

## TEXT IS A HIGH-LEVEL SYNTACTIC UNIT

Turniyazova Shakhnoza Nigmatovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Doctor of Philology (DsC)

turniyazova2019@gmail.com

### ANNOTATION

The article deals with the linguistic status of the text, views on text analysis, syntactic analysis of the text. Thoughts on syntactic semantics are given. In particular, it provides theoretical information that syntactic semantics does not only study the semantic weight of the text, but also analyzes the semantic weight of the text, checks the interpretation of issues such as the completeness of the text, the logical integrity. At the same time, a wide range of the subject of the study of syntactic semantics of texts is considered, while the syntax is directly related to the fact that the object of examination is not only a small syntax, but also a large syntax.

**Keywords.** Text, syntactic semantics, stylistics, verdict, syntactic unity, propositive structure, predicate.

### INTRODUCTION

One of the main problems in linguistics today is whether to approach text analysis from a syntactic point of view, or to study it for stylistic purposes, or whether it is expedient to establish a new field called text linguistics.

Most experts, who do research on the interpretation of syntactic problems, understand the text as the highest syntactic unit. The components of this unit are sentence, complex syntactic device, paragraph. Some of the scholars, who study stylistic problems, consider the text to be a stylistic phenomenon.

### THE MAIN PART

In addition to the above, it should be mentioned that the problems of syntactic semantics are beginning to attract the attention of linguists now. However, as syntactic semantics is inextricably linked with lexical semantics, as well as with phonetic rules, it cannot be said to exist in an autonomous state. We can see this in the propositive structure of the text.

Clearly, the propositive structure is based on a particular predicate. The predicate, on the other hand, requires a primordial structure, that is, a semantic structure. The predicate is based on this semantic situation and forms a propositive structure with its arguments. In complex syntactic devices of text status, however, we see a macropropositive structure formed by the relation of more than one propositive structure. At the same time, semantic invariants are formed from the relationship of predicates to arguments. At this point, of course, the locutive act of pragmatics is actively involved as well. This act is active within the phonetic rules. On this basis, the phenomenon of syntactic semantics begins to take shape.

When syntactic semantics was first described, it was considered within the grammatical context of the sentence. However these days we see that its boundaries have expanded to include the full text as well. We see this first in larger units than in the sentence.

Syntactic semantics does not study the semantic weight of a text, but analyzes the semantic weight of the text. In this case, the interpretation of issues such as the completeness of the text, the logical integrity is checked out.

It is well known that every word in a sentence forms a logical whole. Verdict arises through this very process. At the same time, it should be noted that we must distinguish the concept of verdict from the usual logical verdict. The reason is that the verdicts are studied one by one in logic. In linguistics, however, we can comment on several verdicts and compare them. For example, it is common for the number of sentences to be more than one in a paragraph. It means that the text is formed from the relation of verdicts. Linguist L.P. Dobraev commented on this: "If a sentence that is a part of a certain text gives the expression of a sentence, we think that we have every reason to consider the text as a complex verdict because it consists of several sentences".

In this case, the scholar calls a complex verdict a "text verdict." It is possible to agree with the scholar's opinion, because since the text is complex in structure, the verdict is also called by the same name. G. Ya. Solganik, like L. P. Dobraev, has the same opinion. A similar view has been expressed by scholars such as R.E. Longakr, van Dijk. Of course, these ideas provide sufficient opportunity to study the syntactic semantics of text.

According to Professor N.Turniyazov's viewpoint, the problem of syntactic semantics requires a general semantic structure formed within the framework of human thinking about reality, which by its nature depends on the occurrence of a particular sentence or micro- or macrotext, and this semantic analysis involves more sentences and microtexts in a complex syntactic device. However, our current achievements in the field of text linguistics allow us to study the syntactic semantics of larger speech material, namely macrotexts.

Indeed, the broad consideration of the subject of the study of the syntactic semantics of texts is at the same time directly related to the fact that the object of examination of syntax is not only a small syntax but also a large syntax. At the same time, it should be noted that the investigation object of the syntax is not the speech, but the text. This is because, according to tradition, we have always put forward the idea that the expression of a complete thought is reflected at the level of speech. This idea actually needs to be understood relatively. Sometimes oral expression is observed when two or more complex syntactic devices are taken together.

In this case, it must be said that when we say the expression of a complete thought, we certainly understand the logical integrity of the thought. We can sometimes see this situation both in words and in some cases in syntactic units such as complex syntactic devices and paragraphs. However, that is not the essence of the matter. The reason is that in many cases, the stage of development of thinking cannot be completed within the framework of a single judgment. We have to focus on a number of interrelated verdicts in order to do this.

Now we are traditionally studying that logical judgment consists of a subject-predicate relationship. However, we do not use this concept when we comment on the text. Indeed, the text is a top predictive phenomenon. Therefore, it is considered to be an object that gives a complex verdict expression. It is well known that the logical weight of a predicate is studied, mainly in the sentence expressed in simple sentences. Therefore, when we study the syntactic semantics of a text, we focus on the relationship between the predicates of the text components. Indeed, the overall semantic weight of the text depends on this.

However, now in logical research there is talk of proving the correctness or incorrectness of an idea not only through a single verdict of a particular sentence, but also through several verdicts. This method is called the method of proof in logic. However, this method has not yet been used in linguistics. It is natural that the research to be conducted in this direction will serve as an object of new research.

In the analysis of complex syntactic devices in mathematical logic, the main focus is on studying the relationship of sentences within the device. In this process, the phenomena of **conjunction** (a term denoting “and” conjunction in logic), **disjunction** (a term denoting “or” conjunction in logic), **implication** (a term denoting a conjunction in appearance “if ...” in logic ...) are in the focus. However, no serious attention is paid to the interpretation of the general meaning of the text. In mathematical logic, in other words, text analysis is meant only to satisfy the needs of logic.

The theory of communication is also very important in the study of the semantic weight of text structure in a complex syntactic device template. After all, the text not only requires a complex sentence, but also serves a communicative function as a whole. In addition, the communicative function of the text is closely related to the goal set by the speaker. That is, the illocutive act performed by the speaker is inextricably linked with the semantic weight of the text.

Of course, it is natural to use logical rules in the study of text semantics. These rules can be a tool in the study of the semantic integrity of a text. We need to pay great attention to semantic integrity, which is very significant. The reason is that various confusions occur due to the ambiguity of meaning. As Sh.Safarov noted: “Without referring to the meaning, it is impossible to distinguish the relationship between events, their grouping and generalization”.

The communication analysis of the text is different from the logical-semantic analysis. This difference can be seen in the fact that the communication analysis covers several micro- and even macrottexts at a time. Communication analysis, on the other hand, is largely based on the function that the text performs. The newspaper articles that cover the news, as well as technical recommendations and questionnaires, are the examples of this. They involve the performance of a specific task.

It should be noted that the types of text according to their communicative functions have not been studied even from the point of view of syntactic semantics. According to prof. N.Turniyazov, the following communicative goals should be studied in the cognitive-pragmatic direction for this, in particular, in the context of the interpretation of illocutive, perlocutive acts: 1. To express the message. 2. To describe. 3. To conclude, explain. 4. To prove. 5. To explain. 6. To ask, to command, to beg. 7. To call, to invite.

Indeed, syntactic semantics is directly related to these types of communication. However, this problem has not yet been resolved. It would not be a mistake to say that J. Austin’s information about the performative act is the beginning of the solution to this problem. By a performative act, a scientist is referring to the expression of a message based on a specific (definite) action.

Based on the above, it can be said that the phenomenon of syntactic semantics is still in its early stages of development. That is why there is no consensus in the opinion of scientists about this problem. A. Nurmanov rightly states the following: “Although semantics is now recognized by almost all linguists, there is no consensus on the status of syntactic semantics.” This encourages our scientists to do more research.

It should be mentioned that K. Kojevnikova notes that the hierarchically interconnected text of the text indicates that the problem of including components such as complex syntactic device, paragraph, chapter, complex integrity is explained. In her view, text is the highest ideal unit of communication.

In the research of Professor V.G. Gak, the text is analyzed as a syntactic unit. The components of such a unit are statements of a different nature. The scientist states that the logical-semantic relations of the sentences in the text form its semantic structure. In an analogous situation, if each sentence is considered to indicate or interpret a certain fact, event, such a sentence can be considered as a term of that fact or event (nomination of this fact). The sentences in the text can be compared to each other depending on what fact or event they represent, and they are divided into the following two types: 1) different object sentences, 2) the same object sentences. While different object sentences represent different events, the same object sentences give a description of a particular event.

This suggests that V.G. Gak's teaching is based on the idea that text analysis is based on sentence analysis, and thus it is important to interpret text analysis (text in general) as a syntactic phenomenon.

In our opinion, it is also expedient to interpret the text as a syntactic unit at the highest level. This is because its components, such as sentence, complex syntactic devices, do not require explanation. It is these units that also take an active part in the formation of the paragraph. While this is one side of the issue, the other side is the arrival of a complex syntactic device, such as paragraphs, in a text template. Even a single sentence, as mentioned earlier, can be equated to an entire text surrounded by a particular speech environment.

Understanding the text as a unit of communication seems to be interpreted, after all, is it correct to interpret a completed written speech material, such as the text of a lecture, or even a monologue speech material, as a unit of communication? The unit of communication is formed in the process of speaking. Therefore, it seems expedient to study it in the context of dialogic speech material.

However, even though the sentences in the text are semantically related to each other in time and space, they are relatively independent units in terms of syntactic area and structure. Therefore, we consider that the issue of semantic relations of sentences in the syntax of the text should not be ignored. The main reason for this is that independent sentences and complex syntactic devices, which are the components of each text, are surrounded by a single semantic weight. In other words, each of the independent syntactic devices in the text structure is semantically integral, even if it is not always completely dependent on the other.

If the sentence or complex syntactic device on its left side that forms the beginning of the text connects the text with such syntactic structures on the right side of the previous text, conversely, the syntactic structures on the right side of the text provide such a semantic connection with the structures on the left side of the next text.

It should also be noted that text analysis cannot be compared to sentence analysis. The reason is that the syntactic analysis of a sentence deals with the definition of primary and secondary parts in our current grammars, the syntactic analysis of text components does not require the concept of traditional parts of speech at all.

When syntactic components of a text are syntactically interconnected, sentences containing lexical repetition, synonymous means used at the text level, sentences beginning with additional devices and participles, or consonant conjunctions used after a period are considered. This situation can also be observed between independent texts. The examples to this include paragraphs that start with a preposition or conjunction, a diamond, an introductory word, and a compound. If the morphological means in the connecting function serve to provide a syntactic relationship of the syntactic devices within a text, the means providing the semantic and, to a certain extent, syntactic relationship between the texts are connected with the preceding text through the first sentence of the text in which they take part.

In addition to the above, one of the characteristic features of a paragraph that begins with a preposition or conjunction in a large text (macrotext) is that if such a paragraph connects with the preceding text in both semantic and syntactic plans, the following text is related to the general semantic plan. Complex syntactic devices and paragraphs, which can be used in a large text and can take the status of a text even when taken independently, differ sharply from each other in terms of linguistic levels, since complex syntactic devices are literally based on the syntactic relationship between two points of two or more sentences, the paragraph relies on the semantic relationship of sentences and complex syntactic devices between several points in the text. Therefore, complex syntactic devices and paragraphs can only be similar in appearance.

V.A. Kukharenko argues that the components of the monolithic state, formed as a result of the interaction of text, complex syntactic device and paragraphs, represent a strictly regulated system. However, this does not mean that the text is a syntactic whole that cannot be divided into parts. If necessary, it can be studied in parts. In other words, by means of the deductive method, the text is divided into segments, and sometimes into syntagmas, and thus an idea of the semantic and syntactic relations of the components of the text is formed. For example, a large text may contain more than one chapter and paragraph, and they may be further subdivided, and so on. In this process, of course, a hierarchical relationship is formed between chapters, paragraphs, and sentences. In this regard, the following opinion of E. Benveniste is correct: "Any unit of language can achieve its position only when it is used as part of a unit larger than itself." This consideration also applies to speech units. According to him, we can conclude that the microtext can also have its own status only if it can enter into a larger unit - the macro text.

Of course, the text size will vary. If a particular piece of art requires a single text as a whole, all the chapters within it are examples of relative macro texts that can be interpreted separately, the paragraphs within a chapter are smaller texts relative to the chapter, and the complex syntactic devices within a paragraph are microtexts. In fact, a work of art, a scientific monograph, etc., which form a certain whole, are the highest points of the text.

In our opinion, the study of the structure of such macrotexts, research on its pure linguistic interpretation and analysis of such a text structure as a whole system is much more complicated, it is one of the as yet undiscovered aspects of textology. Therefore, we found it expedient to work on the linguistic interpretation of fragments (separate parts) of macrotext in our work. The reason is that the analysis of such macro texts serves as the subject of separate research.

L.A. Novikov calls the parts of the macrotext by the term “quantum” and writes about it: “Each quantum (component, fragment) of the text represents a multi-level phenomenon. This can be called a piece of text located on a vertical line. Such quanta of the text interact with each other along a straight line, that is, in a horizontal line, and serve to expand the plot of the text, its ideological content, images. It can be called a functional-dynamic structure of a literary text”. This opinion of L.A. Novikov that quanta serve to expand and improve the ideological content, images, plot of the text, at the same time form a functional-dynamic structure of the text, is significant. Indeed, the dynamic text structure shows that language elements move in time. The reason is that the speech that takes place through the structure of the text introduces the elements of language into the flow of time. In this process, the speaker strives to ensure the perfection of speech by making effective use of the tools available in the language system.

It is well known that speech is directly related to the concept of “sentence”. Sentence is the primary means of shaping speech. With this in mind, E.A. Referovskaya calls a sentence the smallest (minimal) unit of speech. Therefore, in text linguistics, it seems expedient to study each sentence as a microsystem. While this is one side of the issue, the other side is observed in the creation of opportunities to study the linguistic nature of the macrosystem that makes up the text material through microsystems.

### CONCLUSION

However, it should also be noted that the text and its linguistic interpretation have been approached superficially so far. In this case, mainly the use of homonyms, synonyms, antonyms or paronyms in a macro-art work, or the norm of using metaphors, metonymy, synecdoche phenomena in a particular play, was studied. In other words, the study of the language of a work of art in this way does not provide the scientific information necessary for the linguistic interpretation of the text, for its analysis as a rounded system.

### REFERENCES

1. Solganik G.Ya. Syntactic stylistics. -M., 1973.
2. Vinokur T.G. On the content of some stylistic concepts // Stylistic research. -M., 1972. - p.43.
3. Turniyazov N.K. Some comments on syntactic semantics and text formation. Modern linguistics and derivation laws.//Republican scientific-practical-conference materials. Samarkand, 2018.
4. Austin J.L. How to do things words. - Oxford: Clardon Press, 1962. - p.92.
5. Dobraev L.P. Logic is a psychological analysis of the text. - Saratov, 1969. - p.14.
6. Moskalskaya O.I. Grammar of the text. - M., 1981. - p.52.
7. Safarov Sh. Semantics. - Tashkent, 2013.-p.217.
8. Nurmonov A. On the semantic structure of speech // Semantic syntax of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent, 1992. - p. 27
9. Kozhevnikova K. on the aspects of connectivity in the text as a whole // Syntax of the text, - M., 1979. - p. 66.
10. Gak V.G. Re-nomination at the sentence level // Text syntax. -M., 1979. - pp.91-102.
11. O'rinboev B. Modern Uzbek Conversation. - Samarkand, 2006. - pp. 72-77
12. Kukharenko V.A. Text interpretation. -M., 1988. -p.69.

13. Benveniste E. Levels of linguistic analysis // New in linguistics. -M., 1965. -pp.438-439.
14. Novikov L.A. Artistic text and its analysis. –M., 1988.-p.19.
15. Guillaume G. Langage et science du langage. –Paris-Quebec, 1969.
16. Referovskaya E. A. Linguistic studies of the structure of the text. - L., 1983.- p. 4.
17. Khrapchenko M.B. Text and its properties // Questions of linguistics, 1985, №2. -p.6.