ТЕРМИЗ ДАВЛАТ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

Илмий-инновацион журнал

Jurnal OAK Rayosatining 2022-yil 30-sentabrdagi 325/6-son qarori bilan filologiya fanlari bo'yicha doktorlik dissertatsiyalari asosiy ilmiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan

2021-yildan buyon nashr etiladi

2026 / № 2,1

Termiz – 2026

Muassis:
Termiz davlat universiteti

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

ILMIY-INNOVATSION JURNAL

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Administratsiyasi huzuridagi Axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan 2020 yil 19 oktyabrda 1122 raqami bilan ro'yxatga olingan. Matnlarda foydalanilgan misol, ko'chirma va ma'lumotlar aniqligi uchun mualliflar javobgardir. Jurnaldan ko'chirib bosilganda manba qayd etilishi shart.

Bosishga ruxsat etildi: 15.06.2026
Qog'oz bichimi: 70x85
Bosma tabog'i: 5.94
Ofset bosma. Ofset qog'ozi
Adadi: 100
Bahosi kelishilgan narxda
Buyurtma: 155-son

«TerDU bosmaxonasi»da chop etildi
Termiz shahri, Barkamol avlod ko'chasi, 43-uy

Tahririyat manzili:
190111, Termiz shahri,
Barkamol avlod ko'chasi, 43.
Telefon: +998990 377 77 23,
+99895 986 07 77

E-mail:
philologicalresearch@umail.uz
Rasmiy sayt:
https://journaltersu.uz

BOSH MUHARRIR:
Abduqodir TOSHQULOV,
iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

TAHRIR HAY'ATI:

Bekpo'lat Umurqulov, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (bosh muharrir o'rinbosari)
Shoxista Maxmaraimova, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (mas'ul muharrir)
O'ral Xoliyorov, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Olmos Ulviy Binnatova, f.f.d., professor (Ozarbayjon)
Karl Rayxl, f.f.d., professor (Germaniya)
Vali Savash yelok, f.f.d., professor (Turkiya)
Dorota Silviya, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (Polsha)
Zabita Mahammad qizi Teymurlu, filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent (Ozarbayjon)
Tarana Imomverdi qizi Xojieva, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Ozarbayjon),
Muslihiddin Muhiddinov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Ibodulla Mirzayev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Abdi Mamatov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Suyun Karimov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Muhammadxon Hakimov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Nafas Shodmonov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Dilmurod Quronov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Murodqosim Abdiyev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Baxtiyor Mengliyev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Normat Y o'ldoshev, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Baxtiyor Xolmuxamedov, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Bobonazar Murtazayev, f.f.n., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Asqar Eshmo'minov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Obidjon Shofiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Zafar Umurqulov, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Nurali Amonturdiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Hakim Ahmedov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Abdulla Xudoyqulov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Ahad Shukurov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Eshnazar Jabborov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Abdumurod Arslonov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Sirojiddin Turdimurodov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Umida Raximova, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Gulchehra Begmatova, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Nargis Qurbonazarova, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Muyassar Xolova, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Shoira Omonturdiyeva, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Sherzod Turdiqulov, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Alibek Omonturdiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Humayun Nadim Muhammad, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)

Texnik muharrir: Bahodir To'raliyev

Учредитель:
Термезский государственный университет

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM
ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

НАУЧНО-ИННОВАЦИОННЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ

Зарегистрировано Агентством информации и массовых коммуникаций при Администрации Президента Республики Узбекистан от 19 октября 2020 года под номером 1122.

Авторы несут ответственность за точность приведенных в текстах примеров, отрывков и данных. Необходимо указывать источник при копировании из журнала.

Разрешено к печати: 15.06.2026
Размер бумаги; 70x85
Печатный лист: 5.94
Офсетная печать. Офсетная бумага
Тираж: 100. Цена договорная
Заказ: 155

Печатано в «Типографии ТерГУ»
ул. Баркамол авлод 43, г. Термез

Адрес редакции:
190111, г.Термез, ул. Баркамол авлод, 43.
Телефон: +998990 377 77 23, +99895 986 07 77

E-mail: philologicalresearch@umail.uz

Официальный сайт: https://journaltersu.uz

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР:
Абдукадир ТАШКУЛОВ,
доктор экономических наук, профессор

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ:

Бекпулат Умуркулов, доктор филологических наук, профессор (зам. главного редактора)
Шохиста Махмараимова, доктор филологических наук, профессор (ответственный редактор)
Урал Холияров, ф.ф.ф.д. (. PhD), доцент (Узбекистан)
Олмос Улвий Биннатова, д.ф.н., профессор (Азербайджан)
Карл Райхл, д.ф.н., профессор (Германия)
Вали Саваш Елок, д.ф.н., профессор (Турция)
Дорота Сильвия, PhD, доцент (Польша)
Забита Магомед кызы Теймурлу, доктор философии по филологии, доцент (Азербайджан)
Тарана Имамверди гызы Хаджиева, доктор наук, профессор (Азербайджан)
Муслихиддин Мухиддинов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Ибодулла Мирзаев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Абди Маматов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Суюн Каримов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Мухаммадхон Хакимов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Нафас Шодмонов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Дилмурод Куронов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Мурадкасим Абдиев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Бахтиёр Менглиев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Нормат Юлдашев, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Бахтиёр Холмухамедов, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Бобоназар Муртазаев, к.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Аскар Эшмуминов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Обиджон Шофиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD), доцент (Узбекистан)
Зафар Умуркулов, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Нурали Амонтурдиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Хаким Ахмедов, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Абдулла Худайкулов, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Ахад Шукуров, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Эшназар Джаббаров, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Абдумурод Арслонов, д. ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Сирожиддин Турдимуродов, д. ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Умида Рахимова, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Гульчехра Бегматова, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Наргис Курбаназарова, д. ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Муяссар Холова, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Шаира Амонтурдиева, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Шерзад Турдикулов, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Алибек Омонтурдиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Хумаюн Надим Мухаммад, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)

Технический редактор: Баходир Туралиев

Institutor:
Termez State University

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

SCIENTIFIC-INNOVATIONAL JOURNAL

Registered by the Agency for Information and Mass Communications under the President's Administration of the of the Republic of Uzbekistan on October 19, 2020 under number 1122.

The authors are responsible for the accuracy of the examples, passages and data provided in the texts. The source must be specified when copying from the journal.

Approved for printing: 15.06.2026
Size of the paper: 70x85
Printed sheet: 5.94. Offset printing.
Offset paper. Circulation: 100
Price is negotiable
Order: 155. Printed at the «Printing House of the TerSU»
43, Barkamol avlod str. Termez city.

Address of Editorial Office:
190111, Barkamol avlod str., 43, Termez city.
Phone: +998990 377 77 23, +99895 986 07 77

E-mail:
philologicalresearch@umail.uz

Official website:
https://journaltersu.uz

EDITOR IN-CHIEF:
Abdukodir TASHKULOV,
doctor of economic sciences, professor

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Bekpulat Umurkulov, doctor of philological sciences, professor (Uzbekistan) (deputy chief editor)
Shohista Makhmaraimova, doctor of philological sciences, professor (Uzbekistan) (editor-in-chief)
Ural Kholiyorov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Olmos Ulviy Binnatova, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Azerbaijan)
Karl Rayxl, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Germany)
Vali Salvash Elok, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Turkey)
Dorota Silvia, PhD, associate professor (Poland)
Zabita Magomed kyzy Teymurlu, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Azerbaijan)
Tarana Imamverdi gizi Khadzhieva, Doctor of Sciences, Professor (Azerbaijan)
Muslihiddin Mukhiddinov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Ibodulla Mirzaev, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdi Mmatov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Suyun Karimov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Muhammadkhon Khakimov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Nafas Shodmonov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Dilmurod Kuronov, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Muradkasim Abdiyev, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Bakhtiyor Mengliev, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Normat Yuldashev, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Bakhtiyor Kholmukhamedov, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Bobonazar Murtazaev, cand.of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Askar Eshmuminov, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Obidjon Shofiev, PhD, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Zafar Umurkulov, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Nurali Amonturdiev, PhD (Uzbekistan)
Hakim Akhmedov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdulla Khudaykulov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Ahad Shukurov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Eshnazar Jabbarov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdumurod Arslonov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Sirojiddin Turdimurodov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Umida Rakhimova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Gulchekhra Begmatova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Nargis Kurbanazarova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Muyassar Kholova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Shoira Omonturdiyeva, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Sherzod Turdikulov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Alibek Omonturdiev, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Humayun Nadim Muhammad, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)

Technical editor: Bakhodir Turaliyev

МУНДАРИЖА

TILSHUNOSLIK

ULUQOV NOSIRJON MUHAMMADALIYEVICH,
SOLIXO'JAYEVA HAVASXON ZOKIRJANOVNA
O'zbek va turk bayramlarining leksik-semantik tasnifi hamda etnolingvistik, lingvokulturologik tahlili 7

МАХМАРАИМОВА ШОХИСТА ТУХТАШЕВНА
Биз нега сўкинамиз? (ёки ҳақоратнинг нейролингвистик табиати) 10

ALIMOVA ZARIFAXON VAXOBOVNA
Alisher Navoiyning "Saddi Iskandariy" dostonidagi fors-tojikcha gidronimlarning
semantik va funksional xususiyatlari 16

ASADOV TO'LQIN HAMROYEVICH,
MARDONOVA SARVINOZ ORIPOVNA
O'zbek tilshunosligida ravishga nisbat beriluvchi oraliq ma'no ifodali affikslar tadqiqi xususida 20

FAYZIYEVA XADICHA CHORIYEVNA
Surxondaryo o'zbek shevalarida bolalar o'yinlarining nomlari 24

BOTIROVA MAXLIYO
O'zbek tilida reklama matnlarining morfologik xususiyati 28

VAFOYEVA MUXAYYO YULDOSHEVNA
O'zbek lingvomadaniyatida «Intizorlik» frazeosemantik guruhi 33

RAXIMOVA UMIDA DJUMAYEVNA
Kasb ohangi nutqda qanday jaranglaydi? 37

SARBAROVA DILNOZA NOSIRJON QIZI,
BABAYEVA SURAYYO ERGASHOVNA,
JUMAYEVA ANORXOL CHAMAN QIZI
O'zbek tilshunosligida zamon kategoriyasining nazariy asoslari 39

TESHABOYEVA GULNOZA
O'zbek tilida "Qora" rangini ifodalovchi sifatlarda mazmuniy sinkretizm 42

SAMIYEVA SURAYYO ORIPOVNA
Evfememik vositalarning funksional uslubiy xususiyatlari 47

PO'LATXONOVA HILOLAXON SHUHRATXON QIZI
Neurolinguistic and linguocognitive features of speech manipulation in cyberspace 50

SOBIROVA FERUZA
Saylov targ'ibot diskursida pragmatik belgilar 54

QURBONOVA MUHARRAM JURABEKOVNA
Xurshid Davron she'riyatida murojaat gaplarning qo'llanilishi 58

ABDUG'ANIYEVA ZEBUNISO
Ilmiy diskursning institutsional-kommunikativ tabiati 61

BADALOVA MUAZZAM
Kibermuloqotda nutq aktlari va etik me'yorlar: ingliz va o'zbek tillari qiyosiy tahlili 65

ERGASHOVA YASMINA,
XOLNAZAROV UMID ERKINOVICH
Neologizmlar klassifikatsiyasi 67

МУНДАРИЖА

O‘ROZBOQOVA MAHLIYO IMOMNAZAR QIZI
Xalq og‘zaki ijodi namunalarida takrorlarning qo‘llanilishi 71

MURODQULOVA IRODA SHAROFIDDINOVNA
Dostonlarda ornitonimlarning majoziy ma’no ifodasi 74

NURMATOVA SABRINA JAXONGIR QIZI
«Devonu lug‘otit turk» va «Qutadg‘u bilig» asarlarida qora rangning qo‘llanilishi 78

OCHILOVA MUXLISA ABDURAXMON QIZI
Badiiy diskursda kinoya nutqiy aktining pragmatik xususiyatlari 81

РАХМАТУЛЛАЕВА БАРНО ЗАФАР КИЗИ
Экзотическая лексика как маркер культурной идентичности персонажей
(на материале романа Г. Яхиной «Зулейха открывает глаза») 85

RUSTAMOVA NIGORA RUSTAM QIZI
O‘zbek tilida duolar va olqishlarning lingvomadaniy talqini 89

ABDINAZAROVA GULISTON MUZAFFAR QIZI,
KHUJANOVA OZODA TOJIYEVNA
Conceptualization of love in uzbek and russian literary discourse:
a comparative cognitive-semantic and axiological analysis 93

O‘RMONOVA DURDONAXON TAVAKKALJON QIZI
Ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida “Tinchlik” konseptining o‘xshash va farqli jihatlari 97

ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIK

MUHIDDINOVA BADIA MUSLIHIDDINOVNA,
AXMEDOVA BAXTIGUL XAITMUROT QIZI
Qardosh xalqlar dostonlarida farzandsizlik motivi 101

RAXIMOVA NODIRA
Pastish, parodiya, travestiya, nazira va tatabbu’da intertekstual birliklarning
ifodalanish mexanizmlari va tipologik farqlari 104

MAMIROVA MAMLAKATXON ILHOMJON QIZI
Nasriy asarda ramziylik 111

КУЗИМУРОДОВА ЛОБАР МУРОТОВНА
Образ маленького человека в повести л.улицкой «Сонечка» 115

XOTIRA

Yuraklarda yashayotgan inson
Marhum tilshunos olim Ro‘ziqul Normurodovning
65-yillik porloq xotirasiga bag‘ishlanadi 119

Filologik tadqiqotlar: til, adabiyot, ta'lim. 2026; 4
ISNN: 2181-1741 (Print)
ISNN: 2181-1725

NEUROLINGUISTIC AND LINGUOCOGNITIVE FEATURES OF SPEECH MANIPULATION IN CYBERSPACE

Po'latxonova Hilolaxon Shuhratxon qizi,
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti
ingliz tili amaliy aspektlari kafedrasi o'qituvchisi

In contemporary digital society, cyberspace has become one of the most influential domains of human communication. Social networks, online news platforms, blogs, messengers, and comment sections do not merely transmit information; they actively shape users' perceptions, emotional reactions, and patterns of social behaviour. In this context, speech manipulation has acquired a new communicative status. It is no longer limited to political speeches, advertising, or traditional media discourse; rather, it functions as a dynamic linguistic mechanism within digital interaction, where messages circulate rapidly and influence large audiences within a short period of time.

The relevance of this study is determined by the increasing role of manipulative language in online communication. In cyberspace, users are often exposed to emotionally charged headlines, metaphorically framed political statements, clickbait constructions, algorithmically reinforced narratives, and polarizing linguistic patterns. These forms of discourse influence not only what people know, but also how they interpret, evaluate, and emotionally respond to information. Therefore, speech manipulation in cyberspace should be examined not only as a rhetorical or pragmatic phenomenon, but also as a neurolinguistic and linguocognitive process.

The scientific problem of the present article lies in the fact that manipulative online discourse has often been studied within political communication, discourse analysis, media studies, and pragmatics, while its neurolinguistic and linguocognitive mechanisms remain insufficiently integrated into one analytical framework. In other words, it is necessary to explain how linguistic structures activate mental frames, emotional responses, conceptual metaphors, cognitive biases, and automatic patterns of interpretation.

Speech manipulation can be understood as a purposeful linguistic influence aimed at directing the recipient's thoughts, emotions or actions in a desired direction without always making this influence explicit. In cyberspace, such manipulation becomes especially effective because online communication is often fast, fragmented and emotionally saturated. Users usually do not analyse every message deeply; instead, they react to keywords, images, metaphors, slogans and emotional signals. This makes cyberspace a favourable environment for implicit influence.

Teun A. van Dijk considers manipulation as a form of discursive power and control. According to his approach, manipulation influences the mental models of recipients and makes them accept certain beliefs or attitudes in the interests of the manipulator[1]. This view is especially relevant to digital discourse, where users are frequently exposed to selectively framed information, ideological opposition, emotional appeals and simplified narratives. Manipulation in cyberspace often does not force the user directly; rather, it creates conditions in which the user begins to interpret information through a prepared cognitive frame.

The linguocognitive foundation of the present study is strongly connected with the theory of conceptual metaphor developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. In *Metaphors We Live By*, they argue that metaphor is not only a stylistic device, but a basic mechanism of human thought and action[2]. This idea is very important for the analysis of cyber manipulation because many online messages influence users not through direct argument, but through metaphorical framing. For example, expressions such as *information war*, *attack on truth*, *defend our values*, *fight against fake news* and *viral threat* do not merely describe reality; they construct reality in a particular cognitive form.

[1] Van Dijk T. A. Discourse and manipulation // Discourse & society. – 2006. – Vol. 17. – № 3. – P. 359–383.
2 Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. – P. 3–6.

Lakoff and Johnson's example ***Argument is war*** is especially applicable to cyberspace[1]. In online political discussions and social media debates, disagreement is frequently represented as conflict. Users "attack" an opponent's view, "defend" their position, "destroy" arguments or "win" debates. Such language frames communication as a battlefield rather than a space for dialogue. As a result, users may perceive alternative opinions not as possible interpretations, but as threats. This strengthens polarization and reduces the possibility of rational discussion.

Another important idea in Lakoff and Johnson's theory is that metaphors highlight some aspects of reality while hiding others[2].This mechanism is central to speech manipulation. When an online message describes a social or political situation as a "war", it highlights enemies, danger, struggle and victory. At the same time, it hides complexity, compromise, dialogue and verification. Thus, metaphor becomes not simply a figure of speech, but a cognitive instrument of manipulation.

Daniel Kahneman's theory of fast and slow thinking helps explain the neurolinguistic and psychological effectiveness of manipulative online discourse. His distinction between automatic, intuitive thinking and slow, analytical thinking shows why emotionally charged messages are powerful in cyberspace[3]. When users encounter phrases such as *shocking truth*, *hidden threat*, *urgent warning* or *they do not want you to know*, they may react quickly and emotionally before critically evaluating the information. In this sense, cyber manipulation often appeals to fast cognitive processing.

Norman Fairclough's approach to media discourse is also important for this study because it shows that language is not neutral: it participates in the construction of social reality[4]. In online environments, media discourse becomes even more complex because professional journalism, personal opinion, advertising, political propaganda and user-generated content often merge. Ruth Wodak's discourse-historical approach also helps explain how political meanings are shaped by context, ideology and repeated communicative strategies[5].

The problem of online manipulation is also related to the structure of digital platforms. Cass Sunstein's idea of digital fragmentation and echo chambers explains how users may become surrounded by information that confirms their existing beliefs[6]. Eli Pariser's concept of the filter bubble similarly shows that algorithmic personalization can limit users' exposure to alternative viewpoints[7]. This is significant for speech manipulation because repeated exposure to the same linguistic frames can normalize particular interpretations and make them appear natural.

Russian and Uzbek linguistic traditions also provide important theoretical support for this topic. E. S. Kubryakova's works on cognitive linguistics emphasise the connection between language, knowledge and mental representation[8]. This approach allows us to analyse cyber discourse as a system that not only transmits information, but also structures knowledge in the user's mind. E. I. Sheigal's research on political discourse is relevant because manipulative online messages often operate through ideological symbols, evaluative meanings and semiotic opposition[9]. In Uzbek linguistics, Sh. Safarov's pragmalinguistic approach is important for understanding speech influence, communicative intention and pragmatic meaning[10]. D. U. Ashurova and M. R. Galieva's work on cognitive linguistics can also be used to explain conceptualisation, categorisation and cognitive models in language[11].

The methodology of this article is based on a qualitative descriptive-analytical approach. The research uses discourse analysis, linguocognitive analysis, pragmalinguistic interpretation, neurolinguistic explanation and comparative analysis. The material for analysis consists of typical examples of online manipulative discourse, including social media headlines, political slogans, clickbait expressions and emotionally charged digital statements. These examples are selected according to the following criteria: presence of emotional vocabulary, metaphorical framing, implicit persuasive intention, possible influence on perception and relevance to cyberspace communication.

[1] Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. – P. 4–6.
[2] Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. – P. 10–13.
[3] Kahneman D. Thinking, fast and slow. – New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
4 Fairclough N. Media discourse. – London: Edward Arnold, 1995.
[5] Wodak R. The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
[6] Sunstein C. R. Republic.com. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
[7] Pariser E. The Filter Bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you. – New York: Penguin Press, 2011.
[8] Кубрякова Е. С. Начальные этапы становления когнитивизма: лингвистика – психология – когнитивная наука // Вопросы языкознания. – 1994. – № 4. – С. 34–47.
[9] Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса. – Москва: Гнозис, 2004.
[10] Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. – Toshkent, 2008.
[11] Ashurova D. U., Galieva M. R. Cognitive linguistics. – Tashkent, 2018.

Discourse analysis is used to identify lexical choices, ideological oppositions, presuppositions and implicit meanings. Linguocognitive analysis is applied to reveal conceptual metaphors, frames and mental models. Pragmalinguistic analysis helps determine the speaker's communicative intention and hidden influence. Neurolinguistic interpretation explains how emotionally marked language may activate attention, fear, curiosity and automatic processing. Comparative analysis connects the results with the theoretical views of Lakoff and Johnson, van Dijk, Kahneman, Fairclough, Wodak, Kubryakova, Sheigal, Safarov and other scholars.

The analysis shows that one of the most common mechanisms of speech manipulation in cyberspace is emotional triggering. Online messages often contain words such as *shocking*, *dangerous*, *hidden*, *urgent*, *threat*, *enemy*, *betrayal* and *truth*. These words are designed to attract attention and create emotional tension. For example, the phrase *"This hidden threat is spreading faster than you think"* does not provide clear evidence, but it activates fear and urgency. The words *hidden*, *threat* and *spreading* construct a danger-based frame. From a neurolinguistic perspective, such language may intensify emotional attention and reduce critical distance.

A second important mechanism is metaphorical framing. The expression *"We are fighting an information war"* is a typical example. It frames cyberspace as a battlefield and transforms information exchange into conflict. In this frame, users are not simply readers or participants; they become fighters, defenders or victims. The metaphor encourages emotional involvement and creates a binary opposition between "us" and "them". This corresponds to Lakoff and Johnson's idea that metaphor structures human understanding and action[1].[14]

Another frequent strategy is the use of presupposition. For example, the sentence *"Even experts now admit that this is the only solution"* contains hidden assumptions. The word *even* presupposes that experts were previously against the idea, while *the only solution* excludes alternatives. The user is guided toward accepting the statement as already established. This strategy is manipulative because it presents a contested interpretation as a fact.

Pronoun polarization is also widely used in cyber manipulation. Expressions such as *we*, *they*, *our people*, *their agenda*, *those who are against us* create symbolic boundaries between groups. The phrase *"They do not want you to know the truth"* is especially powerful because the pronoun *they* is vague but emotionally effective. It creates an invisible enemy and activates suspicion. At the same time, the phrase *the truth* gives the user a sense of privileged knowledge. This strategy strengthens in-group identity and distrust toward others.

Clickbait constructions represent another manipulative mechanism. Phrases such as *"You will not believe what happened next"*, *"This fact will change your opinion"* or *"Read this before it is deleted"* create a curiosity gap. The user is not given complete information, but is pushed to click in order to resolve uncertainty. From a cognitive point of view, this strategy uses the human need for completion. From a neurolinguistic point of view, incomplete information captures attention automatically.

The following table summarises the main mechanisms identified in the analysis:

Manipulative strategy	Linguistic form	Linguocognitive effect	Neurolinguistic effect
Emotional triggering	*shocking, dangerous, urgent, hidden threat*	Activates fear and danger frames	Increases emotional alertness
War metaphor	*information war, attack, defend, fight*	Frames communication as conflict	Intensifies threat perception
Presupposition	*even experts admit, the only solution*	Presents assumptions as facts	Reduces critical questioning
Pronoun polarization	*we/they, our/their, those people*	Creates in-group/out-group opposition	Strengthens emotional identification
Clickbait	*you will not believe, read before deleted*	Creates curiosity gap	Captures automatic attention

The analysis confirms that speech manipulation in cyberspace operates simultaneously at several levels. At the linguistic level, it uses emotionally marked vocabulary, metaphor, presupposition, vague pronouns and incomplete structures. At the cognitive level, it activates frames such as danger, war, truth,

[1] Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. – P. 4–13.

betrayal and protection. At the neurolinguistic level, it appeals to rapid emotional processing, attention capture and automatic interpretation. These levels are closely interconnected.

The results of the analysis correspond to van Dijk's idea that manipulation controls the recipient's mental models. In cyberspace, such control is often achieved not by direct commands, but by controlling the interpretive frame. The user is not told exactly what to think; rather, the message creates a linguistic environment in which a particular interpretation seems natural. Similarly, the findings support Kahneman's view that people often rely on fast and intuitive processing, especially when information is emotionally intense or rapidly presented.

The linguocognitive interpretation of the examples also confirms Lakoff and Johnson's theory. Cyber manipulation is effective because it does not simply give information; it organises information through conceptual metaphors. The metaphor *information is war* makes online communication appear as struggle. The metaphor *truth is a weapon* suggests that information must be used against an opponent. The metaphor *ideology is a virus* presents beliefs as contagious and dangerous. These metaphors simplify complex realities and direct users' emotional responses.

In comparison with traditional media manipulation, cyber manipulation has several specific features. First, it spreads faster because digital platforms allow immediate sharing. Second, it is more fragmented because short messages, comments and headlines often replace extended argumentation. Third, it is algorithmically reinforced because users repeatedly encounter similar content. Fourth, it is multimodal because text, image, emoji, meme and video can work together. Finally, it is interactive because users themselves participate in spreading manipulative frames.

The practical significance of the article lies in the fact that understanding speech manipulation in cyberspace can improve media literacy, critical thinking and digital communication ethics. Users should be trained to recognise emotional triggers, metaphorical framing, presuppositions and polarizing pronouns. Journalists and content creators should also be aware that language can influence cognition and emotion, and therefore digital communication requires ethical responsibility.

In conclusion, speech manipulation in cyberspace is a complex phenomenon that combines linguistic form, cognitive structure and emotional processing. The first research question concerned the linguistic mechanisms of manipulation. The study showed that cyber manipulation is realised through emotional vocabulary, metaphorical framing, presupposition, pronoun polarization and clickbait structures. The second research question focused on cognitive frames. The analysis demonstrated that online manipulative discourse activates frames of war, danger, hidden truth, enemy and protection. The third research question concerned neurolinguistic and linguocognitive explanation. The article showed that manipulative messages become effective because they activate automatic emotional responses, cognitive shortcuts and deeply rooted conceptual models.

Resume. The article examines the neurolinguistic and linguocognitive features of speech manipulation in cyberspace. It shows that online manipulation is realized through emotional triggers, metaphorical framing, presupposition, pronoun polarization and clickbait structures. The study concludes that manipulative digital discourse influences users' perception, emotions and decision-making.

Rezyume. Ushbu maqola kiber makonda nutq manipulyatsiyasining neyrolingvistik va lingvokognitiv xususiyatlarini tahlil qiladi. Unda onlayn manipulyatsiya hissiy triggerlar, metaforik ramkalash, presuppozitsiya, olmoshlar orqali qutblash va klikbeyt (e'tibor jalb qiluvchi sarlavha) tuzilmalari orqali amalga oshrilishi ko'rsatiladi. Tadqiqot xulosasiga ko'ra, manipulyativ raqamli diskurs foydalanuvchilarning idroki, hissiyotlari va qaror qabul qilish jarayoniga ta'sir ko'rsatadi.

Резюме. В статье рассматриваются нейролингвистические и лингвокогнитивные особенности речевой манипуляции в киберпространстве. Показано, что онлайн-манипуляция реализуется через эмоциональные триггеры, метафорический фрейминг, пресуппозицию, местоименную поляризацию и кликбейтные конструкции. Делается вывод, что манипулятивный цифровой дискурс влияет на восприятие, эмоции и принятие решений пользователей.