Research Article

IDIOETHNIC INTERPRETATION OF UZBEK PHRASEOLOGY
(on example of Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages)

Ismailov Gulom Mirzaevich

Senior Scientific Researcher of Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore under the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences. City Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

Abstract

This article focuses on the linguocultural study of phraseological units in Turkic languages and illuminates the implicit manifestation of national-cultural semantics in them. Objects cannot be imagined without comparative study, because one of the main tasks of comparative study is to illuminate the integral and differential features of the way of thinking of each linguist of the linguistic phenomena under study. From our point of view, in addition to the material and cultural elements of the language, the semantic base component in the phraseology of the Turkic languages is the expression of the spiritual elements of the people. Hence, national-cultural identity is expressed in the nucleus of the unit (denotation) in the phraseology, while in some units it is realized in additional semantics. The article describes the idioethnic interpretation of the phraseology available in the three Turkic languages.

Introduction

It has become almost a tradition to study the language along with the culture, that is, the national-cultural peculiarities of the language owner. Years of research in the field of phraseology have confirmed that phraseology is a unit that accumulates the cultural potential of the people and has a cumulative function, and the research of A.Vezhbitskaya, V.N.Telia, V.A.Maslova, and D.O.Dobrovolsky is a clear proof of this. The phraseological fund of language is a "mirror" of the linguocultural society, reflecting its own national thinking, and it is the phraseology that represents the specific way in which language owners perceive existence.

Therefore, there is a growing interest in the characteristics of the field of phraseology, such as the reflection of the specific culture of the people in a particular society, resulting in comparative phraseology (V.G.Gak,A.V.Kunin, A.M.Dubinina, Yu.P.Solodub, S.M.Kravtsov, G.G.Sokolova, G.Smagulova, G.Sagidolda, S.Arora, N.L.Gogolitsina, etc.), cognitive phraseology (N.F.Alefirenko, V.M.Mokienko, N.A.Ryabinina, A.B.Feoktistova, etc.) and idioethnic phraseology (N.N.Kirillova, Yu.E.Lomonosova, V.V.Lamova, G.N.Dukembay, etc.) was the basis for its appearance in science. The study of national characteristics in the phraseological system of different languages as a subject of phraseology is called "idioethnic phraseology" [9]. Thus, "The emergence of idioethnic phraseology is associated with the transition from the inner boundaries of linguistics to the outer. The boundaries of apparent linguistics encompass the total factors that to one degree or another are broadly related to the material and spiritual culture of a people and to world culture in a broad sense. It is at this stage that the phraseological space reflects the content of idioethnic phraseology. The national-specific features of stable associations have their own subject as the subject of idioethnic phraseology, and belong to the anthropocentric paradigm in

which the focus is on the personality factor, i.e., national-cultural competence. The linguocultural approach, on the other hand, allows us to explain the influence of cultural stereotypes on language [8].

In idioethnic phraseology, phraseologies, unlike lexemes, contain the notion of "phraseolex", which is a small text that embodies the ideas and knowledge of a particular people, saturated with idioethnicity.

Methodology

According to V.A.Maslova, "it is a text that transmits culture to the next generation. Text, not language, reflects the spiritual world of humanity. It is the texts that are directly related to culture, it is the code of culture that preserves all the history, ethnography, national psychology, national worldview, etc. that exist in the context of culture. The text, of course, consists of small linguistic units that amplify the cultural signal, and such units are, first of all, phraseological units" [13]. As a result of his research in the field of phraseology, the scientist puts forward the following hypothesis: 1. There are 'traces' of national culture that should be reflected in most phraseologies; 2. Phraseologism preserves the figurative notion of being in subtextual knowledge ("subtextual knowledge" represents the expression of the expression not only explicitly but also implicitly - G.I.) preserves the cultural information that gives it a national-cultural color; Many well-known phraseologists emphasized the importance of studying the system of images fixed in the phraseological composition of the language, since "in the figurative basis of phraseological units of different types, characteristic features of the world study of the linguocultural community are especially condensed"[20]. 3. The emergence of cultural-national identity is the definition of cultural-national connotation.

It is known that the linguist N.N.Kirillina, who made a number of important observations on the idioethnic features of phraseology, notes that there is a concept of **"phraseological marking"** in phraseology, which is relevant in the approach to phraseology within a particular language and vice versa in the interlinguistic approach. Hence, phraseological marking inevitably incorporates idioethnic features of language in phraseology. Meanwhile, the scientist, in this case lexical and semantic features of phraseologisms to be noted, first of all, the idioethnicitywithout equivalent lexics (*ne laptem shi xlebat*) and secondly, the role of idioethnicityappear as a implicitly in semantics (*kogda rak na gore svistnet*) [9]. It is obvious that in each linguoculture phraseologies become semantically similar as a result of the same people's perception of the world and the movement of different events in it, but the image, stereotype, standard, etc. may differ. In phraseology, "the similarity of images is important, which reflects the similarity of percetion of the external world in general and figurative thinking" [22].

As a result of our research, the idioethnical features of phraseology in linguocultural studies include 'linguoculture', 'linguistic picture of the world', 'ethnoculturalpicture of the world', 'phraseological picture of the world', 'idioethnic phraseology' and so on.

It is known from the above that the realization of national-cultural marking in the structure of phraseology as a semantic basic component. A comparative study of phraseologies allows the study of the culture of a particular society and the identification of linguocultural elements in phraseologies to study the linguocultural dominants that reflect the culture of a particular nation. In linguoculturology, linguistic and communicative units, units that have a national-cultural component and linguocultural dominants are called, in V.V.Vorobev's words, 'linguoculturema' [25]. Linguoculturema is by its nature a multifaceted complex unit, expressing dialectical harmony in its linguistic and non-linguistic content [25]. The linguoculturema acts as a unit of etymological analysis of phraseological units, the most general content of which was determined by V.V.Vorobyov [25]. For the first time the concept of linguoculture in the study of phraseology was used by GV Tokarev [21]. According to the scientist, "the linguoculturema reflects the results of the interaction of two semiotic systems - language and culture" and one of the components of the linguoculture meant is a linguistic image. These questions are at the center of attention in the anthropo- and ethno-centric approach to language, associated with the ideas of W. Humboldt (1767-1835) and A.A.Potebnya (1835-1891): the interpretation of linguistic meanings is aimed at understanding the subjectivity of the human perception and ethnocultural characteristics of the linguistic picture of the world, specific to each specific language.

According to N.N.Kirillova and A.L.Afanaseva, linguoculturema is an abstract phenomenon, a linguistic unit that encompasses all the qualities of a particular people, such as worldview, that is, a lexeme that has not only a denotative-signifiable meaning, but also a cultural meaning and represents a certain cultural connotation Arephraseologisms [7]. Linguoculturema is a linguistic phenomenon that demonstrates the commonality of linguistic and non-linguistic factors, and its characteristic feature is that in the process of its study it is possible to determine the relationship and essence of language and culture. For example, in the imagination of the Turkic peoples, the characteristic of 'innocence' is embodied in the image of sheep and musicha (Streptopeliasenegalensis) (Uzbek people) (*qo'yday yuvosh, musichadek beozor*– gentle as a sheep, as calm as *musicha*), in the English in the image of a dove (as harmless as a dove). In all nations, the dog symbol is formed in the mind of the person in the form of loyalty, devotion and insult. For example, in Russia *sobach'yapredannost'*, in Uzbeks it is as loyal as a dog, and in Kyrgyz the dog is only a symbol of insult. The peculiarities of such a pig also allow it to be imagined differently in different peoples, while the Russians are a symbol of immorality and ingratitude; the British are a symbol of greed, which for the Muslim people is a symbol of disgust, insults. As a result of metaphorization of the characteristic features of these animals and birds, the individuality and originality of the human way of thinking has been realized, forming a linguistic picture of the linguistic society. It is clear from this that the connection between language and culture gives rise to the connotative meanings of not only lexemes but also phraseologies.

"Connotation is insignificant, but stable features of the concept expressed by the lexeme, embodying the assessment of the corresponding object or fact accepted in society, reflecting cultural ideas and traditions associated with the word" [2]. Thus, in linguoculturema, the national-cultural component is embodied from different aspects of linguistic units, i.e. in the central place

as an archetype, while in some units it is embodied as additional semantics and perephery. For example, words like *көнек, құрық* (Kazakh), *qarabaraq* (Karakalpak), *ajabsanda* (Uzbek) are realized in the core of the national cultural-component lexeme.

This situation can also be observed in the phraseology of the Turkic languages. The basic component of national-cultural color in the phraseology of *bir piyola choyga taklif qilmoq* (inviting a cup of tea) in Uzbek, *тәтті шайға шақыру* in Kazakh and *шайға шақырыу*in Karakalpak is mentioned in the periphery of this phraseology, first of all they have common features, i.e. inviting guests, relatives or friends delivery, the exact timing, the table setting for the guest.

In contrast to the Uzbek linguoculture, it is one of the ancient traditions of the Kazakh and Karakalpak people to put on the table a lot of meat dishes and to pay attention to the recitation of *өлең* (poems), which formed the basis of national and cultural components. This can be seen in the comparative study of the phraseology of the Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages in the semantic differences of linguoculture. This concept allows us to get an idea of the national-cultural individual thinking, which has a separate character in the three societies, alien to the other society. It should be noted that the nomenclature of an object, subject or event with a certain national-cultural color in a particular linguistic culture calls a lexeme unfamiliar to another linguistic culture a **realema** [24], while others call it a lacuna, non-equivalent lexeme, ethnography [27]. It is clear from the above analysis of phraseology that it is expedient to apply the *realema* not only to the lexeme but also to the additional semantics, connotations understood from the phraseology. Because the national-cultural situational phenomena that exist in the periphery of phraseology also have no analogy in another society.For example, the phrases "to catch, to capture, to capture" are used in Uzbek, *burnidan ip oʻtkazib olmoq* (to pass thread through the nose), in Kazakh, *бұйдалаған тайлақтай*, and in Karakalpak, *басы байлы болыу*. According to the views of A.A. Potebnya, developed in his work "Thought and Language", the internal form of the word expresses the national specificity of the word and reflects the realities of culture: "this is the center of the image, one of its features, prevailing over all others. The inner form, in addition to the actual unity of the image, also gives knowledge of this unity; it is not an image of an object, but an image of an image, that is, a representation"[15].

Language is a key element capable of expressing the peculiarities of a nation's worldview. Language is an important tool in the emergence and formation of human knowledge. This means that man perceives and perceives things in existence, and 'seals' the result into language, and reveals new real phenomena on the basis of these archetypes. The combination of language representatives in a particular society, the perception and knowledge of the world and existence, creates a linguistic picture of the universe. As a result of human interaction with nature on the basis of existing laws, it reflects a different landscape in its mind. The fact that all forms of objective being are embodied in the human mind gave rise to the term 'worldview' in science. The term 'worldview' was first used in physics in the late XIX century by physicists Heinrich Hertz and Max Planck. He viewed the physical landscape of the universe as a collection of perceptions

of objects in the external world, interpreting it as an image of a being formed in physics and reflecting the laws of nature, realizing that information about objects results from these perceptions. This term was later reflected in the field of linguistics by V. von Humboldt and neogumboldtists due to the theories of L.Weisgerber and the American linguist Sepir-Whorf. Thus, while the worldview in the field of physics was originally manifested in the mind of the world, man's conception of being, his knowledge of nature and humanity, the linguistic view of the universe is characterized as linguistically reconstructed information of things in existence.

Naturally, all languages have the property of perceiving a being and shaping it in the mind, allowing its owner to imagine objects in the objective world as well as images re-formed in language through those objects. As a result of imagination, the conceptualization of being manifests itself in a partially universal, in part, in a peculiar way, that is, each bilingual speaker has a different idea of things-phenomena in an objective being. L.Weisgerber writes that everyone has a certain opportunity in the process of mastering and using their native language, and in this regard, the linguistic personality is able to maintain its identity [23]. It is known that the linguistic landscape of the world in a particular linguocultural culture is distinguished by the linguistic person's unique national-cultural perception of being. This, in turn, forms the "ethnoculturalpicture of the world". The worldview, of course, is universal and specific as a product of human activity.

In the process of human assimilation of the phenomena of existence, the worldview expands, and the appearance of new phenomena in the human mind enriches with new ones over time. Archaic elements in the mind (historical, cultural worldview – realities of the people) are the basis for the creation of new images in the human mind in a metaphorical way, saturated with new meanings. In the linguistic landscape of the world, there are always national and cultural features of language representatives. At the same time, it is formed in connection with the history, culture and way of life of the people, realizes a new conceptual world and realizes a unique worldview, that is, the ethnocultural worldview, due to concepts related to a particular linguoculture. However, the linguistic view of the world, based on its archaic basis, shapes man's attitude to existence, defines his ideals, norms and stereotypes of human behavior.

For example, the Uzbek *Anqoning urug'i*or*anqoga shafe* [14] (about something that is never found or very rare), in the Kazakh language *көнекке тас салғандай* [17] (in the sense of insatiable, greedy) and in the Karakalpak language *жөн алды қарабарақ болыў* [16] (aimless). It can be seen that the semantic basic components in the phraseology of the person who goes to the place he encounters are the basis for the formation of a new image as a result of man's understanding of existence in a metaphorical way as an archaic concept already existing in the human mind. It is known from these phraseologies that a certain folk culture has a cumulative function, retaining this information in itself, reflecting the long process of development in the semantics of phraseology. Thus, "phraseology is a kind of microcosm, brief information inherited from ancestors, which contains spiritual and moral laws and common sense" [3].

It is clear from the above that the ethnocultural landscape of the world is an image in the human mind of a being that embodies all layers of people's life in a particular society, namely history, culture, folklore, mythology. According to researchers, the ethnocultural landscape of the world changes dynamically under the influence of internal and external factors, that is, as a result of various socio-cultural changes. According to L.G.Zolotyh, although the ethnoculturalpicture of the world has a dynamic variability, the core of the ethnos, which represents the specificity of a particular language-speaking culture, does not change [28]. Because of this regularity, more phraseologies will be of great importance as units that reflect the national-cultural identity of each nation. Because phraseology is a mirror of the nation.The *concept* term, which is actively used in linguistics today and has different definitions, has different aspects in linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics. The concept is a multifaceted and multifaceted phenomenon, and for linguists working in the field of cognitive linguistics and "linguoculturology as one of the basic concepts of linguoculturology, the concept is a characteristic feature of a particular linguistic culture. [19] That is, a concept is a mental structure that represents a source of information that reflects not only people's knowledge and experience about a particular event, but also perceptions, associations, etc., and the object (event) as a complex means requires expression with. It should be noted that this term was interpreted in Uzbek linguistics by such scientists as Sh.Safarov, E.Mamatov, N.Tukhtakhojaeva, M.Juraeva, and G.Kdirova [19; 18; 12; 4]. N.Mahmudov writes about the term concept: "Linguoculturological research pays a lot of attention to the problems of concept expression, when looking at Internet materials, for example, in Russian linguistics; it is difficult to list and enumerate works in this area. Even the vast majority of dissertations defended in recent years have been devoted to the linguocultural study of the concept in one language or another" [11].

Conclusion

Thus, as a basic unit of linguoculturalstudies is a linguocultural concept, which as a comprehensive phenomenon includes the values of the linguistic personality in a particular linguocultural, the structures of figurative imagination. Because of these factors, existence is conceptualized in the human mind through definition, expression, and description.

While studying the essence of the emergence of concepts in the mind of a linguistic person, V.I.Karasik divides the concept into two types, namely, parametric and non-parametric concept. While parametric concepts are universal concepts that appear as classification categories to compare the description of existing events (space, time, quantity, etc.), nonparametric concepts include the content of specific social events (ethnospecific, sociospecific, and individual) [5].

According to L.V.Kovaleva, "the processes of abstraction and generalization of things-phenomena in the level of human mental activity give rise to segment concepts, and at the verbal level they form lexical and phraseological concepts" [10]. When we compare the phraseology of the Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages in terms of national-cultural, worldview of the people, we can see that the concept of "disagreement" is conceptually specific in all three societies. For example, in Uzbek "*oralaridan ola mushuk o'tdi*" ("a cat passed between them"), in Kazakh "*ат кекілін кесті*" (cut a horse's hair), and in the Karakalpak "*ийтли-пышықлы болыў*" (to grapple). It can be seen that the concept crosses the bridge between linguistic signs (words, phraseology, etc.) and being, and the concept itself forms a set of associative representations, reflecting the total meanings of linguistic signs.

It is clear from the above ideas and examples that objects cannot be imagined without comparative study, because one of the main tasks of comparative study is to illuminate the integral and differential features of each linguist's way of thinking. From our point of view, in addition to the material and cultural elements of the language, the semantic base component in the phraseology of the Turkic languages is the expression of the spiritual elements of the people. Hence, national-cultural identity is expressed in the nucleus of the unit (denotation) in the phraseology, while in some units it is realized in additional semantics. From this point of view, the component that carries the semantic load in the structure of phraseologies depends on the axiological and material culture and can be divided into two groups.

References

1. Alimjanova G.M. Sopostavitel'naya lingvokul'turologiya: vzaimodeystvie yazika, kul'turi i cheloveka. Almati, 2010. 300 s.

2. Apresyan, Yu.D. Izbrannie trudi. T.1. Leksicheskaya semantika: sinonimicheskie sredstva yazika / Yu.D. Apresyan. – M.: Izd-vo Shkola «Yaziki russkoy kul'turi». Izdat. Firma «Vostochnaya literatura» RAN, – 1995. – S. 67.

3. Buslaev F. I. Russkie poslovisi i pogovorki, sobrannie i ob'yasnennie. – M.: Russkiy yazik, 1954. – S. 37.

4. Jo'raeva M. Fransuz va o'zbek ertaklarida modallik kategoriyasining lingvokognitiv, milliy madaniy xususiyatlari: Filol.f.d. diss. avtoref.- Toshkent, 2017.

5. Karasik V.I. Yazikovie klyuchi. – M.: Gnozis, 2009. – 406 s.

6. Kirillina N.N. Idioetnicheskaya markirovannost' frazeologizmov: yazikovie virajenie i yazikovie soznanie. http://phraseo.narod.ru/st/.html

7. Kirillova N. N., Afanas'eva A. L. Prakticheskoe posobie po lingvokul'turologii: fransuzskiy yazik. SPb.: Izd-vo SPbGU, 2008. – S. 73.

8. Kirillova N.N. K voprosu o stereotipax vo frazeologii. – S. 137. URL: www.cyberleninka.ru/article/n/k-voprosu-o-stereotipah-vo-frazeologii.pdf

9. Kirillova, N.N. Idioetnicheskaya markirovannost' frazeologizmov: yazikovoe virajenie i yazikovoe soznanie [Elektronniy resurs] / N.N. Kirillova // Problemi idioetnicheskoy frazeologii: Issues of Idioethnical Phraseology: tezisi dokl. mejdunar. seminara, Sankt-

Peterburg, 12–14 noyabrya 2001 g. / RGPU im. A.I. Gersena; pod red. N.N. Kirillovoy. – SPb., 2002. – Vip. 4. – S. 8–13. – Rejim dostupa: http://phraseo.narod.ru/lit.htm. – Data dostupa: 25.09.15.

10. Kovaleva L.V. Frazeologicheskie konsepti i ix realizasiya v yazikax mira // Nauchniy vestnik Voronejskogo gosudarstvennogo arxitekturno-stroitel'nogo universiteta. Vipusk №4(18), 2015.

11. Mahmudov N. Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llarini izlab... // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. – Toshkent, 2012. – № 5. – B. 9.

12. Mamatov A.E. Tilga kognitiv yondashuvning mohiyati nimada? / O'zbek tilshunosligining dolzarb muammolari (prof. A.Nurmonov tavalludining 70 yilligiga bag'ishlab o'tkazilayotgan ilmiy-amaliy anjuman materiallari. – Andijon, 2012. – B. 212-220.

13. Maslova V.A.Lingvokul'turologiya. – Moskva: Akademiya. – 2001. – S. 87.

14. O'TIL. 1-jild. 2006. – B. 89.

15. Potebnya A.A. Misl' i yazik. – M.: Labirint, 1999. – S. 23.

16. Qaraqalpaq tiliniӊ qisqasha frazeologiyaliq sөzligi. – Nөkis: Qaraqalpaqstan, 1985. – B. 82.

17. Qazaq tiliniӊ sөzdigi. – Almati: Dayk-Press, 1999. – B. 326.

18. Safarov Sh. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. – Jizzax: Sangzor, 2006.

19. Safarov Sh. Semantika. – Toshkent, 2013. – B. 283.

20. Teliya V. N. Ot redaktora / V.N.Teliya // Frazeologiya v kontekste kul'turi. M., 1999. - S. 23.

21. Tokarev G. V. Konsept kak ob'ekt lingvokul'turologii: (na materiale reprezentasiy konsepta «Trud» v russkom yazike). – Volgograd: Peremena, 2003. – S. 63.

22. Uraksin Z.G. Nekotorie problemi sravnitel'nogo izucheniya frazeologii tyurkskix i mongol'skix yazikov / Problemi Altaistiki i mongolovedeniya. Vipusk 2. Materiali Vsesoyuznoy konferensii. – Elista, 17-19 maya 1972. – S. 147.

23. Vaysgerber L. Rodnoy yazik i formirovanie duxa. - M., 1993. – S. 135.

24. Vlaxov S., Florin S. Neperevodimie v perevode. – M., 1980. – S. 5.

25. Vorob'ev V.V. Lingvokul'turologiya: uchebnoe posobie. – M.: Izdatel'stvo RUDN, 2008. – S. 45.

26. Vorob'yov V. V. Kul'turologicheskaya paradigma russkogo yazika: teoriya opisaniya yazika i kul'turi vo vzaimodeystvii / V. V. Vorob'ev. M.: Izd-vo In-ta rus. yaz., 1994. - 75 s.

27. Xashimova D.U. Problemi sopostavitel'nogo issledovaniya lakun v raznosistemnix yazikax: monografiya / otv. red. I. R. Mirzaeva. Tashkent: Izd-vo TGYuI, 2008

28. Zolotix L. G. Kartina mira – Model' mira – obraz mira: problema sootnosheniya kategoriy v aspekte idiomatiki // Gumanitarnie issledovaniya. 2006.-№ 3. – S. 50.