

STYLISTIC FIGURES AND TROPES: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND LINGUO-POETIC ANALYSIS**Tursunov Jakhongir Panjikhonovich**

Lecturer, Termez State Pedagogical Institute

Email: jakhongir.9613@gmail.com

Abstract. In this article, the issue of the aesthetic possibilities of language, its power to create images and its inextricable connection with human thinking is one of the important areas of stylistics and general linguistics. Any artistic text is not limited to performing the function of simple information transmission; it evokes images, emotions and attitudes in the reader's mind. Among the means that create this aesthetic effect, stylistic figures and tropes occupy a special place. Through them, the language reveals its internal possibilities, the meaning of the word expands, and the syntactic structure acquires an expressive character.

Keywords: portable meaning, thinking, abstract concept, trope, cognitive, metaphor, synecdoche.

The term “trope” derives from the Greek *tropos*, meaning “turn” or “change of direction.” This very designation reveals the essence of the phenomenon: a trope is the use of a word in a figurative sense through a “shift” from its primary meaning. Alexander Potebnya directly links tropes to cognition, defining them as “the figurative form of thought.” According to his view, abstract concepts are not perceived directly but rather through imagery. Thus, a trope is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but also a product of the cognitive process. For example, in the expression “the path of life,” life is conceptualized through the notion of movement and pathway. Here, the spatial feature of a path is transferred to the abstract concept of life, resulting in a semantic shift and the emergence of a new image.

Metaphor is the most active and productive type of trope. Nodir Mahmudov characterizes metaphor as “the most important mechanism of image creation in language.” Indeed, expressions such as “the sea of knowledge,” “time is flying,” and “the eye of the heart” arise from the conceptual models of human cognition. In this process, the mechanism of similarity operates: time is understood through motion, while knowledge is likened to an infinite body of water. Representatives of cognitive linguistics, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, interpret metaphor as a universal model of human thought, emphasizing that “metaphor is not only a matter of language but also of the conceptual system.” This approach demonstrates that tropes extend beyond linguistic boundaries and function at the conceptual level as well.

Metonymy and synecdoche also belong to the category of tropes; however, they are based not on similarity but on contiguity and quantitative relations. In the sentence “The hall applauded,” the word “hall” refers not to the building itself but to the people within it. Here, meaning is transferred based on the associative relationship between an object and its related phenomenon. In synecdoche, the relationship between part and whole is dominant: in the expression “a hundred heads gathered,” the word “heads” denotes people. Such tropic units render speech more concise while simultaneously enhancing its expressiveness.

Alongside tropes, stylistic figures also contribute to the expressiveness of speech. However, unlike tropes, they rely not on semantic transfer but on the structural organization of discourse. Viktor Vinogradov defines stylistic figures as “devices that produce aesthetic effect through the formal organization of speech.” For example, anaphora—the repetition of the same word—creates rhythm and emphasis: “I waited for you, I missed you, I did not forget you.” Here, repetition functions not only as a syntactic device but also as a means of emotional

intensification. In antithesis, contrasting concepts are juxtaposed, deepening meaning through contrast: “He smiled—spring came; he left—autumn arrived.” This opposition produces not merely logical contrast but an aesthetic tension.

Figures such as inversion, parallelism, and epiphora also ensure the melodic quality and compositional integrity of speech. By altering word order, emphasis is placed on a particular element: in the structure “Came the spring,” the fronting of the verb intensifies dynamism. Parallel structures harmonize meaning and create rhythmic balance. Although these phenomena occur at the syntactic level, their effects extend to semantic and pragmatic layers as well. It should be emphasized that stylistic figures and tropes are not strictly separate phenomena; they often function together. For instance, a metaphorical expression combined with repetition may produce a stronger effect. Thus, in artistic discourse, form and content exist in an inseparable unity. Vinogradov’s assertion that “in literary discourse, content lives through form” reflects precisely this idea.

From a pragmatic perspective, stylistic devices serve the communicative intentions of the author. They function to evoke specific emotional states in the reader, to evaluate, or to convey particular ideas. In journalistic discourse, expressions such as “sacred land” and “dedicated youth” carry evaluative connotations and aim at shaping social consciousness. Here, tropes and figures perform an evaluative function. From a linguistic standpoint, stylistic devices constitute a multi-layered phenomenon: they arise from lexical-semantic shifts, are expressed in syntactic structures, serve pragmatic purposes, and are linked to cognitive models. Therefore, tropes and figures are complex units connected with all levels of the language system. Through them, language not only transmits information but also reinterprets reality, shapes human cognition, and creates aesthetic value.

In conclusion, stylistic figures and tropes are indispensable elements of artistic discourse. While tropes create imagery through semantic transfer, stylistic figures enhance expressiveness through syntactic organization. Both reveal the aesthetic potential of language and reflect the figurative nature of human cognition. Their study within a comprehensive linguistic framework remains one of the pressing tasks of modern linguistics.

References

1. Yuldashev, M. (2009). *Linguopoetic Study of Literary Texts*. Doctoral Dissertation in Philology. Tashkent.
2. Galperin, I. R. (1981). *Text as an Object of Linguistic Research*. Moscow.
3. Karimova, R. A. (1992). *Semantic-Structural Organization of Text (Based on Oral Spontaneous and Written Texts)*. Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation in Philology. Moscow, p. 27.
4. Toxonov, M. (1990). *Microtext and its communicative integrity*. *Uzbek Language and Literature*, No. 5, pp. 66–69.
5. Tuxsanov, M. (1987). *Microtext and the System of Expression of Its Cohesion in Uzbek Literary Speech*. Abstract of Candidate Dissertation in Philology. Tashkent.
6. Turniyozov, N. (2004). *Text Linguistics (Lecture Notes)*. Samarkand.
7. Turniyazova, Sh. (2010). *Derivational Features of Text Formation in Modern Uzbek Language*. Candidate Dissertation in Philology. Tashkent.
8. Hakimov, M. (2001). *Pragmatic Interpretation of Text in the Uzbek Language*. Doctoral Dissertation in Philology. Tashkent.
9. Mamajonov, A., & Abdupattoyev, M. (2002). *Text Syntax*. Fergana.