IQRO JURNALI , IQRO JOURNAL, ИКРО ЖУРНАЛИ
ISSN:2181-4341| wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/iqro
Volume 24. Issue 01. Oktabr, 2026

THE CONCEPTS OF HEALTH AND ILLNESS IN THE ENGLISH LINGUISTIC WORLDVIEW

Maxmudova Aziza Murod qizi
Urganch RANCH texnologiya universiteti
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23375298

Annotatsiya. Maqolada ingliz tilidagi sog'liq va kasallik konseptlarining mazmuni hamda lisoniy ifodasi ilmiy adabiyotlar tahlili asosida o'rganiladi. Health, illness, disease va sickness leksemalarining etimologiyasi, ma'no farqlari, konseptual metaforalar va frazeologik birliklar tahlil qilinadi. Ingliz tilidagi konseptlar o'zbek va rus tillaridagi muqobillari bilan qiyoslanib, ularning umuminsoniy va milliy-madaniy xususiyatlari ochib beriladi. Natijalar ingliz tilini o'qitish, tibbiy tarjima va madaniyatlararo muloqot uchun amaliy ahamiyatga ega.
Kalit so'zlar: konsept, sog'liq, kasallik, konseptual metafora, frazeologiya, lingvokulturologiya, ingliz tili.

Аннотация. В статье на основе анализа научной литературы исследуются содержание и языковое выражение концептов здоровья и болезни в английском языке. Рассматриваются этимология и смысловые различия лексем health, illness, disease и sickness, концептуальные метафоры и фразеологические единицы. Английские концепты сопоставляются с их соответствиями в узбекском и русском языках, что позволяет выявить их универсальные и национально-культурные особенности. Результаты могут быть использованы в преподавании английского языка, медицинском переводе и межкультурной коммуникации.
Ключевые слова: концепт, здоровье, болезнь, концептуальная метафора, фразеология, лингвокультурология, английский язык.

Abstract. The article examines the content and linguistic expression of the concepts of health and illness in English on the basis of an analysis of scholarly literature. It considers the etymology and semantic differences of the lexemes health, illness, disease and sickness, together with the conceptual metaphors and phraseological units that verbalize these concepts. The English concepts are compared with their equivalents in Uzbek and Russian in order to reveal their universal and culture-specific features. The results can be applied in English language teaching, medical translation and intercultural communication.
Keywords: concept, health, illness, conceptual metaphor, phraseology, linguoculturology, English.

Introduction

Every language offers its speakers a ready-made way of talking about the body, and in doing so it quietly suggests how the body should be understood. Health and illness belong to the oldest layer of human experience, yet the words that name them are not simple labels for biological facts. They carry evaluations, expectations and cultural memories that speakers rarely

notice because they have grown up with them. English is a particularly interesting case in this respect. It is the main language of international medicine, pharmaceutical research and global health policy, and at the same time it remains an everyday language in which ordinary people complain of a cold, feel under the weather or hope to be back on their feet soon. The distance between these two registers, the clinical and the everyday, makes the English concepts of health and illness a rich object for linguistic study. The history of the key words already points to the cultural logic behind them. The noun health goes back to Old English hǣlþ and is related to whole, hale and heal, so the original idea of health was the idea of completeness and intactness of a person. Illness is formed from ill, a word borrowed from Old Norse in which it meant simply "bad", while disease came from Old French and originally described a lack of ease, a discomfort rather than a medical category. In modern usage these words are not interchangeable, and the differences between them reveal how English speakers separate the objective condition of the body from the subjective experience of suffering. The institutional understanding of health has also widened considerably. The Constitution of the World Health Organization describes health as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity [1], and this formulation has shaped the way the concept is used in public discourse all over the world. For learners and teachers of English in Uzbekistan, for translators and for future specialists in medicine and the social sciences, it is therefore important to understand not only the dictionary meanings of health and illness but also the conceptual structures that stand behind them. Cognitive linguistics has shown that abstract and emotionally loaded domains are usually understood through more concrete experience, and that metaphor is one of the main tools of this understanding [2]. The aim of the article is to describe the conceptual content of HEALTH and ILLNESS in the English linguistic worldview on the basis of published research and the author's own analysis of lexical, metaphorical and phraseological material.

Methodology and Literature Review

The study is theoretical in character and relies entirely on the analysis of scientific literature and on the author's interpretation of linguistic units recorded in lexicographic and academic sources. The main methods are descriptive analysis, conceptual analysis, etymological analysis, elements of comparative analysis with Uzbek and Russian, and the interpretive method, which allows the researcher to reconstruct the content of a concept from the meanings of the words and expressions that verbalize it. The theoretical basis of the work is formed by the theory of the concept developed in Russian cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology. Yu.S. Stepanov understood the concept as a bundle of ideas, knowledge, associations and experiences that accompanies a word and through which a person enters a culture and sometimes influences it [3]. Z.D. Popova and I.A. Sternin offered a more operational model in which a concept has an image component, an informational content and an interpretive field, and in which the nucleus is surrounded by a periphery of less obvious features [4]. This model makes it possible to separate the stable core of the concept ILLNESS, the idea of a harmful change in the body, from its peripheral evaluative and social layers. In Uzbek linguistics the cognitive approach was systematically introduced by Sh. Safarov, who stressed that the study of language should include the mental structures standing behind linguistic forms and the knowledge that speakers bring into

communication [5]. A separate line of literature comes from Western humanities and medical anthropology. G. Lakoff and M. Johnson demonstrated that ordinary language is structured by conceptual metaphors and gave examples from the domain of health, such as the orientational metaphor HEALTH IS UP and SICKNESS IS DOWN, visible in expressions like the peak of health or fell ill [2]. S. Sontag, writing from personal experience and from the position of a cultural critic, argued that illness is best regarded without metaphorical thinking and showed how tuberculosis and cancer were surrounded by myths that added moral blame to physical suffering [6]. A. Kleinman introduced the influential distinction between disease, the problem as reconstructed by the practitioner in biomedical terms, and illness, the human experience of symptoms and suffering [7]. S. Fleischman, a linguist who wrote about her own illness, drew attention to the grammar of medical self-description and to the difference between saying I am diabetic, I have diabetes and I suffer from diabetes, each of which places the speaker in a different relation to the condition [8]. A.V. Kunin's work on English phraseology provides a systematic description of idiomatic units, among which expressions related to bodily states form a noticeable group [9], while Sh. Usmonova's textbook on linguoculturology gives a framework for comparing concepts across English and Uzbek [10]. Taken together, these sources show that health and illness have been studied from philosophical, anthropological and linguistic angles, but they are rarely brought together in a single description oriented to Uzbek learners of English, and this is the gap the present article seeks to address.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of the literature and of the lexical material allows us to describe the English concept HEALTH as a concept organized around the ideas of wholeness, balance and capacity. Its nucleus is the meaning of a normal state of the body free from disease, but the etymological link with whole and hale remains active in the periphery and explains why health is so often associated with completeness, strength and being in good shape. The adjectives that typically combine with health, such as good, poor, perfect, robust, mental and public, show two directions of development. On the one hand, health is evaluated on a scale, so that a person can be in better or worse health. On the other hand, health has become an institutional and collective notion, as in public health, health care and health policy. The second direction reflects the influence of the World Health Organization definition [1], which moved the concept from the individual body into the social sphere and added psychological and social well-being to its content. Expressions such as fit as a fiddle, as right as rain, in the pink, alive and kicking and hale and hearty present the healthy person as energetic, active and cheerful. Their imagery is concrete and often old, which agrees with Kunin's observation that English phraseology preserves the cultural and historical layers of the language [9]. The concept ILLNESS has a more complicated structure, because English divides it among several near-synonyms. Disease is the most objective term and is closely tied to medical classification; it collocates with words like infectious, chronic, heart and diagnosis. Illness is more personal and more general, and speakers choose it when they talk about a period of life marked by poor health. Sickness occupies the everyday and often physical end of the scale, as in sea sickness, morning sickness or sick leave, and in British English sick is frequently associated with nausea. This lexical division corresponds closely to Kleinman's distinction between disease and illness [7], so one may say that English has a ready-made

linguistic tool for separating the medical description of a condition from the lived experience of it. In Uzbek the word kasallik covers much of this field, and the more emotional and traditional dard brings in the idea of pain and inner suffering, while Russian uses болезнь as the general word and заболевание as a more clinical one.

The metaphorical side of ILLNESS is even more revealing. Following Lakoff and Johnson, the orientational scheme HEALTH IS UP and ILLNESS IS DOWN is clearly productive in English: people fall ill, come down with a cold, are laid low by flu, and later pick up or get back on their feet [2]. This scheme is not unique to English, since Uzbek speaks of a person who yiqildi because of illness and Russian uses слёг. What is characteristic of English is the extent of the military metaphor, in which illness is an enemy, the body is a battlefield, the patient fights or battles cancer and the immune system defends the organism. Sontag criticized precisely this language, arguing that it turns the sick person into a soldier who can be blamed for losing [6]. Fleischman's grammatical observations support this conclusion: the construction have a disease presents the condition as a possession that can be separated from the self, whereas be ill or be diabetic identifies the person with it [8]. Modern English increasingly prefers person-first expressions such as a person with diabetes, which is a clear example of how ethical attitudes shape the linguistic form of a concept. Comparison with Uzbek shows both similarities and important differences. Uzbek ideas of health are traditionally linked with the proverb sog'lik tuman boylik, according to which health is worth more than any riches, and with xotirjamlik, inner peace, as part of being well. As Usmonova notes, such proverbs reflect the national value system and the collective orientation of the culture [10]. English, by contrast, frames health more often as personal capital and personal responsibility, which agrees with the cultural emphasis on autonomy discussed in cognitive and linguoculturological literature [3; 4]. The discussion thus confirms that the English concepts of health and illness combine a universal bodily base with culturally specific evaluations that become visible only through careful comparison.

Conclusion

The study leads to several conclusions. The English concept HEALTH is built around the ancient idea of wholeness and is developing toward a broad social meaning that includes mental and social well-being. The concept ILLNESS is expressed by a differentiated set of lexemes, disease, illness and sickness, which allow speakers to separate the medical, personal and everyday perspectives on the same condition. Both concepts are strongly shaped by conceptual metaphors, among which the vertical scheme of health as up and illness as down and the military metaphor of illness as an enemy are the most productive. The grammar of illness expressions, especially the opposition between have and be, reflects different degrees of identification of a person with a condition and is now influenced by ethical considerations. Comparison with Uzbek and Russian shows that the bodily basis of the concepts is largely universal, whereas their evaluative and social components differ, with English emphasizing individual responsibility and Uzbek treating health as a supreme value connected with family and community. These conclusions have practical value for teaching English to Uzbek students, for medical translation and for intercultural communication in healthcare. Further research may focus on the dynamics of these concepts in contemporary English public discourse, on the rapidly changing language of

mental health and on a systematic comparison of English, Uzbek and Russian phraseology of the body.

References

1. Constitution of the World Health Organization. New York: World Health Organization, 1946. 18 p.
2. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 242 p.
3. Степанов Ю.С. Константы: Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1997. 824 с.
4. Попова З.Д., Стернин И.А. Когнитивная лингвистика. М.: АСТ: Восток-Запад, 2007. 314 с.
5. Safarov Sh. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. Jizzax: Sangzor, 2006. 92 b.
6. Sontag S. Illness as Metaphor. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978. 87 p.
7. Kleinman A. The Illness Narratives: Suffering, Healing, and the Human Condition. New York: Basic Books, 1988. 284 p.
8. Fleischman S. I am..., I have..., I suffer from...: A linguist reflects on the language of illness and disease // Journal of Medical Humanities. 1999. Vol. 20, No. 1. P. 3-32.
9. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. 2-е изд., перераб. М.: Высшая школа, 1996. 381 с.
10. Usmonova Sh. Lingvokulturologiya: o'quv qo'llanma. Toshkent, 2019. 244 b.