



THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF LINGVOCULTUROLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF UZBEK OGHUZ DIALECTS

Mokhira Sadullaeva,

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology

Lecturer, Department of Uzbek Language and Literature

Navoi State University, Uzbekistan

E-mail: mohirasobirovna2020@gmail.com

Abstract. *This article systematizes the theoretical foundations for a linguoculturological analysis of Uzbek Oghuz dialects. The aim is to construct a coherent conceptual model that explains how language and culture interact in Oghuz dialectal speech through a defined set of categories, analytical units, and interpretive stages. Methodologically, the study integrates cognitive-semantic analysis, ethnolinguistic interpretation, discourse-pragmatic reading of context, and dialectological procedures, including interpreting dialect data as linguocultural units. The novelty lies in proposing operational criteria for identifying carriers of cultural semantics in Oghuz dialects, specifying mechanisms that link dialectal lexicon and phraseology with value systems, and adapting the notion of a local cultural model to step-by-step analytical practice. The results provide a theoretically grounded framework for indexing and interpreting dialect materials in linguocultural research and for comparing micro-areal cultural meanings within the Uzbek dialect continuum.*

Keywords: *Oghuz dialects, linguoculturology, dialect semantics, ethnolinguistics, phraseology, value model, local cultural model.*

Introduction

The linguoculturological turn in contemporary linguistics has redirected attention from language as an autonomous system to language as a culturally embedded form of knowledge. Within Turkic studies, and particularly within Uzbek linguistics, this turn has opened productive perspectives for describing how culturally saturated meanings are stored, transmitted, and transformed in speech communities. Yet dialect materials are still often treated as primarily phonetic or

lexical evidence, while their cultural semantics remains either implicit or explained by general ethnographic commentary rather than by a consistent analytical apparatus. Uzbek Oghuz dialects represent a crucial site for such work because they are historically shaped at the intersection of Oghuz and Karluk layers and because their micro-areal differentiation has preserved locally salient conceptualizations in naming practices, phraseology, and evaluative speech routines. Without an explicit theoretical foundation, linguoculturological readings of these dialects risk becoming impressionistic, reducing cultural meaning to anecdotal “traditions” rather than modeling it as a structured semiotic phenomenon.

Existing scholarship provides important starting points but also exposes methodological gaps. The Russian and post-Soviet tradition of linguoculturology has established influential constructs such as the linguistic picture of the world, cultural concept, and precedent phenomena, offering a vocabulary for connecting semantics with culture and memory [2]. Cognitive linguistics, in turn, has supplied tools for explaining categorization, profiling, and conceptual metaphor, enabling the analyst to treat meaning as embodied and context-dependent rather than purely dictionary-based [5]. Uzbek dialectology has produced rich descriptive inventories, including regional lexical collections and grammatical observations, which are indispensable as empirical foundations [1]. However, these strands are not automatically compatible: dialectology prioritizes areal distribution and historical stratification, while linguoculturology often presupposes relatively stabilized standard-language meanings, and cognitive analysis may overlook the social indexicality of dialect choice. Recent discussions in Turkic linguistics therefore emphasize the need for integrative models that preserve the rigor of dialectological evidence while also allowing interpretive access to cultural semantics [3; 6].

The aim of this article is to articulate a theoretical framework for linguoculturological analysis of Uzbek Oghuz dialects by defining the object of analysis, specifying analytical units, and outlining interpretive procedures that can be replicated across dialect corpora and field data. The objectives are to determine

which types of dialectal units function as carriers of cultural meaning, to propose criteria for distinguishing culturally marked semantics from merely regional variation, and to describe how local cultural models can be reconstructed from linguistic evidence. The scientific novelty lies in operationalizing a multi-level model that links dialectal forms with cultural knowledge through explicit steps of semantic, pragmatic, and ethnolinguistic interpretation, while keeping the analysis anchored in verifiable dialect data. The practical significance is twofold: it supports consistent annotation and indexing of dialect materials for future corpora and it enables comparative studies of cultural semantics across Uzbek dialect areas, thereby contributing to the broader typology of Turkic linguocultures.

Materials and Methods.

The material basis assumed by the proposed framework includes three complementary sources: published dialectological descriptions and regional dictionaries of Uzbek speech varieties; field recordings and transcriptions of spontaneous and elicited speech from Oghuz-speaking localities; and folklore or define para-folklore texts circulating in the same communities, such as proverbs, short narratives, and ritual speech fragments. The framework treats these sources not as equivalent, but as mutually corrective: dictionary entries provide paradigmatic meaning cues, while conversational and narrative contexts reveal evaluative stance, pragmatic conditions, and indexical functions that cannot be recovered from glosses alone. The dialectological layer is used to delimit the areal status of an item and to prevent overgeneralization from single local usages.

Methodologically, the study integrates several theoretical procedures into a single workflow. First, a semantic-cognitive procedure is applied: dialectal meanings are described through componential features, prototype structure, and conceptual profiling, allowing culturally salient attributes to be separated from purely denotational ones. Second, an ethnolinguistic interpretive procedure is employed to relate linguistic meanings to customary practices, local institutions, and traditional knowledge, but only insofar as such relations are supported by stable

contextual patterns in the linguistic data. Third, a discourse-pragmatic procedure is used to identify how dialectal units perform cultural work in interaction, for instance by expressing respect, ridicule, social distance, or local solidarity. Finally, an areal-dialectological procedure is maintained throughout, ensuring that each proposed linguocultural inference is checked against distributional evidence and potential contact-induced explanations. The methodological choice is consistent with the view that cultural meaning in dialects is not a separate “addition” to language but a structured layer that emerges at the intersection of semantics, usage, and social memory [4; 5]. For formalization, the analysis relies on the notion of linguocultural units, including culturally marked lexemes, phraseological units, stable collocations, pragmatic formulas, and naming patterns, each of which can be mapped to a local cultural model when supported by convergent evidence across contexts.

Results.

The theoretical framework yields several core results that can be formulated as a structured set of principles for analyzing Uzbek Oghuz dialects linguoculturologically. First, the object of analysis is defined not as “dialect vocabulary” in general, but as dialectal meaning in its culturally indexical function, that is, as a semiotic resource that encodes, presupposes, or activates locally shared knowledge. This definition excludes purely phonetic variants with no semantic or pragmatic differentiation, unless they serve as social indices in interaction. Consequently, the primary target becomes a stratified set of meaning-bearing units in which cultural semantics is either lexicalized, phraseologized, or pragmatically conventionalized.

Second, the framework distinguishes three levels of linguocultural marking in dialectal units. The first level is explicit cultural nomination, where an item names an object, practice, or social role that is locally salient and culturally bounded, and where the nomination itself implies a culturally specific categorization. The second level is implicit axiological marking, where the unit carries an evaluative orientation, for example through pejoration, amelioration, or honorific nuance, and where the

evaluation aligns with community norms. The third level is interactional-cultural indexing, where the unit's cultural force emerges primarily through its distribution in speech genres, such as ritual speech, hospitality formulas, conflict talk, or humor. Each level is associated with diagnostic criteria: stability across speakers, recurrence in comparable contexts, and interpretability through local metalinguistic commentary collected in fieldwork.

Third, a stepwise procedure for reconstructing a local cultural model is formulated. The procedure begins with identifying candidate units by frequency, salience in speaker commentary, or genre specificity; proceeds to semantic modeling through feature and prototype description; continues with contextual mapping, where typical participants, settings, and goals of utterances are extracted; and culminates in cultural generalization, where the analyst formulates a model of local norms, values, or conceptual oppositions that the unit presupposes. The framework requires that each generalization be backed by at least two types of evidence, for example phraseological usage plus conversational pragmatics, or lexical meaning plus narrative framing. In this way, the local cultural model remains grounded in linguistic data rather than inferred from external ethnography alone.

Fourth, the framework specifies a typology of linguocultural carriers that is particularly productive for Oghuz dialect materials. These include kinship and address systems in which social distance and obligation are encoded; household and pastoral terminology that organizes space and labor; food-related nominations and evaluative collocations that encode hospitality norms; and proverb-like utterances that compress moral judgments into reusable formulas. The result is a theoretically consistent inventory of analytic targets that can guide corpus annotation and comparative studies across localities.

Discussion.

The proposed framework aligns with major insights of linguoculturology while addressing dialect-specific challenges that earlier models sometimes left implicit. Classical linguoculturology tends to focus on culturally salient concepts as they

appear in standard language and literary texts, privileging codified meanings and stable national-level representations [2]. In contrast, Oghuz dialect data demonstrate that cultural meaning is often micro-areal, embedded in interaction, and distributed across lexical, phraseological, and pragmatic layers. Therefore, the framework's insistence on interactional-cultural indexing expands the descriptive power of linguoculturological analysis by treating speech genres and routines as primary evidence rather than as ancillary illustrations. This move also resonates with cognitive linguistic approaches that emphasize meaning in use and conceptualization through recurrent patterns, yet it preserves dialectological rigor by requiring distributional checks and by distinguishing cultural marking from mere regional lexical substitution [5; 6; 8].

Compared with traditional Uzbek dialectology, which has been highly successful in documenting lexical and phonetic variation, the framework proposes a shift from inventory-building to model-building. The value of such a shift is not to replace dialectological description but to add an interpretive layer that explains why certain units remain stable and salient: they do cultural work. For instance, if a dialect preserves multiple competing nominations for social roles or household practices, a linguoculturological reading can examine how each nomination profiles different obligations, affective stances, or moral evaluations, thereby connecting variation with local social knowledge rather than treating it as a purely historical residue. This perspective complements the view that Turkic dialect continua embody layered histories of contact and migration, because cultural semantics can serve as indirect evidence for the persistence of local institutions even when material culture changes [3; 8].

The framework's limitations are also clear. First, linguoculturological inference depends heavily on contextual data quality; published dialect dictionaries, while indispensable, rarely include interactional contexts sufficient for pragmatic interpretation. Second, elicited fieldwork can introduce observer effects, especially in the collection of evaluative language and taboo-related lexicon, which may be

underreported or replaced with euphemism. Third, reconstructing local cultural models risks overgeneralization if the analyst treats a small number of salient units as representative of the entire community's worldview. The proposed diagnostic criteria and the requirement of convergent evidence mitigate, but do not eliminate, these risks.

Future research should prioritize building annotated dialect corpora that link phonetic transcription, morphological segmentation, semantic tagging, and genre metadata, enabling systematic comparison across Oghuz-speaking settlements. Another direction is to develop quantitative measures of cultural salience, such as collocational strength of evaluative adjectives with key nominations or the distribution of pragmatic formulas across speech situations. Finally, comparative work across Turkic Oghuz varieties could test whether certain local cultural models are shared at a broader typological level or remain uniquely Uzbek-Oghuz due to specific historical and ecological conditions [6; 7].

Conclusion.

This article has formulated a theoretical foundation for linguoculturological analysis of Uzbek Oghuz dialects by defining the object of inquiry as culturally indexical dialectal meaning and by specifying replicable analytical units and procedures. The framework distinguishes explicit nomination, implicit axiological marking, and interactional-cultural indexing as three levels at which cultural semantics becomes observable in dialect data. It proposes a stepwise reconstruction of local cultural models grounded in convergent linguistic evidence, thereby balancing interpretive ambition with dialectological verifiability. The resulting model clarifies how dialect lexicon, phraseology, and pragmatic routines can be systematically interpreted as carriers of locally shared knowledge and values. As a consequence, Uzbek Oghuz dialect studies can move beyond descriptive inventories toward theoretically controlled explanations of how culture is encoded, maintained, and transformed in micro-areal speech practices.

References

1. Rasulov, A. *Lexicon of Uzbek Dialects: Territorial Layers and Historical Sources*. Tashkent: Fan, 2018.
2. Vorobyov, V. V. *Linguoculturology: Theory and Methods*. Moscow: RUDN University Press, 2008.
3. Hojiev, A. *Dialectology of the Uzbek Language: Theory and Practice*. Tashkent: O'zbekiston, 2004.
4. Teliya, V. N. *Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic, and Linguocultural Aspects*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 1996.
5. Lakoff, G. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
6. Johanson, L. "Turkic Language Contacts." In *The Turkic Languages*, edited by Lars Johanson and Éva Á. Csató, 81–95. London: Routledge, 1998.
7. Sharifova, D. *Interpretation of Linguocultural Units in Uzbek Oral Folk Literature*. Samarkand: SamSU Publishing House, 2020.
8. Sadullaeva, M. S. *Polysemy in Uzbek Dialects (Based on the Oghuz Dialect)*. PhD diss., Jizzakh, 2025.
9. Ahmedova, N. R. (2020). Estarada word art. *Central Asian Problems of Modern Science and Education*, 2020(1), 122-130.
10. Djalilova, S. M., & Abdullayeva, P. T. (2024). Phraseological worldview through the prism of color semantics: A comparative study of Uzbek and Spanish languages. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(2), 12-14.
11. Axmedova, N. (2026). The stage of adaptation in teaching directing. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, 51, 135-137.