

STYLISTIC EXPRESSION OF FREEDOM AND CONTROL IN DYSTOPIAN NOVELS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF “1984”, “BRAVE NEW WORLD” AND “TUSHDA KECHGAN UMRLAR”**Melibayeva Ma'mura Klichboy kizi.**

English teacher at the Department of "Tillar 2" (Languages 2nd),

Samarkand Oriental University.

E-mail: mamuramelibayeva810@gmail.com

Annotation: This article examines the stylistic treatment of freedom and control in three dystopian stories: George Orwell's "1984", Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World" and Utkir Hoshimov's "Tushda kechgan umrlar". Through a comparative stylistic analysis, the study analyzes how linguistic devices imagery, metaphor, lexical juxtapositions, narrative point of view construct the thematic apparatus of surveillance, state power and the individual acts of resistance. The results show that although all the texts include systematic disempowerment of human autonomy, their stylistic approaches are markedly diverse through cultural and political critique.

Key words: Dystopian literature, euphemistic language, scientific vocabulary, freedom and confrontation, stylistic form, metaphor and stylistics, focalized narratives.

Introduction. Dystopian literature tends to be about the tensions between freedoms and rule; societies where agency is controlled through the political, technological, or ideological system. The writers of disparate historical and cultural backgrounds deploy different stylistic means to expose the subtle manipulation of human consciousness by totalitarian structures. Similarly, Orwell's "1984" evokes a political dystopia, with a focus on surveillance and linguistic suppression, Huxley's "Brave New World" depicts a social environment, conditioned by technology, which leads to conformity and amusement and Hoshimov's "Tushda kechgan umrlar" portrays identity loss and the vulnerability of human being as something central - and therefore often difficult to shake. To achieve this, the analysis of stylistic devices employed by the writers helps identify themes of similarity and difference within each of these works.

Methods. To illustrate, the present study adopts a qualitative comparative stylistic perspective to analyze the three dystopian discourses on freedom and control. This analysis consists of *four main elements*.

- *Firstly*, the lexical analysis identifies loaded vocabulary, euphemisms and political neologisms to demonstrate the ways in which each author creates ideological authority and develops its readers' perspectives on oppression.
- *Then*, we look at how the narrative perspective is constructed through point of view and *focalized narratives*, which highlights how a limited or shifting perspective either strengthens systems of oppression or helps to emphasize instances of resistance.
- *Third*, analysis of *metaphor and stylistics*, exploring significant metaphor, symbol, and irony to explain the ways in which both political and psychological tensions are encoded in each society.

➤ *Fourth*, discourse analysis considers how power operates in dialogue, slogans, and institutional language, borrowing from stylistics and critical discourse theory. Comprehensively, primary sources were read and secondary academic sources consulted for interpretation.

All of the quotes were critically examined in terms of certain page-specific stylistic traits and were analyzed to ensure that there was accuracy and comparability of the three works.

Results. A result of the analysis shows how, first and foremost, these authors are utilizing different stylistic strategies to establish and underpin systems of control in the dystopian scenarios they describe. These processes influence the reader's idea of authority through word, image, and narrative tone manipulation.

Stylistic form of control. Control in *1984* is stylistically portrayed with harsh, oppressive language and political terminology like “*Newspeak*” and “*doublethink*” which symbolically erase independent thought [1, 45]. The tone of the narrative is chilling and authoritarian, akin to the Party's ideological rule. Control in “*Brave New World*” takes the form of euphemistic language (“*Community, Identity, Stability*”) and sensory images of pleasure-oriented conditioning [2, 67]. Stylistically, Huxley contrasts clinical scientific vocabulary with the emotional emptiness of dialogue. In *Tushda kechgan umrlar*, control is imagined through symbolic and dream imagery, lexical connotation and contrast between reality and illusion [3, 112]. Hoshimov uses metaphor anchored in cultures to represent psychological manipulation.

Stylistic emphasis on symbols of freedom and confrontation. The analysis demonstrates that stylistic markers of freedom and resistance differ wildly among the textual components, but all three authors use expressive language to demonstrate individual attempts to reclaim autonomy. Orwell employs bleak irony and internal monologue to create an image of Winston's tenuous attempts at liberty [1, 89]. Freedom is stylistically associated with memory and truth. Huxley uses dialogic contrast in demonstrating how characters such as John challenge society's norms through articulate poetic language that stands in opposition to the superficial hedonistic language [2, 143]. In contrast Hoshimov links freedom with self-recognition, employing lyrical language and narrative turn-around to emphasize the character's enlightenment [3, 156]. Style is influenced by culture and history.

Lastly the results suggest that the authors' stylistic decisions are strongly influenced by their historical, cultural and ideological milieu and that the difference in approach to the theme of freedom vs control emerges from this difference. Orwell's post-war British environment helps underpin his use of a harsh, militarized diction, addressing anxieties around totalitarianism. The interwar period shaped Huxley's usage of word, stating his fears about industrial modernity and biological engineering. Hoshimov's Uzbek environment in the late-Soviet world creates a psychological image of internal reflection, an image that reflects some type of psychological atmosphere of pressure and inner turmoil. [5, 89] But between these differing contexts, these three writers also draw stylistic parallels between freedom, emotional depth, memory, identity and control, linguistic manipulation and twisted perception.

Discussion. Comparative study demonstrate that the dystopian authors use different styles to critique authoritarianism. Orwell's representation of political oppression through linguistic minimalism and strict syntactic form. Through lexical contrast and satire, Huxley cautions readers about dehumanizing impulses born out of a cultural and environmental environment that promotes technological determinism and demonstrates how the effects of consumerism can lead to mass communication, how individual and society-based conditioning and control can shape desires, how we suppress critical thought and how conformity can be enforced. Huxley's stylistic choices illustrate the subtle ways pleasure and comfort are used to control behavior and restrict agency, through deliberately created diction, ironic contrast, and

scientifically framed dialogue. By the same token Hoshimov brings the psychological dimension the internal pressures (internalized pressure combined with cultural norms) and its effect on fragmentation or suppression into narrative aspects using both realistic story elements and symbolic dream sequences is what he shows where it acts as a psychological aspect of control is the illusion of internalized pressures that reduce individuality to a thin slice of identity that hinders agency. [6, 52] At times, there are dreams, and the film's dreamlike interludes serve a stylistic purpose for the protagonist's internal conflict, including moments of awareness, recall of memories, and fleeting resistance to oppressive forces. This study reinforces the thesis that stylistic devices such as lexical, syntactic and symbolic devices are not decorative but rather fundamental to determining the reader's perception of dystopian worlds [5, 144]. With close attention to style, figurative and lexical language, these authors show that dystopian oppression works at the societal level, as well as the individual, and that stylistic choice is essential in exposing the myriad relations between the domination of and independence through autonomy.

Conclusion. In 1984, "Brave New World" and "Tushda kechgan umrlar", the thematic dilemma between freedom and control is realised through a series of differential but interlocking stylistic devices that echo the socio-political interests and issues of the writers themselves. Language repression in Orwell's novel is the primary stylistic mechanism of domination. The systematic tightening of diction, the production of ideological neologisms, denies the very possibility of independent thought, intimating that control commences with the linguistic itself. In Huxley's account instead, focus is stylistic upon the assimilation of pleasure and the loss of emotional complexity through scientific and euphemistic expression; power in this case does not arise from its suppression but through conditioned pleasure and the control over feelings.

Hoshimov works stylistically using a psychological fragmentation in his style and symbolic dreams as metaphorical imagery, showing that control can become mental fragmentation as a type of psychological fragmentation of the mind, as internalising how the figure of control might come to look like: confusion, discombobulation, disorientation and instability of selfhood. This comparative analysis, therefore, confirms that stylistic choices enhance our understanding of how systems of control infiltrate consciousness, regulate behavior, and ultimately delineate the limits of human freedom.

References:

1. Orwell, G. 1984. London: Secker & Warburg, 1949. – pp 45- 89.
2. Huxley, A. Brave New World. London: Chatto & Windus, 1932. – pp 67-143.
3. Hoshimov, O'. Lives in the Dream. Tashkent: Sharq, 1994. – pp 112-156.
4. Resch, Robert. "Utopia, Dystopia and Ideology in the Fiction of George Orwell." Science-Fiction Studies, 1984. Cited pages: – pp 120-138.
5. Qodirov, N. Symbolism and Modernism in Uzbek Literature. Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2015. – pp 89-144.
6. Karimov, M. "Spiritual Analysis in Contemporary Uzbek Novels." Journal of Literary Studies, 2019. -p 52.
7. Melibayeva, M. (2025). THE ROLE OF AGE IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF YOUNG VS. ADOLESCENT LEARNERS IN UZBEKISTAN. Akademicheskije issledovaniya v sovremennoy nauke, 4(34), -p 122.