

Main Features of the Symbol

Akmaljon Abdullayev

FarSU, researcher at the Department of Linguistics

Abstract. *The article discusses the General and various aspects of symbols and metaphors, highlights views on this issue.*

Key words: *trope, symbol, metaphor, image, illocutionary force, the connotation of value, the token.*

A symbol is a special type of sign, a symbol that serves to facilitate understanding of the world and to represent reality figuratively. "A symbol is the ideal content of material objects and processes, expressed in the form of a sign or image. The essence of a symbol cannot be precisely defined within the framework of formal logic." [3, 118]. Linguist M. Yuldoshev puts forward the idea: "A symbol is the use of words in a certain figurative sense to express life events, concepts, and objects in artistic speech." [4, 123].

According to L.O. Reznikov, a symbol is a special type of sign that has its own unique properties. A symbol is an external phenomenon that serves to express a different meaning through its conditional, but tangible image. The symbol itself is concrete, while the meaning it expresses is, in this sense, abstract. [5, 149]. A symbol is a collection (conglomerate) of meanings with the same value, distinguished from other tropes by this sign. [3, 119].

Based on the definitions given to the symbol, it can be noted that it is a unique and separate phenomenon, while metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, allegory, epithet, and simile are phenomena related to the symbol.

In scientific literature, metaphors are interpreted as "a unit of language or speech used figuratively to enhance artistic expressiveness" [1, "the use of words or word combinations in a meaning other than their original meaning to express an object or phenomenon" 1, 55], "the transfer of the name or symbol of one thing to another, or the use of words in a figurative sense in general, in order to enhance the artistic value, expressiveness, and expressiveness of a literary work." [2, 236]

Allegory, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, epithet, and simile are among the most common and widely used types of metaphor. [1, 55]. A symbol, one of the means of enhancing artistic expression and actively used in literary texts, is sometimes considered a type of allegory, and sometimes a metaphor.

One of the most common ways to create a transferable meaning is metaphor - "a transfer of meaning based on the similarity between objects, events, and phenomena" [4, 95]. The term "metaphor" belongs to Aristotle, who was the first to draw attention to the possibilities of metaphor. Although metaphors, which have a special meaning, resemble symbols in some respects, it is necessary to distinguish between these two phenomena.

The specific nature of symbols and metaphors, their associative (figurative) representation of reality, is one of the issues that has attracted the main attention of many studies. Often, despite the common aspects of these two phenomena, there are cases where they are not distinguished from each other. For many years, the term "symbol" has not been used in scientific literature in accordance with its

main meaning, but has been replaced by terms such as "image", "sign", "allegory", "metaphor". Similarly, in some philological explanatory dictionaries, it is interpreted as "A symbol is a form of metaphor, a word combination, image, object used in a conditionally figurative sense." [6, 113]. Similar ideas can be found in a number of literature and scientific research. Also, "Metaphors related to speech phenomena are classified into types in the Small Encyclopedia of the German Language. It lists personification, symbolization, allegory, and synesthesia, which are noted as types of metaphor [7, 96]. "In some interpretations, there are cases where a typical metaphor - a type of movement - is interpreted as a symbol, without paying attention to the function it performs and the meaning it expresses." [8, 18].

The nature of symbols has been interpreted differently by various artists: It led to interpretations such as an image formed on the basis of inner experiences (A. Bely), a fiery sign, a mysterious hieroglyph (A. Blok), an esoteric mythologema (V. Ivanov), and a universal metaphor (U.B. Yeets). Such interpretations led to the connection of symbols with the as yet unsolved secrets of metaphorical content. [9].

In recent years, the generalizing and distinguishing aspects of metaphor and symbol have been studied in depth in fields such as philology, philosophy, and psychology.

When talking about the similarities between symbols and metaphors, many researchers focus on the figurativeness of these two phenomena, the transfer of meaning, the expression of thought through another medium, the interpretive nature, the artificial generalization of different meanings, the formation of meaning, and the absence of illocutionary force. Metaphor and symbol, based on the phenomenon of asymmetry of linguistic signs, condense the form of information expression, through which new meaning and content are discovered. Indeed, when viewed from a substitutional perspective, both metaphor and symbol allow us to name with one word an idea that cannot be expressed in several words. When metaphor is viewed from an interactionist perspective, it can be observed that both metaphor and symbol serve to increase meaning. [10].

Imagery is considered a constant element of speech expression, uniting metaphor and symbol with a common basis - image. Here, the image structure reflects the main source of semiotic concepts, which consists of the relationship (natural or conditional) of expression and content [11]. The symbol is often seen as a natural result of metaphorical evolution. An image enters language through metaphor, and metaphor, in its further semantic development, either becomes a symbol or is reduced to the level of a sign. [12, 34]. Nevertheless, there are differences between these two fundamental phenomena of the lexical system of a language, which are almost invisible.

The relationship of the symbol to the expressive and figurative means of the language, to tropes, is also interpreted differently. From the point of view of V.V. Kolesov, the symbol is the main figurative means, which is the final stage of development of the metaphor or, conversely, appears as the unrevealed metaphoricity of the semantically syncretic word. [13, 67].

Linguist D. Arutyunova emphasizes that metaphor and symbol are more an object of interpretation (expression) than of understanding, that they are not directed at any addressee and do not have illocutionary force [11].

Metaphor and metonymy are understood by many as transfer mechanisms that lead to the formation of a symbol, thereby distinguishing between metaphorical and metonymic types of symbol [14, 553]. In fact, a real symbol cannot be mastered, because it arises in the process of the development of natural language. Metaphor, on the contrary, is created artificially [13, 70]. But there are also differences between symbols and metaphors that are not related to historical and general relationships. These differences were revealed by such scientists as N.D. Arutyunova, A.F. Losev, V.Ye. Shelestyuk, A.Sharopov. According to them, the main difference between these phenomena is the difference in essence. That is, a metaphor is a figure of speech, and a symbol is a linguistic sign [15].

It should be noted that the concepts of metaphor and symbol intersect, but they are not exactly the same phenomena. Based on the results of the research, it can be said that there are sharp differences between a symbol and a metaphor. For example, a metaphor, which takes its starting point from an

image, improves the meaning, and this meaning can sometimes turn into a lexical meaning. In a symbol, on the contrary, the form is stabilized. In a metaphor, the image is not divided, while in symbols the image can be divided into separate signs (color, shape, etc.) [11]. Also, the connection between the expresser (form) and the expressed (content) in symbols is conventional, unlike metaphor. According to A. Sharopov, “poetic symbols have a more complex structure than metaphor. If a simple metaphor is, so to speak, a shortened analogy, then a poetic symbol has a more complex apparent composition. In a metaphor, the connection between the reflecting object and the reflecting one is easier to understand than in a poetic symbol” [8, 51-52].

Symbols usually perform a deictic function, while metaphor has a characterizing function. While metaphor serves to deepen the meaning of existence, a symbol can expand the meaning and lead into a world of other meanings that are outside it.

Men quchlab yuzni yuvmoqqa,

Muzdek kumush olaman shoshib. (R.Xamzatov)

The word "silver" (kumush) used in the above sentence can be used to understand the meaning of a word ("water") (suv) that is not reflected in the text through metaphor, and to enjoy aesthetics. However, for this word to be a symbol, it must reflect some other meaning in addition to the meaning of objectivity, and create images related to confusing human emotions. For example,

Tosh asrning toshlarin

Eritmadi yoshlarim.

Ko'ngling yumshagan bo'lsa,

Ro'molchangni tashlagin... (I.Mirzo, "Malika")

In this sentence, the word “ro'molcha” (handkerchief) is a symbol of love, which affects the reader's emotions and causes them to awaken fantasies about love.

The development of metaphor goes from semantic weakening to precision, while the symbol expands its meaning and deviates from precision. As a result, the symbol acquires a metonymic property - the representation of the whole through the part, thereby enriching the image. [13].

One of the important tasks of metaphor is to assimilate abstraction through clarity, clear emotional perception with rational understanding (this feature is the main one in the symbol). As mentioned above, metaphor is based on an image, it unites two denotations that are partially similar in their signs. “In the convergence of images, the denotant of one of them becomes a model of the other, remaining in its place its figurative generalization” [17, 117].

Symbolization, on the other hand, usually occurs on a similar associative basis. In this case, symbols are structurally similar to metaphors, and are manifested through conceptual connections of different contents. In such cases, a symbol can be distinguished from a metaphor as follows: a metaphor arises as a secondary modeled semanticization using a ready-made sign; a symbol reflects a natural and conceptual connection and the essence arising from this connection, which has become a sign [17].

A linguistically expressed symbol is always different from a metaphor. Although both have a pairwise relationship, a metaphor combines two views of the same linguistic object. A symbol can also connect a linguistic phenomenon with a concept of a non-linguistic nature [18].

Under certain circumstances, simple signs can bypass the metaphorization stage and become symbols. For example, purely quantitative mathematical signs - numbers such as "three", "seven", "forty" - eventually become symbols with different emotional and semantic content.

Another striking feature of metaphor is that, from a logical point of view, it is always based on the principle of exaggeration (falsehood, falsehood) [19] (for example, "the swallows of our school", "the horizon is a heavy one", etc.), while this cannot be the case with a symbol. When such metaphors are used, we accept the expressed meaning only logically and can fit it into our imagination, and in reality it is impossible to understand and accept it. When a symbol is used, we accept its meaning directly

as reality in any case. For example, the fact that the "apple" in the sentence "I threw an apple at the one who threw it, the Sim at the one who lay in bed..." (Folk song) is a symbol of love, and the "expression of love" by throwing it is a simple, natural process that can be understood.

While metaphor is relative in both expression and content, symbol is relative only in content. If the metaphor is created by context, the symbol itself creates the context. The lexeme "dawn" in the sentence "Dawn is breaking. To the clear dawn, People who hold their hearts" (R. Parfi, "Dawn is breaking") is used symbolically, embodying a number of meanings such as new hope, new plans, the beginning of a bright future, and its interpretation forms a separate context.

It should also be noted that metaphor is a binary phenomenon by nature, establishing a single, direct, unmediated connection between the object and the "prism". We can see the object through this prism. In this regard, the symbol is panrelative [19].

Metaphor is syntagmatic in its essence, and it is precisely the non-standard sequence of signs that takes its semantics beyond the linguistic content. The symbol acquires a paradigmatic character.

Metaphors can form a certain system, and symbols already exist in symbolic systems. The emergence of a metaphor system is associated with the conscious creation of individual or mass speech.

Over time, the meaning of metaphors becomes blurred, its uniqueness is lost. Every attempt to understand it can lead to the loss of the metaphor. A symbol is inexhaustible in this respect. The more a person tries to understand a symbol, the more its deep and unexplored meanings become clear. The only way to erase the gloss of a symbol is to forget it. But this is also impossible in practice, because the symbol itself is an association of other symbols, and in this respect its status is predetermined by symbolic consistency. It should be noted that scholars have emphasized that metaphor is observed within the framework of speech activity, and symbol - within the framework of language and culture.

Metaphor can underlie the formation of phraseological units. In phraseologisms, the metaphorical connection is lost for one reason or another, but the meaning of an expression based on metaphor cannot be separated from the meaning of its components. If the expression contains a symbol, the meaning of the symbol is not only preserved, but can also be broken down into separate parts (fragments) [19]. For example, through the phrase "to bend seven shames to the ground," we can see an amplified, exaggerated form of the concept of "to embarrass," "to shame." The symbolic meanings of the words "seven" and "earth" in its content form the basis of the phrase. "Seven" is a number with a divine meaning and reflects abundance, while "earth" represents meanings such as the reflection of heaven, lowliness, and baseness. It is these symbols that not only enhance the meaning of the phrase, but also serve to form emotions related to the topic.

Different aspects can also be seen in the aspects related to the relationship between form and content of these two phenomena.

Usually, in the formation of morphemes, there is a break in the connection between the main and secondary meanings, a break in the metaphorical connection, but this break, in turn, also indicates the loss of metaphor. For example, like the morphemes *yaz* (season), *yaz* (activity). Instead, symbols exhibit a number of phenomena such as homonymy, synonymy, and polysemy, while metaphor is limited only to polysemy.

The idea that there is a phenomenon of synonymy between metaphors contradicts the main feature of metaphor. The reason is that metaphor is based on the principle of similarity, and while establishing a spiritual synonymous connection between two essences, a metaphor cannot be similar to another metaphor [15]. In symbols, the phenomenon of synonymy is often observed. For example, a number of images such as "rose", "bud", "apple", "handkerchief", "red flower" can be used as a symbol of love.

Thus, symbol and metaphor are among the types of transfer that have a special feature. Both have their own common and different functional aspects, but are not exactly the same phenomenon. Therefore, when interpreting them, it is necessary to take into account their common and different features.

Methodology

A qualitative method defines a research approach in this investigation to study conceptual distinctions together with functional properties of metaphor and symbol in linguistic and literary fields. This research performs comparative analysis between definitions and theoretical frameworks about linguistics and philosophy which Turkmen scholars and international experts have established. The research collects primary data from academic texts as well as dictionaries and literary works available in Uzbek and Russian. Using semantic investigation together with contextual breakdown and interpretive methods this research establishes the defining characteristics of both symbols and metaphors as well as their meanings and expressions in artistic language, and The study connects semiotic theory with philological analysis to examine metaphorical structures within selected poetic samples while investing a semiotic approach into understanding of symbolic aspects.

Results and Discussion

The study discovered that metaphor and symbol keep overlapping features yet maintain fundamental differences regarding their basic nature and operational characteristics. The language tool metaphor functions as a stylistic mechanism to transmit meaning by using similar imagery but symbols contain layered cultural meaning that establish their own interpretive setting. The evaluation showed that metaphors operate within specific contexts for artistic enhancement but deeper symbolic units generate extensive emotional and conceptual meanings, and The visualization of abstract content through metaphors assumes straightforward dimensions yet symbols enable diverse cultural-level interpretations. The analysis demands evaluation of metaphors and symbols through linguistic as well as cultural and philosophical perspectives to properly explore their functions in both literary creation and meaning generation.

Conclusion

The two tools of figurative language known as metaphors and symbols operate differently as essential literary elements. The expressive quality in metaphors emerges from comparison yet symbols use cultural symbols to represent complex meanings in ways that cannot be interpreted simply. Knowledge about the distinct characteristics of these two figures forms a fundamental requirement for conducting proper research of literary works and linguistic media.

References:

1. А.Хожиев. Тилшунослик терминларининг изохли луғати. Т. “ЎМЭ” – 2002, 168 б.
2. Шомақсудов А. ва б. Ўзбек тили стилистикаси.Т:«Ўқитувчи», 1983, 246 б.
3. Махмараимова Ш. Лингвокультурология: Ўқув қўлланма. - Т.: Чўлпон номидаги НМИУ, 2017. - 146 б.
4. Йўлдошев М. Бадиий матннинг лисоний таҳлили: Методик қўлланма. - Т. Алишер Навоий номидаги Ўзбекистон Миллий Кутубхонаси нашриёти, 2010. - 130 б.
5. Резников. Л.О. Гнесиологические вопросы семиотики. М., 1979. - 304 бет.
6. Н.Хатамов, Б.Саримсақов. Адабиётшунослик терминларининг русча-ўзбекча изохли луғати. Т., “Ўқитувчи”, 1976.
7. Миртожиев М.М. Ўзбек тили семасиологияси. - Т.: "Мумтоз сўз", 2010.
8. Шабанова Н. Традиционное и индивидуальное в семантической структуре символа. Автор.диссертации - кандидата филологических наук.
9. Блэк М. Метафора /Теория метафоры: сб. статей/ Под общ. ред. Д.Арутюновой и М. А. Журинской. М.: Прогресс, 1990.
10. Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс // Теория метафоры: сб. статей / под общ. ред. Н. Д. Арутюновой и М. А. Журинской. М.: Прогресс, 1990.

11. Лагута О.И. Метафорология: теоретические аспекты. Часть 1. – Новосибирск: Новосибирский государственный университет, 2003. с. 34.
12. Колесов В.В. Философия русского слова. СПб., 2002
13. Потебня А.А. Эстетика и поэтика. М., 1976 (21 с. 553-554)
14. Авдеенко И.А. Символ и метафора // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов: Грамота, 2013. № 3
15. Медведова А.В. Символическое значение как тип значения слова (на материале русских и английских обозначений обиходно-бытовых ситуаций, предметов и явлений материальной культуры). Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Воронеж, 2000
16. Никитин М.В. Курс лингвистической семантики. СПб., 1996
17. Алан М. Олсон. Myth, Symbol and reality. University of Notre Dame Press, 1980.
18. Телия В. Н. Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира // Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира. М.: Наука, 1988.