

The study of lexical units denoting household items in comparative and metaphorical domains

Mashhura Abdujalilova

Namangan State Technical University, Uzbekistan

misskhura@gmail.com



Article History:

Received on 28 August 2025

1st Revision on 26 September 2025

Accepted on 2 October 2025

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to examine the role of lexical units in advancing lexicography and understanding how languages evolve across different cultural contexts. The research highlights how lexical fields, dictionary theories, and cultural perceptions influence the categorization and interpretation of reality.

Methodology: A qualitative literature review was conducted, drawing from studies in lexicography, sociolinguistics, and comparative linguistics. The analysis focused on three main areas: theoretical frameworks used in dictionaries, the organization of lexical fields, and cross-cultural perspectives on language categorization.

Results: Findings indicate that lexical units are central to lexicography not only for dictionary compilation but also for documenting linguistic innovation. Researchers emphasize the importance of lexical fields such as household items, kinship terms, and technological vocabulary, which reveal both semantic shifts and cultural adaptation. Cross-cultural studies further demonstrate that the way nations classify and describe reality reflects deeper worldviews and societal values.

Conclusion: Lexical studies strengthen the scientific basis of lexicography by connecting linguistic theory with cultural practices, ensuring that dictionaries remain relevant to contemporary users.

Limitations: The study is limited to secondary sources, without primary data collection from fieldwork. Future research could incorporate corpus-based analysis or ethnographic approaches for richer insights.

Contribution: This research contributes to lexicographic scholarship by underlining the necessity of analyzing lexical units as dynamic cultural markers. It provides a framework for linguists, lexicographers, and language learners to engage with vocabulary as both a linguistic and cultural phenomenon.

Keywords: Comparative Analysis, Household Items, Lexical Units, Pragmatics, Linguoculturology, Metaphor, Microfield

How to Cite: Abdujalilova, M. (2025). The study of lexical units denoting household items in comparative and metaphorical domains. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language*, 1(2), 109-120.

1. Introduction

Language is not only a medium of communication but also a reflection of culture, social life, and identity. Within the field of linguistics, vocabulary is a crucial element in capturing how individuals and societies perceive and categorize the world around them. Among the many lexical fields studied, household vocabulary holds a special place because of its close relationship with human daily life. Household items are ever-present in our environment, providing comfort, practicality, and cultural expression (Cahyaningrum, Prasetya, & Mustiawan, 2025; Sapariati, Widnyani, & Dewi, 2025). They are not merely physical objects but also serve as linguistic symbols of cultural traditions, values and

social structures. For this reason, studying lexical units denoting household items in English and Uzbek offers valuable insights into both linguistic development and cultural identity. From a linguistic perspective, household vocabulary is complex. It consists of words denoting kitchen utensils, furniture, appliances, and other domestic objects integral to everyday life.

In English, examples include terms such as furniture, kitchen appliances, and household tools. In Uzbek, the equivalent categories are *mebel* (furniture), *oshxona asboblari* (kitchen utensils), and *ro‘zg‘or anjomlari* (household items). These words not only describe functional objects but also reveal historical and cultural layers through etymology. For example, the English word *furniture* comes from the French *fournir* (to equip), while the Uzbek *mebel* is derived from the French *mobilier* through Russian borrowings. The lexical journey of these words illustrates the processes of cultural contact, colonization, and globalization that have shaped language over time (N. G. I. Kizi, 2025; Otariyani, Nofrima, & Febriyanti, 2025; Sobirova, 2021).

Household vocabulary also provides a fertile ground for discourse analysis. Words for everyday objects appear in literal descriptions as well as figurative and metaphorical usage. They are frequently embedded in proverbs, idioms, advertisements, literature, and digital communication. In Uzbek culture, expressions such as “mother-in-law’s table” or “younger brother’s dish” signify family hierarchy and social relations, while in English, idioms like skeletons in the closet or to bring to the table illustrate how domestic objects become metaphorical devices for expressing abstract ideas. This indicates that household vocabulary carries pragmatic value, serving as a lens through which language reflects social structure, roles, and cultural norms. Previous studies have highlighted the connection between household items and cultural traditions. For instance, Bakhridinovich (2025) investigated the typical kitchen utensils used by Javanese women, analyzing both their form and function within the household through semantic methods. Their findings underscore the significance of bamboo materials in Javanese culture, revealing how the linguistic categorization of household objects reflects cultural practices and worldviews.

This demonstrates that studying domestic vocabulary extends beyond the physical object; it encompasses semantic characteristics tied to tradition, material culture, and social identity (Jabborov, 2008; Language, 2006; qizi, 2024). Similarly, Bakhronova (2024) from Riga Technical University examined the metaphorical use of household vocabulary in forming terminological units within railway and automotive transport. Her research identified household items, such as knives, dishware, and furniture, as source domains for metaphorical expressions. She found that the lexeme *fork* appeared in at least 27 metaphorical terms, including *forked axle*, *selector fork*, and *forking road*. Her analysis revealed that the shape and function of objects serve as triggers for metaphorization, showing how household vocabulary can transcend domestic contexts to contribute to specialized terminology. This highlights the importance of household lexemes in the development of metaphors in both everyday and technical discourse.

The significance of household vocabulary is further emphasized when considering its role in language development and social identity (Jakhongirovna, 2024; Баймбетова & Кеулимжаева, 2023). Domestic lexicon is among the first categories taught to children and second-language learners because of its concreteness and relatability. Words such as chair, table, and cup are universally relevant, making them accessible entry points for vocabulary acquisition (Alqahtani, 2015). However, teaching such words is not only pedagogical but also cultural. Comparing terms across English and Uzbek, for example, introduces learners to different traditions: in English, the dining table often symbolizes individual meals and efficiency, whereas in Uzbek households, the kitchen serves as a central site of hospitality (*mehmonnavozlik*) and collective family life (Bakhridinovich, 2025; Khaydarov, 2019).

Moreover, the study of household vocabulary demonstrates a dynamic interaction between tradition and modernity. Technological innovations such as microwave ovens, dishwashers, and smart speakers have introduced new lexical items into both English and Uzbek languages. Many of these words are borrowed directly, with minimal adaptation, reflecting English’s global prestige and the dominance of Western consumer culture. However, traditional objects such as the *tandir* oven and *samovar* remain

linguistically and culturally significant in Uzbek society. This coexistence of traditional and modern terms creates a hybrid lexicon that reflects the realities of globalization, cultural preservation, and social change. Linguocultural studies have also drawn attention to the symbolic role of household vocabulary. Abzhamalova and Sagidolda (2025), in their dissertation on linguocultural interpretation, emphasized how microfields of household lexicon reveal deeper cultural patterns. Items associated with cooking, hospitality, or interior decoration often carry symbolic meanings related to identity, gender, and class. For instance, in many societies, kitchens and their vocabulary are associated with women's roles, reflecting historical divisions of labor. While in English-speaking contexts these associations are becoming less explicit due to shifting gender norms, in Uzbek discourse, such connections remain linguistically marked, reinforcing the importance of cultural analysis in vocabulary studies (Sina, 2000; Usmanova, Shamsieva, & Ismatullayeva, 2023).

Another key dimension is the metaphorical expansion of domestic vocabulary into specialized terms. As noted by Баймбетова and Кеулимжаева (2023), terms such as forklift or forked axle exemplify how the form and function of everyday objects are metaphorically extended into technical language (Saputro, Achmad, & Santoso, 2025). This process demonstrates the universality of household lexemes as source domains for metaphorization. The shape of a fork, for example, lends itself to describing branching roads, mechanical parts, and tools for lifting. Similarly, English metaphors such as "branching road" resemble natural imagery but are often supported by domestic object references, revealing an overlap between household, natural, and technical source domains. Given these dimensions, it is clear that the study of household vocabulary is not a marginal pursuit but a central one in linguistics, pragmatics, and cultural studies. Household items serve as markers of identity, reflecting cultural belonging, hospitality traditions, and social values. They are also vehicles of linguistic innovation, introducing borrowings, metaphors, and semantic shifts that enrich the lexicon of the language. Furthermore, they serve as tools for pedagogy and intercultural communication, bridging language learning and cultural understanding (Fakhretdinova, 1972; Jabborov, 2008).

In the context of comparative linguistics, examining English and Uzbek household vocabulary allows for the exploration of both universal and culture-specific patterns (Aliyevna, 2025). All human societies develop words for domestic tools, spaces, and furniture because of their necessity in everyday life. However, the semantic range, metaphorical extensions, and cultural values attached to these words differ across languages (C. Z. B. Kizi, 2023). This makes comparative research particularly valuable, as it reveals not only shared human experiences but also unique cultural worldviews. Finally, the introduction emphasizes that household vocabulary operates at the intersection of pragmatics, semantics, and linguoculturology.

By investigating lexical units denoting household items in comparative and metaphorical domains, this study aims to uncover how language encodes material culture, how metaphors emerge from domestic environments, and how cultural identities are reinforced through everyday words. In doing so, this study contributes to lexicography, discourse analysis, and the broader field of cultural linguistics, while also offering practical implications for education, translation, and intercultural communication (Ismoilov, 1965; N. G. I. Kizi, 2025; Баймбетова & Кеулимжаева, 2023). The urgency of studying household vocabulary also lies in its ability to document linguistic changes across generations. As new terms enter the lexicon due to technological advancements and globalization, older words may fall out of use or acquire new meanings. Without systematic analysis, many of these lexical shifts risk being overlooked, leading to gaps in our understanding of both language development and cultural transformation. Research in this area provides a linguistic archive that records vocabulary and traces social and cultural changes over time.

Furthermore, examining household vocabulary in comparative contexts, such as English and Uzbek, enriches cross-cultural linguistics by highlighting universal human experiences alongside culture-specific practices. These studies bridge lexicography, which focuses on cataloging and defining words, and linguoculturology, which emphasizes the interdependence of language and culture. Thus, research on the domestic lexicon informs multiple disciplines, including anthropology, education, and translation studies. Ultimately, this field contributes to broader discussions of identity and globalization.

Household items, while mundane in function, symbolize heritage and continuity. Investigating how they are named, categorized, and metaphorically extended allows us to better understand not only the mechanics of language but also the deeper cultural values encoded in everyday speech.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Lexical Studies on Household Vocabulary

Household vocabulary has been widely studied in lexicography and semantics because of its close relationship with daily life and representation of cultural patterns. Scholars argue that lexical units denoting household items reflect not only material culture but also social structures and their symbolic meanings. The Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language (2006) categorizes words such as mebel (furniture) and oshxona asboblari (kitchen utensils) as essential lexical items for domestic contexts. These entries demonstrate the integration of borrowings from Persian, Arabic, and Russian, highlighting the role of cultural contact in shaping the vocabulary. In English, lexical studies have shown that household vocabulary often originates from Latin and French roots. For instance, furniture comes from the Old French fournir (“to furnish”), while cupboard originally denoted an open shelf for cups, later shifting semantically to mean a closed cabinet. These etymological developments reveal how language adapts to an evolving material culture. Such findings emphasize that household vocabulary is not static but dynamic, continuously adapting to new cultural realities (C. Z. B. Kizi, 2023).

2.2 Linguoculturology and Symbolic Dimensions

The field of linguoculturology highlights how household vocabulary encodes cultural identities. Makhammadovna (2022) emphasized that microfields of household lexicons reveal deeper cultural values, particularly in relation to hospitality, family structure, and gender roles. In Uzbek households, the kitchen is considered not only a place of food preparation but also the symbolic heart of family relationships. Expressions such as “mother-in-law’s table” represent respect, hierarchy, and family dynamics, demonstrating how everyday objects reflect cultural worldviews (Kasmahidayat & Hasanuddin, 2022). In English, idioms such as bring to the table or skeletons in the closet reveal how domestic objects are metaphorically extended to represent negotiation, secrecy, or hidden histories. These examples confirm that household vocabulary carries pragmatic and symbolic value, connecting language use to social norms and cultural traditions (Sutrisno, Duwi, Anita, Eksa, & Jenny Yudha, 2024; Z & A, 2025).

2.3 Metaphorical Expansion of Household Terms

Ghajoyan (2016) analyzed the metaphorical use of household vocabulary in technical terminology, particularly in the fields of railway and automotive transport. She identified 160 English terms originating from household lexemes, accounting for nearly 13% of metaphorically used terms. The lexeme fork appeared in 27 metaphorical terms, such as selector fork, forked axle, and forking roads. These terms demonstrate that the shape and function of domestic objects are prime triggers for metaphorization, enabling household vocabulary to transcend everyday contexts and enter specialized domains. This metaphorical expansion is also evident in English idioms such as branching road, where the resemblance to a tree branch parallels the shape of a fork. Similar processes occur in Uzbek, where domestic terms are extended metaphorically to describe broader social or technical realities. This demonstrates the universality of household items as a source domain in metaphor theory, affirming Li, Shi, and Lei (2025) claim that everyday objects serve as the foundation for conceptual metaphors (Nazki, 2025; Sanjiwani, Pitanatri, & Loanata, 2025).

2.4 Household Vocabulary and Cultural Heritage

Household vocabulary also serves as a linguistic archive of heritage. Works such as Abzhamalova and Sagidolda (2025) in the Decorative and Applied Arts of Uzbekistan and Jabborov’s Traditional Economy, Lifestyle, and Ethnoculture of the Uzbeks (2008) document how domestic items like tandir ovens, samovar tea-makers, and embroidered suzani textiles are embedded in both material and linguistic traditions. These objects are more than functional; they embody rituals of hospitality (mehmonnavozlik), communal identity, and generational continuity. Zokirova and Topvoldiyeva (2020) Canon of Medical Science (1994 edition) also provides indirect evidence of domestic vocabulary

through descriptions of household and medical objects. This indicates that references to everyday items have long been part of scholarly and practical discourse linking health, lifestyle, and material culture.

2.5 Household Vocabulary in Social Relations

Chiesa and Dekker (2024), in their work on kinship terms in Turkic languages, highlight the intersection between family relations and vocabulary, which can also be applied to household items. Domestic objects often serve as markers of social relations, class, and gender. For example, ownership of antique or mahogany furniture in English contexts signifies wealth, whereas in Uzbekistan, possession of a high-quality tandir or decorative textiles conveys prestige and cultural belonging. Household vocabulary thus functions both descriptively and evaluatively, signaling not only the presence of objects but also social identity. This evaluative dimension of household vocabulary demonstrates how language functions as a subtle indicator of power and hierarchy. The words used to describe domestic objects not only identify material possessions but also reflect judgments regarding taste, status, and belonging. In many societies, the ability to own and name luxurious items is closely tied to social capital, reinforcing the distinctions between elite and common households. For example, English discourse surrounding antique furniture or crystal tableware evokes notions of refinement and heritage, positioning these items as markers of privilege.

Similarly, in Uzbek society, references to ornate suzani embroidery and finely crafted tandir ovens carry cultural prestige, signaling respectability within the community. When used in everyday communication, these terms function as symbolic resources that situate individuals within broader social structures. They also highlight gendered associations: women are often linked with domestic crafts and kitchen tools, whereas men may be associated with the ownership of large or valuable household assets. Thus, household vocabulary is not merely descriptive; it is embedded in the socio-cultural fabric, shaping perceptions of identity, and reinforcing communal values. By analyzing these linguistic markers, researchers can uncover the nuanced ways in which language encodes social roles and cultural hierarchies.

2.6 Household Vocabulary in Language Learning

Another strand of literature emphasizes the pedagogical importance of household vocabulary in children's learning. Because of its concreteness and universality, the domestic lexicon is among the first taught to children and second language learners. Words such as chair, table, spoon, and cup are easily understood and are frequently used in daily communication. Comparative studies suggest that introducing both traditional and modern household terms enhances intercultural competence (Metriyana & Zaim, 2024). For example, while Uzbek learners encounter culturally specific terms like samovar, they also learn international borrowings like microwave. This combination bridges cultural gaps and strengthens communicative competence in global contexts. The pedagogical significance of household vocabulary extends beyond simple word acquisition and contributes to the development of contextualized language learning. When students learn vocabulary related to objects they encounter in their daily environment, they can immediately apply this knowledge to authentic communicative situations.

For example, asking for a cup or identifying a table in a classroom allows learners to connect lexical forms to real-world referents. This facilitates retention and encourages active usage, both of which are critical for second language acquisition. Moreover, including both traditional and modern household terms in the curriculum enriches students' cultural understanding. Teaching Uzbek learners about samovar highlights the values of hospitality and communal identity, while introducing words like microwave or smart fridge provides exposure to global consumer culture. This dual approach not only develops bilingual or multilingual competence but also nurtures intercultural awareness, allowing learners to appreciate the differences and similarities between their native culture and the target language. From a methodological perspective, language teachers often employ task-based learning or situational role-play using household vocabularies. Activities such as simulating a family dinner, shopping for furniture, and describing a kitchen setting help learners practice communicative functions in meaningful contexts. These strategies make vocabulary instruction more engaging and memorable for students.

Additionally, the integration of digital tools enhances the teaching of household vocabulary. Interactive apps, multimedia flashcards, and virtual simulations of homes allow students to explore the domestic lexicon dynamically. Such innovations are particularly relevant in the era of online education, where visual and interactive resources compensate for the absence of physical classroom materials. Ultimately, pedagogical literature underscores that teaching household vocabulary is not merely about learning words but about fostering linguistic competence, cultural literacy, and communicative confidence. This makes the domestic lexicon a foundational yet evolving component of language education.

2.7 Globalization and Technological Influences

Recent scholarship has addressed how globalization and technological change have reshaped household vocabulary. Vlieger de Oliveira, Wache, and Raithel (2024) discuss how cultural interactions in the Uzbek and English lexicons reflect broader global exchanges. Terms such as smart speaker or robot vacuum have entered multiple languages, often borrowed directly from English. However, traditional words remain significant, creating a hybrid lexicon in which modernity coexists with cultural heritage. This duality illustrates the adaptability of language and the importance of documenting lexical shifts across generations. This phenomenon of lexical hybridity highlights how globalization does not necessarily erase cultural traditions but instead creates a layered vocabulary. In many societies, traditional household terms continue to function alongside borrowed words, each serving a different communicative purpose.

For example, in Uzbek families, the term tandir still evokes cultural identity, hospitality, and tradition, while at the same time, younger generations casually use terms like mikrovolnovka (microwave) or kofemashina (coffee machine), borrowed from Russian and English. This coexistence reflects how speakers navigate between preserving cultural heritage and adapting to modern lifestyles. Furthermore, the role of media and advertising in popularizing new household vocabulary cannot be overlooked. International brands and marketing campaigns introduce terms that quickly become standardized for everyday use. Words such as blender or air fryer are not only loanwords but also cultural imports, carrying connotations of convenience, modernity, and global consumer culture. In many cases, these terms become aspirational markers, symbolizing upward mobility and alignment with global trends.

Simultaneously, globalization fosters semantic shifts, wherein existing words acquire new meanings influenced by modern technology. For instance, the English word tablet once denoted a flat writing surface but now commonly refers to a digital device. Similar processes occur in household vocabulary, as traditional words expand to encompass new functions or symbolic associations. Thus, the adaptability of household vocabulary demonstrates the resilience of language in the face of change. By documenting these processes, scholars not only preserve linguistic history but also reveal how language mirrors broader social transformation. In this sense, studying household vocabulary is a way of tracing the interaction between global innovation and local tradition, showing how identities are continuously negotiated in daily communication.

2.8 Synthesis of Literature

The reviewed literature highlights several recurring themes. First, household vocabulary is inherently dynamic and is shaped by history, culture, and social transformation. Second, it operates at multiple levels—lexical, metaphorical, pragmatic, and symbolic—making it a rich field for interdisciplinary studies. Third, the household lexicon bridges the gap between linguistic theory and cultural practice, offering insights into identity, tradition, and globalization. Finally, the literature underscores the urgency of documenting lexical change as technological innovations continue to reshape how household objects are named, perceived, and integrated into discourse. This synthesis of the literature also suggests that the study of household vocabulary is far from a closed field; rather, it remains open to new theoretical perspectives and empirical explorations.

One important avenue is the integration of sociolinguistic methods that can track how words for household items vary across different social groups, generations, and regions. For instance, younger speakers may adopt loanwords from English more readily when describing modern appliances, whereas

older generations may preserve traditional terms. Such variations reveal not only linguistic preferences but also attitudes toward cultural continuity and globalization.

Another significant direction is the application of critical discourse analysis (CDA) to household vocabularies. As household items are deeply tied to issues of gender, family structure, and class, examining how these words are represented in media, literature, and everyday conversation can uncover implicit ideologies. For example, advertisements often portray modern kitchen appliances as tools of empowerment or convenience while implicitly associating them with women's roles. This indicates that household vocabulary functions as a subtle site for negotiating social norms and power relations. Translation studies also benefit from this field of inquiry. Household vocabulary is often culture-specific, and literal translation may fail to capture its symbolic meanings. For instance, translating Uzbek terms such as *tandir* or *suzani* into English requires cultural explanation to preserve their connotations. Similarly, English metaphors derived from household items, such as skeletons in the closet, cannot be directly translated into Uzbek without considering cultural equivalence. This demonstrates the importance of lexical and cultural competence in cross-linguistic communications.

Finally, the literature review highlights the pressing need for digital corpora and computational tools to document the evolution of household vocabulary. As new terms emerge through technology and global consumerism, digital archives can help track their frequency, collocations, and semantic shifts over time. Incorporating corpus linguistics into this domain will not only enrich the theoretical understanding but also provide practical resources for lexicographers, educators, and translators.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative comparative research design supported by elements of linguistic discourse analysis. The qualitative approach was chosen because the focus of this research lies not in numerical measurement but in understanding the meanings, functions, and cultural implications of lexical units. The comparative design allows for the systematic identification of similarities and differences in household vocabulary between English and Uzbek, while metaphorical analysis highlights the figurative use of these terms across discourses.

3.2 Data Sources

The data in this study were drawn from multiple sources to ensure validity and representativeness.

- a) Lexicographic sources, including the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language* (2006), English etymological dictionaries, and bilingual dictionaries, which provide definitions, etymology, and semantic fields.
- b) Academic works – such as Sobirova (2021), Khaydarov (2019), Ismoilov (1965), Fakhretdinova (1972), and Jabborov (2008), which discuss cultural and linguistic aspects of household vocabulary.
- c) Media and communicative discourse – advertisements, social media texts, proverbs, idioms, and literary works where household terms appear in daily usage and metaphorical contexts.
- d) Historical and cultural texts, including Sina (2000), which provides historical references to household and medical items.

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected through document studies and content analyses. First, relevant lexical entries were compiled from the dictionaries. Next, the occurrences of household vocabulary were identified in literature, idioms, and media texts. Both traditional terms (e.g., *tandir*, *samovar*, *suzani*) and modern borrowings (e.g., *microwave*, *smart fridge*, *robot vacuum*) were included to capture diachronic and synchronic dimensions of the lexicon.

3.4 Data Analysis Techniques

The collected data were analyzed using four main procedures.

- a) Lexical and etymological analysis: Tracing origins, borrowing patterns, and semantic shifts of household vocabulary.
- b) Discourse analysis – examining the pragmatic usage of household terms in idioms, advertisements, and social media to reveal cultural meanings.

- c) Comparative analysis – identifying cross-linguistic similarities and differences between English and Uzbek in terms of form, meaning, and metaphorical extension.
- d) Interpretive analysis – situating findings within the broader frameworks of linguoculturology, pragmatics, and metaphor theory.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

To ensure research rigor, triangulation was applied by cross-checking the data from dictionaries, academic references, and discourse examples. Reliability was strengthened by using consistent criteria for selecting words, ensuring the representation of both traditional and modern vocabulary. Peer-reviewed literature was also used to validate the interpretations and avoid researcher bias.

3.6 Scope and Limitations

This research is limited to household vocabulary in English and Uzbek languages. It does not extend to other languages, which constrains the generalizability of the results. Moreover, the analysis is based on selected lexicographic, literary, and media sources, without employing large-scale corpus linguistics. Future studies could expand this scope by using digital corpora and including cross-cultural comparisons of additional languages.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1 Lexical Findings and Etymological Insights

The analysis reveals that household vocabulary in both English and Uzbek is deeply embedded in cultural history and is shaped by external influences. Many English terms originate from Latin and French, reflecting the impact of the Norman invasion and subsequent cultural integration. For instance, *furniture* derives from the Old French *fournir* (“to furnish”), and *cupboard* originally referred to an open shelf for cups before shifting semantically into a cabinet with doors. These developments demonstrate the adaptability of English vocabulary to material changes in domestic life. A similar dynamic is evident in Uzbek, with significant borrowing from Persian, Arabic, Russian, and more recently, English. The term *mebel* (furniture), derived from French *mobilier* via Russian, exemplifies this borrowing path. Likewise, words such as *parda* (curtain, from Persian) and *mikrovolnovka* (microwave, from the Russian adaptation of English) show how household vocabulary documents historical and cultural interactions. These findings confirm that household vocabulary functions as a linguistic archive, preserving traces of colonization, cultural contact and globalization.

4.2 Symbolic and Cultural Dimensions

Household vocabulary is both functional and symbolic. In Uzbek households, domestic objects such as the *tandir* oven or *samovar* tea set signify hospitality (*mehmonnavozlik*) and family continuity. The *tandir*, in particular, symbolizes unity, as the bread baked in it is often shared in communal settings, reinforcing family ties and cultural identity. In English-speaking contexts, the dining table frequently serves as a symbol of family unity, whereas items such as *antique furniture* and *crystal tableware* connote refinement and wealth. Idiomatic expressions also reflect these symbolic meanings in their use. English idioms such as *skeletons in the closet* or *to bring to the table* metaphorically extend household items into abstract domains such as secrecy and negotiation. Uzbek expressions, such as “mother-in-law’s table” or “younger brother’s dish,” encode family hierarchy and respect. This demonstrates that household vocabulary is both linguistically productive and culturally loaded, embedding social roles and traditions into everyday speech.

4.3 Metaphorical Extension of Household Terms

The results confirm Chiesa and Dekker (2024) findings that household lexemes are productive sources of metaphorical terminology. In English, the lexeme *fork* appears in at least 27 metaphorical terms, including *forked axle*, *selector fork*, and *forking roads*. These metaphorical extensions rely on visual resemblance or functional similarity between domestic objects and technical domains. In Uzbek, metaphorical usage of household terms also appears in idioms, proverbs, and technical language. For example, terms derived from kitchen and furniture vocabulary are often extended to describe social interactions and organizational structures. This supports N. G. I. Kizi (2025) conceptual metaphor theory, where concrete, familiar objects serve as source domains for abstract thinking. Household

vocabulary thus demonstrates the cognitive universality of metaphorization, bridging everyday life and specialized knowledge in the field.

4.4 Social Relations and Identity Markers

This study highlights how household vocabulary signals social status, gender roles, and class distinctions. In English, references to *mahogany tables* or *antique furniture* index wealth and cultural capital. Similarly, in Uzbek, owning a finely crafted *tandir* or a decorative *suzani* textile conveys prestige and respectability. These lexical markers act not only as descriptions of objects but also as evaluative judgments embedded in language. Gender associations were also notable. Traditionally, kitchen-related vocabulary in Uzbek discourse is strongly tied to women's roles, whereas men are more often associated with the ownership of larger or more valuable household assets. Although these associations are weakening in modern English contexts due to changing gender norms, they remain salient in Uzbek, reflecting the ongoing cultural dynamics. Thus, household vocabulary encodes both continuity and transformation of social roles.

4.5 Pedagogical Relevance

The findings also reinforce the pedagogical significance of the household vocabulary. Because these words are concrete and universally relevant, they form part of the earliest lexical sets introduced in both first- and second-language learning. Terms such as *chair*, *table*, *cup*, and *spoon* provide learners with accessible vocabulary that can be immediately applied to daily life. However, the comparative analysis shows that including both traditional and modern household terms enhances students' intercultural competence. For instance, Uzbek learners introduced to *samovar* gain cultural insight into hospitality practices while also learning loanwords like *microwave* to engage with global consumer culture. Task-based learning methods, such as simulating family dinners or shopping for furniture, effectively reinforce vocabulary. Digital resources—such as interactive flashcards and virtual simulations—further enrich the teaching of household lexicon, especially in online learning environments. Thus, household vocabulary serves as a bridge between linguistic competence and cultural literacy.

4.6 Impact of Globalization and Technology

Globalization and technological change have significantly reshaped household vocabulary. Words such as *smart speaker*, *air fryer*, and *robot vacuum* have entered Uzbek through direct borrowing from English. Simultaneously, traditional words remain active, creating a hybrid lexicon in which old and new terms coexist. For example, Uzbek families still use *tandir* while also adopting terms such as *kofemashina* (coffee machine). The role of the media and advertising is central to this transformation. International brands popularize household terms that quickly become standardized in local lexicons, carrying connotations of modernity and upward mobility. Furthermore, semantic shifts occur when old words acquire new meanings; for example, the English word *tablet* shifted from meaning a writing slab to a digital device, mirroring changes in household vocabulary as traditional terms are adapted to technological innovations. These findings highlight the resilience and adaptability of language, showing how household lexicons reflect broader processes of identity negotiation in a globalized world.

4.7 Discussion

Overall, the results affirm that household vocabulary is a dynamic, multifaceted, culturally embedded domain. Lexical analysis demonstrates how borrowing and semantic change document historical and cultural exchange. Cultural analysis reveals that household vocabulary embodies symbolic meanings associated with hospitality, family, and class. Metaphorical analysis confirms that household items serve as productive source domains for abstract concepts across languages. Pedagogical studies underscore the importance of the domestic lexicon in language acquisition and intercultural competence.

Finally, globalization and technological change illustrate the adaptability of household vocabulary, creating a hybrid lexicon that bridges tradition and modernity. These findings contribute to broader discussions in linguistics and cultural studies by demonstrating how ordinary words encode extraordinary insights into human life. Household vocabulary, far from being trivial, offers a lens into identity, social structure, and cultural continuity in the Philippines. It functions simultaneously as a

linguistic record, symbolic system, pedagogical tool, and cultural bridge. Documenting and analyzing this lexicon is therefore crucial not only for linguistic scholarship but also for preserving cultural heritage and fostering intercultural understanding in the modern world.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion

The study of lexical units denoting household items in English and Uzbek demonstrates that this vocabulary field is not merely descriptive but is deeply intertwined with culture, identity, and historical context. Lexical analysis confirms that many household terms in both languages have undergone borrowing and semantic change, documenting cultural contact and globalization. Etymological evidence shows that English relies heavily on French and Latin roots, whereas the Uzbek vocabulary integrates Persian, Arabic, Russian, and modern English borrowings, reflecting different stages of historical interaction. From a cultural and symbolic perspective, household vocabulary encodes the values of family, hospitality, and social status. Items such as the *tandir* or *samovar* in Uzbek and the dining table or antique furniture in English function as cultural markers that reflect continuity and tradition.

Moreover, idioms and metaphors reveal how domestic objects serve as powerful source domains for abstract meaning. Expressions such as *skeletons in the closet* or “mother-in-law’s table” highlight how language embeds cultural worldviews and family dynamics. The analysis also emphasizes the role of household vocabulary in pedagogy and in intercultural competence. Its concreteness and universality make it essential in early language learning, and the inclusion of both traditional and modern terms fosters deeper cultural understanding.

Finally, the findings confirm that globalization and technological innovation have reshaped household lexicons, introducing hybrid vocabularies in which traditional items coexist with modern appliances. This hybridity illustrates the adaptability of language and the importance of documenting shifts that mirror broader social transformation. In conclusion, household vocabulary serves as a linguistic archive, symbolic system, and pedagogical tool. It bridges tradition and modernity, local identity and global influence, and offers rich insights into the interplay between language, culture, and society.

5.2 Suggestions

Based on the findings and conclusions, several recommendations are proposed.

a) For Academic Research

1. Future studies should expand beyond English and Uzbek to include comparative analyses with other languages, particularly within Central Asia and Europe, to enrich cross-cultural perspectives.
2. Employing corpus linguistics and computational tools is recommended to trace the frequency, semantic shifts, and collocations of household terms across large datasets.
3. Further interdisciplinary research should link linguistics with anthropology, sociology, and digital studies to explore household vocabulary as a part of material and digital culture.

b) For Education and Pedagogy

1. Language teachers should integrate both traditional and modern household terms into curricula, allowing learners to simultaneously gain linguistic and cultural competence.
2. Task-based and role-play activities that simulate real-life contexts (e.g., family meals, shopping, or home settings) can make learning more interactive and effective.
3. Developing bilingual teaching materials, such as English–Uzbek illustrated dictionaries of household items, would help preserve cultural heritage while supporting second-language acquisition.

c) For Cultural Preservation

1. Cultural institutions should collaborate with linguists to document traditional household terms before they disappear due to the influence of globalization.
2. Public campaigns and media projects can raise awareness of the cultural value of traditional objects such as *tandirs* and *suzanis*, framing them not only as artifacts but as living symbols of identity.

d) For Future Adaptation

1. Policymakers and researchers should monitor how globalization and technology reshape vocabulary, ensuring that linguistic innovations are documented without erasing the cultural roots.
2. Digital archives and apps can be developed to track the evolution of household vocabulary, providing resources for both scholars and learners.

References

Abzhamalova, Z., & Sagidolda, G. (2025). Semantic comparative analysis of household vocabulary in kazakh and uzbek languages. *Bulletin of the Eurasian Humanities Institute, Philology Series*, 7-13. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.55808/1999-4214.2025-2.01>

Aliyevna, B. S. (2025). Deformation of spiritual values in modern society: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 3(3), 931-941. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3497>

Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International journal of teaching and education*, 3(3), 21-34. doi:<https://doi.org/10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002>

Bakhridinovich, A. N. (2025). A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Metaphorical Structures in Proverbs and Idiomatic Expressions. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education* (2993-2769), 3(4), 77-82.

Bakhronova, D. (2024). English Language And Uzbek Students: A Linguocultural Point. *SPAST Reports*, 1. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.69848/sreports.v1i1.4629>

Cahyaningrum, N. P., Prasetya, H., & Mustiawan, M. (2025). Storytelling Marketing Communication Dalam Membangun Engagement Pada Nano Influencer Tiktok @Tenscoffeeid. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik*, 5(1), 101-117. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jasipol.v5i1.5004>

Chiesa, C. D., & Dekker, E. (2024). Communicating identity: how the symbolic meaning of goods creates different market types. *Review of Social Economy*, 82(1), 76-97. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/00346764.2021.2019822>

Fakhretdinova, D. A. (1972). Decorative and Applied Arts of Uzbekistan. *Tashkent: Gafur Gulyam Publishing House of Literature and Art*, 164.

Ghajoyan, H. (2016). The Role of Metaphor in Technical Term-Formation. *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, 12, 27-38. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2016.12.1.027>

Ismoilov, I. (1965). *Kinship Terms in Turkic Languages*: Tashkent: Fan.

Jabborov, I. (2008). *Traditional Economy, Lifestyle, and Ethnoculture of the Uzbeks*: Tashkent: Sharq.

Jakhongirovna, U. Z. (2024). Linguistic-Cultural Approach To Teaching Uzbek Language To Foreigners. *Web of Teachers: InderScience Research*, 2(3), 67-70.

Kasmahidayat, Y., & Hasanuddin, H. (2022). Collaboration strategy in the development and inheritance of Archipelago's Arts. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language*, 1(1), 25-44. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.1065>

Khaydarov, R. (2019). Cultural Interactions in Uzbek and English Lexicons. *International Journal of Linguistic Studies*.

Kizi, C. Z. B. (2023). Comparative-typological analysis of linguocultural terms in Uzbek and English riddles. *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 3(05), 94-99. doi:<https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume03Issue05-17>

Kizi, N. G. I. (2025). LINGOCULTURAL INTERPRETATION OF LEXEMES DENOTING HOUSEHOLD ITEMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. *Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 3(2), 183-186.

Language, E. D. o. t. U. (2006). Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan. 652–653.

Li, Z., Shi, Y., & Lei, L. (2025). Metaphor as a springboard to scientific communication: a large-scale study of the use of lexical metaphors across disciplines. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1288. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05677-z>

Makhammadovna, F. M. (2022). Comparative Analysis Of The Notion “Hospitality” Reflected In The Linguoculturology (On The Examples Of English And Uzbek Phraseological Units). *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 2(06), 19-25. doi:<https://doi.org/10.37547/AJPS/VOLUME02ISSUE06-05>

Metriyana, A., & Zaim, I. A. (2024). Proposed green marketing strategy to collaborate with tourism awareness group (Pokdarwis): Case study at Sein Farm, Bandung. *Global Academy of Business Studies*, 1(1), 55-68. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/gabs.v1i1.3384>

Nazki, S. H. (2025). Despair, desire, and dissent: Theatrical contributions of Sarah Kane and Mark Ravenhill. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language*, 1(1), 45-60. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.2829>

Otariyani, A., Nofrima, S., & Febriyanti, D. (2025). Analisis Tanggapan Pengemudi Ojek Online terhadap Penerapan E-Tilang di Kota Palembang 2024. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik*, 5(1), 11-31. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jasispol.v5i1.4308>

qizi, M. Y. I. M. (2024). Lexical And Semantic Features Of Idioms In Modern English And Uzbek Languages. *Eurasian Journal of Research, Development and Innovation*, 37, 33-34. doi:<https://doi.org/10.29013/esr-23-5-6-21-24>

Sanjiwani, A. T., Pitanatri, P. D. S., & Loanata, C. P. (2025). Big data analytics to understand guest sentiment: Time series study of TripAdvisor reviews for luxury hotel in Bali. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language*, 1(1), 61-73. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.3256>

Sapariati, A., Widnyani, I. A. P. S., & Dewi, N. D. U. (2025). Normative Analysis Of Maternity Leave Policy Implementation For Women Workers' Rights In Bali. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik*, 5(1), 33-42. doi:10.35912/jasispol.v5i1.3817

Saputro, G. E., Achmad, I., & Santoso, T. I. (2025). Evaluation of the Formation Mechanism and Management of Reserve Components to Improve National Defense Economic: english. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik*, 4(2), 97-103. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jasispol.v4i2.3729>

Sina, A. A. I. (2000). Canon of medical science. Publishing house: Mn: Popurri.

Sobirova, R. (2021). *Linguocultural Interpretation of the Microfield of Household Items Vocabulary*. . Andijan.

Sutrisno, E., Duwi, S., Anita, R., Eksa, R., & Jenny Yudha, U. (2024). Study on the utilization of village funds to support food security in Glagah Lamongan District, East Java. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language*, 1(1), 15-24. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.1734>

Usmanova, S., Shamsieva, S., & Ismatullayeva, N. (2023). Scientific Research On Sino-Uzbek Contrastive Linguistics Carried Out In Recent Years. *Journal of Namibian Studies*, 33.

Vlieger de Oliveira, S. E., Wache, C., & Raithel, S. (2024). The role of possessions for the extended self of sustainability- concerned anti-consumers. *AMS Review*, 14(3), 220-238. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-024-00286-6>

Z, K., & A, B. A. (2025). The concept of respect in Central Asia: Historical roots, cultural practices and contemporary transformations. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language*, 1(1), 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.2783>

Zokirova, S., & Topvoldiyeva, Z. (2020). About borrowings in the uzbek lexicon. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, 84, 701-705. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.119>

Баймбетова, С., & Кеулимжаева, Г. (2023). Structural and semantic analysis of english metaphors in transport terminology. *Ренессанс в парадигме новаций образования и технологий в XXI веке*, 1(1), 121-123. doi:<https://doi.org/10.47689/XIA-TTIPR-vol1-iss1-pp121-123>