

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**SOMATIC COMPONENTS AS AN OBJECT OF PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN
LINGUISTICS****Etibor Murodova***Teacher of Interfaculty department of foreign languages**Chirchik state pedagogical University**e-mail address: murodovaetibor2111@gmail.com**Chirchik, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: somatic components, phraseology, linguistics, philology, idioms, metaphor, cognitive linguistics, anthropocentrism, semantic analysis, cross-linguistic study, cultural linguistics, lexical units.

Abstract: This article investigates somatic component units (SCUs) as a significant object of philological research within modern linguistics. Somatic lexemes—words denoting parts of the human body—play a crucial role in the formation of phraseological units, idioms, and metaphorical expressions across languages. The study aims to analyze the structural, semantic, and cultural features of SCUs, highlighting their universality and language-specific peculiarities. A comparative and descriptive methodology is applied, supported by corpus-based analysis of English, Uzbek, and Russian linguistic data. The findings demonstrate that somatic components are highly productive in phrase formation and reflect anthropocentric perspectives in language. These units often encode cultural values, emotional states, and cognitive patterns, serving as linguistic markers of worldview. Despite cross-linguistic similarities, significant differences are observed in metaphorical mappings and semantic extensions. The study concludes that SCUs are a vital element of linguistic research, bridging lexicology, phraseology, and cognitive linguistics, and offering insights into the interaction between language, culture, and human perception.

Received: 01.06.26**Accepted:** 02.06.26**Published:** 03.06.26

Introduction. Somatic units represent a crucial layer of phraseological systems, reflecting the anthropocentric nature of language. Human bodily experience plays a central role in conceptualizing abstract domains such as emotions, cognition, and social relations, as demonstrated in cognitive linguistics research. Units containing body-part lexemes occupy a central position in phraseological systems because the body provides a universally accessible experiential base that is readily mapped onto abstract domains. Yet the philological analysis of such units is not exhausted by the well-known observation that they are frequent and expressive. Their research value lies in the fact that they concentrate several layers of linguistic information at once: historically sedimented images, conventionalized evaluative meanings, discourse routines, and culturally stabilized models of personhood. Contemporary linguistics increasingly treats phraseology as a domain where lexical meaning, grammatical patterning and pragmatic inference converge, which makes somatic units an especially revealing object for testing theoretical claims about idiomaticity and conceptualization. At the same time, the literature shows a methodological tension between approaches that interpret somatic phraseology primarily as a reflection of conceptual metaphor and those that emphasize language-specific combinatorics, collocational norms, and pragmatic constraints. In practice, many descriptions either remain at the level of illustrative glosses or, conversely, overgeneralize cultural explanations without establishing linguistic diagnostics for classification and comparison.

Lexical items denoting body parts such as head, heart, and hand—are systematically used in idiomatic expressions across languages. For example, “lose one’s head” in English reflects loss of rational control, while Uzbek “yuragi keng” expresses generosity, and Russian “золотые руки” denotes skillfulness. These examples illustrate how somatic elements encode both universal and culture-specific meanings [5, 63]. Studies in phraseology confirm that somatic expressions constitute a significant proportion of idioms and are highly productive in meaning formation [6, 20]. At the same time, cultural linguistics highlights that semantic extensions vary depending on cultural worldview and social norms.

Thus, Somatic components serve as an important object of philological research, linking lexical semantics, phraseology, and cognitive interpretation.

Materials and methods. The material for analysis was compiled through continuous sampling from authoritative explanatory and phraseological dictionaries of the target language tradition, complemented by corpus verification in a representative electronic corpus to control for frequency, genre distribution and contextual variability. The sampling principle included

stable units in which a somatic lexeme functions as a core semantic component, covering both highly idiomatic expressions and semi-fixed collocations whose meaning is partly compositional but pragmatically conventional. Each candidate unit was documented with dictionary definitions, usage examples, and, where available, stylistic labels. Corpus concordances were then used to check whether the unit displays formulaic stability, to identify typical syntactic frames, and to observe pragmatic effects such as intensification, mitigation, irony, or evaluative stance. The analysis combined componential decomposition of meaning with conceptual analysis, in which mappings from bodily experience to abstract domains were formulated as motivated links rather than as speculative cultural narratives. To ensure philological rigor, each classification decision relied on observable diagnostics: degree of lexical fixity, presence of nonliteral meaning, allowance of substitution or grammatical variation, and stability of evaluative polarity across contexts. This procedure follows the general principles of corpus-informed phraseological research and cognitive-semantic interpretation while maintaining a lexicographic sensitivity to conventional meaning and usage constraints.

This study adopts an integrative methodological framework that combines descriptive, comparative, and corpus-based approaches in order to ensure both analytical precision and theoretical coherence. The descriptive method enables the systematic identification and classification of somatic component units (SCUs), while the comparative approach facilitates the examination of cross-linguistic similarities and divergences across English, Uzbek, and Russian. The empirical dataset consists of 300 phraseological units containing somatic lexemes, extracted from authoritative lexicographic sources and representative language corpora. The selection criteria included frequency of occurrence, semantic transparency, and functional relevance in discourse. The reliance on corpus data ensures empirical validity and minimizes subjective bias in the interpretation of linguistic material.

For analytical purposes, the collected units were categorized into four principal semantic domains: emotional states, cognitive processes, social interaction, and evaluative meanings. This classification is grounded in componential analysis, which allows for the systematic decomposition of lexical meaning into distinctive semantic features. In addition, elements of conceptual metaphor theory were employed to interpret figurative meanings, particularly in cases where somatic lexemes function as source domains for abstract conceptualization. This theoretical framework provides a robust explanatory model for understanding the semantic extensions observed in phraseological units [2].

Results and discussion. The data show that somatic-component units cluster around a limited set of body-part lexemes that function as productive phraseological nuclei, with the

highest density typically associated with items denoting head, eye, hand, heart, tongue, and face. Across the corpus, these lexemes recur in patterns that form relatively stable semantic microfields. Units with head and brain predominantly signal cognition, judgment, and rational control; units with eye structure perception, attention, and surveillance meanings; hand-based units encode agency, possession, and social interaction; heart-based units foreground emotion, sincerity, and moral evaluation; tongue and mouth track speech behavior and communicative restraint; face indexes public self-presentation, shame, and reputation. In terms of idiomaticity, three empirically distinguishable groups emerge. The first includes fully idiomatic units in which global meaning is not predictable from component meanings and in which lexical substitution is minimal. The second comprises partially idiomatic units where a somatic component retains a transparent semantic contribution but the overall meaning includes a conventional evaluative or pragmatic increment. The third group consists of conventional collocations where the somatic lexeme participates in a common metaphorical extension but remains compositionally interpretable, with stability residing mainly in preferred lexical co-occurrence and register.

A second result concerns discourse function. Somatic units are not merely nominative; they frequently operate as stance markers that compress evaluation into a compact figurative formula. In narrative discourse they serve as vivid characterization devices, in argumentative discourse as rhetorical intensifiers, and in everyday interaction as socially recognizable templates for advice, reproach, or reassurance. Corpus evidence indicates that many somatic units display stable polarity: certain expressions routinely convey disapproval or suspicion, while others signal empathy or encouragement, and this polarity remains robust across genres. At the same time, a subset is pragmatically flexible and becomes a vehicle for irony or euphemism depending on context and prosody. A third result is that somatic units often show patterned grammatical behavior, for instance preference for possessive constructions, reflexive marking, or fixed prepositional frames, which contributes to their recognizability and limits their translatability by purely lexical means. Finally, comparison of dictionary descriptions and corpus usage reveals that some units are lexicographically under-specified: definitions capture propositional meaning but omit pragmatic force, typical addressee orientation, or interactional conditions of use, all of which are crucial for applied philology.

The analysis reveals that somatic component units exhibit a high degree of semantic productivity and functional versatility across all three languages. A substantial proportion of the examined units demonstrate figurative meaning, with metaphorical constructions clearly predominating over literal usage. This finding corroborates the central claim of cognitive

linguistics that abstract concepts are frequently structured through embodied experience [2]. A notable outcome of the study is the identification of stable cross-linguistic correspondences in the semantic roles of core somatic lexemes. The lexeme head consistently encodes intellectual activity and rational control, whereas heart is associated with emotional and moral evaluation, and hand typically denotes agency and social interaction. These patterns suggest the presence of universal cognitive schemas underlying linguistic expression. At the same time, the data reveal important language-specific variations. Uzbek somatic expressions tend to foreground ethical evaluation and social cohesion, reflecting culturally embedded value systems. In contrast, English idioms frequently emphasize individual psychological states and personal autonomy, whereas Russian expressions often intensify emotional experience through stylistic and semantic amplification. Such variation indicates that while the cognitive basis of somatic expressions may be universal, their semantic realization is shaped by cultural context. Corpus observations further indicate that somatic phraseological units are particularly prevalent in informal and expressive registers of speech, where they contribute to communicative efficiency and emotional nuance. Their relatively high frequency underscores their functional importance in everyday linguistic practice.

The findings of the present study lend substantial support to the theoretical premise that language is fundamentally anthropocentric in nature. The pervasive use of somatic component units demonstrates that human bodily experience constitutes a primary source for the conceptualization of abstract domains, including emotion, cognition, and social interaction. This observation aligns with the broader framework of conceptual metaphor theory, which posits that meaning is grounded in embodied cognition [2, 3-6]. At a cross-linguistic level, the observed regularities suggest that certain semantic mappings—such as associating the heart with emotion or the head with intellect—are not arbitrary but reflect deeply entrenched cognitive patterns. However, the presence of culturally specific variations highlights the role of sociocultural context in shaping linguistic meaning. In this regard, somatic expressions can be viewed as a point of convergence between universal cognition and cultural particularity.

From a philological perspective, somatic units are of particular interest due to their multifunctional character. They operate simultaneously at the levels of lexicon, phraseology, and discourse, thereby serving as a bridge between different domains of linguistic analysis. Moreover, their expressive potential enhances the pragmatic richness of communication, allowing speakers to convey complex emotional and evaluative meanings in a concise and culturally resonant form. It is also important to note that the productivity of somatic lexemes is not merely a quantitative phenomenon but reflects underlying cognitive and semantic

mechanisms. The ability of a single somatic term to generate multiple phraseological constructions indicates a high degree of conceptual flexibility and adaptability. This reinforces the view that Somatism should be regarded as dynamic elements within the linguistic system rather than static lexical units[6, 112-120].

Conclusion. In conclusion, somatic units constitute a central and highly productive domain within phraseological systems, offering valuable insights into the interplay between language, cognition, and culture. Their widespread use across languages confirms the fundamental role of embodied experience in structuring linguistic meaning.

The study demonstrates that while somatic expressions are grounded in universal cognitive principles, their semantic and pragmatic realizations are shaped by cultural and linguistic context. This dual nature underscores their significance as an object of philological research. Furthermore, the findings highlight the importance of integrating multiple methodological and theoretical perspectives in the analysis of somatic phrases, including corpus linguistics, cognitive semantics, and cultural linguistics. Such an integrative approach allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the complexity and variability of somatic phraseology.

Future research should aim to expand the empirical base by incorporating a wider range of languages and employing interdisciplinary methods. This would further illuminate the cognitive and cultural dimensions of somatic expressions and contribute to the development of a more nuanced theory of linguistic embodiment.

References:

- [1]. Apresyan, Y. D. (1995). *Lexical Semantics*. Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, pp. 45–78.
- [2]. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 3–25.
- [3]. Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture and Cognition*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 56–89.
- [4]. Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 120–145.
- [5]. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 67–102.
- [6]. Kunin, A. V. (1996). *English Phraseology*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola Publishing, pp. 112–150.
- [7]. Fillmore, C. J. (1982). *Frame Semantics*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing, pp. 111–137.

- [8]. Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 210–245.
- [9]. Gibbs, R. W. (2006). *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 89–120.
- [10]. Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 134–168.
- [11]. Fauconnier, G. (1997). *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 75–110.
- [12]. Taylor, J. R. (2002). *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 145–180.
- [13]. Vinogradov, V. V. (1977). *Russian Phraseology*. Moscow: Nauka Publishing, pp. 98–130.
- [14]. Evans, V. (2007). *Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 55–90.
- [15]. Nida, E. A. (1975). *Componential Analysis of Meaning*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, pp. 101–135.
- [16]. Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 70–105.
- [17]. Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 180–220.
- [18]. Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 50–88.
- [19]. Bartmiński, J. (2009). *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistics*. London: Equinox Publishing, pp. 120–156.