

## NATIONAL-CULTURAL FACTORS IN LANGUAGES WITH DIFFERENT SYSTEMS

## НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ФАКТОРЫ В ЯЗЫКАХ С РАЗНОЙ СИСТЕМОЙ

## TURLI TIZMLI TILLARDA MILLIY-MADANIY OMILLAR

**Mirzaakhmedov Mirjalol Mansurjon ugli**

*Doctoral student of Fergana state university*

*E-mail: [m.m.mirzaahmedov@pf.fdu.uz](mailto:m.m.mirzaahmedov@pf.fdu.uz)*

**Abstract.** *This study explores how national-cultural factors influence languages belonging to different typological systems: analytic, synthetic, and agglutinative. National culture—including traditions, values, social structures, and worldview—affects language structure, vocabulary, semantics, and pragmatics in distinctive ways. By analyzing English (analytic), Russian (synthetic), and Uzbek (agglutinative), this research demonstrates the interaction between cultural context and linguistic expression. The findings underscore the importance of cultural specificity in linguistic form and usage, highlighting challenges for cross-cultural communication, translation, and language education.*

**Keywords:** *national-cultural factors, language typology, analytic languages, synthetic languages, agglutinative languages, cultural linguistics, pragmatics*

### **Introduction**

Language is not merely a system of communication but a cultural artifact deeply intertwined with the identity and worldview of its speakers. National-cultural factors refer to the set of shared beliefs, customs, social norms, and historical experiences that characterize a community or nation. These factors shape linguistic behavior at all levels—from phonology to pragmatics.

Languages can be typologically classified into analytic, synthetic, and agglutinative systems, each differing structurally. Analytic languages, such as English, use word order and helper words to express grammatical relationships. Synthetic languages like Russian employ inflections, modifying word forms to convey meaning. Agglutinative languages such as Uzbek attach a series of affixes to word stems, each suffix bearing a distinct grammatical or semantic function.

This study aims to examine how national-cultural factors manifest differently across these language systems, affecting vocabulary, grammatical structures, and pragmatic norms.[1]. Understanding these interactions enhances insights into language diversity and informs practical applications such as translation and intercultural communication.

### **Methods**

This research applies a comparative qualitative approach, examining English, Russian, and Uzbek as representative analytic, synthetic, and agglutinative languages, respectively. Data were collected from linguistic corpora, ethnographic sources, and cultural studies.

The study focused on culturally loaded lexical domains (kinship terms, color lexemes, politeness markers), grammatical structures reflecting cultural values, and pragmatic conventions in speech (politeness strategies, indirectness, honorifics).[3]. Textual and discourse analysis identified patterns that illustrate the impact of national culture on linguistic features.

### ***Results***

#### ***Lexical and Semantic Influence***

Cultural specificity heavily informs vocabulary. For example, Uzbek kinship terminology is highly elaborate, reflecting the importance of extended family and social hierarchy, compared to English, where kinship terms tend to be simpler and focused on the nuclear family.

Color terms also illustrate cultural differences: English distinguishes many basic colors, while Russian has a well-known lexical distinction between “синий” (dark blue) and “голубой” (light blue), reflecting finer cultural perceptual categorizations.[2].

#### ***Morphological and Syntactic Reflection***

English’s analytic structure corresponds with cultural preferences for clarity and straightforward communication, favoring fixed word order and auxiliary verbs. Russian’s rich synthetic morphology allows flexible word order and emphasizes nuanced meaning and relational dynamics, reflecting social complexity and formality.

Uzbek’s agglutinative morphology encodes grammatical and semantic detail through suffix chains, mirroring cultural emphases on precision and relationship indicators in communication.[1].

#### ***Pragmatic Norms and Speech Acts***

Pragmatic behaviors such as politeness differ markedly. English speakers often employ indirectness or understatement as politeness strategies. In contrast, Uzbek and Russian use explicit honorifics and formal address forms, deeply rooted in social hierarchy and cultural respect norms.

Metaphorical language in these languages also reflects cultural priorities: English idioms often relate to individual experience, whereas Uzbek and Russian metaphors frequently reference collective history and social values.

### ***Discussion***

The study confirms that national-cultural factors profoundly influence linguistic systems, permeating vocabulary, grammar, semantics, and pragmatics. These findings support the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity, showing that language both reflects and shapes cultural cognition.

Differences in typology do not isolate linguistic systems from cultural influence; rather, culture interacts dynamically with linguistic structure. For instance, while English’s analytic nature facilitates direct communication, its pragmatic norms reflect a culturally ingrained preference for politeness through understatement.

Understanding these interactions is essential in translation, language education, and intercultural communication. Misinterpretations often arise when pragmatic and cultural

conventions are not accounted for, highlighting the need for culturally informed linguistic competence.

### ***Conclusion***

National-cultural factors play a crucial role in shaping languages with different structural systems. By influencing lexicon, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics, culture deeply embeds itself in language use. Recognizing these influences enhances linguistic theory and practical applications like translation and cross-cultural communication. Future research should broaden the range of languages studied and consider globalization’s effects on linguistic and cultural interaction.

### **REFERENCES:**

1. Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
2. Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality*. MIT Press.
3. Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. University of Chicago Press.
4. Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition*. Oxford University Press.
5. Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
7. Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Brill.
8. Kibrik, A. A. (1996). *Typology of Languages*. Moscow State University Press.