

LITERARY TEXT AND PRINCIPLES OF LINGUOPOETIC ANALYSIS

Ortikova NargizakhonPhD., Senior Lecturer, Department of Uzbek Language and Literature,
Ferghana State University, Ferghana City, 150100, UzbekistanE-mail: nargizayoqubjonqizi@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0009-0001-2838-5147

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20046343>

Abstract: This article explores the theoretical and practical principles of linguopoetic analysis of literary texts. Based on the views of Uzbek and world linguists, the author illuminates the specific characteristics of literary texts, their aesthetic nature, and the issues of poetic actualization of language units. The article classifies five main branches of linguopoetic analysis (phonopoetics, lexopoetics, morphopoetics, poetic semantics, and poetic syntax) and analyzes their role in determining artistic mastery.

Keywords: Literary text, linguopoetics, poetic actualization, phonopoetics, lexopoetics, morphopoetics, poetic semantics, poetic syntax, aesthetic function, principles of analysis, imagery, author's mastery.

INTRODUCTION

A literary text is created as a result of the creator's (author's) figurative-aesthetic perception of the world and reality. Its creation and the subsequent comprehension and perception of the resulting artistic entity by the reader is a complex aesthetic activity. Regarding the linguopoetic analysis of literary texts, "...a definitive model has not yet been created. In the practice of linguistics and language education, specific principles and methods of investigation, such as phonetic and morphological analysis, have become established. However, linguopoetics has not yet reached this level" [1].

Literary language possesses "...emotionality, multi-layeredness, imagery, musicality, colorfulness, and conciseness" [2]. Due to these characteristics, literary language serves as a primary source for linguopoetic research. The linguist V. Vinogradov notes two approaches to the interpretation and study of the language of a literary work: the national language system and the "language of art" (the system of artistic expression means) [3].

M. Yuldashev emphasizes that the problem of linguopoetic analysis of a literary text is "...a profoundly complex philological issue of great scientific-theoretical and practical-educational significance" [1], which has not yet been fully analyzed in a comprehensive, monographic scope.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Adherence to specific analytical principles is essential in linguopoetic research. This article considers the following methodical foundations of linguopoetic analysis:

V.M. Zhirmunsky's Method: Studying the classification of linguistic facts as poetic devices. In his work "Theory of Literature. Poetics. Stylistics," Zhirmunsky states: "Since the material of poetry is the word, the systematic structure of poetics should be based on the classification of linguistic facts provided by linguistics... every branch of theoretical poetics should correspond to a branch of the science of language" [7].

Z.I. Khovanskaya's Criteria: Analysis based on the chain of relations: "Reality – Writer – Work – Reader." Khovanskaya identifies four criteria necessary for the linguopoetic analysis of a literary text: "...literary activity can be imagined as a chain of relations, namely: reality – writer – work – reader" [8].

A.O. Timbolova's Approach: Transitioning from content to form and from form to content (shuttle character). Timbolova considers the term linguopoetics as a combination of two



opposite directions of research: analyzing the stylistic nature of artistic expressions and typological linguistic research [10].

M. Yuldashev's Principles: Unity of form and content, poetic actualization, and the ratio of explicitness and implicitness. Yuldashev identified seven main principles of linguopoetic analysis (unity of form and content, unity of space and time, etc.) [1].

RESULTS.

Summarizing the existing linguopoetic views in Uzbek and world linguistics leads to the conclusion that the analysis of a literary text requires more than just listing language units; it demands determining their aesthetic weight within the text. As a result of the research, five fundamental directions of linguopoetic analysis were identified:

1. **Phonopoeitics (Phonetic Poetics):** The sound system is studied not as a simple acoustic unit, but as a carrier of meaning and an emotional atmosphere. Musicality and descriptive harmony emerge through alliteration and assonance.

2. **Lexopoeitics (Lexical Poetics):** The skill of word choice is studied. This focuses on using synonyms to reveal different facets of a concept and utilizing restricted lexis (dialects, archaisms) to animate character traits and the period's atmosphere.

3. **Morphopoeitics (Morphological Poetics):** The aesthetic load of parts of speech and affixes is researched. For example, it was shown that the alternation of verb tenses enhances dynamics, while an abundance of adjectives strengthens descriptive imagery.

4. **Poetic Semantics:** The process of transition from the lexical meaning of a word to its poetic meaning is studied. Literary devices such as epithets, similes, metaphors, and hyperboles are proven to be semantic concepts reflecting the author's worldview.

5. **Poetic Syntax:** The rhythmic-intonational structure of the text is analyzed through sentence construction, inversion, and sentence length. The primary focus is on how the author's use of short or complex sentences affects the reader's psychological perception.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

While there is harmony between the views put forward by different schools and scholars on the linguopoetic analysis of literary texts, there are also unique differences. Analysis shows that linguopoetics is a synthetic discipline at the crossroads of linguistics and literary criticism, approaching the text as a "living organism."

T.V.Zherebilo defines linguopoetic analysis as a system of elements embodying the "image of the world," primarily emphasizing the author's individual style. In our view, this approach is the most accurate for understanding the linguistic and aesthetic unity of the text. Because any linguistic unit, upon entering the scope of a literary text, recedes from its primary lexical meaning and acquires a poetic actuality that serves the general ideological direction of the text.

In Uzbek linguistics, although research in this area has a long history, the theoretical foundation was strengthened in recent decades by scholars like A.Nurmonov and M.Yuldashev. The principle of "unity of form and content" implies that studying phonetic or lexical analysis in isolation from the general ideological content does not yield the expected scientific result. For example, the repetition of the sound "v" (alliteration) in Cholpon's poetry was scientifically grounded as serving the spirit of wind, movement, and excitement, rather than just for resonance.

However, our analysis indicates that many modern studies are still limited to a descriptive method—simply listing linguistic tools. True linguopoetic analysis must reveal why a specific tool was used at that exact point and how it affected the reader's aesthetic perception (interpretation). Only then is linguistic analysis inextricably linked with literary interpretation.

CONCLUSION

Based on the comparative study of linguopoetic views and the systematization of literary text analysis principles, the following conclusions were reached:



Uniqueness of the Literary Text: A literary text is not merely a means of information transfer but an aesthetic whole resulting from the poetic actualization of language units. Every linguistic unit serves the author's artistic intent and the work's ideological-figurative content.

Methodological Integrity: Harmonizing the principles proposed by scholars like Zhirmunsky, Khovanskaya, and Yuldashev ensures the objectivity of the analysis. The "unity of form and content" and the "reality – writer – work – reader" chain are key to unlocking the inner essence of an artistic work.

Five Fundamental Directions: The classified directions (phonopoetics, lexopoetics, morphopoetics, poetic semantics, and poetic syntax) constitute a holistic model for complex text study.

Transition from Description to Interpretation: Modern linguistics demands determining the aesthetic function and the impact on the reader's psyche (interpretation) rather than just listing linguistic means.

This proposed five-stage analysis model serves as a methodological base for scientifically grounding the linguistic richness and poetic potential of works by creators like Anvar Obidjon. The practical significance of the research lies in the fact that these theoretical conclusions and analytical stages can be effectively used in the higher education system for teaching "Linguistic Analysis of Literary Texts," "Linguopoetics," and "Stylistics," as well as in practical exercises for philology students to develop text-processing skills. This, in turn, allows for the study of the artistic-aesthetic facets of Uzbek language development at a new level.

REFERENCES:

1. **Yuldashev, M.** (2008). *Linguopoetics of the Literary Text*. Tashkent: Fan.
2. **Izzat Sultan.** (1980). *Theory of Literature*. Tashkent.
3. **Vinogradov, V.V.** (1981). *Problems of Russian Stylistics*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
4. **Yartseva, V.N. (Ed.)**. (1990). *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia.
5. **Abdurahmonov, G.** (1966). *On the Study of the Language of Literary Works*. In: Issues of Uzbek Language Teaching Methodology. Tashkent: Fan.
6. **Novikov, L.A.** (1979). *Linguistic Interpretation of the Literary Text*. Moscow: Russkiy Yazyk.
7. **Zhirmunsky, V.M.** (1977). *Theory of Literature. Poetics. Stylistics*. Leningrad: Nauka.
8. **Khovanskaya, Z.I.** (1980). *Analysis of Literary Works in Modern French Philology*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
9. **Chicherin, A.V.** (1964). *Notes on the Stylistic Role of Grammatical Forms*. In: Word and Image. Moscow.
10. **Timbolova, A.O.** (2014). *Linguopoetic Analysis of a Literary Text*. Bulletin of KazNU. Philological Series, No. 1(147).
11. **Nurmonov, A.** (2012). *The Relation of Linguistics to Literature*. Selected Works, Vol. 3. Tashkent.
12. **Tukhliyev, B.** (2012). *Some Reflections on the Analysis and Interpretation of Literary Works*. In: Problems of Literary Text Analysis and Interpretation. Tashkent.
13. **Nurmonov, A.** (2012). *Selected Works*, Vol. 1. Tashkent.
14. **Rikhsieva, G.** (2003). *Reflections on the Foundations of Linguopoetic Research*. Uzbek Language and Literature, No. 2.
15. **Andaniyazova, D.** (2016). *Linguopoetic Study of Onomastic Units*. Tashkent: Turon Zamin-Ziyo.
16. **Uralova, Ch.B., & Boymatov, S.Ch.** (2021). *Research of Linguopoetics in Modern Linguistics*. Oriental Renaissance, Vol. 1, Issue 3.



17. **Yuldashev, M.** (2000). *Artistic Language Mastery of Cholpon*. Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation. Tashkent.
18. **Muhammadjonova, G.** (2004). *Linguopoetic Study of Uzbek Poetry of the late 80s and early 90s*. Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation. Tashkent.
19. **Shodieva, D.Sh.** (2007). *Linguopoetics of Muhammad Yusuf's Poetry*. Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation. Tashkent.
20. **Yuldashev, B., & Shodieva, Z.** (2006). *Issues of Linguopoetic Analysis of the "Horizon" (Ufq) Trilogy*. Samarkand: SamDU.

