HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

UNIVERSAL CONCEPTS AND TYPOLOGICAL SIMILARITIES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERARY TEXTS

Mamatqulova Xolida Axtamovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,

Associate Professor of the Department of Comparative Literature

Mail: kholidamamatkulova@gmail.com

Orcid ID: 0009-0000-1572-6435

Tel.+998915295621

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20937228

Abstract. This article examines the role of universal concepts and typological similarities in English and Uzbek literary texts. It focuses on how life, fate, love, homeland, time, space, honor, and moral responsibility are represented in different literary traditions. Drawing on comparative literary studies, cognitive poetics, and linguocultural interpretation, the article argues that typological similarity does not eliminate national specificity; rather, it reveals how common human experience is artistically transformed in culturally distinct forms. Special attention is paid to the ideas of Khalida Akhtamovna Mamatkulova, whose research stresses the relationship between universal human concepts, worldview, national identity, and literary meaning.

Keywords: universal concepts, typological similarity, English literature, Uzbek literature, literary text, worldview, national identity, cognitive poetics, comparative analysis

Universal concepts and typological similarities occupy an important place in comparative literary studies because they allow the researcher to examine both common human experience and national-cultural specificity. English and Uzbek literary texts belong to different linguistic, historical, and aesthetic systems, yet they often represent analogous concepts such as life, fate, love, homeland, honor, memory, time, and moral responsibility. These concepts are universal not because they are identical in all cultures, but because they express fundamental forms of human existence.

The topic is also closely connected with the anthropocentric paradigm in modern humanities. A literary text represents the world through human perception, emotion, value, and choice. Therefore, the comparative study of literary concepts requires attention to the human being as the center of artistic meaning. Mamatkulova Khalida Akhtamovna's research is significant in this respect because she explains the connection between universal concepts, worldview, national identity, and the conceptual field of literature.

In her article Universal Concepts and Typological Similarities in Literary Texts, Mamatkulova states that literary texts explore universal concepts such as space, time, life, and fate while showing how they are understood differently across cultures. This idea serves as the theoretical basis of the present articles. The main purpose is to demonstrate that English and Uzbek literary texts share typological structures but express them through different cultural codes.

The concept may be defined as a mental and cultural unit that stores knowledge, emotion, evaluation, and symbolic meaning. In literary discourse, concepts are realized through images, metaphors, plots, characters, narrative voice, and genre conventions. For this reason, the concept

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

cannot be reduced to a dictionary meaning. It becomes artistically active only when it enters the structure of the text.

Typological similarity is a form of correspondence that appears between literary phenomena without necessarily requiring direct influence. Similar motifs, images, conflicts, or conceptual structures may arise independently because different cultures respond to comparable human situations. Such similarities are especially visible in the representation of birth and death, love and separation, justice and injustice, homeland and exile, freedom and responsibility.

National specificity, however, remains equally important. English literary texts often foreground individual consciousness, psychological development, social mobility, irony, and personal self-definition. Uzbek literary texts often foreground community, family, historical memory, moral dignity, respect, and attachment to homeland. Comparative analysis must therefore identify both structural similarity and cultural difference.

The concept of life in English literature is frequently organized as a path of self-discovery. The hero or heroine must pass through social conflict, illusion, moral trial, or psychological crisis in order to understand the self and the world. In Uzbek literature, life is often represented as a moral path connected with family, community, ancestry, and responsibility. The typological similarity lies in the idea of life as a test; the national difference lies in the value system through which the test is interpreted.

The concept of fate also shows the unity of universality and difference. In English texts, fate may appear as tragic necessity, social determinism, historical pressure, or the result of character. In Uzbek texts, fate is often linked with destiny, patience, spiritual endurance, and ethical response. Both literatures represent the boundary between freedom and necessity, but they do so through different emotional and philosophical accents.

Love is one of the most productive universal concepts in both traditions. English literature often treats love as a means of psychological revelation and social critique, while Uzbek literature frequently connects love with loyalty, sacrifice, moral purity, and spiritual elevation. In both cases, love tests the character and reveals the conflict between inner truth and external expectation.

The concept of homeland is especially important in Uzbek literature, where it is associated with native soil, language, memory, ancestry, and national dignity. English literature also treats homeland as a meaningful space, but it may emphasize nostalgia, landscape, local identity, historical change, or exile. The comparison reveals a typological similarity in the emotional force of homeland and a national difference in its symbolic structure.

Time and space form the basic coordinates of literary conceptualization. In English texts, time may be connected with development, loss, memory, and social change. In Uzbek texts, time often carries the meaning of continuity, heritage, and the transmission of moral values across generations. Space in English literature may appear as home, city, countryside, empire, or interior psychological landscape; in Uzbek literature, space often carries strong associations with homeland, neighborhood, family house, garden, desert, or sacred place.

In the context of universal literary concepts, English and Uzbek texts demonstrate that the same conceptual problem can be represented through different artistic languages. One tradition may prefer irony, psychological analysis, or narrative distance; the other may rely on symbolic images, moral

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

aphorism, emotional intensity, and culturally marked details. This difference enriches rather than weakens comparison.

The quotation from Mamatkulova's work is important here: "universal concepts such as space, time, life, and fate" function as basic elements of literary conceptualization. When these concepts are placed in English and Uzbek texts, they produce typological similarities at the level of human experience and culturally specific meanings at the level of poetic expression.

The methodological value of the present analysis lies in the combination of comparative typology with concept-oriented interpretation. In relation to universal literary concepts, the researcher must distinguish three analytical levels: the universal semantic nucleus, the national-cultural layer, and the individual authorial transformation. The universal nucleus explains why similar concepts occur in unrelated literary systems; the national layer explains why these concepts acquire specific imagery and value; the authorial layer explains why every literary text individualizes inherited cultural meanings.

This approach also prevents two common methodological mistakes. The first mistake is to treat typological similarity as complete identity. The second mistake is to exaggerate difference so strongly that comparison becomes impossible. Mamatkulova's position is useful because it keeps both dimensions together: literary concepts are universal in their anthropological basis, but they are national in their cultural expression.

The comparative study of English and Uzbek literary texts must therefore move from vocabulary to discourse. It is not enough to identify lexical equivalents such as life, fate, love, or homeland. The researcher should ask how these words become images, how images become motifs, how motifs become narrative structures, and how these structures participate in the creation of literary meaning.

Another important aspect is the function of translation and intercultural reception. When Uzbek concepts are rendered into English or English concepts are interpreted in Uzbek academic discourse, the conceptual field may shift. Some meanings become explicit, others are weakened, and some culturally marked associations require commentary. This proves that typological similarity should always be accompanied by careful semantic and cultural interpretation.

The discussion of universal literary concepts shows that English and Uzbek texts may be compared through common human problems rather than through mechanical parallels. Both traditions ask how a person should live, what values must be preserved, how memory shapes identity, and how society influences moral choice. These questions are universal, yet each literature gives them its own stylistic and ideological form.

In English literature, the narrative organization of universal concepts often depends on psychological development, social irony, and the tension between private desire and public norm. In Uzbek literature, the same conceptual problems are frequently organized through ethical evaluation, cultural memory, and the symbolic authority of family, homeland, and tradition. These tendencies are not absolute, but they help reveal dominant patterns of literary conceptualization.

The typological similarities between the two literatures become especially visible when the same concept appears in different genres. In poetry, it may be compressed into metaphor and rhythm. In prose, it may unfold through plot and characterization. In drama, it may be revealed through conflict and dialogue. Thus the study of concepts should be genre-sensitive as well as culture-sensitive.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

The broader implication of this analysis is that universal concepts create a bridge between national literatures. They allow readers to recognize familiar human experiences in unfamiliar cultural forms. At the same time, they teach the reader to respect difference, because the same experience may be expressed through different symbols, values, and narrative strategies.

The study of universal concepts and typological similarities in English and Uzbek literary texts demonstrates that literature expresses common human experiences through culturally specific artistic forms. Concepts such as life, fate, love, homeland, time, space, honor, and moral responsibility belong to the shared conceptual horizon of humanity, yet their literary realization depends on worldview, language, genre, and cultural memory.

Mamatkulova's theoretical ideas are valuable because they help connect cognitive, linguocultural, and comparative approaches. Her emphasis on worldview and national identity shows that universal concepts should not be interpreted as abstract sameness. They are universal in their human foundation and national in their artistic expression.

Thus, English and Uzbek literary texts can be fruitfully compared through conceptual analysis. Such comparison reveals both typological proximity and cultural uniqueness, contributing to a deeper understanding of world literature and intercultural literary dialogue.

References

1. Mamatkulova, K. A. (2026). Universal concepts and typological similarities in literary texts. Shokh Articles Library, 1(1).

2. Mamatkulova, K. A. (2022). Ethnocultural meanings in literary text. Kresna Social Science and Humanities Research, 4, 30-33.

3. Mamatkulova, K. A. (2019). Features of Japanese historiography in the literature of the Heian period. Foreign Philology: Language, Literature, Education, 4(70), 59-63.

4. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Understanding cultures through their key words. Oxford University Press.

5. Lotman, Y. M. (1990). Universe of the mind: A semiotic theory of culture. Indiana University Press.

6. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination. University of Texas Press.

7. Navoiy, A. (1991). Khamsa. Gafur Ghulom Publishing House.

8. Shakespeare, W. (2005). Hamlet. Oxford University Press.

9. Qodiriy, A. (2018). Bygone days. Translated Uzbek literary edition.

10. Dickens, C. (2003). Great expectations. Penguin Classics.

11. Todorov, T. (1984). Mikhail Bakhtin: The dialogical principle. University of Minnesota Press.

12. Karasik, V. I. (2002). Language circle: Personality, concepts, discourse. Peremena.

13. Stepanov, Y. S. (2004). Constants: Dictionary of Russian culture. Academic Project.

14. Likhachev, D. S. (1993). The concept sphere of the Russian language. Russian Literature.

15. Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). Cognitive linguistics. AST.