LEXICAL MEANING AND CULTURAL WORLDVIEW: A CROSS-LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE ON CONCEPTUAL ENCODING

Abdullaeva Dildora Abdinabievna
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Tashkent University of Applied Sciences, Gavhar Str. 1, Tashkent 100149, Uzbekistan
(adildora0701@gmail.com)
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15744246

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 15-Iyun 2025 yil
Ma'qullandi: 20-Iyun 2025 yil
Nashr qilindi: 26-Iyun 2025 yil

KEY WORDS

lexical meaning, cultural worldview, semantic encoding, linguistic relativity, cultural keywords, cross-linguistic comparison, ethnolinguistics

ABSTRACT

Lexical meaning is not solely a reflection of referential content; it is deeply embedded in the cultural knowledge, cognitive categories, and social values of its speakers. This paper explores how lexical units encode culturally specific worldviews, and how cross-linguistic comparison reveals the profound interdependence of language and culture. Drawing on theoretical insights from Wilhelm von Humboldt, Edward Sapir, Benjamin Lee Whorf, and Anna Wierzbicka, as well as the contemporary framework of cultural linguistics, the study argues that words carry with them more than semantic denotation—they function as cultural signposts that transmit ethical systems, spatial cognition, kinship relations, and collective emotions.

The paper examines how cultural keywords, ethnospecific lexemes, and semantic gaps reflect divergent ways of categorizing experience. Case studies from Uzbek, Russian, and English reveal how concepts like halol/harom, toska, or privacy are not easily translatable because they are deeply situated in their respective cultural matrices. These examples illustrate the ways in which languages not only reflect culture but actively shape perception, evaluation, and interpretation of reality.

By emphasizing the epistemological implications of lexical meaning, the study contributes to the broader fields of semantic theory, intercultural communication, and linguistic anthropology. It concludes that lexical meaning is a central site of cultural knowledge, and that understanding it requires attention not only to structure and usage but to the worldview encoded within.

1. Introduction: Lexical Meaning as Cultural Encoding

The meaning of a word extends far beyond its dictionary definition. It is a product of cultural knowledge, social experience, and

inherited ways of seeing the world. While linguistic theory has long sought to define meaning in formal or referential terms, there is increasing recognition that lexical meaning is shaped by culture—that is, by the shared beliefs, practices, values, and ontological assumptions of a speech community. Words are not merely neutral labels for external referents; they are culturally embedded signs that encode and reproduce conceptual frameworks.

This insight has been foundational to anthropological linguistics, semantic typology, and, more recently, cultural linguistics. Scholars such as Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf argued that the structure of a language reflects and influences the worldview of its speakers—a position often summarized in the principle of linguistic relativity.[1] Later, Anna Wierzbicka deepened this view by showing that even apparently "universal" concepts are often ethnolinguistically loaded, and that many lexical items are in fact cultural keywords: lexemes that cannot be understood without reference to a society's specific ethical, emotional, or social landscape.[2]

This paper explores how lexical meaning functions as a vehicle for cultural worldview, with particular emphasis on the ways in which different languages encode and structure human experience. Using examples from Uzbek, Russian, and English, the study demonstrates that key domains of meaning—such as kinship, morality, emotion, and social space—are lexically carved in culturally distinct ways. These differences reveal that the lexicon is not a passive reflection of thought, but an active participant in shaping how people categorize, evaluate, and relate to their world.

In what follows, we turn first to the theoretical foundations of the language-culture interface before examining how lexical systems serve as a conceptual map of cultural knowledge.

2. Theoretical Foundations: Language, Culture, and Meaning

The relationship between language and culture has long occupied the attention of philosophers, anthropologists, and linguists. At its core is a deceptively simple idea: that language is not only a means of describing the world but also a medium through which the world is conceptualized. This premise, most famously advanced by Wilhelm von Humboldt, asserts that "language is the formative organ of thought," not its mere external expression.[3] Humboldt maintained that each language embodies a distinct "Weltansicht" (worldview), a culturally situated lens through which reality is interpreted and organized.

Building on this legacy, Edward Sapir emphasized that language is not just a tool for communication but a guide to social reality.[4] For Sapir, the lexicon of a language encodes the categories, distinctions, and values relevant to its speakers, such that what is easily sayable in one culture may be unthinkable or inexpressible in another. His student Benjamin Lee Whorf further developed this insight into what became known as the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis, or the principle of linguistic relativity. Whorf argued that grammatical and lexical structures influence

[1] Benjamin Lee Whorf, *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, ed. John B. Carroll (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1956), 212–214.
[2] Anna Wierzbicka, *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 5–7.
[3] Wilhelm von Humboldt, *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*, trans. Peter Heath (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 54.
[4] Edward Sapir, *Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality*, ed. David G. Mandelbaum (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949), 162–174.

habitual thought, affecting how speakers of different languages perceive time, causality, and agency.[5]

This tradition was revitalized and systematized in the late 20th century by Anna Wierzbicka, whose work in cultural semantics underscored the fact that many lexemes are non-equivalent across languages, not due to linguistic deficiency but because of cultural specificity. Her concept of cultural keywords—terms like *freedom*, *honor*, *toska*, or *halol*—highlighted how deeply lexicon is tied to ethical and philosophical assumptions.[6] Wierzbicka's Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) approach attempts to define such culturally embedded terms using a set of semantic primes thought to be universal, thus enabling cross-cultural explication while preserving cultural distinctiveness.

More recently, the field of cultural linguistics, as advanced by Farzad Sharifian, has reinforced the idea that the lexicon is shaped by cultural schemas, conceptual metaphors, and distributed cognition.[7] Words, on this view, are not merely static signs but cultural artefacts shaped by collective experience. Lexical meaning, therefore, must be seen not as fixed or universal, but as a culturally saturated phenomenon, revealing the epistemic frames and ontologies of its users.

3. Lexical Encoding of Cultural Worldview

Lexical meaning is not only linguistic—it is cognitive and cultural. Words encode the concepts that a society uses to interpret its world, including its values, social relations, emotions, and metaphysical assumptions. When analyzed cross-linguistically, the lexicon reveals itself as a repository of worldview, where culturally salient domains are encoded with greater lexical precision and density, while culturally marginal domains remain underspecified or entirely absent.

A central insight of Anna Wierzbicka's cultural semantics is that many words cannot be meaningfully translated without losing crucial cultural information. Her work on cultural keywords demonstrates that words like *freedom* (English), *toska* (Russian), or *halol* (Uzbek) are not merely linguistic signs—they are cultural condensations of historical experience, social norms, and moral reasoning.[8] For instance, the English word *freedom* encompasses ideas of individual autonomy, legal rights, and political agency, but has no precise equivalent in many non-Western languages, where communal responsibility may be emphasized over individual choice. Similarly, the Russian word *toska* conveys a uniquely Slavic emotional state blending longing, existential anguish, and soul-weariness, which defies simple translation as "sadness" or "melancholy."[9]

In Uzbek, the opposition *halol/harom* (permissible/forbidden) derives from Islamic ethical and legal systems but is deeply woven into daily linguistic use, including food, behavior, business, and even interpersonal relations. These lexemes are more than labels for religious norms; they encode a cosmological moral order and serve as active tools for judgment and

[5] Whorf, *Language, Thought, and Reality*, 212–214.
[6] Wierzbicka, *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*, 1–20.
[7] Farzad Sharifian, *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017), 5–28.
[8] Wierzbicka, *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*, 1–9.
[9] Ibid., 95–107.

identity. Their pervasiveness in speech reflects a worldview in which divine law structures human action.

Cultural worldview is also embedded in spatial and temporal vocabulary. In Australian Aboriginal languages, for example, many speakers use absolute geocentric reference frames—such as cardinal directions—instead of relative ones like *left* or *right*.[10] This linguistic habit has been shown to shape spatial cognition, enabling speakers to maintain exact bearings even in unfamiliar terrain. Such evidence supports the hypothesis that language doesn't merely reflect mental categories—it guides and stabilizes them.

The concept of semantic density is helpful here. In domains of cultural importance, languages tend to exhibit a richer vocabulary and more finely grained distinctions. Inuit languages famously have multiple lexemes for snow, but this principle applies universally. Japanese distinguishes various forms of social obligation and humility with terms like *giri*, *on*, and *en*, while Arabic elaborates the domain of honor and hospitality through complex lexical sets. These distinctions are not lexical redundancies—they are conceptual necessities in societies where the encoded values are central to social life.

Even ordinary words reveal cultural priorities. The English lexeme *privacy* presupposes the existence of a private–public distinction that is not universally salient. In some collectivist cultures, there may be no lexical equivalent because the notion of "private life" is not foregrounded in social organization. Similarly, concepts such as *karma* (Sanskrit) or *qi* (Chinese) reflect metaphysical assumptions that are embedded in the lexicon and cannot be rendered without extensive explanation.

Thus, the lexicon functions as a cultural map: it encodes ethical frameworks, emotional architectures, spatial reasoning, and metaphysical systems. To study lexical meaning is therefore to study how a community sees and values the world—not abstractly, but as embedded in lived linguistic practice.

4. Cross-Linguistic Case Studies

To further illustrate how lexical meaning encodes cultural worldview, we now examine concrete examples from three languages—Uzbek, Russian, and English—each of which structures key semantic domains in distinct ways. These case studies demonstrate that lexical choices reflect cultural priorities, emotional grammars, and ethical frames of reference, revealing how language becomes a carrier of worldview.

4.1. Uzbek: Ethics and Sacred Norms

In Uzbek, the opposition *halol* (permissible) and *harom* (forbidden) is one of the most pervasive lexical structures in daily language. While the terms originate in Islamic jurisprudence, they have been naturalized into secular speech, functioning as moral qualifiers beyond the domain of religion. A business deal can be described as *halol*, meaning fair or honest; an income source might be *harom* not because it violates civil law, but because it transgresses an internalized code of ethical propriety. Even relationships are described using this pair—e.g., a marriage conducted without parental blessing may be deemed *harom*, thus framing it within both religious and social deviance.

This lexeme pair does not have an exact equivalent in English. While "permissible/forbidden" exists lexically, the moral intensity and spiritual resonance of

[10] Stephen C. Levinson, "Language and Space," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25 (1996): 353–382.

halol/harom are difficult to translate. Their widespread use reflects an Uzbek worldview in which divine will, social harmony, and ethical conduct are tightly interwoven. The lexicon thus not only encodes rules, but activates a cosmologically anchored evaluative system.

4.2. Russian: Emotion and Inner States

Russian is rich in emotion lexicon that reveals culturally specific attitudes toward suffering, longing, and interpersonal connection. A particularly salient example is *toska*, a word famously untranslatable into English. As Wierzbicka notes, *toska* conveys a range of meanings—from melancholy to spiritual yearning—but always includes a sense of existential emptiness tinged with beauty.[11] Nabokov described it as "a sensation of great spiritual anguish, often without any specific cause."[12]

The presence of such a word in the Russian lexicon signals the cultural value placed on depth of feeling, on interiority, and on a certain romanticization of emotional suffering. In contrast, English emotional vocabulary often emphasizes affect regulation, positivity, and psychological clarity. The availability of *toska* as a lexical item grants Russian speakers access to a shared emotional script not easily activated in English, highlighting how even subtle lexical differences reveal underlying affective worldviews.

Another example is *rodina*—commonly translated as "motherland." However, *rodina* is not merely a geopolitical label. It evokes an emotional and almost sacred attachment to homeland, often tied to family, soil, and cultural destiny.[13] In English, "homeland" lacks such resonance and is used more neutrally. The difference is not terminological but ontological: *rodina* encodes a culturally rooted existential bond, while "homeland" denotes spatial belonging without spiritual overtones.

4.3. English: Autonomy and Individualism

English, particularly in its Anglo-American variant, reflects a cultural emphasis on individual autonomy, privacy, and legal identity. The lexeme *privacy*, for instance, presupposes a socially acknowledged boundary between self and other, inside and outside, public and personal. In many collectivist cultures, no direct equivalent of *privacy* exists, not because the concept is unknown, but because the semantic boundary it marks is not culturally foregrounded.[14]

Similarly, the English lexicon is rich in terms like *freedom*, *choice*, *responsibility*, and *rights*—lexical markers of an individualist moral ontology. Wierzbicka has argued that these are not mere words, but cultural keywords reflecting Anglo moral philosophy, Protestant ethics, and Enlightenment rationalism.[15] In contrast, languages such as Japanese or Korean encode more finely differentiated social hierarchies and duties, using honorifics and status-bound lexemes to reflect interpersonal obligations. English, by contrast, flattens these relational distinctions, privileging egalitarian access and personal agency.

These examples show that lexical meaning is never neutral: it is shaped by the conceptual needs of a culture, reflecting dominant ethical models, emotional postures, and social

[11] Wierzbicka, *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*, 95–107.
[12] Vladimir Nabokov, *Strong Opinions* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), 27.
[13] Laura A. Janda, "Conceptual Metaphors in Russian and Czech," *Cognitive Linguistics* 15, no. 4 (2004): 471–498.
[14] Farzad Sharifian, *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017), 105–110.
[15] Wierzbicka, *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*, 1–20.

institutions. Uzbek moral lexemes, Russian emotional vocabulary, and English legal-individualist terminology reveal not only linguistic variation but cultural epistemologies. The lexicon is thus not a passive system of naming but an active map of meaning through which each culture defines what matters, how it feels, and who it believes itself to be.

5. Implications and Conclusion

The comparative analysis of lexical items across cultures confirms that words are not merely neutral referential symbols, but culturally charged forms that reflect how communities conceptualize the world. As demonstrated in the preceding sections, the lexicon functions as a site where cognitive structures and sociocultural values converge. This has profound implications for both linguistic theory and cross-cultural communication.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings support a view of lexical semantics as culturally conditioned, rather than universally stable. What counts as a meaningful semantic distinction in one language may be entirely backgrounded or even absent in another. The cultural centrality of lexical oppositions like *halol/harom* in Uzbek, or emotional lexemes like *toska* in Russian, underscores the selective salience of different semantic fields in different linguistic communities. These differences do not merely reflect divergent vocabularies but indicate fundamentally different ways of organizing ethical, emotional, and social experience.

In practical terms, the cultural encoding of lexical meaning creates challenges for translation and intercultural understanding. Translating a term like *privacy* into a culture that does not prioritize individual boundaries in the same way risks not just linguistic distortion but conceptual misalignment. Even when translation appears successful at the surface level, the deeper cultural scripts embedded in certain lexical items may be lost or misinterpreted. This is particularly crucial in diplomatic discourse, international law, education, and intercultural psychology, where misunderstanding lexical nuances can lead to broader epistemic failures.

Ultimately, this study affirms that language is a repository of worldview, and that lexical meaning must be understood in context—not only linguistic, but historical, ethical, and cognitive. Future research in cultural semantics should continue to investigate how key lexical categories evolve over time, how they are taught and transmitted, and how they interact with larger cultural transformations. To engage with meaning is not simply to analyze language—it is to enter into the cultural logic that underwrites how a society makes sense of itself and the world.

References:

1. Benjamin Lee Whorf, Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf, ed. John B. Carroll (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1956), 212–214.
2. Anna Wierzbicka, Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 1–20, 95–107.
3. Wilhelm von Humboldt, On Language: The Diversity of Human Language Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind, trans. Peter Heath (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 54.
4. Edward Sapir, in Selected Writings in Language, Culture and Personality, ed. David G. Mandelbaum (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949), 162–174.
5. Farzad Sharifian, Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017), 5–28, 105–110.

6. Stephen C. Levinson, “Language and Space,” Annual Review of Anthropology 25 (1996): 353–382.
7. Vladimir Nabokov, Strong Opinions (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), 27.
8. Laura A. Janda, “Conceptual Metaphors in Russian and Czech,” Cognitive Linguistics 15, no. 4 (2004): 471–498.