

Text Is A Syntactic Unit At The Top Level

Turniyazova Shaxnoza Nigmatovna
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Candidate of Philological Sciences, senior teacher

Annotation. The article discusses one of the most pressing problems of today, the problem of syntactic semantics. It states that the territorial position of the syntactic semantics has expanded, and the text is now also the object of verification of syntactic semantics. It is also said that the text is a syntactic or semantic union that has caused widespread debate among scientists. At the same time, the text is a high-level syntactic unit.

Keywords: syntactic semantics, text, propositive structure, predicate, pragmatics.

Most experts in the interpretation of syntactic problems understand text as the highest syntactic unit. The components of this unit are such as sophisticated, complex syntactic devices and paragraphs [12. 23]. Some scholars dealing with stylistic problems consider text as a stylistic phenomenon [4.43].

It is also worth noting that today the issue of syntactic semantics is also on the agenda of research. However, it should not be understood that syntactic semantics live in an autonomous state, because it is linked to lexical semantics and even phonetic rules. We can see the evidence in the propositive structure of the sentence or the text.

Naturally, the propositive structure relies on a specific predicate. Predicate, on the other hand, requires a fundamental structure, either semantic or thoughtful. The relation of the predicate with its arguments constitutes a propositive structure based on this semantic state. In complex syntactic devices of text status, we see macropropositive structures formed by the interaction of more than one propositive structure. At the same time, semantic invariants are formed by the interaction of predicates with arguments. Of course, the local act of pragmatics also takes an active part in this. This act operates within phonetic rules. On this basis, the phenomenon of syntactic semantics begins to take shape [13].

The first description of syntactic semantics is given within the grammatical meaning of the sentence. Today, however, we see that its territorial status is

expanding, and the text is at the top of the syntax - the text. This can be seen first of all in larger units.

It is also worth noting that syntactic semantics does not study the meaning of the sentence or the text. The literary weight of the text, if it is the text of fiction, literary studies, if legal, publicist, educational, etc. k. If there are texts related to the fields, they are studied and analyzed. In syntactic semantics, interpretation of texts such as completeness of the text and its logical integrity is the focus of research.

The problem of syntactic semantics is that it is a common contextual structure that is transmitted in the context of human thinking about the reality of a particular sentence or text, and this semantic analysis involves more words and larger units, more precisely micromatins in the form of a complex syntactic device. However, our recent advances in text linguistics allow us to study the syntactic semantics of larger speech material, that is, macromatins [7.52].

The extension of the study of the syntactic semantics of micromatn, and, if necessary, of macromatn, is directly related to the fact that the syntax object is not only a word and a sentence, but also a text. It should also be noted that the syntax object is the text, not the top level. The reason for this is that it is necessary to relate to the idea that a complete expression of expression is traditionally reflected in the sentence. This is because the whole idea is sometimes accompanied by two or more complex syntactic devices.

When we speak of a complete expression, we understand the logical integrity of the idea. The situation is much more complicated, and we see it sometimes, even in word-of-mouth, and sometimes in syntactic units such as complex syntax and paragraphs. However, this is not the essence of the issue. In fact, in most cases, the development of thought cannot be completed within a single judgment. To do this, you will have to resort to several interrelated sentences.

Clearly, every word contained in a sentence serves to form a logical whole [15.92]. Through it, judgment is created. It is also worth noting that while we use the concept of judgment, we must distinguish it from the logic that is commonly used. After all, logic is studied when judgments are taken separately. In the language, however, we can contemplate and judge more than one sentence. For example, in complex syntactic devices, it is natural that the number of sentences exceeds one. Hence, the text is formed from the attitude of the sentences. In discussing this, L. Dobraev stated: "If a sentence that is part of a particular text is a

sentence, we have every reason to think that the text is a complex sentence because it consists of several sentences."]].

L. Dobraev here calls the complex sentence a "text sentence." Indeed, since the text is complex in its structure, the sentence is also called the same. The statement of G.Solganik in this regard is in full agreement with Dobraev's opinion [12]. We also see this in research by renowned scientists like REE Longakr and van Dyke. This in turn provides an opportunity to learn the syntactic semantics of the text.

Traditionally, logical judgments are made up of subject and predicate attitudes. However, we do not use this concept when referring to text. Because the text is an overpredictable phenomenon, it is also an object of complex judgment. The sentence, which is expressed in simple words, examines the logical weight of the word, which basically means predicate. Therefore, when we examine the syntactic semantics of the text, we focus on the relationship between the predicates of the text components. Because the overall semantic weight of the text depends on that.

Contemporary logic research focuses on proving the correctness or correctness of an idea, not just by a particular sentence, but by several sentences, and this method is called logical reasoning. However, the use of this method in linguistics has not yet been perfect. Research in this area also seems to be needed.

In logic, especially in mathematical logic, analysis of complex syntactic devices focuses on the study of the relation of sentences within the device. In the process, attention is paid to **conjunctions** (terminals that represent logic and connectors), **dyslexia** (terminology that expresses logic or connector), **implantation** (the term that represents the link in logic, **if** ...). However, the interpretation of the overall meaning of the text is not given much attention in mathematical logic, in other words, in the analysis of the text only to meet the needs of logic.

True, logical rules can be applied when examining text semantics. These rules, in particular, can be a tool for examining the semantic integrity of the text. The notion of semantic integrity is, of course, important, because when there is a sense of ambiguity, various confusion can occur. As Safarov noted: "Without appealing to the meaning it is impossible to distinguish the relations between events, their classification and the generalizing features" [11].

Communicative (theory) theory also plays an important role in studying the semantic weight of text structure (which is now considered a complex syntactic

device). The main reason is that the text is not only a complex sentence but also a communicative function. At the same time, the communicative function of the text is inextricably linked to the purpose of the speaker. In other words, the act of the speaker, the illocutionary act, is inextricably linked to the semantic weight of the text.

Communicative analysis of text, in contrast to logical and semantic analysis, can cover several micro-, even macromotives in one way. Communicative analysis relies primarily on the function of the text. We can see evidence of this in newspaper articles dedicated to reporting. Technical advice and questionnaires are also examples of this. All of them imply a specific task.

It is worth noting that according to communicative tasks, the types of text have not been studied in terms of syntactic semantics. For this purpose, it is necessary to carry out research in the following cognitive and pragmatic directions, in particular, in the context of the interpretation of the illocutionary, perlocutionary acts: 1. Reporting. 2. Describe. 3. To conclude, to explain. 4. To prove. 5. Explain. 6. Ask, order. 7. Invite.

Syntactic semantics is directly in contact with these types of communication. However, the interpretation of this issue has not yet begun literally. Austin's report on the performance act may be the debut of this issue. An effective act refers to the expression of a message that is based on a specific (precise) movement [14,92].

Clearly, the phenomenon of syntactic semantics is at an early stage of its development. Therefore, the views of the scholars on the subject are not conclusive. A. Nurmanov correctly states this. "Although semantics are recognized by almost all linguists today, there is no uniformity in the status of syntactic semantics" [9]. This encourages our linguists to search more seriously.

It should be noted that Kozhevnikova also notes that the hierarchical interpretation of the text suggests that it contains a compound syntactic device, paragraphs, chapters, and complex integrity. In his view, the text is the highest ideal communicative unit [5.66].

In Professor VG's research, the text is analyzed as a syntactic unit. The components of such a unit are phrases of a different nature. The scientist acknowledges that the logical and semantic relationships of the words in the text make up its meaning. In the analogy situation, when each sentence reflects or interprets a particular fact, event, it can be thought of as a term or nomination for that fact or event. Words in the text can be compared to each other depending on what fact or event they represent, and they can be divided into two types: 1) different object statements, and (2) the same subject matter. Different object

clauses represent different events, while the same object clauses describe a particular event.

This also shows that the GG doctrine is based on the idea that text analysis is based on discourse analysis, and thus it is important to interpret textual analysis (and the text as a whole) as a syntactic phenomenon [2.91].

In our view, it is desirable to interpret the text as a syntactic unit at the highest level. Because its components, like complex syntactic devices, are not syntactic units and require no explanation. It is these units that are actively involved in the formation of the paragraph. One problem is that the other side is complex syntactic devices, such as paragraphs in the text format. Even a single sentence, as mentioned earlier, can be the whole text surrounded by a particular speech environment.

Understanding the text as a unit of communication seems to be explanatory, since it is wrong to interpret written material, such as a lecture text, even a monologic speech material as a unit of communication. The unit of communication is formed in the negotiation process. Therefore, it seems advisable to study it in the context of a dialogue material.

But even though the words in the text are semantically related to each other in time and space, they are relatively independent units according to their syntactic territory and structure. Therefore, we believe that the semantic relation of words in the syntax of the text should not be overlooked as well. The main reason 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 contained in the text constitutes a meaningful whole, though not necessarily formally dependent on the other.

The sentence or sophisticated syntactic device on its left that forms the beginning of the text associates this text with such syntactic structures to the right of the previous text, and vice versa, the syntactic structures on the right of the text provide that semantic link to the text on the left.

It is also worth noting that text analysis is not comparable to sentence analysis. Because the syntactic analysis of the sentence deals with the definition of the primary and secondary parts in our existing grammar, and the syntactic analysis of the text components does not require the concept of traditional sentences.

When text components are syntactically interconnected, phrases that are used in the text field are lexical repetitions, synonyms, appendices [14.72], and beginning sentences with partsellular devices or punctuation clusters. This can also

be seen in independent texts. Examples are contraindications or attachment clauses, clusters, introductory words, and paragraphs beginning with the word. If the morphological tools in the function of linkers serve to provide the relation of syntactic devices within a single text, the means that first provide the semantic and, to some extent, the syntactic relation, are linked to the text preceding it through the first sentence of the text in which they participate.

Apart from the foregoing, one of the characteristic features of the paragraph starting with the tie-in or linking link in the large text (macromatn) is that if the paragraph is linked to its predetermined text in both semantic and syntactic plans, it will relate to the subsequent context. Complex syntactic devices and paragraphs that can be used independently in large text content and can be ranked differently according to the linguistic levels of the paragraph, because complex syntactic devices are based on the syntactic relationship of two or more sentences between two points. relies on the meaningful relationships between the points and the complex syntactic devices. Therefore, complex syntactic devices and paragraphs can only be similar in appearance. [6.69]

V.A. Kukharenko suggests that the text represents a system with strictly regulated monolithic components resulting from the interaction of speech, complex syntactic devices and paragraphs. However, this is not to say that the text is a syntactic whole, not inseparable. If necessary, it can be broken down into parts. In other words, the deductive method divides the text into segments and sometimes into syntax, giving an idea of the semantic and syntactic relationships of the text components. For example, a large text can contain only a few chapters and paragraphs, and then divide them into sections. In this process, of course, there is a hierarchical relationship between chapters, paragraphs and sentences. In this regard, Benvenist's view is appropriate: "Any language unit can achieve its status only if it is used in a larger unit" [1.438]. The same applies to speech units. According to him, we can conclude that micromatn can also be acquired in the literal sense only if it can become a larger unit - macromatn.

Of course, there are different text sizes. If a particular work of art requires a single text, the relative macromats in which all the chapters can be interpreted individually, paragraphs within the chapter are examples of sub-texts relative to the chapter, complex syntactic devices within the paragraph. In essence, the artistic, scientific and monographical work of a certain integrity, and so on, is at the top of the text.

In our view, it is more difficult to study the structure of macromatins, to study its pure linguistic interpretation, and to analyze such text structure as a holistic system, which is one of the undiscovered aspects of textual science. Therefore, we found it useful to work on the linguistic interpretation of macromatin fragments in our study. This is because the analysis of such macromatins is the subject of separate research.

Parts of the macromatn are called the "quantum" by LN Novikov, who writes: "Each quantum (component, fragment) of the text shows a multi-level reality. It can be called a piece of text in a vertical line. Such quantities of text communicate with each other in a straight line, that is, in a horizontal line, and serve to expand the plot of the text, its ideals, and its images. It can be called the functional - dynamic structure of the fiction text "[8.19].

This statement of LN Novikov, which states that quantum text serves to expand and perfect the ideological content, images, and plot of the text, is at the same time a functional and dynamic structure of the text. Already, the dynamic text structure suggests that language elements move in time. This is because the speech that is conveyed through the textual structure introduces the elements of language into the flow of time. In the process, the speaker effectively uses the tools available in the language system and strives to ensure the perfecting of speech.

It is well known that speech is directly related to the concept of "talk." Speech is the main means of shaping speech. Given this, EA Referovskaya calls the phrase the smallest (minimum) unit of speech [10.4]. Therefore, it is advisable to study each sentence in the text linguistics as a microsystem. One aspect of this problem is the other, the opportunity to explore the linguistic nature of macrosystems that make up text material through microsystems.

References:

1. Benvenist E. Levels of linguistic analysis // New in linguistics.-M., 1965.
2. Hack V.G. Repeated nomination at the proposal level // Text Syntax.-M., 1979.
3. Dobraev L.P. Logic is a psychological analysis of the text. - Saratov, 1969.
4. Vinokur T.G. On the content of some stylistic concepts // Stylistic studies.- M., 1972.
5. Kozhevnikova K. on the aspects of connectivity in the text as a whole // Text Syntax, -M., 1979.
6. Kukharenko V.A. Interpretation of the text. –M., 1988.

7. Moskalskaya O.I. Grammar of the text. - M., 1981.
8. Novikov L.A. Literary text and its analysis. –M., 1988.
9. Nurmonov A. About the meaningful structure of the speech // Contextual syntax of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent, 1992.
10. Referovskaya E. A. Linguistic studies of the structure of the text. - L., 1983.- P. 4.
11. Safarov S. Semantics. - Tashkent, 2013.
12. Solganik G.Ya. Syntactic stylistics.-M., 1973.
13. Turniyazov NK Some Reflections on Syntactic Semantics and Text Formation Contemporary linguistics and derivative regularities. // Republican scientific-practical conference materials. Samarkand, 2018.
14. Urinboev B. Modern Uzbek Speech. - Samarkand, 2006.
15. Austin J.L. How to do words. - Oxford: Clardon Press, 1962.