

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE ARTISTIC TEXT****Feruz Uktamova***Jizzakh State Pedagogical University**Jizzakh, Uzbekistan**E-mail: uktamova@mail.ru***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: analysis of the text, literary texts, assessment, implicit, expressive, emotional, evaluative vocabulary, artistic text, journalistic texts, evaluative layer.

Received: 28.04.23**Accepted:** 30.04.23**Published:** 02.05.23

Abstract: Linguistic analysis of a literary text, as a linguodidactic problem, acquires particular relevance when referring to a literary work in a national audience, since its perception in this case is hindered by the existence of both a “language barrier” and the influence of a national aesthetic system that has developed within the national culture. These difficulties and the specifics of the study of Russian literary texts prompts the search for ways that can provide optimal conditions for mastering the aesthetic potential of the work and its understanding, as well as the development and development of analysis skills. The article studied linguistic, literary, pedagogical, methodological literature on the topic of research, generalized the experience of teaching the linguistic analysis of a literary text, identified the main stages and direction in the process of analyzing a literary prose text, developed a method of slices for experimental verification of the level of proficiency in the analysis of a literary prose text, ascertaining sections were carried out, which made it possible to establish the level of proficiency in the analysis of a literary text before experimental training, the ultimate goals of teaching linguistic analysis of the text are substantiated as a means of developing the language and speech competence of students - identifying the connections and relationships of language units of different levels in the text. The practical significance of the research in this article is determined by the development of methodological tools for teaching linguistic analysis of the text in order to develop the language and speech competence of students; didactic

schemes and tables for Russian language lessons, educational and methodological recommendations for the analysis of texts, systematized according to certain typological grounds. The results of the study can be used in the course of teaching the Russian language in pedagogical universities, special courses and special seminars, in teaching practice, preparation of term papers and theses.

INTRODUCTION

Since the publication of I.R. Galperin's monograph "Text as an Object of Linguistic Research" [7], which traditionally marks the beginning of the existence of text theory (or text linguistics) as an independent scientific (and then educational) linguistic discipline in Russian studies, a significant amount of scientific, educational and educational-methodical literature devoted to the text, its categories and principles of its (text) linguistic or philological (i.e. linguo-literary) analysis (see, for example: Babenko; Bolotnova; Valgina; Vorozhbitova; Grinev; Dymarsky [8]; Ippolitova; Moskalchuk [9]; Nikolina; Novikov [10]; Papina; Solganik; Solganik [11]; Shchukina [12]; Yarygin [13] and many others).

The authors of these works offer both rather lengthy universal schemes for complex text analysis, which include all the main generally accepted features (and / or categories) of the text and language means of their expression, and schemes for analyzing individual text categories. Traditionally, small literary texts or their fragments are analyzed.

Such categories as connectedness (local and global), informativeness, temporality (or text time), locativity (artistic space), evaluation (or modality, image of the author) and some others are considered.

MAIN PART

In this paper, I would like to investigate in more detail on the analysis of the text in terms of the category of evaluation, since, on the one hand, this category is often ignored by researchers (for example, in the monograph by A.F.Papina, evaluation is called the "fifth global category" after time, artistic space, etc., and in the remarkable book by K.A. Rogova and the team of her co-authors the category of evaluation is not even mentioned, although the categories of intentionality, integrity, coherence, informativeness, perceptibility, situationality and intertextuality are thoroughly covered), on the other hand, it is particular evaluative oppositions (normal - abnormal, important - unimportant) and their linguistic expression that are within the scope of our scientific interests [1; 2; 3]. In addition, in our deep conviction, it is in the assessment that the (linguistic) personality of the author most clearly comes through and the author's concept of the text becomes clear.

The main theoretical provisions concerning the category of assessment are set out in the works of N.D. Arutyunova [4; 5], E.M.Wolf [6], M.V.Vsevolodova, T.V. Markelova and others.

Based on these provisions, we propose to analyze the text in terms of the evaluation category, taking into account the components of the evaluation formula, namely: the evaluating subject, the object of evaluation, the basis for evaluation, the estimated value (or relationship) and the system of means of its expression. The most complete at the level of statement (equal in structure to a complex sentence with a subordinate clause of reason), the evaluation formula can be presented, for example, in the following evaluative statement: I liked this film because my favorite actor plays in it. Here, the evaluating subject is the speaker (means of expression is the pronoun me), the object of evaluation is the film, the evaluative value (positive emotional evaluation) is conveyed by the verb liked, the basis of the positive evaluation is the entire subordinate clause (by the way, also containing evaluative information, where there is a subject - my, the object is an actor, the evaluative relation, although non-predicate, is the beloved).

The evaluating subject can be individual and collective. So, in our example, me is an individual subject. An example of a statement with a collective subject: No one cares about poetry - no one reads them! (Weiner Brothers). The object of evaluation is poetry, the evaluative attitude (emotional negative evaluation) is conveyed by the verb spit, the evaluating subject is society, expressed in the first part of the statement (complex sentence) by the pronoun everyone, and in the second part by the pronoun nobody. The evaluator at the sentence level can be explicit or implicit. In the examples given, we observed an explicit subject. In addition to nouns that name the subject, or pronouns that indicate it, it can be expressed by direct reference to the person with introductory units of the type: in my opinion, in your opinion etc., as well as with the help of verbs to speak, seem, evaluate, emphasize, believe, consider, etc., the forms of which, in the absence of these means, turn out to be the only indicator of a collective or individual subject. So, in the sentence We were taught from school: the most important thing is a person, and technology only then (Pikul) the form of the past tense plural verb - taught - indicates an indefinite person (indefinitely personal sentence), that is, part of society (collective subject). Implicit, that is, not verbally expressed at the level of the statement, the subject is usually established from the context or directly identified with the author of the evaluative statement.

The basis of the assessment can also be implicit and derived from the general context, the reader's background knowledge about the worldview of the author or character of the text, their social status, situational role and other personal characteristics.

The object of assessment and the estimated value are always explicit.

Options for classifying estimated values are contained in the previously mentioned works. We propose to use the classification of N.D. Arutyunova [4; 5], which highlights the general appraisal meaning "good - bad" and particular appraisal values: sensory-taste - "pleasant - unpleasant", "tasty - tasteless", "attractive - unattractive", etc., psychological - "joyful - sad", "cheerful - sad", "desired

- unwanted", etc., aesthetic - "moral - immoral", "good - evil", "virtuous - vicious", etc., utilitarian - "useful - harmful", "favorable - unfavorable" and others, normative - "correct - incorrect", "normal - abnormal", "benign - poor quality", etc., teleological - "effective - inefficient", "expedient - inappropriate", etc. [5, p. 198-199]. The above estimated values are represented by the extreme poles of the opposition, but it should be understood that in addition to the polar values "good - bad", there is a median value "neither good, nor bad" and a number of intermediate values "not so bad - bad - very bad - it can't get worse" and others. Therefore, they speak of a scale of evaluation, on which between the poles of "minus - plus" there are general estimated and privately estimated values.

The means of expressing estimated values are very diverse.

At the syntactic level, these are, first of all, evaluative statements (or evaluative predicative units), which have in their structure an explicit object of evaluation and an explicit evaluative meaning (it is expressed by an evaluative predicate). The basis of the assessment and the evaluating subject are either explicit or implicit.

Non-predicate forms that convey various evaluative meanings refer primarily to the lexical-morphological layer (or level). These are qualitative adjectives, adverbs, words of the state category from opposition pairs (good / good - bad / bad, cheerful / fun - sad / sad, etc.), nouns formed from them (joy - sadness / sadness, good - evil etc.), verbs (to rejoice - to be sad, to love - not to love, etc.) and other expressive, emotional, evaluative vocabulary, in particular, a derivative built on subjective-evaluative word-formation models.

At the stylistic level, these are the so-called means of expressive speech, namely tropes and figures, the use of most of which serves to convey a subjective assessment.

It is on the basis of the presence in the text of the listed linguistic means of expressing evaluation that one can draw relatively objective conclusions about the opinion of the author or character of the text on this or that occasion (about this or that object).

Before offering samples of linguistic analysis of the text, I would like to draw attention to the fact that most often in literature subjected to linguistic (not functional-stylistic) analysis of artistic or journalistic texts. Everything that we talked about earlier also applies to a greater extent to literary and journalistic texts, since their assessment is usually subjective (that is, the author clearly expresses his subjective attitude towards the objects described). The assessment (or modality) of a scientific or business text is recognized as objective or not expressed. We believe that this is not entirely true, a number of evaluative values are very typical, for example, for scientific texts: utilitarian, normative and teleological evaluations ("useful - harmful", "favorable - unfavorable", "correct - incorrect", "normal - abnormal" and etc.). On the other hand, if one still adheres to the traditional approach - to recognize the modality (or assessment) of texts in a number of genres of scientific and business styles as objective, then the absence of means of expressing a subjective assessment will be an indicator of

objectivity. In addition, the very verbal expression of the subject with the help of personal pronouns (I, you, we, you) and possessive pronouns (my, yours), as well as introductory units formed from them (in my opinion, etc.) also turns out to be a subjective evaluative means. , in contrast to the objective "author's we" and introductory units (in our opinion, etc.) in a scientific style.

As an example of linguistic analysis of the text in terms of the category of evaluation, we offer an analysis of a fragment of A. Prokhanov's novel "Mr. Hexogen":

Moscow shimmered through the glass, dazzled, flashed with gold scatterings of churches, striped chimneys, steel lace bridges and towers. The Cathedral of Christ the Savior seemed like a huge golden melon ripened in the middle of the city under the falling blue rains. Beloseltsev, looking around Moscow, admiring her feminine beauty, did not forget for a minute that the enemy reigns in the city. Captured the Kremlin, sat down in the ministries and military centers. An invisible worm has pierced the golden apple of the capital, placed its body among its squares and avenues, buried its forehead in the Spasskaya Tower, surrounded the outskirts with a tight tail.

1. We read the text. We define the object (objects) of evaluation. In this text, there are two main objects of assessment: Moscow and the enemy.

2. Perform object-by-object linguistic analysis.

3. The subject evaluating Moscow is the hero of the novel Beloseltsev. This is an individual subject, but its attitude to the object being assessed coincides with the author's and reflects the assessment of at least the majority of patriotic Russians who, like Beloseltsev, love their capital (patriotism is also the main basis for assessment).

4. Estimated value. In this case, a complex of positive emotional and aesthetic values is presented, located on a rating scale above zero and expressed by means of various levels:

a) syntactic: the first, second and third sentences-statements can be qualified as evaluative; they verbally present the object of evaluation (Moscow, the Cathedral of Christ the Savior, the city), in the third sentence the subject is named (Beloseltsev), but from the context it is clear that he is the subject in all other sentences; the most clearly evaluative attitude of Beloseltsev towards Moscow (admiration, admiration) can be seen from the third sentence: a semi-predicate expression as part of the adverbial turnover (admiring), the meaning of the first two sentences is "Moscow was beautiful" (i.e. shimmered, full of colors, flashed with gold placers churches, striped chimneys, steel lace bridges and towers), "The Cathedral of Christ the Savior was beautiful" (i.e., it seemed like a huge golden melon ripened in the middle of the city under falling blue rains);

b) lexical means of expressing the indicated evaluative meaning: shimmered, motley, flashed, gold, placers, huge, golden, blue, admiring, feminine, beauty, golden;

c) stylistic means: epithets (golden, huge, feminine); comparisons and metaphors (with steel lace of bridges and towers; the Cathedral of Christ the Savior seemed like a huge golden melon

ripened in the middle of the city under falling blue rains; the golden apple of the capital), personification (by its feminine beauty).

5. Beloseltsev is also the subject of evaluation of the enemy.

6. Estimated value. The obviously negative emotional meaning is expressed primarily by the very name of the object - the enemy. There is no evaluative statement. The lexical level is represented by lexemes with a pronounced negative connotation: enemy, reigns, captured, sat down, worm, pierced, body, buried, forehead, surrounded, with a tight tail. Stylistic level - consistent comparison with a worm: invisible worm, body, tail, etc.

7. In addition, the text is built on the figure of opposition - the contrast of Moscow and the enemy: in the city (beautiful and beloved) the enemy reigns; an invisible worm has pierced the golden apple of the capital, placed its body among its squares and avenues, buried its forehead in the Spasskaya Tower, surrounded the outskirts with a tight tail. This makes it possible to reveal another emotional and evaluative layer: hatred for the enemy and pain, feeling for the capital, and with it - for the fate of their homeland.

CONCLUSION

The choice of linguistic text analysis as a technological method of educating language and linguistic competence is due to the fact that, being one of the key issues in the methodology of teaching the Russian language, it appears in the theory and practice of teaching the language very differently (the need to educate the language and speech competence of students is indicated in the State Educational Standard of General secondary education through lines that run through the entire five-year course of the native language).

It seems to us that the linguistic analysis of the text in the aspect of the evaluation category contributes to its adequate perception and understanding. And understanding, as you know, is the basis of communication and, consequently, the life of the human society in general and the individual in particular.

REFERENCES

1. Artamonov VN The category of importance: principles of description, the place of the category of importance among other functional-semantic categories // Volga Pedagogical Search. 2016. No. 4 (18). pp. 123–126.

2. Artamonov V. N. Normal and abnormal in language // Rational and emotional in Russian: collection of proceedings of the International Scientific Conference dedicated to the 85th anniversary of the Honored Scientist of the Russian Federation, Honorary Professor of the Moscow State Regional University, Doctor of Philology, Professor Pavel Alexandrovich Lekant (Moscow, November 24-25, 2017) / ed. Col.: N.B. Samsonov, M.V. Golovnya, P.A. Lekant et al. M.: IIU MGOU, 2017. P. 22–24.

3. Artamonov V.N., Uba E.V. Opposition "healthy - sick" in the Russian language // Volga pedagogical search. 2017. No. 4 (22). pp. 83–89.
4. Arutyunova N. D. Types of language meanings (assessment, event, fact) / otv. ed. G. V. Stepanov; Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Institute of Linguistics. M.: Nauka, 1988. 338 p.
5. Arutyunova N. D. Language and the human world. 2nd ed., rev. Moscow: Languages of Russian culture, 1999. 896 p.
6. Wolf E. M. Functional semantics of evaluation. 2nd ed., add. M.: Editorial URSS, 2002. 280 p.
7. Galperin I. R. Text as an object of linguistic research. Rep. ed. G.V.Stepanov. M.: Nauka, 1981. 140 p.
8. Dymarsky M. Ya. Problems of text-formation and artistic text (based on Russian prose of the 19th-20th centuries). 2nd ed., rev. and additional M.: Editorial URSS, 2001. 328 p.
9. Moskalchuk GG Text structure as a synergetic process. M.: Editorial URSS, 2003. 296 p.
10. Novikov L. A. Artistic text and its analysis. Ed. 2nd, corrected. M.: Editorial URSS, 2003. 304 p.
11. Solganik G. Ya. Syntactic style. 3rd ed. correct and additional M.: KomKniga, 2006. 232 p.
12. Shchukina D. A. Russian literature of the 21st century (a fragment of the space of a literary text): monograph. St. Petersburg: LEMA, 2019. 158 p.
13. Yarygina E. S. Syntax of argumentative discourse: monograph. M.: Yustitsinform, 2018. 198 p.
14. Бабенко Л. Г. Филологический анализ текста. Основы теории, принципы и аспекты анализа: учебник для вузов. М.: Академический проект; Екатеринбург: Деловая книга, 2004. 464 с.
15. Болотнова Н. С. Филологический анализ текста: учеб. пособие. М.: Флинта: Наука, 2009. 520 с.
16. Валгина Н. С. Теория текста: учебное пособие. М.: Логос, 2003. 280 с.
17. Ворожбитова А. А. Теория текста: Антропоцентрическое направление: учебное пособие. Изд. 2-е, испр. и доп. М.: Высшая школа, 2005. 365 с
18. Гринев С. В. Введение в лингвистику текста: учебное пособие. М.: МПУ, 2000. 60 с
19. Ипполитова Н. А. Текст в системе обучения русскому языку в школе: учебное пособие для студентов пед. вузов. М.: Флинта: Наука, 1998. 176 с.
20. Николина Н. А. Филологический анализ текста: учебное пособие для студ. высш. пед. учеб. заведений. М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2003. 256 с.
21. Папина А. Ф. Текст: его единицы и глобальные категории: учебник для студентов-журналистов и филологов. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2002. 368 с.
22. Солганик Г. Я. Стилистика текста: учебное пособие. 14-е изд. М.: Флинта: Наука, 2018. 256 с.
23. Папина А. Ф. Текст: его единицы и глобальные категории: учебник для студентов-журналистов и филологов. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2002. С. 267
24. Теоретические основания и принципы анализа: учеб.-науч. пос. / под ред. проф. К.А.Роговой. СПб.: Златоуст, 2011. 456 с