QOʻQON DAVLAT PEDAGOGIKA INSTITUTI ILMIY XABARLARI (2025-yil 2-son)



FILOLOGIYA

PHILOLOGY

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: LINGUISTIC, CULTURAL, AND PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVES

Uliqova Mavudakhon Sotvoldiyevna Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Andijan, Uzbekistan uliqovamavludaxon87@gmail.com

ANNOTATION This paper provides an in-depth analysis of kinship terminology in English and Uzbek, focusing on its structural, semantic, and pragmatic features. Kinship terms play a crucial role in shaping social relations and cultural identity, as they reflect the hierarchical and collectivist nature of Uzbek society and the relatively egalitarian approach in English. The study employs a comparative linguistic framework to highlight key differences, such as the use of honorifics and affixation in Uzbek versus the analytical nature of kinship expressions in English.

Additionally, the research discusses the challenges of translating kinship terms between these languages, particularly the loss of cultural connotations and semantic specificity. The findings contribute to a broader understanding of how language encapsulates social values and provide insights for linguistic anthropology, translation studies, and intercultural communication. Future research may further explore kinship terms in bilingual and multilingual communities, as well as their role in digital communication and language evolution.

Keywords: Kinship terminology, Linguoculture, Pragmatics, English, Uzbek, Comparative linguistics, Translation strategies

INTRODUCTION

Language is a crucial element of cultural identity, shaping and reflecting societal values and relationships. One of the most culturally significant linguistic domains is kinship terminology, which varies considerably across languages and societies. This paper investigates kinship terms in English and Uzbek, analyzing their linguistic structures, cultural connotations, and pragmatic applications.

Kinship terms are crucial components of a language's lexicon, reflecting the cultural and social values of a linguistic community. The study of kinship verbalization provides insight into the conceptual worldview of different nations. This research aims to compare the linguistic and cultural characteristics of kinship terminology in English and Uzbek, focusing on their semantic

structures and pragmatic functions. Previous studies in cognitive linguistics and linguocultural analysis have examined kinship-related lexemes, but a comparative approach remains underexplored.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a multidisciplinary approach, incorporating comparative linguistic analysis, cultural studies, and pragmatics. Data was collected from various linguistic corpora, dictionaries, literary sources, and native speaker surveys to identify the distinct characteristics of kinship terms in both languages.

The study adopts a comparative and descriptive analysis approach, utilizing linguistic corpora, dictionaries, and literary texts from both English and Uzbek sources. The methodological framework includes:

Comparative Linguistic Analysis: Examining kinship lexemes in English and Uzbek for structural and semantic differences.

Linguocultural Analysis: Identifying how cultural values influence the usage of kinship terms.

Pragmatic Analysis: Studying discourse contexts to understand how kinship terms are used in everyday communication.

RESULTS

Structural Differences in Kinship Terms

English kinship terms primarily rely on possessive pronouns to indicate relationships (e.g., "my father," "your cousin"), whereas Uzbek uses possessive suffixes directly attached to kinship terms (e.g., "otam" for "my father").

Uzbek kinship terminology often employs honorific forms and diminutives to express affection and respect (e.g., "akam" for "my older brother," "onajon" for "dear mother").

Cultural Significance and Semantic Nuances

In Uzbek, kinship terms extend beyond biological relations to include social hierarchy and respect. For example, "aka" (older brother) can be used to address unrelated older males as a sign of politeness.

English kinship terms tend to be more restricted in their applications, with fewer instances of extended meanings based on social relationships.

Structural and Semantic Differences: English kinship terms, such as "brother-in-law" and "cousin," exhibit analytical structures, while Uzbek employs synthetic expressions (e.g., "pochcha" for brother-in-law). English distinguishes between direct and indirect kinship relations explicitly, whereas Uzbek relies on context and affixation.

Linguocultural Characteristics: Uzbek kinship terms reflect hierarchical and collectivist social structures, emphasizing respect and age-based seniority. English kinship terms, on the other hand, indicate a more egalitarian system with less rigid formalities in familial interactions.

Pragmatic Aspects: English speakers often use kinship terms metaphorically (e.g., "brother" for close friends), whereas Uzbek maintains stricter familial usage. Honorifics and diminutive forms in Uzbek signal respect and endearment, aspects less pronounced in English kinship expressions.

Translation Challenges: Differences in semantic load make direct translation difficult. For example, Uzbek "qiz bola" (literally "girl child") does not have a precise English equivalent, requiring contextual adaptation.

PRAGMATIC ASPECTS AND SOCIAL COMMUNICATION

Uzbek kinship terms are frequently used in interpersonal communication to express warmth, familiarity, and hierarchy. Terms such as "tog'am" (uncle) may be used metaphorically in broader social contexts.

English also has metaphorical kinship terms (e.g., "brotherhood," "sisterhood"), but they are used in more abstract, ideological, or professional contexts rather than in everyday conversations.

DISCUSSION

These findings highlight fundamental differences in how kinship terms function in English and Uzbek. Uzbek prioritizes social and familial hierarchy in its kinship system, whereas English adopts a more neutral, individualistic approach. The presence of honorifics and metaphorical usage in Uzbek demonstrates a more collectivist orientation compared to the pragmatic, role-based application of kinship terms in English.

The findings highlight the strong interconnection between language, culture, and kinship systems. Uzbek kinship terminology demonstrates the influence of collectivism and hierarchical respect, whereas English reflects a more individualistic and flexible approach. These differences pose challenges in translation, requiring adaptation strategies that balance accuracy with cultural sensitivity. Future research could explore additional socio-pragmatic factors influencing kinship term usage in bilingual or multilingual settings.

CONCLUSION

This comparative study reveals that kinship terminology is deeply rooted in cultural and social practices. Understanding these distinctions is vital for translators, language learners, and cross-cultural communicators. Future research could expand on dialectal variations, historical transformations, and kinship term usage in digital communication contexts.

This study underscores the significance of kinship verbalization in understanding crosscultural linguistic dynamics. While English and Uzbek kinship terms share universal functions, their structural, cultural, and pragmatic features differ significantly. Recognizing these distinctions enhances linguistic comprehension and improves translation accuracy between the two languages.

REFERENCES

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.

2. Crystal, D. (2010). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge University Press.

3. Fasold, R., & Connor-Linton, J. (2006). An Introduction to Language and Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.

4. Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vol. 1 & 2). Cambridge University Press.

5. Trudgill, P. (2000). Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society. Penguin Books.

6. Yusupov, O. Q. (2005). Uzbek Linguistics and Cultural Identity. Tashkent University Press.

7. Morgan, L. H. (1877). Ancient Society. Henry Holt and Company.

8. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words. Oxford University Press.