

MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL



MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL

<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>



ROLE OF LEXICAL GROUPS IDENTIFYING MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING AGGRESSIVE NONVERBAL ACTIONS

Aziz Shavkatovich Mukhamadiyev

Navoi State Pedagogical Institute

Navoi, Uzbekistan

E-mail: azizmuhammadiyevsh@gmail.com

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: aggressive, nonverbal, emotional reaction, lexemes-identifiers, semantics reveals, crime, weapon, punishment, execute

Received: 11.08.23

Accepted: 13.08.23

Published: 15.08.23

Abstract: This article discusses the lexical groups that indicate the implementation of non-verbal aggressive behavior, the expressions that they contain. These phrases are compared and a discursive analysis of some lexical units is given. Also, the emergence of aggressive behavior, the means of its non-verbal implementation, as well as the psychological effect of aggression on a person, and the state after aggression are linguistically analyzed. In addition, an attempt was made to reveal the types of non-verbal aggression, such as punishment and striking actions, examples of actions belonging to these types, the increase or decrease in the level of aggressiveness in their use. Nonverbal aggressive expressions in English and Uzbek languages were compared and analyzed, and an attempt was made to reveal the differences and similarities in their use.

INTRODUCTION

This study describes nonverbal aggression as a type of emotional reaction that manifests as physical and other (non-verbal) activities meant to injure the target, either physically or morally. An exclusive set of *lexemes-identifiers* that are used to semantically categorize violent nonverbal acts define nonverbal aggressiveness as a form of emotional response.

It is important to draw attention to the names of weapons and items / means used for punishment among the *lexemes-identifiers*, the semantics of which include the meaning "*means of implementing violent non-verbal behaviors.*" These punishments imply either aggressively restrained or unrestrained emotions on the part of the subject by their very nature. [2;153]

Slap, beat and other distinct verb forms are frequently used in Uzbek as are lexemes with the same root (beat–kill – knock –bruise – score). If we compare the lexemes, which serve as action-strike identifiers in English and Uzbek, it is clear that Uzbek is distinguished by a conspicuous preponderance of particular verb tenses. This means that unlike English, where lexical units predominate and the semantics of which are the meanings of action-strikes, diverse in terms of the root morpheme represented in them, the Uzbek language's morphological system allows you to increase the number of corresponding lexemes by creating words from a single root. As a result, when compared to Uzbek, the semantics of action-strike identifiers in English is broader (reflecting more specific properties of the related actions).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

It should be mentioned that a weapon is *"a tool for attack or defense, as well as a set of such weapons."* It goes without saying that both defense and attack are connected to aggressive emotions in people, which is why we decided to allocate the following *lexemes-identifiers* in English based on a shared aspect of the meaning of **"weapon"**: *armory, arms, battleship, bayonet, bazooka, billy club, blade, blunderbuss, bomb, booby trap, bow, cannon, car bomb, claymore, cluster bomb, cudgel.* [4;83] The following group of words were able to be distinguished among the *lexemes-identifiers* of weapons as a means of carrying out aggressive acts thanks to the analysis of dictionary entries from the S.I. Ozhegov and N.Y. Shvedova dictionary: *machine gun, artillery, bomb, club, baton, dagger, trigger, mine, mortar, knife, club, PM (Makarov pistol), gunpowder, cannon, rockets.*

The words for military equipment employed in military activities, which are impossible to carry out without the existence of an aggressive component, are designated by the lexemes of the English and Uzbek languages, which not only designate weapons but also their components. At the same time, terrorist attacks frequently use the items recognized by these signs as their targets. Given that it incorporates identifiers of terror tactics, such as activities that result in numerous casualties, this lexical generator need to be referred to as a generator of maximum cruelty. Punishment, which is defined as *"a measure of influence applied to the perpetrator of a crime, a misdemeanor"* has its own place among the aggressive nonverbal behaviors [7;271]. It goes without saying that crimes and misdemeanors are activities that incite *hatred, disdain, or contempt* for the target of their committed in the victim. These hostile feelings incite punishment, which in turn let us realize the significance of designating *lexemes-identifiers* as **"means of punishment"**. The semantic analysis of the generator of the means of punishment also enabled us to signify independently the generator of the means of a person's execution: *electric chair, gallows, and noose.* Extreme cruelty is used as a method of execution in order to punish the victim of physical harm.

However, there are certain instances where the punishment does not involve actual physical harm to the object, which shows a lack of aggression. We have identified the following words as

lexemes-identifiers of means of punishment among which the connotation of physical damage is not represented in their semantics: *warrant, prison, quod*.

Let's go on to a more in-depth examination of the semantic elements of shock identifiers to complement the classification of shock identifiers. As we discovered, it is possible to separate words from this group that have a semantic meaning expressing the intense intensity of the accompanying activity. In this instance, "**intensity**" is defined as the force of the blow and the repeat of the blow, both of which raise the recipient's risk of suffering physical harm. As a result, we have determined the following identifiers: *bash, beat, belt, biff, boot, brain, clobber, clout, club, conk, crack, crash, deck, fell, fill in, haul off and hit / punch smb., horsewhip, knock around, knock, lash, lay out, pistol-whip, punch, punch out, slug, smack, sock, strike, strike down, tear into*.

Keep in mind that the English words execute, fry, guillotine, hang, and hail smb. to the wall/cross all have different meanings depending on the type of execution being carried out. Contrarily, "**execute**" is a lexeme with the general meaning of "*subject to the death sentence*" and lacks any extra components in its semantics that would explain how this action would be carried out: *Kneecap, punish, scourge, smite, thrash, torture; rip, punish, pin, punish* are examples of physical punishment that does not involve the murder of an object.[9;112]

Capital punishment, corporate punishment, death penalty, death sentence, hard labor are English lexemes whose semantics reflect the name of punishment. English and Uzbek lexical units naming actions used as punishment can also be added to the group of lexeme identifiers of punishment (*double jeopardy, executing, flogging, execution*). We think that the crime and punishment should be seen as two separate but related concepts: "*crime as an aggressive action*" and "*punishment as its result*". We also point out that punishment is connected to physical impact on the item according to the semantic analysis of the language's lexicon, although illegal acts aren't always carried out physically. As a result, it is clear that from the perspective of the English language, any crime should be met with physical force. This suggests that English culture is rather aggressive and that native speakers respect the law and the regulations.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

As a result, we were able to pinpoint the sources of weapons and methods of punishment during the analysis of hostile semantic lexemes. At the same time, it was found that some of the generators produce highly aggressive *lexemes-identifiers*, in which both the significance of the murder and the number of victims are noted. The descriptors that have been highlighted in this section naturally imply hostile feelings on the part of the subject, particularly hostility, contempt, disgust, and disdain. This fact acted as a guide for their more in-depth investigation and the identification of specific sources of hostile nonverbal actions. [3;231]

Specific hostile actions make use of the methods of carrying out aggressive acts. As a result, it is necessary to identify the units in the corpus of lexemes that reflect the process of aggression as a particular emotional response. We view the process as the aggressive party acting in a particular way to get what he wants. We can draw the conclusion that the process of aggressive actions is transmitted through words that signify aggressive actions and lexical units that they convey their characteristics, describing the behavior of people as well as their attitude towards objects through the analysis of dictionary definitions. This feature made it possible for us to group these words into distinct groups, or generators, based on the shared meaning. It is possible to tell apart the primary transmitters of the process of aggressive acts from:

- generator of murder (for example: *assassinate, butchery, burn; blow up, ruin, kill*);
- generator of criminal actions (*assault, rape, robbery; terror, murder, fascism*);
- generator of punishment (*execute, fry, punish; tear, punish, punish*);
- generator of physical actions carried out by means of blows (*bash, fight, struggle; bash, thrash*);
- generator of actions carried out using weapons (*attack, level at, strike; blow up, hack, shoot*);
- generator of coercion (*eject, expel, exile; hurry, force, incite*);
- generator of threat (*fearsome, terrifying; threaten, threaten, intimidate*);
- generator of destruction (*disaster, discredit, outburst; explosion, destructive, destructive*);
- generator of actions of harming the object (*battering, harm, mischief; maim, offend, dirty*), causing suffering (*punish, smite, torment; suffer, suffer, suffer*), physical pain (*bash, cripple, hit; beat, poison, bruise*);
- generator of actions involving violence and cruelty (*abuse, maltreat, rape; bludgeon, expel*);
- generator of disgust (*scabby, shitty, vile; disgusting, nauseous*);
- generator of anger (*aggressive, damn, mad; angry, furious, ardent*);
- generators of actions involving rudeness (*bearish, horrible, impudent; audacious, animal, boorish*), anger (*brutal, mean, merciless; poisonous, malicious, prickly*), lack of friendliness (*antagonistic, cold, hospitable*), dislike (*prejudiced, misanthropic, poxy; distressing, nasty, devilish*), hatred (*baleful, malignant, virulent; anti-Semitic*), lack or lack of humanity (*bestial, callous, hard; ruthless, indifferent, cold*), disrespect (*contemptible, disrespectful, impudent; arrogant, indelicate, boorish*), severity (*draconian, stern, strict; bossy*), impatience (*impatient, irritated, testy*), disgust/offensiveness (*distasteful, filthy, shocking; offensive, impudent, cheeky*). [10;189]

It is given that there is a relationship between them, it is evident that the causes of murder, crime, and punishment should be taken into account together. Assuming the deprivation of the object's life, murder is thus characterized by the highest level of cruelty. This suggests that it has some connection to the crime generator. In turn, the crime should unquestionably be punished; in other

words, the factors that lead to murder and other crimes also influence the factors that result in punishment, allowing us to discuss these factors separately.

The analysis of the corpus of lexical units of aggressive semantics reveals that distinct groups of lexemes identify aggressive actions that deprive an object of life, including murder with weapons and carried out by shooting (*pick off, plug, out, pump bullets into smb. / smth., snipe; shoot, fire, shoot, shoot, shoot*), actions of strangling an object (*choke, strangle, suffocate* [In addition, the use of Uzbek morphological structure in the selected lexical units reveals a huge number of words that share the same root as our suggested semantic terms—"arrows" and "souls"—which strikes us as one of the key differences between Uzbek and English. [7;122]

CONCLUSION

Consequently, the corpus of lexical units related to aggressive emotional response that we analyzed enabled us to identify a significant number of lexemes-identifiers of the process of aggressive non-verbal actions and their attendant characteristics. Moreover, the dictionary definitions of both languages enabled a fairly clear identification of the most common generators of the process of the type of emotional response studied in this dissertation research, both in Uzbek and English, based on the identification of a common meaning component in them. However, it should be noted that in the vast majority of generators we have identified, a smaller number of Uzbek language identifiers than English language identifiers have been discovered. Insufficiently detailed semantic descriptions of lexemes in Uzbek explanatory dictionaries are the primary reason for this, in our opinion.

We were able to find a substantial number of lexemes-identifiers of the process of aggressive nonverbal acts as well as their accompanying characteristics thanks to the corpus of lexical phrases we examined that were related to aggressive emotional response. Additionally, by allocating a common component of meaning in them, both in Uzbek and English, the dictionary definitions of both languages allowed for the possibility of a fairly clear identification of the most frequent generators of the process of the type of emotional response investigated in this dissertation research. It should be noted, nonetheless, that fewer identifiers for the Uzbek language were discovered in the vast majority of the generators we chose than for the English language. We believe that the main cause of this is the incomplete semantic descriptions of the supplied lexemes in Uzbek explanatory dictionaries.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Claparede E. Feelings and Emotions. In: Reymert M. L. (Ed.). Feelings and Emotions. Worcester: 1928. P. 124–138. 376 p.
- [2]. Dijk T.A. van. Text and context: Explorations and the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. London, 1977. 261 p.

[3]. Ekman P.C. Studies in communication through non-verbal behavior. In: Segal J.K. (ed.). Mental health program reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973. 352 p.

[4]. Freud S. Beyond the pleasure principle. N.Y.: Bantam Books. 1999. 326 p.

[5]. Hahn M. T., MacLean M.S. Counseling psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955. 286 p.

[6]. Lakoff G., Johnson M. METAPHORS We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.

[7]. Leech G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. London, 1983. 250 p.

[8]. Romaine S. Language in society: An introd. To sociolinguistics. Oxford univ. press, 1994. 12, 235 p.

[9]. Smith F.K. Communication and culture. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966. 316 p.

[10]. Waxer P.T. Non-verbal cues for anxiety: an examination of emotional leakage // Journal of abnormal psychology. 1977. Vol. 86. 314 p.

[11]. Weiner B. An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion // Psychological Review. 1985. 573 p.