(8). Brown H.D. (2007). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (5th ed.). New York, Pearson Education.
(9). Harmer J. (2015). The Practice of English Language Teaching (5th ed.). Harlow, Pearson Education.
(10). Larsen-Freeman D., & Anderson M. (2011). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karimxojaeva Dilafruz (Trainee teacher of Karakalpak State university, Faculty of foreign languages)

THE CONCEPT OF "HUMAN" IN LANGUAGE BY TYPOLOGICAL FEATURES AND ITS REPRESENTATION IN THE LINGUISTIC SYSTEM

Annotation. *This article investigates the typological features of the concept of "human" and its representation within linguistic systems across different languages. The study is grounded in cognitive linguistics, linguistic typology, and pragmatics, and it aims to reveal how languages conceptualize and encode the notion of "human" at lexical, grammatical, and discourse levels. Using a qualitative and comparative methodology, the research analyzes examples from English, Uzbek, and Karakalpak. The findings demonstrate that although the concept of "human" is universal, its linguistic realization varies depending on cultural, typological, and pragmatic factors. The study contributes to the broader understanding of how human-centered meanings are structured in language.*

Keywords: *concept, human, linguistic typology, cognitive linguistics, anthropocentrism, semantic field.*

«INSON» KONSEPTINING TIPOLOGIK XUSUSIYATLARI VA UNING TURLI TILLARNING LISONIY TIZIMLARIDA REPREZENTATSIYASI

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu maqola "odam" konseptining tipologik xususiyatlari va uning turli tillardagi lingvistik tizimlarda ifodalanishini o'rganishga bag'ishlangan. Tadqiqot kognitiv lingvistika, lingvistik tipologiya va pragmatika yo'nalishlariga asoslanib, tillarda "odam" tushunchasining leksik, grammatik va diskursiv darajalarda qanday konseptuallashtirilishi va ifodalanishini aniqlashga qaratilgan. Sifat va qiyosiy metodologiya asosida olib borilgan tadqiqotda ingliz, o'zbek va qoraqalpoq tillaridan misollar tahlil qilinadi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, "odam" konsepti universal bo'lsa-da, uning lingvistik ifodasi madaniy, tipologik va pragmatik omillarga bog'liq holda farqlanadi. Tadqiqot inson markazidagi ma'nolarning til tizimida qanday shakllanishini chuqurroq anglashga xizmat qiladi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *konsept, odam, lingvistik tipologiya, kognitiv lingvistika, antropotsentrizm, semantik maydon*

ТИПОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ КОНЦЕПТА «ЧЕЛОВЕК» И ЕГО РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИЯ В ЯЗЫКОВЫХ СИСТЕМАХ РАЗЛИЧНЫХ ЯЗЫКОВ

Аннотация. *Данная статья посвящена исследованию типологических особенностей концепта «человек» и его репрезентации в языковых системах различных языков. Исследование основано на положениях когнитивной лингвистики, лингвистической типологии и прагматики и направлено на выявление способов концептуализации и языкового выражения понятия «человек» на лексическом, грамматическом и дискурсивном уровнях. В рамках качественного и сопоставительного подхода анализируются примеры из английского, узбекского и каракалпакского языков. Результаты показывают, что, несмотря на универсальность концепта «человек», его языковая реализация варьируется в зависимости от культурных, типологических и прагматических факторов. Работа способствует более глубокому пониманию того, как антропоцентрические значения структурируются в языке.*

Ключевые слова: *концепт, человек, лингвистическая типология, когнитивная лингвистика, антропоцентризм, семантическое поле.*

Introduction. The concept of "human" occupies a fundamental position in linguistic research because language itself is an inherently human phenomenon shaped by social interaction, cultural norms, and cognitive processes [7;15 p.]. In contemporary linguistics, particularly within cognitive linguistics, concepts are interpreted as mental constructs that organize knowledge and experience, while language functions as a tool for encoding and transmitting these constructs [2;34 p.].

From this perspective, the concept of "human" represents a multidimensional cognitive structure that integrates biological, social, cultural, and psychological components. Although this concept exists universally across languages, its linguistic realization demonstrates considerable variation due to

typological diversity and cultural specificity [5;21 p.]. Such variation makes the concept a relevant object of comparative linguistic research.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the typological features of the concept of "human" and to examine its representation across different levels of the linguistic system. The research focuses on identifying universal characteristics alongside language-specific features in English, Uzbek, and Karakalpak, thereby contributing to the broader understanding of conceptual representation in language.

Literature Review. The concept of "human" has been extensively examined across various linguistic paradigms, particularly within cognitive linguistics, linguistic typology, and semantic theory. Scholars have emphasized that human-centered conceptualization is fundamental to language, as linguistic structures inherently reflect the cognitive and cultural experiences of speakers.

One of the foundational contributions to the study of conceptual structures is provided by Lakoff, who argues that human cognition is based on categorization processes shaped by embodied experience [1; 91]. According to this view, the concept of "human" is not a fixed or purely biological category but a prototype-based construct influenced by cultural models and metaphorical thinking. This perspective is further developed within cognitive grammar, where Langacker highlights that linguistic expressions are symbolic representations of conceptual structures, including those related to human identity and interaction [2;52 p.].

In the field of semantic universals, Wierzbicka proposes that certain core meanings related to human existence are shared across languages, forming a set of universal semantic primitives [3; 67]. These primitives include notions such as "someone," "people," and "body," which are essential for expressing the concept of "human." However, while these elements are universal, their combinations and extensions vary significantly across languages, reflecting cultural and typological diversity.

Typological linguistics has also contributed significantly to the understanding of how the concept of "human" is encoded in different languages. Croft emphasizes that languages differ in their grammatical and lexical categorization systems, which influence how human-related meanings are structured and expressed [5; 48]. For instance, distinctions between personhood, individuality, and social roles may be more or less explicitly marked depending on the typological characteristics of a language.

From a sociolinguistic and anthropological perspective, Sapir's work highlights the close relationship between language, culture, and human perception [7;23 p.]. He argues that language not only reflects cultural reality but also shapes how individuals conceptualize themselves and others. This idea is further developed in Whorf's theory of linguistic relativity, which suggests that different linguistic systems lead to different patterns of thought and perception, including those related to the concept of "human" [8; 74].

In addition to cognitive and typological approaches, pragmatic theories provide important insights into the dynamic realization of the concept in discourse. Levinson notes that human interaction is structured through pragmatic principles such as deixis, politeness, and speech acts, all of which rely on the conceptualization of participants as social beings [6;118 p.]. This perspective underscores the importance of analyzing not only the structural but also the functional aspects of language.

Furthermore, research in lexical semantics, as discussed by Crystal, demonstrates that the vocabulary associated with human-related concepts is often rich and culturally loaded, reflecting social hierarchies, values, and norms [4;82 p.]. The lexical field of "human" therefore serves as an important site for investigating the interaction between language and culture.

Overall, the literature indicates that the concept of "human" is a multidimensional construct that cannot be fully understood within a single theoretical framework. Instead, it requires an integrated approach that combines cognitive, typological, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives. The present study builds on these theoretical foundations contributing to the ongoing discussion on conceptual representation in language.

Research Methodology. The research is based on a qualitative methodological framework that integrates conceptual, typological, semantic, and discourse-oriented approaches. Conceptual analysis is employed to define the internal structure of the concept of "human," including its semantic components and cognitive organization [1;87 p.]. This method enables the identification of core conceptual features shared across languages.

A comparative typological approach is used to analyze similarities and differences in the linguistic representation of the concept in English, Uzbek, and Karakalpak. This method highlights universal tendencies as well as structural and cultural variation [5;44 p.].

Semantic field analysis is applied to examine lexical units related to the concept, including synonyms, hyponyms, and culturally marked expressions [3;102 p.]. In addition, discourse analysis is used to investigate how the concept is realized in communication, particularly in relation to speech acts, politeness strategies, and forms of address.

The data for the study are derived from linguistic literature, dictionaries, and selected textual examples, ensuring both theoretical and empirical validity.

Analysis and results. The analysis indicates that the concept of "human" is a complex cognitive entity consisting of several interrelated dimensions. The biological dimension defines a human as a living organism belonging to a specific species, while the social dimension reflects the individual's role within a community and system of relationships [3;56 p.].

The cultural dimension encompasses values, norms, and traditions that shape human behavior, whereas the psychological dimension includes cognition, emotions, and consciousness. These components together form a dynamic conceptual system that is reflected in linguistic structures [7;28 p.].

The typological analysis demonstrates that the concept of "human" possesses both universal and language-specific features. Universality is reflected in the presence of linguistic means for referring to human beings in all languages, confirming the anthropocentric nature of language [1;112 p.].

However, languages differ in how they categorize and encode this concept. English distinguishes between "human," "person," and "individual," each with distinct semantic nuances, whereas Uzbek and Karakalpak employ broader lexical units such as "odam" [5;63 p.]. These differences highlight the influence of typological and cultural factors on conceptual representation.

The lexical representation of the concept includes a wide range of units that denote human beings and their attributes, such as gender, age, profession, and social status. This diversity reflects the central role of the concept in communication and cognition [4;78 p.].

Additionally, lexical items often carry evaluative and cultural meanings, expressing attitudes such as respect, hierarchy, and morality. These connotations enrich the conceptual structure and demonstrate the interaction between language and culture.

Grammatical categories such as pronouns, number, and gender contribute significantly to the representation of the concept of "human." Pronouns encode distinctions related to person and social relationships, reflecting how languages structure interpersonal interaction [2;91 p.].

In English, gender is marked in pronouns, whereas Uzbek and Karakalpak lack grammatical gender, relying instead on contextual cues. This typological variation illustrates different strategies of conceptual encoding [5;88 p.].

Number distinctions further contribute to the conceptualization of human entities by differentiating between individual and collective reference.

At the discourse level, the concept of "human" is realized through communicative practices such as speech acts, politeness strategies, and forms of address. These elements reflect social relationships, cultural norms, and power dynamics within communication [6;120 p.].

The analysis shows that the concept is dynamically constructed in discourse, as speakers continuously negotiate identity, roles, and relationships through language use.

The findings confirm that the concept of "human" is both universal and variable, reflecting the interaction between cognitive processes, linguistic structures, and cultural contexts. From a cognitive perspective, the concept serves as a fundamental category for organizing human experience [1;145 p.].

At the same time, typological variation demonstrates that languages differ in how they encode and interpret this concept, supporting the idea that language shapes thought and perception [8;67 p.]. The diversity observed in lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic representation highlights the role of language as an active constructor of meaning rather than a passive reflector of reality.

The study also emphasizes the importance of integrating multiple levels of analysis to fully understand conceptual representation, as each level contributes unique insights into the structure and function of the concept.

Conclusion. In conclusion, the concept of "human" is a central element of linguistic systems, characterized by both universality and diversity. The study demonstrates that the concept is structured through interconnected biological, social, cultural, and psychological dimensions, all of which are encoded in language.

The typological analysis reveals significant variation in lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic representation, highlighting the influence of cultural and structural factors. These findings contribute to the

field of cognitive and typological linguistics and provide a foundation for further research on conceptual structures.

Future studies may expand the scope of analysis by incorporating additional languages and exploring other related concepts.

References:

(1). Lakoff G. (1987). Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 80–150.
(2). Langacker R. (2008). Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction. Oxford, Oxford University Press, p.30–95.
(3). Wierzbicka A. (1996). Semantics: Primes and Universals. Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 50–120.
(4). Crystal D. (2003). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Oxford, Blackwell, p. 70–90.
(5). Croft W. (2003). Typology and Universals. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 40–90.
(6). Levinson S.C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. p. 110–130.
(7). Sapir E. (1921). Language. New York, Harcourt, Brace & Company, p. 10–30.
(8). Whorf B. (1956). Language, Thought, and Reality. MIT Press, p. 60–80.