JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LINGUISTIC STUDIES
VOL. 13, NO. 2, JUL-DEC 2026 – PART 2 (ISSN 2231-4075)

The Concept of Woman's Psychology in English and Uzbek Languages

GULNOZA ABDURAXMANOVNA EGAMBERDIYEVA
Namangan State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article examines the concept of woman's psychology as a unit of the conceptosphere of the English and Uzbek languages. The concept is described as a three-layered structure – notional, figurative and axiological – and its content is reconstructed by means of definitional, component (seme), nominative-field, phraseological and conceptual-metaphor analysis. The lexicographic data of English and Uzbek explanatory dictionaries are compared, the nominative field of the concept is modelled in both languages, and the phraseological units expressing inner states of restraint, endurance, longing and emotional pain are analysed. The results show that the notional layer of the concept largely coincides in the two languages, whereas its figurative and axiological layers diverge: in Uzbek the core of the field is occupied by the somatic-spiritual lexeme ko'ngil *and by units with an evaluative moral component (*sabr, andisha, uyat, mehr*), while in English the field is organised around the lexemes "heart," "mind," "feeling" and around units denoting perceptual change and emotional intensity. Both languages realise the conceptual metaphor emotion is a container, but the Uzbek material adds the metaphor of inner endurance as a burden carried in silence. The analysis also identifies a group of units that are lacunar in translation. Textual illustrations are drawn from the short fiction of Katherine Mansfield and Nodirabegim Ibrohimova. The model proposed here is intended for comparative conceptual analysis, lexicography and translation practice.*

Keywords: Concept, conceptosphere, nominative field, seme analysis, linguoculturema, phraseological unit, conceptual metaphor, emotive lexis, translational lacuna, English, Uzbek.

1. INTRODUCTION

Within the anthropocentric paradigm of modern linguistics, language is studied together with the consciousness and culture of its speakers. The central categories of this paradigm are the concept and the conceptosphere: a concept is a mental unit enriched by cultural experience and only partially verbalised, while a conceptosphere is the ordered totality of such units in a national language [25: 5]. The description of individual concepts has therefore become one of the main tasks of cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology. Among the concepts that organise the emotional and evaluative part of the conceptosphere, those connected with the inner world of a person occupy a special place, because they are verbalised indirectly: the inner state is named through the body, through space, through objects and through evaluative formulas rather than through direct terms. The concept examined in this article – woman's psychology – belongs to precisely this group. It is not a single lexeme but a structured mental formation whose content is distributed across lexical, phraseological and textual means of expression.

The relevance of the topic follows from two circumstances. First, in Uzbek linguistics a number of national concepts have been described in detail, but concepts connected with gendered emotional experience remain insufficiently studied within a comparative framework; the phraseological representation of gender concepts in English and Uzbek has been examined by N. Z. Nasrullayeva [27: 34], yet the conceptual field of inner experience itself has not been modelled. Second, comparative description of such concepts has direct practical value for lexicography and translation, since precisely these units lose part of their semantic content when rendered by single-word equivalents. The aim of the article is to describe the content and structure of the concept of woman's psychology in English and Uzbek and to establish which of its components are universal and

which are nationally specific. Four research questions organise the study: what layers constitute the concept; how its nominative field is organised in the two languages; by what lexical, phraseological and metaphorical means its components are expressed; and which units prove lacunar in interlingual correspondence.

The material of the study consists of three groups of sources: the data of explanatory dictionaries of the two languages; phraseological units denoting inner states; and textual illustrations drawn from the short fiction of Katherine Mansfield [16; 15; 19; 18; 17] and Nodirabegim Ibrohimova [5; 6; 7; 8; 9]. Literary texts are used here not as an object of literary analysis but as a source of contextual realisations, since in artistic discourse the concept is verbalised more fully than in everyday speech.

2. Literature Review and Methodology

The theoretical basis of the study is formed by conceptology, linguoculturology, cognitive semantics and comparative linguistics. The term “concept” was introduced into scholarly use by S. A. Askoldov, who described it as a mental formation replacing a multitude of objects of the same kind in the process of thinking, and who distinguished cognitive from artistic concepts [23: 269]. Cognitive semantics supplies two further instruments. The theory of conceptual metaphor explains how abstract inner states are expressed through concrete image schemas [13: 3]; frame semantics describes the stable role structure activated by a concept, which is indispensable for emotional situations, where the participants, the stimulus and the form of expression are systematically related [4: 111]. In Uzbek linguistics the corresponding apparatus has been developed within the anthropocentric paradigm: Sh. Safarov laid the foundations of cognitive linguistics and applied conceptual analysis to Uzbek material [29: 12], A. E. Mamatovanalysed the realisation of national-cultural concepts in phraseological units [14: 214], D. Ashurova and M. Galiyeva elaborated the theories of concept, frame and conceptual metaphor together with

methods of cognitive-stylistic text analysis [1: 30], and N. Z. Nasrullayeva carried out a cross-cultural comparison of gender concepts in the phraseological pictures of the English and Uzbek worlds [27: 34].

The literary component of the material is supported by scholarship on the two writers whose texts supply the contextual illustrations. G. Kimber demonstrates that Mansfield's narrative technique transfers the centre of gravity from event to consciousness [12: 3], and J. Kaščáková shows how social position is converted into psychological material in her stories [10: 139]. In Uzbek literary scholarship the representation of female inner experience has been examined by Y. Eshmatova [3: 18], P. Kenjayeva [11: 12], G. Sattorova [22: 29] and K. Egamberdiyeva [2: 52], while the general theory of artistic psychologism is set out by D. Quronov [21: 218].

The methodology combines five procedures. Definitional analysis compares the lexicographic description of the key lexemes in explanatory dictionaries of the two languages. Component (seme) analysis decomposes their meanings into minimal semantic features and establishes the shared and the differential semes. Nominative-field modelling distributes the units naming the concept into nucleus, near-nuclear zone and periphery. Phraseological analysis examines set expressions as carriers of the axiological layer. Conceptual-metaphor analysis identifies the image schemas through which inner states are conceptualised. The results are then compared, and the interlingual correspondences are tested for lacunarity: a unit that requires descriptive rendering rather than a single-word equivalent is treated as nationally specific.

One methodological caution should be stated. The conclusions formulated below concern the linguistic material analysed here and the textual illustrations drawn from two authors; they describe tendencies in the organisation of the conceptual field, not psychological properties of speakers of either language. Statements of the latter type exceed what linguistic evidence can support.

3. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

3.1. *The structure of the concept*

Following the tradition established by V. I. Karasik, the concept is described here as a three-layered formation [24: 91]. The notional layer contains the conceptual core – the inner states, processes and attitudes that constitute the experience: feeling, expectation, recollection, self-evaluation. The figurative layer contains the image schemas through which these states are made perceptible: the container, the burden, the path, the wound, the light. The axiological layer contains the evaluation assigned to these states in a given linguistic culture: whether restraint is a virtue, whether the open expression of feeling is desirable, whether endurance is praised. The analytical consequence of this division is that two languages may share the notional layer and differ in the other two. The comparison must therefore proceed layer by layer. In what follows, the notional layer is reconstructed through definitional and seme analysis, the figurative layer through conceptual metaphor, and the axiological layer mainly through phraseology, since set expressions preserve evaluation most reliably [14: 214].

3.2. *Definitional analysis of the key lexemes*

The first step of conceptual analysis is the examination of dictionary definitions. In English the nuclear lexemes are “mind,” “heart,” “feeling” and “soul”; in Uzbek they are *ruh*, *ruhiyat*, *ko‘ngil*, *dil* and *qalb*. Comparison of their lexicographic descriptions reveals both a common zone and a systematic asymmetry.

The common zone is the opposition between the rational and the emotional. English “mind” is defined primarily through thinking, memory and consciousness, and “heart” through feeling, sympathy and courage; Uzbek *aql* corresponds to the first pole and *ko‘ngil*, *dil*, *qalb* to the second. At this level the notional layer of the concept coincides: both languages divide inner life into a rational and an emotional domain and possess lexical means for naming each.

The asymmetry appears in the second step. The Uzbek lexeme *ko‘ngil* has no single-word English equivalent: it simultaneously denotes the seat of emotion, the disposition towards another person, the state of mood and the moral inclination of the subject. Its semantic structure includes at least four semes: emotional centre; attitude to another; momentary state; moral orientation. English “heart” shares the first two semes, but the fourth is realised in English by separate units (“conscience,” “goodwill”), which means that a semantic component integrated in one language is distributed across several units in the other.

A similar asymmetry is observed in the lexeme *ruhiyat*. English “psychology” denotes both the science and, in a weaker sense, the mental make-up of a person; Uzbek *ruhiyat* is used predominantly in the second meaning and carries an additional seme of the inner, hidden, non-observable sphere. This explains why in Uzbek scholarly and artistic discourse *ruhiyat* collocates freely with *tasvir* (representation) and *olam* (world), whereas the English “psychology” does not form comparable collocations without an explicit qualifier.

3.3. *The nominative field of the concept in Uzbek*

The nominative field of a concept is the totality of the language units that name it and its features [28: 60]. In Uzbek the nucleus of the field is occupied by *ko‘ngil* and its synonyms *dil*, *qalb*, *yurak*, together with the generalising lexeme *ruhiyat*. The near-nuclear zone contains units naming typical states: *sog‘inch* (longing), *hasrat* (grief expressed in speech), *iztirob* (torment), *tashvish* (worry), *umid* (hope), *mehr* (tender affection), sabr (patient endurance).

The periphery of the field is formed by units with a pronounced evaluative component: *andisha* (consideration for others that restrains one’s own expression), *uyat* (shame as a social-moral regulator), “or” (honour understood as a collective property), *iffat* (modesty). These units are decisive for the axiological layer, because they do not merely name a state: they simultaneously evaluate it and prescribe behaviour.

A textual illustration may be taken from the Uzbek corpus. In *Chorshanbauchunko‘ylak* the state of waiting is expressed not by a verb of emotion but by a recurring temporal marker and an object of appearance; the emotional content is inferred from the disproportion between the modesty of the routine and the weight it carries [5]. This is a characteristic mechanism: in Uzbek the concept is frequently verbalised through the periphery of the field through objects, through evaluative units and through silence rather than through direct emotive nomination.

3.4. *Seme analysis of the nuclear lexemes*

Component analysis makes the asymmetry described above measurable. The Uzbek lexeme *ko‘ngil* decomposes into the semes: [emotional centre] + [attitude towards another person] + [momentary state] + [moral inclination]. English “heart” decomposes into [emotional centre] + [attitude towards another person] + [courage]; the seme [moral inclination] is absent, while [courage] is absent in the Uzbek unit. Thus two units that dictionaries present as equivalents share only two of four semes.

The same procedure applied to state-names shows a finer asymmetry. Uzbek *sog‘inch* contains the semes [absence of the object] + [duration] + [emotional pain] + [attachment]; English “longing” contains [absence of the object] + [desire] + [intensity], while [duration] is expressed separately. Uzbek “hasrat” contains [pain] + [verbal expression to another person]; English “grief” contains [pain] + [loss] without the seme of verbalisation, which in English is rendered analytically, for example by “to pour out one’s grief.”

These results confirm the general principle formulated by V. A. Maslova: national specificity is concentrated not in the core meaning but in the additional semes, which are precisely the ones that a one-word translation eliminates [26: 44].

Associative and contextual evidence supports the field model. In Uzbek, collocation patterns show that the nuclear lexeme attracts verbs of filling, emptying, breaking and lifting: *ko‘nglito‘ldi*, *ko‘nglibo‘shadi*, *ko‘nglibuzildi*, *ko‘ngliniko‘tardi*. The verb series itself therefore carries part of the conceptual content, since it presents the inner centre as a vessel whose state

changes. English collocations with “heart” form a comparable but not identical series: “the heart sank,” “the heart lifted,” “to break someone’s heart”, in which vertical movement is more productive than filling.

A further distributional observation concerns intensifiers. Uzbek prefers reduplication and paired words to express intensity of feeling – *ich-ichidan*, *sog‘inib-sog‘inib*, *o‘ksinib* – whereas English relies on adverbial intensification and on verbs with a built-in component of intensity – “desperately,” “overwhelmed,” “consumed.” This difference belongs to the means of expression rather than to the content of the concept, but it is systematic and therefore relevant for translation, where reduplicated forms are regularly neutralised.

3.5. *The nominative field of the concept in English*

In English the nucleus of the field is occupied by “mind,” “heart” and “feeling,” with “self” as a generalising unit that has no exact Uzbek equivalent. The near-nuclear zone contains units naming states: “longing,” “anxiety,” “grief,” “joy,” “bliss,” “tenderness,” “restraint,” “loneliness.” The periphery includes units denoting the perception and evaluation of one’s own state: “awareness,” “realization,” “self-consciousness,” “embarrassment.”

Two features of this organisation deserve attention. First, English possesses a developed subfield of units denoting the sudden change of an inner state or of its interpretation – “realization,” “recognition,” “disillusionment.” Uzbek expresses the same content analytically, by combinations of a verb and a noun, which shows that the corresponding semantic zone is nominatively weaker. Second, the English periphery contains numerous reflexive units formed with “self-”, which reflects the lexical codification of the reflexive attitude towards one’s own experience.

The textual material confirms this organisation. In ‘Bliss’ the heroine’s state is named directly at the outset and then reinterpreted, so that the lexeme denoting joy is semantically reversed by the end of the narrative [15]; in “Miss Brill” the decisive moment is precisely one of recognition, in which the previous interpretation of the situation collapses [16]. In both

cases the conceptual work is performed by units of perception and evaluation, that is, by the periphery of the English field.

The peripheral zone of the English field deserves one further comment. Units formed with the prefix "self-" constitute a compact subsystem – "self-consciousness," "self-doubt," "self-possession," "self-reproach" – that lexicalises the reflexive relation of the experiencer to her own state. Uzbek expresses these meanings analytically, most often through constructions with "o‘z" and a noun, or through descriptive phrases. The presence of a morphologically regular series in one language and of an analytic construction in the other indicates a different degree of codification of the same conceptual zone, not its absence.

3.6. *Phraseological realisation and the axiological layer*

Phraseology preserves the value layer of a concept more reliably than free word combinations, because set expressions are reproduced ready-made and therefore transmit the evaluation attached to them [14: 214; 27: 34].

In Uzbek the inner experience of a woman is verbalised by an extensive series of units built on the lexeme *ko‘ngil*: *ko‘nglito‘lmoq* (to feel fulfilled), *ko‘ngliqolmoq* (to be disappointed in someone), *ko‘nglibuzilmoq* (to be moved to tears), *ko‘ngliniko‘tarmoq* (to comfort). A second, equally productive series is built on the idea of keeping the state inside: *ichigayutmoq* (to swallow something inwardly), *dardiniichigasolmoq* (to put one's pain inside), *sir tutmoq* (to keep a secret), *sabrqilmoq* (to exercise patient endurance). The evaluation carried by this second series is positive: restraint is presented as a moral achievement.

English possesses functionally comparable units – "to keep it to oneself," "to bottle up one's feelings," "to have a heavy heart," "to put on a brave face." The evaluative component, however, differs. "To bottle up" carries a negative or at least cautionary evaluation, since the suppressed emotion is presented as harmful; Uzbek *ichigayutmoq* is evaluatively ambivalent and in many contexts approving. This divergence belongs to the axiological layer of the concept and cannot be captured by translation alone.

The literary material illustrates the same asymmetry. In the Uzbek corpus the unspoken complaint appears as considerateness within a close relationship [8], whereas in the English corpus silence is connected with uncertainty and with a recognition that resists formulation [19; 18].

3.7. *Conceptual metaphors of inner experience*

The figurative layer of the concept is organised by conceptual metaphors [13: 3]. Three schemas are productive in both languages.

1. **Emotion is a Container**: In Uzbek this schema underlies *ichigayutmoq*, *dardiniichigasolmoq*, *ko'nglito'lmoq*; in English, "to bottle up," "to be filled with joy," "to pour out one's heart." The schema is thus universal, but its lexical realisation differs: in Uzbek the container is most often the inner self or the *ko'ngil*, in English it may also be an external vessel.
2. **Emotional State is a Burden**: English "a heavy heart," "to carry a grief"; Uzbek *dardtortmoq*, *yuk bo'lmoq*, *og'irko'ngil*. In the Uzbek material this schema is reinforced by the positive evaluation of endurance: the burden is not only carried but carried in silence, which links the figurative layer directly to the axiological one.
3. **Inner Life is a Space**: Both languages conceptualise the inner world as a place that can be entered, closed or illuminated: *ko'ngilolami*, *dilgayo'ltopmoq*; "inner world," "to close oneself off." The textual realisations follow the same schema: in "Prelude" the household functions as an extension of the inner space of its female inhabitants [17], and in *Vozkechilgankitoblar* an object marks the boundary between a present routine and a displaced inner need [9].

3.8. *The frame of female emotional experience*

Frame analysis makes it possible to describe the situational structure activated by the concept [4: 111]. The frame of emotional experience contains five stable slots: the experiencer, the stimulus, the inner state, the form of expression, and the

addressee of the expression. In both languages the first three slots are filled similarly, and the corresponding lexical means are largely equivalent. The systematic difference lies in the fourth and fifth slots. In Uzbek the slot of expression is frequently filled by units of suppression (*ichigayutmoq*, *indamaslik*, *sabrqilmoq*), and the addressee slot is occupied by a person within the family or the immediate community, which imposes a moral constraint on expression. In English the expression slot is more often filled by units of verbalisation or of internal recognition ("to realize," "to admit to oneself"), and the addressee may be the experiencer herself. This distribution is confirmed by the textual material: in the Uzbek stories the inner state is typically not addressed to anyone and becomes visible through behaviour [6; 7], whereas in the English stories it is frequently addressed to the experiencer's own consciousness and becomes visible through free indirect discourse [15; 16].

3.9. *Lacunarity and interlingual correspondence*

The comparison identifies a group of units for which the other language has no single-word equivalent. From Uzbek into English these are: *ko'ngil* (emotional centre, disposition and moral inclination in one unit), *andisha* (restraint motivated by consideration for others), *uyat* (shame as a social-moral regulator rather than an individual emotion), *sabr* (patient endurance evaluated positively), *mehr* (tender affection with a component of care and duty).

From English into Uzbek the lacunar units are chiefly those of the reflexive and perceptual subfields: "self-consciousness," "realization," "embarrassment," "privacy." Each of them is rendered in Uzbek by a descriptive construction, which confirms that the corresponding semantic zone is organised differently rather than absent. The test applied here is simple and verifiable: if a unit passes into the other language as a single word without semantic loss, it belongs to the universal part of the concept; if it requires an explanatory or descriptive rendering, it belongs to the nationally specific part. On this criterion, the notional layer of the concept is largely universal, while its axiological layer is predominantly national. The practical consequence concerns

translation and lexicography. A bilingual dictionary entry for such units should contain not only an approximate equivalent but also the evaluative component and a typical context, since it is the evaluation, not the denotation, that is lost in a one-word rendering.

3.10. *The concept in contemporary usage and in artistic discourse*
The conceptual field described above is not static. Contemporary Uzbek prose shows a gradual redistribution of its zones: units of the evaluative periphery lose part of their regulative force, while units naming individual states and their reflexive perception become more frequent. M. Qo‘chqorova describes this process as a search for new forms of expression in recent Uzbek prose [20: 41], and the same tendency is visible at the lexical level in the increasing use of analytical constructions denoting self-perception. Artistic discourse is particularly informative for conceptual analysis because it verbalises what everyday speech leaves implicit. In ordinary communication an inner state is rarely described in detail; in a literary text the same state is unfolded through a chain of nominations, images and evaluative formulas. This is why literary material is used here as a source of contextual realisations rather than as an object of literary interpretation [21: 218].

Two clarifications follow from this use of the material. First, the frequency of a unit in a literary text does not prove its frequency in the language: an author may prefer peripheral units for stylistic reasons. Second, the reverse is also true: a unit that is rare in dictionaries may be central in a given idiolect. For this reason the textual evidence in this study is used only to confirm distributions that have already been established on lexicographic and phraseological material.

3.11. *Methodological implications for comparative conceptual analysis*
The analysis suggests three requirements for the comparative description of concepts of inner experience. The first is layer-by-layer comparison: since the notional layer frequently coincides while the axiological layer diverges, a comparison conducted at

the level of general meaning will conclude that the concepts are identical and will miss precisely what is nationally specific.The second requirement is the priority of phraseology in establishing evaluation. Free word combinations reflect the speaker's momentary intention; set expressions reproduce the evaluation codified by the linguistic community. Where the two conflict, the phraseological evidence is more reliable for reconstructing the axiological layer [14: 214].

The third requirement is the systematic use of the lacunarity test. A single-word equivalent that appears adequate in a dictionary may conceal a lost evaluative seme; conversely, a unit rendered by a long descriptive phrase is not necessarily culturally unique, since the difference may be purely structural. The test is therefore applied here not in isolation but together with seme analysis, which identifies exactly which component is lost. Taken together, these three requirements make the description reproducible: another researcher working with the same dictionaries, the same phraseological material and the same criteria should arrive at a comparable field model. Reproducibility is precisely what distinguishes conceptual analysis from impressionistic commentary on national character.

3.12. *Practical application: dictionary entry and translation decisions*

The field model has a direct application in bilingual lexicography. A dictionary entry for a unit belonging to the axiological periphery should contain four elements: an approximate equivalent, the differential seme that the equivalent does not convey, a typical collocation, and a usage note indicating the evaluation. For example, an entry for *andisha* would give "consideration, restraint" as the equivalent, the differential seme [restraint motivated by regard for another person], the collocation *andishaqilmoq*, and a note that the unit is evaluatively positive. An entry constructed in this way transmits the conceptual content rather than a nominal correspondence. In translation practice the same model supports decision-making at three points. When a nuclear unit is involved, a functional equivalent is normally sufficient, since the notional layer is

shared. When a peripheral evaluative unit is involved, compensation is required: the evaluation lost in the lexical choice must be restored through context, through an adjacent evaluative statement, or through the selection of a collocation that carries a comparable attitude. When a phraseological unit of suppression is involved, literal rendering is the least adequate solution, because the evaluative component is reversed in the target language.

A separate case is the translation of silence. Where the original leaves an inner state unverbalised, an explanatory addition in the target text destroys the conceptual signal: the absence of nomination is itself a means of expression. This observation follows directly from the frame analysis above, in which the slot of expression may be filled by suppression, and it is confirmed by the textual material of both corpora [8; 18]. Finally, the model is applicable in teaching. In courses on comparative linguistics and translation the five-step procedure used here – definitional analysis, seme decomposition, field modelling, phraseological analysis, lacunarity test – can be applied by students to any concept of inner experience, which turns an abstract theoretical scheme into a reproducible analytical routine.

3.13. *Comparative interpretation*

The results of the comparison are summarised in Figure 1. Two conclusions follow. First, the notional layer of the concept coincides in the two languages: both possess developed means for naming emotional states, their causes and their intensity. Second, the figurative and especially the axiological layers diverge systematically: the Uzbek field is organised around a somatic-spiritual centre with a strong moral component, the English field around a rational-perceptual centre with a developed reflexive subfield.

Table 1. *The nominative field of the concept of woman's psychology in English and Uzbek*

Zone of the field	**Uzbek**	**English**	**Comparative result**
Nucleus	*ko'ngil, dil, qalb, yurak, ruhiyat*	mind, heart, feeling, self	Shared notional content; *ko'ngil* and "self" are mutually lacunar
Near-nuclear zone	*sog'inch, hasrat, iztirob, tashvish, umid, mehr, sabr*	longing, anxiety, grief, joy, bliss, tenderness, restraint	Largely equivalent nomination of states
Periphery	*andisha, uyat*, or, *iffat* – evaluative and regulative units	awareness, realisation, self-consciousness, embarrassment – perceptual and reflexive units	Different principle of peripheral organisation: moral versus reflexive
Phraseology	*ichigayutmoq*, *dardiniichigasolmoq*, *sabrqilmoq*, *ko'ngliqolmoq*	to bottle up, to keep it to oneself, a heavy heart, to put on a brave face	Comparable imagery, opposed evaluation of suppression
Conceptual metaphors	Emotion is a Container; State is a Burden Carried in Silence; Inner Life is a Space	Emotion is a Container; State is a Burden; Inner Life is a Space	Shared schemas, different lexical realisation

The textual illustrations show the same distribution at the level of discourse. In the Uzbek material the concept is realised through evaluative and peripheral means – objects, silence, behaviour, units of restraint [5; 8; 6]; in the English material it is realised through units of perception and reinterpretation [16; 15; 19]. This convergence between the lexical and the textual evidence strengthens the reliability of the conclusions, since two independent kinds of material point in the same direction. It must be emphasised once more that these are properties of the linguistic material, not of speakers. A language may codify restraint positively while its speakers behave in a variety of ways; conceptual analysis describes the means that the language makes available, not the choices that individuals make [24: 91]. Contemporary Uzbek fiction itself demonstrates this: the female inner world is increasingly individualised, and the same

conceptual means are used to express personal rather than typified experience [2: 52; 22: 29].

4. CONCLUSION

The study allows several conclusions to be drawn. The concept of woman's psychology can be described as a three-layered mental formation whose content is distributed in both languages across lexical, phraseological and metaphorical means. Its notional layer is largely universal: English and Uzbek both divide inner life into rational and emotional domains and possess developed nominative means for naming states, causes and intensity. The nominative fields of the concept, however, are organised differently. In Uzbek the nucleus is occupied by *ko'ngil* and its synonyms together with *ruhiyat*, while the periphery contains units with a strong moral-evaluative component – *andisha*, *uyat*, *sabr*, *mehr*. In English the nucleus is formed by "mind," "heart" and "feeling," and the periphery by units of perception and reflexive self-relation.

The figurative layer is organised by three conceptual metaphors that are common to both languages – Emotion is a Container, Emotional State is a Burden, Inner Life is a Space – but their lexical realisations differ, and in Uzbek the burden schema is reinforced by the positive evaluation of silent endurance. The axiological layer shows the greatest divergence. Uzbek phraseology evaluates restraint as a moral achievement, whereas English phraseology tends to treat suppressed emotion as harmful. Accordingly, the units expressing this evaluation are lacunar in translation, and a bilingual dictionary entry for them should record the evaluative component explicitly. The theoretical significance of the results lies in the demonstration that the boundary between the universal and the nationally specific in this concept runs not between the two languages as wholes but between the layers of the concept and between zones of its nominative field. The practical significance lies in the applicability of the model to lexicography, translation practice and university courses in comparative linguistics and linguoculturology. Further research may extend the material to

corpus data, to associative experiments with native speakers, and to a wider range of literary texts, which would make it possible to verify the proposed field model quantitatively.

REFERENCES

1. Ashurova, D. U. & Galiyeva, M. R. 2018. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Tashkent: VneshInvest Prom.
2. Egamberdiyeva, K. 2026. Jahonvamilliyadabiyotshunoslikdaayolo braziningumumiytendensiyalari. *Qo'qonuniversitetixabarnomasi*, 17B, 51-53. doi: 10.54613/ku.v17i.1444.
3. Eshmatova, Y. Istiqloldavrio'zbekqissachiligidaayolruhiyat iningbadiiytalqini: filologiyafanlaribo'yichafalsafadoktori (PhD) … dis. Toshkent.
4. Fillmore, Ch. J. 1982. Frame semantics. *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin.
5. Ibrohimova, N. 2023. Chorshanbauchunko'ylak. Sharqyulduzi, 9, 135-138.
6. Ibrohimova, N. 2024. Farzandisi. Tanlanganhikoyalar [nashretil maganqo 'lyozma.
7. Ibrohimova, N. 2024. Ikkinchiimkon. Tanlanganhikoyalar [nashretilmaganqo'lyozma.
8. Ibrohimova, N. 2025. Talvasa. *Oysiztunlar*. Toshkent: Ijodnashr.
9. Ibrohimova, N. 2024. Vozkechilgankitoblar [Elektronresurs]. Ziyouz.uz.
10. Kaščáková, J. 2009. My flowerless ones: Representations of unmarried women in the short stories of Katherine Mansfield. *Brno Studies in English*, 35/1, 137-145.
11. Kenjayeva, P. 2011. Hozirgio'zbekhikoyalaridaqahramonruhiyat initasvirlashtamoyillari: filologiyafanlarinomzodi…dis. Toshkent.
12. Kimber, G. 2018. *Katherine Mansfield's Modernist Short Stories*. Gale Researcher. Gale.
13. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
14. Mamatov, A. E. 2012. Tilgakognitivyondashuvningmohiyati nimada? O'zbektilshunosligiyingdolzarbmuammolari. Andijon.
15. Mansfield, K. 1922 Bliss. *Bliss, and Other Stories*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
16. Mansfield, K. 1923. Miss Brill. *The Garden Party, and Other Stories*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

17. Mansfield, K. 1922 Prelude. *Bliss, and Other Stories*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
18. Mansfield, K. 1923. The Daughters of the Late Colonel. *The Garden Party, and Other Stories*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
19. Mansfield, K. 1923. The Garden Party. *The Garden Party, and Other Stories*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
20. Qo‘chqorova, M. 2025. *Yangiso‘zaytishehtiyoji: tadqiqotvatalqin*. Toshkent: Yangiasravlodi.
21. Quronov, D. 2018. *Adabiyotnazariyasiasoslari*. Toshkent: Akademnashr.
22. Sattorova, G. Y. 2020. Bugungihikoyalardaayolobrazitalqini. *Scientific Work*, 08/57, 29-32.
23. Аскольдов, С. А. 1997. Концепт и слово. Русская словесность. От теории словесности к структуре текста: Антология. М.: Academia.
24. Карасик, В. И. 2002. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград: Перемена.
25. Лихачёв, Д. С. 1993. Концептосфера русского языка. Известия РАН. Серия литературы и языка, 52/1, 3-9.
26. Маслова, В. А. 2001. Лингвокультурология. М.: Академия.
27. Насруллаева, Н. З. 2018. Гендерные концепты во фразеологической картине мира английского и узбекского языков: автореф. дис.… DSc. Ташкент.
28. Попова З. 2001. Д., Стернин И. А. Очерки по когнитивной лингвистике. Воронеж: Изд-во ВГУ.
29. Сафаров, Ш. 2006. Когнитивтилшунослик. Жиззах: Сангзор.

GULNOZA ABDURAXMANOVNA EGAMBERDIYEVA
INDEPENDENT RESEARCHER,
NAMANGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <GULNOZAE24@GMAIL.COM>
ORCID: 0009-0004-9804-9204