

Linguocultural Study of Anthropocentric Phraseological Units in English and Uzbek

JABBAROVA ANORA JAVLIYEVNA
Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This study investigates anthropocentric phraseological units in English and Uzbek from comparative linguocultural and cognitive perspectives, focusing on the interaction between universal mechanisms of human conceptualisation and culturally specific phraseological representation. The research employed a balanced dataset of 600 phraseological units, comprising 300 English and 300 Uzbek expressions, classified into eight semantic domains. An integrated methodology combining semantic classification, cognitive analysis, linguocultural interpretation, corpus-assisted verification, and quantitative statistical procedures was applied. The findings revealed a statistically significant difference in the distribution of semantic domains between the two languages ($\chi^2(7, N = 600) = 23.63, p = .0013$, Cramér's $V = .198$). English phraseology showed a comparatively stronger representation of emotional-psychological and intellectual-cognitive domains, whereas Uzbek demonstrated greater concentration in character-related and moral-evaluative categories. In contrast, no statistically significant cross-linguistic differences were identified in the distribution of metaphorical and metonymic mechanisms ($\chi^2(2) = 3.99, p = .136$) or evaluative polarity ($\chi^2(2) = 1.96, p = .375$). The equivalence analysis further showed that only 22.7% of the mappings displayed full linguocultural equivalence, while 62.0% represented partial conceptual or functional-semantic correspondence. The results indicate that English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseology shares relatively stable cognitive mechanisms but differs in the cultural selection, semantic prioritisation, and

conventionalisation of figurative images. The study contributes to comparative phraseology, Cultural Linguistics, cognitive semantics, translation studies, and bilingual lexicography.

Keywords: Anthropocentric phraseology; phraseological units; linguocultural analysis; English; Uzbek; conceptual metaphor; cultural conceptualisation; cross-linguistic equivalence; cognitive semantics; comparative phraseology.

1. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary linguistic research has increasingly shifted from viewing language primarily as an autonomous structural system towards interpreting it as a cognitive, cultural, and socially embedded phenomenon. Within this paradigm, the human being occupies a central position as both the producer and interpreter of linguistic meaning. Such an anthropocentric orientation assumes that linguistic structures are shaped by human perception, bodily experience, emotions, value systems, patterns of social interaction, and culturally conditioned ways of conceptualising reality. Consequently, language is not merely a means of naming objects and transmitting information; it also functions as a mechanism through which speakers conceptualise themselves, other individuals, interpersonal relations, and the surrounding world.

Phraseology represents one of the most productive domains for investigating this relationship between language, cognition, and culture. Phraseological units are relatively stable combinations whose meanings often cannot be reduced to the literal meanings of their individual components. Their semantic structure incorporates metaphorical imagery, evaluative meanings, historical associations, collective experience, and culturally conventionalised models of interpretation. As Moon [1] demonstrates in her corpus-based study of English fixed expressions and idioms, phraseological meaning and function become fully interpretable only when such expressions are examined in their textual and communicative contexts. From this perspective, phraseological units constitute not simply lexicalised

linguistic forms but repositories of socially shared knowledge and culturally established patterns of categorisation.

The cultural dimension of phraseological meaning is particularly significant from an anthropocentric perspective. Human beings conceptualise abstract phenomena through recurring domains of embodied and social experience, including the body, emotions, movement, interpersonal relations, work, family, morality, status, and social behaviour. Conceptual metaphor theory has shown that figurative expressions are closely connected with systematic patterns of human cognition rather than functioning as isolated rhetorical devices [2]. At the same time, cross-cultural research demonstrates that even when certain conceptual mechanisms have an experiential or potentially universal basis, their linguistic realisations may differ considerably across cultures [3]. Such variation results from historically developed cultural models, social practices, value orientations, environmental conditions, and conventional symbolic associations.

This relationship is especially apparent in anthropocentric phraseological units, understood in the present study as stable figurative expressions whose semantic focus is the human being and different dimensions of human existence. This category includes units representing physical appearance and bodily states, intellectual abilities, emotions and psychological conditions, character traits, moral qualities, interpersonal behaviour, social status, actions, and evaluative attitudes towards individuals. Expressions involving body parts are particularly significant in this respect because bodily experience frequently serves as a conceptual source for describing non-physical domains such as courage, fear, sincerity, intelligence, responsibility, anger, affection, or social relations. Thus, anthropocentric phraseology provides an especially productive linguistic domain for reconstructing culturally embedded models of the person.

The linguocultural approach makes it possible to move beyond a purely structural or semantic description of such expressions. Wierzbicka [4] argues that culturally significant linguistic concepts provide access to the values and interpretative patterns characteristic of particular speech communities.

Similarly, Dobrovol'skij & Piirainen [5] emphasise that conventional figurative units are connected with conceptual images whose interpretation may depend on culturally specific knowledge. Accordingly, apparently synonymous phraseological units in two languages may differ in their internal imagery, cultural motivation, evaluative orientation, stylistic markedness, and pragmatic potential. Conversely, expressions that are formally and imagistically different may perform comparable conceptual and communicative functions.

A comparison between English and Uzbek is particularly informative in this respect. The two languages belong to different genetic and typological systems and developed within substantially different historical and sociocultural environments. English phraseology has evolved within a broad Anglo-European cultural space and incorporates imagery associated with religious tradition, classical heritage, maritime experience, commerce, social institutions, literature, and everyday practices. Uzbek phraseology, in turn, has developed within the historical and cultural environment of Central Asia and reflects traditional forms of social interaction, family and kinship relations, hospitality, community-based values, everyday material culture, historical memory, and locally conventionalised ethical norms. The comparison of their phraseological systems can therefore reveal both shared mechanisms of human conceptualisation and culturally specific strategies for linguistically constructing the image of the person.

Existing studies have examined English and Uzbek phraseological units from structural, semantic, translational, cognitive, and linguocultural perspectives. Recent comparative research has also addressed selected semantic domains, including time and space, household vocabulary, flora and fauna, and other culturally relevant categories. Nevertheless, much of this research remains centred either on individual thematic groups or on establishing lexical-semantic correspondences between the two languages. A systematic comparison of English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseological units that integrates semantic structure, conceptual motivation, cultural symbolism, evaluative meaning, and cross-linguistic equivalence remains comparatively

underdeveloped. This gap is particularly important because anthropocentric phraseology provides direct linguistic evidence of how different speech communities conceptualise human character, emotion, behaviour, morality, social interaction, and personal identity.

Another unresolved issue concerns the relationship between universality and cultural specificity. Since human beings share broadly comparable physiological and emotional experiences, phraseological systems frequently display parallel conceptualisations. For instance, the heart, head, hand, eye, face, and other body parts may function in many languages as metaphorical sources for emotions, cognition, control, agency, attention, reputation, or interpersonal attitudes. However, the specific semantic extensions and cultural evaluations associated with these components need not coincide. Kövecses [3] notes that conceptual metaphors may demonstrate considerable cross-cultural variation at more specific levels of linguistic representation. Consequently, the identification of a general conceptual parallel does not automatically imply complete phraseological equivalence.

Against this theoretical background, the present study investigates the linguocultural characteristics of anthropocentric phraseological units in English and Uzbek. Its primary aim is to determine how the concept of the human being is encoded through phraseology in the two languages and to identify the universal and culturally specific mechanisms underlying this representation. The analysis focuses on the semantic domains represented by anthropocentric phraseological units, their dominant metaphorical and metonymic models, their evaluative characteristics, cultural motivations, and patterns of interlingual correspondence.

More specifically, the study addresses the following research questions: 1) which semantic and conceptual domains dominate the anthropocentric phraseology of English and Uzbek; 2) what metaphorical, metonymic, and culturally symbolic mechanisms motivate these units; 3) which anthropocentric phraseological models demonstrate cross-linguistic universality and which reveal language-specific cultural conceptualisation; and 4) how

do similarities and differences between English and Uzbek phraseological units reflect culturally embedded perceptions of human character, emotion, behaviour, morality, and social relations?

The novelty of the research lies in treating anthropocentric phraseology as an integrated linguocultural system rather than as a collection of isolated idiomatic equivalents. By combining comparative phraseology with cognitive and linguocultural interpretation, the study seeks to establish correspondences not only at the level of lexical meaning but also at the levels of conceptual imagery, cultural motivation, evaluative semantics, and pragmatic function. Such an approach provides a more comprehensive explanation of why conceptually comparable human experiences may be phraseologically encoded through similar images in some cases and through culturally distinctive models in others.

The study is expected to contribute to comparative phraseology, cultural linguistics, cognitive semantics, and intercultural communication. Its findings may also have practical relevance for phraseological lexicography, translation studies, foreign-language teaching, and the interpretation of culturally marked figurative language. More broadly, the comparative analysis of English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseological units provides an opportunity to clarify how universal human experience interacts with culturally specific knowledge in shaping the phraseological representation of the human being.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of phraseology has undergone a substantial theoretical transformation over the last several decades. Earlier approaches tended to define phraseological units primarily in terms of structural stability, semantic unity, reproducibility, and restrictions on lexical substitution. More recent scholarship, however, has progressively moved beyond purely structural classifications and has addressed phraseological units as multidimensional phenomena situated at the intersection of lexicon, grammar, cognition, discourse, and culture. Cowie [6],

in his comprehensive account of phraseological theory and application, demonstrated that conventional multi-word expressions form a broad continuum extending from relatively transparent collocations to highly idiomatic constructions. This understanding is particularly relevant to anthropocentric phraseology because expressions describing human emotions, intellectual characteristics, moral qualities, physical behaviour, and interpersonal relationships may display substantially different degrees of semantic transparency and structural fixedness.

A major theoretical development in phraseology concerns the reassessment of the traditional assumption that all idioms are entirely non-compositional. Nunberg, Sag & Wasow [7] argue that idiomaticity cannot be reduced to semantic opacity alone and distinguish between idiomatically combining expressions and idiomatic phrases. In the former, individual components retain identifiable contributions to the figurative interpretation, whereas in the latter, the meaning is associated predominantly with the construction as a whole. This distinction is methodologically important for comparative research because apparently equivalent English and Uzbek phraseological units may differ not only in lexical composition but also in the extent to which their figurative meanings can be reconstructed from their constituent elements.

Psycholinguistic evidence has further challenged the treatment of idioms as unanalyzable lexical wholes. Gibbs, Nayak & Cutting [8] experimentally demonstrated that idiomatic expressions vary in their degree of semantic analyzability and that this variation influences their processing. Their findings indicate that the internal semantic structure of an idiom remains cognitively relevant even when its global meaning is conventionalised. Similarly, Cacciari & Tabossi [9] showed that the recognition and comprehension of idiomatic meaning depend on such factors as predictability, contextual activation, and the point at which an expression becomes identifiable as idiomatic. Taken together, these studies imply that phraseological meaning emerges through an interaction between lexical conventionalisation, semantic motivation, cognitive processing,

and contextual interpretation rather than through the mechanical retrieval of an indivisible semantic unit.

The concept of formulaicity has broadened this perspective further. Wray [10] treats formulaic sequences as an essential component of linguistic competence and argues that language users rely extensively on prefabricated or semi-prefabricated sequences in both production and comprehension. From this standpoint, phraseological units constitute part of a larger system of conventional linguistic patterns stored and retrieved with varying degrees of holistic organisation. For anthropocentric phraseology, formulaicity is particularly significant because socially recurrent evaluations of human beings – such as descriptions of intelligence, courage, generosity, dishonesty, anger, fear, or social behaviour – may become conventionalised through repeated phraseological patterns. Their recurrence therefore reflects not only linguistic economy but also the stabilisation of socially shared conceptual and evaluative models.

Cognitive linguistic research has considerably expanded the interpretation of phraseological motivation. Langlotz [11] proposes that idioms should be examined as cognitively motivated constructions whose semantic structure can remain accessible to language users and may support systematic variation in discourse. His corpus-based analysis demonstrates that idiomatic expressions are not necessarily rigid units incapable of modification; rather, their creative transformation is constrained by underlying conceptual structures. This approach is especially useful for anthropocentric phraseology because a large proportion of expressions concerning human personality, emotions, behaviour, and social relations are organised through metaphorical and metonymic mappings. Consequently, a comparison of English and Uzbek units requires the identification not only of their dictionary meanings but also of the conceptual mechanisms that motivate their imagery.

The relationship between phraseology and culture constitutes another major strand of research. The earlier studies discussed in the Introduction [3-5] established that conventional figurative language can encode culturally specific knowledge and that similar conceptual domains may receive different linguistic

realisations across languages. This position is further developed within Cultural Linguistics. Sharifian [12] conceptualises language as being closely associated with cultural conceptualisations, including cultural schemas, cultural categories, and cultural metaphors. These conceptualisations are not necessarily held identically by every member of a community; rather, they emerge through historically accumulated and socially distributed cultural cognition. Applied to phraseology, this perspective suggests that stable figurative expressions may preserve conventional ways of categorising human character, interpreting emotional experience, evaluating behaviour, and defining socially desirable or undesirable qualities.

Cross-linguistic phraseological research also demonstrates that similarity between idioms cannot automatically be interpreted as evidence of complete semantic or cultural identity. Piirainen [13], analysing widespread idioms across a large number of European and non-European languages, shows that figurative units may spread across linguistic boundaries through shared textual traditions, cultural contact, historical transmission, and common cultural knowledge. Thus, formal or conceptual similarity may result from different mechanisms: universal embodied experience, historical borrowing, intertextuality, or cultural diffusion. This distinction is particularly important when comparing English and Uzbek, since similarities between the two phraseological systems may arise either independently from common human experience or through broader historical and intercultural processes. An adequate comparative framework must therefore distinguish between experiential universality and historically or culturally mediated convergence.

Within Uzbek linguistics, systematic phraseological research has its own established scholarly tradition. Rahmatullayev's works played a foundational role in defining the semantic, grammatical, and lexicographic characteristics of Uzbek phraseological units. His *O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati* [14] provided a substantial empirical basis for the identification and interpretation of Uzbek phraseological expressions and remains an important lexicographic source for contemporary

research. The dictionary demonstrates the semantic richness of Uzbek phraseology and documents numerous expressions concerned with psychological states, interpersonal conduct, physical activity, social evaluation, and human character. Such material is particularly valuable for anthropocentric analysis because it enables the reconstruction of recurrent figurative models through which the human being is represented in Uzbek.

The subsequent development of Uzbek phraseological theory placed greater emphasis on the processes through which phraseological units are formed and conventionalised. Mamatov [15], investigating the formation of Uzbek phraseologisms, drew attention to the semantic and structural mechanisms underlying the emergence of stable figurative combinations. This line of research strengthened the theoretical basis for distinguishing phraseological units from free combinations and for examining their semantic integration, imagery, expressiveness, and functional properties. Nevertheless, much of the classical Uzbek scholarship was primarily concerned with the internal organisation, classification, formation, semantics, stylistics, or lexicographic description of phraseological units rather than with their systematic interpretation within a cross-cultural anthropocentric framework.

More recent scholarship has increasingly introduced linguocultural and cognitive perspectives into English-Uzbek phraseological comparison. Ashurova & Yuldoshev [16], for example, examine idioms in the two languages in relation to cultural meaning and emphasise the importance of cultural context for their interpretation. Their study reflects a broader transition from the search for direct lexical equivalence towards an examination of the relationship between language and culture. However, the analysis remains general in its coverage of idiomatic expressions and does not construct an extensive anthropocentric taxonomy integrating human character, emotions, intellect, morality, social status, interpersonal behaviour, and bodily experience within a single analytical system.

Somatic phraseology has received particular attention because the human body represents one of the most productive

source domains for figurative conceptualisation. Iskenderova [17], comparing somatic phraseological units in English, Uzbek, and Russian, identifies both cross-linguistic parallels and culturally specific differences in expressions containing such components as head, heart, hand, and eye. The study confirms that bodily experience provides a shared cognitive foundation for figurative meaning while the semantic and cultural elaboration of individual body parts may vary across linguistic communities. Recent English-Uzbek work by Sabirova [18] likewise focuses on phraseological somatisms and discusses their cultural, semantic, and metaphorical dimensions. These studies are valuable in demonstrating the anthropocentric potential of somatic vocabulary; however, somatic phraseology represents only one segment of the broader anthropocentric phraseological system.

Cross-cultural studies outside the English-Uzbek context offer additional methodological insight. Boers, Demecheleer & Eyckmans [19] demonstrated that culturally specific metaphorical imagery can influence the comprehension and memorisation of figurative idioms. Such findings reinforce the view that the interpretation of an idiom involves more than lexical knowledge: speakers may need access to the cultural assumptions and conventional imagery underlying its figurative motivation. For comparative linguocultural research, this means that interlingual correspondence should be assessed at several levels, including denotative meaning, conceptual imagery, evaluative connotation, cultural motivation, pragmatic function, and degree of phraseological conventionalisation.

A synthesis of the literature reveals three major tendencies. First, international research has developed sophisticated models for explaining phraseological compositionality, cognitive motivation, processing, variation, formulaicity, and cultural embeddedness [6-13; 19]. Second, Uzbek phraseological scholarship has established a strong descriptive, semantic, structural, stylistic, and lexicographic foundation [14; 15]. Third, recent comparative studies have begun to explore the cognitive and linguocultural dimensions of English and Uzbek idioms, particularly those containing somatic components [16-18]. Despite these advances,

the three traditions have not yet been sufficiently integrated within a unified model of anthropocentric phraseology.

The principal research gap, therefore, is not the absence of studies on English or Uzbek phraseology as such, but the limited availability of systematic research that treats anthropocentric phraseological units as a coherent linguocultural subsystem in both languages. Existing English-Uzbek studies tend either to discuss phraseology at a general comparative level or to concentrate on restricted lexical domains, most notably somatic components. Consequently, broader human-centred semantic categories – such as intellect, emotional state, character and temperament, moral evaluation, physical condition, volitional behaviour, interpersonal relations, social position, and culturally regulated conduct – have rarely been analysed within one comparative framework.

A further limitation concerns the criteria used to establish equivalence. Previous comparative work frequently identifies expressions as equivalent on the basis of their general figurative meanings, whereas correspondence at the denotative level does not necessarily imply equivalence in conceptual imagery, cultural associations, evaluative polarity, stylistic markedness, or pragmatic force. The present study therefore conceptualises phraseological equivalence as multidimensional. It distinguishes between full linguocultural equivalence, partial conceptual equivalence, functional-semantic correspondence, and culture-specific non-equivalence. Such a model makes it possible to explain both why certain English and Uzbek anthropocentric expressions rely on comparable embodied schemas and why other expressions conceptualise the same human quality through substantially different cultural images.

Accordingly, the present research extends previous scholarship in three respects. First, it moves beyond a predominantly somatic interpretation of anthropocentrism by considering a wider system of phraseological representations of the human being. Second, it integrates structural-semantic analysis with cognitive and linguocultural interpretation. Third, it examines universality and cultural specificity at multiple levels rather than reducing comparison to the presence or absence of

dictionary equivalents. This integrated framework provides the theoretical basis for identifying how English and Uzbek phraseology both reflects shared patterns of human embodied experience and constructs culturally distinctive models of human personality, emotion, behaviour, values, and social interaction.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. *Research design*

The present study employs an integrated comparative-linguocultural research design combining qualitative and quantitative methods. The methodological framework brings together phraseological analysis, cognitive-semantic interpretation, linguocultural analysis, contrastive analysis, and corpus-assisted verification. This combination was selected because anthropocentric phraseological units represent multidimensional linguistic phenomena whose interpretation requires consideration of their lexical structure, figurative meaning, conceptual motivation, cultural associations, evaluative orientation, and actual patterns of language use.

The unit of analysis was defined as a conventionalised multi-word expression that: 1) demonstrates relative structural stability; 2) possesses a fully or partially figurative meaning; 3) functions as a reproducible linguistic unit; and 4) directly or indirectly conceptualises a human being, human characteristics, emotional or intellectual states, physical conditions, interpersonal behaviour, moral evaluation, or social relations. This operational definition made it possible to distinguish anthropocentric phraseological units from general idiomatic expressions whose semantics do not primarily concern human experience.

The research followed a mixed qualitative–quantitative comparative model. Qualitative analysis was used to reconstruct conceptual imagery, metaphorical and metonymic motivation, cultural symbolism, and evaluative meaning. Quantitative procedures were employed to identify the distribution of major semantic categories and types of cross-linguistic correspondence. Corpus evidence was used primarily as a validation mechanism rather than as the sole source of phraseological extraction.

3.2. *Data sources and corpus compilation*

A purpose-built bilingual research corpus comprising 600 anthropocentric phraseological units was constructed for the study, with 300 English and 300 Uzbek units. A balanced design was adopted in order to prevent differences in source size from artificially influencing cross-linguistic comparisons.

English phraseological units were collected primarily from established phraseological and idiomatic dictionaries and subsequently verified against authentic language data in the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Corpus verification was particularly important for determining whether dictionary-recorded expressions remain attested in contemporary usage and for examining their contextual, evaluative, and pragmatic behaviour.

The BNC provides a large collection of British English texts representing written and spoken language, while COCA contains more than one billion words distributed across major genres of contemporary American English. These corpora therefore provided complementary evidence for British and American usage and reduced the risk of interpreting lexicographically recorded but marginal expressions as representative of contemporary English phraseology.

The Uzbek dataset was compiled primarily from Rahmatullayev's *O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati* [14], supplemented, where necessary, by other normative and scholarly phraseological sources. The authenticity and contextual functioning of the selected Uzbek units were additionally checked through the Uzbek National Corpus, including its lemma, token, concordance, phrase-search, and parallel-corpus functions. The use of corpus evidence was particularly relevant for identifying contextual meaning, detecting lexical or grammatical variation, and establishing the contemporary functional status of selected units.

The corpus compilation process involved three consecutive stages. First, an initial pool of anthropocentrically relevant units was extracted from phraseological dictionaries and scholarly sources. Second, the units were screened according to predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Third, eligible units were

classified and corpus-validated before being entered into the final comparative dataset.

3.3. *Inclusion and exclusion criteria*

To improve analytical consistency, phraseological units were selected according to explicit criteria.

An expression was included in the corpus when it met the following conditions:

1. it was recorded as a conventional phraseological or idiomatic unit in an authoritative lexicographic source;
2. its meaning referred primarily to a human characteristic, state, behaviour, action, interpersonal relationship, or social evaluation;
3. its global meaning was fully or partially figurative rather than completely literal;
4. the expression demonstrated a sufficient degree of structural or lexical stability;
5. its meaning could be interpreted independently of a single literary or historical context; and
6. its contemporary or established usage could be supported through lexicographic or corpus evidence.

Expressions were excluded when they represented ordinary free combinations, highly specialised professional terminology, individual authorial metaphors, obsolete forms without sufficient relevance to the contemporary language system, literal descriptions of body parts, or expressions whose semantics were primarily object-, nature-, or event-centred rather than human-centred.

These criteria were particularly important for somatic expressions. The mere presence of a body-part lexeme did not automatically qualify an expression as anthropocentric. For instance, the analytical focus was placed on cases where a somatic component metaphorically or metonymically conceptualised an emotional, psychological, intellectual, moral, behavioural, or social property of a person.

3.4. *Semantic classification of anthropocentric phraseological units*

Following preliminary semantic analysis, the units were organised into eight major anthropocentric domains. The classification was based on the dominant semantic function of each expression rather than solely on the lexical component appearing in its surface structure.

Table 1. *Semantic classification framework*

Code	Semantic domain	Main analytical focus
AP-1	Physical state and appearance	health, strength, weakness, fatigue, appearance and bodily condition
AP-2	Emotion and psychological state	happiness, sadness, anger, fear, anxiety, affection and emotional control
AP-3	Intellect and cognition	intelligence, stupidity, understanding, memory, attention and decision-making
AP-4	Character and temperament	courage, patience, stubbornness, modesty, impulsiveness and other personality traits
AP-5	Moral and evaluative qualities	honesty, dishonesty, generosity, selfishness, loyalty, hypocrisy and moral judgement
AP-6	Volition, action and behavioural disposition	effort, initiative, passivity, persistence, control and purposeful activity
AP-7	Interpersonal relations and communication	agreement, conflict, trust, hostility, cooperation and communicative behaviour
AP-8	Social status and social behaviour	prestige, reputation, authority, dependence, humiliation and socially regulated conduct

Where an expression potentially belonged to more than one category, classification was determined according to its dominant conventional meaning in dictionary definitions and corpus contexts. Secondary semantic features were recorded separately and used in qualitative interpretation.

Such categorisation permits anthropocentrism to be analysed as a broader phenomenon than somatic phraseology alone. Body-

part expressions are therefore treated as one important mechanism for conceptualising the human being rather than as the entire domain of anthropocentric phraseology.

3.5. *Cognitive-semantic analysis*

At the second analytical stage, each phraseological unit was examined for its underlying conceptual motivation. Drawing on Conceptual Metaphor Theory [2; 3] and subsequent cognitive approaches to idiomaticity [7; 8; 11], the analysis distinguished three major mechanisms:

- metaphorical motivation, in which one conceptual domain structures another;
- metonymic motivation, in which one salient element of human experience provides mental access to another concept within the same conceptual domain; and
- metaphor–metonymy interaction, in which both processes jointly contribute to phraseological meaning.

For example, body parts such as “head,” “heart,” “hand,” “eye,” “face,” and their Uzbek counterparts *bosh*, *yurak*, *qo‘l*, *ko‘z*, and *yuz* were not analysed merely as lexical components. Their functions as conceptual source domains for **intellect**, **emotion**, **control**, **agency**, **attention**, **honour**, **social image**, and other target concepts were identified. The analysis was therefore conducted at two interconnected levels:

- linguistic level: lexical composition, phraseological meaning, grammatical structure, stylistic characteristics, and contextual function;
- conceptual level: source domain, target domain, metaphor/metonymy, underlying image schema, and cultural conceptualisation.

This procedure enabled structurally dissimilar expressions to be recognised as conceptually related and, conversely, prevented structurally similar expressions from automatically being classified as semantically or culturally equivalent.

3.6. *Linguocultural analysis*

The linguocultural stage examined the culturally relevant knowledge encoded in the internal form of each phraseological unit. Following the principles of cross-cultural phraseology [5; 13] and cultural linguistics [12], the following parameters were considered:

- cultural symbolism of lexical components;
- historically conventionalised imagery;
- culturally salient behavioural norms;
- positive or negative value orientation;
- references to social relations and collective practices;
- culturally preferred models of personality;
- religious, historical, literary, or everyday cultural associations where demonstrably relevant;
- pragmatic and stylistic connotations

A distinction was made between universal experiential motivation and culture-specific conceptualisation. Similarities based primarily on the human body, basic emotional experience, perception, spatial orientation, or elementary social interaction were interpreted cautiously as possible manifestations of shared embodied cognition. Culture-specific interpretations were assigned only where the phraseological imagery or evaluative meaning could be linked to a conventionalised cultural model supported by linguistic or contextual evidence.

This distinction was introduced to avoid the methodological problem of attributing every cross-linguistic difference to culture. Typological structure, lexical conventionalisation, historical contact, semantic development, and chance convergence were also considered as possible explanations.

3.7. *Model of cross-linguistic phraseological equivalence*

English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseological units were compared using a four-level equivalence model developed for the purposes of this study:

1. **Type I:** Full linguocultural equivalence. The units demonstrate closely corresponding phraseological meaning, conceptual imagery, evaluative orientation, and pragmatic function.
2. **Type II:** Partial conceptual equivalence. The units express the same or a closely related anthropocentric concept but differ in one or more elements of imagery, lexical composition, connotation, or stylistic force.
3. **Type III:** Functional-semantic correspondence. The expressions perform comparable communicative and evaluative functions but rely on substantially different metaphorical or cultural images.
4. **Type IV:** Culture-specific non-equivalence. A phraseological unit has no conventional phraseological counterpart with sufficiently similar imagery and linguocultural content in the other language and therefore requires descriptive, contextual, or non-phraseological interpretation.

The classification can be represented schematically as:

Phraseological correspondence = semantic similarity + conceptual similarity + cultural-image similarity + evaluative/pragmatic similarity

Full equivalence was assigned only when all major parameters showed substantial correspondence. Thus, two expressions were not categorised as full equivalents merely because bilingual dictionaries supplied similar literal translations.

3.8. *Analytical procedure*

The analysis was conducted in six consecutive stages:

1. **Extraction:** potential anthropocentric phraseological units were collected from lexicographic sources.
2. **Screening:** expressions were evaluated against the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
3. **Semantic coding:** the selected units were classified into one of the eight principal anthropocentric domains.

4. **Cognitive coding:** metaphorical, metonymic, or combined conceptual motivations were identified.
5. **Linguocultural interpretation:** cultural imagery, evaluative orientation, conventional symbolism, and pragmatic characteristics were determined.
6. **Contrastive mapping:** English and Uzbek units were compared and assigned to one of the four equivalence categories.

The analytical matrix used for individual units consisted of the following variables:

Table 2. *Analytical coding matrix*

Variable	Description
Language	English / Uzbek
Phraseological unit	Canonical form
Literal image	Surface/internal imagery
Phraseological meaning	Conventional figurative meaning
Semantic domain	AP-1–AP-8
Conceptual mechanism	Metaphor/metonymy/interaction
Source concept	Body, movement, object, space, social practice, etc.
Target concept	Emotion, intellect, morality, character, behaviour, etc.
Evaluation	Positive/negative/context-dependent
Cultural motivation	Universal/shared/culture-specific
Corpus evidence	Attested contextual use
Equivalence type	I–IV

This coding system ensured that comparison was carried out systematically rather than through isolated translation equivalents.

3.9. *Quantitative analysis*

Quantitative analysis was used to complement qualitative interpretation. Frequency counts and percentage distributions were calculated for the eight semantic categories, conceptual mechanisms, evaluative orientations, and four equivalence types.

For each semantic category, proportional frequency was calculated as:

$$P_i = (f_i / N) \times 100$$

where P_i represents the percentage of a particular category, f_i is the number of phraseological units belonging to that category, and N is the total number of units analysed for the relevant language.

Because the English and Uzbek datasets contained an equal number of units, direct proportional comparisons could be made without additional corpus-size normalisation.

Where appropriate, a Pearson chi-square test was used to determine whether differences in categorical distributions between the two languages were statistically meaningful:

$$\chi^2 = \sum [(O - E)^2 / E]$$

where O represents the observed frequency and E the expected frequency.

Statistical significance was evaluated at $p < .05$. Cramér's V was additionally used as an effect-size measure for categorical associations:

$$V = \sqrt{[\chi^2 / N(k - 1)]}$$

where N denotes the total number of observations and k the smaller number of categories or groups involved in the comparison.

Statistical results were interpreted as supportive evidence rather than as substitutes for semantic and cultural analysis, since phraseological frequency differences acquire explanatory value only when considered in relation to conceptual and linguocultural patterns.

3.10. *Reliability and validity*

Several procedures were applied to strengthen methodological reliability. First, dictionary-based identification was

supplemented by corpus verification in order to reduce dependence on researcher intuition. Second, semantic classification was conducted using explicit operational definitions and a standardised coding matrix. Third, ambiguous cases were re-examined in their corpus contexts before final classification.

To evaluate coding consistency, a randomly selected 20% subsample of the research material was independently recoded according to the semantic-domain and equivalence frameworks. Inter-coder agreement was evaluated using Cohen's kappa (κ), with a value of .80 or above adopted as the criterion for strong agreement. Disagreements were subsequently reconsidered through joint semantic and contextual analysis before the final dataset was established.

Triangulation was achieved through the combination of three types of evidence:

lexicographic evidence → corpus evidence → cognitive-linguocultural interpretation

This procedure was designed to minimise overinterpretation and to distinguish conventional cultural meanings from subjective associations introduced by the researcher.

3.11. *Methodological framework of the study*

The complete analytical procedure can therefore be summarised as follows:

Phraseological dictionaries → Extraction → Anthropocentric relevance screening → Balanced dataset (English $n = 300$ + Uzbek $n = 300$) → Corpus-based contextual verification → Eight-domain semantic classification → Metaphor–metonymy analysis → Linguocultural interpretation → Four-level equivalence analysis → Quantitative comparison → Identification of universal and culture-specific anthropocentric models

This multidimensional methodology enables the study to move beyond the traditional search for dictionary equivalents. It treats English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseological units

simultaneously as conventional linguistic constructions, cognitive representations, evaluative devices, and carriers of culturally distributed knowledge. Consequently, the framework provides an empirical basis for examining the central research question of how universal human experience and culturally specific conceptualisation interact in the phraseological construction of the human being.

4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

4.1. Distribution of anthropocentric phraseological units across semantic domains

The quantitative analysis of the balanced dataset revealed both common tendencies and notable cross-linguistic differences in the semantic organisation of English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseology. The 600 phraseological units were classified into eight semantic domains according to the dominant human-centred meaning identified in their conventional usage.

For each category, its proportional frequency was calculated according to the following formula:

$$P_i = (f_i / N) \times 100$$

where P_i = percentage of a semantic category; f_i = number of phraseological units in the category; N = total number of phraseological units in the relevant language.

For example, the proportion of English phraseological units expressing emotion and psychological state was calculated as:

$$P = (70 / 300) \times 100 = 23.33\%$$

The resulting distribution is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *Distribution of English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseological units by semantic domain*

Code	Semantic domain	English, n	English, %	Uzbek, n	Uzbek, %	Difference, pp
AP-1	Physical state and appearance	30	10.0	46	15.3	-5.3
AP-2	Emotion and psychological state	70	23.3	47	15.7	+7.7
AP-3	Intellect and cognition	50	16.7	30	10.0	+6.7
AP-4	Character and temperament	35	11.7	50	16.7	-5.0
AP-5	Moral and evaluative qualities	28	9.3	50	16.7	-7.3
AP-6	Volition, action and behavioural disposition	32	10.7	22	7.3	+3.3
AP-7	Interpersonal relations and communication	34	11.3	35	11.7	-0.3
AP-8	Social status and social behaviour	21	7.0	20	6.7	+0.3
Total		300	100.0	300	100.0	—

The results indicate that emotion and psychological state (23.3%) constituted the largest semantic group in the English dataset. This category was followed by intellect and cognition (16.7%), character and temperament (11.7%), and interpersonal relations and communication (11.3%). By contrast, the Uzbek dataset showed its highest proportions in character and temperament (16.7%) and moral and evaluative qualities (16.7%), followed by emotion and psychological state (15.7%) and physical state and appearance (15.3%).

These differences suggest that the two phraseological systems organise human-centred experience in partly different ways. English anthropocentric phraseology in the analysed dataset demonstrated a comparatively stronger concentration on internal psychological experience and cognitive ability, whereas Uzbek phraseology displayed a relatively greater concentration on moral evaluation, personal character, and physically or socially observable properties of the individual.

The difference should not, however, be interpreted as evidence that English culture is inherently more individualistic or that Uzbek culture is inherently more morality-oriented. Phraseological distributions alone cannot justify such broad cultural generalisations. Rather, the results indicate differences in

the linguistic conventionalisation of particular anthropocentric concepts within the sampled phraseological inventories.

4.2. *Statistical significance of cross-linguistic differences*

To determine whether the observed distributional differences were statistically significant, a Pearson chi-square test was performed.

The chi-square statistic was calculated according to the formula:

$$\chi^2 = \sum [(O - E)^2 / E]$$

where O = observed frequency; E = expected frequency.

Expected frequencies were calculated as:

$$E = (\text{row total} \times \text{column total}) / \text{grand total}$$

For example, the total number of phraseological units classified under emotion and psychological state was:

$$70 + 47 = 117$$

The expected frequency for English was therefore:

$$E = (300 \times 117) / 600 = 58.5$$

The English contribution of this cell to the chi-square statistic was:

$$(70 - 58.5)^2 / 58.5 = 2.26$$

The overall test produced the following result:

$$\chi^2(7, N = 600) = 23.63, p = .0013$$

Since $p < .05$, the null hypothesis that semantic-domain distribution is independent of language was rejected. The result indicates that the overall distribution of anthropocentric

phraseological units differs significantly between English and Uzbek.

However, statistical significance alone does not indicate the magnitude of the association. Cramér's V was therefore calculated as an effect-size measure:

$$V = \sqrt{[\chi^2 / N(k - 1)]}$$

where $\chi^2 = 23.63$; $N = 600$; $k = 2$, representing the smaller dimension of the contingency table.

$$V = \sqrt{[23.63 / (600 \times 1)]} = \sqrt{0.03938} = 0.198$$

Accordingly, Cramér's $V = 0.198$. The association can therefore be characterised as relatively modest. This result is theoretically important: English and Uzbek phraseology displays statistically detectable semantic variation, yet the overall effect size remains limited, indicating a substantial shared anthropocentric conceptual basis.

4.3. *Category-level analysis*

Adjusted residuals were additionally examined to identify which categories contributed most strongly to the overall chi-square result.

The adjusted residual may be expressed as:

$$AR = (O - E) / \sqrt{[E(1 - R)(1 - C)]}$$

where R = corresponding row proportion; C = corresponding column proportion.

As a conventional interpretative criterion:

$$|AR| \geq 1.96$$

indicates a cell contributing notably to the overall difference at approximately the .05 level.

Table 4. *Major category-level contrasts*

Semantic domain	English %	Uzbek %	Difference, pp	Adjusted residual, English	Interpretation
Physical state and appearance	10.0	15.3	-5.3	-1.96	Higher representation in Uzbek
Emotion and psychological state	23.3	15.7	+7.7	+2.37	Higher representation in English
Intellect and cognition	16.7	10.0	+6.7	+2.40	Higher representation in English
Character and temperament	11.7	16.7	-5.0	-1.76	Tendency toward higher Uzbek representation
Moral and evaluative qualities	9.3	16.7	-7.3	-2.67	Higher representation in Uzbek
Volition and action	10.7	7.3	+3.3	+1.43	Moderate English predominance
Interpersonal relations	11.3	11.7	-0.3	-0.13	Almost identical
Social status and behaviour	7.0	6.7	+0.3	+0.16	Almost identical

Three contrasts were particularly pronounced. English contained proportionally more expressions belonging to the emotion and psychological state category and the intellect and cognition category. Uzbek, in contrast, demonstrated considerably stronger representation of moral and evaluative qualities.

The most pronounced Uzbek-oriented difference was observed in AP-5: Uzbek = 16.7%; English = 9.3%, giving a difference of approximately 7.4 percentage points. The distribution suggests that a relatively large proportion of Uzbek anthropocentric phraseology in the dataset conventionally evaluates people through such dimensions as honesty, generosity, loyalty, insincerity, selfishness, dignity, shame, and socially evaluated behaviour.

The English dataset, by contrast, contained a greater proportion of expressions relating to internal cognitive and emotional conditions. This result is particularly visible in AP-2 and AP-3, which jointly represented 120 units, or 40.0% of the English dataset, whereas the same two categories represented 77 units, or 25.7% of the Uzbek dataset.

At the same time, the combined categories of character and moral evaluation constituted 63 units (21.0%) in English and 100

units (33.3%) in Uzbek. This contrast provides one of the clearest quantitative indicators of different semantic emphases within the two phraseological systems.

4.4. *Conceptual motivation: Metaphor and metonymy*

The next stage examined the mechanisms underlying figurative conceptualisation. Each unit was classified as predominantly metaphorically motivated, metonymically motivated, or based on metaphor–metonymy interaction.

Table 5. *Conceptual mechanisms underlying anthropocentric phraseology*

Conceptual mechanism	English, n	English, %	Uzbek, n	Uzbek, %
Metaphorical motivation	174	58.0	151	50.3
Metonymic motivation	72	24.0	91	30.3
Metaphor–metonymy interaction	54	18.0	58	19.3
Total	300	100.0	300	100.0

Metaphorical motivation dominated both languages: English = 58.0%; Uzbek = 50.3%. Metonymically motivated units were somewhat more frequent in Uzbek (30.3%) than in English (24.0%), while metaphor–metonymy interaction showed very similar proportions (English = 18.0%; Uzbek = 19.3%).

A chi-square test conducted for these three conceptual mechanisms yielded:

$$\chi^2(2, N = 600) = 3.99, p = .136$$

The corresponding effect size was:

$$V = \sqrt{[3.99 / (600 \times 1)]} = 0.081$$

Unlike the semantic-domain distribution, the distribution of basic cognitive mechanisms did not differ significantly between the two languages ($p = .136 > .05$). This result provides an important answer to the universality-versus-specificity question raised in the ‘Literature Review.’ English and Uzbek differ in what human characteristics are most densely phraseologised, but they remain

considerably closer in how figurative meanings are cognitively constructed. In both systems, metaphor represents the dominant mechanism, while metonymy and metaphor–metonymy interaction play secondary but substantial roles.

The finding supports the assumption that basic figurative mechanisms originate partly in shared human bodily and cognitive experience, whereas the specific lexical and cultural realisations of those mechanisms are more susceptible to cultural conventionalisation.

4.5. *Somatic conceptualisation*

Somatic components formed one of the most productive sources of anthropocentric imagery in both languages. Particularly recurrent components included English “head,” “heart,” “hand,” “eye,” and “face,” and Uzbek *bosh*, *yurak*, *ko‘ngil*, *qo‘l*, *ko‘z*, and *yuz*.

The comparison revealed two principal types of correspondence. The first involved shared conceptual mappings, where comparable body parts were associated with similar abstract domains. For example, “head/*bosh*” was frequently related to cognition, rational control, confusion, and responsibility, while “hand/*qo‘l*” was associated with agency, ability, control, assistance, or participation.

The second involved culture-sensitive somatic selection, where conceptually similar emotional or evaluative meanings were constructed through different anatomical components. The English concept “heart,” for instance, has substantial semantic overlap with both Uzbek *yurak* and *ko‘ngil*. Consequently, a direct one-to-one lexical equation “heart” = *yurak* is insufficient for linguocultural analysis.

Depending on the phraseological context, the functional correspondence may instead be represented as:

HEART → YURAK / KO‘NGIL / BAG‘IR

This is an important example of why literal lexical equivalence does not necessarily correspond to conceptual equivalence. The relevant comparison must be carried out at the level of the

phraseological image and culturally conventionalised conceptual function.

Lexical form $\neq$ conceptual function
Conceptual equivalence $\neq$ lexical identity

4.6. *Evaluative orientation*

Anthropocentric phraseological units were also examined according to their dominant evaluative polarity.

Table 6. *Evaluative orientation of the analysed phraseological units*

Evaluative orientation	English, n	English, %	Uzbek, n	Uzbek, %
Positive	91	30.3	104	34.7
Negative	157	52.3	154	51.3
Context-dependent / ambivalent	52	17.3	42	14.0
Total	300	100.0	300	100.0

Negative evaluation constituted the largest group in both languages: English = 52.3%; Uzbek = 51.3%. The near-identical proportions are noteworthy. They indicate that anthropocentric phraseology performs a strong regulatory and critical function in both linguistic communities. Phraseological expressions frequently mark deviations from desirable behavioural, intellectual, emotional, or moral norms.

The statistical comparison produced:

$$\chi^2(2, N = 600) = 1.96, p = .375$$

$$\text{Cramér's } V = 0.057$$

Thus, the association between language and evaluative polarity was not statistically significant. Although the concrete cultural images differ, both systems appear to employ anthropocentric phraseology extensively as a means of negative social and personal evaluation. This finding suggests that evaluativity may constitute one of the most stable functional properties of human-centred phraseology across the two languages.

4.7. *Cross-linguistic equivalence*

A total of 300 contrastive mappings were constructed by identifying the closest Uzbek functional or semantic counterpart for each English unit. These mappings were then classified according to the four-level equivalence model described in the Methodology.

Table 7. *Types of English-Uzbek phraseological correspondence*

Equivalence type	Number of mappings	Percentage
Type I – Full linguocultural equivalence	68	22.7
Type II – Partial conceptual equivalence	102	34.0
Type III – Functional-semantic correspondence	84	28.0
Type IV – Culture-specific non-equivalence	46	15.3
Total	300	100.0

The most frequent category was partial conceptual equivalence (34.0%). These pairs shared a broadly comparable anthropocentric meaning but differed in one or more components of their internal imagery, lexical structure, evaluation, or pragmatic force.

Full linguocultural equivalents constituted only 22.7% of the mappings. This means that fewer than one quarter of the analysed units could be paired on the basis of simultaneous correspondence in semantic meaning, conceptual imagery, cultural motivation, and pragmatic orientation.

When Types II and III are combined, phraseological pairs involving some degree of semantic or functional similarity but differing in imagery account for 186 mappings, or 62.0%. This is one of the central findings of the study. The majority of English-Uzbek correspondences were therefore neither completely equivalent nor completely unrelated. Instead, they occupied an intermediate zone in which shared human concepts were represented through partially different phraseological models.

Culture-specific non-equivalence represented 46 mappings, or 15.3% of all mappings. Such units presented the greatest challenge for direct translation because their figurative meaning was strongly connected with language-specific conventionalisation or culturally salient imagery.

Full equivalence < Partial + Functional correspondence
 22.7% < 62.0%

This result confirms that direct substitution is not the dominant relationship between English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseology.

4.8. *Universal and culture-specific conceptualisation*

The combined quantitative and qualitative findings reveal three major levels of cross-linguistic relationship.

Level 1: Shared embodied conceptualisation

The first level consists of conceptual models grounded in common bodily and perceptual experience. Human body parts, physical movement, spatial orientation, temperature, vision, and physiological reactions frequently provided comparable metaphorical or metonymic source domains in both languages.

Shared bodily experience → comparable conceptual mapping → potential phraseological similarity

Such similarities are especially evident in the conceptualisation of cognition, emotional reaction, agency, attention, and physical or psychological states.

Level 2: Shared target concept but different imagery

The second and quantitatively most substantial level involves the conceptualisation of the same human quality through different source images.

Same target concept + different source domain = partial/functional equivalence

For example, two expressions may both conceptualise courage, fear, intelligence, generosity, anger, or hypocrisy, while activating entirely different figurative images. This level explains the dominance of Type II and Type III correspondences in Table 7.

Level 3: Culture-specific phraseological conceptualization

The third level contains expressions whose meanings depend more heavily on conventional cultural symbolism, historically transmitted practices, social values, or culturally preferred modes of evaluation.

Culture-specific knowledge → conventional image → phraseological meaning

Such units produce the highest degree of interlingual asymmetry and most commonly belong to Type IV.

4.9. Integrated statistical interpretation

The principal statistical results can be summarised as follows:

Table 8. *Summary of quantitative comparisons*

Variable	Statistical test	χ^2	df	p	Cramér's V	Interpretation
Semantic domains	Pearson χ^2	23.63	7	.0013	.198	Significant difference
Conceptual mechanisms	Pearson χ^2	3.99	2	.136	.081	No significant difference
Evaluative orientation	Pearson χ^2	1.96	2	.375	.057	No significant difference

The contrast between these three results is theoretically significant. The semantic composition of English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseology differed ($p = .0013 < .05$), while the distribution of metaphorical/metonymic mechanisms ($p = .136 > .05$) and evaluative polarity ($p = .375 > .05$) did not show statistically significant cross-linguistic differences.

The findings therefore support a two-level model:

Universal cognitive mechanisms + culture-sensitive semantic organisation

Anthropocentric phraseology = UCM + CSC

where UCM = universal/shared cognitive mechanisms; CSC = culture-sensitive conceptualisation.

The quantitative evidence suggests that English and Uzbek phraseology share relatively stable cognitive mechanisms of metaphorisation, metonymisation, and human evaluation, while differing more substantially in the semantic domains and culturally conventionalised images through which human experience is categorised.

4.10. *Discussion of the main findings*

The results support the theoretical argument advanced in cognitive and cultural approaches to figurative language that universality and variation should not be treated as mutually exclusive phenomena. The dominance of metaphor in both languages is compatible with the view that figurative conceptualisation is grounded in recurring patterns of embodied and cognitive experience [2; 3]. At the same time, the significant difference in semantic-domain distribution demonstrates that shared cognitive mechanisms do not result in identical phraseological systems.

This finding corresponds to Kövecses's [3] distinction between potentially universal conceptual motivation and culturally variable linguistic elaboration. English and Uzbek speakers may rely on comparable embodied experiences, such as bodily orientation, perception, movement, emotion, and physical reaction, while selecting and conventionalising different aspects of those experiences in phraseological form.

The predominance of partial and functional equivalence further supports the cross-cultural phraseological perspective proposed by Dobrovol'skij & Piirainen [5]. Formal similarity, semantic similarity, and cultural similarity must be analytically distinguished. The present results demonstrate that an expression may have a clear functional counterpart in another language without sharing its internal image.

The data also extend earlier English-Uzbek research by showing that anthropocentric phraseology should not be reduced to somatic expressions. Although body-part components constitute a highly productive source domain, the observed differences in moral evaluation, character, emotional experience, cognition, interpersonal relations, and volitional behaviour

demonstrate that anthropocentrism represents a much wider conceptual system.

Particularly noteworthy is the contrast between the semantic and cognitive findings. Whereas semantic categorisation showed a significant cross-linguistic difference, the distribution of underlying cognitive mechanisms did not. This suggests that cultural specificity is located primarily not in the existence of metaphor and metonymy themselves but in the selection, elaboration, conventionalisation, and evaluation of particular conceptual images.

Shared human experience → shared cognitive mechanisms

but:

Cultural conventionalisation → different phraseological representations

Universality ≠ identity

Cultural specificity ≠ complete conceptual incompatibility

Rather, English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseology forms a continuum extending from strong conceptual and cultural correspondence to highly language-specific figurative models.

4.11. *Main findings*

1. First, the semantic distribution of anthropocentric phraseological units differed significantly between English and Uzbek: $\chi^2(7) = 23.63$, $p = .0013$, $V = .198$.
2. Second, English showed a comparatively stronger representation of emotion and psychological state (23.3%) and intellect and cognition (16.7%), whereas Uzbek showed greater representation of character and temperament (16.7%) and moral and evaluative qualities (16.7%).
3. Third, metaphor was the dominant cognitive mechanism in both languages, and the cross-linguistic difference in metaphor/metonymy distribution was not statistically significant: $\chi^2(2) = 3.99$, $p = .136$.

4. Fourth, negative evaluation constituted approximately half of the anthropocentric phraseological inventory in both languages, with no significant difference in evaluative polarity: $\chi^2(2) = 1.96$, $p = .375$.
5. Fifth, only 22.7% of the contrastive mappings demonstrated full linguocultural equivalence, whereas 62.0% demonstrated either partial conceptual equivalence or functional-semantic correspondence.

Taken together, these findings indicate that English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseology is characterised by a combination of shared cognitive foundations and culturally differentiated semantic structuring. The principal cross-linguistic differences are therefore not found in the basic cognitive mechanisms of figurative language but in the culturally conventionalised selection of images, semantic priorities, and forms of human evaluation.

5. CONCLUSION

This study investigated anthropocentric phraseological units in English and Uzbek from a comparative linguocultural perspective, with particular attention to their semantic organisation, cognitive motivation, evaluative orientation, and types of cross-linguistic equivalence. The findings demonstrate that anthropocentric phraseology constitutes a complex linguistic subsystem in which universal human experience interacts with culturally conditioned conceptualisation.

The quantitative analysis revealed that the semantic distribution of anthropocentric phraseological units differs significantly between the two languages. English demonstrated a comparatively higher concentration of expressions related to emotion, psychological states, intellect, and cognition, whereas Uzbek showed a stronger representation of character, temperament, and moral-evaluative qualities. This confirms that the two phraseological systems do not simply encode the same human-centred concepts through different lexical forms; they

also differ in the relative prominence assigned to particular dimensions of human experience.

At the same time, the analysis of cognitive mechanisms showed a considerable degree of similarity between English and Uzbek. Metaphor was the dominant mechanism in both languages, while metonymy and metaphor-metonymy interaction also played important roles. The absence of a statistically significant difference in these mechanisms suggests that the basic cognitive processes underlying phraseological conceptualisation are broadly shared. Consequently, the principal source of cross-linguistic variation lies not in the existence of metaphor or metonymy themselves, but in the culturally specific selection, elaboration, conventionalisation, and evaluation of particular images.

The study also demonstrated that phraseological equivalence is multidimensional. Only a limited proportion of the analysed correspondences could be classified as fully equivalent at the semantic, conceptual, cultural, and pragmatic levels. The majority of English-Uzbek mappings displayed partial conceptual equivalence or functional-semantic correspondence. This finding is especially important for comparative phraseology and translation studies because it confirms that formal or dictionary-based equivalence cannot be treated as sufficient evidence of linguocultural identity.

Somatic phraseology proved to be one of the most productive areas of anthropocentric conceptualisation in both languages. However, the analysis showed that apparently corresponding body-part lexemes do not always function identically across the two systems. The English concept represented by *heart*, for example, may correspond in Uzbek to *yurak*, *ko'ngil*, or other culturally established conceptual components depending on context. This confirms that phraseological comparison must operate at the level of conceptual and cultural function rather than literal lexical matching.

Another important finding concerns evaluative orientation. Negative evaluation represented approximately half of the anthropocentric phraseological material in both languages. This suggests that phraseology performs an important social-

regulative function by encoding culturally conventionalised judgements about desirable and undesirable human behaviour, emotional states, intellectual qualities, and moral characteristics. Despite differences in concrete imagery, the general evaluative function of anthropocentric phraseology appears to be relatively stable across English and Uzbek.

The principal theoretical contribution of the study lies in the proposed integrated interpretation of anthropocentric phraseology as the interaction of two dimensions: shared cognitive mechanisms + culture-sensitive semantic organisation. This model helps reconcile universality and cultural specificity. Human beings share comparable bodily, emotional, perceptual, and social experiences, which provide a common cognitive basis for figurative conceptualisation. At the same time, speech communities selectively conventionalise these experiences through historically and culturally specific phraseological images.

The findings contribute to comparative phraseology, cognitive semantics, linguocultural studies, and Cultural Linguistics by demonstrating that anthropocentric phraseological units should be analysed as culturally embedded conceptual structures rather than as isolated idiomatic expressions. The proposed eight-domain semantic classification and four-level equivalence model may also provide a useful methodological framework for future cross-linguistic phraseological research.

From a practical perspective, the results may be applied in bilingual lexicography, translation, foreign-language teaching, intercultural communication, and the compilation of phraseological dictionaries. In particular, translators and language learners should be aware that phraseological correspondence often depends on conceptual and cultural function rather than literal similarity. This is especially relevant for units expressing emotions, morality, character, social behaviour, and culturally marked forms of evaluation.

The study has several limitations. The research corpus was restricted to 600 phraseological units, and although the dataset was balanced between English and Uzbek, it cannot represent the full phraseological inventories of either language. In addition,

corpus evidence for English is substantially richer than for Uzbek, which may influence the depth of contextual verification. Future studies may therefore expand the dataset, employ larger parallel corpora, examine diachronic changes in anthropocentric phraseology, and compare additional language pairs. Further research may also investigate gender-related conceptualisation, age-related phraseology, professional identity, social hierarchy, emotion metaphors, and the translation of culturally non-equivalent anthropocentric expressions.

Overall, the study confirms that English and Uzbek anthropocentric phraseology is characterised neither by complete universality nor by absolute cultural divergence. Rather, it forms a continuum in which shared human cognition provides the basis for figurative conceptualisation, while cultural experience determines the preferred semantic domains, symbolic images, evaluative patterns, and conventional forms through which the human being is linguistically represented.

In this sense, anthropocentric phraseology may be regarded as one of the clearest linguistic domains through which the relationship between language, human cognition, and culture becomes observable.

REFERENCES

1. Moon, R. 1998. Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198236146.001.0001>
2. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
3. Kövecses, Z. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614408>
4. Wierzbicka, A. 1997. *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195088359.001.0001>
5. Dobrovol'skij, D. & Piirainen, E. 2005. *Figurative Language: Cross-Cultural and Cross-Linguistic Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

6. Cowie, A. P. (Ed.) 1998. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications*. Oxford: Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198294252.001.0001>
7. Nunberg, G., Sag, I. A. & Wasow, T. 1994. *Idioms*. *Language*, 70/3, 491-538. <https://doi.org/10.2307/416483>
8. Gibbs, R. W., Jr., Nayak, N. P. & Cutting, C. 1989. How to kick the bucket and not decompose: Analyzability and idiom processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 28/5, 576-593. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(89\)90014-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(89)90014-4)
9. Cacciari, C. & Tabossi, P. 1988. The comprehension of idioms. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 27/6, 668-683. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(88\)90014-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(88)90014-9)
10. Wray, A. 2002. *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511519772>
11. Langlotz, A. 2006. *Idiomatic Creativity: A Cognitive-Linguistic Model of Idiom-Representation and Idiom-Variation in English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.17>
12. Sharifian, F. 2017. *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/clsc.8>
13. Piirainen, E. 2012. *Widespread Idioms in Europe and Beyond: Toward a Lexicon of Common Figurative Units*. New York: Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-1-4539-0845-7>
14. Rahmatullayev, Sh. 1978. *O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati* [Explanatory Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
15. Mamatov, A. E. 1999. *O'zbek tili frazeologizmlarining shakllanish masalalari* [Problems of the Formation of Phraseological Units in the Uzbek Language]. Doctoral dissertation, Tashkent.
16. Ashurova, M. & Yuldoshev, R. 2023. Linguocultural comparative analysis of idioms in English and Uzbek languages. *Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3/S/8. <https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V3SI8Y2023N42>
17. Iskenderova, K. 2025. A comparative analysis of somatic phraseological units in English, Uzbek, and Russian languages. *The Lingua Spectrum*, 1/1, 116-121.
18. Sabirova, M. R. 2025. Exploring the cultural and linguistic dimensions of phraseological somatisms: A comparative analysis of English and Uzbek languages. *Science and Society*, 8/1, 87-89.

19. Boers, F., Demecheleer, M. & Eyckmans, J. 2004. Cross-cultural variation as a variable in comprehending and remembering figurative idioms. *European Journal of English Studies*, 8/3, 375-388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1382557042000277449>.

JABBAROVA ANORA JAVLIYEVNA

PHD, PROFESSOR,

JIZZAKH STATE PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY,

UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <JABBAROVA.ANORA86@GMAIL.COM>