

Linguistic Realization of the Concept “Foot” in the English and Uzbek Languages

MAMADALIYEVA GULRU RAVSHANOVNA
Ferghana State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article examines the linguistic realization of the concept “foot” in the English and Uzbek languages, highlighting their cognitive and cultural nuances. Through comparative and typological analysis, it identifies universal and specific features of the concept’s main components. Utilizing methods such as definitional and component analysis of lexical meaning, the study explores linguistic units associated with “foot” and “oyoq” from dictionary sources and literary texts. Findings reveal that the concept integrates both physical and mental representations, shaped by national-cultural characteristics and unique language structures. Despite distinct anatomical and functional categorizations in English and Uzbek, similarities emerge in idiomatic and metaphorical expressions, underscoring the universal nature of the concept. The results emphasize the interplay of cognitive linguistics and cultural linguistics in conceptual realization.

Keywords: Linguistic realization, cognitive linguistics, conceptual analysis, English and Uzbek languages, cultural linguistics, idiomatic expressions

INTRODUCTION

An important aspect of cognitive linguistics is its study of language in terms of cognitive function, serving as a means of receiving, organizing, processing, and transmitting information. This requires a view of language as a cognitive ability of a

person. The various cognitive abilities of a person form a single infrastructure in his mind, which also includes language [1: 45]. Another important aspect of cognitive linguistics, which is related to its unique perspective on language as an object of research, is the recognition of the central role of a person in the process of perception (cognition) and speech activity, that is, language's anthropocentric perspective. That is, the cognitive approach to the study of language is due to the fact that the largest, most significant share in the formation of linguistic meanings belongs to a person as an observer and a carrier of existing knowledge. The human being, as a subject who communicates in natural language, does not produce ready-made meanings but actively forms them (the principle of creativity of discursive thinking), and it is the speaking subject (human) who makes the choice of linguistic means of expression to describe a particular situation (state) [2:18].

The basic unit of cognitive linguistics is the concept. To date, various definitions of the concept have been developed. Some scientists emphasize that concepts are a unit of consciousness and information structure reflecting human experience [3: 245], while others call it a cognitive category, a quantum (set) of knowledge [4: 394]. A concept is a set of defined properties used to describe a fragment (piece) of the world or a part of such a fragment. A concept is a representation of a fragment of the world or a part of such a fragment, having a complex structure, realized through various linguistic methods and means. Conceptual sign occurs in stable and free-form combinations of corresponding linguistic units - concept representatives [5:126].

The study of the methods and means of realization of the concept "foot" in the English and Uzbek linguistic picture is the formation of this concept. The purpose of this article is to identify the universal and specific features of the main components of the concept "foot" and conduct a comparative-typological analysis of the factors that contribute to its realization. Linguistic units belonging to the conceptual field of "Foot" in English and Uzbek languages, taken from dictionary sources, as well as examples from various literary works, serve as research material. The method of definitional and component

analysis of lexical meaning, the method of structural-semantic analysis are used as research methods.

Undoubtedly, the analysis of the linguistic means of verbalizing the concepts of “foot” and *oyoq* in a comparative interpretation points to the nominative density of these concepts in English and Uzbek, and in turn shows the peculiar similarities and differences that the concepts of “foot” and *oyoq* occupy in the English and Uzbek linguistic descriptions of the world.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Any linguistic sign denotes a concept in language. However, a sign denotes only a few basic conceptual signs, which by their meaning are related to the message, the transmission of which is included in the speaker’s intention (purpose). The concept as a unit of thought is described by the linguistic means of its objectification in language, which is determined as the nominative field of the concept. The nominative field includes not only the nominatives of the concept itself, but also the nominatives of individual cognitive signs of the concept, which reveal the content of the concept and the attitude towards it in various communicative situations [6: 66]. We rely on the notion that a concept can be expressed only by a set of linguistic means, each of which reveals only a part of it [7: 560]; [8: 123]; [9: 314].

During the comparative analysis of the concepts “foot/ oyoq” we addressed to a substantial corpus of linguistic data. Because one concept is expressed in different languages in different grammatical and lexical forms.

Yu. S. Stepanov identifies three distinct components within the structure of the concept, one of which is the internal form, or etymological sign [10: 40]. Based on etymological lexicons, the main etymological sign of the concept under study is determined. An etymological analysis of the concept of “foot” reveals its origins in the oldest layers of Indo-European vocabulary. This indicates that it has been living in the language and speech for a long time. According to the *Online Etymological Dictionary of English*, the Old English form of the word “foot fot,” meaning the lower part of a vertebrate’s leg, is derived from the Proto-

Indo-European root *ped-*(foot) and is derived from the Proto-Germanic *fōts* (also from Old Frisian *foet*, Old Saxon *foet*, Old Norse *footr*, Danish *fod*, Swedish *foet*, Dutch *voet*, Old High German *fuoz*, German *Fuß*, Gothic *fotus*). The plural form *feet* is an example of *i*-mutation [1].

The Old English measure of length was the length of a human foot (the exact length varied over time); it was a widely used unit of measurement in ancient times. The word “foot” is often used in this sense in the plural. Modern units such as the inch and foot trace their origins to measurements used in 12th-century English churches as we (Flinders Petrie, “Inductive Metrology”), but in medieval England the most common length of the foot was the “foot,” which was common throughout the ancient Mediterranean, equal to 13.2 inches. The Anglo-Saxon “foot” was somewhere between these units. All three correspond to units of measurement used by the Romans, and all three lengths were probably adopted by the Anglo-Saxons from the Romano-Britons. “It is likely that the Saxon units began to be used in the Middle Ages, since the Normans were not the working class but the ruling class” [11].

The medieval phrase “Paul’s foot” (late 14th century) referred to a standard of measurement carved into the base of a column in the old church of St. Paul in London.

The “metric foot” (Late Old English, from the same meaning Latin *pes*, Greek *pous*) is usually used to represent one rise and one fall of the foot; for some it means keeping time, for others it means dancing.

In Middle English, foot also came to mean “man” (c. 1200), from which the expression “non-foot” - no one - arose. By 1200 it had come to mean “the bottom or lowest part of something high or upright.” From 1300 it came to mean “the lower part of a place, grave, etc.”

The expression “on foot” in the sense of “pedestrian” appeared in 1300, while the expression “to get off on the wrong foot” was first used in 1905; “to put one’s best foot foremost” was first recorded in 1849 (in 1596 Shakespeare “has the better foot before”). The phrase “evil-foot” (adj.-adjective) in the sense of bringing misfortune appeared in Middle English.

The expression “to put (one’s) foot in something” dates back to 1823, while the expression “to put one’s foot in (one’s) mouth” – (literal translation “to put one’s foot in (one’s) mouth,” meaning to say a stupid thing, corresponding to the Uzbek expression *qovuntushirmoq* - to drop the melon) was first recorded in 1942. “To have one foot in the grave” was first used in 1844, while the euphemistic expression “My foot!” was first used in 1923 and may be a euphemistic form of the expression “My ass!,” which dates back to 1796.

Etymological data show that the development of the meaning of the word “foot” in English occurred in the process of moving from concrete to more abstract features. Therefore, we can say that the semantics of the word “foot” is based on the emotional image of the subject, the physical object and the ideal essence associated with this object (a body part, standing, leaning and moving). According to the etymological dictionary of the Uzbek language [12: 250], the etymological analysis of the concept of *oyoq* showed that the noun *oyoq* is formed from the *ay-* form of the verb *a:d-*, which meant “step” in the ancient Turkic language, with the suffix *-(a)q*; in the Uzbek language, the vowels *a* were replaced by the vowels “*ā*”: *ay+aq=ayayq ≥āyāq* [13].

Creating a description of lexemes and phraseological units that fall into the nominative field of the concept is carried out using traditional linguistic methods - determining meanings based on dictionaries. We will try to determine the conceptual signs of the lexemes “foot” and *oyoq* using the method of generalizing dictionary definitions.

According to the *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*, the word “foot” has 6 lexical-semantic variations [14: 615]:

1. The part of the foot below the ankle, which holds a person or animal (upright).
2. The lower part of something in an upright position;
3. The part of a bed located at the foot;
4. A unit of measurement equal to an inch (33.48 cm);
5. In poetry, the set of syllables that make up the basic unit of meter;
6. Verb, spoken speech, to pay a bill;

In *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, we can see 17 definitions of the word "foot." Lexical analysis of the words naming the concept of "foot" shows that in linguistic thinking, the foot is understood as an external body part of a physical object – a person and vertebrate animals, having a certain shape and certain parts (segments of leg – thigh, knees, calf, ankle, foot, heel, toe). According to its reflection in the language, this organ is considered a paired organ with a certain location in space (vertical, horizontal), its own movements and states.

According to the 1981 edition of the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language*, there are 5 lexical semantic variants of the lexeme *oyoq* in the Uzbek language (15:522):

1. A limb that serves to support the body of a person, animal, bird, and living organisms in general, and to walk or crawl. *O'ngoyog, chap oyoq*. *Oyoqli* – has a leg. *To'rtoyoqlijonvor* – Four-legged animal. *Uzunoyoqlichigirtka* – Long-legged grasshopper. *Ikkioyoqlab* – with two legs/feet – with both legs/feet. *Oyoqlanmoq* – *bosh ko'tarmoq, qo'zg'almoq, qarshichiqmoq* – to oppose. *Oyoqlantirmoq* – *qarshiqo'ymoq* – to stir up, to oppose.
2. The part of an object such as a table, chair, sofa, bed that rests on the ground, the base. *Oyoqli* – *oyog'ibor-poyali, tagidako'taribturadiganqismibor* – Legged – has a leg, a stem, a part that supports the base *ikkiyoqliskameyka, uchoyoqlistul, cho'yanoyoqlipechka* – a two-legged bench, a three-legged chair, a cast-foot iron stove.
3. End, edge, margin, edge, lower side, skirt. *Ekinzorningoyog'i, yerningoyog'I* – The end of a field, the edge of the land; *oyoqlamoq* – *yerningoyoqtomoniga, etagigayetibbormoq* – to reach the foot, the edge of the land.
4. The place of a house, a room near the door; threshold.

The *Explanatory Dictionary of Active Words of the Modern Uzbek Language* provides the following definitions of the word *oyoq*:

1. The lower limb of a living organism that serves to stand and walk or crawl. *Oyog‘i og‘rib qolmoq* – To have a sore foot.
2. The part of an object such as a table, chair, or tie that rests on the ground. *Stulningoyog‘inisozlamoq* – To adjust the leg of a chair.
3. End, end; edge, side, lower side. *Daryoningoyog‘igachaboribkelmoq* – To reach the foot of a river.
4. *oyoq+lamoq* – to reach the end, the end. *Oy ham oyoqlabqoldi* – Here the month’s reaching its end. [16: 336]

Table 1. Lexical-semantic variations of the lexemes “foot” and *oyoq*

Foot	<i>Oyoq</i>
1. The part of the foot below the ankle, which holds a person or animal (upright)	1. A limb that serves to support the body of a person, animal, bird, and living organisms in general, and to walk or crawl
2. The lower part of something in an upright position	2. The part of an object such as a table, chair, sofa, bed that rests on the ground, the base
3. The part of a bed located at the foot	3. End, edge, margin, edge, lower side, skirt
4. A unit of measurement equal to an inch (33.48 cm);	4. The place of a house, a room near the door; threshold
5. (In poetry) the set of syllables that make up the basic unit of meter;	
6. (Verb, spoken speech) to pay a bill	

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the information in authoritative explanatory dictionaries, the following conceptual features of the concept of “foot” can be identified.

In both English and Uzbek, the concept of “foot” serves as a fundamental anatomical reference. In English, the word “foot” refers specifically to the lower part of the leg from the ankle,

whereas in Uzbek, *oyoq* encompasses the entire leg. This distinction reflects differences in how body parts are classified and named based on function and historical linguistic development.

Table 1 shows the similarities and differences between the lexical semantic variations (LSV) of foot and *oyoq*. The 1st LSV they represent as an anatomical concept.

1. *Foot as an anatomical concept*

- The “lowest part of the leg” of a vertebrate such as a human or animal, on which a person or animal stands upright: “My feet are aching”; “The whole audience rose to its feet.”
- “The moving part” of the body: “I’ve been on my feet all day.” “We were stamping our feet to keep warm.”
- The part that gives the “support” to the body: to gain a foothold; to have a footing.
- The part of the body with a certain “shape” and “quality”: “four-footed,” “club-footed,” “bare-footed,” “flat-footed,” “sure-footed,” “athletes foot,” “left-footed shot into the corner.”
- The body part that forms the leg together with the “thigh, knee, ankle” and “toes”: “We came on foot (walked).”
- “Paired organ” of the body – right foot, left foot, with one foot, both feet, two feet

“*Oyoq*” as anatomical concept

- A member that serves for standing and walking or crawling of the body of a person, animal, bird and living organisms in general;
- The support of the body
- A member of the body with a specific location - lower limb of the body;
- A member of the body with a specific shape and quality: *to’rtoyoqli* – four-legged; *maymoqoyoq* – clubfoot; *o’ngoyoq* – right leg/foot; *chap oyoq* – left leg/foot
- A member of the body with a specific shape, a musculoskeletal organ consisting of parts such as the *tizza* –

knee; *bolder* – calf; *to'piq* – ankle; *tovon* – heel; *kift* – palm; *oyoqbarmoqlari* – toes.

- A paired organ of the body (*o'ngoyoq* – right leg; *chap oyoq* – left leg, *biroyoqlab* – with one leg, *ikkioyoqlab* – with both legs/feet)
- Further LSV are the results of the metonymic transformation of the LSV 1 in its meaning.

2. *Comparative insights of the concepts “foot” and oyoq.*

It is clear from such conceptual signs that the concept of “foot” has common and specific signs in English and Uzbek. For example, despite the fact that in both “foot” and *oyoq* lexemes the body part *seme* is the *archiseme*, in the 1st sense of “foot” the definition is given for the body part, that is, the lower part of the leg from the ankle, the lowest part, and in the 1st sense of *oyoq* the definition is given for the entire foot. The English words “leg” and “foot” are represented in Uzbek by one word – *oyoq*. The reason for this is the peculiarities of the method of classifying and naming body parts according to the functions they perform in different languages, as well as their historical development. The English representation of the word, “leg” and “foot” are anatomically and functionally different. From an anatomical point of view, “leg” refers to the entire part of the body between the thigh and the ball of the foot, including the thigh, knee, calf, ankle, and lower leg. “Foot” refers to the lowest part of the leg that touches the ground, including the ankle, heel, and toes. From a functional point of view, leg is associated with movements such as walking, standing, and supporting body weight; foot performs movements related to balance, standing, and moving on surfaces or pushing off surfaces. It is precisely these differences that play a special role in the formation of derivatives of the lexeme foot, and its metaphorization. English, like many languages, developed by giving different parts of the body special names in order to communicate more clearly. The roots of these names go back to Old English and other Germanic languages. They had separate concepts for “foot” (*fōt*) and “leg” (*læc* or *leggr*). However, today the words “leg” and “foot” have

the same meaning in most contexts – the meaning of the foot. Especially in phraseological units, both words are used interchangeably, but the meaning does not change. For example, find your legs/feet – to become familiar with and confident in a new situation; keep one's feet/legs – manage not to fall, to maintain one's balance; run off one's feet/legs – to be very busy. “We are run off our feet/leg trying to fill the orders; foot it/ leg it” – walk; go on foot: “Several of the wagons became sloughed and the passengers were forced to foot it to town; get a leg/foot in” – to receive support, encouragement, or an added advantage; “to have a leg/foot in the door” – to manage to enter an organization, a field of business, that could bring you success: “I always wanted to work in TV but it took me two years to get a foot in the door.” The analysis demonstrates, regardless of which of the words “leg” and “foot” are used in these idioms, the meaning does not change. In the Uzbek linguistic representation of the world, the functional and anatomical distinctions between the parts of the leg were not important when naming them. Like all Turkic people, the Uzbek uses one word for both parts. For example, “I broke my leg playing the football” – *Futbolo'yinyatib, oyog'imnisindiribolidim*, “The audience rose its feet to applaud” – *Tinglovchilarolqishlashuchunoyoqqaqalqdilar* .

3. *The role of synonyms in the representation of the concept*

The use of a number of synonymous words as a means of linguistic realization of the foot/*oyoq* concept has been observed. Unlike the Uzbek language, in the English and American linguistic pictures of the world, there are many slang words such as “tootsie,” “dogs,” “paw,” “trotter,” “pad,” “cancels,” “gams,” “get away sticks,” “pegs,” “pins,” “slegs,” “stems,” “stump” that refer to the foot as a body part. “The piglets in government will have not only their snouts but their trotters in the trough.” The English words “hoof,” “pad,” “paw,” “trotter” and the Uzbek words *tuyoq*, *panja* are zoonyms of the foot/*oyoq* lexeme: Forge dipped a cloven hoof into social and political commentary; *Qani, tuyog'ingnishi qillat!*

In the Uzbek language, the synonym for the lexeme *oyoq* is the word *poy*, which was adopted from the Persian-Tajik language and means “foot.” This word plays an important role in the formation of several derivatives of the concept *oyoq*: *poya* – stem, *poycha* – trouser leg, *paychoq* – foot of a hoofed animal, *paynov* – drain pipe, *poygak* – threshold, *poyqadam* – visit, *poyandoz* – rag for the guests, *poyabzal* – footwear, *paytava* – foot wrap, *hoki-poy* – foot dust, *poyma-poy* – conversely, *paypoq* – socks.

The synonyms of the lexeme “leg” include the words (lower) “limbs,” “member,” “shank,” which mean the foot/leg. The synonyms of the concept lexemes include the following words: “bottom,” “foundation,” “nadir,” “pier” (words denoting the concepts of “bottom”); *ohir*, *pirovard*, *so‘ng*, *adoq*, *intiho*, *nihoya*, *ket* (words denoting the concept of the “foot” in the Uzbek language); *vertebrate organ*, *bipeds*, *quadripeds*, *podium*, *femur*, *tibia*, *footcandle meter*, *footstone* (terms used in the scientific field); go, walk, stand, step, skip, trace, base, foundation; *iz*, *qadam*, *yurmoq*, *kelmoq*, *turmoq*, *tepmoq*, *ohir*, *adoq* (words containing the semes “foot” and *oyoq*).

4. *Realization of non-verbal means of the concept in the language*

The results of the study show that in both languages, the nominalization of the concepts of “foot” and *oyoq* using compounds containing the somatism of “foot” and *oyoq* plays a large role in the linguistic description of the world. It is worth noting that the concepts of “foot” and *oyoq* can also be realized through nonverbal means – the actions and location of the foot, which have a separate name in the linguistic description of the world. These nonverbal means are verbalized through linguistic units and may describe the psycho-emotional state of a person: “drag one’s legs/feet,” “cross one’s legs/feet,” “stretch one’s feet,” “bounce one’s feet,” “put one’s foot on the table,” “tapping one’s feet,” “shifting weight from one foot to another,” “standing with weight on one foot,” “shaking the foot,” “stomping,” “jumping,” “skipping,” “hopping,” “pussyfoot,” “tip-toe,” “kicking” or “shuffling feet,” “wiggling the toes,” “dangling

shoe,” “ankle locking,” “feet edging”; *oyog‘inisudramoq*,
oyog‘inido‘ppillatmoq, *oyog‘iniyergazarbbilanurmoq*, *gurs-*
gursqadamtashlamoq, *depsinmoq*,
oyog‘ibilanbirornarsanitepmoq, *shippilabketmoq*,
pildirabketmoq, *lapanglabyurmoq*, *oqsamoq*, *hakkalamoq*,
ortgatisarilmoq, *oldingaqadamtashlamoq*,
oyog‘iniuchidayurmoq, *sollanibyurmoq*, *oyog‘iniquo‘ymoq*,
oyog‘initortmoq, *oyoqlariniyig‘ishtirmoq*,
oyoqlarinichetgasurmoq, *oyoqtomongao‘tirmoq*,
oyog‘inichalmoq, *oyog‘iniuzatmoq*, *oyog‘inicho‘zmoq*,
oyog‘initipirlatmoq, *oyog‘inichalishtirmoq*, *oyoquchidaturmoq*,
tizzasigashapatilamoq, *tizzasiniquchmoq*....*Sirojiddinbo‘lsa*,
hubirsafargidek,
yaltiroqtuflikiyibolganoyoqlarinichalishtiribSherzodningkaravoti
dao‘tiraredi. [18:86]. *Elmira oyoqlarinisudragudekbo‘lib*,
ayvondano‘tdi-da, *oshxonagakirdi*. [18:158].

5. *Metaphorical and cultural extensions through phraseological representation of the concept*

The phraseological units involving the foot/*oyoq* lexeme are also considered linguistic realizations of the foot concept. The national and cultural specificity of “foot” as a linguo-cultural concept in English and Uzbek is most clearly reflected in the primordially national somatic phraseological units, which can be divided into the following categories:

- **English and Uzbek “foot” idioms reflecting physical condition of a person:** English idioms: “stretch one’s legs,” “run off one’s legs (feet),” “set foot into,” “to trample under foot,” “put your feet up”; Uzbek idioms: health – *oyoqqaturmoq* – to stand on one’s feet, *oyoqdanqolmoq* – to get off one’s feet, *og‘iroyoq* – to carry a baby in her belly; life stage: *oyog‘inigo‘rtortmoq* – to have one foot in the grave; visit – *oyoqqo‘ymoq*, *qadamqo‘ymoq* – to set a foot, to step, *oyog‘iuzilmoq* – stop visiting; rest – *oyoqningchigaliniyozmoq*, *oyoquzatmoq* – to stretch one’s

feet, to have a feet up; fatigue – *oyoqlaricharchamoq* – to have tired legs.

- **Foot – mental emotional state: love:** sweep somebody off their feet, carry somebody off his foot; **subordination:** bring somebody to heel, fell to his knees, bend the knee to smb, on bent knees ; **fear:** have a cold feet, with your tail between your legs, hang a leg; **stubbornness:** dig your heels/toes in, with both feet against; anger: make sb's toes curl, pull smb's leg; **awkward position:** flat-footed; put your foot in your mouth, get up with the wrong foot foremost, etc.
- **Oyoq – mental and emotional state: fear:** *tizzalariqaltiramoq* – trembling knees, *oyoqlarichalishibketmoq* – legs will be crossed; **stubbornness:** *oyoqtirabolmoq* – to pull the leg, *ikkioyoq nibiretikkatimoq* – to put both feet in one boot; **anxiety:** *oyog' ikuygantovuqdek* – like a chicken with a burnt leg; **humility:** *oyog' iga bosh urmoq, poyiga bosh urmoq* – fall at one's feet (for begging for forgiveness)
- **Foot – social affiliation:** stretch (one's) legs according to the coverlet, follow in sb's footsteps, effect a footing, keep one's footing, loose one's footing, regain one's footing, stand on one's own legs/feet, get a leg up on, feel (or find) your legs (feet), pussyfoot, bind/ tight sb. hand and foot, gain a foothold, set sb beneath the foot, etc.
- **Oyoq – social affiliation: basis, foundation, support –** *oyoqqaqo'ymoq* – to put on one's feet, *oyoqqaturmoq* – be (back) on your feet, *oyog'idanchalmoq* – give (smb) a foot, to strike one's feet, *oyog'igaboltaurmoq* – to strike one's feet with an axe (to strike a disqualifying blow); **humiliation:** *oyoqostibo'lmoq (qilmoq)* – to be (make) trampled underfoot; **humility, submission:** *oyog'iga bosh urmoq* – to bow one's head to one's feet, *tizcho'ktirmoq* – to kneel; **restraint:** *oyog'igatushovbo'lmoq* – to be bound by one's feet, *oyoq-qo'linibog'lamoq* – to tie one's hands and feet.
- **Foot – personal character:** talk the hind legs off a donkey, shake a free leg, put one's best leg first, Achilles' heel, cloven hoof, feet of clay, the bee's knees, footless, sure-

footed, put your right foot foremost, put one foot in front of the other, footpad, think on your feet, let the grass grow under your feet, have two left feet.

- **Oyoq – personal character: self-control:** *oyoqolish* – to walk (as a behavior); mischief: *oyoqchiqarmoq* – to become out of control, *sayoq* – wanderer, roamer, *suyuqoyoq*, *yengiloyoq* – a woman with a bad reputation, *qadaminichakkibosmoq* – to misbehave, to mischieaf; **arrogances:** *oyog'iyerdanuzilmoq* – to lift one's feet off the ground (to become boastful, arrogant), *oyoquchidako'rsatmoq* – to show with the tip of the toe (to set beneath the foot); **slowness:** *itningkeyingioyog'ibo'lmoq* – to be the last leg of a dog (to be late for an appointment), *oqsamoq* – to limp (to fall behind); **agility:** *oyoq-qo'lichaqqon* – nimble with hand and feet: *Keyinkelinposhshaningoyoq* – *qo'lichaqqonemasligi,...dostonbo'ldi.* (157). (Then everyone said that the daughter-in-law was not nimble with her hands and feet.)
- **Foot – physical speed:** take to one's legs; put one's best leg first, fleet of feet, run a good foot, foot it, take to one's feet, be rushed/ run off your feet, run off one's feet, be light on your feet
- **Oyoq – physical speed:** agility, speed: *oyoq-qo'liyengil*, *oyog'ichaqqon* – light on the feet, nimble on the legs, *oyoqniqo'lgaolmoq* – to foot it, *chopmoq*, *yugurmoq* – to run, *tuyog'inisqiqillatmoq* – to have a leg bail; *shaxdamqadamtashlamoq* – stride; slow movement: *oyog'inisudrabbosmoq* – drag one's feet.

The process of formation of phraseological units at the verbal level means that the denotative is abstracted from the specific image of the denotative as a result of the metaphorization of the semantics included in the denotation. The first meaning of the combination drag one's feet is walk slowly and wearily or with difficulty. "They dragged their feet through the orchard towards the house." Its second meaning is be deliberately slow or

reluctant to act. “The government has dragged its heels over permanent legislation.” Thus, as a result of the metaphorization of the semantics “walk slowly,” “wearily,” “with difficulty” following the combination, the connotative semantics – “be deliberately slow to act” is formed. “Foot” in its metaphorical meaning bottom can express negative psycho-emotional state-submission or low status in the idioms such as “bring somebody to heel,” “fell to his knees,” bend the knee to somebody,” “on bended knees,” “bring somebody to their knees,” “go on one’s knees to somebody,” “come to heels,” “under somebody’s foot/feet,” “at a person’s feet”: *tizcho’kmoq* – bend the knee, *oyoqostiqilmoq* – to trample under the foot, *oyoqostida* – under somebody foot; set somebody beneath the foot means to treat somebody with arrogance. It’s Uzbek equivalent is *oyog’ininguchidako’rsatmoq* – meaning to show somebody with the tip of the foot. Foot can denote physical condition of a person in such idioms as be dead on your feet – *oyoqlaridanjonchiqmoq*, run a good foot – *chopqirbo’moq*, pull foot – *juftaknirostlamoq*, on foot – *piyoda*, hot foot it – *tuyog’inishiqillatmoq*, give (smb) a foot – *oyog’idanchalmoq*, etc.

“In that respect he needs to keep his feet on the ground and not get carried away; Mr. Gein followed up the campaign in London with his “Independent Theatre”. It got on its feet by producing “Ibsen’s Ghosts” [Shaw, B. Mrs. Warren’s Profession, p.18]; Someday, she thought viciously, when the store was on its feet, she would pay Rhett for the misery and humiliation he was causing her [Mitchell, M. Gone with the wind, p. 635]. Thank God a thousand times. I am not under my enemy’s feet [S. Ahmad, Ufq].

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the dictionary definitions allowed us to form a preliminary idea of what the meaning of the concept of foot/*oyoq* is, which allows us to determine the limits of the speech situations in which this word can be used. The conceptual signs of the foot concept, determined on the basis of lexicographic analysis, show that the foot concept is divided into physical and

mental conceptual spheres corresponding to the structure of the concept under study.

The analysis of the concept "foot" in English and Uzbek demonstrates both universal and culture-specific features. While the anatomical and functional significance of the foot is universally recognized, cultural and historical factors shape its metaphorical and idiomatic expressions uniquely in each language. This comparative study underscores the interplay between language, cognition, and culture, offering valuable insights for linguistic and intercultural studies

REFERENCES

1. Kubryakova, E. S. Language and knowledge: on the way to gaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in cognition of the world / M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. - 560 p.;
2. Boldyrev, N. N. Conceptual space of cognitive linguistics // Issues of cognitive linguistics. No. 1 (001) 2004.
3. Kubryakova E. S. et al. Brief dictionary of cognitive terms. M.: Publishing house Mosk. unta, 1996.
4. Alefirenko N. F. Poetic energy of the word. Synergetics of language, consciousness and culture. M.: Academia, 2002
5. Pimenova M. V. Conceptual studies and national mentality. // Humanitarian vector. 2011. No. 4 (28), pp. 126-132
6. Popova, Z. D. Cognitive Linguistics. Moscow: 2007. 66-68 pp.
7. Kubryakova, E. S. Language and Knowledge: Towards Gaining Knowledge about Language: Parts of Speech from a Cognitive Point of View. The Role of Language in Understanding the World [Text] / E. S. Kubryakova. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2004. - 560 p.;
8. Boldyrev, N. N. Cognitive Semantics. Tambov, 2000. 123 p.
9. Popova, Z. D. Cognitive Linguistics. Moscow: 2007. 314 p.
10. Stepanov Yu. S. Constants: Dictionary of Russian Culture. Research Experience. - M.: School "Languages of Russian Culture", 1997. 40-76 pp.
11. Petrie, W. M. F. [1877]. Inductive Metrology: Recovery of Ancient Measures from the Monuments.-Kessinger Publishing, 2010.
12. Rakhmatullayev, Sh. Etymological dictionary of the Uzbek language (Turkish words). - Tashkent: 2000.

13. ЭСТЯ, I, 103; ПДП, 356; Devon, I, 112; DS, 27
14. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 10th Edition. Oxford University Press, 2020.
15. Akobirov, S.F. and b. An explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language. -M: Rus. yaz., 1981-
16. A. Hajiyeu and others. Explanatory dictionary of active words of the current Uzbek language. -T.: Sharq, 2001.-336 p
17. Paducheva, E.V. Dynamic models in the semantics of vocabulary, M., Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. P. 309
18. O'. Hoshimov, Nurborki, soya bor, T.: MERYUS, 2017.-86 b.,158

MAMADALIYEVA GULRU RAVSHANOVNA
PHD STUDENT, FERGHANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
FERGHANA, UZBEKISTAN.