

F.T. Kurmangali^{1*}, H. Sirin², A.A. Aidarova³

¹*L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan;*

²*University of Ege, Izmir, Turkey;*

³*Shymkent University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan
(e-mail feliz_kz@mail.ru)*

The National-Cultural Code is a Phenomenon that Makes Up Linguistic Consciousness (Based on the Kazakh and Turkish Languages)

The article explores in detail the interaction between humans and nature in the process of achieving material and spiritual values that form the unique culture of each society. Due to its dynamic, collective, and systemic nature, the cultural knowledge accumulated by society from the past to the present is preserved within cultural memory. The transmission of this knowledge from generation to generation is carried out through language. The language of each nation has different codes that encrypt data. This cultural information plays a key role in the study and recognition of various nationalities and their cultures. The scientific and practical significance of this work lies in the function of cultural codes. These universal and national values are called “cultural codes”. At the end of the 20th century, linguistic research began to shift from structural approaches to those based on an anthropological perspective. This direction opened the way for examining language and culture as closely interconnected phenomena. At the intersection of these two fields, new sub-disciplines emerged within linguistics. Within this context, new theories and findings arose in the fields of linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics, reflecting the relationship between language, culture, and cognition. On this basis, the main purpose of the article is to analyze cultural codes reflecting the worldview, mentality, national and cultural values of the Kazakh and Turkish people. The study focuses on the characteristics of the national-cultural code in Kazakh and Turkish languages. The following methods are used in the article: generalization, classification, interpretation and analysis. As a result of the study, the linguistic features of the national-cultural codes in the Kazakh and Turkish languages were analyzed, and their common and specific characteristics were identified. The value of this work lies in its contribution to the development of contemporary Kazakh linguoculturology through the classification of cultural codes in the Kazakh and Turkic languages.

Keywords: cultural code, cultural values, mentality, linguistic picture of the world, inner form of the word, language mark, symbol, connotative meaning.

Introduction

In the 21st century, linguistic education has increasingly emphasized the role of language not only as a means of communication and instruction but also as a cultural code that preserves national identity and worldview. This perspective builds on the foundational work of Humboldt [1], where the boundaries of a national language were defined as the boundaries of an individual’s perception of the world. Language acquisition is not merely about learning vocabulary and grammar but also about internalizing cultural traditions, values, and historical experiences.

The concept of cultural code initially emerged in scientific and technical fields such as cybernetics, mathematics, and genetics to describe structured systems that organize information. In the humanities, it has been adapted to explain how meaning is encoded and transmitted within a cultural and linguistic community. Cultural codes function as frameworks that regulate meaning-making, influencing how people interpret and communicate ideas, images, and values. Without knowledge of the underlying code, a cultural text becomes ambiguous, perceived as a mere collection of symbols rather than a coherent system of meanings.

This study examines the linguistic nature of cultural codes, their role in national identity formation, and their implications for linguistic education. By analyzing linguistic structures as carriers of cultural meaning, it seeks to understand how language encodes, transmits, and transforms cultural knowledge across generations.

Literature Review

The concept of code in linguistics has been explored by various scholars. N. Zhinkin defines a code as “a system of material signals capable of actualizing a particular language”, identifying several types, includ-

* Corresponding author’s e-mail: feliz_kz@mail.ru

ing literal, sound, speech motor, object, and subject-image codes [2; 26]. Similarly, V. Belikov and L. Krysin [3], as well as N. Mechkovskaya [4] view the code as a linguistic construct encompassing dialects, urban koine, and social dialects, which shape communicative interactions. V. Savitsky expands this concept, defining the cultural code as the “generative-interpretive foundation of the linguistic system”, functioning as both a mechanism for text generation and a tool for meaning restoration in comprehension [5; 24].

The translation of meaning across different cultural codes plays a crucial role in intercultural communication. According to V. Savitsky, coding allows for information to be revealed at various levels, as individuals internalize or reject external codes based on their cognitive and axiological frameworks [5]. If an external code aligns with an individual’s worldview, it becomes part of their personal knowledge system; otherwise, it remains an “alien” code that is not fully assimilated.

Language functions as a key repository of national consciousness, encoding collective experience, traditions, and values. V. Maslova asserts that “language is the cultural code of the nation” highlighting its role in preserving and transmitting national identity [6; 20]. Moreover, V.V. Krasnykh and D.B. Gudkov also emphasize that cultural codes serve as vehicles for intergenerational knowledge transfer, encapsulating moral principles, historical achievements, and societal norms [7]. These codes are preserved through artifacts, historical records, letters, diaries, and travelers’ accounts.

Scholars have also explored the connection between language, culture, and thought. Wilhelm von Humboldt differentiates between *Weltansicht* (worldview) — a stable conceptual framework shaped by language — and *Weltbild* (world image) — a dynamic interpretation of reality influenced by cultural interactions [8]. This distinction illustrates how linguistic structures shape cognition, perception, and cultural identity.

Cultural codes are essential for meaning-making in both verbal and non-verbal communication. O.B. Kafanova describes the cultural code as the “structural foundation of a nation’s cultural system”, ensuring continuity in traditions and maintaining ethno-cultural identity [9; 86]. While G.V. Zubko conceptualizes it as a semiotic matrix, containing core elements of a cultural paradigm [10], N.V. Bukina further defines cultural code as encoded information that allows individuals to interpret cultural phenomena within their social and historical contexts [11].

Maslova synthesizes these perspectives, stating that cultural codes consist of a network of universal and unique symbols that shape national consciousness [6]. These symbols influence cognitive stereotypes, behavioral norms, and cultural perceptions, forming what she terms the cultural unconscious — a set of meanings that, although not always explicitly recognized, deeply affect human interactions.

The study of cultural codes extends beyond linguistics to anthropology, psychology, and semiotics. As K.M. Bykov explains, “we use words to describe objects and events, synthesizing them into meaningful utterances that reflect our understanding of reality” [12; 29]. Language thus serves not only as a communication tool but also as a cognitive framework that structures knowledge and shapes thought. The standardization and development of communicative tools are crucial for cultural transmission. Teshabayeva highlights that “culture is the ability to recognize and convey meaning through the tools available within a given communicative system” [13; 121]. This underscores the importance of cultural literacy in linguistic education, as language users must navigate complex symbolic and semantic structures embedded in their native and foreign languages.

The preservation and transformation of cultural knowledge through language is a key concern for scholars studying cultural codes. As such, O.B. Kafanova argues that the cultural code preserves the stability of the cultural system, maintaining long-term ethno-cultural identity [9]. Similarly, Zubko [10] and Bukina [11] define the cultural code as a semiotic framework that encodes cultural memory and collective knowledge. Maslova also concludes that cultural codes form a systematic network of interconnected symbols that define a nation’s worldview and historical consciousness [6].

Methods and materials

This study analyzes the issue of the national-cultural code through the lens of linguistic material from the Kazakh and Turkish languages. The research is based on the premise that the cultural code functions as a key to understanding the cultural worldview of a people. It reflects culturally inherited knowledge, encoded symbolic information, and a set of meanings that shape the mentality and behavior of a nation.

To conduct this research, a combination of descriptive scientific methods was employed, including the collection, classification, interpretation, generalization, and analysis of linguistic and cultural data. These methods were used primarily to examine and synthesize relevant theoretical literature and to organize lin-

guistic information. Additionally, the semantic field method and contextual analysis were applied to uncover the culturally embedded meanings within lexical units and to identify the interrelations between language and worldview.

The linguistic material for this study comprises lexemes and phraseological units from the Kazakh and Turkish languages that represent culturally marked concepts. The selection criteria for these units were based on their semantic significance, frequency in cultural and everyday contexts, symbolic content, and their function as carriers of national values and ethno-cultural identity. Priority was given to units that demonstrate conceptual metaphors, idiomatic expressions, symbolic representations, and ethnolinguistic specificity.

In interpreting the data, the following parameters were considered:

- Internal form of the word, which provides insights into the origin, development, and cultural background of the term;
 - Ethnolinguistic content, including:
 - a) cognitive substrate not objectified in the sign;
 - b) extralinguistic knowledge enriching the conceptual understanding;
 - c) derivative and metaphorical meanings connected to cultural scenarios;
 - d) communicative-pragmatic functions of units in real discourse [6; 22];
 - Symbolic load, or the connection of a linguistic unit with cultural symbols and archetypes;
 - Contextual use, such as use in folklore, proverbs, rituals, or traditional practices;
 - Comparative ethno-cultural relevance across Kazakh and Turkish, noting commonalities and culturally specific traits.

The concept of the cultural code itself is central to the analysis. It is viewed as a structure that defines and conveys cultural meanings through language. The cultural code forms a set of interrelated images and cognitive stereotypes that influence behavior and perception, often functioning at the unconscious level. According to V.V. Kozlovsky, mentality includes systems of meanings, values, typical reactions, cultural codes, and accepted behavioral norms, which together structure social and cultural cognition [14].

Within the framework of the semiotic (symbolic) approach, culture is treated as a system of communication and information exchange. Cultural phenomena are interpreted as symbol systems encoded through various sign forms — verbal and non-verbal. These include language, folklore, traditions, everyday objects, rituals, etiquette, artistic expression, and written texts. All of these function as manifestations of cultural language, a unified symbolic communication system transmitting culturally significant information.

The levels of meaning expressed through this language of culture are categorized as follows:

- Surface level — socially recognized, rationalized meanings;
- Deep level — subconscious content tied to values, moral codes, and behavior;
- Intermediate level — culturally specific semantic zones that require interpretation through cultural codes.

Moreover, artifacts such as flora, fauna, natural elements, tools, weapons, clothing, architecture, food, and ritual practices form part of the non-verbal cultural code. These cultural “texts” gain interpretability only when integrated into a symbolic system with corresponding codes.

The inner form of the word is emphasized as a primary tool for encoding cultural meaning. It contains embedded ethno-cultural information that provides insights into the history, behavior, and worldview of the ethnic group. The identification and analysis of such symbolic linguistic structures make it possible to reconstruct historical aspects of the people’s cognitive and cultural image of the world.

Based on this theoretical and methodological framework, the study aims to decode elements of national-cultural identity in the Kazakh and Turkish languages by analyzing selected linguistic units that serve as carriers of cultural memory and meaning. Through this, we aim to identify both the unique and universal components of the cultural codes embedded in these two Turkic languages.

Results and Discussion

Each culture operates within a dynamic system of cultural codes — semiotic and cognitive frameworks that reflect and reproduce culturally significant meanings. As noted by Savitsky [5], cultural codes may exist on both denotative and connotative levels, often encoding deep-rooted value systems through symbolic language. This understanding aligns with the cognitive linguistic framework of conceptual metaphor theory, as developed by Lakoff and Johnson [15], who argue that human thought is largely metaphorical in nature. Cultural codes thus become tools for categorizing experience, offering insight into how a community constructs and interprets reality. Moreover, recent studies confirm the interdependence of language, cognition, and cul-

ture. For instance, Kövecses emphasizes that metaphorical conceptualizations are grounded in both universal bodily experience and culture-specific knowledge, supporting the idea that cultural codes act as cognitive-cultural schemas [16].

Language encodes collective memory and national worldview, a perspective widely supported by the linguistic worldview theory as defined by Wierzbicka [17]. For both Kazakh and Turkish, family roles, hierarchy, and collective values are central. In Kazakh, metaphors involving elders and ancestors (e.g., ара-баба рухы) are common, while in Turkish, similar emphasis is found in expressions such as ata yadigârı (“ancestral heritage”). This reflects findings by Sharifian [18], who asserts that cultural conceptualizations — including those in proverbs and idioms — act as “distributed cultural cognition”, encoding shared understandings that guide social behavior. From a cognitive linguistic standpoint, language is a reflection of human thought shaped by experience. According to Evans and Green [19], embodied cognition plays a central role: abstract concepts are grounded in sensorimotor and cultural experience. This is evident in proverbs like “alına yazılan başa gelir” (Turkish) and «маңдайға жазылғаннан қашып құтылмассың» (Kazakh), where destiny is conceptualized as something written on the forehead — a metaphor mapping visual perception onto fate. Recent research in cognitive semantics supports these mechanisms. Yu explores how bodily and spatial metaphors differ cross-linguistically, highlighting the culturally shaped nature of cognitive models [20]. Our analysis reinforces this view, showing that Kazakh and Turkish idioms reflect distinct cultural models of agency, destiny, and honor.

As such, according to Telia’s typology [21], cultural codes in both languages can be categorized as:

- Anthropomorphic (human-related)
- Zoomorphic (animal-related)
- Botanical (plant-related)
- Natural / environmental
- Artefactual (tools, clothes, architecture)
- Food-related
- Spiritual / religious
- Temporal / spatial
- Color codes
- Body part codes

Based on this, the scholar M.L. Kovshova suggests that for the study of linguocultural studies, cultural codes should be divided according to their themes. According to the researcher, cultural codes should be classified as follows:

- 1) Human (anthromorphic) cultural codes
- 2) Natural cultural codes
- 3) Cultural codes of body structure
- 4) Cultural code of things etc. [22; 174].

Although there are various opinions regarding the classification of cultural codes, within the framework of cultural linguistics, V.N. Telia’s viewpoint is adopted as a model by other researchers. In this scientific article, we have also classified cultural codes in the Kazakh and Turkish languages according to the model proposed by V.N. Telia.

- *Human (anthromorphic) cultural codes*: ана — anne, әке — baba, ағайын — kardeş, нағашы әпке — teyze, немере әпке — дауы, немере аға — амса, жиен — уеғен, еркек — erkek, әйел — kadın, бала — çocuk, кәрі — уаşı, жас — генç; жастықтың қадірі қартайғанда білінеді — gençliğin kıymeti ihtiyarlıkta bilinir.

- *Cultural codes of body structure*: көз — göz, қас — kaş, құлақ — kulak, мұрын — burun, бас — baş, аяқ — ayak, саусақ — parmak, кеуде — göğüs, қол — kol; көзден кетсе, көңілден де кетер — gözden gönülden çıkarmak, маңдайға жазылғаны болар — alına yazılan başa gelir.

- *Natural cultural codes*: орман — orman, тау — dağ, теңіз — deniz, көл — göl, мұхит — okyanus, жартас — uçurum, өзен — nehir, батпақ — bataklık, аяа — hava, су — su, от — ateş, топырақ — toprak; теңіз тамшыдан құралады — damlaya damlaya göl olur, батпаққа бату — batağa saplanmak.

- *Color cultural codes*: сары — sarı, қызыл — kırmızı, ақ — beyaz, көк — mavi, қызғылт — pembe, жасыл — yeşil, қоңыр — kahverengi, қара — siyah, күлгін — mor; өмірді жаңа беттен бастау — beyaz sayfa açmak.

- *Cultural codes of space world*: аспан — gök, жер — yer, аяа — hava, күн — güneş, жұлдыз — yıldız, ай — ay; құс жолы — samanyolu, толған ай — dolunay, көктен іздегенім жерден табылды —

gökte ararken yerde bulmak, жұлдызы жану — yıldızı parlamak, yıldızı sönmek, аспаннан түскендей — gökten zembille inmek.

This classification allows for the systematization of metaphorical language, consistent with the methodology used in studies such as Kövecses, where metaphor universality and variation are explored through cross-linguistic corpora [23].

Comparative Analysis of Kazakh and Turkish Cultural Codes:

Anthropomorphic Codes

In both languages, family roles such as ана — anne (“mother”) and әке — baba (“father”) are central. However, Turkish tends to express more emotional closeness, while Kazakh emphasizes authority and collective identity, as found in the Kazakh expression «Анаңды үш рет арқалап Меккеге апарсаң да, қарызыңнан құтылмайсың» (You can’t repay your mother even if you carry her to Mecca three times).

Body Structure Codes

Concepts like fate, morality, and inner strength are mapped onto body parts in both languages, a phenomenon mirrored in other cultural contexts [24]. For instance, the heart (жүрек / kalp) represents emotions in both, but the Kazakh use is often linked to bravery, whereas in Turkish it leans toward love and sensitivity.

Natural and Spatial Codes

Nature metaphors like жұлдыз / yıldız (“star”) represent success and luck. While both languages draw from shared Turkic roots, Kazakh often preserves cosmological or shamanistic layers (e.g., kök tengri), whereas Turkish expressions may reflect Islamic or modern nationalistic influence.

Color Codes

Color metaphors show strong symbolic encoding: ақ / beyaz (“white”) imply purity, honesty, and peace in both. Yet culturally specific associations persist. Turkish idioms like kara gün (“black day”) reflect periods of misfortune, paralleling Kazakh қаралы күн with similar semantics — supporting the cross-linguistic consistency of color metaphors [25].

The animal world is one of the most frequently used symbolic motifs in Kazakh and Turkish mythology. Let’s take the word “wolf” as a case study. The wolf holds rich symbolic meaning in both languages, though with nuanced cultural differences:

- Kazakh: The word «қасқыр» (wolf) in Kazakh is used in various meanings, such as strong, determined, brave, fearless; cruel, villainous, bloodthirsty; a greedy animal. The wolf (бөрі) represents independence and resilience, often idealized in legends as Ақ бөрі. Proverbs like «Бөрі бөрілігін істемей қоймайды» imply the inescapable nature of one’s essence.

- Turkish: In Turkish, the word “kurt” (wolf) signifies bravery, courage, and strength. The wolf (kurt) is a nationalist symbol (e.g., Bozkurt), often associated with intelligence and unity. The idiom “kurt gibi aç” (“as hungry as a wolf”) reflects physical states, linking the animal to primal human experience.

For both cultures бөрі (wolf) is a sacred concept in the historical memory of Turkic peoples, a positive name for the wolf. According to legend, wolves saved the descendants of the Turks. The wolf, as a savior totem, appears frequently in the epic Oğuzname, the saga Ergenekon, and the Kazakh fairy tale Ak Qasqyr (The White Wolf). This is because, according to legend, our ancestors, who were left among wolves, drank the milk of the she-wolf and played with her cubs to survive. This shows that, in the mythological consciousness of our ancestors, the wolf was a sacred animal raised to the level of divine power. This is further emphasized by the saying in our language: «Иттің иесі болса, бөрінің тәңірі бар» (If a dog has an owner, the wolf has a god) [26; 155].

The word «қасқыр» (wolf) has evolved from its original, everyday meaning in both Kazakh and Turkish into a more abstract concept, taking on various symbolic interpretations in each culture. This shift in meaning reflects the differences in how the word «бөрі» (wolf) is understood in the minds of the two peoples, highlighting significant cultural distinctions in the Kazakh and Turkish languages, worldviews, and mentalities. These socio-cultural differences influence not only the lifestyle and daily practices but also the collective identity of each society. For instance, in Turkey, the “wolf” symbol, often associated with a political party, represents the warrior spirit, strength, freedom, and courage of the Turkish people. The presence of the “wolf” symbol on coins minted in the early years of the Republic further emphasizes the importance of the “wolf” motif in Turkish culture as a key national symbol. Additionally, the Turkish expression “kurt gibi” (like a wolf), which refers to a person who is skilled and capable [27], highlights the positive connotations of the «бөрі» (wolf) motif in the Turkish collective consciousness, reflecting its association with strength and leadership.

In the Kazakh language, fixed expressions such as «қасқыр мінезді» (wolf-like character), «қасқыр жүректі» (wolf-hearted), «көкжал қасқыр» (blue-eyed wolf), «аш қасқырдай» (like a hungry wolf), and «қасқыр талаған қойдай» (like a sheep attacked by a wolf), as well as proverbs like «Қасқыр да қас қылмайды жолдасына» (Even a wolf doesn't harm its companion), «Қасқыр байлағанға көнбес, шошқа айдағанға көнбес» (A wolf won't obey being tied up, nor will it obey being driven like a pig), «Қасқырлы жердің елі айтақшыл» (In a land with wolves, the people are provocative), «Қасқырдың аузы жесе де қан, жемесе де қан» (The wolf's mouth is always bloodied, whether it eats or not), and «Қасқыр қарызын терісімен өтейді» (The wolf pays its debt with its fur) all demonstrate that the lexeme «қасқыр» (wolf) has become a cultural phenomenon deeply embedded in Kazakh society.

These interpretations illustrate the concept of cultural salience, where the same referent (wolf) triggers different cognitive and emotional associations across cultures [18].

Overall, this analysis aligns with major claims in cognitive linguistics:

Metaphors are grounded in bodily and cultural experience.

Cultural models shape metaphor variation across languages.

Idiomatic expressions encode collective cognition.

Practical applications:

Language Teaching: Integrating metaphor and cultural code analysis into curricula could enhance students' sociolinguistic and intercultural competence.

Translation Studies: Recognizing culture-bound metaphors could prevent semantic loss and improve fidelity in translation.

Lexicography: Bilingual dictionaries can include cultural annotations to aid comprehension of figurative language.

Intercultural Communication: Understanding cultural metaphors could foster empathy, reduce misinterpretation, and build cross-cultural rapport.

Finally, the comparative analysis of Kazakh and Turkish cultural codes reveals both shared conceptual structures and culture-specific cognitive mappings. These findings support theoretical frameworks in cognitive linguistics and cultural semantics, particularly the idea that metaphor and meaning are shaped by a combination of universal embodiment and local cultural experience.

By linking linguistic data with cognitive theories and current research, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how languages encode culturally significant knowledge. The results are not only academically valuable but also practically applicable in education, translation, lexicography, and intercultural communication.

Conclusion

The influence of the anthropological paradigm in contemporary linguistic research has led to a deeper understanding of the interaction between language and culture. This interdisciplinary approach has strengthened the connection between linguistics and other branches of the social sciences, contributing to the systematization and expansion of linguistic knowledge. As linguistics has evolved, various sub-disciplines have emerged to address the complexities of language and culture. Traditional linguistic methods, while valuable, have proven insufficient in fully capturing the intricate relationship between language and cultural phenomena, prompting scholars to develop new approaches.

One of the most significant developments in this area has been the emergence of linguoculturology as an independent interdisciplinary field. The Russian School of Linguistics has played a key role in shaping this research, offering systematic insights into how language reflects and transmits cultural values, collective worldviews, and social norms. However, the study of linguistic and cultural interconnections is not limited to Russian linguistics alone. It builds on the foundational work of scholars such as Wilhelm von Humboldt, Edward Sapir, and Benjamin Whorf, whose theories continue to influence contemporary research. The knowledge accumulated by individuals through their experience of the world is reflected in linguistic semantics and the linguistic picture of the world. Over time, this knowledge becomes systematized into a shared worldview among speakers of a particular language, demonstrating the anthropocentric nature of language. Specific linguistic units function as cultural codes, representing collective knowledge and cultural patterns. Through the analysis of vocabulary and semantic structures, researchers can identify the core values embedded in a language and its speakers' worldview.

Beyond its theoretical contributions, this study advances the field of linguoculturology by refining its conceptual framework and expanding its interdisciplinary reach. It highlights the dual role of language as

both a national and universal cognitive mechanism, emphasizing how linguistic semantics encodes cultural identity while allowing for cross-cultural understanding. By situating linguoculturology within a broader interdisciplinary context, this research integrates insights from linguistic anthropology, cognitive linguistics, and sociolinguistics, strengthening the methodological foundation of the field. Furthermore, by acknowledging the contributions of both Russian and Western linguistic traditions, it enhances the global relevance of linguocultural studies.

These findings open several promising directions for further research. Future studies could conduct empirical investigations into linguistic semantics and cultural concepts, exploring how languages encode values through metaphor, idiomatic expressions, and conceptual categories. Cognitive and psycholinguistic approaches could further examine the influence of language on perception, employing experimental methods such as reaction-time studies and neuroimaging. Additionally, comparative research in linguoculturology could identify universal and culture-specific aspects of linguistic worldviews across different language communities. Finally, applied research could focus on integrating linguocultural insights into translation, language education, and cross-cultural communication, improving understanding in multilingual and multicultural contexts.

The practical implications of this study are significant. In language education, the integration of cultural knowledge into linguistic instruction can lead to more effective and immersive learning experiences. In intercultural communication, recognizing how linguistic structures shape perception can help prevent misunderstandings in international relations, business, and diplomacy. The study also has implications for artificial intelligence and natural language processing, where a deeper understanding of linguistic semantics can enhance machine translation and AI-driven communication models. Furthermore, linguocultural research can support policies aimed at preserving linguistic diversity and national identity, contributing to cultural sustainability in an era of globalization.

In conclusion, this study underscores the essential role of linguoculturology in contemporary linguistic research. By bridging theoretical perspectives with practical applications, it contributes to the growing recognition of language as both a cognitive and cultural phenomenon. The findings not only deepen our understanding of the interaction between language and culture but also provide a foundation for future research and interdisciplinary collaboration, ensuring that linguoculturology remains a dynamic and evolving field.

References

- 1 Humboldt W. von. On the diversity of human language structure and its influence on the mental development of mankind / W. von Humboldt; P. Heath, Trans. — Cambridge University Press, 1988. — P. 45–67.
- 2 Жинкин Н.И. О кодовых переходах во внутренней речи / Н.И. Жинкин // Вопросы языкознания. — 1964. — № 6. — С. 26–38.
- 3 Беликов В.И. Социоллингвистика: учебник для вузов / В.И. Беликов, Л.П. Крысин. — М.: Рос. гос. гуманитар. ун-т, 2001. — 439 с.
- 4 Мечковская Н.Б. Социальная лингвистика: пособие для студентов гуманитар. вузов и учащихся лицеев / Н.Б. Мечковская. — 2-е изд., испр. — М.: Аспект Пресс, 2000, 207 с.
- 5 Савицкий В.М. Английская фразеология: проблемы моделирования / В.М. Савицкий. — Самара: Самарский университет, 1993. — 171 с.
- 6 Маслова В.А. Национальные ценности и язык: духовный код культуры / В.А. Маслова // Лингвистика. — 2010. — № 2(20). — С. 19–30.
- 7 Красных В.В. Когнитивная база и прецедентные феномены в системе других единиц и в коммуникации / В.В. Красных, Д.Б. Гудков, И.В. Захренко, Д.В. Багаева // Язык, сознание, коммуникация. Филология. — 1997. — № 3. — С. 50–54.
- 8 Гумбольдт В. фон. Язык и философия культуры / В. фон Гумбольдт; пер. с нем. яз. — М.: Прогресс, 1985. — 450 с.
- 9 Кафанова О.Б. Национально-культурные коды: дефиниции и границы / О.Б. Кафанова // Филологическое образование: современные стратегии и практики: сб. науч.-метод. ст. — СПб.: ЛОИРО, 2011. — Вып. 1. — С. 284
- 10 Зубко Г.В. Проблемы реконструкции культурного кода футболь: Западная Африка : автореф. дис. ... д-ра культурологии / Г.В. Зубко. — Москва, 2004. — 54 с.
- 11 Букина Н.В. К вопросу методологии исследования культурных кодов / Н.В. Букина // Вестник Буятского государственного университета. — 2010. — № 2. — С. 232–237.
- 12 Быков К.М. Учение И.П. Павлова и современное естествознание / К.М. Быков // Учение И.П. Павлова и философские вопросы психологии: сборник статей. — Москва : Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1952. — С. 5–32.

- 13 Teshabayeva D.M. The inquiry of mass media means in the cultural aspects of speech: Doctor's thesis / D.M. Teshabayeva. — Tashkent, 2012.
- 14 Козловский В.В. Понятие ментальности в социологической перспективе / В.В. Козловский // Социология и социальная антропология: межвуз. сб. тр. к 60-летию со дня рождения проф. А.О. Бороноева. — СПб.: Изд-во «АЛТЕЙЯ», 1997. — С. 28–37.
- 15 Lakoff G. Metaphors we live by / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. — University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- 16 Kövecses Z. Extended conceptual metaphor theory / Z. Kövecses. — Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- 17 Wierzbicka A. English: Meaning and culture / A. Wierzbicka. — Oxford University Press, 2006.
- 18 Sharifian F. Cultural linguistics: Cultural conceptualisations and language / F. Sharifian. — John Benjamins, 2017.
- 19 Evans V. Cognitive linguistics: An introduction / V. Evans, M. Green. — Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- 20 Yu N. The moral metaphors of the body: A cross-cultural perspective / N. Yu. — Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- 21 Большой фразеологический словарь русского языка. Значение. Употребление. Культурологический комментарий / отв. ред. В.Н. Телия. — Москва: АСТ-ПРЕСС КНИГА, 2006. — 784 с.
- 22 Ковшова М.Л. Лингвокультурологический метод во фразеологии: коды культуры / М.Л. Ковшова. — Москва: Кн. дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2012. — 453 с.
- 23 Kövecses Z. Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor / Z. Kövecses. — Oxford University Press, 2015.
- 24 Yu N. The relationship between metaphor, body and culture / N. Yu; In R. Frank, R. Dirven, T. Ziemke & E. Bernárdez (Ed.), Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 2008. — Volume 2: Sociocultural Situatedness (pp. 387–408).
- 25 White M. Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective / M. White; A. Barcelona (Ed.). — Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense, 2002.
- 26 Ордабекова Х.А. Дәстүрлі және қазіргі тілдік санадағы «қасқыр» лексемасының лингвомәдени сипаты / Х.А. Ордабекова, К.Қ. Күркебаев // Қазақ ұлттық университетінің хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. — 2018. — №3 (171). — Б. 153–159.
- 27 Saraç, H. Bir milletin kültürel belleğinin şifreleri: Kod kültürleri [Electronic resource] / H. Saraç // RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları. — 2019. — P. 157–169. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.648467> (1.06.2024)

Ф.Т. Құрманғали, Х. Ширин, А.А. Айдарова

Ұлттық-мәдени код — тілдік сананы құрастырушы феномен (қазақ және түрік тілдері материалдары негізінде)

Мақалада әр қоғамның бірегей мәдениетін құрайтын материалдық және рухани құндылықтарға қол жеткізу процесінде адамның табиғатпен өзара әрекеттесуі егжей-тегжейлі қарастырылған. Өзінің динамикалық, ұжымдық және жүйелік құрылымының арқасында қоғамның өткен уақыттан бастап қазіргі уақытқа дейін жинақтаған мәдени білімі мәдени жадында сақталады. Бұл білімді ұрпақтан-ұрпаққа беру тіл арқылы жүзеге асырылады. Әр ұлттың тілінде деректерді шифрлайтын әртүрлі кодтар бар. Бұл мәдени ақпарат әртүрлі ұлттар мен олардың мәдениеттерін зерттеу мен тануда шешуші рөл атқарады. Зерттеудің ғылыми және практикалық маңыздылығы мәдени кодтардың қызметінде жатыр. Жалпыадамзаттық және ұлттық құндылықтар «мәдени кодтар» деп аталады. XX ғасырдың аяғында лингвистикадағы құрылымдық зерттеулердің орнына антропологиялық тұрғыдан зерттеулер дами бастады. Мұндай бағыт тіл мен мәдениеттің өзара тығыз байланыста зерттелуіне жол ашты. Осы екі саланың түйіскен жерінде лингвистикада жаңа субдисциплиналар пайда болды. Осы тұрғыда тіл мен мәдениеттің, тіл мен танымның өзара байланысынан туындаған лингвомәдениеттану мен когнитивтік лингвистика аясында қарастыратын жаңа теориялар мен тұжырымдар қалыптасты. Осының негізінде мақаланың мақсаты қазақ және түрік халқының дүниетанымын, менталитетін, ұлттық-мәдени құндылықтарын көрсететін мәдени кодтарды талдау. Зерттеу материалы ретінде қазақ және түрік тілдеріндегі ұлттық-мәдени кодтың ерекшеліктері зерделенген. Мақалада келесі әдістер қолданылды: жалпылау, жіктеу, түсіндіру және талдау. Зерттеу нәтижесінде қазақ және түрік тілдеріндегі ұлттық-мәдени кодтардың тілдік ерекшеліктері талданды, сондай-ақ олардың жалпы және ерекше белгілері анықталды. Жұмыстың құндылығы мынада — қазақ және түрік тілдеріндегі мәдени кодтарды жіктеу арқылы қазіргі қазақ лингвомәдениеттануының дамуына үлес қосу.

Кілт сөздер: мәдени код, мәдени құндылықтар, діл, ғаламның тілдік бейнесі, сөздің ішкі формасы, тілдік таңба, символ, коннотациялық мағына.

Ф.Т. Курмангали. Х. Ширин, А.А. Айдарова

Национально-культурный код — феномен, составляющий языковое сознание (на материале казахского и турецкого языков)

В статье подробно рассматривается взаимодействие человека с природой в процессе достижения материальных и духовных ценностей, составляющих уникальную культуру каждого общества. Благодаря своей динамичной, коллективной и системной структуре, культурные знания, накопленные обществом с прошлого до настоящего времени, сохраняются в культурной памяти. Передача этих знаний из поколения в поколение осуществляется через язык. Язык каждой нации имеет разные коды, которые шифруют данные. Эта культурная информация играет ключевую роль в изучении и признании различных национальностей и их культур. Научная и практическая значимость исследования заключается в функции культурных кодов. Эти общечеловеческие и национальные ценности называются «культурными кодами». В конце XX века вместо структурных исследований в лингвистике начали развиваться исследования с антропологической точки зрения. Такое направление открыло путь к изучению языка и культуры в их тесной взаимосвязи. На стыке этих двух областей в лингвистике возникли новые субдисциплины. В этом контексте появились новые теории и выводы, рассматриваемые в рамках лингвокультурологии и когнитивной лингвистики, как результат взаимосвязи языка с культурой и познанием. На этой основе основной целью статьи является анализ культурных кодов, отражающих мировоззрение, менталитет, национально-культурные ценности казахского и турецкого народа. В качестве исследовательского материала рассматриваются особенности национально-культурного кода в казахском и турецком языках. В статье использованы следующие методы: обобщение, классификация, интерпретация и анализ. В результате исследования были проанализированы языковые особенности национально-культурных кодов в казахском и турецком языках, а также выявлены их общие и специфические черты. Ценность работы заключается в том, что она вносит вклад в развитие современной казахской лингвокультурологии путём классификации культурных кодов в казахском и турецком языках.

Ключевые слова: культурный код, культурные ценности, менталитет, языковая картина мира, внутренняя форма слова, языковой знак, символ, коннотативное значение.

References

- 1 Humboldt, W. von. (1988). *On the diversity of human language structure and its influence on the mental development of mankind* (P. Heath, Trans., pp. 45–67). Cambridge University Press.
- 2 Zhinkin, N.I. (1964). О кодовых переходах во внутренней речи [About code transitions in internal speech]. *Voprosy yazykoznaniiā — Questions of linguistics*, 6, 26–38 [in Russian].
- 3 Belikov, V.I., & Krysin, L.P. (2001). *Sotsiolingvistika: Uchebnik dlia vuzov* [Sociolinguistics: A textbook for universities]. Moscow: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi gumanitarnyi universitet [in Russian].
- 4 Mechkovskaya, N.B. (2000). *Sotsialnaia lingvistika: Posobie dlia studentov gumanitarnykh vuzov i uchashchikhsia litseev* [Social linguistics: A manual for students of humanities and high school students] (2nd ed., rev.). Moscow: Aspekt Press [in Russian].
- 5 Savitsky, V.M. (1993). *Angliiskaia frazeologiya: problemy modelirovaniia* [English phraseology: Modeling problems]. Samara: Samarskii Universitet [in Russian].
- 6 Maslova, V.A. (2010). Natsionalnye tsennosti i yazyk: dukhovnyi kod kultury [National values and language: The spiritual code of culture]. *Lingvistyka — Linguistics*, 2(20), 19–30 [in Russian].
- 7 Krasnykh, V., Gudkov, D., Zaharenko, I., & Bagaeva, D. (1997). Kognitivnaia baza i pretsedentnye fenomeny v sisteme drugih edinit i v kommunikatsii [Cognitive base and precedent phenomena in the system of other units and in communication]. *Yazyk, soznanie, kommunikatsiia. Philologiya — Language, consciousness, communication. Philology*, 9(3), 50–54 [in Russian].
- 8 Humboldt, W. von. (1985). *Yazyk i filosofiia kultury* [Language and philosophy of culture]. (Trans). Moscow: Progress [in Russian].
- 9 Kafanova, O.B. (2011). Natsionalno-kulturnye kody: definitsii i granitsy [National-cultural codes: Definitions and borders]. In *Filologicheskoe obrazovanie: sovremennye strategii i praktiki: sbornik nauchno-metodicheskikh statei. Vypusk 1 — Philological education: Modern strategies and practices: a collection of scientific and methodological articles. Issue 1* (p. 284) [in Russian].
- 10 Zubko, G.V. (2004). Problemy rekonstruktsii kulturnogo koda fulbe: Zapadnaia Afrika: dis. doctora kulturologii [Problems of reconstruction of the Fulani cultural code: West Africa: PhD thesis in cultural studies]. Moscow [in Russian].
- 11 Bukina, N.V. (2008). K voprosu metodologii issledovaniia kulturnykh kodov [On the issue of methodology for studying cultural codes]. *Vestnik Buriatskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta — Bulletin of the Buyat State University*, 2(47), 232–237 [in Russian].

- 12 Bykov, K.M. (1952). Uchenie I.P. Pavlova i sovremennoe estestvoznaniye [The teachings of I.P. Pavlov and modern natural science]. *Uchenie I.P. Pavlova i filosofskie voprosy psikhologii: sbornik statei — Teachings of I.P. Pavlov and philosophical questions of psychology: a collection of articles* (pp. 5–32). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR [in Russian].
- 13 Teshabayeva, D.M. (2012). The inquiry of mass media means in the cultural aspects of speech. *Doctor's thesis*. Tashkent.
- 14 Kozlovsky, V.V. (1997). Poniatiye mentalnosti v sotsiologicheskoi perspektive [The concept of mentality in a sociological perspective]. *Sotsiologiya i sotsialnaya antropologiya: mezhdunarodnyi sbornik k 60-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya prof. A.O. Boronoeva — Sociology and Social Anthropology: an interuniversity collection dedicated to the 60th anniversary of the birth of Professor A.O. Boronoev* (pp. 28–37). Saint Petersburg: Izdatelstvo «ALETEIA» [in Russian].
- 15 Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- 16 Kövecses, Z. (2020). *Extended conceptual metaphor theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- 17 Wierzbicka, A. (2006). *English: Meaning and culture*. Oxford University Press.
- 18 Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural linguistics: Cultural conceptualisations and language*. John Benjamins.
- 19 Evans, V. & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.
- 20 Yu, N. (2021). *The moral metaphors of the body: A cross-cultural perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- 21 Telia, V.N. (Ed.). (2006). Bolshoi frazeologicheskii slovar russkogo yazyka. Znachenie. Upotrebleniye. Kulturologicheskii kommentarii [Big phraseological dictionary of Russian language: Meaning, usage, cultural commentary]. Moscow: AST-PRESS KNIGA [in Russian].
- 22 Kovshova, M.L. (2012). Lingvokulturologicheskii metod vo frazeologii: kody kultury [Linguistic and cultural method in phraseology: Code culture]. Moscow: Knizhnyi dom «LIBROKOM» [in Russian].
- 23 Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where metaphors come from: Reconsidering context in metaphor*. Oxford University Press.
- 24 Yu, N. (2008). The relationship between metaphor, body and culture. In R. Frank, R. Dirven, T. Ziemke & E. Bernárdez (Ed.), *Volume 2 Sociocultural Situatedness* (pp. 387–408). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- 25 White, M. (2002). *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective*. A. Barcelona (Ed.). Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense.
- 26 Ordabekova, K.A., & Kurkebayev, K.K. (2018). Dasturli zhane qazirgi tildik sanadagy «qasqur» leksemasynyn lingvomadeni sipaty [Linguistic character of the lexeme «wolf» in traditional and modern linguistic consciousness]. *Qazaq Ulttyq Universitetinin khabarshysy. Filologiya seriasy — Bulletin of the Kazakh National University. Philology series*, 3(171), 153–159 [in Kazakh].
- 27 Saraç, H. (2019). Bir milletin kültürel belleğinin şifreleri: Kod kültürleri. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları*, 157–169. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.648467> (1.06.2024)

Information about the authors

Kurmangali Fariza Tlepkalikyzy (corresponding author) — Doctoral student, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan; e-mail: feliz_kz@mail.ru

Hatice Sirin — Doctor of Philology, Professor of Ege University, Izmir, Turkey; e-mail: hatice.sirin@ege.edu.tr

Aidarova Amangul Amirovna — Master's degree teacher, Shymkent University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan; e-mail: amangul.aydarova@mail.ru