



An Analysis Of Words Whose Emotional Meaning Changes In Modern English Linguistics

Rahmonov Ulugbek

Doctorate Andijan State University, Uzbekistan

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the problems of interdependence of concepts and lexical meanings. Here are examples of changes in the meaning of emotional words and how these words come in different meanings. It is known from history that words change their emotional meaning entirely by chance, that is, they show that people are changing their views as social or political events change. Words that describe a person's state of mind, their inner mood, no matter how strong or affective they are, gradually begin to lose their power and eventually lose any sensitivity and become obsolete. But that doesn't mean they're out of the emotional vocabulary. They simply point out that it has lost its effectiveness and is often an emotional phenomenon. Words that express the same strong emotion gradually weaken the zeal of that emotion.

KEYWORDS

Emotional vocabulary, emotional meaning, expressiveness, emotion, WND, emotional evaluation, nominative meaning.

INTRODUCTION

Emotions come in many forms in human life. They are reflected in the relationship between people and society. Human emotions and their linguistic research have always been the subject of research. At the beginning of the

19th century, the famous linguist W. von Humboldt noted that language was filled with emotions as human activity. It is on the basis of this doctrine that modern linguists study language in close connection with man.

A person experiences a lot of emotions throughout his life. In this regard, psychologists consider emotions as a universal phenomenon. Because the typological structure of the emotional vocabulary does not coincide in different languages and has national characteristics. Because their reflection in each language is a unique situation. Most emotional words are rich in meaning.

With regard to the question of the criteria for distinguishing emotionally meaningful words in a language dictionary and the emphasis on emotional signs in the process, it should be noted that emotional meaning depends on the natural development of language development, just as it does in the neutral sense. It is no coincidence that L. Lewis introduced the concept of **dangerous sense** linguistics. Here he argues that the meanings of modern English are consistent with those of past authors [1, 23].

The idea that new words and their meanings arise out of the need for such naming does not require proof. According to R.A. Budagov, the development of vocabulary is "associated with the contradiction between its capabilities in each historical period and the fact that people express their feelings in a complete, alternative, methodologically unique and logically correct way." [2, 51].

There are various reasons for the change in emotional meaning. It is useless to look for the cause of these changes in the laws of mental processes. Neither can a change in emotional meaning be associated with a change in attitudes toward the world. However, this situation is more important because it is known from practice that words

change their emotional meaning completely by chance, i.e. people are re-examining their views as social or political events change. Until now, the word **postwar (conditions)** was widely used in America during World War II, gradually idealized and given an **ultra-modern** meaning. In the post-war years, the **postwar** was considered inappropriate and began to discourage its use. The word **postwar** has a negative connotation, including **postwar conditions of political turmoil, postwar housing of shoddy construction, etc.** [3, 11]. In recent days, the **hobby** has always meant light-heartedness, but today it has a completely "**good, correct**" connotation, which means that everyone who has a **hobby** is such a positive person [4, 19].

However, the word consumption law can also work in reverse. J. Vandries describes this idea as follows: "The expressiveness of expressive, meaningful words is particularly rapid in power. The word is dull, weakened, and his sigh comes out. Words that describe a person's state of mind, his inner state, no matter how strong or influential they are, will gradually lose their power and eventually lose their effectiveness and become obsolete" [5, 201]. Indeed, it has long been said that words like **awfully, dreadfully** have lost their "former power". But that doesn't mean they're out of the emotional vocabulary. They simply point out that it has lost its effectiveness and is often an emotional phenomenon. Words that express the same strong emotion gradually weaken the zeal of that emotion. Let's say the word **dismay** has such strong power. Now it is almost a weak, powerless word. Or the verb to **annoy** used to mean **to harm, to injure**, now it is synonymous with the verb **to irritate**, and so on. In many cases, the constant context changes the meaning of words that

express strong emotions in such a way that they eventually begin to express painful sentimental states - masculinity, sensuality, bitterness. Such was the fate of words such as **weep, sob, thrill** in English. They fell out of the category of “**respectable**” words and began to appear only in **Read that & weep or sob-stories, sob-stuff** phrases.

Fielding’s novel [6] Emotional Vocabulary provides an effective material for analyzing the emergence and transformation of emotional meanings. Some emotionally colored words begin to function within a functionally limited stylistic layer of the lexicon. But their fate is unpredictable. For example, although J. Swift was strongly opposed to the use of the word **mob**, the word was still in use and was widely used. Fielding often used the word in the author’s description in a negative connotation. When Fielding uses the word for the first time, he explains it to him in a special footnote: “**Whenever this word occurs in our writings, it intends persons without virtue or sense in all stations, and many of the highest rank are often meant by it**” (Jones, 32). In later places, the writer uses the word **mod** in a negative sense in context.

In G. Fielding's work, the word **bloody** is spelled the same in all cases. Accordingly, comparing the insults used in the works of J. Swift and G. Fielding, it can be said that this word was a common slang in those days and did not sound like an insult. This word, which was popular at the time, could have been included in the phrase **mild expletives** according to the laws of language. However, the process of changing the emotional meaning of the word **bloody** is much more complicated, the word **bloody** begins to

acquire a meaning. Then a series of euphemisms such as **ruddy, bally, blurry** began to appear. The writers of the word **bloody** began to refrain from writing in full. Often they began to use the “-” sign instead. E. Wickley writes that even a police officer who testified in court notes that the perpetrator called him a **bliar** [7, 16-17].

The fact that the word **bloody** is spelled out in full today shows that it is “justified.” It should be noted that the word is perceived differently by Americans and British. For example, when an American talks about a car accident, it is absolutely natural to say **bloody mess**. The English, on the other hand, are embarrassed by the phrase, noting the lack of a social and linguistic norm.

We pay particular attention to words whose emotional meaning has changed a lot. For example, the word **wench** was an absolutely correct word in the XVII century. If we consider that the word is used in the novel of R. Graves as in the time of J. Milton, it is free from the connotation of insult in the compounds **wench-cook, serving wench, strong wench** etc... [8, 251] G. Fielding uses it, as usual, through negative emotional description. It should be noted that in the XVII-XVIII centuries the word **wench** was used in literary-biblical discourse. Modern dictionaries state that the word belongs to the spoken word and connect it to one of the meanings of the girl in its humorous form. However, the general negative connotation of the word is so high that even its verbal pronunciation seems dangerous, and although it seems a little simple, it does not fail to touch a person's dignity.

The fate of words such as **wretch, knave, villain, rogue, rascal** often resembles the word description above.

The emotional meaning of a word changes all the time. What was once considered insulting may have a neutral or positive connotation today. Or conversely, the words “correct” may sound ironic. For example, you can take **nice, sweet** and other words. According to G. Bradley, one of the reasons for the variability of emotional meaning is the fact that this or that word is always used in an ironic way. For example, Latin scholars say that **egregious, sapient** words are adjectives of praise. Rarely today can a person take this adjective as a compliment [9, 32].

The emotional meanings of words are changeable and no authoritative, influential person, no purist (someone who is overly conservative in keeping the language pure, freeing it from foreign words, parvarism, vulgarisms) can stop the natural course of events. An example of the Purists’ fierce struggles is their attempt to stifle the newly emerging emotional meaning of the **individual** word that characterizes people through humor. This common sense was already entitled to be included in the dictionary. However, the **Webster Dictionary** (given **WND** in the form of an abbreviation in later places) [10] did not distinguish this meaning, some purists are in favor of using the word as a separate entity from the community. They tried to correct Ch. Dickens by saying that even though the word, which came to mean a **person** in the phrase **a seedy-looking individual**, was used as a joke, it was still misused [11, 395].

As for the word **Peach**, which has a few more meanings, **WND** describes it as follows: **sl. word with the popular meaning, a person or thing likened to a peach because of its sweetness, fairness, or excellence.** The translation suggested by Muller’s dictionary is that **красавица** completely eliminates the emotional semaphore that **WND** distinguishes.

The authors of the English-Russian dictionaries used the Russian word “**персик**” in the translation and gave the words “**красавица**” or “**красотка**” in parentheses.

We now turn to the adjective, which is another of the parts of speech. We begin the analysis of adjectives with a group of words in which the emotional aspect of meaning coexists with the nominative aspect within the main meaning, upon which the emotional aspect derives from the specific features of the nominative aspect of meaning. When asked about the different aspects of evaluating these types of words, first of all, the qualities of logical evaluator and emotional evaluator are distinguished. The first group of adjectives represents an objectively high standard of some quality: **tall, strong, emiciated**, and so on. There is no need to provide such words with special characters. In their shadow (background) the group of qualities of emotional evaluation is especially evident. They express not only the quality of the objects, but also the value of these qualities by the speakers.

The adjectives of **firm, steadfast, stubborn, obstinate, headstrong, pigheaded** are combined by **following one’s own course of action and refusing to be influenced by others** in relation to common sense.

This is a sema that is constant for all parts of this series. However, it is absolutely clear that in addition to the intellectual (logical) component of meaning, each of these adjectives contains an individual sema that carries out the emotional component of meaning. Yes, no matter which of these adjectives we use, in addition to the information formulated above, we express our appreciation of being.

We refer to the dictionary articles of the words under analysis. **WND firm** word: **not yielding easily under pressure; solid, hard, steadfast, – represents word firm, fixed, settled or established.** These words undoubtedly have a positive emotional value: **He liked to think how firm and steadfast he was. (Craddock, 214).** The same dictionary defines the word **headstrong** as follows: **headstrong - determined not to follow orders, advice, etc. but to do as one pleases.** This comment is very reminiscent of the lexical interpretation of the word **firm** and the word **steadfast** respectively, as the next word is interpreted by the word **firm**. After all, **headstrong** carries a negative emotional assessment in its semantic structure: **Yes, Bertha, I've known for a long time that you were proud and headstrong, but I thought time would change you. (Craddock, 195).**

The word **Stubborn's** is presented as follows: **refusing to yield, obey, or comply; resisting doggedly, determined, obstinate.** In this commentary, the intellectual and emotional-evaluative aspects are presented without grading, which makes it much more difficult to quickly determine which pole the word belongs to. In any case, **SOD [12]** introduces the common sign **in bad sense** when

interpreting the word **stubborn**. As for the word **pigheaded**, readers may be confused by its following **pigheaded - stubborn, obstinate** definition. The very origin of the word suggests that it has the sema of **“blind, inappropriate stubbornness”**. This sema occurs in the following context: **Pigheaded old man, Peterfield. Wouldn't listen to us. Insisted on taking the plans in his own hands. (Pyne, 72).** This word approaches insulting words from the level of emotional power. Concluding the analysis of this series of adjectives and concluding that it is necessary to distinguish between intellectual and evaluative information of emotional-evaluative qualities in the articles of dictionaries, on the basis of data from dictionaries, linguistic and fiction literature we can suggest the following features of these words: **асосида бу сўзларнинг қуйидаги белгиларини таклиф қилишимиз мумкин: Firm, steadfast – strong approval; Obstinate, stubborn – mild disapproval. Pigheaded – strong disapproval.**

Let us consider a group of adjectives whose main nominative meaning is neutral, logical-evaluative, but whose semantic structure can distinguish emotional-evaluative meaning. Thus, **WND** distinguishes eleven meanings of the word **sommon**. The following of these meanings can be considered as emotional-evaluative meanings: **7) not refined, vulgar, low, coarse.** Muller's dictionary translates this meaning as follows: **6) out of obscene, obscene, rude, overly fake, corrupt.** Lexicographers did a minimal amount of work - distinguishing the emotional-evaluative meaning from the semantic structure of the word. Unfortunately, however, this meaning was “lost” in the dictionary article because it was not graphically highlighted - it was not

appended with the appropriate symbol. Experience working with students learning English shows that students usually use the word **common** only as a synonym for the word **ordinary**. However, **common** is widely used in the sense that it includes negative-evaluation connotations:

1. **And rings on men had something flashy and foreign and common about them. (Girl,41)**
2. **Philip thought she had a common laugh and it made him shudder. (Bondage,154)**
3. **And Bertha soon found that her husband's mind was not only commonplace but common. (Craddock,253).**

The latter example clearly demonstrates the emotional-evaluative meaning of the word **common**, which can be described as "**contemptuous**" - "hateful, disgusting, disgusting."

The word **cheap** is one of those words. The information underlying their emotional meaning is similar, because the word **cheap** 6) **held in little esteem, common meaning (contemptuous)** - can be described as "hateful, disgusting, disgusting". Therefore, the translation of this meaning in Muller's dictionary - cheap - 2) bad, ugly "is not exactly the same at all. The following examples confirm this: Therefore, the translation of this meaning in Müller's dictionary - sheap - 2) bad, ugly, ugly "is not exactly the same at all. The following examples confirm this: 1) **With Frolick she had made herself animal and cheap. (Terrace, 363).** 2. **You cheap lout! – get out of here!!!. At the word cheap all his rage came rushing back. (Huntsman, 82).**

We analyze the emotional meanings of the **little** quality, another quality whose primary nominative meaning is neutral, logical-evaluative. The transition from the logical component of meaning to emotion is a very delicate and not always easy task. **Little, old, poor, young**, etc. the semantic structure of the adjectives can serve as an example of this. We get the word **little**. - distinguishes **trivial, trifling** meanings, and in Muller's dictionary it is called "low, low-sighted, petty; low intelligence, limited knowledge, narrow thinking, "translates as, for example, **little minds**. This meaning undoubtedly has an emotional-evaluative component, but it also includes the idea of the basic nominative meaning of the word: the idea of something small, insignificant, small, and also distinguishes the following meaning: **young-of children or animals**. Sometimes used with implications of pleasing or endearing qualities, as *bless your little heart*. If we are talking about children, the relationship between emotional-evaluative and nominative aspects is the same as before, that is, these emotional-evaluative meanings are not separated from the basic nominative meaning and express the general idea of "**small, little**". But the word **little** is often used with a subtle difference in emotional-evaluative meaning, reflecting a conceptual connection that differs from the one mentioned above. This word can express the politeness of the speaker: **Have you had a nice little nap, William? She asked. (Bondage,17)**, or - **Oh, that's only one of his little ways**. The word **Little** can also express the speaker's delight, admiration, amazement:

1. **You are an absolute little smasher. (Girl,58)**
2. **Fascinating devil she was, Poppy. Fascinating little devil. (Tea, 35).**

However, this quality itself can also express feelings such as hatred, disgust, ridicule, hatred, anger, bitterness, ignorance, boiling blood, bitter irony, pitching, mockery, and so on: 1. **You are spying on me you dirty little cad. I thought you was a gentleman. (Bondage, 161).** 2. **Then she murmured. “The minx. Nasty sly little cat! How George can be such a fool.” (Pyne, 9).** 3. **He`s a nasty little bloke of sixty. (Key, 241).** As can be seen from the examples, the word **little** can distinguish at least two emotional-evaluative meanings: one is positive and the other is negative. These emotional-evaluative meanings are the core of independent meanings in the semantic structure of a word. They were to be given at the very end of the dictionary article as a result of the maximum distance from the nominative core of the word. In the general view of meaning, as can be done with a positive connotation, the following can be identified, for example in **WND: used with implications of pleasing or endearing qualities.** With a negative connotation of meaning: **used with implications of contempt, irritation, sarcasm, etc. on the part of the speaker.** English annotated dictionaries, as well as bilingual dictionaries, do not distinguish this meaning, the linguistic activity of the word emphasizes the degree of repetition of the use of this meaning.

In **conclusion**, it can be said that the meanings of words that were considered neutral a few years ago may or may not be part of the emotional lexicon from the point of view of today`s language development. Changes in the area of emotionality or emotional behavior within an area can also occur naturally. Changes in language are determined primarily by language owners, i.e., by external causes, and the exact circumstances of the

changes may be completely different or have different meanings and meanings.

REFERENCES

1. Lewis C.S. Studies in Words. Cambridge University Press, 2013. p.23.
2. Будагов Р.А. Проблемы развития языка. Наука, М. –Л.: 1965, стр.51.
3. Bolinger D. Aspects of Language. –N.Y.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981. p.11.
4. Bergen E. Comfortable Words. Dover publications, 2012. p. 19.
5. Вандриес Ж. Язык. М.: Соцэкгиз: 1937, стр.201.
6. Fielding H. The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling. Create Space Independent Publishing Platform, 2017.
7. Weekley E. Words Ancient and Modern, London, 1926, pp.16-17.
8. Graves R. Wife to Mr.Milton. Penguin Books, 2012. P. 251
9. Bradley H. The Making of English. –U.K.: Alpha Edition. 2019, p.32.
10. Noah Webster. Webster`s New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged. Prentice-Hall, 1983.
11. The English Language, Its Beauty and Use, London, 1947, p.395.
12. William R. Trumble. Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Oxford University Press. 2002.