



UDK:413.211:8.03(045)

Mushtariy YUSUPOVA,
Karshi State University Doctorate PhD student
E-mail: mushtariyyusupova1999@gmail.com

Qarshi davlat universiteti professori, f.f.d N.Yuldosheva taqrizi asosida

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARINING LINGVOKULTURAL XUSUSIYATLARI

Аннотация

Ushbu maqola ingliz va o'zbek tillarining lingvokultural xususiyatlarini o'rganadi, jamiyat qadriyatlarini, an'analari va dunyoqarashlarining lingvistik tuzilmalarida va leksikonda qanday ifodalanishini tahlil qiladi. Taqqoslash sifat metodologiyasidan foydalangan holda, tadqiqot ta'lim lug'atlaridan va haqiqiy matnlardan olingan 100 etnolingvistik birlikni tahlil qiladi, bu birliklar murojaat shakllari, xushmuomalalik strategiyalari, madaniy realiyalar va idiomatik ifodalarga oid bo'ladi. Tadqiqot natijalari kommunikatsiya uslublarida asosiy farqlarni ko'rsatdi: o'zbek tili kollektivistik, yuqori kontekstli madaniyat xususiyatlarini bilvosita, hurmatga sazovor so'zlar va madaniy yukli ifodalar orqali aks ettirsa, ingliz tili individualistik, past kontekstli madaniyatga xos bo'lib, aniqroq nutq va sintaktik xushmuomalalik belgilari bilan ajralib turadi. Bilingval lug'atlarda madaniy atamalarni leksikografik yondashuvning yetarli emasligi, ko'pincha zarur madaniy izohlarning etishmasligi, bu esa til o'rganuvchilarining madaniy tushuncha shakllanishiga to'sqinlik qilishi mumkinligi aniqlangan.

Kalit so'zlar: Madaniyaro muloqot, ta'lim lug'atlari, xushmuomalalik strategiyalari, madaniy realiyalar, bilvosita ifodalar, kollektivizm, madaniyatlararo kompetensiya.

ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО И УЗБЕКСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ

Аннотация

В данной статье исследуются лингвокультурные особенности английского и узбекского языков, анализируется, как ценности, традиции и мировоззрения общества выражаются в лингвистических структурах и лексике. Используя методологию сравнительного качества, в исследовании будут проанализированы 100 этнолингвистических единиц, взятых из образовательных словарей и реальных текстов, которые будут относиться к формам обращения, стратегиям вежливости, культурным реалиям и идиоматическим выражениям. Результаты исследования показали основные различия в стилях коммуникации: в то время как узбекский язык отражает характеристики коллективистской культуры с высоким контекстом косвенно, через уважительные слова и выражения с культурной нагрузкой, английский язык более индивидуалистичен для культуры с низким контекстом и более конкретен в речевой и синтаксической характеристике признаками вежливости. Установлено, что в двуязычных словарях отсутствует лексикографический подход к культурным терминам, часто отсутствуют необходимые культурные объяснения, что может препятствовать формированию культурного понимания изучающими язык.

Ключевые слова: Межкультурная коммуникация, образовательная лексика, стратегии вежливости, культурные реалии, косвенные выражения, коллективизм, межкультурная компетентность.

LINGUOCULTURAL PECULIARITIES OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Annotation

This article explores the linguocultural peculiarities of the English and Uzbek languages, focusing on how social values, traditions, and worldviews are encoded in linguistic structures and lexicons. Employing a comparative qualitative methodology, the research analyzes 100 ethnocultural units drawn from educational dictionaries and authentic texts, covering areas such as address forms, politeness strategies, cultural realia, and idiomatic expressions. The findings reveal fundamental differences in communication styles, with Uzbek reflecting collectivist, high-context cultural traits through indirectness, honorifics, and culturally loaded expressions, while English exhibits characteristics of an individualistic, low-context culture with more direct speech and syntactic politeness markers. The lexicographical treatment of cultural terms in bilingual dictionaries was found to be insufficient, often lacking necessary cultural annotations, which may hinder language learners' cultural understanding.

Key words: Linguoculture, Uzbek language, English language, cross-cultural communication, educational dictionaries, politeness strategies, cultural realia, indirectness, collectivism, intercultural competence.

Introduction. The study of linguocultural peculiarities in world languages has become increasingly significant in the modern era of globalization, where intercultural communication plays a central role in diplomacy, education, and international business. Languages are not merely tools for communication but are also key carriers of cultural knowledge, values, and worldviews. The English and Uzbek languages, originating from distinct linguistic families and historical backgrounds, provide an excellent platform for exploring the relationship between language and culture. English, a member of the Germanic branch of the Indo-European family, has developed through centuries of socio-political and cultural changes, including the Norman Conquest, the Renaissance, the British Empire, and modern globalization, all of which have contributed to a lexicon that is rich, hybrid, and heavily influenced by borrowing. As of 2024, English is the most widely studied second language globally, with around 1.5 billion speakers, including native, second-language,

and foreign-language speakers (Ethnologue, 2024). Its status as a lingua franca in international contexts has led to the simplification of some traditional features, while also promoting the global spread of Anglo-American cultural values. In contrast, Uzbek, which belongs to the Turkic group within the Altaic language family, is the most widely spoken language in Central Asia, with over 35 million native speakers mainly concentrated in Uzbekistan and diaspora communities in neighboring countries.

Uzbek language is characterized by a long history of cultural interaction with Persian, Arabic, Russian, and more recently English, which has shaped its vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, and communicative norms. While English reflects the values of predominantly individualistic, low-context cultures such as those in the United Kingdom and the United States, Uzbek is a product of collectivist, high-context societies, where traditions, communal identity, and social hierarchy strongly influence language use. Given these differences, the study of

linguocultural peculiarities between English and Uzbek is not merely a linguistic exercise but also a necessary step in understanding how each culture encodes its worldview into language. In educational settings, particularly in lexicography and language teaching, recognizing and appropriately addressing these differences is crucial for effective bilingual dictionary compilation and for fostering intercultural competence among learners. Misinterpretations or underrepresentation of ethnocultural features in dictionaries can lead to cultural misunderstandings and communication breakdowns. Therefore, this study aims to identify and analyze the distinctive linguistic and cultural markers embedded in English and Uzbek, with a particular focus on how they are reflected in everyday communication, address forms, cultural realia, and educational materials. The comparative approach taken in this paper seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-cultural communication, while also providing recommendations for the more culturally sensitive design of educational dictionaries and language-learning resources.

Methods. This article employs a comparative qualitative method to analyze the linguocultural peculiarities of English and Uzbek languages, focusing specifically on how cultural values and traditions are encoded in language and reflected through address forms, politeness strategies, and cultural realia. The research adopts a descriptive-analytical approach supported by cross-cultural pragmatics and linguocultural theory. The core of the methodology is based on comparing authentic language data drawn from monolingual and bilingual educational dictionaries, as well as naturally occurring language samples (e.g., recorded dialogues, textbooks, and public discourse materials such as media and folk literature). By examining dictionary entries and communicative patterns in both languages, the study highlights how culture-specific values manifest through lexical choices and pragmatic usage.

The first stage of the methodology involved the selection of two major corpora:

A corpus of English educational materials and dictionaries (e.g., Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Cambridge English Dictionary, and sample dialogues from English-language teaching materials used in ESL contexts).

A corpus of Uzbek educational dictionaries and cultural texts (e.g., O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati, O'zbek tilining orfografik lug'ati, as well as Uzbek-language textbooks and authentic communicative texts such as proverbs, idioms, and ceremonial speeches).

To ensure representativeness, the study selected 50 ethnocultural units from each language. These included common address forms, culturally loaded idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and lexical items associated with traditional customs, social etiquette, and holidays. For example, in English, expressions such as "Would you mind...?", "pub", and "Thanksgiving" were analyzed, while in Uzbek, expressions like "Siz/sen", "Navruz", and "duo qiling" (give a blessing) were investigated.

The comparative framework was based on several key analytical dimensions:

Politeness strategies and address forms, analyzing both formal and informal registers;

Cultural realia, focusing on terms with no direct equivalents or requiring cultural background knowledge for interpretation;

Pragmatic functions, such as how speech acts like requests, apologies, or blessings are performed differently in each language due to cultural norms.

Additionally, the research incorporated insights from cross-cultural pragmatics, specifically leveraging models such as Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory to understand the cultural underpinnings of linguistic behavior (e.g., collectivism vs. individualism, power distance). The study also employed linguocultural analysis to investigate how metaphorical and symbolic meanings are transmitted through culturally specific lexemes.

Data analysis was conducted through content analysis, where each selected ethnocultural unit was examined in terms of:

Its linguistic form (word, phrase, idiom);

The type of dictionary definition provided (direct equivalent, paraphrase, cultural annotation);

Its communicative function and cultural connotation in the source language.

Finally, supplementary interviews and surveys were conducted with 20 Uzbek EFL learners and 10 English-speaking learners of Uzbek to assess the clarity and perceived adequacy of ethnocultural units as explained in existing educational dictionaries. This user-centered aspect of the methodology helped evaluate how dictionary users interpret these culture-bound units and where gaps or misunderstandings commonly occur.

Overall, this multi-method approach allowed for a systematic and culturally informed comparison between the two languages, offering both descriptive and interpretative insights into their linguocultural particularities.

Results. The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek languages revealed several significant linguocultural differences, particularly in the domains of address forms, politeness strategies, and culturally bound lexical items. The study of 50 ethnocultural units from each language, extracted from educational dictionaries and authentic communicative texts, uncovered patterns that reflect the divergent worldviews and cultural norms underlying English and Uzbek. One of the most prominent findings relates to the system of address and politeness. The Uzbek language demonstrates a highly stratified system of social deixis, where the choice between *Siz* (formal "you") and *sen* (informal "you") is dependent on factors such as social hierarchy, age difference, and degree of familiarity. Over 85% of the Uzbek entries analyzed (Uzbek Corpus, 2023) consistently marked this distinction, and the data showed that Uzbek speakers frequently accompany direct address with culturally specific phrases such as "*hurmatli*" (respected) or "*aziz*" (dear). In contrast, English dictionaries, such as the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, revealed that politeness in English tends to be expressed through syntactic constructions (e.g., modal verbs like *could*, *would*, or *may* I) and through tone modulation, rather than morphological address forms. The survey of Uzbek EFL learners indicated that 70% of respondents found English politeness strategies "less explicit" compared to Uzbek, often requiring contextual understanding rather than direct lexical cues.

Analysis and Discussion. The results also show significant disparities in how cultural realia are represented and explained in educational dictionaries. In the English corpus, culturally significant items such as "pub", "tea time", or "Guy Fawkes Night" were commonly provided with brief definitions, occasionally supplemented by cultural notes. However, in 40% of cases, explanations lacked sufficient depth for non-native speakers unfamiliar with British or American culture. In contrast, Uzbek dictionaries often presented culturally loaded terms like "Navruz" (Persian New Year) or "doira" (traditional percussion instrument) with limited or no explanatory notes when translated into English. For instance, the entry for "Navruz" was frequently translated as "Spring Holiday" without a comprehensive description of its historical, spiritual, or ritual significance.

Additionally, the results show that proverbs and idioms in Uzbek are more deeply intertwined with communal values and social morality. The study documented over 5,000 proverbs (*maqollar*) within the Uzbek National Corpus, many of which are regularly used in daily speech, media, and education. These proverbs often reinforce collectivist values such as respect for elders, patience, and cooperation (e.g., "*Katta bosh – katta g'am*" meaning "A big head carries big worries," referring to leadership responsibility). In comparison, English proverbs from major dictionaries (e.g., Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs) numbered around 2,000 and tended to emphasize individual actions, personal responsibility, and self-reliance (e.g., "A stitch in time saves nine" or "Every man for himself"). The interviews with learners also revealed that 65% of Uzbek students struggled with interpreting English proverbs when no culturally adaptive explanation was provided.

Finally, another notable result concerns the treatment of indirectness. The analysis showed that Uzbek speakers rely more heavily on indirect speech acts to maintain group harmony and to avoid confrontation. Expressions such as "*balki mumkin*"

(perhaps it is possible) or “xo‘p bo‘ladi” (it will be okay) were common ways of softening refusals or disagreements. On the other hand, English speech patterns are comparatively more direct, even when politeness strategies are used, often prioritizing clarity over relational considerations. This difference in pragmatic orientation was reflected in dictionary example sentences: Uzbek dictionaries contained 30% more indirect or mitigated sample sentences compared to their English counterparts, which preferred clearer and more direct formulations.

Conclusion. The comparative analysis of the English and Uzbek languages clearly illustrates that linguistic structures are deeply intertwined with cultural values and societal norms. Uzbek, as a reflection of a collectivist and high-context society, prioritizes indirectness, social hierarchy, and relational harmony, as seen in its rich honorific system and pragmatic speech patterns.

In contrast, English aligns with the principles of individualism and low-context communication, marked by directness, syntactic politeness devices, and a relatively neutral system of address. The disparities found in the representation of cultural realia and ethnocultural expressions in educational dictionaries point to an urgent need for lexicographers and educators to incorporate more comprehensive cultural explanations and pragmatic usage examples. Bridging these linguocultural gaps is essential for supporting learners' ability to navigate cross-cultural interactions effectively. The study suggests that further research could expand this analysis to include other Turkic and Indo-European languages, as well as investigate how digital dictionary platforms can enhance cultural learning through interactive and multimodal tools.

REFERENCES

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Ethnologue. (2024). English language profile. SIL International. Retrieved from <https://www.ethnologue.com/language/eng>
3. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
4. Karimov, A. (2023). *Lexical borrowing in modern Uzbek: Trends and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Tashkent State University Press.
5. Oxford University Press. (2024). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (11th ed.). Oxford University Press.
6. Oxford University Press. (2024). *Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.
7. Uzbek Academy of Sciences. (2022). *Survey on foreign lexical influence in Uzbek educational materials*. Tashkent.
8. Uzbek National Corpus. (2023). *Proverbial and idiomatic expressions in Uzbek*. Retrieved from <https://corpus.uzbekcorpus.uz>