



ANTHROPOCENTRIC EXPRESSIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LEXICAL-SEMANTIC AND GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS

Kholmatova Malika Ibadullayevna

Assistant teacher of the department

“Uzbek and foreign languages”

Tashkent institute of textile and light industry,
Uzbekistan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19882512>

Abstract

This article is devoted to a comparative-typological analysis of the lexical and grammatical features of anthropocentric expressions in English and Uzbek. The relevance of the study is determined by the evolution of the modern anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics and the crucial role of the human factor's reflection in language. According to the principle of anthropocentrism, language is conceptualized not merely as a tool for communication, but as a transformative system that reconfigures the physical, mental, social, and cultural experiences of human beings. The study critically examines phraseological units and metaphorical constructions related to human anatomy (somatism), psychological states, and personality traits. Throughout the research, the lexical composition, grammatical structures, and functional-stylistic characteristics of these expressions are explored to reveal their national and cultural identities. The paper concludes by emphasizing the intrinsic link between language and culture, underscoring the role of anthropocentric units in enhancing communicative effectiveness and pedagogical equity in oral discourse.

Keywords: anthropocentrism, anthropocentric expressions, lexical analysis, grammatical structure, phraseology, comparative linguistics, linguoculturology, semantic motivation, pragmatics, language and thought.

Abstrakt

Mazkur maqola ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi antropotsentrik iboralarning leksik-grammatik xususiyatlarini qiyosiy-tipologik jihatdan tahlil qilishga bag'ishlangan. Tadqiqotning dolzarbligi tilshunoslikdagi zamonaviy antropotsentrik paradigmaning rivojlanishi hamda inson omilining tildagi in'ikosi bilan belgilanadi. Antropotsentrizm tamoyiliga ko'ra, til nafaqat aloqa vositasi, balki insonning jismoniy, ruhiy, ijtimoiy va madaniy tajribasi aks etadigan murakkab tizimdir. Maqolada inson tana a'zolari (somatizmlar), ruhiy holati va xarakter xususiyatlarini ifodalovchi frazeologik birliklar hamda metaforik konstruksiyalar qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot davomida har ikki tildagi iboralarning leksik tarkibi, grammatik shakllanish qonuniyatlari va funksional-uslubiy xususiyatlari o'rganilib, ularning milliy-madaniy o'ziga xosliklari ochib beriladi. Xulosa qismida til va madaniyat o'rtasidagi uzviy bog'liqlik hamda antropotsentrik birliklarning nutqiy samaradorlikni oshirishdagi roli asoslanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: antroposentrizm, antroposentrik iboralar, leksik tahlil, grammatik tuzilma, frazeologiya, qiyosiy lingvistika, lingvokulturologiya, semantik motivatsiya, pragmatika, til va tafakkur.

Аннотация

Данная статья посвящена сравнительно-типологическому анализу лексико-грамматических особенностей антропоцентрических выражений в английском и узбекском языках. Актуальность исследования обусловлена развитием современной антропоцентрической парадигмы в лингвистике и значимостью отражения человеческого фактора в языке. Согласно принципу антропоцентризма, язык рассматривается как сложная система, в которой аккумулируется физический, духовный, социальный и культурный опыт человека. В статье подвергаются анализу фразеологические единицы и метафорические конструкции, описывающие части человеческого тела (соматизмы), психическое состояние и черты характера. В ходе исследования изучаются лексический состав, закономерности грамматического построения и функционально-стилистические особенности идиом в обоих языках, а также выявляются их национально-культурные различия. В заключении обосновывается неразрывная связь между языком и культурой, а также роль антропоцентрических единиц в повышении коммуникативной эффективности речи.

Ключевые слова: антропоцентризм, антропоцентрические выражения, лексический анализ, грамматическая структура, фразеология, сравнительная лингвистика, лингвокультурология, семантическая мотивация, прагматика, язык и мышление.

Introduction

In modern linguistics, the anthropocentric paradigm interprets language as a phenomenon inextricably linked to human thought, cognitive activity, and socio-cultural experience. According to this approach, the linguistic system manifests the human being as a central referent, and the processes of perceiving reality are reflected in linguistic units. From this perspective, anthropocentric expressions stable or semi-stable combinations expressing the physical, psychological, and social characteristics of a person occupy a significant place in the conceptual and semantic structure of language.

The comparative study of anthropocentric expressions in English and Uzbek is carried out at the intersection of cognitive linguistics, semasiology, phraseology, and linguoculturology. In particular, the expression of the human factor in adjectival phrases is explained through scientific concepts such as conceptual metaphor theory, semantic projection, evaluativeness, and the axiological component. In the semantic structure of linguistic units, the concept of "man" appears as a central cognitive model, often realized through somatic lexis (heart, soul, eye, hand, etc.) and experiential domains such as sensation, temperature, and spatial parameters.

The relevance of this research lies in the fact that, although anthropocentric expressions in English and Uzbek have primarily been studied from a phraseological or general semantic standpoint, a comprehensive comparative analysis of their lexical-semantic and grammatical features has not been sufficiently systematized. In particular, the issues of structural modeling, syntactic functionality, and the connotative-semantic load of anthropocentrism in adjectival expressions require separate scientific investigation. The aim of the research is to conduct a comparative study of anthropocentric expressions in English and Uzbek from lexical-semantic and grammatical perspectives, and to identify their conceptual foundations and typological features. To achieve this goal, the following tasks were defined:

To identify the semantic field of anthropocentric expressions and categorize them into thematic groups;

To analyze the structural models and derivational mechanisms of adjectival expressions;

To reveal the conceptual motivation of somatic and metaphorical components;

To provide a comparative description of evaluative and pragmatic functions in English and Uzbek.

Theoretically, this research relies on the principles of the anthropocentric approach, conceptual metaphor theory, and comparative-typological linguistics. The methodological framework utilizes descriptive, comparative, component analysis, semantic interpretation, and contextual-pragmatic analysis methods. The expected results will allow for the identification of the linguistic representation of the human concept in English and Uzbek, the semantic structures of adjectival expressions, and the common and national characteristics in their grammatical realization. Thus, this study serves to deepen the comparative-linguistic approach to the study of anthropocentric expressions and provides a broader interpretation of the relationship between language and thought. The anthropocentric approach has become one of the leading directions in linguistic research since the second half of the 20th century. Representatives of cognitive linguistics interpreted language in inseparable connection with human thought and experience. In particular, within the framework of conceptual metaphor theory, human experience was recognized as a primary factor in the formation of linguistic units. Research in the field of phraseology has focused on studying the semantic integrity, imagery, and national-cultural characteristics of expressions. In Uzbek linguistics, there is scientific research on expressions based on the human factor, especially phraseological units related to body parts. In English linguistics, the grammatical and semantic characteristics of idiomatic units have been extensively studied. Nevertheless, the issue of studying the lexical-semantic and grammatical aspects of anthropocentric expressions in English and Uzbek on a complex comparative basis has not been sufficiently researched in a systematic manner.

Materials and methods

The anthropocentric approach, conceptual metaphors, and the connection of phraseological units with the human factor have been studied by a number of influential linguists. First, the theoretical foundations of the human-centered approach within cognitive linguistics were developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson [3, p. 48]. Their theory of conceptual metaphor scientifically grounded the inextricable link between linguistic units and human experience, body parts, and sensory activities. The general linguistic principles of anthropocentrism and the role of the human factor in the language system were investigated in Russian linguistics by Y. Apresyan. He advanced the concept of the “naive picture of the world” in linguistic semantics [2, p. 122]. Within the framework of linguoculturology and the theory of cultural concepts, the relationship between man and language was extensively covered by V. Teliya and V. Karasik [4, p. 56]. They analyzed the national-cultural characteristics of phraseological units and evaluative semantics. In the field of phraseology, systematic research on stable combinations in the English language was conducted by A. Kunin, who developed a structural-semantic classification of English phraseology [5, p. 6].

In Uzbek linguistics, the semantic properties of phraseological units and figurative expressions were studied by scholars such as Sh. Rahmatullayev and A. Mamatov. They demonstrated the connection between phraseologisms in the Uzbek language and national



thought and culture [7, p. 12]. Professor M. Djusupov, Doctor of Philological Sciences, states: *"The anthropocentric paradigm interprets the human factor as a central concept in linguistics and implies the study of linguistic units in inseparable connection with human thought and culture"* [11, p. 40]. B. Yuldashev, studying the semantic composition of phraseological units, emphasizes their basis in figurative meaning transfer [10, p. 96]. Adjectival phraseologisms, in particular, are widely used to express human character, emotions, and states. V.V. Vinogradov, who analyzed the semantic stability of phraseologisms, interprets them as units that form figurative meanings. Adjectival idioms are phrasemes or expressions composed of adjectives to convey a specific meaning or emotion. These idiomatic expressions usually involve the figurative or metaphorical use of an adjective to describe a person, situation, or event. Idioms with an adjectival component are common in everyday life and are often used to add color, emphasis, or a specific tone to oral or written discourse. Examples of adjectival expressions include "couch potato," "black sheep," "green with envy," and "blue in the face" in English, and "oq ko'ngil" (open-hearted), "terisi qalin" (thick-skinned), "ichi qora", "qichiq gap", and "ko'ngli bo'sh" in Uzbek [9, p. 173].

This research is aimed at studying anthropocentric, specifically adjectival, expressions in English and Uzbek based on comparative-linguistic and linguoculturological approaches. The research methodology is complex in nature, utilizing descriptive, comparative-typological, semantic-cognitive, and contextual analysis methods.

In the first stage, adjectival anthropocentric expressions in English and Uzbek were selected using the descriptive method, and their lexical composition and grammatical structures were systematized. The materials were compiled based on explanatory and phraseological dictionaries, examples of fine literature, and modern text corpora. The selected units were sorted according to criteria for expressing a person's physical attributes, mental state, character traits, and social status.

In the second stage, structural and semantic similarities and differences between the materials of the two languages were clarified using the comparative-typological method. In this process, the syntactic models of adjectival expressions (e.g., adjective + noun or noun + adjective constructions), their grammatical agreement, and functional roles were compared.

During the semantic-cognitive analysis, the metaphorical motivation, conceptual foundations, and evaluative components of the expressions were studied. In particular, metaphors based on human experience-descriptive units related to body parts, colors, movement, and sensation-were analyzed within the conceptual field. This approach allowed for the identification of how the principle of anthropocentrism is manifested in adjectival expressions. Furthermore, through contextual and pragmatic analysis, the usage characteristics, degree of expressiveness, and communicative functions of the expressions in speech were studied. This approach revealed the significance of the expressions not only as systemic units but as functional tools in real communicative processes. In general, the set of applied methods enabled a comprehensive analysis of anthropocentric adjectival expressions-lexically, grammatically, semantically, and culturally-and served to identify the common and national characteristics of these units in the English and Uzbek languages.

Results and discussion

During the research, anthropocentric, specifically adjectival, expressions in English and Uzbek were comparatively analyzed from lexical-semantic and grammatical perspectives. The

results indicated that in both languages, adjectival phrases play a central semantic role in expressing physical attributes, psychological states, character traits, and social status. In this context, the principle of anthropocentrism is manifested in the conceptual foundation of linguistic units. According to the analysis, adjectival expressions in English such as “cold-hearted,” “warm-blooded,” “strong-willed,” and “narrow-minded” metaphorically conceptualize human psychological and moral qualities through body parts or physiological processes. For instance, in the compound “cold-hearted,” the “heart” component is interpreted as the emotional center, while the adjective “cold” signifies a lack of empathy. Here, semantic transfer occurs based on the conceptual metaphor model. The degree of semantic independence of components within adjectival phraseological units can vary. In some combinations, this independence is completely lost; that is, their meaning is perceived entirely within the phraseological system. For example, in the English expression “a cold fish” (an emotionless, cold person), it is not the literal meaning of the word “cold” that is used, but a metaphorical meaning denoting character. Similarly, in “a hard nut to crack” (a difficult person or a complex problem), the words “hard” and “nut” acquire a figurative meaning without independent semantic loading. The results showed that in both languages, somatic components (heart, soul, eye, hand, etc.) have high frequency and serve as the primary semantic core in describing the inner world of a person. However, while the *heart* component predominates in English, the lexemes *ko'ngil* and *dil* (soul/heart) are more widely used in Uzbek. This reflects differences in national-cognitive models. Anthropocentric expressions in English represent one of the richest layers of linguistics, where the human factor, body parts, emotions, and life experiences occupy a central place. From an academic perspective, these expressions play a crucial role in forming the linguistic picture of the world. Below, we examine anthropocentric expressions in English with examples:

1.Somatic Expressions (Related to body parts): Somatisms are the most vivid manifestation of anthropocentrism. Humans perceive the world through their own body parts; therefore, body parts often serve as metaphors for expressing abstract concepts.

To be the “eye” of something: The central point. Here, the human eye is taken as the central and most sensitive part of the entire body. In academic discourse, this expression represents the center of a crisis or chaos. Example: “*The eye of the storm.*”

To lend a hand: To help. The hand is the primary tool of human activity and assistance. Here, the method of metonymy is used (the hand represents all human aid). Example: “*The government decided to lend a hand to small businesses.*”

2.Expressions expressing intellectual and psychological states: Expressions related to human mental activity and emotions serve to describe the inner world.

To be in two minds: To hesitate. This expression describes the division of the human mind or hesitation before a choice through numbers and psychologically. Example: “*She was in two minds about accepting the job offer.*”

Cold shoulder: A cold attitude. Body temperature and coldness are transferred to emotional relations. This is an anthropocentric metaphor representing social rejection or indifference. Example: “*The proposal was given the cold shoulder by the committee.*”

3.Expressions expressing social status and character: Anthropocentrism also encompasses a person's place in society and their individual qualities.

A big fish in a small pond: An influential person in a small place. A person's prestige and influence are compared through the ratio of the animal world and the environment, but the main focus remains on human social status. Example: "In his local town, he is a big fish in a small pond."

Heart of gold: Open-hearted, generous. A person's inner value is compared to the most precious metal-gold. The heart being considered the center of human emotions is a product of an anthropocentric view. Example: "Despite his rough exterior, he has a heart of gold."

The analysis of anthropocentric expressions in English shows that these units are not merely decorative but are cognitive mechanisms. Through metaphorical transfer, they express abstract social concepts from physical body parts. Furthermore, from a linguoculturological perspective, they reflect the cultural views of the English people regarding human dignity, labor, and emotions. They increase the expressiveness of speech and convey complex psychological states through short, understandable images. From the viewpoint of the anthropocentric approach, linguistic units are formed based on human experience, emotion, and social perspectives. Humans rely on their physical and psychological experiences to perceive the reality around them. Therefore, phraseological units often arise based on metaphors related to the human body, mental state, or daily life experience. Such metaphorical models reflect the worldview and cultural thinking of language speakers.

Pragmatically, these expressions increase expressiveness in speech, strengthen communicative impact, and reflect the national mentality. They perform not only informative but also emotional and evaluative functions. For this reason, adjectival phraseologisms are widely used in fine literature, journalistic texts, and oral speech. Such units strengthen the imagery of speech and enrich the aesthetic possibilities of the language.

Comparative analysis results showed that anthropocentric adjectival phraseologisms in English and Uzbek are important linguistic tools for describing human character, psychological state, and social behavior. They are formed as products of human-centered thinking and reflect the worldview and cultural values of the language speakers.

Although these expressions have a common conceptual basis in both languages, there are specific typological differences in their grammatical construction, syntactic use, and semantic realization. In English, adjectival phraseological units are used relatively freely in attributive and predicative positions, whereas in Uzbek, they appear more frequently in a predicative function. This demonstrates the uniqueness of the grammatical systems and phraseological models of both languages. Moreover, in the semantic composition of phraseological units, national-cultural components occupy an important place alongside universal human metaphors. Metaphors based on universal human experience provide semantic universality between different languages, while national mentality and cultural traditions create semantic differentiation. In conclusion, anthropocentric adjectival expressions manifest as the linguistic expression of human-centered thinking in the language system, possessing complex and multifaceted characteristics across lexical-semantic, grammatical, pragmatic, and linguoculturological layers. Their comparative study is significant not only for the development of phraseology and cognitive linguistics but also for identifying conceptual similarities and differences between different languages and cultures.

Conclusion



The research results indicate that among anthropocentric phraseological units in English and Uzbek, adjectival phraseologisms play a central role and predominate in the lexical-semantic expression of the central human concept. Such phraseologisms are fundamentally linked to human character, psychological states, social roles, and aesthetic evaluations; they are highly expressed within the phraseological system through semantic motivation and an evaluative component. Compared to other types of phraseological units, adjectival phraseologisms harmonize concepts related to the human being across both concrete and abstract semantic layers, thereby enhancing their pragmatic and communicative potential. Furthermore, their linguocultural component serves as a medium reflecting national thought and cultural values. The study also demonstrates that the prevalence of the anthropocentric principle in adjectival phraseologisms deepens the interrelationship between language and cognition, ensuring the stylistic and functional integration of the phraseological system. From this perspective, the study of adjectival phraseologisms carries methodological significance not only for lexical-semantic and grammatical analysis but also for the fields of pragmatics, linguoculturology, and intercultural communication. The findings of this research establish new scientific foundations for comparative linguistics and translation theory, enabling more effective processes for identifying, interpreting, and translating anthropocentric phraseological units in linguistic practice.

References:

1. Amosova, N. N. (1963). *Fundamentals of English Phraseology [Osnovy angliyskoy frazeologii]*. Leningrad: LSU. – 78 p.
2. Apresyan, Y. D. (1995). *Foundations of Semantics: Theoretical Foundations of the Study of Word Meaning [Osnovy semantiki: teoreticheskiye osnovy issledovaniya znacheniya slova]*. Moscow: Nauka.
3. Johnson, M., & Lakoff, G. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Karasik, V. I., & Teliya, V. V. (2001). *Linguoculturology and Cognitive Semantics [Lingvokulturologiya i kognitivnaya semantika]*. Moscow: Flinta.
5. Kunin, A. I. (1979). *Structural-Semantic Types of Phraseological Units in the English Language [Strukturno-semanticheskiye tipy frazeologizmov angliyskogo yazyka]*. Moscow: Nauka.
6. Kunin, A. V. (2005). *A Course in Modern English Phraseology [Kurs frazeologii sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka]*. Dubna. – pp. 331–488.
7. Rahmatullayev, S. (2007). *Uzbek Phraseology: Theoretical and Practical Aspects [O'zbek frazeologiyasi: nazariy va amaliy jihatlar]*. Tashkent: Fan.
8. Kholmatova, M. I. (2021). Linguoculturological Comparative Analysis of Adjectival Component Idioms in English and Uzbek Languages. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 12, pp. 1391–1397.
9. Kholmatova, M. (2023). Adjectival Idiom: An Analysis of Usage, Origins and Cultural Significance. *Ilm sarchashmasi*, pp. 172–178.
10. Yuldashev, B. (2010). *Phraseological Units in the Uzbek Language and National Thinking [O'zbek tilidagi frazeologik birliklar va milliy tafakkur]*. Tashkent: Akademyashr.
11. Djusupov, M. (2022). Anthropocentric Proverbs as a Linguo-Contrastive and Linguo-Methodological Problem [Antropotsentricheskiye poslovitsy kak lingvokontrastivnaya i lingvometodicheskaya problema]. *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, No. 5 (46), pp. 37–52.



12.Mamatov, A. E. (1991). Issues of Lexical and Phraseological Norms in Modern Uzbek Literary Language [Hozirgi zamon o'zbek adabiy tilida leksik va frazeologiya norma muammolari]. Tashkent. – 274 p.

