

Review Article

## Micro Text And Its Cognitive Model

**Z.O. Kurbanov\***

Samarkand State University, Uzbekistan

Article history: Received 03 February 2018; Accepted 19 February 2018; Published 30 April 2018

### ABSTRACT

The article examines the problem of cognitive model of the micro text. Here the complex sentence is learned as a micro text in the basis of hierarchical relations of its components. In the process of the analysis of language material local and global structure of the components of the microtext is taken into account, which is important for the definition of its cognitive model. In general, the micro text is defined as a global structure, while its separate components are studied as local structures. It is known, that each syntactic structure has a definite situation beyond the microtext, and its components also have a situation. This is also a basic definition of general and private cognitive model of the microtext.

**Keywords:** micro text; discrus; global; cognitive; model; Uzbekistan

**HOW TO CITE:** Kurbanov, Z.O. (2018). Micro Text And Its Cognitive Model, Madrosatuna: Journal of Islamic Elementary School, Vol. 2 (1). 13-18. doi: 10.21070/madrosatuna.v%vi%i.1960

### INTRODUCTION

Syntactical constructions, which we traditionally call complex sentences, in fact are larger both on components and syntactical structure units than a sentence. This puts under doubt sensitivity of the usage of the term «complex sentence» referring them (Kurbanov, 2016).

One of the first who paid attention to it was M.N.Peterson, who considered such notions as «complex or compound sentence» as scientifically not based notions. He wrote about it in the 20-ies of the last century (Peterson, 1923: 33). Unfortunately, his ideas didn't find understanding among the wide cycle of linguists, and as a result in modern linguistic science there is a term «complex sentence» still used. But in accordance with the laws of hierarchical relations of speech units any language unit may get activity only within a larger unit than itself. Can a sentence activate within a sentence? In accordance with it A.M.Peshkovsry offered to use the term «complex whole» instead of the term «complex sentence» (Peshkovsky, 1938: 414).

In the Uzbek linguistics the given problem was brought forward for scientific researches by B.Turniyazov, who put into scientific usage the term «complex syntactical structure» which coincides with the notion of microtext (Turniyazov, 2008: 63).

---

\*Email: kurbanovzayniddin@gmail.com

Peer reviewed under reponsibility of Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo.

© 2018 Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, All right reserved, This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

The given article tells about the hypotaxical constructions having the status of microtext and meaning larger units than a sentence.

While analyzing such macrostructures T.van Deyk used the term «discurs» (local and global). In his opinion, if speaking about the relations between propositions of discurs components it is possible to talk about local joining if speaking about the joint of fragments of discurs of a large scale, then there is a global joint (van Deyk, 1989: 413).

In the given article the global joining means the connection between hypotaxical constructions within a text, or between the transforms of the definite hypotaxis, and local joining is a connection between the components of hypotaxical construction: “ *After the children went into the school building noisily, both aunt Risolat and Kamolova remained there* “ ( H.Gulyam. Koradarya ).

## DISCUSSION

### Theoretical Background

The given example hypotaxical construction has the status of a micro text and consists of two components. At the same time each of the components is based on separate propositions: *The children + into the school building + went; Ant Risolat, Kamolova + to remain.*

Semantic connection between the given propositions has a local status. It is possible to speak about the global connection when hypotaxical construction with other hypotaxes within the larger discurs.

As it was mentioned by T.van Deyk (1989: 41), macrostructure means the unity on the level and content.

It is peculiar, that the global structure is based on the macro proposition which is formed from interrelation of two propositions. As N.Suleymanova mentioned, proposition which occurs within definite sentence has a real expression. But macro proposition formed within macrostructure is characterized by abstractness (Suleymanova, 2015: 203).

It can be seen in the complex syntactical constructions and indentation ( occurrence of polypredicateness and above predicateness ), as the predicateness, expressed in separate sentences forms above – predicateness, connected with the general structure of the text (Khayrullaev, 2001: 20).

In the complex syntactic constructions it is rather hard to imagine macro proposition. As hypotaxical construction in most cases has two components, one of which is leading ( main ), the second has a subordinate status. The first of these components is a semantic center of the

hypotaxis. This kind of situation, certainly a bit weakens proposition of the subordinate sentence. But it cannot be a reason for rejecting of the notion of macro proposition in general. Macro proposition remains one of the characteristic features of hypotaxical construction: “ *Granny Mehribon read the poem in such tender and warm tone that the listeners could imagine the history of a beautiful love and real devotion*“ (H.Gulyam. The Tashkenters).

The fact that the given hypotaxical structure has a status of a text ( micro text ) does not require explanations. We can say it is a complex syntactic construction. It is very important. As any hypotaxical construction exists within the notion of a discours.

In the case given in the main ( leading ) sentence the propositional structure can be identified in the following way: ( *Granny Mehribon* ) *the poem + tender tone + warm + read*. In the subordinate sentence there is the following proposition: ( *the listeners* ) *image + beautiful love + real devotion + history + imagine*. In both cases propositional structure is formed within both syntactic and semantic relations between the predicate and its arguments. Macro proposition appeared in the result of interrelation of propositions we can only imagine. As it is hard to give verbal expression to macro proposition. In other words, relations between propositions of two sentences and macro proposition appearing in this basis is only imagined in the mind of the speaker.

It is not hard to notice, that given hypotaxical construction appears in the basis of result concept (situative content), at the same time each sentence has micro concepts. For example, in the first sentence the compositions “ *tender voice and warm tone* ” and in the second sentence “ *beautiful love and real devotion* ” simultaneously carry out the function of both concepts and frames.

It must be said, that the cognitive model of the micro text is based on the notion of a frame. In each sentences of the micro text the peculiar frame is identified. It has a significant role in the identification of separate models of the given sentences. With the help of the main sentence frame the general model appears.

### **Main Part**

T. van Deyk also spoke about the existence of general and separate ( private) models, their difference from each other. Separate model gives a unique information of the situation, standing beyond the sentence, whereas the general model gives the imagination of the situation, expressed in several sentences.(van Deyk, 1989: 165).

In separate models we get new ( or relatively new ) information. In general model the information gets rather abstract character. Here the frame also obtains some “ general view ”: *Though granny Mehribon lives in the suburbs of the city, on the coast of the Kichkirik, in the field, her fame was familiar to the women in Beshyogoch village and especially, in Aripoya.* (H.Gulyam, The Tashkenters ).

In the given example, the two componenthypotaxical construction is formed, its cognitive model occurs within the given components. Beyond each sentence composing the separate component, there is a definite situation.

Owing to the interrelation of private models, the general model is formed. In the first sentence expression the coast of *Kichkirik*, in the second sentence the words *Beshyogoch* and *Aripoya* have the function of frame. But as the second sentence is the main one, its frame serves as a basis for the formation of a general model.

As it is mentioned by T. van Deyk (1989: 165), private model expresses a definite situation, general model unites all the information. Private models appear on the basis of a concrete frame, scene, in the general model these frames are unites and as a result a general frame appears.

Frames of private models get the status of subframes. T. van Deyk also mentions that in this process also transformations and changes can be observed. That is, in the process of formation of a micro text some components may be omitted, sometimes they may be exchanged with the others. The scientist called this kind of situation by three separate terms: 1. Omission. 2. Selection. 3. Generalization (Turniyazov, 2015).

He brings forward the following examples, demonstrating above mentioned.

1. Omission: *A girl in yellow dress passed us. – A girl passed us. – She was in yellow dress. – the dress was yellow.*
2. Selection: *Peter got on the car. – He got into the car. – He left for Frankfurt. – He left for Frankfurt by car.*
3. Generalization: *The doll was lying on the floor. – The wooden train was lying on the floor. – Bricks were lying on the floor. – The toys were lying on the floor.* (Philippov, 2003:4).

The phenomenon of omission is also observed in the translation of language units into the speech, particularly, in the formation of ( derivation ) of hypotaxical construction. For example:

1. *The girls, each of them is the Beauty.* ( Oybek. Great road )

2. *The day is cold but the market is crowded.* ( Oybek. Great road )
3. *I ensure, that this situation is not a trouble.* ( S.Abdulla. MavlonMukimi )

In the first sentence we can see that some components of hypotaxical construction are omitted: *they are the girls....*

In the second example also some elements are omitted: *Though the day was cold, the market was crowded.* Separate words of subordinate part of the second sentence are also omitted: *I ensure you, that....*

## **CONCLUSION**

As we can see in all sentences separate elements are omitted, but these omissions must not be reflected in the meaning, semantic “weight” of general cognitive models of hypotaxical construction. Only in this case both private and general models have force.

We think, that the phenomena omission, selection and generalization are directly connected by synergetic force of language units. Synergetic influence exists in the derivation of both micro structures and macro structures.

## **REFERENCES**

- Deyk, T.A.van. (1989). *Language. Knowledge. Communication.* – M.
- Khayrullaev, Kh.Z. (2001). *The relation of word ,word composition and sentence to the predicativeness.* // Abstract of candidate dissertation. – Tashkent.
- Kurbonov, Z. (2016). *Cognitive – pragmatic features of the formation of hypotaxical construction (on the materials of borderless meaning sentences).* Scientific thesis. – Samarkand, Uzbekistan.
- Peterson, M.N. (1923). *Thesis of the syntax of the Russian language.- Pt.*
- Peshkovsky, A.M. (1938). *Russian syntax in scientific reveal.* – 6<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Philippov, K.A. (2003). *Text linguistics.* – Saint Petersburg.
- Suleymanova, N. (2015). *Cognitive aspect and syntactic structures of the sentence. General Human and National values in the Great Silk Road: language, education and culture.* Materials of international conference. – Samarkand – Shanghai.
- Turniyazov, B.N. (2008). *Derivation of complex syntactic constructions with equal components in Present day Uzbek language.* – Samarkand, Uzbekistan.
- Turniyazov.N. (2015). *Cognitive – pragmatic factors of text formation. General Human and National values in the Great Silk Road: language, education and culture.* Materials of international conference. – Samarkand – Shanghai.

REPRINT ISSUE