

## SYMBOLS IN CURRENT MODERN LINGUISTICS

Tulaboyeva Gulorom Tulaboyevna

Tashkent State Transport University

Senior teacher of the Department of foreign languages

Mukhiddinov Hasanboy Mukhiddin o`g`li

Faculty of Highway Engineering

### Annotation:

In our article, symbols of modern linguistics are considered and analyzed using the example of scientific work.

**Keywords:** cultural, cognitive, communicative, pragmatic, philosophical, literary, cognitive, stylistic.

The current emphasis on technocracy has shifted the study of language into the anthropocentric realm, focusing not only on linguistics but also on nonlinguistic features that represent a unity of language, individual, culture, cognition, ethnicity, and spirituality. This linguistic approach sees humans as the measure of all things in the world, as humans perceive the world through their senses, evaluate and analyze it through their consciousness, even update existing information in the real world, and create language symbols for practical use in the universe. A symbol is an object, idea, action, or event that represents a specific meaning, crucial to modern trends in linguistics such as cultural, cognitive, communicative, or pragmatic. We know that the effectiveness of communication depends on the recognition and understanding process between the addressee and the addressee. Communication consists of linguistic and non-linguistic units that serve to transform information. Symbols both linguistic and extra-linguistic phenomena have been analyzed from different points of view such as philosophical, literary, cognitive, stylistic, etc., but their cultural value, which causes some misunderstandings in cross-cultural interaction, still needs a deeper analysis, which is the main theme of this one current research.

The etymology of the term symbol refers to the Greek words *bulletin*, which means to throw together and put together, expressing something that stands for something else. The term became popular in the history of philosophy in the 17th century, where symbols are mainly used to represent the transcendent mysteries of the world in the form of spoken utterances, inscriptions, culturally produced meaningful artifacts, and actions such as talismans, ritual performances, religious and sacred



relics, military insignia, spoken words, typographic characters, and other myriad forms. Furthermore, Socrates demonstrated the truth of being through implicit imagery in learning, while E. Kant examined a symbol as a spiritual device that helps to understand the surrounding world from a spiritual perspective [1]. Late 19th-century scholars began to study signs as symbols, developing the new term semiotics or semiology, which studies signs, symbols, and their meaning in language. In particular, Ferdinand de Saussure and Charles Sanders Peirce (1998), as co-founders of this science, who analyzed symbols from a linguistic perspective, developed their semiotic models, namely the dyadic and triadic model, respectively, and established the relationship between the term and its referent or, with, in other words, signifier and signified.

In discussing signs, Peirce (1998) defined a sign as follows: A sign or representamen is something that stands for someone in some way or quality. It speaks to someone, that is, it creates in that person's mind an equivalent sign, or perhaps a more evolved sign. This character that produces it I call the interpreting of the first character. The sign stands for something, its object. It stands for that object, not in every sense, but concerning a kind of idea that I've sometimes called the reason for the representamen. The idea here is to be understood in a kind of platonic sense, very familiar in everyday speech... [2]. Each nation perceives the world with its projection, characterized by a particular system of language and thought. These specific projections are embodied in the mentality, lifestyle, cultural traditions, people's behavior, stereotypical situation, ideas, and judgments about the reality of the culture and form a national linguistic worldview understandable to a specific group of people. Symbols are therefore representatives of national peculiarities that designate the national worldview. J.Hyatt and H.Simons (1999) state that symbols are complex cultural codes, which are a secret system of words, behaviors, characters, customs, and traditions in a culture used to convey contextual information from which they only lead to known cultural elements to their creators or inventors [3].

Similarly, Ashurova and Galieva (2019) affirm that symbols are a representation of the specific ethnic and national activating cultural knowledge structure about life, literature, mythology, religion, fauna, and flora that are sources of symbols in culture. Furthermore, they claim that the same symbols can express very different, even opposing ideas in different cultures, leading to ambiguity. For example, in English-speaking culture, the raven is a symbol of death associated with the poem by E. Poes, while the Chante nation believes the raven to be a symbol of life, spring,



and eternity [4]. The cultural meaning of symbols is crucial for conveying cultural information since culture is a large symbolic world. Therefore, symbols have been studied by a whole range of scholars interested in the cultural meaning of symbols and their role in cross-cultural communication, and have conducted a wide range of research in the field, including the compilation of specific symbol dictionaries.

Furthermore, symbols are an important part of communication as they have layers of meaning that are impossible to hypothesize. As we know, meanings can be categorized into denotative, connotative, contextual, figurative, and other types while symbols mostly have figurative meanings that express reality in an illusory way. This means as the autonomous layer of the human world is captured through the totality of experience and conceptualization. Meanings not only exist autonomously and independently in reality, but also with relevance to individual perception. Nevertheless, there is a third world for the perception of knowledge, namely communication or social interaction, the result of the union of the first world - word and the second world - cognition [5]. All in all, semioticians first started with the academic study of symbolic linguistics by studying the meaning of words, then they studied symbols applied to human behavior, particularly with psychology and anthropology, and then developed into modern directions of Linguistics that encompassed culture and cognition, communicative. Symbols are cultural-cognitive-communicative associations of language that help to achieve successful communication of people from different pragmatic categories: age, status, nation, professional and educational level, etc.



## REFERENCES

1. Ashurova D.U., Galieva M.R. (2019). Cultural Linguistics. Tashkent: O'zkitobsavdonashriyot, p.100
2. Eco U. (1976). A theory of semiotics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Hyatt J. and Simons H.( 1999).Cultural codes. London: Thousand Oaks and New Delhi, p.28
3. Peirce Ch.S. (1998).Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. C. Hartshorne & P. Weiss (eds). Bristol: Thoemmes Press , p.131
4. Toscana A. (2005). The Theatre of Production. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, p.28-30
5. Zairjanovna, S. D., Tulaboevna, T. G., Mirsharapovna, S. Z., & Allovidinovna, I. D. (2022). FEATURES OF TRANSLATION OF MOVIE TITLE FROM ENGLISH TO UZBEK. Journal of new century innovations, 18(3), 179-185.

6. Sayitova Iroda Shuhrat kizi, Tulaboeva Gulorom Tulaboevna, Saydaliyeva Dilfuza Zairjanovna, & Yuldasheva Mamura Bahtiyarovna. (2022). ENGLISH AND UZBEK TRADITIONS, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS. *Academica Globe: Inderscience Research*, 3(12), 39–44. Retrieved from <https://agir.acemiascience.org/index.php/agir/article/view/995>
7. Mirsharapovna, S. Z., Allovidinovna, I. D., Zairjanovna, S. D., & Tulaboevna, T. G. (2022). INTERNET MEME AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION. *Journal of new century innovations*, 18(3), 193-199.
8. Allovidinovna, I. D., Zairjanovna, S. D., Tulaboevna, T. G., & Mirsharapovna, S. Z. (2022). COMPARISON OF WORD-FORMATION SYSTEMS IN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES. *Journal of new century innovations*, 18(3), 200-208.
9. Tulaboevna, T. G., Mirsharapovna, S. Z., Allovidinovna, I. D., & Zairjanovna, S. D. (2022). FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE CONDITIONS OF INFORMATIZATION OF EDUCATION. *Journal of new century innovations*, 18(3), 186-192.
10. Dilfuza, S. (2022). Forms of Pronouns. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 12, 23-26.
11. Ortikovich, N. S., Ozod o'g'li, A. A., & Zairjanovna, S. D. (2022). INTELLIGENT TRAFFIC FLOW MANAGEMENT. *American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development*, 5, 251-254.
12. Saydalieva, D., & Khusenova, G. (2022). THE MAJOR PRINCIPLES OF ASSESSMENT AND THE WAYS IN WHICH THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING/LEARNING ACTIVITIES (TLAS) CAN BE EVALUATED. *Sciences of Europe*, (89-1), 36-38.
13. Dilfuza, S. (2021). Privileges In Railway Transport And Their Peculiarities. *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3, 39-43.
14. Saydalieva, D. Z., Normirzaeva, D. M., Sheralieva, S. I., & Yuldasheva, A. Y. (2021). The Role Of Innovative Technologies In The English Lesson. *European Journal of Molecular & Clinical Medicine*, 8(2), 308-318.
15. Шералиева, Ш. И., & Сайдалиева, Д. З. (2021). НОВЫЕ СПОСОБЫ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА. *Вестник науки и образования*, (16-2 (119)), 52-54.
16. Dilfuza, S., Muzayamhon, M., & Iroda, J. (2020). Computer technology is the best means of formation learning environment for studying and teaching English language. *Бюллетень науки и практики*, 6(4), 411-415.



17. Saydalieva, D. Z., & Akhmatova, K. S. (2020). MEDIA EDUCATION AS A TOOL TO DEVELOP FOREIGN LANGUAGE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE. *www.auris-verlag.de*, 4.

18. Tulabaeva, G., & Saydaliyeva, D. (2020). THE IMPORTANCE OF PROVERBS AND SAYINGS UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES. *Экономика и социум*, (3), 124-126.

19. Тулабаева, Г. Т., & Сайдалиева, Д. З. (2020). К вопросу выбора методов обучения английскому языку в неязыковых вузах. *Academy*, (2 (53)), 30-32.

20. Yuldasheva Mamura Bahtiyarovna, Sayitova Iroda Shuhrat kizi, Tulaboeva Gulorom Tulaboevna, & Saydaliyeva Dilfuza Zairjanovna. (2022). TOURIST ADVERTISING AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS. *Emergent: Journal of Educational Discoveries and Lifelong Learning (EJEDL)*, 3(12), 94–98. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/7EJW2>

21. Saloxiddinovna, M. G., & Xaytbayevich, K. Y. (2022). Problems of Teaching ESP at the Technical Universities of Uzbekistan. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 14, 120-122.

22. Mamadjanovna, K. M., Salaxiddinovna, M. G., Tulaboevna, T. G., & Zairjanovna, S. D. (2022). Current Problems of Training Pedagogical Staff for the Implementation of Inclusive Education. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 14, 12-16.

23. Zairjanovna, S. D., Mamadjanovna, K. M., Salaxiddinovna, M. G., & Tulaboevna, T. G. (2022). Grade-Free Learning System as A Means of Creating a Psychologically Comfortable Educational Environment in the Class to Motivate a Child to Successful Learning Activities. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 14, 17-20.

24. Mustayeva Guldora Salaxiddinovna, Tulaboeva Gulorom Tulaboevna, Saydaliyeva Dilfuza Zairjanovna, & Kurbanova Muxabbat Mamadjanovna. (2022). Emotional Self-Regulation of the Behavior of Pedagogical Workers in the System of Integrated (Inclusive) Education. *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 14, 17–20. Retrieved from <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/tjm/article/view/2645>

25. Tulaboeva Gulorom Tulaboevna, Saydaliyeva Dilfuza Zairjanovna, Kurbanova Muxabbat Mamadjanovna, & Mustayeva Guldora Salaxiddinovna. (2022). Model of the Development of the Legal Culture of Children of the Risk Group in the Conditions of the Organization of Additional Education. *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 14, 13–16. Retrieved from <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/tjm/article/view/2644>





26. Zairzhanovna, S. D., & Tulaboyevna, T. G. (2022). THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROCESS OF USING LITERARY TEXTS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. *Uzbek Scholar Journal*, 9, 236-238.
27. Tulaboyevna, T. G., & Zairzhanovna, S. D. (2022). STUDENT INTEREST CRITERIA IN THE PROCESS OF LEARNING ENGLISH. *Uzbek Scholar Journal*, 9, 206-207.
28. Tulaboevna, T. G. (2022). Grammar and utility functions of pronouns. *Eurasian journal of learning and academic teaching*, 12, 30-32.
29. Kharatova, S., & Tulaboeva, G. (2022, June). Some interactive methods of teaching module system. In *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 2432, No. 1, p. 060005). AIP Publishing LLC.
30. Kharatova, S., Tulaboeva, G., & Xusanova, I. (2022, June). The role of computers in education. In *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 2432, No. 1, p. 060006). AIP Publishing LLC.
31. Tulaboevna, T. G. (2022). Mother-Daughter Relations in the Novel “The Joy Luck Club” by Amy Tan. *Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8, 112-114.
32. Tulaboevna, T. G. (2022). Multicultural Literature of the USA. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 8, 127-130.
33. Tulaboevna, T. G., & Xasanboy, M. (2022). The Theme of Racial Discrimination in “The Weary Blues” Langston Hughes. *The Peerian Journal*, 5, 145-148.
34. Tulaboeva, G. (2022). INTERNET PLATFORM AS A DIDACTIC TOOL FOR DISTANCE LEARNING OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE. *Архив научных исследований*, 2(1).
35. Tulaboyeva, G. T. (2022). Common mistakes in learning english. *International Bulletin Of Engineering And Technology*, 2(9), 51-53
36. Alidjanovna, T. M., Khakimovna, K. S., Tulaboevna, T. G., Shukurovna, A. K., & Xafizovich, U. K. (2021). Lingu-Didactical Basis of Teaching English Learning Vocabulary to the First-Year Uzbek Audience Students. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 415-429.
37. Tulaboyeva, G. T. (2021). Teaching an EAP Course through distance education. *Turkish online journal of Qualitative Inquiry*.
38. Tulaboyeva, G. T. (2021). Some interactive methods of teaching module system. In *AIP Conference Proceedings*.
39. Тулабоева, Г. Т. (2019). АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ПРЕПОДОВАНИЯ ИНОСТРАННОГО ЯЗЫКА В НЕФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ВУЗАХ. In *Университетский комплекс как региональный центр образования, науки и культуры* (pp. 2577-2581).

