

LANGUAGE SYMBOLS AND SPEECH IMAGES

Dilnoza Shavkatovna SHARIPOVA¹
Senior Lecturer of the Department of
Foreign Languages in Natural Sciences
Bukhara State University
e-mail: dilnoza-shavkatovna1976@mail.ru

Abstract

The article gives a brief overview of the formation and stages of development of symbols of cultural unity, their role in society, analyzes some combination of symbolic configurations of cultural models. The symbol is directed to the unconscious depths of the human soul and, being beyond the control of our awareness, directly affects the affective sphere of human nature. It is thanks to this understanding of the nature of the verbal symbol that its poetic, winged definitions appeared.

Key words: Symbol, image, movement, pragmatic, symbolism, subject, metaphor, culture, phenomena, graphic, objective, unique, sign, approach.

Understanding the linguistic nature of culture begins with the transfer of the logic of all arguments about cultural linguistics from the linguistic plane itself into the semiotic scientific paradigm. This makes it possible to represent language as a hierarchy of sign systems, as a combination of symbolic configurations of cultural models. The priority in this approach belongs to E. Sapir. He writes that an important area of research should be “individual symbolism in the use of cultural stereotypes. Individual symbolisms are often more significant, because they are hidden from consciousness and serve as springs of real behavior ... Thus, the individual and society, in an endless mutual exchange of symbolic gestures, build a pyramidal structure called civilization. There are not many “bricks” that underlie this structure” (Sapir, 1993: 209). Paradoxical as it may seem, but the views on the culture of E. Sapir show some similarity with the theory of “models of culture”. The scientist considers culture as “a specific matrix that forms a national civilization” (Sapir, 1993: 473). Further, a question arises that helps to bring the positions of schools closer together: where do “bricks” appear in the individual consciousness, through which the subject of social action builds his behavior, models speech reality, sees his picture of the world? If we return to the reasoning of E. Sapir, which he presented in the article “Do we need a Superorganic?” (Sapir, 1993: 586-593), it turns out that it is not from the surrounding cultural environment. Since it, in fact, culture, is defined by him as an abstract beginning, which is “dissolved” in individual reactions and which is again recreated as a subject of study in the head of the researcher. The behavioral reactions themselves are the sublimated unconscious desires of the individual hidden behind the socially approved packaging. But then where? E. Sapir's answer is unambiguous - from the language. Language forms both the consciousness of the individual, and his cultural worldview, the picture of the world, and his behavior. Language is primary, everything else is secondary. But according to the logic of L. White and A. Kroeber, a person borrows symbolic forms not from some non-existent substance born in the fantasies of culturologists and ethnographers, but from a very specific linguistic reality surrounding him. Only he calls this linguistic environment culture. One way or another, but thanks to the polemics of E. Sapir with L. White and A. Kroeber, the problem of differentiating the concepts of “language” and “culture” as symbolic systems has become even more urgent. In this aspect of considering the problem of culture, a certain context is revealed in which such representatives of European thought such as F. de Saussure, S. Freud, J. Lacan, E. Benveniste, K. Levi-Strauss appear. This is due to the understanding of the process of the formation of a cultural personality as a person's ability to assimilate existing cultural forms, the very bricks that E. Sapir spoke about. They also appear

as shifters in P.O. Jacobson, language holes and voids by J. Lacan and E. Benveniste. Further, the structural paradigm will develop the idea of comparison and even identification of the mechanisms of culture, language and personality, "I". This direction was especially developed in line with the evolution of the ideas of the Tartu school, in the works of Yu.M. Lotman. A whole area of American psycholinguistics, headed by N. Chomsky, is presented as an opposing side.

Thus, all symbolic human activity, primarily language and culture, has a material basis. Brain, intellect, soul, language, word - all this is material and can be reduced to muscle contractions. "All the infinite variety of external manifestations of brain activity is finally reduced to only one phenomenon - muscle movement" (Sechenov, 1947: 71). A symbol is an image of a sign nature, basically a conventional one, or a sign, conceived as an image, in which the visible, concrete, eventful acts only as a kind of hieroglyph signaling about some mysterious subject of the nomination, which serves as a sign of a different reality (Viach. Ivanov). Hence its linguoculturological meaning: capturing the connections, correlations of this and other worlds, considering them in unity as the embodiment of the integrity of the worldview, the desire to "see the eternal in the temporal" (Bely, 1994: 249). The objects symbolized in their essence are mental structures - concepts of the second order, or concepts of concepts (Kravchenko, 2008: 149; Shelestyuk, 2001: 50), which do not have a visible object basis (a lark is a symbol of early awakening, an owl is a symbol of nocturnal activity, a firebird - a symbol of an unattainable dream, a black rose is a symbol of sadness, a red rose is a symbol of love). A symbol represents a concept akin to an image (it is no coincidence that they speak of symbolic images). It is nationally specific and motivated by the semantic connection that is established between the objective and abstract elements of its content. And in this respect, the symbol is akin to the signs of an indirect nomination (even metaphorical and metonymic symbols are distinguished). And its main distinguishing feature is the ability to represent ancient images behind which the pictures of the "collective unconscious" of creation appear. A linguistic image is a verbalized visual perception of the objective world, which fixes the shape, color, light, volume and position in space of the named object. It differs from a representation, which can be partial, fragmentary and incomplete, in its integrity and semantic content, formed by perception, memory, imagination and accumulated impressions. The image serves as the foundation over which the symbol and sign are built. If the image is correlated with an object of any nature, then a symbol that easily overcomes "gravity" is accompanied by "high meanings", as a rule, of an extralinguistic nature. And this is their cultural value. The embodiment of the image in the sign of an indirect nomination (metaphor, in a broad sense,

and an idiom) is associated with linguocreative thinking, since metaphors are capable of generating new concepts in the created linguistic picture of the world. According to N.D. Arutyunov, "the image is psychological, the metaphor is semantic, the symbol is functional" (1998: 338). The linguistic image is not identical to the sensory-objective image: the first can be "seen" only with the inner gaze, the second is the reflection of a real object in our consciousness.

In cultural linguistics, first of all, linguistic images are analyzed (see: Vorkachev, 2001: 65) - the products of "visual generalization" and selection of culturally significant events and situations. They are especially important for understanding discursive signs: the images of individual expressions, having come into contact with other images of discourse, immediately merge into a single holistic and modally colored picture, requiring associative-verbal embodiment in a laconic combination of key concepts for a given discourse. An example of this is the idiom to contribute to what. An idiom arose on the fusion of images of a vivid biblical discourse. One of the Gospel parables tells about a poor widow, who, while collecting donations in the church, put in a money bowl, next to the rich gifts of noble people, everything she had - two pitiful mites (mite is the smallest ancient coin, a penny; "Leptos" in Greek - "thin, small"). But to God, the parable says, these mites of the widow were dearer than all other gifts. It is not for nothing that any modest donation made from a pure heart is called a widow's mite. Thus, the subject image of a mite in combination with such key concepts for this small fragment of discourse as "kindness", "generosity", "sacrifice", formed the meaning of the idiom "to take a feasible, albeit small, participation in any common cause." It was created by various mechanisms of linguistic creative thinking: symbolic, metaphorical and figurative.

References

1. Maslova V.A. Linguoculturology: Textbook. Allowance. M.: Academy, 2001.
2. Semein L.Yu., Tarasova I.A. Cognitive aspects of cultural linguistics. Omsk, 2005.
3. Kravchenko A.I. Culturology: Textbook. pos. 3rd ed. M.: Academic project, 2001.
4. Shalina I.V. Ural urban vernacular: cultural scenarios / [Scientific. ed. N. A. Kupina]. - Yekaterinburg: Ural Publishing House. University, 2009. -- 444 p.
5. Sharipova D., Muhammadiyeva N., Mohigul Q. The Translation of Grammatical Discrepancies //International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation. – 2020. – T. 24. – №. 1.

6. Sharipova D.Sh. THE LEXICAL-SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF THE SYMBOL. //International Journal on Integrated Education. – 2020. – T. 3. – №. 9. – C. 177-180.
7. Shavkatovna S. D., Istamovna I. N. LINGUACULTURAL ASPECTS OF SYMBOLS AND CHARACTERS //Academy– 2020. – № 9. – (60) . – C. 18-19.
8. Sharipova D.Sh., Mavlonova U.K., Ibatova N.I. BEHAVIORAL LANGUAGE ETIQUETTE IN UZBEK PROVERBS AND SAYINGS// Vestnik nauki i obrazovaniya 11-3 (89), 2020.
9. Kadirova Nargiza Arivovna.Parallelism in transformation motives of Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde by Stevenson and The Metamorphoses by Kafka. International Journal on Integrated Education. Impact factor (SJIF 2019 = 5.083) Volume 2, Issue VI, Dec.2019.pp.24-27.
10. Sharipova Dilnoza Shavkatovna, Kutlieva M.G// IMPORTANCE OF SYMBOLS IN LINGUISTICS Academy– 2021. – № 3. – (66) . ISSN 2412- 8236 – C. 21-24.
11. Sharipova D. et al. Bilingualism As A Main Communication Factor For Integration Among Nations In Transoxiana. Modern Uzbekistan //International Journal on Integrated Education. – 2019. – T. 2. – №. 2. – C. 15-23.
12. Sharipova D., Ibatova N. THE TRANSLATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS INTO UZBEK //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2019. – №. 10. – C. 649-651.
13. Shavkatovna S. D., Istamovna I. N., Komiljonovna X. M. Symbols and Images in Uzbek stories //Proceeding of The ICECRS. – 2020. – T. 5.