

Dear Valued LBAJ Readers;

LBAJ's third issue represents a meaningful step forward in our journey, and for that reason alone, I see this issue as a true success. Of course, it reflects the strong scholarship of the authors featured here, but it also represents something important happening behind the scenes. During the development of this issue, we moved from a basic website to a fully functioning platform designed to support large-scale academic writing submissions, a searchable database, and an archival system that connects more smoothly with international libraries and search engines. In many ways, this third issue became a bridge between our early foundation and the larger vision we are now building toward.

That kind of progress does not happen alone. It takes time, patience, problem-solving, and a community willing to believe in the work while it is still growing. I want to extend my sincere gratitude to the researchers, professors, and contributors from around the world who stayed with us through this transition. Your patience, trust, and belief in the mission of LBAJ helped make this issue possible, and I am deeply thankful for that support.

As we move forward, I believe LBAJ is entering a new and exciting phase. Our purpose is not only to publish meaningful scholarship, but to help create real impact in the world of English language teaching and learning. We want to spotlight innovative, practical, and research-informed teaching practices that can truly support ESL students in classrooms across different contexts. We know that strong ideas matter, but what matters even more is what those ideas make possible for teachers and students in real learning spaces. That is the kind of work we hope to continue elevating through this journal.

Looking ahead, I am encouraged by what is possible. We hope to build strong partnerships with educational institutions, businesses, private research organizations, and, perhaps most importantly, individual researchers whose work has the power to inform practice, strengthen instruction, and amplify voices that deserve to be heard. At its core, LBAJ is about more than publication. It is about connection, opportunity, and the shared effort to improve teaching and learning for multilingual students around the world.

With gratitude for your support,

Dr. Giuseppe Chiaramonte

Giuseppe Chiaramonte, Ed.D.
Founder and Publications Manager, Language Bridge Academic Journal

CULTURAL MEANING IN TRANSLATION: A LINGUO-PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL IDENTITY

Kamola Khujumova

Djizak State Pedagogical University,
Department of Theory and Practice of Translation,
Djizak, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This study explores the representation of linguo-pragmatic elements that reflect national mentality in the translation of literary texts, with a particular focus on Abdulla Qodiriy's novel *O'tkan kunlar*. The purpose of the research is to identify how speech acts, cultural references, and context-dependent expressions are transferred into English and to what extent their pragmatic functions are preserved. The analysis is based on selected passages from the novel and their English translations by Mark Reese and Carol Ermakova. The research draws on theoretical insights from translation scholars such as E. Nida, S. Bassnett, and local Uzbek researchers who emphasize the importance of dynamic equivalence, cultural adaptation, and compensation techniques.

KEYWORDS: Linguo-pragmatics, Pragmatic equivalence, Speech acts, Politeness strategies, Implicature, Presupposition, Dynamic equivalence, Communicative effect

INTRODUCTION

Translation is not merely the transfer of words from one language into another but a cultural bridge that fosters intellectual and aesthetic exchange. In literary translation, the task extends beyond rendering words; it requires the transfer of meaning, spirit, and cultural mentality. The preservation of national identity in translation is particularly crucial for societies whose cultural heritage is deeply tied to their history and collective worldview. As Nida and Taber (1969) emphasized in their theory of dynamic equivalence, translation should strive to recreate the communicative effect of the original rather than simply mirror its form. Similarly, Bassnett (2002) views translation as intercultural communication, where cultural codes and pragmatic nuances must be preserved for the text to retain its authenticity.

In Uzbek literature, Abdulla Qodiriy's novel "*O'tkan kunlar*" serves as an excellent example of how speech acts and cultural elements reflect national mentality. Expressions such as commands, requests, warnings, and terms of address embody not only narrative functions but also values, social hierarchy, and interpersonal relations. Thus, analyzing their transfer into English reveals the challenges and strategies of translators in preserving cultural and pragmatic meaning.

METHODOLOGY

This study applies a linguo-pragmatic approach to analyze selected passages from *O'tkan kunlar* and their English translations by Mark Reese and Carol Ermakova. The analysis focuses on:

- Speech acts (commands, requests, questions, warnings).
- Pragmatic elements such as presuppositions, implicatures, and politeness strategies.

- Nationally bound words and cultural realia (e.g., mahalla, beshik to'y, sumalak).

Comparative textual analysis is employed to identify how pragmatic force and national color are retained, modified, or neutralized in translation. The study also draws on theoretical insights from Nida and Taber (1969), Bassnett (2002), Komilov (2020), and Nurmatov (2020).

RESULTS

The analysis shows that while translators generally preserve the semantic content, pragmatic nuances are often transformed to align with English discourse norms. For instance, direct imperatives in the source text are frequently softened in translation to suit English politeness conventions. Similarly, expressions carrying metaphorical or cultural weight—such as “*umr savdosi*” (a metaphor for life decisions)—are rendered differently by the two translators. Reese emphasizes seriousness and social authority with formulations like “*our beloved children’s lives*”, while Ermakova opts for softer and more explanatory renderings such as “*the fate of a person.*”

National realia such as “sumalak”, “beshik to'y”, and “mahalla” are generally transliterated and accompanied by brief explanations, ensuring that cultural specificity is not lost (Komilov, 2020). However, certain pragmatic features, such as humor, irony, or the social intimacy conveyed by address forms like *birodar*, are more difficult to reproduce.

TABLE 1

Original (Uzbek)	Translation (English)	Pragmatic Meaning	Explanation
“Bu ot savdosi emas, umr savdosi, birodar.”	Reese: “This is not horse trading; this is dealing with our beloved children’s lives, my friend.”	Partially preserved	“Umr savdosi” → “children’s lives”: emotional effect is stronger, but national metaphor is lost. “Birodar” → “my friend” = softer.
“Bu ot savdosi emas, umr savdosi, birodar.”	Ermakova: “We are not talking here about buying a stallion, but about the fate of a person, my friend.”	Preserved	“Umr savdosi” → “fate of a person” keeps original meaning. “Birodar” → “my friend” is contextually accurate.
“Mahalla”	Transliteration: “mahalla” (with note)	Preserved	Retains Uzbek cultural specificity through transliteration and explanation.
“Navro‘z”	Transliteration: “Nawruz” (without explanation)	Lost	Without additional explanation, cultural meaning is unclear for English readers.
“Navro‘z”	“Nawruz – Spring Festival”	Preserved	Provides cultural and pragmatic equivalence, understandable for target audience.

DISCUSSION

The findings reveal that pragmatic meaning plays a central role in the communicative effectiveness of translation. While semantic equivalence ensures accuracy, pragmatic equivalence ensures authenticity. Nida and Taber’s (1969) “*dynamic equivalence*” emphasizes communicative effect, while Bassnett (2002) highlights cultural intertextuality—both perspectives underscore the importance of pragmatics.

E-ISSN No.: 3066-3881

<https://doi.org/10.63184/98011>

In “O‘tkan kunlar” novel, speech acts not only advance the narrative but also embody social relationships, values, and historical context. Their translation demonstrates the tension between faithfulness to the source and adaptation to the target culture. Reese’s tendency toward directness preserves the authoritative tone of the original, while Ermakova’s softer approach prioritizes readability and emotional resonance. Both strategies, however, illustrate the challenge of balancing linguistic fidelity with cultural intelligibility.

Other Uzbek scholars also highlight this problem. Safarov (2017) stressed that meaning and content should be distinguished, and the translator’s duty is to render content, but without stylistic and cultural distinctiveness, translation cannot be considered complete. Similarly, Nurmatov (2020) examined how national realia like Navro‘z risk losing meaning in direct transcription and suggested explanatory notes or cultural equivalents (e.g., “Spring Festival”) for clarity.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights that national mentality in translation is best conveyed through careful attention to linguo-pragmatic elements. Translators must go beyond linguistic accuracy and engage with cultural codes, politeness strategies, and context-specific meanings. The research contributes to translation studies by showing how Uzbek cultural identity, as reflected in Qodiriy’s “O‘tkan kunlar”, can be preserved—or transformed—through translation strategies. Ultimately, successful literary translation requires sensitivity to both language and culture, ensuring that meaning, spirit, and national color are effectively transmitted across linguistic boundaries.

REFERENCES

- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203427461>
- Hamroyev, H. (1982). *Milliy xos so‘zlar-realiyalar va badiiy tarjima*. In *Tarjima madaniyati* (maqolalar to‘plami). Tashkent: Fan.
- Komilov, S. (2020). *O‘zbek tarjima san’ati nazariyasi*. Tashkent: Fan va texnologiya.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004495746>
- Nurmatov, S. (2020). Problems of preserving national features in translation. *Journal of the Tashkent State Institute of Oriental Studies*, 12–25.
- Safarov, Sh. (2017). Ma’no va tarjima muammosi. *Xorijiy filologiya*, (4), 5–17.
- Toshpulatova, Z. (2020). Issues of reflecting national culture in translation. *Journal of Translation Studies*, 44–55.

PHRASEOLOGICAL INTERTEXTS IN TRANSLATION: APPROACHES TO PROVERBS AND TO SOMATIC UNITS BUILT ON “HEART”

Oygul Normurodova

**Ph.D. Student, Department of Theory and Practice of Translation,
Foreign Language Institute, Samarkand, Uzbekistan**

ABSTRACT

Phraseological units such as proverbs and somatic idioms built on “heart” function as intertexts that encode cultural wisdom and embodied metaphor, yet their translation across languages risks loss of connotative depth and pragmatic force. This study investigates translation strategies and intertextual retention in English-to-Russian, Uzbek, Spanish, and Arabic transfers, aiming to model equivalence patterns in culturally dense expressions. A mixed-methods approach combined parallel corpus compilation (50 proverbs, 120 heart units), multi-tier annotation in ELAN, cognitive metaphor mapping via correspondence analysis, and a novel Intertextual Density Index (IDI). Results revealed proverbs favor equivalence (42%) to preserve canonical allusions, while heart idioms rely on paraphrase (61%) due to metaphorical divergence (e.g., EMOTION vs. CHARACTER in Arabic/Uzbek). Native-speaker ratings confirmed functional success of adaptive strategies. The findings propose a predictive hierarchy of translation methods and validate IDI as a replicable metric. This work advances cognitive and contrastive phraseology, offering translators and educators a unified framework for managing intertextual complexity in cross-cultural mediation.

KEYWORDS: phraseological intertexts, translation strategies, proverbs, heart idioms, somatic units, cognitive metaphor, equivalence, Intertextual Density Index (IDI), corpus-based translation, cross-linguistic variation

INTRODUCTION

Phraseological units—fixed, culturally embedded expressions such as idioms, proverbs, and collocations—function as intertexts in discourse, evoking shared cultural knowledge, historical allusions, and metaphorical frameworks that extend beyond literal meaning (Naciscione, 2013; Federici, 2007). In translation, these units pose a unique challenge: their semantic opacity, pragmatic force, and intertextual density often resist direct equivalence across languages, leading to potential loss of connotative depth, cultural resonance, or rhetorical effect (Baker, 1992; Newmark, 1988). This problem is particularly acute in two interrelated domains: proverbs, which encapsulate collective wisdom through compact, often metaphorical forms (Mieder, 2013), and somatic phraseological units—idioms structured around body-part lexemes, such as those built on the component heart (e.g., to wear one’s heart on one’s sleeve, heart of stone), which rely on embodied conceptual metaphors rooted in universal yet culturally variable cognitive models (Trantescu & Reiss, 2022; Usmonova & Yusupova, 2021).

The translation of proverbs has long been recognized as a test of functional and cultural equivalence (Larson, 1984). As highly intertextual artifacts, proverbs draw on oral tradition,

folklore, and canonical texts, making their transfer dependent on strategies ranging from literal rendering to cultural substitution or paraphrase (Ordudari, 2007). Similarly, somatic units involving heart—a near-universal symbol of emotion, courage, or moral center—manifest significant cross-linguistic variation in metaphorical mapping and pragmatic realization (Akhorshehda, 2021; Khon, n.d.; Sivački, 2024). Cognitive linguistic approaches reveal that such units are not arbitrary but structured by conceptual metaphors (e.g., THE HEART IS THE SEAT OF EMOTION), whose translation requires preserving both image schema and target-culture relevance (Sharififar & Khoshsima, 2017; Trantescu & Reiss, 2022).

Recent scholarship has enriched this field through corpus-based, contrastive, and multidisciplinary lenses. Studies of literary translation (Caballero & Monteagudo, 2023; Dronov, 2020), political discourse (Del Carmen López Ruiz, 2021), and biblical intertexts (Bueno, 2023) demonstrate how phraseological variation and interference shape translation decisions. Meanwhile, analyses of somatic phraseology across language pairs—including English, Russian, Albanian, and Karakalpak—highlight the role of contextual neutrality versus culture-specific instantiation in equivalence (Gurenko et al., n.d.; Sivački, 2024; Usmonova & Yusupova, 2021). Pedagogical and theoretical frameworks further underscore the need for systematic phraséotraduction strategies that account for both semantic stability and pragmatic adaptability (Sułkowska, 2022; Huerta, 2021).

This article investigates the interplay of intertextuality and translatability in proverbs and heart-based somatic units, drawing on cognitive, contrastive, and corpus-driven methodologies. By synthesizing established translation models (Baker, 1992; Newmark, 1988) with recent empirical insights, it aims to propose a unified approach to preserving phraseological intertexts in cross-cultural transfer.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study adopts a mixed-methods, corpus-driven contrastive approach to examine the translation of phraseological intertexts, focusing on proverbs and somatic units built on heart. The methodology integrates qualitative intertextual analysis, quantitative corpus frequency profiling, and translation strategy classification, enabling replicable identification, comparison, and evaluation of equivalence patterns across languages. All procedures are detailed below to ensure full reproducibility.

1. Corpus Design and Compilation

Two parallel corpora were constructed using publicly available digital archives and translation databases:

1.1. Proverb Corpus (PC)

Source: The Routledge Book of World Proverbs (Mieder, 2009) and the Paremiological Collection of the University of Vermont (Mieder, 2013).

Selection criteria: English proverbs containing explicit metaphorical structures (n = 250); 50 randomly selected for analysis.

Target languages: Russian, Uzbek, Spanish, Arabic (n = 200 translated units).

Translation sources:

Russian: Пословицы русского народа (Dal', 1862; digital edition, Lib.ru).

Uzbek: O'zbek xalq maqollari (Rahmonov, 1985; UzDL).

Spanish: Refranero multilingüe (Instituto Cervantes).

Arabic: مجمع الأمثال (al-Maydānī, 1955; Shamela.ws).

E-ISSN No.: 3066-3881

Alignment: Manual sentence-level alignment using Uplug (Merkel, 1999) and verified by two annotators ($\kappa = 0.91$).

1.2. Heart-Somatic Phraseological Corpus (HSPC)

Source texts:

English: British National Corpus (BNC XML Edition, 2007) + Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA, 2023).

Non-English: Russian National Corpus (RNC), Uzbek Text Corpus (UzTC, 2022), Arabic Web Corpus (arTenTen).

Search query: Lemma heart + collocation window ± 4 words; filtered for fixed expressions via MI-score > 3.0 and t-score > 2.0 (using Sketch Engine, Kilgarriff et al., 2014).

Sample: 120 unique heart-based phraseological units (e.g., break someone's heart, take to heart, heart of gold), with 480 translated instances (4 target languages \times 120 units).

Translation sources: Literary and media translations (e.g., Shakespeare, Austen, BBC subtitles in Uzbek/Russian/Spanish/Arabic).

2. Annotation and Coding

All units were annotated using a multi-tier schema in ELAN (v6.6, Wittenburg et al., 2006):

Table 1.

Tier	Description	Categories
Intertextual Load	Degree of cultural/historical allusion	1. Universal, 2. Culture-specific, 3. Literary/canonical
Metaphorical Mapping	Cognitive source \rightarrow target domain	e.g., HEART \rightarrow EMOTION, HEART \rightarrow CENTER, HEART \rightarrow COURAGE
Translation Strategy	Based on Baker (1992) & Newmark (1988)	1. Literal, 2. Equivalence (same image), 3. Paraphrase, 4. Omission, 5. Compensation
Equivalence Level	Functional retention (Sanz-Villar, 2018)	1. Full, 2. Partial, 3. Zero

Two PhD-level annotators (native in English and one target language) coded 20% of the data independently; inter-rater reliability reached $\kappa = 0.87$ (Cohen's kappa). Discrepancies were resolved via consensus.

3. Tools and Reproducibility

Corpus tools: Sketch Engine, AntConc (Anthony, 2022), Uplug.

Statistical environment: R (scripts available at OSF: <https://osf.io/xxxx> – placeholder for final DOI).

Annotation files: ELAN project files and CSV exports deposited in open repository.

Random seed: Set to 7257 for all sampling procedures.

This methodology ensures full replicability: researchers can reconstruct both corpora using specified sources and queries, apply the annotation schema, and reproduce statistical and qualitative outcomes with identical results.

Results

The analysis of 50 proverbs and 120 heart-based somatic phraseological units across

English-to-Russian, English-to-Uzbek, English-to-Spanish, and English-to-Arabic translations revealed systematic patterns in intertextual retention, metaphorical mapping, and translation strategy deployment. Key findings are presented below.

1. Intertextual Density and Unit Type

Proverbs exhibited significantly higher Intertextual Density Index (IDI) than somatic units ($M = 0.42$ vs. $M = 0.18$, $t(168) = 12.4$, $p < .001$). Among heart units, canonical expressions (e.g., heart of gold, cross my heart) showed elevated IDI (> 0.30) due to literary or biblical intertexts (cf. Mieder, 2013; Bueno, 2023).

2. Translation Strategy Distribution

Table 1 summarizes the frequency of translation strategies by unit type and language pair. Paraphrase dominated both categories (56.8% overall), followed by equivalence (28.4%). Proverbs favored equivalence more than somatic units ($\chi^2(4) = 18.7$, $p < .01$), reflecting efforts to preserve cultural wisdom (Larson, 1984). Omission was rare ($< 3\%$) but occurred in Uzbek and Arabic when no conceptual analogue existed (e.g., lose heart \rightarrow omitted in formal Uzbek discourse).

Distribution of Translation Strategies by Unit Type and Target Language (%)

Table 2.

Strategy	Proverbs (n=200)	Heart Units (n=480)	Russian	Uzbek	Spanish	Arabic
Literal	8.0	12.5	14.0	6.0	11.0	10.0
Equivalence	42.0	21.7	28.0	18.0	36.0	24.0
Paraphrase	46.0	61.0	52.0	68.0	48.0	60.0
Omission	2.0	3.3	2.0	5.0	1.0	4.0
Compensation	2.0	1.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.0

Note: Row percentages sum to 100% per column. Based on Baker (1992) and Newmark (1988) classifications.

3. Metaphorical Mapping Shifts

Correspondence analysis (CA) of conceptual metaphors revealed two primary dimensions explaining 78.4% of variance. Dimension 1 (52.1%) contrasted EMOTION (English heart) with INTELLECT/CHARACTER (Arabic qalb, Uzbek yurak in moral contexts; Akhorsheda, 2021). Dimension 2 (26.3%) separated CENTER (e.g., heart of the matter) from COURAGE mappings. Russian and Spanish aligned closely with English; Uzbek and Arabic showed systematic divergence (Figure 1, not shown; available in supplementary materials).

4. Equivalence and Naturalness

Full functional equivalence was achieved in 61% of proverbs vs. 38% of heart units. Native speaker evaluations ($n=80$; 20 per language) confirmed high naturalness for equivalence and paraphrase strategies ($M = 5.9$ and 5.4 on 7-point scale) but low ratings for literal transfers ($M = 3.1$), particularly in Uzbek ($p < .05$, ANOVA).

5. Case-Specific Observations

Proverb example: “The heart has its reasons which reason knows not” (Pascal) \rightarrow Spanish: equivalence (el corazón tiene sus razones...); Arabic: paraphrase (العاطفة لها منطقتها الخاص); Uzbek: compensation via local proverb.

Heart idiom: “Wear one’s heart on one’s sleeve” \rightarrow Russian: equivalence (носить сердце на рукаве); Uzbek: paraphrase (hissiyotini yashirmaslik); full image lost in 72% of non-

equivalence cases (Sivački, 2024; Gurenko et al., n.d.).

These results demonstrate that while proverbs prioritize intertextual fidelity through equivalence, heart-based somatic units rely more on adaptive paraphrase to maintain pragmatic force across culturally divergent conceptual systems.

DISCUSSION

The findings illuminate the dual nature of phraseological intertexts in translation: proverbs function as cultural monoliths demanding high intertextual fidelity, while heart-based somatic units operate as flexible metaphorical vehicles prioritizing pragmatic adaptation. This dichotomy aligns with established translation theory (Baker, 1992; Newmark, 1988) but extends it through empirical validation across four typologically diverse languages.

The predominance of paraphrase in heart units (61%) reflects a strategic compromise between image retention and target-language naturalness, corroborating Trantescu and Reiss (2022), who identified cognitive restructuring as essential when source metaphors lack direct analogues. The higher equivalence rate in proverbs (42%) supports Mieder's (2013) assertion that these units encode collective wisdom, making cultural substitution risky. This pattern mirrors Ordudari's (2007) analysis of Shakespearean idioms, where intertextual load correlated with resistance to literal transfer.

Cross-linguistic divergence in metaphorical mapping—particularly the EMOTION → INTELLECT/CHARACTER shift in Arabic and Uzbek—validates Akhorsheda's (2021) cognitive-semiotic framework and extends Sharififar and Khoshshima's (2017) model of metaphor translation. The observed alignment of Russian and Spanish with English heart metaphors contrasts with Sivački's (2024) findings on Albanian somatic units, suggesting that typological proximity and shared literary traditions facilitate conceptual transfer (cf. Caballero & Monteagudo, 2023).

The Intertextual Density Index (IDI) proved a robust predictor of translation strategy: units with $IDI > 0.35$ resisted paraphrase ($r = -.68, p < .001$), consistent with Naciscione's (2013) theory of instantial intertextual reinforcement. This metric offers a quantifiable tool for future contrastive studies, addressing a gap noted by Huerta (2021) in multidisciplinary phraseological analysis.

Native speaker evaluations confirmed that functional equivalence does not guarantee naturalness in non-equivalent mappings—a finding that challenges Larson's (1984) dynamic equivalence model when applied to highly intertextual units. The low naturalness of literal translations in Uzbek ($M = 2.8$) echoes Del Carmen López Ruiz's (2021) corpus evidence from political discourse, where cultural interference triggered pragmatic failure.

Notably, compensation emerged as a minority but strategic device (1.5–4%), often involving local proverbs or explanatory glosses—a practice documented in Dronov's (2020) study of Kharms' absurdist phraseology and Bueno's (2023) analysis of biblical somatic units. This suggests a hierarchy of adaptation: equivalence > paraphrase > compensation > omission, with the latter two reserved for extreme cultural gaps.

Compared to Sanz-Villar (2018), who reported higher interference in multilingual EU corpora, our literary and folklore-based data showed lower omission rates (< 4%), likely due to translators' awareness of intertextual value (Federici, 2007). The pedagogical implications align with Sułkowska's (2022) phraséotraduction framework, advocating explicit training in intertextual mapping for translator competence.

In sum, the results advocate a context-sensitive, cognitively informed translation model that

treats proverbs as intertextual anchors and somatic units as metaphorical pivots. Future research should test the IDI in machine translation systems and expand to understudied language pairs (e.g., Turkic-Indo-European) to refine predictive models of phraseological translatability.

CONCLUSION

This study introduces a reproducible, mixed-methods framework for analyzing phraseological intertexts in translation, with a novel focus on the interplay between proverbs and somatic units built on heart. By integrating corpus-driven contrastive analysis, cognitive metaphor mapping, and the Intertextual Density Index (IDI)—a newly proposed quantitative metric—the research establishes that proverbs demand intertextual fidelity through equivalence, while heart-based idioms favor adaptive paraphrase to preserve pragmatic and emotional force across culturally divergent systems. These findings, grounded in English-to-Russian, Uzbek, Spanish, and Arabic data, resolve a long-standing tension in translation studies: the conflict between form (image schema) and function (cultural resonance) in fixed expressions (Baker, 1992; Newmark, 1988).

The novelty of this work lies in three contributions:

IDI as a predictive tool for translation difficulty, validated across unit types and languages.

Empirical mapping of metaphorical shifts (e.g., HEART → EMOTION vs. CHARACTER) using correspondence analysis, extending cognitive approaches (Trantescu & Reiss, 2022; Sharififar & Khoshshima, 2017);

A unified strategy hierarchy (equivalence > paraphrase > compensation > omission), supported by native-speaker validation and inter-rater reliability.

The significance extends beyond theory: the framework offers practical guidance for translators, educators, and machine translation systems, particularly in handling culturally dense units where standard equivalence fails. It also enriches phraseological didactics (Sułkowska, 2022) by providing measurable criteria for intertextual competence.

Future work will:

Apply the IDI to machine translation outputs (e.g., Google Translate, Yandex) to assess automatic intertextual loss.

Expand the corpus to Turkic-Persian and Indo-European-Sino-Tibetan pairs;

Develop a digital annotation platform for collaborative phraseological translation analysis, with open-access ELAN templates and R scripts.

Ultimately, this research affirms that preserving phraseological intertexts is not a matter of lexical matching, but of strategic, cognitively aware mediation—a principle with broad implications for cross-cultural communication in an increasingly multilingual world.

REFERENCES

Akhorsheda, I. (2021). Using the words head, heart and hand in Arabic idioms and how to render their meanings into English. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1), 139–149. <https://doi.org/10.18533/jss.v10i1.139>

Anthony, L. (2022). *AntConc (Version 4.x)* [Computer software]. Waseda University. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>

E-ISSN No.: 3066-3881

Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.

British National Corpus Consortium. (2007). *British National Corpus (BNC) XML Edition* [Corpus]. <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>

Bueno, D. P. (2023). Unidades fraseológicas derivadas de פנים/*facies* en los romanceamientos del Génesis (una aproximación cualitativa). *Revista de Filología de la Universidad de La Laguna*, 46, 111–126. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.refiull.2023.46.06>

Caballero, I. G., & Monteagudo, C. G. (2023). Análisis fraseológico de la traducción inglesa de *Fuenteovejuna* de Victor Dixon. *Hermeneus*, 24, 295–325. <https://doi.org/10.24197/her.24.2022.295-325>

Dal', V. I. (1862). *Poslovitsy russkogo naroda: Sbornik poslovits, pogovorok, rechenii, prislovii, chistogovorok, pribaoatok, zagadok, poverii i proch.* Moskva: Imperatorskoe Obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete.

Dal', V. I. (1862). *Пословицы русского народа* [Proverbs of the Russian people]. [Digital ed., Lib.ru]. [URL]

Davies, M. (2023). *Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA)* [Corpus]. <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>

Debnath, K., & Kumar, N. (2025). From Kundalini to Lord Shiva: Exploring “show” and intertextuality in Kentaro Miura’s *Berserk*. *Journal of Graphic Novels & Comics*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21504857.2025.2548554>

Del Carmen López Ruiz, M. (2021). La recepción y traducción de unidades fraseológicas en el discurso político. Análisis de un corpus ad hoc (EN, FR > ES). *MonTI. Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, 248–286. <https://doi.org/10.6035/monti.2020.ne6.8>

Dronov, P. (2020). Daniil Kharm's phraseology as translated into English, Serbian, and Irish: Semantics and national/cultural peculiarities. *Quaestio Rossica*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.15826/qr.2020.3.503>

Federici, F. P. (2007). The translator's intertextual baggage. *Translation Journal*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/240584626_The_Translator%27s_Intertextual_Baggag_e

Gerratana, G. (2025). Digital women's literature in the Italian High Schools: Canon and invisible feminist writers in study plans. *Asparkia Investigació Feminista*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.6035/asparkia.8031>

Gurenko, M. A., Gurenko, P. A., & Derkach, T. P. (n.d.). Psycholinguistic study of usage of phraseological units having a somatic component in the English, German, Russian and Ukrainian languages. *Molodyy Vchenyy*. <http://moluch.ru/young/archive/11/792>

E-ISSN No.: 3066-3881

Huerta, P. M. (2021). Multidisciplinary analysis of the phenomenon of phraseological variation in translation and interpreting. *MonTI. Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, 7–35. <https://doi.org/10.6035/monti.2020.ne6.1>

Instituto Cervantes. (n.d.). *Refranero multilingüe* [Database]. <https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/refranero/>

Jakubiček, M., Suchomel, V., Kilgarriff, A., & Kovář, V. (2013). *arTenTen: Arabic Web Corpus* [Corpus]. Sketch Engine. <https://www.sketchengine.eu/>

Kilgarriff, A., Baisa, V., Bušta, J., Jakubiček, M., Kovář, V., Michelfeit, J., Rychlý, P., & Suchomel, V. (2014). The Sketch Engine: Ten years on. *Lexicography*, 1(1), 7–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-014-0009-9>

Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. University Press of America.

Merkel, M. (1999). *Uplug—A modular corpus tool for parallel corpora* [Conference paper]. [Conference name], [pages]. [URL]

Mieder, W. (2009). *The Routledge book of world proverbs*. Routledge.

Mieder, W. (2013). *Paremiological Collection of the University of Vermont* [Database]. University of Vermont. [URL]

Mieder, W. (2020). A paremiologist's dream come true: "The Wolfgang Mieder International Proverb Library" at the University of Vermont. *Proverbium*, 37(1), 359–384

Mirzayev, T., Musoqulov, A., & Sarimsoqov, B. (2019). *O'zbek xalq maqollari* (ISBN 978-9943-26-938-5; 512 b.). Toshkent: Sharq.

Mohseni, H. (2024). From having sympathy to showing empathy for the demented: A narratological study of the perspectives of characters with dementia in *Away from Her*, *Still Alice*, and *The Father*. *American & British Studies Annual*, 17, 103–119. <https://doi.org/10.46585/absa.2024.17.2585>

Naciscione, A. (2013). A cognitive approach to instantial use of phraseological units in discourse. In J. Szerszunowicz, B. Nowowiejski, P. Ishida, & K. Yagi (Eds.), *Intercontinental dialogue on phraseology 3: Linguo-cultural research on phraseology* (pp. 115–132). University of Bialystok Publishing House. <https://www.academia.edu/33075384/>

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.

E-ISSN No.: 3066-3881

Ordudari, M. (2007). Translation strategies in the translation of idioms in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 24. <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/279/27962050031/html/>

Sanz-Villar, Z. (2018). Interference and the translation of phraseological units in a parallel and multilingual corpus. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, 63(1), 72–93. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1050515ar>

Sharififar, M., & Khoshsima, H. (2017). A semiotic framework for the translation of conceptual metaphors. *Translation Studies*, 15(58), 23–42. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316002995>

Sivački, A. (2024). Neutral and context-dependent phraseologisms containing a somatic component in the Albanian language and their translation equivalents in Serbian. *Ezikov Svât/Ezikov Svât*, 22(2), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.37708/ezs.swu.bg.v22i2.4>

Sułkowska, M. (2022). Phraséotraduction: Problèmes, méthodes, conceptions. *Romanica Cracoviensia*, 22(1), 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.4467/20843917RC.22.003.15635>

Tiedemann, J. (2002). Uplug—A modular corpus tool for parallel corpora. In L. Borin (Ed.), *Parallel corpora, parallel worlds: Selected papers from a symposium on parallel and comparable corpora at Uppsala University, Sweden, 22–23 April, 1999* (Language and Computers, Vol. 43, pp. 181–197). Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004334298_012

Trantescu, A., & Reiss, G. (2022). Considerations on the meaning and translation of English heart idioms: Integrating the cognitive linguistic approach. *Open Linguistics*, 8(1), 427–439. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2022-0203>

Usmonova, D. S., & Yusupova, M. I. Q. (2021). Comparative analysis of the somatic phraseological units of the English and Russian languages with the component “heart”. *Current Research Journal of Philological Sciences*, 2(11), 94–99. <https://masterjournals.com/index.php/crjps/article/view/540>

Wittenburg, P., Brugman, H., Russel, A., Klassmann, A., & Sloetjes, H. (2006). ELAN: A professional framework for multimodality research. In *Proceedings of LREC 2006* (pp. 1556–1559). European Language Resources Association.

THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM IN LINGUISTICS: THE LANGUAGE PERSONALITY AND COGNITIVE-PRAGMATIC FOUNDATIONS OF TEXT CREATION AND INTERPRETATION

Gulrukh Elmuradova Karimalievna
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

ABSTRACT

In contemporary linguistics, increasing attention is being devoted to the anthropocentric paradigm, which foregrounds the human factor as the central agent of linguistic activity. This article examines the concept of the language personality as a key category integrating the achievements of psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, and linguoculturology. Special emphasis is placed on the role of the language personality in the processes of text production and perception. Drawing on theoretical perspectives advanced by prominent linguists such as Galperin (1974), Zhinkin (1982), Kravchenko (2001), and Katsnelson, the study explores text as a dynamic, cognitively and pragmatically motivated unit of communication rather than a static linguistic construct. The paper argues that textual meaning emerges through the interaction between the text-producing and text-perceiving individuals within specific cultural and cognitive contexts. Particular attention is paid to the linguocognitive mechanisms underlying literary text creation, including conceptualization, implicitness, and the realization of universal subject codes. The analysis further highlights the importance of text linguistics in identifying the structural, semantic, and pragmatic categories of text, as well as in revealing culturally conditioned modes of thinking reflected in language use. The findings underscore the significance of studying individual style and cognitive activity in text formation for understanding the “grammar of thought” characteristic of specific linguistic communities.

KEYWORDS: anthropocentric paradigm, language personality, text linguistics, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, text perception, text production, linguoculturology, discourse, individual style

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary linguistics, the study of the human factor as the agent of linguistic activity has been increasingly deepened within such fields as psycholinguistics, linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, and pragmalinguistics. By integrating the achievements of these anthropocentrically oriented disciplines, this line of research is steadily consolidating its status as an independent scientific paradigm.

As widely acknowledged in linguistic theory, the anthropocentric paradigm places primary emphasis on the subject of speech activity, that is, the language user who produces and perceives speech. The introduction of the category of language personality into scientific discourse has stimulated active engagement with such concepts as personality, linguistic consciousness, thinking, activity, mentality, and culture. The investigation of the personality factor also brings linguistics into close interdisciplinary contact with psychology, philosophy, logic, and cultural studies.

At present, the concept of the language personality is primarily used in the following senses: (a) a person capable of carrying out speech activity in a particular language, that is, producing and perceiving speech; (b) a person who uses language as a means of communication, a communicant; and (c) a representative of a specific language community who possesses and manifests a lexical system reflecting national-cultural and spiritual values.

DISCUSSION

Current linguistic research demonstrates that different branches of linguistics approach the issue of the personality factor from perspectives determined by their specific theoretical orientations. The problem of text interpretation and the personality factor is closely related to the processes of text production and text perception. In investigating this problem, it is essential to study not only the text-producing individual but also the text-perceiving individual, namely the reader or listener.

According to Galperin (1974), a text that has been written but not yet read remains static. A written text becomes dynamic only when it is perceived by a recipient; until then, its content, pragmatic intention, and emotional coloring are not realized. Therefore, the study of text and the personality factor involved in its perception requires a multidimensional approach encompassing semantic, psychological, pragmatic, cognitive, and linguocultural perspectives.

As Zhinkin (1982) noted, a person communicates not through isolated sentences but through texts. Consequently, the stylistic characteristics of an individual can be effectively studied only through the texts they produce. Approaches that limit stylistic analysis to lexical choice or sentence structure no longer satisfy the requirements of contemporary linguistics. Examining text production from the standpoint of individual style enables a more comprehensive understanding of textual organization.

Cognitive linguistics is intrinsically connected with semantics. Kravchenko (2001) emphasized that cognitive linguistics focuses on the mechanisms of storing, representing, and transmitting knowledge through language. In this regard, the study of linguocognitive features of an individual author's language plays an important role in revealing the "grammar of thought" characteristic of Uzbek language users.

Investigating the cognitive activity of the individual in the process of text creation also contributes to understanding culturally specific modes of thinking. Conceptualized meanings embodied in texts may possess an ethnic character. Through the analysis of text production processes, it becomes possible to examine the stages of linguistic realization of the universal subject codes identified by Zhinkin (1982), which are particularly evident in literary discourse. The study of an individual's linguocognitive style thus provides insight into the implicit mechanisms underlying literary text creation.

In contemporary linguistics, text is regarded as a major linguistic unit and the central object of text linguistics. In text analysis, it is essential to distinguish text from phrases and sentences, as text possesses its own categories and governing principles. Khakimov (1993) noted that the lexical meaning of the term text implies connection and cohesion, making the study of cohesive devices one of the core problems of text linguistics.

The concept of text is sometimes used interchangeably with that of context. Arrivé (1986) defined text as the unity that gives rise to discourse and utterance, and the relationship between them. Context, in turn, is understood as the product of a speech situation and as the minimal speech

unit necessary for clarifying meaning. For example, the Uzbek word *tuyoq* (“hoof”) denotes an animal body part in a neutral context. However, when applied metaphorically to a human being, it acquires a negative connotation. Context thus functions as the field in which semantic meanings are actualized within a speech situation.

Katsnelson (1984) argued that reality is reflected not in isolated words but in complete message sentences and texts, where meanings are realized through their relations. Words outside the sentence exist only as potential units whose function can be understood only within the whole structure.

Kilichev (1987) described text as a complex structure whose elements are closely interconnected and which conveys nominative and aesthetic information oriented toward the author’s communicative goal. Galperin (1974) identified several text categories, including informativeness, cohesion, continuum, modality, integrity, and completeness. In general, a text may be defined as a completed product of speech activity, existing in written form, stylistically shaped, and pragmatically oriented.

According to Rasulov (1985), units larger than the sentence constitute complex syntactic wholes in which thought is expressed more fully than at the level of a single sentence. The identification of text types and their distinguishing features, therefore, remains a relevant area of linguistic research.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the anthropocentric orientation of modern linguistic research has substantially expanded the understanding of language by emphasizing the central role of the human participant in communicative processes. Within this perspective, the notion of language personality functions as a significant integrative concept that synthesizes theoretical insights from cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatolinguistics, and linguoculturology. The analysis undertaken in this study confirms that language should not be regarded merely as a system of abstract linguistic forms; rather, it represents a dynamic phenomenon shaped by the intellectual, cultural, and communicative activities of individuals.

The examination of text as a principal linguistic unit demonstrates that meaning does not exist independently within linguistic structures but is constructed through the interaction between the author and the recipient within a particular sociocultural and cognitive environment. From this standpoint, a written text acquires communicative dynamism only when it becomes the object of interpretation, during which the reader or listener actualizes the semantic, pragmatic, and expressive dimensions embedded in the discourse. Consequently, the processes of text production and perception should be viewed as mutually interconnected aspects of speech activity that involve the active participation of the language personality.

Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of examining the linguocognitive processes underlying text formation, including conceptual structuring, implicit meaning construction, and the realization of universal subject codes. These mechanisms reveal how authors organize knowledge, convey culturally conditioned meanings, and express their individual linguistic style. The investigation of an author’s linguocognitive and stylistic features, therefore, provides valuable insights into the patterns of thinking and cultural perception characteristic of specific linguistic communities.

Overall, the findings underline the important role of text linguistics in identifying the structural, semantic, and pragmatic principles that govern discourse organization. At the same time, the concept of language personality enriches linguistic analysis by connecting textual phenomena with human cognition, cultural identity, and communicative intentions. Future research in this area may further explore cross-cultural manifestations of language personality as well as empirical approaches to the cognitive strategies involved in text creation and interpretation, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the interrelationship between language, thought, and culture.

REFERENCES

- Aktaş, Ş. (1993). *Style and its problems in literature*. Akçağ Publishing House.
- Arrivé, M. (1986). *Linguistique et Psychanalyse: Freud, Saussure, Hjelmslev, Lacan*. Méridiens Klincksieck.
- Galperin, I. R. (1974). On the concept of text. *Voprosy Yazykoznaniiya*, (6), 18–27.
- Hakimov, M. Kh. (1993). *Syntagmatic and pragmatic features of Uzbek scientific texts (Candidate of Philological Sciences dissertation)*. Tashkent.
- Katsnelson, S. D. (1984). *Typology of language and speech thinking*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Kilichev, E. (1987). *Linguistic analysis of the text*. Tashkent.
- Kravchenko, A. V. (2001). *Sign, meaning, knowledge: An essay on the cognitive philosophy of language*. Irkutsk State University Press.
- Rasulov, I. (1985). *Problems of text linguistics*. Tashkent.
- Zhinkin, N. I. (1982). *Speech as a carrier of information*. Nauka.
- Zilberman, L. I. (1988). *Text linguistics and teaching the reading of English scientific literature*. Moscow.