

## **THE ISSUE OF STUDYING LINGUOCULTUREMES**

***Mustafayeva Saodat Burxanovna***

*Karshi State University*

***G.N.Tojiyeva***

*Scientific advisor: Doctor of Philology, Professor*

**Annotation:** This article explores the theoretical foundations of the concept of linguocultureme and its role in the interrelation between language and culture. The paper analyzes examples of linguoculturemes in Uzbek and English languages, revealing their semantic and cultural meanings. Particular attention is given to the challenges of translating linguoculturemes and their significance in intercultural communication. Moreover, the article highlights the relevance of linguoculturemes in foreign language teaching methodology and translation studies.

**Keywords:** linguocultureme, linguoculturology, language and culture, concept, translation, intercultural communication, phraseologism, national values.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, in text analysis, researchers rely on achievements in various fields such as grammar, semantics, cognitive science, psycholinguistics, and linguoculturology. The main goal is to determine the role of the speaker and the listener in linguistic activity, as well as to study the semantic and linguoculturological features of the text in greater depth. One of the current issues attracting much attention in linguistic science is the concept of language and culture, which is closely tied to linguoculturology. Although many linguists are researching this topic, it has not yet been fully resolved. This article is noteworthy in that it focuses specifically on this issue - the new branch of linguistics known as linguoculturology.

In modern linguistics, the relationship between language and culture has become one of the most essential areas of research. With the emergence of linguoculturology as a scientific discipline, scholars began to focus on cultural meanings embedded in language units. One of the central concepts of this field is the linguocultureme, defined as a unit of language that reflects specific cultural values and national identity.

This article aims to examine the issue of identifying, classifying, and interpreting linguoculturemes, particularly in the Uzbek and English languages. It also discusses the complications that arise in translation and how misunderstandings in intercultural communication can occur due to differences in cultural concepts.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Linguoculturology is closely related to several emerging branches of linguistic science, such as communicative linguistics, text linguistics, the anthropocentric approach in text analysis, cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, linguistic regional studies, and ethnolinguistics. It is interconnected with research that analyzes issues in these areas.

The methodological foundation for issues related to the interconnection of language and culture, and the problem of how culture is reflected in language, has only begun to take shape in recent

years. The works of V.V. Vorobyov, V.M. Shaklein, V.N. Telia, and V.A. Maslova serve as the foundation in this regard.

## METHODOLOGY

The study uses descriptive and comparative linguistic analysis. Data were collected from Uzbek and English idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and culturally loaded terms. Semantic and conceptual analysis techniques were applied to determine the cultural components within these expressions. The research also involves contrastive analysis to reveal cultural gaps and translation challenges. Examples were selected from authentic texts and native speakers' language use.

## RESULTS

The analysis revealed that each language has unique linguoculturemes shaped by its national worldview, traditions, and values. For instance, the Uzbek phrases like “kelin salom” (bride's greeting ritual) and “mehmon otangdan ulugʻ” (a guest is greater than your father) emphasize family hierarchy and hospitality, which are core values of Uzbek culture.

In contrast, English expressions such as “tea time”, “privacy”, or “gentleman” reflect cultural priorities like individualism, personal space, and etiquette. It was also observed that some linguoculturemes have no direct equivalents in the other language, making them difficult to translate or fully convey their meaning.

Linguoculturology considers its main object of study to be “the interconnection between language and culture at the point of their interaction, and the interpretation of this relationship as a unified system.” The subject of the field, in turn, is defined as “the nationally specific forms that emerge in the process of linguistic communication within society and are based on cultural values,” as well as “everything that constitutes the linguistic worldview”.

V.V. Vorobyov introduces the concept of the linguocultureme as the basic unit of linguocultural analysis, defining it as “a dialectical unity of linguistic and non-linguistic (conceptual and referential) content”. He explains the difference between a word and a linguocultureme using A.A. Potebnya's notion of “the near and distant meanings of a word.”

Unlike a word, a linguocultureme has a more complex structure: its content level is divided into linguistic meaning and cultural meaning. This unit carries connotative meaning and “continues to exist as long as the ideological context that gave rise to it remains relevant”. The unit can be expressed either as a word or as a segment of continuous text.

Representatives of the Volgograd school, V.I. Karasik and E.I. Sheygal, focus primarily on the comparison of language and culture. They consider the cultural concept as the main unit of linguoculturology. This concept represents a “deeper meaning” that includes the content of both concrete and abstract names, and requires additional information about the culture of the people in question. E.I. Sheygal and V.A. Buryakovskaya define linguoculturology as “the study of specific objects in the conceptual worldview and how these objects (e.g., ethnos) are perceived through the collective consciousness and language of that group.” These authors explore the linguoculturological potential of ethnonyms.

The study of cultural markers in language is a result of the achievements linguistics has made to date. The growing interest in linguoculturology determines the future of the field, although its theoretical and methodological foundations are only just beginning to take shape. Phraseologisms and proverbs are being studied as the main units that reflect cultural elements in language. Some studies even refer to samples of classical literature.

The relationship and interaction between language, culture, and ethnos (people) is an interdisciplinary issue, the resolution of which requires the combined efforts of several fields from philosophy and sociology to ethnolinguistics and linguoculturology. For example, the study of national linguistic thinking is a branch of linguistic philosophy; the examination of social or group communication through language falls within the scope of psycholinguistics. Language is closely intertwined with culture: it develops within culture and serves as its expression. Based on this idea, a new science-linguoculturology-emerged. This discipline took shape as an independent field in the 1990s.

The term "linguoculturology" appeared in the works of the phraseological school led by V.N. Telia, as well as in the publications of other researchers such as Y.S. Stepanov, A.D. Arutyunova, V.V. Vorobyov, V. Shaklein, and V.A. Maslova. While culturology (the study of culture) examines human consciousness in relation to nature, society, art, and other forms of socio-cultural reality, linguistics studies the worldview reflected in language as a unique mental model of the world. In linguoculturology, however, both language and culture are objects of study and are analyzed in their interconnection.

If the traditional interpretation of the relationship between language and culture involves solving linguistic problems by relying on various cultural concepts, in this study we explore how language, through its own units, encompasses, preserves, and expresses culture.

## **DISCUSSION**

The results demonstrate that linguoculturemes serve as cultural markers within a language, expressing the unique worldview of a speech community. They play a critical role in intercultural communication and language education. Translators and language learners must be aware of the cultural context behind these units to ensure accurate interpretation and communication.

Failure to understand or translate a linguocultureme correctly can lead to miscommunication or the loss of cultural nuance. Thus, integrating linguoculturemes into teaching materials and translation training programs is essential for developing intercultural competence.

In the mid-20th century, American linguist Dell Hymes laid the theoretical and methodological foundations for the "anthropological study of language and speech" (1963). He proposed the view that "the task of linguistics is to explain knowledge about language from the perspective of language itself, while the task of anthropology is to convey knowledge about language from the human perspective." Alessandro Duranti, in turn, emphasized that linguistic anthropology differs from other branches of linguistics by focusing on the individual's perception of material reality (1992). This direction is also referred to as "language as embedded in human nature".

Due to the fact that Soviet linguistics was based on Marxist-Leninist philosophy and had different theoretical sources, the anthropocentric approach was subject to criticism. However, as Y.S. Stepanov noted, in the past decade there was hardly a linguist who did not criticize dogmatic structuralism and did not show a tendency toward anthropocentrism in language studies (1975).

## **CONCLUSION**

Language is not only a means of communication but also a reflection of national culture and identity. Linguoculturemes offer valuable insight into how a society perceives the world and expresses its values. Studying them contributes to a deeper understanding of both the source and target cultures in translation and foreign language education. Future research may involve applying corpus linguistics and AI technologies to analyze linguoculturemes more systematically

and broadly.

Thus, ethnolinguistics and sociolinguistics are distinct fields. While ethnolinguistics relies on historically significant information and seeks to identify historical facts related to a particular people through modern materials, sociolinguistics focuses on the study of present-day language data. Linguoculturology, in contrast, examines both historical and contemporary language phenomena through the lens of spiritual culture. To be fair, there are differing opinions on this matter as well. For instance, V.N. Telia argues that linguoculturology studies the relationship between language and culture exclusively from a synchronic perspective that is, it analyzes real-time communication processes and the use of language expressions that reflect the current mentality of a people.

## REFERENCES:

1. 1. Shaykhislamov, N. Z., & Maklimudov, K. S. (2020). Linguistics and Its Modern Types. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 7(1), 358-361.
2. 2. Shaikhislamov, H. (2020). Lingvomedenietannudyts tarihi men theorylyk nepzderg O'zbekistonda ilm-fan va ta'lim masalalari: muammo va yechimlar, (2), 219-221.
3. 3. Shayxislamov, N. (2020). Nutqning paralingvistik va ekstralingvistik vositalari. *Uzbekistonda ilmiy-amaliy tadqiqotlar*, 36-37.
4. 4. Shaykhislamov, N. (2020). Cognitive Linguistics, the Symbolic and Interactive Functions of Language. *Education and Science in the 21st Century*, 7(6), 390-393.
5. 5. Shaykhislamov, N. (2020). Linguistic and Cultural Aspects of Bread Baking Terms in English and Uzbek Languages. *Integration Studies: Implications for Learning*, 62-64.