

THE CONCEPT AND ESSENCE OF LINGUOPOETICS**T. S. Eshboyeva**Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Acting Associate Professor, PhD**Abduraxmonova Guldasta**Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Department of Foreign Language and Literature
Group 2232<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20352591>

Abstract. This article explores the concept and essence of linguopoetics as a distinct interdisciplinary branch of linguistics. The study examines its theoretical foundations, key methodological principles, and the principal categories that define it as a scientific field. Special attention is given to the relationship between language and literary aesthetics, the expressive functions of linguistic units in poetic discourse, and the role of stylistic devices in shaping meaning. The paper traces the historical development of linguopoetics from classical rhetoric to modern linguistic approaches, and discusses its relevance to contemporary literary and linguistic studies.

Keywords: linguopoetics, poetic language, expressive means, stylistics, literary linguistics, figurative language, aesthetic function.

Introduction

Language and literature are inseparably linked. While linguistics focuses on the structural and functional properties of language, literary studies examine how language becomes art. Linguopoetics occupies the productive intersection of these two disciplines, investigating how linguistic resources are mobilized to create aesthetic and expressive effects in literary texts. Despite being a relatively young branch of modern linguistics, linguopoetics has rapidly established itself as an essential framework for the comprehensive analysis of literary language.

The term “linguopoetics” derives from the Greek “poiesis” (making, creation) and “lingua” (language), reflecting its dual focus on language as both a communicative and aesthetic phenomenon. Its emergence as a separate discipline corresponds to the growing recognition that literary language operates according to principles distinct from, yet rooted in, ordinary linguistic usage. This article seeks to clarify the concept and essence of linguopoetics, situating it within the broader context of humanistic inquiry.

Theoretical Foundations and Historical Background

The intellectual roots of linguopoetics can be traced back to Aristotle’s Poetics and Rhetoric, where language was first systematically analyzed for its persuasive and aesthetic qualities. In the modern era, the Prague Linguistic Circle — particularly the work of Jan Mukařovský and Roman Jakobson — played a pivotal role in establishing the theoretical basis for a linguistics of poetic language. Jakobson’s famous schema of communicative functions, in which the “poetic function” is directed toward the message itself, laid the

groundwork for understanding how literary language differs from referential everyday speech [1].

In Russian and Soviet linguistics, linguopoetics (or “linguistic poetics”) developed as a distinct field in close dialogue with the tradition of stylistics. Scholars such as Viktor Vinogradov, Mikhail Bakhtin, and Grigoriy Vinokur contributed seminal ideas about the relationship between the individual authorial voice and the linguistic system, the dialogic nature of literary discourse, and the historical evolution of literary language. Their work emphasised that literary language is not a deviation from the linguistic norm but a purposeful and systematic exploitation of linguistic possibilities for creative ends [2].

Contemporary linguopoetics has been further enriched by cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics. The cognitive turn has brought renewed attention to metaphor, conceptual blending, and the mental processes underlying literary comprehension, while corpus-based approaches have enabled systematic empirical investigation of literary style across large datasets [3].

The Concept and Essence of Linguopoetics

At its core, linguopoetics is concerned with the question of how ordinary linguistic units — phonemes, morphemes, words, sentences, and discourse structures — are transformed into carriers of aesthetic meaning in literary texts. This transformation is not arbitrary; it is achieved through systematic selection, combination, and foregrounding of linguistic features that draw the reader’s attention to the form and texture of the text, thereby generating additional layers of meaning beyond the propositional content [4].

The essence of linguopoetics can be captured in several interrelated principles. First, the principle of “foregrounding” (the concept developed by the Prague School) holds that literary language deviates from linguistic automatism, making language perceptible as language. This deviation may take the form of phonological patterning (alliteration, assonance, rhythm), syntactic parallelism, lexical repetition, or figurative language. Second, the principle of “equivalence,” formulated by Jakobson, suggests that the poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection onto the axis of combination, creating dense networks of correspondence and contrast within the text [1].

Third, linguopoetics recognizes the primacy of context in the interpretation of literary language. A word or grammatical structure acquires its aesthetic value not in isolation but within the complex web of textual, intertextual, and cultural relations that constitute a literary work. Fourth, the discipline acknowledges the creative agency of both the author, who encodes aesthetic intentions into linguistic choices, and the reader, who actively constructs meaning through the process of interpretation [5].

Figurative language represents one of the central objects of linguopoetic analysis. Metaphor, simile, metonymy, personification, irony, and other tropes are not mere ornamental devices but cognitive and communicative mechanisms that reshape understanding, evoke emotion, and create new conceptual connections. The metaphor “time is money,” for instance, not only describes an abstract concept in concrete terms but structures entire domains of thought and social behavior, illustrating how deeply linguistic figures are embedded in cognition and culture [3].

Sound organization is another key dimension of linguopoetics. Poetry, in particular, exploits the phonological dimension of language through rhyme, meter, rhythm, and sound symbolism. The arrangement of sounds in a poem is never merely ornamental; sound patterns reinforce semantic content, create expectations and their fulfillment or violation, and contribute to the musicality and memorability of literary texts. Prosodic analysis, therefore, constitutes an indispensable component of linguopoetic inquiry [6].

Methodology and Key Categories

Linguopoetics employs a range of methodological approaches borrowed from linguistics, literary theory, and cognitive science. Close reading, informed by linguistic analysis, allows the researcher to identify and interpret specific textual features. Distributional analysis examines the frequency and co-occurrence patterns of linguistic elements. Comparative stylistics investigates how different authors or literary traditions employ linguistic resources in distinct ways. Discourse analysis focuses on the broader textual and situational context in which literary meaning is produced and received.

The principal categories of linguopoetics include: (1) “Expressive means and stylistic devices,” which encompasses all linguistic forms used to enhance the communicative and aesthetic impact of a text; (2) “Authorial style,” which refers to the characteristic and recurrent patterns of linguistic choice that distinguish a writer’s individual voice; (3) “Poetic image,” which denotes the complex semantic-figurative structure created by the interaction of linguistic units in a literary context; (4) “Literary norm and deviation,” which addresses the tension between linguistic convention and creative innovation; and (5) “Textual cohesion and coherence,” which examines how linguistic devices bind the elements of a literary work into a unified whole [5].

The Significance of Linguopoetics in Contemporary Research

Linguopoetics holds considerable significance for contemporary scholarship. In the field of language teaching and learning, it provides insights into how literary texts can serve as rich sources of linguistic input and cultural knowledge. In translation studies, it raises fundamental questions about the translatability of aesthetic and cultural dimensions of literary language. In digital humanities, computational approaches to linguopoetic analysis are opening new avenues for the large-scale study of literary style and its historical evolution. Moreover, linguopoetics contributes to broader theoretical debates about the nature of language, meaning, and creativity. By demonstrating that language is not merely a neutral medium of communication but a site of aesthetic innovation and ideological contestation, it underscores the humanistic importance of linguistic inquiry. The study of literary language, as conducted within the linguopoetic framework, illuminates the full expressive potential of human language and its role in shaping individual and collective experience.

Conclusion

Linguopoetics is a vibrant and evolving discipline that bridges the gap between linguistic science and literary art. Its concept and essence rest on the conviction that literary language is a systematic and purposeful exploitation of linguistic resources for aesthetic ends, and that a rigorous linguistic analysis of literary texts can illuminate both the mechanisms of artistic creation and the deeper structures of human cognition and culture. As language continues to evolve and new forms of literary expression emerge, linguopoetics will remain an indispensable tool for understanding the creative power of the human word.

References

1. Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (pp. 350–377). MIT Press.
2. Vinogradov, V. V. (1959). *O yazyke khudozhestvennoi literatury* [On the Language of Fiction]. Goslitizdat.
3. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
4. Mukarovsky, J. (1977). *The Word and Verbal Art: Selected Essays*. Yale University Press.

5. Galperin, I. R. (1977). Stylistics. Vysshaya Shkola.
6. Lotman, Yu. M. (1977). The Structure of the Artistic Text. University of Michigan Press.
7. 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.
8. Eshboyeva T.S. Alisher Navoiy gʻazallari tarjimasining lingvopoetik tahlili // SamDU Ilmiy axborotnomasi, – Samarqand, 2023. 4/1-seriya. – B. 80-85.
9. Eshboyeva T.S. Shavkat Rahmon sheʼrlari tarjimasining lingvopoetik tahlili // Xorazm Maʼmun Akademiyasi axborotnomasi. – Xorazm, 2023. 9/4. – B. 28-31.
10. Eshboyeva T.S. Shavkat Rahmon tarjima sheʼrlarining estetik imkoniyatlari (fransuz tiliga tarjimalari misolida) // NamDU Ilmiy Axborotnomasi. – Namangan, 2023. 11-son. – B. 316-320.