



ANALYSIS OF THE SPECIFIC PECULIARITIES OF SOUND SYMBOLISM IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Alisherova Dilshoda

3rd English Faculty of Uzbekistan State World Languages university

Abstract:

Among unmotivated signs, the linguistic sign occupies a special place. Analysis of specific features of sound symbolism in modern linguistics.

Keywords: Linguistic, convention, symbolism, Heraclitus, Galkina-Fedoruk.

Although linguistic signs have commonalities with all non-motivated signs by their conventionality, they differ from other non-motivated signs by the breadth, discreteness, acoustics, multiplicity of the possibility of information transfer, and the existence of a step (level) relationship between these level units. Therefore, a linguistic sign is a special type of sign. F. de Saussure also recommends the construction model of the linguistic sign, defining its two main principles: freedom of expression and continuity. The first principle is determined based on the relationship between the expresser and the expressed. The relationship between these two planes of the linguistic sign has been the cause of heated debates among philosophers, psychologists and linguists since ancient times.

Ancient Greek philosophers Heraclitus put forward the thesis that there is a connection between the name and the object it represents, while Democritus denies this view and says that the relationship between the name and the object it represents is free. He proves the disproportion between the name and the object with the following arguments: 1) one object can be called by several names (the name is more than the object, more): 2) several objects are called by one name (the name is less than the object, it is lacking): 3) names of certain subjects may change over time. This issue has not lost its relevance even today (for more information on this issue, see the section "The structure of the symbol"). The second principle of the linguistic sign is the sequence of the signifier. In the works of F. de Saussure, this principle was less important than the first principle, but it was given great importance. The sequence of a linguistic sign indicates its syntagmatic relationship with other signs. This feature of the linguistic sign also refers to the connection between language and speech. The third feature of a linguistic sign is its discreteness, that is, the property of being separated into small elements. Sign structure In linguistics, there are two approaches to the idea that language is a sign system.





First of all, they deny that the language is a system of words. This theory is evaluated as a theory against philosophy. In particular, this point of view is vividly reflected in the early works of L. O. Reznikov. According to him, agnosticism in linguistics is primarily expressed in the theory that language is a sign system. Dialectical materialist teaching emphasizes the need to sharply criticize this form of agnosticism. The theory of linguistic sign is a non-scientific theory. He says that the most harmful agnostic view has infiltrated linguistics, and therefore it is necessary to expose and reject it. R. A. Budagov also rejects the theory of the linguistic sign. He says that any national language is not only a system of certain expressions, but also the result of a unique reflection of all the activities of those who communicate in this language. He stated that the concept of the marked nature of language greatly impoverishes the nature of national languages and, at the same time, linguistics. All those who deny the theory of linguistic sign think about the nature of linguistic sign in relation to one direction - monoliteralist (one-sidedness of sign). They are based on the idea that the symbol consists only of form. As B. A. Serebrennikov rightly noted, scientists who generally reject the theory of linguistic signs confuse two things - the nature of linguistic signs as a means of communication and the problems of the sign-meaning-object (phenomenon) relationship. With the passage of time, the theory that language is a system of symbols was gradually recognized.

But in the matter of the structure of the linguistic sign, two different currents have emerged. Proponents of the first stream include only the signifier in the structure of the linguistic sign. In particular, according to E. M. Galkina-Fedoruk, the sound complex is representative of the universal concept of a certain object in objective existence. That is why only the sound complex of the word can be called a sign, not the concept expressed by the word. Any possibility of constructing a "sign" in the "meaning" of the word should be completely lost. With its sound structure, a word represents a concept that is a mental reflection of the phenomena of existence, and at the same time, it forms and names the concept. So, the word is not a copy of objects, nor is it a sign. L. O. Reznikov, who previously completely denied the linguistic sign, began to recognize this theory in his later works and considers only the sound complex to be a linguistic sign. He says that the sound side of the word has a material character and acts as a sign in relation to the object. He stated that the meaning does not reflect the object directly, but indirectly through the sound side, because the generalized inner content of the being is only through the second signal system, that is, in the process of pronouncing and receiving a complex of sounds with a generalized meaning. It can be done through a system of special physiological connections. One of the active supporters of this concession is V. Z. Panfilov.





It shows that not the whole language unit, but only its material side should be considered as a sign, that the language sign is not a two-sided, but a one-sided essence. The Polish linguist L. Zavadowski describes the one-sidedness of the sign as follows: "The basis on which the supporters of the two-sided nature of the sign relied is correct. one should not come to the conclusion that it is a whole, a combination. After all, should the owner of the garden be interpreted as a dual essence in the form of a person plus a garden?" V. M. Solntsev also approves that the sign is one-sided. As he rightly noted, whether or not to include meaning in a sign, in other words, to recognize that a sign is a one-sided or two-sided essence, depends to a large extent on different understandings of the nature of meaning. Nowadays, there are two different understandings of the meaning. 1) as a type of relation (a) as a sign's relation to the expressed object, (b) as a relation to a concept. At first glance, there is a reason to approach the sign as a dual essence. According to the second view - no. That is why those who defend the two-sidedness of the sign criticize the second view of the sign. Recognizing meaning as a category of perception, at the same time as a concept, as a fact of consciousness prevents the inclusion of meaning in the sign and serves as a basis for viewing the sign as a one-sided essence. Meaning, as a fact of consciousness, is an "ideal thing" (movement, sign, quantity, etc.), a "mental object". Meaning as a "mental object" can be as different as a concept a) a copy of an external person (with varying degrees of accuracy and adequacy).

For example, the meaning of "tree" is a reflection of concrete objects in the mind, and the meaning of "walk" is a reflection of a class of real actions: b) a distorted reflection of the external world or the result of creative fantasy: a giant, a mermaid, etc. In the first type of meaning, the sound string d-a-r-a-x-t can be used to represent some real object, in this case, the sign, that is, the sound string da-r-a-x-t, gives information about something outside of itself. Those who approach the symbol as a dual essence, usually say that the symbol with the meaning of "tree" serves to represent the object of real existence. According to the interpretation of V. M. Solntsev, the sound string d-a-r-a-x-t, that is, the symbol, first of all, refers to a meaning, a mental object, "a tree in general", so it can correspond to any concrete "tree". "Mental object", "mental action", i.e. behind generalizations there are real objects, actions, and these generalizations can be represented by symbols in any case. 23 In the second type of meaning (giant, mermaid), since there are no real objects, the symbol (sound line) refers only to "mental objects" that exist in the mind as a product of fantasy. According to him, what the sign refers to should not be part of the sign. Meaning is a fact of consciousness, a function of the brain and exists only in the minds of people. And the symbol lives outside of man as a material object. The meaning is inseparable from the





sign. But, at the same time, it is not fully equal to the sign. In the concept of the duality of the sign, the meaning is interpreted as the relationship of the sign to the object being expressed. In the concept of the one-sidedness of the sign, it is emphasized that the approach to the meaning is not correct. V. M.

According to Solntsev, unity of expression and meaning creates unity of language. For example, a word is a morpheme. According to him, when it comes to linguistic unity, it is necessary to add meaning to its composition. In the sense of language unity, the experience of the people speaking this language is reflected. The language unit as a whole is connected with the outside world through its meaning. The language unit is not a symbol as it is today. It is made up of signs and meaning. Some scientists are supporters of the symbolic calculation of the elements of consciousness. Such a view is advanced by A. A. Ufimtsev, N. D. Arutyunova. In particular, A. A. Ufimtseva says that the ideal reflection of existing objects and events creates a world of symbols. And N. D. Arutyunova in her article "On the minimum unit of the grammatical system" concludes that the language consists of two sign systems. One consists of sound symbols and represents a concept, and the other is made up of concepts that reflect an existing object or event. The representatives of the second stream, based on the dual nature of the sign, say that it is composed of the unity of the signifier and the signified (Cassirer, Russell, Saussure, Vandries, Sepir, Elmslev, Bloomfield, Vogotsky, Voloshinov, Serebrennikov, etc.). F. de Saussure, in his work "General Linguistics Course", defined the sign as a unity of the signifier (acoustic image) and the expression (concept). In this case, this current is known as "bimaterialistic current" (Ih) Id). According to II, L, Nerebrennikov, the duality of the sign reflects the concept more correctly. Because it is not possible to have a sign without meaning. Separating the sound shell from the meaning is a great non-methodology." Proponents of the immensity of the sign believe that the meaning is a reflection of the existence, an objective act expressed through the sign. At the same time, the concept is a reflection of the existence. exists. Then what is the relationship between these two types of perception, that is, between meaning and concept? E. M. Galkina - Fedoruk states that concept is a logical category and meaning is a linguistic category. But B. A.

As Serebrennikov showed, the above distinction of these two phenomena cannot explain the simultaneous presence of two reflections in the speech. E. M. Galkina-Fedoruk interprets the lexical meaning of the word as a connection with one or another phenomenon of existence on the part of the speaking collective. Indeed, there is a big difference between concept and meaning. The perception of the object occurs naturally in the human mind. The image of the object is embodied as a generalization





of the signs of the object. At first there will be no connection between the sound complex and the object in reality. There is no phenomenon that can be called reflection here. The connection between the sound complex and the object was made by a person. When there is such a conditional relationship between the sound complex and the object, the sound complex performs the function of showing, pointing. Meaning, unlike understanding, is always created, it originates on a natural basis. B. A. Serebrennikov distinguishes between meaning and understanding and denies that meaning is a category of perception. He stated that the conditional and artificially restored connection can never be considered as a reflection. In fact, the meaning is the conditional connection of the sound complex with the concept created by a person. P. V. Chesnokov also emphasizes that meaning does not exist in relation, but is formed only in this relation.

References:

1. Matusевич M. I., Vvedeniye v obshuyu fonetiku, M., 1959;
2. Reshetov V.V., Uzbek language, ch. 1. Vvedeniye. Phonetics, T., 1959;
3. Modern Uzbek literary language, 1 vol., T., 1966;
4. Baskakov N. A., Sodikov A. S, Abduazizov A. A., General Linguistics, T., 1979;
5. Current Uzbek literary language, 1 part, T., 1980;
6. Sravnitelnoistoricheskaya grammar Turkskih yazikov. Phonetics, M., 1984;
7. Ne'matov H., Historical phonetics of the Uzbek language, T., 1994;
8. Reformatsky A.A., Vvedeniye v yazikovedeniye, M., 1998.

