

Linguocultural Features of Somatic (Basic Anatomy) Vocabulary and Phraseology

Samadova Oydin Ilkhomjon kizi ¹

Abstract: In this article, the linguacultural features of the concept ‘*body*’, a comparative analysis was conducted with the concept ‘*body*’. Knowledge about the concepts under consideration reveals significant similarities.

Keywords: the concept ‘*body*’, phraseological unit, denotative meaning, metaphors, language and culture.

¹ Teacher of Termez State Pedagogical Institute

World of Semantics: Journal of Philosophy and Linguistics (2024)
<http://wos.semanticjournals.org/index.php/JPL.org>

Introduction

To identify the linguocultural features of the concept ‘*body*’, a comparative analysis is made with the concept ‘*body*’. In general, it can be said that the highlighted fragments of the LCM coincide, the differences are of a private character.

From the point of view of structure, verbal PU (phraseological unit) prevail in English and Russian, which is associated with the nature of somatisms. In speech, somatisms act as an instrument or object of influence, which implies the presence of action. The multiplicity of adverbial PU is dictated by the meanings of measure and degree, as well as the container that somatisms carry. In addition, the adverbial nature closely connects these PU with action. In English, there is a multiple predominance of substantive phraseological units in comparison with Russian units, which is explained to a large extent by the slang nature of the material under consideration and the lack of clear criteria for writing units in comparison with Russian material. The somatic vocabulary of the Russian language also mainly reflects nouns and adjectives. The study showed that the semantic groups of the languages under consideration coincide, and the differences are at a lower level and are of a private nature. Private differences within semantic groups include the discrepancy between connotative meanings and the difference in the volume of meaning in the units-correspondences included in this group, as well as the presence in it non-equivalent units. In addition, any seme that makes up the semantics of a group can be represented by a unit in only one of the languages.

Let us give some examples of particular differences. In the group help among PU with somatism *naming a hand*, there are PU-correspondences. These PU cannot be considered equivalent, since the PU *give a*

hand often implies *physical work* – ‘to help someone do something, especially something that involves physical effort’, the PU *lend a hand* includes the connotative meaning of psychological help and support – ‘to help someone, to provide assistance, support, to encourage’. Thus, having the same denotative meaning, these PU diverge in the connotative. Using the example of the chain *give a hand* - *give a hand* one can trace the difference in the volume of meanings of PU. The PU *give a hand* is characterized by a large volume of meaning: ‘to help, to provide assistance to someone’; the meaning of the corresponding English unit is more specific. Another particular case of differences are non-equivalent units: *put one’s best foot forward* ‘to act or appear at one’s best; to try to make a good impression’.

Basically, all units of the semantic group work indicate professional activity: *have one’s hand in the till/cookie jar* ‘to steal money from one’s employer’, *five-finger* ‘to shoplift’; *unclean on the hand* ‘a rogue, thieving, prone to fraud’. The English phraseological unit, indicating the presence of work shifts, is asymmetrical in this group: *gray eye* ‘a work shift that starts in the middle of the night’. In general, cognitive representations of body parts in Russian and English coincide. The differences are of a particular nature. Small differences are observed in the representation of species concepts. Thus, the English language has the aspectual concept ‘*chin*’, but the aspectual concept ‘*chin*’ is absent in Russian. The Russian language has the aspectual concept ‘*nozdrya*’ but the aspectual concept ‘*nostril*’ (definitions: noun- one of the paired external openings of the nose is absent in English). Differences can be manifested at the level of concepts. Thus, the semantic cognitemes reflecting the concepts GUM and DESNA do not coincide. The concept ‘*gum*’ is associated with speech production: ‘gums take part in speaking’ (1): *beat/ bump/ flap/ snap* one’s gums ‘talk, speak, converse’; *gum-beat* ‘talk, chat’; the concept ‘*gum*’ reflects a kiss: ‘the gums take part in a kiss’ (2): to play with gums ‘to kiss’. At the same time, literal cognitemes seem to be equivalent, since they reflect the external impression of these situations: ‘gums are beaten’ (3): *beat one’s gums, gum-beating*; ‘gums are flapped’ *flap one’s gums*; to hit the gums.

Differences are also observed in the prototypes ‘*heart*’. If the prototype ‘*heart*’ is represented as a unity of the emotional and rational:

‘the heart is the seat of the emotional’ (1): *do someone’s heart good* ‘make someone feel good emotionally’; *kind-hearted* ‘kind and generous’; ‘the heart is the seat of the rational’ (2): *know something by heart* ‘know something perfectly; have memorized something perfectly’; then the prototype ‘*heart*’ reflects only the emotional side: ‘the heart is the source of the emotional’ (3): to break a heart ‘to plunge someone into despair, hopelessness’, *kind-hearted* ‘having a kind heart, affectionate, sympathetic’. At the same time, this distinction is eliminated when describing concepts: ‘the heart loves’ (4): *lose one’s heart* ‘fall in love’; *heartthrob* ‘a famous person whom many young people feel romantic love for’; ‘the heart loves’ (5): to fall to one’s heart ‘to please someone’, *heartthrob* ‘someone who easily conquers other people’s hearts, makes them fall in love with themselves’; ‘the heart remembers’ (6): *enshrine someone/ someone’s memory in one’s heart* ‘keep the memory of someone in a special place in one’s heart or mind’.

The idea of the heart as a source of the rational is deeply rooted in the European tradition and goes back to the Bible [Gak 1999:264], where this word corresponds to the concepts of ‘mind’ and ‘thought’ [Barnwell et al. 2000:329]. A study of the metaphorical side of the concept ‘*body*’ showed a complete similarity in the understanding of somatisms. The most numerous groups are the subject and spatial metaphors. The differences in understanding the concept of ‘*body*’ concern only the color metaphor: in Russian, this type is auxiliary in the implementation of other metaphors, while the color does not express a specific part of the body. The commonality of ideas about body parts is explained by the appeal to archetypes, for example, ‘*far-close*’: from under (the) nose ‘in close proximity, at a very close distance from someone’, (right) under someone’s (very) nose ‘right in front of someone’ and belonging to Western culture, which is associated with an appeal to ancient Greek and Roman culture, literature: *nourish a viper/snake in one’s bosom*, to warm a snake on one’s chest; the commonality of Christian morality: *wash one’s hands of smth*, to wash one’s hands; *flesh and blood*, *flesh and blood*; reflection in the internal form

of units of everyday and culturally significant phenomena, such as robbery: twist around one's (little) finger, to lead around a finger; fights: strum heads, clean one's clock, to give on the neck; witchcraft: point the finger at someone, to show with a finger; conquests: on bended knee, to kneel; tortures: twist one's arm, to twist one's hand. Units formed on the basis of these cultural phenomena serve as a source of absolute interlingual equivalents and units-correspondences.

In general, the understanding of the world by speakers of the American version of English and Russian, represented by somatic vocabulary and phraseology, is the same. However, the minor differences in terms of representing fragments of reality explicate the uniqueness of each culture and each worldview.

1. The concept "*body*" is a multidimensional formation, which is hierarchically built into class, ordinal, generic and species concepts. The representation of the concept "*body*" is carried out by whole- and separately formed units at two cognitive levels - meaning and internal form, realized as internal and external representations of the concept under consideration. Internal representation is mainly of a verbal nature and is carried out by primary and secondary somatisms; it can be complete, in which the human body is represented in its entirety, or partial, in which only a part of the human body is represented. In addition to the direct nature of the representation of the concept under study, the internal primary complete representation also has an indirect nature of the representation of the concept "*body*", carried out only by separately formed units. External representation is carried out at the lexical (compound words) and phraseological levels with the participation of primary and secondary somatisms. By analogy with the internal, the external representation can be complete and partial.

2. The structural-semantic classification of somatic PU showed that verbal and adverbial PU are most typical for the English language, which is explained by the instrumental nature of somatisms, their perception as passive objects, in particular objects of influence, attributing to them the functions of a measure and a container. A large number of substantive PU is explained to a greater extent by the slang nature of the material under consideration and, therefore, the absence of a clear graphic representation of these units, as well as the characteristic nature of nominative-attributive chains for the English language. For somatic vocabulary, in contrast to phraseology, the most characteristic nouns and adjectives with a somatic component are most typical, which is explained by the characteristic nature of nominative-attributive chains for the English language and the presence of hidden dynamics in the semantic structure of the units under consideration. Verbs and adverbs with a somatic component are less typical for this vocabulary.

3. The cognitive analysis of the "*body*" concept is aimed at identifying conceptual features of the concept under consideration, presented in units of internal and external representation. The presented cognitivemes give a naive description of the ordinal, generic and species concepts under consideration, which is expressed, first of all, in the absence of a description of certain organs. The literal cognitivemes present the belonging of body parts to a person, their location on the body, structure, shape, color, size, quantity and appearance. Literal and semantic cognitivemes indicate injuries and diseases of body parts, as well as methods of their treatment. In literal, semantic and mixed cognitivemes, special attention is paid to the functions of body parts, in which the emphasis is placed on socially conditioned rather than physiological functions. A feature of the "*body*" concept is the transfer of functions of a certain part of the body to an adjacent one. Since a person is a unity of the spiritual and material, and the "*body*" concept represents the material, physical essence of a person, an important place is occupied by the transfer of spiritual content with the help of the material embodiment of a person, carried out by semantic and mixed cognitivemes. The centers of concentration of invisible entities are the internal organs and tissues of the body, and the explication of these categories is carried out by the integuments and external parts of the body. In associative metaphorical and metonymic cognitivemes, the commonality of primary and secondary somatisms is revealed.

Associative metaphorical cognitivemes are realized in subject, spatial, gastronomic, color, phyto-, zoo- and anthropomorphic metaphors. Associative metonymic cognitivemes are realized in the form of a synecdoche "part of the body - a person". Anthropomorphic metaphor and synecdoche reflect the connection between

the concepts ‘*body*’ and ‘*person*’. Representation of the person by the human body leads to an ideographic description of somatic vocabulary and phraseology.

4. Ideographic study of somatic vocabulary and phraseology is based on units of external representation. It showed that these units reflect a person in different guises (as a living being, describing the biological characteristics of a person, the life cycle of human existence, his psycho-emotional and physical states, physiological and mental processes, mental illnesses, appearance, internal qualities, accumulated experience and fate; as well as a social being, carrying out activities and possessing a certain behavior, attitude to different facts of reality). In the everyday world, a person is surrounded by various objects and phenomena that are commensurate with parts of the human body, and which are given a quantitative and qualitative assessment. A person thinks in abstract categories of distance, time and movement, which he also structures in terms of body parts.

5. To identify the linguocultural features of the ‘*body*’ concept, a comparative analysis was carried out with the ‘*body*’ concept. Knowledge about the concepts under consideration reveals significant similarities. However, a slight asymmetry is observed in the representation of species concepts. A comparative analysis of the external representation of the concept ‘*body*’ showed that, in general, these fragments of the English and Russian pictures of the world are the same, which is due to the coincidence of semantic groups. In semantic groups, there are particular differences at a lower level.

Conclusion The findings of this study underscore the intricate linguocultural dynamics of somatic vocabulary and phraseology, revealing both significant cross-linguistic similarities and nuanced differences. The research highlights how cognitive representations of body parts in English and Russian align in semantic structure but diverge in their cultural connotations, such as the emotional versus rational associations with the concept of the "heart." Additionally, the prevalence of specific phraseological units in English, driven by its slang influences, contrasts with the formalized structures in Russian, reflecting differing linguistic priorities. These insights have implications for cross-cultural communication, emphasizing the importance of understanding linguistic nuances to foster mutual cultural comprehension. Future research could expand this comparative analysis to include additional languages, particularly those outside the Indo-European family, to explore whether these patterns hold universally or vary across broader cultural contexts.

References:

1. Alefirenko N. F. *Frazeologiya v svete sovremennix lingvisticheskix paradigm*. M.: Elpis, 2008. 271 s.
2. Demyankov V. Z. Termin "kontsept" kak element terminologicheskoy kulturi// *yazik kak materiya smisla: Sbornik statey v chest Akademika*
3. N. Yu. Shvedovoy / Otv. Red. M. V. Lyapon. M.: Izdatelskiy tsentr
4. "Azbukovnik", 2007. S. 606-622. Yoldoshev B. Functional stylistic features in phraseologisms of the current Uzbek language. -Tashkent, 1993.
5. Mamatov A.E. Problems of lexical and phraseological norms in the modern Uzbek literary language. - Tashkent, 1991.
6. M. S. Alshynbekova, "Linguocultural Analysis of Phraseological Meanings," *Journal of Linguistic and Intercultural Education*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 9–20, 2022, doi: 10.29302/jolie.2022.2.2.
7. N. T. Dosbaeva, "The Linguocultural Analysis of Literary Translation from Uzbek into English," *Journal of Critical Reviews*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 262–265, 2020, doi: 10.31838/jcr.07.03.51.
8. M. L. Kovshova, "The Role of Linguocultural Studies in Modern Times: Basic Principles and Method of Research," *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 745–756, 2023, doi: 10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-3-745-756.

9. A. Kassymova, "Structural-Semantic and Linguocultural Aspects of Vocabulary in Social Networks," *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 2024, doi: 10.1080/15456870.2024.2418064.
10. N. A. Sergienko, "Linguomental Anthroposphere in Focus of Comparative Linguocultural Analysis," *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 93–104, 2022, doi: 10.18413/2313-8912-2022-8-1-0-6.
11. M. A. Alshynbaeva, "Linguocultural Anatomical Code: Concept of Sacredness," *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2021, doi: 10.21659/RUPKATHA.V13N1.31.
12. G. T. Mambetova, "Comparative Analysis of Phraseological Units with Somatism 'Hand' as a Way of Linguocultural Competence Formation (on the Material of Russian, Kazakh, Tuvan and English Languages)," *New Research of Tuva*, no. 4, pp. 109–123, 2023, doi: 10.25178/nit.2023.4.8.
13. E. V. Stoyanova, "Humorous Effect When Linguocultural Phenomena Are Included in Forum Comments to Media Texts," *Medialingvistika*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 254–272, 2022, doi: 10.21638/spbu22.2022.306.
14. M. B. Pavlović-Šajtinac, "Linguocultural Elements in Text of Novel 'On the Eve' and Analysis of Their Translated Equivalents in Serbian," *Nauchnyi Dialog*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 45–62, 2024, doi: 10.24224/2227-1295-2024-13-1-45-62.
15. B. M. Oybekovna, "Linguocultural Properties of Somatic Phraseological Expressions," *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 263–269, 2024.
16. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=RzAMQcgAAAAJ&citation_for_view=RzAMQcgAAAAJ:LkGwnXOMwfcC
17. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=RzAMQcgAAAAJ&citation_for_view=RzAMQcgAAAAJ:d1gkVwhDpl0C
18. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=RzAMQcgAAAAJ&citation_for_view=RzAMQcgAAAAJ:_FxGoFyzp5QC
19. <https://www.scholarexpress.net/index.php/wbss/article/view/2663>