



Lexical-Semantic And Contextual-Pragmatic World-Building In English And Uzbek Science-Fiction Prose: Theoretical Foundations

Mashrabova Buviniso Nurbek qizi

Assistant Lecturer, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences,
Andijan State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This paper establishes a theoretical basis for comparing the lexical-semantic and contextual-pragmatic representation of fictional worlds in English and Uzbek science-fiction prose. A literature-based synthesis brings genre theory and cognitive stylistics into dialogue with Uzbek systemic lexicology, linguopoetics and pragmalinguistics. Its methodological contribution is a common basis of comparison connecting nomination, semantic organization and contextual interpretation. The proposed approach treats equivalent world-building functions, rather than identical linguistic forms, as the starting point for contrastive analysis.

KEYWORDS: Science-fiction prose, fictional world, contrastive linguistics, English and Uzbek, lexical semantics, linguopoetics, text-world theory, nomination, presupposition, contextual interpretation.

INTRODUCTION

The linguistic problem posed by science fiction is not simply how an unfamiliar entity receives a name, but how that name acquires an interpretable place within a narrative. Invented vocabulary becomes meaningful through semantic relations and the contextual availability of information [1; 2]. For English-Uzbek comparison, this requires a distinction between three questions: what is named, how its meaning is organized, and how its relevance is established in context. The present paper addresses these questions through theoretical synthesis rather than a completed corpus-frequency study.

D. Suvin's account of cognitive estrangement relates the genre's departure from familiar reality to a framework through which that departure becomes intelligible [1]. His concept of the novum concerns a significant innovation within the represented world; it should not be equated with a newly coined word. A familiar expression may designate an unfamiliar institution, while an invented name may contribute little to the world's underlying organization. This distinction provides a common criterion for English and Uzbek material without equating science-fictional meaning with neologism density.

Genre development also affects the conditions of linguistic interpretation. P. Stockwell connects stylistic patterns with the historical accumulation of science-fiction conventions, whereas S. Mandala examines how apparently ordinary language can construct extraordinary settings and differentiated characters [2; 3]. Their approaches make historical context relevant to linguistic analysis without reducing a work to its period. For a bilingual study, the implication is methodological: the histories of English-language and Uzbek science fiction must be

documented separately, while the functions of their language can be compared through common analytical questions.

E. Semino's account of world creation and J. Gavins's presentation of Text World Theory explain how linguistic choices support the construction of situations, participants and perspectives [4; 5]. A fictional world is therefore understood here as a textually warranted configuration of referents, properties, spatial-temporal relations and knowledge. This configuration is neither a national worldview nor every reader's actual mental representation. The distinction permits comparison of English and Uzbek textual evidence without treating an analyst's interpretation as experimentally established reader response.

M. M. Bakhtin's chronotope provides a complementary account of the interconnected organization of literary time and space [6]. It should nevertheless be distinguished from the deictic centre of an utterance. Expressions such as *now* and *hozir*, or *here* and *bu yerda*, locate information relative to a contextual position; chronotopic analysis asks how temporal-spatial organization structures the narrative as a whole. Their conjunction is useful for comparing fictional orientation, but their analytical scales should not be collapsed.

Lexical-semantic and stylistic categories. H. Ne'matov and R. Rasulov's systemic lexicology directs attention to relations among linguistic units rather than isolated dictionary meanings [7]. N. R. Musulmanova distinguishes semantic analysis of a unit's nominative meaning from metasemiotic analysis of its artistic function [8]. Read alongside cognitive stylistics, these approaches support a controlled movement from lexical description to literary interpretation. Their application nevertheless requires categories appropriate to the objects and contexts examined in both languages.

Terminological status and lexical novelty should consequently be recorded separately. An established scientific term does not become a quasi-term merely because it appears in fiction. A quasi-term, as used in the present framework, designates a specialised concept whose validity is stipulated within the fictional world. Attributing a neologism to an author, by contrast, requires checking its earlier usage. These dimensions can intersect: a newly formed expression may also function as a quasi-term, while an ordinary word may acquire a new fictional referent without changing its form.

A lexical-semantic field likewise requires more than thematic proximity. Vocabulary concerning technology, for example, must be examined for relations of inclusion, contrast, part and whole, and contextual association [7]. The same expression can participate in more than one field when its narrative function changes. English and Uzbek fields should therefore be compared through explicitly defined relations rather than by transferring a ready-made inventory from one language to the other. Stylistic interpretation then asks whether recurrent naming, metaphor or register contrast gives these relations an evaluative or aesthetically salient function [3; 8].

Contextual-pragmatic categories. Sh. Safarov's treatment of communicative meaning, shared knowledge and deixis offers a basis for connecting linguistic form with its conditions of interpretation [9]. In science fiction, this connection requires attention to the unequal knowledge of narrator, characters and implied reader. A proposition familiar to a character may be new to the reader; an apparently settled designation may later be revised. Reference, presupposition, implicature and epistemic modality should accordingly be analysed in the

passages where they operate, not merely listed as abstract categories. The relevant comparison concerns how each text introduces, withholds and revises information.

The relationship can be illustrated by two analyst-constructed sentences, not quotations from literary works: "The memory archive is working again" and "Xotira arxivi yana ishlayapti." Under a repetitive interpretation, again and yana background an earlier period of operation. The nominal expressions refer to an archive without specifying what kinds of memory it stores. The Uzbek sentence contains no direct counterpart of the English definite article, yet its referent can be established through preceding context. Comparable interpretive functions therefore need not require word-for-word correspondence.

Epistemic modality introduces a further distinction between the existence of an entity and a speaker's commitment to a proposition about it. A scientist-character's conjecture need not count as an established fact of the fictional world. Modal expressions, reporting constructions and subsequent confirmation or correction must therefore be considered together [5; 9]. The contrastive question is not whether a predetermined English form has an Uzbek equivalent, but which contextual resources mark comparable degrees and sources of knowledge in each passage.

The common basis of comparison proposed here is the world-building function of a nominative unit within its developing context. Each case is described through its form and lexical status, its semantic relations, and its contribution to contextual interpretation. Original English and original Uzbek works should constitute the principal comparative material; translations require a separate layer of analysis. Genre, publication period, subject matter and authorship must also be recorded so that an individual stylistic preference is not attributed prematurely to an entire language.

This approach generates a testable question about the relation between semantic transparency and contextual explanation. A structurally interpretable name may require less immediate definition, but familiar components do not necessarily reveal the nature of a fictional referent. Consequently, transparency should be examined alongside first mention, subsequent explanation and possible reinterpretation. Isomorphic features would concern comparable relations among these operations; allomorphic features would concern differences in their linguistic realization. Such correspondences require confirmation through the selected literary material.

Conclusion

The theoretical synthesis supports a relational account of world-building in English and Uzbek science-fiction prose. Genre theory identifies the status of fictional innovation; systemic lexicology and linguopoetics explain semantic organization and artistic function; contextual pragmatics and Text World Theory clarify the textual conditions of interpretation. These approaches are complementary because they answer different questions about the same narrative material [1–9].

The resulting methodological proposal links nomination, lexical-semantic relations and contextual interpretation without conflating their analytical levels. Its value lies in establishing comparable questions and evidential criteria for both languages, not in declaring untested linguistic universals. Subsequent corpus analysis can determine which correspondences recur across authors and which remain specific to particular works.

References

1. Suvin, D. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. Ed. G. Canavan. – Oxford: Peter Lang, 2016.
2. Stockwell, P. *The Poetics of Science Fiction*. – Harlow: Longman, 2000.
3. Mandala, S. *The Language in Science Fiction and Fantasy: The Question of Style*. – London: Continuum, 2010.
4. Semino, E. *Language and World Creation in Poems and Other Texts*. – London: Longman, 1997.
5. Gavins, J. *Text World Theory: An Introduction*. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
6. Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. M. Holquist. Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. – Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
7. Ne'matov, H., and Rasulov, R. *O'zbek tili sistem leksikologiyasi asoslari*. – Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1995.
8. Musulmanova, N. R. "Badiiy matnning lingvopoetik tahlili: tarixi, metodologiya va tadqiqot metodlari" // *Uzbekistan: Language and Culture. Applied Philology*. – 2023. – No. 2(5). – P. 90–97. DOI: 10.52773/tsuull.uzlc.aphil.2023.2.5/FSSX5369.
9. Safarov, Sh. *Pragmalingvistika*. – Tashkent, 2008.