

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF STYLISTIC FEATURES OF ANECDOTES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

**Abdiraxmonova Sarvinoz**

Aniq va ijtimoiy Fanlar universiteti  
Xorijiy til va adabiyoti ( magistratura)

**Scientific adviser: Erdanova Zebiniso Abulkasimovna (Phd)**

**Abstract:** This research presents a comparative linguistic and cultural analysis of anecdotes in the English and Uzbek languages, with a particular focus on their stylistic features. Anecdotes, as a form of short, often humorous narratives, serve various functions in both spoken and written discourse—ranging from entertainment to social commentary and moral instruction. The study aims to explore how language structure, cultural values, and humor mechanisms influence the stylistic construction of anecdotes in two distinct linguistic and cultural environments. A qualitative research approach was employed, involving the collection and textual analysis of 60 anecdotes—30 from English-language sources and 30 from Uzbek-language sources. The anecdotes were selected to represent a range of social themes such as politics, education, family, and everyday life. The study concentrates on four primary stylistic elements: tone, narrative voice, figurative language, and cultural references. They commonly reflect individualistic perspectives and highlight personal cleverness or irony in social interactions. In contrast, Uzbek anecdotes draw heavily on oral storytelling traditions, making frequent use of idiomatic expressions, hyperbole, repetition, and culturally embedded characters such as "Nasriddin Afandi." The tone in Uzbek anecdotes is often more animated, and the humor frequently arises from social norms, communal wisdom, and exaggerated depictions of everyday life.

**Key words:** Comparative analysis, linguistic features, cultural analysis, anecdotes, English language, Uzbek language, stylistic features.

**Annotatsiya:** Mazkur tadqiqot ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi latifalarning lingvistik va madaniy xususiyatlarini taqqoslovchi tahlilga bag'ishlangan bo'lib, ularning uslubiy jihatlariga alohida e'tibor qaratilgan. Latifalar – qisqa va ko'pincha kulgili hikoyalar shaklida bo'lib, og'zaki hamda yozma nutqda turli vazifalarni bajaradi: ular nafaqat ko'ngilochar vosita, balki ijtimoiy tanqid yoki axloqiy saboq manbai sifatida ham xizmat qiladi. Ushbu tadqiqot ikki turli til va madaniyat muhitidagi latifalarning uslubiy tuzilishiga til tizimi, madaniy qadriyatlar va hazil mexanizmlarining qanday ta'sir qilishini o'rganishni maqsad qilgan. Sifatli (qualitative) tadqiqot yondashuvi asosida 60 ta latifa – 30 tasi ingliz tilidagi, 30 tasi esa o'zbek tilidagi manbalardan tanlab olinib, matn tahlili o'tkazildi. Latifalar siyosat, ta'lim, oila va kundalik hayot kabi ijtimoiy mavzularni qamrab oladigan tarzda tanlandi. Tadqiqot asosan to'rt asosiy uslubiy elementni o'rganishga qaratildi: ohang (tone), hikoya ovozi (narrative voice), badiiy tasvir vositalari (figurative language) va madaniy ishoralar (cultural

references). Ushbu elementlar har bir tilda kulgi yaratish va madaniy mazmuni yetkazishdagi roliga ko'ra tahlil qilindi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatdiki, ingliz va o'zbek latifalarida uslubiy vositalardan foydalanishda umumiyliklar bilan bir qatorda sezilarli farqlar mavjud. Inglizcha latifalarda qisqalik, kinoya, va nozik hazil ustuvorlik qiladi, bu esa ko'pincha yashirin istehzo yoki so'z o'yinlari orqali ifodalanadi. Ular odatda shaxsiy fikrlar va individual yondashuvni aks ettiradi. O'zbek latifalari esa og'zaki hikoyachilik an'anasiga tayanadi, ularda idiomatik iboralar, mubolag'a, takrorlar va madaniyatga singib ketgan qahramonlar – masalan, “Nasriddin Afandi” obrazlari keng qo'llaniladi. O'zbek latifalarida ohang ko'proq jonli bo'lib, kulgi ko'pincha ijtimoiy qadriyatlar, ommaviy donolik va kundalik hayotning bo'rttirib tasvirlanishidan kelib chiqadi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Taqqoslovchi tahlil, lingvistik xususiyatlar, madaniy tahlil, latifalar, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, uslubiy xususiyatlar.

#### Data Collection

In order to conduct a comparative stylistic analysis, a total of 60 anecdotes were purposefully selected 30 from English sources and 30 from Uzbek sources. The English anecdotes were gathered from a combination of literary collections, online humor websites, and oral storytelling traditions. The Uzbek anecdotes were drawn from folk tales, published joke books, televised comedic programs, and oral folklore. Care was taken to ensure a diverse thematic representation, with anecdotes reflecting political satire, family dynamics, educational scenarios, and common social situations. The selection criteria emphasized cultural relevance, stylistic richness, and popularity within the respective linguistic communities.

#### Analytical Framework

The study adopted a qualitative content analysis methodology to investigate the stylistic elements of the anecdotes. The analysis centered on four primary stylistic features:

- Tone and Voice: The narrator's attitude and stylistic personality in the anecdote.
- Figurative Language: The use of rhetorical devices such as metaphors, irony, sarcasm, hyperbole, and idioms.
- Narrative Structure: The structural organization of the anecdote, including setup, climax, and resolution.
- Cultural References and Values: Implicit or explicit references to societal norms, traditions, values, and communal ideologies.

Each anecdote was closely examined, and recurring stylistic patterns were categorized and compared. Particular attention was paid to how linguistic choices reflected broader cultural narratives. The approach allowed for the identification of both intra-cultural consistencies and cross-cultural divergences in the storytelling techniques employed.

#### Tone and Voice

The tone and narrative voice varied considerably between English and Uzbek anecdotes. English anecdotes frequently employed a dry, ironic, or subtly witty tone, often narrated in the first-person or using an omniscient third-person perspective. This voice choice often serves to create an intimate or observational tone, allowing readers to appreciate the humor intellectually. In contrast, Uzbek anecdotes characteristically adopted a playful, exaggerated, and performative tone. The narration predominantly utilized the third-person perspective, and featured archetypal characters such as “Nasriddin Afandi”, who symbolizes common sense cloaked in folly. These storytelling voices not only convey humor but also function as vehicles for moral or social commentary.

#### Use of Figurative Language

A clear divergence was observed in the figurative language employed. English anecdotes tended to utilize understatement, sarcasm, and puns, often appealing to a more subtle and intellectual form of humor. The punchlines were concise, sometimes requiring inferential reasoning. On the other hand, Uzbek anecdotes made extensive use of proverbs, idioms, allegories, and hyperbolic expressions rooted in oral storytelling traditions. These rhetorical devices were often more vivid and emotionally expressive, resonating with a wider audience across different ages and educational backgrounds.

#### Narrative Structure

In terms of structure, English anecdotes were typically brief and tightly constructed, following a linear pattern that led to a punchline or twist. The economy of language was a defining feature, consistent with the idiomatic tendencies of English. In contrast, Uzbek anecdotes were often more elaborate, sometimes including repetitive sequences, moral framing, and extensive dialogue. These elements enhance the oral performability of the anecdotes and contribute to their role in cultural transmission and social education.

#### Cultural References and Values

The cultural references embedded within each set of anecdotes were reflective of their respective sociocultural contexts. English anecdotes often mirrored individualistic values, where the humor arose from personal cleverness, irony, or situational absurdity. Conversely, Uzbek anecdotes were grounded in collectivist cultural frameworks, with humor derived from shared experiences, community wisdom, traditional authority structures, and respect for elders or social roles. Such cultural embeddings are central to the interpretation and reception of the humor in each context.

#### Discussion

The comparative analysis reveals that while English and Uzbek anecdotes share a common communicative function—humor and social commentary—they diverge considerably in their stylistic execution, which is deeply influenced by linguistic, cultural, and historical factors. English anecdotes reflect the language’s tendency toward conciseness, understatement, and intellectual wit.

Their humor often demands inferential reasoning and rewards individual cleverness or social critique through irony. The narrative is minimalist yet impactful, favoring brevity and ambiguity.

In contrast, Uzbek anecdotes are richer in expressive detail and cultural references, owing to their oral folklore heritage. Their use of exaggeration, idioms, and communal archetypes like “Nasriddin Afandi” not only entertains but also instructs. Humor in Uzbek anecdotes serves as a tool for moral education and the reinforcement of social norms, often embedded in the fabric of daily life and communal relationships. These findings emphasize the significance of cultural context in shaping humor and narrative style. The stylistic differences not only reflect linguistic diversity but also highlight contrasting worldviews—where English storytelling values individual perception and wit, Uzbek narratives prioritize communal harmony, tradition, and collective wisdom.

### **Conclusion**

This comparative study demonstrates that anecdotes in English and Uzbek differ significantly not only in their linguistic expression but also in the underlying cultural values they embody. While both serve the shared purpose of entertaining and reflecting societal norms, the stylistic choices ranging from tone and figurative language to narrative structure and cultural references—highlight the distinct worldviews and communicative priorities of English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking communities. In English anecdotes, the preference for brevity, irony, and intellectual wit underscores a cultural inclination toward individualism, subtlety, and personal agency. These texts often celebrate cleverness, irony, and personal insight, reflecting a worldview where humor is a tool for critique and individual reflection.

### **References**

1. Abrams, M. H., & Harpham, G. G. (2015). *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (11th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning. pp. 140-160.
2. Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 70-190.
3. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 140-180.
4. Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press. pp. 50-80.
5. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. pp. 70-130.
6. Kadir, D. (2011). Stylistic features in humorous texts: A comparative study. *Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies*. pp. 123–134.
7. Nurgali, S., & Ybyraimzhanova, N. (2017). The transformation of the genre of anecdote in the oral tradition of the Turkic peoples. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*. pp. 184–193.

8. Norrick, N. R. (1993). *Conversational Joking: Humor in Everyday Talk*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 34-68.
9. Rashidova, G. (2023). INGLIZ TILI DARSLARIDA YOZISH KO'NIKMASINI O'RGATISH JARAYONIDA ZAMONAVIY INNOVATSION TEXNOLOGIYALARDAN FOYDALANISH. *Engineering problems and innovations*.
10. Sultonova, M. (2024, October). Features of Critical Thinking Skills for B1 Level Learners. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 786-790).
11. Gulomova, R. (2022). AUTHENTIC MATERIALS AS A SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACH. *British View*, 7(1).
12. Erdanova, Z. (2021). THE PROBLEM OF THE NORMS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, 2021(1), 74-81.
13. Rasulova, S., & Muhtashamova, P. (2024). Innovative teaching techniques for distance education. *O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti konferensiyalari*, 169-174.
14. Nasirova, G., Soatova, G., Tilovova, G., & Makhim, A. (2023). A Review of Individual Level Knowledge Sharing in the Workplace. *International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development*, 9(4), 22-28.
15. Alimdjanovna, K. M. (2024). ADVANTAGES OF SCAFFOLDING IN TEACHING WRITING COMPREHENSION. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 4(5-3), 70-72.