

## Expression of the Symbol in the Uzbek Language

Abdullayev Akmaljon Uktamovich

FarSU, researcher at the Department of Linguistics Doktor of philosophy (PhD)

**Annotation:** This article presents ideas about the representation of symbols in the Uzbek language and the study of this phenomenon. At the same time, it highlights its differences from some related phenomena.

**Key words and phrases:** trope, symbol, metaphor, image, etalone, the connotation of value, the token.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

In recent years, world linguistics has been paying special attention to the study of symbols as units characterizing the national characteristics of the language. This direction, like other areas of linguistics, is important and comprehensive, and is in the stage of constant development and improvement. Today, linguopoetic and linguocultural studies, including the research conducted within the framework of symbols, are of particular practical importance in the development of the field.

The emergence of fields such as sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, linguoculturology, psycholinguistics as directions of the anthropocentric paradigm in world linguistics is the reason for the improvement of new views in the study of symbols. This phenomenon has been thoroughly studied in the fields of philosophy, semiotics, sociology, and since the 80s of the last century, the interest in studying symbols as a linguistic phenomenon has increased more than ever. As a result of this, new theories have appeared in the areas of modern linguistics such as linguistics, text linguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguopoetics, linguistic semantics.

In Uzbek linguistics, symbols are interpreted as a universal category, and ideas about its symbolic nature are put forward. It was justified that through symbols, the aspects that unite people into a single ethnocultural community in the human mind are revealed. However, the fact that this phenomenon has not been thoroughly studied is the reason why other types of signs, such as conditional signs, cases of naming linguistic signs with the term symbol, and opinions that symbols are a form of metaphor, have arisen. Symbols are a special phenomenon with their own characteristics, and it is important to distinguish them from other types of signs and symbols. Therefore, the fact that researching symbols from a linguistic point of view and elucidating their particular aspects is complicated, but extremely important, determines the relevance of this work.

The study of symbols begins with the consideration of symbols as a separate phenomenon, one of the important tools for knowing and understanding the world in the European antiquity. Views on

this issue can be found in the works of ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato, Empedocles, and Dionysius the Areopagite. New theories about symbols have been put forward in world science since the second half of the 19th century. By the 20th century, the place of symbols in cultural studies (N.Arutyunova, A.Vejbitskaya, Y.Lotman, A.Golan, K.E.Kerlot, M.Makovskiy)<sup>1</sup>, philosophical interpretation of symbols (A.Losev, N.Rubsov, A.Panov, L.Reznikov, A.Uaytxed, S.Todorov, E.Kassirer, G.Gadamer)<sup>2</sup>, semiotic interpretation (F. de Sossyur, Ch.S.Pirs, R.O.Yakobson, Y.M.Lotman, V.Ivanov)<sup>3</sup>, symbolic meanings of the word (V.Vinogradov, A.Medvedeva, Y.Ayupova, Y.Shelestyuk, V.Guzenko)<sup>4</sup>, the relationship of this phenomenon with other linguistic categories (O.Aleynikova, L.Uvarov va b)<sup>5</sup>, traditions of cognitive linguistics (Y.S.Stepanov, Y.S.Kubryakova, R.M.Frumkina, V.I.Postovalova, V.Z.Demyankov)<sup>6</sup> researches were carried out in such directions and theoretical issues of the issue were created.

In this direction, scientists A.Nurmonov, M.Mirtojiyev, Sh.Mahmaraimova, D.Khudayberganova and others conducted research in Uzbek linguistics<sup>7</sup>. The study of the functional aspects of symbols in Uzbek philology was carried out on a large scale in the field of literary studies, and the symbols related to the color used in the work of a certain creator or in the text (N. Jumatova, S. O'tanova, A. Abdurahmonov), number symbols (S. Jumayeva), symbols expressed through different means (Sh. Atayev, N. Toirova, M. Roziyeva, S. Kuronov, S. Kochkarova, S. Majitova),

<sup>1</sup> Арутюнова Н. Язык и мир человека. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999; Вежбицкая А. Обозначения цвета и универсалии зрительного восприятия // Язык. Культура. Познание. – М.: Русские словари, 1996; Лотман Ю.М. Избранные статьи. Т. 1. – Таллин, 1992; Голан А. Миф и символ. – М.: Русслит, 1993; Керлот Х.Э. Мифология. Магия. Психоанализ. – Москва: REFL-book, 1994; Маковский М. Язык-миф-культура: Символы жизни и жизнь символов. – Москва: Б. И., 1996.

<sup>2</sup> Лосев А.Ф. Проблема символа и реалистическое искусство. – М.: Искусство, 1995; Рубцов Н.Н. Символ в искусстве и жизни. – М.: Наука, 1991; Панов Е. Знаки. Символы. Языки. – М.: Знание, 1983; Резников Л.О. Гнесиологические вопросы семиотики. – Ленинград: ЛОЛГУ, 1963; Уайтхед А.Н. Избранные работы по философии. – М.: Прогресс, 1990; Тодоров Ц. Теории символа. – М.: Дом интеллект книги, 1998; Кассирер Э. Опыт о человеке, Введение в философию человеческой культуры. – М.: Гардарики, 1998; Гадамер Г. Г. Истина и метод: Основы философской герменевтики. – М.: Прогресс, 1988.

<sup>3</sup> Соссюр Ф. Курс общей лингвистики. – М.: Прогресс, 1977; Пирс Ч.С. Принципы философии: в 2 т. – СПб.: С.Петербург. философское общество, 2001; Якобсон Р.О. В поисках сущности языка // Семиотика. – Благовещенск, 1998; Лотман Ю.М. Избранные статьи. Т. 1. – Таллин, 1992; Иванов В. Мысли о символизме // Родное и вселенское. – М.: Республика, 1994.

<sup>4</sup> Виноградов В.В. О теории художественной речи. – М.: 1971; Медведова А.В. Символическое значение как тип значение слова (на материале русских и английских обозначений обиходно-бытовых ситуаций, предметов и явлений материальной культуры. Дисс... канд. филол. наук. – Воронеж, 2000; Гузенко И. Христианская символика в русском языке: вербализация, функционирование, эволюция: Дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Волгоград, 2009; Шелестюк Е.В. Семантика художественного образа и символа (на материале англоязычной поэзии XX века): Дисс. канд. филол. наук. – М.: 1998; Аюпова, Е.И. О символическом компоненте значения слова // Русская и сопоставительная филология: состояние и перспективы: Международная научная конференция, посвященная 200-летию Казанского университета. – Казань, 2004.

<sup>5</sup> Алейникова О.Ю. Аллегория и символ // Символ в культуре: Материалы региональной научной конференции. – Воронеж, 1996; Уваров Л.В. Образ, символ, знак (Анализ современного гнесеологического символизма). – Минск: Наука и техника, 1967.

<sup>6</sup> Степанов, Ю.С. Методы и принципы современной лингвистики. – М.: Наука, 2003; Кубрякова, Е.С. Концепт // Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов. – М.: 1996; Фрумкина Р.М. Цвет, смысл, сходство. Аспекты психолингвистического анализа. – М.: Наука, 1984; Постовалова В.И. Язык как духовная реальность: учение об имени и молитве и православной традиции (истоки, направления, концептуальное развитие). – М.: Культурная революция, 2019; Демьянков В.З. Когнитивная лингвистика как разновидность интерпретирующего подхода // Вопросы языкознания, № 4. – М., 1994.

<sup>7</sup> Нурмонов А. Лингвистик белги назарияси: ўқув қўлланма. - Тошкент: Фан, 2008; Миртожиев М.М. Ўзбек тили семасиологияси. – Тошкент: Mumtoz soʻz, 2010; Махмараимова Ш. Лингвокультурология: ўқув қўлланма. – Тошкент: Чўлпон номидаги НМИУ, 2017; Худайберганова Д.С. Ўзбек тилидаги бадий матнларнинг антропоцентрик талқини. Филол.фан.док-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 2015.

theoretical issues of symbols (A. Sharopov, Sh.Turdimov, N.Sobirova, N.Djusupov, Z.Mamadaliyev) are especially noteworthy<sup>8</sup>.

It should be noted separately that in Uzbek linguistics symbols have not been specially studied as a separate linguistic phenomenon.

According to A.Losev, philosopher and scientist, symbol is “one of the most abstract, mixed and sometimes contradictory concepts<sup>9</sup>”. Therefore, despite the fact that the symbol as a separate category has been thoroughly studied by philosophers, psychologists and sociologists, linguists and writers, representatives of various fields of science, there is no clear definition and single conclusion about this concept.

In the encyclopedia and explanatory dictionaries, “Symbol - (Arabic “to indicate”), sign, emblem, indication; nickname, pseudonym is defined as a specific concept or idea that conveys a certain understanding among people, an event or incident, thought and the like, emphasizing that it is a conditional sign. The term symbol comes from the Greek word *simbolon* – “signals”, “emblem”, “sign”, “password” and was originally used to refer to an item used by members of a secret organization or group to recognize each other. Also, *symbolon* as a verb means to gather together, to unite.

In this season, views on the phenomenon of symbols were studied in literary studies, philosophy, sociology, psychology, pedagogy, cultural studies. It should be noted that the symbol is one of the concepts that has not yet been clearly described in the linguistic literature. In particular, there is no comment on the term symbol or symbol in the Uzbek “Dictionary of Linguistic Terms”.

In the field of linguistics, symbols are often defined by various definitions provided by different researchers. In general, *a symbol is considered as a conventional, motivated relationship between the signifier and the signified, without a specific designated function and usually expressing an abstract content, commonly described as a special type of sign that conveys multiple meanings.*

Symbols have ambivalent views on the question of motivation. Philosopher Ch. Peirce says that there is a conditional, conventional, unmotivated relationship between the signifier and the signified in symbols, while F. de Saussure says that “there is a rudiment of a natural connection between the signifier and the signified” in symbols.<sup>10</sup> Professor A. Nurmonov clarified the issue of motivation in signs: “Any sign has two objects that have a certain relationship with each other. There are two types of relationships between objects: causal relationships and conditional

<sup>8</sup> Абдурахмонов А. Ўзбек шеърятда нур, ранг ва руҳият тасвири поэтикаси (анъана ва новаторлик аспекти): Филол.фан.б.фалс. док...дисс. – Фарғона, 2018; Жумаева С. Ўзбек мумтоз шеърятда рақам рамзлари ва уларнинг маъно талқини (XII-XV асрлар): Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс. – Тошкент, 2006; Куронов С. Замонавий ўзбек адабиётда синтез муаммоси (шеърят ва рангасвир санъатлари мисолида): Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс. – Андижон, 2018; Тоирова Н. Бадиий адабиётда кўзгу ва сурат рамзларининг ғоявий-эстетик вазифалари (Омон Мухтор ва Оскар Уайльд асарлари асосида). Филол.фан.б.фалс. док...дисс. – Фарғона, 2018; Мамадалиев З.У. Алишер Навоийнинг «Лисон-ут тайр» достонидаги рамзий образлар тизими: Филол.фан. номз...дисс. – Тошкент, 2011; Рўзиева М. Ўзбек халқ қўшиқларида ранг символикаси. Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс. – Тошкент, 2017; Қўчқорова С. Ўзбек ва француз эртақларида маданий рамзларнинг коммуникатив-прагматик роли: Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс.автореф. – Самарқанд, 2022; Шаропов А. Оламлар ичра оламлар. – Тошкент: Адабиёт ва санъат, 1978; Турдимов Ш. Халқ қўшиқларида рамз. Тошкент: Фан, 2020; Джусупов Н. Лингвокогнитивний аспект исследования символа в художественном тексте: дисс. ...канд.филол.наук. – Ташкент, 2006; Собирова Н.Э. Хоразм халқ лирик қўшиқларида поэтик рамзлар тизими ва уларнинг бадиий-эстетик вазифалари: Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс. – Тошкент, 2018; Жуматова Н. Ҳозирги ўзбек шеърятда ранг билан боғлиқ рамзий образлар: Филол. номз...дисс.автореф. – Тошкент, 2000; Ўтанова С. Алишер Навоий ғазалиётда ранг символикаси. Тошкент: Тафаккур, 2011.; Мажитова С. Жомий ғазалиётдаги рамзий истилоҳларнинг луғавий ва мажозий маъноларини талқин қилиш усуллари: Филол. номз...дисс.автореф. – Самарқанд, 2018;

<sup>9</sup> Лосев А.Ф. Проблема символа и реалистическое искусство. – 2-е изд. – М.: Искусство, 1995. - С.132.

<sup>10</sup> Соссюр Ф. де. Курс общей лингвистики // Соссюр Ф. де. Труды по языкознанию. – М.: Прогресс, 1977. – С. 31.

relationships. Objects in a cause-and-effect relationship are motivated, and in a conditional relationship they are unmotivated.<sup>11</sup> It is known that motivation is observed in the relationship, which is a natural connection between the expresser and the expressed in a cause-and-effect relationship. Taking this into account, it was concluded that there is a motivation between the symbol and the meaning it represents.

The study of symbols began in the period of ancient European culture, and views on this issue can be found in the works of ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato, Empedocles, and Dionysius the Areopagite.

A special place has been allocated to the study of symbols in the European and Russian scientific community, and it has been studied in the fields of science such as philosophy, sociology, semiotics, cultural studies, and psychology. It should be mentioned separately that until the first half of the 19th century, symbols were evaluated as a type of sign and were defined as a sign in the encyclopedias and dictionaries of this period. In the research conducted since the second half of the 19th century, attention began to be paid to uncovering other aspects of symbols. During this period, P. Florensky, E. Cassier, K. Jung, M. Eliade, R. Guénon, etc. began to advance theories about symbols. In particular, Hegel, based on the point of view of philosophy and art, divides human art into three types: symbolic, classical and romantic. Among them, he considers symbolic art to be the earliest art of mankind<sup>12</sup>.

F. de Saussure analyzed the symbols in the work “Course of General linguistics” and emphasized that “the symbol is characterized by the fact that it is not completely free and “empty”, and that there is a rudiment of a natural connection between the signifier and the signified.<sup>13</sup> Through these thoughts of the scientist, one of the main characteristics of the symbol, different from other symbols, is revealed. The same ideas can be found in the studies of L. Reznikov. He emphasizes that at first the connection between symbols and the meanings they express was more natural, concrete and motivated, and later it began to acquire conditionality and abstraction<sup>14</sup>.

By the 20th century, research was carried out in areas such as the role of symbols in cultural studies, the philosophical and semiotic interpretation of this phenomenon, the symbolic expression of words, the relationship of symbols with other linguistic categories, the traditions of cognitive linguistics, and the theoretical issues of the issue were created. .

The study of symbols in Uzbek linguistics and literature begins in the 80s of the 20th century. In literary studies, A. Sharopov and Sh. Turdimov in folklore studies are noteworthy. It should be said that the functional aspects of symbols are mainly studied in the field of literature.

Also, the linguist scientist A. Nurmonov defines symbols as “any material representatives of social information” and emphasizes Ch. Peirce's thoughts on the classification of symbols and shows the different characteristics of symbols from linguistic symbols. Due to the existence of a conditional, conventional, unmotivated relationship between the signifier and the expressed in symbols, he emphasizes that linguistic symbols are similar to symbols, but occupy a special place in the typology of symbols.<sup>15</sup> It should be said that the existence of the phenomenon of motivation between the symbols and the meaning they represent has been highlighted in recent years of research.

---

<sup>11</sup> Нурмонов А. Лингвистик белги назарияси: ўқув қўлланма. – Тошкент: Фан, 2008. – Б.6

<sup>12</sup> Гегель Г.В.Ф. Лекции по эстетике. Соч., Т. 12. – М.: ЛУЧ, 1938. – С. 242.

<sup>13</sup> Ф. де Соссюр. Курс общей лингвистики. Редакция Ш. Балли и А. Сеше. – Екатеринбург: Издательство Уралского университета, 1999. – С. 83

<sup>14</sup> Резников Л.О. Гнесиологические вопросы семиотики. – Ленинград: ЛОЛГУ, 1963. – С. 150.

<sup>15</sup> Нурмонов А. Лингвистик белги назарияси: ўқув қўлланма. – Тошкент: Фан, 2008. – Б. 8.

Philosophers and later linguists paid special attention to the fact that a symbol is a special type of sign. Within the framework of semiotic signs, it is noted that symbols have special, unique characteristics of the sign and are sharply distinguished from other signs by these characteristics.

The works of F. de Saussure pay particular attention to the symbolic nature of symbols and state that “conditionally independent symbol means a type of symbol whose most important feature is not clearly related to the object whose content is expressed, and whose further development does not directly depend on the object”<sup>16</sup>. Hegel also notes that the symbol refers to signs and believes that “it is not a simple sign, but a sign that has absorbed the content it expresses into its external form”<sup>17</sup>.

The Russian scientist S. Averinsev points out that a symbol is a sign and considers it to be a vision, and puts forward the idea that a sign is also a symbol in some sense. “A symbol is a sign whose meaning is revealed, and a sign is an undisclosed symbol, a “bud: of a symbol. A sign is a special type of symbol.”<sup>18</sup>.

The fact that symbols are signs (a type of sign) was also emphasized by the scientist D. Khudaiberganova, “the symbol is a reflection of the inner world, consciousness, thinking and spirit of representatives of different cultures of the external world. A symbol is considered a sign and is used as a form for a different meaning than its initial meaning”<sup>19</sup>.

The thesis refers to the theories of symbols of scientists such as Hegel, L.Reznikov, and F.Saussure in several places, and based on their opinions, the difference between a symbol and a conventional sign is determined.

It can be noted that the primary difference between a **symbol and a conventional sign** appears in the relationship between them and the meaning being expressed. Also, symbols have a number of properties that distinguish them from other types of symbols. For example,

the symbol contains a remnant (rudiment) of the natural connection between the signifier and the signified;

the symbols themselves are concrete, but the meaning they represent is usually abstract;

symbols do not have an addressee and without a communicative task, symbols do not directly call for any action and are not focused on any limited task;

the symbol is consciously and emotionally oversimplified and ambiguous and prompts a person to make a philosophical observation;

symbols are not focused on a limited task, in most cases they are local;

the symbol is consciously and emotionally oversimplified, and the conventional sign is inherently simple.

**Symbol and metaphor.** The analysis of scientific literature shows that in some places the symbol is considered as a type of movement, and in some places as a metaphor. Based on the definitions given to the symbol and its specific features, it can be noted that symbols are a separate phenomenon, and metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, allegory, epithet, and simile should be considered phenomena related to the symbol. It is worth saying that symbols arise during the natural development of language and cannot be mastered, while “metaphor, on the contrary, is

---

<sup>16</sup> Соссюр Ф. Заметки по общей лингвистике. – М.: Прогресс, 2000. – С. 91-92

<sup>17</sup> Гегель Г.В.Ф. Лекции по эстетике. Соч., Т. 12. – М.: Луч, 1938. – С. 242.

<sup>18</sup> Аверинцев С. Риторика и истоки европейской литературной традиции. – М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. – С. 279.

<sup>19</sup> Худайберганова Д. Ўзбек тилидаги бадий матнларнинг антропоцентрик талқини. Фил.фанл.док-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 2015. – Б. 234.



artificially created”<sup>20</sup>. But there are also differences between symbols and metaphors that do not depend on historical and general relations. These differences were revealed by scientists such as N. Arutyunova, A. Losev, V. Shelestyuk, A. Sharopov. According to them, the main difference between these phenomena is the difference in essence. That is, if a metaphor is a metaphor, a form of speech, a symbol is a language sign.

Scientist N. Arutyunova distinguished that in metaphor the image cannot be divided, and in symbols the image can be separated into separate symbols (color, shape, etc.)<sup>21</sup>. A. Sharopov says that symbols have a complex structure compared to metaphors, and emphasizes that the connection between the subject and the person reflected in a metaphor is easier to understand than a poetic symbol.<sup>22</sup> If the metaphor serves to deepen the meaning of existence, the symbol can expand the meaning and bring it into the world of other meanings outside of it.

Another obvious feature of metaphor is that “logically speaking, it is always based on the principle of exaggeration (false, fake)”<sup>23</sup>. For example, “maktabimiz qaldirg‘ochlari”, “qontalash ufq”, “og‘ir gap” etc. such as. The meaning expressed in metaphors can only be logically accepted and imagined. And we accept the meaning of the symbol directly as reality in any case. For example,

*“Olmani otdim otganga,*

*Sim karavotda yotganga...”*

(Folk song).

Instead, symbols show a number of phenomena such as homonymy, synonymy, polysemy, and metaphor is limited only to polysemy. The view that there is a phenomenon of synonymy in metaphors contradicts the main feature of metaphor. The phenomenon of synonymy is often observed in symbols. For example, a number of images such as “rose”, “bud”, “apple”, “handkerchief”, “red flower” (“atirgul”, “g‘uncha”, “olma”, “ro‘molcha”, “qizil gul”) can be used as a symbol of love.

Symbols, as a rule, perform a deictic function, and metaphors have a characteristic feature. If the metaphor serves to deepen the meaning of existence, the symbol can expand the meaning and bring it into the world of other meanings outside of it.

**Symbol and allegory** both have commonalities and differences. For example, an allegory is always single-meaning, and a symbol is always multi-meaning. In symbols, an object (concept) is first chosen and abstract meanings are assigned to it. In allegory, the opposite is observed. These events also differ in terms of their intended purpose. For example, if allegories are used to convey an educational, moral content, symbols are limited to expressing deep meaning. It is not intended for such purposes. In general, symbols are a unique concept, and it is important to distinguish it from related phenomena.

**Symbol and etalon.** Professor D. Khudayberganova stated that linguistic and cultural units are linguistic units that are formed by the combination of the meaning of a linguistic sign and cultural content, and in the semantics of which cultural information is clearly manifested.<sup>24</sup>. Taking these aspects, symbols and standards form a common, but separate concept.

<sup>20</sup> Колесов В.В. Философия русского слова. – СПб., 2002. – С. 70.

<sup>21</sup> Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс // Теория метафоры: сб. статей. – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – С. 142.

<sup>22</sup> А.Шаропов. Оламлар ичра оламлар. – Тошкент: Адабиёт ва санъат, 1978. – Б. 51.

<sup>23</sup> Телия В. Н. Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира // Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира. – М.: Наука, 1988. – С.154.

<sup>24</sup> Худайберганова Д. Ўзбек тилидаги бадий матнларнинг антропоцентрик талқини. Фил.фанл.док-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 2015. – Б. 234

Etalons are representative of people's unique perception of the world and are extremely important in terms of defining linguistic, cultural, i.e. language, national culture and mentality relations. The following are the differences between the symbol and the etalon:

symbols have multiple meanings, while etalons usually have one meaning;

in symbols, the connection between the signifier and the signified is blurred, and in the etalon, such a connection is clearly noticeable;

the content of similes, comparisons, and contrast is high in the benchmark, and in symbols, the relationship is leading.

A symbol is a universal and complex phenomenon and is the object of study in a number of fields of science, such as philosophy, semiotics, literary studies, psychology, sociology, pedagogy, cultural studies, linguo-cultural studies, linguistics. The history of the study of symbols goes back to ancient European antiquity. Since the second half of the 19th century, the study of symbols has been given special importance in the European and Russian scientific community, and in Uzbek philology, attention has been paid to this issue since the end of the 20th century, and fundamental researches in Uzbek linguistics have not been conducted.

People's history and culture are encoded in symbols, deep and comprehensive meanings, ideas, laws and principles, memories of an event, and predictions about the future are gathered. From a linguistic point of view, symbols are a special type of sign that has a conventional, motivated relationship between the signifier and the signified, is not focused on a specific task, and usually expresses an abstract meaning.

### **Methodology**

The research analyzes symbols in the Uzbek language by using descriptive-analytical methodology. The study analyzes a wide range of theoretical material taken from Western and Uzbek linguistic traditions which involve philosophical, semiotic, cognitive, and cultural approaches. An analysis demonstrates differences between symbol types by establishing distinctions from metaphorical and allegorical elements and etalon categories. The investigation uses Uzbek literary texts together with examples from folk expressions to present the functional aspects and semantic properties of symbols. Marking symbols both linguistic and cultural functions through an interdisciplinary research approach leads to complete comprehension of these linguistic units.

### **Results and Discussion**

Uzbek linguistic symbols operate as complicated cultural signs in addition to their linguistic function by showing substantial differences when compared to metaphorical and allegorical and etalonic devices. Symbols originate spontaneously in language and cultural contexts but metaphors depend on artificial creation from exaggerated concepts. The research demonstrates that real natural links between signs and their meaning remain present in symbols while conventional signs lack such connections. Abstract meanings characterize symbols though they exist as concrete objects and do not seek to deliver communication immediately. They trigger broad cultural responses that spread various emotional experiences together with maintaining collective memories of shared values and understanding of the world. The semantic scope of metaphors remains restricted because symbols present multiple meanings and relationships between related concepts as well as diverse cultural layers. Etalons present standardized meanings while symbols deliver ambiguous meanings which can be interpreted differently by each viewer. Thus the analysis demonstrates the necessity of linguistic studies for symbol interpretation to reveal language mechanisms that construct collective identity and shared consciousness. Uzbek linguistics research requirements additional attention to create systematic frameworks for studying symbols since they function as standalone linguistic occurrences.

## Conclusion

The research verifies symbols operate as an independent essential category within cultural and linguistic investigations. The distinctive elements of symbols contrast them from associated linguistic forms including allegories and metaphors and etalons because they possess distinct framework and operational dynamics and semantic components. Symbols display three distinctive properties they come from cultural origins and they contain profound abstract messages which help mirror the shared beliefs and life perspectives of people. The stylistic purposes of metaphors alongside other tropes never reach the same depths as symbols do when they convey cultural values together with emotional meanings and philosophical contributions to society. Linguistics currently considers such intricate symbols essential because they relate to national identity and contain multiple semantic layers. The research domain of symbols needs further development within the field of Uzbek linguistics. It remains essential to deepen research on symbols as independent linguistic units for the field of Uzbek linguistics. Future investigations into this field will improve comprehension of how language serves as a presentation tool of cultural heritage and personal identities while acting as a guide for collective past recollections.

## References:

1. Абдурахмонов А. Ўзбек шеърятда нур, ранг ва рухият тасвири поэтикаси (анъана ва новаторлик аспектида): Филол.фан.б.фалс. док...дисс. – Фарғона, 2018;
2. Аверинцев С. Риторика и истоки европейской литературной традиции. – М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. – С. 279.
3. Алейникова О.Ю. Аллегория и символ // Символ в культуре: Материалы региональной научной конференции. – Воронеж, 1996; Уваров Л.В. Образ, символ, знак (Анализ современного гносеологического символизма). – Минск: Наука и техника, 1967.
4. Арутюнова Н. Язык и мир человека. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999;
5. Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс // Теория метафоры: сб. статей. – М.: Прогресс, 1990.
6. Вежбицкая А. Обозначения цвета и универсалии зрительного восприятия // Язык. Культура. Познание. – М.: Русские словари, 1996;
7. Гегель Г.В.Ф. Лекции по эстетике. Соч., Т. 12. – М.: ЛУЧ, 1938.
8. Голан А. Миф и символ. – М.: Русслит, 1993;
9. Гузенко И. Христианская символика в русском языке: вербализация, функционирование, эволюция: Дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Волгоград, 2009;
10. Жумаева С. Ўзбек мумтоз шеърятда ракам рамзлари ва уларнинг маъно талқини (XII-XV асрлар): Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс. – Тошкент, 2006;
11. Керлот Х.Э. Мифология. Магия. Психоанализ. – Москва: REFL-book, 1994;
12. Колесов В.В. Философия русского слова. – СПб., 2002.
13. Кўчкорова С. Ўзбек ва француз эртақларида маданият рамзларнинг коммуникатив-прагматик роли: Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс.автореф. – Самарқанд, 2022;
14. Лосев А.Ф. Проблема символа и реалистическое искусство. – М.: Искусство, 1995;
15. Лотман Ю.М. Избранные статьи. Т. 1. – Таллин, 1992;
16. Маковский М. Язык-миф-культура: Символы жизни и жизнь символов. – Москва: Б. И., 1996.



17. Мамадалиев З.У. Алишер Навоийнинг «Лисон-ут тайр» достонидаги рамзий образлар тизими: Филол.фан. номз...дисс. – Тошкент, 2011;
18. Нурмонов А. Лингвистик белги назарияси: ўқув қўлланма. – Тошкент: Фан, 2008. – Б. 8.
19. Панов Е. Знаки. Символы. Языки. – М.: Знание, 1983;
20. Резников Л.О. Гнесиологические вопросы семиотики. – Ленинград: ЛОЛГУ, 1963. – С. 150.
21. Рубцов Н.Н. Символ в искусстве и жизни. – М.: Наука, 1991;
22. Рўзиева М. Ўзбек халқ қўшиқларида ранг символикаси. Филол.фан.б.фалс.док...дисс. – Тошкент, 2017;
23. Соссюр Ф. Заметки по общей лингвистике. – М.: Прогресс, 2000. – С. 91-92
24. Степанов, Ю.С. Методы и принципы современной лингвистики. – М.: Наука, 2003;
25. Телия В. Н. Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира // Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира. – М.: Наука, 1988. – С.154.
26. Тоирова Н. Бадиий адабиётда кўзгу ва сурат рамзларининг ғоявий-эстетик вазифалари (Омон Мухтор ва Оскар Уайльд асарлари асосида). Филол.фан.б.фалс. док...дисс. – Фарғона, 2018;
27. Ф.де Соссюр. Курс общей лингвистики. Редакция Ш. Балли и А. Сеше. – Екатеринбург: Издательство Уральского университета, 1999. – С. 83
28. Худайберганава Д. Ўзбек тилидаги бадиий матнларнинг антропоцентрик талқини. Фил.фанл.док-ри...дисс. – Тошкент, 2015.
29. Шаропов А.. Оламлар ичра оламлар. – Тошкент: Адабиёт ва санъат, 1978
30. Шелестюк Е.В. Семантика художественного образа и символа (на материале англоязычной поэзии XX века): Дисс. канд. филол. наук. – М.: 1998;