

**IMMANENT AND CONTEXTUAL TEXT ANALYSIS IMMANENT AND
CONTEXTUAL OUT-OF-CLASS BASED APPROACH DESIGNING
LITERATURE LESSONS**

Saidova Nodira Mustakimovna*

*Lecturer,

Department of Theory of Primary Education,

Bukhara State University,

UZBEKISTAN

Email id: saidova@mail.ru

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00260.9

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the methodological problem of literary text analysis in the process of teaching literature. The choice of one or more methods for analysis usually depends on the text itself and the goals of the researcher. But in methodological practice, the most productive and appropriate is the combination of two approaches - immanent and contextual. These two approaches cover almost all the main literary methods and contribute to a holistic and adequate understanding of the text. The article considers in detail the possibilities and limits of the use of immanent and contextual analysis in the study of a literary work.

KEYWORDS: *Analysis, Method, Learning, Immanent, Contextual, Close Context, Far Context, Understanding.*

INTRODUCTION

There are problems in the methodology of teaching literature, which, for all their awareness, familiarity and theoretical elaboration, remain controversial and difficult to solve for the majority of philologists. One of them is the school analysis of a work of art. The paradoxical nature of the solution of this methodological problem lies in the very essence of the concept of "analysis", in the scientific specifics of the analytical study of the work and in the methodical art of the philologist to refract it in a dialogue with the student. The presented situation is conflicting. What is analysis in general and analysis of a work of art in particular?

Analysis (Greek analysis - decomposition, dismemberment) - a method of scientific research by considering individual aspects, properties, components of something, as it is interpreted in the Explanatory Dictionary of S.I. Ozhegov. "Analysis of a work of art is the study of the parts and elements of a work, as well as the relationships between them" [1]. As can be seen from the definition, on the one hand, this is a strictly scientific procedure for working with a text, to some extent violating the integrity of its perception and based on specific literary knowledge. And knowledge, as you know, needs to be explained. On the other hand, a work of art, like any work of art, affects the reader emotionally - it surprises, pleases, shocks, in a word, excites. Explanation and excitement are different things, lying on different planes, difficult to combine, and often excluding each other. The conflict between the rational and the sensual becomes even

more aggravated in the process of the school study of literature. This gives rise to discussions and disputes among methodologists and philologists about the appropriateness of analyzing a work of art in school. [2]

The importance of the first perception of a work of art through expressive reading, called the hours allotted for the teaching of literature, "hours of inspiration, emotional uplift and moral insight." Schoolchildren in such lessons should not analyze the text "with a pencil in their hands", but "surrender to the process of reading as a process of joyful communication with the book." A rather large group of critics and language teachers who saw in the analysis of the work its formal, rational, stereotyped and boring study. Discussion "Read or analyze a work of art in a literature lesson?" dragged on for decades. At the initial reading, much escapes the attention of young readers. It is possible to teach thoughtful reading only by developing the ability to analyze the text in the unity of form and content, the ability to feel the author's position in everything.

So, to read and enjoy primary perception, or to read and analyze a work of art, thereby deepening primary perception? Is it really necessary to analyze a work of art in school? Does it destroy the emotional impression of the read? Does it not excommunicate the young reader (who reads so little today) from the book? What should be the analysis of the work at school and how can it develop the child? To what extent, with the help of what methods and techniques, at what stage of literary education can one seriously and deeply engage in the analysis of a work in the classroom? These questions are not bypassed in their teaching activities by any thinking, rooting for the fate of literature at school, reflective philologist. It will be interesting for a future teacher of literature to know that these same questions have been raised almost from the very time when the methodology of teaching literature was just beginning to take shape as a science. By the way, Methodist scientists of the 19th century. did not use the term "analysis", but they considered the analysis of a work of art necessary, although they solved it differently. The difference in methodological concepts in relation to this problem was expressed in determining the direction, essence, goals and objectives of working with a literary text. [3]

The methodological schools and directions of the turn of the century (logical-stylistic, historical-cultural, psychological, formal) continued to develop different approaches to the study of a work of art: some focused on studying the style of the writer, others on the psychology of the author-creator and the creative process, and others focused on on the analysis of the form of the work as a set of artistic techniques. It is curious that instead of the term "analysis", which is familiar to us, almost all works used its equivalents: "philological reading", "explanatory reading", "educational reading", "analysis", "criticism", "consideration". The method of "parsing" a work of art can be represented by the list of those methods and techniques for working with text that are mentioned in the works of various methodologists of the 19th century. and the turn of the century: "working with the layout of the parts of the work", "explaining incomprehensible words and expressions (statar reading)", "establishing links between individual thoughts and facts in a work of art", "conversation", "method of questions", "composition analysis", "sound method (expressive reading, memorization)", "comparison, juxtaposition", "composition", "retelling". From the point of view of modern approaches to the analysis of a work in school and its methodology, these techniques may seem too simple, "schoolboy". [4]

In literary criticism, there are two approaches to the analysis of a work of art: contextual and immanent. Any analysis of a work of art should be directed to its core, in depth, since the

explanation of the work must be sought "within itself" (K. Brooks). The work can be considered as a proper artistic phenomenon. In this case, we will talk about immanent analysis, i.e. beyond what is stated in the text. And at the same time, the fact that a work of art is associated with a certain life and cultural context is absolutely indisputable, which gives reason to consider it as an expression of a certain era or the author's spiritual life. Distinguish between the nearest (specific) contexts and remote (general). The first include, as a rule, the creative history of the work, the biography of the author, his personal connections. To the second - the phenomena of socio-cultural life, literary traditions, the experience of past generations, biblical reminiscences, archetypes, etc. The context in which works of art are created is diverse and wide. V.E. Khalizev believes that attracting and studying contexts is a necessary condition for penetrating into the semantic depths of a work. However, in his opinion, immanent analysis can also be used in school practice. Which approach should be given preference in the middle classes, and which - in the senior ones? M.L. Gasparov believes that it is impossible to start with contextual analysis. "You need to start with a look at the text and only at the text - and only then, as the reader matures and the need for a deeper and more comprehensive understanding, expand the reader's field of vision" [2]. Sharing the point of view of Gasparov, we are talking about the need for immanent analysis in the middle classes, meaning the degree of focus on the work itself. We insist on such concentration also because the general cultural and aesthetic experience of the adolescent is not broad enough to attract external connections. Life (biographical) context can be the subject of attention insofar as it can shed light on the work itself. Biographical research provides valuable material for a systematic study of the psychology of the creator and the creative process itself. But this already shifts the focus of attention to the human personality itself. And to understand the spiritual life of the author, the teenager still lacks his own emotional and spiritual experience. In addition, the context of life becomes interesting to eighth graders due to the increased attention to the individual at this age. Thus, teenagers may be interested in a work of art in itself, and they discover it for themselves. However, any analysis today cannot be strictly hermetic. The involvement of the context somehow accompanies the immanent consideration of the work. In the middle classes, the context should be close (the context of the genre, era). In high school, of course, distant contexts are involved. Their actualization makes the analysis wider, richer, expanding the cultural and aesthetic experience of the young reader. In addition, in the upper grades, students get acquainted with works that are rather difficult to perceive and understand (works of the Silver Age), the meaning of which can only be discovered by attracting contexts. In any case, the context is suggested by the author of the work. Literature at school needs to be paired, synthesizing the immanent and contextual study of artistic creations. Let's add as much as possible. Let us keep this "conjugation" as one of the principles of school analysis.

According to IO.M. Lotman, "the solution of each scientific problem is determined both by the method of research and by the personality of the scientist: his experience, talent, intuition" [4]. These words of the scientist can be fully attributed to our problem. The richer the spiritual world of the philologist, the more original his personality, the deeper his aesthetic and emotional experience, the more subtle and attractive will be the analysis that he will offer to young readers in the lesson.

Questions and tasks

Compiling a glossary.

Make a dictionary entry "School analysis of a work of art."

We work with text.

1. Make a detailed lecture plan. Highlight that (or those) point (s) that (s) seemed (s) to you the most interesting (s) and expand it (or them) into a thesis.

2. Read the text of the lecture using the "Review" strategy. The lecture material should be partly familiar to you (the problem of analysis is primarily a literary problem). This strategy can be described step by step as follows:

What is familiar?	Highlight information in the text that you know
What kind themes affected?	Refer to the title and keywords, think about what topics will be covered!
What are yours appear questions?	Formulate proposed questions
How organized chapter material?	How are topics, sub-themes, micro-themes highlighted in the chapter?
Vocabulary	Write down no more than 5 terms and give them an interpretation or translate into another language/modality (picture, graph, diagram, symbol, etc.)

3. Make a cluster (or table) "The ratio of literary and school analysis of a work of art."

Answering questions, completing assignments

- 1. Which of the approaches to the analysis of a work of art in the methodology of teaching literature of the XIX century. do you think are the most modern and promising? Whose studies do you plan to read?
- 2. Compare the system of constituent elements of the analysis of the work proposed by V.V. Golubkov at the beginning of the 20th century, with the one that is offered now. What has changed in the approaches to the analysis of the work at school today?
- 3. If you are already familiar with the practice of teaching literature at school, then what else, in your opinion, hinders the effective implementation of the analysis of the work in the classroom today?

- 4. How does school literary analysis differ from literary analysis? Name 3-4 main differences.
- 5. How do you understand the principle of a holistic analysis of a work of art? Give an example of its implementation in practice (including from your student experience).
- 6. Give an example of the implementation of any literary concept of the analysis of a work in a lesson. Show how literary analysis will be transformed into school analysis. Write a short methodological justification for your example.

Reflection

Re-read carefully the fragment of the lecture devoted to the discussion about the analysis of a work of art in school. What point of view are you willing to defend? Why? Argue the position in your defensive word.

Contextual analysis should not replace immanent analysis, but only supplement it, contribute to a more complete and deeper understanding of the work. The expediency of involving contextual data of one kind or another must be established in each specific case, based on the characteristics of a work of art.

REFERENCES

1. Skaftymov AP. Poetics of a work of art. Moscow: Vysshayashkola, 2007.
2. Lotman YuM. About poëtahipoëtsy: analysis of the poëtic text. Article's research. Notes. Reviews. Performances. St. Petersburg: Art-SPB, 1996.
3. Bakhtin MmM. e Aesthetics of verbal creativity. Moscow: Art, 1979.
4. Halizev VEO. Composition of literary criticism and the specifics of its methodology. Nauka o literature v HH veke (history, methodology, literary process): sbornikstatej. Moscow, 2001.