UDC 811.111'373
DOI https://doi.org/10.32447/2663-340X-2025-17.3

LINGUISTIC REPRESENTATION OF HUMAN INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITY IN ENGLISH: A PHRASEOLOGICAL AND SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

Hrom Oksana Ivanivna
Lectures at the Foreign Philology Faculty
Dragomanov Ukrainian State University
9, Pyrohov Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
orcid.org/0000-0003-2238-2831

This study investigates the linguistic representation of human intellectual activity in English through a comprehensive analysis of phraseological units, metaphorical expressions, and semantic structures. The research examines how intellectual abilities are conceptualised, categorised, and evaluated within the English linguistic worldview, focusing on key lexemes such as "mind", "reason", "head", and "brain", as well as their antithetical counterparts "stupid" and "fool". The analysis reveals that English speakers employ a rich array of metaphorical models to represent intellectual capacity, including conceptualisations of the mind as a container, a plant, a fire, an animal, and a person. Six primary thematic groups emerge through systematic examination of phraseological units: smart-stupid dichotomy, gaining-losing intelligence, extensive-trivial knowledge, giftedness-ordinary abilities, quick-slow wit, and good-poor memory. These categories demonstrate a hierarchical evaluation system where intellectual skills are measured gradually, notably lacking a neutral "normal" category. Component analysis of phraseological expressions identifies somatic elements (head, brain, mind), object-based metaphors (knife, brick, light), natural phenomena comparisons (rock, whip), measurement metaphors (encyclopedia, fountain, sieve), animal references (elephant, bird, chicken), and action verbs as primary linguistic mechanisms for expressing intellectual concepts. The study reveals a predominance of negative evaluations in intellectual characterisation, with positive assessments typically requiring intensifiers. The research demonstrates that intellectual activity representation in English reflects cultural values and social norms, where intelligence is a virtue subject to moral evaluation. The analysis uncovers distinct conceptual boundaries between "mind" (basic thinking ability) and "reason" (higher cognitive function), as well as between "stupid" (slow intellectual capacity) and "fool" (violation of social behavioural norms). These findings contribute to understanding how cognitive abilities are linguistically constructed and culturally transmitted through language. The study's implications extend to cognitive linguistics, cultural anthropology, and language pedagogy, offering insights into the relationship between language, thought, and cultural conceptualisation of human intellectual capacity within English-speaking communities.

Keywords: *phraseology, cognitive linguistics, intellectual activity, metaphorical models, semantic analysis, English linguistics, cultural conceptualisation, lexical semantics, linguistic worldview, evaluative language.*

The statement of the problem. Language is a mirror and a mechanism for human cognition, reflecting and shaping how societies conceptualise fundamental aspects of human experience. Among these aspects, intellectual activity occupies a particularly significant position, representing one of human personality's most valued and socially relevant characteristics. The linguistic representation of intellectual abilities reveals individual cognitive processes and collective cultural attitudes, social hierarchies, and value systems embedded within language communities.

With its rich phraseological heritage and extensive metaphorical expressions, the English language provides a unique window into how intellectual activity is conceptualised, categorised, and evaluated. From everyday expressions like "*bright mind*" and "*sharp wit*" to more complex metaphorical constructions such as "*memory like a sieve*" or "*few sandwiches short of a picnic*", English speakers employ diverse linguistic mechanisms to describe, assess, and understand human cognitive abilities.

This linguistic representation extends beyond mere description to encompass complex evaluative frameworks that distinguish between various levels and types of intellectual capacity. The dichotomy between intelligence and stupidity, wisdom and foolishness, creates a linguistic landscape where cognitive abilities are not simply described but morally and socially evaluated. Such evaluative dimensions reveal deep-seated cultural assumptions about what constitutes intellectual virtue and social competence (Fauconnier&Turner, 2002).

Studying intellectual activity representation in language intersects multiple linguistic disciplines, including cognitive linguistics, phraseology, semantics, and cultural linguistics. We can uncover

systematic patterns in how speakers conceptualise mental processes through phraseological analysis, while semantic investigation reveals the underlying cognitive models that structure these conceptualisations. The metaphorical dimension of intellectual representation demonstrates how abstract cognitive concepts are understood through concrete, embodied experiences.

The aim of this research is to conduct a comprehensive linguistic analysis of how human intellectual activity is represented in the English language through phraseological units, metaphorical expressions, and semantic structures, with particular focus on identifying systematic patterns of conceptualisation and evaluation.

The tasks of the research are to analyse the semantic structure and dictionary definitions of key lexemes representing intellectual activity ("*mind*", "*reason*", "*head*", "*brain*", "*stupid*", "*fool*"), to identify and classify metaphorical models underlying the representation of intellectual concepts in English phraseology, to systematise phraseological units expressing intellectual activity into thematic groups based on semantic criteria, to examine the evaluative dimensions of intellectual representation and determine the predominant assessment patterns, to conduct component analysis of phraseological units to identify recurring linguistic elements and their semantic contributions, to investigate the cultural and social implications of intellectual activity representation in English linguistic consciousness, to determine the distinctive features between related concepts (*mind vs. reason, stupid vs. fool*) and their linguistic manifestations.

The object of this research is the linguistic representation of human intellectual activity in the English language system.

The subject of investigation comprises phraseological units, metaphorical expressions, idiomatic constructions, and lexical items that represent, describe, or evaluate human intellectual abilities, cognitive processes, and mental capacities in English.

The presentation of the primary material. Linguistic units that characterise human intellectual activity define personality by the level of intellectual abilities (*stupid, narrow-minded, dull, smart, clever, brilliant*), as well as determine the intellectual capabilities of an individual (*quick-witted, shrewd, perceptive, resourceful*), and qualities of thought processes (*sharp, penetrating, keen mind*).

The definition of intellectual properties of personality is connected with evaluation. Intelligence is a virtue; its presence is evaluated positively, while its absence is evaluated negatively. On the normative scale of intelligence assessment, positive deviations from the norm would be genius and talent, and negative deviations from the norm would be mental deficiency and madness. In contrast, intelligence and stupidity are evaluated as normative. Intelligence represents an average level of intellectual ability, while stupidity represents the lower boundary of the norm for such ability (Gibbs, 2006; Johnson, 1987).

Human intellectual abilities are represented through the lexemes "*head*" and "*brain*". The head is the place where thoughts arise (*it came to mind, popped into my head*), an organ of memory (*keep in mind, get out of my head, slipped my mind*), while the brain is the organ of mental activity (*not the sharpest tool in the shed, use your brain*).

Thus, about a person endowed with intellectual abilities, we say "*clear head*", "*bright mind*", while about someone lacking such skills, we say "*airhead*", "*scatter-brained*", "*lost his head*", "*head in the clouds*", and others. When solving a vitally essential but difficult task, we use the expression "*it's a real headache*".

Other concepts expressing representations of the level of human intellectual abilities in English are the concepts of "*mind*" and "*reason*". The concept "*mind*" actualises specific intellectual skills and capabilities of a person that distinguish them from animals. This evaluation is partially preserved in derivative words from the lexeme mind: mindful, reasonable (about a prudent, sensible person). However, the term "*know-it-all*" often has an ironic connotation, connected with the culturally condemned desire to appear more intelligent than everyone else, to stand out intellectually (Kovecses, 2002).

In some cases, within proverbs and sayings, the concepts mind and reason are used as synonyms: "*Mind your own business and reason will follow*"; "*A sound mind in a sound body*".

The lexeme "mind" expresses a person's cognitive ability (out of his mind, intelligent but not wise, etc.). This lexeme in metaphorical usage in phraseology and poetic speech represents the following metaphorical models:

1. **mind as fruit** (*fruits of the mind, fruitful mind, mature mind*)
2. **mind as plant** (*flowering mind, budding intellect*)
3. **mind as seed** (*plant the seed of an idea*)
4. **mind as container** (*it's brewing in my mind, empty-headed*)
5. **mind as surface** (*shallow mind, surface thoughts*)
6. **mind as animal** (*bird-brain, pig-headed, sharp as a tack, cunning mind, etc*.)
7. **mind as person** (*English mind, German mind, American mind, feminine mind, masculine mind, vengeful mind, etc*.)

8. **mind as repository** (*bear in mind, fill the mind*)

9. **mind as fire** (*spark of genius, bright mind*) (Moon, 1998).

The mind is capable of understanding and experiencing emotions (*grasping with the mind, restless mind, cheerful disposition*). In reflecting representations of the mind, the category of space plays a significant role (*lose one's mind, come to mind, mind over matter, narrow mind, broad mind, comes to mind, thought flashed through the mind*).

The lexeme "*reason*" is no less actively used in various metaphors and comparisons. In the English metaphorical worldview, the lexeme "reason" is endowed with features of higher spiritual power, human, and animal characteristics. Let's examine what linguistic means express these features in phraseology and poetic texts:

1. **reason as force** (*force of reason, strong reasoning*)

2. **reason as hearing/voice** (*listen to the voice of reason, reason dictates*)

3. **reason as bird** (*wings of reason, flight of reason, soaring intellect*)

4. **reason as a person** (*enlightened reason, reason abandoned him, arguments of reason*)

5. **reason as solid substance** (*solid reasoning, firm reason*)

6. **reason as space** (*reason opens the door to understanding*)

Evaluating human intellectual abilities in the English linguistic worldview is connected with the opposition "*smart–stupid/foo*l". The content and linguistic representation of the concept "*mind*" was discussed earlier, so let's focus on the second part of this opposition – the concepts "*fool*" and "*stupid*".

These dominant lexemes for designating intellectual ability differ in dictionaries by the degree of possessing intellect: *stupid* – "*lacking sufficient intelligence*", *fool* – "*a foolish person*". These words also differ stylistically: the latter often belongs to offensive vocabulary.

In the dictionary, the lexeme "stupid" definitions highlight the social aspect of human intellect: the inability to behave appropriately and reason soundly. Stupidity in English linguistic consciousness is forgivable due to a young age and a lack of personal experience.

In everyday consciousness, the lexeme "*fool*" is connected not only with representations of a stupid person having intellectual abilities below the norm, but also of someone behaving mentally inadequately, as well as a person deprived of reason.

Researchers, generalising observations on the functioning of the word "*fool*" in various contexts, have made the following conclusions about the character of intellectual norms in English linguistic consciousness: the ability to formulate one's thoughts and understand others, and the presence of cognitive skills in the scientific sphere. Non-compliance with intellectual norms receives a negative, contemptuous evaluation when using this lexeme to designate a person (Taylor, 2003; Granger&Meunier, 2008).

Linguistic means representing this concept are classified into four thematic groups:

1. **performing foolish actions**: *foolish, silly, foolhardy, act foolishly*

2. **behaving unseriously, playing around**: *fool around, act the fool, clown around*

3. **pretending not to understand**: *play dumb, act stupid, feign ignorance*

4. **experiencing the influence of external or emotional factors**: *be stunned, be dazed, lose one's wits*

In English proverbs and sayings, the social characteristics of a foolish person include: immodesty, desire to stand out, self-admiration, arrogance, vanity, boastfulness, inappropriate speech and actions, gullibility, aggressiveness, and a tendency to lecture others (Lajoff&Johnson, 1999).

In contemporary linguistic culture, mythological and ideological models of the concept "*fool*" also prove relevant. The mythological model is based on the folkloric image of the "*fool*" from fairy tales and literature. This image carries positive connotations: the fairy-tale hero is rewarded with kindness, selflessness, luck, and happiness (characters like Forrest Gump or the "wise fool" archetype). The ideological model is connected with the cultural phenomenon of divine madness. The concept "*fool*" refers to such behavioural traits as open truthfulness and possessing higher spiritual virtues (holiness, righteousness) (Langacker, 2008).

Thus, human intellectual activity is represented in the English linguistic worldview through key lexemes: "*mind*", "*reason", "head*", and "*brain*".

Several features can be identified when using these lexemes in phraseology, poetic texts, and dictionary definitions.

The concepts "*mind*", "*reason*", "*stupid*", and "*fool*" are distinguished in most cases. Mind denotes a simple human ability to think, while reason represents the highest manifestation of this ability. A person is called stupid when they have slow intellectual skills, while "fool" violates social behavioural norms (Lakoff, 1987).

These concepts also have distinctive features at the level of linguistic representation. The concept "reason" lacks images expressing emotions, feelings, or temporal characteristics.

The concepts "*head*" and "*brain*" are opposed in the English linguistic worldview to the concept "*heart*".

Let's present the identified thematic groups of analysed phraseological units:

1) ***Smart – Stupid***

Smart: *bright mind, sharp as a tack, head on one's shoulders, has a good, brainy, intelligent, quick-witted, wise head*.

Stupid: *airhead, empty-headed, blockhead, numbskull, dim-witted, thick-skulled, brain-dead, not the sharpest knife in the drawer, few sandwiches short of a picnic, lights are on but nobody's home*

2) ***Gaining Intelligence – Losing Intelligence***

Gaining: *wise up, smarten up, learn the ropes, get smart, come to one's senses*

Losing: *lose one's mind, go out of one's head, lose one's marbles*

3) ***Extensive Knowledge – Trivial Knowledge***

Extensive: *walking encyclopedia, fountain of knowledge, know-it-all, well of wisdom, human Google*

Trivial: *doesn't know beans about, clueless, knows nothing from nothing*

4) ***Giftedness – Lack of Superior Abilities***

Gifted: *gifted, brilliant mind, reach for the stars, touch of genius, born with brains;*

Ungifted: *no great shakes, nothing special, won't set the world on fire, no Einstein.*

5) ***Quick Wit – Slow Wit***

Quick: *quick* on the uptake, sharp as a whip, quick study, catch on fast, think on one's feet;

Slow: *slow on the uptake, thick as a brick, dense, slow learner*.

6) ***Good Memory – Poor Memory***

Good: *memory like an elephant, photographic memory, sharp memory;*

Poor: *memory like a sieve, forgetful, absent-minded, scatter-brained.*

The characterisation of human intellectual abilities through phraseological units of the named groups can be measured gradually: *smart – very smart – smarter – getting smarter; stupid – very stupid – stupider – getting more ridiculous* (Moon, 1998).

This scale lacks a middle link meaning "normal", since normal is an unremarkable person who is still above stupid, most likely intelligent rather than ridiculous. As a result, a person can be either silly or intelligent. We also note that in English, one can both "wise up" and "lose one's mind", meaning one can be smart but also cease to be so.

The phraseological units "*smart–stupid*", indicating the presence or absence of mental abilities, are the most numerous in terms of phraseological units. This is not accidental, since intellectual abilities contain the basic evaluation of a person's personality.

According to our calculations, most phraseological units with the meaning of human intellectual activity negatively evaluate the basic type. Basic evaluation assesses how competent or incompetent someone is as a person.

Negative basic evaluation is expressed by phraseological units indicating:

– **Absence of abilities** (*won't set the world on fire, no great shakes*);

– **Poor memory** (*memory like a sieve, absent-minded, forgetful, scatter-brained*);

– **Slow wit** (*slow on the uptake, thick as a brick*);

– **Trivial knowledge** (*doesn't know beans about, clueless*);

– **Loss of mental abilities** *(lose one's mind, lose one's marbles*);

– **Absence of mental abilities** (*airhead, empty-headed, blockhead, numbskull, etc.*).

For phraseological units with positive evaluation of mental abilities, the presence of intensifiers like "very" or "extremely" is characteristic (*brilliant mind – someone very smart; sharp as a tack – very intelligent, clever*). Phraseological units with positive evaluation indicate extensive knowledge and a person's broad outlook.

Analysis of key components in the phraseological units of the considered groups allows us to determine what concepts intellectual activity is associated with in the consciousness of English-speaking people (Barcelona, 2000; Cameron&Maslen, 2010).

Let's examine the corresponding groups of phraseological units by the nature of their component composition:

Somatic Components (Body Parts)

Head, brain, mind: bright head, head on one's shoulders, have a good head, brainy, empty-headed, blockhead, use your head, rack one's brains.

Objects and Substances

Objects whose invention or use requires intellectual abilities, as well as objects as standards for lack of intelligence: knife (*not the sharpest knife in the drawer*), sandwich (*few sandwiches short of a picnic*), light (*lights are on but nobody's home*), brick (*thick as a brick*).

Natural Phenomena and Materials

Natural phenomena and objects serving as standards for talent or lack of intellectual abilities: sharp (*sharp as a tack, sharp mind*), rock (*dumb as a rock*), whip (*sharp as a whip*).

Measurement and Container Metaphors

Names of objects and phenomena serving to measure the volume of intellectual abilities: ency-

clopedia (*walking encyclopedia*), fountain (*fountain of knowledge*), well (*well of wisdom*), sieve (*memory like a sieve*).

Animal References (Zoonyms)

Components denoting domestic animals include elephants (memory like an elephant), which refer to animals known for particular traits related to memory or intelligence.

Action Verbs

Human actions demonstrating the presence of thought processes: catch (*catch on, quick on the uptake*), think (*think on one's feet*), wise (*wise up*), lose (*lose one's mind*), pick up (*pick up quickly*).

The component "head" is most actively used to characterise human intellectual activity. The head is considered not only the upper part of the human body but also a "container" for knowledge. If this "container" is intact, then the person possessing this "baggage" of knowledge will be considered smart (have a good head on one's shoulders, use your head). The image of an "empty" head negatively represents human intellect and mental abilities (Johnson, 1987).

Through metonymic transfer, the head can also denote the person as a bearer of intellectual qualities (bright head, good head).

Another critical component figuratively conveys human intellectual activity in phraseological units is the "*chicken*" or "*bird*". This is not surprising since this image is the best way to evaluate a person's intellectual capabilities negatively.

The chicken is a stereotype of a simple-minded bird in the consciousness of the linguistic community. Consequently, phraseological units with this word usually have a sharp and expressive character. For example, "bird-brain" (about someone who is not very bright), "*memory like a sieve*" or "*scatter-brained*" (about poor, short memory, inability to remember elementary things), "*chicken-headed*" (foolish, simple-minded).

In English, bird-related expressions for intellectual deficiency include:

– *Bird-brain* (stupid person)
– *Feather-brained* (silly, scatter-brained)
– *Empty nest upstairs* (lacking intelligence)
– *Flying south for the winter* (acting foolishly)

Another key component through which images of human intellectual activity are created is the lexeme "mind" and "wit". Let's identify the most frequent and vivid phraseological units with this lexeme***: brilliant mind, come to one's senses, wise up, gain wisdom, sharpen one's wits; lose one's mind, out of one's mind, lose one's wits, slow-witted.*** As a rule, most phraseological units with this component positively evaluate a person's intellectual abilities.

In traditional English understanding, "mind" refers to the general name for human cognitive activity, i.e., the ability to think; it represents the rational part of human nature. In the modern linguistic worldview, the word "mind" correlates with a person's rational part, consciousness, and ability to think.

Let's characterise some of the presented phraseological units with the "mind/wit" component:

– *Slow-witted* (unable to make a decision or figure things out in time) – a phraseological unit expressing delayed intellectual response;

– *Gain wisdom/wise up* (become sensible and intelligent) – this phraseological unit has a conversational colouring, though in specific contexts it can express sarcasm and irony, in addition to positive evaluation of intellectual abilities;

– *Sharp-witted* (quick to understand) – indicates mental agility and quick thinking;

– *Quick-witted* (mentally agile) – demonstrates rapid intellectual processing;

– *Half-witted* (lacking full mental capacity) – indicates intellectual deficiency;

Thus, the most frequent comparative images, as shown by component analysis of phraseological units, are concrete object components and animal components (zoonyms).

Through these images, negative characteristics of human intellect are most often expressed:

– **Animal-based:** *bird-brain, pig-headed, dumb as an ox, stubborn as a mule, memory like a goldfish*

– **Object-based:** *thick as a brick, dense as a post, sharp as a bowling ball (ironic), dull as dishwater, empty as a drum*

– **Material-based:** *thick-headed, block-headed, wooden-headed, stone-faced* (when referring to lack of understanding)

These expressions demonstrate how English speakers conceptualise intellectual deficiency through concrete, tangible comparisons that emphasise the absence of mental agility, understanding, or cognitive capacity.

Conclusions. The comprehensive analysis of the linguistic representation of human intellectual activity in English reveals a sophisticated and culturally embedded system of conceptualisation that extends far beyond simple descriptive categories. The research demonstrates that philosophical activity is described in English and systematically evaluated, categorised, and integrated into broader social and moral frameworks through language. The study establishes that English speakers employ nine primary metaphorical models to conceptualise the mind: fruit, plant, seed, container, surface, animal, person, repository, and fire. These metaphors

reveal how abstract cognitive processes are understood through concrete, embodied experiences. The container metaphor proves particularly significant, representing the mind as a space that can be filled, emptied, or organised, fundamentally shaping how intellectual capacity is perceived and discussed. The plant metaphors (flowering mind, budding intellect) suggest developmental and organic aspects of intelligence. In contrast, fire metaphors (spark of genius, bright mind) emphasise cognitive activity's dynamic and illuminating nature.

The research reveals a pronounced hierarchical evaluation system where intellectual abilities are measured gradually without a neutral middle ground. This binary opposition between "smart" and "stupid" reflects cultural values that position intelligence as a fundamental virtue. The absence of a "normal" category suggests that individuals are perceived as either intellectually capable or deficient within English linguistic consciousness, with normal being implicitly categorised as bright rather than neutral. This finding has significant implications for understanding how English-speaking societies conceptualise cognitive diversity and intellectual standards.

The analysis uncovers crucial semantic distinctions between related concepts that reflect sophisticated cultural understanding of intellectual phenomena. The differentiation between "mind" (basic cognitive ability) and "reason" (higher intellectual function) demonstrates recognition of cognitive hierarchy. In contrast, the distinction between "stupid" (limited intellectual capacity) and "fool" (violation of social norms) reveals how intellectual assessment intersects with social behaviour evaluation. These distinctions indicate that English linguistic consciousness recognises multiple dimensions of intellectual competence beyond simple cognitive ability.

Through systematic component analysis, the research identifies six primary categories of linguistic elements used to construct intellectual representations: somatic components (head, brain, mind), objects and substances (knife, brick, light), natural phenomena (rock, whip), measurement metaphors (encyclopedia, fountain, sieve), animal references (elephant, bird), and action verbs (catch, think, wise up). The predominance of somatic components, particularly "head", reflects the embodied nature of cognitive conceptualisation, where intellectual activity is inherently linked to physical structures.

A striking finding is the predominance of negative evaluations in intellectual characterisation, with positive assessments typically requiring intensifiers for expression. This pattern suggests that intellectual deficiency is more linguistically marked and culturally salient than intellectual competence. The research reveals that most phraseological units expressing intellectual activity carry a negative basic evaluation, indicating cultural sensitivity to cognitive limitations and social emphasis on identifying intellectual inadequacy.

The study demonstrates that intellectual representation in English reflects broader social hierarchies and cultural values where cognitive ability is a social competence and moral worth marker. The extensive vocabulary for describing intellectual deficiency and the requirement for intensifiers to express high intelligence suggest a cultural context where intellectual performance is closely monitored and evaluated. This linguistic evidence points to societies where cognitive ability is a significant factor in social positioning and personal evaluation.

The analysis reveals that intellectual representation extends beyond practical description to encompass mythological and ideological dimensions. The concept of "fool" carries both negative connotations (social incompetence) and positive associations (divine wisdom, spiritual virtue), reflecting complex cultural attitudes toward intellectual deviation. This duality suggests that English linguistic consciousness recognises multiple pathways to wisdom and acknowledges that conventional intellectual standards may not capture all forms of valuable cognitive contribution.

The research identifies significant attention to temporal aspects of intellectual change, with numerous expressions describing gaining intelligence (wise up, smarten up) and losing cognitive capacity (lose one's mind, lose one's marbles). This temporal dimension indicates cultural recognition that intellectual ability is not fixed but subject to development and decline, reflecting a dynamic understanding of cognitive capacity throughout human experience. While focused on English, the study reveals potential universal elements in intellectual conceptualisation, particularly container metaphors, animal comparisons, and embodied cognition models. The extensive use of animal references for describing intellectual deficiency (bird-brain, dumb as an ox) suggests cross-culturally recognisable patterns of cognitive categorisation, though specific cultural interpretations vary significantly.

The findings have practical implications for language education, cross-cultural communication, and cultural competency development. Understanding how intellectual activity is linguistically represented provides crucial insights for non-native speakers navigating English-speaking cultural contexts where cognitive evaluation plays significant

social roles. The research contributes to cultural linguistics by demonstrating how deeply embedded cultural values shape everyday linguistic expression and cognitive categorisation.

This analysis opens several avenues for future investigation, including comparative studies across languages and cultures, diachronic analysis of intellectual representation evolution, and how digital communication technologies influence intellectual conceptualisation. The relationship between linguistic representation and actual cognitive assessment practices presents another promising research direction, as does the investigation of how intellectual representation varies across different English-speaking communities and social contexts. The comprehensive nature of this investigation establishes intellectual activity representation as a rich domain for understanding the intersection of language, culture, and cognition, providing a foundation for continued exploration of how human societies linguistically construct and transmit concepts of mental capacity and cognitive worth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barcelona A. (Ed.). Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective. Mouton de Gruyter, 2000.
2. Cameron L., & Maslen R. (Eds.). Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities. Equinox Publishing, 2010.
3. Fauconnier G., Turner M. The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities. Basic Books, 2002.
4. Gibbs R. W. The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
5. Gibbs R. W. Cognitive linguistics and metaphor research: Past successes, sceptical questions, future challenges. Delta, 22(1), 1–20, 2006.
6. Johnson M. The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason. University of Chicago Press, 1987.
7. Kövecses Z. Metaphor: A practical introduction. Oxford University Press, 2002.
8. Kövecses Z. Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor. Oxford University Press, 2015.
9. Lakoff G. Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. University of Chicago Press, 1987.
10. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought. Basic Books, 1999.
11. Langacker R. W. Foundations of cognitive grammar: Vol. 1. Theoretical prerequisites. Stanford University Press, 1987.
12. Langacker R. W. Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction. Oxford University Press, 2008.
13. Semino E. Metaphor in discourse. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
14. Sweetser E. From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
15. Granger S., Meunier F. Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective. John Benjamins, 2008.
16. Moon R. Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach. Oxford University Press, 1998.
17. Taylor J. R. Linguistic categorization (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, 2003.

REFERENCES

1. Barcelona, A. (Ed.). (2000). Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective. Mouton de Gruyter.
2. Cameron, L., & Maslen, R. (Eds.). (2010). Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities. Equinox Publishing.
3. Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities. Basic Books.
4. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding. Cambridge University Press.
5. Gibbs, R. W. (2006). Cognitive linguistics and metaphor research: Past successes, sceptical questions, future challenges. Delta, 22(1), 1–20.
6. Johnson, M. (1987). The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason. University of Chicago Press.
7. Kövecses, Z. (2002). Metaphor: A practical introduction. Oxford University Press.
8. Kövecses, Z. (2015). Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor. Oxford University Press.
9. Lakoff, G. (1987). Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. University of Chicago Press.

10. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought. Basic Books.
11. Langacker, R. W. (1987). Foundations of cognitive grammar: Vol. 1. Theoretical prerequisites. Stanford University Press.
12. Langacker, R. W. (2008). Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction. Oxford University Press.
13. Semino, E. (2008). Metaphor in discourse. Cambridge University Press.
14. Sweetser, E. (1990). From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure. Cambridge University Press.
15. Granger, S., & Meunier, F. (Eds.). (2008). Phraseology: An interdisciplinary perspective. John Benjamins.
16. Moon, R. (1998). Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach. Oxford University Press.
17. Taylor, J. R. (2003). Linguistic categorization (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

ЛІНГВІСТИЧНЕ ВІДОБРАЖЕННЯ ІНТЕЛЕКТУАЛЬНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ЛЮДИНИ В АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ: ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИЙ ТА СЕМАНТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

Гром Оксана Іванівна
лектор факультету іноземної філології
Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова
вул. Пирогова, 9, Київ, Україна

Дослідження було присвячене лінгвістичному відображенню інтелектуальної діяльності людини в англійській мові через комплексний аналіз фразеологічних одиниць, метафоричних виразів та семантичних структур, а також вивчено, як інтелектуальні здібності концептуалізуються, категоризуються та оцінюються в англійському лінгвістичному світогляді, зосереджуючись на таких ключових лексемах, як «розум», «голова» та «мозок», а також на їхніх антитетичних відповідниках «дурний» та «дурень». Аналіз показує, що носії англійської мови використовують багатий набір метафоричних моделей для представлення інтелектуальних здібностей, включаючи концептуалізацію розуму як контейнера, рослини, вогню, тварини та людини. В систематичному дослідженні було виявлено фразеологічні одиниці, які поділені на шість основних тематичних груп: дихотомія розумний-дурний, набуття-втрата інтелекту, глибокі-тривіальні знання, обдарованість-звичайні здібності, швидкий-повільний розум та хороша-погана пам'ять. Ці категорії демонструють ієрархічну систему оцінювання, в якій інтелектуальні здібності вимірюються поступово, причому помітно відсутня нейтральна категорія «нормальний». Компонентний аналіз фразеологічних виразів виявляє соматичні елементи (голова, мозок, розум), метафори, засновані на об'єктах (ніж, цегла, світло), порівняння з природними явищами (скеля, батіг), метафори вимірювання (енциклопедія, фонтан, сито), посилання на тварин (слон, птах, курка) та дієслова дії як основні лінгвістичні механізми для вираження інтелектуальних понять. В дослідженні було виявлено переважання негативних оцінок в інтелектуальній характеристиці, причому позитивні оцінки зазвичай вимагають підсилювачів та продемонстровано, що представлення інтелектуальної діяльності в англійській мові відображає культурні цінності та соціальні норми, де інтелект є чеснотою, що підлягає моральній оцінці. В аналізі було виявлено чіткі концептуальні межі між «розумом» (базова здатність до мислення) і «розумом» (вища когнітивна функція), а також між «дурним» (повільна інтелектуальна здатність) і «дурнем» (порушення соціальних норм поведінки). Ці висновки сприяють розумінню того, як когнітивні здібності конструюються лінгвістично і передаються культурно через мову. Висновки дослідження поширюються на когнітивну лінгвістику, культурну антропологію та мовознавство, пропонуючи розуміння взаємозв'язку між мовою, мисленням та культурною концептуалізацією інтелектуальних здібностей людини в англомовних спільнотах.

Ключові слова: *фразеологія, когнітивна лінгвістика, інтелектуальна діяльність, метафоричні моделі, семантичний аналіз, англійська лінгвістика, культурна концептуалізація, лексична семантика, лінгвістичний світогляд, оціночна мова.*