



THE PROBLEM OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF ART IN UZBEK LANGUAGE

Kurbanova Muharram Jurabekovna

graduate student of in the name of Sharof Rashidov

Samarkand State University

Phone: +998974085234,

e-mail: muharramqurbonova2@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8194872>

Abstract.

In the work of poem, the creator uses various similes and language elements to reveal his individual views. Studying the work of the poet Khurshid Davron, we can witness that together with the folk spirit, historicity occupies a leading place. The poet used many language elements to express his historical, social and national views. That is why its lexicon is rich and varied. The relationship between language and literature is also analyzed through his works. This article explains the elements of language, syntactic figures in Uzbek linguistics and their importance in literature. At the same time, while analyzing the connection between language and literature, the revelation of the human psyche with the help of language phenomena is studied.

Key words: Antithesis, metaphor, poetics, Aristotle, linguopoetics, imagery, poem.

Analyzing and studying works of art means learning our mother tongue. If this process began in the middle of the 19th century, then the scope of this research expanded somewhat with the initiatives of our linguists. Little by little, it is a sign of increasing attention to our language, which has a deep history.

Although the language of a work of art is organized by various studies, and many scientific works have been done in this regard, the process of studying a work of art has not lost its relevance and novelty even today. Why, as works of art continue to be created, their language and the unique skills of the creator continue to be explored. Because the individual style of the writer is first of all reflected in his language. About this prof. S. Karimov: The creator perceives the material world in his own way, he can see the edges of things and events in nature and society that no one has yet noticed or been able to grasp, therefore, what we say is common to everyone in consumption becomes an individual image tool in the writer's pen. Therefore, he argues that every work of art is truly private[3.26].

At the beginning of the 20th century, the formation of the linguopathic approach to the study of poetry began with the name of Russian linguists, and today Uzbek linguists are also conducting extensive work in this regard. First of all, it is no exaggeration to say that the first views on linguistics and literary studies began with Aristotle's Poetics. "The skillful use of metaphors is a sign of talent, and in order to discover good metaphors, it is necessary to notice similarities in things. It is important to correctly use all the indicated methods of expression, complex and unique words, especially portable words: it is not appropriate to use them only by copying them from others, says the philosopher"[1.53].

The study of linguistics and literary studies is not new for world linguistics. For example, in world linguistics, such linguists as R. Jakobson, V. Khrakovskiy, H. Kurbatov, Sh.

Balli, L. Vedenskaya, G. Belova, J. Galperin, G. Solganik, V. Vinogradov, S. Saport, G. Stepanov those who dealt with methodology, the connection between poetry and prose, poetic problems and did scientific work in this regard. The scientific work of these researchers is considered to have given some impetus to the serious nature of dealing with the problems of the language of fiction in Uzbek linguistics. However, we can say that linguopoetic research in Eastern linguistics began somewhat earlier. For example, in *Kabusnoma* by Kaikovus, it is said: But if you want the words to be effective, do not use sarcastic words, but do otherwise, i.e. use the words in a metaphorical form as much as possible.

Or, in the works of our grandfather Nizamiddin Mir Alisher Navai, “*Muhokamat ul-lughatayn*”, in the process of comparing the two languages, he mentions that there are many factors that create poetry in Turkey: It is clear to all poets and it is clear to all lyricists that in poetry “*tajnis-u ihom*” (gendered at the end of verses, the rule of using similar words, extracting different meanings and making a month of words) is generalized. Among these beautiful expressions and beautiful signs, there are more words and points of inspiration in Turkish than in Persian, which make the poem more beautiful and artistic.

From the 40s and 50s of the 20th century, extensive research on the compatibility of language and literature was carried out in our linguistics. In particular, the initial research in this regard began with the writing of some articles in this field by A. Gulom, and later, R. Kangurov’s “*Essays on the Stylistics of the Uzbek Language*” (1975), R.Q. Kangurov, S.A. Karimov’s “*Dictionary of Zulfiya’s Poetry*” (1981), S.A. Karimov’s “*Artistic Style and The scientific researches such as expressive means of the language, stylistic signs of the literary text, the artistic style of the Uzbek language*”, M. Muhiddinov, S. Karimov’s “*Poetic skills of Gafur Gulom*” further developed the field.

Even today, many linguists are conducting linguopoetic research on the language of artistic works. M. Yuldashev’s monographs on linguistic means and poetic individuality in Uzbek poetry, S. Umirova’s monographs on literary text linguopoetics, are vivid examples of this.

Although everyone has the right to use the language, the level of its use is not the same. If an ordinary language consumer uses only words that are on the surface of the ocean of language and are necessary for daily household needs, those who are engaged in artistic creation can find the jewels that are at the bottom of this ocean and create it like a pearl. They have the ability to pick the joy. Therefore, studying the language skills of artists engaged in art is equivalent to rediscovering the riches of our native language discovered by them and opening new aspects of the laws of our language in practice in the field of artistic creativity.

“It is absolutely impossible to imagine the formation of a literary text as an artistic-poetic work without language material. It is a natural phenomenon in the creative process that the artist, who is the author of this work, goes his own way in the use of this unique material. Every poet and writer’s work and attitude to language is individual. Therefore, the use of linguistic tools in the text of one creator’s works never corresponds to the manner of another creator. Studying his activity in the system of poetic individuality allows us to draw certain conclusions not only about the creative style of the poet and writer, but also about his contribution to the development of the native language” [12.6-7].

Although the language of the work of art has been studied in various ways, and many scientific studies have been created in this regard, the topic has not lost its relevance and freshness even today. As long as works of art are created, their language and creative poetic

skill will continue to be researched. Why, the individual style of the writer is first of all reflected in his language.

References:

1. Aristotle. Poetics. Rhetoric. -Tashkent: Generation of the new century. 2011, p. 68.
2. Karimov Suyun Amirovich. Artistic style and means of expression of language.-Samarkand. 1994.
3. Karimov Suyun Amirovich. Artistic style of the Uzbek language. -Samarkand: Zarafshan, 1992.
4. Khurshid Davron. The day before spring. -Tashkent: Shark, 1997.
5. Komilova S. About some syntactic figures in poetic speech. 2001, p. 57-59.
6. Lapasov J. Artistic text and linguistic analysis.-Tashkent: Teacher, 1995.-p 86.
7. Kungirov R. Visual means of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Science, 1977. -p125.
8. Rikhsieva G. Comments on the foundations of linguistic research. / ULAL. 2003. No. 3. Pages 84-86.
9. Sultansaidova S., Sharipova O. Stylistics of the Uzbek language. -Tashkent: Jurist-media center, 2009. -B 112.
10. Tojiboeva D. A poetic symbol in Khurshid Davran's poetry. /ULAL 2009. No.6. Pages 69-71.
11. Tashkhojaeva Sh. Some issues of linguopoetics. / ULAL. 2020. No. 3. Pages 117-121.
12. Umirova S. Linguistic tools and poetic individuality in Uzbek poetry (Monograph). - Samarkand: Silk Road, 2021. -p 236.
13. Yoldoshev M. Yadgarov Q. Linguistic analysis of literary text.-Tashkent, 2007.-p 113.
14. Yuldashev M. Linguistics of literary text. -Tashkent: Science, 2008. -p160. 23. Shukurov R. Antonyms in the Uzbek language.-Tashkent: Science, 1977. -p 153.
15. Shukurov R. Methodological tasks of syntactic parallelism. / ULAL . 2004. No. 4. Pages 72-75.