

BASIC FEATURES OF GENERAL SEMIOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS IN LANGUAGE-COMPOSITION ANALYSIS OF WORKS OF ART

Gulomova Nargiza Sadullayevna

Senior Lecturer, Department of "Methods of Language Teaching",
Navoi Regional Center for Retraining and Advanced Training of Public Education

ANNOTATION

The article provides scientific information on the fact that the science of semiotics is an integral part of linguistics, and the study of the relationships and characteristics of the structure of the work of art as a result of the verbal capabilities of language units. Studies devoted to the study of the language of fiction, the study of the plot and other features of the work in literary theory, but the semiological features of the images in the work are also the main object of fundamental and applied research in language theory and literary theory. It is written that

Keywords: text, linguistic-compositional, sociolinguistic, pragmatic effect, addressee, discourse, component, contextual meaning, novel, semantic structure.

INTRODUCTION

Each text is analyzed in terms of its main features and the content it expresses, as well as the linguistic-compositional characteristics of the addressee. The internal compositional features of the components of a work of art are also included in the object of linguistic analysis. In the semiological analysis of the requirements of the research, the relationship between the creator of the text (creator, writer) and the recipient of the text is very important. The balance between the creator of the text and the recipient of the text, the proportionality, the asymmetry, the elements of the relationship (elements) are not sufficiently studied, there is no sufficient basis for the semiological analysis of the work. For example, in order for the addressees (mass readers) to understand the content of the novel "Between Two Doors" by the writer Utkir Hoshimov and to feel its socio-psychological (spiritual) potential, not only to describe the social environment of that time, but also to describe the writer period should make extensive use of sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic opportunities. Sociolinguistic possibilities are mainly the description of the content of the text in the social period and a comprehensive study of the spheres of influence of the social period on the consciousness and worldview of the addressees (mass readers). combines pragmatic-dynamic features. Sociolinguistic possibilities include the conceptual and cognitive connections between the writer's ideal and the mass reader, the period being described, the psycholinguistic possibilities of the people of that period, environmental problems in their worldview, socio-economic categories, religious, ethical, aesthetic and other possibilities. 'depends on the secret.

According to the Russian linguist GA Zolotova: "... the user of language and the creator of language is man. Man lives in nature and society. He acts, moves, thinks feels in this space and time. He (the person) tests different emotions, with which he enters into the most basic variety of relationships. He (man) feels and accepts natural phenomena, sees them, studies

their properties, organizes interactions with other people, which in turn has an impact on the people around him and nature [1].

That is, man uses the word and the text or discourse in which he participates for all the ideals of the existing universe and human thought. The universe uses words and text to keep abreast of information about the universe and time, as well as to convey certain levels of information to recipients. All the elements and elements of the world around him (man), the complex of human relations (social, economic, religious, ethical, aesthetic, etc.) perceive the realities and events through language, words, text. perceives, distinguishes their features and characteristics. A dictionary is a collection of words that combine with their variations. In any case, the vocabulary of a language is the spiritual richness of that national language. The most active element of language, created by man (nation) and enriched day by day, is concentrated in dictionaries. If we read a work of art carefully, we will understand, comprehend, and raise our ethical, aesthetic, and cultural level through the words used in the content of the work. If the reader has correctly studied the meanings of all the words used in the work, their methodological use and the components of pragmatic meaning, then the content of the work will be fully understood by the public reader, the addressee. Through the lexical tools available in the play and the text of the work, we explore all the emotional, aesthetic, and cultural sources that influence the connections, contradictions, relationships, and other possibilities between the writer's ideal and the period and space (social environment) analyzed in the mind of the reader. The writer communicates with the mind and consciousness of the reader through the content and text of the work, even if the writer is not within the real possibilities. Expands his ideals under the influence of the writer. As L. Ginzburg points out, "... whether the reader (reader) understands the content of the work, whether it accepts the cognitive and conceptual foundations, the influence of pragmatic effects through the content of the work, everything is expressed in words used in the text. If the reader does not know the pragmatic effect and pragmatic meaning component of the words in the text, the content of the work and the ideal of the writer will not reach the addressee "[2].

Hence the linguistic image of the world. Its history is that when a person's life in society passes through the prism of the social environment, when language and its elements are accepted by society through the communication they use, then he becomes socialized, absorbed into the life of society.

The description and classification of fragments of a work of art in terms of the content of the sources in the object of our thought and analysis realizes the general semiological possibilities of the linguistic-compositional nature of the text. Here it is possible to analyze and implement language units not only on the basis of a separate process of analysis, but also on a contextual basis, the lexical unit of "disorganization" described above. The main issue in the problem of text is the "dichotomy of language and speech" (F. De Saussure), we believe that the linguistic analysis of the literary text should be based on different language levels. According to our analysis, the pragmatic possibility of the word "disorganizer" in the text (context) confirms the presence of additional information in the classification of this lexical unit in the semantic structure.

According to linguist GV Kolshansky, "the concept of language ensures that language dynamics is recognized as an activity." In this case, language and its units take place in the process of speech, the process of realization forms a text or discourse in the structure and system of speech. The actualization of language units from the simple phoneme to the text level brings the speech process to the level of human activity. That is, the discourse of speech and the passage of speech, of course, carries information that describes a person and his activities.

So, G.V. Kolshansky's subjective and objective factors in language, their realization, the question of the realization of the speech process in the addressee and the addressee relationship of the language elements in the speech process, realized in a dynamic relationship. The text describing the activities of Muzaffar and Shavkat Qudratovich in the object of analysis and the factors in its units depend on objective factors as they are related to production. And since the issue is between these two subjects, we recognize them as a subjective factor. Based on the description of GV Kolshansky, it is reasonable to deduce the component of contextual pragmatic meaning and to consider it as a component of the semantic structure of the word, based on the semantic structure of words in the context. The word "organizer" is a lexical unit that has not yet been fully mastered by the norms of modern Uzbek literary language, but its contextual meaning describes the relationship of these two characters to the production process.

Another important point needs to be made in the analysis of the dynamics of language units in the activities of this subject. According to the linguist YeS Kubryakova, the realization of the speech process as a dynamic aspect of language and its derivatives in the process of our analysis:

Hence, the object of linguistic pragmatism in this passage, like other branches of linguistics, is mentioned as being a speech activity and as a speech material (text). The subject of linguopragmatics in this passage is the dynamic and developmental nature of the aspect of human activity, in terms of dynamics and statics, as well as the relationships between people (people) constitute the social context. All of the episodes in this passage deal with issues of social etiquette, social order, social demand, and social norms. These issues are based on an ontological point of view. In the object of this analysis, which combines social ethics, etiquette and demand, through the protagonist Muzaffar, their pure love for Munavvar, the Tashkent earthquake, Muzaffar's departure from higher education to work in construction, the social and industrial environment in construction, In the process of analyzing the content of the text describing the relationship of (people) with each other in the social, psychological environment, it is fair to say that the designation of research objects in the sciences of psycholinguistics, text linguistics, cognitology, linguopragmatics and lingvosemiotics. It is true that most of the research work on text linguistics in our country, the creation of scientific and didactic sources, was only the basis for the emergence of textual linguistics. The question of their connection with other disciplines is not yet fully understood.

Linguist Breal argues that this is based not only on the dynamic description of language, the movement of language units to the scope of the text in the syntagmatic plan, but also on the need to describe the important social issue in the text, the anthropocentric nature of the text. The issue of anthropocentrism has long been the subject of analysis in linguistics. However, the description of anthropocentrism has not been sufficiently studied in Uzbek linguistics in

the twentieth century. Because Uzbek linguistics at that time was in the shadow and swamp of various "isms". More specifically, the use of the theoretical foundations of progressive ideas in Western linguistics in research was a violation of cosmopolitanism. Well, these issues in their own way in the discovery of the linguopragmatic study and general semiological features of the text within the object and subject of our research, we include these issues as a reference, albeit not as a basis for research.

Let us refer to Breal's opinion: "... language facts are related to the foundations of folk history, aesthetics, culture and ethics, language is a social phenomenon, in the analysis of language facts it is analyzed not only isolated, but also at the level of social status of language. , just as it is impossible to separate man from society, the facts of language are inseparable from the social environment and social psychology, folk culture, ethics and aesthetics "[5]. According to Breal, the anthropocentric nature of language, that is, the text and the linguistic units that make it up, has been passed down from generation to generation as the heritage and wealth of a nation and people. If anthropocentric principles (principles) are analyzed in the context of the text, the subject and object of the text, the addressee complex, in psycholinguistics it is possible to create the text and the text in the dichotomy of perception. The principles of anthropocentrism, as noted above, have social significance. Whether the use of linguistic facts exceeds one person, the credibility of the information they transmit and receive, the question of text is of a social nature. Thus, these analyzes are the basis not only for general semiological research or linguopragmatic, but also for the creation of the science of social linguistics (sociolinguistics).

Linguist R. Jakobson recommends the participation of communicators in the text realization of the sign state of language (including communicants, addressee, text participants, characters, information subject and codes in the act of communication) in the implementation of the text. Thus, the formula created by R. Jakobson for the study of the communicative potential of the text in the general semiological plan describes not the linguistic fact of the text, but the main cases of research in the whole speech process and situation. The events that unfold at the beginning of the novel continue over time, in terms of the social environment. The reader solves these problems together with the writer through the information in the following chapters of the novel and describes its socio-philosophical possibilities in space and time [6].

It is unreasonable to conclude that the social features of language facts have not been revealed or studied. These issues have been addressed in different terminology, in different field research objects, for different linguistic purposes and tasks. This study is based solely on the study of the text under analysis in the whole social environment. For this reason, the text created on the basis of all language materials and units has a social character. Since the matter is of a social nature, the German philosopher Martin Heidegger describes it as a "category of existence in space and time." It is this belief that characterizes the ontological nature of language.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Золотова Г.А. Коммуникативные аспекты русского синтаксиса. М.: Наука, 1982. С.5
2. Гинзбург Л.В. В начале было слово// Мастерство перевода. М.: Писатель. 1959. С. 287.
3. Кубрякова Е.С. Номинативный аспект речевой деятельности. М.: Наука. 1968. С.4
4. Сорокин Ю.А., Тарасов Е.Ф., Шахнарович А.М. Теоретические и прикладные проблемы речевого общения. М.: Наука, 1979, С.28
5. Breal M. Melanges de methologie et la linguistique. Paris.1978, P.78
6. Равшанов М. Философские вопросы лингвистики// Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. Навои: НГГИ. 2009. Сборник статей. С.31-38