

## THE ROLE OF LINGUOPOETICS IN UNDERSTANDING CROSS-CULTURAL LITERARY SYSTEMS

**Kakharova Mohigul Yusufovna,**

*at Bukhara State University, associate professor*

*Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences*

**Abstract.** *The article is about theoretical views related to linguopoetic analysis, the aesthetic function of language, the unity of form and content, and the unity of time and space have been analyzed, including the distinctive features found in Uzbek literature, the early manifestations of realistic forms of expression, their characteristics, causes, and interpretations based on theoretical perspectives.*

**Keywords:** *linguopoetics, literary text, lexical units, compositional essence of literary works.*

**Abstract.** *В статье рассматриваются теоретические взгляды, связанные с лингвопоэтическим анализом, эстетической функцией языка, единством формы и содержания, а также единством времени и пространства. Кроме того, анализируются своеобразные особенности, присущие узбекской литературе, ранние проявления реалистических форм выражения, их характеристики, причины возникновения и интерпретации на основе теоретических подходов.*

**Ключевые слова:** *лингвопоэтика, художественный текст, лексические единицы, композиционная сущность художественных произведений.*

**Annotatsiya.** *Maqolada lingvopoetik tahlilga oid nazariy qarashlar, tilning estetik funksiyasi, shakl va mazmun birligi hamda zamon va makon birligi tahlil qilingan. Shuningdek, o'zbek adabiyotida uchraydigan o'ziga xos xususiyatlar, realistik ifoda shakllarining dastlabki namoyon bo'lishi, ularning belgilari, sabablari va talqinlari nazariy qarashlar asosida yoritib berilgan.*

**Kalit so'zlar:** *Lingvopoetika, badiiy matn, leksik birliklar, badiiy asarlarning kompozitsion mohiyati.*

**Introduction.** The problems of American and Uzbek prose linguopoetics encompass scholarly issues related to the distinctive features of literary texts belonging to two different cultural and linguistic systems, as well as their structural and stylistic analysis. The problems of American and Uzbek prose linguopoetics include the analysis of literary texts at the intersection of linguistics and literary studies.

Theoretical views related to linguopoetic analysis, the aesthetic function of language, the unity of form and content, and the unity of time and space have been analyzed, including the distinctive features found in Uzbek literature, the early manifestations of realistic forms of expression, their characteristics, causes, and interpretations based on theoretical perspectives.

The genesis of realistic prose in American and Uzbek literature, the importance of linguopoetics as an integrative field of philology in relation to significant socio-cultural and specific historical realities, as well as unified criteria concerning time, space, and linguopoetic norms in literary works, have also been studied. Furthermore, the dialectical interrelationship of linguopoetics with other philological disciplines, along with their differences and commonalities, and the significance of the objectivity of the comparative

linguopoetic analysis method based on principles of integrity in studying the ideological and compositional essence of literary works have been examined.

**Discussion and analysis.** The linguist G. O. Vinokur interprets the language of a literary work as the language of art. He notes that language has both communicative and expressive functions. Having devoted his life to studying the language of literary works, he states: “A person wants to express their attitude toward their thoughts; that is, alongside the logical factor, a psychological factor is also added in a fully enriched way.” He emphasized that literary language is never purely logical or informational. In artistic speech, thought is always accompanied by emotion, mood, and personal evaluation. The writer does not merely report reality; they interpret and emotionally color it.

Paul Simpson emphasizes that analyzing the linguopoetic features of a literary work requires a threefold approach. He argues that linguopoetic analysis should have three Rs: “rigorous” (strict), “retrievable” (reproducible), and “replicable” (repeatable); he believes that any literary work should be approached from a logical standpoint.

“Literature is an ornamented, embellished form of language,”—Firat believed. In his work *“Rules of Literature,”* he put forward ideas about the specific features of literary language, style and artistic devices, as well as the role of linguistic means in their creation.

The linguist G. O. Vinokur interprets the language of a literary work as the language of art. He notes that language has both communicative and expressive functions. Having devoted his life to studying the language of literary works, he states: “A person wants to express their attitude toward their thoughts; that is, alongside the logical factor, a psychological factor is also added in a fully enriched way.”

V. Vinogradov conducted extensive scientific research on the language of literary works and issues of linguopoetics. He emphasized that attention should be paid to both the linguistic and the aesthetic-stylistic structure of a literary text. He also notes that while some researchers recognize linguopoetics as an “introduction to linguistics,” such views have caused disagreement among other scholars.

Vinogradov studied the language used in literature — for example, how writers choose words, sentence structures, imagery, and style in novels, poems, and stories. He believed that when analyzing a literary work, scholars should examine two things together:

1. The linguistic structure – the grammar, vocabulary, sounds, and sentence patterns.
2. The aesthetic and stylistic structure – how the language creates beauty, emotion, artistic effect, mood, or the author’s unique style.

In other words, literature should not be studied only as language rules, but also as art. V. Vinogradov also discusses linguopoetics, which is the study of how language creates artistic meaning in literature.

G. Jumanazarova, in her research on the lexical and linguopoetic features of the epic *“Shirin and Shakar,”* studied the lexical layers, tropes, and poetic figures in the epic from the perspective of linguopoetics and linguostylistics.

The aesthetic function of language is characteristic of literary works, and this function plays a leading role in linguopoetics. The linguist D. N. Shmelev states: “The aesthetic function of language is manifested only in literary works, and the reader’s attention is directed toward the form of the literary text and the way in which the idea is expressed.”

In his research on linguopoetics, M. Yoldoshev studied the lexical, morphological, and syntactic features of literary texts. According to the English literary scholar Terry Eagleton, at Cambridge University in the 1920s and 1930s, the study of the principles of the capitalist system in English literature caused debates among students. During this period, it was relevant for students to study various creative methods and styles in English literature, which contributed to ensuring that students would become mature individuals in the future. At Cambridge University, students in that period studied secular subjects such as history, political science, and philosophy, which were included in the English literature curriculum.

Knowledge of secular sciences served as a foundation for studying literature. According to M. Gorky, prose works are mostly written in a realistic style. The writer clearly and intricately depicted the internal and external struggles of the characters in his prose works. [The Literature and Revolution]

O. V. Dolgova studies the relationship between oral and written speech. In linguistics, she established that oral and written speech are closely interconnected and form a single whole. Written speech can be perceived visually; syntactic relations and punctuation are conveyed through writing, and a person, by observing written text, reflects their inner speech.

V. N. Telia explains the term “connotation” as follows: “Information about the speaker’s attitude toward what is being expressed is encoded, and when a sentence is constructed in a literary text, this information is immediately activated, as if a compressed spring were released.” In our view, lexical units can perform a pragmatic function. According to the renowned playwright N. Pogodin: “the plot is the interconnectedness of life events and conflicts that arise from the content and essence of a literary work.”

In Jack London’s works, the “American Dream” — that is, the idea of achieving success through hard work, determination, and self-improvement — is often expressed in either an explicit or implicit form. This concept is especially evident in the following works of his.

In the stories of 20th century American literature, the main theme is generally the deep analysis of human intellect. In addition, during this period, short stories established the fundamental principles of the adventure literature genre.

**Conclusion.** The genesis of realistic prose in American and Uzbek literature, the importance of linguopoetics as an integrative field of philology in relation to significant socio-cultural and specific historical realities, as well as unified criteria concerning time, space, and linguopoetic norms in literary works, have also been studied. Furthermore, the dialectical interrelationship of linguopoetics with other philological disciplines, along with their differences and commonalities, and the significance of the objectivity of the comparative linguopoetic analysis method—based on principles of integrity in studying the ideological and compositional essence of literary works have been examined.

#### References:

1. Asadov T.H. Matn tilshunosligi. –Buxoro: Durdona, 2023. – B.20.
2. Boboyev T. Adabiyotshunoslik asoslari. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston, 2002. – B.113.
3. Simpson, P. (2014) Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students (Second Edition). London: Routledge. – 262 p.
4. Yo‘ldoshev M. Badiiy matn va uning lingvopetik tahlili asoslari. – Toshkent: Ozbekiston Fanlar akademiyasi, 2007. – B.50.
5. Виноградов В. Проблемы русской стилистики. Москва: Высшая школа, 1981. – С.169
6. Шмелов Д.Н. Русский язык в его функциональных разновидностях.-М.:Наука, 1977. С. 35.

