JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LINGUISTIC STUDIES
VOL. 13, NO. 2, JUL-DEC 2026 – PART 2 (ISSN 2231-4075)

Socio-Pragmatic Variation of Somatic Phraseologisms in German and Uzbek: A Comparative Analysis of Equivalence, Register and Discourse Function

QURBANOVA ZULXUMOR AZAMATQIZI
National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Somatic phraseologisms constitute a productive interface between embodied experience, phraseological conventionalization, and pragmatic meaning. This study presents a comparative analysis of German and Uzbek based on 50 somatic phraseological units selected primarily from phraseological dictionaries. Umarxo'jayev and Nazarov's (1994) German-Russian-Uzbek phraseological dictionary was used as the principal bilingual lexicographic source, while Duden's Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik *served as an additional German-language source. The analysis goes beyond semantic equivalence by coding each unit for somatic domain, cross-linguistic correspondence, register, evaluative polarity, and discourse function. Only two units preserve an identical or near-identical somatic image together with a closely corresponding functional meaning; seven units were classified as close or near equivalents; 39 units were assessed as functionally corresponding, retaining the communicative meaning while changing the bodily image, lexical form, or pragmatic realization; and two cases exhibited asymmetric correspondence, in which the Uzbek counterpart did not contain a somatic image. Thus, within the selected sample, functional correspondence is substantially more frequent than formal somatic equivalence. Pragmatically, the units perform recurring functions including encouragement, interpersonal relationship management, emotional expression, character*

evaluation, directive control, warning, self-regulation, and deliberative decision-making. The findings indicate that although German and Uzbek somatic phraseology share broadly embodied motivation, this motivation is conventionalized through substantially different lexical and pragmatic forms. The study proposes a transparent coding framework suitable for subsequent corpus-based validation in bilingual lexicography, translation, and advanced language education.

Keywords: Somatic phraseologisms, German, Uzbek, comparative phraseology, pragmatic equivalence, embodiment, register, evaluative polarity, discourse function

1. INTRODUCTION

Somatic phraseological units are fixed or semi-fixed expressions containing lexical items denoting parts of the human body. Their significance in phraseology derives from the fact that bodily experience provides a particularly productive source for conceptualizing emotion, cognition, interpersonal relations, evaluation, social behavior, and action. However, the presence of a shared bodily basis does not guarantee identical conventionalization across languages. Languages may select different body parts, different images, or different communicative-interactional patterns to express similar meanings.

German somatic phraseology has been extensively documented. Duden's *Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik* records more than 18,000 fixed expressions, idioms, and proverbs and provides information on their meanings and usage; Mellado Blanco's major descriptive study analyzes a corpus of 1,385 German somatic phraseologisms compiled on the basis of Duden. In German-Uzbek comparative research, the 1994 trilingual dictionary by Umarxo'jayev and Nazarov has likewise been used as an important source.

The present study addresses a specific gap: German-Uzbek somatic correspondences need to be described not only in terms

of meaning but also from the perspective of pragmatic use. Semantically similar idioms may differ in register, interpersonal force, evaluative orientation, or discourse function. Consequently, a translation equivalent provided in a bilingual dictionary does not always give the learner or translator sufficient information for contextually appropriate use.

Three research questions were formulated: RQ1: What types of German–Uzbek correspondence occur among the 50 selected somatic phraseologisms? RQ2: What pragmatic profiles emerge when the units are coded for register, evaluative polarity, and discourse function? RQ3: What do the patterns of correspondence and divergence reveal about the relationship between shared embodied experience and language-specific phraseological conventionalization?

The analysis is based on a purposively selected sample. The 50 units are not presented as a statistically representative corpus of German or Uzbek phraseology. Rather, they constitute a lexicographically grounded analytical sample intended to identify recurring patterns that can subsequently be tested in large contemporary corpora.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1. *Embodiment, conceptual metaphor and somatic phraseology*

Embodied approaches to language treat bodily experience as an important source of conceptual structure rather than as a merely literal domain. Comparative research on body-part terms has shown that body-based lexical extensions display recurring cross-linguistic patterns while also being shaped by culture and usage. This combination of shared bodily experience and language-specific conventionalization is particularly relevant to somatic phraseology, where concrete body-part expressions acquire abstract meanings associated with cognition, emotion, evaluation, and interpersonal behavior. Recent comparative evidence indicates that the relationship between language and action is modulated by cultural and linguistic experience, supporting a cautious rather than strictly universal interpretation of embodiment (Ghandhari et al. 2020).

2.2. *Comparative phraseology, idiomaticity and equivalence*
Comparative phraseology requires a distinction between formal similarity and functional equivalence. An idiom may preserve its lexical image across languages, but it may also be translated through a structurally different expression that performs a comparable communicative function. Research on figurative-language processing demonstrates that familiarity, transparency, decomposability, and motivation affect the interpretation of idiomatic expressions and that cross-language experience influences how speakers recognize and understand figurative phrases. These findings support an analytical framework in which equivalence cannot be reduced to word-for-word or image-for-image correspondence.

2.3. *Socio-pragmatic functions, registr and evaluative meaning*
Idioms are not only carriers of lexical meaning; they can also encode stance, evaluation, affect, and interpersonal positioning. Recent psycholinguistic research has demonstrated systematic variation in idioms' affective valence, arousal, concreteness, and imageability, including differences between first- and second-language speakers (Morid & Sabourin 2024). Neuroscientific evidence likewise indicates that idiomatic expressions can evoke stronger affective responses than literal sentences, highlighting the interaction between conventionalized figurative meaning and emotional processing (Citron et al. 2019). From a discourse perspective, figurative language can be especially effective in expressing attitudes and pragmatic effects rather than merely describing states of affairs (Gibbs 2023). These observations justify the inclusion of register, evaluative polarity, and discourse function in the present analysis.

2.4. *German-Uzbek Phraseogical Research*
German-Uzbek phraseological research has documented equivalence, cultural specificity, and body-part imagery as important dimensions of comparison. The foundational German-Russian-Uzbek phraseological dictionary by Umarxo'jayev and Nazarov (1994) provides a principal lexicographic basis for identifying German phraseological units and Uzbek counterparts.

Duden's *Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik* provides an additional referencefor German idiomatic meaning and usage (Scholze-Stubenrecht & Haller-Wolf 2013). More recent comparative research specifically addressing German and Uzbek idioms has examined more than 100 units across thematic domains and has emphasized metaphor, cultural conceptualization, and non-equivalent idioms in intercultural communication (Yusupova & Yusufjonova 2025).

2.5.*Research gap and contribution*

Although previous studies provide important lexical, cultural, and cognitive perspectives, a focused unit-level comparison of German and Uzbek somatic phraseologisms that simultaneously codes equivalence type, register, evaluative polarity, and discourse function remains limited. The present study addresses this gap through a transparent coding framework applied to 50 lexicographically selected units. The design does not claim statistical representativeness; instead, it provides an analytically explicit basis for identifying recurring patterns and for subsequent validation through contemporary corpora. The study therefore connects comparative phraseology with socio-pragmatic analysis and makes the distinction between formal somatic equivalence and functional correspondence central to the interpretation.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1. *Lexicographic sources and data selection*

The dataset consists of 50 German somatic idioms and their functional counterparts in Uzbek. The principal source is the trilingual educational phraseological dictionary *Deutsch-Russisch-Usbekisches phraseologisches Wörterbuch* (1994) by Umarxo'jayev and Nazarov, published in Tashkent. According to library information, the work comprises 160 pages and contains more than 700 phraseological units. The German forms were additionally checked conceptually against Duden's *Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik*, an important source documenting the meanings and uses of German idioms.

The units were selected purposively rather than randomly. A unit was included when it met the following criteria: 1) it contained a recognizable somatic component; 2) it functioned as an established phraseological expression in German; 3) it had a functional or formal counterpart in Uzbek; and 4) it permitted pragmatic interpretation. The sample covers the following major somatic domains: hand, head, eye, mouth, heart, tongue, abdomen/stomach, ear, and thumb.

3.2. *Coding system*

Each unit was coded in five stages. First, the somatic component was identified. Second, the German and Uzbek expressions were compared with respect to the preservation of the bodily image and figurative meaning. Third, the correspondence was assigned to one of four categories: full formal equivalence, close/near equivalence, functional equivalence, or asymmetric correspondence. Fourth, register was classified as colloquial, neutral, or mixed/neutral-colloquial. Fifth, evaluative polarity and discourse function were coded on the basis of the conventional communicative profile of the expression.

Full formal equivalence indicates that the bodily image and core idiomatic meaning are preserved to a closely comparable degree in Uzbek. Close/near equivalence refers to a highly similar counterpart with minor lexical, structural, or conventional differences. In functional equivalence, the communicative meaning is preserved, whereas the body-part image, lexical metaphor, or phraseological construction changes. Asymmetric correspondence was used for cases in which the somatic image is not preserved in the Uzbek counterpart and the adaptation is substantially non-isomorphic.

3.3. *Pragmatic coding*

Register was coded as colloquial/informal when an expression was strongly associated with everyday interaction, as neutral when it corresponded to ordinary standard usage, and as mixed when both colloquial and neutral uses were possible. Evaluative polarity was coded as positive, negative, or neutral/ambivalent. Discourse functions were grouped into expressive, interpersonal,

evaluative, directive/control, warning, motivational, deliberative, and metalinguistic categories. Multiple pragmatic interpretations are possible in actual discourse; for comparability, the table records the primary analytical function.

3.4. *Reliability and scope of the study*

Because the dataset is lexicographic in nature, the pragmatic coding cannot be interpreted as evidence of corpus frequency. No conclusion is drawn that 39/50 cases of functional correspondence represent the German-Uzbek phraseological system as a whole. A subsequent empirical study should employ independent coding by at least two bilingual researchers and validation against contemporary German and Uzbek corpora.

4. RESULTS

4.1. *Overall correspondence profile*

The 50-unit dataset substantially changes the interpretation of the data. Two units were classified as fully formally equivalent, seven as close/near equivalents, 39 as functionally equivalent, and two as asymmetric correspondences. Thus, 9/50 units (18%) preserve the somatic image through a fully or nearly identical counterpart, whereas 39/50 units (78%) preserve the communicative function primarily through a changed image or lexical realization. In the remaining 2/50 cases (4%), the Uzbek counterpart is non-somatic.

The coding distinguishes between preservation of the same somatic image and preservation of the shared communicative function. This distinction is methodologically important for comparative phraseological research.

4.2. *Distribution across somatic domains*

In the selected dataset, hand and head are the most frequent domains, jointly accounting for 23 of the 50 units (46%). They are followed by eye and mouth, with 7 and 6 units, respectively. This concentration is a characteristic of the selected sample only and should not be interpreted as evidence that these body parts

are objectively the most productive somatic domains in German or Uzbek.

4.3. *Pragmatic patterns*

The coding shows that somatic idioms perform a broad range of interpersonal and evaluative functions. Hand-related expressions are frequently associated with agency, assistance, independence, cooperation, competence, and intervention. Head-related expressions are strongly associated with self-regulation, determination, avoidance of problems, deliberation, and interpersonal dominance. Eye-related expressions often convey surprise, deception, desire, secrecy, and attention. Heart-related expressions are predominantly affective and relational, particularly in contexts involving emotional disclosure, generosity, attachment, and hurt.

Mouth- and tongue-related expressions are especially productive in regulating speech. den Mund halten and jemandem den Mund verbieten carry directive or controlling force, whereas kein Blatt vor den Mund nehmen and eine scharfe Zunge haben evaluate directness and verbal sharpness. Ear-related expressions focus on attention and reception, while Bauch/Magen expressions highlight the relationship between bodily sensation and intuition, excitement, or psychological burden.

4.4. *Register and evaluative polarity*

The selected units are predominantly neutral or colloquial rather than formal-institutional. This is consistent with the phraseological nature of the dataset and the role of idioms in everyday communication. Negative evaluation is particularly evident in expressions associated with deception, incompetence, passivity, stubbornness, boastfulness, silencing others, and ignoring advice. Positive evaluation is concentrated in idioms concerning support, trust, generosity, assistance, cooperation, and self-regulation. Neutral or ambivalent polarity is common where an idiom primarily describes a state, an interactional process, or a cognitive process.

4.5. *Illustrative cases of divergence*

Several cases demonstrate why functional equivalence must be distinguished from formal equivalence. *Jemandem die Hand für jemanden ins Feuer legen* expresses strong personal loyalty, whereas its Uzbek counterpart is based on the idea of risking one's head or reputation; the communicative meaning of loyalty is retained, but the bodily image changes. *Kein Blatt vor den Mund nehmen* corresponds in Uzbek to an expression conveying direct speech without preserving the German image of the mouth and the leaf and is therefore treated as an asymmetric case. *Aus dem Bauch heraus entscheiden* likewise expresses an intuitive decision, but the Uzbek expression does not require an identical somatic correspondence. These cases show that embodied motivation may be conceptually retained even when phraseological conventionalization differs.

4.6. *Full analytical dataset*

The following table presents the 50-unit dataset used in the 'Results and Discussion' sections. It should be retained as a supplementary analytical table in the manuscript submitted to the journal. The pragmatic categories are analytical labels derived from lexicographic meanings and comparative analysis; they are not claimed to be direct quotations from the dictionaries.

No	German idiom	Uzbek counterpart	Somatic domain	Corresp-ondence	Core pragmatic meaning	Register	Polarity	Discourse function
1	*jemandem die Daumen drücken*	*kimgadiromadtilam oq; omadingizkelsin*	Thumb	Functional equivalence	Encouragement/ good wishes	Colloquial	Positive	Supportive; wishes success.
2	*ein Augezu drücken*	*ko'zyumibqo'ymoq; bilmaslikkaolmoq*	Eye	Close/near equivalence	Tolerance / deliberate overlooking	Colloquial -neutral	Neutral	Signals leniency rather than strict enforcement.
3	*große Augen machen*	*ko'zinikattaochmoq ; hayratdanqoti bqolmoq*	Eye	Close/near equivalence	Surprise	Colloquial	Neutral	Expressive; marks strong astonishment.
4	*jemandem Sand in die Augen streuen*	*ko'zigaqumsepmoq*	Eye	Formal full equivalence	Deception	Neutral-colloquial	Negative	Manipulative; frames deliberate misleading.
5	*ein Auge auf jemanden/etwas werfen*	*ko'zolaytirmoq; ko'ztikmoq*	Eye	Close/near equivalence	Interest /desire	Colloquial	Neutral	Interpersonal; indicates interest or desire.
6	*mit einem blauen Auge davon kommen*	*birko'zibilanqutulm oq; omonqolmoq*	Eye	Functional equivalence	Escaping serious consequences	Colloquial	Positive	Minimises the severity of an outcome.

7	*die Augen sind größer als der Magen*	*ko'zito'ymas; ko'zikatta*	Eye	Functional equivalence	Excessive desire	Colloquial	Negative	Criticises overreaching or excess.
8	*jemandem unter vier Augen sprechen*	*yuzma-yuzgaplashmoq; ikkovlonga plashmoq*	Eye	Functional equivalence	Private communication	Neutral	Neutral	Requests privacy/ confidentiality.
9	*den Kopf verlieren*	*boshiniyo'qotmoq; dovdira bqolmoq*	Head	Close/near equivalence	Loss of self-control	Neutral	Negative	Describes panic or disorientation.
10	*den Kopf in den Sand stecken*	*Boshiniqum gatiqmoq; muammodan qochmoq*	Head	Close/near equivalence	Avoidance	Colloquial	Negative	Reproaches refusal to face a problem.
11	*einen klaren/kühlen Kopf bewahren*	*sovuqqonliknisaqlamoq; aqlniyo' qotmaslik*	Head	Functional equivalence	Self- control	Neutral	Positive	Advisory; recommends rational action.
12	*seinen Kopf durchsetzen*	*o'zfikrinio'tkazmoq; o'zbil ganiniqilmoq*	Head	Functional equivalence	Assertiveness /insistence	Neutral-colloquial	Neutral /negative	May praise determination or criticise obstinacy.
13	*mit dem Kopf durch die Wand wollen*	*devordanboshbilan o'tmoq; o'jarlikqilmoq*	Head	Functional equivalence	Obstinacy	Colloquial	Negative	Criticises excessive insistence.
14	*den Kopf hängenlassen*	*Boshinie gmoq; tushkunlik katushmoq*	Head	Functional equivalence	Despondency	Colloquial	Negative	Expresses discouragement.
15	*Kopf und Kragenriskieren*	*Boshinixavfgaqo'ymoq; joninixavfgaqo'ymoq*	Head	Functional equivalence	Risk /danger	Neutral-colloquial	Negative	Highlights personal risk.
16	*jmdm. auf dem Kopf herumtanzen*	*Boshigachiq ibolmoq*	Head	Functional equivalence	Domination/ disrespect	Colloquial	Negative	Criticises exploitation of tolerance.
17	*Hand und Fußhaben*	*mustahkamasosgaegabo'lmoq; mantiqlibo'lmoq*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Soundness/ coherence	Colloquial-neutral	Positive	Evaluates an argument or plan positively.
18	*jmdm. freie Hand lassen*	*yo'lochibbermoq; erkinlik bermoq*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Freedom of action	Neutral	Positive	Grants autonomy and responsibility.
19	*jmds. rechte Hand sein*	*kimningdiro'ngqo'libo'lmoq*	Hand	Close/near equivalence	Trusted assistance	Neutral	Positive	Marks trust and close cooperation.
20	*zweilinkeHändehaben*	*qo'likalta; qo'lidanish kelmaslik*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Practical incompetence	Colloquial	Negative	Humorous or critical character evaluation.
21	*die Hände in den Schoß legen*	*qo'liniqovushtiribo'tiribqolmoq*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Inaction	Colloquial	Negative	Condemns passivity.
22	*in guten Händen sein*	*ishonchliqo'llardabo'lmoq*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Security / care	Neutral	Positive	Reassures and establishes trust.
23	*Mitbeiden Händenz ugreifen*	*Imkoniyatdanfoydalanmoq; jon-dilibilanishgakirishmoq*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Seizing opportunity	Colloquial	Positive	Encourages energetic action.
24	*imHand umdrehen*	*birzumda; birlahzada*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Speed	Colloquial	Neutral	Intensifies rapidity/ease.
25	*jmdm. das Handwerklegen*	*yo'linito'smoq; zararliishigachekqo'ymoq*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Stopping harmful activity	Colloquial-neutral	Negative	Signals intervention against misconduct.
26	*die Hand für jemanden ins Feuer legen*	*kimningdirsha'nigaboshinitikmoq; kafolatbermoq*	Hand	Close/near equivalence	Guarantee/ loyalty	Neutral-colloquial	Positive	Expresses strong confidence and commitment.

27	*von der Hand in den Mund leben*	*kuniniko'ribyasham oq; qo'luchidayas hamoq*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Economic insecurity	Colloquial	Negative	Highlights precarious living.
28	*von der Hand gehen*	*ishio'ngidankelmoq ; osonbitmoq*	Hand	Functional equivalence	Ease/fluency	Neutral-colloquial	Positive	Presents work as proceeding smoothly.
29	*jemandem die Hand reichen*	*qo'luzatmoq; yordamqo'linicho'z moq*	Hand	Close/near equivalence	Help / reconciliation	Neutral	Positive	Signals cooperation or reconciliation.
30	*jemandem die Hand schütteln*	*qo'lberibko' rishmoq*	Hand	Formal full equivalence	Greeting / social contact	Neutral	Neutral	Phatic social-contact function.
31	*sich etwas zu Herzen nehmen*	*yuragigayaqinolmoq; ko'ngligaolmoq*	Heart	Functional equivalence	Emotional internalisation	Neutral	Neutral /negative	Indicates taking something personally.
32	*jemandem sein Herzau sschütten*	*dardiniyuragidanchiqaribaytmoq; ko'ngliniochmoq*	Heart	Functional equivalence	Confiding	Colloquial -neutral	Positive	Creates intimacy and disclosure.
33	*Eingroßes Herzhaben*	*yuragikattabo'lmoq;ko'nglioc hiqbo'lmoq*	Heart	Close/near equivalence	Generosity/ kindness	Neutral	Positive	Positive character evaluation.
34	*das Herzbrechen*	*yuraginisindirmoq; ko'ngliniog'ritmoq*	Heart	Functional equivalence	Emotional hurt	Neutral	Negative	Foregrounds interpersonal pain.
35	*jemandem liegt etwas am Herzen*	*birornarsayuragigayaqinbo'lmoq; ko'ngligayaqinbo'lmoq*	Heart	Functional equivalence	Personal importance	Neutral	Positive /neutral	Marks high personal importance.
36	*Schmetterlingeim Bauchhaben*	*qornidakapalaklaruchmoq; sevgi /hayajon his qilmoq*	Abdomen	Functional equivalence	Romantic excitement	Colloquial	Positive	Expresses nervous happiness.
37	*aus dem Bauch heraus entscheiden*	*Ichkisezg ibilanqarorqilmoq; ko'ngligaqarabqaror qilmoq*	Abdomen	Asymmetric corresp-ondence	Intuition	Colloquial -neutral	Neutral	Legitimises intuitive decision-making.
38	*jemandem auf den Magen schlagen*	*asabigategmoq; ko'ngligaog'irbotmoq*	Stomach	Functional equivalence	Psychological burden	Colloquial	Negative	Intensifies distress or irritation.
39	*den Mundhalten*	*og'ziniyopmoq; jimturmoq*	Mouth	Functional equivalence	Silence / restraint	Colloquial	Neutral /negative	Directive; order, warning, or criticism.
40	*kein Blatt vor den Mund nehmen*	*dangalgapirmoq; gapniyuzigaaytmoq*	Mouth	Asymmetric correspondence	Frankness	Colloquial	Positive /neutral	Legitimises direct speech.
41	*den Mundvollnehmen*	*kattagapirmoq; o'zigaortiqchabahobermoq*	Mouth	Functional equivalence	Boastfulness	Colloquial	Negative	Challenges exaggerated self-presentation.
42	*den Mundaufmachen*	*gapirmoq; fikriniaytmoq*	Mouth	Functional equivalence	Speaking up	Colloquial	Neutral	Encourages participation or disclosure.
43	*jemandem den Mundverbieten*	*og'ziniyopmoq; gapirtirmaslik*	Mouth	Functional equivalence	Silencing	Neutral-colloquial	Negative	Marks control over another's speech.
44	*jemandem auf der Zunge liegen*	*Tilininguchi daturmoq*	Tongue	Close/near equivalence	Retrieval of words	Neutral-colloquial	Neutral	Meta-linguistic; almost recalled information.
45	*einescharfeZungeh aben*	*tiliachchiq; tilizaharbo'lmoq*	Tongue	Functional equivalence	Verbal sharpness	Colloquial	Negative	Character evaluation of hurtful speech.
46	*sich auf die Zunge beißen*	*tilinitishlamoq; o'zinitiyibqolmoq*	Tongue	Functional equivalence	Self-restraint	Neutral	Neutral	Deliberate suppression

								of a remark.
47	*jemandem das Wort aus dem Mund nehmen*	*uningaytmoqchibo'l ganiniaytibqo'ymoq*	Mouth	Functional equivalence	Anticipating speech	Neutral-colloquial	Neutral	Signals agreement or anticipation.
48	*auf taube Ohrenstoßen*	*quloqqakirmaslik; gapigaquloqsolinmaslik*	Ear	Functional equivalence	Ignoring advice	Neutral	Negative	Describes failed persuasion.
49	*die Ohrens pitzen*	*quloqlarini ding qilmoq; diqqatbilantinglamoq*	Ear	Functional equivalence	Attention	Colloquial	Neutral	Signals heightened listening.
50	*sich etwas durch den Kopf gehen lassen*	*birornarsaniyaxshilabo'ylabko'rmoq*	Head	Functional equivalence	Deliberation	Neutral	Neutral	Encourages reflection before decision.

5. DISCUSSION

The dataset changes the central interpretation of German–Uzbek somatic equivalence. The earlier claim of 92% full equivalence is not supported by the unit-level coding applied here. Instead, only 18% (9/50) of the units preserve the somatic image through full or near equivalence. The dominant tendency is functional equivalence (78%), whereby German and Uzbek converge in communicative meaning but differ in bodily metaphor, lexical construction, or pragmatic realization. This finding is theoretically significant because it distinguishes shared communicative intent from formal phraseological identity.

The predominance of functional equivalence is particularly evident in the hand domain. Expressions such as *Hand und Fuß haben*, *jmdm. freie Hand lassen*, *die Hände in den Schoß legen*, and *zwei linke Hände haben* concern competence, independence, inactivity, and practical ability. Uzbek counterparts convey these meanings through different constructions or images associated with other body parts. At the same time, *jmds. rechte Hand sein* and *jemandem die Hand schütteln* demonstrate close or full correspondence, indicating that the hand domain supports both shared and language-specific conventionalization rather than divergence alone.

The head domain likewise combines close and functional correspondences. Den Kopf verlieren and den Kopf in *den Sand stecken* have highly transparent counterparts in Uzbek, whereas *einen klaren/kühlen Kopf bewahren* and *sich etwas durch den Kopf gehen lassen* are more naturally rendered in Uzbek through

expressions centered on rationality, thinking, or deliberate reflection rather than by reproducing the exact phraseological form. This pattern supports a distinction between embodied motivation and conventional phraseological form.

The heart domain is predominantly associated with affective and interpersonal functions. *Sich etwas zu Herzen nehmen*, *jemandem sein Herz ausschütten*, *ein großes Herz haben*, *das Herz brechen*, and *jemandem liegt etwas am Herzen* all use the heart as a source for emotional conceptualization. Uzbek frequently uses the lexical items *yurak* and *ko'ngil* in this semantic field, producing functional correspondence even when the exact lexical construction differs. This suggests relatively strong cross-linguistic conceptual proximity in affective domains, while the phraseological form need not be identical.

Mouth- and tongue-related expressions display a different pragmatic concentration: the regulation of speech. *Den Mund halten*, *den Mund aufmachen*, *jemandem den Mund verbieten*, *kein Blatt vor den Mund nehmen*, *eine scharfe Zunge haben*, and *sich auf die Zunge beißen encodesilence*, "disclosure," "directness," "verbal aggression," and "self-restraint." Their pragmatic value is therefore strongly interactional. In translation, preserving interpersonal force is more important than preserving the bodily image literally, except where an established somatic counterpart exists in the target language.

The two asymmetric cases are theoretically significant. *Aus dem Bauch heraus entscheiden* is rendered in Uzbek through an expression oriented toward intuition rather than through a somatic equivalent construction; *kein Blatt vor den Mund nehmen* corresponds to an expression of direct speech without the German leaf-and-mouth image. These cases demonstrate that general communicative meaning may survive even after a somatic metaphor is lost. Such asymmetry is important for bilingual lexicography because a literal somatic translation may produce an unnatural or misleading target-language expression.

From a socio-pragmatic perspective, the dataset indicates that idioms often function as markers of stance and interpersonal positioning. Positive expressions establish solidarity, trust, encouragement, or approval; negative expressions perform

functions of criticism, warning, control, or character evaluation; neutral expressions manage information, attention, secrecy, or deliberation. Idiom choice is therefore not merely a lexical decision: it can alter the interpersonal positioning of the speaker or writer.

The findings also support a cautious cognitive-cultural interpretation. The recurrence of body-based conceptualization in both languages is compatible with embodied cognition, yet the 78% rate of functional equivalence indicates that shared embodied experience does not automatically produce identical phraseology. Conventionalization, cultural salience, discourse practices, and language-specific lexical resources determine which bodily image becomes conventional in a particular expression.

For translation and bilingual lexicography, the practical implication is that dictionary entries should, where possible, provide at least four types of information: figurative meaning, a functional equivalent in the target language, register, and pragmatic/discourse function. In language pedagogy, idioms should be taught in context, particularly where the same semantic message can be expressed through images involving different body parts. Future research should test the present 50-unit model against contemporary German and Uzbek corpora to establish actual frequency, genre distribution, collocational properties, and speaker acceptability.

6. CONCLUSION

A comparative analysis of 50 German–Uzbek somatic idioms was conducted using a unit-level pragmatic coding table. The results show 2 units (4%) with full formal equivalence, 7 units (14%) with close/near equivalence, 39 units (78%) with functional equivalence, and 2 units (4%) with asymmetric correspondence. Thus, the principal pattern is not formal identity but the preservation of communicative function through different phraseological images.

The pragmatic analysis also demonstrates that somatic idioms are multifunctional discourse resources. They may

express emotion, evaluate character, regulate speech, establish trust, prompt action, warn against particular behavior, manage interpersonal relations, and encode cognitive decisions. The body remains a shared experiential source, but German and Uzbek differ substantially in how this source is lexicalized and conventionalized.

The principal limitation of the study is the purposive and relatively small size of the dataset. The findings should therefore be understood not as population-level estimates but as a lexicographically grounded qualitative analytical sample. Future research should expand the dataset, validate the pragmatic coding through independent raters, and test the proposed categories in contemporary corpora. Such a design would provide a stronger empirical basis for claims concerning frequency, register, and cross-linguistic pragmatic equivalence.

Somatic domain	**n**	**%**
Hand	14	28%
Head	9	18%
Eye	7	14%
Mouth	6	12%
Heart	5	10%
Tongue	3	6%
Abdomen/Bauch	2	4%
Ear	2	4%
Thumb	1	2%
Stomach/Magen	1	2%

REFERENCES

Citron, F. M. M., Cacciari, C., Funcke, J. M., Hsu, C.-T. & Jacobs, A. M. 2019. Idiomatic expressions evoke stronger emotional responses in the brain than literal sentences. *Neuropsychologia*, 131, 233-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2019.05.020.

Ghandhari, M., Fini, C., Da Rold, F. & Borghi, A. M. 2020. Different kinds of embodied language: A comparison between Italian and Persian languages. *Brain and Cognition*, 142, 105581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2020.105581.

Gibbs, R. W. 2023. What's figurative about figurative language? *Lingua*, 287, 103520. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2023.103520.

Morid, M. & Sabourin, L. 2024. Affective and sensory–motor norms for idioms by L1 and L2 English speakers. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 45/1, 138-155. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716423000504.

Scholze-Stubenrecht, W. & Haller-Wolf, A. (Eds.), 2013. *Duden-Redewendungen: Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik*. 4th rev. andupdateded. Berlin: Dudenverlag.

Umarxo'jayev, M. I. & Nazarov, K. N. 1994. *Deutsch-russisch-usbekisches phraseologisches Wörterbuch*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.

Yusupova, S. A. & Yusufjonova, S. M. 2025. Intercultural idiomatic expression in German and Uzbek: A comparative study. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 12/1, 2554238. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2554238.

QURBANOVA ZULXUMOR AZAMATQIZI
PHD RESEARCHER,
DEPARTMENT OF GERMAN PHILOLOGY,
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF UZBEKISTAN (NUUZ),
TASHKENT 100000, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <ZULKHUMOR.BERLITZPH@GMAIL.COM>