

Psycholinguistic Expression of The Male “Self” In English And Uzbek Fiction

(Based on E. Hemingway’s The Old Man and the Sea and Tog’ay Murod’s Ot kishnagan oqshom)

Madrakhimova Maftuna Shokir kizi

Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Beruni, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 August 2026; **Accepted:** 25 September 2026; **Published:** 23 October 2026

Abstract: The article analyzes, in a comparative perspective, the psycholinguistic expression of the male “self” in English and Uzbek fiction. The research material consists of E. Hemingway’s novella *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952) and the speech of male characters in Tog’ay Murod’s *Ot kishnagan oqshom* (“The Evening When the Horse Neighed”). The analysis draws on the factors that influence a person’s speech (V. Bogdanov), models of masculinity (A. Smiler; R. Levant and Y. Wong), archetypes of masculinity (R. Moore and D. Gillette), and the principles of the anthropocentric paradigm. The results show that the English protagonist’s “self” is expressed mainly through inner monologue and address to natural objects, whereas the “self” of Uzbek characters is expressed through appeals to the community, the collective “we”, proverbs and idioms, somatic metaphors, and expressive colloquial units.

Keywords: Male “self”, psycholinguistics, inner monologue, stream of consciousness, anthropocentric paradigm, literary speech, gender, comparative analysis.

Introduction: Modern linguistics finds it increasingly difficult to study language apart from the person who creates and uses it. As N. Mahmudov emphasizes, in the anthropocentric paradigm the human being is placed at the center, while language is interpreted as the principal element that shapes the individual [5, p. 56]. Whereas the social-ethical approach prevailed in the study of personality in twentieth-century linguistics, at the beginning of the twenty-first century cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, linguoculturology and linguopragmatics began to treat language as a factor that determines thinking, worldview and social behavior.

V. Bogdanov includes among the factors influencing a person’s speech language proficiency, national origin, socio-cultural status, biological and physiological data (sex, age, health), psychological type and state, tastes,

and outward appearance [6]. In a literary text, all of these factors manifest themselves through language units. For example, from the sentence “I have grown old, but I still have strength” one can understand that the speaker has physically aged but has not given up in spirit. Thus, a character’s “self” is reflected in his lexical choices, syntactic constructions and forms of address. Since communication is a psychological process taking place between at least two persons [9, p. 282], a person’s inner “self” also finds expression in his speech; here, alongside verbal means (words and expressions), nonverbal means – gestures, intonation, irony and implied meaning – are also important [10, p. 453].

The male image has been widely portrayed in sculpture (for example, Michelangelo’s *David*), painting, fiction and psychology as a symbol of strength, courage, will and inner resolve. In psychological research,

masculinity is interpreted not as a single and unchanging phenomenon but as a multifaceted concept shaped by cultural and social norms [1, p. 418]. A. Smiler distinguishes the models of the “provider”, the “protector”, the “self-reliant man” and the “man who does not openly express emotions” [2, p. 217]; R. Moore and D. Gillette distinguish four archetypes of mature masculinity – the King, the Warrior, the Magician and the Lover [3, pp. 49–119]; and J. Gray links the communicative features of men to the striving for independence and temporary withdrawal from communication under stress [4].

Nevertheless, the expression of the male “self” in literary speech through linguistic means – especially from the standpoint of comparing English and Uzbek literatures – appears to be insufficiently covered within systematic analysis. The aim of the study is to identify and comparatively describe the ways in which the “self” of male characters is expressed psycholinguistically in the two literatures. To achieve this aim, the following tasks were set: (1) to synthesize theoretical views on the male personality and masculinity as a basis for the analysis; (2) to classify Santiago’s inner monologues psycholinguistically; (3) to identify expressions of the “self” in the speech of the characters of *Ot kishnagan oqshom*; (4) to show the similarities and differences between the two literatures.

METHODS

E. Hemingway’s novella *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952) [11] and excerpts from the speech of the characters in *Tog’ay Murod’s Ot kishnagan oqshom* (“The Evening When the Horse Neighed”) [12] were chosen as the primary material. Santiago (the old fisherman) was chosen from English literature because in the work the character’s inner world is revealed largely through his speech addressed to himself and to

nature; here the writer’s “iceberg” principle – whereby most of the meaning remains below the surface of the text – plays an important role. From Uzbek literature, monologues and dialogues in *Murod’s* work that reveal the character’s “self” in situations of communication and public speech (passages of an emotional-expressive and social-ethical nature) were selected. Since the examples from the English work are cited from the Uzbek-language text, it was taken into account that the translator’s lexical and stylistic choices may influence the results of the analysis.

The anthropocentric paradigm [5], the classification of factors influencing personal speech [6], and concepts of the psychology of masculinity [1–4] served as the theoretical basis. Methods: descriptive method, contextual and psycholinguistic interpretation, thematic content analysis (grouping the speech units of characters by the types of emotional “self” they express), and the comparative-contrastive method. The analysis was carried out in three stages: (a) selecting the passages and describing them in terms of form of address, use of pronouns and syntactic construction; (b) identifying the emotional state expressed and relating it to models and archetypes of masculinity; (c) comparing the data from the two literatures. The study is qualitative in nature and makes no claim to statistical generalization.

RESULTS

1. Expression of Santiago’s “self”

In *The Old Man and the Sea*, the “stream of consciousness” technique (in the sense found in the works of J. Joyce and V. Woolf) is not used directly; however, the author creates a psychological portrayal close to it through Santiago’s inner monologues and his addresses to himself. The analyzed passages were grouped into five types of emotional “self” (Table 1).

Table 1. Psycholinguistic classification of Santiago’s inner monologues

Episode	Inner monologue	Emotional “self” revealed
Struggle with the fish	<i>“Fish, you may kill me. But man was made not to kill, but to struggle.”</i>	Will, determination, philosophy of life
Love and obligation	<i>“Fish, I love you. But I must kill you.”</i>	Conflict between love and obligation
Loneliness	<i>“There is no one. Only I and the sea.”</i>	Sense of loneliness and helplessness

Episode	Inner monologue	Emotional “self” revealed
Self-encouragement	<i>“I am strong. I can be patient.”</i>	Spiritual self-support
Dialogue with nature	<i>“Sea, you are my friend, but you are also harsh.”</i>	Unity with nature, sincerity

Three regularities were observed in the data of the table. First, the form of address: in most monologues the “I–you” pair is used, and the “fish” and the “sea” are put in the place of an interlocutor. The absence of a real listener (loneliness) is compensated through speech, as a result of which the character’s emotional “self” forms a direct, as if “invisible”, closeness with the reader. Second, the syntactic construction: the adversative conjunction “but” is the main means of expressing inner conflict in two monologues (strength versus weakness, love versus obligation). Third, in short simple sentences such as “I am strong. I can be patient”, the repetition of the pronoun “I” performs the function of self-affirmation; since in Uzbek the person marker is carried by the verb (kuchli-man ‘strong-I.am’, qila ol-a-man ‘can-do-I’), the use of the pronoun men (“I”) here is emphatic (marked).

From the standpoint of models of masculinity, Santiago corresponds to the “self-reliant” model, and his emotional expression is directed not at another person but mainly at inner speech and nature; this is close to Smiler’s model of the “man who does not openly express emotions” [2]. In terms of archetypes, determination and endurance belong to the Warrior, while affection and sympathy toward the fish belong to the Lover archetype [3]; both are fused in a single speech process.

2. Expression of the “self” of the characters in *Ot kishnagan oqshom*

In the passages selected from Tog’ay Murod’s work, in contrast to the English example, the “self” manifests itself more in public and dialogic speech, in the presence of a listener (the community). The analysis revealed the following distinctive features.

1) Appeal to the community and shift to “we”. The character’s speech opens with the address “Brothers...”; the individual “I” frequently shifts into the collective “we”: “It is we ourselves... We bite our tongues. We fear losing our reputation or our position”. Here the speaker acknowledges his own shortcoming in

the name of the community, including himself. In this way, the socio-ethical pathos about justice being trampled merges with personal responsibility.

2) Responsibility, self-blame and somatic metaphors. In the sentence “I considered myself guilty for these tears flowing”, the “I” appears as a bearer of moral responsibility. The expression “Whichever finger I bite, it hurts” conveys feeling the pain of one’s loved ones as pain in one’s own body and renders a psychological state through physical experience.

3) Honor, will, and the unity of physical endurance with spiritual fortitude. In the passages “I swallowed the blood in my mouth, teeth and all” and “Even if your mouth is full of black blood, do not spit in front of your enemy!”, not showing pain and weakness before the enemy is presented as a sign of male dignity. The sentence “I’m not going anywhere! I will ride the kopkari to the end!” (kopkari is a traditional equestrian game) likewise expresses determination (the Warrior archetype) and refusal to retreat from the situation.

4) Folk imagery and the system of values. In the passage “A machine is just iron! It has no soul! ... A horse becomes kin (el) to a person, for a horse has a soul, a heart!”, the character’s world of values (horse, kin, heart) is revealed through the opposition of the living and the lifeless. Expressions such as “we will become a source of amusement for the people and a fool (shaloq) for the folk” link the male “self” with public opinion and reputation.

5) Colloquial and affective units, forms of address. Interjections and colloquial elements such as “Eb-y”, “xayriyat-e” (“thank goodness”), “debman” (“I was afraid that...”) and “Ha-a”, and forms of address such as “muxbir aka” (“elder brother reporter”) and “o’rtoq Qurbonov” (“comrade Qurbonov”), show the speaker’s social status, age and attitude toward the interlocutor; appropriately used colloquial and dialectal elements, in turn, individualize the character’s speech [7, p. 29; 8, p. 57]. The sentence “We are not worthy of him, you know” serves as a formula of humility, expressing the

“self” submitting to the principle of not exalting itself.

Table 2. Expression of the male “self” in the two literatures (comparative overview)

Criterion	English example (Santiago)	Uzbek examples
Form of speech	Inner monologue, self-address	Public, dialogic and oratorical speech
Object of address	Elements of nature (“fish”, “sea”)	The community and the interlocutor (“brothers”, “elder brother”)
Expression of emotion	In solitude, in inner speech	Openly, through exclamatory and interrogative sentences
Center of values	Personal will, patience, self-reliance	Honor, responsibility, reputation before the people
Main linguistic means	Repetition of the pronoun “I”, adversative conjunction, short simple sentences	The “we” form, proverbs and idioms, somatic metaphor, colloquial units

Table 2 shows that the expression of the “self” in the two literatures does not exclude but complements each other: in the English example the male “self” is portrayed through the inner world and relations with oneself and nature, while in the Uzbek examples it is portrayed through the social environment, responsibility before the people and reputation. In both cases, the character’s language functions as a set of psycholinguistic markers reflecting his age, social status, psychological state and cultural belonging [6].

DISCUSSION

The results show that in both literatures the male “self” has a common core linked to will, patience and endurance, but that its verbal expression differs depending on cultural and mental factors. In Santiago’s case, the “self” stands alone face to face with nature and fate, whereas in the Uzbek passages the “self” is always portrayed in relation to the community, the people and reputation. This difference can perhaps be explained by cultural notions that emphasize individual independence on the one hand and give priority to communal connectedness on the other; at the same time, this conclusion is valid only within the selected texts and must be tested on broader material.

The combination of the Uzbek “self” with humility also deserves attention. In Islamic ethics arrogance is condemned, while humility and self-knowledge are valued; therefore in Uzbek speech the “self” is often not displayed but hidden under forms such as “we” and “we are not worthy, you know”. However, this is not self-abasement: the proverb “Bow to the one who

bows until your head touches the ground; stand tall against the one who swaggers until your head reaches the sky” promotes respecting the humble and responding to the arrogant while preserving one’s dignity. The passage “do not spit in front of your enemy” likewise shows the same balance – the unity of outward endurance and inner honor.

In Hemingway’s case, according to the “iceberg” principle, the main part of the emotional “self” remains hidden: Santiago’s laconic inner sentences are only the visible part of his spiritual world. In the Uzbek passages, by contrast, the emotional “self” manifests itself openly and expressively in the speech itself. In this sense, the English example is closer to an internal (introspective) type of expression, and the Uzbek example to an external (rhetorical and communicative) type. This observation allows us to suppose that the image of the “independent man who solves his problems himself” described by Gray [4] and Smiler’s “self-reliant” model [2] appear more clearly in the English text, while communal responsibility and the “protector” model predominate in the Uzbek text.

The limitations of the study: the analysis relied on a limited volume of text and on a translated text; the Uzbek material is limited to one work and one author’s style, so other authors’ works should also be covered before the results can be interpreted as a general feature of Uzbek literature. In the future, it would be advisable to conduct corpus-based studies that include quantitative indicators and cover more works.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were reached as a result of the study. First, the male “self” is revealed in a literary text not only through external actions but also through forms of address, the use of pronouns, syntactic construction and figurative means; therefore studying it from a psycholinguistic standpoint is productive. Second, in *The Old Man and the Sea*, Santiago’s “self” is expressed through inner monologue and address to nature, combining will, loneliness and the conflict between love and obligation. Third, in Tog’ay Murod’s *Ot kishnagan oqshom*, the “self” manifests itself through appeals to the community, the “we” form, proverbs and idioms, somatic metaphors and colloquial units, in connection with honor and responsibility. Fourth, in both literatures will, patience and fortitude form the common core, and the difference is seen mainly in the form of expression – inner and individual (English) versus open and communal (Uzbek). The results can be used in studying the linguopsychological features of the male image in literary text analysis and in comparative studies of English and Uzbek.

REFERENCES

1. Levant R. F., Wong Y. J. (eds.). *The Psychology of Men and Masculinities*. – Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2017. – P. 418.
2. Smiler A. P. *Clinical Work With Men: Understanding Masculinity in Psychotherapy*. – Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2026. – P. 217.
3. Moore R. L., Gillette D. *King, Warrior, Magician, Lover: Rediscovering the Archetypes of the Mature Masculine*. – San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1990. – Pp. 49–119.
4. Gray J. *Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus*. – New York: HarperCollins, 1992. – 286 p.
5. Mahmudov N. *Til tilsimi tadqiqi [Studying the Mystery of Language]*. – Tashkent: Mumtoz so’z, 2017. – P. 56.
6. Богданов В. В. *Речевое общение.: прагматические и семантические аспекты*. –Л.: Изд-во Ленинградского ун-та, 1990. –88 с.
7. Йўлдошев М. *Чўлпон сўзининг сирлари [The Secrets of Cho’lpon’s Word]*. – Тошкент: Маънавият, 2002. – P. 29.
8. Шомақсудов А. *ва бошқ. Ўзбек тили стилистикаси [Stylistics of the Uzbek Language]*. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1983. – P. 57.
9. Карнеги Д. *Как завоевать друзей и оказывать влияние на людей [How to Win Friends and Influence People]*. – Ташкент: Шарқ, 1992. – P. 282.
10. Воронцов В. Л. *Тафаккур гулшани [The Garden of Thought]*. – Тошкент: Фафур Фулом, 1989. –Б. 453.
11. Hemingway E. *The Old Man and the Sea*. – New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1952.
12. Tog’ay Murod. *Ot kishnagan oqshom [The Evening When the Horse Neighed]*. –Tashkent: Pharos ambition, 2024. –P. 173.