THE PROBLEM OF THE TEXT IN UZBEK PHILOLOGY

Marufjon Yuldashev
DSc in philology, Professor, The Uzbekistan
State Institute of Arts and Culture, Uzbekistan
Zuhra Yuldasheva
Researcher of the Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract. Naturally, the text, like any whole, consists of its constituent elements, certain units. There is a lot of debate in linguistics about which units make up a text or which units are considered text units when dividing a text into fragments. At first glance, it seems that assigning text units is not so difficult. But in fact, this is not the case, so there are many different views on this issue among researchers of text linguistics..

Keywords: text, language, linguistics, literary criticism, aesthetics.

When defining the text, we paid special attention to two main features, namely, coherence and integrity. Naturally, coherence and integrity arise between sentences and on the basis of the semantic-grammatical unity of sentences. Almost all textual scholars have never lost sight of these two signs. Especially in the definitions given to the text by Western linguists, it is regularly emphasized that the sequence of sentences, the chain of sentences, is the main side of the text, without which the text cannot exist. For example, the Dutch linguist S.Dik sees "the highest form of agreement in the textual chain of sentences". In other words, the text is formed as a product of high-level coordination of independent sentences (of course, in order to express certain information). High-level coordination, of course, the integrity of the text itself, is the harmony of all aspects between sentences that create a whole, that is, semantic, syntactic, communicative, aesthetic and all other aspects. The text exists as a result of such mutual harmony and consistency of sentences. Based on these one or two considerations, we can conclude that the basic unit of the text is the sentence. But the evaluation of a sentence as a text unit is not so common in linguistics. On the contrary, there are many controversial approaches to this.

Most linguists consider a sentence not a unit of text. For example, I.R.Galperin says that the unit of the text may not be a sentence, but a relatively large whole that unites a number of sentences - a whole larger than a phrase (“superphrasal unity”). He emphasizes that a sentence participates as a component in such a whole, and a sentence, which is an integral part of a larger whole than a phrase, cannot be an integral part of the entire text at the same time.

From the same phrase, it can be seen that the assessment of a larger whole ("superphrasal unity") as the main unit of the text is common in almost all linguistics. The concept expressed by this term is called differently by different linguists, that is, there are several synonyms for this term. For example: “superphrasal unity” (O.S.Akhmanova), “complex syntactic whole” (A.M.Peshkovsky, N.S.Pospelov), “text component” (I.A.Figurovsky), “prose stanza” (G.Y.Solganik), “syntactic complex” (A.I.Ovsyannikova), “monologic statement”, “communicative block” and others.

In Uzbek linguistics, a number of different terms are used to express this concept. For example, A. Mamazhonov initially used the term “large syntactic unit”, but later on he regularly uses the term “supra-phrasal syntactic unit”. I. Rasulov and Kh. Rustamov, who paid special attention to the stylistic problems of the text, prefer the term "complex syntactic integrity". M. Abdupattoev, who monographically studied such units in the Uzbek text, considers it appropriate to use the term “supra-syntactic integrity”. We also prefer the term "supra-syntactic integrity" as a term that more correctly and impartially reflects the essence of the phenomenon.

In this Ph.D. thesis, M.Abdupattoev scientifically substantiated the essence, syntagmatic and semantic-methodological features of supra-syntactic units in the Uzbek text. It should also be said that the researcher has developed principles (semantic, grammatical and compositional-stylistic) for determining the boundaries of the textual content of supra-syntactic units, their selection. On this basis, he rightly stated that the completion of a small topic in the text and the transition to a new topic is one of the factors that determine the structure of the supra-syntactic whole, that there is a strong semantic-grammatical connection between relatively independent sentences. that make up this whole, and that this connection ensures the semantic-structural integrity of the supra-syntactic whole.

Naturally, sentences participate in the formation of a supra-syntactic whole, no one denies this. But the combination of two or more sentences into a whole is not just a process, but a rather complex and multilayered phenomenon. There are a number of factors that add to this set of statements. Most researchers (I.R.Galperin, O.I.Moskalskaya, Z.Y.Turaeva, L.M.Loseva, A.Mamajonov, M.Tukhsanov, M.Abdupattoev and many others), who thought about this issue by the presence of a single subtopic, on this basis, commonality and mutual harmony of the content of sentences, semantic-grammatical and communicative integrity are noted as such factors. For example, the following passage contains all these factors, so it can be called a separate supra-syntactic whole: When a person is too frightened, his limb becomes immobile and painful, of course we know that this is because he is very afraid. In fact, if a tiger comes at us, we are very afraid, because death awaits us, a person has nothing more to fear, except death in the world. Naturally, we consider this fear natural. But

what is interesting is when we are waiting for the happiness of the world, when a prophecy about happiness is given to us, why we become the same as when we are waiting for death, and our organic organization forgives the first situation (A. Kadiri, "Past Days").

It can be said that there is no doubt that supra-syntactic units are textual units. They are undoubtedly the basic unit of the text.

Some linguists talk about the presence in the text of single sentences that are not part of the supra-syntactic units, and evaluate them as "free" sentences, on the basis of which they classify free sentences as text units among the supra-syntactic units. A. Mamajonov and M. Abdupattoev also support this opinion and, analyzing such free sentences in the text in Uzbek, give an example taken from the novel “Horizon” by Said Ahmed:

That mulberry tree that hides the summer heat in its chest, burning fields and stones, at noon resting its head on the brave chest of a noble youth...

Those days promised Dildor great happiness, a life as sweet as a dream. The deceived girl still felt the pain of the moments when it was noon.

Many still do not know how much fidelity costs for a woman.

Dildor couldn’t blame anyone. She knew she had only herself to blame. If she had not betrayed Nizamjon, these days would not have happened.

The authors emphasize that the underlined sentence belongs neither to the first supra-syntactic whole consisting of two paragraphs, nor to the second supra-syntactic whole in the form of the last paragraph, therefore it is a free sentence. It can be said that in terms of content, such free sentences in the text serve to express the author’s explanation, mention of a specific related topic, lyrical digression, and so on.

Some linguists consider a sentence to be a fragmented “minimal unit of text”.

In this regard, the comments of M.Y.Bloch are especially noteworthy. In his opinion, the direct element of a holistic text structure is not only a unit larger than a phrase (in our opinion, a supra-syntactic whole), that is, it is not only a combination of sentences, but also separate sentences to which the author of the text attaches an important status. The very status of such sentences requires their selection as separate paragraphs in monologue written speech. In this opinion, he seems to be referring to the freedom of speech mentioned above. But M.Y.Bloch draws attention to the extreme importance of any sentence in the text. He says that this is the most important (cardinal) element of speech expression in terms of text construction, which is confirmed by studies based on observation of speech in various forms and purposes (oral, written, everyday, professional, quiet, emotional, and others). He writes: “This becomes clear as soon as we remember that speech is an expression of predication, that is, the assignment of the nominative content of speech to reality. None of the "real" units of text presented as alternatives to a sentence has its own means of expressing predication.

This means that the text cannot express judgments and conclusions outside the sentence, that is, the text loses its ability to serve as a full-fledged means of conscious reflection of the world."

A similar idea can be seen in the work of other researchers. For example, the Russian linguist G.V.Kolshansky emphasizes that the sentence expresses a subject-predicate relationship and is a content-structural unity that allows the content to be formed as a logical thought in the text, and that the sentence is "the main operational element of the text". We can say that it is difficult to imagine without words the content of the text, the relationship of this content to the objective world, that is, its correct understanding.

It seems that the place of the sentence in the text system, especially its ability to create a text, cannot be denied. Speaking about the text-forming features of speech, experts recall a very figurative saying (1838) of one of the figures of Russian rhetoric I. Davydov: "Speech is the grain from which a whole work grows." In general, the sentence is a unique material in the formation of the text. Taking this into account, it is appropriate to consider any sentence within such units, recognizing both free sentences and supra-syntactic units as text units.

One of the most controversial and widely studied issues of text linguistics, in particular the definition of text units, is the question of the essence, nature and status of a paragraph in a text. In this regard, a huge number of scientific works have been created in Russian and European philology, their number exceeds several hundred. Most of them discuss issues such as the relationship between paragraphs and supra-syntactic units ("supra-syntactic unity", "complex syntactic whole", general and different aspects, their level of significance in the text, and so on). But in advance it must be emphasized that, in our opinion, comparing a paragraph with supra-syntactic integers, comparing them with each other, is not very reasonable from the point of view of scientific logic.

In linguistics, one can meet several different points of view regarding the interpretation of a paragraph and its meaning. Let's look at some of them.

Comparing the supra-syntactic whole ("superphrasal unity") and the paragraph, O. I. Moskalskaya emphasizes that the supra-syntactic whole is a phenomenon that has a syntactic essence, and the paragraph is a unit of the compositional level. Other researchers also pay attention to the status of the paragraph as a compositional and stylistic unit in the text.

A number of researchers say that a paragraph cannot be a syntactic structural unit. In their opinion, the paragraph is not a unit of the language system, therefore, it does not have grammatical features that serve to distinguish it from other syntactic units, therefore it is not a separate syntactic unit. Based on this, they do not consider the paragraph to be a syntactic category and state: "The syntactic structure of the text has

no unity, except for a phrase, a combination of words, sentences, complex syntactic units.” At the same time, they emphasize that a paragraph is a unit consciously singled out by the writer in order to facilitate the perception of thought in the practice of writing.

And some linguists are trying to prove that the supra-syntactic whole (“complex syntactic whole”) cannot be considered as a syntactic unit in the text, and only a paragraph can have such a status in the text. For example, L. G. Friedman, who studied the same question on the material of the German language, believes that a complex syntactic unit does not have relevant indicators that determine its status as a syntactic unit, so it will be correctly interpreted in the style of not a grammatical unit, but a logical-semantic one. unit formed on the basis of the content commonality of a number of independent sentences. The author criticizes the fact that in the studies of a paragraph as a stylistic, literary and compositional unit, the features that secure the status of a syntactic unit for it are either relegated to the background or completely ignored. He puts forward a rather harsh opinion about the essence and status of a paragraph as follows: “We consider that a syntactic unit larger than a phrase, being a unit of a relatively lower level and having a different set of relevant features from a sentence, is a paragraph... Without denying the role of a paragraph as a compositional unit, we believe that it is primarily a syntactic unit, because the syntactic nature of a paragraph is the basis, the basis that allows it to be used as a literary and compositional unit". It seems that the researcher is interpreting a paragraph as a syntactic phenomenon, just like a sentence, and is trying to firmly establish the idea that the basic unit of text is a paragraph.

This point of view, although not so sharp, is shared by other linguists, especially specialists involved in the methodology of teaching foreign languages. For example, in one of the works of this direction, a paragraph is singled out as an obligatory element of text formation, it is emphasized that it is an integral unit with its own structure in the linguistics of the text, and on the basis of this it is concluded that the paragraph is a “small text” inside a “large text”, types content such as “paragraph-analysis”, “paragraph-description”, “paragraph-contrast”, “paragraph-analog”, “paragraph-definition” distinguish it.

List of references:

1. Moskalskaya O.I. Grammar of the text. –M.: Higher School, 1981, p. 5-6.
2. Nikolaeva T.M. Linguistics of the text. Current state and prospects / New in foreign linguistics. Issue. 8. Linguistics of the text. –M.: Progress, 1978, p. 5-39..
3. Galperin I.R. Text as an object of linguistic research. –M.: Nauka, 1981, p. 5-7. Dijk van T.A., Kinch V. Strategies for understanding a connected text / New in

foreign linguistics. Issue. 23. Cognitive aspects of language. –M.: Progress, 1988, p.153-211.

4. Lotman Yu.M. The structure of the artistic text. –M.: Art, 1970.
5. Loseva L.M. How the text is built. –M.: Enlightenment, 1980.
6. Odintsov V.V. Text style. -M.: Nauka, 1980.
7. Zarubina N.D. Text: linguistic and methodological aspects. -M.: Russian language, 1981.
8. Turaeva Z.Ya. Linguistics of the text. –M.: Enlightenment, 1986.
9. Sidorov E.V. Problems of speech system. –M.: Nauka, 1987.
10. Kamenskaya O.L. Text and communication. -M.: Higher school, 1990.
11. Gorshkov A.I. Russian style. -M.: Astrel-AST, 2001, p. 53-258.
12. Valgina N.S. Text theory. –M.: Logos, 2004.
13. Budagov R.A. Philology and culture. –M.: MGU, 1980, p. 78-80.
14. Зәкиев М.З. Хәзерге татар әдәби теле (Синтаксис). -Казан, 1974, 257.
15. Зәкиев М.З. Хәзерге татар әдәби теле синтаксисы һәм пунктуациясе. -Казан: Татарстан китап нәшрияты, 1984, 199-226-б.
16. Abdullaev K.M. Theoretical problems of the syntax of the Azerbaijani language: Abstract of the thesis of a doctor of philological sciences. - Baku, 1984, p. 33-43.
17. Gulomov A., Askarova M. Modern Uzbek literary language. Syntax. - Tashkent: Uchitel, 1987. p. 6-7.
18. Tukhsanov M. Microtext and the system of expressing its coherence in Uzbek artistic speech: Abstract of the thesis of a candidate of philological sciences. - Tashkent, 1987.
19. Mamajonov A. Linguistics of the text. -Tashkent, 1989.
20. Mamazhonov A., Abdupattoev M. Text syntax. - Ferghana, 2002.
21. Turniyazov N. Linguistics of the text (text of lectures). - Samarkand, 2004.
22. Yuldashev M., Ramazanova S., Tojimatov R. Expression Of The Linguistic Concept Of “Motherland” In Muhammad Yusuf’s Poetry //Journal of Positive School Psychology. – 2022. – T. 6. – №. 10. – C. 4179-4186.
23. Yuldashev M., Yuldasheva Z. Linguopoetic Features of Repeated Units in Uzbek Folk Epics //Telematique. – 2022. – C. 4258-4265.
24. Mahmudov N. M., Yuldashev M. M. Literary Text And Its Linguopoetic Issues Research //Journal of Positive School Psychology. – 2022. – T. 6. – №. 10. – C. 4157-4168.
25. Yuldashev M. The Problem Of Text In Lınguıstıcs: text definition, text units and text types. 2023, Tashkent: Tubo Nashr.