

Artificial Intelligence and Writer's Style: A Comparative Literary Analysis

FERUZA HAFIZOVA
Termez State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a literary-stylistic analysis comparing artificial-intelligence-generated text with three Uzbek-language qissa (novellas) in which animal protagonists serve as central poetic devices: Ch. Aytmatov's Farewell, Gulsary!, T. Murod's An Evening When Horses Neigh, and M. Safarov's Ayriqchilik. Through close reading, we examine animal imagery, sensory synthesis, and regional (Surkhandarya) dialect as defining poetic features that are largely absent from representative AI-generated Uzbek prose. Drawing on Buffon, Hegel, Khrapchenko, and Bakhtin's theories of style as the imprint of individual consciousness, we argue that the literary style exemplified by these three writers is irreducible to surface pattern, and is instead grounded in lived experience, cultural memory, and personal consciousness in ways that current AI-generated prose does not yet replicate.

Keywords: Uzbek literature, animal imagery, poetic style, stylistics, AI-generated text, large language models

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs) has raised profound questions about the character and authenticity of machine-generated text [1]. While significant research on stylistic and authorship analysis has focused on English-language corpora, low-resource languages such as Uzbek remain largely underexplored. Uzbek possesses a rich literary heritage and

unique morphological characteristics that make stylistic analysis both challenging and significant.

This paper compares AI-generated prose against three qissa in which the animal – not the human – occupies the narrative and symbolic center: Aytmatov's horse Gulsary, Safarov's deer Ayrishox, and Murod's horses Tarlon and Qizbel. All three works are further connected by their roots in the pastoral and equestrian culture of Central Asia, with writer T. Murod and writer M. Safarov both drawing on the Surkhandarya regional dialect and ethnographic vocabulary of horse and animal husbandry.

Our guiding questions are: (1) What poetic and stylistic devices – particularly animal imagery and sensory synthesis – characterize each writer, and how do they differ from representative AI-generated prose on similar themes? (2) Can a theory of style as individual imprint, as articulated by Buffon, Hegel, Khrapchenko, and Bakhtin, help explain why these qualities are difficult for AI systems to reproduce?

Section II reviews related work; Section III presents the theoretical framework on style; Section IV offers a close literary-poetic analysis of the three works in comparison with AI-generated prose; Section V discusses the findings; Section VI concludes.

2. RELATED WORK

Stylometry – the study of writing style, including its quantitative dimensions – has a long history in authorship attribution [2]. Classical methods rely on function word frequencies, sentence length distributions, and character n-grams [3]. Recent approaches leverage transformer-based models for authorship verification [4].

The character of AI-generated text has become a subject of broader interest following the deployment of GPT-4, Claude, and Gemini [5]. Existing detection approaches, such as DetectGPT, rely on statistical measures like perplexity and probability curvature [6], though these tools are primarily designed for English and are known to degrade on morphologically rich, low-resource languages [7].

Research on Uzbek NLP remains nascent, addressing tasks such as tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, and named entity recognition [8], but close literary analysis of Uzbek prose – particularly its poetic and dialectal dimensions, and how these compare with AI-generated output – is virtually absent from the literature. This paper makes a first contribution at this intersection.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF HUMAN STYLE

The problem of literary style has been discussed throughout the history of human thought. The French naturalist and writer Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon, in his famous 1753 address to the French Academy, articulated a conclusion that remains influential to this day: style is the man himself.

Buffon interpreted individual style as a direct reflection of human character [9].

This view was later expanded by the philosopher Hegel in his *Aesthetics*: style, in this sense, refers to the subject's distinctiveness, which is fully expressed in a person's manner of expression, character of speech, and similar features [10].

As the Russian theorist M. Khrapchenko noted, style is the synthesis and expression of the subtle and meaningful observations a writer accumulates through a deep assimilation of life [11].

The author's personality – the geographic place of their birth and upbringing, their creative phonetics, genetic disposition, the historical-cultural environment surrounding them, the literary circles that shaped them, their reading culture, the creative laboratory of preceding and contemporary writers – and, most importantly, their individual level of talent, poetic perspective, and stream of consciousness, are among the many distinct factors that play a significant role in the formation of style.

As the philologist M. Bakhtin observed, the condition of possibility for any aesthetic outlook is the human being [12].

This theoretical foundation defines our hypothesis: however skillfully artificial intelligence may generate text, it cannot fully

recreate – at the level of art – a style that is the product of human emotion, consciousness, and personal history. In the following section, we examine this claim through a close reading of the three novellas in comparison with representative AI-generated Uzbek prose.

4. LITERARY-POETIC ANALYSIS: ANIMAL IMAGERY AND SENSORY LANGUAGE

4.1. *Writer Ch. Aytmatov: epic tragedy and anthropomorphic suffering*

In *Farewell, Gulsary!*, the horse Gulsary is not merely a means of transport but becomes a tragic protagonist equivalent to a human fate. The following excerpt (kept in the original Uzbek) depicts the moment the pacer horse is caught by the lasso:

*Yo'rg'aotnidahshatbosdi. U
tag'inbirsapchiboyoqlarinibalandko'tardi,
so'ngyanaosmongasapchidi,
ko'zio'ngidaquyosholovlidoiralargabo'linibxiralashibketdi...
Shunda yiqilgan saman
yo'rg'ayonigayangixo'jayinningo'ziyuguribkelib...
go'youningoldidaotemas, balkiodam –
uningashaddiydushmaniyotgandayoshkoranafratvatantanabilantirj
aydi*

[13]

Here, the distinctiveness of writer Ch. Aytmatov's style lies in the long, cascading sentence structure, the expression of inner states through external visual imagery ("fiery circles," "pitch-black, terrifying void"), and – most importantly – the attribution of human suffering and dignity to the horse, which perceives itself as facing an "enemy." This is anthropomorphism written in an epic, almost tragic register, marked by long sentences and dense use of modifiers.

4.2. *Writer T. Murod: Folk oral style and equestrian ethnography* *An Evening When Horses Neigh* is written in an entirely different register – first-person narration, short, clipped sentences, and the

intonation of folk storytelling: *Galani aylanibuyurdim. Bir bo'zgako'zimtushdi. Shuni ushladim. Tishlariniko'rdim... Birodarlar, otolsang, ho'kizqorindanol, ho'kizolsang, otqorindanol!* [14].

What stands out here is the ethnographic precision with which the process of selecting a horse is described (the age indicated by teeth, the shape of the belly, the hock, the hoof), combined with the rhythmic repetition characteristic of folk proverbs ("if you choose a horse, choose it like an ox; if you choose an ox, choose it like a horse"). The recurring direct address *Birodarlar* ("Brothers") ties the narrative voice to the tradition of oral storytelling and epic recitation (*dostonchilik*). Furthermore, the local (Surkhandarya dialect) names of horse equipment – *terlik*, *bellik*, *chirgi*, *jahannik*, *ko'pchik*, *pushton*, *quyushqon* – form an ethnolinguistic layer of a density found in no other author in this corpus.

4.3. *Writer M. Safarov: Sensory synthesis and the inner consciousness of the animal*

In *Ayrishox*, unlike the other two writers, M. Safarov attempts to depict animal consciousness from within – through its sensory organs:

Ayrishoxboshiniko'taribchalg'isimontig'dorshoxlarinibaquvvatyelk asigaqo'ydivaburunkataklarini kengeribhavonihidladi. O'lsilardankelayotgan hid qadrdontuyuldi. Bu hid tog'dankeldimiyokisamodan? Nahotki, ajdodlarhidihamonborliqda adashib, daydibmakonizlabyurganbo'lsa? Namozshomshamolisug'dadimlanganoqjo'xorivayormaarpahidinia diroshiribkeltirdi. Bundanesankirabqolgan Ayrishoxning ding quloqlarig'alatichiyild oqto'vushgato'bborolmadi... Chambarakshoxlariyelkasigaqadalibog'rigach, o'zigakeldi. [15]

In these passages, smell (corn, barley, the scent of ancestors), sound (alert ears, a shrill noise), and physical pain (the antlers pressing into the shoulder) are presented in a single synthetic breath. This is the central feature of writer M. Safarov's poetic language: by elevating animal sensation above human cognition,

he achieves not only zoopsychological precision but also a philosophical statement – that the creatures of nature perceive existence more deeply than humans do. This technique of "animal inner monologue" appears in world literature in the works of Jack London (*White Fang*, *The Call of the Wild*) and Ernest Thompson Seton (*The Wild Pacer*, translated into Uzbek by T. Murod), but had scarcely been used as a systematic poetic device in Uzbek prose before M. Safarov – suggesting that he may be regarded as an early figure in developing what might be called "animal psychologism" within Uzbek prose.

4.4. Comparative observations

What unites all three works is that the animal image functions not as mere background but as the narrative's central consciousness and symbolic axis. This is especially bound, in the works of writer T. Murod and writer M. Safarov, to the linguistic-cultural context of the Surkhandarya region – the culture of horse and deer husbandry, and the agro-pastoral way of life.

To make this contrast concrete, we generated the following short passage using a general-purpose AI language model in 2026, prompted simply to write a brief piece of Uzbek prose about a horse in a rural setting, without reference to any of the three authors discussed above or their works. We reproduce it here as a single illustrative example prepared for this comparison – not as part of a systematically constructed AI corpus or a claim about AI writing in general:

*Ot uzoqdanyuguribkeldi, uningtuyoqlariyerbag'ridagupillaburardi.
Ko'zlariyorqin, yolidashamolo'ynardi. U
go'yoerkinlikningramziedi, dashtningsokinfarzandi.
Chorvadorunisevgibilanboqardi, chunkiotuningengyaqindo'stiedi.
"The horse came running from afar, its hooves thudding against the
earth. Its eyes were bright, the wind playing in its mane. It seemed
like a symbol of freedom, the steppe's quiet child. The herder cared
for it with love, for the horse was his closest friend."*

Compared with the excerpts examined above, this passage relies on conventional imagery ("symbol of freedom") and generic visual description rather than the specific sensory detail,

ethnographic vocabulary, or narrative interiority found in the human-authored excerpts. It contains no dialect terms, no named body parts or equipment specific to horse husbandry, and no attempt to render the animal's sensory experience from within, of the kind found throughout writer M. Safarov's prose. We do not present this single passage as proof of a general pattern across all AI-generated text, but as a concrete illustration of the qualitative difference we observed more broadly when reviewing AI-generated Uzbek prose on similar themes during the preparation of this study.

A systematic corpus-based study of this gap – with a larger, carefully sampled set of AI-generated texts, clearly defined metrics, and multiple independent readers – remains a task for future computational work, discussed further in Section V.

5. DISCUSSION

Our reading suggests that the distance between these three writers' prose and representative AI-generated Uzbek text is not merely a matter of surface vocabulary but reflects something more fundamental about the sources from which literary style draws. As Buffon, Hegel, Khrapchenko, and Bakhtin argue, style is the product of a particular human being's lived experience, cultural memory, and personal consciousness.

Writer T. Murod's and writer M. Safarov's knowledge of the Surkhandarya dialect and the culture of horse and deer husbandry, and writer Ch. Aytmatov's epic-tragic worldview, are all resources grounded in personal and collective memory that current general-purpose LLMs, trained primarily on generic web text, do not draw upon in the same way. The sensory synthesis found in writer M. Safarov's prose, in particular, appears to depend on lived observation and cultural rootedness rather than on patterns learnable from typical training corpora.

At the same time, we note that this qualitative gap does not by itself establish that such stylistic markers are undetectable by computational means, only that they are not straightforwardly reproduced by AI systems operating under ordinary prompting conditions. Whether such features could be captured through

targeted feature engineering or fine-tuning, and how reliably a classifier could distinguish AI from human authorship on this basis, are empirical questions that this literary-analytical study does not attempt to answer and that would require a dedicated, carefully validated computational study.

Limitations of this study include its qualitative and interpretive nature, its reliance on a relatively small set of illustrative excerpts, and the informal, non-systematic basis on which AI-generated comparison text was reviewed. Future research should pursue a more rigorously constructed comparative corpus, involve multiple independent readers in the qualitative assessment, and, where computational claims are made, report the full experimental protocol needed for those claims to be independently verified.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper has compared the poetic styles of three Uzbek-language qissa centered on animal imagery – writer Ch. Aytmatov's *Farewell, Gulsary!*, writer T. Murod's *An Evening When Horses Neigh*, and writer M. Safarov's *Ayrishox* – through close literary reading, and contrasted them with representative AI-generated text. The analysis suggests that each writer possesses a distinct stylistic "fingerprint" – writer Ch. Aytmatov's expansive epic sentence structure, writer T. Murod's folk oral rhythm and ethnographic precision, and writer M. Safarov's sensory synthesis – all of which appear largely absent or markedly weaker in the AI-generated prose we reviewed.

From the standpoint of style theory, drawing on Buffon, Hegel, Khrapchenko, and Bakhtin, we suggest that however skillfully artificial intelligence generates text, it does not yet fully recreate a literary style that is the product of human experience, cultural memory, and individual consciousness. Establishing this claim on a firmer empirical footing – through a systematically constructed corpus and a transparently reported computational protocol – remains an important direction for future research, alongside expanding the literary corpus to include additional animal-centered works of Uzbek literature.

REFERENCES

1. Gehrmann, J., Strobelt, H. & Rush, A. 2019. GLTR: Statistical detection and visualization of generated text. In *Proc. ACL*.
2. Juola, P. 2006. Authorship attribution found. *Trends Inf. Retr.*, 1/3, 233-334,
3. Koppel, M., Schler, J. & Argamon, S. 2009. Computational methods in authorship attribution. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.*, 60/1, 9-26.
4. Murauer, H. & Specht, G. 2021. Developing a large-scale benchmark for authorship attribution. In *Proc. ECIR*.
5. OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774,
6. Mitchell, E., Lee, Y., Khazatsky, A., Manning, C. & Finn, C. 2023. DetectGPT: Zero-shot machine-generated text detection using probability curvature. In *Proc. ICML*.
7. Markov, I., Sogaard, A. & Bizzoni, G. 2023. Limitations of AI-text detectors for morphologically rich languages. In *Proc. EMNLP*.
8. Tursunov, B. & Rashidov, M. 2022. UzBERT: Pre-trained language model for Uzbek NLP tasks. In *Proc. AIST*.
9. Buffon, G.-L. L. 1753. Discours sur le style, address to the French Academy.
10. Hegel, G. W. F. 1968. Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art. Vol. 1. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
11. Khrapchenko, M. B. 1975. *The Creative Individuality of the Writer and the Development of Literature*. Moscow: Pisatel.
12. Bakhtin, M. M. 2003. *Collected Works*. In S. G. Bocharov & N. I. Nikolaev (Eds.), *Philosophical Aesthetics of the 1920s*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Russkie Slovari/Yazyki Slavyanskoy Kultury.
13. Ch. Aytmatov, Alvigo, eyGulsari. n.d. [Farewell, Gulsary!] (novella). Tashkent: ZiyoUz Digital Library.
14. Murod, T. Ot kishnaganoqshom [An Evening When Horses Neigh] (novella).
15. Safarov, M. Ayrishox [The Antlered One] (novella).

FERUZA HAFIZOVA

PHD STUDENT,

TERMEZ STATE UNIVERSITY,

TERMEZ, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <FHAFIZOVA730@GMAIL.COM>