

ETHNOCULTURAL CODES OF THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LINGUISTIC
WORLDVIEWS

G. R. Aminova

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

ORCID: 0009-0005-9570-7440

Abstract

This article examines language as a means of representing ethnocultural meanings based on the material of the English and Uzbek languages. The main focus is placed not on external cultural realia, but on internal linguistic units through which national worldview, value systems, social hierarchy, communicative distance, and moral evaluation are expressed. The analysis of Uzbek concepts such as *andisha*, *hayo*, *oriyat*, *oqibat*, *ko'ngil*, *yuz*, *gap-so'z*, *egachi*, *quda*, *ovsin*, *boja*, *fotiha*, *rozi-rizolik* and English concepts such as *privacy*, *personal boundaries*, *understatement*, *self-reliance*, and *fair play* reveals specific features of the ethnocultural consciousness of the two peoples. The theoretical basis of the research is formed by the works of Russian and Uzbek linguists in the fields of linguoculturology, ethnolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and intercultural communication. The article concludes that language not only reflects culture but also fixes ways of social evaluation, speech behavior, and interpretation of human relations.

Keywords: language; ethnoculture; linguistic worldview; linguoculturology; English language; Uzbek language; cultural code; national consciousness; intercultural communication.

Introduction

In modern linguistics, language is considered not only as a means of communication but also as a form of reflection of culture, thinking, and national experience. The relationship between language, culture, and thought is one of the central problems of linguoculturology and ethnolinguistics (Maslova, 2001; Vorobyev, 1997; Stepanov, 2004). In this respect, language functions not simply as a system of signs but as a cultural code in which values, behavioral norms, ways of social evaluation, and specific features of national worldview are fixed.

The concept of the linguistic worldview makes it possible to consider language as a means of conceptualizing reality. Through language, a nation not only names objects and phenomena but also expresses its attitude toward them, forms a system of values, and transmits historical experience to the next generations (Arutyunova, 1999; Karasik, 2002; Ter-Minasova, 2000). Therefore, the ethnocultural analysis of the English and Uzbek languages should take into account not only the dictionary meanings of words but also the hidden cultural meanings fixed in speech practice.

In Uzbek linguistics, language is also regarded as one of the most important carriers of national consciousness, spiritual experience, and cultural memory of the people (Mahmudov, 1998; Nurmonov, 2002; Safarov, 2006). From this point of view, such Uzbek concepts as *andisha*, *hayo*, *oriyat*, *oqibat*, *ko'ngil*, *yuz*, and *gap-so'z* are not merely lexical units, but ethnocultural codes through which norms of behavior, emotional restraint, social responsibility, and public evaluation are manifested.

The relevance of the topic is determined by the fact that in the conditions of active intercultural communication, knowledge of vocabulary and grammar alone is no longer sufficient. Successful communication requires an understanding of the cultural logic of word usage, forms of address, ways of expressing agreement and disagreement, respect, distance, and emotional evaluation. This is especially important in the comparison of English and Uzbek, since these languages represent different cultural models. The English linguistic worldview tends to emphasize personal autonomy, individual boundaries, and communicative distance, whereas the

Uzbek linguistic worldview clearly reflects social involvement, moral responsibility, and the significance of public evaluation.

The purpose of this article is to identify the ethnocultural codes of the English and Uzbek linguistic worldviews through the analysis of lexical, phraseological, and communicative units. The research material consists of culturally significant words and expressions in English and Uzbek. The methodological basis of the study includes descriptive, comparative, and linguocultural methods of analysis.

The linguocultural approach makes it possible to study language as a space in which the cultural meanings of a people are preserved. V. A. Maslova considers linguoculturology as a field that studies the interrelation of language and culture, as well as the ways in which cultural information is fixed in linguistic units (Maslova, 2001). V. V. Vorobyev emphasizes the systematic nature of the connection between language and culture, viewing language as a form of existence of the cultural memory of a people (Vorobyev, 1997). Yu. S. Stepanov introduces the notion of cultural constants, that is, stable semantic formations preserved in the consciousness of a people and manifested in language (Stepanov, 2004).

The concept of the cultural concept plays a special role in ethnocultural analysis. A concept allows us to examine a word not only as a dictionary unit but also as a carrier of cultural information. In this sense, Uzbek words such as *andisha*, *ko'ngil*, *oriyat*, and *oqibat*, as well as English words such as *privacy*, *fairness*, and *self-reliance*, may be viewed as cultural concepts because they combine lexical meaning, social norm, evaluation, and communicative scenario.

In Uzbek linguistics, the connection between language and national worldview is explored in the works of N. M. Mahmudov, A. Nurmonov, Sh. Safarov, and other scholars. N. M. Mahmudov emphasizes that language expresses the spiritual experience of a people and serves as one of the most important means of preserving national identity (Mahmudov, 1998). A. Nurmonov examines the development of Uzbek linguistic thought in connection with the cultural history of the nation (Nurmonov, 2002). Sh. Safarov, relying on the cognitive approach, shows that language participates in the categorization of the world and reflects human ways of cognition (Safarov, 2006). Therefore, the analysis of ethnocultural units in English and Uzbek makes it possible to reveal not only differences in vocabulary but also differences in the cultural interpretation of reality.

Uzbek ethnocultural codes: social involvement and moral evaluation

One of the most profound Uzbek ethnocultural concepts is *andisha*. It may be approximately translated as “tact,” “consideration,” or “thoughtfulness,” but these equivalents do not fully convey its cultural content. *Andisha* denotes a person's inner ability to evaluate in advance the consequences of his or her words or actions from the point of view of family, elders, neighbors, the collective, and public opinion. In Uzbek culture, a person who possesses *andisha* does not act only according to personal desire; he or she considers the emotional state of others, the social situation, and the possible reaction of the surrounding community. Therefore, *andisha* is not simple politeness, but a mechanism of internal social self-control.

The concept of *hayo* is closely connected with *andisha*. It is often translated as “modesty” or “shyness,” but ethnoculturally it is broader. *Hayo* expresses an inner moral boundary that regulates speech, behavior, gestures, appearance, and the degree of openness of a person. While the English word *modesty* is often associated with moderation or the absence of self-promotion, Uzbek *hayo* has a stronger moral and ethical connotation. It is connected with the idea of inner discipline, restraint, and the inadmissibility of excessive demonstrativeness.

The concept of *oriyat* occupies a special place. It may be compared with the words “honor,” “dignity,” and “self-respect,” but in the Uzbek linguistic worldview *oriyat* has not only an individual but also a collective component. Expressions such as *oriyatli odam* and *oriyatini*

saqlamoq show that a person's dignity is perceived as a socially significant category. A person is responsible not only for himself or herself but also for the reputation of the family, kinship group, and immediate social environment. In English, the word *dignity* is more often associated with individual personal worth, whereas Uzbek *oriyat* includes public and family responsibility.

Another important ethnocultural concept is *oqibat*. It cannot be reduced to the words "kindness," "loyalty," or "responsiveness." *Oqibat* expresses a long-term moral connection between people, memory of kindness, the ability to maintain relationships, and the refusal to forget one's human duty. A person described as *oqibatli* is perceived as someone who preserves attachment, responds to attention with attention, and does not break moral ties. This concept reveals the special value of human memory and emotional responsibility.

One of the most difficult Uzbek words to translate is *ko'ngil*. It may be rendered as "soul," "heart," "mood," or "inner state," but none of these translations fully covers its meaning. Expressions such as *ko'ngli qoldi*, *ko'nglini olmoq*, *ko'ngli keng*, and *ko'ngliga qaramoq* convey not only an emotional state but also the cultural norm of careful treatment of another person's inner world. For example, *ko'nglini olmoq* does not simply mean "to comfort" or "to please"; it means to restore a person's emotional balance, remove resentment, and show attention. This confirms the idea that set expressions and phraseological units preserve the cultural information of a people especially vividly (Teliya, 1996; Maslova, 2001; Stepanov, 2004).

The word *yuz*, meaning "face," is also symbolically significant. In Uzbek, it denotes not only a part of the body but also reputation, honor, and social evaluation. Expressions such as *yuzini yorug' qilmoq*, *yuzi shuvut bo'lmoq*, and *yuziga qaray olmaslik* show that "face" is connected with a person's moral status before others. A parallel may be drawn with the English expression *to save face*, but in Uzbek speech the idea of "face" is deeply integrated into the everyday system of moral evaluation.

A special group of Uzbek ethnocultural markers is formed by kinship-based forms of address: *egachi*, *aka*, *opa*, *uka*, *singil*, *amaki*, *tog'a*, *xola*, *kelinoyi*, *quda*, *ovsin*, and *boja*. Their meaning is not limited to kinship relations. In real speech practice, many of these words perform the function of respectful address and help define a person's place in the system of social relations. For example, *egachi* denotes an elder sister or an older woman, but communicatively it expresses a soft form of respect, recognition of seniority, and social closeness. The English equivalent *elder sister* conveys only the kinship meaning and does not always reflect the respectful and socio-communicative shade of Uzbek *egachi*.

The words *quda*, *ovsin*, and *boja* are also highly illustrative. *Quda* denotes the parents of spouses in relation to each other; *ovsin* refers to the wives of brothers in relation to each other; *boja* refers to the husbands of sisters in relation to each other. In English, such relations are usually expressed descriptively or generally through the word *in-laws*. Uzbek, by contrast, fixes these relations in a detailed way. This shows that in the Uzbek linguistic worldview, marriage is understood not only as a union of two individuals but also as a connection between two family systems.

The words *fotiha* and *rozi-rizolik* are also important ethnocultural units. *Fotiha* expresses not only a prayer or blessing but also the social recognition of a particular decision. *Rozi-rizolik* denotes consent, approval, and the inner moral readiness to accept another person's action. These words show that in Uzbek culture, a personal decision often requires not only formal approval but also spiritual and moral agreement with relatives and elders.

English ethnocultural codes: autonomy, distance, and self-control

The English linguistic worldview represents different cultural emphases. One of the key concepts is *privacy*. It is usually translated as "private life," but in English-speaking culture it includes personal space, the right to non-interference, independent decision-making, and emotional

reserve. In everyday communication, this is reflected in caution when asking personal questions. Questions about income, age, family problems, or personal relationships may be perceived as a violation of *personal boundaries*.

The concept of *personal boundaries* denotes psychological, emotional, and communicative limits of the individual. English expressions such as *I need some space*, *It's personal*, *I'd rather not talk about it*, and *That's private* show that refusing to discuss a personal topic is not necessarily rude. On the contrary, it is understood as a normal protection of individual space. In Uzbek culture, similar questions in certain situations may be interpreted as a sign of care or involvement, whereas in English-speaking culture they may violate the principle of personal autonomy.

Another important English ethnocultural code is *understatement*, that is, the deliberate softening of evaluation. Expressions such as *not bad* or *a bit difficult* may convey a stronger meaning than they seem to express literally. This speech strategy reflects a cultural orientation toward restraint, emotional control, and indirect expression of attitude. If Uzbek communication places great importance on preserving the interlocutor's *ko'ngil*, English communication emphasizes avoiding pressure on personal space and excessive emotional directness.

The concept of *self-reliance* expresses the value of independence and personal responsibility. English expressions such as *stand on your own feet*, *make your own decision*, and *take responsibility* reflect the idea of a person as an autonomous individual capable of making independent decisions. In Uzbek culture, independence is also valued, but it is more often correlated with moral responsibility toward family and social group. In the English linguistic worldview, the emphasis is more strongly shifted toward individual choice.

The concept of *fair play* is connected with the idea of honest competition, observance of rules, and equal opportunities. In English culture, fairness is often understood as following rules and procedures. In Uzbek culture, justice may be more strongly associated with human decency, conscience, seniority, social context, and moral attitude toward others. Thus, universal values receive different linguistic forms and cultural interpretations.

Comparative analysis

The comparison of English and Uzbek ethnocultural codes shows that differences are manifested not only in vocabulary but also in ways of organizing social behavior. Uzbek concepts such as *andisha*, *hayo*, *oriyat*, *oqibat*, *ko'ngil*, *yuz*, *gap-so'z*, *egachi*, *quda*, *fotiha*, and *rozi-rizolik* reflect a culture of social involvement, emotional delicacy, public evaluation, and moral responsibility. They show that the individual is perceived not in isolation but through a system of relations with other people.

English concepts such as *privacy*, *personal boundaries*, *understatement*, *self-reliance*, and *fair play* reflect a culture of autonomy, personal distance, restraint, and procedural justice. Here, the right of the individual to independent decision-making, protection of personal space, and freedom from excessive external interference becomes especially important.

At the same time, these differences should not be reduced to a simplified opposition between collectivism and individualism. Uzbek culture does not exclude individuality, and English culture does not deny sociality. Rather, the issue concerns different mechanisms of cultural regulation of behavior. In the Uzbek linguistic worldview, emotional and moral ties between people are important, while in the English linguistic worldview, the balance between respect for the individual and non-interference in the private sphere becomes central.

S. G. Ter-Minasova notes that intercultural communication requires knowledge not only of words but also of the cultural norms of their use (Ter-Minasova, 2000). Therefore, when teaching English to Uzbek-speaking students, it is necessary to explain not only grammatical structures but also pragmatic meanings of expressions. For example, the English phrase *It's private* may be understood literally, but its cultural function is connected with the protection of personal

boundaries. Conversely, Uzbek expressions connected with *ko'ngil*, *andisha*, or *rozi-rizolik* require descriptive translation and cultural commentary.

Thus, the comparative study of English and Uzbek shows that ethnocultural meanings are manifested at different levels of language: in vocabulary, phraseology, speech etiquette, and communicative strategies (Ter-Minasova, 2000; Karasik, 2002; Safarov, 2006).

Conclusion

Language in an ethnocultural perspective is a system in which not only the meanings of words but also deep cultural meanings are fixed. The material of English and Uzbek shows that each linguistic worldview forms a specific way of perceiving the individual, society, emotions, responsibility, and communication.

Uzbek concepts such as *andisha*, *hayo*, *oriyat*, *oqibat*, *ko'ngil*, *yuz*, *gap-so'z*, *egachi*, *quda*, *ovsin*, *boja*, *fotiha*, and *rozi-rizolik* reflect a culture of social connectedness, moral self-control, emotional delicacy, and public evaluation. English concepts such as *privacy*, *personal boundaries*, *understatement*, *self-reliance*, and *fair play* express the values of personal space, autonomy, restraint, independence, and observance of rules.

Therefore, ethnocultural analysis of language is important for linguoculturology, comparative linguistics, translation studies, and foreign language teaching. It allows us to see behind a word not only its meaning but also a cultural norm, social evaluation, and national way of interpreting the world.

References

1. Arutyunova, N. D. (1999). *Language and the World of Man*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture.
2. Ashurova, D. U., & Galieva, M. R. (2016). *Stylistics of Literary Text*. Tashkent: Turon-Iqbol.
3. Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse*. Volgograd: Peremena.
4. Mahmudov, N. M. (1998). *Til*. Tashkent: Yozuvchi.
5. Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Linguoculturology: A Textbook for Students of Higher Educational Institutions*. Moscow: Akademiya.
6. Nurmonov, A. (2002). *History of Uzbek Linguistics: A Textbook for Students of Uzbek Philology Faculties*. Tashkent: O'zbekiston.
7. Safarov, Sh. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Jizzakh: Sangzor.
8. Safarov, Sh., & Toirova, G. (2007). *Foundations of Ethnosociopragmatic Analysis of Speech*. Samarkand: SamSIFL.
9. Stepanov, Yu. S. (2004). *Constants: A Dictionary of Russian Culture*. Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt.
10. Teliya, V. N. (1996). *Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic and Linguocultural Aspects*. Moscow: School "Languages of Russian Culture".
11. Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2000). *Language and Intercultural Communication*. Moscow: Slovo.
12. Vorobyev, V. V. (1997). *Linguoculturology: Theory and Methods*. Moscow: Peoples' Friendship University of Russia.