



## “Involta” Ilmiy Jurnal

Vebsayt: <https://involta.uz/>

### CONTRADICTIONARY-TYOLOGICAL STUDY OF LANGUAGE UNITS EXPRESSING THE CONCEPT OF " XURSANDCHILK "(JOY) IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

**ABDURASHIDOVA KAMOLA ABDURASULOVNA**

Andijan State Medical Institute Teacher of English in the department of foreign  
languages

**Annotation:** This article discusses in detail the contrast-typological study of words that express the intensity of the concept of "xursandchilik" in English and Uzbek.

**Keywords:** English and Uzbek, "xursandchilik", language, joy, units, contradictions, typology.

It is divided into the opposite study of the means of expressing the concept of "xursandchilik" (joy) in English and Uzbek. All possible means (words, phrases, phraseological units, sentences, paramias, and text) that make up the area of ‘joy’ are shown. The semantic, structural, functional, stylistic and pragmatic features of the components of the field of "joy" are revealed.

It is devoted to the study of the compatibility of interlinguistic languages with the semantics of "joy", which means the strengthening of units.

New theoretical views on the process of cognition, the concept of "joy" and its

implementation in English and Uzbek, the results of conflicting studies on the isomorphic and allomorphic properties of the latter, including new theoretical views.

The relevance of the topic can be seen in the following theoretical and practical issues related to the concept of "joy".

- to explain the concepts, notions and meanings and their interrelationships;
- The concept, definition, characteristics and features of joy.
- create a nomenclature of all verbal and nonverbal means of expressing the concept of joy in the English and Uzbek languages;
- To study the nature, scope and systemic relations of the industry, which forms the field of "xursandchilik" (joy);
- create a list of semantic amplifiers and give their functional-semantic properties;
- Comparative study of verbalizers of the concept of "xursandchilik" in English and Uzbek and the identification of isomorphic and allomorphic features;
- To study the problem of interlingual correspondence in English and Uzbek.

The purpose of this article is to examine the contrasting language units and semantic enhancers that express the concept of "joy" in English and Uzbek.

Are linguistic means of expressing the concept of "joy". Important features of the concept of "joy" such as the structure, semantics, functional, stylistic features and translation problems of the spoken language were selected as the topic of the work.

The following tasks are clearly solved in the reading process:

- Explain the existing theoretical sources and select and compare translation dictionaries and research methods;
- to determine the conceptual essence of the concept of "joy", its characteristics and features;
- identify and compile a list of all possible language units that can be used to express "joy" in English and Uzbek;
- to study the semantic, functional, frequency, features and nominative field of language units in English and Uzbek languages;

- Contradictory study of meaning enhancers associated with joy (happiness);
- to study the possibility of translating existing means of expression into English and Uzbek;
- to determine the semantic, structural, functional, similarities and similarities of the units that make up the sphere of joy (xursandchilik).

The hypothesis is that the concept of “joy” is universal in nature, a feeling of excitement as a result of having good pleasant feelings or expectations arising from the hope of prosperity, success, luck, or something a person loves or wants, but has it. general and specific features and verbalizers that vary from language to language, forming a field of joy and occupying different positions according to their semantics, function, and frequency.

Materials, works of well-known English and Uzbek writers, Webster's third new international dictionary (1993, Konemann), full English-Russian, Russian-English dictionary (2013, Moscow-Oxford), Advanced Learner's dictionary at current English (1982, Oxford), English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English dictionary (2013, Tashkent), “Explanatory dictionary of Uzbek language” (2006, Tashkent) and others, served as a source in the formation of descriptions and theoretical views.

Foreign language works examine general problems of linguistic cognition, categorization and conceptualization, types of concepts, semantics of language units, linguistic description of the world, pragmatics of language units, and national and cultural features. Kubryakova, 1991, M.Cole, Scerbnier, 1977, J. Lacoff 1981, M.Minkiy 1979, Ch.Fillmore 1985, L.V. Barsalov 1987, X Gardner 1987, E.Rosh 1978, VLMaslova 2001, VVVorobyov 2006) and native linguists (Yusupov 2010, Sh. Safarov 2006, 2008; A. Hojiyev 2006, ADU Ashurova, N.DU60201; Nurnianov 2013, E. Begmatov 2013; A. Ziyayev 2020). Unfortunately, modern linguistics knows nothing about the special study of the concept of "joy", part of which is in addition to the manual and doctoral

dissertation on the strengthening of the semantics of "joy" and sorrow, the features of the language culture of the latter.

In linguistics, field research has already become one of the affective methods of scientific understanding of the dialectical relationship of world, thought, and language. Field research of language facts is carried out at the lexical and grammatical (morphemic syntactic) levels.

The birth and development of this direction in foreign linguistics I.Trier, V.Portsig, L.Weisberger, L.Tonger, M.Mayer, H.Miller M.Pokrovsky, A.Ufimtseva, N.I. closely related to names such as Filicheva, Y. N. Karaulov, G. S. Shur, A. Bondarko, L. M. Vasilyeva, F. V. Guliga, E. I. Shendels, U. K. Yusupov, A. Nurmanov, E. Begmatov, Sh. Iskandarova, O. Bozorov, Sh. Safarov, B. Qilichev, H. Hojjeva, A. Sh. Sabirov is studying Uzbek linguistics.

It was G. Ipsena who defined the field of understanding as “a set of words with a common meaning” (Ipsen, 1924).

M. Mayer divides the semantic field into three types:

- 1) Natural (names of trees, animals, body parts, etc.).
- 2) Artificial (names of army officers, parts of mechanisms).
- 3) Semiartificial (fishing terms, ethnic concepts).

(Meyer 1986, 105).

I.Trier says that individual words of a language are meaningless, and if there are other words around them that are directly related to them, they acquire the status of a meaningful unit (Trier, 1931, 36 ).

In his view, the field consists of elementary units: concept and word. Here it means a complete parallel between the concept and the word field.

The term field was introduced into linguistics in 1924 by G. Ipsen.

- 1) area of understanding;
- 2) Lexical field (Trier, 1931).

An analysis of Trier’s theoretical legacy allows us to identify the following:

- 1) Field issues have been studied from a logical perspective.

- 2) Consider the field as a closed word group.
- 3) Denial of the independence of the word as a unit.
- 4) Rejection of the polysemantic nature of words and their relationship.
- 5) The study of the problem is based only on the study of horse and quality, and so on.

Scholars who have studied the theoretical problems of the semantic field can be divided into three groups. The first groups of linguists (for example, L. Weisgerber, K. Roy) focus on the study of paradigmatic relations between language units: Others, for example, V. Portsig, studied pragmatic relations. In their paradigms, the third group of linguists takes into account both the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic relationship of words. In our opinion, the latter approach is correct.

G. Miller distinguishes lexical and linguistic areas. He understands the field of concept through the term lexical field, and the syntactic field according to the field of language (Miller, 1976).

Today we have different field theories based on semantics, relationships, and levels: the paradigmatic field (Trier, Kosirio, Lounsterry). Syntactic field (Portsig, Weisgerber, Filicheuva) grammatical field (Admoni), grammatical lexical field (Guliga, Shendels), functional semantic field (Badarco).

We will add the terms conceptual field or conceptual nomination field to this list.

Well-known Uzbek linguist UK Yusupov writes: “The nominative units of the language of the concept and its parts flow through the language and lurk in speech, so it is necessary to analyze the nominative field of language to define the concept. concept (Yusupov, 2010, 12). He then writes that it is necessary to distinguish between content (content) and its structure. The content of the concept is the same as that of cognitive cues. Cognitive signs are signs of things and events reflected in thought.

Modern scholars acknowledge that the content of the concept is regulated by the principles of the field as the core and the zone, and the place of cognitive signs is

determined by the degree of brightness of these signs in the mind.

It was L. Weisgerber who wrote, “Concept and related issues. In his view, language should be studied not as a simple means of spiritual content but as an intellectual form of knowing the world, semantics is a doctrine of concepts, not a science of meanings (Weisgerber, 1963, 49-50).

W. Portsig tried to create a field theory by studying speech. He argues that the field of content is associated with certain words in a language on the basis of some relationship, and that it arises as a result of the relationship between verbs, adjectives, and nouns that perform a predicative function (Port, 1957, 48).

Lexical-semantic field is a set of lexemes representing the concept.

The theory of semantic field is reflected in the works of F. I. Buslayev, A.A. Potebnya, A.M. Peshkovsky. Different approaches can be observed in the use of the field of concepts. For example, E.V.Guliga and E.I.Shendels studied the areas of plurality, tense, modality, comparison, vitality, inanimateness, and index in German language materials. They divided the modality category into two macro spheres (real and unreal). They called semantics (plurality, tense, etc.) micro fields that emerged on the basis of semantic macro fields. According to them, different linguistic devices serve to express a common concrete meaning, and the generalization of the relationship between them forms a grammatical-lexical field (Guliga, Shendelc, 1969, 8).

“Functional grammar theory originated in St. Petersburg in the 1980s and 1990s. Trend’s leading expert, A.V. Bondarko and his followers studied meanings based on a functional semantic field (Bondarko, 1984). It distinguishes meaningful and expressive plans in the field, and they manifest as a conceptual phenomenon of language. He defines the functional semantic field as a system of various linguistic tools that serve to perform specific semantic tasks (Bondarko, 1984, 8).

The area consisting of the core and peripheral parts has the following characteristics:

1. The field has a center showing common signs and periphery;

2. It is important to determine the relationship and relationship of central elements to peripheral elements;

3. The central components represent the main semantics, and the peripheral components represent the secondary, less important semantic aspects, and the peripheral elements, along with other semantics, can serve as the primary expression.

A. V. Bondarko divides the functional-semantic field into two types according to the structure of the sphere.

1) A monocentric field based on a grammatical category.

For example, aspect, temporality, modality, sound belong to the monocentric field;

2) A multicenter field based on different morphological, syntactic-lexicogrammatic, lexical meanings. This field consists of semas such as taxi, state, subject, object, certainty, cause, purpose, condition (Bondarko, 1984, 61-62).

Uzbek linguists have also contributed to the development of field theory.

The linguistic, ie syntactic, field approach to the study of concessive relations in objective reality, their syntactic means with different forms, semantic and functional features, was first introduced into Uzbek linguistics by docent MA Abduvaliyev.

A concessive relation is defined as follows: A concessive relation is a binary semantics that represents an event of objective reality, consisting of contradictory and interrelated components, characterized by a state-concessional outcome, a binding in which the opposite relation is characteristic, real category:

1) Obstructive condition and insufficient condition. The first component can be action, status, process, character, etc.:

We played football even when it was raining

We played football even when it was raining

Even though I helped, he couldn't read the book

As the author of the dissertation "Compound sentences" (1989, 4-5), the syntactic

means of concessive relations can be separate compound sentences, compound sentences, compound sentences, simple sentences with two semantic connections . . , mixed types of compound sentences, asyndetic types of compound sentences. However, the author divides this area into three parts: dominant, nucleus, and periphery. The first two syntactic tools form the core, and the concession pieces dominate the industry, while the remaining types dominate the field. The scope of the field can be wider or narrower in world languages.

MA Abduvaliyev studied the problem from the linguistic-cognitive point of view. In his view, the concept of concession is universal. He expressed the relationship of the objective world precisely between people, between man and things, between things and things. In the article, the author points out that in addition to communicative expressive syntactic units, there are lexical-morphological means such as phrases, subordinate clauses, adverbs, verb command forms, conditional verb forms, conditional-command sentences. double-stemmed infinitive forms, meaningful words, participle I forms of the verb, subjunctive forms of the verb to look, with cut + together + (Abduvaliev, 2010, 39-40).

It establishes inter-level and single-level relationships between components, and the author identifies synonymous series, as well as minor paradigms.

Abduvaliyev says that members of the paradigm will exist in the minds of speakers as a pattern. One of the members of the paradigm plays the role of an unchanging unit, which finds its realization in different variants throughout the speech activity.

Some constructive units (elements) lead the main semen, others the secondary semen (Abduvaliev 2010. 41) Authors of the article "Linguocognitive and communicative-pragmatic aspects of the verbalization of the subjective-modal value microconcept". different systems "to determine the linguistic means of expression. Components of the field can include lexemes, phrases, introductory syntactic structures, and complex instructions. The area is divided into a nucleus and a periphery. They talk about conceptual and categorical core and periphery.

They also distinguish the types of meanings (19) that express compound sentences (surprise, amazement, pity, happiness, gratitude, satisfaction, dissatisfaction, doubt, hesitation, awareness, irony, sincerity, etc.) (Nazarova, 2010, 75). These tools, which belong to different levels, serve specific purposes, depending on the mentality, culture and qualifications of the participants in the speech dialogue.

A.Sh. In his monograph "Study of the lexical level of the Uzbek language as a system of systems" (2004), Sabirov tries to determine the role of field theory in the study of the lexical level as a system of systems. to discover all the possible means by which a language is used in the process of communication, to teach them to use them in certain contexts, and to provide conflicting connections with one another. He tries to explain the work using a conflict group show (watch): He separates dozens of groups related to television:

- a) a micro field representing the names of the person (producer, TV journalist, cameraman, director);
- b) micro-area of things: TV, screen, TV program;
- c) micro field of place names: studio, TV and radio company...
- d) micro-area of the process: seeing, watching, talking, shooting, participating, etc.

A. Sabirov analyzes the disputed areas of plants and animals and concludes that any area can be divided.

Consequently, it separates macro and micro fields according to the system principle in the system. He later writes that the semantic field can be dominant, nucleus, and peripheral parts. For example, the dominant sign of the eagle; lochin; ants; that is, they are birds. The words "wild" and "deadly" form the nucleus of a bird's nest. "Wing" "pat" "tail" "egg" "nest" "foot" and other lexemes form the edge of the field. Because they can also be seen in other birds. It also separates the middle areas.

The smallest element of the semantic field is called the tax lexemes "nest", "nectar", "mother", "collect", "bees" and so on.

Sh. Iskandarova from Fergana State University raised the issue of studying Uzbek lexicon as a semantic field on the example of a personal microfield. He discovered about 100 lexical-semantic groups within the micro field. He studied the semantic properties of lexemes and sought to clarify the relationship between nouns and sentences. “Savodkhon” belongs to the group of horses that differ in the level (or skill) of the lexeme “wise”, “intelligent”, “discerning”, “intelligent”, and the scientist explains their general and various aspects (Iskandarova, 1999).

While studying the morphemic paradigms and syntagmatics of the Uzbek language, T. Mirzakulov tries to explain the tasks of the semantic field and its peculiarities. His definition of this field is “Field is a functional-semantic unit of units of different levels, based on a common content or formal similarity (Mirzakulov, 1994, 18).

Sh. I.Shokirov's doctoral (PhD) dissertation is one of the new examples of research in the field of contrasting linguistics.

In the first chapter of the work, the author studies the history of field studies.

He pays special attention to the semantic and structural features of phraseological units. According to him, the phraseological units are located between the core and peripheral zones, and they have 13 basic models in English and 4 in Uzbek.

Before defining the scope of the field of "joy", we want to clarify the history of linguistics.

Malgorsata Fabiszak defended her dissertation on The Concept of Place in Old and Middle English: Semantic Analysis (2002). He is devoted to the study of the history of emotional words in relation to philology, linguistics, social history, anthropology, and psychology. He looks at the linguocultural aspects of the word emotion (positive emotion), i.e., “joy,” and seeks to define the universal and specific aspects of the subject from modern English.

Religious and non-religious texts and dictionaries have provided the author with valuable material for analysis. The author presents two word lists, one is Old English, the other is Middle English words bliss, flipness (flipe), dream, gefen,

gladness (glad, less). Blips, cheers, delight, gream,

Dainess (gay), joy, “xursandchilik,” less, cheerfulness, and vinn were on the second list. Fabizak’s study of “xursandchilik” in mediaval English is valuable for those dealing with emotional words in English.

The article “Joy and Happiness at the Same Time and Evolutionary Concept Analysis” written by Laura Kottrell in *Advanced Nursing* in 2016 is noteworthy. nursing literature is well represented through negative concepts. When mentioned in the literature, neither “joy” nor happiness is adequately described, explained, or clearly understood. To help in-depth study of these concepts in nursing and their relationship to health and healing; conceptual clarity is an important first step (Cottrell, 2013. 1506).

He used Rogers’ evolutionary model and house. And also a way to analyze the concept at the same time.

According to L. Kottrell, this research is necessary to help further explore, describe, and explore the ongoing concepts in the development of the concept of “joy” and happiness. Encouraging the study of the concept of position can provide opportunities to more positively restructure and balance nursing speech and shape a view of the nursing world that can focus on strengths rather than weaknesses (Cottrell. 2016. 1507).

Although the concepts of “joy” and happiness are interrelated, they are two different concepts.

The work clarifies the specific and general characteristics of “joy” and happiness, explores the place and role of the concepts studied in nursing practice and research.

We would like to dwell on his thoughts on the attributes of ‘joy’ and happiness and their consequences. The concept of "joy" has five characteristics, and the concept of happiness has four characteristics.

Temporary first attribute. You are, as he writes, sudden, short, and transient. In this case, he joins the views of Close (1951) and Portkay (2007). There are no age restrictions in the play, as the author believes that people of all ages can experience

‘joy’ (Ahror, 2010, Domiels 2010).

Intention is another feature of “joy”. ‘Joy’ is spontaneous and involuntary, neither thought nor persecuted. As stated in religiously studied literature, “joy” is a gift from God (Gordon, 2001, 2004 Howars).

Awareness is defined as a key attribute of “joy”. This sudden perception, inspiration, and sense of self-renewal often confirms the departure.

Another important aspect of “joy” is the connection, the connection, the union and the connection with the community, not with the individual. But in our view, “joy” is associated with both individuals and communities of people, small and large.

We think the author is right about those critically ill patients. Even the slightest change in their health can lead to flight, self-recovery, and rebirth and reunion in society, reunion with others.

According to scientists (Siraude, 2009, 120). Portkay 2007, Barbalet 2007, and Loe 2009, the physical attributes of “joy” can be eye smiles, tears, and physical movements (dancing, clapping, and laughing). This “joy” attribute is broad for our understanding. This “joy” attribute is also associated with different movements of the eyebrows, hands (fingers) and other parts of the body.

But here it is important to keep in mind the national and cultural characteristics of “joy,” which can have different interpretations and meanings.

The positivity of the concept of ‘joy’ connects it with positive concepts such as happiness, hope, enjoyment, gratitude, enjoyment, satisfaction. The author shows 11 types of results such as freedom, courage, openness, meaning, activity, , creativity and more.

Ancient scientists (Aristotle) and modern scientists (Ollmark) distinguish between short-term and long-term types of happiness.

Port Kay (2011) and Sloon (2011) emphasize that short-term happiness involves luck and is characterized by pleasure and enjoyment. In our view, in terms of their duration, short-term happiness is associated with “joy,” both of which are short in such cases. We now turn to L. Gottrell’s views on the attributes of happiness. 6 of

them.

Unlike “joy,” happiness is a long-term and long-term conceptual phenomenon. L. Cattrell writes that it is characteristic. It includes features such as sustainability, permanence, and sustainability (Cattrell, 2016, 1511).

People choose happiness, their choice depends on their sacred and dead hopes, intentions and plans in life. The main goal, we think, is to live a prosperous life, to be satisfied with one's work, to be healthy.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Safarov. Sh. Cognitive Linguistics Sangzor Publishing House, Jizzakh, 2006.
2. Alsfirenko N. Spornye semantic problems M. "Gnozis", 2005.
3. Yuirgov U.K. Regarding the terms of concept and lingvokulturema: "Actual problems of comparative, general linguistics. Materials of the republican scientific-practical forum Andijan, 2010.9-155.
4. Vereshagin E.M., Kostamarov V.G. Yazyk and culture. Lingvo-staranovedenie v predpodovanii russkogo yazyka kak inostrannogo.-M .: russkiy yazyk, 1983.
5. Vorobyov VV Linguoculturology. Theory and method.-M, 1997.
6. Krasik V. Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs.-M, 2004.
7. Maslova V.A. Linguoculturology. -M .: Academia, 2001.
8. Krasnyx V. Ethnopsycholinguistics and Linguoculturology. -M .: Gnozis, 2002.
9. Kubryakova E.S Pamyat i eyo rol v issledovanii rechevoy deyatelnosti // Tekst v kommunikatsii.- .: I-t yazykoznaniya, 1991.
10. Lakoff D.J. Lingvisticheskie peshtaevty.V.kn .: Novye v zarubejnoy lingvistike. M .: Progress, 1981.