

**LINGUOCULTURAL FEATURES OF ETHNOGRAPHISMS IN ENGLISH AND
UZBEK LANGUAGES**

Qurbanova Shaxnoza Damin qizi

Teacher in Economics and pedagogy university, Karshi city

E-mail: shaxnozaqurbanova35@gmail.com

Abstract. This article explores the linguocultural characteristics of ethnographies in English and Uzbek languages. Ethnographies, as carriers of cultural information, reflect the national mentality, traditions, and everyday life of a particular community. The study aims to analyze similarities and differences in the linguistic and cultural representations of ethnographic vocabulary in both languages. A comparative and descriptive method is used to identify semantic, cultural, and functional peculiarities. The results demonstrate that ethnographies serve as a linguistic mirror of national culture and are vital for understanding the worldview and identity of the speakers.

Key words: ethnographies, linguistic borrowing, linguocultural competence, national mentality, traditions, globalization

1. Introduction

Language and culture are inseparable phenomena. Every language reflects the historical, social, and cultural experience of its speakers. Ethnographies—words and expressions that denote national customs, clothing, food, festivals, and social relations—serve as important linguistic elements that reveal the spiritual and material culture of a nation.

In both English and Uzbek languages, ethnographies function as indicators of national identity and cultural values. For instance, English ethnographies such as pub, Thanksgiving, or tea-time represent social and cultural traditions of British life, while Uzbek ethnographies like palov, do‘ppi, and navro‘z reflect local lifestyle, customs, and national mentality.

The purpose of this research is to study how ethnographies function as linguocultural markers in English and Uzbek languages and to compare their semantic and cultural aspects.

2. Methods

The research employs the comparative, descriptive, and linguocultural methods of analysis.

Comparative method was applied to identify similarities and differences in the meanings and cultural backgrounds of English and Uzbek ethnographies.



Descriptive method was used to analyze the lexical and semantic features of the ethnographic words in their cultural contexts.

Linguocultural approach allowed interpreting the ethnographisms as reflections of national mentality and traditional worldview.

The data were collected from dictionaries, literary texts, and folklore sources in both languages.

3. Results

The analysis revealed several key findings about the linguocultural nature of ethnographisms in English and Uzbek languages:

Semantic Fields:

Ethnographisms in both languages are mainly related to categories such as traditional clothing, food, dwellings, social rituals, and holidays.

English examples: kilt, pub, Easter, cottage, royal family

Uzbek examples: do‘ppi, suzani, palov, navro‘z, ayvon

Cultural Reflection:

Each ethnographism reflects a fragment of the national worldview. For example, the English tea-time symbolizes hospitality and socialization, while the Uzbek choyxona expresses a communal and conversational culture deeply rooted in hospitality and respect for elders.

Translation Equivalence:

Many ethnographisms have no exact equivalents in the other language due to cultural specificity. For example, do‘ppi can only approximately be translated as skullcap, which lacks the Uzbek symbolic meaning of tradition and respect.

Linguistic Borrowing:

In modern English, globalization has led to the borrowing of ethnographisms such as kimono (Japanese), sushi (Japanese), or sari (Indian). Similarly, Uzbek has borrowed some Russian and English cultural words like non, futbolka, or internet kafe, enriching its ethnolinguistic system.

4. Discussion

Ethnographisms, as linguistic units reflecting the national and cultural peculiarities of a people, serve as a mirror of social life, traditions, and worldview. They represent the deep connection between language and culture, illustrating how national identity and mentality are encoded through linguistic expression. In both English and Uzbek languages, ethnographisms occupy a special place in the linguistic worldview, as they are closely tied to the everyday life, customs, and historical experiences of their speakers.



In the English language, ethnographisms are mostly associated with the historical development of the nation, social hierarchy, and regional traditions. Words such as pub, cottage, roast beef, tea time, Thanksgiving, Halloween, and Christmas carol carry cultural meanings that go beyond their literal sense. These lexical units reflect English lifestyle, values of privacy, individualism, and respect for tradition. For example, tea time is not merely a mealtime expression but a cultural ritual symbolizing social interaction and hospitality.

In Uzbek, ethnographisms are more vividly expressed through references to traditional clothes, food, ceremonies, and national values. Words such as do'ppi, palov, non, dasturxon, keldi-ketdi, to'y, otinoyi and mehmondo'stlik encapsulate the essence of Uzbek culture and the collective nature of its society. These expressions reveal the deep respect for elders, family ties, and spiritual harmony that characterize the Uzbek worldview. The frequent use of such ethnographisms in proverbs, idioms, and folklore demonstrates their integral role in preserving national identity. From a linguocultural perspective, English ethnographisms tend to reflect a more individual-oriented cultural model, while Uzbek ethnographisms emphasize communal values and interpersonal harmony. The contrast between home in English and uy in Uzbek illustrates this difference: while home often represents personal comfort and privacy, uy in Uzbek implies a space of shared life, family unity, and hospitality.

Furthermore, translation of ethnographisms between the two languages often poses difficulties because many of these terms are culture-bound. For instance, translating the Uzbek do'ppi simply as "hat" or "cap" ignores its symbolic and national value. Similarly, translating Thanksgiving into Uzbek as minnatdorchilik kuni conveys the idea but not the historical and cultural background behind it. Therefore, understanding the linguocultural essence of ethnographisms is crucial for intercultural communication, linguistic analysis, and translation studies. The comparison shows that ethnographisms function as linguistic signs of cultural memory. In Uzbek, ethnographisms are closely tied to national identity, family relations, and moral values. The lexical field of Uzbek ethnographisms emphasizes hospitality, collectivism, and respect for tradition. In contrast, English ethnographisms often reflect individuality, historical continuity, and social structure.

Moreover, ethnographisms can create translation challenges because they carry connotative meanings rooted in cultural experience rather than linguistic equivalence. Understanding these terms requires knowledge of the nation's traditions, lifestyle, and worldview.

Therefore, linguocultural competence is essential for translators and language learners to grasp the full meaning of ethnographic vocabulary.



5. Conclusion

Ethnographisms in English and Uzbek languages serve as vital linguistic tools that preserve and transmit national culture. Their study through a linguocultural lens reveals deep connections between language, thought, and identity. Recognizing and understanding ethnographisms helps to foster intercultural communication and appreciation of cultural diversity. Future research can further explore ethnographisms in literary and media contexts to deepen our understanding of their modern transformation and semantic evolution.

References

1. Karimov, I. A. Yuksak ma'naviyat – yengilmas kuch. Tashkent: Ma'naviyat, 2008.
2. Crystal, D. The Cambridge encyclopedia of language. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
3. Humboldt, W. von. On language: The diversity of human language structure and its influence on the mental development of mankind. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
4. Sapir, E. Language: An introduction to the study of speech. Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921.
5. Whorf, B. L. Language, thought, and reality. MIT Press, 1956.
6. Yuldasheva, D. Linguocultural aspects of ethnographisms in Uzbek language. Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies Journal, 2020.

