

presented in this research pave the way for further exploration of somatic expressions in different languages and cultures, opening new avenues for understanding the profound impact of language on human interaction and cultural exchange [9].

Conclusion. In conclusion, the comparative analysis of phraseological somatisms in English and Uzbek has illuminated the intricate interplay of language, culture, and embodied experiences in shaping human communication. Through a meticulous examination of selected somatic expressions, this research has unraveled the semantic, syntactic, and cultural dimensions of these idiomatic constructs, offering valuable insights into the richness and diversity of linguistic expression in both languages.

The findings of this study underscore the universal aspects of somatic expressions that transcend cultural boundaries, as well as the distinct cultural influences that shape the interpretation of these idiomatic phrases in English and Uzbek. By highlighting the shared human experiences encapsulated in somatic expressions, this research emphasizes the role of language in reflecting and expressing embodied sensations, emotions, and social interactions[10].

Moreover, the comparative analysis has shed light on the syntactic structures of somatic expressions in English and Uzbek, revealing the grammatical intricacies that contribute to the nuanced meanings and interpretations of these idiomatic constructs. The varying syntactic patterns

observed in somatic expressions underscore the stylistic preferences and linguistic conventions embedded in each language, showcasing the dynamic nature of language as a vehicle for cultural expression and communication.

Through this research, we have deepened our understanding of the cultural and linguistic implications of phraseological somatisms, recognizing their significance as bridges between abstract concepts and tangible experiences. The exploration of somatic expressions in English and Uzbek has not only expanded our knowledge of linguistic diversity but has also underscored the importance of cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity in communication.

Moving forward, further research in the field of phraseological somatisms can delve into exploring the manifestation of these idiomatic constructs in a broader range of languages and cultural contexts. By continuing to unravel the complexities of somatic expressions, we can enhance our appreciation for the diverse ways in which language reflects and shapes human experiences, emotions, and social interactions.

In essence, the comparative analysis of phraseological somatisms in English and Uzbek serves as a testament to the profound impact of language on culture and communication. As we navigate the intricate web of somatic expressions, we are reminded of the power of language to convey not just words, but embodied meanings and shared experiences that transcend linguistic boundaries and unite us in the richness of human expression.

References

1. Lakoff George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
2. Skorik P. I. *Phraseological Units in Modern English and Uzbek*. – Moscow State University Publishing House, 2005.
3. Kövecses Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
4. Crystal David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. – Cambridge University Press, 1997.
5. Pavlenko Aneta. *Bilingual Minds: Emotional Experience, Expression, and Representation*. – Multilingual Matters, 2006.
6. Кунин А.В. *Курс фразеологии современного английского языка*. – Москва: «Высшая школа», 1996.
7. Амосова Н.Н. *Основы английской фразеологии*. – Ленинград: Издательство Ленинградского университета, 1963.
8. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
9. Cowie A.P., Mackin R., Mc Caig, I.R. *Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
10. Newmark P. *A Textbook of Translation*. – New York: «Prentice Hall», 1988.

REZYUME. Maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi frazeologik somatizmlar olamiga chuqurroq kirib, ushbu noyob til hodisalarining qiyosiy tahlili berilgan. Tanlangan somatik iboralarni tizimli tahlil qilish orqali frazeologik somatizmlarning tildan foydalanishni boyitish va madaniyatlararo tushunishni rivojlantirishdagi roli yoritilgan.

РЕЗЮМЕ. В статье более подробно рассматривается мир фразеологических соматизмов в английском и узбекском языках, проводится сопоставительный анализ этих уникальных языковых явлений. Систематический анализ отдельных соматических выражений позволяет подчеркнуть роль фразеологических соматизмов в обогащении использования языка и развитии межкультурного взаимопонимания.

SUMMARY. The article delves deeper into the world of phraseological somatisms in English and Uzbek, providing a comparative analysis of these unique linguistic phenomena. Through a systematic analysis of selected somatic expressions, the role of phraseological somatisms in enriching language use and developing intercultural understanding is highlighted.

COGNITIVE AND CULTURAL DIMENSIONS OF RIDDLE TYPOLOGY: ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK PERSPECTIVES

Z.Sagatova – Doctoral student, Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences
Karakalpak state university named after Berdakh

Tayanch soʻzlar: topishmoq, tipologik tahlil, shakl, funksiya, ogʻzaki anʼana, madaniy metafora, tuzilma.

Ключевые слова: загадки, типологический анализ, форма, функция, устная традиция, культурная метафора, структура.

Key words: riddles, puzzles, typological analysis, form, function, oral traditions, cultural metaphore, structure.

Introduction. Puzzles, or riddles, as a folkloric and linguistic phenomenon, exhibit distinct typological characteristics that reflect their structure, function, and

cultural relevance across languages. Theoretical and practical analysis of puzzles were widely presented in the works of the linguist Kongas-Maranda [4:47].

Typologically, puzzles can be classified into several types based on their form, content, and function. One major structural type is the interrogative riddle, which poses a question requiring interpretation or solution — commonly seen in both English and Karakalpak traditions. For example, the English riddle “*What gets wetter the more it dries?*” (Answer: A towel) and the Karakalpak puzzle “*Ulli jolğa shıǵadı, ózi ornında turadı*” (It moves along a great road but stays in one place – Answer: A clock) both rely on metaphorical reasoning and personification. Another typological category includes descriptive riddles, which present vivid imagery to conceal the answer in poetic or figurative language. These are especially prevalent in Karakalpak oral literature, where agricultural, environmental, and household imagery is rich and symbolic. In terms of function, typologically puzzles serve didactic, entertaining, socializing, and mnemonic purposes. They are often used to test knowledge, encourage critical thinking, and transmit cultural values from one generation to another. A further typological feature is their brevity, rhythmic structure, and use of metaphors or analogies, which aid in memorization and performance. While English puzzles tend to prioritize linguistic play and cognitive challenge, Karakalpak riddles focus more on shared experience, communal knowledge, and symbolic thinking [2:12]. These typological distinctions show how puzzles adapt to the intellectual and cultural needs of each society, yet maintain a universal role in stimulating reasoning and preserving heritage.

Materials and Methods. The material was collected by the following groups of research methods: descriptive, comparative, and analytical methods. As our research rely on comparison of two unrelated heterogen languages, our main used material consists of dictionaries of these languages. The research uses samples of English and Karakalpak puzzles are collected, classified, and analyzed to identify patterns and differences. Elements of semantic and structural analysis are applied to interpret figurative language and symbolism.

Results and Discussion. Riddles can be classified into two main types: true riddles and conundrums. True riddles usually present a problem in metaphorical language and require interpretation based on analogical thinking; for example, a classic English riddle might describe an object using poetic clues, while a Karakalpak equivalent often uses nature-based metaphors. Conundrums, on the other hand, are often based on wordplay, puns, or double meanings, and tend to be humorous or ironic in tone – more common in English than in Karakalpak folklore.

Another method of classification is thematic – organizing puzzles based on their subject matter. Common themes include elements of nature (sun, moon, wind), animals, tools, body parts, everyday objects, and social roles. In Karakalpak puzzles, themes are often closely tied to the local landscape, traditional lifestyle, and nomadic culture, such as references to yurts, livestock, rivers, and agricultural tools. English puzzles, particularly medieval ones, often take a more abstract or symbolic turn, including philosophical reflections or personifications of time, death, and emotions.

A further classification relates to function and context of use: puzzles can be didactic (educational), recreational (for entertainment), ritual (used in ceremonies or traditional

events), or social (to strengthen group identity or test intelligence in community gatherings). For example, in Karakalpak culture, puzzles are frequently used as part of oral competitions or children’s games with educational intent. In contrast, many English riddles have been preserved in written literary form, indicating their function as poetic or intellectual exercises.

Additionally, puzzles may also be classified based on form and structure: whether they are posed in question-answer format, rhymed verses, prose, or call-and-response. The structure often reflects the oral or literary nature of the tradition. Karakalpak puzzles typically follow a simple, rhythmic structure that supports oral transmission, while English literary riddles – especially those from the Exeter Book – often exhibit sophisticated poetic construction.

Puzzles are classified into several types, often based on their linguistic or cognitive features:

Type	Description	Example
Descriptive	Describe the object indirectly using metaphor	“It has a neck but no head.” (Bottle) “Bir oshaqqa bes kösew” (Mouth and fingers)
Comparative	Compare an unknown to a known object	“As white as snow, but burns your tongue.” (Salt) “Tawday bälent, sayday tereñ” (Mind)
Question-and-Answer	Presented as a challenge or question, typical in folk riddles	“What has keys but can’t open doors?” (Piano) “Patsha kimgе bas iyedi?” (To the barber)
Enigmatic Riddles	Philosophical or abstract, often literary	“What devours all things?” (Time) “Tatlıdan tatlı qanday zat?” (Uyqı - Dream)
Visual/Mathematical	Modern puzzles involving patterns or logic (less common in oral cultures)	Sudoku, logic puzzles

Furthermore, comparative folkloristics suggests that puzzles can also be distinguished by their degree of openness: some puzzles have a single correct answer, while others are more open-ended, allowing for multiple interpretations depending on cultural context and creativity of the solver. Especially in oral traditions like that of the Karakalpak people, puzzles often encouraged flexible thinking and were used not only to assess knowledge but also to stimulate creative and socially valued responses. These modern classification approaches enrich our understanding of riddles and puzzles, showing that they function on multiple levels – cognitive, social, linguistic, and cultural – and that their structures are as diverse and dynamic as the societies that create and transmit them.

Conclusion. The differences between the two traditions are equally significant and rooted in historical, environmental, and social factors. Thematically, English riddles often display a more abstract and philosophical tone, dealing with

universal concepts such as life, death, wisdom, and the passage of time, whereas Karakalpak puzzles are more concrete and practical, closely tied to the natural world and daily life activities such as herding, farming, and fishing. In terms of structure, English riddles, especially from the Old

English period, are often longer, more poetic, and multi-layered, using complex figurative language and sometimes multiple possible interpretations. Karakalpak puzzles, by contrast, tend to be shorter, more direct, and focused on clarity, although they maintain rich metaphorical expression.

References

1. Айымбетов Н.Қ. Қарақалпақ фольклоры. Т. 88-100. – Нөкис: «Илим», 2015.
2. Алимов А. Қарақалпақ халық жумбақлары. – Нукус: «Қарақалпақстан», 1978.
3. Дементьев В.В. Теория речевых жанров. – Москва: «Знак», 2010.
4. Кенгэс-Маранда Э. Теория и практика анализа загадок. – Москва: «Наука», 1984.
5. Ковшова М.Л. Лингвокультурологический анализ идиом, загадок, пословиц и поговорок: антропонимический код культуры. – Москва: URSS, 2021.
6. Johnson D. Readings in Medieval Texts: Interpreting Old and Middle English. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
7. Taylor A. English Riddles from Oral Tradition. – Berkeley - Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951.
8. Williamson C. The Old English Riddles of the Exeter Book. – Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

REZYUME. maqolada ingliz va qoraqalpoq topishmoqlari ularning funksiyasi, tuzilishi va shakli nuqtayi nazaridan qiyosiy-tipologik tahlil asosida o'rganiladi. Topishmoqlarni tadqiq etish insonning til va ijodiy qobiliyatlarining boyligini namoyon etish bilan birga, turli xalqlarning madaniy o'zligiga va tajribalariga oid chuqur ma'lumotlarni ham taqdim etadi.

РЕЗЮМЕ. Настоящая статья посвящена сравнительно-типологическому анализу английских и каракалпакских загадок с точки зрения их функции, структуры и формы. Исследование загадок не только демонстрирует богатство человеческих языковых и творческих способностей, но и раскрывает глубокие представления о культурной идентичности и жизненном опыте различных народов.

SUMMARY. The present article is devoted to comparative typological analysis of English and Karakalpak puzzles according their function, structure and form. The study of puzzles not only demonstrates the richness of human linguistic and creative abilities but also offers profound insights into the cultural identities and experiences of different peoples.

INGLIZ VA QORAQALPOQ TILLARI KOMPARATIV IBORALARINING SEMANTIK-STRUKTUR TAHLILI

S.P.Saparov – *filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori*
Ajiniyoz nomidagi Nukus davlat pedagogika instituti

Tayanch so'zlar: komparativ, adyektiv, iboralar, semantik-struktur, frazeologizm, komponent, qiyoslash, o'xshatish obyektlari.

Ключевые слова: компаратив, адъектив, выражения, семантико-структурный, фразеологизм, компонент, сравнение, объекты сравнения.

Key words: comparative, adjectival, expressions, semantic-structural, phraseology, component, comparison, objects of comparison.

Kirish. Taqqoslanayotgan iboralar semantikasi qiyoslash asosi yoki qiyoslash obyekti tahlilida aniqlanadi. Aksariyat holda semantik tasnif mavzuiy bo'lib, ularda «iboralar yoki qiyoslash asosi yoki qiyoslash obyektiga qarab tasniflanadi» [5]. Mavzuiy guruh muayyan mavzuda muloqot qilishda qo'llanadigan leksik birliklar yig'indisi sifatida namoyon bo'ladi. Mavzuiy guruh integratsiyasining asosi – mavzuiy guruhni tashkil etuvchi lug'aviy birliklarning denotatlari bo'lmish obyektiv voqelik predmetlarining o'zaro aloqalaridir.

Mavzuga oid adabiyotlar tahlili. O.M.Nevedomskaya frazeologizmlarning birinchi va ikkinchi komponentlarining leksik-semantik tahlilini keltiradi [4:14]. Sifatlarini (qiyoslash asosi) o'xshatishlar hosil qilishdagi mahsuldorlikka qarab taqsimlaydi. Otlar (o'xshatish obyektlari) to'rtta mavzuiy guruhga ajratilgan: a) jonli tabiat bilan bog'liq otlar (o'simliklar va hayvonot olami), b) jonsiz tabiat predmetlarini ifodalovchi otlar, v) inson faoliyati bilan bog'liq otlar, g) mavhum tushunchalarni ifodlovchi otlar. Mahsuldorligiga ko'ra bu otlar guruhida muallif yana kichik guruhlarni farqlaydi. Michael McCarthy va Felicity O'Dellar [9] shunday tasnifni keltiradiki, bunda amaliy maqsadda 44 ta mavzuiy guruh va ibora semantik strukturasining asosiy komponenti sifatida ajratilgan somatizm yoxud boshqa bir lug'aviy birlikni o'z ichiga olgan iboralarning kichik guruhlari taqdim etilgan.

Ularining soni 16 ta bo'lib, semantik strukturalarning jami mavzuiy guruhlari – 60 ta.

A.N.Lyubova [3] ta'kidlaganiday, muqobillik darajasini taqqoslanayotgan frazeologik birliklar ma'nolarining to'liq muvofiqligi, leksik to'ldirilganligi va uslubiy xususiyati kabilar nuqtayi nazaridan tahlil qilish mumkin. Birinchi belgisiga ko'ra muqobillar konstant muqobillar deyiladi, ya'ni ma'nosiga ko'ra mos bo'lgan iboralar, shuningdek, semantik ma'nosiga ko'ra qisman farqlanuvchi polisemantik iboralar ajratildi. Ikkinchi belgisiga ko'ra muqobillar mutlaq muqobillar deyiladi, ya'ni bunday iboralarning leksik tarkibida qisman farqlanishlar va uslubiy yo'nalganlik mavjud. Soloduxo [7] ta'kidlaganidek, frazeologik ekvivalentlarning tashqi tomoni, ya'ni grammatik shakllanganligi va iboralarni tashkil etuvchi komponentlarning miqdoriy tarkibi ekvivalentlik darajasiga jiddiy ta'sir ko'rsatmaydi. Shuning uchun, tillararo ekvivalentlarning uch turini ajratishda Yu.G. Solodub izdoshlarining [6] obrazli asosga murojaat qilishlarini mantiqiy jihatdan to'g'ri deb bilamiz:

1. obrazli tuzilishi o'zaro yaqin bo'lgan ayni frazeologizmlar;
2. obrazli o'xshashligi yiroq bo'lgan ayni frazeologizmlar;
3. taqqoslanayotgan tillarda ma'noviy va frazeologik muqobili bo'lmagan muqobilsiz frazeologizmlar.