A Cognitive-Conceptual Analysis of "Cult" Words in the Kazakh and Kyrgyz Linguistic Worldview

Guldarkhan Rysbayeva[1*], Bayan Kulbekova[1], Sholpan Kozhabekova[1], Kurmangazy Sadybayev[1], Gauhar Burkitbay[2], Zhadyra Nurgozha[1]

[1]Egyptian University of Islamic Culture Nur-Mubarak, Kazakhstan, [2]Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Kazakhstan

Abstract This study provides a cognitive-conceptual analysis of “cult” (worship) concepts within the Kazakh and Kyrgyz linguistic worldview. Moving beyond purely religious interpretations, we argue that cult-related vocabulary functions as a system of culturally-loaded cognitive structures. Applying the theory of cultuling (culture in language) and a tripartite cognitive methodology, we deconstruct the concept into three interlocking layers: (1) Ritual Cult, analyzed via script theory to model procedural knowledge of worship; (2) Venerative Cult, analyzed via frame and Gestalt theory to map the symbolic networks surrounding sacred entities like the Sun, Moon, and Fire; and (3) Metaphorical Cult, revealing the entrenchment of these entities as source domains for everyday metaphors of beauty, power, and value. Our findings, derived from the systematic analysis of 150 lexemes and phraseological units from authoritative Kazakh and Kyrgyz sources, demonstrate that the “cult” concept is not monolithic but a stratified cognitive architecture. This architecture sustains cultural memory, anchors ethnic identity, and provides a replicable methodological framework for future comparative studies across Turkic languages.

Keywords: *Linguistic worldview, Cult concepts, Phraseological units, Language, Anthropocentrism*

[*]Corresponding Author:
Guldarkhan Rysbayeva
guldarhan@inbox.ru

Received: October 23, 2025
Revised: December 20, 2025
Accepted: January 2, 2026
First Published: January 13, 2026

© 2026 Rysbayeva, Kulbekova, Kozhabekova, Sadybayev, Burkitbay, and Nurgozha.
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Language functions as both a mirror and a mediator of human reality, intricately weaving together individual perception and collective cultural consciousness. It is through language that the intangible dimensions of culture (i.e., beliefs, values, and worldviews) are encoded, preserved, and transmitted. As Vorobyev (1997) posits, language is inextricably linked to culture; it germinates from it, expresses it, and serves as a fundamental prerequisite for cultural development. This relationship underscores the concept of the linguistic picture of the world, a framework through which a linguistic community perceives, categorizes, and interprets reality (Karaulov et al., 1994; Yakovleva, 1996).

https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2026.2076039.4244

The linguistic picture of the world is uniquely woven in each language, shaped by the specific characteristics of that language and by the different ways of perceiving and depicting colours and fragments of the world (Teliya, 1996). As Karaulov et al. (1994) state, the linguistic picture of the world encompasses the entire conceptual content of a given language. The renowned linguist Apresyan (1995) describes how human identity is reflected in language and how language conveys the emotional states of individuals. Kornilov (2003) identifies two primary traditional approaches to studying the linguistic picture of the world. First, scholars examine language-specific concepts that are verbalized within this worldview. Second, within the framework of the conceptual picture of the world and the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics, various studies have emerged, particularly those focusing on theories such as the "Linguistic Picture of the World (Universe)" and the "National Linguistic Picture of the World (Universe)".

Building on this foundation, cognitive linguistics further investigates the mental structures that shape our understanding of the world within an anthropocentric framework. A pivotal development within this interdisciplinary nexus is the theory of cultuling (culture in language) (Pishghadam, 2013), which refines our understanding of this intrinsic link by positing that culture is not merely reflected but inherently embedded within linguistic fabric. This theory suggests that linguistic units, from lexemes to proverbs, act as specific vessels for cultural memes, carrying and transmitting shared knowledge, attitudes, and behavioral patterns (Pishghadam et al., 2020a, 2020b). Consequently, the cultuling perspective provides a robust analytical framework for examining the precise mechanisms through which abstract cultural, spiritual, and emotional concepts are lexicalized and perpetuated within a speech community's unique linguistic picture of the world.

Although the relationship between language, culture, and cognition is widely acknowledged, scholarly analysis of specific linguistic worldviews, particularly concerning abstract spiritual concepts, often remains either overly generalized or descriptively fragmented. Existing research frequently lacks a systematic, cognitive-conceptual methodology to deconstruct how deeply embedded cultural models, such as those related to worship and the sacred, are precisely encoded and sustained within the linguistic fabric of a given community. This gap limits a nuanced understanding of the cognitive architecture that shapes a cultural group's spiritual identity through language.

The primary objective of this research is to perform a cognitive-conceptual analysis of "cult" (from Latin *cultus*, meaning worship, adoration) concepts within the Kazakh and Kyrgyz worldview. By applying the cultuling theory and three cognitive models (frame, script, and gestalt) as well as the conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) that deconstruct how memes are structured, this study aims to deconstruct how abstract notions of worship, reverence, and the sacred are linguistically encoded and culturally contextualized in Turkic languages, particularly Kazakh and Kyrgyz. The analysis seeks to unveil the cognitive architecture of these concepts, establishing a methodological model that can inform future comparative work across the Turkic family.

2. Theoretical Framework

This study is situated at the intersection of cultural linguistics, cognitive linguistics, and ethnolinguistics. Its analytical approach is constructed upon a tripartite theoretical foundation: first, the concept of the linguistic picture of the world as the overarching paradigm; second, the theory of cultuling, which provides the specific cognitive mechanism for analyzing cultural-linguistic encoding; and third, the anthropocentric principle that governs its construction.

2.1. The Linguistic Picture of the World: Conceptual Foundations and Anthropocentric Core

The foundational concept for this research is the *linguistic picture of the world* (LPW). Introduced by the German linguist Johann Leo Weisgerber in the 1930s, the LPW is understood as the historically formed, holistic system of knowledge about reality that is encoded in and transmitted through a specific language (Teliya, 1996; Weisgerber, 1993). It is not a direct reflection of objective reality but a conceptual model, uniquely woven in each language (Teliya, 1996) through the collective experience of its speakers. Consequently, the study of this "language world", defined as the specific method of reflecting and representing reality in linguistic forms and structures centered on the human being, is a

central and urgent problem in modern linguistics (Rysbayeva et al., 2015). As Vorobyev (1997) asserts, language is inextricably linked to culture, both germinating from it and serving as its fundamental prerequisite for development. Consequently, the LPW represents the worldview of a linguistic community, encapsulating its "specifics of a person, their existence, and their relationship with the world" (Postovalova, 1988, p. 21). Empirical studies consistently demonstrate that this worldview is unconsciously shaped by linguistic habits (Sapir, 1993) and is "fixed within the language" as a community's specific framework for perception (Yakovleva, 1996, p. 47).

The architectonic principle of the LPW is anthropocentrism—the positioning of human experience as the central axis for interpreting the world (Apresyan, 1995). In linguistics, the anthropocentric paradigm posits that language is inherently human-centric, reflecting human cognition, perception, and cultural values in its very structure (Maslova, 2004). Research within this paradigm examines how language encodes the "human image," including emotional states and value judgments (Apresyan, 1995), and how all linguistic phenomena, from grammar to phraseology, are ultimately tied to human interaction with society, culture, and nature. Within Kazakh linguistics, Kaidar (2004) pioneered the description of the LPW from multiple perspectives (logical, philosophical, aesthetic, ethnolinguistic), demonstrating how language illuminates human intellect and wisdom. This aligns with the broader understanding that a people's history, spiritual heritage, customs, and values are preserved and transmitted intergenerationally through language (Mankeeva, 1997). Thus, the LPW is both a product of historical development and a catalyst for cultural continuity, creating and reinforcing a group's unique identity (Weisgerber, 1993).

2.2. Cognitive Linguistics and the Theory of Cultuling

To move from describing the static content of the LPW to analyzing the dynamic cognitive processes that generate it, this study employs the theories and methods of cognitive linguistics. Cognitive linguistics, a core development within the anthropocentric paradigm, investigates the mental structures (i.e., concepts, categories, frames, and image schemas) that underpin our use and understanding of language (Evans & Green, 2006). It posits that language is a window into conceptualization, and that linguistic patterns reveal how experiences are categorized and construed (Lakoff, 1987).

A pivotal theoretical advance that directly bridges the study of the LPW with cognitive analysis is the theory of cultuling (from culture in language) developed by Pishghadam (2013). This theory posits that culture is not merely reflected in but is constituted within language. Linguistic units act as vessels for cultural memes which are the replicable units of cultural knowledge, attitude, and practice (Pishghadam et al., 2020a, 2020b). Recent empirical work in cultural linguistics affirms this view, showing how proverbs, idioms, and narrative patterns function as meme-carriers, dynamically adapting to modern contexts while preserving core traditional values (Sharifian, 2017). The cultuling approach is particularly apt for analyzing abstract spiritual and religious "cult" concepts, as these are quintessential cultural memes that require linguistic embodiment for transmission. To deconstruct how such memes are structured, this study applies three key cognitive models:

Frame Analysis: Following Fillmore (1982) and Minsky (1975), a frame is understood as a structured data network representing a stereotyped situation. Frame analysis is used to map the conceptual structure of "cult" as a data network containing slots for agents, actions, objects, and cultural settings (Maslova, 2004; Minsky, 1979). The most important categorical feature of a frame is the unified cognitive image of both linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge, a structure that can be transformed into an image (Uali, 2007). A frame is a system of informational structures in the human mind about a particular subject, comprising a set of related concepts and understandings. Frames are linguistic units grouped around a specific concept. We analyze the "cult" concept as a cognitive frame containing slots for *agents* (worshippers, deities), *actions* (prayer, sacrifice), *objects* (sacred entities like Sun, Fire), and *cultural settings* (ritual contexts). This method allows us to map the conceptual architecture of cult-related knowledge.

Script Theory: Scripts specify the sequential, event-based knowledge of routine activities (Schank & Abelson, 1977). We employ this to outline the prototypical sequences of ritual practices (e.g., preparation, invocation, offering, supplication) associated with specific cults, revealing the procedural

knowledge embedded in the language. As Maslova (2004) explains in her textbook "Cognitive Linguistics," knowledge in the human mind is expressed and reflected through various linguistic structures. Units such as "... imagination, scheme, picture, frame, script, gestalt" serve as linguistic tools for conveying information in human cognition (Maslova, 2004, p. 35). All concepts are reflected in language through linguistic units (names, terms, proverbs, phraseological units, sentences, etc.), each represented by different structural models. The primary models include frame, script, schema, gestalt, and scenario. These are stored in the mind in a specific structured pattern as sequential steps.

Gestalt Theory: This approach captures the holistic, often symbolic and metaphorical, understanding of concepts that transcends the sum of their parts (Köhler, 1929). It is essential for analyzing how "cult" concepts form unified, emotionally and spiritually charged wholes within the Turkic worldview, where the veneration of a natural element like Fire is more than a sum of ritual actions—it is a complete perceptual and symbolic Gestalt.

Furthermore, the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) is employed to analyze the metaphorical cult. This theory posits that abstract concepts (e.g., beauty, power) are understood via systematic mappings from concrete source domains (e.g., celestial bodies). This allows us to trace how venerated entities become entrenched in everyday thought.

2.3. The "Cult" Concept in Ethnolinguistic and Lexicographic Research

The abstract concept of "cult" (from Latin *cultus*, meaning worship, adoration) has been a subject of interdisciplinary scholarship, providing essential context for its linguistic analysis. Ethnographic and religious studies have extensively cataloged the types and functions of cults among global and Turkic peoples. Tokarev (1964), in his comprehensive work on early religion, systematically analyzed primitive beliefs, including totemism, animism, shamanism, and various cults (funerary, agrarian, familial). Similarly, Snesarev (1957) provided philosophical examinations of Islamic and pre-Islamic belief systems in Central Asia, including the cult of nature and saints. Turkic-speaking peoples also had common customs and a shared cultural life. Akhmetov (1995) studied the ethno-linguistic system of taboos and euphemisms, which hold a special place in the traditions of the Turkic peoples. These elements are directly connected to cognitive linguistics, language, culture, and ethnography, forming the ethno-cultural foundations of the group. For the Turkic peoples, historical and ethnographic research documents a polytheistic, animistic tradition with a profound connection to nature, manifesting in specific cults such as the Sky (*Tengri*), the Earth Mother (*Yer Ana*), the Sun (*Güneş*), the Wolf (*Bozkurt*), and Ancestors (*Atalar Kültü*), the Fire (*Ateş*), the Moon (*Ay*), the Sky (*Gökyüzü*), and others (Holland, 2010).

Lexicographic research offers a crucial entry point into the LPW's encoding of this concept. Dictionary definitions reveal the semantic boundaries and components of a concept as conventionalized within a speech community. A comparative analysis of Kazakh and Kyrgyz lexicographic data shows both convergence and divergence in the conceptualization of "cult." For instance, the Kyrgyz Language Dictionary (Udahin, 1957) defines it primarily as "worship" and "religion," while the Atheist Dictionary of the Kazakh Language (Madeev et al., 1988) emphasizes "a set of religious actions related to supernatural power," noting subtypes like magical and benevolent worship. These differences in definitional focus and semantic elaboration reflect subtle distinctions in the national conceptual worldviews, confirming that universal concepts like "cult" are inflected with unique ethnic traits (Akhmetov, 1995). The lexicographic evidence confirms that the "cult" concept in these languages is highly abstract, centered on verbs of reverence and supplication, and linked to a network of related ritual terms and objects. This established semantic field provides the raw material for our subsequent cognitive frame, script, and Gestalt analysis, moving from static definition to dynamic conceptual structure.

The lexicographic and ethnographic record reveals that the concept of "cult" encompasses a spectrum of phenomena. To achieve analytical precision and ensure the appropriate application of cognitive models, this study operationalizes "cult" by distinguishing three interrelated but distinct types of manifestation within the linguistic worldview:

1. *Ritual Cult* refers to formalized, procedural practices of worship and supplication directed toward sacred entities (e.g., animal sacrifice, structured prayer). This type is characterized by prescribed sequences of action and is primarily analyzed through script theory to model its event-based knowledge structure.
2. *Venerative Cult* denotes the socio-cultural veneration of symbolic figures, natural forces, or ancestors that serve as core ethnic or communal identity markers (e.g., the cult of the Wolf/Bozkurt, the cult of Ancestors). This type functions as a complex cultural symbol and is analyzed through frame analysis (to map its conceptual attributes) and Gestalt theory (to capture its holistic, non-decomposable symbolic value).
3. *Metaphorical Cult* captures the pervasive, conventionalized use of lexemes denoting venerated forces within the language's figurative and evaluative expressions (e.g., "bright as the Sun," "beautiful as the Moon"). This type reveals the deep conceptual and axiological entrenchment of these entities and is analyzed through frame analysis and the principles of conceptual metaphor theory.

While these categories may overlap, this tripartite distinction allows for a structured lens to dissect how a broad cultural concept is differentially encoded in language, moving from explicit ritual to social symbol to implicit metaphorical cognition.

3. Methodology

3.1. Materials

The primary empirical material consists of 150 linguistic units (lexemes, phraseological units, stable collocations, and proverbs) related to cult and ritual practices. These units were systematically extracted from a defined set of authoritative lexicographic and phraseological sources: the Kazakh Phraseological Dictionary (Kenesbaev, 1977), the Kazakh Explanatory Dictionary (Iskakov, 1974; Iskakov, 1979), the Kyrgyz–Russian Dictionary (Udahin, 1957), and the Mythological Dictionary (Meletinsky, 1990). The study's primary empirical focus is on Kazakh and Kyrgyz data, as these languages provided a sufficient and coherent corpus for deep, qualitative cognitive analysis using the chosen models.

The selection of these 150 units was guided by explicit semantic and functional criteria. A unit was included if it explicitly or implicitly encoded notions of worship, reverence, ritual action, sacred objects, supernatural forces, or mythological entities. The extraction process employed a keyword-based and semantic-field approach: it began with core seed lexemes (e.g., equivalents of *cult*, *worship*, *sacrifice*, *spirit*) and expanded iteratively through dictionary cross-references, definitions, and listed phraseological correlates. To ensure data saturation, this extraction continued until a thorough review of the designated sources no longer yielded new conceptual categories, semantic features, or metaphorical patterns relevant to the "cult" domain. The recurrence and stability of meanings across these authoritative sources indicated sufficient conceptual coverage for a qualitative analysis.

In addition to this core lexicographic dataset, sacred texts of the Avesta (1992) were consulted to capture the historical and spiritual dimensions of cult-related concepts. Their purpose was not for systematic unit extraction but to illuminate the diachronic depth and spiritual dimensions of the identified concepts, providing interpretive context rather than primary data.

3.2. Procedure

The analysis followed a multi-methods procedure integrating linguistic, cultural, and cognitive approaches, implemented in five sequential and replicable stages.

Stage 1: Data Identification and Compilation: Cult-related lexemes and phraseological units were systematically identified in two Turkic languages (i.e., Kazakh, Kyrgyz) using the source materials and selection criteria detailed in Section 3.1. For broader contextualization within the Turkic family, established etymological and ethnographic literature (e.g., on pan-Turkic cosmonyms) was consulted, but the systematic cognitive modeling was applied to the Kazakh-Kyrgyz corpus. The resulting dataset was compiled into a structured comparative lexical inventory, documenting each unit, its source, language, and a preliminary gloss.

Stage 2: Frame and Script Analysis (Typology-Driven): The compiled units were categorized according to the operational typology (Ritual, Venerative, Metaphorical Cult) to guide the application of cognitive models. For units classified as Ritual Cult, script analysis was the primary tool. The procedural knowledge was mapped by reconstructing the canonical sequence of events (e.g., Preparation → Consecration → Offering → Supplication) from descriptive definitions and contextual phrasings. In Venerative Cult frames, the focus is on symbolic entities (like deities, sacred elements, or mythological figures), not on events or actions. In frames that model events, the typical slots are action (what happens) and object (what the action is performed on), because the frame's meaning is tied to a process or occurrence. However, in frames representing symbolic entities:

1. *Attribute* replaces action because the entity is not defined by what it *does*, but by its qualities or characteristics (e.g., life-giving, protective, sacred). Attributes capture enduring properties rather than temporary events.
2. *Function* replaces object because the entity is not primarily something acted upon; instead, it serves a role or purpose within the culture (e.g., mediating divine power, ensuring fertility, legitimizing authority). Function captures cultural meaning rather than a physical or direct recipient of an action.

In short, attribute and function are used because Venerative Cult frames describe what an entity *is* and *means* in a cultural or symbolic context, rather than what happens to or through it. For example, for "the Wolf (Bozkurt)": agent = progenitor, attribute = strength, function = protection. Gestalt analysis was then applied to venerative items to interpret their indivisible symbolic weight. For Metaphorical Cult units, the analysis focused on identifying the conceptual metaphors (e.g., 'A valuable person is the Moon") and mapping the cross-domain correspondences (e.g., from the source domain of the Moon to the target domain of a person) to reveal underlying values. This typology-driven approach ensured that each cognitive model was applied to the data type for which it is most epistemologically suited.

Stage 3: Conceptual Metaphor and Gestalt Analysis: Gestalt analysis was applied to holistic, often metaphorical expressions (e.g., "beautiful as the Moon," "powerful as the Sun"). The procedure here was qualitative and interpretive. Each expression was analyzed as an indivisible conceptual unit to capture its emergent symbolic, affective, and evaluative meaning, focusing on the integrated whole rather than the sum of its semantic parts.

Stage 4: Synthesis and Theoretical Modeling: The frame structures, script sequences, and Gestalt meanings from Stages 2-3 were synthesized into an integrated, layered model of the 'cult' concept (presented in Section 5). This model captures the cognitive architecture within the studied languages and is proposed as a framework for future comparative ethnolinguistic research across related linguistic cultures.

This staged procedure ensures the analysis is systematic, transparent, and replicable, moving from data compilation through distinct layers of cultural and cognitive examination to a final comparative synthesis.

4. Results

This chapter presents the findings of the cognitive-conceptual analysis, organized according to the three operational types of cult phenomena: Ritual, Venerative, and Metaphorical Cult. This structure allows for the targeted application of cognitive models - script, frame, gestalt analysis, and conceptual metaphor analysis - to reveal the distinct layers of cultural knowledge encoded in the Turkic linguistic worldview.

4.1. Analysis of Ritual Cult: Scripts of Sacred Practice

The analysis of linguistic units denoting formal worship reveals a structured, procedural knowledge system. This Ritual Cult is best modeled through script analysis, which outlines the stereotypical sequence of actions embedded in cultural memory. The core conceptual frame for ritual interaction, derived from the linguistic data, is centered on communication with transcendent forces. The primary slots in this frame include:

- Agent: Human supplicant.
- Action: Worship, prayer, supplication, thanksgiving, repentance.
- Object/Recipient: Creative forces, deities (Tengri, Allah), natural elements (Sun, Moon), ancestors, spirits.
- Cultural setting: Seeking help, giving thanks, fulfilling destiny, and avoiding sin.

This frame organizes the knowledge, but the ritual process itself is captured in scripts. For example, the script for a sacrificial offering (*құрбандық*) can be reconstructed from phraseological units and descriptive terms as a sequence of key stages: 1) Preparation/Purification (cleansing, intention), 2) Consecration (dedication of the offering), 3) The Ritual Action (the act of sacrifice), 4) Supplication (verbal prayer or request), and 5) Distribution/Feasting (communal sharing of the offering). Similarly, the script for daily prayer involves sequences of ablution, recitation, bowing, and supplication.

For the concept of creative forces, the script structure is illustrated through a series of connected actions, such as supplicating to God, praying, reading the Quran, giving alms, and performing dhikr (remembrance of God). These actions follow one another in a prescribed order, forming a coherent process of religious practice. The conceptual network of ritual actions, derived from our data, is systematized in Table 1, which presents the major frames constituting the “cult” concept.

Table 1
Frame System for Ritual Cult Concepts

Frame Type	in Kazakh	Description
Communication with the power of the Creator	жаратушының құдіретімен тілдесу	Talking to the Creator’s power when something happens to you
Asking for help from the Creative Forces	жаратушы күштерден көмек сұрау	Asking for help from divine forces in difficult situations
Supplication to the Creative Powers	жаратушы күштерге жалыну	Pleading and supplicating to divine powers when misfortune occurs
Supplication to the Mysterious Forces of Nature	табиғаттың тылсым күштеріне жалбарыну	Appealing to the mysterious forces of nature
Respect for Animals	жан-жануарларды пір тұту	Revering and respecting animals
Honoring Spirits	аруақтарды құрметтеу	Honoring spirits and remembering ancestors
Praying at Holy Places	әулиелі жерлерге мінәжет ету	Visiting sacred places and praying

These frames, centered on verbs of reverence and interaction, provide the conceptual architecture for ritual scripts. They exemplify the principles of cultuling (Pishghadam, 2013), demonstrating how the cultural rules for engaging with the sacred are encoded not just in single words, but in the procedural knowledge implied by the language.

4.2. Analysis of Venerative Cult: Frames of Identity and Sacred Symbols

Beyond formal ritual, the data reveals a deep layer of socio-cultural veneration for entities that serve as core identity markers. This Venerative Cult is analyzed through frame analysis (to map conceptual attributes) and Gestalt theory (to capture holistic symbolic value). The system of these interrelated venerative frames is mapped in Table 2.

Table 2
Frame System for Venerative Cult Concepts

Frame Type	in Kazakh	Description
The cult associated with the Object	Культ обьектіге байланысты	General frame for cults focused on a specific object, entity, or natural element
The cult of the Heaven	Аспан культі	Veneration of the sky as a divine or sacred entity
The cult of the Moon	Ай культі	Worship of the Moon as a celestial body with symbolic and spiritual significance

The cult of the Sun	Күн культі	Worship of the Sun as a symbol of life, energy, and divine authority
The cult of the Star	Жұлдыз культі	Reverence for stars or constellations as objects of divine or mystical significance
The cult of Nature	Табиғат культі	General frame for reverence toward natural elements
The cult of Water	Су культі	Worship of rivers, lakes, or springs as sacred or life-giving forces
The cult of Fire	От культі	Reverence for fire as a sacred, transformative, and protective element
The cult of Tree	Ағаш культі	Worship of trees as sacred beings or ancestral symbols

4.2.1. The Venerative Frame of the Sun

The Sun (Күн) holds a paramount position in the venerative system, functioning as a central symbolic node in the Turkic worldview and symbolizing ultimate power, cosmic order, and the source of life. Its cognitive frame comprises interconnected slots and is supported by a dense network of linguistic, symbolic, and ritual evidence.

The Sun's primary lexeme is ancient and pan-Turkic, demonstrating its conceptual stability. Key variants include: *kün* (Kazakh, Kyrgyz), *kun* (Uzbek), *gun/güneş* (Turkmen), *koyash* (Bashkir), and *kun* (Tatar) (Pansat & Khalikova, 2023). This linguistic unity underscores a shared conceptual core. Furthermore, the Sun is intrinsically linked to concepts of growth and prosperity. The term *"өркен"* (shoot, sprout) is also used to refer to the Sun, and blessings such as *"Күнің өссін!"* (May your day/Sun grow!) and *"Өркенің өссін!"* (May your shoot/prosperity grow!) directly fuse solar symbolism with wishes for flourishing (Amanzholov, 2003). Among some Siberian peoples, the Sun was called "big shoot" and the Moon "small shoot," and the Buryats referred to it as "The eight-legged Sun" (*Naiman khultai Khara*), indicating a rich tapestry of descriptive epithets that anchor it in a natural and mythical lexicon.

Symbolic Slot: The Sun functions as a central symbolic node. Its symbolism extends into a vast associated network:

- The Yurt and Shanyrak: The round *Shanyrak* (yurt crown) is a direct architectural symbol of the Sun, representing the home, family lineage, and cosmic order. Its profound cultural value is encapsulated in blessings (*"Шаңырағың биік болсын!*/ Шаңырагың бийик болсун!*"* (Kazakh, Kyrgyz) – *"May your shanyrak be high!"*) and the severe curse of its fall (*"Шаңырағың ортасына түссін!*/Шаңырагың ортосуна түшсүн! (Kazakh, Kyrgyz)*"* – *"May your shanyrak fall inward!"*), representing the total collapse of a family.
- Fire: Understood as the Sun's earthly manifestation and a benevolent deity in its own right (Avesta, 1992).
- Ancient Iconography: Solar symbols, such as the wheel and circle in petroglyphs, are identified as representations of the Sun God. Amanzholov (2003) notes that the oldest solar symbols, the "wheel" ⊕ and circle ⊛ in petroglyphs, are identified in Gorge in Semirechye. Similar symbols, representing the solar deity, are known in ancient Babylon, the Saimaly-tash region of the Fergana Range, and Southern Sweden (Amanzholov, 2003). The tradition of creating a circular shape is an ancient belief rooted in reverence for the Sun. During Nowruz, when a bull was sacrificed, it was customary to draw a circle with the blood on the foreheads of young children. This tradition dates back to the Saka period, where the nomadic Sakas revered a goddess of prosperity and abundance named Anaitis.
- Mythological Links: The Sun is linked to mythical figures like the snake-haired Saint *Баба Түкті Шашты Әзіз (Baba Túkti Shashty Áziz- Baba with Hairy Hair)* and the concept of *жылан-сәулелер* (*zhylan-säuleler* – "snake-rays"), connecting it to themes of power and protection (Qondybaev, 2004). Ritually, reverence is shown by not looking directly at the Sun.

Attribute: Power (*қуат*), vitality, life-giving warmth (*жылылық*), majesty.

Function: It functions to provide divine protection, ensure continuity of the family (*ұрпақ*), and influence fertility and prosperity.

Value: Sacred, ancestral, a source of blessings (*береке*). Reverence is shown by not looking directly at the Sun. Ritually, during Nowruz, when a bull was sacrificed, it was customary to draw a circle with the blood on the foreheads of young children, a tradition with ancient roots.

Linguistic Evidence: The Sun's name is ancient and pan-Turkic, with variants such as *kün* (Kazakh, Kyrgyz). Its association with growth is evident in blessings like *"Күнің өссін!/ Күнүң өссүн!"* (May your day/Sun grow!) and the term *"өркен"* (shoot).

The Sun as an Axiological Source: The Sun generates a set of "constant similes" that convey attributes of power and radiance: *"күндей нұрлы"* (bright as the Sun), *"күндей қуатты"* (powerful as the Sun), *"күндей жайнау"* (comfortable/radiant as the Sun).

In summary, the cult of the Sun is cognitively framed as the central, animating force of the Turkic cosmos. Its symbolism permeates from the macrocosm (the sky) to the microcosm (the home, via the *shanyrak*), and from ancient ritual to everyday language. The linguistic evidence—from its stable pan-Turkic name to its role in blessings, curses, and evaluative metaphors—demonstrates that the Sun is not merely a worshipped object but a foundational conceptual anchor for understanding power, continuity, and value.

4.2.2. The Venerative Frame of the Moon

The Moon (Ай) constitutes one of the most ancient and elaborated venerative frames within the Turkic linguistic picture of the world. Its veneration dates to prehistoric times, establishing it as a primordial sacred entity (Rawlinson, 2014). The cognitive frame of the Moon is centered on its role as a sacred celestial deity (ай құдайы), revered alongside the Sun and Stars. For nomads, these celestial bodies were considered as sacred and powerful as 'God' itself (Rysbayeva et al., 2014b).

Symbolic Slot: The Moon's symbolic representation is diverse and deeply embedded in material and social culture.

- The Celestial Crescent: This is the primary symbol. Its cyclical phases are fundamental temporal markers, with *"Айдың жаңасы"* (the new Moon) beginning the lunar month and *"Ай туғанда"* (when the Moon is born) describing its appearance (Kenesbaev, 1977). The half-Moon also functioned as a sacred sign for Muslims.

Social and Material Symbols: The crescent was directly incorporated into the tribal emblems (*таңба*) of various Kazakh clans, concretizing group identity. For example, the Kipchak clan is depicted by two crescent Moons, and the Shapyrashty, Kanly, and Saryjomart tribes used a sickle-shaped symbol (Kaidar, 2004). Beyond the clan, the Moon was symbolized in everyday life by the horns of cattle, the image of a snake, and round mirrors (Rysbayeva et al., 2014b). The likening of cattle parts to the Moon was a symbolic act to ask for the safety of people and livestock.

Attribute: The Moon's key attributes are Beauty (сұлулық), Tenderness (нәзіктік), Purity, and Cyclical Renewal. It is explicitly described as "the symbol of beauty and gentleness" (Rysbayeva et al., 2014b). Mythologically, it is conceptualized as animate and relational: it is "born" (*ай туды*), "dies" (*ай өледі*), and serves as the "nest of the Sun" (*күннің ұясы*), reflecting a dynamic understanding of celestial bodies (Uali, 2007).

Function: The Moon serves multiple interconnected cognitive-cultural functions:

- Temporal Regulation: It structures timekeeping and the calendar.
- Aesthetic Benchmark: It acts as the primary source domain for metaphors of beauty and value.

Social and Personal Identification: It functions powerfully in onomastics. This is evidenced in traditional personal names that follow the pattern of the celestial source domain (e.g., *күн, ай, таң*) followed by an evaluative attribute like *сұлу* (beautiful) or *жарық* (light), resulting in names like *Айсұлу* (Moon-Beautiful), *Күнжарық* (Sun-Bright), *Таңсұлу* (Dawn-Beautiful) (Rysbayeva et al., 2014a).

Value: The Moon's sacred value is inseparable from its aesthetic and symbolic roles. This profound value is reflected in ritual practices and sayings across Turkic peoples. The utterance upon seeing the new Moon, "to new Moon I see to mean I live", underscores its association with life and continuity. Ritual responses varied: the Kyrgyz offered blessings, West Siberian Tatars danced, the Bashkurt asked for goodness, while the Altai people considered it an inauspicious time to begin new ventures (Rysbayeva et al., 2014b).

Linguistic Evidence: The cosmonym "Ai" is remarkably stable across Turkic languages (Kazakh, Kyrgyz, etc.), indicating its foundational status (Udahin, 1957). The attribute of beauty generates a set of fixed similes that feed the conceptual metaphor beauty is celestial: *"Айдай сұлу / Айдай сулуу"* (beautiful as the Moon), *"Айдай болған ақ жүз/ Айдай ак жүз"* (white face like the Moon), *"Айдай таза"* (pure as the Moon).

In summary, the cult of the Moon is not a simple object of worship but a complex cognitive frame. It links cosmology (cyclical time), sociology (tribal and personal identity), aesthetics (beauty metaphors), and spiritual value into a coherent system within the Turkic worldview, demonstrating its role as a fundamental structuring principle of cultural cognition.

4.2.3. The Venerative Frame of Fire

The Fire (От) is considered the most important among all cults. Fire occupied a central place in everyday life, permeating nearly all of its aspects. The foundation of Zoroastrianism is closely connected with the cult of fire. Fire was regarded as a benevolent divine force and understood as the earthly manifestation of the Sun. The origins of fire worship can therefore be traced back to solar worship.

Fire (От) is venerated as a living, divine agent:

Symbolic Slot: The hearth (*ошақ*) is the sacred focal point of the home. Fire is a symbol and earthly manifestation of the Sun.

Attribute: Purifying, protective, animate and emotional (capable of happiness, anger, or revenge), essential for survival.

Function: Purification ritual, guarding the household from evil, uniting the family. In Zoroastrian scripture, it functions as a divine mediator, considered the son of the supreme creator (Avesta, 1992).

Value: A benevolent deity, a sacred force of blessing (*береке*) and evil-repulsion. It is regarded as a powerful, living divine being (Avesta, 1992).

Linguistic Evidence: Fire is personified in sayings: "*Отын салсаң, жанады – ол тамақ жегені; су құйсаң, өшеді – ол ажал келгені / От салсаң, жанат – ал тамак жегенин; суу куйсуң, өчөт – ал ажал келгенин."* (If you put firewood, it burns — it has eaten; if you pour water, it goes out — its death has come).

In summary, the cult of Fire is not a simple object of worship but a sacred phenomenon that was revered and worshipped by most Turkic peoples. The word "fire" is highly valued, as evidenced by the expression "fire-mother."

4.2.4. Cognitive Nature of the Concept of "Creative Forces"

The "Creative Forces" represent a supreme, abstract venerative frame centered on a creator deity. Its cognitive nature is revealed through a complex semantic field.

Lexical Core and Combinatorics: The frame is organized around sacred lexemes: “God” [Құдай], “Allah” [Алла], “Creator” [Жаратушы], “Power” [Құдірет], “Lord” [Ие, Хақ] (Iskakov, 1974). These combine into fixed expressions: *"жаратқан құдай"* (God who created), *"жаратушы бір құдай"* (the creator is one God).

Conceptual Unity Across Turkic Languages: While phonetic forms vary—Kazakh/Kyrgyz: *kudai*; Uzbek: *hudo*; Tatar: *hodai*; Uyghur: *huda*; Turkmen: *hudai*—the core meaning “the creator of the existing world, the Almighty” remains consistent, indicating a shared conceptual frame.

Associated Practices: This frame is linked to practices like sacrifice, alms-giving, prayer, and fasting, forming a system of interaction with the creative forces.

The Gestalt, or holistic symbolic essence, of these venerative cults transcends the sum of their individual slots. While frame analysis maps the conceptual components, Gestalt theory captures the indivisible, emergent meaning that gives these symbols their cultural power. The Shanyrak is not just a Sun symbol; it is the Gestalt of *“family, lineage, and eternal continuity.”* Fire is not just a purifying element; it is the living Gestalt of *“the animate, emotional heart of the home.”* The Moon is the Gestalt of *“celestial beauty, cyclical time, and feminine essence.”* This layer of holistic, non-decomposable meaning, accessed through Gestalt analysis, explains why these symbols evoke such deep emotional and spiritual resonance within the Turkic worldview.

4.3. Analysis of Metaphorical Cult: Conceptual Entrenchment in Figurative Language

The most pervasive evidence of these concepts’ entrenchment is found in conventional figurative language. This Metaphorical Cult shows how the entities from the Venerative layer have become source domains for understanding fundamental human values. The analysis identifies stable conceptual metaphors where celestial and sacred entities structure abstract qualities in Kazakh and Kyrgyz:

• Beauty/value is celestial: This is the most productive pattern.

- *"Beautiful as the Moon"* (Айдай сұлу/ Айдай сулуу)
- *"Beautiful as the Sun"* (Күндей әдемі/ Күндөй сулуу)
- *"Pure as the Moon, bright as the Sun"* (Айдай таза, күндей нұрлы/Айдай таза, күнүдөй жарык)
- *"My star in the sky, my beaver on the shore"* (Aspandagy zhuldyzym, zhagadagy kundyzum) – term of endearment that compares a beloved girl to a celestial body (Tektigul et al., 2023).

• Power/glory is solar: (e.g., *Күндей қуатты/* Күндөй күчтүү (Powerful as the sun)

• Fate/destiny is astral/divine: Concepts like *"Құдайдың жазуы/* Кудайдын жазуусу*"* (God's writing) link divinity to preordination.

Furthermore, this conceptual entrenchment permeates personal identity. Women’s names like Aizhamal and Tolganai incorporate the cosmonym. The affectionate term “Kundyz” for daughters fuses the solar symbol with a valued creature to express preciousness (Tektigul et al., 2023). Gestalt expressions related to the creative forces, such as *“Thank God,"* *“God's repentance,"* and *"God's power,"* communicate abstract concepts of thankfulness, destiny, and divine mediation through holistic, formulaic phrases. This layer demonstrates conclusively that these venerated concepts have moved from the sphere of ritual and symbol into the foundational metaphoric and onomastic system of everyday thought and valuation within the Turkic linguistic picture of the world.

5. Discussion

The primary objective of this study was to deconstruct the concept of "cult" within the Kazakh and Kyrgyz linguistic worldview using a cognitive-conceptual framework. By applying the operational typology of Ritual, Venerative, and Metaphorical Cult, the analysis moves beyond a flat description to reveal a layered architecture of cultural cognition. This discussion synthesizes the key findings to address how abstract spiritual beliefs are structured, transmitted, and sustained through language, thereby contributing to the theories of the LPW and cultuling. Furthermore, we outline the theoretical

implications of this model and acknowledge the study's limitations to provide a complete and integrated final section.

The most significant finding of this research is that the Turkic concept of "cult" is not a monolithic category but a complex cognitive system with three distinct, interconnected layers. Each layer corresponds to a different type of cultural knowledge and mode of linguistic encoding, as summarized in the integrated model below:

- *The Ritual Cult (Scriptual Layer):* This foundational layer consists of procedural knowledge—the sequenced scripts for engagement with the sacred (e.g., sacrifice, prayer). As evidenced by the frame analysis in Section 4.1 and Table 1, this layer is organized around verbs of interaction (*табыну*, *жалбарыну*) and is characterized by a clear agent-action-purpose structure. It represents the most explicit, rule-governed dimension of the concept.
- *The Venerative Cult (Symbolic-Identity Layer):* Built upon and extending from the ritual base is the symbolic and identificatory knowledge mapped in Figure 1 and analyzed in Section 4.2. Here, natural forces and entities (Sun, Moon, Fire) are cognitively framed as sacred symbols imbued with attributes and functions that anchor group identity. The Sun is not merely worshipped; its frame includes the *Shanyrak* (symbol of lineage), circular petroglyphs, and fire, creating a network that ties cosmology to social structure. This layer transmits cultural memes (Pishghadam, 2013) related to belonging, continuity, and protection.
- *The Metaphorical Cult (Conceptual- Evaluative Layer):* The most pervasive and entrenched layer is the conceptual and axiological knowledge revealed in Section 4.3. Here, the entities from the Venerative layer (Sun, Moon) have become source domains for fundamental conceptual metaphors (e.g., Beauty is celestial, power is solar). This demonstrates their deep cognitive entrenchment, moving from objects of external worship to internalized tools for understanding and valuing the human world.

This tripartite model illustrates that the LPW is stratified. Ritual provides the behavioral grammar, veneration provides the symbolic identity, and metaphor provides the unconscious conceptual substrate. Together, they form a cohesive cultural-cognitive system that resolves the initial ambiguity surrounding the term "cult" by distinguishing its ritual, symbolic, and conceptual manifestations.

The typology also illuminates the different mechanisms by which this cultural knowledge is transmitted and preserved, explaining its remarkable resilience.

- *Ritual Cult: Transmission through Prescribed Practice.* The script-based knowledge of the Ritual Cult is transmitted explicitly and performatively. Its stability relies on the faithful replication of sequences (e.g., the script for daily prayer). This makes it potentially vulnerable to disruption with religious or social change but also allows for clear intergenerational instruction.
- *Venerative Cult: Transmission through Symbolic Materiality and Narrative.* The frame-based knowledge of the Venerative Cult is transmitted through material culture (yurt, shanyrak, emblems), art, and foundational narratives. This mode is more adaptable; the symbol of the Sun can persist as the *Shanyrak* even as explicit solar worship rituals fade, seamlessly integrating into modern secular national identity. Its stability lies in its deep connection to tangible artifacts and social structures.
- *Metaphorical Cult: Transmission through Unconscious Language Use.* The metaphor-based knowledge is transmitted implicitly and unconsciously through daily language. Phrases like *"айдай сұлу"* (beautiful as the Moon) are acquired not as lessons but as natural speech patterns. This represents the most stable and resistant form of cultural transmission, as these conceptual mappings operate below the level of conscious belief. They ensure that the axiological values of the venerative system (e.g., the Moon's beauty, the Sun's power) endure in the collective psyche.

Thus, the concept's longevity is not due to a single mechanism but to this multi-channel system of reinforcement, where the weakening of one layer (e.g., ritual practice) can be compensated for by the strength of others (e.g., symbolic identity and entrenched metaphor).

This study offers two key theoretical advancements by applying a cognitive lens to established paradigms.

1. Refining the LPW: The findings demonstrate that the LPW is not a static "picture" but a dynamic, multi-layered cognitive architecture. Previous research often catalogues elements of the LPW (Karaulov et al., 1994; Yakovleva, 1996). This analysis shows how these elements are cognitively organized, into procedural scripts, symbolic frames, and conceptual metaphors, and how these layers interact. It provides a model for moving from describing the content of a worldview to explaining its cognitive structure.

2. Expanding the Cultuling Theory: The study operationalizes and expands Pishghadam's (2013) Cultuling theory. It demonstrates that cultural memes are not uniformly "in" language; they exist in different cognitive formats that dictate their function and resilience. A ritual script meme ensures behavioral continuity, a symbolic frame meme sustains group identity, and a conceptual metaphor meme perpetuates value systems. This typology provides a more precise toolkit for future Cultuling analysis, allowing researchers to predict and analyze how different types of cultural knowledge behave and persist linguistically.

In conclusion, the cognitive-conceptual analysis, guided by the Ritual-Venerative-Metaphorical typology, reveals that the Turkic "cult" concept is a robust, multi-faceted engine of cultural cognition. It functions simultaneously as a guide for action, a blueprint for identity, and a foundation for thought. This layered structure is the key to understanding its historical endurance and its continuing vitality within the modern Turkic linguistic worldview.

This research is not without limitations, which also point to valuable avenues for further study. The analysis relied primarily on lexicographic and phraseological sources, which, while authoritative, represent a curated, conventional layer of the language. Future studies could benefit from incorporating data from contemporary corpora, ethnographic interviews, and multimodal analysis (e.g., of gestures, rituals) to capture the dynamic, performative aspect of these cults in real-time use. Furthermore, while this study was intentionally focused on a deep analysis of Kazakh and Kyrgyz data to establish a robust model, the proposed tripartite framework is explicitly designed for comparative application. A logical and necessary next step is to apply this methodology systematically to a balanced corpus from a wider range of Turkic languages to test its explanatory power and map both shared cognitive structures and culture-specific elaborations across the linguistic family.

In summary, by disentangling the multifaceted concept of "cult" through a rigorous cognitive-linguistic typology, this study has provided a clearer window into the Kazakh and Kyrgyz spiritual mindset. It has shown that language does not merely reflect a worldview but actively constructs and sustains it through a sophisticated architecture of interrelated cognitive models. The findings underscore that the spiritual heritage of these peoples is not a relic of the past but a living, cognitive system preserved in the scripts of their rituals, the frames of their symbols, and the very metaphors of their speech, continuing to shape identity and perception in the modern age. The resulting layered model offers a replicable methodology for future research aiming to decode other complex cultural concepts within the anthropocentric paradigm of linguistics and for conducting systematic comparative studies across related linguistic cultures.

Acknowledgements

The authors used an AI-based tool solely for linguistic polishing and/or for generating figures or tables. The ideas, interpretations, and analyses presented in this paper are entirely original and the sole responsibility of the authors.

Disclosure Statement

The authors claim no conflict of interest.

Funding

The research did not receive any specific grants from funding agencies.

References

Akhmetov, A. K. (1995). *Taboo and euphemisms in Turkic languages: A comparative ethnolinguistic study*. Nauka.

Amanzholov, A. S. (2003). *History and theory of ancient Turkic writing*. Mektep.

Apresyan, Y. D. (1995). Integral description of the language and system lexicography. *Languages of Russian Culture*, *2*(1), 481-497.

Avesta. (1992). *The book of Avesta: Selected hymns; From the Videvdat* (I. M. Steblin-Kamensky, Trans.). Halyqtar Dostyǵy.

Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315864327

Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In The Linguistic Society of Korea (Ed.), *Linguistics in the morning calm* (pp. 111–137). Hanshin Publishing.

Holland, G. S. (2010). *Gods in the desert: Religions of the ancient near east*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Iskakov, A. (1974). *Explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language* (Vol. 1). Gylym.

Iskakov, A. (1979). *Explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language* (Vol. 4). Gylym.

Kaidar, A. T. (2004). *Folk wisdom: Explanatory dictionary and study of Kazakh proverbs*. Toganay.

Karaulov, I. U. N., Sorokin, I. U. A., Tarasov, E. F., Ufimtseva, N. V., & Cherkasova, G. A. (1994). *Russian associative dictionary: Book 1. Direct dictionary: From stimulus to reaction*. AST Publishing House.

Kenesbaev, I. (1977). *Phraseological dictionary of the Kazakh language*. Gylym.

Kornilov, O. A. (2003). *Language pictures of the world as derivatives of national mentality*. Moscow.

Köhler, W. (1929). *Gestalt psychology*. Liveright.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. University of Chicago Press.

Madeev, D., Sapuanov, E., & Bermakhanov, A. (1988). *Atheist's pocket dictionary*. Almaty.

Mankeeva, Z. (1997). *National character of cultural vocabulary*. Nauka.

Maslova, V. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Tetra Sistems.

Meletinsky, E. M. (1990). *Mythological dictionary*. Sovetskaya Encyclopedia.

Minsky, M. (1975). A framework for representing knowledge. In P. H. Winston (Ed.), *The psychology of computer vision* (pp. 211–277). McGraw-Hill.

Minsky, M. (1979). Frames for the representation of knowledge. In D. Metzing (Ed.), *Frame conceptions and text understanding* (pp. 1-25). De Gruyter.

Pansat, Z., & Khalikova, N. (2023). Semantic features of color in emotional, expressive words: The concept of "blue" in the Kazakh language. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *11*(2), 85-93.

Pishghadam, R. (2013). Introducing cultuling as a conceptual tool in language and culture studies. *Journal of Language and Translation Studies*, *46*(1), 1-18.

Pishghadam, R., Ebrahimi, S., & Naji, S. (2020a). Cultuling analysis: A new methodology for discovering cultural memes in language. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *20*(3), 254-270.

Pishghadam, R., Ebrahimi, S., & Naji, S. (2020b). The role of cultulings in the construction of social identity: A case of Persian. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *8*(2), 1-15.

Postovalova, V. I. (1988). *The picture of the world in human life. The role of the human factor in language*. Language and World View.

Qondybaev, S. (2004). *Argykazakh mythology* (Vol. 4). Daık-Pres.

Rawlinson, G. (2014). *Religions of the ancient world*. Sagwan Press.
Rysbayeva, G., Rysbay, B., Sholpan, B., & Yegizbayeva, N. (2014a). Animistic beliefs and totemic personal names in the world picture. *Life Science Journal. 11*(11), 299-302. https://doi.org/10.7537/marslsj1111s14.67
Rysbayeva, G., Rysbay, B., Sholpan, B., & Issayeva, Z. (2014b). Phrase logical unities connected with cult concepts in Turkish languages. *Life Science Journal*, *11*(12s), 954-959. https://doi.org/10.7537/marslsj1112s14.207
Rysbayeva, G., Erhozhina, S., Baines, S., & Sadenova, A. (2015). Totemic Views in the Anthroponomical Picture of the World. *Review of European Studies*, *7*, 239. https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v7n6p239
Sapir, E. (1993). *Language, race and culture*. Moscow.
Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures* (1st ed.). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203781036
Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural linguistics.* John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/clscc.8
Snesarev, G. P. (1957). *On the reasons for the preservation of religious and domestic relics among the Uzbeks of Khoresm*. Sovetskaya Etnografia.
Tektigul, Z., Bayadilova-Altybayev, A., Sadykova, S., Iskindirova, S., Kushkimbayeva, A., & Zhumagul, D. (2023). Language is a symbol system that carries culture. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 11*(1), 203-214. https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2022.562756.2781
Teliya, V. N. (1996). *Russian phraseology: Semantic, pragmatic and linguacultural aspects*. Yazikirusskoikulturi.
Tokarev, S. A. (1964). *Early forms of religion*. Poliizdat.
Uali, N. (2007). *Theoretical foundations of the culture of Kazakh speech*. Almaty.
Udahin, K. K. (1957). *Russian-Kyrgyz dictionary*. Sovetskaya Encyclopedia.
Vorobyev, V. V. (1997). *Cultural linguistics: Theory and methods*. Moscow.
Weisgerber, L. (1993). Language and philosophy. *Questions of Linguistics*, *2*, 114-124.
Yakovleva, E. S. (1996). *Description of Russian language picture of the world*. Russian Language Abroad.