

**LANGUAGE, CULTURE AND ETHNOGRAPHSMS: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY
STUDY****Qurbonova Shaxnoza Damin kizi**

Teacher of Economics and Pedagogy University, Karshi, Uzbekistan

Department of Foreign language and literature, Faculty of Foreign languages

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9621-2757>e-mail: shaxnozaqurbonova35@gmail.com**To‘xtayeva Dilinur Ozod kizi**

The second year student of Economics and Pedagogy University, Karshi, Uzbekistan

Department of Foreign language and literature, Faculty of Foreign languages

Abstract: This article explores the multifaceted nature of ethnographisms—lexical items that encode culturally specific practices, artifacts, institutions, or social norms—positioning them as critical markers at the intersection of language and culture. Moving beyond simple lexicography, this study argues that ethnographisms are invaluable data points for testing core hypotheses across the humanities and social sciences. Drawing on frameworks from linguistic anthropology, semantic typology, translation studies, and cognitive linguistics, the paper examines why these culture-bound terms merit focused interdisciplinary attention. We analyze how ethnographisms reveal fundamental questions regarding semantic universality versus cultural particularity, demonstrate the processes of cultural salience through lexicalization, and highlight the inherent challenges in achieving semantic equivalence during intercultural communication and translation. Ultimately, the study posits that analyzing ethnographisms—from kinship terms to ritual vocabulary—offers a powerful method for conducting 'thick description' of conceptual systems, thereby enriching our understanding of how language shapes and reflects human social reality.

Keywords: ethnographisms, culture-bound terms, linguistic anthropology, lexicalization, semantic universals, translation studies, intercultural communication.

Ethnographisms are lexical items (single words or fixed multiword expressions) that encode culturally specific practices, artifacts, social roles, rituals, foods, institutions or interactional norms.

They often resist exact translation because they package culturally loaded conceptual content (e.g., kinship terms, ritual names, traditional foods, social honorifics). For example, an Uzbek term like plov or palov (a culturally salient rice dish with specific preparation and social functions), English “housewarming” or “Thanksgiving” (institutionalized events with cultural scripts), Japanese omotenashi (a culturally specific hospitality concept).

The study of ethnographisms (or culture-bound terms) is inherently interdisciplinary because these words serve as the precise lexical intersection point between abstract cultural concepts and concrete linguistic structures. They allow researchers across various fields to test foundational theories about language, thought, and society.

As a relevance to Theoretical linguistics and Lexical semantic, the study of ethnographisms is crucial for understanding how human language organizes and packages experience, particularly experience unique to a specific community.

Classical semantics often seeks to define universal, basic components of meaning. Ethnographisms challenge this search by demonstrating that many concepts are non-atomic (i.e., they cannot be defined using universal semantic primes alone without significant cultural background).

Ethnographisms serve as stress tests for theories like Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM), developed by Anna Wierzbicka. If a term (like an Uzbek kinship term or a Japanese politeness marker) cannot be concisely defined using universal primes, it highlights the density and irreducibility of the cultural knowledge packaged within that single word.

Why does one culture compress a complex social event into a single word (e.g., *beshik-to'yi* – Uzbek cradle ceremony), while another requires a lengthy descriptive phrase? Ethnographisms provide direct evidence of a language's lexicalization patterns—what a community deems culturally salient enough to dedicate a dedicated linguistic marker to. Analyzing these patterns reveals which cultural domains (e.g., hospitality, hierarchy, ritual food) are central to a society's conceptual framework, offering insights into linguistic typology beyond grammatical structure.

Morphosemantic Analysis and Conceptual Packaging

Many ethnographisms, particularly in agglutinative languages (like Uzbek), are morphologically decomposable (e.g., compounds, derivational forms) but semantically non-compositional in their cultural load. Studying their structure helps linguists differentiate between words that are simply compounds (meaning derivable from parts) and true ethnographisms (meaning requires external cultural context), illuminating the interplay between morphology and cultural ideology.

For anthropology, ethnographisms are not just words; they are crystallized fragments of cultural models and social structure. They are the linguistic evidence for how a society categorizes and interacts with the world.

Ethnographisms are shortcuts for entire cultural scripts—expected sequences of action, belief systems, and relational frameworks. A single term can summarize a complex process or institution. Analyzing the semantic components of terms related to kinship, hospitality, or ritual allows anthropologists to reconstruct the underlying cultural model. For example, a deeply lexicalized system of hierarchical kinship terms suggests a society where age, lineage, and generation are highly relevant for social interaction and power distribution.

Clifford Geertz's concept of "thick description" emphasizes that culture must be interpreted through context. Ethnographisms are ideal subjects for thick description because their minimal form requires maximal context to be fully understood. The necessity of providing extensive background, usage notes, and historical context just to define a single ethnographism forces the researcher to engage in deep cultural interpretation, bridging the gap between linguistic form and cultural function.

While strong linguistic determinism is largely discarded, the weak version of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis (that language habits influence thought/attention) is strongly supported by ethnographisms.

For translators and communicators, ethnographisms represent the ultimate challenge: the problem of non-equivalence.

Ethnographisms highlight where linguistic equivalence breaks down. Since the target language community often lacks the corresponding cultural object, practice, or concept, a literal translation is impossible or meaningless.

The study provides the theoretical foundation for developing robust translation strategies beyond literal rendering:

- Foreignization: Keeping the source term (loanword) to preserve cultural distance (e.g., using plov instead of "rice dish").
- Domestication: Adapting the term for easier target-culture consumption (e.g., descriptive paraphrase or functional equivalent).
- The choice between these strategies reflects ethical and ideological stances in translation.

The difficulties encountered when translating an ethnographism reveal the underlying "cultural filters" between communities. What one culture takes for granted (presuppositions) must be explicitly explained to another.

- Contribution: This process is crucial for training in Intercultural Competence, showing communicators that linguistic fluency is insufficient; they must master the cultural scripts associated with the words they use.

Ethnographisms are powerful social markers. Their usage is often governed by strict social norms, making them critical for understanding identity, status, and language politics.

Ethnographisms often function not just to name things, but to index social relations, formality, and respect. Honourifics, specific kinship vocatives, and ritual terms are used to perform social hierarchy or intimacy. Studying these terms reveals how social structure is enacted in moment-to-moment interaction, following the theories of Indexicality (Silverstein). Choosing the "correct" term is a social act that affirms one's identity and status within the community.

In a globalized world, the preservation or use of ethnographisms is often tied to national identity, heritage protection, and language revitalization efforts. Analyzing how ethnographisms are discussed, codified in dictionaries, or employed in national media sheds light on language ideology—the beliefs and political stances surrounding language use. They represent linguistic evidence of cultural uniqueness and heritage.

In summary, studying ethnographisms is not merely a descriptive exercise in lexicology. It is an essential interdisciplinary endeavor because these terms function as the nexus where the abstract conceptual categories of culture are encoded into the concrete lexical units of language.

Bibliography:

1. Berlin, B., & Kay, P. Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution. (example of cultural lexicalization) 1969.
2. Duranti, A. Linguistic Anthropology. (introduction to linguistic anthropology approaches). 1997
3. Hymes, D. Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. (ethnography of communication). 1974
4. Journal outlets: Journal of Linguistic Anthropology; Language in Society; International Journal of Lexicography; Journal of Pragmatics.
5. Geertz, C. The Interpretation of Cultures. (thick description). 1973
6. Levinson, S. C. Enfield & Levinson (eds.) — papers on language & cognition (for cross-cultural cognition). 1996
7. Sapir, E. Language — an introductory survey. (classic on language & culture). 1921
8. Silverstein, M. The limits of awareness: Indexicality and language ideology (various essays). 1976-2003
9. Whorf, B. L. Language, Thought, and Reality. 1956
10. Wierzbicka, A. Semantics, Culture, and Cognition. (NSM & cross-cultural semantics). 1992