

ARTICLE

Sacred Hypercode “*Արև*”/“*Arev*”/ in the Armenian Linguaculture vs. Symbolic Cultural Code “*Sun*” in the English Linguaculture

Narine Harutyunyan * , Armine Khachatryan * 

*The English Chair of Cross-Cultural Communication, Faculty of European Languages and Communication,
Yerevan State University, Alex Manoogian 1, Yerevan 0025, Armenia*

ABSTRACT

This article aims to identify the specific functioning of the sacred hypercode “*Արև*”/“*Arev*” in the Armenian linguaculture and to compare it with the symbolic cultural code “*Sun*” in the English cultural and linguistic tradition. The focus of the study is on the structure, functions, stability, and degree of sacralization of the symbol, as well as its role in the formation of cultural identity and its linguistic and discursive manifestations. The scientific novelty of the work lies in the interpretation of the Sun as a sacred hypercode from a cross-cultural and interdiscursive perspective. This interpretation is supported by the use of ethnolinguistic, cognitive, and semiotic methods of analysis. The proposed study is based on the synthesis of theoretical provisions on cultural codes (Lotman, Lakoff and Johnson, Wierzbicka, Bakhtin, Lefebvre) and empirical data on Armenian and English language practices, paremiology, mythology, and symbolism. The research methodology includes linguacultural and semiotic analysis, elements of conceptual modeling, and a comparison of lexical-semantic and figurative systems in various cultural contexts. The mythopoetic and discursive approach is also employed to reconstruct the function of the sacred hypercode in the national consciousness. Thus, the present study aims to deepen the understanding of the mechanisms underlying the formation of holy meanings in language and culture, which is important both for theoretical linguacultural studies and for the practice of intercultural communication, as well as for the semiotics of culture.

Keywords: Cultural Code; Sun; Sacred Hypercode; Linguaculture; Semiotics; Cultural Identity

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Narine Harutyunyan, The English Chair of Cross-Cultural Communication, Faculty of European Languages and Communication, Yerevan State University, Alex Manoogian 1, Yerevan 0025, Armenia; Email: narineharutyunyan@ysu.am; Armine Khachatryan, The English Chair of Cross-Cultural Communication, Faculty of European Languages and Communication, Yerevan State University, Alex Manoogian 1, Yerevan 0025, Armenia; Email: arminekhachatryan@ysu.am

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 26 July 2025 | Revised: 7 July 2025 | Accepted: 14 August 2025 | Published Online: 15 October 2025
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i10.10741>

CITATION

Harutyunyan, N., Khachatryan, A., 2025. Sacred Hypercode “*Արև*”/“*Arev*”/ in the Armenian Linguaculture vs. Symbolic Cultural Code “*Sun*” in the English Linguaculture. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(10): 1124–1138. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i10.10741>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Within modern humanities, special emphasis is placed on studying cultural codes as representations of collective consciousness, reflecting the core ideological attitudes of an ethnic group. Using an interdisciplinary approach that combines linguistics, cultural studies, cognitive science, and semiotic theory, cultural codes are viewed as stable mental-linguistic structures that record a society's cultural memory and value orientations. One of the most important and universal phenomena within these codes is sacred hypercodes, which are characterized by high levels of generality, normativity, and connections to religious and mythological experiences. Sacred hypercodes serve as metasemiotic regulators, shaping the interpretative frameworks of many local codes and maintaining semiotic stability within the linguacultural system. Archetypal images, deeply embedded in historical and mythopoetic traditions, play a key role in this structure. Among these images, the *Sun* carries significant cultural and semiotic weight—a universal symbol present in religious systems and in the linguistic consciousness of diverse peoples. Despite its apparent universality, the sacralization, functions, and semantic meanings of the solar symbol differ depending on the cultural context. In Armenian linguaculture, the Sun functions as an independent sacred hypercode, incorporating religious, mythopoetic, and ritual elements. In English cultural tradition, the Sun is also widely represented but is mainly interpreted metaphorically and poetically, lacking direct sacred functions. This allows for a linguacultural and semiotic comparison between two distinct traditions.

The image of the *Sun* is a universal cultural and mythological symbol that plays a significant role in shaping ethnic and religious identity. In this article, the *Sun* is considered a sacred hypercode - a high-level semiotic sign integrated into various levels of linguistic culture. A comparative approach enables us to examine how the same symbol assumes different functions and forms in two cultures: Armenian and English. The *Sun* acts as an archetype of life, light, truth, and divine order in many cultures. As a symbol, the sun functions as a cosmological axis (*axis mundi*), illuminating the path of heroes, determining ritual time, and structuring calendar cycles.

2. Theoretical Frameworks

Culture manifests itself in everyday communicative and speech behavior, setting the norms of interpretation, speech choice, and pragmatic attitudes. Discourse, in turn, functions as a mechanism for actualizing cultural codes, giving specific communicative situations nationally specific semantic content^[1].

Often, these cultural components operate at an implicit level, are not realized, and are not reflected by the speakers themselves, which significantly complicates their identification in linguistic analysis. However, it is this latent layer – the so-called “base culture” – that forms the basis of the individual's cognitive-discursive competence^[2].

The concept of culture, proposed by Clifford Geertz, one of the leading figures in North American cultural anthropology, has significant heuristic potential. We are talking about the interpretive approach within the framework of cultural anthropology, which, in our opinion, represents one of the variants of the semiotic approach to culture. K. Geertz understands culture as a historically transmitted system of meanings embodied in symbols; a system of inherited ideas expressed in symbolic forms, through which people transmit, preserve, and develop their knowledge of life and their attitude toward it. He understands culture as a “web of meanings” that a person creates and which allows him to navigate the world around him^[3].

In this regard, it seems appropriate to turn to the concept of a cultural code^[4], understood as a set of symbolic, linguistic, and behavioral norms that ensure the interpretation and reproduction of cultural meanings. As Yu. M. Lotman emphasizes, culture is a mechanism for storing and processing information, and its basis is codes^[5]. Similar ideas are developed by U. Eco, who defines a code as “a system of rules which assigns to certain physical or mental occurrences a conventional meaning”^[6], which allows us to consider culture as a text structured by a multitude of interconnected codes. Cultural codes are recorded in linguistic consciousness in the form of mental representations and are reflected in vocabulary, phraseology, metaphors, and discursive strategies^[7]. In this regard, the observation of A. Wierzbicka is representative: “Cultural keywords are conceptual cores of cultural codes”^[2], as well as the position of J. Lakoff and

M. Johnson on metaphors as basic structures of thinking: “Our ordinary conceptual system [...] is fundamentally metaphorical in nature”^[8]. A similar approach to the cultural code was also developed by M.M. Bakhtin, who considered language as a form of social memory: “Each word is a point of intersection, a weaving of voices, meanings, contexts”^[9], reflecting the polycode nature of culture and the dialogic nature of collective consciousness. In the works of V. A. Lefebvre, code is interpreted as an internal mechanism of choice and self-regulation: “Culture sets the codes by which a people build their reflexive actions”^[10], giving culture a functional-cybernetic dimension.

Contemporary research in the field of cultural semiotics increasingly turns to the concept of “code” as a key element in structuring collective consciousness. Culture can be thought of as a system of cultural codes. Since people perceive space through the relationships between objects, defining a cultural code through the metaphor of a “matrix” seems to be a promising approach. In this case, the code acts as a hidden cultural matrix - a kind of semantic carrier, where linguistic elements acquire various shades of meaning, thereby filling and shaping the code itself. A cultural matrix is a set of cultural elements that influence the formation of people’s worldviews and behavior within a particular culture and reflect their system-forming function:

1. A code is a network of stable relationships between signs, symbols, and concepts (structural aspect). This is confirmed by the structuralist approach of K. Levi-Strauss, who states: “I, therefore, claim to show not how men think in myths, but *how myths operate in men’s minds without their being aware of the fact*”^[11];
2. It acts as a mechanism for producing new meanings within the framework of culturally conditioned algorithms (generative aspect), which, according to R. Barthes, can be interpreted as a perspective of intelligibility that permits us to articulate the meaning of the world^[12];
3. It forms a kind of “cultural DNA” that ensures the reproduction of worldview patterns (identification aspect). In the logic of P. Bourdieu, this is realized through the bodily and behavioral incorporation of structures: “The schemas of perception and appreciation are the product of the incorporation of social structures”^[13].

The phenomenon of a cultural matrix can be understood as a multi-level system of sign-symbolic structures. These structures store cognitive and axiological patterns specific to a given ethnocultural community and require special tools for their adequate interpretation.

The cultural code is hidden from the understanding of many people but is manifested in the linguistic consciousness of a particular nation. As Yu. M. Lotman notes, “cultural codes function according to the principle of a semiotic cipher, accessible only to the bearers of the corresponding tradition”^[4]. A representative of each national culture perceives, divides, structures, and evaluates the surrounding world in his way. National culture encodes its representatives, who perceive the world through the matrix given to them, which contains information, archetypes, symbols, images, and associations from ancient times to the present day. In the system of any culture, codes as models of formation, and transmission of values, norms, rules of behavior, knowledge, and socio-cultural experience play a special role. They are a collective paradigm of thinking and represent a set of signs and their combinations within a historical, cultural, religious, and temporal space.

Cultural codes are manifested both in verbal and non-verbal forms, which makes them inseparable from the issue of the relationship between language and culture, language and thinking. The study of the meaning and nature of cultural codes inevitably touches on the problem of the relationship between language, culture, and thought processes.

The French thinker Michel Foucault believed that the key element of culture is codes that act as templates for creating certain messages. In his opinion, the codes of culture that govern its language, its patterns of perception, its exchanges, its forms of expression and reproduction, its values, and the hierarchy of its practices, determine for each person the empirical orders with which he will deal and in which he will navigate^[14].

3. Methodology

The study employs an interdisciplinary approach that combines the principles of cognitive linguistics, cultural semiotics, and discourse theory. The key concept of the study is the cultural code, understood as a system of signs, symbols, and behavioral norms that ensure the interpreta-

tion and reproduction of cultural meanings^[4]. As part of the comparative analysis of the solar cultural code, this section employs a cultural-semiotic approach to examine the symbolism of the *Sun* in the pre- and post-Christian English tradition. The study is based on historical and ethnographic sources, literary texts, materials of phraseology, onomastics, and toponymy. The methodological framework of the study is based on the following theoretical provisions:

1. The semiotic nature of culture. Culture is considered a cognitive-semiotic system presented in the form of stable mental representations in individual and collective consciousness. Linguistic signs, discursive models, and concepts function as mechanisms for recording and transmitting cultural knowledge^[15].
2. Language as a repository and mediator of cultural meanings. Language is considered not only as a means of expression but also as a form of storing and processing cultural information. It records the consciousness of the speakers' key values, behavioral models, and semantic structures representing the "basic culture"^[2].
3. Discourse as a mechanism for actualizing cultural codes. Discourse performs the function of interpreting and reproducing cultural patterns in specific communicative situations. Attention is paid to pragmatic strategies, metaphorical structures, and keywords as carriers of latent cultural attitudes^[2,8,9].
4. Cultural code as a cognitive matrix. According to the proposed hypothesis, the cultural code is a hidden cognitive matrix that structures the perception of reality and speech behavior. It appears as a system of stable relationships between concepts, symbols, and linguistic forms^[5,10,11].
5. Lexicographic dimension of the cultural code. One of the key areas of research is the lexicographic analysis of linguistic units (words, set expressions, idioms) with the *Sun* component, recorded in various explanatory, idiomatic, and paremiological dictionaries. Analysis of lexicographic data allows identification of culturally significant metaphors and tracing the specifics of the conceptualization of the *Sun* in various linguacultures.
6. The empirical base was formed according to the following criteria: *solar and symbolic semantics*: inclusion of lexemes, phraseological units, onomastic units, toponyms, anthroponyms, and cultural texts in which

the symbolism of the *Sun* is represented; *cultural and religious marking*: the use of elements of language and culture in the context of mythological, liturgical, and ritual practices; *archaism and symbolic density*: reference to sources containing stable forms of sacred symbolism (in particular, the works of Movses Khorenatsi, traditional tales, and ritual texts); *modern functionality*: analysis of living forms of symbolic code in modern language, everyday life, rituals, and onomastics.

The following methods are used to achieve the goals and objectives of the study: cognitive analysis (to identify mental structures and concepts that reflect cultural codes in language); comparative cultural analysis (to compare linguistic and conceptual features of different cultures); interpretative approach (to reveal implicit meanings and assessments contained in linguistic units); lexicographic analysis (to identify semantic, pragmatic and conceptual characteristics of lexemes associated with the archetype of the sun, their representation in dictionaries and stability in linguistic consciousness). The theoretical basis of the study is the works of Yu. M. Lotman, W. Eco, A. Wierzbicka, J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, M. M. Bakhtin, V. A. Lefebvre, and other researchers who consider culture as a text, and language as a cognitive-discursive and semiotic mechanism for transmitting cultural meanings. The inclusion of lexicographic analysis allows additionally recording stable linguistic forms that reflect deep cultural attitudes and value orientations associated with the symbolism of the *Sun*.

4. Results and Discussion

One of the most important components of the cultural code is language, as its keeper. Language has been passed down from one generation to another for hundreds of years, connecting them. The ability to speak the same language and understand each other is an element of collective identity, a feeling that "we" are together and will remain together for a long time, despite all the problems. Since the cultural code is a historically established system of sign correspondences, a multi-layered semiotic construct, and a mechanism for transmitting collective experience, a certain "semiotic key" is therefore necessary for its decoding. This key provides access to implicit meanings, correct interpretation of symbols, and understanding of contextual meanings. Analysis of lan-

guage structures allows us to identify the deep mechanisms of encoding cultural meanings, in particular, historically established models of worldview, value orientations of an ethnic group, the specifics of national character and linguistic consciousness, and ways of categorizing reality. Thus, cultural codes are the basis for conceptual and discursive modeling of reality within a certain linguaculture. In this paper, we propose to introduce and theoretically substantiate two new concepts—*hypercode* and *sacred hypercode*—in which, in our opinion, allow us to reveal the nature and structure of cultural codes.

We define a *hypercode* as a special suprasegmental formation with a high degree of generalization and normativity. It functions as a metasemiotic mechanism regulating the interpretation of many private cultural and linguistic codes. Hypercodes ensure the coordination of meanings, supporting the unity of the cultural semiotic system and its stability over time. As a specific type of hypercode, we introduce the concept of a *sacred hypercode* — a semiotic superstructure serving the sphere of the holy, the transcendental, and ontologically significant. Sacred hypercodes codify ideas about the divine, about absolute moral values, taboos, and rituals. They act as supernormative regulators operating both in individual and collective linguistic consciousness. Among their key characteristics are a high degree of stability and ritualization, the symbolic and mythopoetic nature of expression, as well as the functions of cultural identification and integration. Sacred hypercodes form a special layer of cultural memory and discursive identity, being the most important elements in the analysis of national linguistic cultures.

Thus, the sacred hypercode acts as a key component of the semiosphere of culture, reflecting deep religious and mythopoetic structures. Its polysemy, historical layering, and semiotic density make it an important tool for analyzing the mechanisms of cultural identity formation. In different linguacultures, sacred hypercodes materialize through specific images, symbols, and archetypes that have high semiotic and value significance. One such archetypal element in the Armenian cultural paradigm is the image of the *Sun* (*Uplu/Arev*), which plays the role of a sacred hypercode. This symbol is distinguished by its stability, deep mythopoetic load, and transcendental semantics, having retained its significance in the transition from pre-Christian beliefs to the Christian tradition, as well as in everyday linguistic and

cultural practice. The sacred hypercode “*Sun*” (*Uplu*) is a key semiotic unit of the Armenian linguoculture, combining the functions of sacralization, collective identification, and historical-religious continuity. Let us present a number of arguments in favor of its special status and multi-level significance.

Ancient historical evidence, linguistic, ethnographic, and archaeological materials indicate that the original cult of worship involved some incomprehensible force, intelligence, and pure energy, called *Ar*. The famous English orientalist Archibald Sayce claims that *Ar* was the Sun god of the Armenians: “*Ar* was the name of the Sun-god of the Armenians, whose name survives in the word Ararat, and in the name of the country itself, Armenia, as well as in the name of their god Ara, who was identified with the *Sun*”^[16].

The physically visible embodiment of *Ar* was considered to be the Sun (*Aregak/Areg/Arev*), an anthropomorphic deity worshiped by the ancient Armenians, who called themselves *Arevordiner* (*Sons of the Sun*). In pre-Christian Armenia, *Uplu/Arev* was the personification of light and life. According to myths, the palace of the deity *Uplu/Arev* is in the East, at the edge of the world. In the evening, inflamed and tired, *Uplu/Arev* returns to his mother (sunset in Armenian is “*mayramut*”, “*entrance to the mother*”). According to another myth, *Uplu/Arev*, in the form of a young god, rushes across the sky, sitting on a lion, and the Lion protects him from evil spirits with its huge sword. The sign of Leo in astrology is ruled by the *Sun*, and this coincides with the Armenian cult: the eighth month of the calendar was called *Upluq/Areg* (the same as *Uplu/Arev*), and the first day of each month was also “*Areg’s day*”. That is, August (in ancient Armenian – “*Areg’s month*”) is a period under the strong influence of solar energy, personified by *Leo-Sun*^[17].

The first written evidence of sun worship in ancient Armenia belongs to Xenophon, who claims that “in Armenia horses were sacrificed to the god of the *Sun*”^[18]. This fact not only confirms the existence of a stable solar religious practice but also indicates the high sacred significance of the *Sun* as a deity in the Armenian mythopoetic system.

Over time, the cult of the *Sun* did not disappear but was transformed, preserving its key signs and meanings in various forms of cultural expression. Solar symbolism firmly entered the national pantheon, and its images became an integral part of architecture, decorative and applied arts, orna-

mentation, and traditional clothing. One of the most archaic and stable symbols is the *arevakhach* - the Armenian sign of eternity. This image, called the *arevakhach* (*solar cross*) in Armenia, is a unique synthesis of the pre-Christian solar symbol and the subsequent Christian cult, reflecting the deep continuity of sacred hypercodes in the Armenian linguaculture. Its ubiquitous presence in Armenian architecture (especially *khachkars*), stone carvings, textiles, jewelry, and modern symbolism testifies to the deep roots of this sign in the cultural memory of the Armenian people.

This stability is explained not only by the universality of the meanings embedded in the *arevakhach* but also by its deep historical stability. The earliest images of the solar cross, found in the territory of the Armenian Highlands, date back to the Neolithic period, approximately 7000 BC. For thousands of years, the *arevakhach* retained the status of a sacred sign endowed with apotropaic power. It can be seen both on prehistoric megaliths and on medieval *khachkars* - carved stone crosses with richly ornamented motifs. The semantic dichotomy of the direction of its rays is also interesting: the right-sided *arevakhach* was associated with the active, masculine principle, and the left-sided with the passive, feminine. Already in ancient times, the symbol served as a powerful amulet: its image was placed above the cradle of a newborn, depending on the sex of the child^[19]. Despite its pagan origins, the *arevakhach* was not displaced after the adoption of Christianity, but, on the contrary, was integrated into Christian semiotics. From that moment on, it began to symbolize not only the sun and fire but also eternal life in Christ, and it is in this meaning that it is widely used in architecture and on tombstones. In a culture where Christianity was one of the first to take root in the world, the *Sun* became not a pagan god, but the face of God, a sign of presence and mercy. The symbol of eternity in the center of *khachkar* is not just an ornament but a visual prayer addressed to time and eternity.

Sun worship in the Armenian environment was associated with its material manifestation on Earth — fire worship, and ancient Armenians attached great importance to the cult of fire. A peculiar combination of manifestations of fire worship and Christian beliefs is the celebration of *Spññkq/Trndez* (Meeting of the Lord). In ancient times, *Spññkq/Trndez* was a holiday dedicated to fire. According to ancient Armenian beliefs, the flame burning during *Trndez* warmed the sun,

thereby softening the cold and accelerating the arrival of spring. During the holiday, modern Armenians, like their ancestors, jump over the fire, interacting with this natural element.

More than 5,000 years ago, the Sumerians considered the sunrise on the day of the spring equinox to be special and referred to it as “*zidig/zitik*” or “*zedik/zetik*”. On this particular day, the *Sun* (the *Sun God*) rises over the two peaks of Masis (the second name for Ararat mountain). The word “*zidig/zitik*” or “*zedik/zetik*” in Sumerian is translated as “true sunrise” or “legitimate sunrise”, reflecting its essence - the day of the equinox is the only day of the year when the sun rises exactly in the east^[20]. In the Armenian national religious system, the word “*zidig/zadeg/zatik*” had the same meaning and was used to celebrate the equinox in honor of the birth of the *Sun God Vahagn* and the ritual celebrations associated with it. This solar holiday, widely celebrated in the ancient world, was identified by Christianity with the resurrection of Christ. The holiday of the Sun God was forgotten, but owing to Mesrop Mashtots (a monk and linguist who invented the Armenian alphabet), the name of the holiday was preserved in the national consciousness and language. In the translation of the Bible, he used the Armenian name “*Zatik*” instead of the word “*pasek*”. The centuries-old tradition emphasizes the deep cultural and religious significance of the vernal equinox in the history of Armenia.

The cult of the Sun in the Armenian culture is also reflected in festive dishes such as *gata*. Armenian *gata*, a traditional dish often round in shape, has deep roots in the Armenian culture and history, including those associated with the cult of the Sun. The round shape of the *gata*, symbolizing the sun, the source of life and warmth, is a key element of its traditional meaning. Performing the “*Gata dance*” during a wedding is believed to bring good luck to the couple’s family. A grain or a coin is placed in the round *gata*, which is considered to contribute to the well-being and success of the family, and finding the coin brings good luck^[21].

In pagan times, there were cult dances in honor of the *Sun God*. These dances (*Kochari*, *Ver-veri*, *Echmiadzin*, *Shoror*, etc.), often performed collectively, can be interpreted as rituals aimed at attracting the sun and displacing negative forces. For example, one of them repeated the shape of the celestial body. When the dancers moved forward and narrowed the circle, it meant sunset; when they moved out of

the circle — sunrise. They took 12 steps, six in each direction, and this number was not accidental — it symbolized the signs of the zodiac. The dancers bowed to the Sun as a sign of respect and veneration. With the advent of Christianity, the dance did not disappear but was rethought. It was called “*Echmiadzin*” — after the first Christian church in Armenia. The essence of worship and prayer remains, but now the 12 steps do not represent the zodiacs signs, but apostles^[22].

There is a syncretism of paganism and Christianity, as a result of which ancient ritual forms were not eliminated, but transformed and adapted to the new religious paradigm. Such processes correspond to the mechanisms of secondary modeling of consciousness^[23], in which cultural processes and re-encode previous sign systems within the framework of new ideological and religious contexts. In this case, elements of pagan dance associated with the cosmological cycle and astral symbolism were interpreted through the prism of Christian teaching: the number 12, initially correlated with the zodiac circle, receives a new sacred load, relating to the 12 apostles. This indicates that archaic forms of sacred action do not disappear when the religious system changes, but continue to function in a modified semiotic shell. This ensures cultural continuity^[23], and the sacred hypercode retains its relevance, becoming an element of collective cultural memory.

Thus, we observe a stable cultural mechanism in which ancient archetypes do not disappear with the advent of a new religious paradigm but are rethought and continue to exist in a transformed form. Armenian culture, in this case, demonstrates the process of integrating new meanings into old forms, typical of ancient civilizations, which helps preserve continuity, strengthens national identity, and supports the symbolic integrity of the semiosphere.

Against this background, the linguistic aspect is of particular interest, in which a stable line of symbolic and sacred interpretation of the *Sun* is manifested. The Armenian language turns out to be not just a means of communication but also a bearer of deep mythological structures reflecting sacred meanings rooted in the collective consciousness of the people. From vocabulary to poetic and idiomatic constructions, from folk songs to medieval literature, “*Uplu*”/“*Arev*” remains a universal sign of life, truth, and heavenly order. These traces appear at various levels of the language: in vocabulary, onomastics, toponymy, and paremiology, as well as

in the symbolism recorded in folklore and mythological tradition. These manifestations are not just linguistic archaisms but reflect deep cultural and ideological layers, testifying to the ancient solar cult, which left its mark on the national linguistic picture of the world.

The lexical composition of the Armenian language preserves deep traces of ancient symbolism associated with the sun. Particularly indicative in this context is the fact that there are more than 400 words in the Armenian language that contain the component “*upl*” in their structure. This testifies not only to the linguistic richness but also to the strong rootedness of solar semantics in the worldview and cultural system of the Armenian people: *upluhhuil/arevahan* (literary — *with a taste of the Sun*) — “*sweetness, sweet taste acquired under the influence of the Sun*”; *upluquq/arevagal* (literary — *the arrival of the Sun*) — “*sunrise*”; *upluδuq/arevatsag* (literary — *birth of the Sun*) — “*dawn, the appearance of the Sun*”; *upluquyuzin/arevapashd* — “*Sun worshiper*”; *upluquyurā* (arevadarts) — “*return of the Sun, solstice*”; *upluquyurk* (arevazurk) — “*deprived of the Sun*”; *upluquyur* (arevatu) (literary — *Sun giver*) — “*sunny*”; *upluquyurh/arevashkharh* (literary — *country of the Sun*) — “*sunny land*”; *upluδhū* (arevatsin) — “*born of the Sun*”; *upluquyug* (arevahayats) — “*looking at the Sun*”, *upluquyur* (arevazard) — “*adorned with sunlight, bathed in it*”; *upluquyurpūā* (arevahambarts) — “*rising towards the Sun*”, *upluquyurpūy* (arevahamppuyr) — “*kissed by the Sun*”, *upluquyur* (arevamayr) — “*mother of the Sun*”, *upluquyur* (arevmanuk) — “*sunny boy*”, *upluquyur* (arevhatik) — “*Sun grain*”, etc.^[24].

As we have already noted, in the distant past *Ar/Ara* was the main deity of the indigenous peoples of the Armenian Highland, and since they were usually called by the name of this god, it is natural to expect that some toponyms contained the name of this deity or the people bearing his name. And indeed, in ancient times the entire Armenian Highland abounded in names containing the component *Ar* or *Ara*, and in modern Armenia, all these historical toponyms have been preserved: *Uruquun/Ararat*; *Uruquun/Artashat*; *Uruquun/Aravashogh*; *Uruquun/Aragats*; *Uruquun/Aragatsotn*; *Uruquun/Artik*. According to the dictionary of toponyms of Armenia and adjacent regions, there are more than 80 toponyms with the word “*upl*”/“*arev*”, and more than 1000 geographical names beginning with the component

Ar^[25].

Thus, both the structural and word-formation productivity of the root “Ար”/“*Ar*” and “Արև”/“*Arev*” in the Armenian language not only emphasize the deep rootedness of solar symbolism but also point to the close connection between language, mythology, and spatial-cultural identity. These linguistic traces of sun worship are not confined to vocabulary or toponymy – they continue to exist in everyday speech practice, and culturally colored communication formulas, in which the sacred meaning of the sun is preserved as part of the national symbolic consciousness.

Many examples of sun worship survivals have been especially preserved in national folklore. In Armenian folk tales, the sun appears not only as a natural element but also as a personified force with will, character, and sacred function. The image of the sun is presented in a mythopoetic coordinate system, where it can be both a protector and a judge, a benefactor or a punishing principle. Sun worship is found in the image of both female and male heroes, symbolizing the universality and transcendence of this cosmogonic category. The names of the main characters, which retain a direct connection with solar symbolism, are especially noteworthy: *Արևաւն/Aravat* — “a seed of the Sun”, a symbol of the life principle; *Արևաւնայր/Aravamayr* — “Mother of the Sun”, the archetype of the solar goddess or the feminine principle, personifying light and fertility; *Արևաւնակ/Aravmanuk* — “Sun-boy”, the image of a hero-light-bearer, often endowed with supernatural qualities, defeating darkness and injustice. These names and images in folklore are not random artistic devices but are culturally motivated concepts reflecting the deep archetypes of the Armenian linguaculture, in which the solar hypercode remains a stable element of the worldview even centuries after Christianization.

Thus, folklore, which has preserved mythopoetic images, demonstrates the vitality of archetypes dating back to pre-Christian solar mythology. This semantic stability is manifested not only in the plots and symbolic motifs of fairy tales but also penetrates everyday elements of culture, including anthroponymy.

In no other country in the world will you find as many personal names beginning with “*Ar*” as in Armenia. The first written mentions of personal names starting with “*Ar*” date back to the 1st century BC. In M. Khorenatsi’s work *History of Armenia*, the names of 11 Armenian patriarchs

are mentioned, 5 of which begin with “*Ar*”: *Aramanyak*, *Aramais*, *Arma*, *Aram*, *Ara the Beautiful*. Then *Artavazd*, *Artashes*, *Ariobarzan*, *Arshak*, *Arsham*, *Artavan*, *Arkegayos*, *Arshavir*, *Artashir*, and other names are mentioned. In the inscriptions of the kings of the Kingdom of Van, we find the names *Arame*, *Argishti*, *Erimena*, to which are added *Artak*, *Aramazd*, *Armen*, *Armenak*, *Artem*, *Artan*, *Arsen*, *Areg*, *Arbak*, *Artsrun*, *Armanush*, *Arevik*, *Armine*, *Arpi*, *Armenui*, and other names^[26].

Even today, the use of solar symbols in male and female names is widespread in Armenian culture, which demonstrates the profound symbolic meaning of the *Sun* in the worldview of the people. Many names directly or indirectly contain the idea of light, radiance, divinity, vitality, or protection. For example *Արեգ/Areg* — “Sun”, “Sacred movement (sign)”; *Արնույ/Artak* — “Striving for the Sun”; *Արնշահ/Arushan* — “Solar face”; *Արշակունի/Arshavir* — “Solar hero”; *Արշակ/Arshak* — “Life-giving Sun”; *Վաղարշակ/Vagharshak* — “Omnipresent Sun”; *Վահագն/Vahak* — “The Omnipresent Sun”; *Վաղինակ/Vaghinak* — “Solar Warrior”; *Քերոպ/Kerop* — “Solar Arrow”; *Մեր/Mher* — “Sunny”; *Մելքոն/Melkon* — “Meeting the Sun”; *Մելքում/Melkum* — “Welcoming the Dawn”; *Միգրան/Migran* — “Sunny face”; *Արեւիկ/Arevik* — “Sun”, “Sacred Movement”; *Արեւիկեան/Arpenik* — “Sun”, “Holy Protection”; *Արս/Arus* — “Solar”; *Եգինե/Egine* — “Rushed to the Sun” and many others. These names not only preserve the relics of archaic solar cults but also continue to function as cultural markers carrying mythological and sacred meanings. Such onomastic heritage demonstrates how the sacred hypercode “*Sun*” penetrates the basic categories of self-identification and is passed down through generations as the most important component of national symbolic capital.

Traces of worship of the sun god *Ar/Ara* have also been preserved in the Armenian pagan calendar. Thus: “The 6th month of the pagan calendar was called *Arats*, “it denoted the days of the Ars/Armenians/ and was dedicated to the festivities of the god *Ara*.” V. A Khachatryan believes that *Arats* “should denote the days of *Ara*”^[27].

One of the most striking manifestations of the deep sacralization of the sun in the Armenian linguistic culture is its persistent presence in the formulas of oaths and ritual speech that have survived to this day. It is difficult today to

point to another nation that, having been Christian for 1724 years, continues to swear by the sun: “*I swear by the sun of my father*” (*hnpu uplu — ho’res arev*), “*I swear by the sun of my mother*” (*vnpu uplu — mo’res arev*), “*I swear by the sun of my child*” (*kplhunu uplu — erekhu’s arev*), “*I swear by my sun*” (*hu uplu — im arev*), and even the sun of one’s interlocutor “*I swear by your sun*” (*pn uplu — qo arev*). These expressions are linguistic archaisms that have preserved elements of pre-Christian sun worship in the structure of everyday speech, which indicates the deep-rootedness of the solar sacred hypercode in the consciousness of native speakers.

The *Sun*, being one of the central sacred symbols in the Armenian linguaculture, often appears in an inverted, “dark” semantics – in the structure of curses and expressions of grief. The archaic phrase “*uplu hn’er nlu*” (*arevd hogē dnem*, literally “*let your sun lie in the ground*”, synonym: “*uplu jounlu*” – *arevd t’agem*) expresses the extreme degree of a curse, implying the loss of vitality, happiness, or offspring. Expressions like “*arevā t’agel*”, “*arevā sev anel*”, “*arevin sev ga*” are used in the context of death, misfortune, or deep sorrow, where the sun – a symbol of life and light – is painted in mourning tones or disappears altogether. Such idioms demonstrate the ambivalence of the solar symbol, which simultaneously acts as a source of life (vital force and the most precious person) and as a marker of its end (the loss of a child or a loved one, as a symbolic “fading of the *Sun*”).

One of the culturally specific expressions of the Armenian language is the phrase “*Achkd luys*”, which literally translates as “*light to your eye*”. Despite the literal reference to the organ of vision and light, the expression functions as a formula of congratulations and good wishes. It is used in a variety of contexts, including at the birth of a child, when receiving good news, or when acquiring something new and significant. Semantically, this phrase contains a culturally marked idea of light as a symbol of goodness, joy, and renewal, and the eye is perceived as a channel for perceiving this grace. Thus, “*uxn jnyu*”/“*achkd luys*” is a vivid example of a stable, well-wishing expression that combines poetry, mythopoetic imagery, and emotional support of the interlocutor.

Linguistic formulas of an oath with the mention of the sun are not the only manifestation of the vitality of the solar sacred hypercode in the Armenian linguaculture. Its semantic

core, associated with the ideas of light, truth, divine justice, and protection, is further reflected in the paremiological fund — proverbs and sayings, where the sun acts not only as a physical object but also as a moral and value symbol.

In Armenian proverbs and sayings, the sun often acts as a symbol of truth, justice, and hope (more than 60 sayings). Such symbolism continues the tradition of representing the *Sun* as the supreme witness and bearer of moral order, which goes back to the idea of the solar deity as a judge and source of justice: “*Արևը ճշմարտության է սիրում*” — “*The sun loves truth*”; “*Արևի տակ տուր չի թաքնվում*” — “*A lie cannot be hidden under the sun*”; the sun as a symbol of blessing: “*Գարնան արևը տղու ու հարսիս վրա, աշնան արևը փեսիս ու աղջկա*” — “*May the spring sunshine on my son and daughter-in-law, and the autumn sunshine on my son-in-law and daughter*”; the sun as a metaphor of a daughter for a mother (compare the moon as a metaphor of a daughter for a father): “*Հոր համար աղջկը լուսին է, մոր համար արեգակ*” — “*For a father, a daughter is like a moon, and for a mother, like a sun*” and others^[27].

The symbolic load of the sun as a sacred hypercode is especially clearly manifested in the idioms and set expressions of the Armenian language (150 idioms), where the *Sun* performs the metaphorical function of the bearer of higher moral, ontological, and cognitive meanings. Below are examples of such expressions, in which the solar image is used to mark complex mental and ethical concepts: “*արևի մերը մեռել է*” / “*arevi mery merel e*” (literary “the mother of the sun died”) — “the heat has subsided, autumn has come”; “*արևն ուտել*” / “*arevn utel*” — (literary “to eat the sun”) — to live somehow, to exist; “*արևը ջուր էր խմում*”/“*arev jurer khmum*” (literary “the sun drinks water”) — is used when the sun either hides behind the clouds or comes out; “*արևը գգել մեկի նստանին*” / *arev gtsel meki chakatin*” — (literary “to place the sun on someone’s brow”) — shift blame or responsibility to someone else; “*արևին աղոթք անել*” / “*arevin aghotk’anel*” — (literary “pray to the sun”) — to appeal to the unattainable, to appeal in vain; “*արևի հետ խոսել*” / “*arevi het khosel*” — (literary “to talk to the sun”) — to talk in vain, not to be heard; “*արևը մի կողմ քաշել*” / “*arev mi koghm k’ashel*” — (literary “to push the sun aside”) — to try to change the natural order of things, to do the impossible or daring; “*արևից երես անել*” / “*arevits yeres arnel*” — (literary “to turn away from the sun”) — to

avoid the truth, justice, to feel shame, etc. [28].

Since the sun also had a sacred status among the Celts and Anglo-Saxons in the pre-Christian period, we will try to analyze this cultural code in English linguaculture.

A comparison shows both the universality and the cultural specificity of this archetype. The Celts did not worship the *Sun* but considered it a symbol of a bright divine principle. All Celts worshiped such deities, but in different places, they were often called by different names. An example of this was the god *Lugus*, who is mentioned in late Irish mythology as *Lug*, and later in Welsh mythology under the name *Lleu Llaw Gyffes* [29]. Among different Celtic peoples and at different times, the *Sun* changed its gender. For the Irish and Welsh, even the word “sun” was originally feminine, and in Irish mythology there was a beautiful maiden under the names of *Igraine*, *Graine*, *Graine*, *Granne*, etc. (all derived from the Irish word “*grian*” — “sun”) [29].

In pre-Christian England, the early Anglo-Saxons used a runic system as an alphabet, in which the *Sigel* rune symbolized the sun as the force of success and victory, playing an apotropaic role [30].

On the day of the summer solstice, the ancient Celts celebrated the festival of *Litha*, or *Midsummer*. The connection with the cult of the *Sun* was emphasized by the custom of rolling wheels wrapped in straw and lit from mountains or steep river cliffs. On this day, ritual fires were necessarily set alight, over which couples wishing to tie the knot jumped (this can be compared with the aforementioned Armenian *Trndez*). With Christianization of Britain, the solar archetype received new theological content. As in the Armenian tradition, in the English biblical discourse, Christ appears as the “*Sun of righteousness*” (Malachi 4:2), which indicates a common theological basis for both traditions [31]. This metaphor is widely used in Anglican liturgy and religious poetry. The *Sun* appears as a symbol of divine light, truth, and salvation in the works of Chaucer, Milton, and later Victorian authors [32]. In material culture, the sacred image of the *Sun* is manifested particularly, in Celtic crosses, where a circle (*solar disk*) frames the cross; typologically, this is similar to Armenian *khachkars*. Like Armenian culture, Anglo-Saxon (Celtic) culture shows that the *Sun*, inscribed in the Christian symbol, also did not lose its pre-Christian meaning. For the ancient Celts, a circle represented a life cycle — the unity of the four elements, seasons, life, and death. Thus, the *Sun*

here became not just heavenly light, but a sign of a world arranged in a circle, where everything returns: winter gives way to spring, death gives way to life.

The image of the *Sun* in English linguaculture has symbolic meaning, manifested in toponymy, anthroponymy, and cultural codes. Unlike the Armenian sacred tradition, in England, the *Sun* is perceived primarily as a metaphor for vital energy, optimism, clarity, and well-being. *Sunbury-on-Thames* is a town in Surrey (the name can be interpreted as “*sunny settlement*”); *Sunninghill* and *Sunningdale* are toponyms that go back to the Old English name *Sunna* (associated with the Goddess of the *Sun*). In the English-language cultural tradition, the forms *Sunny* and *Sunshine* are widely used — the former as diminutive names, the latter as nicknames that carry positive, life-affirming semantics.

In English linguaculture, blessings are stable formulas conveying good wishes and poetic metaphors. Unlike the Armenian tradition, where the sacredness of the *Sun* is manifested in religious and folkloric blessings (for example, “*Աստուծոյ Արևի տու*”/“*Astvats Arevd ta*” — literally “*May God give you the Sun*” or “*May God give you light/happiness*”), in English culture solar images act more as poetic and emotional metaphors, for example, the Irish blessing: *May the sun shine warm upon your face*, and rains fall soft upon your fields... [33]. Here, the *Sun* symbolizes warmth, protection, well-being, and connection with nature. This formula reflects the agrarian roots of Celtic culture and a close connection with the natural cycle.

Wishes and greetings with solar symbolism in Armenian culture, such as “*Թող արևը լինի քո նսնասպարհին*” (*May the Sun be on your path*), traditionally contain a wish for happiness and heavenly protection, appealing to the faithful accompaniment of light. In the English version, for example, “*Sending you sunshine and smiles today!*” [34], the intention is emotionally positive intention, but without a deep symbolic reference. This shift reflects different models of attitudes towards the world and symbolism in the post-Christian tradition: in Armenia, a vertical (cosmic) model; in England, a horizontal (human-centric) one.

Such expressions are widespread in modern English-language epistolary and congratulatory traditions. Here, the *Sun* acts as a metaphor for inner light, warmth, and joy. In English blessings, the *Sun* functions not as a sacred symbol but as a poetic image conveying psychological and emotional

support. It retains positive semantics but does not perform the function of a sacred hypercode, as in Armenian culture.

Personal characteristics are also expressed through solar metaphors. The Armenian expression “*սրկսննսն մսրդ*” (“*a person similar to the Sun*”) carries connotations of a bright, blessed personality, often associated with sacred purity. In contrast, the English term *sunny person* primarily conveys a cheerful and friendly personality, without implying any religious or mystical undertones.

In the English lexicon, compound words with the component “*sun*” are quite limited in number (approximately 80 compound words) and most cases they have a specific and utilitarian meaning, for example: *sunlight, sundress, sunfish, sunflower, sunshine, sunspot, sunstroke, sunrise, sundown, sunbeam*, etc. In contrast, in the Armenian, the number of compound words with the component “*սրկ*”, as already noted, exceeds 400 units. Such a significant number of compound words with the component denoting “*sun*” in the Armenian, testifies to the greater importance and sacredness of this cultural code in the Armenian linguistic and cultural picture of the world. According to the *Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms*^[35] and the *Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs*^[36], English idioms and proverbs related to the *Sun* (about 30 idioms and 25 proverbs) demonstrate a stable positive perception of this symbol, associating it with success, opportunities, the light of truth, and emotional warmth. The *Sun* often symbolizes: truth (*truth comes to light; a false friend and a shadow stay only while the sun shines*), hope (*after darkness comes the sun*), and justice (*the sun shines on the righteous*).

Unlike the sacred and religious code of the Armenian tradition, the *Sun* most often symbolizes clarity of thought, emotional warmth, love of life, and the impulse to action, which is reflected in set expressions and idioms of modern English. Thus, the expression “*to have a sunny disposition*” is used to describe a person with a kind, bright disposition. A similar meaning is conveyed by the idiom “*a ray of sunshine*”, denoting a person who brings joy and warmth into the lives of others. Optimism associated with the *Sun* is also expressed in the proverb “*make hay while the sun shines*”, which encourages action in favorable conditions — symbolically appealing to light as a metaphor for opportunity and productivity. In addition, the expression “*everything under the Sun*” demonstrates the idea of abundance, the fullness

of being, and the universality of human experience within the action of sunlight. A special place in the English language picture of the world is occupied by the expression “*The sun never sets on the British Empire*”, which, since the Early Modern period, has become a metaphor for expansion, global influence, and the ideology of Enlightenment accompanying colonial processes. The *Sun* in this context symbolizes not only the geographical extent of the empire but also the assertion of order, control, and rationality — values closely associated with the Enlightenment. Thus, in English linguaculture, the *Sun* is transformed from an object of worship into a symbol of bright emotionality, intellectual clarity, and historical dominance, while in the Armenian tradition, it continues to function as a cosmic and sacred core, carrying the semantic load of the eternal divine order.

Thus, the proposed concept of a hypercode, possessing metasemiotic functions of coordination and hierarchization of meanings in a cultural system can be productively extrapolated to the analysis of other symbols possessing deep sacralization and a high degree of cultural rootedness. Like the solar archetype, such archetypal symbols as the Cross, the Tree, the Moon, and the Fire represent stable semiotic complexes whose function goes beyond the local meaning and manifests itself as meaning-organizing structures in the linguacultural matrix. These elements of the cultural semiosphere can be considered as nodal points of hypercodes that form cognitive schemes, value guidelines, and ritual behavior patterns within a certain ethnocultural tradition. For example, the cultural hypercode “Cross” is one of the most powerful and polysemantic semiotic constructs, functioning both within the Christian sacred semiosphere and beyond it, adapting to various cultural matrices. In Armenian linguoculture, the Cross (խաչ) functions not only as a religious symbol associated with Christian identity and martyrdom but also as an element of the ethnocultural code, embodied, for example, in the tradition of khachkars (խաչքար) - stone crosses that symbolize faith, memory, sacrifice, and collective immortality. The Armenian cross is usually decorated with plant ornaments, which give it the semantics of cosmic harmony, life, and rebirth, combining sacred and natural registers. In English-language linguoculture, the symbol of the Cross also has a complex semiotic load. In addition to its direct religious function (crucifix, sign of the Cross), it can act as a sign of suffering and redemption (to bear one’s cross),

as a symbol of fate or a heavy burden, and also as an element of moral or ideological identification (for example, the cross as an emblem of the Crusaders or as a symbol of the national flags — St. George's Cross, St. Andrew's Cross, etc.). In the Anglo-Saxon cultural matrix, the Cross, especially in the poetic tradition (cf. the Old English poem *The Dream of the Rood*), is understood not only as an instrument of execution but also as a living subject carrying out a mission of salvation, connecting the sacred with the heroic. Thus, despite the differences in visual, discursive, and ritual implementation, the Cross in both linguacultures functions as a sacred hypercode: it coordinates a wide range of symbolic meanings — from sacrifice and salvation to national identity and memory. Its semiotic stability, historical richness, and ability to integrate multiple contexts confirm the hypothesis of hypercodes as metasemiotic structures that organize the hierarchy of cultural meanings within a certain semiosphere. Thus, this theoretical model demonstrates its heuristic value, allowing us to identify and describe the deep mechanisms of conceptualization in various linguacultures and form the basis for a comparative analysis of intercultural semiotics.

5. Conclusions

The conducted analysis of the sacred hypercode “*Uplu*”/“*Arev*”, within the framework of Armenian linguaculture in comparison with English linguaculture, confirms its status as one of the fundamental elements of cultural and discursive identity. This hypercode embodies a synthesis of archaic mythological ideas, ritual practice, symbolic representation, and stable linguistic formulas reflecting the deep value attitudes of the people. In Armenian culture, the image of the *Sun* performs not only a metaphysical but also an integrative one — it connects various historical eras, religious paradigms, and semiotic systems, acting as a universal mediator of sacred knowledge.

Particular importance in the structure of the sacred hypercode is given to its mythopoetic dimension, in which the *Sun* is perceived as an anthropomorphic deity, the source of life, light, and justice. As the analysis showed, this idea has been preserved for thousands of years, from pre-Christian cults to Christian symbolism, in which solar and Christian semiotics were synthesized in a single visual-symbolic image. This semiotic continuity testifies to a high degree of

stability and the cultural normativity of the sacred hypercode.

The *Sun* as a hypercode performs several key functions: *sacralization* (connection with the divine principle), *identification-integration* (unification of cultural bearers through a common symbolic resource), *cognitive-structuring* (modeling the picture of the world through solar metaphors), and *communicative-pragmatic* (representation of values in everyday speech). These functions are manifested both in language (stable expressions, nominal forms, vocabulary, and paremiology) and cultural materiality: architecture, decorative and applied arts, and folklore. It should be especially noted that in the Armenian linguaculture the sacred hypercode *Sun* acts not only as a symbol of eternity, light, and life, but also as a means of actualizing deep cultural memory. Its ubiquitous presence in *khachkars*, traditions, and paremiology, as well as in the system of names and oath formulas, indicates its active functioning in modern linguistic consciousness. Thus, the sacred hypercode *Sun* in the Armenian linguistic picture of the world is a unique metasemiotic structure that ensures centuries-old continuity, cultural integrity, and value stability. In the Armenian linguaculture, the *Sun* has a pronounced mythopoetic and religious component. It is considered a transcendental principle, divine power, source of life, light, time, and justice. Its image is deeply integrated into the linguistic fabric — from idiomatic formulas to names, ritual practices, and architectural symbolism. Armenian linguistic consciousness today continues to perceive the *Sun* as a sacred symbol associated with spiritual continuity, collective identity, and cultural memory. Its study allows us to better understand the mechanisms of formation of cultural identity, the role of the sacred in linguistic consciousness, and the specifics of the interaction of mythological and religious layers in the national semiosphere.

In English linguaculture, the image of the *Sun* also occupies an important place, but its functions and symbolic contents are predominantly metaphorical, poetic, and philosophical. In the English language, the symbolic cultural code the *Sun* is more often associated with positive emotional states, vital energy, beginnings, hope, and love. It acts as a universal symbol, devoid of a specific religious or ritual connotations. For example, in English poetry and prose, the *Sun* often symbolizes renewal, spring, and enlightenment, but rarely the sacred in a narrow sense. The metalinguistic status of the *Sun* here is limited to aesthetic, emotional, and

cognitive functions. In the Armenian language, the *Sun* is actively present in vocabulary, set expressions, oaths, names, and rituals. In English, it is more often present in literary discourse and idioms, but without a sacred connotations.

Considering culture as a cognitive-semiotic system has enabled us to establish several significant provisions regarding the nature and functioning of cultural codes. We are convinced that culture is formed and exists thanks to a complex network of signs, symbols, and concepts stored in the linguistic consciousness of native speakers. These signs serve as the basis for understanding the surrounding world, facilitating communication, and shaping identity, thereby ensuring the transmission of culturally significant information. The main conclusions of our analysis are the following:

- Cultural codes function as a system of rules regulating the interpretation and reproduction of cultural meanings, acting simultaneously at the conscious and unconscious levels of human experience.
- Semantics and structures of natural language play an important role in the recording and transmission of cultural values, performing not only communicative but also cognitive functions.
- The most important components of cultural codes are key concepts (cultural keywords), which speakers use to express the most essential meanings and ideals for a given culture. These keywords not only reflect mental attitudes and values but also serve as the core for the formation of various types of cultural codes, including sacred hypercodes and symbolic cultural codes. In particular, sacred hypercodes, such as the Sun and the Cross, are formed on the basis of stable cultural representations fixed in the language through specific lexemes and semantic fields. Symbolic cultural codes, in turn, also rely on such keywords, which, through multi-layered associations and mythological structures, ensure the stability and reproducibility of cultural meanings within a specific linguaculture. Thus, cultural codes perform the function of semiotic anchors linking the superficial and deep levels of culture, ensuring the unity of the linguistic, symbolic, and sacred components of the cultural space.

To continue research in the field of cultural codes, it is important to develop several key areas that allow us to approach the problem in a comprehensive and well-rounded

way. Firstly, a detailed study of the cultural matrix is emerging as a promising area. Understanding the internal structure of cultural codes will open up opportunities for deep insight into the processes of the formation of individual and collective worldviews, allowing us to identify patterns and principles in the functioning of these systems. Secondly, modern technologies provide ample opportunities for computer modeling of cultural codes. The use of artificial intelligence and machine learning allows us to analyze large volumes of texts, revealing hidden semantics and helping us better understand the peculiarities of cultures in different regions of the world. The third area is related to the study of the dynamic component of cultural codes. In the era of globalization and intensive intercultural communication, analyzing the changes and adaptations of cultural codes is particularly relevant. Identifying the factors influencing the stability and ability of cultures to change is of great importance for predicting social processes and developing effective approaches to intercultural interaction. Finally, successfully solving problems related to cultural codes requires the involvement of specialists from various fields of science. The integration of efforts by psychologists, sociologists, philosophers, and anthropologists will allow us to create a more complete picture of the nature of cultural codes and their role in society, contributing to the development of a holistic and multifaceted picture of culture.

A comparative analysis of the Armenian and English linguacultures shows that the same universal symbols, such as the Sun, can occupy fundamentally different semiotic positions depending on the cultural matrix. In the Armenian tradition, the solar archetype retains the status of a sacred center included in religious, folklore, and everyday practice, while in the English culture, it is largely reinterpreted in a secular and psychological key, associated with mood, character, and emotional coloring. These differences in the status and functions of key symbols reflect broader typological features of cultural codes and emphasize the need to take into account deep semiotic differences in the practice of intercultural communication. An adequate understanding of such symbolic discrepancies helps minimize the risk of misunderstanding, promotes more accurate translation and interpretation of cultural messages, and creates the basis for a sustainable and respectful dialogue between representatives of different linguacultures.

Despite the theoretical generalizations and examples presented in the work, the analysis of sacred hypercodes as elements of the cultural matrix faces a number of methodological and empirical limitations. Firstly, the problem of operationalizing the concept of “hypercode” in empirical studies remains unresolved: its high level of abstractness and interdisciplinary nature complicate the development of unified analytical criteria that would allow for the precise identification and comparison of hypercodes across different linguacultures. Secondly, additional research is needed on the mechanisms of cognitive acquisition and actualization of hypercodes in individual and collective linguistic consciousness, especially in the context of globalization, migration and cultural hybridization. Thirdly, there is a shortage of language corpora that adequately reflect the sacred and symbolic layers of culture, especially with respect to poorly studied or dying languages. In addition, there remains a risk of Eurocentrism in the interpretation of universal symbols (such as the Cross, the Sun, the Tree, etc.), which can have radically different semiotic functions in different cultures. Future research could be aimed at systematically comparing sacred hypercodes in a broad typological and cultural-historical context, as well as developing digital tools (corpus semiotics, semantic modeling) that allow visualizing the dynamics of meanings and identifying deep cross-cultural structures.

Thus, this work opens up new prospects for the further development of the theory and practice of studying cultural codes, emphasizing the importance of integrating the linguistic approach with general semiotic theories and methods.

Author Contributions

Both authors have made the same contribution to the writing of the article. Both authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

This study does not require ethical review and approval, as humans and animals were not directly involved in this study.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Karasik, V., 2002. *Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse*. Peremena: Volgograd, Russia. (in Russian)
- [2] Wierzbicka, A., 1997. *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.
- [3] Geertz, C., 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. Basic Books: New York, NY, USA.
- [4] Lotman, Y., 1992. *Articles on Semiotics and Typology of Culture, Vol. I*. Aleksandra: Tallinn, Estonia. pp. 191–199.
- [5] Lotman, Y., 1996. *Inside the Universes of the Mind. Iazyki russkoi kul'tury*: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [6] Eco, U., 1976. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington, IL, USA.
- [7] Karasik, V., 2004. *Language Circle: Values, Concepts, Communication*. Peremena: Volgograd, Russia. (in Russian)
- [8] Lakoff, G., Johnson, M., 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA.
- [9] Bakhtin, M., 1979. *The Aesthetics of Verbal Creativity*. Iskusstvo: Moscow, USSR. (in Russian)
- [10] Lefebvre, V., 1991. *Conflicting Structures*. Nauka: Moscow, USSR. (in Russian)
- [11] Levi-Strauss, C., 1970. *The Raw and the Cooked: Mythologiques I*. Jonathan Cape: London, UK.
- [12] Barthes, R., 1974. *S/Z* (Miller, R. Trans.). Hill and Wang: New York, NY, USA.
- [13] Bourdieu, P., 1979. *The Distinction: Social Critique of Judgment*. Éditions de Minuit: Paris, France. (in French)
- [14] Foucault, M., 1977. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Progress: Moscow, USSR. (in Russian)
- [15] Kubryakova, E., 2004. *Language and knowledge. Towards the creation of cognitive linguistics. Yazyki slavianskoi kul'tury*: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [16] Sayce, A.H., 1903. *Lecture XII: The Religion of the Hittites and of Ancient Armenia*. In: *The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*. Morrison and Gibb

- limited, for T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, UK.
- [17] Wikipedia, n.d. Arev. Available from: <https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ruwiki/1280141> (cited 5 May 2025).
- [18] Xenophon, 1951. *Anabasis*. Academy of Sciences: Moscow, USSR. (in Russian)
- [19] Radio Van, n.d. Armenian Sun: Symbolism and Cultural Significance. Available from: <https://radiovan.fm/station/article/7721> (cited 18 May 2025).
- [20] Vstrokax.net, n.d. Ancient tradition of the spring equinox. Available from: <https://vstrokax.net/drevnyaya-armeniya/drevnyaya-tradicziya-vesennego-ravnodenstviya/> (cited 26 May 2025).
- [21] Intangible Cultural Heritage of Armenia, n.d. The production of Armenian gata and its cultural manifestations. Available from: <https://int-heritage.am/ru/making-of-the-armenian-gata-and-its-cultural-manifestations/> (cited 14 April 2025).
- [22] Move2Armenia, n.d. Armenian National Dances: What and How Armenians Dance. Available from: <https://move2armenia.am/ru/kultura/armyanskie-naczionalnye-tancy-cto-i-kak-tanczuyut-armyane/> (cited 25 May 2025).
- [23] Lotman, Y., 1998. The structure of a literary text. *About art*. Iskustvo–SPB: St. Petersburg, Russia. (in Russian)
- [24] Assmann, J., 2004. Cultural memory: Writing, Memory of the Past, and Political Identity in Ancient High Cultures (Miloslavskaya, A.Y. Trans.). *Yazyki slavianskoi kul'tury*: Moscow, Russia. (in Russian)
- [25] Language Institute named after Hrachya Acharyan, 1969–1980. *Explanatory Dictionary of Modern Armenian Language*. Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR: Yerevan, Armenia. (in Armenian)
- [26] Hakobyan, T.K., Melik-Bakhshyan, S.T., Barseghyan, H.K., 1986. *Dictionary of Toponyms of Armenia and Neighboring Regions, Vol I*. YPH hrat: Yerevan, Armenia. (in Armenian)
- [27] Khorenatsi, M., 1981. *History of the Armenians*. Yerevani Hamalsarani Hratarakchutyun: Yerevan, Armenia. (in Armenian)
- [28] Ghanalanyan, A.T., Pivazyan, E.A., (eds.), 1960. *Arats'ani*. Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR: Yerevan, Armenia. (in Armenian)
- [29] Sukiasyan, A.M., Galstyan, S.A., 1975. *Phraseological Dictionary of the Armenian Language*. Yerevani Hamalsarani Hratarakch'ut'yun: Yerevan, Armenia. (in Armenian)
- [30] Green, M., 1995. *The Celtic World*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [31] Green, M., 1992. *Symbol and Image in Celtic Religious Art*. Routledge: London, UK.
- [32] Frye, N., 1981. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. Academic Press: Toronto, Canada.
- [33] Woodhead, L., 2004. *An Introduction to Christianity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [34] Country Living, n.d. 50 sunshine quotes to brighten your day. Available from: <https://www.countryliving.com/life/g28412003/sunshine-quotes/> (cited 5 June 2025).
- [35] White, J.G., 1998. *The Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [36] Simpson, J., Speake, J., (eds.), 2008. *The Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs*, 5th ed. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/978019539536.001.0001>