

## Concepts Representing Intellectual World Of Humans

*Yusuf Shakarboyevich Nurmukhammedov*

*Lecturer, social sciences department Samarkand branch of the center of scientifically-methodical providing for retraining and professional development of specialists in physical culture and sport under the ministry of physical culture and sport, Uzbekistan*

*E mail: [nurmuhammad.yu@gmail.com](mailto:nurmuhammad.yu@gmail.com)*

### Abstract

Phraselological unities are an integral part of culture and language and a crucial factor that determines certain cultural characteristics. On the basis of the phraselological unities characterizing intellectual nature of humans have been analyzed the concepts of “intelligence” and “stupidity” and detected what kind of perceptual sensations underlie the creation of their images. The author concludes that the presence of so many proverbs, idioms, and phrases related to the above listed concepts in the Uzbek language shows that they are basic concepts and culturally specific in the Uzbek language conscious. The results obtained contribute to the development of theoretical and practical perspective for explaining linguocultural aspect of linguistic unities.

**Key words:** linguoculture, concept, phraselological unit, intelligence, stupidity, introspective approach

### Introduction

The last decades of XX century is noticeable for forming two large-scaled macro paradigm – communicative-pragmatic and cognitive-discourse – and a whole range of particular paradigms in a frame of anthropocentric super paradigm. Thanks to the greatest scientific achievement of listed above paradigms and meticulous works of linguists (Alefrenko N, Wierzbicka A, Naciscione A, Telia V, Maslova V, Vorobyev A, Kubriyakova E, Karaulov Yu, Karasik V, N.

Mahmudov, M. Xoliqova, and ets] linguistic study of culture, i.e. linguoculturology has recently become an independent discipline. It focuses on interaction of *language* as a translator of cultural information and *culture* with its settings and preferences and *human being* who creates this culture by using language. Language is usually perceived as “a tool for expressing meaning”, “a guide to “social reality”, “not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas but rather the shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individual’s mental activity, for analysis of impressions, for synthesis of his/her mental stock in trade”, and “contains a characteristic worldview”.

Phraseological units (PhUs] as a field of linguistics is valuable source of information about culture and mentality of ethnos, preserve ideas about myth, custom, ceremony, ritual, habit, moral, behavior, and etc. In addition, since phraseological unities essentially contains creativity and originality of particular linguocultural society on evaluating fragments of external and internal fragments of world we prefer to observe concepts representing intellectual nature of human being. The task of research is conceived as seeking response to question what consists of national specifics of language from the perspective of native language speakers.

### **Literature review**

Phraseologoly is a fruitful field of linguistics from the perspective of linguoculturology. According to V. Teliya linguoculturology should orientate to cultural factor in language and linguistic factor in human being [1, 222]. Postovalova more distinctly expressed: “participation of language in creation of spiritual culture and participation of spiritual culture in formation of language” is the essence of linguoculturology [2, 26]. Thus, language /discursive

activity observed from valuable-semantic perspective becomes an object of linguoculturology and then valuable-semantic field of language is a subject of it.

As a mental structure concept represents the knowledge of an individual about a particular segment of the world. Being a part of the world picture concept reflects the orientation of values of the entire linguistic community, may include the generally valid features as well as the individual characteristics of native speakers. Stepanov [6, 38] stressed that culture is the total of the concepts and relation among them, and concept is “a basic cultural cell in the mental world of a man” [7, 48]. According to Karasik [8, 91], concept as a category of linguoculturology, has multilateral meaningful structure in which stand out evaluative, figurative and notional strata. Values, higher orientation define human beings’ behavior, compose the most significantly part of linguistic picture of world. Figurative component of concept correlate with perceptive and cognitive parts of human being. Perception represents linguistic embodiment of examined phenomenon. It embraces visual, auricular, tactile, tasteful perceived characteristics of thing, in a broad sense, which relevant signs of practical knowledge that reflected in our memory. And the last component of cultural concept is linguistic fixation of ones that embodies its denotation, description, definition, indicative structure, etc. Analyzing the concepts “intelligence” and “stupidity” from the cultural point of view on the material of paremiology the range of conceptual meaning would be bounded with particular culture and epoch, since proverbs have static nature.

In contemporary linguistics there is seriously discussion on classifying proverbs among linguistics. According to Kunin, “a phraseological unit is a stable combination of words with a fully or partially figurative meaning” [4, 210]. This definition is best suited for purposes of both theoretical analysis and practical identification. Kunin’s understanding of PhUs also embraces proverbs [4, 313]. I follow Kunin in including proverbs in the phraseological stock of language.

Indeed, the study of proverbs has established itself into a separate discipline – paremiology. Latvian linguist Nascione also argued that from the linguistic point of view proverbs belong to phraseology for the following reasons. Semantically, they comply with the two main categorical requirements: stability and figuration. Syntactically, they feature sentence structure [simple or complex] and they never exceed sentence boundaries in their base form. Stylistically, the functioning of proverbs presents a great variety of patterns of stylistic use, the same as in other types of PUs [5, 19].

Using a lingua-cultural approach to the intellectual nature of human being we can gain information about complex inner structure of the concept, identify system of values and appreciation, which is influenced by cultural and spiritual experience of Uzbek nation.

### **Research methodology**

We have made an introspective approach to the issue of national-cultural specifics of PhUs. Baranov and Dobrovolskiy point out a few insignia for intuitively perceive national specifics of idioms as non-typical expressive plan phraseologisms, factors of complication forms, having national proper names and their derivatives, personages of «national myth», unique word, traditional attributes daily life, elements people's semiotics, archaic components in the structure of idioms [11,230]. In contemporary linguistics exist a number of methods to explore concepts as conceptual analyze, historical-comparative analyze, definitional interpretation, component analyze, stylistic interpretation, distributive analyze, method contextual and textual analyze, cognitive interpretation results of description semantics of language unities, verification cognitive description received from bearer of language. To some extent, all of them used to research linguocultural aspect of concept as object of interaction of language, mind, and culture. It is need to distinguish conceptual analyze from semantic analyze of

word. Lexical semantics advance from unities of linguistic form towards semantic content, conceptual analyze from a sense of unities towards linguistic form their expression [10, 248-249].

We have studied the representation of the concept of intelligence/stupidity in the Uzbek language through proverbs and sayings. As the source of the research have been used the explanation dictionaries [Explanatory Dictionary of Uzbek language, 2008; Etymological Dictionary of Uzbek language, 2000, 2003, 2009], dictionaries of proverbs [Uzbek national proverbs, 1988; Explanatory Dictionary of Uzbek proverbs, 1987], phrasological dictionaries [Raxmatullaev, 1978, Sadikova, 1993].

### **Analysis and results**

Intellect is a value, having intellect positively evaluated, contrariwise, negatively. Hereby, coherent link of lexeme which denotes intellectual nature of person with absolute estimation manifest the significance of opposability in core of described field. In conscious of Uzbek language bearer intellectual nature person is reflected, first of all, in opposition to “intelligible-stupid”. Explanatory dictionary glosses ‘intellect’ as human being’s thinking ability, mental development level; consciousness and an owner of intellect [12, 216]. ‘Knowledge’ is explained as an educated level, education, erudition [12, 260]. The notion “intellect” is usually associated with parts of body as *head*, *brain*. Their active function is positively evaluated what take place in the kernel of the concept “intelligence”. The lexeme ‘ahmoq’ is originated from Arabic language used to describe a person who doesn’t do the work reasonably, does foolish things, and allow such as [12, 130]. The concept ‘ahmoq’ [stupid] is associated with donkey [*eshak miya*, mostly for male], hen [*tovuq miya*, for female] that mostly used in social speech.

After analyzing the groups of PhUs characterized intellectual activity of human being allow us to show semantic field that include 456 PhUs selected from listed dictionaries above. All selected phraseologisms might conditionally divide into three large groups characterized various features of human being intellect:

1. Presence/absence of intellect
2. Presence/absence of knowledge
3. Characterization of memory, attention

The division is grounded on the classification of phraseologisms suggested by Emirova A.M [9]

### **1. Presence/absence of intellect**

- a) presence of intellect: *aqli yetmoq, ko‘zi yetmoq, aqli kirmoq, es-hushli bo‘lmoq, aqlini tanimoq, aqli ikki ko‘zida, pochasi qo‘lida, ko‘zi ochiq, ko‘zi o‘tkir, oq-qorani tanimoq, mag‘zini chaqmoq, aqli boshda soch turmas, es-hushini yig‘ishtirmoq, esini tanimoq, xayoliga kelmoq, tegirmonga tushsa butun chiqmoq, etc.*
- b) absence of intellect: *Aqlini emoq, miyasini emoq, esini yemoq, aql-u hushini yo‘qotmoq, aqlini yo‘qatmoq, esi past, esidan og‘moq, aqldan ozmoq, tishi o‘tmaydi, oq-qorani tanimaslik, “og‘zing qani desa?” qulog‘ini ko‘rsatmoq, esi yo‘q, zehni po‘stak, aqli qisqa, qovoq bosh; esi past uyatni bilmas, aqli zaif, xum kalla, tariqcha aqli yo‘q, telbaning terisi qalin, anglamay so‘zlagan og‘rimay o‘lar, o‘qimagan – yalang oyoq, // baayni bir tayoq, xamiri achimgan, bosh bo‘lmasa gavda losh, aqli kishi baqirmas, etc.*

### **1) Presence/absence of knowledge**

- a) presence of knowledge: *qaysi ignaning ko‘ziga qaysi ip to‘g‘ri kelishini bilmoq; kalavanning uchuini topmoq; ko‘zini bilmoq; ko‘zi pishidi; yer tagida ilon qimirlasa bilmoq, aynlining bolasi qarg‘aning tilini bilar, etc.*

b) absence of knowledge: *alifni kaltak deyolmaslik, kalavani uchini yo 'qotmoq, ko 'zi ko 'r, qulog 'i kar, ona suti og 'zidan ketmagan, ichini yorsang alif chiqmaydi, etc.*

## 2) Characterization of memory, attention

*Boshidan kechmoq, miyasidan o 'tmoq, miyasidan kechmoq, xayolidan o 'tmoq, fikridan o 'tkazmoq, boshini og 'ritmoq, miyasini charchatmoq, boshi shishdi, miyasi g 'ovlab ketmoq, boshi qotmoq, yetti o 'lchab, bir kesmoq, ko 'z oldiga keltirmoq, o 'y surmoq, esida tutmoq, esidan chiqmoq, esiga solmoq, esiga tushmoq, miyasi aynimoq, nazar solmoq, etc.*

Lakoff argued: “most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature” and “human thought processes are largely metaphorical” [13, 4]. We have observed that a few idioms about intellectual nature are structured roughly by the following complex conceptual metaphors:

### INTELLECT IS A ALIVE CREATURE

*aql[li] kirmoq, aql[i] yetmoq, bosh[i] shishdi, miya[si] charchamoq, etc.*

### INTELLECT IS A FOOD

*aql[i]ni emoq, miya[si]ni emoq, es[i]ni yemoq, xamiri achimgan, miya[si] aynimoq, etc.*

In the examples given, a set of such phrasal lexical items is coherently structured by a single metaphorical concept. Most of these expressions are not noticed as being metaphorical. One reason for this is that a very limited range of purposes – referring, quantifying, etc. We are not claiming that all cultural values coherent with a metaphorical system.



Comparison might step forward as a mode perception of world, a way strengthening results of the perception in culture. Comparison would build an image. Particularly bright image creates impressionistic comparison. Below we have brought examples grounded on semantic field method. In the Uzbek linguoculture intelligent people is associated with:

- a) precious natural substance: *dono durdan a'lo, inson aqli – olmos, kalam bor – bir qop tillam bor, aql aynimas, oltin chirimas;*
- b) water: *teran daryo tinch oqar, totli suv toshdan chiqar, yaxshi aql – boshdan, aqli qariya – oqib turgan daryo;*
- c) stone: *tog'ning ko'rki tosh bilan, odamning ko'rki bosh bilan, fikrsiz odamdan tosh yaxshi;*
- d) light: *aqlsiz bosh – nursiz chiroq, fikri ravshanning so'zi ravshan, oy nuri tunni yoritar, odam aqli – hayotni;*
- e) hand made things: *aql – fikr pichog'i, tuyaday bo'y berguncha, ninaday aql bersin, chinordek bo'yig bo'lguncha, tumordek aqlinig bo'lsin.*

stupid people is associated with:

- a) animal: *echkining ajali yetsa, qassobni suzar, echkining o'lgisi kelsa cho'ponning tayog'iga suykanar, sigiro zining buzoq bo'lganini bilmas;*
- b) poultry: *ko'r tovuqqa har narsa don ko'rinar, tovuq miya;*
- c) darkness: *qorong'uning ko'zi ko'r, aqlsiz bosh – nursiz chiroq;*
- d) people: *elanmagin kalga, o'zi kelar halga;*
- e) hand made things: *johillar kamon bo'lar;*
- f) hazardous substance: *donoda mehr bo'ladi, nodonda –zahr;*
- g) insects: *burgaga achchiq qilib, ko'rpaga o't qoyma;*



h) vertical dimension: *tuyaday bo'y berguncha, ninaday aql bersin, chinordek bo'ying bo'lguncha, tumordek aqlinig bo'lsin, aqlli pakana ahmoq darozdan yaxshi.*

i) plants: *tariqcha aqli yo'q, qovoq bosh*

It is known that each nation has its proper representation about commensuration human being and animal, human being and plants, human being and things, etc. The images of intelligent for Uzbeks are *tillo*[gold], *nur* [light] and the images of stupid for ones are *eshak* [donkey], *tovuq* [hen], *qovoq* [hen].

## Conclusion

By linguistic representation way of concepts may distinguish that cogitative form which obtain linguistic expression in lexical and phraseological system of language. Effective method for studying concepts is an interpretative analyze, furthermore, conceptual metaphor and semantic field methods give additional crucial cultural information. For obtaining more full conceptual map of a particular ethnos we need to carry out a survey.

## References

1. Teliya V.N. Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskiy, pragmaticheskiy i linguakulturologicheskiy aspekti.-M.: Yazikiy russkoy kulturiy, 1996.-288 s.
2. Postovalova V.I. Linguokulturologiya v svete antropologicheskoy paradigm [k problem osnovaniy i granis sovremennoy frazeologii] // Frazeologiya v kontekste kulturiy.-M.: Yazikiy russkoy kulturiy, 1999.-S.25-33
3. Maslova V.A. Linguokulturalogiya: uchebnoye posobiye.-M.: Akademiya, 2000.-154 s
4. Kunin, A. V. *Angliyskaya frazeologiya: teoreticheskiy kurs*[English Phrasology: A Theoretical Course]. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 1970. – 320 s

5. Naciscione, A. Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010. – p.289
6. Stepanov, Y.S. Konstanty. Slovar' russkoy kultury. Opyt issledovaniya. Moskva: Yazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1996. – 824 s
7. Stepanov, Y.S. Konseptiy. Tonkaya plenka sivilizasiya. Moskva: Yazykiy slavyanskix kultur, 2007. – 240 s.
8. Karasik, V.I. Yazikovie klyuchi. Moskva: Gnosis, 2009. – 330 s.
9. Emirova A.M. Russkaya frazeologiyavkommunikativnomaspekte. Monografiya.- Tashkent.1988.-120s
10. Popova Z.D. Kognitivnaya linguistica / Z.D.Popova, I.A.Sternin.-M.:AST: Vostok-Zapad.-2007. 315 s.
11. Baranov A., Dobrovolskiy D. Osnoviy frazeologii. Uchebnoye posobiye. M.: 2014. 308 s
12. Uzbek tilining izohli lug'ati. I-V jild. T.: UME.-2006.
13. Lakoff J, Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. The University of Chicago Press. 1979. p.242