of differences in the mentalities of speakers of different languages. Of course, intercultural differences can be very deep, and language to some extent reflects them, but the objectivity of language as a “mirror” of mentality is not obvious, especially if we rely as a criterion on the untranslatability of a particular word. The fact is that complete translatability is an extremely rare phenomenon, and from the absence of exact equivalents it is impossible to draw a conclusion about global differences in mentalities and emotions.

Returning to the semantic field of ‘anger’, consider an example from the work of Wierzbicka, where we are talking about the feeling of angra (angry-jahli, in anger-g'azabda) in a dying person: *Dying people may feel angry... Some people feel angry at God for allowing them to get sick, at their doctors for not being able to find a cure, at the government for putting money into weapons instead of medical research, or at the world in general* (literal translation: “*O'layotgan odamlar g'azablanishlari mumkin ... Ba'zi odamlar kasal bo'lishlariga yo'l qo'ygani uchun Xudoga, davo topa olmagan shifokorlariga, tibbiy tadqiqotlar o'rniga qurolga pul sarflagan hukumatga yoki umuman dunyoga g'azablanishadi*”). The author argues that the impossibility of accurately translating this phrase into Uzbek due to the lack of translation equivalents indicates a fundamental difference in how native speakers of English and Uzbek feel in the described situation. “By examining the meaning and the use of words like anger and angry in contemporary English we can indeed learn a great deal about the “emotional universe” of the speakers of contemporary English... They reflect its /society's/ “habits of the heart”. The conclusion drawn from the above that the feeling that a native English speaker would experience in such a situation is unique and that speakers of different languages will experience fundamentally different emotions seems still too strong. Of course, residents of different countries may feel differently in a similar (or any other) situation, but it can hardly be argued that this is determined primarily by language differences. Rather, such things are determined by a whole complex of factors: character, social and cultural environment, country and environment, religiosity or lack thereof. It may well be that speakers of the same language will experience different feelings in a similar situation due to differences in age, temperament, and values, and speakers of different languages - if they are close in these parameters - in a similar way, despite the impossibility of verbalizing this feeling in the same way.

Another type of “angry (jahli)” expressed in English, similar to irritation, is annoyance, a type of “anger” caused by a repeated unpleasant stimulus, i.e. something between being annoyed. Like irritation, annoyance indicates an almost physically unpleasant and annoying feeling that deprives a person of peace of mind. However, annoyance has an additional limitation: it typically occurs after something unpleasant has happened several times, and when the experiencer feels personally affected by it. Unlike irritation, annoyance is a deep feeling: deeply annoyed. In addition, annoyed is often seen as a more justified reaction to a stimulus than irritation, which

can be caused by the character traits of the experiencer - the fact that the person is irritable; there is no such character trait as *annoyable. In Uzbek, the concept of such “anger” is also present, but not in the literary language, but in slang or in rough form: “*jonga tegding, xit qilding*”.

There is another type of “anger” in English, which can be caused by circumstances and not directed at a specific person (similar to irritation and annoyance). This type of “anger” is expressed in English by the words to frustrate, frustrated, frustration, frustrating. It, like annoyance, is caused by a repeated stimulus, but is close not to boredom, but to disappointment, it involves constant failure to achieve the goal and, as a result, a feeling of impotent “anger” about the object that prevents the achievement of the goal, or circumstances; these three emotions – frustration, disappointment and anger – are often even mentioned side by side: “This is causing a great deal of frustration and anger and disappointment among women (COCA) women; (Bu ayollarda umidsizlik, g'azab va ko'ngil qolishni keltirib chiqaradigan omil bo'lmoqda); I had a sense of tremendous frustration and disenchantment and anger (Menda juda ko'p umidsizlik, ma'yuslik va g'azab hissi bor edi)”.

In general, the conceptual maps of “anger” in Uzbek and English show quite a lot of overlap, although the more specialized and marginal types of “anger” coincide to a greater extent than the central, neutral part. This fact is interesting from a theoretical point of view, since it contradicts the idea that the semantically neutral, central, prototypical should be more universal, and the more specialized, marginal, distant from the center should be more variable. It seems that the probability of the coincidence of simple semantic structures in different languages is no higher than the probability of the coincidence of more complex structures (for example, simple anger does not have an exact correlate, but the more complex spite and malice are correlated). This is apparently due to the fact that the reflection of certain concepts in language is regulated not only by the linguistic, semantic processes themselves, but also by universal human cognitive characteristics, due to which some configurations of life situations and, accordingly, semantic components in the meaning of words turn out to be more frequent and in demand and, as a result, linguistically more universal than others.

Analysis of the features of the concept “anger” in the English and Uzbek languages demonstrated both general and specific characteristics. General characteristics are illustrated by the predominance of meanings common to words in both languages of conceptual groups. At the same time, the distinctive features are reflected due to differences in the names themselves involved in the formation of phraseological units. Thus, the concept of “anger” in the Uzbek language, compared to the concept of the English language, has a smaller number of names themselves, which are expressed by a large number of examples compared to the English meanings of words; and, accordingly, the concept “anger” in the English language has a larger number of names, but at the same time they have a minimal number of examples. It follows from this that the features of the concept of “anger” in the English language are more diverse in terms of the number of different names. It is also worth noting that during this analysis of the concept of “anger” the English language differed from the Uzbek language in its more abstract nature and special specific structure; in the Uzbek language this tendency is manifested to a lesser extent.

In general, the differences in the names involved in the formation of a sentence with the concept of “anger” demonstrate different associative connections and emphasize the individual nature of the development of English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking cultures. The concept of “anger” is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, the formation of which was influenced by cultural and historical development, worldview, religion and way of life, whose differences left a certain imprint in the form of specific features. Thus, the concept of “anger” is a reflection of the cultural development of linguistic cultures and the characteristics of thinking and perception.

References

1. Karasik V.I. Basic characteristics of linguistic and cultural concepts. Ed-3. - Volgograd: Paradigm, 2021. - T. I.

2. Koshkina E. G. The concept and essence of a concept as a multidimensional semantic formation in the collective consciousness // Language and communication in the context of culture: materials of the XIV international scientific and practical conference (June 23–24, 2021). — Ryazan: Ryazan State. ped. University named after S. A. Yesenina.
3. Rasulova N. V. (2022). Comparative characteristics of symptomatic expressions of the semantic field “Anger” in Arabic and English using the example of phraseological units. Scientific notes of the Crimean Federal University named after V.I. Vernadsky. Philological Sciences, 26 (65), 268-274.
4. Sharipov B.L. Intercultural relations: Language, consciousness, communication: Sat. articles. - M.: MIR, 2021. - Issue. 23. - 124 p.
5. Wierzbicka A. Semantics, culture and cognition. Universal human concepts in culture-specific with configurations. New York; Oxford, 2019.