
CONFERENCE ARTICLE**The Concepts of 'Minimalism' and 'Psychological Realism': Dynamics of Transfer from European Literary Theory to Uzbek Texts****Samatova Gulnoza Nematjonovna**Assistant Lecturer at Samarkand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article explores how the European theoretical constructs of minimalism and psychological realism travel into Uzbek literary practice and criticism. Treating concepts as portable repertoires rather than fixed taxonomies, the study analyzes how stylistic reduction, subtext, and ellipsis associated with minimalism, as well as interiority, motivation, and causal psychology associated with psychological realism, are adopted, hybridized, or resisted in Uzbek prose. A focused comparative reading of twentieth- and twenty-first-century European and Russian exemplars alongside selected Uzbek short prose and novellas informs the discussion. Attention is paid to narrative economy, focalization, dialogic texture, and closure. The results suggest that Uzbek texts selectively appropriate minimalist "surface discipline" while re-anchoring it in culturally salient ethical frames, and that psychological realism is adapted through dialogized inner speech in which private cognition is refracted by communal idioms and moral axioms. The article argues that transfer dynamics operate through translation series, curricula, and editorial paratexts, producing a situated poetics where the two repertoires co-exist as complementary rather than antagonistic modes. Implications are proposed for translation practice, criticism, and syllabus design.

KEYWORDS

Minimalism; psychological realism; Uzbek prose; narratology; interiority; subtext; transfer of concepts; comparative poetics.

INTRODUCTION

Minimalism and psychological realism are frequently treated as oppositional: the former privileges reticence, metonymic detail, and the aesthetics of omission; the latter foregrounds inner life, causal motivation, and reflective depth. In European and North American criticism of the twentieth century, these modes developed recognizable protocols associated with Hemingway's theory of omission, Carver's pared-down style, and the modernist short story on one side, and the Jamesian and Russian traditions of psychological causality on the other. Uzbek prose evolved at a crossroads of Persianate narrative legacies, Russian-Soviet schooling, and post-independence global reading, making it an especially sensitive site for testing how imported concepts are naturalized. Rather than assuming direct imitation, this article tracks how minimalism and psychological realism are filtered through translation and pedagogy, stabilized by paratextual labels such as "hikoya" and "qissa," and recalibrated by local discourse ethics that privilege social intelligibility and moral anchoring.

The aim is to describe the mechanisms by which minimalism and psychological realism from European theoretical discourse are transferred and adapted to Uzbek texts, to identify the narratological and pragmatic adjustments that accompany this transfer, and to assess the degree to which the two repertoires function competitively or synergistically within Uzbek short prose and novellas.

The study combines conceptual synthesis with close comparative readings. The theoretical baseline draws on programmatic essays and criticism associated with minimalist practice and with psychological realism in European and Russian traditions. On the reception side, paratexts from Uzbek editions

and school anthologies were consulted to observe how works are framed for readers and how key terms enter classroom and public criticism. The textual sample, illustrative rather than exhaustive, pairs European and Russian short prose that exemplify each mode with Uzbek texts whose narrative economy, focalization, and closure suggest engagement with those repertoires. Analytical attention centers on the distribution of scene and summary, the density and placement of detail, the presence and syntax of inner speech, and the relation between epiphanic perception and ethical commentary. Because the goal is to model transfer rather than to measure it quantitatively, the method privileges pattern-seeking across cases.

Comparative reading indicates that minimalism enters Uzbek prose primarily as technique rather than ideology. The reduction of descriptive spread and reliance on salient detail are evident in short prose where objects and gestures carry disproportionate narrative weight, and where dialogue is choreographed to create subtextual pressure. Yet the endings rarely embrace open indeterminacy for its own sake; the charged pause is often aligned with an ethical horizon that gives the withheld explanation a culturally legible direction. This inflection does not cancel minimalism's surface discipline; it reframes the unspoken as morally resonant rather than purely aesthetic. Psychological realism, by contrast, is adapted through dialogized interiority. Instead of extended free-floating streams of consciousness, Uzbek texts frequently embed inner speech within proverb, verse fragments, or an implied address to elders, God, or community, converting individual cognition into a socialized monologue. The narrative voice thus oscillates between close focalization and communal idiom, preserving access to

motivation while avoiding solipsism.

Transfer dynamics are mediated by translation and curricula. Anthologies that align Chekhov with the Uzbek hikoya canon naturalize a short-form psychology grounded in gesture and implication, thereby smoothing the path for minimalist techniques. Meanwhile, Russian critical terms related to “*motivatsiya*” and “*psikhologicheskaya tochka zreniya*” circulate in Uzbek pedagogy, stabilizing expectations that characters’ actions must be causally intelligible even when narrated with economy. Editorial paratexts contribute by labeling texts “*qissa*” when longitudinal exposition and moral consequence are foregrounded, and by foregrounding “*hikoya*” when epiphanic compression dominates; these signals guide readers toward either a minimalist or a psychological-realist reading protocol without excluding the other. The result is a hybrid field where a spare stylistic surface can coexist with ethically framed motivation and where inner life is rendered briefly yet densely through cultural idioms.

The observed adjustments point to a model of concept transfer governed by reception horizons rather than by formal fiat. Minimalism’s rhetorical force in Anglo-American discourse was tied to a late-modern suspicion of explanation and an aesthetic of reticence that relocates meaning to the seam between text and reader. When this repertoire crosses into a literary culture that values social readability, the unspoken becomes an invitation to ethical inference rather than an embrace of ambiguity for its own sake. Hence, minimalist endings in Uzbek prose tend toward soft adjudication, where a final image or silence aligns with communal values without tipping into didacticism. Psychological realism, which in European criticism risks overexpository introspection, is moderated through dialogized inner speech. The private is not insulated from the social; proverbial wisdom and liturgical cadence shape the rhythms of thought, producing interiority that is both intimate and public. This adaptation resonates with Bakhtinian accounts of heteroglossia while maintaining the phenomenological intensity associated with modern psychological prose.

These dynamics also clarify why the two repertoires are more synergistic than antagonistic in Uzbek texts. Minimalist technique provides the surface economy demanded by short forms and contemporary publishing, while psychological realism, recalibrated through communal idiom, supplies motivational depth that anchors the narrative ethically. The combination yields a situated poetics: detail-driven scenes, compressed dialogue, and withheld explanation are balanced by morally legible subtext and flashes of interiority that are audible as social speech. For translators, this hybridity poses the task of preserving both the low-temperature surface and the culturally coded resonance of inner speech; flattening dialogized monologue into neutral free indirect style risks erasing the very mechanism that domesticates imported psychological realism. For critics and teachers, the implication is to avoid binary categorization in favor of feature-based description that tracks how brevity, subtext, and interiority cooperate within a single text. Syllabi can stage this cooperation by pairing minimalist exemplars with Uzbek texts that display ethical anchoring and dialogized interiority, making explicit how translation and pedagogy mediate the traffic of concepts.

Minimalism and psychological realism travel into Uzbek prose as flexible repertoires whose techniques are selectively adopted and culturally recalibrated. Minimalism’s economy, metonymic detail, and strategic omission are retained, but their indeterminacy is often ethically oriented; psychological realism’s focus on causation and inner life is preserved, but interiority is dialogized through communal idioms that socialize thought. The transfer is sustained by translation traditions, curricular canons, and editorial paratexts that cue readers toward compatible protocols. Recognizing this situated synergy improves translation choices, sharpens critical vocabulary, and supports pedagogical designs that teach concepts as adaptable

toolkits rather than rigid labels. Future research might broaden the corpus, include discourse-analytic study of classroom talk about these modes, and test reader reception to measure how ethical anchoring conditions the interpretation of minimalist endings.

References

1. Hemingway E. *Death in the Afternoon*. — New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1932. — 358 p.
2. Carver R. *What We Talk About When We Talk About Love*. — New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981. — 159 p.
3. Chekhov A. P. *Polnoe sobranie sochineniy i pisem*. T. 8: *Rasskazy*. — Moskva: Nauka, 1977. — 624 p.
4. James H. *The Art of Fiction* // *Longman’s Magazine*. — 1884. — Vol. 4. — P. 502–521.
5. Genette G. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. — Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980. — 285 p.
6. Bakhtin M. M. *Voprosy literatury i estetiki*. — Moskva: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1975. — 504 p.
7. Ginzburg L. Ya. *O psikhologicheskoy proze*. — Leningrad: Sovetskiy pisatel, 1977. — 352 p.
8. Shklovsky V. O. *Teoriya prozy*. — Moskva: Federatsiya, 1929. — 288 p.
9. May C. E. *The Short Story: The Reality of Artifice*. — London; New York: Routledge, 1995. — 208 p.
10. Booth W. C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. — Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983. — 572 p.