

Linguistic and Discursive Features of the Reception of Fitrat's Heritage in Foreign Scholarly Discourse

SADULLAYEVA DILNOZA NORTOJIQIZI
National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article examines the linguistic and discursive representation of Abdurauf Fitrat's literary heritage in foreign scholarly discourse through the framework of discourse analysis. The purpose of the study is to identify the linguistic and discursive strategies employed in the scholarly texts of foreign Fitrat scholars (E. Allworth, H. Komatsu, A. Khalid), with particular attention to the lexical-semantic, modal, and evidential means through which the concept of "reception" is represented in German, Russian, and Uzbek scholarly discourse. The research employs discourse analysis, comparative-typological analysis, lexical-semantic analysis, and contextual analysis to identify the linguistic features and discursive strategies characteristic of foreign scholarly texts on Fitrat. The results indicate that each foreign researcher employs distinctive linguistic and discursive strategies, reflected in differences in terminology, lexical-semantic choices, modality, evidentiality, and patterns of scholarly argumentation, which are closely related to their respective linguistic and academic traditions. The findings demonstrate that the linguistic representation of reception is shaped by the researcher's native language, lexical-semantic choices, modality and evidentiality patterns, and the conventions of the academic discourse in which the scholarly text is produced.

Keywords: Linguistic representation, scholarly discourse, discourse analysis, lexical-semantic analysis, evidentiality, reception, Fitrat studies.

INTRODUCTION

The linguistic representation of literary reception constitutes an important object of study for discourse analysis and text linguistics. When a literary heritage is read, interpreted, and re-articulated within a foreign linguistic and cultural environment, this process does not occur outside language: it is realized through concrete lexical, terminological, modal, and evidential choices that a researcher makes when constructing a scholarly text. It is precisely this linguistic materialization of interpretation, rather than interpretation as an abstract literary-critical act that constitutes the object of the present study. Reception theory, associated with the works of R. Ingarden, V. Zhirmunsky, H. R. Jauss, and W. Iser, provides a useful conceptual background, since it treats the meaning of a text as reconstructed through successive acts of reading rather than as a fixed property of the text itself. For the purposes of this article, however, reception is approached primarily as a linguistic-discursive phenomenon: every act of scholarly reception is expressed through language, and is therefore shaped by the lexical, semantic, terminological, and discourse-organizational resources available to the researcher who produces it. The reception of Abdurauf Fitrat's (1886-1938) literary heritage in foreign scholarship offers a linguistically relevant corpus for this kind of analysis. Fitrat's works have been discussed by researchers representing different linguistic, cultural, and academic discourse communities, and the scholarly texts of E. Allworth, H. Komatsu, and A. Khalid demonstrate differences not only in interpretive content but, more importantly for this study, in the linguistic means through which that content is constructed in terminological choice, argumentative structure, modal marking, and evidential strategy. Reception is therefore treated here not as a literary-critical category but as a linguistic-discursive process: the researcher's choice of terminology, lexical-semantic units, argumentative constructions, and discourse markers reflects the discourse conventions and academic register within which a given scholarly tradition operates. Particular attention is given to the lexical-semantic representation of the very concept of "reception" across

languages, since its semantic realization is not identical in German, Russian, and Uzbek scholarly discourse, where it intersects with adjacent terms such as literary influence, literary contact, and aesthetic perception. This terminological variation is itself a linguistic fact worth documenting, as it shows how a single theoretical concept is lexicalized differently depending on the linguistic-academic tradition in which it is used.

The linguistic dimension of foreign Fitrat studies can be observed most directly through modality, evidentiality, terminological choice, and discourse-marking patterns in scholarly argumentation. Speculative expressions, evidential constructions, and source-oriented formulations are not stylistic ornamentation but systematic linguistic devices through which a researcher signals the epistemic status of a claim and positions their text within a given discourse tradition. Identifying these devices makes it possible to describe, in linguistically verifiable terms, the discursive strategies characteristic of individual Fitrat scholars and to relate them to the discourse conventions of their respective academic and linguistic communities.

Accordingly, the purpose of this article is to identify the linguistic and discursive strategies employed in the scholarly texts of E. Allworth, H. Komatsu, and A. Khalid, with particular attention to the lexical-semantic, terminological, modal, evidential, and discourse-marking features through which Fitrat's literary heritage and the concept of reception are linguistically constructed. The study further provides a comparative analysis of the relationship between these linguistic choices and the discourse traditions of the academic communities in which the respective texts were produced.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The source materials for this study comprise the scholarly texts dedicated to Fitrat's heritage by foreign Fitrat scholars E. Allworth, H. Komatsu, A. Khalid, and Uzbek researcher A. Qosimov, as well as the theoretical views on reception theory by R. Ingarden, V. Zhirmunsky, M. Bakhtin, V. Khalizev, A. Esin, and A. Matyushkin. Specifically, the core research corpus is built

upon E. Allworth's interpretations of Fitrat's works *Qiyomat* (The Doomsday), *Bedilbirmajlisda* (Bedil in a Gathering), and *Shaytonningtangrigaisyoni* (Satan's Rebellion Against God); H. Komatsu's source-study research on the work *Munozara* (The Debate); and A. Khalid's works analyzing Jadidism within a historical-political context.

The following methods were utilized in the study: the method of discourse analysis to identify the styles of argumentation and narrative strategies used in the researchers' texts; the method of comparative-typological analysis to determine the differences in the concept of "reception" across the German, Russian, and Uzbek languages; and the method of hermeneutic interpretation to analyze the texts based on M. Bakhtin's concepts of dialogic understanding and W. Iser's concept of "gaps in the text." Methodologically, the research relies on four principles: historical-receptive-discursive analysis, interpretative-comparative analysis, hermeneutic-dialogic analysis, and intentional-translation studies analysis.

The research process was carried out in three stages: in the first stage, the selected texts were classified according to their genre, scope, and period of creation; in the second stage, each text was observed for its argumentation style, terminological choices, and narrative strategies; and in the third stage, the identified discursive characteristics were synthesized based on the theories of reception and interpretation. This step-by-step approach served to ensure the consistency and scholarly validity of the analysis results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The linguistic analysis demonstrates that although the term "reception" functions as a shared cross-linguistic label, its lexical-semantic scope and collocational behavior vary systematically by language, which is itself a matter for lexical-semantic and terminological analysis rather than literary interpretation. In German explanatory dictionaries, the lexeme *Rezeption* primarily denotes "the acceptance or assimilation of a foreign idea or cultural asset," as well as the reception of a text or

artwork by a reader; etymologically, the word derives from the Latin “reception” “to receive.” In Russian and Uzbek scholarly discourse, by contrast, the same conceptual field is more commonly lexicalized through collocations with literary influence, literary contact, and aesthetic perception. This lexical-semantic divergence directly shapes how foreign researchers linguistically frame their analysis of Fitrat's texts: representatives of the German and American scholarly traditions tend to select vocabulary foregrounding “influence on the receiving consciousness,” whereas representatives of the Russian-Soviet tradition favor terminology built around “literary contact and influence.” In Uzbek scholarly writing, the same concept has been lexicalized variously as a “receptive approach” or “aesthetic perception,” which is itself linguistic evidence of how multi-layered the underlying terminological field is across discourse communities.

Each foreign Fitrat scholar exhibits a distinct, linguistically identifiable discursive strategy, realized through recurrent lexical and syntactic choices rather than through content alone. In the texts of H. Komatsu, a source-study discourse type predominates, marked linguistically by factographic, document-referencing constructions and precise date- and source-citing formulations a register characteristic of the source-study school of Japanese Turkology. In A. Khalid's texts, a historical-political discourse type predominates instead, lexically organized around nation-building and institutional-political terminology, consistent with the analytical register of American Sovietology. A particularly instructive case is E. Allworth's texts, where the concept of “double talk” names a distinct discursive strategy realized through a systematic linguistic tension between surface-level and implied propositional content: the researcher reconstructs the “unspoken” meaning of texts produced under Soviet censorship by attending to what is linguistically withheld rather than stated. This can be related to W. Iser's notion of “gaps in the text”: every text contains indeterminacies that the reader must linguistically and inferentially fill, and it is in this inferential filling that a researcher's own discursive-interpretative idiolect takes shape.

The register differences among these three researchers can further be explained through audience design. Komatsu writes primarily for a professional Orientalist readership, which correlates with a high density of specialized terminology and low redundancy. Khalid addresses a broader readership interested in Sovietology and history, which correlates linguistically with more explicit contextual glossing and lower terminological density. Allworth, addressing both a professional and a philosophical-literary readership, produces a hybrid register in which scholarly-analytical and essayistic stylistic markers co-occur within the same text a linguistically measurable register-blending strategy.

From a discourse-linguistic perspective, the intertextual relationship between a scholarly text and its object text is itself linguistically constituted. M. Bakhtin argued that “dialogue is not restricted by any boundaries,” and that a text truly begins to live only when it enters into contact with another text [3: 371-373]. Read as a claim about intertextuality, this suggests that each foreign Fitrat scholar's text is linguistically indexed to Fitrat's text through citation, paraphrase, and evaluative commentary, and that the specific linguistic form of this indexing is shaped by the researcher's native language and discourse register. A related, more explicitly hermeneutic formulation is offered by Gadamer, who described the process of approaching a foreign culture as *das ist alles nur Verstehen* (“this is all simply understanding”) [1 380].

The variation among the interpretations offered by Allworth, Komatsu, and Khalid raises a further, discourse-community-oriented question: on what grounds can such linguistically and interpretively divergent texts still be evaluated as belonging to the same scholarly discourse? V. E. Khalizev's concept of the “range of scientifically valid interpretations” provides a useful criterion here [5: 8]: within a single discourse community, several interpretations may be linguistically and argumentatively grounded without being infinite in number, while interpretations falling outside this range violate the evidential and argumentative norms of the discourse community and are accordingly evaluated as scientifically inadequate. On this basis, although Allworth's

“double talk” reading and Khalid's historical-political reading differ sharply in content, both remain within the shared scholarly “range” because both are constructed through documented, evidentially marked argumentation rather than unsupported assertion.

From the standpoint of translation and pragmatics, A. V. Matyushkin's distinction is directly relevant: the text's “intensionality” (its internal semantic orientation) must be distinguished from the author's antecedent “creative intent” (*zamyсел*) [4: 15-17]. In pragmatic terms, this is close to the distinction between speaker-meaning and text-meaning: foreign researchers not infrequently conflate Fitrat's biographical intent with the meaning linguistically encoded in the text itself, a conflation that constitutes a methodological error requiring separate attention within discourse analysis. As A. Qosimov notes, in the reception process the final evaluative judgment rests with the reader-researcher, but the linguistic means through which that judgment is expressed depend directly on the researcher's own linguistic-discursive tradition [2: 30].

The linguistic core of this analysis lies in the systematic patterning of modality and evidentiality markers across the three researchers' texts. In E. Allworth's writing, a high frequency of epistemic modality markers of low commitment (“perhaps,” “apparently,” “might be”) is linguistically consistent with a hypothetical-hermeneutic reading strategy that foregrounds inference over assertion. H. Komatsu's texts, by contrast, show a high frequency of direct evidential constructions (“according to the document,” “as recorded in the source”), linguistically encoding the factographic-documentary discourse norm of the Japanese source-study tradition. A. Khalid's texts favor institutional evidentiality (“as historical documents testify”), indexing an argumentative style grounded in institutional and archival authority rather than individual inference. These modal and evidential patterns can additionally be correlated with discourse-marker distribution: Allworth's text shows a comparatively high density of concessive and contrastive markers (“however,” “yet,” “nonetheless”), consistent with a dialectical, tension-reading strategy; Khalid's text favors causal-

consecutive markers (“consequently,” “as a result”), consistent with a historical-explanatory strategy; and Komatsu's text favors additive-cumulative markers (“furthermore,” “in addition”), consistent with a factographic, list-like presentation of documentary evidence. Taken together, these lexical-grammatical patterns allow the discursive diversity of foreign Fitrat studies to be demonstrated in linguistically precise and empirically verifiable terms, rather than through impressionistic characterization alone.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis conducted demonstrates that the attitude of foreign researchers toward Fitrat's literary heritage differs not only from a conceptual-theoretical standpoint but also from a discursive-linguistic perspective. Each researcher (Allworth, Komatsu, Khalid), proceeding from their own national academic tradition and the terminological-discursive capabilities of their language, approaches Fitrat's text through a distinct strategy (source-study discourse, historical-political discourse, and the “double talk” strategy). The lexical-semantic differences in the concept of “reception” across the German, Russian, and Uzbek languages further confirm that the same theoretical concept acquires different semantic nuances in distinct linguistic and scholarly environments. The hermeneutic-dialogic views of Bakhtin and Gadamer allow foreign Fitrat studies to be interpreted as a means of interethnic understanding, while Khalizev's concept of “range” serves to explain the diversity in various interpretations within scientifically grounded boundaries.

In conclusion, studying foreign Fitrat studies through the methods of discourse analysis alongside reception and interpretation theories elevates research in this field to a new, linguistically grounded methodological level. The proposed analytical model can serve as a universal methodological framework that can be applied to analyze the reception of not only Fitrat's heritage but also that of other Jadid writers abroad. In future studies, the corpus analysis of foreign Fitrat studies texts, along with the statistical-linguistic analysis of the modality

and argumentative devices used in them, could hold distinct scholarly prospects.

It should also be noted that this study has certain limitations: the corpus selected for analysis is restricted to the work of three foreign researchers; in future research, expanding it to include texts by representatives of French, Turkish, or Chinese Fitrat studies could be of particular interest. Furthermore, the current analysis is qualitative in nature; enriching it with quantitative analysis using corpus linguistics tools in the future will further strengthen the statistical validity of the research findings.

REFERENCES

1. Gadamer, H.-G. 1986. *Hermeneutics I: Truth and method*. Tübingen, p. 380.
2. Qosimov, A. G'. 2021. The Problem of Reception in Uzbek Literary Studies: A Study of Translations from German Literature. PhD dissertation abstract, Tashkent.
3. Bakhtin, M. M. 1979. *The Aesthetics of Verbal Creativity*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura.
4. Matyushkin, A. V. 2007. *Problems of Interpreting Literary Texts*. Petrozavodsk: KGPU Publishing House.
5. Khalizev, V. E. 1977. On the theory of literary criticism. *Scientific Reports of Higher Education: Philological Sciences*, 1, 8.

SADULLAYEVA DILNOZA NORTOJIQIZI

DOCTORAL STUDENT,

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF UZBEKISTAN,

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <SADULLAYEVADILNOZAXON@GMAIL.UZ>