

## NATIONAL CULTURAL AND COGNITIVE SEMANTIC FEATURES OF THE CONCEPT OF MAN IN SPANISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

*Fotima Komiljon qizi*

*Uzbekistan State University of World Languages*

*Faculty of Romano-Germanic*

*Teacher of the Department of Applied Spanish Language.*

**Abstract:** A model of the concept about person for anthropological analysis based on the individual, culture, society and knowledge is proposed. The concept about person is a key conceptual element for the anthropological knowledge about human beings. Anthropology understands that its importance should not be limited to the Western concept, but to include elements from other perspectives that show its obvious relevance. Based on this study: the unity between sensitivity and thought is added, the duality between inside and outside, the ontogeny process of becoming a person, the systemic and relational nature, the animal part in the concept and the evolutionary value that people have.

**Keywords:** person, concept, anthropology, biocultural being, perspectives, sensitivity, study

**Introducción.** Semantic breadth and its structure constitute the keys to the scientific concepts that explain reality to us. In this work, proposals are made to complement the content and structure of the concept of person that are useful to anthropology. Boethius (449) proposed the five elements that make a being a person: a) possess substance, which excludes being such by accident, b) constitutes a complete nature, c) subsists by itself, d) can be separated from what exists and this sense allows to assign this character to Christ, e) is of a rational nature. These five characteristics are as related as they are current.

**Literature review:** The history of the concept of person in the West (Boethius, 449; Cock, 1947; Copleston, 1950; Craemer, 1983; Laín Entralgo, 1997; Sapontzis, 1981; Teichman, 1985; Zavala Olalde, 2010) allows us to affirm that it has four characteristic notes: appearance, essence, consciousness and identity. That is, when one thinks of the person in the West, a relationship is established with what is observable and what one appears to be at the same time; whoever knows that he is a person recognizes something in himself that belongs to him as a substantial foundation. Thus, he knows that he has a consciousness by which he knows that he is and sees himself identified by his sociocultural environment, that is, he has an assigned identity that he himself recognizes for himself.

Despite the semantic richness of the concept, a series of anthropological investigations in Mexico show that it can be expanded. This paper provides elements

based on the concepts held by some indigenous groups in our country. The texts were selected because they explicitly seek to understand the person. Despite being valuable contributions, such as the extensive and well-known research by López Austin (1980 and 1990), they were not considered because the concept was not an object of research, but rather a result of it.

The paper highlights the importance of the person for anthropology and the openness it has to understand human reality in its cultural diversity. This perspective is situated in the Mexican context of understanding the person; it is therefore the contribution that anthropological work in our country can make in the context of its study. Therefore, this article is an example of how anthropological work in Mexico generates relevant contributions to fundamental concepts of the Western tradition.

**Research Methodology.** By universality I convey the idea that a person is a sociocultural construction of individuals that characterizes their way of life in any human social group. As such a process of socialization, identity and consciousness, it can be observed in all cultural groups, regardless of their variability, and can be considered a universal character for human beings. The author of the idea is Marcel Mauss (1938).

In 1938 Mauss wrote a broad work in which he first proposed the universal existence of the concept. He identified that in each cultural group at least one notion of person can be found, which, although it is different from one group to another, is comparable to a mode of sociocultural existence proper to the human being.

Cultural variability is such that the semantic content can be the result of three different ways of thinking and identifying people. The possibilities are: a) recognizing that every human being is a person from birth, b) recognizing that only some types of human beings are people, and c) identifying that once a phase of development has been passed, a human being is transformed and can be recognized as a person.

In all cases, it is a cultural construction in the individual that is made and in the concept that belongs to the language system. Being a person is answering the question: who am I? As well as it is a necessary answer to how should I be in society? Likewise, a system of meanings arises that give coherence to the individual response in the cultural context.

In the presence of the person as a cultural unit, the question arises: why do people exist? (Barresi, 1999). This question will lead me to present the evolutionary value of the same and its conceptualization, which I will do towards the end of the text. For now, it shows us that the Western concept is not the only way of thinking about the person, and even that the concept from the West still exposes doubts.

The importance of the concept of person in anthropology is evident in the research that is carried out in Mexico. I consider whether it is possible to speak of the human being as a sociocultural entity without mentioning, tangentially or directly, some aspect related to the person. When dealing with the subject, we qualify something about the

human being. Anthropology is born precisely from this adjectivization, its cultural being, to take it as an object of study (Wallerstein, 1990). In this sense, I will show examples of the relevance of the concept of person in the anthropology that is done in Mexico.

Let us see to what extent some indigenous groups in Mexico allow us to access a more complete conceptual system of the concept of person to understand the cultural existence of people.

**Analysis and results.** Ruth Rosas Mérida's (2006) work with the ódami presents a creative argument for the concept that I analyze in this work. "The person supposes a process that involves the possession of a body, which will condense in it a set of collective representations of the group" (Rosas Mérida, 2006: 89). The notion is an inseparable element within a symbolic set of the ódami that is part of the traditional worldview that is centered on a complex unity between personal development and the environment of social relations.

The study of the ódami life cycle allows Rosas Mérida to establish phases of development from early childhood in which one is not a full person, since one is learning to think and act. At this stage of life, as the heart is the receptacle of feeling and thinking for the ódami, it is said that it has not yet finished developing. Throughout childhood and adolescence, the ódami "learn to think in order to become people" (Rosas Mérida, 2006: 125). Learning to think is possible when one thinks with the heart and with the head. It is in youth when the ódami possess both thinking in harmony, when they can be good ódami, which means that they possess tranquility and peace that they express in their relationship with the social environment.

The person in these indigenous groups is, once again, a unity of dissimilar elements. Some of it comes from outside, another part is inherent, but it is only the unity that provides its constitution. This perspective shows us a profound reflection on what influences being a person and the role that each one has.

In immediate perspectives, the person is directly associated with individuality; however, the concepts mentioned allow us to assure that it is at the same time the individual and the society from which he comes. Although the consciousness of individuality belongs to the person, it also depends on a social and cultural construction that makes him who he is.

The concept of person has an evolutionary value only insofar as the person has a biocultural life. Through the ontogeny of individuals as persons, it is possible for key concepts, such as that of person, to be integrated into their way of seeing the world and of recognizing themselves in it. The concept becomes a part of the person as are their feelings and as part of their thoughts.

The above is not enough to establish its evolutionary value, but it is necessary to resort to the importance of ontogeny in the process. Ontogeny has an impact on phylogeny because ontogeny creates phylogeny (Garstang, 1921). If cultural groups

have an influence on the existence of people, and if people are units of variability subject to evolutionary processes, then sociocultural evolution is possible insofar as ontogeny provides people based on a concept of how to be recognized in the cultural group.

For the above, I consider two answers to the question why people exist? One is that the ontogeny of the person has a value in the evolutionary process and the other is that there is a concept that has its realization in the ontogeny of individuals as persons. By joining these two answers we have an evolutionary mechanism. The answer to why people exist? has a solution through the explanatory understanding of the semantic and ontogenic role and its anthropological repercussions.

**Conclusions.** The concept of person is a key element in the development of the humanities. Its long history in Western thought does not leave aside the possibility of being expanded in its explanation of the human. When we analyze some concepts of person in Mexican indigenous groups we realize that it is enriched.

The concept is a cultural explanation of how the human being should be considered for living in a specific sociocultural environment. It means the form of recognition, identity and belonging. There are many elements that characterize it and the person emerges from the systemic interaction between all of them.

In addition to the notes of the concept of person that the West has developed, we can add that it is not limited to the rational being, but to its unity as a way of life. It also has an internal reality that is opposed to an external one, it means a process of development, it constitutes a systematic unit of understanding of the human and is not isolated from its animal nature. Finally, its evolutionary value can be considered, which explains its existence in each ethnic group.

A concept of person in this sense constitutes a unit of analysis in anthropology, it has the capacity to be a unit of analysis in evolutionary anthropology and as an understanding of the human being in his biocultural experience. If the concept is structured with the person as the core of systemic interaction, knowledge, culture and the social, it fosters the emergence of our general understanding. The resulting system allows for comparing the various cultural groups in their unity and diversity.

The structure of the concept is conducive to providing an overview of how the person is understood in a cultural group, how the notion may have been transformed historically, what are the points of coincidence with other groups and of difference. This is how the structure proposed in this work aims to support the theoretical development that is being developed in anthropology regarding the concept of person.

#### **Referencias:**

1. Asamblea General (1948). Carta internacional de los derechos del hombre. Declaración universal de los derechos del hombre. Organización de las Naciones Unidas.

2. Arzápalo Marín, R. (1995). *Calepino de Motul. Diccionario maya-español*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
3. Arzápalo Marín, R. y Zavala Olalde. J. C. (2010). El concepto de persona entre los mayas. *Papeles de Trabajo*, 20 , 1-11.
4. Barresi, J. (1999). On becoming a person. *Philosophical Psychology*, 12, 79-98.
5. Boecio, A. M. S. (449). *Cinco opúsculos teológicos contra Eutiques y Nestorio. Tratado sobre la persona y las dos naturalezas de Cristo*. London: Heinemann.
6. Bourdin, L. G. (2007-2008). La noción de persona entre los mayas: una visión semántica. *Revista pueblos y fronteras digital*, 4 , 1- 31.
7. Cock, A. (1947). What does it mean to be a person? *Meeting of the Aristotelian Society*, 47 , 129- 142
8. Copleston, F. (1950). The human person in contemporary philosophy. *Philosophy. The Journal of the International Institute of Philosophy*, vxxv , 92 , 3-19.
9. Craemer, W. (1983). A cross-cultural perspective on personhood. *Health and Society* , 61 (1), 19-34.
10. Garstang, W. (1921). The theory of recapitulation: a critical re-statement of the biogenetic law. *Linnaean Journal of Zoology* , xxxv , 81-101.
11. Garza, M. (1978). *El hombre en el pensamiento religioso náhuatl y maya*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.