

EXPLORING THE STYLISTIC RICHNESS OF FIGURATIVE EXPRESSIONS IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGES

Sulaymonova Mahfuza Shavkat qizi,

PhD Student, I grade

TSUULL

Annotation. This article analyzes the characteristics of figurative devices in the Uzbek language, particularly metaphor, simile, epithet, hyperbole, and litotes. The linguistic structure of these devices, their role in poetic speech, and their functional features are examined based on scientific approaches. The differences between similes and metaphors, their components, and their role in literary texts are illustrated with examples. This article serves as a valuable resource for those engaged in literary analysis, linguistic research, and stylistics.

Аннотация. В данной статье анализируются особенности изобразительных средств в узбекском языке, в частности метафоры, сравнения, эпитеты, гипербола и литота. Рассматриваются их лингвистическая структура, роль в поэтической речи и функциональные особенности на основе научных подходов. Выявлены различия между сравнением и метафорой, их компоненты, а также роль в художественной литературе, что подтверждается примерами. Данная статья является ценным источником для специалистов, занимающихся литературным анализом, лингвистическими исследованиями и стилистикой.

Keywords: *Uzbek language, figurative devices, metaphor, simile, epithet, hyperbole, litotes, poetic speech, literary imagery, stylistics, emotional-expressive language.*

The components of simile that we study – the object being compared, the comparative image, and the comparative attribute – have been referred to by various scholars using different terminologies: B. V. Tomashevsky named them object, image, and attribute[1] ; A. I. Efimov used subject of comparison, object of comparison, and basis of comparison[2]; M. I. Sharipo referred to them as object of comparison, image of comparison, and attribute of comparison[3]; A. Sa'diy named them the compared element, the element it is compared to, and the attribute of similarity[4].

Depending on whether the comparative attribute in the simile is expressed through lexical units or not, similes can be divided into complete and incomplete similes. If all three components are expressed through lexical units, it is referred to as a complete simile. In an incomplete simile, the comparative attribute is not

explicitly expressed. This allows us to classify similes as three-component and two-component structures.

For example:

a) Three-component simile:

Nizomjon, unsure of what to say, glanced at the golden-crumpled velvet-like shimmering sands. (Said Ahmad)

In this example:

“golden-crumpled velvet-like” is the comparative image,

“shimmering” is the comparative attribute,

“sands” is the object being compared.

b) Two-component simile:

The woman stood leaning against the wall near the door, her face pale as a corpse, trembling. (A. Qahhor)

Here, the woman's paleness is compared to that of a corpse.

“face” is the object being compared,

“as a corpse” is the comparative image,

and the comparative attribute is not explicitly mentioned.

In speech, qualification (attribution) and simile are closely interconnected in terms of their function of conveying concreteness and emotional-expressive evaluation. They transition into one another in artistic imagery and assist each other in characterizing objects. The main aesthetic function of simile is the function of concreteness. If the attributive relation is removed from a simile, its meaning becomes less clear and less emotionally expressive. Therefore, similes often appear alongside qualifiers (adjectives or attributes).

Hyperbole is the art of exaggerated description of objects and events. Based on its nature, hyperbole is categorized into simple, *igroq* (intensified hyperbole), and *gulu* (unrealistic, implausible exaggeration that goes beyond possibility). Even though *igroq* and *gulu* types of hyperbole are often used without explicit simile markers, a simile can be understood from the meaning. In the example from Navoi (poetic part omitted here), the beloved's face being covered is likened to the setting of the sun, and the tears shed due to separation are likened to the appearance of stars after sunset. Hyperbole is more commonly found in folk epics and songs.

Litotes is a stylistic device that depicts objects and events by understating or diminishing them. Like hyperbole, litotes is also used across all types of literary works for specific artistic purposes. For example, in the sentence: “...hoping for

Zuhrakhon's sharp mind to grasp knowledge faster, he didn't notice her elephant-sized sin at home because of her thread-sized success at school.” (A. Qahhor)

The use of the suffix -day in "qilday" (thread-like) expresses litotes, as the success being that small seems unbelievable. Simultaneously, the phrase "filday gunoh" (elephant-sized sin) employs hyperbole, as the notion of a sin being that large is also unrealistic.

Metaphor. In a metaphor, two objects or phenomena are compared based on certain features. In this case, the described object is portrayed as something else, and another object is used in its place based on similarity or relation. Unlike similes, metaphors consist only of the compared image and convey both the quality and the object in a figurative sense. Considering these features, scholars have provided various definitions for metaphor. For example, Quintilian explains that, unlike simile, which compares the depicted object to something else, metaphor directly takes the name of that object. Aristotle considered simile to be metaphor with only a partial difference between them[5]. A. Bely interpreted simile as the comparison of qualities, and metaphor as the completed form of that comparison[6]. G. L. Abramovich described metaphor as a hidden form of simile, while A. T. Rubaylo stated that simile underlies metaphor. He asserted that simile is the initial form of metaphor, and metaphor emerges from simile; moreover, some metaphors can easily be converted into similes[7]. S. Usmonov, in his Uzbek language textbook, defines it as follows: “Metaphor is the use of a word that expresses one object or phenomenon to represent another, based on relative similarity between them”. Sh. Rahmatullayev further explains: “Metaphor is the transfer of the name of one object, quality, or action to another based on mutual similarity”[8].

According to the Dictionary of Literary Terms, metaphor is described as one of the main poetic transfers (tropes), which are of two types: "transfer based on similarity – metaphor, and transfer without similarity – metonymy." It is evident that in both literary and linguistic studies, metaphor is referred to as a “shortened simile,” “simile itself,” “completed form of comparison of features,” “hidden simile,” “derived from simile,” “transfer based on similarity,” and a “transfer with similarity.” All of these definitions affirm that simile underlies metaphor. However, the main point to understand is that the difference between metaphor and simile lies in their components, specifically in the presence or absence of connecting elements. For instance:

If we say Karimjon is as strong as a lion, it is a three-component full simile.

If we say Karimjon is like a lion, it becomes a two-component incomplete simile.

If we say Karimjon is a lion, we create a metaphor.

It becomes clear that a metaphor does not include all the components (object being compared, comparative quality, and image), but rather implies them within a figurative expression. It is important to emphasize that metaphor is not always expressed through a single word; it can also appear in phrases. For example: “The captains of the blue ship prepared their steel horses for the harvesters of white gold.” In this sentence:

Captains of the blue ship refers to mechanics,

White gold refers to cotton,

Steel horses refers to machines.

It is evident that each metaphor is based on a simile and is formed through abstract thinking.

Therefore, studying the linguistic features of simile as one of the stylistic devices in literary language allows us to better understand concepts such as emotional-expressive tone, figurative imagery, and tropes in literary discourse. Metaphor is one of the most powerful and widely used figurative devices in language. It not only serves as a linguistic ornament but also functions as a cognitive tool that reflects how humans understand and conceptualize the world. By comparing one thing to another, metaphors provide insights into abstract concepts and enhance the emotional depth of communication. The term metaphor comes from the Greek word *metaphora*, meaning "transfer" or "carrying over." This reflects the fundamental nature of metaphor, which involves transferring meaning from one domain to another. For example, when we say "the classroom was a zoo," the classroom is metaphorically compared to a zoo, evoking an image of chaos and noise.

Metaphors are integral to language, appearing in both everyday speech and literary texts. They allow speakers to describe abstract or complex ideas in concrete terms. For instance, saying "he's in the driver's seat of his life" uses the metaphor of driving to convey the idea that someone is in control of their life. In contrast to similes, which make comparisons explicit with words like "like" or "as," metaphors imply a more direct and sometimes more profound comparison. Metaphors can be divided into different types. Conventional metaphors are common expressions that have become so familiar that we no longer notice their figurative nature. For example, phrases like "a flood of emotions" or "a heavy heart" are conventional metaphors that evoke powerful imagery. Literary metaphors, on the other hand, are often more creative and novel, used to add depth and beauty to language, as seen in poetry and novels. "The curtain of night" or "a sea of stars" are examples of literary metaphors that invoke vivid and artistic imagery. Dead metaphors are those that have

been used so frequently that their original figurative meaning has been lost, such as "the arm of a chair" or "the foot of a mountain."

The stylistic richness of metaphors lies in their ability to evoke powerful emotional responses and provide clarity to abstract concepts. They can convey complex ideas in a more relatable or tangible way. For example, in Uzbek, a metaphor like "yuragi tog'dek" (his heart is like a mountain) is used to describe someone with immense bravery or strength. This cultural metaphor relies on the imagery of a mountain, a symbol of stability and resilience, to communicate a deep personal quality. In addition to their stylistic value, metaphors are also significant from a cognitive perspective. Scholars such as George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their seminal work *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) argue that metaphors shape our understanding of the world. They are not just rhetorical tools but fundamental to how we think, process, and conceptualize our experiences. For instance, the metaphor of "time is money" reflects a Western cultural view of time as a valuable resource that should be managed efficiently. Across languages and cultures, metaphors vary in their expressions and imagery, but they often share similar conceptual structures. In English, the metaphor "time flies" suggests that time passes quickly. In Uzbek, a similar expression might be "vag'z uzildi", meaning "time is broken," which evokes the idea of time slipping away or being fragmented.

In conclusion, metaphors are a central element of both language and thought. They enrich communication by adding vividness and emotional depth, allowing speakers to articulate complex ideas in accessible and impactful ways. Studying metaphors offers valuable insights into how different cultures and languages perceive and conceptualize the world.

List of References:

1. B.V. Tomashevsky, *Stylistics and Versification*, Leningrad, 1952, pp. 208–209.
2. A.I. Efimov, *Stylistics of Artistic Speech*, Moscow, 1961, p. 491.
3. M.A. Sharipo, *Structure of Comparisons*, "Scientific Notes of the Tiraspol Pedagogical Institute", Issue 5, Chisinau, 1958.
4. A. Sa'diy, *Practical and Theoretical Literature Lessons* (Textbook for Secondary Schools), Tashkent, 1925, pp. 21–22.
5. T.A. Timofeyeva, *Metaphor as an Artistic Means in Popular Science Literature*, pp. 214–215;
6. A. Bely, *Symbolism*, Moscow, "Musaget", 1910, p. 78.
7. A.T. Rubaylo, *Artistic Means of Language*, Moscow, 1961, p. 37.
8. U. Tursunov, J. Mukhtorov, Sh. Rahmatullayev, *Modern Uzbek Literary Language*, Tashkent, 1965, p. 125.



9. I. Rybakova, On the Lexical-Stylistic Description of the Epithet, 1964, Issue 52, and others.
10. H. Hamidiy, Sh. Abdullayeva, S. Abdurahimova, Dictionary of Literary Terms, Tashkent, 1967, p. 228.
11. G.L. Abramovich, Introduction to Literary Studies, Moscow, 1953, p. 119.
12. M. Mirzayev, S. Usmonov, I. Rasulov, Uzbek Language, Tashkent, 1962, p. 424.