



Journal Website:
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ijll>

Copyright: Original
content from this work
may be used under the
terms of the creative
commons attributes
4.0 licence.

THE TEXT AND ITS UNITS RESEARCH IN LINGUISTICS

Submission Date: July 09, 2023, Accepted Date: July 14, 2023,

Published Date: July 19, 2023

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ijll/Volume03Issue07-07>

Marufjon Yuldashev

Dsc In Philology, Professor; The Uzbekistan State Institute Of Arts And Culture, Uzbekistan

Dilrabo Andaniyazova

Phd In Philology Phd., Scientific Researcher Of The Institute Of Uzbek Language, Literature And Folklore Under The Uzbekistan Academy Sciences, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Language is an extraordinarily unique phenomenon as a central and at the same time extremely complex object of study of old and new sciences that explore the essence, psyche and human activity from different angles. The path of direct awareness and manifestation of this mysterious phenomenon is to divide the entire flow of speech into parts, to divide it into pieces, to be able to imagine each part or particles separately, and also to be able to perceive proportional and even disproportionate relationships between these parts or particles, there is no doubt that his mind went through a long and difficult path of gradual improvement. He also discovered such ways of using language in the process of human self-expression, development processes, connecting these speech fragments with each other, as a result of which he became the author of a miraculous tool called artistic speech. Masterpieces of the word, created as unique forms and samples of such beautiful speech - legends, myths, epics, fairy tales, proverbs, riddles, songs, poems, dramas, stories, novels and novels live, are created and, of course, will be created as unique evidence of artistic human genius. This art of magical speech is explored with such disciplines as linguistics, literary criticism, aesthetics, history, so to speak, hand in hand, together, in cooperation. But regarding the study of the life of the language in this special area, called fiction, although the beginning of the study of this problem dates back to ancient times, disputes and discussions have never stopped. No one has ever denied the fact that literature is the art of the word, and its primary element is language. In the history of mankind, the art of visual perception of the world, called literature, was created, and the word, the means of expressing this art, is the painstaking task of fully interpreting the language that constantly occupies the human imagination and thinking.

KEYWORDS

Text, units of text, text types, text semantics, linguopoetics, textology.

INTRODUCTION

The great enlightened writer Abdurauf Fitrat wrote in the manual “Rules of Literature”: “If the goods (material) in the visual arts are sound and melody, then the visual arts are musical; if there are colors, lines, it will be a picture; stone or other various minerals will be sculpture; if it is wood, brick, ganj, earth, then it will be architecture; and the actions of the body and face (facial expressions), and the movements will be a game (dances); and speech, sentence and word become literature” and defines literature as follows: “Literature consists in describing the waves in our thoughts and feelings with the help of words and sentences and creating the same waves in others”.[1]

The well-known Uzbek literary critic O. Sharafiddinov in his article “Literature begins with language” writes: “There is no literature without language, just as there is no fine art without color and music without melody. Literature is called human science. In fact, the writer explores various human characters and discovers important truths that help the development of society. However, all this is realized in literature through language”.[2]

The following remarks by the great writer and literary critic P. Kadyrov are especially noteworthy here: “Statues are made of copper and marble, buildings are built of brick, glass and steel. In a literary work, instead of copper, marble, steel and brick, an artistic word is used. The difference between a literary work and music, painting and other areas of creativity is that it is created not through tones, lines, colors, but through the word. This means that artistic language is one of

the main indicators that determine the specifics of any literary work. The theory of artistic language is in the first line of questions related to the theory of literature”.

Similar comparisons related to the definition of the primary element of a work of art have been mentioned by other well-known researchers since the beginning of the last century. In an article by V. M. Zhirmunsky, the greatest philologist of his time, published in 1919, “The Tasks of Poetics”, one can see the following thoughts: “All art uses certain material belonging to the natural world. Art, with the help of the methods at its disposal, carries out a special processing of this material; as a result of processing, a natural object (material) increases the value of an aesthetic object, turns into a work of art. Comparing the raw materials of nature and the material of finished art, we determine the ways of its artistic processing. The task of studying art is to describe the artistic techniques (principles) of a particular work, poet or whole period in historical terms or in a comparative systematic order. For example, in a piece of music, sounds that have an inevitable - relative and absolute - height, a certain duration and strength, falling into the artistic forms of rhythm, melody and harmony, which are in one or another simultaneity and sequence, are the material of music. The material of a color image is visible forms drawn as forms of a color image, which are located on a plane as a combination of lines and spots of paint. The study of poetry, like the study of any other art, requires the identification of its material and

the means of creating a work of art from this material”.[3]

Continuing his thoughts in this direction, V. M. Jirmunsky proves the inconsistency of old views in philology, such as “The material of poetry is images”, and states as follows: “The material of poetry is not images, not emotions, but words. "Poetry is the art of the word, the history of poetry is the history of literature". [4] Indeed, no matter how important the place and functions of the image in fiction, especially in poetry, and in some cases even determining ones, it cannot exist separately from the word and language. Without words, there is no image.

D. N. Shmelev's book “Word and Image” begins with the recognition of the truth about the role of language in creating an image: “Language is not only the main means of communication between people, a means of forming thoughts, expressing feelings, desires and a means of expression, but it is also a real external form which is covered by the images of fiction”.[5]

Of course, whether it is logical thinking, which is the main way of knowing the world, or figurative thinking, which is another peculiar way of knowing the world, there is always a dialectic of language and thinking, that is, thought cannot live without language, and language cannot live without thought.

It should also be said that among the arts, fiction is the highest art, it is characterized by completely unique features and rules. That is why, when dealing with literature, it is desirable to be somewhat careful in identifying its material with that of other arts. Already, as the well-known philologist G. V. Stepanov emphasized, “language material differs from all other materials used by artists (marble, paints, wood,

granite, sounds in music, and so on) by the presence of material and ideal aspects in it”. [6] For example, marble as a raw material that has not been processed by special artistic techniques and has not become a work of art has only a material side, an ideal side, it acquires artistic meaning only and only after processing by an artist with a specific artistic purpose. The same goes for colors, paints, wood, granite, sound and so on. But language as the material of fiction has a completely different nature. Language exists as a certain material form and content, a semantic unity even before its units are introduced into fiction. Language units, such as words, phrases, sentences, having their own lexical and grammatical meaning, serve to identify and express the corresponding artistic and aesthetic content in a state subordinate to the writer's artistic goal. Thus, linguistic units that already have meaning form the linguistic fabric of a work of art, develop new, unique artistic meanings in accordance with the artistic abilities of the artist.

The language of a work of art is such a complex and unique phenomenon. Linguistics, in general, in the history of philology, different approaches to its study were used. V. Vinogradov, who has been studying the language of literary works all his life, in his lecture "The Science of the Literary Language and Its Tasks" emphasizes that the word "language" is used in two senses when discussing the language of fiction, that is: 1) one or another national language in the meaning of "speech" or "text" (analysis material on the history of the literary language, historical grammar and lexicology), reflecting the system; 2) "language of art" in the sense of a system of means of artistic expression. [7] Such two different interpretations of the language of a literary work and the presence of two different

approaches to the study of the language of a literary work are also noted by other foreign scientists. [8]

In Uzbek linguistics, it can be noted that in the works devoted to the study of the language of works of art, two directions came to the fore. In their books Kh. Doniyorov and S. Mirzaev called "The Art of the Word" the linguistic aspect of the direction, which sets itself the task of studying such issues as the growth and change of the language, the relationship between the literary language and the national language, the attitude of the writer to the national language, the use of linguistic means, writing skills, interpreting the direction of the conclusion about the style as a stylistic aspect. [9]

The language of literary and artistic works of that period is studied with the aim of scientific research of the state of the language in a certain historical period, its features, lexical, phonetic and grammatical differences, general and various aspects of the current state of the language. The current state of the language, the analysis and study of the relevant phenomena in it, is no exception. In this case, the language of works of art and written monuments serves only as material for research with the same purpose.

It is known that the language of any work of art reflects a certain universal language. The most objective mirror of language changes, evolutions, development is fiction at the level of genuine art. Even when determining the norms of the literary language of the era, the language of the works of skillful writers, real "generals of the word" (F. Buslaev's expression), is one of the main parameters. The source of the analyzed material in most modern studies related to today's Uzbek language is naturally the works of Uzbek

writers. The state of the language, its various phenomena, textbooks describing laws and regulations, and other teaching aids also draw the main factual material from works of art (of course, there are other sources).

In the description and study of the history of the language, this path, that is, based on the language of written monuments, literary and artistic works of the corresponding period, lives as the oldest and strongest linguistic tradition. A lot of fundamental research has been created in Uzbek linguistics in this direction. [10]

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.

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". [11] 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. [12]

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.Ya. Solganik), "syntactic complex" (A.I. Ovsyannikova), "monologic statement", "communicative block" and others. [13]

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", [14] but later on he regularly uses the term

"supra-phrasal syntactic unit". [15] I. Rasulov and Kh. Rustamov, who paid special attention to the stylistic problems of the text, prefer the term "complex syntactic integrity". [16] M. Abdupattoev, who monographically studied such units in the Uzbek text, considers it appropriate to use the term "supra-syntactic integrity". [17] 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.Ya. 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. [18] 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. [19] 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.

In this regard, the comments of M. Ya. 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. [20] In this opinion, he seems to be referring to the freedom of speech mentioned above. But M. Ya. 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”. [21] 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". [22] 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. [24] Other researchers also pay attention to the status of the paragraph as a compositional and stylistic unit in the text. [23]

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.

Understanding a paragraph as a syntactic phenomenon or mixing the concepts of a paragraph and a supra-syntactic whole is quite common in different linguistics. You can even find several different interpretations of a paragraph in a given work. For example, in the book "Modern English Stylistics" by I. V. Arnold, the paragraph entitled "Text Level - Paragraph" begins like this: "A fragment of written speech, from one paragraph to the next paragraph, implemented as a complex syntactic whole and forming a relatively complete part of an artistic text, is called a paragraph". Noting that the origins of the theory of the paragraph go back to the works of A. M. Peshkovsky, and later studied by N. S. Pospelov, T. I. Silman and many other linguists, the author further clarifies his thoughts in this definition: "A paragraph is a syntactically-intonational an integer of a higher level than the sentence". But after one page, he seems to change his mind. He emphasizes that the grammatical and meaningful independence of sentences in a paragraph is different for different writers, even in the works of the same writer in different genres, and therefore argues that "it is absolutely impossible to give an example of the typical structure of a paragraph". Based on the analysis of one or two pages of examples, he comes to the following conclusion, which contradicts his initial opinion: "Thus, since the paragraph graphically reflects the logical-emotional

structure of the sentence (statement), it can be interpreted as a compositional device that makes it easier for the reader to perceive the statement". Of course, a paragraph cannot be both a "syntactic-intonation whole, greater than a sentence" and a "graphic-compositional method", that is, a whole-unity and a method are different concepts and phenomena.

The main points in the comments on the paragraph considered so far can be grouped as follows: 1) a paragraph is a syntactic unit, 2) a paragraph is not a syntactic unit, 3) a paragraph is a compositional-stylistic unit, 4) a paragraph is a compositional-graphic method. As can be seen, each of these opinions denies or does not fully recognize the other. Most linguists argue that a paragraph is not a syntactic (in general, linguistic) phenomenon, it cannot be such in its essence. But, despite this, there is no end to the debate about the relationship between a paragraph and a supersyntactic unit (a complex syntactic whole).

In this place there are many scientific studies in different linguistics devoted to showing that the supra-syntactic unit (a common variant in Russian linguistics is "super-phrasal unity") and the paragraph have a different essence. Among them, however, two articles stand out in particular. In particular, the articles by N. A. Levkovskaya on the Russian-language material and the articles by E. V. Referovskaya on the French-language material approached this problem in a peculiar way and tried to consistently identify specific differences on the merits of the issue.

According to N.A. Levkovskaya, the division of the text into parts is a multifaceted complex process, this process as a whole has a two-sided character, that is, firstly, it is an objective process associated with the functional orientation of the text - the pragmatic

purpose of the text. Secondly, this is a subjective process, depending on the intention of the author of the text - the pragmatic goal of the author. When dividing the text, a dichotomy arises between the pragmatic goal of the text and the pragmatic goal of the author. Supra-syntactic unity ("supra-phrasal unity") arises as a product of text division precisely for the pragmatic purpose of the text. A paragraph is created as a product of dividing text according to the pragmatic purpose of the author. Accordingly, the researcher says that the supra-syntactic unit is a unit of subject division of the text, has intellectual completeness, logical integrity. He emphasizes that a paragraph, being a unit of subjective articulation of a text, may not always have intellectual completeness, and that in most cases a paragraph acts as a purely emphatic means of increasing the effectiveness of influencing the reader. The author of the article emphasizes that although in a scientific text a paragraph has the status of a structural, semantic and communicative whole, in a literary text it participates mainly as a means of performing an emphatic task. Of course, it is known that the specific goals and objectives, the features of this literary text as a whole are connected with the pragmatic goal of the writer of aesthetic impact on the reader. In a literary text, of course, the aesthetic intention of the writer is of decisive importance.

The scientific observations of E.A.Referovskaya also focus on the subjectivity of the essence of the paragraph, in her opinion, "the paragraph is aimed at the meaningful development of the topic in accordance with the individual style of the author, and the supra-syntactic unit is aimed at the structural formation of the expression of thought". [24]

It seems that an objective solution to the problem can be achieved if the difference between a supersyntactic unit and a paragraph is based on objective and subjective factors of text fragmentation. After all, when dividing the text into paragraphs, the subjective goal of the author plays a decisive role, what, how and with what to emphasize the content of the thought. True, in a scientific text it is important to naturally express the logical flow of thought, therefore, a supra-syntactic unit and a paragraph are most suitable. But even in a scientific text, in certain cases, one supersyntactic unit can be divided into several paragraphs in order to consistently highlight the researcher's thought, "squeal," and this provision does not make it difficult to understand the author's thought, on the contrary, it makes it easier. For example, consider the following scientific text on linguistics:

If we look from the point of view of the semantic field, then we will come across interesting information about the functional-semantic properties of words with the opposite meaning.

The range of conflicts between members of the semantic field is wider and more varied than the range of antonyms.

In this sense, antonyms can be seen as a form of contradiction between members of the field. In the semantic field, in addition to inter-lexical conflicts, there are also groups, micro-fields, and even large-scale inter-device conflicts (Sobirov A. The study of the lexical level of the Uzbek language on the basis of the system of systems. Tashkent: Spirituality, 2004. 152 p.).

The passage consists of three paragraphs, but there is one supra-syntactic unit. This is evidenced by

commonly used words and connecting techniques that provide a semantic-syntactic and logical connection of sentences in all three paragraphs, as well as intellectual completion.

In official texts, for example, in legal documents, not only one supersyntactic unit, but even some sentences can be divided into several paragraphs. This will, of course, be linked with the aim of highlighting relevant emphases and points of view. For example:

Article 186. Manufacture or sale of low-quality products

The release to the market of low-quality products or their sale will entail the infliction of moderate or serious bodily harm, -

punishable by a fine in the amount of 100 to 200 minimum monthly wages, or correctional labor for up to 3 years.

If these actions lead to the death of a person,

they are punished with imprisonment from three to seven years.

These actions:

a) death of people;

b) if it entails other grave consequences, - shall be punished by imprisonment from seven to ten years (Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan. - Tashkent: Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2001. P. 99)

As you can see, there is one supersyntactic unit in the text, consisting of three sentences, but broken into eight paragraphs.

In a literary text, such a structure of paragraphs, the expression of one supersyntactic unit in several paragraphs is often observed in connection with the artistic and aesthetic intention of the writer. This can be seen in these examples:

Otakuzi came around the corner with the dignity and pomposity of a millionaire chairman. When Domla Shomurodov heard the noise of the car and got out, two Volga cars were standing in front of the gate - a white one and a blue one. One by one, the Gazik arrived and stopped.

Otakuzi first came out of the white "Volga", followed by a slender man dressed modestly, and Otakuzi's daughter Tahira stepped out of the blue "Volga". (O. Yakubov, novel "Religion").

... Now Mahkam understood Gawhar's aspirations as his own and felt strength and confidence, as if not one, but two hearts were beating in his chest, and his heart was quickly cleared of doubts.

In Gavkhar, respect for Mahkam's beloved work appeared last year. Looking into the future of Mahkam, she imagined a noble teacher raising children. (P. Kadyrov, Novel "Three Roots").

Both quoted passages contain one suprasyntactic unit each, but these units are expressed as two paragraphs. Undoubtedly, this served to emphasize and strengthen the relevant thoughts, consonant with the artistic and aesthetic intention of the writer. These one or two examples show once again that it is inappropriate to compare a paragraph with a supra-syntactic unit.

In most works devoted to the study of text in Uzbek linguistics, if we talk about text units, then such units

are mainly a sentence, a complex syntactic unit and a paragraph.

Some researchers, for example, the great researcher of the German language W. G. Admoni, emphasize that the paragraph is primarily a graphic whole, since in the written text on both sides of the paragraph they leave some free space for distinguishing it, which is its graphic border. Scholar says that later German editions used a (vertical) series of spaces between paragraphs instead of this open space that separates a paragraph.

In Russian linguistics, there is also a tradition to consider a paragraph in a system of punctuation marks. For example, A. N. Gvozdev, commenting on punctuation marks, writes: «According to its function, a paragraph is one of the punctuation marks... The paragraph serves as an indicator of a new direction of thought; ideas expressed by independent sentences within a paragraph are nevertheless united in content and develop a certain subtopic... The selection of several sentences or even one sentence as a separate paragraph gives these sentences a certain weight, such a division is carried out by the author in a way that depends on his purpose». [25]

I. R. Galperin, one of the major researchers in text linguistics, in a book published fifty years ago, argued that a paragraph, like punctuation marks, is a tool, a compositional and graphic technique that serves to highlight the logical and emotional aspects of the text. [26] It is worth noting that I. R. Galperin, like I. V. Arnold (we cited his opinion above), emphasizes that a paragraph is not a unit in a text (of course, a written text), but a way to emphasize a certain thought, increase emotionality highlight an important aspect.

In our opinion, the interpretation of a paragraph as a text unit does not have an appropriate justification. Such an interpretation is probably associated with one-sidedness in determining the essence of the text. As we saw above, a number of specialists consider only speech in written form to be a text. Accordingly, it is natural that the concept of a paragraph, unique for written speech, was transferred to the field of text units. However, the text can also be verbal. Therefore, attempts are being made to search for linguistic features of the paragraph, but, as discussed earlier, scientific results have not yet been obtained.

Even in written speech, the paragraph is not a completely objective phenomenon, but rather the product of a subjective attitude, as can be seen from the above fairly detailed review of the literature in this area.

Based on this, it becomes clear that it is inappropriate to interpret a paragraph as a text unit. But in a written text there is a phenomenon called a paragraph that should be studied. The study of not only a paragraph as a text unit in written speech, but also as a unique compositional and stylistic device (namely, a device, not a unit) in a written text allows us to draw objective scientific conclusions.

Based on these considerations, we can say that it is advisable to consider the supra-syntactic unit and the sentence as the main units of the text.

REFERENCES

1. Fitrat A. Selected Works. Volume IV. - Tashkent: Spirituality, 2006. p. 12-13.
2. Sharafiddinov O. Literature begins with language // Literature and art of Uzbekistan, September 5, 1986
1. Literary theory. 2 volumes. Volume 1. Literary work. - Tashkent: Nauka, 1978. p. 312.
2. Jirmunsky V.M. Theory of Literature. Poetics. Stylistics. – L.: Nauka, 1977, p.18.
3. Jirmunsky V.M. ibid., p. 22.
4. Shmelev D.N. Word and image. –M.: Nauka, 1964, p.3.
5. Stepanov G.V. Language. Literature. Poetics. –M.: Nauka, 1988, p. 141.
6. Vinogradov V.V. Problems of Russian stylistics. –M.: Higher School, 1981, p.184.
7. For example, see: Shmelev D.N. Handbook, pp. 4-22; Gukhman M.M. History of language and text // Literature. Language. Culture. –M.: Nauka, 1986, p.252.
8. Doniyerov Kh., Mirzaev S. Art of the word. - Tashkent: Literary publishing house of Uzbekistan, 1962. p. 173-174.
9. For example: Mutalibov S. The verbal category in written monuments of the 11th century. - Tashkent: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, 1955; Makhmudov K. Phonetic and morphological features of the language “Khibatul hakaik”: Abstract of the thesis of a candidate of philological sciences. – Tashkent, 1964; Rustamov A. Phonetic and morphological characteristics of the language of the works of Alisher Navoi: Doctor of Philology Dissertation - Tashkent, 1966
10. See about this: Dressler V. Text syntax / New in foreign linguistics. Issue 8. -M.: Progress, 1978, p.119.
11. Galperin I.R. Quoted work, pp. 67-68.
12. See about this: Galperin I.R. Work cited, p. 69; Turaeva Z.Ya. Work cited, p. 114.
13. Mamajonov A. Large syntactic units // Uzbek language and literature, 1980, No. 5, p. 62.

14. Mamajonov A. Text Linguistics. - Tashkent, 1989. p. 27.
15. Rasulov I. Complex syntactic integrity // Uzbek language and literature, 1983, N1, p. 22; Shomaksudov A., Rasulov I. and others. The style of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Uchitel, 1983. p. 223-227.
16. Abdupattoev M.T. Supersyntactic units in the Uzbek text: abstract of the dissertation of a candidate of philological sciences. - Tashkent, 1998.
17. Loseva L.M. Quoted work, pp. 69-70.
18. Mamazhonov A., Abdupattoev M. Indicated work, pp. 82-84.
19. Baranov M.T., Kostyaeva T.A., Prudnikova A.V. Russian language. -M.: Enlightenment, 1989, p. 263. Also see: Abramova S.V. Expression of a coherent text in scientific literature in Spanish / Linguistic and stylistic features of a scientific text. -M.: Nauka, 1981, p.67-68.
20. Kolshansky G.V. From sentence to text / Essence, development and functions of language. -M. Science, 1987, p.40.
21. Odintsov V.V. Text style. -M.: 1980, p. 122.
22. Moskalskaya O.I. Quoted work, pp. 14, 30, 83.
23. Referovskaya E.A. Supra-phrasal unity and paragraph / Theory of language. Methods of its research and teaching.-L.: Nauka, 1981, p. 225-228.
24. Gvozdev A.N. Modern Russian literary language. Part II. Syntax. -M.: Enlightenment, 1968, p. 331. Also see: Modern Russian literary language. Part 2. Syntax. Edited by D.E. Rosenthal. -M.: Higher school, 1976, p. 218. Babaitseva V.V. Russian language. Syntax and punctuation. -M.: Enlightenment, 1979, p.260.
25. Galperin I.R. Essays on the style of the English language. -M., 1958, p. 226-230.

OSCAR
PUBLISHING SERVICES