

Stylistic and Semantic Dimensions of Literary Concepts

Halimova Firusa Rustamovna

*Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign
Languages, Uzbekistan*

Abstract. *This article delves into the concept of “literary concept” as a cognitive unit that emerges within an author's conceptual field, shaped by both national and individual factors. It explores how literary concepts are rooted in the author's worldview and their cultural or national identity, as well as how they can be expanded through unique linguistic means, stylistic devices, and personal semantic systems. The article emphasizes the role of literary concepts in poetic texts, illustrating how they reflect the author's emotional state and worldview while also generating new meanings through their interaction with readers.*

Additionally, the paper examines the concept of idiostyle, which represents the author's personal semantic system in literary works, and highlights the complexity of stylistic devices in revealing the author's individuality. Through an analysis of the poems “Orol” by Abdulla Oripov and Muhammad Yusuf, the article demonstrates how literary concepts can transcend their literal meanings, conveying profound emotional and conceptual significance. The study also touches on cognitive and stylistic perspectives in the analysis of literary texts, underscoring the importance of stylistic devices in shaping the clarity and depth of conceptual meanings in literature.

This research contributes to the understanding of how linguistic and stylistic tools interact to construct complex meanings and reflect both individual and cultural identities within literary works, offering insights into the evolving field of cognitive stylistics.

Key words: *literary concept, idiostyle, stylistic devices, cognitive style, semantic field, literary text, poetry, author's personality, conceptual field, analysis, idiomatic style, poetic semantics, linguistic signs, meaning, linguistics, national culture, artistic representation, linguistic research, literary work.*

A literary concept is primarily regarded as a cognitive unit that becomes activated either nationally or individually within the author's conceptual field, embodied in a single work or throughout their entire creative activity. The core of the concept of a "literary concept" is referred to as its “general foundation” or “nucleus.” The surrounding zones and boundaries collectively form the conceptual field, which reflects the spirit, knowledge, and worldview of a given nation. This is because the author who constructs this conceptual field is, by nature, a representative of a particular cultural or national identity. Conversely, the author may also expand the peripheral zones around the nucleus using unique linguistic means, stylistic devices, and other elements derived from their own semantic system, thus forming an individual conceptual field. This phenomenon is particularly observable in the works of poets, i.e., within poetic texts.

A literary concept emerges in the author's consciousness as a result of their life experiences, skills, and emotions. It is then embedded in an artistic context and fulfills a discursive function through the interaction between the author's and the reader's understanding of the concept. As a result of this interaction, new associative meanings are generated in the reader's perception of the concept.

Thus, a literary concept can be defined as a unity of authorial thought that integrates a high degree of associativity, discursiveness, and both national and individual characteristics.

An author typically reveals themselves through concepts or literary images, which reflect their worldview, prior experiences, perception, and attitude toward reality. Therefore, it is legitimate to speak of the linguistic personality of the writer, especially as it is manifested in a literary text.

The author's linguistic personality is revealed in the literary work. A literary text is distinguished by the author's unique voice, known as their *idiostyle*, which represents their individual style. *Idiostyle* is rightfully understood as a "distinctive personal meaning" grounded in a conceptual foundation.

Despite being studied from various perspectives, there is no universally accepted definition of the concept of *idiostyle* (*idiostyle*, *idiolect*, *individual style*, *stylistic manner*). According to S.G. Vorkachev, an individual style is "a systemically integrated and internally connected set of oral expression means and forms" [Воркачев 2001: 65]. V.V. Pinochetov, on the other hand, defines it as a coherent system that arises as a result of specific principles applied in the selection, combination, and purposeful use of linguistic units [Пиночетов 1963: 45]. Thus, the concept of *idiostyle* primarily involves the deliberate selection of linguistic means, the methods of their combination, and their mutual interaction.

M.T. Abdupattoyev classifies the means that determine an author's *idiostyle* into the following groups:

- stylistic devices;
- phonetic and intonational means;
- graphic means;
- lexical-semantic means;
- lexical-syntactic means [Abdupattoyev 2021: 122].

Based on various perspectives, *idiostyle* can be defined as the author's personal semantic system expressed through methods of combining linguistic means on the basis of individual selection within a literary work.

Literary texts reflect not only the individuality of the author but also the worldview of the entire ethnocultural community to which the author belongs. Understanding the complexity of semantic relations in language, the specific characteristics of semantic fields, and their structure enables a transition to a new stage in the study of linguistic phenomena.

A literary text is a highly saturated field of all kinds of semantic transformations, where general linguistic and individual-authorial meanings and contents are synthesized [Новикова 2016: 127]. Scholars dedicated to studying this area of linguistics propose applying a deep and comprehensive approach to the analysis of literary works.

Researchers classify literary concepts as semantic and aesthetic categories formed through the assimilation of universal human experience, worldview, and systems of values by a linguistic personality [Бабенко, Василев, Казарин 2000]. It is important to note that national-cultural and individual-authorial concepts do not always align with their value components and meanings.

A literary concept reflects the worldview of the individual author and may selectively express values related to both national spiritual heritage and the author's own mental representation of the world.

However, a literary concept, formed in the author's consciousness and expressed through linguistic signs, can be realized in various ways. In literary texts, a word may take on entirely different, novel meanings beyond its literal sense. This, in turn, facilitates the emergence of a literary concept. It is within such concepts that features not encompassed by general linguistic or cultural concepts can be activated.

Mazmun, bir tomondan, matn tuzilishi va uning lisoniy vositalariga bog'langan hodisa bo'lsa, boshqa tomondan, shaxs ongida mavjud bo'lgan va fikrlash jarayonlari bilan bog'liq bo'lgan hodisadir.

Ma'no dialogik xususiyatga va subyektlararo xarakterga ega hamda qabul qiluvchining individual va shaxsiy fazilatlariga bog'liq.

O.G. Revzinaning fikriga ko'ra, poetik matn strukturasi va uni idrok etishni izohlash "poetik semantika"ning vazifasidir [Ревзина 2002: 418]. Lisoniy zahiradagi har qanday birlik she'riy kontestda poetik bo'yoqqa, poetik libosga ega bo'ladi. Poetik libosga ega bo'lgan lisoniy birliklar va ularning konseptual xususiyatlari bilan bog'liq bo'lgan konseptlar poetik semantikada o'rganiladi [Nosirova 2020: 98].

In a poetic text, the author's communicative intent is considered one of the key characteristics of the communicative process, and such an intent is linguistically realized in both the structure and content of the poetic text as a deliberately constructed communicative intension [Ibid: 98].

For instance, we will analyze the poems titled "Orol" (island) by Abdulla Oripov and Muhammad Yusuf from the perspective of the author's conceptual field through a semantic analysis. The poem "Orol" by Abdulla Oripov:

*Bir quruqlik paydo bo'ldi,
Dengizda ne hol?
Meniki deb e'lon qildi
Kimlardir darhol.
Oxiri kelib qarashsalar,
Hech vaqo yo'qdir,
Shunchaki u suzib yurgan
Kit ekan, "orol".*

In this poem, "Orol" functions as a factual, culturally universal concept. All the words expressing imagination, reality, setting, and so on are used in their literal meanings, that is, their denotative senses. An "orol" (island) is a landmass surrounded by sea. In the poem, reality is described directly and explicitly, without any wordplay or figurative coloring: "A landmass appears in the sea, it becomes a subject of dispute among people, but in the end, it turns out not to be an island, but a whale." The poem's semantic structure is simple and composed of words with factual, culturally universal, and denotative meanings.

An Analysis of Muhammad Yusuf's poem "Orol":

*Xasta holing, xasta o'yga botursan,
Bemajol, bemador, behol yotursan.
Doding bilan dunyoni uyg'otursan,
Ketib qolma, Orolim!
Oqu qarosisan qaro ko'zimning,
Yuzlaringga bosib yashay yuzimni.
Suing qurib quritmagil izimni,
Ketib qolma, Orolim!
Daryolaring kelolmasdan yig'lar zor,
Senga mador bo'lolmasdan yig'lar zor.
Baliqlaring ko'zlarida savol bor,
Ketib qolma, Orolim!
Qirg'og'ingda qovjiragan dalangman,*

*To 'lqinlaring titrog 'iman, nolangman,
Men ham bitta qaqshab qolar bolangman,
Ketib qolma, Orolim!*

The poem exhibits a complex semantic structure in which the boundaries of the conceptual field are shaped through artistic devices. During the reading of the opening lines, various connotative and secondary meanings of the concept “Orol” begin to emerge in the reader’s imagination. The use of lexical items and expressions such as “*xasta hol*” (ailing state), “*xasta o’y*” (troubled thoughts), “*bemajol*” (powerless), “*bemador*” (unwell), “*behol*” (weak), “*dod*” (lament), and “*ko’zimning oqu qarosi*” (the apple of my eye) naturally leads to the conclusion that the word “Orol” is used in a figurative sense.

However, the subsequent lines featuring words like “*daryolaring*” (your rivers), “*baliqlaring*” (your fish), “*qirg’og’ing*” (your shore), and “*to’lqinlaring*” (your waves) affirm that the word “Orol” represents the nucleus of the conceptual field – though it is employed with a secondary lexical meaning.

For every reader who identifies with the poet’s cultural background, it is immediately evident that in this poem, “Orol” does not refer to an “area of land surrounded by water,” as recorded in explanatory dictionaries, but rather to the Aral Sea itself. The shrinking of the Aral Sea, located in the southwestern part of the Republic of Uzbekistan, is perceived as a national ecological disaster by the entire Uzbek population.

The poet, moved by this phenomenon, conveys his impressions, emotions, and state of mind through the use of emotionally charged words with connotative meaning and personification, thereby achieving a strong pragmatic effect on the reader. As a result, the emotional expressiveness of the poetic text is significantly heightened.

In poetic texts, the role of stylistic devices in manifesting the author's idiosyncrasy is unparalleled. As noted by D.U. Ashurova and M.R. Galieva, stylistic analysis of a text can resolve a number of issues, including the functional-stylistic and compositional structure of the text, its stylistic categories, coherence and logic of stylistic devices, the stylistic characteristics of the individual style, the role of linguistic units in the conceptual representation of information, and the interpretation of the conceptual landscape of the world [Ashurova, Galieva 2018: 19].

According to the scholars, personal style (idiosyncrasy) is considered a complex structural unity of linguistic expression tools and forms unique to specific authors. It reflects the depiction of the world and the subjective evaluation of the events described [Ashurova, Galieva 2013: 29].

Currently, the issue of the "personal paradigm" has been reinterpreted, and the term “cognitive style” has emerged. This term is described as the style of transmitting and presenting information, its specific positioning in text/discourse associated with the choice of certain cognitive operations, or the preferential use of them during the creation and interpretation of a text [KCKT 1996: 80]. Cognitive style is seen as the individual mode of presentation related to the author's personality, the unique features of their individual creative thinking process, and subjective modality.

Examining stylistic devices as a special structure of knowledge expression from a cognitive perspective helps identify various aspects of its complex meaning and activity: primarily, the characteristics of cognitive processes and the various mechanisms that shape them, the main principles and models of interpreting stylistically related data, creating stylistic effects, and the interrelation of linguistic and non-linguistic structures of knowledge [Джусупов 2020: 28].

From the cognitive-stylistic perspective, the issue of reflecting knowledge structures in a literary text becomes deeper and more detailed [Болотнова 2004; Джусупов 2011; Орлова 2009; Дубовицкая 2018]. This primarily concerns the representation of a specific cognitive structure (frame, concept) in a literary text, which is linked to a number of stylistic devices. These devices, in conjunction with the markers inside and outside the text, define the level of its clarity and contribute to the interpretation of conceptual meanings.

List of used literature

1. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Stylistics of literary text. –Tashkent, 2013. –204p.
2. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. Cognitive linguistics. – T.: Vneshinvestprom, 2018. – 160 p.
3. Nosirova U.I. Poetik matnning pragmatic xususiyatlari. – Farg‘ona, “Classic”, 2020. – 152 b.
4. Xalimova F.R. Badiiy konseptlar tipologiyasi // Ilmiy xabarlar. – Farg‘ona: FarDU, 2023. – P. 101-105.
5. Джусупов Н.М. Тюркский символ в художественном тексте (лингвокогнитивный аспект). – Астана: Сарыарка, 2011. – 218 с.
6. Новикова У.В., Зимина Н.Ю. К вопросу об особенностях языковой репрезентации орнаментального поля художественного текста // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. № 2 (56): в 2-х ч. Ч. 2. – С. 127-129.
7. Ревзина О.Г. Загадки поэтического текста // Коммуникативно-смысловые параметры грамматики и текста. – М., 2002. – С. 418-433.