

**ARTISTIC REPETITION IN GENERAL LINGUISTICS AND KARAKALPAK POETIC DISCOURSE:
THE CASE OF K. RAKHMANOV**

Kudaybergenova Gulparshin Polatbaevna – *Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences*

kudaybergenovagulparshin@gmail.com

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

**UMUMIY TILSHUNOSLIK VA QORAQALPOQ SHE'RIY DISKURSIDA BADIY TAKROR:
K.RAHMONOV IJODI MISOLIDA**

Kudaybergenova Gulparshin Polatbaevna – *filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori*

Berdaq nomidagi Qoraqalpoq davlat universiteti

**ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫЙ ПОВТОР В ОБЩЕМ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИИ И КАРАКАЛПАКСКОМ
ПОЭТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ: НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ТВОРЧЕСТВА К. РАХМАНОВА**

Кудайбергенова Гулпаршин Полатбаевна – *доктор философии по филологическим наукам*

Каракалпакский государственный университет имени Бердаха

Tayanch soʻzlar: lingvopoetika, badiiy takror, alliteratsiya, leksik takror, anafora, epifora, simploka, ritm, ekspressivlik.

Rezyume. Maqolada umumiy tilshunoslik va lingvopoetika nuqtayi nazaridan K. Rahmonov she'riyatidagi fonetik va leksik badiiy takrorlar tahlil qilinadi. Alliteratsiya, anafora, epifora, simploka va leksik takrorlarning ritm, matn yaxlitligi hamda emotsional-ekspressiv ta'sirga qo'shgan hissasi aniqlanadi. Misollar kontekstual, struktur-pozitsion va uslubiy tahlil usullari asosida o'rganiladi. Natijalar takror poetik ma'noni tashkil etuvchi va o'quvchi e'tiborini muhim birliklarga yo'naltiruvchi lingvopoetik vosita ekanini ko'rsatadi.

Ключевые слова: лингвopoэтика, художественный повтор, аллитерация, лексический повтор, анафора, эпифора, симплока, ритм, экспрессивность.

Резюме. В статье анализируются фонетические и лексические формы художественного повтора в поэзии К.Рахманова с позиций общего языкознания и лингвopoэтики. Рассматриваются аллитерация, анафора, эпифора, симплока и лексический повтор, а также их роль в ритмической и смысловой организации текста. Материал исследуется контекстуальным, структурно-позиционным и стилистическим методами. Результаты показывают, что повтор выступает средством текстовой связности, смыслового акцентирования и эмоционально-экспрессивного воздействия.

Key words: linguopoetics, artistic repetition, alliteration, lexical repetition, anaphora, epiphora, symproce, rhythm, expressiveness.

Summary. This article examines phonetic and lexical forms of artistic repetition in selected poems by K.Rakhmanov from the perspectives of general linguistics and linguopoetics. The analysis covers alliteration, anaphora, epiphora, symproce, and lexical recurrence, with attention to their role in rhythm, textual cohesion, and expressive meaning. The material is studied through contextual, structural-positional, and stylistic analysis. The findings show that repetition functions as a linguopoetic device that organizes poetic meaning, foregrounds key units, and intensifies emotional perception.

Introduction. Repetition is a central organizing device in poetic language because it can connect sound, lexical choice, rhythm, and line structure within the same artistic unit. In linguopoetic analysis, a repeated sound or word is therefore not treated merely as duplication: its function depends on position, context, and interaction with surrounding language. The source manuscript distinguishes phonetic and lexical repetition and shows that both are productive in Karakalpak poetry. Vekshin's phonostylistic approach also treats sound recurrence as a textually meaningful phenomenon [1:38], while Tychiev identifies word repetition among the elements that participate in poetic structure [2:39].

The selected examples from K. Rakhmanov's poems reveal several recurring patterns: consonantal alliteration, repeated line openings and endings, symproce, and lexical constructions expressing contrast, indefiniteness, persistence, and emotion. The aim of the present study is to systematize these forms and explain how their position influences textual cohesion and expressive effect. The analysis focuses on the material reproduced in the source manuscript and does not make frequency claims about the poet's complete oeuvre.

Materials and methods. The material consists of excerpts from K. Rakhmanov's poems cited in the source manuscript, including "Gúzgi muhabbat," "Sen haqqında qosiq," and "Argımağım." Four qualitative methods are combined: descriptive analysis identifies the repeated unit; structural-positional analysis determines where it occurs in the line or stanza; contextual-semantic analysis explains its relation to meaning; and stylistic analysis evaluates its contribution to rhythm, cohesion, emphasis, and emotional effect. For phonetic repetition, the analysis distinguishes vertical recurrence across lines from horizontal recurrence within a line. For lexical repetition, attention is given to anaphora, epiphora, symproce, and repeated words or phrases.

Results.

1. *Phonetic repetition and alliteration.* A clear phonetic pattern occurs in lines where the consonant represented by "j" is repeatedly placed in prominent positions:

Jeñil jordan jürgenim joq jasımnan,

Turmis ayap sıypamadı basımnan,

Sırlasar kewil joq qasımnda,

Jalgızlıq janımın jегisi.

("Gúzgi muhabbat" ("Autumn Love"))

The recurrence links separate lexical units into a recognizable acoustic chain and strengthens the cohesion of the passage. Its stylistic value is contextual: the sound itself does not carry an independent meaning, but together with vocabulary, rhythm, and the emotional direction of the stanza it becomes perceptually prominent. This interpretation is consistent with the phonostylistic orientation represented by Vekshin [1:38].

The manuscript also differentiates vertical and horizontal alliteration. In the sequence beginning with “Jıl qusları... / Japlardağı... / Japıraqsız... / Jalañash...”, the repeated initial consonant organizes several consecutive lines and therefore forms a vertical pattern. By contrast, “Qanatsız, qonsam qáyteyin” and “Qaydasañ, qayır-saqawat...” concentrate recurrence inside the line, illustrating horizontal organization. The two patterns demonstrate that sound repetition can structure both the internal shape of a line and the relation between lines. The broader phonetic-stylistic tradition cited in the manuscript likewise supports examining sound as part of artistic organization [3:58].

2. *Anaphora, epiphora, and symploce.* Repetition becomes especially visible when it occupies fixed positions. Anaphora repeats an element at the beginning of successive lines, whereas epiphora repeats an element at the end. Their combination produces symploce, in which both boundaries of adjacent lines are patterned.

*Biriñiz dúr kibi shashılğan waqta,
Biriñiz gúl kibi ashılğan waqta,
Biriñiz kúlkini jasırğan waqta.*

(“Sen haqqında qosıq”)

Here “Biriñiz” forms an anaphoric frame and “waqta” provides a repeated ending. The middle lexical component changes, so the structure combines stability with semantic variation. The same principle appears in “Kimler ushın gúl ómir / Kimler ushın tul ómir / Kimler ushın qul ómir”: the repeated opening and final “ómir” frame contrasting images. Repetition therefore does not reduce semantic content; instead, the stable form makes the changing element more noticeable.

A larger repeated construction is visible in “Men seni kóremen aydıñ qasınan / Men seni kóremen saydıñ qasınan.” The clause “Men seni kóremen” remains stable while the spatial image changes. This type of recurrence creates textual continuity and also intensifies the idea of persistent perception. In each case, the repeated frame directs attention to the element that varies within it.

3. *Lexical repetition and expressive meaning.* Lexical recurrence is also used to organize semantic contrast. Tuychiev’s view of word repetition as a component of poetic structure is relevant because the same lexical frame can simultaneously support rhythm and meaning [2:39].

*Birew tez qartayar, al birew tozbas,
Birew baxıtın tapsa, birew – urlatqan.
Birewde kúlki bar, birewde – kóz jas.*

(“Sen haqqında qosıq”)

The forms built around “birew” create a chain of indefinite human situations and oppositions. Because the grammatical frame is repeated, differences such as happiness and loss, laughter and tears become more salient. The recurrence thus performs a cohesive function while organizing the conceptual contrast of the stanza.

*Iğbalsız bolsam, qáyteyin...
Biymezgil solsam, qáyteyin...
Qanatsız qonsam, qáyteyin...*

(“Gúzgi muhabbat” (“Autumn Love”))

The recurring “qáyteyin” appears at the end of successive lines and accumulates emotional tension. Each opening clause introduces a new unfavorable state, but every line returns to the same rhetorical response. The repetition gains expressive force from this repeated return and from the changing context that precedes it.

*Shın muhabbat gey waqta,
Eki jasqa dáneker.
Shın muhabbat gey waqta,
Bawırındı qan eter.*

(“Argımağım”)

The phrase “Shın muhabbat gey waqta” functions as an anaphoric thematic anchor. Its recurrence creates unity, while the following lines present different consequences of love. A stable subject frame therefore allows semantic expansion and encourages comparison between the successive descriptions.

Discussion. The analyzed material shows that artistic repetition functions across several levels at once. Phonetic recurrence gives the verse an audible pattern; lexical recurrence provides structural parallelism; and positional repetition connects lines into larger units. The key principle is the interaction of recurrence and variation. Repetition supplies continuity, while changing words or images produce semantic development. This explains why the device can intensify information rather than merely restate it.

The examples also support a cautious interpretation of sound expressiveness. Repeated phonemes contribute to the perceptible form of the poem, but the available material does not justify assigning fixed meanings to individual sounds. Their effect emerges from context, rhythm, lexical semantics, and line structure. In the lexical examples, by contrast, repeated words and phrases directly foreground concepts such as uncertainty, contrast, emotional helplessness, and persistent feeling. From a linguopoetic perspective, repetition therefore acts as a foregrounding mechanism that guides the reader toward structurally and semantically important units. The source bibliography places such analysis within a broader tradition of linguostylistic study of literary language [4:9].

A comparison of the analyzed devices also reveals a functional hierarchy. Sound repetition primarily strengthens perceptual cohesion, whereas lexical and positional repetition more directly organize semantic relations between lines. When these levels coincide, the effect becomes especially pronounced: a recurrent phonetic pattern can support the rhythm of a repeated lexical frame, while anaphoric or epiphoric placement can make a concept visually and aurally prominent. The poetic examples therefore illustrate how stylistic meaning emerges from interaction rather than from a single isolated feature. This interaction is particularly important in short lyrical forms, where a limited number of words must carry structural, semantic, and emotional functions simultaneously.

Because the study is based only on the excerpts contained in the source manuscript, its conclusions are functional rather than statistical. A complete corpus of K.Rakhmanov’s poetry would be necessary to determine

the frequency and distribution of each repetition type across different works. Within the available material, however, the interaction of repetition with rhythm, contrast, cohesion, and emotional emphasis is consistently observable.

Conclusion. Artistic repetition in the selected poems of K.Rakhmanov is a multi-level linguopoetic resource. Alliteration contributes to sound cohesion; anaphora and epiphora organize line boundaries; symploce combines repeated beginnings and endings; and lexical recurrence strengthens contrast and emotional emphasis. The most important functional pattern is the balance between stable repeated forms and changing semantic content. Through this balance, repetition structures the stanza, foregrounds

key concepts, supports rhythm, and directs the reader's attention. It should therefore be interpreted not as redundant duplication, but as a purposeful mechanism of poetic organization.

The findings also indicate that future analysis of Karakalpak poetry should describe repetition by both linguistic level and textual position. Such a combined approach can distinguish identical forms that perform different functions and can clarify how an author's individual style is created through recurring structural choices. In the present material, the most consistent result is that repetition becomes artistically meaningful when it coordinates form with semantic development.

References

1. Векшин Г.В. Фоностилистика текста: Звуковой повтор в перспективе смыслообразования: Автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. – Москва, 2006.
2. Туйчиев У. Ўзбек адабиётида бадиийлик мезонлари ва уларнинг маромлари. – Тошкент: «Янги аср авлоди», 2011.
3. Пирогова Н.К., Трубецкой Н.С. Фонетическая стилистика. // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 9. – Москва: 1992.
4. Боймирзаев С. Ойбек прозасининг лингвостилистик тадқиқи: Филол. фан. ном. ... дис. автореф. – Самарқанд: 2004.