

## **MEANS OF EXPRESSING DISAGREEMENT IN LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL APPROACH**

**Nafisa Karayeva**

Teacher of Philology and teaching language department at the International Innovative  
University

**Qodirova B.,**

**Qilichova A.**

Students of Philology and teaching language department at the International Innovative  
University

The concept of disagreement, as well as its antonym consent, originated in philosophy in antiquity. This term was actively used by such ancient thinkers as Socrates and Plato. They used it in their works, analyzing completely new approaches to human existence. For ancient thinkers, "disagreement" is a way to negate previous theories. With the phenomenon known as the "linguistic turn," when there was awareness of the priority of language and an active study of dialogic speech, the topic of disagreement started to be actively investigated in linguistics. The speech act of disapproval was typically examined in publications alongside the speech act of consent [64,14-15]. "The speech act of a negative reaction is a reactive act expressing the speaker's negative attitude to the interlocutor's action or statement, which is an informative, evaluative or imperative statement with various emotional shades and has a certain embodiment in speech".

The relevant semantic field includes both the speech act of dispute and the speech act of consent. The semantic field of disagreement unites all constituents that have a common meaning - in one way or another a negative meaning and a negative attitude of the speaker to the action or initiating remark of the interlocutor. Negative reactions include the following expressive meanings: refutation, objection, judgment, expression of discontent, disapproval, etc. All constituents of the semantic field of disagreement, manifested, as a rule, through the category of denial, can be located in the core, in the center or in the periphery of a given field. The means of expressing disagreement are multi-level components of the field, which is associated with their expression in a specific speech situation. Thus, each language develops its own system of linguistic means that enshrines the concept of disagreement, and

chooses the leading way to denote it in various manifestations. Disagreement can be expressed by language means related to different levels of the language.

There is a difference between strong and weak disagreement. Strong disagreement is associated with the expression of an opposing opinion, while as a weak disagreement only negates the information given in the cue-stimulus. Disagreement can also manifest itself in relation to the whole statement or its individual parts. E. Klima proposed another characteristic of strong and weak disagreement – the presence of certain negative elements, varying depending on the intentions of the speakers. The scientist developed the continuum using the example of the English language, but it can be implemented in other languages. It looks like this: not – never –hardly – little – few – seldom [13,245-320]. Depending on the use of each of the proposed adverbs, the degree of disagreement varies.

Linguists have naturally felt the need to characterize certain linguistic elements of a linguistic personality, which is seen as a combination of social, historical, ethnic, and mental plans [49,116]. Accordingly, the latter is a practical analysis of a particular linguistic material, whose study helps to identify national color and national specificity as a result of a lengthy historical development linked to the transmission of experience from generation to generation within this cultural and linguistic community. The goal of the analysis may be to determine which pragmatic orientation is used in this linguistic and cultural community to communicate a speech act through language. The system-forming quality of the utterance's illocutionary force includes disagreement/agreement, denial, wrath, delight, etc. In this study, an effort is made to conduct a culturological investigation of some speech behavior expressions that occur when expressing disagreement.

The following conclusions can be reached by introspective analysis, the theoretical underpinning of which is the acknowledgement of the presence of inherent national and cultural traits that can be detected without reference to other linguistic codes [41,47]. The presence or expression of an opinion that differs from that of another person or persons assumes a situation of disagreement. Accordingly, disagreement is a form of denial that expresses someone's judgment or opinion rather than asserting a fact [45], [14,222]. The following conclusions can be reached by introspective analysis, the theoretical underpinning of which is the acknowledgement of the presence of inherent national and cultural traits that can be detected without reference to other linguistic codes. The presence or expression of an opinion that differs from that of another person or persons assumes a situation of disagreement. Accordingly, disagreement is the kind of denial that expresses someone's

judgment or opinion rather than a claim of fact. As a result, when there is disagreement, the speaker is motivated to speak for the following reasons: (a) he disagrees with the given opinion, judgment, or assumption; (b) he wants to share his opinion; and (c) he thinks the other person will listen to him. Disagreement denotes disapproval of the expressed opinion, proposition, or statement (truth, preferences, complaints, etc.) semantically speaking. It should be emphasized that English has a unique set of grammatical constructions for expressing disagreement: direct intent (*It isn't/doesn't/can't/ etc.; I don't agree (with you) (there); I disagree ((with you) (there); You are mistaken; Nothing of the kind; Nonsense; Rubbish; Ridiculous* and indirect action (*I don't know; I wouldn't say that; Do you really think so?* [77,97-112] In accordance with the accepted behavioral code, native English speakers prefer indirect means of expressing disagreement [41,104].

A strong tone is characterized as a forthright declaration of disapproval. This is supported by the fact that the text contains clues about a negative property's enhanced emotionality. To link the attitude to the message (direct disagreement) and the manner in which this relationship is verbalized, the following text's sharply negative is reinforced by the nonsensical verb snapped.

For example, «*Niccolo has the most brilliant mind of anyone at present in the service of the Signory*», he said now. "Nonsense," snapped Monna Francesco [16,9].

The lexical means of expressing disagreement include words of different parts of speech: nouns – *nonsense, rubbish*; verbs – *to fail, to refuse, to contradict*; adjectives (sometimes belonging to the group of "swear words") – *horrible, beastly, awful, bloody, foul, etc.*; adverbs (used, as a rule, to enhance emotions) – *absolutely, rather, really, utterly, perfectly, quite, too, completely, horribly, just, etc.*

According to researcher E.V. Zhabina, among the lexical means of expressing disagreement, nouns occupy a special place, because they have the most vivid evaluative meaning and most strongly explicate disagreement. Such a remark is explained by the nature of the noun, which, unlike the adjective or verb, has a greater nominative power [43,124].

A number of lexical phrases and models for expressing disagreement are quite common in the English language. For example: *You must be joking! - You've got to be kidding!;/ I see things rather differently myself - I have a different opinion; / That is not necessarily so - not necessarily so; / It is not as simple as it seems - - everything is not so simple; / There is more to it than that - it's not that simple; / This is in complete contradiction to – this completely contradicts; / I am of a different opinion – I have a different opinion; / I*



*cannot share this / that / the view – I do not share this opinion; / What I object to is... – I object to it.. ; / I'd say the exact opposite – I would say exactly the opposite, etc.* Lexical means of expressing disagreement are included in the core, center and periphery of a given field, depending on the additional semantic features that they have in addition to the main feature.

The only exception to this rule is a formal dialogue or interview, where truthfulness and conciseness of expression are encouraged. In this situation, the tools appropriate to the associated speech register are applied. In the context of regular conversation, objectivity and directness—which are highly regarded in an official setting—give way to tolerance. In the latter situation, the interlocutors try to avoid offending the other person or hurting his feelings by using indirect methods to express disagreement. In order to reduce conflict, linguistic tools are also used for this aim. These include the usage of introduction words and phrases (*I am afraid ...; Personally...; Well...; As a matter of fact...*, etc.), interrogative sentences, conditional mood, common sentences as opposed to uncommon ones, and sentences that are short yet have a sharp tone.

E.g. *"What a wonderful surprise! Aren 't you a sweetie to call?"*

*"I'm afraid we have some terrible problems here, and I had to call" [3,132] .*

*John: And then this crazy time began.*

*Mollie: Why do you say it's crazy? It's perfectly ordinary.*

*John: You did help him. For half your lifetime you helped him.*

*Mollie: If I had truly helped him, he would be alive today [2,137].*

When expressing disagreement, it's crucial for a native English speaker to follow the courtesy rule. As a result, it is easy to steer clear of contentious and contentious circumstances. The ability of disagreement to conceal itself behind speech acts with a different pragmatic focus also helps to soften the statement of disagreement: (a) the expression of the improbability of what is happening (*That can't be true / I don't believe it*), (b) denial of the claimed fact (*No /Not*), (c) half-assent (*Yes, I agree to a point / Yes, perhaps you are right*) and even (d) consent, hiding in its depths disagreement with the statement of the interlocutor, which is revealed through the use of oppositional conjunctions:

E.g. (a) *«Of course it is possible one of the servants may be concerned, eh?» Colonel Bantry shook his head. «I don't believe it. They are all a most respectable lot. We had 'em for years» [2,22].*

*«I suppose we ought to consider the dancing fellow, Raymond Starr. After all he saw a lot of the girl». «Can't believe he took much interest in her — or else he's a thundering good actor. And he's got an alibi too. I don't see we can make a case against him» [20,91].*

*(b) «I'm afraid you know you're rather an idealist». «I?» He laughed. «Not me. I'm a hard boiled cynic» [7,107-108].*

*Paris: The burglar was my father — in a burglar 's face.*

*Mollie: Silly-billy! You see how silly the whole thing is. There is no burglar in the house and it's past two o 'clock.*

*(c) «I didn 't need to learn the tenses of Greek verbs to know that», said Pierro. «Perhaps not, but it is reassuring to have good authority for following one's natural inclinations» [16,18-19].*

*Mollie: Once my daddy told me not to go to the Delight drugstore and not to eat ice cream. And I chanced to see the old lady and she looked into my eyes. And against my will I was drawn into the Delight Drugstore and I ate ice cream. Against my daddy's wishes and against my will. John: But maybe you wanted to eat ice cream [2, 80].*

*(d) I am grateful to you for the offer but my area of concern is not in vague hypothesis and, to be frank, I need to know why I am being offered this post and what the actual nature of your intention is [16,77].*

*«My dominions border upon yours along an extended frontier. I am bound to take every means in my power to safeguard them. I know only too well that your city is ill-disposed to me. You have tried to embroil me with the Pope and the King of France. You couldn't have treated me worse if I were a murderer. Now you must choose whether you will have me as a friend or as an enemy.» «I can assure Your Excellency that there is nothing my government wants more than your friendship », he answered blandly, «but they have not forgotten that you allowed Vitellozzo to invade our territories and they are doubtful of its value» [21,23]*

The speaker can avoid directly expressing how wrong the communication partner is by shifting the focus from the person of the interlocutor to the event under discussion (examples a, b) by stating the improbability of the alleged and its denial. In cases of half-hearted and apparent agreement (end examples) there is an expression "objections under the mask of consent" [83,125]. Generalizations that express thanks, promises of friendship, loyalty, and good intentions, as well as respect for the interlocutor's dignity, among other things, serve to soften the tone of the statement (see both examples d). "Communication in the psychological sense is always a process of solving a communicative task" [16,169]. Being a member of a

particular language and cultural group can influence a communication task's solution, including the strategy, tactics, and resources needed, as was amply demonstrated in the analysis done above.

So, in addition to individual characteristics, speech activity, which consists of speech acts, also carries some common characteristics typical of a specific speech commonality. These characteristics "are connected with the personality of the speaker and the personality of the listener, but at the same time with what the members of this speech collective have in common" [53,10]. Since members of the linguistic and cultural communities make up the speech community, each of them will have some degree of national-specific phenomena in their speech, which can be used as research material for linguistic and cultural studies.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Alefirenko N. F. Linguistic culture as a scientific and educational discipline // Alefirenko N. F. Linguistics. The language of value-semantic space. - M., 2010. - S. 44.
2. Alefirenko N.F., Semenenko N.N. "Phraseology and Paremiology", M.: Flint: Nauka, 2009. - C. 269
3. Rozin V.M. Culturology. - M.: INFRA-M, FORUM, 2002. - p. 282-283
4. Humboldt 1985: Humboldt W. background Language and culture of philosophy. M., 1985. - 60c.
5. Sapir E. Works on linguistics and cultural studies. – M.: Progress, 1993.- 60c.
6. Maslova V.A. Introduction to linguoculturology. Tutorial. - Moscow: Heritage, 1997. - 38c
7. Maslova V.A. Linguistics: Proc. student allowance \_ textbook institutions - M.: Academy, 2001. - 208 p.
8. Teliya VN Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic and Linguistic and Cultural Aspects. - M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1996. - 288 p.
9. Whorf, Benjamin. 1956. Language, Thought and Reality. Cambridge UP: MIT Press. Edited by J. Carroll.
10. Фрумкина Р.М. Концепт, категория, прототип / Р.М. Фрумкина //Лингвистическая и экстралингвистическая семантика. – М., 1992. – С. 28-43
11. Горелов К.Н. Невербальные компоненты коммуникации. - М.: Наука, 1980.-104 с
12. Ахманова О.С., Гюбенетт И.В. Вертикальный контекст как филологическая проблема // Вопросы языкознания. - 1977.- № 3. - С. 47-54.