



<https://doi.org/10.70728/b.series.fil.v08.i05.171>

INTERPRETATION OF DYSTOPIAN DISCOURSE IN THE INTERCULTURAL LITERARY SPACE: “ANIMAL FARM” AND “KECHA VA KUNDUZ”

Temirov Navro‘zbek Ulug‘murot o‘g‘li

Independent researcher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8439-7465>

navrozbeq.temirov9077@gmail.com

+998945229077

Abstract. This article attempts a comprehensive linguodiscursive analysis of dystopian components in the works of George Orwell and A. Chulpan. The study examines dystopian discourse as a representative system that distorts the cognitive structures of linguistic personality. Using a comparative typological method, strategies of linguistic suggestion and methods for eroding the conceptual fields of “freedom”, “justice”, and “equality” are explicated. The author demonstrates that while logical-semantic inversion prevails in Orwell’s English-language discourse, Chulpan’s Uzbek discourse is dominated by the ethnolinguistic metaphorization of “night” as a communicative impasse.

Key words: linguistic dystopia, discourse analysis, linguacultural studies, resemantization, pragmatics, Orwell, Chulpan, concept, communicative slavery, intertextuality.

Аннотация. В статье предпринимается попытка комплексного лингводискурсивного анализа антиутопических компонентов в произведениях Дж. Оруэлла и А. Чулпана. В рамках исследования антиутопический дискурс рассматривается как репрезентативная система, деформирующая когнитивные структуры языковой личности. На основе сравнительно-типологического метода эксплицированы стратегии лингвистической суггестии, приемы эрозии концептуальных полей “свобода”, “справедливость”, “равенство”. Автором доказано, что если в англоязычном дискурсе Оруэлла превалирует логико-семантическая инверсия, то в узбекском дискурсе Чулпана доминирует этнолингвистическая метафоризация “ночи” как коммуникативного тупика.

Ключевые слова: лингвистическая антиутопия, дискурс-анализ, лингвокультурология, ресемантизация, прагматика, Оруэлл, Чулпан, концепт, коммуникативное рабство, интертекстуальность.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola Jorj Oruell va Abdulhamid Chulpan asarlaridagi distopik komponentlarni keng qamrovli lingvodiskursiv tahlil qilishga harakat qiladi. Tadqiqotda distopik diskurs lingvistik shaxsning kognitiv tuzilmalarini buzadigan vakillik tizimi sifatida o'rganiladi. Qiyosiy tipologik usul yordamida lingvistik taklif strategiyalari va “erkinlik”, “adolat” va “tenglik” kontseptual maydonlarini yo'q qilish usullari tushuntiriladi. Muallif Oruellning ingliz tilidagi diskursida mantiqiy-semantik inversiya ustunlik qilsa-da, Chulpanning o'zbek diskursida “tun”ning kommunikativ boshi berk ko'chaga aylanishi kabi etnolingvistik metaforalashuvi ustunlik qilishini ko'rsatadi.

Kalit so'zlar: lingvistik distopiya, diskurs tahlili, madaniy lingvistika, resemantizatsiya, pragmatika, Oruell, Chulpan, kontseptsiya, kommunikativ qullik, intertekstuallik.

INTRODUCTION

The modern linguistic paradigm views literary text not only as an aesthetic object but also as a battleground for discourses. Dystopian discourse in this context is the most aggressive type of speech organization, the purpose of which is to legitimize violence through language. J. Orwell's novels “Animal Farm” and A. Chulpan's “Kecha va kunduz” offer unique material for cross-cultural comparison. While Orwell creates a model of “pure” linguistic dystopia, Chulpan infuses dystopian elements into the fabric of socio-psychological realism, creating the effect of a “discursive occupation” of the characters' consciousness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical and methodological basis of this study is formed by the fundamental tenets of critical discourse analysis (CDA), developed in the works of T. van Dijk and N. Fairclough. Within the framework of this linguistic paradigm, language is viewed not as an invariant code, but as a form of social practice that determines and legitimizes power relations through speech [Van Dijk, 2008]. The linguistic nature of the dystopian text in this context is inextricably linked with the category of “linguistic violence” – the deliberate deformation of the semantic and pragmatic structures of language with the aim of suggestively suppressing the will of the addressee.

Of particular significance for the interpretation of dystopian space are the theses of R. Fowler, who qualifies George Orwell's discursive model as radical “linguistic determinism”. Drawing on the hypothesis of linguistic relativity, the researcher demonstrates that under conditions of severe reduction of lexical and grammatical inventory (the “Newspeak” phenomenon), an irreversible transformation of the individual's cognitive horizons occurs:

the boundaries of the language accessible to the subject begin to manifest the boundaries of their conceptual world [Fowler, 1995]. Thus, dystopian discourse appears as a mechanism for the artificial sterilization of consciousness through the removal from verbal circulation of concepts that facilitate critical reflection.

In Uzbek linguistics and literary studies, the works of N. Karimov and D. Kuronov laid a solid foundation for a profound interpretation of A. Chulpan’s symbolic system. While the researchers described in detail the hierarchy of artistic images and revealed the philosophical depth of his prose, the linguistic interpretation of the novel “Kecha va kunduz” as a dystopian discourse aimed at the systemic deconstruction of value dominants remains a little-studied and promising direction [Quronov, 2004].

A distinctive feature of this review and the subsequent analysis is the shift in focus from purely literary categories to an analysis of the deformation of the basic linguacultural concept of “erkinlik” (freedom). We believe that Chulpan, operating within different cultural and linguistic coordinates, captures the same processes of semantic erosion as Orwell. Under conditions of ideological or colonial pressure, the lexeme “freedom” is subjected to forced resemantization in the characters’ discourse, being replaced by surrogate meanings of “submission to fate” (taqdir) or “the inevitability of oppression” [Karimov, 2012]. This perspective requires a systematic comparison of the Uzbek text with global benchmarks of the dystopian genre to identify universal linguistic patterns of the suppression of linguistic identity in intercultural space.

METHODOLOGY

The original texts of the novels served as the material for the study. The following were used: discourse analysis – to identify the hidden intentions of power; component analysis of lexemes – to record semantic shifts in key concepts, as well as the linguacultural method – to analyze national metaphors (e.g., the concept of “night” in Uzbek culture).

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In his artistic modeling of a totalitarian space, George Orwell explicates in detail the phenomenon defined in modern linguistics as “semantic collapse”. This process is characterized by the deliberate entropy of a language’s lexical composition, in which the artificial narrowing of synonymous series and the leveling of antonymous oppositions serve as the prevailing strategy for reducing the cognitive range of the linguistic personality. In the novel “Animal Farm”, this strategy is implemented through two key lingua-pragmatic mechanisms: radical binarization and the resemantization of discourse. The transformation of the slogan “*Four legs good, two legs bad*” exemplifies the rigid dichotomization of reality. From a linguistic perspective, this simplifies the axiological scale: multifaceted social and ethical categories are reduced to a primitive binary opposition, excluding any gradation or nuance of meaning. The discourse of power imposes a ready-made presupposition on the

recipient, blocking the possibility of critical interpretation through the restriction of lexical choice.

The culmination of this discursive expansion is the final transformation of the commandments: *"All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others"*. From a linguapragmatics perspective, this utterance deliberately distorts a grammatical norm – the use of the comparative form of an adjective with absolute semantics (*equal* – “equal”). This logical destruction leads to a rift between the signifier and the signified: the lexeme “equality” is stripped of its denotative core and transformed into an “empty sign”. This signals the complete degradation of objective language and the transition to a communicative model in which the truth value of a statement is entirely determined by the will of the subject of power, effectively signifying the death of language as a tool for understanding reality.

The dystopian discourse in Chulpan’s novel is built on discursive asymmetry. The language of the oppressor characters is saturated with bureaucratic jargon, euphemisms, and manipulative religious formulas. The conceptual metaphor of “Kecha” (Night): In the novel’s linguistic space, “night” is a macroconcept, encompassing the lexemes *“zulm”* (oppression), *“jaholat”* (ignorance), and *“qullik”* (slavery). Chulpan shows how this discourse paralyzes the heroine, Zebi. Her speech acts become lapidary, and she loses the ability to predicate her fate. The use of proverbs about fate (taqdir) acts as a linguistic block. When the system speaks the language of “eternal truths”, individual protest becomes impossible at the grammatical level (the absence of an active voice in the subject).

Chulpan’s Miryoqub is a character undergoing linguistic escape. His inner speech at the beginning of the novel is filled with the stereotypes of a colonial businessman, but his encounter with Maria initiates a process of “renaming” the world. This parallels Orwell’s characters’ attempts to keep a diary – that is, to restore words to their original denotative meaning.

Comparison parameter	Linguistic discourse “Animal Farm”	Linguistic discourse “Kecha va kunduz”
Dominant figure	Oxymoron, inversion of meanings.	Antithesis (light/darkness), euphemism.
Type of manipulation	Imposing a new vocabulary (Top-down).	Exploitation of traditional codes (Inside-out).
The fate of the “Freedom” concept	Exclusion from dictionary / Substitution.	Identification with sin or madness.

It is important to note that Orwell describes the discourse “after the victory” of the system (statics), while Chulpan captures the discourse in the process of capturing consciousness (dynamics). A linguistic interpretation of the texts reveals that dystopia isn't always the presence of a dictator, but rather a discursive vacuum in which words are devoid of denotation. In “Animal Farm”, this is achieved through grammatical simplification; in

“Kecha va kunduz”, through the semantic viscosity of a “night” language, where any personal action is drowned out by the verbosity of justifications for fate.

CONCLUSION

The analysis allows us to formulate more detailed conclusions, namely that dystopian discourse in English and Uzbek literature exhibits an isomorphic structure at the level of pragmatic goals, consisting of the depersonalization of the subject through the destruction of their verbal competence. In other words, the suppression of the individual is accomplished not only through institutional mechanisms of power, but primarily through the transformation of language as a means of self-identification and communication. In both artistic worlds, the subject loses the ability to formulate their own experience and comprehend reality, as the language in which they think and speak is subject to systemic distortion. Thus, dystopia acts not only as a social model but also as a model of linguistic alienation.

The difference between the works lies in the artistic tools employed: Orwell relies on the mechanisms of formal logic and semiotic substitution, demonstrating how changes in symbolic structures lead to changes in reality itself. His allegorical system is built on a logical paradox, where a linguistic formula becomes an instrument of power. Chulpan, on the other hand, employs the mechanisms of linguacultural coding, within which the transformation of the individual is achieved through the pressure of traditional and social norms, enshrined in the cultural semantics of language.

Both authors emphasize that the only way to preserve identity is to maintain the autonomy of discourse – the subject’s ability to call things by their proper names, resisting the euphemisms and distortions imposed by the system. It is precisely the ability to speak the truth in a language not subject to ideological dictates that becomes the final space of freedom. Thus, maintaining verbal independence is not simply an act of communication, but an act of resistance and a condition for the preservation of human identity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Orwell G. *Animal Farm* / G. Orwell. – London: Secker & Warburg, 1945. – 112 p.
2. Чўлпон А. Кеча ва кундуз: роман / А. Чўлпон. – Тошкент: Шарқ, 2014. – 320 б.
3. Fowler R. *The language of George Orwell* / R. Fowler. – London: Macmillan, 1995. – 162 p.
4. Van Dijk T. *Discourse and power* / T. van Dijk. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. – 320 p.
5. Fairclough N. *Language and power* / N. Fairclough. – London: Longman, 1989. – 259 p.
6. Quronov D. *Cho‘lpon poetikasi* / D. Quronov. – Toshkent: Fan, 2004. – 160 b.
7. Karimov N. *Cho‘lpon* / N. Karimov. – Toshkent: Ma‘naviyat, 2003. – 120 b.

8. Berlin I. Liberty / I. Berlin. – Oxford: Oxford university press, 2002. – 300 p.
9. Foucault M. Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison / M. Foucault. – New York: Vintage Books, 1995. – 333 p.
10. Sutherland J. Orwell’s Nose: A pathological biography / J. Sutherland. – London: Reaktion books, 2016. – 256 p.
11. Arendt H. The origins of totalitarianism / H. Arendt. – New York: Harcourt brace, 1951. – 528 p.
12. Жўраев М. Чўлпон ижодида эркинлик концепцияси / М. Жўраев // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. – 2018. – № 3. – Б. 45–52.
13. Каримов Б. Чўлпон ва замон / Б. Каримов. – Тошкент: Янги аср авлоди, 2002. – 180 б.
14. Fromm E. Escape from Freedom / E. Fromm. – New York: Holt, 1941. – 256 p.
15. Hitchens C. Why Orwell Matters / C. Hitchens. – New York: Basic books, 2002. – 224 p.