

Research On The Language Of Literary Works In Linguistics

Tursunov Mirzokhid Ikromjon o'g'li

Independent Researcher, Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore, Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan

Received: 24 October 2025; **Accepted:** 13 November 2025; **Published:** 20 December 2025

Abstract: This article examines the issues related to the study of the language of literary works from a linguistic perspective. In addition, the paper analyzes the approaches of Russian and European linguists to literary texts.

Keywords: Language of literary works, linguistics, linguopoetics, stylistics, aesthetic effect, literary text.

Introduction: The language of a literary work is one of the main means that determine the aesthetic essence of artistic creation and convey the author's worldview and artistic intention to the reader. Through language, reality is not only depicted but also recreated, evaluated, and artistically interpreted. Therefore, the issue of attitudes toward the language of literary works should be regarded not merely as a linguistic phenomenon, but as a process closely connected with aesthetic, cultural, and social thought. Situated at the intersection of literary studies and linguistics, this issue plays a crucial role in identifying the author's linguistic choices, individual style, degree of utilization of expressive means, and the impact produced on the reader's consciousness.

It is well known that the term poetics was first introduced into scholarly discourse through Aristotle's Poetics and is considered one of the oldest and fundamental branches of literary studies, aimed at examining expressive devices used in literary works and their systemic organization. Initially, poetics primarily focused on the aesthetic nature, genre, and compositional features of literary texts; however, today its scope has significantly expanded and continues to develop in close interaction with linguistics. Accordingly, from the standpoint of modern scholarship, poetics may be regarded as a connecting link between literature and language.

By the 1920s, the study of literary texts began to be recognized as an independent scientific problem. During this period, theoretical foundations for the linguistic analysis of literary texts started to take shape.

In this regard, the scholarly views of the Russian linguist L. V. Shcherba are of particular significance. He emphasized that the main purpose of interpreting a literary work lies in identifying and analyzing linguistic means that reveal its ideological content and emotional-expressive layers. [10] This approach substantiated the necessity of studying literary texts not merely as aesthetic phenomena but as complex linguopoetic systems. As a result, a solid theoretical basis was established for modern linguopoetic research aimed at revealing the functional and aesthetic potential of linguistic units in literary texts.

The concept of the poetic function of language was first introduced into scholarly discourse by the prominent Russian-American linguist R. Jakobson in his work Linguistics and Poetics. In formulating this concept, Jakobson relied on the well-known thesis that in literature it is not only what is expressed but how it is expressed that is decisive. According to Jakobson, the poetic function is characterized by the orientation of language toward the form of expression rather than mere information transmission and serves to actualize the aesthetic potential of linguistic units in literary texts. Moreover, the poetic function is interpreted as one of the key factors ensuring the unity of content and form and determining the aesthetic impact of a literary work [11].

G. O. Vinokur, who devoted a substantial part of his scholarly research to the study of literary language, introduced not only the concept of the "poetic function" but also that of the "artistic function" of language. Emphasizing the communicative and expressive functions of language, Vinokur

demonstrated their specific interaction in literary texts. In his view, the artistic function of language serves to enhance aesthetic impact, create imagery and expressiveness, and constitutes one of the defining features of literary language [7].

From the 1960s onward, the linguopoetic study of literary texts became an active object of scholarly research in world linguistics. During this period, issues related to the object of linguopoetics, its similarities and differences with stylistics, and the selection of texts and authors suitable for linguopoetic analysis attracted considerable attention. It was particularly emphasized that literary texts should be analyzed not only in terms of content but also through linguistic mechanisms that generate aesthetic effect.

It is widely acknowledged that the aesthetic power of a literary work depends not so much on what is depicted as on how it is expressed. From this perspective, identifying how authors select and use linguistic units and how words and word combinations produce aesthetic effects constitutes the main objective of linguopoetic analysis. Consequently, the linguopoetic approach aims to reveal the internal laws of literary language and to scientifically explain the artistic and aesthetic functions of linguistic units.

In *Stylistics of Modern English*, I. V. Arnold interprets the literary text as an inseparable unity of form and ideological content and argues for its holistic and conscious analysis. Striving to encompass all contemporary linguistic research directions, Arnold consistently elucidates the multifaceted nature of literary texts. The work thoroughly discusses stylistic analysis at the levels of functional stylistics, lexical stylistics, expressive means, as well as phonetics and morphology, substantiating their role in creating artistic meaning and aesthetic effect [1].

As A. L. Grishunin aptly notes, the philological approach to the study of literary texts consists of two formal aspects that are dialectically oriented toward a common goal [3]. According to him, this approach enables the integrated analysis of literary texts not only within the framework of individual linguistic or literary elements but also in terms of their interrelations and overall aesthetic-ideological objectives. Thus, the philological approach facilitates a deeper understanding of the internal structure of literary texts, systems of imagery, and the functional-aesthetic significance of linguistic means [3].

The scholarly works of V. Vinogradov marked a new stage in the study of literary language. He proposed examining literary texts not exclusively from literary or linguistic perspectives, but through a broader, general philological approach. This perspective enabled an

integrated analysis of linguistic and literary aspects, allowing for a deeper comprehension of the unity of form and content.

The Swiss linguist C. Bally emphasized the necessity of clearly distinguishing between the affective and aesthetic functions of language in his work *French Stylistics*. While he considered the affective function to fall entirely within the domain of linguistics, he viewed the aesthetic function as fundamentally belonging to aesthetics and literary studies. However, the Russian linguist R. A. Budagov did not fully accept this strict division, arguing that expressive elements in words, phrases, or sentences may consciously carry aesthetic functions, with affective functions simultaneously manifesting as integral components of aesthetic function. In this way, Budagov scientifically substantiated the intrinsic connection between the aesthetic and affective functions of language [8].

Such diverse perspectives played a significant role in shaping major scholarly works in the study of literary texts and laid a solid foundation for subsequent linguopoetic research. The examination of literary works from specific historical periods serves as an important source for identifying phonetic, lexical, and grammatical characteristics of language at particular stages of its development. In this regard, literary texts, along with ancient written monuments, function as primary sources for linguistic research – a tradition that remains one of the oldest and most established in the history of linguistics.

The second major direction in the study of literary language focuses on the aesthetic function of language. Since this function primarily manifests in literary texts, it cannot be fully examined within the confines of either linguistics or literary studies alone. Therefore, comprehensive research on the aesthetic function of language requires the collaborative engagement of stylistics, phonetics, lexicology, etymology, semasiology, and grammar, alongside literary studies. Only through such interdisciplinary cooperation can the aesthetic function of language be thoroughly and systematically investigated.

Linguopoetics continues to develop rapidly in world linguistics, giving rise to numerous significant studies. In this context, the extensive scholarly contributions of V. Y. Zadornova and A. A. Lipgart deserve special recognition.

In her doctoral dissertation, V. Y. Zadornova clearly defines the object, main goals, and pressing issues of linguopoetics. She emphasizes that linguopoetic analysis is not aimed merely at identifying linguistic units, but at explaining the aesthetic effect produced by literary works through language [9]. From this

perspective, linguopoetics has emerged as an independent field dedicated to analyzing the aesthetic essence of literary texts and determining the artistic and aesthetic functions of linguistic units.

Similarly, A. A. Lipgart's work *Foundations of Linguopoetics* provides a comprehensive examination of linguopoetic issues. He focuses on the linguistic and aesthetic analysis of literary texts, the functional-aesthetic potential of linguistic units, and their role in creating imagery. According to Lipgart, linguopoetics is a branch of philology concerned with stylistically marked units in literary texts and their role in producing aesthetic effects. His work thoroughly addresses both theoretical and practical aspects of linguopoetic analysis, including its methodological features and its relationship with stylistics and literary studies [5].

In A. V. Kirtayeva's research on linguopoetics, attention is also given to linguistic stylistics, which is concerned with the preliminary analysis of linguistic material, determining the stylistic affiliation of texts, and identifying distinctions between styles. She emphasizes that the objects of study of linguistic stylistics and linguistic poetics are distinct [4].

Recent research has expanded the study of words and word combinations in literary texts by incorporating linguistic, literary, aesthetic, cultural, linguopoetic, and cognitive approaches. As a result, literary text analysis has evolved into a complex interdisciplinary field encompassing linguistic, aesthetic, cultural, and psychological functions. The growing emphasis on conceptual approaches to imagery and language has further deepened scholarly inquiry and strengthened interdisciplinary integration [2]. From this standpoint, the application of linguocognitive and cognitive-psychological approaches enables a systematic examination of artistic thinking, mechanisms of literary speech formation, and the degree of its aesthetic and linguistic impact. Consequently, these approaches elevate literary text research to a new qualitative level and substantiate the necessity of comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and multidimensional analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Арнолд И. Стилистика современного английского языка, – М.: «Просвещение», 1981. – С. 295.
2. Бурцева Т.А. Лингвопоэтика Б.Л. Пастернака и ее эволюция: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Казан, 1999. – С. 18.
3. Гришунин А. Л. О методике текстологии Текст. // Известия Академии Наук СССР. Т. 48. Серия «Литература и язык». – 1989. № 4. – С. 291-298.
4. Киртаева А.В. Лингвопоэтика

многокомпонентных атрибутивных словосочетаний в английской драме XVI-XVII веков: Автореф. дисс. ...канд. филол. наук. – М., 2001. – С.8.

5. Липгарт А.А. Лингвопоэтическое исследование художественного текста: теория и практика: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 1996. – С. 23.
6. Милейко Е.В., Рус-Бруишнина И.В. Художественный концепт как объект лингвистического исследования // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. – № 11(65): в 3-х ч. – Ч.3. – С. 128-130.
7. Винокур Г.О. О языке художественной литературы. – М. Высшая школа, 1991. – С. 44.
8. Йўлдошев М. Бадиий матн лингвопоэтикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 2008. – Б. 92.
9. Задорнова В.Я. Словесно-художественное произведение на разных языках как предмет лингвопоэтического исследования: Дисс. ... д-ра филол. наук. – М., 1992. – С. 61.
10. Щерба Л. В. Избранные работы по русскому языку. – М.: Учпедгиз, 1957. – С. 7.
11. Якобсон Р. Лингвистика и поэтика. – М., 1975. – С. 29.