



DOI:10.29013/EJLL-23-3-8-13



SEMANTIC PRIMITIVES IN ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES AND THEIR LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL FEATURES

*Sapiura Polatbaevna Kudaybergenova*¹

¹Lecturer, Department of English linguistics, Karakalpak State University, Uzbekistan

Cite: Kudaybergenova, S.P. (2023). *Semantic Primitives in English and Karakalpak Languages and their Linguoculturological Features*. *European Journal of Literature and Linguistics 2023, No 3*. <https://doi.org/10.29013/EJLL-23-3-8-13>

Abstract

This article deals with the concepts and assessments of structural and functional differences of semantic primitives and stages in the English and Karakalpak languages.

Keywords: *linguistic culture, sense, initial primitive, syntactic structure, lexeme, conceptual primitive, intro-speculation, extra-speculation*

Introduction

Do the differences in the culture of the peoples and civilizations of the Danube also imply differences in thinking? Twenty years ago, one of the famous psychologists, the American George Miller, wrote: "Every culture has its own myths. In our country, in the most developed countries, people have written that there is a special primitive thinking that is below ten in the brilliant round of our thinking. To deny the existence of these differences will not come to anyone. Denying this is tantamount to recognizing that differences in culture and technology, differences in life experience gradually, step by step lead to significant psychological consequences. Rather, the origin, formation, and development of these differences in conflict thinking is related to people close to a person and their sources" (Miller, 1971, VII).

We see that terms such as "primitive thinking" in linguistics and anthropology were the cause of many controversial prob-

lems twenty years ago. However, the question of whether there are real cognitive differences between different cultures, especially between Western and non-Western territories, areal culture, the extent of their observance, the definition of the present and the future remains open.

Disputes on this issue occurred frequently, and in different circles time turned to the language. This is quite appropriate, because language is "the best of human thinking" (Leibniz, 1709/1981), and linguistic data are extremely important for determining the basic patterns of thinking in various social and other groups. However, in this case, linguistic data may be misinterpreted for ideological purposes. And if we look at the opinion of one of our scientists, we will see that since the first primitives appeared in human consciousness, various concepts have arisen.

Interpreting the absence of abstract thinking in some human communities, Hallpike says: "Before effectively discussing whether

elementary, primitive thinking can or cannot be abstract, it is necessary to spend a lot of time on small and multithreaded semantics” (Hallpike, 1979).

In this article we will try to find a solution to the question connected with strong foundations. We do not refute the claims of the supporters of “elementary thinking” that their arguments are wrong, and we do not try to make it clear that they are wrong, because this concept has been accepted by most anthropologists, psychologists and linguists.

Materials and methods

If there are no words, there is no concept? If in any one language there are no words for such concepts as “everything”, and “if”, does this affect the cognitive abilities of speakers? If words in this language were fragments in which emoticons were added instead of general concepts, the absence of special words would not fulfill the role.

For example, if the essence of a common word is associated with various cheeky structures, then the use of a common lexeme there is usually insignificant: because the concept of “cause” and then the concept of “after” can still be given clearly. The same is true if the common word all “barliq” and many “kop” are used to convey the content, but each individual word is associated with the grammatical construction of themselves, then the common lexical material in this case does not affect the conceptual picture: any idea containing the concept of all “barliq” is still such it can be expressed in language.

However, in some languages there is only one word to convey Mani “because” and then “then”, and these two entities cannot be separated, so there is no reason to interpret Mani before the two words, they are not separated.

Many believe that this does not mean anything, because “beings have more equal and unanimous potential, therefore, even if there is no special word for a particular concept, these entities can be combined or otherwise, and the absence of a word does not limit them in any way. “But here, abandoning a biased attitude to facts, empty rhetoric means secrecy.

This situation largely does not correspond to the ideas of the keepers of the idea of “elementary thinking” primitive thinking.

We think that humans have a greater capacity for uniformity, but the use of this language and the existence of natural languages, in fact, have a common expressive power. We say “fundamentally” because some ideas are easier to express in some languages than in others. However, if something is not allowed to be expressed in the language of the concept of fll “hámme”, if “eger” or because “because”, its expressive capabilities would be really limited.

For example, let’s look at the following dialog:

– Неге жылап атырсан? Сени кимдур урды ма?

– Пул жоғатқаным ушын эжағам мени урды. Мени урғаны ушын жыламайман. Пул ушын жылап атырман.

We think that in a language where there is no word (morpheme, expression) for because “reason”, it is impossible to convey this meaning in a dialogue.

But why is it so important to have some words? People can’t have concepts without pe words? Those who don’t have hidden categories in the pa language?

Of course, there are hidden categories, and concepts can exist even without the words that represent them. However, first of all, the presence of the word as (a lexical unit in front of itself) serves as a direct proof of the existence of concepts, and in its absence -the best, the only indirect proof. Secondly, it is not enough to “earn” a concept in human speech, the means of communicating it to other people are also important. For some concepts, such a transfer can be implemented using constructions to give meaning or paraphrasing; for others, it should be a direct lexical expression. This last statement requires some interpretations and illustrations.

The situation would be hopeless if there was no word in the language to express the meaning of all “hámmesi”, the reason is that the more this concept is present in the vocabulary, the more it cannot be obtained in the same way from other concepts.

The idea of the phrase “every person” (in Greek pantaanthropon “every person”) is an important part of Christian teaching. If it were not for the word (or morpheme) every “every” or all “all”, this idea could not be conveyed in other languages.

Only inaccurate statements about such a sequence manilerdi hides the presence of words necessary to transfer from one language to another, but not all words are like that.

If something is not a semantically compatible word (or morpheme) in the language, this will not cause difficulties with translation, such difficulties may arise, because if the essence cannot be derived from simple concepts in a general way.

On the other hand, the concept of a goal “Goal” can be derived from the concepts of cause, because “reason (reason)”, thinking “oylaw” and want “qalew”, and the following cannot be derived from the other two things. This will not be a difficult task if there is no word in the language for the expression for “catch”:

I went out for some hunting. Я вышел поохотиться.

I want to the forest. Я пошел в лес.

I thought because I want to go Hunting. Я подумал, я хочу пойти на охоту.

I go hunting. охотиться (или я иду на охоту, я пойду на охоту).

If these words “sebebi”, “oylaw” and “kalew” were not in this language, then among them, of course, it would be difficult to explain anything.

Some concepts can be derived using other concepts, while others can be derived directly using lexical stress. On the one hand, this proposal seems obvious. In the presence of figurative-conceptual primitives, the existence of these primitives can serve as a solid basis for other concepts: infinitely many new concepts can be derived from a small number of semantic primitives.

Although there are an infinite number of concepts that need to be understood, most of them can be understood directly. By combining several elements into one, you can get an unlimited number of them. In principle, this is possible not only, but perhaps because people close to person t sought to achieve maximum memory with the minimum number of elements, that is, to act in the simplest way.

Linguoculturology in the semantics of words is a language or a unit of speech that forms a certain part of culture. These can be words (tone or compound fragments and complex words), phrases, phrases, sentenc-

es, paroemias, complex syntactic integers, text, and others (Yusupov U. K., 2021).

In our opinion, in linguoculturology, a person turns to words and sentences involuntarily, because they arise due to the conditions of socialization and the need for language. Further on, V.A. In her works Maslova divided linguoculturology into 9 types. 1) dictionary category without equivalent – realities (covers national costumes, food and drinks, holidays and holidays, program, names of individual items) and lacunae; 2) mythologems-archetypes, mythologies, heroes, images, program and customs, rituals; 3) paremiological fund of language (covers proverbs and sayings); 4) phraseological foundation of the language; 5) standards, stereotypes, symbols; 6) images and images (parables); 7) various linguistic stylistic overlays (literary / non-literary forms, etc.); 8) conversational etiquette and manners; 9) conversational etiquette. One of the basic concepts of linguoculturology is the “world language view”. The world language image is a single whole of signs and icons in the general consciousness that contribute to the development of human thinking in acquiring new world knowledge and reflect the basic and self-conscious features of the lifestyle of the population, giving rise to the world core of human eyes. Every culture has its own cultural manner, including language, personality, and behavioral characteristics. According to Likhachev, in linguoculturology, the term “branch of concepts” means “a set of possibilities arising in the vocabulary of a person and a common language. “... the richer its literature, folklore, science, art, the richer it becomes in the national linguistic branch of concepts, the richer it is in itself with all the historical experience of the nation and especially with religion. an intermediate comparison will be” (Likhachev D.S., 1997).

Further, N.D. Arutyunova, taking into account that the concept of a concept is a simple philosophical concept that arises from the causal relationship of the national program, folklore, religion, life experience, art images, a system of thoughts, feelings and values. Concepts of service between man and society executive cultural shell (logical analysis of language... 1993: 3).

The possibility of successful communication between different cultures is directly

related to the universality of the basic set of semantic primitives, in which each language can create an almost endless series of more or less “tanned” concepts. The existence of such a common initial run can explain the “spiritual community of humanity”, and the hypothesis that the vocabulary of different languages reflects different configurations of this run is responsible for the language and thinking of each culture.

Result and discussion

We have repeatedly tried to show how this happened in Vizhbetskaya 1992 and many other books and articles: the presence of a set of semantic primitives corresponding to a set of lexical worlds, and it was listed to shed light on the fact that this set of primitives is the universal basis of human communication and thinking, and this reflects that the configurations recognized in the original the language of humanity is different in the cultures it makes. The Leibniz primitive is a universal generalization, and we think it is correct to assume that it can only be obtained by trial and error, here is a summary of the research conducted on primitives of relative semantics in various cultures. During twenty years of intensive research conducted by our colleagues, we can consider semantic primitives as the basis for constructing other concepts of existence, the search for lexical overlaps in the languages of existence has revealed a complex of several dozen concepts.

I would not say that there is no uncertainty here, the reason is that polysemy often leads to uncertainty. However, for example, the fact that She was attached to the dog – “Ol iytkе baylangan edi” in English – “he was tied to the dog” – may have a conjugate concept, means that the attached “tied” does not have two different entities (1. leash, jeep or chain, 2. like, get used to). The polysemic meaning is difficult to distinguish, but it can aggravate the situation, but does not change the meaning.

Here it is understood that events occur simultaneously, and the reason is not depicted. The territory is the same, in the following sequence in English After her husband died, she fell ill. “Күйеуи өлгеннен кейин, ол кесел болып қалды” here implies interpretation, (interpretation due to the time sequence of events is still unambiguous).

On the other hand, “dan”, “keyin” or “sebepli” (sequential) concept, which in various contexts can be represented as “from”, “After” or “causally”, can also be represented as “causal relationship”. For example:

- Неге жылап атырсаң?
- Тис аўрығым бар. (Тисим аўрып атыр).

Consistently (“son”) according to Godard, it does not correspond to the sentence, it is necessary to determine the meaning of “sebeby”.

Consider the following sentence in (Wilkins D., 1989).

You must care your mother, because she ill very ill. You have to take care of your mother “sebebi” she is very sick.

In this alternation analogy, here “sebebi” is translated as a processed ablative morpheme can mean “dan” or “dan keyin” in other contexts, but in this context, the explanation of “dan” or “dan keyin” will be meaningless. The speaker suggests visiting the mother during the child’s illness, and not after. If we assume that such recommendations are meaningful in themselves, then we can assume that this morpheme is polyphemic and that they have different meanings: “dan”, “dan keyin” and “sebepli”.

A word (or morpheme) that can be distinguished as a primitive “yaki” primitive “yaki” or “keyin” has no meaning in its preposition, more abstractly than the words “cause” and “after”, and both are equally present in the usage. If someone says that he may have such a mania, but we don’t have the words in the context to avoid it, we repeat that we need to remain calm. There is no word “spiritual meaning” based on the semantics of the prediction is not verified, and therefore the semantics of them have no place in the analysis.

On the other hand, a semantic primitive is a set of universal predicates, including if “eger” and because “reason”, which are transparent for empirical verification (this analysis can lead to many new assumptions and versions proposed earlier by semantic primitives for many years).

Therefore, it would be inappropriate to try and justify various assumptions that we support our predictions with lexical universals in order to express criticism from an em-

pirical standpoint. It is necessary to confirm the existence of polysemy, it cannot be used without a good reason. For example: as described above, the hypothesis refutes the fact that “after” and “consistently” meaning in English is relative, since after corresponds to the discussion of after in any context.

If someone wants the vocabulary to be universal for understanding, and there is a special word in English for this, he cannot find a carrier of the mania vocabulary that could be a sequence of these predictions in English.

Let's add that at this stage it is impossible to distinguish all languages in which there is only one lexical indicator for the expression “after” and “because of” “Because”.

Semantic primitives are primitives of lexical indicators that are used in various constructions as evidence of polemics. the recognition of everyone is extremely important, we will illustrate this with another example.

Generalizing that we can exist without distinguishing polysemic syntactic constructions, as is the case with the English words attached or bank (“дәрья кырғағы» and «кредит банки “). However, if the basic concepts that are the basis of human communication and thinking (for example: all “barliq”, if “eger”, because “because”, then “then”, I “I”, you “you”), polysemy is allowed only when there are some syntactic properties (or differences in other types of indicators) can be provided. This request requires further study, but emphasizes that denoting one language denotes a common word like “you” and “I”, usually two universal semantic primitives found in common grammatical contexts confirm this idea.

Two words may have a common origin, but may refer to different areas of use. For example: despite the fact that languages with a certain existence have special words for “you” and “I”, the areas of use of these words can vary greatly.

Similarly, intro-speculation and “talking about feelings” are reflected differently in different cultures. For this reason, the number of terms related to feelings can vary from one to several. The differences in the scale of the dictionary of feelings are related to the sphere of use of the word “feeling”. The use of the English verb feeling has an unusually

wide scope and expresses the state of feeling Holi, combined with various words (for example: I feel depressed — I feel depressed), feeling (for example: I feel hungry — I feel hungry), including to express surface states for the subject with words (for example: I feel abandoned — I feel abandoned, I feel betrayed — I feel abandoned). However, in many other languages there are enough questions and topics for conversation. Very little is known about feelings, and the use of the word is limited to a very small number of combinations. However, this does not mean that the essence of English Sezim is very different from similar words in a narrow area of use in other languages, or that in a language that has a narrow area of use of the closest spelling of English Sezim, there is no word containing the concept of feeling.

Conclusion

As mentioned above, “eger” is a concept that we have demonstrated in contradiction with any attempts to fragment it, and nevertheless, researchers believe that it is not observed in some languages other than the European standard. We believe that such messages often arise due to the inability to distinguish between lexical polarity. Hallpike mentions that there is no concept of “everything” in what he calls “primitive cultures”, which avoids references to multiple languages to confirm this. The results of this statement are so significant that they deserve full consideration. He writes that “plural” and “integer” are the basic concepts of logic and are fundamental for input sentences connecting sections into a single whole. However, when using primitive words that ethnographers translate as “several” and “all”, “all” does not mean “possible members of the being”, but “to know us” or simply “a lot”. Usually primitive thinking tends to use “everything” in the sense of “too much” because of the desire of fugitive elements to maximize the number; primitive, of course, can be called “being” if there are physical, possible members of being, but in the sense of “completeness” there is a spatial concept of “filled vessel”.

In fact, in most non-European languages, the word “nothing” has the meaning “nothing” in the sentence for the meaning of negation alternately. In many languages, the word

that ethnographers translate as “everything” is, in fact, an abnormal template.

While for many languages the main essence is sentences containing the word “many”, English translations cover not “many”, but English “all” *sezim*.

Linguoculturological search for semantic primitives in English and Karakalpak allows us to mark the following as the ending. The theory of semantic primitives is the

most promising, debatable, theoretical and practical direction of cognitive linguistics. This theory created the basis for a more associative method of concepts. Semantic primitives make it possible to classify concepts based on the principles of nominative density of concepts and metaphorical diffusion, when the dynamics of the development of concepts makes it possible to classify.

References

- Lihachev D.S. Kul'tura kak celostnaya sreda // Lihachev D.S. Izbrannyye trudy po russkoj i mirovoj kul'ture. 1997.— 282 p.
- Logicheskij analiz yazyka ...— M.: Nauka, 1993.— 3 p.
- Maslova V.A. Vvedenie v kognitivnuyu lingvistiku.— M. Flinta. – nauka, 2006.
- Ysupov Ÿ. K. Znachenie, tuchcha, konsept i lingvokul'turema atamalari. osobennosti // Stilistika tilshunoslikning izuchil sovremennost'. 2021 g.
- Cliff Goddard and Anna Wierzbicka (Eds.) Semantic and Lexical Universals Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1994.
- Hallpike C. R. The Foundations of Primitive Thought. Oxford: Clarendon Press.— 171 p.
- Miller G. A. Forward // Cole, Gay, Glick, Sharp 1971.
- Leibniz, 1709/1981.— 368 p.
- Wierzbicka A. Semantics, Culture and Cognition: Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations. N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press.1992.
- Wilkins D. Mpamtwe Arremte (Aranda): Studies in the Structure and Semantics of Grammar: Ph. D. Thesis / ANU. 1989.— 186 p.

submitted 28.07.2023;
accepted for publication 17.08.2023;
published 8.10.2023
© Kudaybergenova S. P.
Contact: sapura_1984@mail.ru