

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LINGUAPOETIC ELEMENTS IN THE IN WORKS OF JACK LONDON AND ABDULLA QODIRIY

Abdulazizov Dovudbek

Teacher at Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Introduction. Language and culture are inseparable phenomena. Linguoculturology studies how linguistic units reflect the worldview, mentality, and traditions of a particular nation. In literature, this interconnection manifests through artistic and linguistic devices that carry cultural meanings. Both Abdulla Qodiriy, a pioneer of modern Uzbek prose, and Jack London, a representative of American naturalism, vividly express the cultural and social essence of their nations through their language and style.

Theoretical Framework. The concept of the **linguocultureme** lies at the heart of linguocultural studies. It is defined as the smallest unit of cultural meaning embedded in language - a linguistic sign that reflects national worldview, traditions, and social norms. Unlike ordinary words, linguoculturemes carry emotional and historical associations that link speakers to their cultural identity.

A linguocultureme may take the form of a **word, idiom, proverb, metaphor, or even an entire text** that embodies shared cultural experience. For instance, in Uzbek, expressions such as “**ona tilim**” (my mother tongue), “**navro‘z**” (the traditional New Year celebration symbolizing renewal), or “**millat g‘ururi**” (national pride) express not only lexical meaning but also deep emotional resonance. Each of these terms encapsulates the moral and historical consciousness of Uzbek society - the reverence for language, heritage, and unity.

Similarly, in English, phrases like “**the American dream**” or “**frontier spirit**” reflect the cultural myths and ideals that shape American identity. These expressions embody aspirations toward freedom, self-determination, and progress. As Wierzbicka (1997) notes, such culture-specific meanings “reveal how people think, feel, and act within their own cultural universe” (p. 23).

In the works of Abdulla Qodiriy and Jack London, linguoculturemes appear as vehicles of collective experience and worldview. Qodiriy’s moral expressions and metaphors mirror the values of honor, duty, and emotional integrity central to Uzbek culture. London’s naturalistic phrases, in contrast, project individualism and struggle for survival characteristic of early 20th-century American thought. Through these linguistic and cultural codes, both authors articulate their nations’ moral and psychological landscapes.

Understanding linguoculturemes thus provides a theoretical foundation for comparing cross-cultural literary imagery. It enables researchers to analyze not only what is said but how culture shapes the way meaning is constructed and perceived.

Comparative Analysis. Abdulla Qodiriy’s O‘tgan kunlar portrays Uzbek society in transition, balancing the tension between traditional customs and the influence of modernization. Through phrases such as “ota yurt” (fatherland), “vijdon azobi” (the torment of conscience), and “baxtli kelajak” (a happy future), Qodiriy presents characters torn between moral obligation and personal desire. For instance, when Otabek struggles between love and duty, Qodiriy writes about his vijdon azobi - a phrase that carries both spiritual and ethical weight, reflecting the deeply moral character of Uzbek culture. This linguistic choice mirrors the nation’s value system, where conscience (vijdon) is not just an inner feeling but a measure of human dignity. Similarly, the recurring concept of “ota yurt” symbolizes more than a homeland - it embodies ancestry, loyalty, and the sacred connection to one’s roots. When Otabek feels responsibility

toward his ota yurt, Qodiriy emphasizes a collective identity built on respect for family and heritage. Such expressions function as **linguoculturemes**, encapsulating cultural values that define the Uzbek worldview.

In contrast, Jack London's *White Fang* reflects the harsh realities of survival and the natural struggle between instinct and civilization. Phrases like "the call of the wild" and "the law of club and fang" reveal the animalistic foundation of human existence. For example, the phrase "the law of club and fang" describes the brutal code of survival that governs life in the wilderness. Here, the club symbolizes human dominance, while the fang stands for nature's raw instinct. London's choice of language creates a linguistic metaphor for the eternal conflict between primal instinct and moral restraint - a key theme in American naturalism.

Moreover, the phrase "the call of the wild" encapsulates the irresistible pull of nature and freedom. It is not merely a physical sound but a **metaphorical voice** that represents man's longing for authenticity beyond the constraints of civilization. London's use of such metaphors conveys the American spirit of independence and exploration - a reflection of the frontier mentality that shaped the nation's identity.

When we compare both authors, a clear contrast emerges:

Qodiriy's metaphors are **social and moral**, focusing on duty, honor, and communal harmony.

London's metaphors are **natural and existential**, centering on survival, freedom, and the individual's relationship with nature.

Yet, both use **language as a cultural mirror**. In Qodiriy's world, conscience and family are the guiding forces of human behavior, while in London's, nature and instinct are the defining powers. Both writers use **linguopoetic imagery** to reveal how their cultures understand humanity - one through collective morality, the other through individual struggle.

Translation and Cultural Interpretation. Translating Abdulla Qodiriy's works into English requires more than lexical accuracy — it demands sensitivity to cultural meaning. His novel *O'tgan kunlar* is rich in linguistic expressions that reflect Uzbek social values, moral codes, and emotional depth. Many of these phrases carry implications that cannot be conveyed through direct translation.

For instance, Qodiriy's expression "**ko'ngil ko'zi**" literally means "the eye of the heart." However, in Uzbek, it represents a spiritual and emotional intuition that goes beyond physical sight. Rendering it simply as "heart's eye" or "inner vision" risks losing its deep cultural connotation of empathy and wisdom. A translator must find a balance - perhaps using "inner perception" or "spiritual insight" - to maintain both clarity and cultural resonance.

Another example is the phrase "**el or-nomusi**", which literally translates to "the nation's honor." In Qodiriy's narrative, this concept is not only patriotic but also moral, representing a shared sense of dignity and collective responsibility. Translating it mechanically would strip the expression of its emotional charge and historical background rooted in Uzbek communal life.

Similarly, the expression "**yor yo'lida o'lmoq**" (to die for one's beloved) reflects the romantic fatalism and emotional intensity typical of Qodiriy's style. While English might render it as "to die for love," this translation lacks the poetic rhythm and cultural resonance found in Uzbek, where love is often portrayed as sacred sacrifice.

Such examples show that translation is an act of interpretation rather than substitution. The translator must convey not only what the words mean but also how they feel within the author's cultural framework. As Bassnett (2014) argues, translation is "a process of negotiation between cultures" (p. 12), and Qodiriy's texts exemplify how linguistic imagery carries collective identity.

In contrast, Jack London's naturalistic imagery presents fewer cultural barriers but demands emotional precision. Translating his phrase **"the law of club and fang"** into another language involves maintaining its raw brutality and primal tone. The challenge, then, is not cultural equivalence but preserving emotional force.

Thus, effective translation of both authors' works depends on cultural empathy and linguistic creativity. The translator acts as a cultural mediator, ensuring that the rhythm, emotion, and values embedded in Qodiriy's Uzbek prose or London's American narrative remain alive across languages.

Conclusion. The comparative exploration of Abdulla Qodiriy and Jack London reveals that language in literature serves as far more than a means of communication - it becomes a vessel of cultural memory, moral consciousness, and collective identity. Both writers, though separated by geography and history, share an artistic commitment to expressing the human condition through their respective linguistic worlds. Qodiriy's prose in O'tgan kunlar embodies the moral and emotional depth of Uzbek culture, where expressions such as *vijdon azobi* ("torment of conscience") and *baxtli kelajak* ("happy future") evoke spiritual struggle and social aspiration. His language reflects a society negotiating between tradition and modernity, between moral duty and individual desire.

In contrast, Jack London's *White Fang* articulates a distinctly American worldview rooted in survival, freedom, and the eternal tension between civilization and instinct. Phrases like "the law of club and fang" and "the call of the wild" symbolize the raw forces of nature that define not only the animal world but also the essence of human courage and resilience. Through such imagery, London translates the American frontier experience into a universal narrative of endurance and transformation. Both authors use metaphor and symbolism as linguistic mirrors of their societies. Qodiriy's metaphors of "light" and "darkness," for instance, often represent moral clarity and social ignorance, while London's use of "wilderness" becomes a metaphor for the untamed forces within the human spirit. These linguopoetic devices reveal how each author internalizes cultural values within the structure of language itself.

The act of translation between these two literary traditions also unveils the complexity of linguocultural transfer. Qodiriy's culturally bound expressions — such as *ko'ngil tozaligi* (purity of heart) or *millat g'ururi* (national pride) — cannot be fully rendered into English without losing their emotional and ethical resonance. Similarly, London's natural imagery, when translated into Uzbek, requires adaptation to preserve its symbolic strength beyond its original context. Translation, therefore, is not mere substitution of words but a creative dialogue between two cultural realities, demanding sensitivity to both linguistic form and cultural essence.

Ultimately, this comparative analysis underscores that literature is a living embodiment of cultural consciousness. Through their artistry, Qodiriy and London demonstrate that every language holds a worldview — a way of seeing, feeling, and valuing the world. Their works remind us that language shapes thought, that metaphor carries history, and that literature serves as a bridge between peoples.

In future studies, deeper examination of cross-cultural metaphor and translation strategies could illuminate how literary meaning evolves in different linguistic environments. Such research would not only enhance understanding of comparative poetics but also strengthen the dialogue between nations through literature. By reading Qodiriy and London together, we are reminded that though languages differ, the human desire to express truth, emotion, and moral vision remains universally shared.

References:

1. London J. White Fang. Macmillan. 1906.
2. Qodiriy, A. O'tgan kunlar. Tashkent. 1925.
3. Karasik, V. I. Linguistic Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse. Moscow: Gnosis. 2002.
4. Wierzbicka, A. Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words. Oxford University Press. 1997.
5. Sapir, E. Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. Harcourt, Brace & Company. 1921.
6. Bassnett, S. Translation Studies (4th ed.). Routledge. 2014.
7. Qodiriy A. O'tgan kunlar [Bygone Days]. Tashkent: State Publishing House. 1925.
8. London J. White Fang. New York: Macmillan. 1906.