

COGNITIVE AND COMMUNICATIVE ASPECTS OF CONTEMPORARY STYLISTICS

¹ Pazilova Nasibaxon Muhammadqosimovna

² Shokhujaeva Feruzakhon Maxmudxon qizi

¹ **ANDIJON DAVLAT CHET TILLARI INSTITUTI DOTSENTI**
npazilova304@gmail.com

² **FARG'ONA DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI 2-KURS MAGISTRANTI**
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7597286>

Annotation. This article is devoted to the problems of stylistics which discusses cognitive and communicative aspects of contemporary stylistics. It gives information on communicative style and its specific features in Modern linguistics.

Key words: speech, style, stylistics, cognitive aspects, communicative aspects.

Cognitive stylistics, also known as cognitive poetics has rapidly become an ever-expanding, entrepreneurial and extremely productive branch. At its most basic, a definition can comprise a single sentence: 'Cognitive poetics is all about reading literature'. Cognitive stylistics/poetics highlights the aspects of reading that literature consumers operate when they process literary texts. Cognitive stylistics, essentially, has emanated from the application to literature of models originally used in disciplines such as cognitive linguistics, cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence. Of special relevance are the multiple frameworks in which this branch has managed to capture issues such as 'what do people do when they read' and 'what happens to people when they read'. Because of the data that cognitive stylistics is concerned with, i.e., literature, this branch is intricately linked to literary stylistics, alternatively known as literary linguistics. In fact, cognitive stylistics is said to have derived directly from it. Cognitive stylistics combines the kind of explicit rigorous and detailed linguistic analysis of literary texts that is typical of the stylistics tradition with a systematic and theoretically informed consideration of the cognitive structures and processes that underlie the production and reception of language. According to Michael Burke, cognitive stylistics/poetics combines the detailed analysis of linguistic choices and patterns in texts with a systematic consideration of the mental processes and representations that are involved in the process of interpretation. Within Cognitive poetics, literary reading is assumed to involve the same mental processes and representations that are involved in comprehension generally. However, special attention is paid to linguistic creativity and its interpretation, since creativity is a central part of the literary experience (even though it is not an exclusively literary phenomenon) [3].

Stylistic device: general issues and disputable questions A figure of speech is popularly associated with such expressive devices of language as metaphor and simile, by which images are evoked through comparison of one 'object' with another: e.g. Women are angels, wooing; Time is like a fashionable host (Shakespeare: Troilus and Cressida). In rhetoric, whence the origin of the term, figures of speech are actually much more numerous than those given in, and far more diverse in their nature, so that it is difficult to define their essential feature [4].

Plett defines the figure as 'the smallest deviant language unit', which implies controversially that figures generally depart from the linguistic 'norms' of everyday language in some way, whether semantically, or syntactically. This is possibly the case if we see deviations as not only rule-breaking, but also over-regular. Originating in classical oratory as devices to structure and elaborate an argument, and to move the emotions of an audience, figures of speech soon came

to be associated with the art of literary composition. According I.R. Galperin, stylistic device is “a conscious and intentional intensification of some typical structural and/or semantic property of a language unit (neutral or expressive) promoted to a generalized status and thus becoming a generative model”. It follows then that an SD is an abstract pattern, a mould into which any content can be poured. As is known, the typical is not only that which is in frequent use, but that also which reveals the essence of a phenomenon with the greatest and most evident force. [1]. Broadly, figures are traditionally divided into schemes and tropes, of which schemes are by far the most frequent. A linguistic reinterpretation of the traditional distinction between schemes and tropes is given in Leech, schemes are defined as ‘foregrounded repetitions of expression’, and tropes as ‘foregrounded irregularities of content’. Various kinds of scheme, corresponding to traditional figures of speech such as ‘anaphora’ and ‘antithesis’ are discussed in Leech, [6] The line between these two categories, as with many other rhetorical classifications, has always been vaguely and inconsistently drawn. Schemes, roughly, have included figures such as alliteration, anaphora, and chiasmus, and have been described as abnormal arrangements lending themselves to the forceful and harmonious presentation of ideas. Tropes, more radical in scope and more powerful in effect, have (again roughly) been identified as devices involving alteration of the normal meaning of an expression: they include metaphor, irony, and synecdoche. Some rhetoricians draw up a third category of ‘figures of thought’. These are more concerned with the psychological strategy of developing a theme than with the actual choice of language, and so lie outside our province [8]. Leech sees no harm in resurrecting the division between the schemes and tropes, and reinterpreting it on a more strictly linguistic basis. Schemes have to do with expression, and tropes with content: this much is traditional. Schemes and tropes are identified at different levels: i.e. a scheme may be identified as a phonological, a graphological, or a formal (i.e. grammatical and/or lexical) pattern; likewise, a trope may be identified as a formal or a semantic deviation. But these identifications are not so distinct as they may seem, because there is a great deal of interdependence between the levels [5].

In the last two decades or so, that is from the 1980s and onwards, both linguistic semantics and other, related disciplines that deal with meaning and thinking have seen a steadily increasing interest in figurative language. More specifically, this interest has centered on the occurrence of words and formulations that have some kind of extended or transferred meaning. Tropes is a cover term from traditional rhetoric for language uses with some kind of secondary meaning. In other words, the meaning of a trope has come about through some obvious shift from a more basic type of understanding of a language element. [6]. Literary interest in, and use of, figures of speech reached its zenith in the Renaissance: Peacham's handbook lists nearly 200 different types. Poets handled them with verve and ostentation, having learned their names as part of their grammar school education and their study of elocutio. A decline in the study of classics, and a growing suspicion of the rhetorical, have led to a decline in their use in literary composition and public speaking, although a 'hard core' of figures still persists, and some are known reasonably well by name. Devices of repetition are common in public speaking; and figurative language is generally characteristic of advertising, for example [3]. Indeed, new figures unknown in traditional rhetoric have to be accounted for here: e.g. graphemic deviations in brand names [5]. Undoubtedly, a knowledge of stylistic figures is of considerable importance for our understanding of stylistic effect in literary language in earlier periods.

In the second half of the twentieth century, however, renewed interest in figures of speech came from French structuralism influenced by the earlier Russian formalists; from deconstruction theory; from stylistics in work on text analysis; speech act theory; cognitive linguistics and pragmatics. As a result, there have been several attempts at new classifications of figures. [2] The occurrence of novel figures of speech is one effect of the creativity of a language, although there is of course also a host of established figurative uses. More specifically, the construction of novel figures of speech shows that the need to express thoughts and impressions that have no conventional verbal representations can make us invest words with new meanings. However, if a novel figure of speech is repeatedly used by the members of a speech community after it has been introduced in their language, it becomes a conventional part of it. So, both conventionalized and merely incidental polysemous shifts reflect the flexibility of verbal languages in dealing with the infinitely complex nature of human experiences, thoughts and reactions. [6] A rhetorical figure can be defined as an artful deviation in the form taken by a statement. Since antiquity dozens of figures have been cataloged, ranging from the familiar (rhyme, pun) to the obscure (antimetabole). Despite the frequent appearance of rhetorical figures in print advertisements, their incorporation into advertising theory and research has been minimal. [4]. In fact, from the perspective of advertising theory, previous efforts to systematize the set of rhetorical figures have all been handicapped by one or more of the following shortcomings: the taxonomic categories are vague or too coarse grained, the categories are not linked to consumer responses, or the focus is on outcomes other than persuasion [4].

References:

1. Арнольд И.В. Стилистика современного английского языка. - М., 1990. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. - М.: КомКнига, 2007. - 576 с
2. Craig H. Stylistics or Cognitive Stylistics? 2006
3. Crystal D., Davy, D. Investigating English Style. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman, 1969. 264 p.
4. Stockwell P. 'Cognitive poetics is all about reading literature' 2002, p. 1
5. Pazilova NEFFECTIVE WAYS OF TEACHING AND EXPANDING VOCABULARY. ResearchJet Journal of Analysis and Inventions. ISSN: 2776-0960. Impact Factor: 7.655. VOLUME 2, ISSUE 5 , MAY-2021. Website: <http://reserchjet.academiascience.org>
6. Pazilova NEFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING WRITING (THE USE OF "CHARACTER WHEEL" METHOD) EURASIAN JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH. Volume 1, Issue 2. Part 2 May 2021. The official website of the journal. www.innacademy.uz. Volume 1 Issue 02, May 2021 ISSN 2181-2020. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4904069>
7. Pazilova N "O'rganilayotgan til stilistikasi fanidan elektron qo'llanma" – "Электрон ўқув қўлланма. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Адлия вазирлиги ҳузуридаги интеллектуал мулк агентлиги. №ДГУ 14247. 17.12.2021.

PAZILOVA N THE INVESTIGATION OF SYNTACTICAL EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UZBEK INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, IT, ENGINEERING AND SOCIAL SCIENCES ISSN NO: 2349-7793 VOLUME16, ISSUE 01 JANUARY, 2022