

Communicative Features of Signs: Translation in Literary Works

OTAJONOVA DILDOR BAKHTIYAROVNA
Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

*This article analyses the communicative features of sign utilisation in literary translations, concentrating on English, Russian, and Uzbek literature. It explores the semiotic and pragmatic aspects of language, emphasising the significance of verbal and non-verbal factor in intercultural communication. The study examines the historical and linguistic progressions of semiotics, tracing its roots to early pictographic and ideographic scripts and their transformation into intricate communicating systems. Semiotics is established as a linguistic and philosophical subject, influenced by prominent scholars such as Charles Sanders Peirce and Ferdinand de Saussure. Furthermore, the paper highlights how signs – comprising iconic, indexical, and symbolic types – facilitate meaning in texts, particularly, emphasis is placed on the translations of books such Jack London's *Martin Eden* and Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. The translations are assessed for their efficacy in transmitting emotional, demonstrative, and symbolic factors across cultural and language divides. The distinctions in lexical and structural selections, including the translation of emotional expressions such as "cheeks hot" and demonstrative pronouns, are rigorously examined. In addition, the research finds that communicative cues are essential to both verbal and non-verbal communication, with unique subtleties arising in each language. Verbal expressions provide cognitive and emotional insights, but non-verbal clues, including gestures and rhythmic patterns, enhance significance. This research highlights the necessity of comprehending linguistic and cultural*

circumstances to attain precise and successful literary translations, preserving the integrity and impact of the original work across languages.

Keywords: Communicative signs; iconic signs; indexical signs; symbolic signs.

INTRODUCTION

When we analyse the history of writing, we see that numerous systematic languages have emerged based on a single writing system. The history of writing in English and Russian is separated into two periods: pre-writing and writing. The Uzbek script has experienced alterations over numerous phases. These include the Sogdian and Khorezmian scripts, which were established based on Aramaic (Nöldeke 1898), and subsequently the scripts of Tokharistan and Uyghur, as well as the usage of Arabic scripts following the Arab conquest. However, every nation has both pre-writing and writing stages. The Uzbek script includes a kind of writing that conveys meaning through pre-writing features, as seen by the letters from Herodotus (Gasparov 2001) delivered to Greece.

It is understood that writing is represented through numerous signs and conveys distinct meanings. Even now, we may observe historical writing samples that have become core ideals of our nation. For example, the wedding bands of men and women represent their marriage, while the flowers in needlework, considered one of the first types of writing, have traditionally communicated numerous meanings and acted as a way of communication. This is backed by Friedrich's (Korolyov 2002) study, which not only investigates the history of writing but also explores how it is mirrored via numerous symbols, signs, and other sorts of signals, and how these are regarded some of the first examples in human history.

It is also important to acknowledge that pictographic, ideographic, and phonographic scripts were prevalent during the initial phases of the development of writing. Pictographic writing is one of the earliest examples of written language culture, as

evidenced by its rules and principles. Consequently, the history of the development of writing commenced with the examination of inscriptions that were engraved into stone (Champollion 1824). The following types of writing have been identified as a result of the research conducted by archaeologists: pictographic (Evans 1909) (from the Greek *pictus* meaning "drawn" and *grapho* meaning "writing"), ideographic (Durkheim 1912) (from the Greek "idea" meaning "concept" and *grapho* meaning "writing"), and phonographic (Bloomfield 1933) (from the Greek "phone" meaning "sound" and *grapho* meaning "writing"). The spoken language of humans is tied to the history of writing and written monuments throughout the last millennia. In ancient times, writing passed through historical stages of growth, and now it has grown into a more advanced and practical form.

Thus, we can certainly state that the genesis of language as a system of signs is marked by the development of the first forms of writing. The field that sees the system of signs as its goal is semiotics, which investigates the content of multiple signified meanings. During the investigation in this subject, it has been established that it has numerous meanings, including:

- the science of signs.
- its medical meaning: one of the diagnostic disciplines that investigates and assesses the signs and symptoms of illnesses. Here, the term "semiotics" is used in its original sense: the Greek *semeiotikon* (*semeion* – sign, indication) originally related to the science of symptoms in medicine.

It is regarded as a scientific subject relating to the study of the foundations of mathematics. Georg Hermes (1818) has observed this in his publication *Semiotics*.

The philosopher John Locke, who identified semiotics as the science of signs, stressed in his research the relevance of the idea of signs in understanding how the mind sees objects or in transferring information. He also explored the significance of words as a critical aspect in interpreting communicated thoughts, illustrating the place of signals in human communication.

Later, M. A. Korniyenko (2016) did study in this field. He highlighted the necessity of language in grasping the meaning of signals and the contrast between truth and fiction.

Charles Sanders Peirce (Chandler 2007) founded the scientific theory of semiotics and systematized signs, dividing them into the following types:

- **Iconic signs:** These are signs that express a specific meaning and have certain parallels with the objects they represent, such as a sign signalling an exit (a door and a person walking outside) or road signs.
- **Index signs** (also known as demonstrative or deictic signs). These are signals that communicate a given meaning and are connected to the objects they represent in a mixed manner, typically demonstrating cause and effect, such as fire (cause) and smoke (effect).
- **Symbolic signs** - These relate to signs that have a specific meaning and are tied to the objects they represent according to established traditions within society.

In this way, Peirce shows the core of a sign through the union of these three components, highlighting that a sign has a restricted meaning as a representation of content; the represented item is its denotation; and its perception in human consciousness.

Karl Ludwig Bühler (Cobley & Jansz 1997) explored the theory of signs in connection to language, claiming that language is strongly tied to the combination of factors such as 1) things and circumstances, 2) the transmitter of information, and 3) the recipients of that information. For this reason, the language sign serves three main semantic functions: representational, expressive, and conative. His followers, like Ogden-Richards (1923) and Frege (1952), similarly incorporated these functions under the semiotic triangle: denotation, reference, and extension. Symbols mediate between the substance of phenomena, their meanings, and their representations, on one side, and the direct influence of things and real phenomena on sense organs, on the other.

Some researchers prefer to consider signals as a one-sided essence from the standpoint of expression and form. The Austrian positivist professor Rudolf Carnap (1947) established a logical-mathematical method in semiotics. Logicians refer to the object indicated by signs as the denotation; the idea (*designatum*) is regarded as the mental representation of the collection of denotations created in the subject of sign activity. Gottlob Frege (1952) presented the link between denotation, notion, and sign in a triangle form.

The American Charles Morris (1938) produced a little book titled *Foundations of the Theory of Signs* in 1938, which gives a basic summary of this new subject of research. Morris's (1946) following work, titled *Signs, Language, and Behavior*, tackles the current challenges in the subject of semiotics, claiming that it is proper to create the foundations for a thorough and successful science of signs. In inventing this new discipline, Morris (1946) drew on the study of Peirce (Chandler 2007).

Historically, the knowledge of the essence of signals in semiotics has developed in two directions: one is logical-philosophical, going back to Peirce (Chandler 2007); the other is linguistic-communicative, tracing back to F. de Saussure (1916). According to the first viewpoint, a sign is an item (word, picture, symbol, signal, thing, physical phenomena, etc.) that acts as a substitute for and conveys another material or conceptual object in the processes of knowledge and communication.

It is worth mentioning that study on the formation of semiotics as the science of signs has been done not only by philosophers but also by linguists. According to F. de Saussure (1916), "the science that studies the nature of signs formed in social life characterizes semiotics and must provide information about how signs manifest and what laws govern them". His theories were not adequate for the creation of semiotics as a linguistic science. However, the release of Buysen's (1943) book *Languages and Discourses* in 1943 insured the fulfillment of F. de Saussure's (1916) views. The implementation of this research illustrates that the components of the subject of semiotics may be explored not only from a philosophical viewpoint but also from a language position.

K. Bühler (Cobley & Jansz 1997) elucidated the characteristics of the sign system through a series of axioms. His foundations include the preliminary study on semiotics. Initially, in a speech act, the involvement of the speaker, listener, and object is guaranteed, whereby the sign fulfils the roles of a symbol, symptom, and signal. In the subsequent instance, if the sign conveys emotion, it must have an equivalent role in an abstract context. The third axiom integrates four concepts: speech act, speech action, linguistic text, and language structure.

Thereafter, the sign was examined within the domains of communicative linguistics, pragmatics, and other linguistic disciplines. S. A. Pesina and A. I. Andryushina (2015) underscored the significance of verbal communication, the interlocutor and speaker, the conveyed information, and its mode of expression in ascertaining the substance of the sign, its referent, and its purpose. A. A. Romanovskaya (2018) examined the sign as an archaic symbol, predominantly drawing on the theories of F. de Saussure (1916) and Peirce (Chandler 2007).

Ogden-Richards' (1923) research characterises the sign through the semantic triangle, seeing it as an authentic communicative sign from a semiotic viewpoint. A communicative sign is a socially acknowledged unity of meaning and designation, encompassing both content and presentation.

Multiple interpretations exist concerning the description of the sign from various angles. Kenneth Pike (1967) examines the morpheme system, André Martinet (1985) explores the ideas of moneme and phoneme, Louis Hjelmslev (1961) emphasises structure, Vittore Pisani (1954) investigates isogloss, August Schleicher (1861) and his adherents analyse the link between language and mind, and Hartung and Vater assess the communicative function. Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager (1942) analyse the communicative function and vocal symbols, whereas Daniel Chandler (2007) investigates the category of signs and meanings. These diverse methodologies and viewpoints endeavour to delineate the indication.

The historical examination of the aforementioned sign suggests that it might include all information on the participants in verbal communication, humanity, or societal speech activities.

Nonetheless, the subsequent concerns emerge in translation studies: 1) Participants in speech communication may embody diverse nationalities, 2) all information pertaining to them may possess varying significances, 3) the addressee and addresser may utilise distinct systemic languages, 4) the process of transmitting information during translation between languages, and 5) the role of the transmitter may be executed through multiple representatives. It is apparent that translation studies topics have been neglected in semiotics.

METHODS

Various methodologies have been employed in research to ascertain the core of the sign utilised in a speech act or the phrase that conveys it. Friedrich (Korolyov K. 2002) examined communicative signals using historical-comparative analysis, determining that their origins may be traced to the first instances of writing. Diverse meanings have been communicated using diverse symbols; for example, the quantity of knots on a thread may transmit distinct messages: three knots may denote "I love you," but four knots would indicate a reciprocation of affection. The Russian linguist S. G. Barkhudarov (1938) systematically analysed the evolution of the letters in the Russian alphabet using the oldest examples of writing.

O. I. Tayupova and L.G. Yusupova (2014) examined the sign using sociolinguistic approaches, elucidating the interpretation of the communicator's speech and the precise grasp of the communicated message. This is applicable just to users of a single language.

N. V. Voloshin performed a pragmatic study, illustrating the unique characteristics of sign usage in communication and the correlation of diverse meanings to the interpretation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Every utterance in discourse serves not just to articulate concepts and information but also to communicate a certain emotion. The foundation of speech culture is established by the literary

language, which serves multiple functions, including communicative, interactive, and perceptive roles. A specific area within linguistics is dedicated to the study of communication, analysing the expressions of language in direct action and the transformations that take place throughout the communication process. The study of this specific aspect of language within the field of linguistics is known as its “communicative-pragmatic aspect.”

Linguists have not yet reached a consensus on the communicative aspects involved in the process of learning the literary language. The challenges associated with the elements that define the unique characteristics of speech culture as a core linguistic discipline remain unresolved. These include:

1. the question of literary norms and its theoretical and cultural significance;
2. the management aspect, which encompasses situations such as safeguarding the mother tongue from various negative influences and providing support for it.

It is important to acknowledge that numerous studies have been carried out regarding the culture of speech, and they reveal the presence of four primary centres.

In a communicative act, individuals who explain and express information participate. In the communication process, the sender and the receiver exchange information that consists of various signs, namely verbal and non-verbal means. The signs characteristic of speech are studied from the perspective of “semiotics” (Rozental 1976), while non-verbal signs are examined from the standpoint of “paralinguistics” (Rozental 1976).

A. F. Losev (1982) states, “a sign is an expression and indicator of a certain linguistic meaning.”

The renowned English philosopher Bertrand Russell (1905) articulated that the essence of language encompasses not merely a method of communication but also the integration of various elements. This implies that the spoken word, image, gesture, and other perceptible forms must elicit an idea regarding something that is typically unfamiliar. When this occurs, the observable

element designated as a “sign” or “symbol” leading to the development of a concept concerning their “meaning” (Panov 1983).

Y. V. Rozhdestvensky (1990) highlights that “language functions as a medium for communication among various sign systems and is manifested through human speech activity.” This language should embody the following attributes:

1. accurately represent reality;
2. facilitate the teaching of other signs;
3. issue commands and offer guidance, thereby fulfilling its intended function efficiently.

Numerous events and circumstances in life necessitate human communication. This natural rule plays a crucial role in the evolution of languages. The proliferation of communication fosters societal advancement and enhances linguistic complexity. In this sense, written discourse is regarded as one of the most comprehensive modes of communication. This communication can also be achieved through translation between languages. For example, we will analyze Jack London's work *Martin Eden* and its translated versions in Russian and Uzbek.

Original text

«This man Swineburne», he began, attempting to put his plan into execution and pronouncing the i long.

«Who?»

«Swineburne,» he repeated, with the same mispronunciation.»The poet.»

«Swinburne,» she corrected.

Translated text into Russian

– *Этот... Свайнберн, – начал он, осуществляя свой план, но при этом делая ошибку в произношении.*

– *Кто?*

– *Свайнберн, – повторил он, – поэт.*

– *Суйнберн, – поправила она его.*

Translated Uzbek text

– *Халиги... Свайнберн, –деб Мартин ўз режасини амалга оширишига киришди-ю, аммо бу сўзни янглиш талаффуз этди.*

- *Ким?*
- *Свайнберн, –деб такрорлади йигит, –шоир.*
- *Суинберн, – деб қиз унинг сўзини тўзатди.*

Original text reveals that:

1. The interaction occurs between two individuals;
2. The aim of their conversation is for the two young people to enhance their understanding of one another;
3. The interests of the participants are reflected in the same aspect.

All three texts provide social information, which includes the following:

1. One participant demonstrates intellectual capabilities;
2. The second participant lacks literacy;
3. The communicators represent diverse social classes.

The translations in Russian and Uzbek accurately represent the content of the text in English. The next sample extracted from Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Hound of the Baskervilles*:

Original English text

You saw this?
 As clearly as I see you.
 And you said nothing?
 What was the use?
 How was it that no one else saw it?
 The marks were some twenty yards from the body and no one gave them a thought. I don't suppose I should have done so had I not known this legend.
 There are many sheep-dogs on the moor?
 No doubt, but this was no sheep-dog.
 You say it was large?
 Enormous.

Russian translated version

- *Высамихвидели?*
- *Точно так же, как вижу вас.*

- *И ничего об этом не сказали!*
- *А зачем?*
- *Неужели, кроме вас, их никто не видел?*
- *Они были шагах в тридцати от тела, и на них, вероятно, просто не обратили внимания. Я бы сам ничего не заметил, если б не вспомнил легенду.*
- *На болотах, должно быть, много овчарок?*
- *Разумеется. Но это была не овчарка.*
- *Вы говорите, что следы очень большие?*
- *Огромные.*

Uzbek version of a translated text

- *Ўша изларни ўзингиз кўрдингизми?*
- *Худди сизни кўргандек кўрдим.*
- *Бу хусусда ҳеч нима демасиз-да!*
- *Айтиб нима қилардим?*
- *Наҳотки, ўша изларни сиздан бошқа ҳеч ким кўрмаган бўлса?*
- *Мен ўша изларни ўлик ётган жойдан ўттиз қадам нарида кўрдим, шунинг учун ҳам ҳеч ким эътибор бермаган бўлса керак. Агар афсона эсимга тушмаганда эди, ўзим ҳам ҳеч бир нарсани пайқамаган бўлардим.*
- *Ботқоқликда този итлар кўп бўлса керак?*
- *Кўп, албатта. Лекин излар този итники эмас эди.*
- *Изларни жуда катта деддингизми?*
- *Жуда ҳам баҳайбат.*

The dialogue in the extract occurs between two persons, showing that:

1. The employment of personal pronouns implies a degree of formality in the discourse;
2. The objective of the dialogue is to get comprehensive information regarding the murder and to elucidate it to some extent;
3. The communication indicators employed to convey purpose encompass linguistic aspects such as a) confirming a notion (As clearly as I see you/ *Точно так же, как вижу вас/ Худди сизни кўргандек кўрдим*); b) offering clarification (no sheep-dog/ *не овчарка/ този итники эмас, large/ очень*

большие/ жуда катта, enormous/огромные) among others.

Through the process of questioning, concepts are elucidated, and a successful response signifies that the recipient has attained their objective. Analyses indicate that most of the linguistic units conveying human thinking in the text are initially comprehended through the substance of the creative work and the techniques utilised by the author, followed by the translation process. The translated text evolves and enhances according to the translator's varied perspectives.

The participation of every individual within society through this sign establishes the foundation for its evolution into a paralinguistic instrument. Communicative signs denote distinct concepts that signify specific events, phenomena, objects, or an individual's condition. Verbal communication articulated through words, whereas non-verbal communication transmitted via gestures, sounds, and facial expressions. These signs represented equally in artistic texts. L. A. Vvedenskaya (2005) classifies non-verbal communication into rhythmic, emotional, demonstrative, figurative, and symbolic signs. We believe it is crucial to examine the signals that convey the notions identified by L.A. Vvedenskaya (2005) from a linguistic standpoint.

1. *Rhythmic sign*

a. *селенáвинà | крѣшкà поднесъ пивà пья.*

This passage is extracted from M. P. Pogodin's *A Tale of Sorrow and Pain*, composed in the 17th-18th century. The vowels "a" in the words *селенá, винà, крѣшкà, пивà, пья*, together with the vowels "i" and "u" in the lexeme *поднесъ*, create harmony among the words, imparting a musical character to the text. This process is further enhanced by rhythmic elements, including logical emphasis and pauses.

b. Two households, both alike in **dignity** (1),
In fair Verona, where we lay our **scene** (2),

From ancient grudge break to new **mutiny** (1),
Where civil blood makes civil hands **unclean**(2).

Russian version

Две равно уважаемых семьи (1)

В Вероне, где встречают нас события (2),

Ведут междоусобные бои (1)

И не хотят унять кровопролитья (2).

Uzbek version of translated text

Бизнинг Веронада икки хонадон (1)

Аслу насаблари эрур баробар (2),

Улар низоларга киришиб ҳар он (1)

Шу шаҳар аҳлига етказди зарар (2).

This passage is extracted from William Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, illustrating a rhythmic characteristic. The English sentence features a rhyme between the lexical components "dignity – mutiny" (1) and "scene – dirty" (2), producing a rhythmic impact. While the Russian and Uzbek translations do not conclude with identical phonetic endings as the original, the Russian version incorporates the terms *семьи – бои* (1) and *события – кровопролитья* (2), whereas the Uzbek translation contains the lexical units *хонадон – он* (1) and *баробар – зарар* (2), which similarly rhyme, thereby maintaining the original rhythm.

The use of additional musical components to convey rhythmic indications enhances the emotional depth and intensity of speech. The sample from Ruth Smelter's poem 'My Vigil' employs the recurrence of the consonant sound "s" in the phrases *silver, stars* and *sky*, imparting a melodic feel to the text:

- c. The silver stars shine in the sky,
The night wind murmurs low

2. *Expressions of emotion encompass movements*

Such as slapping, striking the table with a fist, and analogous behaviours:

- a. She **shoved him away** from her, but not before he caught a glimpse of her moist eyes.

Translation in Russian

Она *оттолкнула* его, но он все-таки успел заметить ее слезы.

Uzbek translated text

У Мартинни *итариб юборди*, лекин Мартин опасининг кўзлари ёшланганини, барибир, кўриб қолди.

The translations of this line into Russian and Uzbek employ expressive emotional indicators, namely – shove away – *оттолкнуть* – *итарибюбормоқ*, and with the phrase “shove away” having similar variations in both Russian and Uzbek languages.

- b. «Yes, that's the chap,» he stammered, his **cheeks hot** again.» How long since he died?»

Translation into Russian

– Да, он самый, – проговорил он, снова *покраснев*. – Давно он умер?

Uzbek translated text

– Ҳа, ўша, – деб гапира бошлади Мартин яна *чўгдай қизариб*, – ўлганига анча бўлганми?

In the English literature, the emotive term “cheek hot” denotes the redness of both cheeks. Russian and Uzbek translators have employed the vocabulary units *покраснев* (reddened) and *чўгдайқизариб* (*blushing*) to accurately translate the original phrase *cheek hot*. The translator accurately employed the term *қизармоқ* (to blush) in the Uzbek rendition, aligning with the Russian translation and fully conveying the original text’s meaning. In certain instances, emotional sentiments also communicated through textual sentences. For instance:

- c. *Хурсандчилик*: As he entered his eyes fell upon the stick in Holmes's hand, and he rantowardsit with **an exclamation of joy**.

Russian version

Как только наш гость вошел в комнату, его взгляд тотчас же упал на палку в руках Холмса, и он с *радостным криком* потянулся за ней.

Uzbek translated text

У хонамизга кириши биланоқ, дарҳол кўзи Холмснинг қўлидаги ҳассага тушиди. *Хурсанд бўлиб, қичқириб*, ҳассага қўл узатди.

The phrases indicated in the text express joy.

- d. *Норозилик ва ачиниш: "Dear, dear, that's bad!" said Holmes, shaking his head*.
 –*Ай-ай, как это скверно!* –сказал Холмс, *покачивая головой*.
 –*Ҳай, ҳай, жуда чакки бўлган экан-да!* – деди Холмс *бошини силкитиб*.

The interjections used in the text, such as “Dear, dear,” – *Ай-ай* – *Ҳай, ҳай* convey a sense of pity, while the phrases “shaking his head” – *покачивая головой* – *бошини силкитиб*” embody characteristics of discontent.

- e. Doubt and hesitation: “I **laughed incredulously** as Sherlock Holmes leaned back in his settee and blew little wavering rings of smoke up to the ceiling”.

Russian translated text

Я недоверчиво рассмеялся, а Шерлок Холмс откинулся на спинку дивана и пустил в потолок маленькие, плавно колеблющиеся в воздухе кольца дыма.

Uzbek version

Мен ишонмагандай жилмайиб қўйдим, Шерлок Холмс эса диванга суяниб, папироснинг тутунини ҳалқа-ҳалқа қилиб пуфлаб ўтираверди.

Used expressions such as “laughed incredulously” – *недоверчиво рассмеялся* – *ишонмагандай жилмайиб қўйдим* convey uncertainty and indecision in the stated extracts. The contextual meaning in English fully expressed in Russian and Uzbek languages. The translation of expressive signals in Russian matches the original in both number and substance. In the Uzbek translation, the verb *қўйдим* employed with the adverb *жилмайиб* resulting in a discrepancy in the number of lexemes compared to the original.

Emotional expressions expressed through both major and auxiliary components of speech, including pronouns.

3. *Signs expressing gestures and signals*a. **Juliet**

Come **hither**, nurse. What is **yond** gentleman?

Nurse

The son and heir of old Tiberio.

Juliet

What's he **that** now is going out of door?

Nurse

Marry, **that**, I think, be young Petrucio.

Russian translated text

Джульетта. Кормилица, послушай:

*Кто **этот** гость у выхода в углу?*

Кормилица. Сын и наследник старика Тиберио.

*Джульетта. А **этот** вот, который стал в дверях?*

*Кормилица. А **это**, кажется, Петруччо-младший.*

Uzbek translation of the text

Жульетта (энагага)

Бу ёққа кел. Қани айт-чи, ким у афанди?

Энага

Тиберио чолнинг ўгли ҳам ворисидир.

Жульетта

*Эшиклардан чиқаятган **анов** йигит-чи?*

Энага

Янглишмасам, назаримда ёш Петруччо.

Throughout English literature, terms such as “hither” and “yond” are prevalent throughout Shakespeare’s writings. The English term “yond” functions as a demonstrative pronoun, translating to *этот* in Russian and having a comparable version in Uzbek. The omission of the translation for the pronoun “hither” has led to an erroneous depiction of the content in the Russian text. In Uzbek, the pronoun “hither” serves as an analogous expression for *бу ёққа*. The English demonstrative pronoun “that” is rendered as *этот* in Russian and *анов* in Uzbek. Presently, the pronouns “hither” and “yond” have evolved into “here” and “there” functioning as demonstrative indicators:

- b. «Come **here**, Alfred,» he called to the crying child, at the same time thrusting his hand into his trousers pocket, where he carried his money loose in the same large way that he lived life in general.

Russian translated text

– *Иди сюда, Альфред, – крикнул он плачущему ребенку и запустил руку в карман, где у него лежали деньги. К деньгам он относился небрежно, в этом сказывалась его широкая натура.*

Uzbek translation of the text

– *Бу ёққа кел, Альфред! – деб чақирди у йиглаб турган жиянини ва ён чўнтагига қўлини тикди. У пулга бепарқ эди, бу унинг қўли очиқлигини кўрсатарди.*

The terms included in the translations of the English text into Russian and Uzbek denote an indication of reference. The employment of descriptive symbols in the texts is also significant. They are particularly prevalent in the writings of Shakespeare.

4. *Descriptive Signs*a. **Romeo**

What is her mother?

Nurse

Marry, bachelor,

Her mother is the lady of the house,

And a good lady, and a wise and virtuous

Translation text in Russian

Ромео. А кто она?

Кормилица. Да вы-то сами где?

Она глава семьи, хозяйка дома.

Я в мамках тут и выходила дочь.

Translation in Uzbek

Ромео

Онаси ким?

Энага

Онт ичаман, сизга, эй йигит,

Оналари бека бўлур бу хонадонга,

Илтифоткор, кўп оқила бир бонудир у,

The literary fragment utilizes a descriptive symbol associated with a “woman,” incorporating a demonstrative sign as well. The examples presented distinctly illustrate *она* (mother, *мать*) and

ҳасса (stick, *налка*). Another example of a symbol included in the English language is a symbolic mark.

5. *Symbolic signs*

- a. She **nodded her head** resignedly.
Translation of the Russian language
Жена покорно кивнула головой.
Uzbek translated text
Хотин итоаткорона бош иргатди.

The lexical components in these phrases, such as “nodded head” – *кивнула головой* – *бош иргатди* convey agreement.

- b. Still his wife **sighed, shook her head** sorrowfully, and stitched on.
Russian version
Но жена по прежнему только вздыхала, качала головой и продолжала шить.
Translation in Uzbek
Лекин хотин бояги-боягича фақат хўрсинар, бош чайқар ва ямоқ ямаида давом этарди.

The concept of *чуқур нафас олиш* is articulated in both English and Russian, but its translation into Uzbek employs a method of logical generalisation. The English terms “sighed” and “shook her head” together with their Russian and Uzbek equivalents, *вздыхала* and *качала головой* – *хўрсинар* and *бошчайқар* convey a sentiment of sorrow.

- c. **No, no**, my dear Watson, not all – by no means all.
Russian version
– *Нет, нет, дорогой мой Уотсон, не все, далеко не все.*
Translation in Uzbek
– *Йўқ, йўқ, азизим Уотсон, ҳамма гап асло шунда эмас.*

The terms specified in the phrases in English, together with their equivalents in Russian and Uzbek, express a notion of negation.

- d. Holmes leaned back in his chair, **placed his finger-tips together, and closed his eyes**, with an air of resignation.

Откинувшись на спинку кресла. Холмс сомкнул концы пальцев и с видом полной покорности судьбе закрыл глаза.

Холмс креслога суяниб олиб, бармоқларини бир-бирига туташтирди ва тақдирга батамом тан берган кишидек кўзларини юмиб олди.

The visuals included in the text convey a sense of contemplation. Communicative signals transmitted via “hand,” “head,” and “face” motions, for instance:

- e. Dr. Mortimer **blinked** through his glasses in mild astonishment. “Why was it bad?”

Доктор Мортимер изумленно заморгал глазами:

– А что же тут скверного?

Доктор Мортимер таажжубланиб, кўзини жавдирадди:

– Бунингимасичакки?

The words indicated in the text convey a sense of astonishment. Through the examples analyzed, the following communicative signs were identified in Table 1:

Table 1. *Communicative signs analyzed in three languages*

No.	Original text	Russian translation	Uzbek translation	Explanation
Signs that express emotions				
1.	Shoved away	<i>Оттолкнула</i>	<i>итариб юборди</i>	Being offended
2.	Cheeks hot	<i>Покраснев</i>	<i>чўгдай қизариб</i>	To be shy
3.	An exclamation of joy	<i>радостным криком</i>	<i>хурсанд бўлиб, қичқариб,</i>	Happiness
4.	Dear, dear	<i>Ай-ай</i>	<i>Ҳай, ҳай</i>	To feel pity
5.	Shaking his head	<i>покачивая головой</i>	<i>бошини силкитиб</i>	Disagreement
6.	Laughed incredulously	<i>недоверчиво рассмеялся</i>	<i>ишонмагандай жилмайиб кўйдим</i>	Hesitation
Signs expressing gestures				
7.	Hither	-	<i>бу ёққа</i>	Demonstrative
8.	Yond	<i>этот</i>	<i>у</i>	Demonstrative
9.	That	<i>этот</i>	<i>анов</i>	Demonstrative
10.	Here	<i>сюда</i>	<i>бу ёққа</i>	Demonstrative
Descriptive signs				
11.	her mother	<i>она</i>	<i>у</i>	The descriptive sign indicates to whom it belongs through the exchange of information.

Symbolic signs				
12	Nodded her head	<i>кивнула головой</i>	<i>бои иргатди</i>	Agreement
13	Sighed	<i>вздыхала</i>	<i>хўрсинар</i>	Unhappiness
14	Shook her head	<i>качала головой</i>	<i>бои чайқар</i>	Disagreement
15	No, no	<i>Нет, нет</i>	<i>Йўқ, йўқ</i>	Disagreement
16	Placed his finger-tips together	<i>сомкнул концыпальцев</i>	<i>бармоқларини бир-бирига туташтирди</i>	Pensive
17	Closed his eyes	<i>закрывает глаза</i>	<i>кўзларини юмиб олди</i>	Pensive
18.	Blinked	<i>заморгал</i>	<i>кўзини жавдиратди</i>	Fear

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the examples presented above indicates that communicative signs are present in various systemic languages, including English, Russian, and Uzbek literary texts. In literary texts, communicative signs interpreted based on the context or through the explicit naming of the action. Through the analysis of the spoken discourse within the communication process, one can ascertain the action that has executed. In the literary texts of English, Russian, and Uzbek, communicative signs conveyed not only through hand gestures, but also through facial and eye expressions. In conclusion, the texts in English have expertly translated into Russian and Uzbek.

Jack London's *Martin Eden* and its Russian and Uzbek translations offer sociological insights about the dynamics of interaction between two individuals, the objectives of their dialogue, and the interests of the participants. The Russian and Uzbek translations faithfully convey the substance of the English text.

In Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, the original English text faithfully conveys the material in both languages. The Russian and Uzbek translations faithfully convey the English text's substance, emphasising the significance of grasping the subtleties of communication across different fields.

Communication is the clarification of concepts, language, and information, enabling reciprocal understanding. The cornerstone of speech culture is rooted in literary language,

which fulfils several tasks, including communicative, interactive, and perceptive roles. The examination of communication within linguistics is referred to as its “communicative-pragmatic aspect.”

Linguists have struggled to achieve consensus on the communication elements required in acquiring the literary language. The issues related to the factors that delineate the distinctive features of speech culture as a fundamental linguistic discipline remain unaddressed. Extensive research has been conducted on the culture of speech, identifying four principal centres: verbal and non-verbal modalities.

The core of language includes not only a means of communication but also the amalgamation of many components. Verbal communication, imagery, gestures, and other discernible forms must provoke an understanding of concepts that are generally unknown. Language serves as a conduit for communication among diverse sign systems and is expressed via human verbal action.

Communicative signals are unique notions that indicate certain occurrences, phenomena, objects, or an individual's state. Verbal communication is conveyed through words, whereas non-verbal communication is expressed through gestures, noises, and facial expressions. L.A. Vvedenskaya categorises non-verbal communication into rhythmic, emotive, demonstrative, figurative, and symbolic indicators.

The examination of communication in Uzbek, Russian, and English texts is essential for comprehending its distinct attributes and the influence of language on communication. The phrase “cheek hot” which is translated into Russian and Uzbek utilising emotive markers, such as “shove away” and *итарибюбормоқ*. The evocative phrase “cheek hot” in English literature denotes the redness of both cheeks. The Uzbek phrase *қизармоқ* (to blush) is correctly used, corresponding with the Russian translation and effectively communicating the original text's meaning.

Emotional expressions are conveyed by literary phrases, such as *хурсандчилик* (joy), *ҳорозилик ва ачиниш* and “doubt and hesitation.” The contextual meaning in English, is completely

conveyed in both Russian and Uzbek languages. The translation of expressive signals in Russian corresponds to the original in both quantity and content, however, the Uzbek translation exhibits a disparity in the number of lexemes relative to the original. Emotive expressions are conveyed through both primary and secondary elements of speech, including pronouns. The text in Uzbek, Russian, and English is a literary excerpt that employs descriptive symbols related to femininity and demonstrative indicators.

In conclusion, the Uzbek and Russian texts efficiently express pondering and emotion through diverse linguistic symbols. The thesis emphasises the significance of comprehending the distinctions between the two languages and the utilisation of symbols and demonstrative indicators in linguistic communication.

REFERENCES

- Bloch, B. & Trager, G. L. (1942). *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, Waverly Press.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Buysens, É. (1943). *Essai de linguistique fonctionnelle dans le cadre de la sémiologie*. Brussels: Éditions de l'Institut de Sociologie.
- Carnap, R. (1947). *Meaning and Necessity: A Study in Semantics and Modal Logic*. University of Chicago Press.
- Champollion, J. F. (1824). *Précis du système hiéroglyphique des anciens Égyptiens* (Summary of the Hieroglyphic System of the Ancient Egyptians). Paris.
- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The Basics* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Cobley, P., & Jansz, L. (1997). *Introducing Semiotics*. Icon Books.
- Durkheim, E. (1912). *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Paris: Alcan.
- Evans, A. (1909). *Scripta Minoa: The Written Documents of Minoan Crete*. Oxford University Press.
- Frege, G. (1892). "Über Sinn und Bedeutung." *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, 100, 25–50. Translated as

- "On Sense and Reference" in *Translations from the Philosophical Writings of Gottlob Frege*, edited by P. Geach and M. Black, 1952.
- Gasparov, M. L. (2001.) *The Stories of Herodotus About the Greco-Persian Wars and Much More*. Moscow: Soglasie, 228 pages. (in Russian)
- Hermes, G. *Einleitung in die christkatholische Theologie: Philosophische Einleitung*. 1819.
- Hjelmslev, L. (1961). *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Korniyenko, M. A. *The Role of the Word as a Linguistic Sign in the Communicative Space of Social Interaction* / M. A. Korniyenko; Scientific Advisor: M. S. Kukhta // *Resource-Efficient Systems in Management and Control: A Look into the Future*: Collection of Scientific Papers from the 5th International Conference for School Students, University Students, Postgraduates, and Young Scientists, Tomsk, October 3–8, 2016. In 3 volumes. – Tomsk: TPU Publishing House, 2016. – Vol. 3. – [pp. 23–30]. (in Russian)
- Korolyov, K. (2002.) *The History of Writing: The Evolution of Writing from Ancient Egypt to Modern Times*. Moscow: Eksmo, 324 pages. (in Russian)
- Losev, A. F. (1982.) *Sign. Symbol. Myth*. Moscow: Moscow University Publishing House, P. 33. (in Russian)
- Martinet, A. (1985). *Syntaxe générale*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Morris, C. (1938). *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*. Published as part of the *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* (Volume 1, Number 2), edited by Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap, and Charles Morris. Publisher: University of Chicago Press.
- —. (1946). *Signs, Language, and Behavior*. Publisher: Prentice Hall, New York.
- Nöldeke, T. (1898). *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Contributions to Semitic Linguistics).
- Obnorsky, S. P. & Barkhudarov, S. G. (1938) *Anthology on the History of the Russian Language*. Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, 320 pages. (in Russian)
- Ogden, C. K. & Richards, I. A. (1923). *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- Panov, E. N. (1983) *Signs, Symbols, Languages*. Moscow: Znanie, P. 67. (in Russian)

- Pesina, S. A. & Andryushina, A. I. (2015) *Sign Processes in Communication // Science and Modernity*. Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk. (in Russian)
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Pisani, V. (1954). *Manuale dei dialetti italiani*. Bologna: Pàtron.
- Romanovskaya, A. A. (2018) *The Antique Symbol as a Communicative Linguistic Sign // Regional Onomastics: Problems and Prospects of Research: Collection of Scientific Articles / Edited by A. M. Mezenko*. – Vitebsk: P. M. Masherov Vitebsk State University, 327 pages. (in Russian)
- Rozhdestvensky, Yu. V. (1990) *Lectures on General Linguistics*. Moscow: Higher School, P. 64. (in Russian)
- Rozental, D. E. & Telenkova, M. A. *Dictionary-Guide of Linguistic Terms*. 2nd ed. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1976. – 366 pages. (in Russian)
- Russell, B. (1905). *On Denoting*. *Mind*, 14(56), 479–493. Oxford University Press. DOI:10.1093/mind/XIV.4.479
- Saussure, F. de. (1916). *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, with the collaboration of Albert Riedlinger. Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Vvedenskaya, L. A. & Chervinsky, P. P. (2005). *Theory and Practice of Russian Speech. Difficult Topics*. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg: Piter, 368 pages. (in Russian)

OTAJONOVA DILDOR BAKHTIYAROVNA
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR,
CHIRCHIK STATE PEDAGOGICAL
UNIVERSITY, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <PRINCESS1986@BK.RU>