

THE LITERARY MODEL OF ANIMAL-RELATED SPACES IN THE PROSE OF UTKIR HOSHIMOV AND ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Alqarov Nazarbek Alisher o'g'li,

Researcher at Tashkent State Transport University

Abstract: The article offers a comparative analysis of the literary model of animal-related spaces in the prose of Utkir Hoshimov and Ernest Hemingway. The model is constructed on three parameters: the boundedness of the space, its connection with the relation of ownership and the presence of a vertical dimension. Each parameter is illustrated by passages drawn from both bodies of material. The analysis substantiates that in the Uzbek material the space is bounded and defined by ownership, whereas in the American material it is unbounded and ownerless, and that the vertical dimension is activated only in the second corpus.

Keywords: Literary space, chronotope, frame, bounded space, vertical dimension, relation of ownership, comparative analysis

O'TKIR HOSHIMOV VA ERNEST HEMINGUEY NASRIDA HAYVON BILAN BOG'LIQ MAKONLARNING BADIY MODELI

Annotatsiya: Maqolada O'tkir Hoshimov va Ernest Heminguey nasrida hayvon bilan bog'liq makonlarning badiiy modeli qiyosiy tarzda tahlil qilinadi. Model uch parametr – makonning chegaralanganligi, uning egalik munosabati bilan bog'lanishi va vertikal o'lchovning mavjudligi asosida quriladi. Har bir parametr ikki materialdan olingan parchalar bilan izohlanadi. Tahlil natijasida o'zbek materialida makon chegaralangan va egalik bilan belgilangan, Amerika materialida esa chegarasiz va egasiz ekani, vertikal o'lchov faqat ikkinchi korpusda faollashishi asoslanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: badiiy makon, xronotop, freym, chegaralangan makon, vertikal o'lchov, egalik munosabati, qiyosiy tahlil

ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННАЯ МОДЕЛЬ ПРОСТРАНСТВ, СВЯЗАННЫХ С ЖИВОТНЫМИ, В ПРОЗЕ УТКИРА ХОШИМОВА И ЭРНЕСТА ХЕМИНГУЭЯ

Аннотация: В статье сопоставительно анализируется художественная модель пространств, связанных с животными, в прозе Уткира Хошимова и Эрнеста Хемингуэя. Модель строится на трёх параметрах: ограниченность пространства, его связь с отношениями собственности и наличие вертикального измерения. Каждый параметр иллюстрируется фрагментами из обоих массивов материала. Анализ обосновывает, что в узбекском материале пространство ограничено и определено собственностью, а в американском – безгранично и лишено владельца, при этом вертикальное измерение активируется только во втором корпусе.

Ключевые слова: художественное пространство, хронотоп, фрейм, ограниченное пространство, вертикальное измерение, отношения собственности, сопоставительный анализ

Introduction:

The space in which an animal appears in a literary text is never a neutral background. It determines what the creature may do, who may observe it and how far its own initiative extends. For this reason the description of animal-related space provides an indirect but reliable indicator of the status assigned to the creature. The comparison of two literary traditions makes this indicator more informative. When the same category of creature appears in spaces organised on opposite principles, the difference points to distinct underlying models rather than to individual authorial preference. The relevance of the study lies in the fact that the spatial organisation of animal episodes has not been raised as a separate question in comparative literary scholarship devoted to these two authors. The aim of the article is to construct a model of animal-related space on three parameters and to establish the behaviour of each parameter in the two corpora.

Review of the literature:

The concept of the chronotope, which links spatial and temporal relations into a single artistic unit, provides the general framework for the present analysis [1]. Within this framework space is not a container but a form of meaning, and its properties are inseparable from the events that take place in it. Frame semantics supplies the instrument for describing the typical participants of a situation and their positions [2]. Applied to animal episodes, the frame allows the recurring elements of a scene to be listed and compared across corpora. A study of the relation between space and place has distinguished between undifferentiated space and space endowed with value through experience [3]. The distinction is directly relevant to the comparison of household and open spaces. Geocritical scholarship has proposed a method for treating literary space as a system of references rather than as a reflection of geography [4]. Within animal studies a separate line of research has introduced the notion of animal spaces, that is, of places defined by the presence and the movement of non-human beings [5]. In national scholarship the theoretical foundations of comparative poetics have been systematised and the conditions of comparison have been specified [6]. This work provides the methodological basis for placing two heterogeneous corpora on a single analytical plane.

Research methodology:

The study employs comparative and typological analysis, frame analysis and contextual analysis. The material consists of the prose of Utkir Hoshimov in Uzbek and the novella of Ernest Hemingway in the original English. Three parameters were established in advance. The first is the boundedness of the space, that is, whether the limits of the location are named in the text. The second is the connection with ownership, that is, whether the space belongs to someone. The third is the presence of a vertical dimension, that is, whether depth or height is measured. Passages from the Uzbek material are quoted in the original; passages from the English material are quoted in the original with an Uzbek rendering supplied in parentheses as the author's translation. All conclusions are formulated within the limits of the selected authorial corpora.

Analysis and results:

The first parameter, boundedness, divides the two corpora immediately. In the Uzbek material every animal-related location is named and bounded: the byre, the yard, the pasture, the market. The boundaries are not described in detail, yet they are always implied, and the creature moves

within them. The pasture, for instance, appears as a place to which access must be granted: “echkimni o‘tloqda boqishga ruxsat tegdi” [7 – B. 192.]. The verb of permission is decisive here, since it presupposes an authority that controls the boundary and a subject that must obtain access. The yard functions as the default location of the domestic creature, and its acoustic dimension is particularly developed: “muttasil chirqillayotgan chumchuqlar qulog‘imni batang qilib yubordi” [8 – B. 35.]. The birds are not seen; the yard is filled by their sound, and the space is thereby marked as inhabited even when it is visually empty.

In the American material the situation is reversed. The principal location, the open sea, has no named boundaries, and the text emphasises precisely this absence. The distance from the shore is repeatedly referred to as a quality rather than as a measurement: “This far out, he must be huge in this month” [9 – B. 46.] (“Bu qadar uzoqda u shu oyda albatta bahaybat bo‘lsa kerak” – muallif tarjiması). The absence of boundaries is also formulated as a risk: “He thought of how some men feared being out of sight of land in a small boat” [9 – B. 67.] (“U ba‘zi odamlar kichik qayiqda quruqlikni ko‘rmay qolishdan qo‘rqishini o‘yladi” – muallif tarjiması). The disappearance of the shore is the condition of the encounter with the great creature, and the text makes this connection explicit. The second parameter, the connection with ownership, follows the same division. In the Uzbek corpus the space is always somebody’s: the byre belongs to a household, the pasture to a collective, the market to a community. The creature is located through this relation, and its movement between spaces is a transfer of ownership.

The market deserves separate mention, since it is the only Uzbek location in which the creature changes hands. The space is crowded and its description is dominated by movement and noise, which corresponds to its function as a point of transition rather than of dwelling. In the American corpus the principal space belongs to no one. The sea is never described through ownership, and the only owned object within it is the boat. The boat therefore performs a double function: it is at once a tool and the sole bounded space available to the protagonist. The internal organisation of this bounded space is described with unusual precision. The bow and the stern are named repeatedly and each is associated with a specific activity: “He knelt against the bow and, for a moment, slipped the line over his back again” [9 – B. 98.] (“U qayiq boshiga cho‘kkaladi va bir lahzaga chilvirni yana beliga o‘tkazdi” – muallif tarjiması). The small vessel thus reproduces, in miniature, the structure of a dwelling.

The land in the American material appears only at the two ends of the narrative, and it is marked by the same object each time: the shack. The return is measured by the distance to it: “He had to sit down five times before he reached his shack” [9 – B. 134.] (“U kulbasiga yetguncha besh marta o‘tirishga majbur bo‘ldi” – muallif tarjiması). The dwelling is thus the endpoint of the spatial trajectory but not its setting. The third parameter, the vertical dimension, produces the sharpest contrast. In the Uzbek corpus the animal-related space is organised horizontally: the creature moves from the byre to the yard, from the yard to the pasture, from the pasture to the market. Depth and height are not measured.

In the American corpus depth is measured constantly and with numerical precision: “Others let them drift with the current and sometimes they were at sixty fathoms when the fishermen thought they were at a hundred” [9 – B. 35.] (“Boshqalar ularni oqim bilan suzib ketishiga qo‘yib berishardi va baliqchilar yuz quloch deb o‘ylagan paytda ular oltmish quloch chuqurlikda bo‘lardi” – muallif tarjiması). The vertical dimension is not only measured but also imagined. The protagonist projects an aerial point of view that does not belong to any character in the narrative: “I would like to fly very slowly at two hundred fathoms high and see the fish from above” [9 – B. 79.] (“Men ikki yuz quloch balandlikda juda sekin uchib, baliqni

yuqoridan ko‘rishni istardim” – muallif tarjimasini). The imagined elevation completes the vertical axis.

The dream space of the American text adds a further layer. The remembered coast belongs to another continent and it is reproduced through smell and sound rather than through visual detail: “He smelled the tar and oakum of the deck as he slept and he smelled the smell of Africa that the land breeze brought at morning” [9 – B. 27.] (“U uxlar ekan, palubaning smola va kanop hidini, ertalab quruqlik shabadasi olib kelgan Afrika hidini sezdi” – muallif tarjimasini). This third space is neither bounded nor owned, and it is inhabited exclusively by animals.

Bringing the three parameters together produces two distinct models. The Uzbek model may be described as bounded, owned and horizontal: the creature occupies a defined place within a household hierarchy and moves between such places along a plane.

The American model is unbounded, ownerless and vertical: the creature occupies no place, it is located by depth rather than by position, and the only bounded element of the space is the human vessel. The frame analysis confirms this division [2]. In the Uzbek episodes the recurring participants are the owner, the household and the enclosure; in the American episodes they are the solitary man, the vessel and the depth. The absence of a second human participant in the second corpus removes the possibility of a social organisation of space.

The two models also differ in their temporal behaviour. In the Uzbek material the animal space is governed by the cycle of the day and the season, and the same locations recur. In the American material the space is governed by a single continuous movement outwards and back, and no location recurs except the shack [1]. A final observation concerns the acoustic organisation of space. In the Uzbek corpus sound fills the bounded space and marks it as inhabited; in the American corpus sound is almost absent from the open sea and appears only at the moments of attack. Silence therefore functions in the second corpus as the characteristic of unbounded space [5].

The Uzbek corpus also contains a space in which the animal appears as the object of a hunt rather than of husbandry. Such episodes are rare and they are marked by a shift in the location: the creature is brought from outside the household boundary into it. The passage in which a bird is shot and carried home [7 – B. 20.] illustrates the transition, and the space of the hunt itself is never described. A further Uzbek case shows how a proverbial expression may create a space without describing it: “nemisga sichqonning ini ming tanga bo‘lib qolganini” [8 – B. 162.]. The burrow appears here as a measure of desperation rather than as a location, and its value is expressed in currency. The idiom therefore converts a spatial notion into an evaluative one.

The comparison of scale in the Uzbek corpus operates through familiar spatial reference points. A creature may be measured against another creature rather than against an abstract unit: “E, ot minan tuyu bolarmidi, opovsi!” [7 – B. 243.]. Two large animals are placed side by side and the comparison establishes a hierarchy without any numerical measurement, which is characteristic of the horizontal model described above. In the American corpus, by contrast, scale is expressed in units throughout, and the transition from qualitative to quantitative measurement is one of the clearest markers separating the two models. The reserve of line, the depth of the water and the length of the creature are all given in numbers, and these numbers structure the narrative time as well as the space [1].

The role of the threshold deserves a separate remark. In the Uzbek corpus the movement of a creature across a boundary is always narrated: the animal is led out, brought in, tied or released, and the act is performed by a named person. The threshold is therefore a social operation rather

than a physical line. In the American corpus no comparable threshold exists, since the space has no boundary to cross. The functional equivalent is the moment at which the shore disappears from view, and this moment is registered by the protagonist himself rather than by an external observer. The transition is thus perceptual rather than social. The two models, finally, differ in what they make possible for the creature. Within a bounded and owned space the animal may be sheltered, fed, sold or lost, but it cannot initiate movement of its own. Within an unbounded space it may set the direction of the action, and the human participant follows. The spatial organisation therefore constrains the degree of agency available to the animal image [5].

Conclusion:

The literary model of animal-related space was constructed on three parameters: boundedness, connection with ownership and the presence of a vertical dimension. The two corpora differ on all three. The Uzbek model is bounded, owned and horizontal. Every location is named and limited, it belongs to a household or a community, and the creature moves between locations along a plane. Sound fills the bounded space and marks it as inhabited. The American model is unbounded, ownerless and vertical. The principal space has no named limits and no owner, depth is measured with numerical precision, and an imagined elevation completes the vertical axis. The only bounded element is the vessel, which reproduces the structure of a dwelling in miniature. The presence of a third, remembered space inhabited exclusively by animals in the American corpus has no counterpart in the Uzbek material. This asymmetry is formulated within the limits of the selected corpora and requires verification on a broader body of material.

REFERENCES:

1. Bakhtin M.M. Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel // The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. – Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. – P. 84–258.
2. Fillmore C.J. Frame Semantics // Linguistics in the Morning Calm. – Seoul: Hanshin Publishing, 1982. – P. 111–137.
3. Tuan Yi-Fu. Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience. – Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977. – 235 p.
4. Westphal B. Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces / Trans. by R.T.Tally. – New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. – 202 p.
5. Philo C., Wilbert C. Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New Geographies of Human-Animal Relations. – London; New York: Routledge, 2000. – 336 p.
6. Jo‘raqulov U. Nazariy poetika masalalari. – Toshkent: G‘afur G‘ulom nomidagi NMIU, 2015. – 264 b.
7. Hoshimov O‘. Dunyoning ishlari: qissa va hikoyalar. – Toshkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2019. – 336 b.
8. Hoshimov O‘. Ikki eshik orasi: roman. – Toshkent: “Sharq”, 2012. – 624 b.
9. Hemingway E. The Old Man and the Sea. – New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1952. – 140 p.