



[www.bjisrd.com](http://www.bjisrd.com)

---

## **Zoomorphic and Phytomorphic Cultural Codes in Turkish and Uzbek Linguistic Worldviews**

---

**Zebo Rustamqizi Salimova**

PhD, Higher School of Turkology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan,  
E-mail: zebosalimova1990@gmail.com

---

***Abstract:** Before discussing zoomorphic and phytomorphic cultural codes, it is essential to clarify the concept of code. Without coding, the creation of artificial languages, machine translation, and text encryption would be impossible. A cultural code enables the transformation of values into meaning and provides access to the semantic structure of culture. Cultural codes exist in all languages, yet they are not always easy to identify, as they emerge at the transition between different levels of meaning.*

*This article examines the lexical and figurative potential of Turkish and Uzbek by analyzing zoomorphic and phytomorphic cultural codes used to construct the image of a human being. The study demonstrates that biomorphic imagery plays a significant role in shaping national linguistic worldviews and enhances the expressive and evaluative capacity of language.*

***Keywords:** zoomorphic code, phytomorphic code, biomorphic imagery, linguoculturology, linguistic worldview, national mentality*

---

**Introduction:** Language, as a social phenomenon, is inseparably connected with culture. In the contemporary world, expanding political, economic, cultural, and academic relations among nations have intensified intercultural communication, giving rise to interdisciplinary fields such as linguoculturology. This discipline focuses on the interaction between language, culture, and human cognition, introducing concepts such as linguocultural units, national-cultural connotation, cultural semes, linguistic consciousness, and linguistic worldview.

Among these concepts, *cultural code* occupies a central position. In semiotics, any material carrier of social information is regarded as a sign, while a code is understood as a system of rules governing the organization and interpretation of such signs. Initially applied in mathematics and information

technology, the notion of code later gained prominence in the humanities, particularly in the study of language and culture. Through codes, collective experience and value systems are transmitted from generation to generation.

According to K. Rapaille, cultural codes structure the images associated with concepts in human consciousness; thus, understanding a culture requires decoding its symbolic systems. V. N. Telia defines cultural codes as secondary sign systems consisting of material and formal means used to encode culturally significant meanings. These codes reflect everyday realities, flora, and fauna, which are internalized as knowledge, associations, and images within a linguistic community.

**Material and methods:** The purpose of this study is to substantiate the role of zoomorphic and phytomorphic cultural codes as effective tools for constructing the image of a human being in Turkish and Uzbek linguistic worldviews. The research aims to identify both universal and culture-specific features of biomorphic imagery. The study employs descriptive, classificatory, comparative, and linguocultural analytical methods. Phraseological units, comparative expressions, and metaphorical constructions from Turkish and Uzbek are analyzed to reveal their semantic, cognitive, and axiological properties.

Cultural codes are often conceptualized as interpretive frameworks that structure human perception of reality. V. V. Krasnykh metaphorically describes cultural codes as a “net cast over reality,” which categorizes, organizes, and evaluates the surrounding world. Similarly, O. A. Sviridova defines cultural code as a system of fundamental concepts, values, and norms necessary for interpreting cultural texts.

D.Khudoyberganova interprets cultural codes as linguistic representations of archetypal worldviews embedded in human cognition. Scholars generally agree that cultural codes function as keys to understanding culture, enabling the identification and interpretation of encoded cultural information. Within linguoculturology, various types of cultural codes are distinguished, including somatic, spatial, temporal, object-based, spiritual, and biomorphic codes. Among these, biomorphic codes—encompassing zoomorphic and phytomorphic imagery—play a particularly significant role in representing human qualities and social values.

From a cognitive-linguistic perspective, zoomorphic and phytomorphic cultural codes are grounded in the human tendency to conceptualize abstract qualities through concrete and perceptually salient domains. Animals and plants represent some of the earliest and most stable sources of metaphorical mapping, as human survival historically depended on close interaction with the natural environment. These codes operate through conceptual metaphor and metonymy. The metaphor *HUMAN IS AN ANIMAL* enables speakers to attribute strength, cunning, cowardice, or diligence to a person through culturally salient animal traits. Similarly, the metaphor *HUMAN LIFE IS A PLANT* underlies phytomorphic expressions related to growth, decline, fertility, and continuity. These metaphors function as collective cognitive models shaped by centuries of cultural experience.

Zoomorphic cultural codes play a crucial role in the linguistic representation of human character and behavior. In both Turkish and Uzbek, animals serve as stable comparative standards for evaluating personal qualities. For example, the lion symbolizes courage and nobility, the fox cunning and deception, the donkey endurance or foolishness, and the rabbit fearfulness.

While some associations appear universal, their evaluative orientation varies across cultures. In Uzbek linguoculture, the comparison *qo'yday yuvosh* (gentle as a sheep) carries a positive connotation, emphasizing modesty and harmlessness. In contrast, in some European linguocultures, the sheep is

more often associated with cowardice or lack of individuality. This divergence illustrates how the same zoomorphic image may encode different axiological meanings depending on national mentality.

**Result and discussion:** Zoomorphic codes frequently function as tools of social evaluation. Through metaphorical comparison, speakers express approval, disapproval, irony, or moral judgment. Thus, zoomorphic expressions are not merely descriptive but deeply evaluative in nature.

Phytomorphic cultural codes are closely connected with archetypal notions of life, growth, and continuity. Plants symbolize stages of human life, generational succession, and moral or aesthetic qualities. Expressions such as *gulday nozik* (delicate as a flower) or *chinordek umr ko 'rmoq* (to live long like a plane tree) illustrate how plant imagery conceptualizes both physical appearance and existential values.

In Turkish and Uzbek linguistic worldviews, trees often symbolize strength, longevity, and stability, while flowers are associated with beauty, youth, and fragility. These associations are reinforced through folklore, poetry, and everyday speech, revealing a holistic worldview in which human existence is inseparable from natural cycles.

An important characteristic of zoomorphic and phytomorphic cultural codes is the interaction between universal and culture-specific elements. Certain metaphorical associations—such as the fox with cunning or the flower with beauty—are widespread across languages. However, their pragmatic use and emotional coloring are shaped by historical experience, national traditions, and collective memory.

Thus, biomorphic codes provide an effective lens for comparing linguistic worldviews, revealing how different cultures interpret the same natural phenomena through distinct cognitive and axiological frameworks.

From a linguoculturological perspective, biomorphic codes function as condensed carriers of cultural information. They encode collective knowledge, emotional attitudes, and value judgments in an economical linguistic form. Consequently, they play a key role in preserving cultural continuity and national identity.

In translation studies, zoomorphic and phytomorphic expressions pose particular challenges. Literal translation often fails to convey cultural meaning, requiring adaptive or descriptive strategies. Understanding the underlying cultural code is therefore essential for achieving semantic and pragmatic equivalence.

**Conclusion:** Zoomorphic and phytomorphic cultural codes constitute a significant component of Turkish and Uzbek linguistic worldviews. Through systematic metaphorical mappings from the animal and plant worlds, these codes enable speakers to conceptualize human qualities, behavioral patterns, social relations, and existential values. As condensed semiotic structures, biomorphic codes reflect the collective cognitive experience of a linguistic community and serve as an effective means of evaluating reality.

The analysis has demonstrated that zoomorphic codes predominantly function to characterize human behavior and moral qualities, often carrying strong axiological connotations. Animals such as the fox, lion, sheep, and rabbit operate as culturally stabilized standards for comparison, revealing both universal tendencies and culture-specific interpretations. Phytomorphic codes, in contrast, are more closely associated with notions of growth, life cycles, continuity, beauty, and fragility, thereby reflecting a holistic perception of human existence as inseparable from natural processes.

Although many zoomorphic and phytomorphic images are shared across languages, their semantic scope, emotional coloring, and pragmatic functions differ depending on national mentality, historical experience, and cultural tradition. This dual nature of biomorphic imagery—simultaneously universal and culture-bound—confirms the relevance of linguoculturological analysis for uncovering implicit cultural meanings encoded in language.

The findings of this study also highlight the importance of biomorphic cultural codes for translation studies and intercultural communication. Accurate interpretation and translation of zoomorphic and phytomorphic expressions require not only linguistic competence but also cultural awareness, as literal translation often fails to convey the underlying evaluative and symbolic meanings.

In conclusion, the study of zoomorphic and phytomorphic cultural codes provides valuable insights into the interaction between language, culture, and cognition. These codes function as a key mechanism through which national identity, collective values, and worldview are linguistically represented. Further research may expand this analysis through corpus-based methods, diachronic perspectives, or broader cross-linguistic comparisons, thereby deepening our understanding of how natural imagery continues to shape human thought and linguistic expression in a globalized world.

## References

1. Ergin, M. “Türk Dil Bilgisi.” – İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 2017.
2. Ercilasun, A. B. “Türk Dünyası Üzerine İncelemeler.” – Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2009.
3. Qodirova, D. “O‘zbek frazeologiyasida o‘simlik nomlari asosida hosil bo‘lgan birikmalar.” – Toshkent: O‘zMU nashriyoti, 2020.
4. Demir, N. “Türk kültüründe bitki adlarının metaforik işlevi.” – Ankara: Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi, 2015.
5. Tekin, T. “Türk Dilinin Gelişme Süreci.” – Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2016.
6. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. “Metaphors We Live By.” – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
7. Öztürk, M. “Türk ve Özbek deyimlerinde bitki isimlerinin kültürel işlevi.” – İstanbul: Uluslararası Türkoloji Dergisi, 2021.
8. Salimova Z. Personality, character, zoonim, phytonym, image, portrait, positive, negative, appearance //Terminology Issues. – 2023. – T. 1.
9. kizi Salimova Z. R. THE ROLE OF PHYTONIMS IN THE EMBODIMENT OF THE HUMAN IMAGE IN THE TURKISH LANGUAGE.
10. Salimova Z., Üniversitesi T. D. Ş. GÖRÜNÜĞÜNÜ YANSITMANIN ÖZELLİKLERİ //ÖN SÖZ. – 2023. – C. 58.
11. Salimova Z. R. Q. ISSUES OF CREATING AND TRANSLATING THE HUMAN IMAGE THROUGH ZOONYMS IN TURKISH //CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES. – 2021. – T. 2. – №. 10. – C. 108-115.