

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 03 Volume: 95

Published: 17.03.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Sevara Anvarovna Erdanova
Tashkent Institute of Finance
Teacher, Uzbekistan, Tashkent

THE LINGUISTIC NATURE OF SYMBOL IMAGINATIVE LITERATURE

Abstract: Attention to the symbol as a special category is present in the works of many philosophers, linguists and literary critics. We could not find an unambiguous interpretation of the symbol. We are more interested in the specifics of the symbol in the language of a work of art and the ways of analyzing the symbol as a linguistic category. The article is devoted to the analysis of different points of view on the category of symbol and the methods of linguistic description of symbol in imaginative literature.

Key words: the symbol, the language of imaginative literature, English language.

Language: English

Citation: Erdanova, S. A. (2021). The linguistic nature of symbol imaginative literature. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 03 (95), 156-158.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-03-95-27> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.03.95.27>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

The category "symbol" is most often interpreted in comparison with a myth, concept, sign, image, or trope. We are more interested in the specifics of the symbol in the language of a work of art and the ways of analyzing the symbol as a linguistic category.

In our opinion, symbols are able to preserve the mythological consciousness that they express through language. Therefore, E. Cassirer's remark is valuable for us: "Language and myth are related to each other. But the myth, as we know, has a representative symbolism. Although there are different approaches to analyzing the features of mythical language and speech, myth and symbol are not separated.

Paul Riker, considering the symbolism of evil, makes interesting remarks both about the nature of the symbol and about the peculiarities of its functioning in art and religion. He argues that rational symbols are close to concepts, and "concepts are not self-sufficient, that they refer to similar expressions, similar not because they lack rigor, but because they have an excessive meaning; in the concept of original sin, one should probe not its false clarity, but its dark side rich in analogies." Ricker writes about the rich semantic content of pre-rational symbols. As an example, he cites "biblical symbols that existed before abstract language was formed."

Jung emphasizes the psychological nature of symbolization: "The symbol represents the special nature of intuition acting through a "medium", that is, a person who is able, entering a state close to trance, to receive knowledge about distant events or facts about which his consciousness is not aware".

The categories of time and space are often not applicable to the symbolic model. A character can move from one text to another. Its meaning does not depend on the time of writing or reading the text, since the symbol has a stable range of values, which, however, can be replenished".

Of course, for us, to a greater extent, the linguistic interpretation of the symbol is important. F. de Saussure used the category symbol as a synonym for the sign in its relation to the concept: "By a conditional independent symbol we mean such categories of symbols, the most important property of which is the absence of any kind of visible connection with the designated object and, consequently, the absence of even indirect dependence on the object in its further development <...> For their part, historians and linguists have explained to us that language as a special system of independent symbols is subject to changes over time. But the fact has escaped the attention of philosophers and logicians that as soon as a system of symbols becomes independent of the

Impact Factor:

SIRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

objects designated by it, it, on its part, undergoes shifts as a result of the action of the time factor, which the logician is unable to calculate; however, it necessarily retains its continuity <...> the fact has escaped the attention of linguists that in this case the subject, which is the object of the influence of history, is in no way subjected to the usual historical assessment...".

As Spirova notes, "symbolization is interpreted as a significant property of language, but it is not associated with the essential comprehension of language".

S. S. Averintsev states: "The sign of a thing or event is its meaning, but not just a meaning, but one that is realized, embodied or given on some substrate, not on the one that is the substrate of the things or events being interpreted, on the one that it symbolizes". But the most interesting thing here is that "the meaning transferred from one subject to another merges so deeply and comprehensively with this second subject that it becomes impossible to separate them from each other. A symbol in this sense is a complete interpenetration of the ideological imagery of a thing and the thing itself."

Olkhovikov says about the metaphorical nature of the symbol: "The symbol is basically connected with the metaphorical beginning. The blurring of the semantic objectivity of words leads to the fact that, in its general meaning, metaphor serves as the most adequate means of visual transmission of images available in consciousness, or artistic feeling".

A symbol is associated with a specific token that has symbolic potential. For example, Gendler writes: "The symbol dictates a special semantic load. It refers us to the implementation of a token—a symbol that can exist both outside the context and, conversely, as part of other works of art.

As academician V. V. Vinogradov noted, "a work of art does not represent a "straight-line" construction in which the symbols would join one another like dominoes laid out in a row of rectangles or such a mosaic picture, where the components are directly revealed and clearly separated. The symbols, when they touch, unite into large centres, which in turn should be considered again as new symbols, which in their entirety are subject to new aesthetic transformations. And their meaning in the general concept is by no means equal to the simple sum of the meanings of the word series from which they are composed.

Thus, in a work of art, it is necessary to distinguish between simple symbols, correlated with each other, and complex symbols, which combine, like a cycle of morphemes, a group of fractional symbols. These complex symbols are also correlated with complex word groups, but represent a new stage of semantic ascent".

A researcher who revealed the essence of the symbol as an internal form of the word, fixed in folk art, which is at the heart of any kind of modern art:

"The need to restore the forgotten proper meaning of words was one of the reasons for the formation of symbols. The proximity of the main features, which is visible in constant identical expressions, was also between the names of the symbol and the designated object. < ... > Since symbolism is a remnant of immemorial antiquity, it can be found only where the separation of thought from language is slower, where the new penetrates more slowly". Distinguishes three ways of expressing a symbol through its relation to the object: "comparison, opposition, and causal relation".

Under the symbol, we will understand such a nominative unit of the language, the meaning of which goes beyond the direct (concrete) and does not lend itself to unambiguous interpretation. The concrete meaning of a given language unit is related to the abstract in the following way: the abstract concept is expressed through the concrete. These units (words and phraseological units) are included in the structure of explanatory dictionaries and dictionaries of symbols, but not all their possible meanings are covered. The symbolic in the structure of the lexical meaning of the word-symbol is expressed by the potential sema, which most actively manifests itself in artistic speech, especially in poetic speech. Sema has a sacred character, that is, it reflects either mythological ideas, archetypes, or the spiritual vision of humanity, characteristic of any religion.

A lexicon whose semantic structure has a sacred sema can be called a sacred lexicon, which in its free and phraseologically related use has the ability to be a verbalizer of symbols. According to coporativistics, Indo-European languages have a certain layer of words with common roots. These words, in our opinion, most often have sacred semas. The meaning of lexemes is strongly influenced by extralinguistic factors. On the surface are symbols verbalized by florisms (for example, rose, lily), zoonyms (for example, butterfly, snake, fish), natural facts (for example, moon, sun, star), color designations (for example, white, red, black), etc.

As an example, we will give the symbol "butterfly" in the novel "The Silence of the Lambs" by Thomas Harris. In the work, we found 63 lexemes in free and phraseologically related use (262 uses). All the lexemes that objectify the symbol under study are grouped into 5 semantic groups:

1. The actual lexeme "butterfly" (14 uses) and the units that replace it: moth (41), insect (31), bug (24), species (12), species, lepidoptera (2 each), brown object, a thing (1 each). In this group, we have included 9 lexemes, which are called butterfly species (18 uses).

2. Units representing the terminological names of butterflies: Erebus odora, The Death's-head Moth (4 each), Noctuid (3), Owlet (2), The Black Witch Moth, Caligo beltrao, Acherontia styx, Atropos, Malaysian Luna Moth (1 each).

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

3. Units that reveal the stages of development of butterflies: cocoon (9 uses), chrysalis (8), pupa (5), imago (5), eggs (4), larva (3), adult (3), caterpillar (3), immature insect (2), pupal stage (2) and worm (1).

4. Units naming butterfly body parts: wings (18), back (8), body, proboscis (3), antennae, pilifers (2), appendages, dorsocephalic region, spiracles, mesothorax, abdominals, abdominal segments, mandibles, galeae, maxillae, ventro meson, mesal margin, cremaster, prothoracic femur, chaetaxy, larval warts, fur (1 each). Also here we have included the units wingspan, butterfly powder, butterfly colors (1 each).

5. Units denoting butterfly actions: to come out (3 uses), (to) fracture, to emerge, to pump (up) (2 each), to button up, to mate (1 each).

6. Units related to aspects of butterfly study: entomologist, entomology (2 each), and collector (1 usage).

This analysis allows us to draw deeper conclusions about the functioning of the symbol in the

text. The symbol "butterfly" can be considered text-forming in the novel by Thomas Harris, so it has many interpretations of the usual and occasional plan. We will focus only on the main [19].

Our research confirms once again that symbols can be the object of special linguistic analysis. Moreover, there are a number of words that, when interpreting a literary text, require the disclosure of their symbolic nature. In our opinion, component analysis with a focus on finding sacred semas in the structure of the word meaning, as well as the method of semantic reconstruction, which we used in another study, is most suitable for this purpose.

Symbols can expand the semantic perspective of the work, evoke associations with various phenomena of life. We agree with the statement of J. Hall, that "writers use symbolization in order to destroy the illusion of life-likeness, which often occurs in readers, to emphasize the ambiguity, the great semantic depth of the images they create".

References:

1. Farxodjonova, N. F., & Pulatov, A. (2019). Modern methods of increasing student interest in social sciences. *Jekonomika i socium*, №. 4, pp. 38-40.
2. Isroilovich, I. M., et al. (2020). Philosophical ideas and views of national culture in the condition of globalization. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, T. 17, №. 7, pp. 14289-14295.
3. Farxodjonova, N. F. (2021). "Modernization Of Uzbek Language And National-Spiritual Heritage In National Culture." *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations* 3.01 (2021): 585-594.
4. Farxodjonova, N. F. (2020). *Formation of national idea through factors of national culture*. mirovaja nauka 2020. Problemy i perspektivy, pp. 3-6.
5. Farxodjonova, N. F., & Abdurahimov, V. A. (2020). *Modern technologies of students training in higher education*. Nauka i tehnika. Mirovye issledovaniya, pp. 5-7.
6. Farxodjonova, N. F. (2018). Relation to national culture in the condition spiritual renewal of society in the republic of uzbekistan. *Mirovaja nauka*, №. 6, pp. 14-17.
7. Numonjonov, S. D. (2020). Innovative methods of professional training. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 01 (81), pp. 747-750.
8. Nigmatullina, A. Sh. (2016). *Problema povysheniya i razvitija jeffektivnosti kachestva chteniya na inostrannom jazyke*. Uchenyj XXI veka, p.95.
9. Farxodjonova, N. F. (2016). *Problemi primeneniya innovatsionnix texnologiy v obrazovatel'nom protsesse na mejdunarodnom urovne*. Mejdunarodnaya konferentsiya. Innovatsionnie tendentsii, sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie i pravovie problemi vzaimodeystviya v mejdunarodnom prostranstve.
10. Shamsunovna, N. A. (2019). Integration of the modern pedagogical technologies into the assessment process of students' knowledge. *Problemy sovremennoj nauki i obrazovaniya*, №. 11-2 (144).
11. Nigmatullina, A. S. (2016). *Effective methods and techniques of teaching reading in a foreign language*. Uchenyj XXI veka, p.92.