

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –  
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –  
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**THE ARTISTIC AND AESTHETIC FUNCTION OF SYNONYMY IN LANGUAGE****Saida Jumanazarova***Master's Degree Student (Year 1)**Specialization: Uzbek Language and Literature**Chirchik State Pedagogical University*[jumanazarovasaida010@gmail.com](mailto:jumanazarovasaida010@gmail.com)*Chirchik, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

**Key words:** Synonymy, artistic-aesthetic function, connotation, denotation, semantic gradation, stylistic coloring, idiolect, pragmatics, Uzbek linguistics, literary text.

**Received:** 01.05.26**Accepted:** 02.05.26**Published:** 03.05.26

**Abstract:** This article analyzes the role of synonymy within the lexico-semantic layer of the language system and its aesthetic functions in literary texts. The author interprets synonymy not merely as a system of meanings but as a "field of choice" that realizes the author's image-making strategy and pragmatic intent. The article highlights the connotative properties of synonyms, semantic gradation, individualization of character speech, and their role in ensuring the cohesion of literary texts, illustrated with examples from the Uzbek language.

**Introduction.** Synonymy is one of the most active and aesthetically effective phenomena in the lexico-semantic layer of the language system, ensuring not only the nominative need but also the artistic expressiveness, emotional-expressive power, and stylistic variety of speech. In a literary text, the conscious selection of lexical units that are close to each other within one semantic scope is directly related to the author's point of view, the strategy of creating an image, and the emotional-psychological resonance created in the reader. Therefore, analyzing the artistic-aesthetic function of synonymy in language serves, on the one hand, to illuminate the internal semantic mechanisms of language, and on the other hand, the pragmatic

and poetic laws of artistic speech. Although synonymy is often defined in linguistics as a “system of synonymous words,” from an artistic-aesthetic point of view, it is a “field of choice”: while maintaining the denotative core of the content, the author subtly manages connotative shades (evaluation, emotion, socio-stylistic layer, color of time and space). Thus, synonymy in a literary text performs such functions as “strengthening the content without repetition,” “clarifying the description,” “adjusting rhythm and melody,” “individualizing the character,” and “showing the spirit of the era and the social stratum.” The scientific study of this issue stands at the intersection of lexicology, stylistics, poetics, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics; because the real use of a synonymic series is always conditioned by the context, the author’s intention, and the reader’s interpretation.[1;68]

**Materials and methods.** The theoretical interpretation of the phenomenon of synonymy is primarily related to the issue of “full synonymy” and “partial synonymy.” Many studies note that absolute synonyms are very rare, and due to the economy of language and the need for communicative differentiation, two units with the exact same meaning cannot exist in parallel in the language system for a long time. [1;75] Therefore, the artistic-aesthetic function is performed precisely by partial synonymy—that is, units that have stylistic, emotional, evaluative, figurative, or collocational differences against the background of denotative proximity. For example, although variants such as “to die,” “to pass away,” “to leave the world,” “to give up the ghost,” “to close one’s eyes,” and “to perish” all signify the same reality, they provide different aesthetic effects according to the degree of formality, evaluation and emotional tone, the genre of the text, and the author’s position. In artistic speech, the author selects one from this series and also codes the worldview of the character or the attitude of the narrator; the tone of tragedy, satire, or lyrics cannot be the same as a formal-neutral expression. The choice of a synonym, therefore, is a matter of stylistics along with semantics.[6;15]

In Uzbek linguistics, the issue of synonymy has been regularly covered within the scope of lexicology and stylistics: the layers of synonymous words, the structure of synonymic series, the difference between dominant units and peripheral units, as well as the principles of selection according to stylistic coloring and speech situations have been emphasized. The historical layering of units with Turkic roots, Persian-Tajik, and Arabic sources in the lexicon of the Uzbek language has expanded synonymic possibilities: words of different origins gather in one semantic field, creating a rich resource for the artistic style. For example, units such as “go‘zal” (Turkish), “zebo” (Persian-Tajik), and “latif” (Arabic) stand around a similar meaning and provide different registers and poetic colors; the author subtly tunes the stylistic register

of the text through this opportunity. Such layering is especially important in poetry for adjusting meter, rhyme, alliteration, and assonance, because choosing a synonym also means controlling the phonetic form.[3;26]

To understand the artistic-aesthetic function of synonymy more holistically, it is necessary to interpret “meaning” not only as denotation but as a complex of connotative components. The connotation of a lexical unit—evaluation (positive/negative), emotionality (calm/passionate), figurativeness, socio-stylistic markers (colloquial, literary, formal), dialectal or historical tinge—creates a semantic “light-and-shadow” in the literary text. [2;59] The difference between synonyms is often manifested precisely in this connotative layer; the author, by choosing the appropriate connotation, defines the inner state of the image or the color of the environment. For example, the difference between “to cry” and “to moan,” “to wail,” or “to lament,” besides a quantitative increase, also changes the depth of the psychological state and the degree of descriptiveness; “to moan” evokes a subtle image associated with injury, grief, and internal breaking, while “to wail” provides an emotion close to a sharp, external explosion. In this way, synonymy performs the role of a “psychological microscope” in the artistic-aesthetic task.[3;10]

In a literary text, synonymy often increases the aesthetic impact by creating “semantic gradation” (strengthening or weakening). When a series of synonyms are placed one after another, a dynamic description appears not as a repetition of the denotative core, but as a result of the growth or change of meaning shades. One of the rhetorical methods, “intensification with a synonymic series,” strengthens the rhythmic-syntactic parallelism and emotional intensity in the reader’s perception; this is especially noticeable in dramatic monologues or publicistic lyrics.[19;91] In this, the author chooses the first word as relatively neutral and the subsequent ones as more emotional or evaluative, providing psychological step-by-step progression: sequences such as “thought—pondered—hesitated—wavered” allow “showing” the process that took place in the hero’s mind. This gradation mechanism is closely related to the synonymic resources of the language and is often used in the artistic style to illuminate compositional centers.[16;85]

Another important aspect of the aesthetic function of synonymy is the enhancement of the accuracy and concreteness of the description. Since the literary text is the art of “showing,” the author chooses a more precise, figurative, or collocationally appropriate synonym instead of a word signifying a general trait. For example, using one of the variants such as “to walk” instead of “to wander,” “to stagger,” “to skip,” or “to crawl” also signifies the speed,

purposefulness, social status, or mental mood of the movement. Here, the difference between synonyms changes the “action scenario”: freedom and observation in “to wander,” poverty or aimlessness in “to stagger,” and exhaustion or compulsion in “to crawl” are strengthened. From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, such a choice affects conceptualization: the reader begins to see the reality exactly in the “frame” proposed by the author.[12;36]

The artistic-aesthetic function of synonymy is also seen in the formation of individual style (idiolect). Every creator chooses certain units from specific synonymic series as “favorites,” creating a unique lexical signature by using them repeatedly. In this, the historical period, literary school, genre, and the author’s worldview can be decisive factors. For example, in classical poetry, literary synonyms belonging to the Arabic-Persian layer are often found in accordance with poetic tradition and the requirements of aruz (prosody), while the increase of units with Turkic roots close to colloquial speech in modern prose gives the effect of realism and naturalness. This process is interpreted in stylistics as “lexical selection,” and synonymy is seen as one of its main mechanisms.[11;32] The stylistic system of the Uzbek literary language also differentiates the use of synonyms according to the distribution of functional styles: units such as “to decease,” “to confirm,” “to implement” in the official style, and expressions such as “to pass away,” “to approve,” “to come to fruition” in the artistic style provide more aesthetic color.[17;22]

The individualization of character speech in a literary text is also realized through synonymy. In dialogues, the author distributes different synonyms within one semantic field according to the character’s social origin, age, profession, cultural level, and temperament. One character might say “food” (ovqat), while another says “meal” (taom) or “provisions” (yegulik); the choice of variants such as “funds” (mablag‘) or “pennies” (chaqa) in colloquial speech instead of “money” (pul) draws the character’s linguistic portrait. Here, synonymy performs the task of social indexation: social roles and relationships are seen through the choice of words. From the point of view of pragmatics, the choice of a synonym also determines the degree of politeness, distance, and respect indicator of the speech act. For example, the difference between “tell” and “please, narrate” changes the communicative situation instantly; in a literary text, this difference often serves to illuminate conflict or hierarchy.[20;64]

The aesthetic function of synonymy is also active in poetic organization, that is, in layers related to sound, rhythm, and syntactic parallelism. Elements such as rhyme, radif, meter, internal rhyme, and alliteration often require the selection of synonyms that express the same meaning but have a different phonetic appearance. The author uses synonymy to “find” the

melody without losing meaning; as a result, while maintaining the semantic core, the artistic form becomes perfect. Jakobson saw the essence of the poetic function in “directing the message to itself”; in a poetic text, the choice and combination of language units are in strong connection with each other. The choice of a synonym expands the possibilities on the “axis of selection” and stabilizes the poetic organism: if one word breaks the rhythm, another synonymous word restores it; if one word cools the tone, another increases the emotional temperature.[8;30]

At the same time, synonymy is the main tool for managing “repetition” in a literary text. Although repetition sometimes serves an artistic purpose in literary speech, in many cases, excessive lexical repetition weighs down the text. Synonymic replacement (paraphrase) renews the expression while maintaining the continuity of content, smoothes the flow of the text, and holds the reader’s attention. This phenomenon is also interpreted as a cohesive device within the framework of text linguistics: one referent or situation is mentioned again with different synonymic names, strengthening the semantic connection. In a literary work, calling the hero “the youth,” then “the young man,” then “the lad” is not only to avoid repetition but can be a step-by-step “zooming in” of the description and managing the focus of the reader’s attention. Thus, synonymy performs cohesive and aesthetic functions simultaneously.[9;87]

The aesthetic possibilities of synonymy are often harmonized with tropical tools such as metaphor and metonymy. The juxtaposition of an “ordinary” synonym and a “figurative” synonym in one semantic field makes the artistic description multi-layered. For example, variants such as “to glimpse,” “to look,” “to gaze” stand next to the verb “to see”; some of them signify the action directly, while some signify a psychological relationship (interest, suspicion, aggression, amazement). These differences can also be enriched with metaphorical expansions: in combinations such as “his heart saw,” “his soul felt,” sensory verbs form a figurative meaning in the synonymic field, strengthening the artistic-aesthetic impact. The poetic semantics of a literary text often arises through these “synonymic shifts”: the author surprises the reader with an unexpected but motivated choice.

Synonymy in the artistic-aesthetic function also serves antithesis: the author opposes the positive and negative names of a referent, strengthening the conflict or creating irony. For example, a person who is a “hero” for one character may be a “vagabond” or “heartless” for another; although the denotation is close, the evaluative connotation differs sharply. In irony, the author chooses a “gentle” synonym contrary to the context, showing the real attitude hiddenly. Such pragmatic games strengthen the polyphony of the literary text because the

choice of a synonym always signifies a point of view. In discourse analysis, this can also be explained as “lexical framing”: synonyms “frame” reality differently, and the reader evaluates through this frame.[13;15]

The unique aspect of the synonymic system of the Uzbek language is that it has a dynamic balance between historical layers, dialectal richness, and literary language norms. In fiction, by using dialectal elements alongside normative literary synonyms, it is possible to provide local color, show the character’s origin, or create a realistic detail. Such a method, of course, requires a balance of norms and artistic goals: excessive dialectalism can make the text incomprehensible, but an appropriate choice enlivens the character and the environment. At this point, synonymy appears as a managed form of “variability”; by choosing a variant, the author also draws the geography of the artistic world. Issues of lexical norms and stylistic coloring are also noted in the explanatory and synonym dictionaries of the Uzbek language, which serve as a practical source for artistic creation.[18;78]

**Result and discussion.** The issue of the dominant word and periphery in synonymic series has methodological significance in explaining the artistic-aesthetic function. The dominant unit is often neutral and widely used; the periphery works in a narrower context, has a strong connotation, or is characteristic of a certain style. In a literary text, when the author deviates from the dominant and chooses a peripheral unit, “markedness” increases in the reader’s perception: exactly this choice serves as an aesthetic signal. This is clearly seen, for example, in peripheral tools such as “to whisper,” “to mutter,” “to speak with sweat on one’s forehead” in relation to the dominant “to speak.” The increase of markedness in artistic description often illuminates the frame: the author chooses a marked synonym, not a neutral one, at an important point and “stops” the reader there.[17;42]

Another dimension of the artistic-aesthetic function of synonymy is its connection with intertextual and cultural codes. Some synonyms are related to national poetic tradition, religious-cultural texts, or historical discourse, and choosing them brings an additional semantic layer to the literary text. For example, Arabic-Persian literary synonyms sometimes remind of Quranic, Sufi, or classical literature tones, raising the text to a “high style”; simple synonyms with Turkic roots create a folk, natural mood close to the “inner voice.” In this, the choice of a synonym is not only an aesthetic decoration but a process of cultural semiosis: the reader perceives familiar codes and interprets the meaning more deeply. This situation is explained as “secondary modeling of the sign” within the framework of a semiotic approach.

In general, synonymy synthesizes several main functions in the artistic-aesthetic task: (1) increasing expressiveness and creating emotional impact; (2) clarifying and specifying the image and subtle differentiation of the psychological state; (3) managing the stylistic register and forming an individual authorial style; (4) social and psychological individualization of character speech; (5) adaptation to the requirements of poetic form (rhythm, rhyme, melody); (6) ensuring text cohesion and aesthetic control of repetition; (7) engaging cultural intertextual codes. These functions do not work in isolation from each other in a real text, but rather together; a synonymic choice often performs several tasks at the same time. Therefore, studying synonymy from an artistic-aesthetic point of view is not limited to just compiling a “list of synonymous words”; it requires a comprehensive view of contextual analysis, pragmatic intention, stylistic coloring, and reader perception.

**Conclusion.** In conclusion, it can be said that synonymy is one of the most powerful mechanisms that employ the artistic possibilities of language and manage the aesthetic impact at a “micro-level.” In fiction, synonyms do not repeat the denotative meaning, but illuminate it anew each time: lyrical softness appears in one, dramatic sharpness in another, ironic distance in another, and historical color in yet another. The multi-layered lexical system, historical, and cultural resources of the Uzbek language further expand the aesthetic potential of synonymy. In future studies, frequency analysis of synonymic series based on a corpus, statistical modeling of the author’s idiolect, as well as experimental testing of the psycholinguistic effects of synonym choice in reader perception will help to reveal the artistic-aesthetic function even more clearly. However, even now it is clear that synonymy remains one of the central linguistic phenomena ensuring the semantic accuracy, stylistic elegance, and aesthetic impact of a literary text.

#### References:

- [1]. Lyons, J. (1977). “Semantics (Vols. 1–2)”. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [2]. Lyons, J. (1977). “Semantics (Vols. 1–2)”. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3]. Vinogradov, V. V. (1977). “Lexicology and Lexicography” (Selected Works). Moscow: Nauka.
- [4]. Arnold, I. V. (1981). “Stylistics of Modern English”. Leningrad: Prosveshchenie.
- [5]. Hojiyev, A. (2002). “Explanatory Dictionary of Uzbek Language Synonyms”. Tashkent: O’qituvchi.
- [6]. Jakobson, R. (1960). “Linguistics and Poetics. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), Style in Language (pp. 350–377)”. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- [7]. Cruse, D. A. (1986). "Lexical Semantics". Cambridge University Press.
- [8]. Vinogradov, V. V. (1977). "Lexicology and Lexicography" (Selected Works). Moscow: Nauka.
- [9]. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). "Metaphors We Live By". Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [10]. Arnold, I. V. (1981). "Stylistics of Modern English". Leningrad: Prosveshchenie.
- [11]. Hojiyev, A. (2002). "Explanatory Dictionary of Uzbek Language Synonyms". Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
- [12]. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). "Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13]. Jakobson, R. (1960). "Linguistics and Poetics. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), Style in Language (pp. 350–377)". Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [14]. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). "Cohesion in English". London: Longman.
- [15]. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). "Metaphors We Live By". Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [16]. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). "Modern Uzbek Literary Language". Tashkent: Universitet.
- [17]. O'TIL (2006–2008). "Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language (5 volumes)". Tashkent: State Scientific Publishing House of the National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan.
- [18]. Lotman, Yu. M. (1977). "The Structure of the Artistic Text". Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- [19]. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). "Cohesion in English". London: Longman.
- [20]. Hojiyev, A. (2002). "Explanatory Dictionary of Uzbek Language Synonyms". Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
- [21]. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). "Modern Uzbek Literary Language". Tashkent: Universitet.