

Principles of Linguocultural Analysis of Historical-Fictional Texts

ZOHIDA QODIRJONOVA
Andijan State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This study systematizes the principles of linguocultural analysis applicable to historical-fictional texts. It is based on theoretical works in linguoculturology, historical poetics, anthropocentric linguistics, conceptology, semiotics, contextual analysis, and intertextuality. The study employs qualitative analysis and theoretical synthesis to integrate these approaches into a unified analytical framework. The findings identify seven interconnected principles: – historicity, the unity of language and culture, anthropocentricity, the identification of linguocultural concepts, the analysis of cultural codes and symbols, contextual interpretation, and intertextual relations. The principle of historicity requires culturally marked units to be interpreted in relation to the political, social, and cultural conditions of the represented period. The unity of language and culture explains how linguistic units encode cultural knowledge, whereas the anthropocentric principle connects language with characters' cultural consciousness, worldview, and social identity. Conceptual and semiotic approaches reveal the values, concepts, cultural codes, and symbols represented in historical-fictional discourse. Contextual interpretation determines the functions of culturally marked elements linguistic units within particular textual and communicative situations. The principle of intertextual relations examines the connections of historical fiction with chronicles, historical documents, religious writings, folk narratives, and other cultural sources. The combined application of these principles enables the systematic identification and interpretation of national-cultural values,

historical meanings, concepts, symbols, and forms of cultural memory represented through literary language. The proposed framework brings these theoretical perspectives together and provides an integrated basis for the linguocultural study of historical-fictional texts.

Keywords: Historical-fictional text; linguocultural analysis; historicity; language and culture; anthropocentricity; linguocultural concept; cultural code; contextual interpretation; intertextuality; cultural memory

1. INTRODUCTION

Language and culture constitute an inseparable system through which a community expresses its worldview, collective experience, historical consciousness, traditions, and values. Language functions not only as a means of communication but also as an instrument for organizing and transmitting culturally conditioned perceptions of reality. Differences in linguistic representation are therefore connected with differences in the ways cultural communities conceptualize the world. The theoretical relationship among language, national culture, and human thought provides an essential foundation for the linguocultural interpretation of literary discourse (Humboldt 1984; Sapir 1993; Whorf 1960).

Literary texts occupy a distinctive position within this relationship because they preserve cultural knowledge through lexical meanings, connotations, evaluations, concepts, images, and symbols. The national-cultural character of a literary work is determined not only by the events or communities represented in it but also by the cultural information embedded in its linguistic organization. Such information has been examined through the notions of cultural component, cultural connotation, ethnocultural information, nationally specific cultural meaning, and the ethnocultural specificity of concepts. These categories demonstrate that culturally meaningful linguistic units contain semantic and symbolic dimensions that extend beyond their direct dictionary definitions. Literary discourse thus functions as

a medium through which cultural experience is preserved, interpreted, and communicated to readers (Alefirenko et al. 2013; Berezovich 2007; Sternin 2011, as cited in Kazyutina & Ozerova 2023).

The cultural function of a literary text is also connected with the dialogue of cultures. Literary communication allows readers to encounter the cultural experience of different communities, historical periods, and generations. Such interaction does not necessarily eliminate national distinctions. Instead, it may facilitate mutual understanding while preserving the historical originality and cultural identity of each community. A literary text can consequently establish dialogue between an author and a reader, between characters representing different social positions, and between the cultural consciousness of the past and that of the present.

The relationship between language and culture also has an anthropocentric dimension. Language is produced and interpreted by individuals whose identities are shaped by particular social and cultural environments. In a literary text, characters' speech may reveal their worldview, knowledge, values, social position, emotional attitudes, and cultural identity. Linguistic personality can therefore be examined as the textual manifestation of an individual who possesses and employs culturally conditioned knowledge. The anthropocentric analysis of discourse focuses on the interaction among the human factor, national-cultural meaning, and the conceptual structure of a literary text (Karaulov 1987; Xudoyberganova 2013).

The anthropocentric dimension is particularly relevant to historical fiction because the speech of a character may represent the communicative norms and social relationships attributed to a particular period. The discourse of rulers, state officials, diplomats, military figures, and women may differ according to their social authority, responsibilities, cultural position, and participation in historical events. These differences are communicated through linguistic choices, forms of address, evaluations, titles, and culturally established patterns of interaction. Character speech should therefore be interpreted as

part of the historical and cultural organization of the fictional world.

Historical fiction represents individuals, events, institutions, and social practices associated with the past. However, it does not reproduce historical reality as an unchanged collection of facts. The past is selected, organized, and reconstructed through literary language, narrative structure, characterization, and artistic interpretation. Literary images, motifs, and plots consequently need to be examined in connection with their historical development and the culture, ideology, and social conditions of the period represented in the narrative. Historical poetics provides a basis for establishing these relationships between literary representation and historical-cultural development (Veselovsky 1989).

The relationship between historical evidence and fictional representation also involves the distinction between accuracy and authenticity. Historical accuracy concerns the extent to which a textual representation corresponds to the evidence available about the past. Historical authenticity, by contrast, concerns the impression that a literary work successfully captures the characteristics of a historical period. This impression is influenced by readers' previous knowledge and their encounters with other representations of history. A fictional representation may therefore be perceived as authentic even when all of its details cannot be confirmed as factually accurate. Linguocultural analysis should consider both the evidential basis of a textual element and its role in creating a culturally convincing representation of the past (Saxton 2020).

Culture-specific vocabulary constitutes an important linguistic means for constructing such representations. Culture-specific items designate phenomena closely associated with a particular cultural community and may possess distinctive national or historical colouring. These units can refer to the natural environment, social organization, administrative institutions, material life, traditions, ceremonies, religious practices, military structures, and other culturally relevant phenomena. In literary texts, they contribute to the representation

of the setting, the everyday lives of characters, and the historical-cultural background of events.

The complexity of culture-specific vocabulary is reflected in the range of terms used to describe it, including “lacuna,” “cultural term,” “cultural item,” “cultural element,” “culture-bound term,” “culture-specific item,” and “realia.” Existing classifications group these units according to different areas of the environment, social life, and everyday cultural experience. They also demonstrate that a culturally marked expression combines denotative meaning with ethnocultural information that may be unfamiliar to members of another community. Titles, administrative positions, military terminology, forms of address, ceremonial names, and designations of material objects can thus participate in the construction of a culturally and historically recognizable literary setting (Aixelá 1996; Fernandez Guerra 2012; Harvey 2003; Katan 1999; Kazazi 2014; Newmark 1988; Nida 2003; Vlahov & Florin 1990; Zorivchak 1989, as cited in Borysenko et al. 2024).

The interpretation of culture-specific vocabulary requires attention to both linguistic form and cultural content. A culturally marked unit does not merely identify a person, object, institution, or practice. It can also communicate information about social hierarchy, political organization, material conditions, religious beliefs, and historically established behaviour. Removing such a unit from its cultural environment may reduce its meaning to a general nomination and obscure the ethnocultural knowledge associated with it.

The cultural turn strengthened scholarly attention to the cultural dimensions of textual interpretation. It established the need to examine not only linguistic relationships but also differences between the communities in which linguistic units function. This approach emphasizes that the transfer or interpretation of literary meaning should account for both the denotative content of a word and its culturally encoded associations. It also demonstrates that cultural elements contribute to the aesthetic and pragmatic effects of literary discourse. A literary text may lose culturally significant characteristics if these elements are neutralized, whereas an

interpretation that fails to explain unfamiliar cultural meanings may remain inaccessible to readers (Bassnett 2007; Bassnett & Lefevere 1990; Cómitre Narváez & Valverde Zambrana 2014; Mizin et al. 2021, 2023; Muñoz 2019; Savory 1957; Slavova & Vozna 2022; Valeišaitė 2022; Venuti 1995, 2001).

In addition to culture-specific vocabulary, linguocultural concepts form an important component of historical-fictional discourse. A concept represents a complex mental formation through which a community's historical experience, values, and worldview are organized. Concepts may be verbalized through interconnected lexical units, descriptions, evaluations, characters' actions, and symbolic representations. In historical fiction, concepts such as "state," "ruler," "homeland," "justice," "loyalty," and "honour" may function as semantic centres that connect individual actions with broader cultural systems. Their meanings are determined by the discourse and communicative environment in which they are represented (Karasik 2002; Stepanov 2004).

Historical-fictional texts also communicate cultural meaning through codes and symbols. Culture can be understood as a complex semiotic system in which linguistic and non-linguistic signs preserve and transmit information. A literary text functions within this system by organizing culturally meaningful signs into a coherent representation. Some units acquire symbolic meanings in addition to their direct nominations. A crown may represent political authority, a throne may signify rulership and succession, and a sword may be associated with military power. Similarly, a flag, horse, palace, or kingdom may activate meanings derived from collective historical experience. Semiotic analysis reveals how such units participate in the deeper cultural organization of literary discourse (Lotman 1970, 2000).

The interpretation of culturally marked units depends on the context in which they occur. Linguistic meaning is determined not only by the semantic content of a word but also by its relationship with the communicative situation, the identity of the speaker, and the wider cultural environment. The same unit may express different linguocultural meanings in different textual situations. A term denoting a political entity, for example, may

acquire additional associations with authority, power, or social status. Contextual interpretation is therefore necessary for identifying the particular function and semantic load of a cultural element within a historical-fictional text (Firth 1957; Malinowski 1923).

Historical-fictional discourse is also characterized by its relationships with other texts. Historical novels may draw upon chronicles, historical records, religious writings, folk narratives, legends, and earlier representations of historical individuals. The meaning of a literary text may consequently be shaped through dialogue with preceding discourses and cultural sources. Intertextual analysis makes it possible to determine how historical information is selected, reorganized, and transformed through literary representation. It also helps clarify the relationship between a historical source and its artistic reinterpretation (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981; Kristeva 1966).

Historical fiction additionally functions as a medium of cultural memory. Literary representations of the past may be shaped by letters, photographs, postcards, periodicals, pamphlets, memorial objects, and other surviving traces of historical experience. These materials can provide contextual detail and create a connection between contemporary readers and earlier events. However, the preservation of historical evidence is unequal. Some experiences are extensively documented, whereas others remain fragmentary or absent. The availability or absence of sources therefore influences which historical voices can be reconstructed and which remain peripheral within literary and collective memory. Historical fiction may preserve established cultural narratives, extend them by incorporating neglected experiences, or demonstrate the incompleteness of existing representations of the past (Einhaus 2025).

The theoretical foundations considered above show that historical-fictional discourse combines several interconnected dimensions. Linguoculturology explains the relationship between linguistic form and cultural content. Historical poetics situates literary representation within historical development. Anthropocentric analysis connects language with personality and cultural consciousness. Conceptual analysis identifies the mental

and axiological structures represented in a text, while semiotics reveals cultural codes and symbols. Contextual analysis explains the functions of culturally marked units within particular situations, and intertextual analysis establishes the relationship between literary discourse and other historical or cultural sources (Maslova 2001; Vorobyov 1997).

Nevertheless, these dimensions have generally been examined separately. Previous studies have focused individually on language and culture, linguistic personality, historical representation, culture-specific vocabulary, concepts, cultural codes, contextual meaning, intertextuality, authenticity, or cultural memory. Their separate treatment creates a need for an integrated framework that brings these dimensions together within the linguocultural analysis of historical-fictional texts.

The present study therefore aims to systematize the principles of linguocultural analysis applicable to historical-fictional discourse. It integrates historicity, the unity of language and culture, anthropocentricity, the identification of linguocultural concepts, the analysis of cultural codes and symbols, contextual interpretation, and intertextual relations. This framework provides a basis for identifying and interpreting national-cultural values, historically conditioned meanings, cultural consciousness, concepts, symbols, and textual relationships represented in historical fiction.

The theoretical foundations of linguocultural analysis originate from studies examining the inseparable relationship between language, culture, and human thought. Humboldt (1984) viewed language as an expression of a nation's cultural and intellectual character, while Sapir (1993) and Whorf (1960) further developed the idea that language is connected with culturally conditioned perceptions of reality. These approaches demonstrate that linguistic units should be interpreted not only through their lexical meanings but also through the cultural knowledge they embody.

Literary texts are particularly significant in this respect because their linguistic organization preserves national values, traditions, collective experience, and culturally specific interpretations of reality. Kazyutina & Ozerova (2023) argue that

linguistic elements in literary discourse function as cultural markers and communicate information about a community's worldview and value system. They also identify contextual-semantic analysis as an effective method for interpreting ethnocultural constants and culturally marked units within their textual environments. Xudoyberganova's (2013) anthropocentric approach similarly emphasizes the relationship between the human factor, cultural meaning, and the conceptual structure of a literary text. Karaulov's (1987) theory of linguistic personality provides an additional foundation for analysing a character's speech as an expression of individual and culturally conditioned consciousness.

Culture-specific vocabulary constitutes another important aspect of linguocultural research. Borysenko et al. (2024) explain that culture-specific items designate phenomena associated with a particular community and possess national or historical colouring. In literary discourse, such units contribute to the representation of the cultural setting, characters' everyday lives, and the general atmosphere of the narrative. Drawing on Vlachov & Florin, Borysenko et al. (2024) note that these expressions may lack direct equivalents in other languages because the phenomena they designate are specific to the source culture. Existing classifications associate culture-specific vocabulary with different areas of social organization, the environment, and everyday life (Katan 1999; Newmark 1988; Vlachov & Florin 1990, as cited in Borysenko et al. 2024).

Conceptual and semiotic approaches also provide important foundations for linguocultural interpretation. Stepanov (2004) regards concepts as central elements of culture, whereas Karasik (2002) connects them with personality, discourse, and communicative context. These approaches make it possible to examine concepts such as the state, ruler, homeland, justice, loyalty, and honour as mental units embodying historical experience and cultural values. Lotman (1970, 2000), in turn, interprets culture as a semiotic system and the literary text as a mechanism for preserving and transmitting cultural information. His approach provides a theoretical basis for analysing such units

as the crown, throne, sword, flag, palace, and kingdom as cultural symbols rather than exclusively as names of objects.

The historical dimension of literary texts is addressed through Veselovsky's (1989) historical poetics, which investigates the development of literary images, motifs, and plots in relation to the culture, ideology, and social life of particular periods. Saxton (2020) further distinguishes between accuracy and authenticity in historical fiction. Accuracy refers to the correspondence between literary representation and available historical evidence, whereas authenticity concerns the reader's impression that a fictional text convincingly reconstructs the past. This distinction confirms the need to consider both historical evidence and its artistic-cultural representation when analysing historical fiction.

The interpretation of culturally marked units also depends on their context and relationships with other texts. Malinowski (1923) and Firth (1957) established the importance of situational context in determining linguistic meaning. Bakhtin's dialogic theory, Kristeva's (1966) concept of intertextuality, and Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) text-linguistic approach explain how textual meanings are shaped through relationships with other voices and texts. These theories are relevant to historical fiction because historical novels frequently interact with chronicles, religious writings, legends, historical documents, and earlier representations of historical figures.

Historical fiction additionally participates in the preservation and reconstruction of cultural memory. Einhaus (2025) shows that letters, photographs, periodicals, postcards, pamphlets, and other surviving historical materials influence both cultural remembrance and literary representations of the past. However, the availability of such materials is unequal, and this inequality affects which historical experiences are represented or marginalized. Thus, the existing scholarship provides separate foundations for analysing language and culture, linguistic personality, culture-specific vocabulary, concepts, cultural symbols, historical authenticity, context, intertextuality, and cultural memory. The present study brings these perspectives

together in order to formulate interconnected principles for the linguocultural analysis of historical-fictional texts.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study employs a qualitative and theoretical approach to formulate the principal foundations of the linguocultural analysis of historical-fictional texts. The research material consists of theoretical works on linguoculturology, historical poetics, anthropocentric linguistics, conceptology, semiotics, contextual analysis, and intertextuality. The study draws particularly on the views of Humboldt (1984), Sapir (1993), Whorf (1960), Veselovsky (1989), Lotman (1970, 2000), Stepanov (2004), Karasik (2002), Karaulov (1987), Xudoyberganova (2013), Malinowski (1923), Firth (1957), Kristeva (1966), and Beaugrande & Dressler (1981). Recent studies of linguocultural markers, culture-specific vocabulary, historical authenticity, and cultural memory were also considered (Borysenko et al. 2024; Einhaus 2025; Kazyutina & Ozerova 2023; Saxton 2020).

The theoretical synthesis method was used to combine these approaches into a unified system of principles applicable to historical-fictional discourse. Historical poetics provided the basis for interpreting linguistic and cultural units in relation to the political, social, ideological, and cultural conditions of the period represented in a literary text. The linguocultural approach was applied to identify the cultural information encoded in lexical units, forms of address, ceremonial terms, religious expressions, and nominations connected with state administration and social organization.

The anthropocentric method was employed to examine characters' speech as an expression of their worldview, values, social position, and cultural consciousness. Conceptual analysis was used to identify culturally significant concepts, including "state," "ruler," "homeland," "justice," "loyalty," and "honour." The semiotic method served to interpret such units as "crown," "throne," "sword," "flag," "horse," "palace," and "kingdom" as

cultural codes and symbols containing meanings beyond their direct nominative functions.

Contextual-semantic analysis was applied to determine the specific cultural meaning and textual function of each unit within its historical, social, and communicative environment. This method made it possible to consider culturally marked elements in connection with the general meaning of the text rather than in isolation. Intertextual analysis was used to identify the relationships of historical-fictional texts with chronicles, historical records, religious writings, legends, and other cultural sources.

The analysis was conducted in three stages. First, the theoretical approaches relevant to the interaction of language, culture, individual consciousness, historical context, concepts, symbols, and textual relations were reviewed. Second, the principal objects and analytical procedures associated with these approaches were identified and classified. Finally, the selected theoretical positions were synthesized into seven interconnected principles: the principle of historicity, the principle of the unity of language and culture, the anthropocentric principle, the principle of identifying linguocultural concepts, the principle of analysing cultural codes and symbols, the principle of contextual interpretation, and the principle of intertextual relations.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The synthesis of the theoretical approaches examined in this study resulted in seven interconnected principles for the linguocultural analysis of historical-fictional texts: historicity, the unity of language and culture, anthropocentricity, the identification of linguocultural concepts, the interpretation of cultural codes and symbols, contextual interpretation, and intertextual relations. Each principle addresses a particular dimension of the cultural meanings encoded in historical-fictional discourse.

3.1. *The principle of historicity*

The principle of historicity requires linguocultural elements in historical fiction to be interpreted in relation to the political,

social, ideological, and cultural conditions of the period to which they belong. Their meanings should not be determined exclusively through contemporary usage because historical change may alter the functions, associations, and cultural value of linguistic units.

The theoretical foundation of this principle is related to Veselovsky's (1989) historical poetics, which examines the historical development of literary images, motifs, and plots. This approach enables historical fiction to be analysed in connection with the cultural environment, ideology, and social organization of the represented period. Bakhtin's dialogic approach is also relevant because it allows characters' voices, authorial position, and cultural consciousness to be considered as interacting components of historical literary discourse.

The distinction between historical accuracy and authenticity further clarifies this principle. Saxton (2020) defines accuracy as the correspondence of a fictional representation with available historical evidence, while authenticity concerns the impression that a text successfully reconstructs the past. Therefore, the analysis of historical fiction should consider both the historical basis of a particular linguistic or cultural element and its function in creating a convincing representation of the historical period.

Titles, administrative positions, customs, military terms, and expressions associated with state government should consequently be evaluated as components of the culture represented in the narrative. Units such as *amir*, *tarkhan*, *noyan*, *cherik*, *farman*, *shikar*, and *munshi* possess meanings associated with particular political structures, social relations, and cultural practices. Their linguocultural interpretation requires the simultaneous consideration of historical reality and its fictional representation portrayal.

This principle establishes reflects the broader view that culture-specific items contribute to the representation of a narrative setting and provide a literary work with national and historical colouring (Borysenko et al. 2024). Accordingly, historically marked vocabulary should be interpreted as evidence of the relationship between linguistic nomination and the cultural organization of a particular period society and period.

3.2. *The principle of the unity of language and culture*

The principle of the unity of language and culture is based on the understanding that language serves as one of the principal means through which cultural knowledge is expressed and transmitted. Humboldt (1984) regarded language as an expression of a nation's cultural and intellectual character. Sapir (1993) and Whorf (1960) subsequently developed the relationship between language, thought, and culturally conditioned perceptions of reality.

From this perspective, linguistic units in historical fiction embody information associated with the traditions, values, ceremonies, beliefs, and social relations of the represented community. Such units should therefore be analysed not only according to their lexical meanings but also according to the cultural content they communicate. Forms of address, ceremonial terminology, religious expressions, and terms related to government may reveal the principles according to which members of a historical community organized and interpreted their social world.

Literary texts transmit cultural experience and represent systems of cultural values through linguistic means. The national and cultural character of a literary work is consequently manifested through the interaction of denotative meaning, cultural connotation, ethnocultural information, and symbolic associations. The unity of language and culture in historical fiction can thus be observed when a linguistic unit simultaneously performs its nominative function and communicates historically established cultural knowledge (Kazyutina & Ozerova 2023).

Culture-specific items help create a culturally distinctive setting and represent the background against which literary characters and events are portrayed. These findings support the interpretation of culturally marked vocabulary as an integral part of literary meaning rather than as supplementary historical detail (Borysenko et al. 2024).

The application of this principle involves identifying linguistic units that encode cultural information and determining how they contribute to the representation of values, traditions,

rituals, and social relationships. It therefore establishes the general foundation for the remaining principles because anthropocentric meanings, concepts, symbols, contextual functions, and intertextual relationships are all expressed through the interaction between language and culture.

3.3. *The anthropocentric principle*

The anthropocentric principle examines linguistic and cultural meaning in connection with the individual who produces, uses, and interprets language. In historical-fictional texts, the worldview, values, social identity, and cultural attitudes of characters are expressed through their speech. Characters' utterances may therefore be approached as linguistic manifestations of historically and culturally determined consciousness.

Karaulov's (1987) theory of linguistic personality provides a basis for analysing the individual as a bearer of language, knowledge, values, and cultural experience. Xudoyberganova's (2013) anthropocentric approach to textual research likewise emphasizes the relationship among the human factor, national-cultural meaning, and concepts in literary discourse. These perspectives make it possible to study how cultural identity is represented through individual linguistic behaviour.

The speech of rulers, state officials, women, and participants in diplomatic communication constitutes an important object of analysis under this principle. Differences among these forms of speech may represent social hierarchy, political authority, gender position, communicative responsibility, and cultural expectations. The analysis should focus on the linguistic choices through which a character's social and cultural position becomes visible in the text.

The anthropocentric principle is connected with the view that individuals develop within a culturally established field of meanings and values. Alefirenko states that personality is formed within an ethnic culture and that individuals interpret their personal and social existence through the forms of their native language (as cited in Kazyutina & Ozerova 2023). Thus, characters' speech in historical fiction can be examined as a

textual representation of the relationship among individual consciousness, social position, and collective culture.

The principle does not isolate an individual character from the historical environment. On the contrary, it interprets linguistic personality as culturally and historically situated. A character's speech is therefore analysed in relation to the values, forms of authority, social conventions, and communicative norms represented in the historical-fictional text.

3.4. The principle of identifying linguocultural concepts

The principle of identifying linguocultural concepts focuses on the culturally significant mental formations represented in historical-fictional discourse. Stepanov (2004) conceptualizes such units as central points of culture that preserve socially and historically established meanings. Karasik (2002) connects concepts with personality, discourse, and the communicative environment in which cultural meanings are activated.

A linguocultural concept contains elements of collective experience, value, and worldview. In historical fiction, concepts are expressed through interconnected words, descriptions, evaluations, actions, and symbolic representations. They may become organizing elements of the literary narrative because they connect the experience of individual characters with the broader system of values attributed to the represented culture.

The concepts of "state," "ruler," "homeland," "justice," "loyalty," and "honour" constitute principal objects of analysis within this approach. Each of these concepts may be verbalized through several linguistic means and acquire different meanings depending on the historical situation and the position of the character. Their interpretation therefore requires identifying the textual units through which they are constructed and establishing the cultural values associated with those units.

For example, the concept of the ruler may be represented through titles, forms of address, descriptions of authority, and characters' attitudes toward political power. The concept of loyalty may be expressed through evaluations of service, obedience, personal commitment, or relationships between rulers and their followers. The purpose of conceptual analysis is to

determine how these separate linguistic manifestations collectively represent culturally significant ideas.

This principle develops the general relationship between language and culture by focusing on the mental and axiological structures communicated through literary language. It also connects the anthropocentric and semiotic dimensions of analysis because concepts are embodied in characters' consciousness and may be expressed through culturally significant symbols.

3.5. The principle of analysing cultural codes and symbols

The interpretation of cultural codes and symbols is grounded in Lotman's semiotic approach. Lotman (1970, 2000) conceptualizes culture as a complex system of signs and regards the literary text as a semiotic mechanism that preserves and transmits cultural information. His concept of the semiosphere provides a theoretical foundation for examining the relationships among individual signs, literary texts, and their broader cultural environments.

Certain units in historical-fictional texts acquire symbolic meanings in addition to their direct nominative meanings. Such units can function as cultural codes by activating historically established associations and collective cultural knowledge. Their analysis makes it possible to identify deeper semantic layers of the text that cannot be explained solely through literal lexical interpretation.

Units such as "crown," "throne," "sword," "flag," "horse," "palace," and "kingdom" may function as objects of this analysis. A crown, for example, denotes a material object but may simultaneously represent authority and political domination. A throne can similarly be connected with rulership and succession, while a sword may participate in the representation of military power. The cultural meaning of these units arises from the relationship between their textual use and the cultural associations preserved within the represented historical environment.

Kazyutina & Ozerova (2023) explain that cultural meanings in literary texts are manifested at both the lexical and semiotic levels. This indicates that culturally marked words may function

simultaneously as nominations and as signs within a broader cultural system. Cultural codes and symbols therefore reflect historical memory and accumulated cultural experience while contributing to the internal semantic organization of the literary text.

The purpose of this principle is to identify units that contain symbolic potential and determine what cultural meanings they activate within the narrative. Such interpretation should remain connected with textual evidence and the relevant historical-cultural context.

3.6. *The principle of contextual interpretation*

The principle of contextual interpretation requires linguocultural units to be examined in relation to the complete textual, historical, social, and communicative environments in which they occur. A culturally marked unit cannot be interpreted adequately when removed from the situation that determines its function and meaning.

The theoretical foundations of this principle include Humboldt's account of the relationship between language and culture, Maslova's (2001) linguocultural approach, Stepanov's (2004) theory of concepts, Lotman's (1970, 2000) semiotic model, and the contextual approaches of Malinowski (1923) and Firth (1957). These perspectives demonstrate that linguistic meaning is influenced by cultural systems, historical conditions, textual relations, and the immediate communicative situation.

Kazyutina & Ozerova (2023) identify contextual-semantic analysis as an effective method for recognizing and interpreting ethnocultural markers in literary texts. Under this approach, linguistic units are studied in connection with the general meaning of the text, the identity of the speaker, the communicative situation, and the cultural associations activated by their use.

The same word may express different linguocultural meanings in different contexts. For example, "kingdom" may denote a political entity in one situation but represent power and political status in another. Its meaning must therefore be

determined by examining its textual function, semantic load, and relationship with the surrounding discourse.

Contextual interpretation integrates the other analytical principles. The historical significance of a title, the cultural meaning of a form of address, the worldview expressed in a character's speech, and the symbolism of a particular object can be determined only through their contextual use. The principle consequently prevents the interpretation of linguocultural units as isolated lexical items.

3.7. The principle of intertextual relations

The principle of intertextual relations approaches a historical-fictional text through its semantic and cultural connections with other texts. Bakhtin's theory of dialogism provides a foundation for understanding textual meaning as an interaction among different voices, positions, and discourses. Kristeva's (1966) concept of intertextuality develops this perspective by emphasizing that texts acquire meaning through their relationships with other texts. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) also identify intertextuality as an important characteristic of textuality.

Historical-fictional works are commonly created in relation to chronicles, historical documents, legends, religious writings, oral narratives, and previous accounts of historical individuals. These sources provide historical and cultural material that may be selected, reorganized, or interpreted within fictional discourse. Intertextual analysis helps identify the connections between a literary representation and the historical or cultural texts with which it interacts.

Einhaus (2025) demonstrates that historical fiction may also engage with material traces such as letters, photographs, postcards, periodicals, pamphlets, and other documents of everyday life. Such materials can shape the narrative representation of history and connect contemporary audiences with earlier experiences. Their availability or absence influences which historical voices can be reconstructed and which remain incomplete or marginalized.

The principal objects of intertextual analysis therefore include chronicles, historical records, folk narratives, religious texts, and written sources concerning historical figures. This principle makes it possible to examine how historical reality is transformed into a literary representation and how cultural memory participates in this process.

Intertextual relations should be considered together with historical accuracy and authenticity. A connection with a historical source may support the evidential basis of a representation, while the literary transformation of that source may contribute to the impression of authenticity described by Saxton (2020). Intertextual analysis thus clarifies the relationship among historical evidence, cultural memory, and fictional interpretation.

3.8. *Integration of the principles*

The identified principles are based on a synthesis of linguoculturology (Maslova 2001; Vorobyov 1997), historical poetics (Veselovsky 1989), semiotics (Lotman 1970, 2000), conceptology (Karasik 2002; Stepanov 2004), anthropocentric linguistics (Karaulov 1987; Xudoyberganova 2013), theories of context (Firth 1957; Malinowski 1923), and intertextuality (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981; Kristeva 1966).

Recent research on linguocultural markers (Kazyutina & Ozerova 2023), culture-specific items (Borysenko et al. 2024), historical accuracy and authenticity (Saxton 2020), and cultural memory (Einhaus 2025) complements these theoretical foundations. Together, these approaches provide a connected framework for identifying national-cultural values, historical consciousness, linguocultural concepts, cultural codes, and intertextual meanings in historical-fictional discourse.

The seven principles address different but interconnected dimensions of the text. Historicity establishes the temporal and cultural conditions of interpretation. The unity of language and culture identifies culturally encoded linguistic meaning. The anthropocentric principle connects that meaning with the cultural consciousness of characters. Conceptual analysis identifies the mental and axiological structures represented in the text.

Semiotic analysis reveals cultural codes and symbols. Contextual interpretation establishes their functions in particular textual situations, while intertextual analysis determines their relationships with historical and cultural sources.

4. CONCLUSION

The study demonstrates that the linguocultural analysis of historical-fictional texts can be conducted through seven interconnected principles: historicity, the unity of language and culture, anthropocentricity, the identification of linguocultural concepts, the analysis of cultural codes and symbols, contextual interpretation, and intertextual relations.

The principle of historicity requires linguistic and cultural units to be interpreted according to the political, social, and cultural conditions of the represented period. The unity of language and culture makes it possible to identify the cultural information encoded in titles, forms of address, rituals, religious expressions, and terms related to social and political organization. The anthropocentric principle focuses on characters' speech as a representation of their worldview, values, social position, and cultural consciousness.

Conceptual analysis reveals culturally significant mental units such as "state," "ruler," "homeland," "justice," "loyalty," and "honour." The analysis of cultural codes and symbols explains how units such as "crown," "throne," "sword," "flag," "horse," "palace," and "kingdom" acquire symbolic meanings in addition to their direct nominations. Contextual interpretation determines the meaning and function of these units within particular textual and communicative situations. Intertextual analysis, in turn, identifies the relationships of historical-fictional discourse with chronicles, historical sources, religious writings, folk narratives, and records concerning historical figures.

These principles synthesize the theoretical foundations of historical poetics, linguoculturology, anthropocentric linguistics, conceptology, semiotics, contextual analysis, and intertextuality. Together, they allow historical-fictional texts to be examined as linguistic and cultural representations of the past. Their

integrated application reveals the national-cultural values, historical consciousness, concepts, symbols, and cultural meanings expressed through literary language.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed principles should be applied as an interconnected system in the linguocultural analysis of historical-fictional texts. Linguistic units should first be interpreted in relation to their historical period and subsequently examined according to the cultural information, concepts, values, and symbolic meanings they express.

Culture-specific titles, administrative terms, military vocabulary, forms of address, ceremonial names, and religious units should be analysed within their historical, social, and textual contexts. Characters' speech should be examined in relation to their cultural consciousness, social position, and worldview.

Cultural concepts and symbols should not be interpreted separately from their textual functions. Their meanings should be established through contextual analysis and their associations with the cultural environment represented in the work. The relationship of historical-fictional texts with chronicles, historical documents, religious writings, folk narratives, and other cultural sources should also be considered.

The combined application of the seven principles is recommended for identifying and interpreting the national-cultural values, historical meanings, concepts, cultural codes, and forms of cultural memory represented in historical-fictional discourse.

REFERENCES

- Aixela, J. F. 1996. Culture-specific items in translation. In E. R. Alvares et al. (Eds.), *Translation, Power, Subversion* (pp. 56-66). Multilingual Matters.
- Alefirenko, N. F., Golovaneva, M. A., Ozerova, E. G. & Chumak-Zhun, I. I. 2013. *Text and Discourse*. Flinta.

- Bassnett, S. 2007. Culture and translation. In P. Kuhiwczak & K. Littau (Eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 13-23). Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. Printer Publishers.
- Beaugrande, R.-A. de & Dressler, W. U. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. Longman.
- Berezovich, E. L. 2007. *Language and Traditional Culture: Ethnolinguistic Studies*. Indrik.
- Borysenko, N., Slavova, L., Kodubovska, O. & Matushevska, N. 2024. Culture-specific items in the source and target literary texts: Classification of translation strategies. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6/1, Article 1988. <https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v6i1.1988>.
- Cómitre Narváez, I. & Valverde Zambrana, J. 2014. How to translate culture-specific items: A case study of a tourist promotion campaign by Turespaña. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 21, 71-112.
- Einhaus, A.-M. 2025. 'All I have are fragments': Ephemera and cultural memory in contemporary historical fiction about the First World War. *Literature & History*, 34/2. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03061973251397280>.
- Fernandez Guerra, A. 2012. Translating culture: Problems, strategies and practical realities. *A Journal of Literature, Culture and Literary Translation*, 1/3, 1-27.
- Firth, J. R. 1957. *Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951*. Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, M. 2003. *A Beginner's Course in Legal Translation: The Case of Culture-Bound Terms*. <http://tradulex.com/Actes2000/harvey.pdf>.
- Humboldt, W. von. 1984. *Selected Works on Linguistics*. Progress.
- Karasik, V. I. 2002. *The Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, and Discourse*. Peremena.
- Karaulov, Y. N. 1987. *The Russian Language and Linguistic Personality*. Nauka.
- Katan, D. 1999. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. St. Jerome.
- Kazyutina, E. S. & Ozerova, E. G. 2023. Linguocultural markers of literary texts by B. L. Vasiliev. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 14/1, 231-244. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-1-231-244>.

- Kazazi, L. 2014. The lacuna as a cultural phenomenon: Analyzing Martin Camaj's 'Circles'. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4/4, 353-356.
- Lotman, Y. M. 1970. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Iskusstvo.
- Lotman, Y. M. 2000. *The Semiosphere*. Iskusstvo-SPB.
- Maslova, V. A. 2001. *Linguoculturology*. Akademiya.
- Merriam-Webster. 2023. *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com>.
- Mizin, K., Slavova, L. & Khmara, V. 2021. The equivalence of terms denoting the emotion concepts of German angst and Anglo-Saxon fear: A corpus-based method. *Lege Artis Language Yesterday Today Tomorrow*, 6/2, 69-104.
- Mizin, K., Slavova, L., Letiucha, L. 2023. The emotion concept disgust and its German counterparts: Equivalence determination based on language-corpus data. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 5/1, 72-90.
- Muñoz, E. F. 2019. Analysis of the presence of Spanish culture in American culinary language. *Transletters International Journal of Translation and Interpreting*, 3, 25-48.
- Newmark, P. 1988a. *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall International.
- Newmark, P. 1988b. *Approaches to Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. 2003. *Fascinated by Languages*. John Benjamins.
- Sapir, E. 1993. *Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies*. Progress.
- Savory, T. H. 1957. *The Art of Translation*. Jonathan Cape.
- Saxton, L. 2020. A true story: Defining accuracy and authenticity in historical fiction. *Rethinking History*, 24/2, 127-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2020.1727189>.
- Slavova, L. & Vozna, M. 2022. The ethnic and cultural nature of historical terminology. *Movni i Kontseptualni Kartyny Svitu*, 1/71, 115-131.
- Stepanov, Y. S. 2004. *Constants: A Dictionary of Russian Culture*. Akademicheskii Proekt.
- Sternin, I. A. 2011. On the concept of the linguocultural specificity of language resources. *Language Literature Culture*, 1, 8-22.
- Valeišaitė, I. 2022. Peculiarities of rendering charactonyms in *The Lord of the Rings*. *Transletters International Journal of Translation and Interpreting*, 6, 127-150.
- Venuti, L. 1995. Translation and the formation of cultural identities. In C. Schäffner & H. Kelly-Holmes (Eds.), *Cultural Functions of Translation* (pp. 9-25). Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Venuti, L. 2001. Strategies of translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 240-244). Routledge.
- Veselovsky, A. N. 1989. *Historical Poetics*. Vysshaya Shkola.
- Vorobyov, V. V. 1997. *Linguoculturology: Theory and Methods*. Peoples' Friendship University of Russia.
- Vlakhov, S. & Florin, S. 1990. *The Untranslatable in Translation*. Nauka i Iskustvo.
- Vozna, M. & Slavova, L. 2022. Rendering Ukrainian historical terminology. *English Studies at NBU*, 8/2, 183-202.
- Whorf, B. L. 1960. Science and linguistics. *New Trends in Linguistics*. Vol. 1. Foreign Languages Publishing House.
- Xudoyberganova, D. 2013. *An Anthropocentric Study of Text*. Fan.
- Zorivchak, R. P. 1989. *A Case Study of the English-Language Translations of Ukrainian Prose*. Lviv University Press.

ZOHIDA QODIRJONOVA

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOLOGY,
ANDIJAN STATE UNIVERSITY,
ANDIJAN, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <QODIRJONOVAZOHIDA9@GMAIL.COM>