

DOI: 10.26565/2786-5312-2022-95-03

УДК 811.111'373.7.001.11

Dmytro Pavkin

PhD, Associate Professor of the Chair of English Philology and Methods of English language teaching, the Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy; e-mail: zlata-1978@ukr.net;

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9321-9591>;

GOOGLE SCHOLAR: <https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=ojlqEcAAAAJ&hl=uk>

(Cherkasy)

Reading riddles aright: a cognitive linguistic analysis of english and ukrainian riddles

The article offers an analysis of the conceptual structure of English and Ukrainian riddles with the subsequent comparison of the empirical data under scrutiny. The relevance of the cognitive-linguistic vantage point adopted in the paper is determined by the fact that riddles constitute coal-and-ice elements of the linguistic image of the world which is a reflection of the ethnic conceptual image of the world. Thus, exposing the conceptual organization of riddles lays foundations for establishing unique features of the mindset of the English and Ukrainian peoples reflected in riddles in both languages. To reach the goal, I apply the methodology of conceptual analysis, namely the notions of conceptual sphere and domain introduced by cognitive linguists, as well as basic propositional schemas that feature in semantics of lingual networks. The research consists of two stages. At the first stage, I perform the modeling of the conceptual arrangement of objects the riddles refer to. The objects are found to fall within one of the two conceptual spheres (LIVING BEINGS and INANIMATE OBJECTS) that consist of three and six domains correspondingly. At the second stage, the characteristics of referents that are mentioned in the riddles serving as clues for guessing them are considered. These 25 characteristics are viewed as predicates of 11 basic propositional schemas. In conclusions, I draw a comparison between the riddles of the two languages. The similar features are attributed to the universals embedded in the conceptual image of the world symptomatic of all humans whereas the revealed differences pertain to idioethnic specificity of the two linguistic communities.

Keywords: *basic propositional schemas, conceptual image of the world, conceptual sphere, domain, referent of the riddle, riddle.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Riddle as a peculiar type of a phraseological unit has often attracted attention of linguists [13; 18; 19; 22; 24; 26; 28]. Cognitive linguistics as a novel approach to the study of language data offers opportunities for new insights into the nature of riddles considered by it as packages of verbalized information. Analyzing them might bring us closer to understanding the ways the human mind works [7].

Modern linguistics does not offer a unified opinion on the status of the riddle. Traditionally, riddles are studied by [paroemiology](#) together with other paroemiological units – sayings, proverbs, adages, etc. Paroemia as a term has been widely used by scholars for quite a time, yet it doesn't have a universal interpretation in linguistics. Nevertheless, scholars (for instance [8, p. 4; 15, p. 412]) do agree that paroemiae are short adages mostly as long as a sentence (or even a part of it) which represent a brief dialogue or a sketch. They reflect a person's character, his/her actions, life experience, and religious beliefs as well as the events in the immediate environment. As a kind of paroemia, the riddle is an expression that contains an explicit or implicit question and provokes the listener to find the answer, which is a condensed thought denoted by the word that names the object or phenomenon referred to by the riddle [14, p. 8].

Recently, there has been a rise of scholarly interest in the riddle (for instance, [6; 20; 25; 27]), yet the researchers have not paid any attention to the conceptual background of the riddles in different languages, still less to their comparison.

The topicality of the paper is stipulated by the methodology the analysis is grounded on. The application of various kinds of conceptual analysis developed by different schools of cognitive linguistics enables to reveal the mental foundations of English and Ukrainian riddles paving the way for making conclusions about the peculiarities of the mindset and worldview of the two nations.

The article aims to expose the conceptual structure of English and Ukrainian riddles with their subsequent comparison. To reach the goal set, the following tasks were solved:

- the classification of referents of English and Ukrainian riddles as the entities belonging to certain domains and conceptual spheres;
- the discovery of characteristics of the referents that give a clue for guessing the riddle;
- the comparison of the revealed features of riddles in the two languages.

The object of the study is English and Ukrainian riddles. The subject matter of the article is the conceptual organization of these riddles. The empirical data of the research consist of 285 English and 404 Ukrainian riddles received through continuous sampling from the novel *The Hobbit* by J.R.R. Tolkien and three internet resources.

The article makes use of the methodology of cognitive linguistics. The conceptual arrangement of objects the riddles refer to was modeled via applying the notions of the conceptual domain and conceptual sphere introduced in cognitive semantics. The conceptual sphere signifies all background information necessary to identify the meaning of a linguistic unit. Its constituents are called domains [9, p. 87]. Features of the objects riddles refer to are related to predicates of basic propositional schemas (BPS) of four types – being schemas, action schemas, possession schemas, and comparison schemas. According to S. A. Zhabotynska [10; 11], these BPS constitute a conceptual network that underlies the informational system of a human. They are called basic since they expose original and most general principles governing the processes of categorization and arrangement of information about the surrounding world. Each type comprises several schemas which reveal the major types of relations between an object and its features or between several objects.

2. FINDINGS

As scholars have noted, riddles and proverbs are significantly (sometimes literally) similar in their structure which allows their mutual transformations in different folklore traditions. Since A. V. Koonin, I. I. Chernyshova and others place proverbs within the phraseological stock of a language [see 2, p. 29–30], the same can be evidently stated about riddles. V. V. Vinogradov in his classification considers proverbs (and thus riddles as well) to be phraseological unities as they are expressions retaining semantic separability of the elements, so their meaning is partially motivated [see 17, p. 139]. I maintain that there are five characteristic features conditioning treatment of the riddle as a peculiar type of the phraseological unit.

The first such feature is the metaphoric nature of the riddle. The latter is defined as a metaphoric expression in which one object is depicted with the help of another having some kind of similarity with it. The tradition of defining riddles as metaphors goes back to Aristotle who considered the riddle to be a well-constructed metaphor [see 4, p. 10]. A. N. Afanasyev calls the riddle “a splinter of the ancient metaphorical language” [1, p. 14]. Similarly, a phraseological unit is metaphoric in its nature as well [23, p. 203]. A metaphor is a figure of speech that presupposes using words or expressions in indirect meaning based on some likeness, similarity, or comparison. All these features can be found in the riddle. As O. O. Selivanova remarks [21, p. 16], the most typical metaphoric mapping in the riddle is based on [anthropomorphism](#) i.e. on associating inanimate things with humans.

The second phraseological feature of the riddle is its stability which has several aspects [17, p. 133]. The stability of usage surfaces in its universal application in a speech community. “Extraordinary integrity of the tradition and stability of images in a riddle” [3, p. 7]

explain the fact that the riddle preserved very well its ancient meaning and form. Stability also transpires in its clichéd nature i.e. it is being reproduced readymade. Syntactic stability determines certain word order in the riddle which may seldom be violated by the introduction of a few lexemes. Riddles also manifest the stability of meaning and lexical composition being traditional fossilized models which hardly (or not at all) change except in singular cases. Sometimes, the word which names the object the riddle refers to is a part of a set expression and the other part of it is employed in the text of the riddle to help identify the answer. In this case, the riddle is stable because it is impossible to change components of the set expression.

The third phraseological feature of the riddle is its equivalence to a word. The riddle is a cohesive unit of the language functioning in it like a single word which is the answer to the riddle. Moreover, the riddle as a word equivalent is semantically inseparable and has synonyms – riddles which refer to identical objects.

The fourth is its nominative nature. The riddle as a phraseological sentence names single objects or their classes which shows that the riddle performs a nominative function [2, p. 31].

Cumulativity is the fifth phraseological feature of the riddle. In archaic societies, riddles were used as a part of a rite and a means of rendering sacred knowledge about the world [12, p. 5]. They carry an impact of ancient times and retain their “primeval mythic nature” being “remnants of mythic creed” and “elements of the world image of a folklore group” [5, p. 33; 16, p. 111]. Historic circumstances, experience, and peculiar mentality of a language community determine typical (for this very language community) features and expressive means surfacing in the test of a riddle pertaining to a certain object.

Thus, being a peculiar kind of phraseological units, riddles are the elements of the idiomatic stock of a certain language where they reflect the standardized image of the world of the language community. This image relates the imprint of a nation’s history, its ethnic specificity, and, consequently, a peculiar mindset. The latter consideration enables employment of the methodology of cognitive linguistics for studying these language units, which is what I do in this article to analyze English and Ukrainian riddles.

The objects that the riddles of both languages refer to fall within two conceptual spheres – LIVING BEINGS and INANIMATE OBJECTS. Each sphere consists of several domains: Human, Animal and Mythic creature belong to the former and Artefact, Object of nature, Natural phenomenon, Culture concept, Plant and Substance – to the latter.

Objects belonging to domain Human refer the human as a biological species (e.g. *What walks on four legs in the morning, two at mid-day, and three in the evening? (Human); Не дорослий ще мужчина, та вже зовсім не дитина, то ж назвати його як? Здогадалися?*

(Юнак)), family relations (e.g. *A father’s child, a mother’s child, yet no one’s son. (Daughter)*), ethnicity (e.g. *Хто вродлива ця панянка, що сорочка-вишиванка? – А я дівчина Устинка, я маленька ... (Українка)*), occupation (e.g. *He has married many women, but has never been married. Who is he? (Preacher); Де живуть у горах хмари, випасаються отари? Поміркуйте, постарайтесь, хто пасе їх? Здогадайтесь. (Чабан)*), or mention human’s body parts (e.g. *Different lights do make me strange, thus into different sizes I will change. (Pupil of an eye); Тридцять двоє козаків все молотять без цінків. Лиш цукерку показати, зникне вмить, годі шукати. (Зуби)*).

Constituents of domain Animal refer to mammals (e.g. *What always goes to bed with shoes on? (Horse); Клишоногий, волохатий, влітку спритний та зазятий, ну а взимку, лежебока, у барлозі гріє боки. (Ведмідь)*), insects (e.g. *I move without wings, between silken strings, I leave as you find my substance behind. (Spider); Летить – вие, сяде – рие. (Жук)*), birds (e.g. *Птах поважно походжає, у хвості квітник ховає. Як розпустить він хвоста, наче ружа зацвіта. (Павич)*), fish (e.g. *Має хвіст, та не літає, має рот – не розмовляє. Можеш вудкою спіймати і загадку відгадати. (Риба)*), amphibians (e.g. *«Ква-ква-ква» – вона виводить, позира булькатим очком. Як журавлика угледить, прикидається листочком. (Жаба)*), shellfish (e.g. *Who moves without a leg and carries his house on his back? (Snail)*), arthropods (e.g. *Він не ходить, а задкує, рибка з нього, знай, кепкує. Має клешні той дивак, здогадалися? Це ... (Рак)*), and their body parts (e.g. *Бігла ящірка прудка біля нашого садка. Міг її спіймати Костик, шусть, лишила тільки ... (Хвостик)*) as well as by-products (e.g. *Lovely and round, I shine with pale light, grown in the darkness, a lady’s delight. (Pearl); Сім соколят на одній постелі сплять. (Гніздо)*).

Domain Mythic creature includes biblical (e.g. *I killed one fourth of mankind. (Cain); Прохали два вірних одного невірного: дай нам те, що краще царства небесного. (Йосиф і Никодим у Пилата тіла Христового)*) and mythic characters (e.g. *A man but an animal, a horn with two hands. (Minotaur)*).

Objects belonging to domain Artefact are divided into material (e.g. *What gets wetter the more it dries? (Towel); Поїздами, літаками мандрувала я світами, хоч брала квиточок на концерт в куточок. (Марка)*) and spiritual artefacts (e.g. *If you have me you want to share me. If you share me you won’t have me. (Secret); Хтось на біле полотно чорне висипав пшоно. Як зумієш позбирати, зможеш книжку прочитати. (Букви)*).

Objects of nature are those elements of the natural environment that have discrete shape (e.g. *What has roots as nobody sees, is taller than trees, up, up it goes, and yet never grows? (Mountain); Вдень він спить, вночі – мандрує, сяйво ніжне нам дарує. Уночі у тихій річці любить плескатись в водичці. (Місяць)*).

Natural phenomena don’t have discrete shape in time and space (e.g. *The more there is, the less you see.*

(*Darkness*); Погойдаю в лісі гілку, заколишу в квітці бджілку. Якщо добре розлютити, можу шкоди наробити. (*Bimpe*)).

Culture concepts include such notions as courage, trust, love, knowledge, soul, etc. (e.g. *You can have me but cannot hold me; gain me and quickly lose me. If treated with care I can be great, and if betrayed I will break.* (*Trust*); На уроках, в книжці, в школі почерпнеш ти їх доволі. І назавжди у житті стануть друзями тобі. (*Знання*)).

Domain Plant includes the names of trees (e.g. *Dies half its life, lives the rest, dances without music, breathes without breath.* (*Tree*); Проливала дрібні сльози молода дівчиця. Полоскала довгі коси у чистій водичі. (*Верб*)), fruit (e.g. *I'm red and I can be green or yellow.* (*Apple*); Сам жовтенький, соковитий, досягає серед літа. Він у джемі, у варенні, і солодкий, і приємний. (*Абрикос*)), vegetables (e.g. *Take off my skin, I won't cry, but you will.* (*Onion*); Сидить панна у світлиці, молода, червонолиця. Хто до неї завітає – вітамінами вгощає. (*Морква*)), berries (e.g. *Примостився на баштані в посмугованій піжамі. Вигріває круглі боки, що смачним наліті соком.* (*Кавун*)), cereals (e.g. *І комасі, і дитинці припаса вона гостинці: і нектар, і кашу, ще й корівці пашу.* (*Гречка*)), and flowers (e.g. *First you see me in the grass dressed in yellow gay; next I am in dainty white, then I fly away.* (*Dandelion*); У матінки-квіточки лиш блакитні діточки. З жита виглядають, літечко вітають. (*Волошки*)).

Domain Substance contains such constituents as mercury, sand, wine, water, milk, etc. (e.g. *When young, I am sweet in the sun. When middle-aged, I make you gay. When old, I am valued more than ever.* (*Wine*); І поживне, і смачне, біле, пінне, запашне. Залюбки малята н'ють, здоровенькими ростуть. (*Молоко*)).

The numbers of referents of English riddles (287) and riddles per se (285) differ since one riddle may refer to several objects, e.g. *I'm a god, a planet, and measurer of heat.* (*Mercury*). This riddle refers to objects which belong to mythic creatures, objects of nature, and substances. Ukrainian riddles don't reveal such cases. The features of the referents in the riddles of both languages are viewed as predicates of 11 basic propositional schemas.

Predicates of evaluation schema (SOMETHING/SOMEBODY is SUCH-evaluation) inform about three kinds of evaluation [29, p. 45]:

- mode evaluation describes feelings and physical or psychic states caused by the object, among which are interest, boredom, surprise, satisfaction, etc.

E.g. *Прилетіла цокотуха, щось торочить понад вухом. Всім набридла байка ця без початку і кінця.* (*Муха*)

- utility evaluation shows how safe or dangerous, valuable or useless the object is.

E.g. *Під землею народилась і для борщів згодилась. Мене чистять, ріжуть, труть, смажать, валяють і печуть.* (*Картопля*)

- aesthetic evaluation shows how beautiful or ugly the object is.

E.g. *A very pretty thing am I, fluttering in the pale-blue sky. Delicate, fragile on the wing, indeed I am a pretty thing.* (*Butterfly*)

Predicates of the quantitative schema (SOMETHING/SOMEBODY is THAT MANY) inform about the quantity of objects.

E.g. *What is it that given one, you'll have either two or none?* (*Choice*).

Predicates of the qualitative schema (SOMETHING/SOMEBODY is SUCH) reveal the following features of the object:

- physical characteristics, e.g.

На будові помагає, богатирську силу має, він на поверх будь-який подає вантаж: тяжкий. (*Підйомний кран*)

- color, e.g.

I am white, black, and read all over. (*Newspaper*)

- shape, e.g.

Long and slinky like a trout, never sings till its guts come out. (*Gun*)

- sound, e.g.

Невидимка-вередка все дзижчить та набрида. Як з'являється цей гість, скрізь лунає «лясь» та «трісь». (*Комар*)

- size, e.g.

Вертоліт такий маленький сів на квітку золотеньку. Усміхнулася кульбабка: «Завітала в гості ...» (*Бабка*)

- kinship, e.g.

A father's child, a mother's child, yet no one's son. (*Daughter*)

- haptic characteristics, e.g.

Alive without breath, as cold as death; never thirsty, ever drinking, all in mail never clinking. (*Fish*)

- age, e.g.

В променах купався, силюньки набрався. Хоч за віком не дідусь, та козацький має вус. (*Овес*)

- material, e.g.

Дерев'яний та довгенький, хвостик в нього є маленький. Як у фарби хвіст мочає – все довкола розцвітає. (*Пензлик*)

- appearance, e.g.

Примостився на баштані в посмугованій піжамі. Вигріває круглі боки, що смачним наліті соком. (*Кавун*)

- weight, e.g.

I am weightless, but you can see me. Put me in a bucket, and I'll make it lighter. (*Hole*)

Predicates of the mode of being schema (SOMETHING/SOMEBODY exists SO) inform about the physical state of the object. E.g.

Живе – чорне, умре – червоне. (*Пак*).

Predicates of the locative schema (SOMETHING/SOMEBODY is THERE) inform about the location where the object is or acts. E.g.

In a tunnel of darkness lies a beast of iron. It can only attack when pulled back. (*Bullet*).

Predicates of the temporative schema (SOMETHING/SOMEbody is THEN) indicate the period of time when the object exists. Наприклад, . E.g.

Взимку у саду на вітах заіскрилились білі квіти. Хто ж цей диво-садівник, що зробив такий квітник? (Іній).

Predicates of action schemas (contact, state/process, and causation) inform about the action or the motion of the object: e.g.

Він беззубий, а хусає, він безрукий, а ханає, ще й причепиться міцненько до штанців і до сукенки. (Рен'ях)

I go up and down the stairs without moving. (Carpet)

Predicates of the part-whole schema (WHOLE has PARTS) inform about parts that the referent has (or doesn't have), e.g.

Як у цирку акробати лізуть вгору по канату, так і він – без рук, без ніг всі тички обвиту зміг. (Горюх)

Predicates of the inclusive schema (CONTAINER has CONTENT) inform about the filling of something which is viewed as a container, e.g.

My sides are firmly laced about, yet nothing is within; you'll think my head is strange indeed, being nothing else but skin. (Drum)

Predicates of ownership schema (OWNER has OWNED) inform about the property someone has, e.g.

I'm hard as a rock, and as light as a feather. I'm passed on to one another. Poor people need me, and rich people have me. What am I? (Money)

Predicates of the similarity/analogy schema (COMPARATIVE is as CORRELATE) inform about the

similarity of entities that belong to the same category), e.g.

What is round as a dishpan, deep as a tub, and still the oceans couldn't fill it up? (Sieve)

Predicates of the likeness/metaphor schema (COMPARATIVE is as if CORRELATE) inform about the likeness of objects that belong to different categories, e.g.

По травичці він стрибає, і сюркоче, і співає, заливається, як дзвоник, називають його ... (Коник)

3. CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The analyzed data enable the following inferences:

As we have discovered (see Table 1 and Table 2), most objects that riddles of both languages refer to represent inanimate objects (English – 83% and Ukrainian – 71.2%).

Yet the representation of domain differs: English riddles more often refer to artifacts (41.8%) and Ukrainian riddles – to plants (32.2%) and animals (25.8%). Such discrepancy is explained by a more “technological” orientation of the English and closer ties with the nature of Ukrainians.

285 English riddles refer to objects which possess 25 features the latter being used 1359 times (see Table 3).

Objects 404 Ukrainian riddles refer to have one feature less (24) and are used 1445 times (see Table 4).

Thus, on average, an English riddle contains 4.77 features of the “encoded” object while a Ukrainian

Table 1

The conceptual structure of referents in English riddles

Conceptual sphere	Domain	Number of usages	
		absolute	percentage
LIVING BEINGS	Animal	26	9.1
	Human	20	6.9
	Mythical creature	3	1.0
INANIMATE OBJECTS	Artifact	120	41.8
	Natural phenomenon	39	13.6
	Object of nature	30	10.5
	Substance	24	8.4
	Plant	17	5.9
	Culture concept	8	2.8
Total		287	100

Table 2

The conceptual structure of referents in Ukrainian riddles

Conceptual sphere	Domain	Number of usages	
		absolute	percentage
LIVING BEINGS	Animal	104	25.8
	Human	10	2.5
	Mythical creature	2	0.5
INANIMATE OBJECTS	Plant	130	32.2
	Artifact	66	16.3
	Natural phenomenon	42	10.4
	Object of nature	26	6.4
	Culture concept	15	3.7
	Substance	9	2.2
	Total		404

Table 3

Features of the referents of English riddles

Features of referents	Number of usages	
	absolute	percentage
Action/motion	306	22.5
Physical state	254	18.7
Existence of parts	156	11.5
Location	113	8.3
Time	105	7.7
Mode evaluation	73	5.4
Physical characteristics	71	5.2
Color	42	3.1
Shape	33	2.4
Utility evaluation	29	2.1
Sound	21	1.6
Size	18	1.3
Kinship	17	1.2
Content	15	1.1
Property	15	1.1
Haptic characteristics	14	1.0
Quantity	14	1.0
Aesthetic evaluation	12	0.9
Similarity	12	0.9
Likeness	9	0.7
Age	9	0.7
Material	9	0.7
Appearance	7	0.5
Weight	5	0.4
Total	1359	100

Table 4

Features of the referents of Ukrainian riddles

Features of referents	Number of usages	
	absolute	percentage
Action/motion	285	19.7
Location	239	16.5
Physical characteristics	124	8.6
Existence of parts	121	8.4
Color	118	8.2
Time	77	5.3
Utility evaluation	59	4.1
Quantity	52	3.6
Sound	48	3.3
Similarity	45	3.1
Shape	41	2.8
Physical state	39	2.7
Mode evaluation	35	2.4
Appearance	31	2.2
Size	29	2.0
Kinship	22	1.5
Content	20	1.4
Haptic characteristics	18	1.3
Age	17	1.2
Material	14	1.0
Aesthetic evaluation	7	0.5
Property	2	0.1
Likeness	2	0.1
Total	1445	100

riddle – 3.58. So to read a riddle, the English generally offer one feature of the described object more than the Ukrainians do.

It is evident that the conceptual structure of both English and Ukrainian riddles is modeled with similar basic propositional schemas. Moreover, the most frequent characteristic (action/motion) is identical in both languages. It means that it is vital to state what the thing does or how it moves in order to make it easier to guess the referent of a riddle in both languages. As for other features, the numerical representation of the predicates of the propositions differs.

English predicates of evaluation BPS mostly inform about mode evaluation of the referent whereas Ukrainian predicates of the said BPS present the referent’s utility evaluation. This testifies to the fact that for the English it is more important to know what emotions the referent excites whereas Ukrainians focus on the referent’s (in)ability to be useful for a person.

The number of qualitative features the objects reveal is greater (11) in English riddles since the Ukrainian ones (10) don’t expose such a feature as the referent’s weight. Yet, in the riddles of both languages, identical qualitative features (physical characteristics, color, shape, and sound) prevail. With all possible certainty,

one can claim that these features represent primary attributes of objects which people of any ethnicity focus their foremost attention on.

Generally, the most frequently mentioned features of the objects English riddles refer to include the objects’ action/motion (22.5%), physical condition (18.7%), composition (existence of parts) (11.5%), location (8.3%), and time of existence (7.7%). Their Ukrainian counterparts are mostly described through their action/motion (19.7%), location (16.5%), physical properties (8.6%), composition (existence of parts) (8.4%), and color (8.2%). The revealed data testify to the fact that when asking a riddle the English focus on the object of it per se whereas Ukrainians emphasize the co-existence of the object and the human within a certain space.

We venture to claim that all that the revealed differences pertain to the idioethnic specificity of the two linguistic communities.

The p r o s p e c t s for further research in the field lie in analyzing the empirical data from other Germanic and Slavic languages (foremost, German, Russian, and Polish) so that conclusions could extend to the peculiarities of the mentality of larger cognate linguistic communities.

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, R. D. (1972). The literary study of the riddle. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 14, 177–197.
- Afanas'ev, A. N. (1995). *Pojeticheskie vozzrenija slavjan na prirodu [Poetic views of Slavs on nature]* (Vol. 1). Moskva: Sovremennyj pisatel' Publ. (in Russian)
- Akínyemí, A. (2015). *Orature and Yorùbá Riddles*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baran, Ya. A. (1997). *Frazeologiya u sy'stemi movy' [Phraseology in the system of language]*. Ivano-Frankiv's'k: Lileya-NV Publ. (in Ukrainian)
- Ben Amos, D. (1976). Solutions to Riddles. *Journal of American Folklore*, 89, 249–254.
- Berezovs'ky', I. P. (1962). Ukrayins'ki narodni zagadky' [Ukrainian folk riddles]. In *Zagadky'. Seriya Ukrayins'ka narodna tvorchist' [Riddles. Ukrainian folklore]* (pp. 3–7). Ky'yiv: AN URSS Publ. (in Ukrainian)
- Brusecev, A. E. (2005). *Ponimanie zagadko-poslovic v poznavatel'nom i komunikativnom kontekstah [Understanding riddles/proverbs in the instructive and communicative contexts]*, Proc. of sci. conf. "Ponimanie v kommunikacii" (pp. 9–11). Moskva: MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova Publ. (in Russian)
- Buslaev, F. I. (2003). *Narodnyj jepos i mifologija [Folk epic and mythology]*. Moskva: Vysshaja shkola Publ. (in Russian)
- Dudenko, O. V. (2002). *Nominaty'vna ta komunikaty'vna pry'roda ukrayins'ky'x paremij (Avtoreferat kandydatskoj dysertatsii) [Nominative and communicative nature of Ukrainian paroemiae (Philology PhD thesis synopsis)]*. Ky'yivs'ky'j nacional'ny'j univerty'tet, Ky'yiv. (in Ukrainian)
- Gacenko, I. O. (2018). Svojeridnist' zagadky' yak zhanru fol'klornogo dy'skursu [Uniqueness of riddle as a genre of folk discourse]. *Naukovi zapysky' Nacional'nogo univerty'tetu «Ostroz'ka akademiya»: seriya «Filologiya» [Scientific notes of the National University "Ostrog Academy": Philology series]*, 1(69), 1, 107–110. (in Ukrainian)
- Guk, I. A. (2003). *Metonimiya v anglijs'kij frazeologiji: lingvokognity'vny'j analiz [Metonymy in English phraseology: a cognitive linguistic analysis]*, Proc. of sci. conf. "Treti Karazy'ns'ki chy'tannya" (pp. 143–145). Xarkiv: Konstanta Publ. (in Ukrainian)
- Haritonchik, Z. A. (1992). *Leksikologija anglijskogo jazyka [Lexicology of the English language]*. Minsk: Vysshaja shkola Publ. (in Russian)
- Kaivola-Bregenhøj, A. (2018). The riddle: Form and performance. *Humanities*, 7(2), 49. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325268276_The_Riddle_Form_and_Performance
- Koval's'ka, N. A. (2004). Paremiyi yak zasib vidobrazhennya kognity'vny'x procesiv [Paroemiae. as means of reflection of cognitive processes]. *Visny'k L'vivs'kogo univerty'tetu. Seriya Filologichni nauky' [Messenger of Lviv University. Series: Philological sciences]*, 34(1), 412–418. (in Ukrainian)
- Maranda, E. K. (1971). Theory and practice of riddle analysis. *Journal of American Folklore*, 84, 51–61.
- Mechkovskaja, A. V. (1998). *Jazyk i religija: lekci po filosofii i istorii religij [Language and religion: lectures on philosophy and history of religion]*. Moskva: Fair Publ. (in Russian)
- Mostovy'j, M. I. (1993). *Leksy'kologija anglijs'koyi movy' [Lexicology of the English language]*. Xarkiv: Osnova Publ. (in Ukrainian)
- Nikolaeva, T. M. (1994). *Zagadka i poslovica: social'nye funkcii i grammatika [Riddle and proverb: social functions and grammar]*. *Issledovanija v oblasti balto-slavjanskoj duhovnoj kul'tury. Zagadka kak tekst [Research in the field of Baltic and Slavic spiritual culture. Riddle as a text]*. Vol. 1 (pp. 143–177). Moskva: Indrik Publ. (in Russian)
- Ony'shhenko, G. A. (2006). *Movna struktura ukrayins'koyi narodnoyi zagadky' (semanty'chny'j i sy'ntaksy'chny'j aspekty') (Avtoreferat kandydatskoj dysertatsii) [Linguistic structure of Ukrainian folk riddle (semantic and syntactic aspects (Philology PhD thesis synopsis))]*. Dnipropetrovs'ky'j nacional'ny'j univerty'tet, Dnipropetrovs'k. (in Ukrainian)
- Panasenko, T. A. (2010). *Komunikaty'vno-pragmaty'chny'j potencial zagadok u raznosy'stemny'x movax (Dy's. kand. filol. nauk) [Communicative and pragmatic potential of riddles in languages with diverse systems (Philology PhD thesis)]*. Pivdenoukrayins'ky'j nacional'ny'j pedagogichny'j univerty'tet im. K. D. Ushy'ns'kogo, Odesa. (in Ukrainian)
- Pavkin, D. (2020). A cognitive linguistic approach to the analysis of fantasy text characters. *Cognition, communication, discourse*, 20, 41–61.
- Selivanova, O. O. (2004). *Komunikaty'vni strategiji i takty'ky' v ukrayins'ky'x zagadkax [Communicative strategies and tactics in Ukrainian riddles]*. *Visny'k Cherkas'kogo univerty'tetu. Seriya Filologichni nauky' [Messenger of Cherkasy University. Series: Philological sciences]*, 60, 10–22. (in Ukrainian)
- Sibirceva, V. G. (2002). Otrazhenie mirovospriyatija v zagadkah 30-90-h godov XX veka [Reflection of the worldview in riddles of the 1930s – 1990s]. In *Problemy jazykovoj kartiny mira na sovremennom jetape [Contemporary problems of the linguistic image of the world]* (pp. 82–85). Nizhnij Novgorod: Vektor Publ. (in Russian)
- Zaxarova, N. V. (2009). *Zagadka yak zakodovane znannya pro svit [Riddle as an encoded knowledge about the world]*. *Uchenye zapiski Tavricheskogo nacional'nogo univerty'teta im. V. I. Vernadskogo. Seriya «Filologija» [Scientific notes of V. I. Vernadsky Tauric national university]*, 21, 4(2), 252–256. (in Ukrainian)
- Zaxarova, N. V. (2018). *Strukturno-ty'pologichni osobly'vosti ukrayins'ky'x i nimecz'ky'x narodny'x zagadok [Structural and typological features of Ukrainian and German folk riddles]*. *Visny'k Mariupol's'kogo derzhavnogo univerty'tetu. Seriya: Filologija [Messenger of Mariupol State University. Series: Philology]*, 17, 130–138. (in Ukrainian)
- Zhabotinskaja, S. A. (2004). *Konceptual'nyj analiz jazyka: frejmovye seti [Conceptual analysis of language: frame networks]*. *Mova. Naukovo-teorety'chny'j chasopy's z movoznavstva, 9: Problemy' pry'kladnoyi lingvisty'ky' [Language: scientific and theoretical journal in linguistics, 9, Problems of applied linguistics]*, 81–92. (in Russian)

Zhabotinskaja, S. A. (2018). Generativizm, kognitivizm i semantika lingval'nyh setej [Generativism, cognitivism, and semantics of lingual networks]. *Doctrina multiplex, veritas una. Uchen` bagato, isty`na odna: zbirny`k pracz` do yuvileyu Izabelly` Rafayilivny` Buniyatovoyi [Schools are numerous, truth is only one: a collection of treatises commemorating the jubilee of Izabella Rafailivna Buniyatova]*, 99–141. (in Russian)

Zhabotynska, S. A. (2019). Semanty`ka lingval`ny`x merezh u navchal`nomu kombinatornomu tezaursi [Semantics of lingual networks in an educational combinatory thesaurus]. *Studia Philologica. Filologichni studiyi*, 13, 17–27. (in Ukrainian)

Zhurinskij, A. N. (1989). *Semanticheskaja struktura zagadki: nemetaforicheskoe preobrazovanie smysla [Semantic structure of riddle: metaphoric transformation of meaning]*. Moskva: Nauka. (in Russian)

Дмитро Павкін – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри англійської філології та методики навчання англійської мови Черкаського національного університету ім. Б. Хмельницького; e-mail: zlata-1978@ukr.net; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9321-9591>; SCHOLAR GOOGLE: https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=_ojlqE-cAAAAJ&hl=uk

ВІДГАДУЮЧИ ЗАГАДКИ: ЛІНГВОКОГНІТИВНИЙ АНАЛІЗ АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ЗАГАДОК

У статті запропоновано аналіз концептуальної структури англійських та українських загадок із подальшим порівнянням досліджуваного емпіричного матеріалу. Доречність використання когнітивного підходу зумовлена важливою роллю загадок як особливого різновиду фразеологічних одиниць і водночас невід'ємного складника мовної картини світу, що відбиває концептуальну картину світу певного народу. Тож, з'ясування концептуальної організації загадок закладає підвалини для встановлення унікальних рис менталітету англійців і українців, що знаходять втілення у загадках відповідних мов. У статті використано доробок концептуального аналізу, зокрема запропоновані різними школами когнітивної лінгвістики поняття «концептосфера» і «домен», а також базисні пропозиціональні схеми, які фігурують у семантиці лінгвальних мереж – новітній методології, розробленій С. А. Жаботинською. Аналіз здійснено у два етапи. На першому моделюється концептуальна організація денотатів загадок, які належать до однієї з двох концептосфер (ЖИВИ ІСТОТИ та НЕЖИВИ ОБ'ЄКТИ), де перша містить три домени, а друга – шість. На другому етапі аналізуються ознаки денотатів, що подані в загадці аби допомогти вгадати неназваний денотат. Ці 25 ознак розглядаються як предикати 11 базисних пропозиціональних схем. Підсумком аналізу є порівняння загадок обох мов у плані їхніх денотатів та характеристик цих об'єктів. Вочевидь, виявлені схожі риси є універсальними, які є складниками концептуальної і мовної картини світу кожної людини, незалежно від її національної приналежності, а наявні розбіжності пояснюються ідіоетнічними рисами світосприйняття носіїв двох мов.

Ключові слова: базисні пропозиціональні схеми, денотат загадки, домен, загадка, концептосфера, концептуальна картина світу.

СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Афанасьев, А. Н. (1995). *Поэтические воззрения славян на природу*. (Т. 1). Москва: Современный писатель.
2. Баран, Я. А. (1997). *Фразеология у системі мови*. Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ.
3. Березовський, І. П. (1962). Українські народні загадки. *Загадки. Серія Українська народна творчість* (с. 3–7). Київ: Видавництво АН УРСР.
4. Брусенцев, А. Е. (2005). *Понимание загадок-пословиц в познавательном и коммуникативном контекстах*. Понимание в коммуникации: тезисы докладов международной научной конференции. Москва: МГУ им. М. В. Ломоносова, 9–11.
5. Буслаев, Ф. И. (2003). *Народный эпос и мифология*. Москва: Высшая школа.
6. Гаценко, І. О. (2018). Своєрідність загадки як жанру фольклорного дискурсу. Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»: серія «Філологія», 1(69), Ч. 1, 107–110.
7. Гук, І. А. (2003). *Метонімія в англійській фразеології: лінгвокогнітивний аналіз*. Треті Каразинські читання: матеріали міжнародної науково-методичної конференції. Харків: Константа, 143–145.
8. Дуденко, О. В. (2002). *Номінативна та комунікативна природа українських паремій*. (Автореф. канд. філол. наук). Київський національний університет, Київ.
9. Жаботинская, С. А. (2004). Концептуальный анализ языка: фреймвые сети. *Мова. Науково-теоретичний часопис з мовознавства, 9: Проблеми прикладної лінгвістики*, 81–92.
10. Жаботинская, С. А. (2018). Генеративизм, когнитивизм и семантика лингвальных сетей. *Doctrina multiplex, veritas una. Uchen` bagato, istina odna: zbirnik pracz` do yuvileyu Izabelly` Rafayilivny` Buniyatovoyi*, 99–141.
11. Жаботинська, С. А. (2019). Семантика лінгвальних мереж у навчальному комбінаторному тезаурусі. *Studia Philologica. Філологічні студії*, 13, 17–27.
12. Журицкий, А. Н. (1989). *Семантическая структура загадки: неметафорическое преобразование смысла*. Москва: Наука.

13. Захарова, Н. В. (2009). Загадка як закодоване знання про світ. *Ученые записки Таврического национального университета им. В. И. Вернадского. Серия «Филология»*, 21, 4(2), 252–256.
14. Захарова, Н. В. (2018). Структурно-типологічні особливості українських і німецьких народних загадок. *Вісник Маріупольського державного університету. Серія: Філологія*, 17, 130–138.
15. Ковальська, Н. А. (2004). Паремії як засіб відображення когнітивних процесів. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія Філологічні науки*, 34(1), 412–418.
16. Мечковская, А. В. (1998). *Язык и религия: Лекции по философии и истории религий*. Москва: Фаир.
17. Мостовой, М. І. (1993). *Лексикологія англійської мови*. Харків: Основа.
18. Николаева, Т. М. (1994). Загадка и пословица: социальные функции и грамматика. Исследования в области балто-славянской духовной культуры. Загадка как текст. Т.1 (с. 143–177). Москва: Издательство Индрик.
19. Онищенко, Г. А. (2006). *Мовна структура української народної загадки (семантичний і синтаксичний аспекти)*. (Автореф. канд. філол. наук). Дніпропетровський національний університет, Дніпропетровськ.
20. Панасенко, Т. А. (2010). Комунікативно-прагматичний потенціал загадок у разносистемних мовах. (Дис. канд. філол. наук). Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет ім. К. Д. Ушинського, Одеса.
21. Селіванова, О. О. (2004). Комунікативні стратегії і тактики в українських загадках. *Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія Філологічні науки*, 60, 10–22.
22. Сибирцева, В. Г. (2002). Отражение мировосприятия в загадках 30-90-х годов XX века. Проблемы языковой картины мира на современном этапе (с. 82–85). Нижний Новгород: Вектор.
23. Харитончик, З. А. (1992). *Лексикология английского языка*. Минск: Высшая школа.
24. Abrahams, R. D. (1972). The literary study of the riddle. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 14, 177–197.
25. Akínyemí, A. (2015). *Orature and Yorùbá Riddles*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
26. Ben Amos, D. (1976). Solutions to riddles. *Journal of American Folklore*, 89, 249–254.
27. Kaivola-Bregenhøj, A. (2018). The riddle: Form and performance. *Humanities*, 7(2), 49. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325268276_The_Riddle_Form_and_Performance
28. Maranda, E. K. (1971). Theory and practice of riddle analysis. *Journal of American Folklore*, 84, 51–61.
29. Pavkin, D. (2020). A cognitive linguistic approach to the analysis of fantasy text characters. *Cognition, communication, discourse*, 20, 41–61.

ДЖЕРЕЛА ІЛЮСТРАТИВНОГО МАТЕРІАЛУ

1. *Загадки*. Retrieved from <http://www.abetka.ukrlife.org/zagadki0.html>
2. *Brain food*. Retrieved from <http://www.rinkworks.com/brainfood/p/riddles1.shtml>
3. *Riddles*. Retrieved from <https://www.riddles.com/riddles>
4. Tolkien, J. R. R. (1993). *The Hobbit*. New York: Ballantine Books.