

## COGNITIVE ANALYSIS OF CLOTHING LEXICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15501856>

**Rakhmatova Mekhriniso Musinovna**

*PhD, Docent ,*

*Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan*

**Khayrulloeva Azizabonu Tojiddinovna,**

*Master student of Bukhara state university*

### **Abstract.**

Language serves not only as a tool for communication but also as a reflection of cognitive and cultural patterns. This research explores the cognitive dimensions of clothing-related vocabulary in English and Uzbek, focusing on how lexical units encapsulate cultural values, social roles, and conceptual metaphors. Using a cognitive linguistic framework, including Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Frame Semantics, and Prototype Theory, the study analyzes clothing lexicon to uncover patterns of categorization, metaphorical usage, and cultural framing. Through a comparative analysis of dictionary entries, corpora, literature, and media, the findings reveal both universal and culture-specific conceptualizations of clothing. While English demonstrates lexical diversity and metaphorical richness shaped by industrial and fashion influences, Uzbek retains traditional expressions rooted in cultural symbolism and climate-driven needs. This study contributes to a broader understanding of the interplay between language, cognition, and culture, highlighting how everyday vocabulary encodes deeper conceptual and societal models.

### **Keywords**

Cognitive linguistics, clothing vocabulary, conceptual metaphor, prototype theory, frame semantics, cultural conceptualization, English-Uzbek comparison, lexical analysis, embodiment, metaphorical language

### **Introduction.**

Language is not merely a system of rules and structures but a reflection of human thought, culture, and experience. The field of cognitive linguistics seeks to understand how language interacts with mental processes, conceptualization, and perception. Within this framework, the vocabulary related to clothing serves as a

rich area for cognitive analysis, as it encapsulates not only physical descriptions of garments but also cultural norms, social identities, and metaphorical meanings<sup>62</sup>.

This study focuses on the cognitive analysis of clothing lexical units in English and Uzbek. Clothing-related vocabulary in any language does more than describe attire—it reflects environmental needs, historical developments, gender roles, and cultural values. For instance, while English may lexicalize clothing through industrial and fashion-driven developments, Uzbek clothing terms often retain traces of traditional, climate-influenced, and culturally symbolic expressions<sup>63</sup>. The comparison of these two languages—belonging to two different linguistic families and cultural backgrounds—offers insight into how people from distinct societies conceptualize everyday objects such as clothing.

By applying key concepts from cognitive linguistics such as categorization, conceptual metaphor, embodiment, and cultural framing, this research aims to uncover the mental representations and semantic structures underlying clothing terms in both languages. Special attention is paid to metaphorical uses of clothing terms, prototypical structures, and the influence of cultural models on the formation and understanding of these lexical units. The ultimate goal is to highlight both universal and culturally specific features in the way clothing is conceptualized in English and Uzbek, thereby contributing to the broader understanding of language and cognition.

### Methodology

This research employs a comparative and descriptive methodology within the framework of cognitive linguistics. The study focuses on the identification, classification, and analysis of clothing-related lexical units in English and Uzbek, drawing from both linguistic data and cultural context. The central aim is to uncover how these lexical units reflect different conceptualizations, metaphorical frameworks, and categorization patterns in each language.

#### 1. Research Design

The study is qualitative in nature, with elements of contrastive analysis and cognitive semantic analysis. It follows a **three-phase approach**:

- **Data Collection:** Gathering clothing-related lexicon from multiple sources.
- **Classification & Categorization:** Grouping lexical units by semantic field and cognitive categories<sup>64</sup>.

<sup>62</sup> Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.

<sup>63</sup> Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. University of Chicago Press.

<sup>64</sup> Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, pp. 132–135.

- **Cognitive Analysis:** Analyzing conceptual metaphors, prototypical structures, and cultural models.

## 2. Data Sources

To ensure a representative and culturally grounded dataset, the research draws from the following sources:

- **Dictionaries:**

- *Oxford English Dictionary* and *Macmillan Dictionary* (for English)
- *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati* and bilingual Uzbek-English dictionaries

- **Corpora:**

- *British National Corpus (BNC)*
- *Uzbek National Corpus (if available)* or online text collections (news, literature, blogs<sup>65</sup>)

- **Literary and Folklore Texts:** Clothing references in classic English and Uzbek literature.

- **Media & Advertisements:** Modern usage of clothing terms in fashion blogs, magazines, and TV shows to understand contemporary semantics<sup>66</sup>.

## 3. Data Selection Criteria

Lexical units were selected based on:

- Their relevance to the **semantic field of clothing** (e.g., names of garments, accessories, parts of clothing).
- Their **frequency** and **metaphorical use** in discourse<sup>67</sup>.
- Their **cultural specificity** (e.g., "doppi" in Uzbek, "tuxedo" in English).

## 4. Analytical Framework

The study applies concepts from **Cognitive Linguistics**, particularly:

- **Conceptual Metaphor Theory**<sup>68</sup> (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980): to explore figurative uses of clothing terms (e.g., "tight-lipped", "dressing down").

- **Frame Semantics**<sup>69</sup> (Fillmore): to understand how clothing terms evoke culturally-situated frames or scenarios.

- **Prototype Theory**<sup>70</sup> (Rosch): to identify central vs. peripheral clothing items in each language.

- **Metonymy & Embodiment:** analyzing how clothing represents body parts, roles, emotions, or social norms<sup>71</sup>.

## 5. Comparative Approach

<sup>65</sup> Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University Press, pp. 158–163.

<sup>66</sup> Baker, P. (2006). *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. Continuum, pp. 47–49.

<sup>67</sup> Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. Edward Arnold, pp. 60–63.

<sup>68</sup> Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 33–35.

<sup>69</sup> Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame Semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Hanshin, pp. 111–137.

<sup>70</sup> Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of Categorization. In *Cognition and Categorization*. Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 30–32.

<sup>71</sup> Barcelona, A. (2000). *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*. Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 31–35.

A **contrastive analysis** is conducted to compare:

- Lexical richness and categorization (e.g., how many words exist for specific clothing types).
- Metaphorical and symbolic uses (e.g., idioms like “wear the pants” vs. their equivalents in Uzbek).
- Cultural frames and cognitive models associated with clothing in both languages.

## 6. Expected Outcomes

The methodology is designed to reveal:

- How language encodes cultural attitudes toward clothing.
- How metaphorical language around clothing differs between English and Uzbek.
- Which clothing terms serve as prototypes and how these reflect each culture’s values.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Lexical Categorization of Clothing Terms

The collected data from both English and Uzbek revealed notable differences in the way clothing items are **categorized** and **lexicalized**

Semantic Category	English Example	Uzbek Equivalent
Headwear	hat, cap, beanie	do’ppi, qalpoq, shlyapa
Upper body	shirt, blouse, T-shirt	ko’ylak, futbolka
Lower body	trousers, pants, jeans	shim, jinsi
Outerwear	coat, jacket, blazer	palto, kurtka, jimjimador ko’ylak
Footwear	shoes, boots, sneakers	oyoq kiyim, etik, tufli
Accessories	belt, scarf, gloves	belbog’, ro’mol, qo’lqop

**Observation:** Uzbek often retains traditional items (e.g., *do’ppi*) that are culturally marked, whereas English reflects industrial and fashion diversity (e.g., *hoodie*, *cardigan*, *vest*<sup>72</sup>)

<sup>72</sup> Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, pp. 129–133.

## 4.2. Conceptual Metaphors Involving Clothing

Using Lakoff and Johnson's *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*, several **metaphorical patterns** were identified in both languages<sup>73</sup>.

Conceptual Metaphor	English Expression	Uzbek Equivalent / Note
CLOTHING IS STATUS/POWER	"He wears the pants in the family"	"Shlyapasini kiyib oldi" (symbol of readiness/authority)
CLOTHING IS IDENTITY	"Put yourself in my shoes"	"Ko'ylagini kiyib ko'r" (used metaphorically in some dialects)
CLOTHING IS EMOTION	"Buttoned up emotions"	Less common metaphor, Uzbek uses heart-centered expressions more
EXPOSURE = SHAME / VULNERABILITY	"Caught with your pants down"	"Uyalganidan ko'ylagining ichiga kirdi" (lit. 'hid inside the shirt')

**Interpretation:** English tends to use clothing more widely in **metaphors** related to power, emotion, and roleplay, while Uzbek relies more on **symbolic meaning and modesty norms** embedded in traditional expressions<sup>74</sup>.

## 4.3. Prototypicality in Clothing Categories

According to **Prototype Theory** (Rosch), each category has central (typical) and peripheral (less typical) members<sup>75</sup>.

- In **English**, prototypical upper-body clothing is "shirt" (neutral, unmarked).
- In **Uzbek**, "ko'ylak" covers both male and female long shirts or dresses, serving as a broader prototype.

This suggests **linguistic economy** in Uzbek, where one word (ko'ylak) can function in multiple roles that would require different words in English (shirt, dress, tunic<sup>76</sup>).

## 4.4. Cultural Framing and Symbolism

Using **Frame Semantics**, the data shows that clothing often activates cultural scenarios<sup>77</sup>:

- **English frame:** "business suit" activates the frame of professionalism, hierarchy, and formality.
- **Uzbek frame:** "atlas ko'ylak" evokes tradition, femininity, and festivity.

Some Uzbek expressions (e.g., wearing a *belbog'* in ceremonial contexts) carry **ritual and symbolic meanings**, which are less prominent in everyday English clothing terms<sup>78</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 32–35.

<sup>74</sup> Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 78–81.

<sup>75</sup> Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of Categorization. In *Cognition and Categorization*. Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 27–33.

<sup>76</sup> Taylor, J. R. (2003). *Linguistic Categorization* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, pp. 55–58.

<sup>77</sup> Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame Semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Hanshin, pp. 117–123.



#### 4.5. Loanwords and Globalization Influence

English terms like “jeans,” “T-shirt,” “sweater” are often **borrowed** into Uzbek, especially in urban and media contexts. These words are usually phonologically adapted (e.g., “jinsi” for jeans), showing how **lexical gaps** are filled under global cultural influence<sup>79</sup>.

#### Conclusion:

This study has shown that clothing-related lexical units offer valuable insight into the cognitive and cultural frameworks of language. Through a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek, it becomes evident that while both languages share universal patterns of conceptualization, such as metaphor and categorization, they diverge significantly in how clothing is framed and interpreted. English, shaped by industrialization, fashion trends, and Western social structures, exhibits a broad and specialized vocabulary for clothing. It frequently employs metaphorical expressions involving clothing to communicate identity, power, and emotion. Uzbek, by contrast, reflects a tradition-rooted lexicon where cultural symbolism, environmental factors, and multifunctional usage define clothing terms. Prototypical items like ko‘ylak demonstrate linguistic economy and semantic flexibility, while idiomatic expressions draw heavily on modesty, ritual, and social roles.

By applying key concepts from cognitive linguistics—Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Prototype Theory, and Frame Semantics—the research highlights how clothing vocabulary serves not only to describe garments but also to encode deep-seated cultural values and mental models. This contrastive study contributes to the growing body of work in cognitive linguistics by emphasizing the interplay between language, thought, and culture, and underscores the importance of culturally grounded approaches in linguistic analysis. Clothing terms reflect not only material culture but **cognitive patterns**.

- **Uzbek clothing lexicon** is more traditional and multifunctional in certain domains.
- **English clothing lexicon** shows greater specialization and metaphorical flexibility.
- Cultural scripts and values are embedded in the way clothing is **named, categorized, and conceptualized**.

<sup>78</sup> Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language*. John Benjamins, pp. 144–147.

<sup>79</sup> Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp. 164–167.

## REFERENCES:

1. Baker, P. (2006). *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. Continuum, pp. 47–49.
2. Barcelona, A. (2000). *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads*. Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 31–35.
3. Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, pp. 129–135.
4. Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp. 164–167.
6. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University Press, pp. 158–163.
7. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. Edward Arnold, pp. 60–63.
8. Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame Semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Hanshin, pp. 111–137.
9. Holland, D., & Quinn, N. (Eds.). (1987). *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. University of Chicago Press.
11. Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford University Press, pp. 95–97.
12. Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 78–81.
13. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 32–35.
14. Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of Categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and Categorization* (pp. 27–48). Lawrence Erlbaum.
15. Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualisations and Language: Theoretical Framework and Applications*. John Benjamins.
16. Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language*. John Benjamins, pp. 144–147.
17. Taylor, J. R. (2003). *Linguistic Categorization* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, pp. 55–58.
18. Urinboyev, R. (2020). *Uzbek Cultural Identity and Tradition*. Tashkent University Press

19. .Rakhmatova, M. M. (2018). Reflection of aesthetic values in the language: Uzbek "Gozal" and English "Beautiful". Impact: International journal of research in Humanities, Arts, and Literature, 6(6),[https://scholar.google.com/scholar?oi=bibs&hl=en&q=related:O2oRPSTzCSUJ:scholar.google.com/#d=gs\\_qabs&t=1744124420106&u=%23p%3DO2oRPSTzCSUJ](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?oi=bibs&hl=en&q=related:O2oRPSTzCSUJ:scholar.google.com/#d=gs_qabs&t=1744124420106&u=%23p%3DO2oRPSTzCSUJ)
20. Rakhmatova, M. (2016). Discussion on values, culture, and languages. In International Scientific and Practical Conference World science (Vol. 2, No. 11, pp. 40-42). ROST.[https://scholar.google.com/scholar?oi=bibs&hl=en&q=related:O2oRPSTzCSUJ:scholar.google.com/#d=gs\\_qabs&t=1744124552791&u=%23p%3DwrtFAmfQX4gI](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?oi=bibs&hl=en&q=related:O2oRPSTzCSUJ:scholar.google.com/#d=gs_qabs&t=1744124552791&u=%23p%3DwrtFAmfQX4gI)
21. Musinovna, R. M. (2023). Developing culture, language and literature through international literature. In Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes (pp. 82-84).