HSR London International Conference on Multidisciplinary Academic Research
(HSR-ICMAR) 2026
https://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/conference

STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC ORGANISATION OF ENGLISH SOMATIC SLANG: ANATOMICAL GROUPS AND DISTRIBUTIONAL PROFILE

Bunyodbek To‘lqinjon o‘g‘li Sotvoldiyev
Associate Professor, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences
E-mail: b.sotvoldiyev91@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21857240

Abstract. This thesis systematises 294 English somatic slang units from the supplied card index. The material is divided into five anatomical groups and described through structural patterns and semantic target fields. External body-part terms account for 251 units (85.4%), while internal-body terms account for 43 (14.6%). Head-and-face units form the largest group, and human reference constitutes the field core.

Keywords: somatic slang, body-part term, structural model, semantic field, anatomical group, productivity, core, periphery.

Introduction. The structural-semantic study of somatic slang requires form and meaning to be analysed together. A body-part base may function as an unchanged lexeme, a derivative, a compound, a phrase, or a component of a fixed expression; each form can activate a different target field. The supplied source therefore first divides the material anatomically and then describes its structural and semantic organisation.

The study uses five source-defined groups: head and face; hand and upper body; torso, chest and waist; leg and lower body; and internal organs. This division retains the sequence and totals of the source tables. The research question is whether visible external body-part terms and less visible internal-body terms contribute equally to slang nomination and whether the five groups share the same semantic centre.

Literature review. The source associates slang word formation with recurrent structural operations. Kulkarni and Wang discuss English slang formation through models that capture productive formal relations [3, pp. 1424–1434]. Redkina and Palutina examine the interaction of structure and semantics in youth-slang units [5, pp. 158–164]. Musurmankulova’s corpus-oriented classification distinguishes component structure in phraseological material [4, pp. 19, 22], while Sotvoldiyev treats paradigmatic and syntagmatic resources of English slang [7, pp. 120–132]. These source-cited approaches support a classification in which the same somatic base is traced across different formal constructions.

The distributional interpretation also follows the source. Sablayrolles reports lower argot activity for bone names and less visible internal parts, with activation often mediated by an externally perceptible feature [6, pp. 7–8, 16–17]. Ali identifies particularly active head-related rows in American slang [1, pp. 211–217]. Suleimenova and Umatova distinguish a field core, where defining features are concentrated, from a periphery, where they are weaker or less complete [8, pp. 125–126]. The supplied card index applies these observations to English somatic slang recorded in Green’s dictionary [2].

Methodology. The dataset contains 294 units. Each item was assigned to one anatomical group, one structural pattern and one semantic target field according to the source classification. Structural labels include monolexemic use, affixation, compounds, body-part plus noun, body-part plus toponym, body-part plus anthroponym, combinations of somatic bases, adjectival, adverbial and participial constructions, syndetic combinations and phraseological units. No new item or count was introduced.

Source categories involving restricted or harmful domains were retained only in aggregate statistics and were not repeated as usage examples.

Results and discussion. Distribution by anatomical group. The distribution is strongly asymmetrical. Head-and-face terms alone constitute 44.9% of the dataset. All four external groups together contain 251 units, whereas the internal-organ group contains 43.

Table 1. Distribution of the five anatomical groups

Anatomical group	Units	Share
Head and face	132	44.9%
Hand and upper body	42	14.3%
Torso, chest and waist	40	13.6%
Leg and lower body	37	12.6%
Internal organs	43	14.6%
Total	294	100%

The 251 external-body units represent 85.4% of the material. Their advantage is clearest in the head-and-face group, which exceeds the combined hand-and-upper-body and torso groups. The source connects this productivity with the visibility and communicative salience of the head, face and sensory organs. Neutral examples show the breadth of the group: jaw and chin designate conversation, headlamps designate eyes, nose music designates snoring, and brainpan designates the head. The internal group remains semantically diverse but is much smaller in absolute size.

Structural profile. The source inventory shows that somatic slang is not restricted to one word-formation type. Monolexemic units such as jaw, chin and liver preserve the visible body-part form while changing the referent. Affixal models such as brainiac and muscleman add a derivational marker. Compounds such as headlamps, brainpan, facebox and footmobile compress a descriptive relation into a lexical unit. Phrasal models include jaw work, chin work and ankle excursion; fixed expressions extend the same bases into clause-like structures.

Several component patterns narrow the target referent. A somatic base plus noun identifies an object, person, activity or state; a somatic base plus toponym or place-forming component names a location; a somatic base plus another somatism creates a more specific anatomical image. Syndetic formations coordinate two bases, while participial and adjectival forms foreground state or evaluation. The structural variety explains why the same base can participate in separate semantic rows without losing its recognisable bodily source.

Semantic profiles. Human reference is the largest category in every anatomical table: 39 of 132 head-and-face units (29.5%), 8 of 42 hand-and-upper-body units (19.0%), 8 of 40 torso units (20.0%), 7 of 37 lower-body units (19.0%), and 15 of 43 internal-organ units (34.8%). Across all groups this produces 77 units, or 26.2% of the 294-item field. The human category therefore forms the source-defined core.

Table 2. Dominant semantic fields by anatomical group

Group	Largest field	Second prominent field	Source-defined profile
Head and face	Human: 39 (29.5%)	Speech/communication: 21 (15.9%)	Broadest and most productive

Group	Largest field	Second prominent field	Source-defined profile
Hand and upper body	Human: 8 (19.0%)	Physical conflict/action: 6 (14.3%)	Action and social interaction
Torso, chest and waist	Human: 8 (20.0%)	Wholeness/quantity: 5 (12.5%)	Body, amount and material value
Leg and lower body	Human: 7 (19.0%)	Movement/departure: 6 (16.2%)	Mobility and state
Internal organs	Human: 15 (34.8%)	Body/physiology: 6 (13.9%)	Human evaluation and internal state

The second-ranked fields reveal group specialisation. Head-and-face items are closely linked to speech and communication; the jaw and mouth rows are especially concentrated in this area. Hand-and-upper-body items foreground physical and social action. Torso terms distribute meanings across wholeness, quantity, bodily form and material value. Lower-body terms are strongly associated with movement and departure. Internal-organ terms combine human evaluation with physiological and intellectual reference.

The core-periphery model clarifies the forty source-defined semantic directions. Human nomination forms the core because it appears in all five groups and has the largest combined count. Speech, action, emotional state and other recurrent cross-group fields occupy the near-core layer. Narrow directions represented by one or very few units form the periphery. This arrangement does not remove the source categories; it describes their relative distribution within the 294-unit field.

Productive bases. The source count records head and brain in twelve units each and nose in eleven. The head row spreads across human, body-part, place and abstract meanings; the brain row covers person, evaluation, object and institution. The nose row reaches person, action, physiological process and medical practice. By contrast, jaw and mouth are more strongly concentrated in speech-related meanings. Productivity therefore has two dimensions: the number of formations and the breadth or concentration of their semantic targets.

These data support the source's distinction between external visibility and internal semantic diversity. The external groups dominate numerically, but internal terms still contribute 14.6% and display several structural models. The distribution should be understood as a property of the supplied lexicographic card index rather than a claim about present-day conversational frequency.

Conclusion. The 294-item classification demonstrates a coherent interaction of anatomical source, structural model and semantic target. External body-part terms account for 251 units (85.4%), and head-and-face terms alone account for 132 (44.9%). Internal-organ terms account for 43 units (14.6%). Human reference is the common core with 77 units (26.2%), while recurrent and narrow fields form near-core and peripheral layers. Structural diversity — from monolexemes and derivatives to compounds and phraseological units — enables the same somatic base to serve different nominative functions. The findings describe the supplied historical lexicographic repertoire and do not equate dictionary attestation with current usage frequency.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, A. H. (2015). Lexical Molding and Metaphoric Mapping of Some Human Body Parts in American Slang Expressions. Zanco Journal of Humanity Sciences, 19(3), 207–218. Cited pages: 211–217. 12 pp.
2. Green, J. Green's Dictionary of Slang. https://greensdictofslang.com/ (accessed 28 April 2026, 11:43).
3. Kulkarni, V., & Wang, W. Y. (2018). Simple Models for Word Formation in English Slang. Proceedings of NAACL-HLT, 1, 1424–1434.
4. Musurmankulova, Sh. (2024). O'zbekcha va turkcha frazemalar korpusining lingvistik ta'minoti: PhD dissertation abstract. Tashkent. Cited pages: 19, 22. 53 pp.
5. Редькина, А., & Палутина, О. (2019). Структурно-семантические особенности единиц молодежного сленга в испанской прессе. TERRA LINGUAE, 6, 158–164.
6. Sablayrolles, J.-F. (2021). L'argotier est-il un invertébré? Y a peu d'os dans l'argot. Écho des études romanes, 17(1), 7–18. Cited pages: 7–8, 16–17. 12 pp.
7. Сотволдиев, Б. (2021). Инглиз тилида сленгнинг парадигматик-синтагматик хусусиятлари: PhD dissertation. Namangan. Cited pages: 120–132. 142 pp.