

The Theoretical Foundations Of Linguocultural Analysis Of Paremiological Units

Aripova Mahliyo

1st-year basic doctoral student, Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 September 2025; **Accepted:** 23 October 2025; **Published:** 28 November 2025

Abstract: This article highlights the theoretical foundations of linguocultural analysis of paremiological units (proverbs, sayings, expressions and aphorisms). The organic interrelation of language and culture, as well as the role of paremiological units in reflecting a people's worldview, mentality, historical experience and national values, is analyzed on a scientific basis.

Keywords: Paremiology, linguoculturology, national mentality, cultural code, folklore, proverb, saying, phraseological unit.

Introduction: In world linguistics, a wide range of theoretical and practical views and considerations have been expressed regarding the linguocultural analysis of paremiological units. Here we have in mind the scholarly works of such specialists as V.N. Teliya, V.V. Vorobev, N.F. Alefirenko, M.L. Kovshova, A.P. Vasileko, V.A. Maslova, Lieu Txi Xong Fuk and a number of other researchers. Below, we will focus on the important aspects of their work that are directly related to the problem posed in our study.

V.N. Teliya examines the essence and content of the linguocultural analysis of paremiological units mainly through two factors. The first is "emphasizing the information that shows the cultural significance of the linguistic essence," and the second is "identifying the signals concerning the nature of the ways of referring to the object domain of culture, as carried out by speakers on the basis of the cultural layers of the linguistic object—its codes, symbolic meanings and culture-related concepts that collectively form its thesaurus within a given space–time continuum." As we can see, in this scholar's reflections the issue of revealing the cultural-semantic structure of paremiological units comes to the fore.

In numerous scholarly studies conducted in the field of linguistic culturology, we have observed diverse views concerning the essence and specific features of the concept of the linguocultureme, which is directly relevant to our topic. In particular, V.V. Vorobev

regards the linguocultureme as "an interlevel complex unit representing the dialectical unity of linguistic and extralinguistic (conceptual or referential) components." Another scholar, N.F. Alefirenko, advances the view that "logopoetics, as a carrier of cultural knowledge, shapes the cultural content of the linguocultureme."

In V.V. Vorobev's scholarly works, the notion of the linguocultureme is viewed as an analogue of the phoneme and morpheme, that is, as the result of the linguistic interrelation of terms. According to the scholar, the linguocultureme encompasses not only segments of language, but also cultural segments marked by specific features; therefore, he describes it as "an inter-level complex unit representing the dialectical unity of linguistic and extralinguistic (conceptual or referential) components." From this it follows that, by its essence and content, the linguocultureme is a linguistic unit that is deeper and more wide-ranging than the lexical word. For this reason, the scholar, comparing the linguocultureme with the word, states that "the word belongs to language, whereas the linguocultureme belongs to a specific field of the objective world." In terms of its content, unlike the word, the linguocultureme incorporates not only linguistic meaning but also cultural meaning. Emphasizing this, the scholar identifies several linguistic characteristics of this term. They are as follows:

a) it denotes the name of a specific domain;

b) it belongs to a particular linguistic system and may range in scope from individual lexemes to an entire text;

c) it both merges with and differentiates itself from the nature of its sources.

In substantiating these linguistic characteristics, V.V. Vorobev directly relies on words and texts from the Russian language. For example:

a) by means of a single word: manilovizm (Manilovism – “universality, unity”), oblomovichizm (Oblomovism – “weak-willed inactivity; laziness as a social phenomenon”);

b) by means of a phrase: ruskiy narod (“the Russian people” in the sense of ‘people’), russkaya pechka (“Russian stove” as a special brick stove used for cooking food, baking bread and heating the home);

c) by means of a heading: a description of the emotional responsiveness of Russians to the world in the works of F.M. Dostoevsky;

d) by means of an entire text: A.N. Tolstoy’s story “The Russian Character.”

Our purpose in citing these texts in full and exactly as they are is to emphasize that, in V.V. Vorobev’s interpretation, the linguocultureme represents the speech process ranging from the lexical level to an entire work, that it is defined as a complex inter-level unit, and that it possesses a number of linguistic characteristics. Another of V.V. Vorobev’s achievements in linguistics is that he also identified the primary sources of linguoculturemes. These sources are as follows:

1. Folk poetic creativity (samples of folklore);
2. Monuments of history and social thought, as well as research in the fields of history, philosophy, sociology, literature, linguistics, aesthetics and other areas;
3. Statements made by figures of science, literature and art;
4. Works of fiction that reflect the activity of the national personality;
5. Individuals who serve as models of the national personality; the opinions of foreigners about the nation and its culture.

As we can see, the linguistic foundations related to the sources of linguoculturemes proposed by this scholar are quite well-developed and substantial. The reason for this is that the essence and content of the term linguocultureme differs from that of the term concept; it pertains only to independent fields such as linguistic culturology and ethnolinguistics.

The scholar M.I. Kovshova, who has studied linguocultural methods related to paremiological units, has identified that linguoculturological analysis has two levels (simple and complex). In her view, the simple level of analysis is based on minimal cultural and linguistic units characteristic of the language user and does not require special acquisition. At this level, paremiological units are linked to cultural meanings that are implemented in a “compressed” form in the mind through the knowledge and ideas that make it possible to construct the image of the paremiological unit. The simple form of analysis is marked by words and expressions such as “well-known,” “familiar,” “generally speaking,” and the like.

At the complex level of analysis, by contrast, one uses general scientific vocabulary and linguistic terms such as “metaphor,” “standard,” “stereotype,” “symbolization,” “concept,” and “inner form.” Since the linguistic and cultural semantics of paremiological units is expressed only in their combination, in linguocultural analysis such units are described as signs of both language and culture. We have also observed that certain points corresponding to and directly complementing the content of these views are present in the works of other scholars. In particular, according to A.R. Vasilenko, the linguocultural analysis of paremiological units includes the content of their inner form, that is, the cultural meanings embedded in paremiological units that link a particular cultural sphere with a distinct feature as a system. The cultural meanings contained in paremiological units represent the most ancient forms of perceiving and understanding the world.

Another achievement of A.P. Vasilenko in linguistics is that she identified four important factors in the analysis of paremiological units. In her view, these factors are as follows:

1. Revealing the indicators of the cultural composition of phraseological units, for which the analysis must be carried out through their inner form;
2. Indicating the source of the emergence of the cultural component, with the main sources being myths and legends, folklore, literature, national history, and the like;
3. Tracing how components that have acquired a “cultural” status are “grafted” onto the semantics of phraseological units, and understanding and evaluating the components of phraseological units in the context of culture from the standpoint of cultural value; within this, showing anthropomorphism, zoomorphism, plant names, religion, and units of time and space;
4. Revealing the tropic mechanisms of idiom formation, such as metaphor, symbol, metonymy,

synecdoche, personification, hyperbole, and litotes.

From the above-mentioned information, it becomes clear that one of the most urgent tasks in the linguocultural analysis of paremiological units is to determine which cultural subjects are represented in the language and by what linguistic means and methods they are expressed. In this regard, it is of primary importance to take into account the essence and content of paremiological units, their national and cultural characteristics, and the way they are reflected in modern paremiological dictionaries. Solving this issue in such a way makes it possible to study the cultural significance of paremiological units and to reveal their connections with other domains.

As the linguist Maslova notes, "Against the background of the object of study of linguoculturology, we can distinguish several domains, each consisting of separate linguocultural units."

In linguistics, there are a number of tasks performed in practice for the linguocultural analysis and description of paremiological units. Here, first of all, special attention should be paid to identifying the factors that represent the existing linguistic and cultural reality within set expressions. In our view, they are as follows:

1. Lexemes and expressions without equivalents in other languages. Words and expressions of this type do not occur in other languages. Usually, they denote specific objects, ethnographic realia, and the like. In everyday spoken language, especially in some dialects, expressions such as "boriga baraka" (literally: "blessing on what there is"), "samovarga bormoq" ("to go to the samovar"), "samovarda o'tirmoq" ("to sit at the samovar"), "jinchiroq olmoq" ("to light a kerosene lamp") belong to this group.

2. Lexemes that express an ethnographic component. Words and expressions of this type appear in literary texts, in materials of mass media, in folklore created on the basis of the people's historical experience, and in various names for clothing, household items and other objects, yet in all of them traces of national culture prevail. For example, "oshga bormoq" ("to go to a ceremonial pilaf feast"), "do'ppisi tor kelmoq" ("his skullcap has become tight for him," i.e. "he has become arrogant").

3. Metaphors occurring in set expressions. That is, personal names, nicknames, parts of the human body, various animals and other living beings or creatures, names of plants. In comparing these with landscape objects of nature, they serve to express how people perceive the world.

4. Lexemes and expressions that reflect the linguistic picture of the world. Words and expressions

of this type encompass a person's everyday empirical experience, the archetypal layer, names from myths and legends, names of artefacts, religious and anthropomorphic names, names of things and objects, and names of units of time and space. However, in them the linguistic picture of the world expressed in language, that is, people's attitude to a particular object or situation, is predominant.

5. The reading of paremiological units within culture through frame semantics, which covers the literal interpretation of paremiological units or the reasons for the formation of set expressions. Yet here too, the central issue is the question of how people perceive the surrounding world.

At present, it is extremely important to study the presence of cultural objects in paremiological units and to offer the corresponding reflections to the scholarly community. Carrying out such a complex and urgent task gives the researcher a great opportunity to understand deeply and thoroughly a certain image that reflects the culture of the speakers of the language. In this regard, on the basis of the above-mentioned considerations, we attempt to analyse the semantics of phraseological units within a linguoculturological (linguocultural) and logoepistemic framework.

In the field of linguoculturology there are a number of innovative methods—linguistic clusters—among which the cluster called "human nature and evaluation" is quite well known and, at the same time, more complex. The linguistic domains related to the content of this cluster are numerous and, in terms of their essence, very wide-ranging: from the standpoint of their semantics, stylistics and pragmatics they demand particular responsibility from every researcher.

The results we obtained from studying and analysing the sememes belonging to this cluster show that three semantic phraseo-fields predominate in them, namely the system of "positive, neutral and negative qualities of a person and their evaluation." We will try to substantiate our observations in this regard on the basis of certain linguistic domains that occur in our language and are widely used in the language of folk epics.

1. Within the content of the linguistic domain related to the system "positive qualities of a person and their evaluation," paremiological units that neutrally express the evaluation of a person's specific activity and behaviour are particularly prevalent. In particular, linguistic units such as "ajoyib odam" ("a wonderful person"), "tilla odam" ("a golden person") used when assessing someone's activity can serve as a clear example. Similar linguistic units with positive semantics occur quite frequently in our language. Let us briefly

examine one of them.

Ochiq ko'ngil ("open-hearted") – in this expression the seme of "sincerity" predominates; it serves to evaluate a particular person's activity and to objectively describe their character traits, and it is used with reference to a person who does not wish harm to anyone, who is disinterested, pure-hearted, honest and morally upright. Authoritative dictionaries state that the word ko'ngil is of Turkic origin and, in terms of its essence, denotes "a person's feelings" and "the world of experiences" (O'TIL, 288). In our language, ko'ngil belongs to a synonymic series together with dil and qalb ("heart, soul") and is mainly used in colloquial speech. For example, the expression "ochiq ko'ngil" is used in the sense of "a sincere, straightforward person who is not deceitful," while the expression "ko'ngli joyiga tushmoq" is used with meanings such as "to feel at ease, to calm down."

The ochiq component in the expression "ochiq ko'ngil" is often used, by naming a certain part of the human body, in the sense of "a generous person who does not begrudge anything," as in "qo'li ochiq" ("open-handed, generous"), "dasturxonni ochiq" ("his table is always open," i.e. hospitable). In some cases, ochiq combines with a verb to emphasize a figurative meaning: "ochiqchasi gaplashmoq" – "to speak openly, without concealment."

2. The phraseo-semantic field related to the system "negative traits of a person and their evaluation" is much broader and encompasses a great many paremiological units, all of which are negative in terms of their essence and content. If we pay attention to these meanings, we can see that, first of all, they may reflect the implied content of the neutral question "What kind of person is this?" Some other linguistic examples belonging to this paremiological field fall into the peripheral zone of the corresponding domain, for one reason: they consist of semes that add additional features (meanings) to the general negative seme.

To substantiate these observations, we will attempt to analyse linguoculturally just one seme—"theft." In our language this seme appears in the expression "qo'li egri" ("with a crooked hand"), which is used when speaking about a person's negative activity. In all the texts we have collected and brought into analysis, we have observed that the semantics of this paremiological expression is realized in meanings such as "robber, thief, swindler," "a person without conscience, a corrupt person."

3. In the structure of paremiological units belonging to the system "neutral qualities of a person and their evaluation," we can observe that the ways of perceiving and modelling the disorderliness of the

world ultimately go back to opposition-based concepts such as "straight-crooked," "good-bad," "virtuous-evil," with at the centre a human being who has grasped the linguistic picture of the world. For example: "to'g'ri odam" – "egri odam" ("a straightforward person" – "a crooked person"), "yaxshi odam" – "yomon odam" ("a good person" – "a bad person"). If we focus on a particular part of a person's body, say the hand, we obtain the model "qo'li to'g'ri – qo'li egri" ("a straight hand – a crooked hand"), and in this expression the hand, while being a part of the human body, is understood as representing the activity of the person as a whole. Here an anthropomorphic metaphor takes place: a person's moral integrity is expressed by transferring the figurative sign-notion "crooked" to a specific "instrument" that works with objects in the surrounding world and performs its own functional format. The figurativeness of the metaphor in this case lies in the fact that the hand in question is presented not only as a part of the human body, but also as a tool with which a person acts.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we emphasize the following:

1. Every linguistic domain has a centre and a periphery. The central unit we have in mind is a set expression. These expressions possess not only the semantics of the linguistic domain, but also the most neutral, easily understandable and semantically transparent meaning.

2. In other paremiological units, the presence of certain additional semes is also noticeable. This makes it possible to study them as an object of linguoculturological and logoepistemic analysis for every researcher.

3. The results of the analysis carried out provide a certain basis for the creation of systematic studies that describe Uzbek paremiological units and their linguoculturological codes (LCC), and they offer practical assistance in gaining a deeper understanding of important features of the Uzbek linguistic picture of the world through the prism of paremiological units.

The linguocultural analysis of paremiological units makes it possible to study in depth their semantic, cultural and cognitive layers. As a result of such analysis, the expression of a people's thinking, cultural heritage and national identity through language becomes even clearer. In linguistics, this line of inquiry creates a scientific foundation for interpreting a people's spiritual values in the context of global intercultural communication.

REFERENCES

1. Maslova V.A. Lingvokulturologiya. Moskva.

Akademiya. 2001

2. Teliya V.N. Ruskaya frazeologiya: Semantiko – pragmaticheskii i lingvokulturologicheskii aspekti. Moskva. YaRK, 1996
3. Vorobev V.V. Lingvokulturologiya (teoriya i metodi). Moskva. 2006.
4. Kovshova M.L. Lingvokulturologicheskii metod v paremiologik kodi kulturi – Moskva. 2013.
5. Mamatov A. O'zbek xalq maqollari tili va uslubi. Toshkent. Fan, 2017.