

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LINGUOPOETICS AND OTHER BRANCHES OF LINGUISTICS

T. S. Eshboyeva

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Acting Associate Professor, PhD

Shomirzayeva Sevinch

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Department of Foreign Language and Literature
Group 2232

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20352268>

Abstract. This article examines the relationship between linguopoetics and other major branches of linguistics, including stylistics, semantics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and cognitive linguistics. The study demonstrates that linguopoetics, as an interdisciplinary field focused on the aesthetic and expressive dimensions of language in literary texts, draws extensively from and contributes to multiple linguistic disciplines. By analysing shared methodologies, theoretical frameworks, and research objectives, the article highlights how linguopoetics serves as a bridge discipline that enriches both literary studies and linguistic science. The findings suggest that understanding these interconnections is essential for comprehensive literary-linguistic analysis.

Keywords: linguopoetics, stylistics, semantics, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, interdisciplinary, literary language, expressive means.

Introduction

Linguopoetics, also referred to as linguistic poetics or poetic linguistics, is a scientific discipline that investigates the linguistic means through which aesthetic and expressive effects are achieved in literary texts. It occupies a unique position at the intersection of linguistics and literary studies, combining the rigorous analytical tools of language science with the interpretive sensitivity of literary criticism. Since its emergence as a distinct field in the twentieth century, linguopoetics has developed rich theoretical foundations while maintaining close ties to virtually all major branches of modern linguistics. The interdisciplinary nature of linguopoetics makes it particularly relevant in contemporary scholarly discourse. As the boundaries between linguistic disciplines continue to blur, understanding how linguopoetics relates to neighbouring fields becomes increasingly important for researchers, literary scholars, and linguists alike [2, 45]. This article aims to map the relationships between linguopoetics and five core linguistic disciplines, revealing the conceptual and methodological continuities that define modern linguistic scholarship.

Linguopoetics and Stylistics

The relationship between linguopoetics and stylistics is perhaps the most direct and historically significant. Both disciplines concern themselves with the expressive potential of language, analysing how specific choices of words, structures, and figures of speech produce particular effects on the reader. However, while stylistics tends to encompass a broader range of texts, including journalistic, political, and everyday speech, linguopoetics focuses specifically on literary language as its primary object of study. Stylistics provides linguopoetics with a foundational set of analytical categories, including imagery, metaphor, repetition, foregrounding,

and deviation from linguistic norms. The concept of foregrounding, developed within the Prague School of Linguistics, is particularly central to both disciplines. Foregrounding refers to the deliberate departure from ordinary language use in order to draw the reader's attention to the aesthetic dimension of a text. Linguopoetics adopts this concept while extending the analysis to the deeper semantic and cognitive layers of literary meaning-making[6, 158]. Thus, stylistics and linguopoetics share a common research agenda, though they differ in scope and theoretical emphasis.

Linguopoetics and Semantics

Semantics, the study of linguistic meaning, constitutes another indispensable foundation for linguopoetics. Literary texts are fundamentally concerned with the construction and deconstruction of meaning, and linguopoetics relies on semantic theory to account for the complex ways in which literary language generates meaning beyond its literal content. Polysemy, connotation, metaphorical extension, and symbolic meaning are all semantic phenomena that linguopoetics investigates within literary contexts. One of the most productive areas of overlap between linguopoetics and semantics is the study of figurative language. Metaphor, metonymy, irony, and other tropes have been extensively analysed within both semantic and linguopoetic frameworks. The cognitive turn in semantics, represented by scholars such as Lakoff and Johnson, has also profoundly influenced contemporary linguopoetics, leading to the development of cognitive poetics as a related discipline.[8, 23.] Through semantic analysis, linguopoetics is able to trace the intricate web of meanings that literary texts generate, revealing how authors manipulate linguistic resources to achieve aesthetic depth and emotional resonance.

Linguopoetics and Pragmatics

Pragmatics, which studies language use in context and the communicative intentions of speakers, offers linguopoetics a framework for understanding the relationship between literary texts and their readers. Literary communication is a specific form of speech act, and pragmatic theories such as Speech Act Theory (Austin, Searle) and the Cooperative Principle (Grice) can be productively applied to the analysis of literary discourse. Linguopoetics employs pragmatic tools to investigate how authors encode meaning, how readers interpret implied or indirect meaning, and how the literary text functions as a communicative act. The concept of implicature, central to Gricean pragmatics, is especially relevant in linguopoetic analysis, since literary language frequently relies on what is left unsaid or only implied. Similarly, the notion of relevance, as developed by Sperber and Wilson, helps explain why certain linguistic choices in a literary text foreground particular interpretations while suppressing others. The pragmatic dimension of linguopoetics thus enables a dynamic, reader-centred approach to literary language, acknowledging the active role of the reader in the construction of literary meaning.

Linguopoetics and Sociolinguistics and Cognitive Linguistics

Sociolinguistics contributes to linguopoetics by providing tools for the analysis of social variation in literary language, including dialect, register, code-switching, and the representation of social identity. Literary texts frequently reflect or reproduce social realities through language, and linguopoetics draws on sociolinguistic research to account for the social dimensions of literary style. The representation of speech patterns associated with particular social groups is a key area of linguopoetic investigation informed by sociolinguistics. Cognitive linguistics, with its emphasis on the embodied, experiential basis of language and meaning, has given rise to cognitive poetics as a sister discipline to linguopoetics. Concepts such as conceptual metaphor, mental spaces, blending theory, and narrative schema are widely used in contemporary linguopoetic research. Cognitive approaches enable linguopoetics to explain how literary texts engage the reader's imagination, produce emotional responses, and activate complex mental representations. The integration of

cognitive linguistic frameworks has significantly expanded the theoretical and methodological resources available to linguopoetics in recent decades[9, 82].

Conclusion

The foregoing analysis demonstrates that linguopoetics maintains productive and multifaceted relationships with all major branches of modern linguistics. Rather than functioning in isolation, linguopoetics is constitutively interdisciplinary, drawing on the methods, concepts, and findings of stylistics, semantics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and cognitive linguistics in order to develop a comprehensive account of literary language. At the same time, linguopoetics contributes to these neighbouring disciplines by raising questions about the aesthetic, creative, and affective dimensions of language that are not adequately addressed within their individual frameworks. Understanding these relationships is essential for the advancement of both linguistic and literary scholarship. Future research in linguopoetics would benefit from continued dialogue with adjacent disciplines, particularly as new theoretical developments in cognitive science, discourse analysis, and computational linguistics open up novel perspectives on the study of literary language.

References

1. Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
3. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Mukarovsky, J. (1964). *Standard Language and Poetic Language*. In P.L. Garvin (Ed.), *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style* (pp. 17–30). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
5. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
6. Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive Poetics: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
7. Vinokur, G.O. (1959). *Philological Studies: Linguistics and Poetics*. Moscow: Nauka. [In Russian]
8. Eshboyeva T.S. Linguopoetical analysis of poems translated from Uzbek into French // *Texas journal of philology, culture and history*. ISSN2770-8608. Impact factor(2023):6.956, In volume 25, December, 2023. – P. 22-25.
9. Eshboyeva T.S. Alisher Navoiy g‘azallari tarjimasining lingvopoetik tahlili // *SamDU Ilmiy axborotnomasi*, – Samarqand, 2023. 4/1-seriya. – B. 80-85.
10. Eshboyeva T.S. Shavkat Rahmon she‘rlari tarjimasining lingvopoetik tahlili // *Xorazm Ma‘mun Akademiyasi axborotnomasi*. – Xorazm, 2023. 9/4. – B. 28-31.
11. Eshboyeva T.S. Shavkat Rahmon tarjima she‘rlarining estetik imkoniyatlari (fransuz tiliga tarjimalari misolida) // *NamDU Ilmiy Axborotnomasi*. – Namangan, 2023. 11-son. – B. 316-320.