

THE ROLE OF A SYMBOL IN THE ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF A LITERARY TEXT

*UlugbekTurgunov, turgunov@jspi.uz
Karimova Gulruh, karimova@jspi.uz
Islyamova Soniya, islyamova@jspi.uz
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj> Part of the Higher Education Administration Commons

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online

THE ROLE OF A SYMBOL IN THE ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF A LITERARY TEXT

Ulugbek Turgunov, turgunov@jspi.uz

Karimova Gulruh, karimova@jspi.uz

Islyamova Soniya, islyamova@jspi.uz

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract: In this article, based on the analysis of existing works on the symbol in literature which is primarily a combination, an attempt was made to justify its use in the process of studying literature at school. Since a literary text is an act of creative consciousness serving art, the symbol in it strives for disclosure, for liberation, for unification with being. The main goal of analysis and interpretation in this case will be to come to the discovery of a work of art as a new universe, integral and multifaceted, to highlight all the semantic shades that will be available to the reader's perception.

Key words: symbol, image, literature, artistic system, humanity, reader, essence, fayritale, externalization, exteriorization, archetypal imagery, polar, supersensible, versatility, perception, unification.

INTRODUCTION

Any work of art is a multifaceted world. A work of art, like the writer's world, is "a model of the world, a microcosm with its own internal laws" [1, p. 6]. And this world consists of two principles: "subject-logical" and "expressive" [1, p. 6]. The subject-logical level refers to the plan of the image and represents the intellectual beginning. If the image is "a reflection of the objective, material, sensually perceived world in volume, color, sound, plasticity, in its specific life-

like forms”, then the expression is “this is the disclosure of the essence of the phenomenon, the transfer of the impression of the object in a conditionally generalized form” [1, with. 20]. The expressive world of a work of art includes two forms of expressiveness: symbol and intonation [1]. The symbol refers to the expressive, immaterial, which, in turn, is a conductor of the emotional, aesthetic and value. This determines the specificity of the symbol as a form of the expressive world.

A symbol in art is a universal aesthetic category, revealed through comparison with adjacent categories - an artistic image on the one hand, a sign and allegory - on the other. In a broad sense, it can be said that “a symbol is an image taken in the aspect of its symbolism”, and that it is “a sign endowed with all the organicity and inexhaustible ambiguity of the image” [2, p. 378]. “Any artistic symbol is an artistic image” (but “not every artistic image is a symbol”) [3, p. 41]. The category of a symbol points to the image going beyond its own limits, to the presence of a certain meaning, inseparably merged with the image, but not identical to it.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The objective image and the deep meaning appear in the structure of the symbol “as two poles, one inconceivable without the other (because the meaning loses its appearance outside the image, and the image outside the meaning crumbles into its components), but also divorced from each other, so that in tension between them and the symbol is revealed” [2, p. 378-379].

It should be noted that “the meaning of a symbol objectively reveals itself not as a cash, but as a dynamic trend: it is not given, but given” [2, p. 379]. This meaning cannot be explained by reducing it to an unambiguous logical formula. It can only be clarified by relating it to further symbolic chains, which will lead to greater clarity. The symbol is inherent in “a metaphorical beginning, contained in poetic tropes, but in the symbol it is enriched with a deep intention” [4, p. 263]. The depth of the symbolic image is due to the fact that “it can be applied with equal justification to various aspects of being” [4, p. 263].

After all, a symbol is a generalization as an infinite extension of the semantic volume, but also a generalization involved in the meaning. The generalizing energy of a symbol allows it to be a “mechanism of cultural memory” [5, p. 241]. On this occasion Yu.M. Lotman believed that in the symbol "there is always something archaic" [5, p. 241]. It is closely related to culture. Culture, according to K. Levi-Strauss, is “a generalized creation of the mind, namely the totality of symbols that are accepted by members of society” [6, p. 52]. Culture is based on “myth-making”, which acts as a characteristic human ability to build “analogies” [6, p. 52]. Those. universal processes of the psyche process "natural material" into some "archetypal schemes" [6, p. 52].

As a result, a chain of concepts is built: culture - symbol - myth - archetype - man. Each link in this series is significant and is the rationale for another link. All together, this allows us to build a system of working with a work of art as a product of culture, created by man in the process of myth-making (his own re-creation of the world) with the help of a set of symbols that embody an archetypal nature.

Any symbol connects the consciousness of the individual with the collective unconscious, i.e. with the archetypal one: “...each symbol also expresses an essential unknown element of the soul...” [7, p. 161]. The creative symbol lives in every individual, it can live everywhere, anywhere, in any form and at any time. And every artist in the creative process becomes a creator of symbols. In other words, the creative process, as far as we can trace it, consists in the unconscious activity of the archetypal image and its further processing and shaping into a finished work.

Giving form to such an image, the artist translates it into the language of the present, which makes it possible for us to find the way back to the very beginnings of life. This is the social significance of art: it is constantly working, teaching the spirit of the era, bringing to life the forms that it most of all lacks. The dissatisfaction of the artist leads him back to the primitive image in the

unconscious, which can best compensate for the inconsistency and one-sidedness of the present. Having grasped this image, the artist raises it from the depths of the unconscious in order to bring it into line with conscious values and, transforming it so that it can be perceived by the minds of contemporaries in accordance with their abilities.

However, as you know, the level of ability depends on how they have evolved and developed. If this is not worked on, then the characters may go unnoticed. And a person will pass by what he may need at this moment. And then it will become a problem of "desymbolization" [8], and hence the problem of the destruction of culture. Therefore, it is important not to belittle the role of the symbol in the life of mankind, in the life of art and in the life of a work of art, in particular. Since a symbol in literary criticism is a universal aesthetic category, it has universal, specific features - semantic generalization (emotional-aesthetic, value), "semantic multi-layeredness, polysemy" (polysemy) [9].

As mentioned above, a symbol is a form of the expressive world. But, on the other hand, the symbol is an artistic form, expressed through the elements or means of the pictorial world. More A.F. Losev pointed to the pictorial character of the symbol [10]. Therefore, each element of an artistic system can be a symbol: a metaphor, a comparison, a landscape, an artistic detail, a title, a literary hero, a character, and so on. However, they move into the realm of artistic reality, depending on a number of features of the symbol: it has semantic depth; endowed with a semantic perspective; cannot be deciphered by a simple effort of reason; inseparable from the structure of the image; does not exist as a rational formula; it is the more meaningful, the more meaningful and each particular phenomenon-symbol gives a complete image of the world [11].

Thus, the meaning of a symbol cannot be deciphered by a simple effort of the mind, it is inseparable from the structure of the image, it does not exist as a kind of rational formula that can be "embedded" in the image and then extracted from it, since "symbols are thought by us as representations of not objects and events, but

conscious sendings and results of consciousness” [8, p. 99]. Here one has to look for the specifics of the symbol in relation to the category of the sign.

If for a non-artistic sign system polysemy is only a hindrance that harms the rational functioning of the sign, then the symbol is the more meaningful, the more it has many meanings. “The symbol takes the text beyond the scope or expands the semantic framework to infinity” [9, p. 103]. In this “openness”, only that which is consistent with the rest of the meanings found in the text is accepted, hence the “smell” of the symbol [9]. For example, the hero A.S. Pushkin from *The Miserly Knight* is a symbol of the end of the era of chivalry and the beginning of the era of stinginess. But also a symbol of an unsuccessful global attempt to save life from spending, to be "above all desires." Those. the symbolic meaning of "the miserly knight" is something broader than a historical play.

So, the symbolic world of a work of art is the “territory of gathering”, “meeting of meanings” [9, p.104], “the core of the work” [11, p. 35]. Therefore, in working with a symbolic text, a meeting with semantic ambiguity is inevitable and is designed for the active inner work of the perceiver. After all, the perception of symbols that burst out in a work of art is difficult because they always reflect a more complex reality than that which can be squeezed into rational concepts of consciousness. The analysis of the creative process begins only where the grounding analysis ends. Namely, from the investigation of the connection between personal factors and archetypal content, i.e. the content of the collective unconscious [7]. The sense of a unified reality that precedes the sense of reality divided by consciousness is highly symbolic. Symbolic sensation is the primary existence, when a single reality is perceived consciously and when the obstacles to understanding the meaning of being have not yet been erected or have already been demolished. With the help of symbols, a person can navigate the world and adapt himself to it in such a way that he becomes capable of life and self-realization. This, for us, is the value of a symbol as a key to a person's comprehension of the versatility and integrity of the artistic world. Since a literary text is an act of

creative consciousness serving art, the symbol in it tends to reveal, liberate, unite with being.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

So, "the appeal of a work to each reader is possible only with a generalized - symbolic - nature of the artistic world and its images" [8, p. 99]. Due to its essence, the symbol has those stimulus capabilities that can expand the reader's consciousness, help him to comprehend the versatility and depth of the pictorial and expressive artistic world. Thus, the multi-meaning structure of the symbol contributes to the completeness of grasping the world, as well as to the active internal work of the perceiver. This structure can never be finally given; it can only be given by symbol. [2].

Interestingly, the interpretation of the symbol is dialogic in nature and is opposed to both subjectivism and objectivism; she combines both. When we take into account the existing meanings of symbols, such as literal (obvious, everyday), allegorical (meaning hidden under the cover of myths), moral (personal morality of a person), mystical (that which cannot be explained by any of the five senses; then, which is connected with an appeal to the spiritual, divine), then the analysis and interpretation will have to be built according to a complicated scheme. First, perception picks up the literal meaning (the symbol is felt intuitively through archetypal forms living in the collective unconscious). At the second stage, the primary understanding is supplemented by the meanings that are contained in the symbol of a particular artistic text, they are recreated by the author in the process of myth-making. Of course, the specific meaning of a symbol can only be determined based on the context in which it arose. Then the symbol goes through the stage of filling with personal meanings that arise in the mind and soul of the reader as a response to the plurality of images that speak in this symbol. The fourth stage is the most difficult on the way of comprehending some sacred knowledge about the world, about which the symbolic field of the work speaks to

us. We can only try to feel behind the “flickering of meanings” something incommensurably greater, immense, to feel the depth, to come closer to understanding the supersensible, which is completely inaccessible to human consciousness. The last highest stage of analysis and interpretation passes into reflective reflection. “A symbol expressed in an artistic way is always reflective” [3, p. 45], which allows you to look at the world of your “I”, at the world of your own thought-bearing values, at the world of personal myth through the eyes of an outside observer.

Thus, the way of perception and awareness of the symbol is divided into the following stages: first - sensory, live perception, sensory; then - intellectual filling with additional values. If there is something to add, this is the symbol. Sometimes the characters are deciphered by the reader as puzzles. This leads to a narrowing of the meaning. For example, in the story “Warm Bread” K.G. Paustovsky, the name itself is symbolic: we are not talking about freshly baked bread, not just warm bread (in the literal sense), as an unthinking reader might assume, but we are talking about “warm” bread, because it is warmed by human kindness, sympathetic attitude and sensitivity hearts of the main character of Filka's story. The symbolic image has a broad generalization, therefore, one must strive to perceive this broad generalizing meaning, to show what semantic depth it contains.

According to Yu.M. Lotman, the most important feature of a symbol (“archaic”) is that “a symbol, representing a complete text, may not be included in any syntagmatic series, and if it is included in it, it retains its structural and semantic independence” those. “it is easily isolated from the semiotic environment and just as easily enters a new textual environment” [5, p. 241].

A symbol is able to expose the idea of an artistic image, since it is distinguished by “powerful semantic richness” [1, p. 17]. It is “closely fused with the sensual figurative layer of a work of art, i.e. with style” [1, p. 17]. Using symbols, the artist does not show things, but only hints at them, makes us guess the meaning of the obscure, reveal secret meanings, in other words, expresses his style

through a symbol. Therefore, the ability to read all its features in a symbol will help to see the individual personal content that is brought in by the author's consciousness. But not only individual personal content.

Since a symbol is an imagery that takes root in culture, it can evoke certain cultural associations that a person (as a child) joins early (for example, the symbol of the sun). The general cultural symbol is less dependent on the author - here there are cultural connections between the meaning and the subject (for example, a gray stone, the sun or a rose are general cultural symbols). Author's symbolism is a symbolism enriched with author's connotations.

For example, Andersen's symbol of tears is the author's symbol, acquiring meanings: a symbol of rebirth and return, namely "hot" tears that characterize the strength of the feeling that overwhelms Gerda - tears of love; love is so hot that tears, as its release, are capable of melting ice ("The Snow Queen"); symbol - tears as "the most precious reward for the singer's heart" (a feeling of supreme pleasure; tears - from participation in the beautiful in this world, purifying and liberating the soul of a person and his feelings (in the story "The Nightingale"). If in the "Snow Queen" H. K. Andersen has "hot" tears in Gerda, then in "The Happy Prince" by O. Wilde they are "heavy". The prince realized that the world is not a garden of Carelessness, that there is a place in it for both sorrow and suffering, a feeling of powerlessness from the impossibility of changing something. In this tale, another aspect of the symbol of tears is revealed. Tears in the context of a fairy tale are mourning the disorder and unhappiness of the world in which there are sick children, hungry poets, women exhausted by labor. Tears embody the idea of redemption before God for the carelessness of life through every second contemplation, and then only feeling all the pain of the world. The image of tears is combined with the idea of sacrifice, when the prince gives his eyes to bring people a little happiness, and with the image of a heart split from unbearable suffering, loss and deprivation. The main thing for the reader is not to give a concept to a symbol, but to express an understanding of the essence. And

with good cognitive behavior, the symbol will contribute to the awakening of reflection (understanding) of a work of art.

Any work of art "is a zone of generalization, where everything is a symbol" [9, p. 94]. According to Yu.M. Lotman, "a symbol is a condensed program of the creative process", "a plot gene" [5, p. 239]. "The further development of the plot is only the deployment of some of the potentials hidden in it. This is a deep encoding device, a kind of "text gene" [5, p. 239]. "However, the fact that the same initial symbol can unfold into different plots and that the very process of such unfolding is irreversible and unpredictable shows that the creative process is asymmetric in nature" [5, p. 239]. Therefore, the problem of analyzing a work of art is the problem of the interaction of its two worlds - subject-logical and expressive. Myth, idea, pathos, intuition, symbol - all these are hypostases of the original, vague, indivisible, all-encompassing, "single wholeness", essence, the origins of two principles in the image - irrational and logical [4]. They can be the key to uniting the two sides of the literary text. The problem of analysis and interpretation of a work of art is limited precisely to this problem of the interaction of subject-logical and expressive.

In our opinion, the key issue in resolving this problem is the question of the meaning of a work of art. The difficulty of answering this question is connected with the identification of the concepts of "meaning" and "content". Hence the indistinguishability between analysis and interpretation. However, the category of content is the subject of analysis, the category of meaning is the subject of interpretation. The purpose of analysis is to explain the structure of the work, and the purpose of interpretation is to understand its meaning. Interpretation cannot have a clear set of procedures, because it does not deal with an object (like analysis), but with a unique meaning, namely with the unity of value and meaning in a work of art. Interpretation is, of course, related to cognition. Any reader is involved in the analytical situation by the fact that he perceives the work in portions, parts. Reading decomposes the unity of the work and at the same time

creates it through the effort of understanding. In the process of understanding, the work correlates not only with the cultural and historical context, but also with life, i.e. with the ideas of those who are trying to understand it. At the same time, any understanding of a work of art is connected precisely with taking into account the value nature of a work of art, which is closely related to its symbolic nature.

According to L.Yu. Fuchson, the value and symbolic aspects of a work of art are the deployment of the position on the "humanity of the artistic image" [9, p.78]. If we understand the "anthropocentricity" of the artistic world as "the embodiment of the spiritual", then this "opens up the corresponding symbolic and value planes of a work of art" [9, p. 119].

Symbol and value are "the poles of the unity of being and meaning, which is the artistic image of a person" [9, p. 119]. Movement to the pole of the symbol (i.e. meaning) is "interiorization" [9, p. 119]. Movement towards the pole of aesthetic value (i.e., being) is "externalization, exteriorization of a person (and individualization)" [9, p. 120]. If "ethical value is a meaning that can become being", then "aesthetic value is a meaning that has become a being" [9, p. 120]. In other words, the specificity of artistic meaning, which consists in its inseparability from being, is viewed from two points of view: symbol and value, i.e. "the meaning of being, which is revealed in being itself, and the being of meaning as its incarnation" [9, p. 120]. In the "symbolic horizon" the work opens up as a "field of semantic multilayeredness" [9, p. 120]. The value "dimension" of interpretation reveals in the work the "unity of tension", which is formed due to the "effect of polarization of all its formations" [9, p. 120]. Consideration of a literary text is an interpretation not due to the use of the words "symbol" and "value", but due to the identification of "symbolic-representative and value-polar relations that form a special semantic structure of the work" [9, p. 120-121]. Thus, special analysis and interpretation are complementary. "The symbolic meaning and value tension, the relationship of both - this is also a structure that needs to be described" [9, p. 121].

It is worth noting that when analyzing and interpreting symbolic forms, it is necessary to take into account the main features of the symbol, the knowledge of which contributes to a deeper understanding of its essence:

- 1) the binarity of oppositions comes from archetypal imagery, which has an active, polar nature;
- 2) universality is determined by the collective unconscious and cultural experience of mankind;
- 3) the multi-layered semantics is the very essence of symbolic forms.

So, the symbol combines the archetypal, cultural and personal principles of its own essence. The symbol represents a model of the structure of a work of art: it covers all the richness of its content. The symbol (as a "microstructure") concentrates and reflects the patterns of the content of the work ("macrostructure"). This makes it a powerful tool for analysis and interpretation.

The actualization of symbolic meanings develops the ability to enter the world of the author's personal meanings and helps to get closer to the author's intention. This skill is significant not only for the analysis and interpretation of a work of art, but also for a deeper understanding of another consciousness. D.N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky says that symbolic images successfully carry out the work that figurative art is called upon to serve: "To study the human soul with the help of images, reveal its "secrets", pave the way for an intimate understanding of a person by a person, explain human life, raise questions of moral consciousness, develop the human ideal" [6, p. 104].

CONCLUSION

Reasoning about the symbol, its specificity, role in the analysis and interpretation of a work of art allows us to draw a number of conclusions:

1. The very structure of the symbol is aimed at immersing each particular phenomenon in the element of "original being and giving through this phenomenon a holistic image of the world."

2. The multi-meaning structure of the symbol contributes to the completeness of grasping the world, as well as to the active internal work of the perceiver.

3. Each element of an artistic system can be a symbol: a metaphor, a comparison, a landscape, an artistic detail, a title, a literary hero, a character, etc.

4. Depending on which of the facets of the symbol is most accessible for perception, the analysis and interpretation of the image will be built:

- from the condensation of the artistic generalization itself;
- from the conscious attitude of the author to identify the symbolic meaning of the depicted;
- from the context of the work, when, regardless of the intention of the author, the symbolic meaning of one or another element of artistic imagery is revealed, when considered in the integrity of the writer's creative system. Often, the symbolic meaning of a particular element is signaled by its accentuated use, which makes it possible to speak of it as a motive and leitmotif of the work;
- from the literary context of the era and culture (the problem of "eternal images").

All these features of symbolic images in the analysis and interpretation of them in a work of art will contribute to the development of skills to perceive the figurative world of a work of art more voluminously and deeply. This, for us, is the value of a symbol as a key to the reader's understanding of the versatility and integrity of a work of art. Since a literary text is an act of creative consciousness serving art, the symbol in it strives for disclosure, for liberation, for unification with being. The main goal of analysis and interpretation in this case will be to come to the discovery of a work of art as a new universe, integral and multifaceted, to highlight all the semantic shades that will be available to the reader's perception.

REFERENCES:

[1]. Zeltser L.Z. The expressive world of art. - M.: Non-profit publishing group E. Rakitskaya ("Era"), 2001. - 467 p.

- [2]. Averintsev S.S. Symbol in art: literary-encyclopedia dictionary. – M.: Nauka, 1987. – S. 378-379.
- [3]. Kolodina N.I. Symbol in works of art // Understanding as discretion and construction of meanings. - Tver: TGU, 1996. - P. 40-45.
- [4]. Kvyatkovsky A. Poetic Dictionary. - M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966. - 376 p.
- [5]. Lotman Yu.M. Semiosphere. - St. Petersburg: Art-SPb, 2000. - 704 p.
- [6]. Gurevich P.S. Philosophy of culture: a textbook for higher education. - M.: Publishing house NOTA BENE, 2001. - 352 p.
- [7]. Jung KG, Neumann E. Psychology and art / Per. from English. - M.: KEEP-Book, K. Vakler, 1996. - 304 p.
- [8]. Mamardashvili M.K., Pyatigorsky A.M. Symbol and consciousness: Metaphysical reasoning about consciousness, symbolism and language - M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1999. - 216 p.
- [9]. Fukson L.Yu. The problem of interpretation and the value nature of a literary work: a monograph. - Kemerovo, 1999. - 128 p.
- [10]. Losev A.F. The problem of the symbol and realistic art. - M.: Art, 1976. - 367 p.
- [11]. Khalizev V.E. Theory of Literature. - M.: Higher school, 1999. - 398 p.
- [12]. Lanin B.A. Methods of teaching and studying literature (anthology). - Sapporo: Center for Slavic Studies, Hokkaido University, 2001. - 438 p.