

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.1/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 08 Volume: 100

Published: 16.08.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Mukhammad Khodjakhonovich Khakimov
Fergana state university
Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor
Fergana, Uzbekistan

Hilola Ravshan kizi Yunusova
Fergana state university
Independent researcher,
Fergana, Uzbekistan

VISUAL POETIC TEXTS AS MULTISEMIOTIC SYSTEM

Abstract: The article discusses a variety of terms proposed by linguists for naming texts consisting of different semiotic systems (verbal and nonverbal) that could equally be used for visual poetic texts since they are also considered to be semiotically complex.

Key words: creolized texts, polycode texts, syncretic messages, linguo-visual complex, multisemiotik texts, multisemiotik system, visual poetic texts, contaminated texts, dicode texts, intersemiotic relation, heterogeneous texts, semiosphere, semiotic complex texts, videoverbal texts, isoverb, isoverbal complex, isoverbal texts, intersemiotic maze, multisemiossis, multimodality.

Language: English

Citation: Khakimov, M. K., & Yunusova, H. R. (2021). Visual poetic texts as multisemiotik system. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 08 (100), 185-188.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-08-100-36> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.08.100.36>

Scopus ASCC: 1200.

Introduction

Text linguistics began to take shape in the 1970s-80s. It was firstly addressed by foreign linguists in the eighth issue of "Novoe v zarubezhnoy lingvistike" [1]. In this digest of articles, the text is mainly recognized as an object of linguistic research, and as a new direction, where issues such as definitions, different interpretations of the text are discussed. Nowadays texts are being studied even more in-depth, becoming the object of semiotics [2; 3], cognitive linguistics [4; 5], pragmalinguistics [6; 7; 8; 9; 10], psycholinguistics [11] and many other branches. This article will mainly discuss visual texts from the angle of semiotics considering it as a whole comprising different semiotic systems, and also focusing on visual poetic texts regarding them as multisemiotik system.

The main part.

In some sources related to semiotics and text linguistics texts with visual elements are named differently. Some terms refer not only to visual poetic texts that are the object of our research, but are

considered to be a general name for texts that combine the signs of different semiotic systems. Many foreign, especially Russian, scholars, in their research work with texts composed of several semiotic systems, and suggest their own different terms that could be applied to them. K. Sloutskaya, a Russian scholar who conducted scientific research in the field of visual poetic texts, lists various terms ("polycode texts" - G. Ejger and V. L. Juht, "syncretic messages" - R. Jakobson, "linguo-visual complex" - L. Bolshiyanova, "isoverb" - A. Mikheev, "isoverbal complex" - A. Bernackaja), but emphasizes the importance of applying the term "creolized texts" proposed by Russian psycholinguists Yu. Sorokin and E. Tarasov in relation to visual poetic texts [12.10].

Researchers differently defined creolized texts and commented on them. In fact, the term "creolization" in linguistics refers to the process of formation of a mixed language (lexically and grammatically) as a result of the interaction of two or more languages that are in use in a particular area [13]. Later, Russian linguists applied the term to texts,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

proposing that under the concept of creolized text, two or more semiotic systems are combined within a single text. This term is still the most common in Russian linguistics to refer to multimedial texts (texts that combine several semiotics).

The definition of the term “creolized texts” differs from one author to another. According to psycholinguists Yu. A. Sorokin and E. F. Tarasov, who were the first to use this term, creolized texts are texts whose texture (i.e., composition) consists of two non-homogeneous parts: verbal (linguistic) and nonverbal (not linguistic). Scholars include films, radio broadcasts, visual propaganda materials, posters, and advertising texts into this type of texts [14.180-181].

E. E. Anisimova describes creolized texts as semiotically complex texts in which various semiotic code tools, including iconic tools, are involved in the formation process [15].

A.A. Bernackaja understands creolization as a combination of different means of semiotic systems that form the state of textuality [16].

Another term in Russian linguistics is the term “polycode,” which is a relatively new concept used to refer to specific texts that contain semantically different components. According to O. Maksimenko, the term has now replaced the term “creolized” [17]. Being the authors of this term, G.S. V. Eiger and W. L. Yukht in their typology of texts distinguish between “mono- and polycode texts.” “Polycode texts should also include cases of pure linguistic code merging with any other semiotic system code (image, music, etc.) in a broad semiotic sense” [18.107].

R. O. Jakobson calls this phenomenon syncretic messages based on a combination of different sign systems, emphasizing the need to clearly distinguish between homogeneous and syncretic (heterogeneous) messages in the study of communication [19].

For all types of semiotically complex texts, i.e. texts consisting of the signs of two or more semiotic systems, a number of researchers have suggested the term “contaminated texts” (lat. contamination - blend) [20].

A. According to E. Bocharyov, “the relation of the language system to other systems should, of course, be regarded as a relation between different semiotics, and accordingly ... should be interpreted as an intersemiotic relation” [21.103].

Later, a new concept called “heterogeneous text” emerged in linguistics. Heterogeneous text “is a phenomenon in which verbal and pictorial elements form a visual, structural, semantic and functional whole and have a complex effect on the addressee.” [22.73].

“The overwhelming majority of studies describe a two-part structure of creolized, so-called dicode texts, in which the verbal and non-verbal parts are highlighted,” is stated by N. V. Schwagla [23], that is, the scholar finds it correct to call texts that arise from the combination of two semiotic systems as dicode

texts instead of polycode texts. At the same time, she repeatedly emphasizes that in the combination of the poetic text and its graphic presentation, language always takes the lead, and the visual form plays a supporting role in enhancing the process of perceiving the work. Otherwise it ceases to be visual poetry. We also find R. Bart's view appropriate here: “Nonverbal objects gain real value only because they are repeated or retransmitted through language” [24.114]. A similar content can be seen in A. Jovtis' statement: “Certain graphic devices have a positive impact only if they contribute to the intonation of the text, comprehension of the content of the work, and do not complicate reading and penetration processes” [25.120].

Speaking of multimedial texts, M. Voroshilova quotes Yu. Gerchuk: “and not every message can exist in isolation, they all form an environment of complex organized symbols - the semiosphere.” The scientist emphasizes that the laws governing the semiosphere, the ways of its formation and development, the identification and expression of the peculiarities of the interaction of the various elements that make it up are among the issues that need to be addressed in the future. “From the study of individual sign systems to understanding of their integrity, not a single step has been taken” [26]. Hence, we believe that the term “semiosphere” proposed by the linguist can also be applied to the integrity of verbal and nonverbal elements in visual poetic texts.

In many sources, the above terms are mainly used for texts in the media. For example, “The texts in modern newspapers and journals are sometimes referred to as lingua-visual complex (Bolshyanova), isoverb (Mikheev), isoverbal complex (Bernackaja), and isoverbal text” [17]. As well as these, they also referred to as semiotic complex texts (A. V. Protchenko), videoverbal texts (O. V. Poymanova) [27], coded- inhomogeneous texts [28]. In our opinion, these terms could also be applied to visual poetic texts, because the textual features mentioned in the explanation of these terms exist in visual poetic texts too.

Above we have presented the terms for texts consisting of signs of several semiotic systems suggested by Russian linguists. It is also worthwhile to study the views of a number of foreign researchers on this type of texts.

First of all, it should be noted that the idea that studying nonverbal signs is not part of linguistic research and therefore only pure language must be the object of linguistics, has been repeatedly stated. In modern linguistics, however, there are many researchers who do not support this view. According to L. Mozdzensky, “... incorporating image and other semiotic resources into linguistic research is still a taboo and has found much resistance in some more traditional approaches... Therefore, it is possible to establish that the elevation of the status of multimedial genres as an object of linguistic studies

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

has just happened recently” [29]. The great importance of semiotics in this regard is emphasized by scientists. In particular, E. Muchchi states that: "Visual poetry offers a field of interesting communicative phenomena which only semiotics, with its widely varied instruments, can adequately investigate"[30.801]. However, highlighting the fact that even if much research has been conducted in this area so far, it is insufficient and the issue has been partially covered, according to Polish linguist, G. Grokhovsky: "There have not yet been any in-depth and thorough theoretical studies devoted to the issue of such intratextual interaction between various signs (despite plenty of notable examinations of certain parts and aspects), nor any attempts to verify general theses through specific analyses..."[30.300]. In his research, the scientist regards texts that contain several semiotic systems as "multi-coded messages". U. Bon uses the term "intersemiotic maze" in relation to such a text: "Visual and verbal cues work together to guide the reader through the intersemiotic maze"[31.16].

Chilean linguist G. Parodi uses the terms "multisemiosis", "multisemiotic text" and "multimodality" in relation to this type of texts, describing them as "the organization of the various semiotic systems that make up a written static text"[32.262]. It should be noted that the linguist's approach to the text is unique and radically different from the views of Russian researchers. Among other scholars (J. Lemke, K. O'halloran, T. Van Leeuwen, M. Bednarek, J. R. Martin), the researcher believes that there are four semiotic systems or modalities that synergetically complement and interact to construct

meaning through the text. These are verbal, graphical, mathematical and typographic systems. The verbal system is composed of words and clauses; photographs, graphics, diagrams, tables, spaces are typical resources of the graphic language; the mathematical system is composed of numbers (Roman and Arabic), letters (Greek and Latin), operators (arrows, parentheses, etc.) and punctuation marks; the typographic system includes the shape and color of the letters (bold, italic, uppercase and lowercase, dimensional (one, two or three dimensional)). It is precisely the signs of typographic system that, in Parodi's view, are the least-regarded and even forgotten by scientists.

Conclusion.

From the above, it can be concluded that while working on texts with visual elements, each scholar conducting research in this area tries to come up with something new. But as they enter this arena, they will have to be prepared to face many unresolved, unexplored fronts. It is quite clear that the meanings of the concepts referred to by the various terms cited in this article are the same. Therefore, we believe that the focus should not be on giving an appropriate name to this type of texts, but rather on identifying their components, analyzing the individual impact of each semiotic system on the addressee, as well as its effect in conjunction with other systems, and a number of other issues. This is especially important for studying visual poetic texts that stands out from other types of multisemiotic texts requiring in-depth attention and thorough analysis.

References:

1. (1978). *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Vip. VIII. Lingvistika teksta.* (p.489). Moscow: Progress.
2. Dressler, W.U. (2000). *Textlinguistik und Semiotik.* In: K. Brinker et.al. (Eds.). *Text-und Gesprächslinguistik. 1. Halbband.* Walter de Gruyter: Berlin. (pp.762-772).
3. Rozin, V. M. (2001). *Semioticheskiye issledovaniya.* Moscow: PER SE; Saint-Petersburg: Universitetskaya kniga. (In Russian).
4. Hart, Ch. (2019). *Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Text and Discourse: From Poetics to Politics.* Print.
5. Jurin, S., & Krišković, A. (2017). "Texts and their usage through text linguistic and cognitive linguistic analysis."
6. Aznaurova, E. (1987). *Pragmatika tekstov razlichnyh funkcional'nyh stilej.* [Text pragmatics of different functional styles]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
7. Hakimov, M., & Gazieva, M. (2020). *Pragmalingvistika asoslari.* (p.480). Darslik - Fargona: "Classic".
8. Hakimov, M., & Nosirova, U. (n.d.). *On pragmatic symptoms.* International conference: Actual problems and solutions of modern philology. Published by Research Support Center <https://doi.org/10.47100/v1i2.260> pp. 46-55
9. Hakimov, M., & Nosirova, U. (2020). Pragmatic indicators of poetic text. *Scopus/International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*|Apr - Jun 2020|Vol 12|Issue 2|ISSN 0975-2366, pp.1692-1697. www.ijpronline.com

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHJ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

10. Norman, B. (2009). *Lingvisticheskaja pragmatika (na materiale russkogo i drugih slavjanskih jazykov) [Linguistic pragmatics (on the basis of Russian and Belorussian languages)]*. Minsk [in Russian].
11. Nurullina, G.M., Ramazanov, R.K., & Usmanova, L.A. (2018). "Psycholinguistic Aspect of Studying the Text as a Product of Speech Activity," *The Journal of Social Sciences Research, Academic Research Publishing Group*, vol. 4, pages 113-116, 11-2018.
12. Slouskaya, K. A. (2011). *Strukturno-semioticheskie aspekty russkojazyčnoj i anglojazyčnoj vizual'noj poezii: avtoref. dis. ...* kand. filol. nauk. (p.23). Nizhnevartovsk.
13. Krysin, L.P. (2008). *Tolkovij slovar' inojazyčnyh slov*. (p.944). Moscow: Jeksmo.
14. Sorokin, Ju.A., & Tarasov, E.F. (1990). *Kreolizovannye teksty i ih kommunikativnaja funkcija*. Optimizacija rečevogo vozdejsťvija. (pp.180-181). Moscow.
15. Anisimova, E.E. (2003). *Lingvistika teksta i mezhkul'turnaja komunikacija (na materiale kreolizovannyh tekstov)*. Moscow: Academia.
16. Bernackaja, A.A. (2000). K probleme «kreolizacii» teksta: istorija i sovremennoe sostojanie. *Rečevoe obshhenie: Specializirovannyj vestnik*. Krasnojarsk. gos. un-t. Vyp. 3 (11), Krasnojarsk.
17. Maksimenko, O. I. (2012). Polikodovyj vs. kreolizovannyj tekst: problema terminologii. *Vestnik RUDN. Serija: Teorija jazyka. Semiotika. Semantika*, №2. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/polikodovyj-vs-kreolizovannyj-tekst-problema-terminologii>
18. Ejger, G.V., & Juht, V.L. (1974). *K postroeniju tipologii tekstov*. Lingvistika teksta: Materialy nauchnoj konferencii pri MGPIIJa im. M. Toreza. Ch. I. (p.107). Moscow.
19. Jakobson, R.O. (1985). *Jazyk v otnoshenii k drugim sistemam komunikacii*. Izbrannye raboty. Moscow: Nauka.
20. Bel'chikov, Ju.A. (1996). *Vzaimodejstvie funkcional'nyh raznovidnostej jazyka (Kontaminirovannye teksty) // Kul'tura russkoj reči i jeffektivnost' obshhenija*. (pp.335-356). Moscow.
21. Bochkarev, A.E. (2003). *Semanticheskij slovar'*. Nizhnij Novgorod: DEKOM.
22. Anisimova, E. E. (1992). Pragmalingvistika i tekst (k probleme kreolizovannyh i gibridnyh tekstov). *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, # 1, pp. 71-79.
23. Shvagla, N. V. (2017). Kreolizovannye teksty v poezii S. Birjukova. *Evrazijskij Sojuz Učenyh*. 2017. #12-3 (45), pp.47-50 <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kreolizovannye-teksty-v-poezii-s-biryukova>
24. (2001). *Bart Rolan*. S/Z. Per. s fr. 2-e izd., ispr. Pod red. G. K. Kosikova. (p.232). Moscow.: Jeditorial URSS.
25. Zhovtis, A.L. (1982) Stihi, kotorye čitaesh'... *Literaturnaja učeba*, # 4, pp.116-121.
26. Voroshilova, M.B. (2006). Kreolizovannyj tekst: aspekty izučeniya. *Politicheskaja lingvistika*, #20. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kreolizovannyj-tekst-aspekty-izučeniya>
27. Sinica, I. A. (2019). *Prezentacija kak rezul'tat kreolizacii učebnogo teksta pri obučenii inostrannomu jazyku*. Russkij jazyk na perekrjostke jepoh: tradicii i innovacii v rusistike / Sbornik nauchnyh statej : sbornik nauchnyh statej po materialam IV Mezhdunarodnoj nauchno-praktičeskoj konferencii, Erevan, 26–28 sentjabrja 2019 goda. (pp.189-194). Erevan: Rossijsko-Armjanskij (Slavjanskij) universitet.
28. Tomchakovskij, A. G. (2009). *K probleme «kreolizacii» leksikograficheskoi stat'i anglojazyčnogo tolkovogo slovarja: istorija i sovremennoe sostojanie* [Elektronnyj resurs] / A. G. Tomchakovskij. Materialy 6-j mezhdunarodnoj nauch.-prakt. konf. pamjati prof. V. L. Skalkina. (pp.567-572). Odessa. Available from: http://dSPACE.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/906/1/4_conf_skalkina_567-572%2b.pdf
29. Mozdzenski, L. (2013). Verbal-visual intertextuality: how do multisemiotic texts dialogue?. *Bakhtiniana, Rev. Estud. Discurso* [online], vol.8, n.2 [cited 2021-04-11], pp.177-201. http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2176-45732013000200011&lng=en&nrm=iso ISSN 2176-4573 <https://doi.org/10.1590/S2176-45732013000200011>
30. Mucci, E. (2019). "Semiotics and 'Visual Poetry'". *A Semiotic Landscape. Panorama sémiotique*, edited by Seymour Chatman, Umberto Eco and Jean M. Klinkenberg, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 799-801. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110803327-149>
31. Grochowski, G. (2015). Where Codes Meet: On the Literary Uses of Iconic Signs. *Teksty Drugie*, 2 (8), 295-320. 10.18318/td.2015.en.2.18.
32. Bohn, W. (2010). *Reading Visual Poetry*. (p.176). Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
33. Parodi, G. (2013). "University genres and multisemiotic features: accessing specialized knowledge through disciplinarity." *Forum linguist., Florianópolis*, v. 9, n. 4, pp.259-282.