

THE ESSENCE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE POETIC SIGN

Ortiqov Eldor Mardonovich

Independent Researcher at Denau

Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy

Phone: +998 91 517 07 47

Email: eldor.mardonovich@bk.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5046-403X>

Annotation:

This article analyzes the discursive interpretation of poetic texts, focusing on their semantic and cognitive features. Poetic texts are connected with surrounding culture and other texts, allowing the formation of new meanings. The discursive approach examines the text through the “author–text–reader” relationship, emphasizing the importance of text creation and perception processes. The article also discusses the multiplicity of interpretations, cognitive-discursive factors, semantic and emotional components of poetic speech, zones of uncertainty, and their influence on reader activity. As a result, the polysemantic potential of poetic texts and the significance of interaction with the reader are highlighted.

Keywords: Poetic text, discourse, interpretation, polysemantic, cognitive-discursive approach, semantic component, emotional component, zones of uncertainty

Any poetic text is connected with preceding texts and other texts of the surrounding culture; in other words, it operates within multiple semiotic systems and within a specific linguocultural space. Identifying intertextual relationships in a literary text allows us to determine the degree and nature of influence of other texts related to national or global culture, as well as the mechanism through which new meanings emerge as a result of these connections. To interpret a text as a two-way process, the basis is the general characteristics of text creation and perception, as well as the universal mechanism of text activity that is accepted from opposing positions (author – reader).

According to many researchers of literary communication, the meaning of a literary work does not reside in the poet, but develops in the mind of the recipient. N.B. Petrova writes:

“The listener may understand the thought hidden behind the word better than the speaker, and the reader may grasp the idea of the poet’s work better than the poet himself. The essence and power of such a work depend not on what the author intended, but on the effect it produces on the reader or audience, that is, on the infinite possibilities of its meaning” [1].

Thus, the discursive approach makes the study of a “poetic” text particularly relevant from the perspective of the author-text-reader relationship, taking into account the specific characteristics of text production and perception.

Perception is a crucial element in any creative process: the reader's capacity for co-creation complements the text, and the multiplicity of interpretations indicates the text's modification by the reader. The main feature of poetic text perception is precisely the plurality of interpretations. What factors determine this plurality, and what is it related to? From a cognitive-discursive perspective, the multiplicity of interpretations can be seen as both a subjective and objective factor of poetic communication [2].

Subjectively, interpretation is related to the characteristics of the reader as a poetic linguistic personality and is determined by their unique communicative goals, knowledge level, social status, psychological and biological traits, and the time and place of communication.

The model of semantic information in poetic discourse includes the following essential components:

Aesthetic component: information about the features of artistic poetic communication, reflecting the real world in figurative form from the author's aesthetic ideal.

Emotional component: information about the poet's emotional state and feelings involved in the act of creating the poem.

Sometimes, factual information in a poetic text—which may be difficult to identify – is the “material” carrier of the deeper, central meaning of lyrical communication [3].

Within this approach, the discursive space of a text can be seen as a specially organized set of information, which constitutes the source of meaning formation in the poetic text.

When commenting on a text, the reader relies on culture and simultaneously on other factors – “transforming all elements of the text into semantically rich elements, considering their interconnections...” The increase in informational content is largely explained by the “density of verse lines” and, correspondingly, by the “vertical” rather than “horizontal” interconnections of each poetic word, as opposed to prose.

The multiple connections of each poetic word create an elevation of meaning. Consequently, in poetry, almost every word can be perceived and interpreted differently, and the poetic structure becomes saturated with meanings, capable of conveying complex semantic nuances that cannot be expressed in ordinary language.

The reader's interpretation is based on the universal text-creating category of coherence, whose main mechanisms are retrospection and anticipation [4].

A poetic communicative act is aimed at creating new information. According to Lotman, it differs from a communicative act whose purpose is the transmission of constant (scientific) information, in which the text is transmitted “intact from the sender to the addressee.” In poetic discourse, the transmission of the text from sender to receiver involves the system's movement with a shift of meaning that is far from insignificant.

Poetic discourse incorporates the necessary resources and includes the rules that regulate the processes of text production and text creation within a given discursive space—that is, the

production of the text by the addressee and the perception of the text by the receiver. For communicants, this virtual structure exists in the form of traces in memory and is also present during its objectification. This virtual structure is objectified as a special poetic language in the process of transmitting poetic information from the poet to the reader [2].

Poetic meanings are determined by the structure of poetic discourse and the poetic cognitope, which is linked to the linear combinatorics of poetry. In a poetic text, the semantic modulation of words through sound, the forced influence of metrical constraints on the selection of linguistic means, and the unification of words into a whole through rhythm – all of these, according to I. Brodsky, act as “a tremendous accelerator of the poet’s consciousness.”

According to Yu.M. Lotman:

“...as an integral part of the unique structure of the poem, significant elements of language are connected with a complex system of relations and oppositions that would be impossible in ordinary language construction. This endows each individual element, as well as the entire structure, with a completely distinct semantic load” [4].

The formal construction of the poetic text predefines the existence of the poetic word – it serves as a secondary (internal) source necessary for producing texts within a given discursive space. According to many researchers, the motivating factor of reader activity – the driving force of the reader’s interaction with the text – is the presence of zones of ambiguity, gaps, “empty spaces,” textual voids, hidden elements, and the like. These create receptive difficulties and thereby stimulate the cognitive processing of the text. They encourage the reader to develop certain expectations, to determine the predicted prospective semantics of the text and its components, and, at the same time, to form conceptual ideas about the semantic and structural parts of the text, which are then verified through experience (corrected and enriched), allowing the gaps to be filled. By resolving uncertainty in this way, the reader reduces the polysemantic potential of the text to a single interpretation [3].

In this process, the predicted existence in the text, which is connected to the original image, collides with unexpected meanings conditioned by the context. The poetic image created in such a case resembles a sudden “flash” or “unexpected rethinking” arising from astonishment. As a stylistic construct that appears before the emergence of each element, this highlights the role of the “reader” as a signal receiver who participates in the text’s realization.

References

1. Lotman, Yu.M. *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta*. Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1970.
2. Brodsky, I. O poezii. Moscow: Progress, 1988.
3. Petrova, N.B. *Psikhologiya vospriyatiya khudozhestvennogo teksta*. Moscow: Nauka, 2002.
4. Lotman, Yu.M., Uspenskiy, B.A. *Tipologiya kul'tury*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1978.