

STYLISTIC-CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF ZOONYMS IN RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES**Isakov Mukhammad Sabirovych**Independent Applicant, Karshi State University
Assistant Lecturer, Department of Languages,
Asian Technological University**Abstract**

This article presents a stylistic-contextual analysis of zoonyms (animal names) in Russian and Uzbek languages. Zoonyms represent a lexically rich layer that extends beyond simple biological nomenclature, functioning as powerful stylistic devices in literary and colloquial discourse. The study examines how zoonyms acquire stylistic nuances and contextual meanings depending on their usage in different communicative situations, genres, and cultural contexts. Special attention is given to the stylistic functions of zoonyms: expressive-evaluative, figurative-metaphorical, ironic-satirical, and folk-poetic. Through comparative analysis, the research identifies universal stylistic patterns rooted in anthropocentric perception, as well as language-specific features conditioned by cultural traditions, literary heritage, and stylistic systems of Russian and Uzbek. The findings contribute to the theory of stylistics, literary analysis, translation studies, and the practice of teaching Russian and Uzbek as foreign languages.

Keywords

zoonyms, stylistic analysis, contextual analysis, Russian language, Uzbek language, metaphor, connotation, expressiveness, literary text, comparative stylistics.

INTRODUCTION

Language is not merely a system of signs for naming reality; it is also a powerful instrument for expressing emotions, evaluations, and aesthetic values. Among the lexical units that most vividly manifest these expressive potentials are zoonyms—names of animals. While their primary function is nominative (identifying biological species), zoonyms in actual speech acquire a wide range of stylistic meanings determined by context, communicative situation, authorial intention, and cultural conventions. The relevance of this study lies in the need for a systematic description of the stylistic and contextual behavior of zoonyms in two typologically different languages: Russian (Slavic) and Uzbek (Turkic). Both languages possess rich literary traditions and developed stylistic systems, yet the ways in which zoonyms function stylistically reflect both universal human cognitive mechanisms and specific national-cultural characteristics. The aim of this article is to identify the stylistic functions and contextual variations of zoonyms in Russian and Uzbek, and to conduct a comparative analysis of their usage across different types of discourse—primarily literary texts, but also colloquial speech and journalistic genres. The objectives of the study include:

1. Defining the stylistic potential of zoonyms as a lexical category.
2. Identifying the main stylistic functions of zoonyms in Russian and Uzbek.
3. Analyzing contextual transformations of zoonyms in literary texts.
4. Conducting a comparative analysis to highlight similarities and differences in the stylistic use of zoonyms across the two languages.

METHODOLOGY

The theoretical foundation of this research draws on works in stylistics, functional linguistics, and comparative lexicology. Key references include the stylistic theories of V.V. Vinogradov, the functional stylistics of M.N. Kozhina, and the works of Uzbek scholars such as Sh. Rahmatullaev and A. Abduazizov on the lexical and stylistic features of the Uzbek language. Comparative studies on zoonyms by O.N. Galimova, R.Kh. Karimova, and D. Metyakubov also inform the methodological approach. The research employs the following methods:

- Functional-stylistic analysis — to determine the stylistic roles of zoonyms in different types of discourse.
- Contextual analysis — to examine how the meaning and stylistic effect of zoonyms shift depending on linguistic and extralinguistic context.
- Comparative method — to identify similarities and differences in the stylistic functioning of zoonyms in Russian and Uzbek.
- Interpretive analysis — to analyze the aesthetic and expressive functions of zoonyms in literary texts.

The material for analysis includes literary works by Russian authors (A.S. Pushkin, I.S. Turgenev, N.V. Gogol, M.A. Bulgakov) and Uzbek authors (Abdulla Qodiriy, Oybek, Abdulla Qahhor, Erkin A'zam), as well as examples from colloquial speech and journalistic texts. The corpus comprises over 200 contextual usages of zoonyms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Zoonyms possess a high degree of stylistic markedness due to their associative richness. Unlike neutral lexical units, zoonyms evoke vivid imagery rooted in cultural perceptions of animals. This associative potential makes them indispensable tools for stylistic expression. In both Russian and Uzbek, zoonyms can function as:

- Neutral nominatives — used in scientific, official, or everyday speech without additional stylistic coloring (собака, корова; it, sigir).
- Expressive-evaluative units — conveying positive or negative attitudes (орёл, свинья; burgut, cho'chqa).
- Metaphorical transfers — characterizing human traits (лиса, медведь; tulki, ayiq).
- Symbolic images — embodying cultural archetypes (журавль, соловей; turna, bulbul).

The stylistic range of zoonyms is broader in literary texts, where they can acquire individual authorial meanings not fixed in dictionaries. In both languages, zoonyms are frequently used to express subjective evaluation. Negative evaluations predominate: Russian козёл (goat) as a term of abuse, Uzbek it (dog) similarly used to insult. Positive evaluations are associated with zoonyms symbolizing strength (орёл, burgut), grace (лебедь, oqqush), or melodiousness (соловей, bulbul). However, the degree of expressiveness may vary. In Russian, the use of animal names as direct insults is more common and often more aggressive; in Uzbek, due to cultural norms emphasizing respect for the interlocutor, such usage is often softened through context or indirect forms.

The metaphorical transfer of animal traits to humans is a universal stylistic device. In Russian and Uzbek, stable metaphorical associations exist: лиса / tulki (cunning), волк / bo'ri (predatory, solitary), осёл / eshak (stupidity, stubbornness). Literary authors often extend these conventional metaphors, creating original comparisons. For example, in Russian literature, Gogol's use of zoonyms in *Dead Souls* (e.g., comparing Sobakevich to a bear) creates a grotesque, satirical effect. In Uzbek literature, Abdulla Qodiriy in *The Past Days* (O'tgan kunlar) employs zoonyms to convey social and moral characteristics of his characters, drawing on traditional nomadic symbolism. Zoonyms are powerful tools for irony and satire. By comparing a person or phenomenon to an animal, authors create a defamiliarizing effect, exposing negative traits. In Russian, Saltykov-Shchedrin's *The History of a Town* (Istoriya odnogo goroda) uses zoomorphic imagery to satirize bureaucracy. In Uzbek, Abdulla Qahhor's short stories frequently employ ironic zoonyms to criticize social vices. The ironic effect often relies on context: a respectful title combined with a derogatory zoonym creates sharp satire. This device is productive in both languages, though the specific zoonyms chosen reflect cultural relevance.

In folk poetry and stylized literary texts, zoonyms acquire symbolic, often idealized meanings. Russian folk songs and fairy tales feature сокол (falcon) as a symbol of a brave young man, лебедь (swan) as a symbol of feminine beauty. Uzbek folklore similarly uses bulbul (nightingale) for the lover, lochin (falcon) for the hero, and tog'ora (crane) as a symbol of longing and loyalty. This folk-poetic layer is actively employed by writers in both traditions. Pushkin's *Ruslan and Ludmila* draws on folk zoomorphic imagery, while Uzbek poets like Hamza Hakimzade Niyazi incorporate traditional animal symbolism to convey national identity and emotional depth. The meaning and stylistic effect of a zoonym are highly context-dependent. Contextual factors include:

- Text genre: In scientific texts, zoonyms are terminological; in literary texts, they become expressive.
- Authorial style: Individual writers develop unique patterns of using zoonyms (e.g., Bulgakov's zoomorphic characters in *The Heart of a Dog*).
- Cultural context: The same zoonym may carry different connotations in Russian and Uzbek cultural traditions.
- Co-text: Neighboring words (epithets, comparisons) modify the stylistic coloring of zoonyms.

For example, the Russian zoonym медведь (bear) in neutral context is a large animal; in a fairy tale, it may represent a strong but simple character; in political journalism, it can symbolize Russia itself. The Uzbek ayiq similarly has neutral, folkloric, and metaphorical uses, but its cultural symbolism differs—it is less frequently used as a national symbol than bo'ri (wolf) or bura (camel).

Similarities:

- Both languages use zoonyms for expressive-evaluative, metaphorical, and ironic purposes.
- The cognitive mechanism of anthropomorphic projection is universal.
- Folk-poetic zoonyms (falcon, nightingale, crane) carry similar symbolic meanings due to shared natural observations.

Differences:

- The set of stylistically active zoonyms differs: Russian draws more on forest animals (bear, wolf, fox, hare), while Uzbek draws on desert and mountain fauna (camel, eagle, wolf, snake) and domestic animals central to nomadic culture.
- The degree of negative connotation varies: *soʻbaka* / it is more intensely negative in Uzbek due to Islamic cultural taboos.
- Literary traditions: Russian literature has a longer history of urban satirical use of zoonyms; Uzbek literature retains stronger ties to oral epic traditions, where zoomorphic symbolism often carries heroic rather than comic connotations.

CONCLUSION

The stylistic-contextual analysis of zoonyms in Russian and Uzbek reveals that these lexical units possess a rich and multidimensional stylistic potential. Their functions extend far beyond simple biological reference to encompass expressive evaluation, metaphorical characterization, irony, satire, and folk-poetic symbolism. Context—understood broadly as genre, cultural setting, authorial intention, and co-text—plays a decisive role in determining the actual stylistic meaning of a zoonym. The comparative perspective highlights both universal patterns (rooted in shared human cognitive and communicative needs) and language-specific features (conditioned by cultural traditions, literary heritage, and stylistic systems). Russian and Uzbek stylistics, while distinct, share common mechanisms of zoomorphic imagery, yet each language draws on its own cultural repertoire of animals and its own literary traditions. The findings of this study have practical implications for translation theory (where adequate transfer of stylistic nuances is essential), for lexicography (where stylistic labels and contextual examples are needed), and for teaching Russian and Uzbek as foreign languages (where understanding stylistic and contextual variation is crucial for achieving communicative competence). Further research perspectives include extending the analysis to journalistic and digital discourse, examining the diachronic evolution of stylistic functions of zoonyms, and conducting experimental studies on the perception of zoomorphic imagery by native speakers.

REFERENCES

1. Abduazizov, A. O‘zbek tili stilistikasi. Toshkent: O‘qituvchi, 1989. — 256 b.
2. Bulgakov, M.A. Sobachye serdtse [The Heart of a Dog]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1988. — 128 s.
3. Galimova, O.N. Stylistic Potential of Zoonyms in Turkic Languages. *Philological Sciences. Theory and Practice*, 2013, No. 5-2, pp. 43–46.
4. Karimova, R.Kh. Semantics of Zoonyms in German and Russian Phraseology. *Political Linguistics*, 2005, No. 16, pp. 169–176.
5. Kozhina, M.N. *Stilistika russkogo yazyka* [Stylistics of the Russian Language]. Moscow: Flinta, 2008. — 464 s.
6. Metyakubov, D. Comparative Analysis as a Method of Identifying Linguistic Isomorphism (Based on Zoonyms). *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 2020, Vol. 6, No. 5, pp. 540–543.
7. Qahhor, A. *Tanlangan asarlar* [Selected Works]. Toshkent: G‘afur G‘ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san‘at nashriyoti, 1985. — 480 b.

8. Qodiriy, A. O'tgan kunlar [The Past Days]. Toshkent: Sharq, 2004. — 352 b.
9. Rahmatullaev, Sh. O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati [Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1992. — 384 b.
10. Vinogradov, V.V. O yazyke khudozhestvennoy prozy [On the Language of Literary Prose]. Moscow: Nauka, 1980. — 360 s.
11. Yakovleva, E.S. Connotative Features of Zoonyms. Issues of Journalism, Pedagogy, Linguistics, 2016, Vol. 31, No. 21 (242), pp. 75–78.