

---

## THE USE OF ZOOMORPHISM IN SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY

*Azimova Nigora Anvar qizi,*

*Babamuradov Oybek Salijanovich*  
*English Teachers of Shakhrisabz state*  
*Pedagogical Institute*

**Abstract.** The purpose of this section is to demonstrate how zoomorphism works as a scientific process. The first thing to observe is that the overall explanatory technique zoomorphism employs, namely, importing certain animal factors to explain. The focus of this work, however, is zoomorphism as a method of comprehending the human mind. Using thoughts about the minds of nonhuman animals to understand the human mind is also a common and successful study tool, at least in some disciplines of cognitive science, particularly cognitive neuroscience.

**Абстрактный.** Цель этого раздела — продемонстрировать, как зооморфизм работает как научный процесс. Первое, на что следует обратить внимание, это то, что общая объяснительная техника, которую использует зооморфизм, а именно импорт некоторых животных факторов для объяснения. Однако в центре внимания этой работы находится зооморфизм как метод постижения человеческого разума. Использование мыслей о разуме нечеловеческих животных для понимания человеческого разума также является распространенным и успешным инструментом исследования, по крайней мере, в некоторых дисциплинах когнитивной науки, особенно в когнитивной нейробиологии.

**Key words:** Zoomorphism , nonhuman, animals, anthropomorphism, human-like, paradigm, zoomorphic, behaviorism, philosophical.

**Ключевые слова:** Зооморфизм, нечеловек, животные, антропоморфизм, человекоподобный, парадигма, зооморфный, бихевиоризм, философский.

I wish to distinguish zoomorphism as a scientific practice from zoomorphism as a philosophical explanatory framework. A similar difference may be made concerning anthropomorphism, therefore I'll explain it here in a more recognizable setting. Anthropomorphism, or the attribution of human-like mental states to animals, can be utilized as a scientific methodology: while describing any specific behavior of a certain type of animal, we should assign certain mental states known from human psychology to them. However, anthropomorphism is more than just a scientific approach; it is also a philosophical explanatory paradigm that holds that if we begin with the assumption that these creatures have human-like mental processes, we will arrive at the proper manner of understanding animal brains.

Zoomorphism as scientific methodology, on the other hand, is a tool for understanding what specific mental states we, humans, experience by postulating animal like mental states. As previously said, one can utilize zoomorphism as

---

scientific practice (perhaps because a certain experiment would be too invasive in humans but not in animals) without embracing zoomorphism as a philosophical explanatory paradigm. And one does not have to support zoomorphism as a philosophical explanatory framework in order to apply zoomorphic scientific methods.

Nonetheless, zoomorphism as a philosophical explanatory paradigm serves as the theoretical underpinning and regulatory ideal for zoomorphism as a scientific practice. Zoomorphism (as a philosophical explanatory paradigm) is a wide theoretical answer to the difficulty of explaining human mental components. How can we know what people's mental states are? Zoomorphism addresses this issue by concentrating on animal minds. The study of animal cognition has taught us about many types of mental states. These mental state types should be used to characterize the human mind. This does not explain all human behavior, but it is a useful starting point, with new mental state types offered only when explanations based entirely on animal mental state categories fail.

It is critical to highlight that zoomorphism is a philosophical explanatory paradigm, not a theory: it makes no claims about what these mental processes that we should assign to humans (since we know other animals have them) actually are. It is critical to note that zoomorphism is not intended to provide a complete explanation of the human mind: it is an explanatory paradigm for learning about the human mind, but there is no reason to assume that it is the ultimate or only tool we have for understanding the human mind.

Similarly, zoomorphism is not intended to undertake all of the work in comprehending the human mind. The first step in comprehending the human mind, according to the explanatory paradigm of zoomorphism, is to assign mental states known through studying nonhuman animals to humans. It would be quite strange if this provided us with a complete picture of the human mind, given the human mind has developed greatly since our most recent common ancestor with nonhuman animals. Thus, the second step would be to determine how this conceptual apparatus derived from nonhuman animal research has to be developed and transformed in order to explain human behavior. And this isn't the end of the narrative.

Another crucial distinction to make concerning zoomorphism is that it is not synonymous with behaviorism, another ancient and significant philosophical explanatory paradigm. Zoomorphism is all about assigning mental processes to nonhuman animals as well as humans—in fact, the basic premise is that we should do the latter based on the former. Any such attribution of mental states is not justifiable, according to behaviorism.

The contrast between zoomorphism and behaviorism is significant because it demonstrates how much the explanatory scheme of zoomorphism is governed by what we consider to be those mental processes that we may legitimately assign to nonhuman animals. If you are a behaviorist, the answer is no mental states. However, the goal of cognitive ethology and comparative psychology (see Allen

2004) is to propose credible possibilities for nonhuman animal mental states. These factors can then be used to support attributing these mental states to humans. Zoomorphism is not the only plausible response to the question of how to explain the building blocks of the human intellect. To demonstrate what type of explanatory attempt zoomorphism is meant to be, I analyze what I believe to be the two main possibilities (a third is behaviorism, see Sect. 4.2). I contend that zoomorphism is better to these alternatives as a philosophical explanatory paradigm.

The study of zoonyms within the framework of three languages in semantic and linguocultural aspects can be considered as a perspective for the future research of the zoomorphic code of national culture. Such a zoomorphic code, as noted above, has a strong place in the lexicon, phraseology and paremiology, helps to determine the universal and national characteristics characteristic of one or another language community.

The analysis of the language material allows us to come to the following conclusions: the correspondence and similarity in the structure and boundaries of the human concepts, manifested through zoonyms, show some prototypical commonality of the compared mentalities. This situation makes it possible to talk about universal cultural categories that structure a person's behavior. Crossroads in the field of connotative images indicate the partial commonality of the image fund and some content constant in the cultures being compared.

#### **List of used literature**

1. Allen, C. (2004). Is anyone a cognitive ethologist? *Biology and Philosophy*, 19, 589–607.
2. Andrews, K. (2015). *The Animal Mind: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Animal Cognition*. New York: Routledge.
3. Blumberg, M. S., & Wasserman, E. A. (1995). Animal mind and the argument from design. *American Psychologist*, 50, 133–144.
4. Carruthers, P. (2011). *The opacity of mind: An integrative theory of self-knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. De Waal, F. B. M. (1999). Anthropomorphism and anthropodenial: Consistency in our thinking about humans and other animals. *Philosophical Topics*, 27, 255–280.
6. De Waal, F. B. M. (1999). Anthropomorphism and anthropodenial: Consistency in our thinking about humans and other animals. *Philosophical Topics*, 27, 255–280.