

<https://doi.org/10.36719/2789-6919/43/32-35>

Gulnara Nasibova

Ganja State University

PhD student

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8255-2260>

gulnarnasibova6@gmail.com

Urgiyya Hajiyeva

Ganja State University

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1012-6671>

mujgan.rustemova@gmail.com

Aytan Rahimli

Ganja State University

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4603-2645>

111aytanrahimli@gmail.com

Holistic Analysis of a Literary Work

Abstract

One of the most pressing central problems of theory today is the systematic development of the theory of literature of a work of art.

The brilliant idea of distinguishing between the content and formal aspects of a work of art has determined the main trend in the study of the problems of a work for centuries. Content traditionally includes all aspects related to the semantic aspect of creativity (understanding and evaluation of reality). The plane of expression, the phenomenological level, is related to the area of form (Ubaidova, Ergasheva, 2021).

At the same time, this same fundamental idea provoked a simplified approach to the analysis of works. On the one hand, scientific analysis of content is often replaced by so-called interpretation, i.e. arbitrary recording of subjective aesthetic impressions, when what is valued is not objective knowledge of the patterns of formation and functioning of a work of art, but an originally expressed personal attitude towards it.

Keywords: *literary work, humanitarian disciplines, philosophical problems, aesthetic problems, strictly speaking*

Gülnarə Nəşibova

Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti

doktorant

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8255-2260>

gulnarnasibova6@gmail.com

Urqiyyə Hacıyeva

Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1012-6671>

mujgan.rustemova@gmail.com

Aytan Rəhimli

Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4603-2645>

111aytanrahimli@gmail.com

Ədəbi əsərin vahid təhlili

Xülasə

Bu gün ən aktual olan nəzəriyyənin mərkəzi problemlərindən biri bədii əsərin ədəbiyyat nəzəriyyəsinin sistemli inkişafıdır. Əsrlər boyu bədii əsərin məzmunu ilə formal cəhətlərinin fərqləndiril

məsinin parlaq ideyası əsərin problemlərinin öyrənilməsində əsas tendensiyanı müəyyən etmişdir. Məzmun ənənəvi olaraq yaradıcılığın semantik tərəfi ilə bağlı bütün aspektləri (reallığın dərk edilməsi və qiymətləndirilməsi) ehtiva edir. İfadə müstəvisi, fenomenoloji səviyyə formalaşdırılmış yavaş-yavaş sahəsinə aiddir (Ubaidova, Ergasheva, 2021). Eyni zamanda, bu eyni fundamental fikir əsərlərin təhlilinə sadələşdirilmiş yanaşmaya səbəb oldu. Bir tərəfdən, məzmunun elmi təhlili tez-tez sözdə şərh ilə əvəz olunur, yəni, subyektiv estetik təəssürlərin ixtiyari qeydə alınması, o zaman ki, dəyərli olan sənət əsərinin formalaşması və fəaliyyət qanunları haqqında obyektiv bilik deyil, ona ilkin ifadə edilmiş şəxsi münasibətdir.

Açar sözlər: ədəbi yaradıcılıq, humanitar fənlər, fəlsəfi problemlər, estetik problemlər, sözlə desək

Introduction

The work serves as a starting point for the interpreter, who rethinks the work in the context relevant to him. On the other hand, the necessity and possibility of knowing the work from the side of its content is generally denied. The work is interpreted as some purely aesthetic phenomenon, allegedly having no content, as a pure phenomenon of style.

To a large extent this is because, having outlined the substantive and formal poles (the poetic "world of ideas", spiritual content and the means of its expression), science has not yet been able to overcome, "remove" these contradictions, "coexist" with them. In the course of literary thought, either hermeneutically oriented concepts (that is, the work was interpreted in a certain socio-cultural key; hidden meaning was sought in it, the identification of which required an appropriate decoding methodology) or aesthetic, formalistic schools and theories studying poetics (that is, not the meaning of the works themselves, but the means of conveying it) were inevitably actualized in the inevitably convincing version of the entire history. For some, the work was, in one way or another, a "phenomenon of ideas", for others - a "phenomenon of language" (accordingly, the work was considered mainly from the standpoint of either the sociology of literature or historical poetics).

Research

The first group includes the "real criticism" of the Russian democratic revolutionaries of the 19th century, the cultural-historical, spiritual-historical, psychoanalytic, ritual-mythological schools, Marxist (pan-sociological) literary criticism, and post-structuralism. The second group includes the aesthetic theories of "art for art's sake," "pure art," the Russian "formal school," structuralism, and aesthetic concepts "serving" modernism and post-modernism. The cardinal question of the entire theory of literature – the question of the mutual representation of content in form and vice versa – was not only not resolved, but most often was not even posed. Without rejecting the fundamental approach to the study of a work of art as an ideological formation by its nature, having a specific plan of content and a plan of expression, aestheticians and literary scholars increasingly cultivate the idea of the multi-level nature of the aesthetic object (Aaker, Schmitt, 2001).

At the same time, the idea of the nature of the integrity of the work itself changes. Achievements in the field of general scientific methodology - in particular, the development of such concepts as structure, system, integrity - force humanists to also move from the macro- to the micro level, without forgetting about their integration. The development of dialectical thinking is becoming extremely relevant for all humanitarian disciplines. Obviously, only in this way can one achieve deep knowledge about the object of study, adequately reflect its properties.

Main part. The nature of the formulation and methods of solving all problems of literary theory depend on the starting point – on the solution to the question of the necessity and regularity of the existence of art (and fiction as its type).

If literature exists, does it mean that someone needs it?

Such a paraphrase of the poet is a profoundly materialistic formulation of the question. Scientifically, this same question can be formulated as follows: why does human spirituality manifest itself (and therefore cannot but manifest itself) in an artistic form, the opposite of scientific? After all, the spiritual content of a person can become the subject of scientific research. However, this was not enough for a person who took art as his "eternal companion" (Allen, Brophy, 2001).

Without touching on all the depths of the philosophical and aesthetic problems of verbal and artistic creativity, it is necessary to note some decisive circumstances. First of all, art, unlike science, uses a completely special method of reproduction and, in a certain sense, knowledge of reality - an image, that is, a concrete, sensually perceived carrier of information about certain objects or phenomena. The image is singular, moreover - unique, and due to its concreteness is addressed to the senses (Henkin, 2005; Herman, Vervaeck, 2001).

But this is only half of what should be said about the nature of the image. The second half will contradict what has just been said. Behind the unique in the image shines the general, the universal as a characteristic of these phenomena - a characteristic that is fundamentally not reducible to sensory-perceived information. In the image (here it is, the source of artistry!) there is not only a sensory-perceived principle, but also a supersensory principle - information addressed not exclusively to the senses (psyche), but also to abstract-logical thinking (consciousness).

What should we call this "something" that is the opposite of an image in its informational nature?

A supersensible principle, perceived by consciousness but not by the senses, is called a concept. An image in this capacity (image + concept) acts as a special language of culture, the specialization of which is synthetic information that is ambivalent in relation to the "soul" (psyche) and "mind" (consciousness). Science, including literary criticism, does not use images, but concepts, the function of which is to designate an essence that is extremely abstracted from individual features (Aaker, Schmitt, 2001). An essence as such cannot be perceived by the senses at all, because it is perceived by abstract-logical thinking.

Concepts also act as a special language of culture, the specialization of which is to operate with a strictly defined volume of meanings, to describe processes and relationships perceived from the side of their essence. There can be no talk of any informational ambivalence in relation to concepts; they are "soulless" (super-sensory), and therefore addressed to the "cold mind" (consciousness). Therefore, scientific works are almost devoid of emotions, which only "obscure" the essence. From concepts, one can build a chain of conclusions, hypotheses, theories, but it is impossible to create an image, something artistic. In the same way, it is impossible to present a scientific theory with the help of an image (Gafarova, Bozorova, Jumayeva, Idiyeva, Radjabova, 2020). The principle of artistic typification in art is based on the property of reality to "respond" to an image, on its ability to be reflected adequately not only by means of concepts but also by means of images. The more individual and unique an artistic image is, the more it is able to convey the general and universal (Corbin, Strauss, 2008). What has been said about the image is still more or less a common place in the theory of art.

Much less frequently, researchers ask other equally important questions: why is "figurative thinking" possible at all, which underlies artistic creativity, and, further, the corresponding perception of creativity – the reader's "co-creative empathy"?

Why is an image, unlike a concept, always "more than an image" (image + concept)? (Mustafoyeva, 2018).

In what cases does the need for figurative thinking arise? What is the epistemological potential of such thinking? Why can't we do without it?

This kind of "figurative" (artistic) activity must be somehow explained from the point of view of the functioning of consciousness, which, on behalf of culture, "legitimately" represents human needs.

It has long been noted that the worldview of the individual, that is, what is of decisive importance for literature, is formed in the field of tension arising between two poles: "worldview" and "theoretical activity of consciousness" (Abbott, 2008). If we translate the terminology into the language of philosophy, we are talking about the distinction between the psyche and consciousness. How are these categories related, how do they interact?

Only by answering these fundamental non-literary questions can we understand the nature of imagery and integrity and explain the laws of their origin and functioning (Rayhonov, Murodov, 2020). Let us keep in mind that the question with which literary theory begins has an epistemological – not strictly literary or artistic! – nature.

Strictly speaking, it is not a matter of images and concepts as such; it is a matter of the psyche and consciousness, which master the world differently and therefore speak different languages. In order to understand and adequately perceive the figurative language of literature, it is necessary to have an idea of what possibilities literature has in comprehending the world, what is the epistemological potential of literature (Salikhova, 2022).

Conclusion

To substantiate this thesis, some new concept is needed that explains how personality problems are connected with text problems. Such a concept exists, and it can be conventionally designated as a holistic approach to artistic phenomena (works of art, thinking, creativity). For brevity – a holistic analysis. In essence, before our eyes, perhaps the most original and promising literary theory of today is being formed and established.

References

1. Aaker, L.A., & Schmitt, B. (2001). Cultural dependent assimilation and differentiation of the self: Preferences for consumption symbols in the United States and China. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(5), 1-30.
2. Abbott, P.H. (2008). *The Cambridge introduction to narrative*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Allen, J., & Brophy, J. (2001). *Social studies excursions, K-3. Book one: Powerful unit of food, clothing, and shelter*. Westport, CT: Heinemann.
4. Corbin, J., and Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research. (3rd ed.)*. CA: Sage.
5. Gafarova, Z.Z., Bozorova, M.A., Jumayeva, S.Sh.; Idiyeva, L.I.; Radjabova, L.U. (2020). *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*. T. 24. № 1, p.403-407.
6. Henkin, R. (2005). *Confronting bullying: Literacy as a tool for character education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
7. Herman, L., & Vervaeck, B. (2001). *Handbook of narrative analysis*. University of Nebraska Press.
8. Mustafoyeva, L.M. (2018). Study of the features of V.Vysotsky's poetry in modern philology. *Problems of pedagogy*. No. 2 (34). p. 29-31.
9. Rayhonoy, S., Murodov, G. (2020). Structural semiotic analysis of a literary text. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*. T. 9, № 2, p.3319-3323.
10. Salikhova, Z.A. (2022). Improvement of Reading Competence in Future Teachers. *European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability*. t. 3, № 1, c. 92-94.
11. Usmanovna, R.L. (2021). Status And Trends Of Internet Use In The Education System Of Uzbekistan. *Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 2 (6), 102-105.
12. Ubaidova, D.A., Ergasheva, D.K. (2021). *The History Of The Creation Of Lexicographic Dictionaries*. Theoretical And Practical Ways Of Development.

Received: 01.12.2024

Accepted: 15.03.2025