

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Functional and Conceptual Categorization of Lexical and Stylistic Devices Used in Literary Discourse: A Study Based on English And Uzbek Languages

 **Parmonov Alisher Abdupattayevich**

Acting associate professor, Kokand University, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue06 2026

PAGE: 13-18

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This article investigates the functional and conceptual categorization of lexical and stylistic devices used in literary discourse on the material of English and Uzbek languages. The study is based on a comparative analysis of allegory, metaphor, simile, symbol, personification, phraseological units, and culturally marked lexical items in selected English and Uzbek literary texts. Special attention is paid to George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, Muhammadsharif Gulkhaniy's *Zarbulmasal*, and selected folk narratives, including "Ur to'qmoq" and "A Good Story." The research argues that lexical and stylistic devices in literary discourse are not merely decorative elements but cognitive, cultural, pragmatic, and evaluative mechanisms through which national worldviews are represented. The study applies descriptive, classificatory, comparative-contrastive, semantic-stylistic, contextual, and cognitive-metaphorical methods.

KEYWORDS

Literary discourse, stylistic devices, lexical devices, allegory, metaphor, simile, symbol.

INTRODUCTION

Literary discourse is one of the most complex forms of language use because it unites linguistic form, aesthetic intention, cultural memory, and cognitive interpretation. In literary texts, words and stylistic devices do not function only as means of communication; they become instruments of artistic representation, emotional influence, ideological evaluation, and cultural coding. Therefore, the study of lexical and stylistic devices in literary discourse requires an interdisciplinary approach involving stylistics, linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, and comparative literary studies.

In both English and Uzbek literary traditions, figurative devices such as allegory, metaphor, simile, symbol, personification, irony, and phraseological units play a central role in

constructing meaning. These devices help authors express abstract ideas through concrete images, criticize social reality indirectly, represent national values, and create an aesthetic effect. In literary discourse, the reader does not simply decode the literal meaning of words; rather, the reader interprets the cultural, conceptual, and pragmatic meanings hidden behind them.

METHODS

The material of the study consists of English and Uzbek literary texts in which lexical and stylistic devices perform significant artistic, cultural, and conceptual functions. The main literary sources include George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, Muhammadsharif Gulkhaniy's *Zarbulmasal*, the Uzbek folk tale

“Ur to‘qmoq,” and the English folk narrative “A Good Story.” These texts were selected because they contain rich examples of allegory, animal imagery, symbolic objects, moral contrasts, social criticism, and culturally marked lexical units.

The theoretical basis of the article relies on stylistics, comparative linguistics, linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics, and discourse analysis. Uzbek stylistics traditionally distinguishes between speech stylistics and linguistic stylistics, while linguistic stylistics includes phonetic, lexical, and grammatical stylistics. Within this framework, tropes and syntactic figures are treated as important means of artistic expression. This classification is useful for analyzing literary discourse because it allows stylistic devices to be studied at different linguistic levels: lexical, semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, and cultural.

The research employs several complementary methods to achieve its objectives. The descriptive method is used to identify and explain lexical and stylistic devices occurring in literary discourse. The classificatory method helps organize these devices according to their linguistic characteristics and discourse functions. A comparative-contrastive approach is applied to examine similarities and differences between English and Uzbek literary materials. Semantic-stylistic analysis is used to determine the meanings, expressive potential, and stylistic significance of the selected devices. Contextual analysis enables the interpretation of figurative units within their literary, social, and cultural environments. Cognitive-metaphorical analysis is employed to reveal conceptual mappings and mental models reflected through figurative language. In addition, linguocultural analysis is used to identify the national and cultural meanings encoded in lexical and stylistic devices and to explain how these meanings contribute to the representation of cultural values in literary discourse.

The study treats literary discourse as a multilayered semiotic system in which lexical and stylistic devices operate at three interconnected levels: the linguistic level, the conceptual level, and the cultural-pragmatic level.

RESULTS

The analysis shows that lexical and stylistic devices in English and Uzbek literary discourse perform several major functions. They may be categorized as representational, evaluative, emotive-expressive, cognitive-metaphorical, cultural-

symbolic, pragmatic, and didactic devices.

The representational function is connected with the artistic depiction of characters, events, and social realities. In *Animal Farm*, animal characters represent political figures, social groups, and ideological forces. Pigs, horses, dogs, and sheep are not only animals in the narrative but also symbolic representations of power, labor, violence, obedience, and manipulation. Similarly, in *Zarbulmasal*, birds and animals represent human qualities, social types, and moral positions. Through these images, abstract social and ethical problems become concrete and understandable.

The evaluative function is realized when lexical and stylistic devices express the author’s attitude toward characters, social events, or moral behavior. In English literary discourse, especially in Orwell’s text, evaluation is often connected with political criticism, irony, and exposure of ideological hypocrisy. In Uzbek literary discourse, evaluation is frequently connected with moral judgment, wisdom, social responsibility, and didactic instruction.

The emotive-expressive function is achieved through emotionally colored words, figurative expressions, repetitions, exaggerations, and stylistically marked phraseological units. These devices increase the emotional force of the text and guide the reader’s response. In both English and Uzbek literary discourse, emotive-expressive devices are used to create sympathy, criticism, irony, admiration, or moral disapproval.

The cognitive-metaphorical function appears when stylistic devices organize abstract ideas through familiar images. For example, power may be conceptualized through domination, animals, hierarchy, or physical control. Wisdom may be expressed through old age, experience, proverbs, or culturally respected figures. Deception may be represented through foxes, masks, cunning speech, or indirect behavior.

The cultural-symbolic function is especially important in Uzbek literary discourse. Objects such as *dasturxon* carry not only material meaning but also cultural associations with hospitality, blessing, family unity, respect, and social ethics. In English discourse, the concept of table may also symbolize gathering, negotiation, food, or social order, but its cultural associations differ from the Uzbek *dasturxon*. Therefore, similar lexical items may carry different conceptual loads in different linguistic cultures.

The pragmatic function is related to indirect influence on the

reader. Allegory, metaphor, irony, and symbol allow authors to criticize social reality without direct statement. This function is central in both *Animal Farm* and *Zarbulmasal*. Through indirect representation, the writer creates a space for interpretation and encourages the reader to infer hidden meanings.

The didactic function is particularly strong in Uzbek literary discourse. In *Zarbulmasal*, figurative devices are closely connected with moral education, social criticism, and the transmission of ethical values. In English discourse, didacticism may also be present, but in *Animal Farm* it is more strongly connected with political warning and ideological critique.

From a conceptual point of view, lexical and stylistic devices in the analyzed texts can be grouped into several categories.

The first category is anthropomorphic conceptualization, in which animals, birds, and natural phenomena are given human qualities. This device is central to both English and Uzbek texts. In *Animal Farm*, animals think, speak, organize political structures, and reproduce human social behavior. In *Zarbulmasal*, birds and animals express human virtues and vices. This category shows that both cultures use the animal world as a mirror of human society.

The second category is moral conceptualization, in which stylistic devices express ethical oppositions such as good and evil, honesty and deception, wisdom and ignorance, justice and oppression, humility and arrogance. Uzbek literary discourse often presents these oppositions through proverbs, fables, symbolic characters, and didactic dialogue. English literary discourse may present them through irony, contradiction, symbolic plot development, and satirical characterization.

The third category is socio-political conceptualization, which is especially visible in English literary discourse. In *Animal Farm*, allegory serves to conceptualize revolution, dictatorship, propaganda, inequality, and the abuse of power. The stylistic devices create a model of society in which political processes are simplified through animal imagery but conceptually deepened through symbolic interpretation.

The fourth category is cultural-object conceptualization. In this category, culturally significant objects become carriers of social and symbolic meaning. The Uzbek *dasturxon* represents not only a physical object but also a cultural model of

hospitality, generosity, family relations, and blessing. The English table may represent civilized communication, negotiation, or domestic order. The comparison of these concepts shows that lexical devices in literary discourse are often culturally marked.

The fifth category is wisdom and folk-memory conceptualization. Uzbek literary discourse widely uses proverbs, sayings, phraseological units, and traditional images as carriers of collective wisdom. These devices connect individual literary texts with the broader cultural memory of the people. English literary discourse also uses proverbial and symbolic structures, but the Uzbek material demonstrates a particularly strong connection between literary expression and oral tradition.

The comparative analysis shows that English and Uzbek literary discourse share several universal features. First, both traditions use allegory to express ideas indirectly. Second, both use animals and symbolic characters to represent human behavior. Third, both use figurative devices to criticize social problems. Fourth, both rely on metaphor and symbol to transform abstract ideas into concrete artistic images.

However, there are also important differences. In English literary discourse, particularly in *Animal Farm*, allegory is closely connected with political satire and ideological criticism. The main function of stylistic devices is to expose the mechanisms of power, manipulation, and social inequality. The language of the text is relatively simple on the surface, but its conceptual structure is complex because each character and event corresponds to a broader political meaning.

In Uzbek literary discourse, particularly in *Zarbulmasal*, allegory is connected not only with social criticism but also with moral instruction and cultural education. The text reflects traditional ethical values and uses figurative devices to teach readers about proper behavior, social responsibility, and human dignity. The Uzbek tradition gives special importance to proverbs, symbolic animal images, culturally marked objects, and indirect moral evaluation.

Another difference concerns the cultural density of lexical units. In Uzbek discourse, many lexical items have strong ethnocultural associations. Words connected with family, hospitality, respect, social relations, and moral behavior often carry meanings beyond their dictionary definitions. In English discourse, cultural marking also exists, but in the analyzed

texts it is more closely associated with political and ideological symbolism.

Based on the analysis, the following classification of lexical and stylistic devices in English and Uzbek literary discourse may be proposed:

Category	Main devices	Main function	Examples of conceptual content
Representational	Allegory, personification, symbol	Depiction of social and human reality	Society as farm; human society as animal world
Evaluative	Irony, metaphor, emotionally marked lexis	Expression of authorial attitude	Criticism of power, greed, hypocrisy, ignorance
Emotive-expressive	Repetition, hyperbole, expressive vocabulary	Emotional influence on the reader	Fear, sympathy, moral disapproval
Cognitive-metaphorical	Metaphor, simile, conceptual mapping	Structuring abstract ideas	Power as domination; wisdom as experience
Cultural-symbolic	Culturally marked words, symbols	Representation of national values	<i>Dasturxon</i> , table, hospitality, social unity
Pragmatic	Allegory, irony, indirect speech	Indirect influence and hidden criticism	Political warning, moral instruction
Didactic	Fable, proverb, moral dialogue	Teaching ethical values	Justice, honesty, respect, responsibility

This classification demonstrates that lexical and stylistic devices should be analyzed not only according to their formal features but also according to the functions they perform in discourse and the concepts they activate in the reader’s mind.

DISCUSSION

The findings confirm that stylistic devices in literary discourse are multifunctional. A single device may simultaneously perform representational, evaluative, cognitive, cultural, and pragmatic functions. For instance, allegory in *Animal Farm* represents animals, evaluates political systems, conceptualizes power, and pragmatically warns readers against totalitarianism. In *Zarbulmasal*, allegory represents animal images, evaluates social behavior, expresses moral wisdom, and preserves cultural values.

The comparison also shows that universal figurative mechanisms are adapted to national-cultural contexts. The use of animals as human substitutes is common to both English and Uzbek traditions, but the meanings attached to specific animals may differ. A fox, a pig, a horse, a bird, or a donkey may carry different connotations depending on cultural memory, literary tradition, and textual context. Therefore, the interpretation of stylistic devices requires cultural competence.

The role of lexical devices is especially important in Uzbek

literary discourse because many words are connected with collective cultural experience. Concepts such as *dasturxon*, hospitality, blessing, respect, and social harmony cannot be fully understood through literal translation alone. They require linguocultural interpretation. This is particularly relevant for translation studies, because culturally marked lexical items may lose part of their conceptual meaning if translated only at the denotative level.

The results also support the idea that literary discourse is a cognitive model of reality. Through stylistic devices, authors construct alternative worlds that reflect real social, political, and moral structures. In these worlds, animals may speak, objects may symbolize values, and simple events may represent complex historical processes. Thus, figurative language becomes a means of conceptualizing human experience.

For English-Uzbek comparative linguistics, this study shows that stylistic analysis should combine linguistic, cultural, and cognitive perspectives. A purely formal classification of devices is not sufficient. It is necessary to ask what function a device performs, what concept it activates, what cultural value it encodes, and how it influences the reader.

CONCLUSION

The study has shown that lexical and stylistic devices used in

English and Uzbek literary discourse perform complex functional and conceptual roles. They are not only artistic ornaments but also mechanisms of cultural representation, cognitive modeling, pragmatic influence, and moral evaluation. Allegory, metaphor, simile, symbol, personification, irony, phraseological units, and culturally marked lexical items help authors represent social reality indirectly and express national worldviews.

The comparative analysis of *Animal Farm*, Zarbulmasal, "Ur to'qmoq," and "A Good Story" demonstrates both universal and nationally specific features. Universal features include the use of animals as symbolic representatives of human behavior, the indirect criticism of social problems, and the transformation of abstract ideas into concrete images. Nationally specific features are seen in the cultural meanings attached to lexical units, symbolic objects, moral values, and traditional images.

In English literary discourse, figurative devices often serve political, satirical, and ideological functions. In Uzbek literary discourse, they are more strongly associated with didacticism, moral education, social criticism, and cultural continuity. The Uzbek concept of *dasturxon* and the English concept of *table* illustrate how similar lexical fields may encode different cultural associations.

The article proposes a functional-conceptual classification of lexical and stylistic devices into representational, evaluative, emotive-expressive, cognitive-metaphorical, cultural-symbolic, pragmatic, and didactic categories. This classification may be used in future studies of comparative stylistics, linguoculturology, literary discourse analysis, and translation studies. It may also serve as a methodological basis for analyzing literary texts in English and Uzbek language teaching.

REFERENCES

1. Rajapova, M. A. qizi. Badiiy matnda qo'llanuvchi allegorik vositalarning lingvokulturologik xususiyatlari. PhD dissertation. Qo'qon State University, 2025.
2. Sultonsaidova, S., & Sharipova, O'. O'zbek tili stilistikasi. Tashkent: Yurist-Media Markazi, 2009.
3. Orwell, G. *Animal Farm*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1945.
4. Gulkhaniy, M. Zarbulmasal. Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom Publishing House.
5. Fletcher, A. *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1964.
6. Arnold, I. V. *Stylistics: Modern English*. Moscow: Flinta, 2002.
7. Sadikovna, M. S., & Boymurod o'g'li, M. Q. (2026). GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN AI-MEDIATED ENGLISH-UZBEK DIGITAL COMMUNICATION. *YANGI O'ZBEKISTON, YANGI TADQIQOTLAR JURNALI*, 3(9), 921-925.
8. Sadikovna, M. S., & Boymurod o'g'li, M. Q. (2026, January). THE ROLE OF NOTE-TAKING IN TRANSLATION IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE. In *CONFERENCE OF MODERN SCIENCE & PEDAGOGY* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 361-364).
9. Mamadjanova, S. S. (2025). ASSISTED LEXICAL INNOVATION IN UZBEK INTERNET SLANG: INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH DIGITAL CULTURE. *GOLDEN BRAIN*, 3(17), 159-166.
10. Mamadjanova, S. S. (2025). AI-DRIVEN CODE-SWITCHING PATTERNS IN UZBEK-ENGLISH DIGITAL COMMUNICATION. *GOLDEN BRAIN*, 3(17), 131-136.
11. Mamadjanova, S. S. (2024). COMPLEX TYPES OF TRANSFORMATION IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETATION. *O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti konferensiyalari*, 386-388.
12. Ochilidiyeva, H. (2023). Modern foreign language perspectives on creativity. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 4(1).
13. Ochilidiyeva, H. (2023). Nutqni aloqa vositasi sifatida rivojlantirish. *Scientific Bulletin of NamSU--NamDU ilmiy axborotnomasi*.
14. Ochilidiyeva, H. (2022). System of work on use information and communication technologies at the classes of russian language and literature for the purpose development of russian speech of youth students.
15. Ochilidiyeva, H. (2022). Lexical and grammatical categories of nouns. *International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research*.
16. Ochilidiyeva, H. (2022). The importance of innovative

educational technologies in teaching the subject of the russian language. asia pacific journal of marketing & management review.

- 17.** Ochilidzeva, H. (2022). Lexical and Phraseological Means of Expressing Ethical Evaluation of a Person in Russian and Uzbek Languages. MIDDLE EUROPEAN 120 SCIENTIFIC BULLETIN.
- 18.** G'ulomovna, O. H. (2022). THE IMPORTANCE OF INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES IN TEACHING THE SUBJECT OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. ASIA PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MARKETING & MANAGEMENT REVIEW ISSN: 2319-2836 Impact Factor: 8.071, 11(12), 8-10.