



Original Research Paper

POETICS AND ARTISTIC MASTERY. FORMS OF INTERLITERARY PROCESSES

¹Khaliyeva Gulnoz Iskandarovna, ²Mukhammadzokirova Mokhinur Mukhtorjon kizi

¹<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5013-0792>

²<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4741-0361>

¹gulnoz7410@mail.ru.

²mohinurmuhammadzokirova@gmail.com

¹Uzbek State University of World Languages, Professor of the Department of World Literature, Doctor of Philological Sciences.

²Basic doctoral student of Tashkent state university of uzbek language and literature named after Alisher Navoi.

Article history

Received: 05.09.2026

Revised: 11.09.2026

Accepted: 27.09.2026

*Corresponding Author:

Khaliyeva Gulnoz

Iskandarovna, Uzbek State

University of World

Languages, Naxçıvan,

Azərbaycan

Email:

aliyevanurlana71@gmail.com

Xülasə

This article examines the concepts of poetics, artistic mastery, and interliterary processes as important theoretical categories in comparative literary studies. The study highlights the role of poetics in identifying and evaluating the artistic elements that shape a literary work and reveal the writer's creative mastery. The article discusses the historical development of poetics and its major types, including general, descriptive, normative, theoretical, and historical poetics. Particular attention is paid to the criteria of literariness, such as humanism, aesthetic impact, fidelity to reality, depth of reflection, artistic generalization, functional use of detail, plot and character construction, psychological depiction, and linguistic richness. The article also analyzes interliterary relations as an important factor in the spiritual and cultural development of nations. Drawing on the theoretical views of comparative literature scholars, the study distinguishes typological and genetic forms of literary interaction. Special emphasis is placed on N.I. Konrad's classification of interliterary relations, including acquaintance with original literary works, translation, common thematic treatment, national adaptation, and the interaction of common narrative traditions. The study demonstrates that interliterary processes contribute to literary enrichment, creative exchange, and the development of national literary traditions.

Keywords: *poetics, general, descriptive, normative, theoretical and historical poetics, poetic mastery, artistic world*

Introduction

Most studies conducted in comparative literary studies are directly related to the concept of poetics. The primary aim of poetics is to reveal and evaluate all artistic elements that contribute to the

creation of a literary work and to demonstrate the writer's mastery. To properly analyze the specific features of a writer's or poet's work, it is first necessary to thoroughly study the theory of poetics.

The term *poetics* was first used by Aristotle [9]. While dividing literature into three types, epic, lyric, and drama, the philosopher also analyzed the artistic features specific to each. Subsequently, numerous scholarly works on poetics emerged in both Eastern and Western traditions.

The Russian scholar Alexander Potebnya (1835-1891) was among the first to develop the theoretical foundations of poetics [37]. In his book "*Theoretical Poetics*," he provided scholarly conclusions on poetry and prose [38], artistic imagery, poetic and mythological thinking, and stylistic figures. His ideas were later developed by Mikhail Bakhtin [2]. According to U. Jo'raqulov, none of Bakhtin's works were created without synthesizing historical and theoretical poetics [16].

The word *poetics* originates from Greek and means "art, creativity, mastery." According to the Russian scholar Viktor Zhirmunsky, poetics is the discipline that studies poetry as an art form. In this regard, his idea that "the science of literature develops under the sign of poetics" [17] remains relevant today.

Results and discussion

In modern literary studies, poetics is divided into five main types:[36]

1. **General poetics** – studies artistic principles common to all literatures (e.g., creative principles, authorial position).
2. **Descriptive (specific) poetics** – examines the creative process of particular works and the artistic world of an author (e.g., the artistic world of H. Olimjon, the poetics of Cho'lpon's prose).
3. **Normative poetics** – addresses the question "how should a literary work be written?" It evaluates literary works and belongs to literary criticism. Works such as U. To'ychiyev's "*O'zbek adabiyotida badiiylilik mezonlari va ularning maromlari*," B. Sarimsoqov's "*Badiiylilik asoslari va mezonlari*," and A. Rasulov's "*Badiiylilik mezonlari*" belong to this category [33].
4. **Theoretical poetics** – closely connected with literary theory and explains the theoretical aspects of literary phenomena (e.g., psychologism in Oybek's novels, form and content in Pushkin's poetry). U. Jo'raqulov's work explores such aspects as author, genre, and chronotope [14].
5. **Historical poetics** – studies the genesis of artistic elements that contribute to the creation of a work. The writer's artistic world is analyzed in relation to historical-literary processes and the spirit of the time. Scholars such as A. Veselovsky, V. Zhirmunsky, N. Konrad, I. Neupokoyeva, and M. Bakhtin made significant contributions [34].

Studies by I.V. Stebleva, A.B. Kudelina, B. Shidfar, E.E. Bertels, V.I. Braginsky, R. Musulmonqulov, and Sh.M. Shukurov are devoted to historical poetics in Oriental studies [35]. Poetic



or artistic mastery refers to the writer's unique artistic world and creative skill. It is reflected in the effective use of language, the creation of images, the appropriate use of artistic devices, and the structured composition of the work.

Additionally, the following ten criteria of literariness [36] help determine artistic mastery:

1. Humanism
2. Ability to evoke aesthetic feeling
3. Fidelity to reality
4. Deep reflection
5. Logical coherence of the author's idea and creative imagination
6. Ability to generalize and typify
7. Precision and functional role of artistic details
8. Skill in constructing plot and character system
9. Ability to reveal characters' inner world
10. Richness and diversity of language

Each element contributing to the composition of a literary work can be studied poetically. For example, Dmitry Likhachev studied Old Russian poetics, I.V. Silantyev studied motifs, V.V. Vinogradov studied plot and style, N.E. Falikova studied chronotope, N. Bandurina and Z. Suvanov studied imagery, Y. Solijonov studied artistic speech, and K. Hamrayev studied composition [28].

Studies by I.V. Stebleva, A.B. Kudelina, B. Shidfar, E.E. Bertels, V.I. Braginsky, R. Musulmonqulov, and Sh.M. Shukurov are devoted to historical poetics in Oriental studies [35]. Poetic or artistic mastery refers to the writer's unique artistic world and creative skill. It is reflected in the effective use of language, the creation of images, the appropriate use of artistic devices, and the structured composition of the work.

Additionally, the following ten criteria of literariness [36] help determine artistic mastery:

10. Humanism
11. Ability to evoke aesthetic feeling
12. Fidelity to reality
13. Deep reflection
14. Logical coherence of the author's idea and creative imagination
15. Ability to generalize and typify
16. Precision and functional role of artistic details
17. Skill in constructing plot and character system
18. Ability to reveal characters' inner world



10. Richness and diversity of language

For scholars interested in plot and genre typology, O.M. Freidenberg's fundamental monograph provides extensive theoretical material [29]. It is also possible to study the research style and intellectual approach of literary scholars from the perspective of poetics. For example, O. Presnyakov analyzed the poetics of Potebnya's scientific work [10].

Modern research in poetics mainly focuses on theoretical and historical aspects. A specialized journal on historical poetics publishes leading articles in Russian, English, Italian, and Spanish [30]. National, regional, and world literature develop in constant interaction and enrich one another. No literature develops in isolation; it evolves by drawing on the progressive experiences of others.

National literature is an integral part of a people's cultural life, representing its literary heritage. According to B.G. Reizov, national literature is a synthesis of multiple cultural forces and tendencies [31]. One of its defining features is the reflection of national mentality, traditions, and cultural identity.

Regional literature refers to geographically defined literary systems (e.g., Central Asian, European, Middle Eastern literatures). Such classification helps identify common features among culturally or historically connected literatures. For instance, the literature of Uzbek, Turkmen, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tajik, and Karakalpak peoples shares many similarities in language, traditions, folklore, and literary history. These commonalities foster literary interaction and mutual influence [23].

World literature refers to works that, regardless of origin, achieve universal recognition due to their aesthetic value [32].

Any great literary work is both a national heritage and a part of global intellectual wealth. For example, the works of Alisher Navoi are not only part of Turkic heritage but also of world culture, as they express universal values such as humanism, courage, and friendship.

Every national literature is an integral part of world artistic thought. The global recognition of a nation largely depends on the dissemination and appreciation of its literature, art, and culture.

Interliterary relations. Interliterary relations play an important role in the spiritual and cultural development of every nation. The place of literary relations as an object of comparative literary studies and their essence have been discussed in numerous scholarly works. In the studies of A. Dima, I. Neupokoeva, N. Konrad, M. Zhirmunsky, B. Nazarov, N. Karimov, B. Karimov, and other scholars present important scientific-theoretical conclusions regarding literary relations and their significance in literary studies are presented.

The scientific works of T.T. Khamidova, M.E. Rasuli, S. Matkarimova, T. Sultanov, and others are directly devoted to literary relations [26]. I.G. Neupokoeva proposes studying interliterary relations by dividing them into typological and genetic types and emphasizes the necessity of considering social



factors in this process. The scholar also particularly stresses that literary relations represent a historical necessity and a space for the exchange of experience (“...Готовых творческих решений ни одна из литератур другой дать не может, но и ни одна литература не может пройти мимо того инонационального, художественного опыта, который ей исторически нужен.”) [27].

N.I. Konrad defines literary relations as the penetration of one nation’s literature into the literary world of another and identifies five main types of interliterary relations:

1. Acquaintance with literary works in the original, their study, and their popularization among one’s own people. For example, European or Russian orientalists were able to read the works of Alisher Navoi in the original rather than in translation.

2. Translation as another form of literary relation, through which one nation’s literature enters the literary world of another. In this case, the translator acts as a literary mediator (литературный посредник);

3. The treatment of the same theme in the literature of different peoples. For example, the “*Khamisa*” of Nizami, Dehlavi, and Navoi is the result of fruitful literary relations.

4. The history of world literary relations as another form of literary interaction. Konrad explains this type as “national adaptation.” For example, the collection “*Otogi Boko*” (1666), whose narratives share similarities with Chinese stories from “*Jiandeng Xinhua*.” However, Japanese stories influenced by Chinese ones were adapted to suit Japanese readers and their mentality.

5. Hagiographic narratives common to all nations and their interrelations. For example, stories about Buddha (symbol of generosity), Yusuf (symbol of beauty), and Alexander Nevsky [20]. Such narratives are today referred to as narrative prose. The narrative method (the art of storytelling) is also widely used in literary creation [21].

According to M. Zhirmunsky, literary relations and influences are historical categories that manifest with varying intensity and in different forms depending on specific historical conditions (“Литературные связи и взаимодействия представляют категорию историческую и в различных конкретных исторических условиях имеют разную степень интенсивности и принимают разные формы”) [22].

As literary scholar K. Quramboyev emphasizes, the issue of literary relations and influence has become an undeniable truth as one of the factors ensuring the development of national literatures. No literature in the world has developed solely within its own boundaries without relying on the advanced experiences of other literatures [23]. In recent years, extensive efforts have been made to develop national literature, promote Uzbek classical and modern literature internationally, and translate outstanding works of world literature into Uzbek.



Sh. Rizayev notes that literary relations are among the most essential factors for the development of any literature. He points out that literary isolation and stagnation arise primarily from a failure to study other literatures, to critically evaluate one's own literature, and to engage in comparison. Therefore, studying global literary phenomena, engaging in reading, and establishing creative connections are crucial for enriching literary processes [24].

Typology is a comparativist concept that helps identify common features in the literatures of peoples that are not genetically related and differ in language, history, and culture. Typological study plays an important role in understanding global literary processes and revealing interliterary relations.

Comparative typology refers to the comparison of literary phenomena based on shared features such as genre or ethnic characteristics. Through typology, general patterns inherent in certain literatures are identified.

D. Ďurišin, a prominent Slovak scholar, is one of the leading specialists in typological literary studies. He regards typological analysis as one of the key tasks of literary studies, emphasizing that its purpose is to determine the nature of literary influence and reveal its internal regularities [25].

Ďurišin distinguishes three types of typological similarities:

1. **Socio-typological similarities.** These involve the reflection of social conditions in the ideological and philosophical content of a work. Social and ideological factors are embedded in literary texts and are especially evident in the author's philosophical views on society and historical context.

2. **Literary-typological similarities.** These are based purely on literary phenomena and involve analyzing similarities and differences in genres, themes, characters, composition, plot, motifs, imagery, and stylistic devices. The monograph by Sh. Sirojiddinov on Navoi's sources is an example of such analysis [8].

3. **Psychological-typological similarities.** These involve the study of the author's individual psychological tendencies in creating a work. Scholars often explain similarities between works through the psychological closeness of authors. For example, the similarity between "*The Little Prince*" and "*The White Ship*" lies in the inner emotional experiences of their protagonists [7].

The works of scholars such as N. Toirova, A. Qosimov, B. Kholikov, Z. Qobilova, T. Prokhorova, and O. Pokholenko are based on typological analysis [7]. There are also studies devoted to the typology of literary genres [15]. Such research not only reveals common features across unrelated literatures but also contributes significantly to the development of international literary relations.

Multiculturalism also plays an important role in the system of interliterary relations. Its ideological essence lies in promoting coexistence, mutual respect, and appreciation of different cultures,



histories, and literatures within multiethnic societies. It emerged in the late twentieth century in the United States [19]. Multiculturalism encompasses all aspects of social life, including literature.

In comparative literary studies, multiculturalism is especially important in defining the essence of interliterary processes. It is based on rejecting Eurocentrism and the idea of cultural superiority, promoting instead equality among cultures and the concept of literature as a unified mosaic. According to its proponents, literary phenomena cannot be evaluated through rigid or centralized criteria; rather, all literary expressions should be studied equally.

In Russian literary studies, early ideas related to multiculturalism appeared in early twentieth-century scholarship. According to S.A. Vengerov (1919), a true literary scholar should not focus only on major figures but also on lesser-known writers, as they often more vividly reflect the characteristics of a particular era (“...я считаю совершенно ненаучным изучать литературу только в её крупных представителях. Бывает даже так, что мелкий писатель... ярче характеризует эпоху ...”) [1].

In some scholarly articles, it is possible to observe different approaches to the same issue. V.M. Zhirmunsky (1891–1971) and N.I. Konrad (1891–1970) were prominent scholars who lived and worked in the same time and space and made significant contributions to the development of the methodology of comparative literary studies. In their articles devoted to the issue of “Alisher Navoi and the Renaissance,” N.I. Konrad relies on the ideas of multiculturalism [5], whereas V.M. Zhirmunsky bases his views on the principles of Eurocentrism [6].

N.I. Konrad compares episodes from “*Layli and Majnun*” with Western literary works such as *Tristan and Isolde* and *The Master and Margarita*, while V.M. Zhirmunsky compares Navoi’s ideas with those of Dante, Leonardo da Vinci, and Petrarch. Focusing on the universality of Navoi’s creative work, N.I. Konrad concludes that Navoi is a poet of all peoples. V.M. Zhirmunsky, on the other hand, advances the idea that Navoi shares intellectual affinity with the “titans of the Western Renaissance,” and that their ideas are reflected in the poet’s works.

In both articles, the Renaissance is presented as a common ground; however, V.M. Zhirmunsky attempts to demonstrate the superiority of Western achievements in culture, spirituality, and science over those of the East. In contrast, N.I. Konrad emphasizes that Eastern spirituality and culture have their own ancient sources and did not require dependence on the West. Based on the concept of intercultural equality inherent in multiculturalism, the scholar supports the idea that no nation has the right to consider itself superior to others (“...ни у кого нет права считать себя народом особым, превосходящим всех других, мания величия у нации столь же ложна, вредна и просто смешна, как мания величия у отдельного человека”) [5].



In conclusion, national, regional, and world literature, literary relations, multiculturalism, and similar phenomena constitute the forms of interliterary processes.

References

1. *Академические школы в русском литературоведении.* (1975). М.: Наука, С. 179.
2. Бахтин М.М. (1979). *Эстетика словесного творчества* // К исторической типологии романа.
3. Эсалнек А.Я. (1991). *Типология романа (теоретический и историко-литературный аспекты):* монография.
4. Жирмунский В.М. (1973). *Типология восточной поэмы* // Советская тюркология. №4. С. 35-48.
5. Конрад Н.И. (1966). *Средневосточное возрождение и Алишер Навои* // Иностранная литература. №2. С. 212-220.
6. Жирмунский В.М. (1961). *Алишер Навои и проблема Ренессанса в восточных литературах* // Ученые записки ЛГУ. Сер. филол. наук. Вып. №59. С. 86-97.
7. Қосимов А. (2007). *Типологик ўхшашликлар ва ўзаро таъсирнинг назарий муаммолари (А.де Сент-Экзюпери ва А. Камю ижоди мисолида).* Тошкент.
8. Сирожиддинов Ш. (2011). *Алишер Навоий манбаларининг қиёсий-типологик текстологик таҳлили.* Тошкент: Akademnashr.
9. Аристотель. (1961). *Поэтика. Об искусстве поэзии.*
10. Пресняков О.П. (1980). *Поэтика познания и творчества: Теория словесности А.А. Потебни.* М.
11. Тўйчиев У. (2011). *Ўзбек адабиётида бадийлик мезонлари ва уларнинг маромлари.* Тошкент.
12. Саримсоқов Б. (2004). *Бадийлик асослари ва мезонлари.* Тошкент.
13. Расулов А. (2007). *Бадийлик – безаволянгиллик.* Тошкент: Шарқ.
14. Жўракулов У. (2015). *Назарий поэтика масалалари: Муаллиф. Жанр. Хронотоп.* Тошкент: Фафур Фулом.
15. Бахтин М.М. (1979). *Эстетика словесного творчества.* М.: Искусство.
16. Бахтин М. (2015). *Романда замон ва хронотоп шакллари. Тарихий поэтикадан очерклар / Рус тилидан У. Жўракулов таржимаси.* Тошкент.
17. Жирмунский В.М. (1977). *Задачи поэтики / Теория литературы. Поэтика. Стилистика.* Л. С.15.



18. *Историческая поэтика: Итоги и перспективы изучения*. (1986). С.12.
19. Гасанова Н. К определению концепта «мультикультурализм» // <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/k-opredeleniyu-kontsepta-multikulturalizm>.
20. Конрад Н.И. (1978). *К вопросу о литературных связях* // Литература и театр. М.: Наука, Б.49-59.
21. *О нарративных техниках* // [http:// litmasters.ru](http://litmasters.ru)
22. Жирмунский В.М. (1979). *Сравнительное литературоведение*. С.77.
23. Курамбоев К. Адабий алоқалар – миллий адабиётлар тараққиётининг қонуниятларидан бири // http://uzadab.ndpi.uz/adabiy_aloqalar.html
24. Rizayev Sh. (2014). *Адабий алоқалар ижодий жараён кўзгуси (давра суҳбати)* // <https://ziyouz.uz>
25. Дюришин Д. (1979). *Теория сравнительного изучения литературы*.
26. Хамидова Т. (1973). *Русско-узбекские литературные связи в годы Великой отечественной войны*. Ташкент.; Расули М.Е. (1978). *К проблеме взаимовлияния и взаимообогащения русской и узбекской литератур*. Ташкент: Фан.; Маткаримова С. (2019). *Анъана, янгилик ва бадий маҳорат (Хоразм шоирлари ижодида Навоий анъаналари мисолида)*. Тошкент.; Султанов Т. (2019). *Алишер Навоий ва Озарбайжон адабиёти: тарихий илдизлар, анъаналар, ворисийлик (Кишварий ва Содиқий асарлари мисолида)*. Тошкент.
27. Неупокоева И.Г. (1976). *История всемирной литературы. Проблемы системного и сравнительного анализа*. М.: Наука. С.85.
28. Лихачев Д.С. (1967). *Поэтика древнерусской литературы*.; Силантьев И.В. (2004). *Поэтика мотива*.; Виноградов В.В. (1963). *Сюжет и стиль*. М.; Фаликова Н.Э. (1992). *Хронотон как категория исторической поэтики* // Проблемы исторической поэтики. Петрозаводск.
29. Фрейденберг О.М. (1997). *Поэтика сюжета и жанра*. М.: Лабиринт. 448 с.
30. *Проблемы исторической поэтики* // <http://poetica.pro>
31. Данилина Г.И. *Сравнительное литературоведение. Хрестоматия*. – Тюмень, 2011. – С.134.
32. Qosimov A., Hamroqulov A., Xoʻjayev S. (2019). *Qiyosiy adabiyotshunoslik*. Toshkent: Akademnashr. B.35.
33. Тўйчиев У. (2011). *Ўзбек адабиётида бадийлик мезонлари ва уларнинг маромлари*. Тошкент.; Саримсоков Б. (2004). *Бадийлик асослари ва мезонлари*. Тошкент.; Расулов А. (2007). *Бадийлик – безавол янгилик*. Тошкент: Шарқ.



34.Веселовский А.Н. (1989). *Историческая поэтика*. М.; Жирмунский В.М. (1939). *Историческая поэтика А.Н.Веселовского и ее источники* // Ученые записки ЛГУ. Сер. филол. наук. Вып. №3. С.3 19; Конрад Н.И. (1966). *Запад и Восток*. М.: Восточная литература.; Михайлов А.В. (1989). *Проблемы исторической поэтики в истории немецкой культуры: Очерки из истории филологической науки*. М.; Храпченко М. (1982). *Историческая поэтика: основные направления исследований* // Вопросы литературы. №9. С.73. 79; *Историческая поэтика: Итоги и перспективы изучения*. (1986).

35.*Проблемы исторической поэтики литератур Востока*. (1988). Коллективная монография. М.: Наука.

36.Темирболат А.Б. (2011). *Поэтика литературы*. Учебное пособие. Алматы.

37.Потебня А.А. (1976). *Эстетика и поэтика*. М.; *Теоретическая поэтика*. (1990). М.

38.Потебня А.А. (1905). *Из записок по теории словесности*. Харьков.

