

LEXICAL-SEMANTIC REALIZATION OF “GOOD” AND
“EVIL” IN ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES

Trapova Gulirano Nabijon kizi

3rd-year doctoral student of Karakalpak State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20269352>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 14th May 2026Accepted: 16th May 2026Online: 18th May 2026

KEYWORDS

good, evil, lexical semantics, Karakalpak, English, culture, differentiation

ABSTRACT

This study explores how the concepts “good” and “evil” are expressed in English and Karakalpak from a comparative linguacultural perspective. Although these moral categories are universal, their lexical and semantic realization differs across languages. Specifically, English shows greater lexical differentiation and abstraction, whereas Karakalpak reflects more holistic and culturally grounded meanings. Moreover, both languages share similar metaphors (e.g., light vs. darkness), but differ in usage and cultural emphasis. Overall, the findings highlight the role of language in shaping moral concepts..

The concepts of “good” and “evil” represent universal moral categories that exist in all human cultures. Nevertheless, despite their universality, the linguistic realization of these concepts varies significantly across languages due to differences in cultural values, historical development, and worldview [2]. In this regard, both English and Karakalpak languages provide rich material for analyzing how moral oppositions are encoded lexically and semantically. Moreover, language does not merely reflect reality; rather, it interprets and categorizes it. Therefore, the study of lexical-semantic representations of “good” and “evil” allows us to understand how speakers conceptualize morality, social norms, and human behavior. Consequently, a comparative analysis of English and Karakalpak reveals not only linguistic differences but also deeper cultural meanings embedded in vocabulary, phraseology, and metaphorical expressions.

To begin with, the notion of “good” in both languages is associated with positive evaluation, moral approval, and socially desirable behavior. In English, the lexical field includes words such as *good, kind, virtuous, honest, generous, and benevolent*. Similarly, in Karakalpak, equivalents like *jaqsı (good), iygilik (kindness), ádat (justice), meyrim (compassion)* carry comparable meanings.

However, it is important to note that semantic nuances differ. For instance, English distinguishes between *good* (general evaluation) and *kind* (emotional warmth), whereas Karakalpak often integrates these meanings within broader culturally loaded terms such as *jaqsı adam* (a good person), which implies not only moral goodness but also social responsibility and respect for tradition.

On the other hand, the concept of “evil” represents negative moral evaluation. In English, lexical items such as *evil, bad, wicked, cruel, immoral, and malicious* express various degrees of

negativity. In Karakalpak, words like *jaman* (*bad*), *ziyanlı* (*harmful*), *qáwipli* (*dangerous*), *zalım* (*cruel*) serve similar functions.

Nevertheless, the semantic scope of these terms is not identical. For example, the Karakalpak word *jaman* can denote both moral evil and general negativity (e.g., bad weather, poor condition), whereas English often uses more specific lexical distinctions (*bad* vs. *evil*) [3, 58].

Furthermore, the lexical-semantic fields of “good” and “evil” in both languages demonstrate structured organization. In English, the field of “good” is highly differentiated, including subcategories such as:

- moral goodness (*virtue, righteousness*)
- emotional positivity (*kindness, warmth*)
- social approval (*respectable, honorable*) [4].

In contrast, Karakalpak tends to organize lexical meaning more holistically. That is to say, a single lexical unit often covers multiple semantic dimensions. For example, *jaqsı* may simultaneously imply moral, emotional, and social evaluation.

Similarly, the semantic field of “evil” shows differences. English frequently differentiates between intensity levels (*bad* → *evil* → *wicked*), while Karakalpak relies more on contextual intensification and additional modifiers.

Thus, although both languages share the binary opposition of “good” vs. “evil,” the internal structure of these categories differs significantly.

Moreover, from a cognitive perspective, both languages conceptualize “good” and “evil” through metaphor. For instance, in English, *good* is often associated with light (*bright future, shining example*), whereas *evil* is associated with darkness (*dark intentions, black deeds*).

Similarly, Karakalpak employs comparable metaphors:

- *aq* (*white*) symbolizes purity and goodness
- *qara* (*black*) symbolizes negativity or evil [1, 147-149].

However, there are culturally specific extensions. For example, Karakalpak culture strongly associates goodness with hospitality, respect for elders, and community contribution, whereas English conceptualization often includes personal integrity and individual ethics. Therefore, although the basic metaphorical patterns are universal, their cultural interpretation differs.

Another important aspect is the functional use of these concepts in discourse. In English, expressions of “good” and “evil” are often used for:

- evaluation (*That was a good decision*)
- moral judgment (*He did something evil*)
- politeness (*Good job!*)

In Karakalpak, however, such expressions are more frequently embedded in social norms and moral instruction. For instance:

- proverbs are widely used to teach ethical behavior
- evaluative expressions often carry collective implications

Consequently, the pragmatic function of these lexical units differs: English tends toward individual evaluation, while Karakalpak emphasizes social cohesion and moral education.

Importantly, the differences between the two languages reflect broader cultural distinctions. On the one hand, English-speaking cultures, influenced by individualism, tend to conceptualize “good” and “evil” in terms of personal responsibility and internal moral choice. On the other hand, Karakalpak culture, which is more collectivist, interprets these concepts through social relationships, traditions, and communal values. As a result, lexical meanings are not only linguistic phenomena but also cultural constructs shaped by worldview and social structure.

In conclusion, the lexical-semantic realization of “good” and “evil” in English and Karakalpak languages demonstrates both universal and culture-specific features. While both languages share a fundamental moral opposition, they differ in semantic structure, phraseological representation, metaphorical patterns, and pragmatic usage. Thus, English shows a higher degree of lexical differentiation and individual-oriented meaning, whereas Karakalpak reflects holistic semantics and community-centered values. Ultimately, this comparative analysis confirms that language serves as a mirror of culture, and the study of moral concepts such as “good” and “evil” provides valuable insight into the cognitive and cultural frameworks of different linguistic communities.

References:

1. Djumamuratova, G. (2025). Comparative Linguocultural Analysis Of The Color Concepts “White/Aq” And “Black/Qara” In English And Karakalpak Languages. *TLEP–International Journal of Multidiscipline*, 2(5), 147-149.
2. Geach, P. T. (1956). Good and evil. *Analysis*, 17(2), 33-42.
3. Mambetova, R. B., & Sherniyazova, G. (2021). Concepts—good|| and—bad|| in Russian and Karakalpak phraseological units. *НА ПЕРЕСЕЧЕНИИ ЯЗЫКОВ И КУЛЬТУР*, 58.
4. Wilson, R. A. The Semantics of “Good” & “Evil”. RA Wilson.–электронный ресурс: <http://fendersen.com/Semantics.htm>. ЛЕКСИКОГРАФИЧЕСКИЕ ИСТОЧНИКИ.