



## SUPER SYNTACTIC INTEGRITY

Zarnigor Yuldasheva Hasanboykizi

Postgraduate Student,  
Ferghana State University

### ABSTRACT

*This article focuses on textual linguistics, which focuses on the components of the text. Separately, the term super-syntactic integrity has been studied and given a detailed description.*

**KEYWORDS:** *text, super-syntactic integrity, paragraph, sentence, phrase, freedom of speech, pragmatic purpose of the text.*

### DISCUSSION

Naturally, coherence and integrity arise between sentences and on the basis of the semantic-grammatical unity of sentences. Almost all text researchers have never lost sight of these two characters. In particular, the definitions given to the text by Western linguists regularly emphasize the consistency of sentences, the fact that the sentence chain is a key aspect of the text and that the text cannot exist without it. For example, the Dutch linguist S. Dick sees "the highest form of coordination in the textual chain of speech." In other words, the text is formed as a product of a high degree of coordination of independent speech (of course, in order to express certain information). A high level of coordination is, of course, the consistency of all aspects that make up the whole, semantic, syntactic, communicative, aesthetic and so on. As a result of this harmony, a text appears. From these one or two considerations, we can conclude that the basic unit of text is speech. But evaluating a sentence as a unit of text is not so common in linguistics. On the contrary, there are many conflicting approaches in this regard. Most linguists believe that a sentence is not a unit of text. For example, I.R. Halperin argues that a relatively large whole that combines a series of sentences, rather than a sentence, can be a text unit larger than the phrase ("superphrase unity"). He claims that the sentence participates as a whole in such a whole that the sentence, which is an integral part of the whole, larger than the phrase, cannot simultaneously be part of the whole text.

It is from this phrase that we can say that the assessment of the whole as the main unit of text is common in almost all linguistic studies. The concept

expressed by this term is called different linguists in different ways, i.e., this term has several synonyms. For example: "the integrity of the text from the phrase" - "super-phrasal unity" (O.S. Aksmanova), "complex syntactic integrity" - "the complex syntactic whole" (A.M. Peshkovsky, N.S. - "component of the text" (I.A. Figurovsky), "Prose stanza" - "Prose stanza" (G. Ya. Solganik), "Syntactic complex" - "Syntactic complex" (A.I. Ovsyannikova), "Monological sentence" - "Monological statement", "Communicative block" - "Communicative block" and others.

In Uzbek linguistics, a number of different terms are used to express this concept. For example, A. Mamadzhanov first used the term "large syntactic unit", and later regularly uses the term "superphrasal syntactic unit". I. Rasulov and H. Rustamov, who pay special attention to the stylistic problems of the text, prefer the term "complex syntactic integrity". M. Abdupattoev, who monographed such units in the Uzbek text, considers it appropriate to use the term "super-syntactic units". We also prefer the term "super-syntactic integrity" as a term that more accurately and objectively reflects the nature of the phenomenon. In this dissertation, M. Abdupattoev scientifically demonstrated the essence, syntagmatic and semantic-methodological features of supersyntactic units in the Uzbek text. It should also be noted that the researcher developed the principles (semantic, grammatical and compositional-stylistic) of determining the boundaries of super-syntactic units in the text. On this basis, 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 super-syntactic integrity, the presence of a strong semantic-grammatical relationship between relatively



independent sentences that make up this whole, which ensures the semantic-structural integrity of super-syntactic integrity. correctly indicated. Naturally, speech is involved in the formation of super-syntactic integrity, which no one denies. But the combination of two or more sentences into a single whole is not just a process, but an extremely complex and complex phenomenon. There are a number of factors that supplement such statements. Most researchers who think about this problem (I.R. Halperin, O.I. Maskalskaya, Z.Ya. Turaeva, L.L. Moseva, A. Mamadzhonov, M. Tukhsanov, M. Abdupattoev and many others) that there is only one small topic. as such factors, such factors as generality and consistency of the content of sentences, semantic-grammatical and communicative integrity are mentioned. For example, the following passage contains all of these factors, so it can be called a separate supersyntactic integer: When a person is overly frightened, he becomes embarrassed, motionless, and experiences the pain that we know from fear. Indeed, if we face a tiger, we are horrified, because death awaits us, and there is nothing more terrible than the death of a person in the world. So the bottom line is that we are really looking forward to it. But the interesting thing is why, when the world is waiting for happiness, when we are given a prophecy about happiness, why we are waiting for death, and our membership organization is faced with the first situation (A. Kadyri, "The Last Days"). It can be said that there is no debate as to whether super-syntactic units are text units. They are undoubtedly the basic unit of text. Some linguists say that there are separate sentences in the text that are not part of super-syntactic units, and consider them as "free" sentences, on the basis of which free sentences are considered as text units along with super-syntactic units. A. Mamadzhonov and M. Abdupattoev agree. They support and analyze such free expressions in the Uzbek text, citing the following example from Said Ahmad's novel "Horizon":

This sinister mulberry tree that hid the heat of cancer that burned a wild stone in his chest was a dream that fell on the hero's chest ...

At that time, Dildor was promised great happiness and a sweet life. The deceived girl was still tormented by moments when she forgot about her dream.

Many people still do not know how much it costs to be faithful to a woman.

Dildor could not blame anyone. He was the only one who knew that I was guilty. These days would not have happened if he had not been unfaithful to Nizamjan. The authors emphasize that the underlined sentence does not apply to the first supersyntactic whole, consisting of two paragraphs, and, therefore, to the second supersyntactic whole in the form of the last paragraph. We can say that the author's commentary on the content of such free

sentences resembles a close subject, serves to express a lyrical digression, and so on. Some linguists consider the sentence "the minimum unit of text." In this regard, the comments of M.Ya. The block is especially noteworthy. In his opinion, the direct element of the structure of the whole text is not only the unity of the phrase (in our opinion, super-syntactic integrity), that is, the addition of sentences, but also individual sentences that give the compiler the importance of content. The very status of such statements requires that they be divided into separate paragraphs in monological written language. Comparing supersyntactic integrity and paragraphs, O.I. Maskalskaya argues that super-syntactic integrity is a phenomenon of syntactic significance and that the paragraph is a unit of compositional level.

There are many studies in the field of linguistics on the topic of super-syntactic unity (a common alternative in Russian linguistics), and it has been shown that paragraphs have different meanings. But among them, two articles deserve special attention. In particular, the Russian-language material N.A. Levkovskaya and the French material material of E.V. Referovskaya uniquely approach this problem and try to identify specific differences in the nature of the problem. Levkovskaya shows that the separation of the text into parts is a complex process in many respects, this process is usually twofold, that is, firstly, it is associated with the functional direction of the text - the pragmatic purpose of the text. The objective process. Secondly, this is the subjective process of the author of the text, a subjective process that depends on the pragmatic goal of the author. This is how the text is divided, that is, the pragmatic goal of the text - a kind of dichotomy in the form of the pragmatic goal of the author. A super-syntactic unit is formed as a result of the separation of the text in accordance with the pragmatic purpose of the text. The paragraph is a product of the pragmatic division of the author's text. Accordingly, the researcher claims that the super-syntactic unit is a unit of objective separation of the text, that it has intellectual completeness, logical integrity. The paragraph, on the other hand, emphasizes that the text is not always subjective because it is a unit of subjective fragmentation, and that the paragraph is often seen as a purely decisive means of influencing the reader. The author of the article emphasizes that, although the paragraph has the status of structural, semantic and communicative integrity in a scientific text, it participates in a literary text mainly as a means of performing an expressive function. Of course, it is known that the specific goals and objectives, especially this literary text, in general, are associated with the pragmatic goal of the writer, which is to have an aesthetic effect on the reader. In a literary text, of course, the aesthetic intention of the writer is crucial. The scientific observations of E. A.



Referovskaya are also aimed at subjectivity in the essence of the paragraph, in which "the paragraph focuses on the semantic development of the subject in accordance with the individual style of the author, and the super-syntactic unity - on the structural formation of the expression." Obviously, when determining the difference between a super-syntactic unit and a paragraph, an objective solution to the problem based on objective and subjective factors of text fragmentation can be achieved. Indeed, in dividing the text into paragraphs, the decisive role is played by the subjective goal of the author: what, how and how the idea is emphasized. True, it is important to naturally express the logical flow of thoughts in a scientific text, so super-syntactic units and paragraphs are largely compatible. But even in a scientific text, in some cases, a super-syntactic unit can be expressed in several paragraphs in order to emphasize the researcher's opinion one after another, "embarrassingly", which does not complicate the understanding of the author's opinion. It just makes it easier. For example, consider the following scientific excerpt on linguistics:

From the point of view of the semantic field, we come across interesting information about the functional-semantic properties of words with opposite meanings.

The range of contradictions between members of the semantic field is wider and more multifaceted than the range of antonyms.

In this sense, antonyms can be considered as a form of conflict between members of the field. In the semantic field, in addition to the contradictions between lexemes, there are groups, microfields and even large inter-instrument conflicts (A. Sobirov. Study of the lexical level of the Uzbek language based on the principle of systems. Tashkent: Manaviyat, 2004, p. 152). The passage consists of three paragraphs, but there is one super-syntactic unit. This is evidenced by common words and connecting devices that provide a semantic-logical and logical connection between sentences in all three paragraphs, as well as intellectual completeness.

The famous linguist J. Tojiev also expresses his views on text units in his article "Approaching the text": "In our opinion, speech and super-syntactic integrity can be parallel text units. Of course, it is wrong to say that a text unit is either a sentence or a super-syntactic whole. "Supersyntactic integrity, if interpreted from the point of view of M. Yuldashev (he seems to have correctly defined it), can also consist of paragraphs." Based on these considerations, we can say that it is advisable to consider the super-syntactic unit and sentence as the main units of the text.

## REFERENCES

1. Zilberman L.I. *Text Linguistics and English Language Teaching literature. M., 1988, p. 29.*
2. *New in foreign linguistics. VIP. 8. Linguistics in the text. - M.: Progress, 1978*
3. Shamsiddinov H. *Functional-semantic synonyms of words in the Uzbek language. Filol.fan.doct. ... dis.s.-Tashkent, 1999, 187 p.*
4. Khakimova M.K. *Lexical units of time in the Uzbek language and the possibility of their formation of the text. Filol.fan.nomz ... dis. Fergana, 2004, 103 s.*
5. Lotman Yu.M. *The structure of the divine text. - Moscow, 1970, p. 67.*
6. Dolgova O.V. *Syntax as the science of building speech. -M.: High school, 1980.*
7. Bart R. *Linguistics in the text / New in Foreign Linguistics. VIP. Linguistics in the text. -M.: Progress, 1978*
8. Moskalskaya O.I. *Grammar in the text. -M.: Hanging School, 1981*