



# Contrastive Analysis Of The English And Uzbek Language Picture Of The World

## OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITTED 17 August 2025

ACCEPTED 13 September 2025

PUBLISHED 15 October 2025

VOLUME Vol.05 Issue 10 2025

## COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 License.

Amirova Zokhida Oripovna

Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences,  
Karshi state university, Uzbekistan

**Abstract:** This article focuses on the world as it is presented in Uzbek and English. The article's goal is to identify the most distinctive and innate characteristics of the national character and mindset, as well as how they are reflected in the vocabulary and grammatical structures of the Uzbek and English languages. In order to make inferences about cross-cultural communication, a more thorough contrastive analysis has been conducted to identify the similarities and differences between the two countries. On the lexical level, the analysis was conducted by applying linguistic data from researchers on the subject; defining "nationally-colored" set expressions, phraseological units, proverbs, sayings, etc.; and utilizing quotes from well-known Uzbek and English writers regarding the national character and mentality.

Several common grammatical constructs that demonstrate national identity were discovered for both languages. It was determined that the compared linguistic pictures of the world show more variances than similarities based on the examined characteristics of the national character and mindset of Uzbekistan and England. The following common phenomena have been identified: tolerance, politeness, love for freedom, and love for fairness (truth). However, the analysis reveals that even these are fundamentally distinct.

For this reason, in order to improve the friendliness of our shared world, individuals interacting with cross-cultural communication between Uzbek and England need extensive training as well as a cautious and inclusive attitude toward one another. As a result, two comparative tables were created that may be useful to academics and instructors in a variety of subjects related to cross-cultural communication and ethnic

studies.

**Annotation:** The linguistic picture of the world (LPW) of English and Uzbek are the focus of this investigation. Finding the most important and unique aspects of each country's national character and mindset, as well as how these are represented in language at the vocabulary and grammar levels, is the goal. A contrastive analysis of common and differing features was conducted, and conclusions were drawn regarding intercultural communication.

At the lexical level, proverbs, sayings, idioms, and expressions corresponding to communicatively relevant traits of the Uzbek and English national character and mentality were analyzed, along with statements by well-known writers. The findings of linguists studying this issue were also taken into account. At the grammatical level, several structures demonstrating particular aspects of the linguistic worldview were compared. It was concluded that the linguistic worldviews of the two nations being compared have more differences than similarities. Even though such seemingly common national traits as love of freedom, a sense of justice (honesty), tolerance (patience), and politeness were identified, they differ substantially in each culture. Therefore, everyone involved in intercultural communication (especially politicians) should undergo training to make our shared world more harmonious. As a result of the study, two tables are presented. The article may be of interest to teachers, students, researchers, and anyone connected with intercultural communication and ethnolinguistics.

**Keywords:** Language, Culture, Contrastive Analysis, the English and Russian Linguistic Worldview, National Character, National Mentality.

**Introduction:** In the modern scientific paradigm of linguistic researches, in particular, in cultural linguistics and linguodidactics, one of priority issues is studying a ratio of language, culture and thinking and various methods of reflecting reality in this or that ethnos. Efficiency of cross-cultural communication and teaching foreign languages in many respects depends on the knowledge of ethnic, group and other features of language, culture, national mentality of the studied ethnos (communicant) and a capability to unconflictive, mutually interested communication. Now, the international contacts have extended; in the center of attention of communicative and anthropocentric linguistics there lies a relation of a language and a person; interest in cross-cultural communication and cross-cultural understanding,

national identity of different people has become more active. Moreover, the number of interethnic conflicts requiring settlement has been increasing. Taking into consideration everything aforementioned, one can testify the relevance of researches in the sphere of cross-cultural communication. The subject matter of this paper is Uzbek and English language picture. This investigation is an extension of my previous work [1]. The article is aimed at determining inherent and the most original traits of national character and mentality and their reflection in the Uzbek and English language – at both lexical and grammar levels. The further comparative analysis has been carried out to reveal common and varying features of the two nations to draw conclusions concerning cross-cultural communication. On the lexical level the analysis was made by means of defining “nationally-coloured” set expressions, phraseological units, proverbs, sayings, etc.; using statements of famous Russian and English writers about the national character and mentality; applying linguistic data of researchers on the topic under consideration. On the level of grammar some typical structures for both languages were found out which show national identity. As a result two comparative tables were made which can be of possible use to the teachers and scholars in various fields concerning ethnic studies and cross-cultural communication. From the sixtieth of the 20th century the problem of a picture of the world was considered within semiotics when studying primary modeling systems (language) and secondary modeling systems (the myth, religion, folklore, poetry, prose, cinema, painting, architecture, etc.). The culture at this approach was treated as «not hereditary memory of a collective», and its main task was the structural organization of the world around that finds its expression in a world model. Respectively, if different symbolic systems model the world differently, then different languages form unequal models of the world.

The term «picture of the world» which is used in philosophy, linguistics, physics and other disciplines is interpreted in different ways. According to B.A. Serebrennikov, for the first time this concept appeared in physics at the end of XIX – the beginning of the 20th century. Then Hertz (1918) applied this term in relation to the physical picture of the world treated by him as «set of internal images of external objects from which in the logical way it is possible to receive data concerning behavior of these objects». Internal images, or the symbols of external objects created by researches of G. Herts, shall be such that «logically necessary consequences of these representations were in turn images of naturally necessary investigations of the displayed objects». V.I. Karasik determines a world

picture as «complete set of images of reality in collective consciousness». Components, in his opinion, are images and concepts. Images are any perceptual, objectively existing or thought up mental formations created in one's consciousness. Concepts are logically shaped general ideas of classes of objects or the phenomena. The picture of the world represents a complex system of the images reflecting reality in collective consciousness. They differentiate scientific and naive pictures of the world, and if the former operates with the terms and it is constructed on practical and theoretical knowledge, then the latter is more dialectic and allows contradictory definitions of things. According to A. Vezhbitskaya in all natural languages there are elementary concepts (semantic primitives) which are fundamental to the mankind (i.e. a part of genetic inheritance). I presume that these semantic primitives are characteristic of a naive picture of the world. Interest in a language picture of the world can be found even in the works of W. Humboldt who wrote that various languages are bodies of their original thinking and perception for the nation. «Peculiarity of the spirit and the structure of a language of any people are so internally connected among themselves that if one of them was given, the second should be deduced from it. Language is also an external manifestation of the spirit of the people. Language is their spirit, and their spirit is their language. Never it is possible to express sufficiently their identity».

According to many researchers, a language picture of the world forms and directs the type of relation of a person to the world (to the nature, animals, him/herself as to a world element). It sets standards of behaviour of a person in the world, defines his/her relation to it. Each natural language reflects a certain way of perception and organization («conceptualization») of the world. The values expressed in this conceptualization develop in a certain uniform frame of viewpoints, some kind of collective philosophy which is imposed as obligatory for all native speakers. Forming of LPW is influenced by language, traditions, nature and a landscape, education, training and other social factors.

To this day, the problem of interrelation of language and culture is one of central in linguistics. The first attempts of the solution of this problem can be traced in the works of W. Humboldt whose basic provisions of the concept can be reduced to the following: 1) material and spiritual culture are realized in a language; 2) any culture is national, its national character is expressed in a language by means of special vision of the world; the internal form (IF), specific to each people, is inherent in a language; 3) IF of a language is an expression of «national spirit», its

culture; 4) a language is a mediating link between a person and the world surrounding him/her W. Humboldt's concept received a peculiar interpretation in A.A. Potebnya's work «A Thought and Language», in Sh. Balli, Zh. Vandriyev, I.A. Baudouin de Courtene, R.O. Jacobson works and other researchers.

Except group, there is a national mentality – the national way of perception and understanding of reality determined by a set of cognitive stereotypes of the nation. For example, an American seeing a rich person thinks: rich means clever, an Uzbek in this case usually thinks rich means boyvachcha.

Thus, the national mentality represents a national way of perception and understanding of reality on the basis of the stereotypes which are present at national consciousness, mental clichés, schemes of explanations of the phenomena and events, mechanisms of causal attribution. These are consciousness stereotypes. The most popular source of stereotypic ideas of national characters are the so-called international jokes, that is the jokes constructed on a sample plot: representatives of different nationalities, having got into the same situation, react to it differently, according to those lines of their national character which are attributed to them in the homeland of a joke.

Reserve of the English people is implemented in the following sayings and proverbs: Silence is gold(en). – Brevity is the soul of wit. – First think; then speak. A word to the wise. – Still waters run deep. Especially it is necessary to stop on exclamatory sentences. Moderation and restraint of British, in particular, are shown in the lack of exclamatory sentences, especially in formal and business styles (Dear Mr. Smith, Dear Sir/Madam).

British are polite and affable everywhere. In a shop or office they patiently wait when they are noticed. It is not accepted to draw attention of a service personnel to oneself and it is useless if at this moment they serve another client. But, as soon as your queue has approached, you will be served exactly so much time as it is necessary. Moreover, one can speak to the seller about the weather and other things, and nobody from the queue will show either the slightest irritation, or impatience. British tell thanks not only in response to the service, but also in many other communicative situations: a passenger says to the controller Thank you in response when returns the checked ticket.

British are very tolerant, and are inclined to compromises. They perfectly understand that existence of different opinions on the same question – is in the nature of things, another opinion is not a crime. They do not, as a rule, do remarks to the surrounding people, even if their behavior creates big inconveniences. If a

remark is, nevertheless, done, it will sound in a very soft form (Excuse me, I think you're standing on my foot – in a subway train), and frequently in the form of a request (Could you please stop talking? – to the schoolmates during the lesson). British have a respect for other person's property, which is a compulsory provision of a decent behaviour in the society. It is impossible to criticize property of another person. For example, in England it is not accepted to laugh at the deceived husbands, because they suffered in what belongs to them.

Privacy is that zone of personal autonomy in which the entrance to strangers is prohibited. The importance of this fragment of a language picture of the world is reflected in many English proverbs: An Englishman's house is his castle. - Good fences make good neighbours. - Love your neighbour, yet pull not down your fence. - He travels the fastest who travels alone. - Come seldom, come welcome. - It is easy to keep a castle that was never assaulted. - Better a castle of bones than of stones.

The English are very pragmatic. It is usually noted that their pragmatism is a consequence of their historical development as «the most bourgeois nation». They are prudent, they do what is necessary and try not to do anything superfluous. The English are obliged to their pragmatism and rationalism by rather small losses in World War II. Both the foreign policy of Great Britain, and work of its intelligence agencies is pragmatic.

If a comparison is made in the usage of concepts qalb/soul/mind, the result shows prevalence of the concept mind in the English language that undoubtedly is a sign of rationalism, while Uzbek language demonstrates the dominant concept qalb: qalb sokinligi / peace of mind -kaltafahm / mentally-ill-ruhiy kasal/aql dan ozgan/ load (weight) off one's mind.

Love for freedom, freedom of opinions, tastes and behaviour can be demonstrated in the following proverbs: It takes all sorts to make a world. – Variety is the spice of life. Uzb: hayotning achchiq-chuchugi. – Tastes differ. – Every man to his taste. – There is no accounting for tastes. – One man's meat is another man's poison. – Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Uzb: Hammaning didi har xil.

In general, the English culture belongs to individualist type.

Now let us move on to the main communicative and relevant features of Uzbek mentality and Uzbek national character which contribute to the formation of the Uzbek language picture of the world. 1. Generosity, hospitality Hospitality and generosity of the Russian people is reflected in Uzbek proverbs as in

a mirror: "Mehmon otangdan ulug', "Borini bergan uyalmas".

Uzbek proverbs demonstrate great love for freedom: "Sevgini ko'zi ko'r"- "Love is blind".

English culture belongs to the individualist type of culture. The core of Englishness is a social dis-ease, which gives rise to other most English traits of national character – being reserved, overpolite, individualistic, not categoric and hypocritical, pragmatic, distant from other people, using humour, irony and understatement. Comparing language pictures of the two nations, some common phenomena have been found –love for freedom, love for fairness (truth), tolerance and politeness. Nevertheless, as our study shows, even these are very different in their core. English courtesy seems to be almost entirely a matter of obedience to a set of rules rather than expression of genuine concern. Uzbek people not seem to be polite, but are polite, expressing genuine concern.

As a result, nations, but it does reveal It should be mentioned that according to the analyzed properties of the English and Uzbek national character and mentality, the contrasted language pictures of the world reveal more differences than commonalities. That is why people (and politicians, in particular) dealing with crosscultural communication between England and Uzbek require much training and very careful and inclusive attitude to each other to make our common world more friendly.

## REFERENCES

1. Serebrennikov B. A., Kubryakova E. S., Postovalova V. I., Thelia V. N., Ufimtseva A. A. Function of a Human Factor in a Language. M.: Science, 1988. 416 p. 4.
2. Karasik V. I. Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse / monograph: Volgograd: Change, 2002. 477 p.
3. Vezhbitskaya A. A. Semantic Universaliya and Basic Concepts/Anna Vezhbitskaya; A. D. Koshelev; translation from English A. D. Shmelyov, etc. M.: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2011. 568 p. 6.
4. Humboldt V. The Selected Works on Linguistics. M, 1984.
5. Maslova V. A. Cultural Linguistics: Studies. A grant for students of higher institutions. M.: Publishing center "Akademiya", 2001. 208 p.
6. Apresyan Yu. D. An Image of a Person according to Language: Attempt of a System Description// selected works. Vol. 2. Integrated description of language and system lexicography. M, 1996.