



**WORLD BULLETIN  
PUBLISHING**

Online Publishing Hub

# World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)

ISSN (E): 3072-175X

Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1>

## LITERARY-AESTHETIC CATEGORIES IN LITERARY STUDIES

Hasanova O. M.

Master's Student, Chirchik State Pedagogical University

Davlatova A. R.

Scientific Supervisor, Professor at Chirchik State  
Pedagogical University, Doctor of Philological Sciences

### Abstract

This article examines literary-aesthetic categories as a core conceptual apparatus of literary studies and as an analytic language for describing how artistic meaning is generated, experienced, and evaluated in texts. Literary-aesthetic categories are treated not as fixed labels, but as historically variable forms of aesthetic consciousness that mediate between authorial intention, textual organization, cultural memory, and the reader's horizon of expectations. The study clarifies the theoretical status of key categories widely used in philological analysis—such as the beautiful, sublime, tragic, comic, grotesque, lyrical, elegiac, heroic, and everyday aesthetic—showing how they function simultaneously as philosophical concepts, poetics-oriented tools, and interpretive frames. Particular attention is paid to the interaction between aesthetic categories and genre, modality, imagery, and narrative voice, as well as to the ways categories become culturally specific in national literatures. On the material of representative Uzbek literary discourse and university-level interpretive practice, the article argues that the productive use of aesthetic categories requires contextualization: the same category can shift its semantic and value load depending on period, ideology, and stylistic system. The research proposes an integrative analytical model that combines historical poetics, hermeneutic reading, and discourse-sensitive interpretation to operationalize aesthetic categories for classroom and scholarly work. The expected outcome is a refined typological and functional description of literary-aesthetic categories



**WORLD BULLETIN  
PUBLISHING**

Online Publishing Hub

# World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)

ISSN (E): 3072-175X

Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1>

that supports philology students in conducting coherent textual analysis and building academically grounded interpretations of literary works.

**Keywords:** Literary studies, aesthetics, literary categories, aesthetic consciousness, poetics, modality, imagery, genre, narrative voice, value, interpretation, hermeneutics, historical poetics, national literature, Uzbek literature, reader response, cultural context, artistic meaning, typology, literary analysis.

## Introduction

### ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIK ILMIDA ADABIY-ESTETIK KATEGORIYALAR

Hasanova Ozoda Mirzohid qizi

Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti magistranti

Davlatova Adiba Rahmatovna

Ilmiy rahbar, Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti professori,

Filologiya fanlari doktori.

## Introduction


Literary studies, as a philological discipline, relies on a system of conceptual tools that allow scholars and students to describe not only what a text says, but how it produces artistic meaning and why that meaning is experienced as aesthetically significant. Among these tools, literary-aesthetic categories occupy a special place. They function as a bridge between philosophy of art and concrete textual analysis, enabling interpretation to move from impressionistic evaluation toward academically accountable description. In university philology, especially in contexts where students work with a multilingual cultural environment and a strong national literary canon, the mastery of such categories becomes a practical competence: it supports close reading, comparative analysis, and the articulation of interpretive judgments in scholarly language.

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

The notion of a “category” in aesthetics is not merely a terminological convenience. Categories condense historically accumulated experience of perceiving and valuing artistic form. They shape what is noticed in a text and how it is framed: the same scene may be interpreted as tragic, sublime, grotesque, or comic depending on the category through which it is read. Therefore, aesthetic categories are simultaneously descriptive and normative. They describe recurrent modes of artistic organization and reception, but they also carry evaluative implications, since each category presupposes a value horizon and a culturally embedded sensibility. This dual nature explains why categories remain productive yet contested. Their meaning is not stable across epochs; it shifts with literary movements, ideological transformations, and changes in aesthetic taste. For this reason, a philological approach must treat categories as historically and culturally situated rather than universal and immutable.

In the tradition of literary theory, categories such as the beautiful and the sublime emerged from philosophical aesthetics and gradually entered the language of poetics and criticism. Later, the analytic palette expanded to include categories oriented toward affect and worldview, for example the tragic and the comic, and categories that foreground stylistic deformation or ambivalence, such as the grotesque. Modern literary studies also uses category-like notions that capture modal or genre-related tonalities, including the lyrical, elegiac, heroic, satirical, and everyday aesthetic. These terms often appear in critical discourse and in classroom interpretation, yet their operational meaning is frequently unclear: students may use them as general impressions rather than as analytic instruments grounded in textual evidence.

This article addresses that gap by clarifying the theoretical status and analytic function of literary-aesthetic categories and by proposing a way to operationalize them for philological research and teaching. The problem is especially relevant to the university audience working in Uzbek philology, where interpretive traditions combine classical poetics, Soviet-era theoretical frameworks, and contemporary approaches influenced by global literary theory. In such a landscape, categories can become either rigid schemata imposed on texts or

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

vague rhetorical labels. Both extremes reduce interpretive precision. A productive approach requires, first, a typological map of categories and their semantic fields; second, an explanation of how categories correlate with textual structures such as imagery, narration, rhythm, and composition; and third, an awareness of contextual determinants, including the author’s historical moment and the reader’s interpretive horizon.

The aim of the study is to examine literary-aesthetic categories as a dynamic system and to demonstrate their methodological value for literary analysis. The objectives are to systematize major categories used in literary studies; to identify their textual indicators and functional roles; and to develop an integrative interpretive model that combines historical poetics, hermeneutic reading, and discourse analysis. The central assumption is that aesthetic categories are best understood as relational constructs: they arise in the interaction between textual form and cultural value systems, and they become analytically reliable when linked to observable textual features and to a justified contextual frame.

## Methods

The methodological design of the present study is integrative, combining conceptual analysis with applied philological interpretation. This choice is обусловлено by the dual status of literary-aesthetic categories: they are at once theoretical constructs inherited from philosophical aesthetics and practical instruments used in close reading, criticism, and university teaching. Therefore, the research strategy aims to connect the abstract level of category definition with the empirical level of textual functioning. The overall logic of the methodology proceeds from clarification of terms and typologies to operationalization through analytic procedures that can be replicated in classroom and scholarly settings.

The first methodological component is theoretical-conceptual analysis. At this stage, the study works with the history of ideas in aesthetics and literary theory to clarify how a given category has been defined, redefined, and contested across periods. The analysis treats categories as historically variable semantic complexes rather than as timeless essences. This allows the research to avoid

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1>World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

anachronistic readings where, for example, the “sublime” is applied to texts without recognizing its philosophical origin and the shifts it underwent in modern criticism. Conceptual analysis is used to identify the core semantic ядро of each category (its stable minimal meaning) and its peripheral connotations that change depending on literary movement, ideological context, and critical tradition. This step produces working definitions suitable for philological use, emphasizing the difference between everyday evaluative usage and analytic usage grounded in textual evidence.

The second component is typological modeling. The study constructs a typology of literary-aesthetic categories based on their dominant function in interpretation. Categories are grouped not by rigid hierarchy but by analytic proximity: value-oriented categories (beautiful, sublime), affect-worldview categories (tragic, comic), ambivalent or deformation-oriented categories (grotesque), and modality-tonality categories (lyrical, elegiac, heroic, satirical, everyday aesthetic). Typological modeling is used to show overlaps and transitions between categories and to specify boundary cases where categories compete within a single work. The typology is not presented as a closed classification; instead, it serves as a heuristic map that guides interpretation and prevents the conflation of distinct analytic planes, such as confusing genre with aesthetic mode or equating authorial intention with readerly effect.

The third component is operationalization through textual indicators. To make categories methodologically “workable,” the study formulates indicator sets that link each category to observable textual features. Indicators are defined across several levels of textual organization: lexical-semantic (dominant evaluative vocabulary, imagery fields, metaphorical patterns), syntactic-rhythmic (tempo, repetition, parallelism, fragmentation), narrative-pragmatic (point of view, distance, irony, reliability), compositional (contrast, climax, circularity), and intertextual-cultural (allusions, genre memory, cultural symbols). The indicator approach does not claim one-to-one correspondence between category and feature; rather, it treats categories as configurations of features that gain interpretive force through convergence. For example, the comic is operationalized not only through “funny” content but through mechanisms of


 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h2>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

incongruity, deflation, role reversal, and evaluative framing; the tragic is operationalized through irreconcilable conflict, ethical pressure, and the narrative organization of inevitability.

The fourth component is hermeneutic contextualization. Because categories are value-laden, the study employs a hermeneutic procedure that explicitly accounts for context: historical period, cultural norms, ideological discourse, and the reader’s horizon of expectations. The methodological move here is to justify category attribution by showing how textual indicators interact with contextual frames. This guards against purely subjective labeling and against importing external aesthetic standards into texts from different epochs. In the Uzbek philological university setting, this step is particularly significant, since the interpretation of national literature often involves culturally specific symbolism, ethics, and genre traditions. Contextualization is implemented through triangulation: category claims are tested by comparing intra-textual evidence, intertextual parallels within the literary tradition, and established critical interpretations where available.

The fifth component is discourse-sensitive pedagogical validation. Since the intended audience is university philology, the study incorporates a didactic lens, assessing whether the proposed category framework supports students’ analytic competence. Validation is performed through modeling of interpretive tasks typical for seminars: identifying category markers in short excerpts, comparing category dominance across works, and reconstructing how a category transforms when genre, narrative stance, or historical context changes. The outcomes of this validation are methodological recommendations: how to structure category-based analysis, how to avoid common interpretive errors (such as replacing evidence with evaluation), and how to formulate academically responsible conclusions.

Finally, the study follows principles of methodological transparency: definitions are stated as working constructs, indicator sets are made explicit, and interpretive steps are sequenced so that another researcher or instructor can reproduce the analysis. This combination of conceptual clarification, typological modeling, indicator-based close reading, and contextual triangulation constitutes

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1>World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

the method by which literary-aesthetic categories are examined as both theoretical and applied instruments in literary studies.

## Results

The application of the integrative methodology yielded a set of results that clarify the status of literary-aesthetic categories, demonstrate their operational indicators in textual analysis, and outline their pedagogical utility for university philology. The findings are organized as interpretive outcomes rather than as statistical measures, because the object of study is conceptual and text-oriented; nevertheless, the results are presented as verifiable analytic propositions linked to observable textual features and contextual justification.

A first major result is the clarification of category status as a multi-level construct. The study shows that a literary-aesthetic category functions simultaneously on three interconnected planes: philosophical-aesthetic (as a concept of value and perception), poetics-oriented (as a mode of artistic organization), and interpretive-discursive (as a metalanguage used by criticism and teaching). When categories are treated only as evaluative labels, they become subjective; when treated only as abstract philosophical notions, they lose analytic usefulness. The integrated approach demonstrates that the category becomes methodologically reliable when the three planes are aligned: philosophical meaning provides conceptual discipline, poetics provides textual anchoring, and interpretive discourse provides rules for argumentation. This alignment is especially important in seminar practice, where students often use category words as substitutes for analysis. The results indicate that explicit separation of the planes improves interpretive precision and reduces terminological ambiguity.

A second result is the construction of a functional typology that captures both stability and variability. The proposed typology revealed that categories cluster around dominant interpretive functions and that these clusters predict how categories behave in textual readings. Value-oriented categories (beautiful, sublime) tend to be activated by strategies of elevation, harmony, or intensity and are strongly dependent on the cultural code of what is considered “worthy”

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

of admiration. Affect-worldview categories (tragic, comic) are driven by conflict structures, ethical pressure, and evaluative framing and are therefore closely linked to narrative and dramatic organization. Ambivalent categories (grotesque) emerge as a boundary phenomenon that combines incompatible registers and destabilizes normative evaluation. Modality-tonality categories (lyrical, elegiac, heroic, satirical, everyday aesthetic) function as interpretive “keys” that shape the reader’s stance toward the represented world. Importantly, the typology demonstrated that categories are not mutually exclusive: they form a dynamic system where one category may dominate while others operate as secondary layers. This layered model explains why many works resist single-label classification and why category conflict can itself become an artistic effect. A third result concerns operational indicator sets. For each category group, the study identified recurring indicator configurations that allow a reader to justify category attribution through textual evidence. For the tragic, the most stable indicators were the presence of an irreconcilable conflict structured as necessity, a high ethical stake, and compositional movement toward irreversible loss or transformation. For the comic, stable indicators included incongruity mechanisms, controlled deflation of status, role reversal, and the presence of an evaluative “distance” often produced by irony or narrative framing. For the sublime, indicators were linked to scale, intensity, and the reader’s experience of limit, frequently supported by imagery of vastness, power, or transcendence and by syntactic-rhythmic expansion. For the grotesque, the crucial indicators were register collision, hybridization of incompatible forms (the elevated with the bodily, the sacred with the banal), and a sustained ambiguity of evaluation that prevents closure. For lyrical and elegiac modalities, the most productive indicators were the dominance of subjective focalization, rhythmic organization that foregrounds affect, and image clusters that function as emotional structures rather than as mere description. The key methodological outcome here is that indicators operate as convergent patterns: a single feature rarely proves a category, but a network of features across levels produces a robust analytic claim.

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h2>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

A fourth result is the demonstrated role of context as a determinant of category semantics. The study found that the same textual mechanism can be interpreted differently depending on historical and cultural frames. For example, elevation imagery may support the sublime in one tradition, while in another it may function as ideological rhetoric and shift the reader toward skepticism or satire. Similarly, comic mechanisms can serve corrective social critique in one period but become a sign of existential absurdity in another. In Uzbek literary discourse, categories often carry culturally specific ethical and symbolic dimensions: motifs of homeland, honor, spiritual endurance, and communal solidarity can intensify heroic or elegiac modalities, while everyday aesthetics may be shaped by local patterns of social interaction and speech etiquette. The result is a rule of contextual triangulation: category attribution should be justified not only by intra-textual indicators but also by the culturally available meanings that make those indicators intelligible.

A fifth result addresses pedagogical effectiveness. When the category framework was applied to typical university interpretive tasks, it improved students' ability to move from impression to argument. The study identified three instructional gains. First, students became more capable of differentiating category from genre and theme, which reduced common mistakes such as calling a work "tragic" merely because it contains death or "comic" merely because it includes humor. Second, students were better able to formulate evidence-based interpretations by citing indicator patterns and explaining their function in shaping reader response. Third, the framework supported comparative analysis: students could compare how the comic operates differently in satire and in lyrical irony or how elegiac tonality transforms when combined with heroic narrative framing. These outcomes suggest that literary-aesthetic categories, when operationalized and contextualized, function as a powerful scaffold for philological competence.

In sum, the results establish that literary-aesthetic categories are best understood as dynamic, layered, and context-sensitive analytic constructs. Their scholarly and pedagogical value increases when they are defined through functional

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

typology, justified by convergent textual indicators, and triangulated within historical and cultural contexts relevant to the literary tradition under study.

## Discussion

The obtained results confirm that literary-aesthetic categories are not decorative vocabulary but a disciplined interpretive technology that coordinates value, form, and meaning. In philological practice, the productive role of categories becomes visible precisely where interpretive work faces ambiguity: when a text invites competing evaluations, when it fuses registers, or when national and historical codes reshape what appears “beautiful,” “tragic,” or “comic.” The discussion therefore focuses on three interrelated issues: the epistemic reliability of category claims, the dynamics of category interaction within texts, and the implications for university-level Uzbek philology.

From an epistemic standpoint, the study supports the view that category attribution is an argument rather than an intuition. The indicator-based procedure transforms a category statement into a structured claim that can be tested and refined. This is crucial in academic environments where students often equate aesthetic categories with personal taste. The method does not eliminate subjective response, but it disciplines it by requiring explicit textual grounds and contextual justification. In this sense, categories operate similarly to scientific constructs in the humanities: they are not measured in a laboratory, but they are validated through coherence, explanatory power, and intersubjective plausibility within a community of readers.

A second issue concerns category interaction and dominance. The layered model developed in the results implies that categories often appear in constellations rather than in isolation. Such constellations can be stable, as when heroic and sublime modalities reinforce each other, or unstable, as in grotesque formations where evaluative clarity is suspended. This has methodological consequences. First, interpretive reading must identify a dominant category that organizes the reader’s stance, while also accounting for secondary categories that modify tone and value. Second, category conflict should not be treated as a failure of classification; it can be a central artistic strategy. For example, the coexistence

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

of elegiac tonality with satirical deflation can produce a complex ethical effect where loss is acknowledged but sentimental closure is refused. The grotesque is particularly revealing here, because it functions as a diagnostic category of modern and transitional aesthetics: it exposes how cultural norms are destabilized and how the text compels the reader to negotiate incompatible value codes.

The third issue is contextual specificity in national literature and in the institutional setting of Uzbekistan’s philological education. The discussion indicates that categories travel across cultures but are never culturally neutral. In Uzbek literary traditions, ethical and communal horizons often shape the semantics of heroism, dignity, endurance, and moral trial, intensifying the tragic not only as private fate but as socially meaningful suffering, and configuring the beautiful through imagery and symbolism rooted in local poetic memory. Conversely, the comic may carry strong pragmatic and moral functions, acting as social correction, critique of hypocrisy, or reinforcement of community norms. If students apply imported definitions without contextual triangulation, they risk either flattening national specificity or reading texts through external evaluative standards. The proposed framework addresses this by treating cultural codes as part of the evidence base rather than as background decoration: a category becomes valid when it explains how textual features activate culturally available meanings.

Finally, the results suggest a pedagogical shift from category naming to category reasoning. Effective instruction should train students to ask how a category is produced: through what imagery systems, what narrative distance, what compositional tensions, what speech genres, and what intertextual echoes. This shift aligns with competence-based university education because it develops transferable analytic skills: close reading, interpretive justification, and comparative thinking. In broader scholarly terms, the study supports an integrative philological model where aesthetics is not separated from poetics, and where literary interpretation becomes a controlled, evidence-responsive practice rather than a set of inherited judgments.

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

## Conclusion

The study has demonstrated that literary-aesthetic categories constitute a central analytic language of literary studies and an essential competence for university philology. Their methodological value becomes fully visible when they are treated not as fixed labels or subjective impressions, but as dynamic, historically variable, and culturally mediated constructs that organize the reader's perception of artistic meaning. By aligning the philosophical-aesthetic plane of category meaning with the poetics-oriented plane of textual organization and the interpretive-discursive plane of scholarly argumentation, the research clarified how categories function as bridges between aesthetic evaluation and evidence-based close reading.

The integrative methodological model proposed in the article produced several key outcomes. First, it established that category attribution should be framed as an argument grounded in convergent textual indicators rather than as an intuitive judgment. This shift strengthens interpretive reliability in academic writing and classroom discussion, because it requires explicit demonstration of how imagery, narrative stance, rhythm, composition, and evaluative framing generate a particular aesthetic mode. Second, the typological mapping of categories confirmed that literary works often operate through layered category constellations. Dominant categories organize the global tone and value horizon of a text, while secondary categories modify or complicate meaning, and category conflict can function as a deliberate aesthetic strategy rather than a classification problem. Third, the study highlighted the decisive role of contextual triangulation. Categories acquire concrete semantics within historical and cultural frames; therefore, responsible interpretation must correlate intra-textual evidence with the cultural codes and literary memory that make category effects intelligible.

For the Uzbek philological university audience, these conclusions have direct practical implications. The operationalization of categories into indicator sets and interpretive procedures supports students' transition from evaluative commentary to academically accountable analysis. It also improves the quality of comparative work, enabling students to trace how the tragic, comic, sublime,


 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

grotesque, lyrical, elegiac, heroic, satirical, and everyday aesthetic transform across genres, periods, and discursive traditions. In this way, literary-aesthetic categories become not only a terminological toolkit but a structured mode of thinking that connects textual form with cultural value systems and interpretive responsibility.

Overall, the research confirms that strengthening category literacy in literary studies contributes to the modernization of philological education: it refines interpretive precision, enhances argumentative culture in academic writing, and deepens engagement with national literature through context-sensitive analytic frameworks. Future work may extend the model by developing corpus-based pedagogical materials, expanding comparative analyses across Turkic and world literatures, and elaborating category-specific rubrics for assessing students' interpretive texts in university courses.

## References

1. Aristotle. (1996). *Poetics* (M. Heath, Trans.). Penguin Classics.
2. Auerbach, E. (2003). *Mimesis: The representation of reality in Western literature* (W. R. Trask, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
3. Abdurashitovna, U. L. (2025). Ёшларни умуминсоний қадриятлар асосида тарбиялашда Навоий қарашларининг аҳамияти. ИКРО журнал, 14(01), 270-274.
4. Abdurashitovna, U. L. (2025). Алишер Навоий қарашларида илм ва маърифатнинг фалсафий таҳлили. Международный журнал научных исследователей, 10(1), 496-499.
5. Umarqulova, O. N., & Yuldasheva, L. S. (2024). SANITARY AND HYGIENIC RULE IN THE WORKS OF ABU ALI IBN SINA. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 4(10), 255-257.
6. Sagdullaevna, Y. L. (2023). The Spiritual Heritage of Eastern Thinkers in Education in the Spirit of Respecting and Glorifying Our National Values. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 4(6), 151-153.

 <b>WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING</b> Online Publishing Hub	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
<b>ISSN (E): 3072-175X</b>	<b>Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026</b>
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
<a href="https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1">https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1</a>	

7. Izaitullayeva, L. (2024). Zamonaviy talaba va uning psixologik qiyofasi. ЛУЧШИЕ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНЫ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ, 1(1), 136-140.
8. Izaitullayeva, L. (2024). Sun'iy intellekt va zamonaviy kasblarning hayotimizda tutgan o'rni. Matematika va informatika fanlarining o'qitish istiqbollari, 1(1), 364-368.
9. Izaitullayeva, L. (2024). Communication and conflicts between high school students. International Journal of scientific researchers, 1(1), 577-580.
10. Quchqorova, D. (2024). Examples of increase and decrease of function. Web of Technology: Multidimensional Research Journal, 2(11), 82-89.
11. Quchqarova, D. (2024). Pedagogika fanida qo'llaniladigan interaktiv metodikalar. Mugallim, 5(5), 120-123.
12. Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). Rabelais and His World (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Indiana University Press.
13. Barthes, R. (1977). Image-Music-Text (S. Heath, Trans.). Hill and Wang.