

THE LEVELS OF CONTENT IN AN INTEGRAL ASPECT

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10138155>

Abdulkhapi Latipovich Mamatkulov

candidate of Philology, Associate Professor at AGIA

The article: *deals with the problem of text forming and text understanding peculiarities of linguistic units .*

Key words: *Text formation, text competence, three leveled analysis.*

The construction and understanding of a text are not reversible actions. Firstly, because any already constructed text represents an inexhaustible source of information. This means that the understanding of a text is multiple; different meanings can be embedded in the same text during comprehension. When constructing a text, there is a single meaning. Uncovering this single meaning constitutes the task of correct comprehension. Another difference between text construction and text understanding is that text understanding is purely a psychological process, while text construction is a logical process. Text construction can involve the division of labor (the work of the author, editor, typesetter, proofreader, etc.), whereas text understanding does not allow for such division of labor. Only the interaction in interpreting the text is possible.

From a linguistic point of view, every text should represent the unity of content embedded in it during construction and understanding. This unity of content is an approximation to the actual processes of text construction and comprehension. According to linguistic postulates, every utterance consists of sounds or graphical signs that are endowed with meaning by the speaker or listener, writer, or reader. The attribution of meaning, when taken as an individual action, can proceed in any way. For example, when a child says, "Hello, Dad," they might not be addressing their father but instead their younger sister, while playing a game, for instance. The sister may accept or reject this game. This subjective arbitrariness would lead to the demise of linguistic relationships if there were no established rules for assigning specific meanings. Rules for assigning meaning to sounds are not fixed forever. The semantics of speech become more complex, leading to the need to standardize the semantic interpretation of speech and its intricate differentiation.

The current state of philological science is such that many authors seek to construct an integral interpretation of the meaning of an expression. Integral interpretation of the meaning of an expression is often referred to as the understanding of the expression, imbuing it with a philological rather than a psychological sense. In this case, understanding implies the individual process of comprehension. Such a process always involves a false understanding of the meaning of an expression, while correct understanding involves

revealing the full scheme of its content. This scheme is integral and allows for a definitive interpretation of the expression and rules for the interpretation of similar expressions that are obligatory for those who create speech and those who perceive it.

This philological, or more precisely, linguistic interpretation of understanding essentially means scientific integration of the rhetorical, poetic, logical, stylistic, and linguistic content of the expression. Of course, such integration presupposes a particular way of dividing the content. The most general division of the content would be the separation of the content into three main levels:

- 1) Sign-based;
- 2) Imaginary-object-conceptual;
- 3) Modal-temporal.

1. The sign-based content is the minimal layer of meaning that is present in the sign form based on the principle of sign bilateralism. Since the same sign form can be used to represent different, usually related concepts or to name different, though similar concepts or to evoke thoughts about objects, the sign-based content is the most generalized layer of content. The meaning of a linguistic sign is so generalized that it is practically emptied, as the sign-based content is the linguistic content generated as an abstraction from the specific meanings of a given sign used in various expressions. The sign-based content is a hint, clearly visible when constructing new linguistic signs. According to A.A. Potebnya's theory, the construction of new linguistic signs is achieved by abstracting one characteristic of an object called by a particular word and transferring that characteristic to another object. A.A. Potebnya provides the following example: a child sees a round lamp for the first time and calls it "арбузик" (arbuzik), and the round shape of a watermelon serves as the basis for transferring the name to another object with a round shape. Thus, the sign-based meaning in this case is the idea of roundness, spherical shape, based on which all objects with a spherical shape are called "арбузик" (arbuzik), and this idea of transferring the name from one object to another based on an insignificant characteristic is an association and apperception. According to A.A. Potebnya, the transfer of association and apperception values is carried out almost automatically and represents a meaning explained by association. Thus, the sign-based meaning of linguistic entities is essentially associative. It is an association of either the expression and content plans or an association that uses the internal form of words to create new linguistic signs. A.A. Potebnya believes that associative sign-based meanings of linguistic units serve to develop higher-level meanings. To form higher-level meanings, purposeful thought work, driven by vital necessity, is necessary.

2. The subject-imagery-conceptual meaning is the meaning that a word or part of an expression acquires in a text that goes beyond the word itself. Depending on the context in which the idea of an image or object is expressed, there are specific modifications of meanings. The simplest form of meaning at the second level is the meaning of an object. The meaning of an object appears in the text when the creator of the text provides an

example. An example can either point to a specific object or refer to a typical object as one of a series of similar objects. Pointing to a specific object is more common in business texts, where concrete situations are described. When composing a document (a type of document), real-life situations are described. A typical example often appears in mass media texts, describing specific situations that are indeed happening but represent the most characteristic among similar cases. It is a reference to an individual but typical case. The third type of examples is used in scientific writings. For example, they say, "A frog is a typical representative of amphibians." In this case, there is no reference to a specific frog, although it is quite characteristic of all frogs. In this case, the example belongs to the same category, i.e., the conceptual class. A conceptual class is initially introduced, and then this conceptual class is broken down into units through a similar operation, and one of the units of the class is presented as an object. These three different types of examples serve as the basis for forming an image on one hand and a concept on the other. The image and the concept are formed in the text by combining statements and parts of statements whose meanings are concentrated on one subject of thought. In this process, one characteristic leads to another, logically predicting another characteristic, thereby forming an image. In another case, the primary focus is on the unity of characteristics and the division and connection of objects in accordance with these characteristics. In this case, a conceptual meaning is formed based on the meaning of an object. A conceptual meaning arises as a judgment. Both the imagery and conceptual meanings are the domain of a specific text. The formation of conceptual meaning is achieved through definition. Definition can take different forms: through enumeration, by indicating a type by analogy, through comparison, etc. In definition, the focus is on the characteristic of the object. When forming an image, characteristics are attributed to the object. These characteristics are created by the creator of the image. Their task is to outline the properties of the object, either in a generalized or individualized way. However, the primary focus in forming an image is on the characteristic attributed to the object, which modifies and creates the subject-imagery-conceptual meaning, which arises in the interplay of words in the text as it unfolds. Imagery and conceptual meanings are always specific to a particular text. If some expressions have imagery and conceptual meanings and go beyond the confines of a specific text, they are either terms that are defined in a certain way or idioms.

3. The modal-temporal level of speech semantics is characterized by addressing questions like who created the text and for whom, what is the purpose of its creation, what it represents in terms of its intended purpose, the techniques used in creating texts, and how they can be understood from a historical-textual perspective, as well as how the text fits into a historical-typological system of texts.

With these types of questions, the content of texts is considered from the perspective of the author's intentions and the means used, as well as the results achieved. It's easy to see that at this level of speech content, modal and temporal values take center stage. Temporal values allow us to relate speech to reality and refine modal values. If the

speaker's goal is to give advice to the listener, it would be meaningless to talk about past events. Such speech pertains to the future. For example, if the speaker's goal is to analyze the occurrence of events or write a history of events, then such speech is addressed in the context of the past. Modal and temporal values are the axes on which classification is built.

Through these two axes – modal and temporal – speech can be dissected and conceived as the interaction between the speaker and the listener: who is speaking to whom, the speaker's intent, why they are speaking, what they have in mind, using specific linguistic means in a given speech act.

The three levels of speech content – semiotic, subject-imagery-conceptual, and modal-temporal – are revealed through specific comparisons. These comparisons are recorded in the history of philology and represent the disclosure of specific types of speech content. To analyze and reveal the meaning of speech at the semiotic level, it is necessary to compare segments of this speech with respect to the expression plan and relate them to similar and different segments of speech in terms of the nature of the expression plan. In this way, units of the expression plan that do not depend on the speech work in which they were included are distinguished and identified.

After that, based on the similarity and difference of the expression plan, general principles of content variation in connection with regular transformations of the expression plan are established. These general principles of variation of the expression plan with regular changes in the expression plan are usually not fully given. In the analysis of speech meanings, the semiotic values of linguistic signs may only represent types of values associated with linguistic forms.

The subject-imagery-conceptual meaning is analyzed based on a different type of comparison. The starting point for this comparison is the speech meaning that is correlated with non-linguistic reality. The comparison begins with the content plan of speech segments. The material of speech as a sequence of sounds or graphical signs is divided depending on the content plan, understood as elements of non-linguistic reality.

Next, the relationship between elements of linguistic reality, expressed either in the given speech or in similar types of speech, is considered. For this comparison, speech is subdivided into parts based on the content plan, and segments of speech are compared according to the content plan. Consequently, for the subject-imagery-conceptual level of content, an understanding of the scope of the compared material is characteristic.

If the principle of revealing conceptual content is under consideration, texts of a specific form of syllogisms are required, and types of plots and descriptions are established. When syllogisms and specific descriptions are being considered, the analysis is limited to the given text. Therefore, not any linguistic material or speech is involved in the comparison, but either specific speech or specially selected speech and its parts.

LITERATURE:

1. Потебня А.А. Из записок по русской грамматике. Т. I-II.- М . Учпедгиз , 1968-536 с.
2. Бахтин М.М. Проблема текста // Вопросы литературы - 1976 / - №10 / -С . 122-152 .
3. Виноградов В.В. О языке художественной прозы - М .: Наука , 1980-360 с .
4. Пospelov Н.С. Сложное синтаксическое целое и основные особенности его структуры // Доклады и сообщения ИРЯ . Вып.2 . - 1948 . - С.43-68.
5. Мамасолиева, Г. А. (2023). ФРАНЦУЗ ВА ТИЛИ УНЛИЛАРНИНГ СИНТАГМАТИК ҲОЛАТДАГИ ДАРАЖАЛИ МУНОСАБАТИ. Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities, 11(5), 2388-2396.
6. Saidahmadovna, I. M. (2022). Deictic Features of Verbs in French and Uzbek Languages. Journal of Pedagogical Inventions and Practices, 10, 35-37.
7. Saidakhmadovna, I. M. (2023). LEXICOGRAPHIC STUDY OF BABURNOMA'S TRANSLATIONS. Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities, 11(4), 364-367.
8. Munosibxon, I., & Risolat, O. (2023). DEYKSIS VA ANAFORA. Scientific Impulse, 1(8), 257-259.
9. Ishanjanova, M. S. (2020). DEIXIS AS AN ASPECT OF PRAGMATICS. Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology, 2(2), 239-245.