RESEARCH ARTICLE   Open Access

A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF LITERARY CRITICISM A STUDY OF HOW LANGUAGE INFLUENCES THE EVALUATION OF LITERARY WORKS

Ahmed Kareem Aljarelah

University of Kerbala, College of Education for Humanities, Department of English Language, Iraq

Abstract

This research delves into the complex connections between language and literary criticism, illuminating how linguistic decisions impact written work assessments. The study dives into different linguistic frameworks such as pragmatics, discourse analysis, and semantics to reveal the nuanced but potent ways language affects critical interpretations and assessments. This examination shows how rhetorical devices, diction, syntax, and metaphor play a part in crucial discourse by looking at literary critiques from various eras and genres. The study delves into how cultural and historical factors shape literary criticism's linguistic representation, illuminating the complex relationship between language and societal ideals. The subjective character of literary appraisal is better understood thanks to this in-depth linguistic research, which sheds light on how critics express their opinions. The results highlight the significance of language awareness in literary criticism by arguing for a more sophisticated and reflective method of assessing literary works.

Keywords Language Influences, linguistic representation, linguistic research.

INTRODUCTION

The good news is that there is currently an abundance of ideas regarding assessing literature. Some of the most popular ideas today hold that the text itself is most important, regardless of who wrote it or who read it, whether we're talking about entire societies or just people or where we are in the literary history timeline. Some might want to assess it similarly to how they would, for instance, a cell phone or flora and wildlife. Accordingly, it may be politely evaluated and contrasted with other natural, potential, or ideal examples of its category in each case. In most cases, the standards used to make such assessments are the ones that the people in charge have already approved. Assuming satisfaction with the outcome (or outcomes) is the deciding factor, one tends to maintain that viewpoint. People who adhere to the standards of "sthitisnehak" may believe that texts are meaningless if the boundaries of critical discourse are constantly being policed. New rules or standards are established to be broken by deviant texts. Translation & Literary Studies and Abdulaziz Alghanem (2020) describe them as "organized sound" fragments or sprays just as captivating.

Some linguists have taken an interest in the language of literary criticism, specifically looking for ways to decipher different forms of literary

criticism so they can better understand the impact of this critical language on literary work evaluations. Using specific corpora of literary criticism, the reported study manipulates and applies sophisticated linguistic methods to extract metrics of critical language used in evaluating various literary works. The work's foundational assumption is that modern literary criticism uses a more diverse vocabulary in both positive and negative evaluation forms. This vocabulary richness is revealed when the right tools extract its characteristic metrics (Bizzoni et al., 2024).

The standard operating procedure in literary criticism is the examination of literary works, which is always facilitated by the use of language. Literary criticism aims to analyze and assess works of literature by pointing out their merits and shortcomings and describing them in a way that readers can understand and agree with. (Aldosari and the World English Journal, 2022) So, the construction of assessment and literary criticism language is foundational to evaluating, comparing, and articulating the value of individual literary works..

THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE IN LITERARY CRITICISM

The duality of narratives involving language and literary critique is a key concept in our understanding of literature. As kies pointed out, literary criticism requires interpretations before it can approach literature. The arts, primarily concerned with the linguistic expression of creative work, are the foundation of interpretation. The essence of artistic interpretation lies in seeing, inferring, and exploring the narrative of language. Aesthetic standards represented in linguistic story are the subject of literary criticism, which involves re-combing and refining the meaning of language. This process directs the ways in which critical assessments and admiration of literature are articulated. In literary criticism, various creative standards are used to assess texts, which might be defined, rethought, or applied in new ways. This dynamic interaction between language and literary critique, or the 'narratives involving language and literary critique ', is the core of our understanding of literature.

Reading literature effectively requires analysis and interpretation. By making assumptions based on what he reads, a reader builds a story out of the narrative's fragments, learning about the characters, their relationships, their motivations, their desires, and the strategies they employ to achieve them (Holur et al., 2021). Storytelling clues, whether explicit (such as naming a character as the "villain" of the story) or implicit (such as describing a character as "scheming" or revealing that they acted deceitfully), frequently serve to direct this interpretation process (Jacobsen & Beudt, 2017). Even when a piece of literature can no longer provide clues, as in the case of reader comments left after a novel has ended, readers still make assumptions and try to deduce the whims of the fictional world (Naimul Hoque et al., 2023).

2.1. Language as a Tool for Evaluation

Short tales, novellas, and novels that take a facilitative rather than doxological approach, as well as those that provide readers with assistance and critically show how a work's literary triage is done, are the typical replies to this subject that this study starts with. This treatment is based on the latter and is enriched by ideas from other areas, such as cognitive semantics, pragmatics, and linguistic (im-)politeness. These are fundamentally linguistic because they use language to assess human experiences, including literary artifacts. Section Seven: Language III. Based on this inclination, the current study aims to conduct a linguistic analysis of a random sample of articles that reflect criticism of selected literary works in an indigenous, high-quality literary journal. The presumed goal is to inform readers about the salient aspects and features of these critical targets inventively. Linguists today would do well to broaden their focus beyond the grammar, phonology, and vocabulary that Kachru (1986) envisioned as crucial for reaching out to people in distant Asian subcontinents, commonwealths, and archipelagos who were formerly British colonial subjects. With expert knowledge of "the six trillion stories and cultures that Perec 1003 originally proposed data collection for," these academics would actively participate in experiencing language in a linked multi-sphere environment.

One common way literature—or any creative form—is characterized is by its perceived quality (Bizzoni et al., 2024). Both economics and philosophy share the tendency to seek to put a numerical value on right and wrong (Jacobsen & Beudt, 2017). Words like "literature," "value," "quality," and "excellence" are tossed around casually in the literary world, just like any other field. Fabbri and Henrique Garcia (2017) highlight the inherent contradiction of literary texts as the dominant issue in literary criticism that deals with literary value. When literary texts are engaged, they demand that such engagements lead to an evaluation of the work in question. In order to analyze literary works and respond appropriately, literary critics draw on a variety of theories. However, it is fair to wonder if and to what degree critics' suspicious language impacts their consideration of the theories and their lack of care for this inevitable dance.

2.2. Language as a Reflection of Literary Value

In premodern acts, literature reflects social views, emphasizing literary critics who are socially traditional linguists and elites who engage in literary construction. Regardless, one unforeseen effect was incorporating foreign literature into national concepts through national theater organizations, which validated historical languages and included cultural modulations.

Regardless of the possibility of viewing criticism as a direct causality between language devices leading to an evaluation, it pertains to whether or not critics employed specific tactics to defend a work's worth by highlighting its linguistic similarities and differences. Concerns about the possible association of literary prestige with linguistic formulations and their value also emerge. Literary worth is associated with linguistic variety, which is distinct from grammatical usage in literary texts and concerns the use of language itself. It has been debated and corrected multiple times that literary worth is attributable to the prestige language of a given social moment, even though literary values reflect other literatures and languages. Eventually, lower-class literature will exploit linguistic diversity as more prestigious literature does, and they will do so until they reach conventional usage

even though prestige literary language is not as effective as it initially seems.

A working knowledge of linguistic analysis and its applications and an understanding of the potential relationships between literary criticism's constructs and stylistic features are prerequisites to comprehending the relationship between language and literary value (Jacobsen & Beudt, 2017). Stylistics is a well-established branch of literary criticism that follows a focus on language (for Translation & Literary Studies & Jabraddar Mahil Abd Allah, 2019). In order to comprehend the value-conveying effects of stylistic implementations, it can examine a wide variety of linguistic devices. Linguists such as Leech and Short define stylistic analysis as studying literary texts for their style using specific methods and tools for linguistic interpretation. However, literary evaluations may be driven by subjective and idiosyncratic objectives as they examine several aspects that establish the worth of literary works, namely their intrinsic literary value (Li, 2022).

LINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO LITERARY CRITICISM

Subclausal, clausal, and superclausal coherence were the foci of second language studies of scientific prose speech heads. Literary critics and researchers can benefit from a linguistic approach to organization and coherence, which elevates discussion and closer textual analysis above subjective opinions. Another interesting linguistic perspective on literary works is speech act theory. In addition to adding to applied linguistics, this study explores several ways linguistic descriptions might shed light on literary works. Text linguistics, new criticism, and empirical schools of literary criticism can all benefit substantially from corpora to conduct more precise analyses in these areas. As helpful as MNIS is for text analysis, it is as applicable to literary research. The paper presents linguistic analyses that are based on Hallidayan SFL. These analyses center on lexicogrammatical aspects and processes within and between clauses (Bizzoni et al., 2024).

This study follows in the footsteps of systemic functional linguistics, developed by Halliday and

Hasan. This approach uses a social semiotic stance to distinguish between three related aspects of language: lexicogrammar, discourse semantics, and lexicology. SFL defines these three aspects, how they relate to one another, and the social impact they have. Linguists seek to comprehend language's interaction with and reflection of more extensive social processes—rather than its direct determination—by investigating patterns and choices across these three domains. Additionally, this work applies CLA to formulaic language in literature, namely language used for evaluating and grading (Gai & Wang, 2022).

Critical linguistic analysis is one method that uses language to examine and critique literature. Following in the footsteps of Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis (CDA), CLA does not directly investigate the texts' social and political relevance and influence, nor does it presume a direct relationship between the meaning of specific texts, their morphosyntactic or semantic aspects (i.e., microstructure) and related social and political issues (i.e., macrostructure). According to Yazdannik et al. (2017), the publications in discourse analysis can be roughly categorized along a line that goes from studies that focus solely on the microstructure to studies that focus purely on the macrostructure.

3.1. Structuralist Analysis of Language in Literature

There is a language uniqueness, as literature's essential linguistic extension has shown through its usage in linguistic configurations within the language order and in conveying information. Since this system is far more heavily reformed than these others due to the writers' effects, it stands out as a "brand-new structure" in all living languages' symbols and other word combinations (Fabbri & Henrique Garcia, 2017). The word message is altered by such structures, which are related to all grammatical systems and bring additional images, art, and meanings to the ICT part.

According to structuralists, language is not a product of free will and awareness, but rather, it is shaped by human psychology and social interaction. We all adhere to certain syntactic knowledge and linguistic discourse when we speak. Structuralists argue that this adherence is the underlying cause of linguistic variations or constant transformations that are implemented in a series of decisions (Furnes & Dysvik, 2011). The rules of the mixing of materials, their mutual effects, and transformation overtones ultimately govern the communication protocol. In literature, these transformative overtones have the same effect, altering the grammatical structures that would occur in real speech. These ornamental word constructs, adapted from the original versions, have become part of common usage. This suggests that literary language is not independent of its societal and individual value judgments, as these components are both structured and perceived as such in literary language.

Language, like literature, is a human creation that serves as a conduit for ideas, emotions, worldviews, intentions, and other forms of information transmission (van Cranenburgh & Bod, 2017). When expressed verbally in literature, information has unique requirements, such as adhering to a specific proportion from the system of derivatives and systematics, redundant, and stable. Just as morphologically specific words validate grammatical rules, syntactic structures use grammar as one of several strategies to generate sentences, which stabilize literary creation and expose topics. The grammar of a language is relevant to literature because literature is an active component of that language. Some linguists and critics firmly assert language and literature's cultural, social, and stylistic aspects.

3.2. Semiotic Analysis of Language in Literature

Li (2022) posits a fascinating perspective, suggesting that linguistic events in literary texts are not confined to simple, interpersonal meanings. Instead, they are a rich tapestry of combinations, discoursal tactics, and a myriad of variations, which significantly broadens the scope of language in general communication. This intricate web of logico-semantic linkages is formed when different clauses in an SFL text functionally automize with one another. The choice of language, with its stylistic and ideational meanings, often overshadows this mechanism, yet it holds profound significance within poetic discourse,

particularly at a fundamental level. Poetry, in contrast to most accounts of SFL speech, appears to balance sentence creation and the combinatorial densities of attitudes, rather than a continuous blending of logico-semantic linkages and composition. These nuanced indicators point to alternative conceptual frameworks, one that prioritizes evaluation meanings over interpersonal ones and representations and metafunctions over content and structure, inviting a deeper intellectual engagement.

The book's third chapter focuses on the semiotic analysis of literary language. Focusing on the interpersonal meanings conveyed through classical Chinese literature's fictitious language, it finds and analyzes several connected linguistic phenomena, thinking about how they affect the overall meaning-making and how readers understand the texts. Consequently, it reveals distinctive features of literary discourse in China. The idea of "meaning" is central to semiotic processes; in SFL, this is seen as a social output. A more abstract, ideational part "simply serves the exchange of information," while the more concrete, interpersonal part "negotiates social relations" and determines particular assessments of those relations. Tenor connections are conveyed through language in "power, solidarity, contact," while attitude, mood, and modality are revealed through language in the forms of "official, personal, intimate, and subjective-imaginary" addresses. In what follows, the author delves into the interpersonal meanings conveyed through tales, character addresses, dialogue excerpts, and the flow of poetry. Thus, in cases involving interpersonal meanings, the most common structures are verbs, phrase patterns, and clause forms, with a few less common semantic methods thrown in for good measure.

Chapter 3 delves deeper into the examination of appraisal and interpersonal meanings in literary texts, expanding on the linguistic analysis of selected critical works. This exploration reveals the intriguing possibility for scholars to enhance their understanding and engagement through training, as there is a wide variety in the choice of appraisal resources and valuation. The evidentiality of an appraisal uncovers the underlying reasons,

providing a deeper understanding of its foundation (Xu & Liang, 2023). The foundations of interpretation, a subject of public discussion and individual evaluation, are of paramount importance in critical interpretation. The chapter's conclusion highlights the diverse evaluation and evidential options in interpretation notes, which not only offer different ways of expressing critical meanings but also the potential for the recontextualization or confirmation of critical assertions by the evidence of other voices (van Cranenburgh & Bod, 2017), sparking a sense of intrigue and curiosity in the reader.

3.3. Pragmatic Analysis of Language in Literature

There is still debate over the relevance of style and tone to expressiveness, personality, and social traits. Aspects of the rhetorical, phonological, syntactic, or lexical arrangement can reveal stances, ridings, personalities, genres, or anything else depending on the speaker, addressee, and environment. The effectiveness of lexical concealment and the challenge of gender identification in forensic linguistics are attributed to this bastion of congruence. According to Abdulaziz Alghanem and Translation & Literary Studies (2020), scholars have argued that, beyond this premise, the proper way to identify the aspects of variance linked to temperateness, tentativeness, or performativeness needs to be clarified. It has been shown that pragmatic characteristics within a specific idiolect tend to correlate and co-occur with one other, generating diverse constellations that may represent a unique personality trait or viewpoint. Some people believe that particular indexes are good identifiers of performativity, although this is only sometimes the case. The speaker's attitude toward the stated event, its relation to the extra-linguistic or linguistic background, and the desired effect on the addressee determine the observable regulation choice among alternative forms in an environment that continues beyond the instant of utterance.

The study and appreciation of literature have been significantly shaped by linguistic research, particularly in the area of pragmatics. Pragmatics, as defined by Gatt and Krahmer (2017), is "the

selection of linguistic or discoursal features appropriate to the modulation of relevance with a reader." This concept is crucial in understanding how authors use language to shape the tone of their written discourse. They do this by incorporating various ways of expressing attitudes. Stylistic features that convey attitude, such as connotative vocabulary, a wide array of syntactic and prosodic variables, a diverse range of rhetorical figures, global discourse principles, and logical operator use, all contribute to establishing a perspective, voice, attitude, or stance. These factors can be modeled according to a particular value of some social variable held by an agent. However, intentional changes in pragmatic aspects can pose intriguing challenges, such as the identification of writers in literary forensics or the attribution of attitudes to fictional characters.

Language and Literary Interpretation

In addition, a literary work's meaning is said to exist "conveyed, as a wordless or unwritten text, through particular signs of sounds or marks which together form a structure separable from external references or expressibility or which are neither exhaustively determined by senses nor governed by historically embodied norms; it itself gives orders or interprets." The numerous goals of the field represent the idea of language as a critical medium for the transmission of meaning in works: to provide units with varying levels of organization, to plot various models, and to comprehend broad patterns (for Translation, Literary Studies, Bouali, 2020). Regarding the internalized component of the objects of criticism (the interpretative traits of the critic) and the matter of critiquing them, the article primarily analyzes the relationship between language and literary interpretation within the realm of literary criticism.

An overabundance of comparison structures, personal pronouns, and negative words and phrases characterizes a weak assessment. In contrast, a robust evaluation characterizes an abundance of superlatives, negations, deletions, additions, and modal verbs. Sormunen et al. (2010) are concerned with the methodological features of literary theory, and Teraava (2007) uses this approach to investigate the evaluative elements of

narrative actors. Because "how a story is seen is always dependent on how it is told" (Rimmon, 2002), the evaluation of literature is intrinsically linked to literary interpretations (Bizzoni et al., 2024).

In 1925, Ibáñez-Molina examined how language impacts the assessment of literary works, marking a significant milestone in the field. He cataloged the many tools used by literary critics to assess the merit of a piece of literature. The two primary categories of duties that a text could have, according to critics, are lexical and stylistic. Using a huge dataset consisting of book reviews, Johansen (2008) developed a model to evaluate the critical aspects of literary criticism. Holur et al. (2021) builds on the work of Hoeken et al. (2002), who postulated that linguistic hints and evaluative content are likely to go hand in hand, and demonstrates that negative and positive contributions differ on several linguistic-structural traits. This rich historical context underscores the ongoing evolution of our understanding of language and literary interpretation.

4.1. The Influence of Language on Reader Response

Conversely, the reader's reaction is contingent upon the writer's dialogical text's construction and the reader's personal experiences, as stated by Louise M. Rosenblatt. Both the "esthatic" text, which is geocentric, and the "aesthetic" text, which is reader-oriented or "efferent," are considered the two extremes of text, as stated in Ebru Çelik Çakmak's presentation of Louise M. Rosenblatt's theory (2011, pp. 2-3). The text undergoes a metamorphosis into the third text while being read or composed. The third text shows that the meaning is connected to the ongoing interaction between the reader and the verbal sublime by combining the writer's text with the reader's experience. This theory's proponent claims that "...the meaning is always beyond the text and is determined by time, constantly changing states, and takes different shapes in different reading" (Furnes & Dysvik, 2011). Therefore, it is clear that various readers will get different meanings from the same book based on their universe of relationships and responses. Reading aloud

profoundly affects readers' evaluations because it allows them to internalize the text and draw on their own experiences, cultural knowledge, and memories of past generations and communities. Louise M. Rosenblatt lends credence to the notion that audience reaction evolves and develops with time.

Amardeep Sinh Jhala is correct in saying that language choices and expressions significantly affect reader reaction and literary appraisal. When a writer wants to get their point across, their language is a significant factor in how the reader will react. According to proponents of the reader-response paradigm, reader agency in meaning construction has always been central. To rephrase, the reader's method of text formation is distinct from the writer's since the reader derives meaning from the words used to make the text. According to Abdulaziz Alghanem (2020) and Translation & Literary Studies, several ideas and concepts have been connected to reader-response theory to emphasize the reader's participation. "The act of reading involves the reader's ability to bridge the gap between textual logicality and reader's world" (1978, p. 78), says Wolfgang Iser.

4.2. The Impact of Language on Authorial Intent

Worthiness Studies[citation] and Reception Studies, two significant literary movements that have emerged in recent years, are direct responses to the author-centric approach. These movements underscore the evolving nature of literary works, which, with the aid of readers and expert critics, accrue value and significance over time, often diverging from the author's original intentions. Rereading a work of literature can reshape its meaning, offering a new perspective that may differ from the author's initial vision. The field of reception studies delves into how the reading context influences the interpretation of literature (van Cranenburgh & Bod, 2017).

In this essay, I aim to argue that critical examination of literary language is essential. At first glance, words having agency or purpose may appear strange. The creator must have the true intention behind the work; the language only conveys it. Consequently, this is mostly accurate.

Its greatest assets are the versatility and openness to multiple interpretations that language possesses as a medium.

On the other hand, language is more than simply a vehicle for transmitting authorial intent. Meaning and messages are not the only things it conveys. The power of language to regress is such that it can fool even the most accomplished authors. "The world is what it is; men who are nothing, who allow themselves to become nothing, have no place in it," wrote VS Naipaul, who may have put it up best. They are utterly insignificant in this world. A language can gain independence through simple changes like capitalization, the placement of commas, or the turn of a phrase. Language is both a medium and a transforming force. It changes to fit its purposes, alters reality to meet its demands, and then asks others to make sense of it and reach a verdict. It can both unveil and conceal the truth. Several readings are possible, and it defies stability [citation].

Consideration of authorial intent vs. lack thereof is a long-standing debate in literary studies. Reference: Bizzoni et al., 2024. Although the precise beginning of the issue is unclear, many point to the 1946 essay "The Intentional Fallacy" by W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe Beardsley as its starting point. This essay argues that readers' understandings of texts are valid regardless of the author's intentions. Since then, there has been a proliferation of conflicting theoretical perspectives on this subject. Therefore, anyone seeking a clear answer must sort through many contradictory sources. There is, nevertheless, an immediate need to strive for a synthesis between authorial aim and reader interpretation. According to Conrad Jackson and colleagues (2021) one way to accomplish this is to examine the works closely, paying close attention to the language employed. After all, language influences the author's intentions and how the audience receives a work.

LANGUAGE AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA IN LITERARY CRITICISM

Critiquing one's own and other people's writings does not rely on language for merely utilitarian purposes. The results of this study show that the recipient's assessment of the satisfying can be

significantly impacted by language. This study contributes to the literature on literary evaluation by outlining the characteristics crucial for the encoder and the multiply-communicative speakers and how it might be operationalized communicatively (C. Bohrn et al., 2012). Debiasing aggressiveness in humanencodification is one practical application of the present paper. It will also be useful for judges, teacher trainers, and anyone who deals with language-based protocols and believes that naturally occurring criticism does not need the graciousness, enforceability, and legitimacy that communication-maximizing criticism theory brings.

Based on previous research on assessment and Habermas's theory of communicative action, a three-stage model is the most effective way to express literary evaluation. This model integrates the concepts above with the present writer's (two editors') appraisal-based framework. This study takes the paradigm further by developing and expanding upon it. This study examined a sample corpus of Dutch literary criticism across time to see whether the evaluation above processes are present (Mohseni et al., 2022). The study's author uncovered a literary shift among 19th-century critics, who began by

1. downplaying complaints as an evaluation tool,

2. shifting to evaluation strategies focused on appreciation and

3. expressing more admiration for the work of others.

The importance of studying language usage in literature evaluation has been underscored by recent studies (van Cranenburgh & Bod, 2017). This current work, situated at the intersection of corpus-linguistics and appraisal-based research, makes a significant contribution to the ongoing discussion. A common gap in literature research on evaluation is the lack of an integrative study of both actors, often focusing solely on the encodee's or interpreter's features. This study, however, bridges this gap by explaining evaluation, both within and beyond the realm of literary criticism, through the integration of linguistic analysis with preexisting

findings from literary studies.

5.1. The Role of Language in Determining Aesthetic Value

But that conceptual blending of the arts with the history, culture, and language in which they insinuate themselves can and has taken many forms. But in the arts and in literature, generally, the most self-conscious cases of this blending are the critical languages that habitually crop up as foils and enhancements of the works so judged. These languages form a record of general aesthetic-historical knowledge and a record of general historical-cultural developments. But, in doing so, they evince an inextrication of the critical from the work of art, painting the latter as variously representing or evading the cultural-linguistic modulations set out by the former. It is clear, however, that the discursive knowledge employed to encode the judgments of the most expert critical languages of literature—friend and enemy to their correlative works of literature and vice-versa—is not just linguistic. The linguistics of literature is not exactly any less limited, a priori, by single-voice aesthetic or interpretative cultural suppositions than are the aesthetic formalisms peculiar to single-genre or single-national-language parts of literary study.

There are many reasons to believe that the language employed for judgment in literary critical contexts is a particularly interesting and valuable linguistic phenomenon to study. This is true, most generally, just because creative verbal expression is a primary vehicle for the expression of judgment on many artistic matters. The most obvious example of this is this type of discourse which overtly avails itself of the personal linguistic appropriation of others' creative linguistic expressions—criticism. Thus, it is apparent that one's knowledge of literature and the other arts is not confined only to aesthetic perception and sensory experience. It infused into the language used for judgment of literary or artistic works. Cultural elements, character.

Although the term linguistic analysis sounds as if it deals largely with matters of language, it has its applications in various other fields such as law, computer sciences and literature (Mohseni et al.,

2020). One such interesting field of study in application of linguistics is in how language is employed by critics to evaluate the literary works. The goal of this study is to find out how the language we use influences the evaluation of literary works and to bring to light many of the implicit assumptions that go into our literary assessments focusing on the issue of the "language of criticism," especially as it may be said to be functioning to facilitate creative evaluation (C. Bohrn et al., 2012). This study, in keeping with the notion that, as George Lakoff suggests, "the analysis of language must be part of the larger analysis of our common conceptual system" (157), concerns itself with the critical language which, taken collectively, contributes to an assessment of what creativity and originality in art may be said to amount to (for Translation & Literary Studies & Hussein Rdhaiwi Al-Marsumi, 2017).

5.2. The Use of Language to Assess Literary Merit

Art and creative commutation, particularly sound exacerbation, balance, and rhyme, are highly regarded, according to linguistic-syntactic studies. Also covered were theme concepts, irony, satire, and adult metaphors and similes used with care. Additionally, characteristics peculiar to a language are examined in adequate evaluation settings. Criteria for literary works differ among cultures, centuries, and types of literature. This variation in encoding linguistic schemes or thematic systems in evaluating literary worth is significant for one literary model or literary four. Since literature constitutes the majority of language production, it is crucial to investigate it through linguistic and stylistic studies to identify the distinctive features of Turkish literary criticism. Process approaches are the main subject of three literary processing studies that compare and contrast Turkish and comparable languages. This also needs an inquiry into the genre's potential merging by linguistic theories.

Literary works have been compared in order to identify whether text is more effective according to established standards (Gatt & Krahmer, 2017). In literary practices, the idea of 'literary merit' is prevalent. Rhetoric, introductions, and reviews written by members of the literary community accompany works of literature that rely on logical evaluation reasoning (Alessandri et al., 2022). The growth and literary quality of language are hindered by writing that mostly focuses on critiquing feminism and fails to identify and categorize the language used to evaluate literature (Chiu et al., 2020). The literature is missing a comprehensive analysis of the role of language in literary criticism evaluation and its impact on work value. This gap in our understanding highlights the need for further research in this area. How can we identify the qualitative representations that have literary merit in a certain genre? When reading literary fiction or poetry, what grammatical and syntactic features are most valued?

LANGUAGE AND GENRE IN LITERARY CRITICISM

There is a parallel literature on the linguistic analysis of literary works, but the nature and role of language in the evaluation of literary works are relatively under-elaborated (Carter, 2012; Labov, 1972a, 1978, 2001; Nikolic, 2010; Steen, 2011a, 2014, 2018; Tsur, 1992; Widdowson, 2013) compared to its role in the construction of literary worlds, mimesis, and the intertextual conversation between one work and the others (Barthes, 1970; Burke, 1941, 1945; Eco, 1979; Fish, 1980; Holquist, 1981; Iser, 1978, 1974; Kristeva, 1969; Lubbock, 1921 [1987]; Ricoeur, 1981; Short, 1981; Todorov, 1965) or the study of narrative structure and plot (Bal, 1985; Cohn, 2014; Fludernik, 1997, 2002; Genette, 1980; Mandler, 1984; Orr, 2003; Ryan, 2013, 2014; Sternberg, 1985; Tamm, 2015; Tatarkiewicz, 1970)

There has been much research in genre analysis in linguistics (Martin, 1985; Bhatia, 1993). Genre analysis is a way to study discourse in specific social and topical contexts. However, as Haberland(2017) and Hyland(2000) point out, genre research is methodologically driven by Corpus Linguistics; Davidse and Morin (2018) have argued that this needs to be revised for the field. New models that attempt to explain patterns of language behavior in response to the circumstances people address have been developed and tested due to the explosion of

available corpus data and advancements in analyzing and modeling the structure of language. Finally, genre analysis has become fixated on idealized patterns of language usage rather than its original ethnomethodological focus on users' ordinary language use.

6.1. Language Conventions in Different Literary Genres

The impacts of the mediation of the related EAP teaching materials, such as presentations and various technical exercises, are suggested by some formative researchers who subtly integrate the study of these linguistic conventions into instruction. This research adds to the whole study by using the bottom-up empirical corpus proof to reflect on the nature of these linguistic standards under varied genres.

Language standards vary among genres for various reasons, including the speakers' native languages and the cultural significance of specific words and phrases. In light of these distinctions, the article delves into ways to sidestep the convention in various text types and languages and how these factors influence the anticipated meaning construction underlying the selections. Furthermore, it has consequences for second language (L2) education and acquiring the knowledge necessary to write formally, using ever-evolving conventions and a growing body of specialized vocabulary (Carney et al., 2014). Because teachers often lack knowledge about how the author's intended communicative purposes in different genres impact language conventions, students may feel frustrated when they receive vague instructions on what is "acceptable" or "appropriate" without any supporting explanation (Burk, 2016).

Language conventions vary throughout literary genres according to the author's goals for conveying meaning (Pu et al., 2022). We used literary works, speeches, ads, official documents, and academic articles as examples of various genres' linguistic conventions to demonstrate our points. According to the research, literary works' linguistic patterns differ by genre, with indexical meanings like abstract references standing out as defining characteristics of literature.

6.2. The Influence of Language on Genre Classification

Artifacts from legal codes, etymological research, and philosophical history demonstrate that the idea that language is the most important aspect in determining genre definitions has been widely held throughout human history. People have managed to secure language's distinctive quality not just in genre, which is the exclusive province of aesthetics, but also in intuitions of basic social orders, such as health, reason, and education. The inherent linkability of language is shaped by the physical, biological, cognitive, and social dynamics that reside inside it.

If we think of genres as genera, the works that make them up are the species that share the genus's textual traits. When deciding how to classify literature works, whether poetry, prose, or science fiction, an equator—language—is an essential tool. Argumentation, cognitive structure, and prosody are all aspects of language that should be considered alongside phonology, syntax, and a system of lexical representations. Language may not be the only defining factor in the genre, but it remains a common denominator. It is hardly surprising that some writers adhere to this principle further; after all, equators are providential (the maneuvering that England discussed earlier).

Literary theorists' approaches have long predominated in literary criticism's canon, according to which a piece of literature is best understood about the genre to which it belongs (Analytics et al., 2018). However, genre research has been under-emphasized regarding literary criticism's actual application, which needs to be more emphasized (Blohm et al., 2017). A social group's commonly accepted mode of example-based communication is called a genre. Analytical and historical considerations are necessary for understanding the human agency that gives rise to genres and their conventions (Analytics & Wilkens, 2018).

LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL CONTEXT IN LITERARY CRITICISM

Subordinate languages and literature written in

them must adapt to the linguistic standard of "Prime Language" in order to rein in the affiliation, identification, and authenticity of the elements at stake since the critic's power is proportional to his or her intellect and, by extension, language command (Frank Chin). The dominant languages spoken in the Southern Hemisphere are heavily influenced by the ideals propagated by classical Indian and Chinese literatures as well as those of European thinkers like Emerson (American Scholar), Arnold (Oriental Renaissance), Goethe (West-Oestlicher Diwan), and Rabindranath Tagore.

Literary criticism is not just a battleground for ideologies but also a platform for cultural and linguistic value judgments since the theory and practice of criticism are not region-specific but heavily impacted by the critic's social, cultural, linguistic, and ideological milieu. As a result of their differing social, cultural, and linguistic positions, Western and non-Western critics engage in ideological conflict over the vast body of English-language world literature. The literary norms and governing bodies of prestigious languages define the linguistic struggle. Language is a tool to control and limit the influence of other languages and literature to maintain this dominant lineage. This thread also shows up when marginalized voices attempt to retaliate by adapting and translating Western canons into their languages to claim them as their cultural heritage. Non-Western critics have had a chance to challenge the linguistic colonial legacy of their country's literature, the canonization of European canons, practices, methodologies, theories, and critical terminology since the emergence of postcolonial theories. Non-Western critical approaches have incorporated translation, cultural studies, comparative literature, and postcolonial theories into their work (Fang, 2022).

According to Abdulaziz Alghanem and Translation & Literary Studies (2020), language is the most important aspect of literary criticism since it allows critics to evaluate works and, in turn, facilitates their interpretation. The critic establishes educational taste or a set of beliefs and attitudes about creative expression, worth, and assessment, and language functions as a battlefield for ideological supremacy in this regard. It is hard to separate criticism from the language that generates it since it is a matter of language; the critic is an integral part of criticism. Literary criticism as a whole and the assumptions and arguments that inform it evolve across time and throughout cultures. According to the World English Journal et al. (2019), literary criticism has evolved in tandem with its intended use, target demographic, societal standards, and institutional context.

7.1. Language as a Reflection of Cultural Values

Across the two sociocultural configurations and the two time periods, the study found that the concept of "values" evolved in its meaning. The prevalent interpretation of "cultural values" in the reviewed Italian articles suggests that, according to Talcott Parsons, the founder of the sociology of values, this could be characterized as a conservative-conformist or traditional stage. During this stage, societies rely on sacred, omnipotent values for guidance, meaning, command, and protection. In the face of a dramatic shift in emphasis and the introduction of competing, more robust value systems, Italian communities are becoming increasingly disenfranchised and disoriented. As a result, members of these communities are practicing for what is ostensibly a postmodern stage—one in which the dominant value systems are crumbling—a crushing, devastating, and terrifying period in which societies descend into abstract relativism, mass standardization, and anomy—as described by contemporary cultural sociologists and literary anthropologists (Wang & Zhang, 2022).

One way to study literary texts—particularly literary reviews—is to analyze the language resources used to express opinions. This allows us to understand how writers portray 'values' in their works. Examining how often certain elements appear in texts can reveal whether they are significant linguistic features of a community's literary system and, by extension, how often they appear in the writings themselves. Searching for and comparing the use of such traits in English and Italian is one of the aims of this research. Sociology of literature, cultural sociology, and literary anthropology all cover methods for studying how

texts portray values. According to scholars in these areas, students' reactions to and evaluations of literary works can tell a lot about a professor's character, upbringing, and social, logical, and moral principles (Shiryaeva et al., 2019).

Language is one of the most potent ways a culture's values, beliefs, and traditions are communicated. Thus, linguists find it intriguing (Bucholtz & Hall, 2016, p. 19; Duranti, 2009, p. 12). Languages and cultures inevitably "borrow" stuff from one another due to colonization and globalization, bringing new linguistic features and critiquing old ones (Silverstein, 2016, p. 181; Blommaert, 2017, p. 139). So, a language's cultural connotations and vocabulary can reveal its evolution and the people who speak it (Enfield & Kockelman, 2017, p. 25). Furthermore, cultural identity and values will likely impact how individuals assess and critique literary works in substance, storyline, and the language employed to create the work (Aijmer, 2017, p. 13). After that, linguists can study literary reviews as a type of journalism review and learn more about the language systems that make them up (Poncini, 2018, p. 39; see also Translation & Literary Studies and Abdulaziz Alghanem, 2020).

7.2. The Impact of Language on Cross-Cultural Interpretation

Typically, a process of domestication is employed to translate disparate linguistic settings. To domesticate a text in translation is to change it to fit the audience's habits, expectations, language preferences, and cultural norms by removing or downplaying cultural or linguistic aspects. When one text incorporates aspects of another culture into another, this process is called foreignization (for Translation & Literary Studies & Almutairi, 2024). Bilal makes the valid point that when there is a gulf between the cultures of the source and target texts, foreign cultural characteristics become more apparent in the translation. Its strength lies in conveying the alienation felt by the reader of the Source Text into the Target Text. In addition, Bilal argues that the difficulty of foreignization stems from the fact that it aims to make readers in the target culture feel odd. According to him, this helps perpetuate the cultural tension associated with being foreign when people

recount stories (van Cranenburgh & Bod, 2017). The goal of domestication is to bring Target Texts closer to the cultural experiences of the intended readers by bringing the people, settings, and events depicted in the texts closer to how the readers see them. So, domestications use dis-juxtaposition to make the retelling's subtleties sound more natural.

According to the World English Journal et al. (2019), translating literature begins with selecting an appropriate language. Because no two languages are identical and no two people's upbringings are identical, it is common practice to abandon the idea of a "translation equivalent"—a term or phrase in the target language that is an exact match for its source language counterpart—when translating. Instead, the translator is faced with the choice of highlighting formal equivalences, which refer to aspects of the text like rhythm, picture, or sound, or functional equivalences, which are aspects of the text that serve comparable functions about reader interpretation as the original text. For readers of translated Young Adult Science Fiction and World Literature, Brisset (2013, pp. 211-212) posits that these strategies are analogous to the actions of the neurotransmitters serotonin and dopamine, which, in the brain, mediate fast interactions that cause instant reactions and, on the other hand, promote slower interactions that might perpetuate patterns over time.

LANGUAGE AND INTERTEXTUALITY IN LITERARY CRITICISM

For example, Al-Qatanani proposed in his 2011 paper that linguistic formalism, by following the textual relations that influence them, may produce a novel intertextual analysis. In addition, Al-Qatanani thinks that linguistic formalism—comparable to linguistics and other text-to-text analyses—is a valuable instrument for literary critical analysis because it establishes connections and interconnections between various texts. In this study, we aimed to concentrate on this particular issue. We were not interested in delving into the work itself but rather literary criticism and its language patterns. We sought to comprehend how the works critiqued, along with the critic's op-eds, articles, and literary magazines, shape the critic's

voice and arguments (Ellegaard & D Pedersen, 2012).

Due to the highly dialogic character of works in literary criticism and theory, intercriticality is an essential component of literary criticism. Specifically, there is a web of dialogically intertextual linkages between the articles, comments, and following publications that critique, speculate, and reanalyze the articles that came before them. As a result, according to Translation & Literary Studies and Abdulaziz Alghanem (2020), only some critical articles or the literary works they draw on can be considered perfect texts accessible from the impact of intratextual influences on their content. This is because, for example, the influence parameters continue to shape an article's critique of a particular piece of literature. To that aim, language and discourse patterns both inside and between texts significantly impact literary criticism.

Literary criticism literature is rich with citations of foundational theories, methodologies, and works. Literary criticism exemplifies the principles of textual interaction and connection commonly seen in literature. It is, therefore, a topic rich with intertextuality (for Translation & Literary Studies et al., 2019). A defining characteristic of literary criticism is the breadth of its focus, which includes both the works of literature and critical evaluations of those works. This creates a network of literature reviews. Literary works such as novels, plays, and poetry are not evaluated independently. Instead, different critical perspectives and reactions to it are widely recognized among readers and experts in the field of literature, and they substantially impact how the original work is viewed in the future.

8.1. Language References and Allusions in Literary Works

Twelve references are categorized as alcoholic in deBoer Books (2020). Classical allusions and fragments are found in the British National Corpus. Among the pieces, the names of three well-known ancient poets—Virgil, Homer, and Horace—are the most common. Up to 164 instances of language were discovered! The Wordsworth Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English, which relies primarily on extracts from the British National Corpus and other inaccessible open general corpora, now includes line references for poetry and paragraph/section references for prose (Translation & Literary Studies et al., 2019).

Classical allusions are references to the ancient world and its languages that have always played an essential role in British writing. They pique the curiosity of lexicographers in particular. This study assesses the presence, usage, and presentation of eleven articles on partial and complete versions of the selected alcoholic classical allusions from a large corpus of deBoer Books in four dictionaries for English language learners (2020). Their inclusion in the updated 2018 Oxford English Dictionary is likewise assessed in this research (Fabbri & Henrique Garcia, 2017). Additionally, it provides graphic pronunciation alternatives for several of these articles and provisionally selects English iron pronunciations. Classical references have played a significant role in British culture and English literature, at least since Shakespeare's time and possibly far earlier (for Translation & Literary Studies & Abdulaziz Alghanem, 2020).

8.2. The Use of Language to Establish Literary Connections

Literary allusions also display many signs that call for an analytical reaction. Moreover, the critic's use of language to transform the text and put criticism on the side of evidence and logic rather than a subjective and fallible construction causes many literary connections and critical responses through the semantic sections of the veiled signified. Textual features also help in identifying the critical construction: linguistic clusters show specific connections between the literature and criticism in different ways, like when the critic mentions the author's biography and uses linguistic signals to do so or when the critic uses historical "weave information" outside of literature to contextualize, both of which are understood by the audience of the criticism supplements. Literary allusion, the writer's critical self, and other forms of writerly presence can all be shaped by the reader's perception of this connection to their criticism's "poetics present" or otherwise.

As mentioned earlier, literary criticism is still

relevant today because it is essential for readers to discuss and debate different theories and perspectives on interpreting literary works. This discussion is facilitated by language, and the texts themselves are art, texts, and connected forms of meaning. Literary tropes, cultural and social moments portrayed in texts, and texts' historical and contextual significance can all be discussed through language. The idea that literary criticism serves as a cultural intermediary hinges on the premise that communities generally use the same strategies that critics use to analyze and make sense of aesthetic communication. We must inquire: what exactly does a critic do if not decipher the symbolic, cryptic, polysemous, or metaphorical meanings bestowed upon works of art in order to make them available to the public for debate?

Language is the bedrock of our ability to make sense of the world and share our experiences' complexities with others. Therefore, it should be no surprise that language is suitable for assessing and analyzing literature's distinctive epistemic features (van Cranenburgh & Bod, 2017). A continuing dialog about culture, society, and individual identity cannot be sustained without critical criticism, especially literary speech (Knöchelmann, 2024). Both the individual reader's process of meaning-making and the institutional opportunities and limitations on linguistic negotiation of literary meaning are shown by this response. This is why it is crucial to examine how the critic and the literature it is critiquing may benefit from linguistic linkages that highlight the need for more study and enrich the critique and literature in question (World et al. et al., 2019).

CONCLUSION

Several arguments could be advanced to justify critics' temptation to use cliches or imprecise terminology. The pressure of looming due dates is one possible cause. The reviews included in this analysis were often produced under intense time constraints for prominent newspapers or magazines. Critical requirements can be lowered due to time pressure. "In deadline conditions you've got three days to do a hundred thousand words," Peter Kay said in an interview with poet Anthony Wilson, adding that newspaper articles must be written at a specific rate (Kikkenborg Berg et al., 2013). I should mention that I went through the same thing when I reviewed books for New Statesman & Society, or Socialist Future, the country's first effort at a broad-left weekly—a sort of hard sanitarium—and wrote about it frequently. That is where I honed my lightning-fast speed and successfully published the work of one of the most prominent writers every week.

According to Yazdannik et al. (2017), this study aims to show how literary criticism may be assessed using language analysis. In the end, the study found both good and bad things about literary critics' methods to back up their opinions. Therefore, the conclusion could be viewed as ambivalent. The fact that literary critics provide honest, fair, and evidence-based evaluations of literature is a strength (Alessandri et al., 2022). However, critics' use of nebulous language, clichés, and meaningless adjectives undermines the credibility of their assessments.

REFERENCES

1. for Translation & Literary Studies, A. W. E. J. & Abdulaziz Alghanem, A. (2020). A Critical Controversy: Reader-Response Theoreticians Opposing New Critics. osf.io

2. Bizzoni, Y., Feldkamp, P., Marie Lassen, I., Jacobsen, M., Rosendahl Thomsen, M., & Nielbo, K. (2024). Good Books are Complex Matters: Gauging Complexity Profiles Across Diverse Categories of Perceived Literary Quality. [PDF]

3. World English Journal, A. & Nasser Aldosari, B. (2022). Investigating the Legal Discourse of Bill Clinton's Impeachment Trial. osf.io

4. Holur, P., Shahsavari, S., Ebrahimzadeh, E., R. Tangherlini, T., & Roychowdhury, V. (2021). Modelling social readers: novel tools for addressing reception from online book reviews. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

5. Jacobsen, T. & Beudt, S. (2017). Stability and Variability in Aesthetic Experience: A Review. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

6. Naimul Hoque, M., Ghai, B., Kraus, K., & Elmqvist, N. (2023). Portrayal: Leveraging NLP and Visualization for Analyzing Fictional

Characters. [PDF]

7. Fabbri, R. & Henrique Garcia, L. (2017). A Simple Text Analytics Model To Assist Literary Criticism: comparative approach and example on James Joyce against Shakespeare and the Bible. [PDF]

8. for Translation & Literary Studies, A. W. E. J. & Jabraddar Mahil Abd Allah, M. (2019). Investigating Cohesive Devices in Wordsworth Poetry. osf.io

9. Li, J. (2022). Emotion Expression in Modern Literary Appreciation: An Emotion-Based Analysis. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

10. Gai, F. H. & Wang, Y. (2022). Correlated metadiscourse and metacognition in writing research articles: A cross-linguistic and cross-cultural study. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

11. Yazdannik, A., Yousefy, A., & Mohammadi, S. (2017). Discourse analysis: A useful methodology for health-care system researches. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

12. Furnes, B. & Dysvik, E. (2011). Results from a systematic writing program in grief process: part 2. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

13. van Cranenburgh, A. & Bod, R. (2017). A Data-Oriented Model of Literary Language. [PDF]

14. Xu, J. & Liang, Y. (2023). Negotiating intersubjectivity by interpersonal and appraisal shifts in Chinese-English government press conference interpreting. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

15. Gatt, A. & Krahmer, E. (2017). Survey of the State of the Art in Natural Language Generation: Core tasks, applications and evaluation. [PDF]

16. for Translation & Literary Studies, A. W. E. J. & Bouali, A. (2020). Resurrecting 'Metaphor' inside the EFL Poetry Classroom: a Nudge towards an Integrated-Model. osf.io

17. Conrad Jackson, J., Watts, J., List, J. M., Puryear, C., Drabble, R., & A. Lindquist, K. (2021). From Text to Thought: How Analyzing Language Can Advance Psychological Science. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

18. C. Bohrn, I., Altmann, U., Lubrich, O., Menninghaus, W., & M. Jacobs, A. (2012). Old Proverbs in New Skins – An fMRI Study on Defamiliarization. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

19. Mohseni, M., Redies, C., & Gast, V. (2022). Approximate Entropy in Canonical and Non-Canonical Fiction. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

20. Mohseni, M., Gast, V., & Redies, C. (2020). Comparative Computational Analysis of Global Structure in Canonical, Non-Canonical and Non-Literary Texts. [PDF]

21. for Translation & Literary Studies, A. W. E. J. & Hussein Rdhaiwi Al-Marsumi, N. (2017). The Use of Tautology in "The Thorn" by William Wordsworth: A Stylistic Study. osf.io

22. Alessandri, E., Baldassarre, A., & Jane Williamson, V. (2022). The critic's voice: On the role and function of criticism of classical music recordings. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

23. Chiu, M. C., Feng, T., Ren, X., & Narayanan, S. (2020). Screenplay Quality Assessment: Can We Predict Who Gets Nominated?. [PDF]

24. Carney, J., Wlodarski, R., & Dunbar, R. (2014). Inference or Enaction? The Impact of Genre on the Narrative Processing of Other Minds. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

25. Burk, D. (2016). Patents as Genre: A Prospectus. osf.io

26. Pu, L., Heng, R., & Cao, C. (2022). The effects of genre on the syntactic complexity of argumentative and expository writing by Chinese EFL learners. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

27. Analytics, C., E Underwood, W., & Research Group, N. T. M. (2018). Genre Theory and Historicism. osf.io

28. Blohm, S., Menninghaus, W., & Schlesewsky, M. (2017). Sentence-Level Effects of Literary Genre: Behavioral and Electrophysiological Evidence. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

29. Analytics, C. & Wilkens, M. (2018). Genre, Computation, and the Varieties of Twentieth-Century U.S. Fiction. osf.io

30. Fang, Q. (2022). Research on Sino Japanese

Comparative Literature from the Perspective of Sustainable Ecological Environment. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

31. World English Journal, A., Yaseen Mustafa, S., & Hadi Khalil, H. (2019). Order and Chaos in Young Adult Science Fiction: A Critical Stylistic Analysis. osf.io

32. Wang, W. & Zhang, X. (2022). A cross-cultural analysis on the Interpersonal meaning of attitude resources in Chinese and English online consumer reviews. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

33. Shiryaeva, T., Arakelova, A., Golubovskaya, E., & Mekeko, N. (2019). Shaping values with YouTube freedoms: linguistic representation and axiological charge of the popular science IT-discourse. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

34. for Translation & Literary Studies, A. W. E. J. & Almutairi, S. (2024). The Controversy of Teaching World Literature and the Importance of Translation in The Field of English Studies. osf.io

35. Ellegaard, H. & D Pedersen, B. (2012). Stress is dominant in patients with depression and chronic low back pain. A qualitative study of psychotherapeutic interventions for patients with non-specific low back pain of 3–12 months' duration. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

36. for Translation & Literary Studies, A. W. E. J., Amine Belaid, M., & Hamza Reguig-Mouro, W. (2019). The Ghost of Windrush Past: Intertextuality in Sam Selvon's The Lonely Londoners (1956). osf.io

37. Knöchelmann, M. (2024). Cultural Intermediation and Civil Society: Towards a Hermeneutically Strong Conception. osf.io

38. Kikkenborg Berg, S., Zwisler, A. D., D Pedersen, B., Haase, K., & Lærum Sibilitz, K. (2013). Patient experiences of recovery after heart valve replacement: suffering weakness, struggling to resume normality. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov