

## **The Formation and Development of Linguoculturology**

***Gulmira Shavkat qizi Toshtemirova***

*first-year Master's student in the Foreign Language and Literature program at the Samarkand Campus of the  
University of Economics and Pedagogy  
[gulmiratoshtemirova002@gmail.com](mailto:gulmiratoshtemirova002@gmail.com)*

***Umidjon Egamberdiyevich Qurbonov***

*lecturer at the Samarkand Campus of the University of Economics and Pedagogy*

**Annotation** *Linguoculturology emerged as an interdisciplinary field that studies the ways in which language preserves, represents, and transmits culturally significant meanings. Its formation was prepared by several earlier traditions, including ethnolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, semiotics, and Cultural Linguistics. However, linguoculturology acquired its most recognizable disciplinary form within Russian and post-Soviet scholarship, where language began to be examined not only as a communicative system but also as a carrier of national mentality, cultural memory, value orientations, and symbolic codes. This article analyses the theoretical essence, formation stages, conceptual apparatus, and contemporary significance of linguoculturology. The research is based on a theoretical-analytical review of scholarly works retrieved through Scite, including studies on Cultural Linguistics, post-Soviet linguoculturology, anthropocentric linguistics, Uzbek linguistics, cultural conceptualisations, symbols, and national-cultural codes. The article argues that linguoculturology should not be reduced to an alternative name for Cultural Linguistics. Rather, it may be understood as a historically specific paradigm shaped by the anthropocentric turn in linguistics and by the post-Soviet tradition of studying culturally marked language units. Its key categories include linguocultureme, concept, national-cultural code, symbol, metaphor, phraseological unit, and paremial unit.*

**Keywords:** *linguoculturology, Cultural Linguistics, language and culture, concept, linguocultureme, national-cultural code, anthropocentric linguistics, Uzbek linguistics.*

### **Introduction**

The relationship between language and culture has long occupied a central place in the humanities, yet it became a distinct linguistic problem only when scholars began to move beyond the structural description of language and examine language as a form of cultural memory. In this broader intellectual movement, linguoculturology appeared as a discipline concerned with the cultural content of language units, the linguistic representation of national worldview, and the ways in which collective experience is encoded in speech, discourse, metaphor, phraseology, symbols, and proverbs.

The relevance of linguoculturology is connected with the anthropocentric turn in modern linguistics. Language is no longer interpreted merely as a system of phonological, grammatical, and lexical relations. It is increasingly viewed as a human-centred phenomenon through which speakers classify reality, express values, preserve collective experience, and transmit cultural norms. Cultural Linguistics, as formulated by Sharifian, studies the relationship between language and cultural conceptualisations, including cultural schemas, categories, and cultural-conceptual metaphors [1]. Linguoculturology shares this concern, but it developed within a different scholarly genealogy and

with a distinct focus on national-cultural specificity, linguoculturemes, concepts, stereotypes, precedent phenomena, and cultural codes.

A key research problem arises from the terminological proximity of linguoculturology and Cultural Linguistics. Peeters argues that Western scholars may assume that linguoculturology simply refers to the same field known in English-language scholarship as Cultural Linguistics, but the two traditions are not identical [2]. Mizin and Korostenski also show that “Western” Cultural Linguistics and “post-Soviet” linguoculturology developed in parallel, shaped by different academic languages, institutional histories, and methodological traditions [3]. This means that linguoculturology must be analysed as a historically specific scholarly paradigm rather than as a mechanical translation of an English-language term.

The aim of this article is to examine the formation and development of linguoculturology as an interdisciplinary branch of modern linguistics. The main objectives are: first, to define the theoretical essence of linguoculturology; second, to identify the intellectual traditions that influenced its emergence; third, to compare its relation to Cultural Linguistics, ethnolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and linguistic anthropology; fourth, to analyse its key concepts; and fifth, to show the role of Uzbek and Central Asian linguistic studies in the development of linguocultural analysis.

The article is guided by three research questions. First, what theoretical and methodological factors contributed to the formation of linguoculturology? Second, how does linguoculturology differ from Cultural Linguistics, ethnolinguistics, and cognitive linguistics? Third, what place do Uzbek linguistic studies occupy in contemporary linguocultural research?

The scientific novelty of the article lies in its integrative interpretation of linguoculturology as a field located at the intersection of language, culture, thought, and national identity. The article argues that linguoculturology should be studied not only through its Russian and post-Soviet origins, but also through its contemporary expansion into Uzbek linguistics, translation studies, intercultural communication, and discourse analysis.

## **Methodology**

This article is a theoretical-analytical study. Its source base consists of scholarly publications identified through Scite on linguoculturology, Cultural Linguistics, ethnolinguistics, anthropocentric linguistics, Uzbek linguistics, cultural conceptualisations, symbols, and national-cultural codes. Since the present version has not independently verified each journal’s Scopus indexing status, the sources are used as scholarly sources retrieved and checked through Scite, while their final Scopus status requires separate confirmation before publication.

The selection of sources followed four criteria. First, the publication had to address the relation between language and culture either directly or through related concepts such as cultural conceptualisation, linguocultureme, symbol, concept, or national-cultural code. Second, preference was given to works that discuss the theory and methodology of linguoculturology or Cultural Linguistics. Third, Uzbek and Central Asian authors were included where their work directly relates to anthropocentric linguistics, linguocultural concepts, or symbolic meanings. Fourth, sources with DOI or official publication data were prioritised in order to avoid unverifiable references.

The methodological framework combines comparative-analytical, historical-typological, conceptual, discourse-oriented, and linguocultural methods. The comparative-analytical method is used to distinguish linguoculturology from Cultural Linguistics and ethnolinguistics. The historical-typological method helps to reconstruct the stages of formation of linguoculturology from earlier language-and-culture traditions. Conceptual analysis is used to clarify such categories as concept, linguocultureme, symbol, cultural code, and metaphor. Discourse-oriented analysis is applied to explain the relevance of linguoculturology for globalization, translation, intercultural communication, and identity studies. The linguocultural method is used to interpret language units as carriers of cultural information.

The article also relies on the anthropocentric principle, according to which language is analysed through its relation to human consciousness, social experience, and cultural identity. Khudayberganova, Mukimova, and Karimova examine the role of linguistic anthropocentrism in Uzbek national linguistics and connect this approach with the broader transformation of linguistic research toward the human factor [4,5]. This principle is essential for linguoculturology because cultural meaning is not a secondary addition to language; it is formed through speakers' historically conditioned experience.

## Results and Discussion

3. RESULTS. 3.1. The theoretical essence of linguoculturology. Linguo-culturology may be defined as a branch of linguistics that studies culturally marked language units and the ways in which they represent collective worldview, national mentality, symbolic associations, and cultural memory. Its object is not culture in general and not language in isolation, but the interaction between linguistic form and cultural meaning.

The basic theoretical assumption of linguoculturology is that language and culture are mutually connected. Language records cultural meanings, but it also participates in their reproduction and transformation. Iermachkova and Mujkošová note that linguoculturology is built on the triadic relation between language, culture, and nation, referring to Vorobjov's view that these three elements constitute the fundamental framework of the field [6,7]. This triad explains why linguoculturology is especially interested in units that contain national-cultural information: phraseological expressions, proverbs, metaphors, symbols, etiquette formulas, culturally marked lexical items, and precedent names.

Linguoculturology differs from purely structural linguistics because it does not treat meaning as only a semantic relation inside the language system. It asks what cultural knowledge stands behind a linguistic unit. For example, a symbol in linguocultural analysis is not simply a sign replacing another object; it is a condensed form of collective experience. Khakimova's study of fauna symbols in Uzbek and English cultural spaces shows that symbols function as linguoculturemes presenting information about lifestyle, religion, mentality, ethnography, geography, and social experience [8]. This confirms that symbol, concept, and cultural code are central categories in linguoculturology.

3.2. Stages in the formation of linguoculturology. The formation of linguoculturology can be divided into five broad stages.

The first stage may be called the philosophical and pre-disciplinary stage. During this period, the connection between language, thought, nation, and culture was discussed in general philosophical and anthropological terms. Humboldtian ideas about language and worldview, as well as early discussions of national spirit and linguistic relativity, prepared the ground for later linguocultural thinking.

The second stage was the ethnolinguistic and anthropological stage. Here, scholars began to study language as part of the life of an ethnic community. Folklore, ritual, mythology, kinship terminology, naming practices, and traditional categories became important objects of analysis. Mizin and Korostenski argue that ethnolinguistics served as one of the foundations for both Cultural Linguistics and linguoculturology, although Western and Slavic traditions developed along different methodological lines [9,10].

The third stage was the cognitive and anthropocentric turn. At this stage, linguistics began to study the relation between language and human consciousness more directly. The concept became one of the most important categories. Fayzieva notes that the concept is an interdisciplinary object of cognitive linguistics, cultural studies, and linguoculturology, but cognitive and linguocultural approaches interpret it differently [11]. In cognitive linguistics, the concept is often treated as a mental representation, whereas in linguoculturology it is interpreted as a culturally loaded unit of collective consciousness.

The fourth stage was the institutionalization of linguoculturology in Russian and post-Soviet scholarship. During this period, linguoculturology acquired its own terminology, research units, and methodological debates. It became associated with such categories as linguistic personality, cultural code, linguocultureme, concept, stereotype, precedent text, national mentality, and value picture of the world. Peeters observes that one reason for the limited visibility of linguoculturology in Western scholarship was that many linguoculturological works were published in Russian or other post-Soviet academic contexts [12].

The fifth stage is the contemporary comparative and global stage. Linguoculturology is now applied to translation, intercultural communication, globalization, discourse studies, language teaching, and comparative linguistics. Iermachkova and Mujkošová show that globalization affects language through cultural contact, borrowing, neologisms, and the transformation of cultural boundaries [13]. This stage expands linguoculturology beyond national description and turns it into a tool for analysing cultural interaction.

3.3. Linguoculturology and Cultural Linguistics. Linguoculturology and Cultural Linguistics share a common interest in the relation between language and culture, but they differ in their theoretical origin and analytical emphasis. Sharifian defines Cultural Linguistics as a multidisciplinary field that studies culturally constructed conceptualisations manifested in language, including cultural schemas, categories, and metaphors [Sharifian, 2015, pp. 515–532]. This approach is strongly linked to cognitive linguistics and linguistic anthropology.

Peeters distinguishes between cultural linguistics as a broad field and Cultural Linguistics as a specific theoretical framework associated with Palmer and Sharifian [Peeters, 2016, pp. 137–160]. This distinction is useful because linguoculturology can be placed within the broader family of culture-oriented linguistic approaches, but it should not be reduced to Sharifian's framework.

Mizin and Korostenski explain that Western Cultural Linguistics and post-Soviet linguoculturology developed in parallel because they were shaped by different scholarly traditions [14]. Western Cultural Linguistics is more closely tied to cognitive anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and cultural conceptualisation. Linguoculturology, by contrast, is more closely linked to post-Soviet ethnolinguistics, national mentality studies, phraseology, paremiology, and the analysis of culturally marked language units.

3.4. The conceptual apparatus of linguoculturology. The central categories of linguoculturology include the linguocultureme, concept, national-cultural code, symbol, metaphor, stereotype, phraseological unit, and paremiological unit.

The concept is perhaps the most widely used and debated category. Fayzieva's comparison of cognitive and linguocultural concepts demonstrates that the linguocultural concept differs from the cognitive concept because it carries cultural value, national specificity, and collective symbolic associations [Fayzieva, 2021, pp. 60–68]. A linguocultural concept is therefore not merely an idea in the mind; it is a culturally meaningful mental formation expressed through language.

The linguocultureme refers to a language unit that contains culturally significant information. It may be a word, phrase, proverb, metaphor, symbol, or discourse formula. Khakimova's analysis of fauna symbols in Uzbek and English indicates that symbols function as linguoculturemes because they verbalize cultural knowledge about religion, mentality, social life, and national worldview [15].

The national-cultural code refers to the system through which a culture organizes and interprets reality. Baissydyk and Aldabek's research on national and Oriental character names shows that linguocultural analysis can reveal how character, behaviour, and identity are encoded through national-cultural meanings. In this sense, a cultural code is not a single sign but a system of associations through which a linguistic community interprets human qualities, social relations, and moral values.

Metaphors, phraseological units, and proverbs are especially important because they preserve collective experience in compact linguistic forms. They often express culturally specific evaluations of work, family, honour, hospitality, kinship, courage, modesty, and wisdom. From a linguocultural

perspective, such units are not decorative expressions; they are verbal forms of cultural memory.

3.5. Uzbek linguistics and linguoculturology. Uzbek linguistics has increasingly engaged with anthropocentric and linguocultural approaches. The study of language in relation to national mentality, communicative behaviour, symbolic meaning, gender, etiquette, phraseology, and cultural concepts has become an important part of contemporary Uzbek linguistic research.

Khudayberganova, Mukimova, and Karimova connect the development of Uzbek national linguistics with the anthropocentric paradigm, emphasizing the importance of studying language through the human factor. This is highly relevant to linguoculturology because the Uzbek language contains rich cultural material in proverbs, idioms, kinship terms, religious expressions, etiquette formulas, metaphors, and symbolic vocabulary.

Fayzieva's work is also important because it directly discusses the difference between cognitive and linguocultural concepts within the context of cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology. This contribution shows that Uzbek scholarship does not merely import terminology from Russian or Western linguistics, but actively participates in clarifying the theoretical boundaries of the field.

Khakimova's comparison of Uzbek and English fauna symbols demonstrates the productive potential of Uzbek material for comparative linguocultural analysis. Animal symbols, colour terms, kinship names, hospitality formulas, and religious-cultural expressions can reveal how Uzbek speakers encode national worldview in language. Such studies help place Uzbek linguistics within broader international discussions of language, culture, and cognition.

4. DISCUSSION. The findings suggest that linguoculturology should be understood as an interdisciplinary field whose development cannot be explained through one source alone. It grew out of the convergence of several traditions: ethnolinguistics provided attention to ethnic culture and folklore; linguistic anthropology supplied the idea of language as social practice; cognitive linguistics offered the category of conceptualisation; sociolinguistics emphasized language in society; semiotics contributed the analysis of signs and symbols; and post-Soviet linguistics developed the category of linguocultureme, cultural code, and national mentality.

The most debated issue is the relation between linguoculturology and Cultural Linguistics. The available literature suggests that they are close but not identical. Cultural Linguistics, especially in Sharifian's model, focuses on cultural conceptualisations, including schemas, categories, and metaphors. Linguoculturology, by contrast, has tended to focus on culturally marked language units, national worldview, phraseological and paremiological material, symbols, and linguistic personality. Peeters' observation that Cultural Linguistics and linguoculturology are "different subjects" in some scholarly contexts should not be understood as a complete separation, but as a warning against careless terminological equivalence.

Another important issue concerns methodology. Mizin and Korostenski point out that post-Soviet linguoculturology has sometimes been criticized for methodological uncertainty. This criticism may be interpreted in two ways. On the one hand, the field still needs clearer procedures for identifying, classifying, and interpreting linguocultural units. On the other hand, methodological plurality is partly inevitable because linguoculturology works with complex objects: cultural memory, symbols, values, national stereotypes, metaphors, and discourse. Such objects cannot be fully explained by one method.

The concept is a good example of this methodological complexity. In cognitive linguistics, concept analysis often begins from mental representation and categorization. In linguoculturology, however, the concept is treated as a culturally meaningful formation that connects language, consciousness, value, and collective experience. Therefore, the linguocultural concept may include semantic, associative, symbolic, evaluative, and historical layers. This makes it richer than a purely logical or cognitive category.

Symbols also reveal the interdisciplinary nature of the field. Khakimova's study of fauna symbols shows that symbolic meanings in Uzbek and English depend on both linguistic and

extralinguistic factors, including religion, geography, mentality, and cultural practice. This indicates that linguoculturology cannot be limited to dictionary meanings. It must consider how signs function in collective imagination and social communication.

The Central Asian dimension of linguoculturology deserves special attention. Kazakh, Uzbek, and other regional linguistic traditions provide rich material for studying national-cultural codes. Baissydyk and Aldabek's analysis of national and Oriental character names shows that linguoculturology is especially useful for studying culturally specific evaluations of behaviour and identity. Uzbek linguistics, in turn, can contribute through the study of proverbs, religious-cultural vocabulary, hospitality discourse, kinship terminology, metaphorical expressions, and symbolic codes.

Globalization has made linguoculturology even more relevant. Cultural contact, migration, digital communication, translation, and the global spread of English create new forms of linguistic interaction. Iermachkova and Mujkošová argue that globalization affects language through the mixing of cultures, neologisms, and borrowings, especially from English. From a linguocultural perspective, globalization does not simply replace national languages with global forms; it creates hybrid spaces where local cultural codes are preserved, transformed, or reinterpreted.

Translation studies also benefit from linguoculturology. A translator does not transfer words alone; they transfer cultural meanings, symbolic associations, etiquette norms, metaphors, and pragmatic expectations. When a linguocultureme has no direct equivalent in another language, translation requires interpretation rather than substitution. This is particularly relevant for Uzbek-English and Uzbek-Russian translation, where concepts connected with family, respect, hospitality, religion, and social hierarchy may require cultural explanation.

Overall, linguoculturology can be considered a necessary field for analysing language in its cultural depth. It does not replace Cultural Linguistics, ethnolinguistics, or cognitive linguistics. Rather, it connects them through a specific focus on culturally marked language units and national-cultural meanings. Its future development depends on methodological precision, corpus-based studies, comparative research, and careful integration with discourse analysis and translation studies.

## Conclusion

Linguoculturology emerged as a result of the broader anthropocentric turn in linguistics, which shifted scholarly attention from language as a formal structure to language as a carrier of cultural memory, national worldview, and collective values. Its formation was influenced by several related disciplines, including ethnolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, semiotics, and Cultural Linguistics. Nevertheless, linguoculturology acquired its most recognizable disciplinary form within Russian and post-Soviet scholarship. Although Linguoculturology and Cultural Linguistics are closely related, they should not be regarded as identical fields: Cultural Linguistics mainly focuses on cultural conceptualisations, schemas, categories, and metaphors, while linguoculturology pays particular attention to culturally marked language units, national mentality, linguoculturemes, cultural codes, phraseology, proverbs, and symbols. Its main analytical categories – linguocultureme, concept, national-cultural code, symbol, metaphor, stereotype, phraseological unit, and paremiological unit – allow researchers to interpret language not merely as a grammatical or lexical system, but as a complex system of cultural meanings. In this regard, Uzbek linguistics has considerable potential within linguoculturology, especially through the study of anthropocentrism, linguocultural concepts, Uzbek-English symbolic systems, phraseology, proverbs, etiquette formulas, and national mentality. In the context of globalization, linguoculturology becomes increasingly significant for translation, intercultural communication, discourse studies, language teaching, and identity research, since it helps explain how cultural meanings are preserved, transformed, or negotiated in multilingual communication. Future studies in this field should therefore focus on more precise methodology, verified corpus material, comparative Uzbek-English and Uzbek-Russian research, and page-accurate source-based analysis of linguocultural units.

## References

- [1] I. B. Baissydyk and N. A. Aldabek, “Linguocultural Aspects of National and Oriental Characters,” *Eurasian Journal of Philology: Science and Education*, vol. 188, no. 4, 2022, doi: 10.26577/ejph.2022.v188.i4.03.
- [2] S. Fayzieva, “Underlying Differences Between Cognitive and Linguocultural Concepts in the Field of Cognitive Linguistics and Linguoculturology,” *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, pp. 60–68, 2021, doi: 10.36078/1643721879.
- [3] O. Iermachkova and T. Mujkošová, “Language as a Mirror of Globalization from the Linguocultural Aspect,” *Slavica Slovaca*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 118–136, 2022, doi: 10.31577/slavslov.2022.2.2.
- [4] S. I. Khakimova, “Fauna Symbols in Uzbek and English Cultural Spaces,” *E3S Web of Conferences*, vol. 413, Art. no. 03016, 2023, doi: 10.1051/e3sconf/202341303016.
- [5] D. S. Khudayberganova, Z. Mukimova, and F. Karimova, “The Role of Linguistic Anthropocentrism Theories in Uzbek National Linguistics,” *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, vol. 11, no. 12, Art. no. e2524, 2023, doi: 10.55908/sdgs.v11i12.2524.
- [6] K. Mizin and J. Korostenski, “‘Western’ Cultural Linguistics and ‘Post-Soviet’ Linguoculturology: Causes of Parallel Development,” *Linguistic Studies*, no. 37, pp. 7–13, 2019, doi: 10.31558/1815-3070.2019.37.1.
- [7] B. Peeters, “Applied Ethnolinguistics is Cultural Linguistics, but is it Cultural Linguistics?,” *International Journal of Language and Culture*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 137–160, 2016, doi: 10.1075/ijolc.3.2.01pee.
- [8] B. Peeters, “On Linguoculturology and Cultural Linguistics,” *Vestnik NSU: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 6–11, 2019, doi: 10.25205/1818-7935-2019-17-4-6-11.
- [9] F. Sharifian, “Cultural Linguistics and World Englishes,” *World Englishes*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 515–532, 2015, doi: 10.1111/weng.12156.
- [10] O. P. Matuzkova, “Linguoculture as Synergy of Language, Culture and Mind,” *Opera in Linguistica Ukrainiana*, no. 27, pp. 160–172, 2020, doi: 10.18524/2414-0627.2020.27.206498.
- [11] F. Sharifian, *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2017.
- [12] G. Palmer, *Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics*. Austin, TX, USA: University of Texas Press, 1996.
- [13] W. von Humboldt, *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- [14] E. Sapir, *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York, NY, USA: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921.
- [15] B. L. Whorf, *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1956.