



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.02272.2**

MENTAL THINKING IN A LITERARY TEXT

Jaloliddin Jamolidinovich Yodgorov*

*Base Doctoral Student,
Uzbek language, literature and folklore Institute of the Academy of Sciences,
Republic of UZBEKISTAN

ABSTRACT

From the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century, there has been a growing interest and empirical research in the study of individual language in the context of speech. The manifestation of subjective reality in speech, that is, the reflection of linguistic identity in speech acts, is associated with the awareness of the language owner of the synchronous and diachronic language base, as well as associative-verbal ability. The study of the internal and external "I" as a dual phenomenon, the planning of the individual's speech and the analysis of the state of speech realization are among the urgent issues. The communicative process (creator and reader) is not only an exchange of ideas and informational contact, but also a moment directly related to human emotions, moods, feelings and total views about existence. It is precisely as a result of the psycho-emotional aura of the text that the reader creates a world free from the reality of his being.

KEYWORDS: *Literary Text, Dialogue And Monologue, Poetic Tone, Author And Reader, Mental Thinking, Lexical Character, Speech Argument, Linguopoetic Approach, Communicative-Linguistic Personality, Theory Of Speech Communication, Linguistic Pragmatics, Act Of Genetic Motivation.*

INTRODUCTION

In linguistic scattered research, dialogue and monologue are analyzed as the main form of speech communication and the most important component of the compositional-speech structure of the literary text, as well as the component that forms the character traits of the work of art. A set of international and local scattered and progressive general philological researches has been formed.

Main part

The fact that the literary text is composed of aesthetically valuable communication and the poetic tone of the work is characterized by its anthropocentricity, social significance and figurative modeling by the author is able to embody a special artistic landscape of the world. Indeed, the literary text is characterized not only by the author and the reader, but also by the total combination of lexical characters within the literary text, and as a result of views on this issue, a number of ideas have been formed. Therefore, in the linguopoetic analysis of a literary text, as a result of anthropocentric principle and linguopoetic interpretation, it is a fact that there is a linguistic person “behind the text” (V.Karaulov).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Mental thinking as an artistic phenomenon is voiced as a textual exchange of ideas between the author and the recipient. In this regard, the formation of the image, character and types embodied in the work of art on the basis of verbal arguments, as well as its artistic expression allows to analyze the image as a linguistic entity in the set of features given in the text. At the same time, the main issues are raised in the study and research of the linguistic personality at the artistic level as a subject of textual communication. Also, a comprehensive analysis of trends in linguistic research has shown that innovative paradigms of modern linguistics (functional, communicative-pragmatic, linguoculturological, lingvopoetic and other approaches) open up prospects for further study of this phenomenon of literary genres. In general, our views will be on the priority of the functional-communicative and lingvopoetic approach in the analysis of dialogue and monologue. In this case, dialogue is manifested as a sphere of manifestation of human speech activity, and its participants are manifested in different types of activities, but primarily as communicative-linguistic individuals. At the same time, dialogue is studied in terms of the theory of speech activity, the theory of speech communication, linguistic pragmatics, the theory of speech genres that study human behavior in society, and therefore has a bright anthropocentric direction.

The creator behind the text understands the world with his own eyes and consciousness and realizes it in the text based on his inner lexicon. In particular, the ideas he wants to convey and express are expressed in different forms of the text (monologue, dialogue, polylogue). Based on its speech units, it shapes the text idioethnically and poetically actualizes it in linguistic units.

–Yes, Nilu, you’re dressed up, are you going to a party? – I said fondly.

–I was born today, – he said, blinking his dark eyes and smiling.

–Iya, you are a jubilee, but don’t hurry, now ... (U. Hoshimov. World affairs).

Indeed, its pragmatic and aesthetic influences through text are formed in dialogues, where the total totality of artistic information is concentrated. If in the text there are units of exhortation, it fully reflects the appeal of the literary text and the secondary reality formed on the basis of the creative inner world. The “*iya*” consonant is an act of genetic urge that is actively used in the Uzbek language, is a unit that fully embodies our national language and mental characteristics, and performs the full function of emotional lexicon in the literary text. If we repeat the moment of dialogue in the example and embody it on the basis of our imagination and consciousness, it is not difficult to understand the age-specific actions of communicators in the process of

conversation, their propensity for phonographic adaptations in the process of using the act of encouragement. In particular, the first speaker used the adjective “*iya*” very briefly, using it in a way that was specific to the age of the second communicator in front of him and to the specific (age of the communicant). If this aspect, that is, the sound of *ya* in the vowel *ya*, lengthens and the tone falls towards the end of the sound, we can observe that it generally turns into a secondary sema of wonder, ridicule and hatred (meaningful “atomic” particles). However, the linguistic-verbal aspects of such cases in all parts of speech cannot be shown in the text, and the phonetic potential of any language is not sufficient for this.

– *Did you hear that the dentists were lucky?*

– *What the hell happened?! – said his uncle, glad that the conversation had turned away.*

– *Iya, don't you know yet? – A new class of robbers has emerged in the city. On the tram, on the bus, on the street - when he sees a man with gold teeth, he puts a hammer in his mouth and pulls out his teeth.* (S.Ahmad. Karakoz Majnun).

Russian linguist S. Kartsevsky points out that sign and expression (meaning) cannot completely overlap. Their boundaries do not intersect at all points, and a character can have multiple functions or a single meaning can be represented using different characters. Any character has the ability to be “homonymous” and “synonymous” at the same time. Indeed, if we pay attention to the verbal expression of the act of urge (*iya*) used in the above examples elsewhere, we realize that the scholar's views are correct.

– *Well, opajon, I'll come to work tomorrow.*

– *We're leaving now.*

– *Iye, after all ...* (T. Malik. Demon streets of Satan.)

It should be noted that the main directions of dialogic research in modern linguistics are described and generalized, and there is a need for multidimensional research based on its anthropocentric, textual and linguocultural approaches. In the literary text, new views are being formed on the comprehensive structural-semantic, functional, pragmatic and lingpoetic description of dialogue. At the same time, dialogue analysis in fiction is becoming increasingly important in the study of dialogue theory, text theory, speech communication theory, modern genre studies, literary text lingvopoetics, and the peculiarities of national (mental) thinking. The specific features, tasks and types of dialogue in the literary text, as well as the specificity in the formation of the literary text along the theme plan are very important. Also, the study and analysis of the heroes of a literary work as linguistic individuals through dialogue shows the poetic perfection in the linguistic tricks of the creator. In particular, the activity of the acts of encouragement in the dialogic phases and the very intentions of the creator and the arguments he wants to show. Dialogue is a dynamic structure as the main, primary form of communication, which is primarily determined by its communicative nature. Artistic dialogue, which is an integral part of the worldview created by the writer, as a secondary form of communication, becomes an important tool for the realization of the aesthetic function, originality, based on the individuality of the author. In dialogue, artistic (secondary) communication is directly related to natural (primary) communication, which is especially reflected in the parameters of the verbalization of the communication situation in the story genre.

– *I'm not going, – said the old woman. – It's going to die. Take the corpse out of the suitcase.*

–*Iya, that's interesting! My uncle is leaving today!*

The old woman entered the house in silence ... (S.Ahmad. Karakoz Majnun).

The act of encouragement used in the text embodies the character of the literary text as an integral linguistic person in general in terms of social, psychological, age, gender characteristics and activates his verbal behavior in all respects emotionally. The idiosyncrasy of the subject is embodied as an artistic representation of national interpersonal communication.

–*Balli!* - *The testy expression in Mirzo Ulugbek's eyes was replaced by warm kindness. (O.Yakubov. Ulugbek's treasure).*

Socio-psychological types of linguistic personalities of characters are identified, their relationship with functional and semantic varieties of dialogue on the one hand, and the specific features of the situation described by the writer on the other. However, the communicative and pragmatic features of character speech behavior remain underdeveloped, as the specific features of dialogicity are largely determined by the pragmatic nature. Man is also the main object of the author's aesthetic pursuits, and his stories reflect the diversity of folk characters in different life situations. The study of dialogue in a literary text turns out to be most perfect if its analysis is carried out through the prism of a linguistic personality. As a linguistic person, character is a carrier of cultural-linguistic, communicative-activity values, knowledge, attitudes and behavioral reactions. In interspecific communication, the sign is determined by the socio-psychological type of the linguistic personality, its socio-role status.

Kozimboy tried to distract.

– *You see four years of the nineteenth century, you see ninety-two years of the twentieth century.*

Wow, *do you want to see the twenty-first century again? Ibi, where is the honesty? (S.Ahmad. Karakoz Majnun).*

The idiosyncrasy of an artistic image is based on the type of dramatic scenes in which dialogue becomes an organic way of expressing the author's thoughts, his worldview, and becomes the subject of the image. As in drama, interspecific dialogue is multifunctional and forms a special type of text, whose functions are to collect information about characterization, action development, behavioral motives and causes of characters, and to evaluate them. An integrative approach to the study of artistic dialogue, that is, its analysis in terms of structure, functions, semantics and pragmatics in terms of communicative activity, determines the relevance of this work, taking into account the specificity of the author's linguistic personality and linguistic personality. The timeliness of the research is related to the need to compare artistic dialogue with the primary, prototypical form of communication. The communicative situation, expressed in the literary text, has its own characteristics and is mainly associated with prototypical dialogue. This defines the specific features of dialogue modeling as part of a work of art. Verbal design of communicative situation parameters helps to convey the verbal behavior of the character and its verbal and nonverbal components. Dialogue is one of the main types of human communication based on verbal interactions. The theory of dialogue is actively developing in linguistics, and its complexity at the problem level shows that linguistic and linguopoetic analyzes are evolving. The multidimensional nature of dialogue is also analyzed in the fields of art history, literature,

sociology, anthropology, philosophy. Dialogue is analyzed by them as a specific form of verbal communication, a field of manifestation of verbal activity, a form of language existence, and a form of human communication with the world. The main material for the study of dialogue is a dialogic piece that reflects the specific features of the literary hero's verbal behavior. The special significance of the dialogic passage is that it represents a literary character in the interaction with the "other" (M. Bakhtin) in the situation in which "man in man" appears.

–I wrote it by heart, – replied Diyorov.

–I wanted to warn our healthy generation about the dangerous path that the mullahs are embarking on.

–Vot molodes, – said Fatkhullin, impatient. – ... a devoted patriot joins the party! (S.Ahmad. Karakoz Majnun).

In fiction, verbal communication is represented by a piece of text. The textual parameters of constructing a communicative situation include the elements that determine the main tone of the dialogue: the identifier of the addressee and the addressee, their relationship, social roles in communication, intentions, indicators of speech-related actions, the place and time of communication. The defined parameters of the communicative situation determine the speech-behavioral scenario conveyed in the author's story, which provides textual unity. We can also highlight as a separate problem the principle of the author's choice of linguistic material to model the linguistic personality of a literary hero.

–Hey, Nazirbuvi, is this going to happen, or have we sent the chairman's sheep stuffed with empty walnuts?

–Voy, Tuxtabuvi, why not? – We put it in the meeting, didn't we? (A.Qahhor. Tales from the past).

The urgency of the problems of dialogue research suggests that there are still a number of controversial issues, in particular the question of the relationship between dialogue and monologue, dialogue and speech, that dialogue has its own characteristics as a textual type. In traditional linguistics, dialogic speech has always been contrasted with monologic speech by distinguishing their distinctive features. Dialogue was defined as a form of speech in which there is a direct exchange of speech between two persons. The monologue is viewed as a self-directed form of speech (G. Vinokur) rather than intended for the other person's verbal reaction to the speaker. Later, the terms "dialogic speech" and "monologue speech" refer to the features of the two main forms of speech, and the terms "dialogue" and "monologue" refer to the artistic expression of these forms of speech. These terms are used synonymously. Dialogue, first, is a dialogic form of speech characterized by the constant activity (role of the speaker) and passivity (role of the listener) of the communication participants. Second, in the changing direction of the messages, the dialogue consists of short statements that appear spontaneously, each of which is encouraged by the one before it (the other).

–Auntie, you have to be patient in everything, – said Arslanqul softly so as not to offend. – Let's assume that sooner or later no one will catch them...

– Ah, my son has given you the patience of an apple!" – The old woman sighed and did not open her mouth. (Oybek. Navoi).

Dialogic speech is characterized by grammatical confusion, shortcomings, reduction of grammatical forms, active and meaningful gestural approach, and communicative polarization. One participant of monologue communication is characterized by the stability of the speech activity with the external passivity of others. It is distinguished by detailed and structured, premeditative statements that have a thematic unity. In modern linguistic research, the problem of the relationship between dialogue and monologue often does not find a single solution due to the complexity of their skills, their mutual overlap. Dialogue is primary, it ensures the dominance of being and the development of communication, and is recognized as a source of “being a means of communication” (M.Bakhtin).

The bakovul elders wore a one-ton beqasam around their waists.

– **Balli**, you’re equal! – he said.

The elders did not come empty-handed.

– **Eb-ey**, what do you say, Grandpa? – said Hotam the wrestler. (T.Murod. The stars burn forever).

In modern research, dialogue is the subject of research in such areas of linguistics as communication theory, pragmalinguistics, text linguistics, syntax, stylistics, social and psycholinguistics, linguopoetics. In modern linguistics, there are three areas that study communication: actual analysis of conversation (conversation analysis), speech ethnography (speech ethnography), and speech analysis, on the basis of which the total aspects of the speech situation are studied. It is also important to note the secondary nature of the monologue over the dialogue, because, on the one hand, the monologue is the semantic origin of the dialogue, on the other hand, it is a dialogue compressed by a textual requirement. As a result, with a broad understanding of dialogue, the issue of distinguishing between dialogue and monologue is usually overshadowed. However, as the main difference between monologue and dialogue, it is necessary to recognize that monologue is a special type of communication, not an abbreviated form of communication, in order to establish and describe the parameters of monologue communication, taking communication participants as a sign of communicative equality or inequality.

The earth is washing the dishes. The pervert is accountable to his father. He was a dog! Cough again! He, let your lungs rot! (T.Malik. Demon streets of Satan).

In the reflection of the dialogue in the status of the text is explained by such factors as the constancy of the composition of the participants, space and time, situation, integrity, referential and semantic dependence of replicas and their continuity, the presence of linguistic indicators. The main difference between dialogue and monologue is that subjects change their communicative roles (speaker-addressee) and create text together. A dialogic text is an alternate chain of sentences formed by alternating the speech of two or more participants in a speech act in the role of speaker or listener. In the case of a monologue, only one of the subjects is the person performing the production of the text, the second participant in the speech act is the addressee or the recipient, either thinking or reacting immediately. Given the complex multidimensional nature of dialogue, we consider it necessary to clarify a number of concepts we use in our work.

Before Tursunali's imprisonment, a man who saw the house on horseback a year later would grab him by the collar and say, "Yopiray, he was beaten by a thief last night". (T. Malik. Demon streets of Satan).

CONCLUSION

The importance of internal speech is that it plays a uniquely important role as the basis of oral and written speech, and is sometimes referred to as passive speech. The inactivity of internal speech is that it is self-directed and does not require the presence of a second person. At first glance, this idea may seem correct, but it also has some limitations. After all, even in the inner monologue, the presence of a representative of the second pole secretly is felt on the basis of the demand of the literary text and the factors that reveal the character.

REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova N.D. Dialogic modality and the phenomenon of citation // Human factor in language. Communication, modality, deixis. – Moscow .: Nauka, 1992.
2. Borisova I.N. Russian conversational dialogue: the problem of integrability: Author's abstract. dis. doct. philol. sciences. – Yekaterinburg, 2001.
3. Krasnykh V.V. Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics and Communication Theory. – Moscow .: Gnosis, 2001.
4. Paducheva E.V. Pragmatic aspects of the connectedness of the dialogue // Izvestiya AN. A series of literature and language. 1982.
5. Shiryaev E.N. The structure of intentional conflict dialogues of the spoken language // Problem of speech communication. – Saratov: Publishing house Sarat. University, 2000.
6. Lapasov J. Literary text and linguistic analysis. – Tashkent: Teacher, 1995
7. Mahmudov N.M. Semantic-syntactic asymmetry in simple sentences in Uzbek language. – Tashkent: Teacher, 1984
8. Yuldoshev M. Fundamentals of literary text and its lingvopoetic analysis. – Tashkent: Fan, 2007.
9. Mamajonov A. Text linguistics. – Tashkent: Fan, 1989.
10. U. Hoshimov. World affairs. – Tashkent: 2018.
11. S.Ahmad. Karakoz Majnun. – Tashkent: Sano-standard, 2016.
12. T. Malik. Demon streets of Satan. – Tashkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2017. Yakubov. Ulugbek's treasure. – Tashkent: Tafakkur anoti, 2016.