

*Ibrahimova B. E.,
PhD Student,
Baku Slavic University*

HIERARCHICAL ISSUES IN THE TEXT ORGANIZATION

Summary. The units of separate text levels – form, content, word combinations, and sentences – have such qualities that manifest only within the literary text and in some cases, play both structural and microstructural components of it and formally integrate micrometers. It can create harmony and rhythm between the content and the form. Every artistic text is a perfect arrangement. There are many details, methods and tools that are considered essential for its organization. Their study makes it necessary to carry out specific research on the language of literary texts in this direction and in this respect; this article differs from traditional textual research. In fact, textual science is a philological discipline that summarizes the principles and methods of studying literary texts in a great sense of the word. In the Turkish literary text with a specific contextual structure, the form and the content indicators are characterized by certain features. The interest in the problems related to functional aspects of a language is one of the most characteristic features of the modern era of linguistics. The biggest breakthrough in the study of this problem dates back to the early 1970s. This was followed by series of processes both in linguistics and in a number of subjects. The content plan of the text is based on a specific informative approach that defines its formal boundaries. The article deals with the informative structure of literary text, its mechanism of organization, formation of complex syntactic entities as literary textual units. It also reveals the functional-content, structural-form elements that are specific to the literary texts. The different features of poems and prose texts, the syntactic structures specific to the literary language and their roles in the literary text are also investigated. All these issues are analyzed in the article basing on more extensive material.

Key words: hierarchy, linguistics, text category, text theory, semantics, transformation, semiotics.

In recent decades, bilingual text has been at the center of linguistics. At present, textual linguistics is in its mature form as a field of language theory. Quite a few scientific-research works have been written on a number of text categories and it has been proven that these categories play an important role in the organization of the text [1; 8; 10]. However, some of the issues that researchers have explored, being connected with the text, have not yet been accepted as a category and still remain controversial. Whether their being a category of a text or not can probably be clarified on the basis of their relationship and comparison with other known categories.

There are two approaches to text theory research after a colloquium held in Constantinople in 1968: on the one hand, there are attempts to create formal grammar of the text – for this, rules, procedures, and modeling of the structure are provided; On the other hand, a common text theory is created by examining specific speech acts, their organization and activity patterns, describing the different

styles of such actions, and defining the categorical features of any type of a text [25].

One of the key issues in the characterization of the text is its volume index. The size of the text can be increased as much as desired, but it is, by its very nature, an object that can be viewed visually by a person, because it has a beginning and an end. The fact that some theorists present text as a boundless object does not justify itself. The text is a separate part of a process, where all the distinctive features of an object manifest themselves in different ways. This means that each text unit must be distinguished only as a unit specific to the object. In this regard T. V. Bulgina's view that "despite some combining features of sentences in the text, I think that text does not, in any case, create a specific structure that is superior to the sum of the features of the sentences that constitute the text" [12, p. 224]. The concept put forward by Western linguists M. Daskal and A. Margalit does not differ from T. V. Bulgina. They show that there is no need for a separate text theory to be developed, and the perfectly used grammar of the sentence can describe all the features of the text [24, p. 195–213]. This kind of text implies some isomorphism (identification, equalization) of the sentence and text structures, which cannot be considered correct, above all, because the sentence is a component of the text and as a whole the parts can never be equal to one another; the text is not simply a "summary of sentence signs" [14, p. 8–9]. In order to form a theory of a text, it is necessary to review, in short, the scientific basis for this theory. First of all, the observations on the structure, content and composition of the text are considered major that allow us to reveal certain regularities of the text organization and to study its meaning and function. These observations and conclusions have been reached as a result of generalizations do not always require strict adherence to the exact methodology of the sciences. A number of scientific sources indicate that the seriousness of the evidence is not necessarily an explanation. For example, Y. Shreider writes: "The physicist may use such evidences that the mathematician may not consider it serious" [20, p. 213].

Arguments for the theory should, first and foremost, be distinguished by their consistency, logical coverage, and illustrations, because the theory is scientifically justified when it is approved practically. It is important to remember that the text is a structure that occurs, exists, and develops in the written version of the literary language. Only in this variant, graphical organization of the text in an exploitative manner is the result of a conscious use of a language expression. In this regard, the fundamental distinctive symptoms that identify the differences between the written and oral variants of the language may be reminded [14, p. 15]. The complexity of the concept of the text requires distinguishing the leading issue that demonstrates the ontological and functional signs of the text. The text is the work of a speech-making process that is objectively written, worked on according to the type of the document from

literary point of view, it is also a work consisting of specific names (headings), special units (phrases), which combine with various types of lexical, grammatical, logical, stylistic relation types and has a specific purpose and a pragmatic founding. From this definition it is understood that text refers to a type of speech that is not defined on paper, rather than a verbal, non-organized, non-consecutive verbal recording, but that has its own parameters being different from its verbal ones. Verbal speech is only in linear development, it is a process of moving forward, and this process is a sign of instability. In fact, all the signs and features of the oral speech are in conflict with the characteristic of the text. As such, the text is not, above all, a spoken word, it is not only a linear development, but a movement forward, but also is characterized by its stability.

The text has a dual nature and exists in immobility and movement. The text, imagined as a sequence of discrete units, is in immobility, and the sign of motion is implicit. When reading, the text becomes more active and, on the contrary, signs of immobility become to be in an implicit form. The specified parameters of the text constitute an important characteristic of the text and are based on the pyramid of its signs. The text is so composed that its components are interconnected with one another. The structure of the text is due to the closure of separate vegetative sentences together or in a distant position. At the same time, the content of the individual components of the text is relative. From this, we can conclude that the same sentence model has to be approached differently both within and outside the text. Even models of the same sentence can be different in different texts due to their associative semantic properties; the text, as a more organized syntactic unit, is capable of altering the semantic and associative structure of the sentences within it. Transformation of a sentence into a text component often occurs as a result of implicit and random changes. The organization of the relations of the components appears as the first step of the same transformation. For example, R. I. Pimenov states that objects in any relationship cannot coincide with objects that are not related to each other [19, p. 219]. Thus, it is worth noting that only the interaction of components within the text opens great opportunities for the semantic transformation of each of them. The importance of the information transmitted by its components must also be taken into account to determine the structure of the text. Each small text that has the functionality within the text has its own regular structure. In the structural-composition plan, each text goes through three stages:

- 1) initial stage;
- 2) middle stage;
- 3) the final stage [16, p. 46–52].

Such a division usually refers to the structure of the small text. In this regard, the large text also has its own structure. Such text goes through the following steps:

- 1) title (title);
- 2) a prolonged individual;
- 3) the main part of the text;
- 4) a separate epilogue;
- 5) the place and time of writing [16, p. 46–52].

T. K. Demidova distinguishes another composition between macro text and micro text, and describes the larger speech fragment of micro text as “fragmentation”, compared to any micro text that is closely linked to each other in terms of meaning and syntactic relationships. As sentences within micro texts do not play the same role, micro texts within the fragment, which are considered to be a larger speech unit, differ according to their meaning [16, pp. 46–52].

In terms of meaning, micro text is characterized by the unity of thought and the relative abundance of thought. The conceptual integrity and interconnection of its components are more evident in the literary prose texts. As for the fragment, it is usually a greater micro text, in other words, a larger theme dependence of the elemental components that make up their components by combining several micro-subjects within a common theme at a high level [13, p. 49–51].

The importance of semiotic symbols for textualization has already been accepted in linguistics. At the same time, the text has the integrity of the symbols and the systematic connection of the characters, reflecting the author’s attitude to the objective reality. At the same time, the textual character of the text is on the one hand material, and on the other, it has content that is of non-material character. Therefore, the text is represented in the form of denotation – sign – triangle. Frege’s triangle principle, which we usually refer to in lexicology, can also refer to the text, which is justified [17, p. 24].

The content of the text is stored in the text structure by the text author; as a result of the author’s thinking. The meaning of the text relates to the meaning of the text understood by the recipient. Consequently, the semantic structure of the text is associated with the symbolic nature of its content structure and represents the unity of form and content of the text; the content structure is related to coding (i.e. information encoding), and the meaning structure is related to the decoding of information reception, semantic disclosure [6, p. 81].

As in lexicology, textual criticism refers to the unity of content and expression plan as well. At the same time, the content side of the text consists of information, and the form side is the structure. We cannot speak about the text outside these two factors [17, p. 24].

The text consists of a hierarchy of structural elements. They have a basis for systemic linking from bottom to top. The linguistic hierarchy expresses the principle of structure, moving from the smallest to the largest trajectory, covering a large area beyond the phoneme [16]. Because of this, phonemes form lexemes, morphemes, they also form micro texts and micro texts form macro texts.

Thus, as micro fluidics develop from micro to macro; a system of macro text is formed on the basis of mutual interdependence. Macro text is a complete hierarchy in this context, for example: J. Mammadguluzadeh’s “Mailbox” story consists of a large number of micro texts, and the structural semantic hierarchy between them ends with the completion of the “Mailbox” macro text. Therefore, macro-hierarchy has a relationship between macro and micro.

The components of micro text and micro do not differ significantly in terms of their organization and connection; they are easily separated into constituents. For example: micro texts are subdivided into sentences, and in turn sentences are subdivided into subunits – semi-systems. As a result, in the formation of macro text, growth occurs from small sub-systems to a greater one. The elements mentioned in the process of speech form an interconnected system that enables each other to act, and the dynamics end with the formation of a large text in the form of a large system; the communication system between them is stable and includes all sub-systems of the language.

The language system is a complex system. Herbert Simon notes that complex systems evolve from simple to complicated ones rapidly, when they have a common stage [15, p. 118].

Micro texts can be taken as a middle step in macro text formation. Because it is isomorphic and has a common position between the macro text and the sentence:

From the bottom it is associated with the smallest unit of speech and from the top with the largest one. The formation of macro thinking of people in communication has occurred on the basis of it. So, there was a micro level of a text as a middle step that led to the logical development of a macro text. This concept is also confirmed by the principles of logical development. Because macro system cannot be formed without a subsystem; micro system does not deny macros.

The text has both reported and known aspects. That is, the text is known as information of a reported one. This duality embodies the structure and content of the text. Here the denotation is a part of the reality, and the signal is connected to the content of the text with the intensity of the writer. The text is also a sequence of symbols representing interchangeable levels. It is of a specific nature with integrity. The sequence of their interrelationships develops at the expense of each other, creating a hierarchical grouping of growing elements. Thus, the text structure is formed. The complexity of the semiotic system at this time depends on the complexity of the information provided. Consider, for example, a man dying under a horse and a horse under a saddle [21, p. 56].

In this issue, a man and a horse are represented by their own semantics; where the informational complexity is derived from the content of the compared parts. Based on the informative complexity, a complex semiotic system was used.

The complexity of the semiotic system is that it serves to make the parallel structural informative value more and more vivid.

It is known that the text has a hierarchical system, but its specific style based on the intensity of the author depends on the complexity of the information. This means that each text is marked according to its content. The complexity of the semiotic system in that text is also related to this point.

Hierarchy is a general principle of text structure, and paradigmatic hierarchy is concerned with the independent organization of each structural level that makes up the text. N. Enkvist rightly points out that besides the sentence hierarchy, there is also a text hierarchy [23]. For example, phonetic, lexical, morphological and syntactic levels. Thus, all levels have a hierarchy within the framework, but the hierarchy of the text is different from that level hierarchy, which involves all levels of language in the hierarchy and facilitates the transmission of information that is important for communication. N. Enkvist shows an example of the text hierarchy as the relationship between a claim and its justification or the subject and its justification [23].

Talking about these features of the text, N. S. Bolotnova notes two directions: informative and pragmatic. Both factors gain valuable quality in the organization of the text [11, p. 87]. The syntagmatic hierarchy is related to the establishment of additional structural links between the paradigmatic hierarchy groups in the text structure. The syntagmatic hierarchy is provided by the law of semiotic equivalence. The two signs at this time should be similar or different in terms of one or another relationship. The equivalence of the signs is manifested in two ways: in the hierarchy stairs from up to down and to transverse. At the same time, a unit of one level is transformed into another one in the other level, for example, if the word *bird* in English, or *quş* in Azerbaijani is a noun as a morphological unit, it is the subject in the syntactic level.

If the text is viewed from the point of view of the listener rather than from the point of view of the speaker, then the invariant system is present. The invariant text is marked as a low level in comparison with the variant text. This means that the text is a complex system of symbols that expresses elements and inter-level relationships.

At the pragmatic level of the text, presupposition also plays a great role. It is a unit of the pragmatic level of the text, and the reader draws it out of the general context as a rational result, rather, presupposition is an implicit form of expression. Presupposition is foreseen and related to the general knowledge of the reader. Sometimes presuppositions and textual presuppositions are also discussed. Presupposition by subjective identity is classified as followings:

- 1) the author;
- 2) reader;
- 3) presupposition of images [4, p. 183].

Language symbols are indexed, iconic and symbolic according to Pierce. The icons are similar to denotations and symbols; they are similar to each other [6, p. 43].

The continuum plays an important role in the formation of a text system and its integration into a single system. The Continuum, as a text category, presents events took place in different time and space with new artistic thinking; this term refers to the concept of sequence in text linguistics; is a coherent development in a linear flow of events, combined with a movement trajectory of time and space [8, p. 24].

Unlike literary texts, mathematical texts are meta-notes. All scientific texts have such character. In text linguistics the text is understood as a manifestation of the language. Those who are not in the language do not find their expression in the text.

The text does not only perform as a communicative function, it also shapes the text. In this case, it is not only a cover of language, but a generator of ideas.

At this point, the semantics of the text comes before the language, so the listener needs to organize the language for that text. In this case, the text is principally heterogeneous and has a heterogeneous structure and also it is a manifestation of many languages. The text is a homogenous event because of the sequence of characters. If the text is verbal, it is a veterinary object. First, it has a hierarchical structure, and on the other hand, the text combines symbolic, iconic, meta iconic signs. Verbal texts are different, such as tables, schemes, pictures and so on.

Speaking of semiotics, semiotics consider it to be composed of three components (semantics, pragmatics and syntactic) [5, p. 68–70]. When we refer to the text, semantics can be understood as the relation of sign to reality. Semantics can be regarded as a marker's connection to the reader. Segmentation is the regularity of the internal structure of the image, and pragmatism refers to the relationship between the image and the human being.

One of the most important signs of the text is its relevance. It can be not only text-based but also outside of it as well. The same relevance – the hierarchy refers to the content of the text structure. In the text, the hierarchy of structural units occurs according to each speaker's language system [18, p. 10–42].

The semantic structure of the literary text is numerous; it includes the thematic, ideological, aesthetic etc. layers of thought. There are various components of the text, especially macro context, micro context, text development, etc. These are the main contexts of literary text comprehension. Completeness, integrity,

and coherence of the literary text are linked to a single author's image that unites them [7, p. 112].

This hierarchy comes before the material hierarchy – the structural hierarchy and is different from it. It is known that the structural hierarchy is formed by the presence of language levels. The systematic hierarchy of the text resembles a related morphological paradigm, and one of the scales of that paradigm is activated in the process of constructing speech. In the communication process, a unit of the systematic hierarchy is also transformed into a separate text in which one receives the appropriate material structure. Thus, we can conclude that the text arises from the existence of a hierarchy both within of the text and outside of it.

References:

1. Abdullayev A. Text, meaning and understanding (communicative analysis) : Phd. Dissertation. Baku, 2001. 359 p.
2. Allahverdiyeva A. Cognitive features of English-language based television texts. Baku : Baku State Publication, 2014. 264 p.
3. Azerbaijani linguistics, Volume III. Baku : ANAS, 2013. 522 p.
4. Jafarova L. The role of the fixed word combinations in the structural-semantic organization of a literary text. Baku : BSU, 245 p.
5. Ahmadov İ. Grammatical structure of the Azerbaijani language. Baku, 1982. p. 68–70.
6. Huseynova M. Semantic Interpretation of the Text. Baku : ANAS, 2016. 144 p.
7. Mammadov A. System of formal communication means in the creation of a text. Baku : NURLAR, 2017. 237 p.
8. Novruzova N. Text syntax. Baku : Education, 2002. 184 p.
9. Veyselli F. Fundamentals of Linguistics. Baku, 2013. 420 p.
10. Адмони В. Типология предложения и логико-грамматические типы предложений. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1973. № 2. С. 46–57.
11. Болотнова Н. Знаковый характер текста. URL: http://www.xliby.ru/jazykoznanie/teorija_teksta_uchebnoe_posobie/p5.php (дата обращения: 20.01. 2019).
12. Булыгина Т. О границах между сложной единицей и сочетанием единиц. Единицы разных уровней грамматического строя языка и их взаимодействие. Москва, 1969. 331 с.
13. Гальперин И. Ретроспекция и проспекция в тексте. *Филологические науки*. 1980. № 5. С. 44–52.
14. Гальперин И. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. Москва : Наука, 1981. 139 с.
15. Сайман Г. Наука об искусственном. Москва : Едиториал УРСС, 2000. 144 с.
16. Демидова Т. Коммуникативно-стилистическая обусловленность структуры художественного микротекста. *Сборник научных трудов МГИИЯ им. М. Тареза «Текст в функционально-стилевом аспекте»*. Москва. 1988. Вып. 309. С. 46–52.
17. Лотман Ю. Структура художественного текста. Москва, 1970. 285 с.
18. Лотман Ю. Избранные статьи. Таллин : Александра, 1982. 472 с.
19. Пфютце М. Заметки об участии некоторых грамматических средств в построении текста. *Новое в зарубежной лингвистике*. Москва. 1978. Вып. 8. С. 218–242.
20. Шрейдер Ю. Наука – источник знаний и суеверий. *Новый мир*. 1969. № 10. С. 207–226.
21. Якобсон Р. Избранные работы. Москва : Прогресс, 1985. 454 с.
22. Язык, сознание, коммуникация / Ред. В. Красных, А. Изотов. Вып. 3. Москва : Филология, 1998. 120 с.
23. A Three-level Approach to syntax. Prague: Travaux Linguistique de Prague / Firbas L. *On the defining the theme in functional interplay in functional sentence perspective. In the Prague School of linguistics and Language Teaching*. London : Longman, 1964. P. 199–244.
24. Dascal M., Margalit A. A new “Revolution in linguistics”. Text-Grammars's. “Sentence-Grammars”. *Theoretical linguistics*. 1974, V. 1, N 1/2 p. 195–213.
25. Hartman P. Text als linguistisches Objekt. *Beitrag zur textlinguistik*. Munchen, 1971. 287 p.

Ібрагімова Б. Ієрархічні питання в текстовій організації

Анотація. Одиниці окремих текстових рівнів – форма, зміст, словосполучення й речення мають такі якості, котрі проявляються лише всередині літературного тексту, а в деяких випадках відіграють роль його структурних чи мікроструктурних компонентів і формально інтегрують мікрометри. Це може створити гармонію та ритм між змістом і формою. Кожен художній текст – це досконала композиція. Існує багато деталей, методів та інструментів, які вважаються важливими для її організації. Їх вивчення обумовлює необхідність проведення конкретних досліджень мови літературних текстів у цьому напрямку та в цьому відношенні. Ця стаття відрізняється від традиційного текстологічного дослідження. Насправді текстологічна наука – це філологічна дисципліна, яка узагальнює принципи й методи вивчення літературних текстів у великому сенсі цього слова. У турецькому літературному тексті зі специфічною контекстуальною структурою форма й змістові показники характеризуються певними ознаками. Інтерес до проблем, пов'язаних з функціональними аспектами мови, є однією з найхарактерніших особливостей сучасної епохи мовознавства. Найбільший прорив у вивченні цієї проблеми припадає на початок 1970-х. Після цього відбулися певні процеси як у лінгвістиці, так і в ряді предметів. Змістовий план тексту будується на конкретному інформаційному підході, який визначає його формальні межі. У статті розглядається інформативна структура літературного тексту, механізм його організації, формування складних синтаксичних утворень як літературних текстових одиниць. Також розкриваються функціонально-змістові, структурно-формові елементи, характерні для літературних текстів. Досліджено також різні особливості віршів і прозових текстів, притаманні літературній мові синтаксичні структури та їхня роль у літературному тексті. Усі ці питання аналізуються в статті на основі багатьох прикладів.

Ключові слова: ієрархія, лінгвістика, категорія тексту, теорія тексту, семантика, трансформація, семіотика.