



Stylistic Devices as a Means of Characterization in Literary Texts

Fayziyeva Nilufar Ne'mat kizi

PhD in philology, acting associate professor

National university of Uzbekistan, Tashkent

Lily_angel94@mail.ru

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19641827>

Keywords: linguosynergetics, political discourse, language systems, self-organization, nonlinearity, attractors, pragmatics.

This article examines the functional role of linguosynergetics in language systems, with a particular focus on political discourse. Linguosynergetics views language as a complex, dynamic, and self-organizing system in which meaning emerges through the interaction of linguistic elements. The study integrates discourse analysis and a linguosynergetic framework to investigate how political language constructs meaning, influences public opinion, and shapes ideological narratives. Special attention is given to examples from English and Uzbek political discourse. The findings reveal that political discourse operates through mechanisms such as self-organization, nonlinearity, attractors, and the interplay of order and chaos. These mechanisms allow political actors to strategically influence audiences and construct persuasive messages.

Modern linguistics increasingly recognizes language not as a static structure but as a dynamic and evolving system. Within this paradigm, linguosynergetics has emerged as a significant interdisciplinary approach that applies principles of synergetics to linguistic analysis. It focuses on how linguistic elements interact, adapt, and self-organize to produce meaning in complex communicative environments.

Political discourse represents one of the most powerful domains of language use. It is not limited to the transmission of information but serves as a tool for persuasion, ideological construction, and social influence. Political actors deliberately select linguistic resources to frame reality, guide interpretation, and shape collective cognition.

For example, in English political discourse, expressions such as "*protecting freedom*" or "*ensuring national security*" are frequently used to legitimize political decisions. Similarly, in Uzbek political discourse, phrases like "*xalq manfaatlari*" (public interest) and "*yangi O'zbekiston taraqqiyoti*" (the development of New Uzbekistan) function as key ideological constructs.

From a linguosynergetic perspective, these expressions are not random; they emerge as central elements within a dynamic system, influencing how meaning is constructed and interpreted. Therefore, this study aims to explore the functional role of linguosynergetics in language systems, particularly in political discourse, by analyzing both English and Uzbek examples.

The analysis demonstrates that political discourse functions as a complex, adaptive system governed by linguosynergetic principles.

First, self-organization plays a central role. In English political discourse, frequently repeated lexical items such as "freedom," "democracy," and "security" gradually become dominant semantic elements. For instance:

"We must defend democracy at all costs."

Here, "democracy" acts as a central organizing unit, shaping the entire discourse.

Similarly, in Uzbek political discourse:



"Mamlakatimizda amalga oshirilayotgan islohotlar xalq farovonligini ta'minlaydi."

The word *"islohotlar"* (*reforms*) becomes a semantic center. Through repetition, it evolves into an attractor that structures the discourse and directs interpretation.

Second, nonlinearity is evident in how small linguistic variations lead to significant communicative effects. In English:

"We will solve the problem"

"We are committed to addressing the challenge"

The second statement appears more persuasive and diplomatic, demonstrating how subtle lexical choices influence perception.

In Uzbek:

"Muammo bor"

"Muammo ustida ishlayapmiz"

The second form creates a sense of action and control, illustrating nonlinear dynamics in meaning construction.

Third, political discourse is structured around attractors, which function as conceptual centers. In English, expressions like *"national security"* and *"public interest"* serve as key attractors:

"National security remains our top priority."

In Uzbek discourse:

"Har bir qaror xalq manfaatlaridan kelib chiqadi."

Here, *"xalq manfaatlari"* becomes a dominant ideological attractor guiding the interpretation of political actions.

Fourth, the interaction between order and chaos enhances communicative effectiveness. Structured arguments are often combined with emotionally charged statements:

English:

"We will never give up!"

Uzbek:

"Biz bu yo'ldan hech qachon qaytmaymiz!"

These elements introduce controlled spontaneity, increasing emotional engagement and persuasive impact.

Overall, the results confirm that political discourse in both English and Uzbek is shaped by dynamic interactions among linguistic elements, supporting the linguosynergetic model of language.

The findings support the theoretical foundations of synergetics proposed by Hermann Haken, particularly the concept of self-organization[1; 15]. The analyzed examples demonstrate that linguistic structures emerge through internal interactions rather than being entirely predetermined.

The study also aligns with Teun A. van Dijk, who emphasizes the relationship between discourse, ideology, and social cognition. In both English and Uzbek political discourse, key lexical units such as *"freedom"* and *"taraqqiyot"* function as ideological markers influencing public perception. [2; 36]

Furthermore, George Lakoff highlights the importance of metaphor in political language[3; 117]. Expressions such as:

"building a strong nation"



"kuchli davlat qurish" demonstrate how conceptual metaphors act as attractors, organizing thought and reinforcing political narratives.

The comparative analysis reveals that while English and Uzbek differ structurally and culturally, they share common linguosynergetic mechanisms. Both exhibit:

- self-organizing lexical patterns;
- nonlinear pragmatic effects;
- attractor-based discourse structures.

However, cultural differences influence their realization. Uzbek discourse tends to emphasize collectivist values (*"xalq," "jamiyat"*), whereas English discourse often foregrounds individualistic concepts (*"freedom," "rights"*).

Additionally, linguosynergetics proves effective in identifying manipulative strategies. Repeated use of positively connoted terms such as *"development"* and *"taraqqiyot"* creates favorable cognitive frames, even when specific details are absent. This highlights the strategic nature of political language.

Despite its strengths, linguosynergetics faces challenges in modeling complex linguistic systems with precision. Further interdisciplinary research is required to enhance its analytical tools.

In conclusion, linguosynergetics provides a powerful framework for understanding language as a dynamic and self-organizing system. Its application to political discourse reveals how meaning emerges through interaction, repetition, and contextual influence.

The study demonstrates that political discourse in both English and Uzbek operates through mechanisms such as self-organization, nonlinearity, attractors, and the balance between order and chaos. These mechanisms enable political actors to influence public opinion and construct persuasive narratives.

Future research should focus on expanding empirical data and integrating computational approaches to further develop linguosynergetic analysis in political and other types of discourse.

References:

1. Haken H. Synergetics: Introduction and Advanced Topics. – Berlin: Springer, 2004. – 758 p.
2. van Dijk T. A. Discourse and Power. – New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. – 308 p.
3. Lakoff G. The Political Mind: Why You Can't Understand 21st-Century Politics with an 18th-Century Brain. – New York: Viking, 2008. – 292 p.
4. Fairclough N. Language and Power. – 2nd ed. – London: Longman, 2001. – 259 p.
5. Wodak R. The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. – 252 p.
6. Shukurov Sh. Matn lingvistikasi. – Toshkent: Fan, 2011. – 256 b.
7. Yo'ldoshev B. Diskurs va pragmatika. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2018. – 240 b.
8. Rasulov R. Umumiy tilshunoslik. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2007. – 300 b.