

SEMANTIC INTEGRATION AND ANTHROPOCENTRIC EVALUATION OF
THE CONCEPT FAHM-FAROSAT IN UZBEK LINGUOCULTURE**Imomova Madinakhon Umardjonovna**

The English language teacher

Orcid: 0009-0000-2763-5098

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22630900>

Abstract. This conference thesis examines the Uzbek linguocultural unit *fahm-farosat* through the semantic relation between *fahm* and *farosat* and through the human qualities evaluated by the paired form. The analysis combines Uzbek lexicography, Arabic-source semantic control, selected literary contexts, and contemporary Uzbek discourse. Five complementary procedures were used: definitional-lexicographic, component-semantic, contextual-discursive linguocultural-evaluative, and anthropocentric analysis. The findings indicate that *fahm* is most consistently linked with understanding and perception, while *farosat* more often foregrounds the ability to reach a contextually adequate evaluation. Noticing, sensitivity, and socially appropriate behaviour are significant but non-obligatory features. The paired unit *fahm-farosat* shows semantic-functional integration and supports an anthropocentric pattern in which understanding is followed by evaluation and, depending on context, by self-regulation, consideration of others, appropriate conduct, or practical decision-making.

Keywords: Uzbek linguoculture, anthropocentrism, semantic integration, evaluation.

1. Introduction

Linguocultural research treats lexical meaning not only as a system of dictionary definitions but also as a culturally mediated way of conceptualising people, situations, and values. In anthropocentric linguistics, the focus shifts from language as an autonomous structure to language as a means through which speakers interpret experience and evaluate human behaviour. This orientation is especially relevant to culture-loaded units that describe intellectual and behavioural qualities. Ashurova and Galieva (2019) emphasise the human factor in Cultural Linguistics, while Apresyan (1995) demonstrates that linguistic data can be used to reconstruct culturally shaped models of the human being.

The Uzbek units *fahm*, *farosat*, and *fahm-farosat* form such a field. Explanatory sources associate *fahm* primarily with understanding, comprehension, and perception, whereas *farosat* is linked with quick and accurate understanding, sensitivity, intelligence, and taste (Hojiyev et al., 2001). However, a dictionary definition alone cannot explain how these meanings



function in literary and contemporary discourse or how the paired form evaluates a person. Previous scholarship has already addressed related material: Abdujabbarova (2024), for example, analysed lexemes connected with *fahm-farosat* and *aql* in Qutadg'u bilig. The present study therefore does not claim that the concept has never been investigated. Its narrower aim is to clarify how *fahm*, *farosat*, and *fahm-farosat* interact semantically in Uzbek material and how this interaction contributes to an anthropocentric model of the person described as *fahm-farosatli*.

The study addresses three questions: (1) what semantic relation exists between *fahm*, *farosat*, and *fahm-farosat*; (2) whether the paired unit displays semantic-functional integration beyond simple juxtaposition; and (3) what human qualities are positively or negatively evaluated through this conceptual field.

2. Materials and Methods

This conference thesis is a condensed English-language presentation of the findings developed in the author's broader Uzbek-language article, "O'zbek lingvomadaniyatida "fahm-farosat" konsepti: semantik-konseptual va antropotsentrik xususiyatlar" (2026), and therefore preserves its verified source base, analytical categories, and principal results. The full study draws on fifteen verified sources across lexicographic, theoretical, literary, and contemporary-discourse layers. For close analysis, eleven empirical contexts were selected: eight literary occurrences from four works and three present-day discourse examples. The literary evidence was drawn from Alisher Navoiy's *Khayrat ul-abror*, Abdulla Qodiriy's *Mekhrobdan chayon*, Abdulla Qahhor's *Asror bobo*, and Pirmqul Qodirov's *Yulduzli tunlar*. Contemporary contexts were used as evidence of present-day discourse rather than as theoretical authorities. Arabic *fahm* and *firasa* were consulted only as a semantic-control layer; their meanings were not automatically transferred to modern Uzbek.

The analysis combined five procedures. Definitional-lexicographic analysis established the initial semantic boundaries. Component-semantic analysis identified recurrent features such as understanding, evaluation, sensitivity, and behaviour. Contextual-discursive analysis examined which features were activated in specific textual situations. Linguocultural-evaluative analysis focused on positive and negative judgements of persons. Finally, anthropocentric analysis asked what type of person is represented as *fahm-farosatli* or, conversely, *farosatsiz/befarosat*. Counterexamples were retained in order to prevent the empirical material from being forced into a predetermined model.



3. Results and Discussion

The first result concerns *fahm*. Across the lexicographic evidence, its most stable semantic area is understanding, comprehension, and perception. Literary contexts refine this picture. In *Mekhrobdan chayon*, *fahmlamoq* occurs where characters infer a situation from indirect signs rather than receive an explicit verbal statement (Qodiriy, 2019). In *Yulduzli tunlar*, the same verb is used in contexts involving an unspoken communicative intention and irony (Qodirov, 2017). These examples show that *fahm* may activate inferential understanding in context. They do not, however, justify a universal hierarchy in which *fahmlamoq* is always "deeper" than *tushunmoq*. The more defensible conclusion is that understanding/perception is the stable semantic basis, while inference and interpretation of implicit meaning are context-dependent extensions.

The second result concerns *farosat*. Its lexicographic description includes speed, accuracy, sensitivity, intelligence, and taste, but literary evidence suggests that these features do not have equal status in every context. In *Hayrat ul-abror*, *farosat* is associated with deliberation and the need to avoid premature judgement (Navoiy, 2006). In *Yulduzli tunlar*, a social episode links *farosat* with noticing the demands of the situation, recognising an etiquette norm, and adjusting one's conduct accordingly (Qodirov, 2017). Elsewhere in the same novel, *farosat* appears in the sphere of rational administration and practical judgement rather than interpersonal sensitivity. Thus, sensitivity and noticing are important possibilities but not obligatory components. A more stable pattern is the relation between understanding and a contextually adequate evaluation.

The third result concerns the paired form *fahm-farosat*. The evidence does not support treating it merely as a mechanical repetition of two near-synonymous items. In Qahhor's *Asror bobo*, *fahm-farosat* occurs together with *aql* in a context where a person is expected to regulate inner emotion through conscious judgement (Qahhor, 2012). In contemporary discourse, the paired form likewise appears in contexts where understanding is linked with evaluation and practical or social response. These independent discourse layers support a tendency toward semantic-functional integration. At the same time, the available material does not prove that *fahm-farosat* has developed a completely autonomous lexical meaning unrelated to its components, nor that its positive evaluative force is always stronger than that of *fahm* or *farosat* separately.

The fourth result is anthropocentric. The material suggests that *fahm-farosat* evaluates more than intellectual capacity in the narrow sense. A *fahm-farosatli* person is represented as someone who understands a situation or inner state,



reaches an appropriate evaluation, and then responds in a context-sensitive way. The response may take different forms: self-regulation in Qahhor, consideration of another person and etiquette-sensitive conduct in Qodirov, or practical rationality in contemporary discourse. Negative forms such as farosatsiz or befarosat are especially informative because they may describe not a lack of intelligence, but a failure to draw the relevant conclusion from an evident situation or to translate understanding into suitable conduct.

These findings make it possible to formulate an anthropocentric pattern: UNDERSTANDING/PERCEPTION -> CONTEXTUALLY ADEQUATE EVALUATION -> CONTEXT-DEPENDENT RESPONSE -> POSITIVE LINGUOCULTURAL EVALUATION. The response stage is not fixed. Depending on the discourse situation, it may involve self-control, attentiveness to others, socially appropriate behaviour, or practical decision-making. In this sense, the study specifies the human-centred perspective proposed in Cultural Linguistics by showing how a culture-loaded Uzbek unit connects cognition with evaluation and behavioural relevance (Ashurova & Galieva, 2019).

4. Conclusion

The analysis shows that *fahm*, *farosat*, and *fahm-farosat* overlap semantically but are not fully interchangeable. *Fahm* is most consistently related to understanding and perception and may, in particular contexts, involve inferential or implicit comprehension. *Farosat* combines understanding with the ability to produce a contextually adequate evaluation; sensitivity, noticing, taste, and appropriate conduct are activated selectively rather than universally. The paired form *fahm-farosat* exhibits semantic-functional integration and functions as a positive anthropocentric evaluator of a person whose understanding is reflected in judgement and context-sensitive response. The proposed model is limited to the analysed material: the literary mini-corpus is not statistically representative, and no frequency-based core-periphery structure is claimed. Further research should expand the literary and paremiological corpus and compare the Uzbek model with functionally related English conceptual units.

References:

1. Muxtorova B. (2023). The “concept” in linguistics // Махсус сон. “ФарДУ. Илмий хабарлар” илмий журнали. – Farg‘ona – B.50-52.
2. Abdujabbarova, F. (2024). “Fahm-farosat, aql” konsepti bilan bog‘liq leksemlarning lingvomadaniy tahlili. Tamaddun Nuri, 12(63), 420-425. <https://doi.org/10.69691/3kj0p865>
3. Апресян Ю. Д. (1995). «Образ человека по данным языка: попытка системного описания», «Вопросы языкознания» (1995, № 1, с. 37–67)



POLAND

CURRENT APPROACHES AND NEW RESEARCH IN MODERN SCIENCES

International scientific-online conference



POLAND

4. Ashurova, D. U., & Galieva, M. R. (2019). Cultural Linguistics: Main Issues, Trends and Tasks. Uzbekistan: Language and Culture, 2(2), 42-73. <https://doi.org/10.52773/tsuull.uzlc.2019.2/UBBD9506>
5. Hojiyev, A., Nurmonov, A., Zaynobiddinov, S., et al. (2001). Hozirgi o'zbek tili faol so'zlarining izohli lug'ati. Tashkent: Sharq.
6. Navoiy, A. (2006). Hayrat ul-abror (A. Qayumov & V. Rahmonov, Eds.). Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom NMIU.
7. Qodiriy, A. (2019). Mehrobdan chayon. Tashkent: Yoshlar nashriyot uyi.
8. Qahhor, A. (2012). Anor: qissa va hikoyalar. Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom NMIU.
9. Qodirov, P. (2017). Yulduzli tunlar. Tashkent: Yoshlar nashriyot uyi.

