

## SYMBOLIZATION AND ITS ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT OF SIGN THEORY

<sup>a</sup>PANAKHLI SURA TARIYEL

*Azerbaijan Medical University, 167, Samad Vurghun Str., Nasimi, Baku, AZ1022, Azerbaijan*  
email: <sup>a</sup>sara-1983@mail.ru

**Abstract:** Symbols are one of the universals of culture. Many fields of humanities have a special role in the theoretical and cultural-historical study of the symbol. Sociocultural, religious, political, and artistic symbolism, its interpretation is explained from different points of view. In logical-philosophical and semiotic research, symbols are presented as a type of sign. The process of sign and symbol differentiation is a very important problem. Symbols and signs are considered to be an integral part of modern culture and human consciousness. Symbolization is a key part of the communicative space of culture. The study of symbolism is the basis of social forecasting. In the theoretical analysis of the symbol, it is presented in the process of values and perception, in the dynamics of sociocultural functionalization. The analytical context of sociocultural axiology is of special importance in the understanding of the symbol. Symbols can be understood as a mechanism for the functioning of mass consciousness. The study of the symbol at the international, intercultural, and interreligious levels is of particular importance. The study of the axiological nature of the symbol prevents its perception in the semiotic framework, creates conditions for the study of the socio-cultural development of the human mentality, the functioning of individual and social consciousness.

**Keywords:** historical and cultural phenomenology; culture of the transition period; system of socio-cultural values; formation of human personality; theoretical analysis of the symbol; intercultural and interreligious relations; evolution of sociocultural semiosis

### 1 Introduction

The symbolism of primitive community culture is mainly observed within religious rituals. This symbolism serves the function of biological and social values. The initial symbolization was connected with the practical activity of man and with the religious ideas of each ethnos. The symbols embodied in the religious rituals of the Australian aborigines represent the comfortable and rich life of each person and society as a whole. In the imagination of the ancients, these rituals were performed to maintain secular and social order, comfort and happiness. The symbolic expression of the social order of the world is depicted in the person of the tribal leader, and later in the person of the monarch, tsar or emperor. This is one of the most stable and cultural archetypes. These archetypes have been presented for centuries as symbols of European, Byzantine, and Russian culture. For example, for many years in Russia, the coronation of the new tsar was symbolically associated with his resemblance to Jesus [4, p. 263-274]. The symbolic culture of each monarch became more visible during social changes and revolutions. In the French Revolution, the assassination of the king was considered a symbolic rebellion against God [21, p. 26-29].

In mythology and art history, the symbol has not been adequately explored, equating it with a sign. Symbols represented in sign systems are considered secondary symbols. Unlike signs, symbols are distinguished by their logic and non-differentiability.

### 2 Materials and Method

During this scientific research, the scientific and theoretical literature on the subject is analyzed and the facts of the Traikh language are referred to. In order to analyze this material, the historical-comparative research method was used in the theoretical aspect.

### 3 Results and Discussion

The perception of the world in symbolic forms in the human mind is a semiotic idea. According to M. S. Kagan, symbols are a means of semantization and interpretation of the surrounding world [10, p. 118-119]. The original characters previously existed as objects. This symbolic object is valued as both a moving and evolving value.

According to S. S. Averintsev, the symbol became semantically included in the sign system of mythology. The unity of the emotional image and the ideal meaning is the essence of the

sign. Symbols, unlike myths, are a combination of an object and its action. Myth is a method of rationalization of the symbolic essence. The text contains the situational frame, the character of the symbol when taken as a frame. For example, the meal ceremony has been unique in the history of mankind in every nation [1, p. 166-169].

The feast was sometimes considered an archetypal symbol. However, the semantics of this symbol is always determined by the text. In this respect, the dining ceremony of the Bushmen or any other civilized people living in Australia is different. This meal ceremony cannot be taken as a symbol or sign. The syncretism of the symbol, the versatility of meaning, connects it with the mythological consciousness. The syncretism of the symbol is an expression of the syncretism of the myth, which is perceived as an epistemological paradoxical and axiological duality. Early symbolism can be seen as an integral part of mythological consciousness. Characters can be considered primary in relation to ritual and myth.

Symbols can be taken as expressions of many signs and semiotic organizations in the human mind. It should be noted that the relationship between the symbol and the text (ritual) is asymmetric dualism. Symbols are sometimes considered part of the discourse. In the initial symbolization, the functions of the language come to the fore. V. V. Nalimov connects the symbol with the connotative function and notes that the symbol is discourse and pragmatic, while the myth is connected with the text [15, p. 102-105]. Research shows that the structural characteristics of characters and myths are measured over time. The potential time of the symbol is relevant in mythological plots of different periods. From this point of view, the myth (ritual) is of a supernatural nature.

The internal form of this myth can be considered a symbol. Symbols represent the result of a process of binary conceptualization. The symbolism of reality is its categorization in language. This is perceived as a symbolic reality. From the point of view of the bearer of any culture, a symbol is the identity of an object and its meaning and value. That is, in general, in fact, there are no symbols - the same thing can be embodied as a symbol or not. Characters do not exist, but only a symbolization process. It is clear from observation that a symbol is a symbolic organization, and its system of meanings is a semantic invariant of many sign systems. These sign systems include myths, art, language, and rituals. Therefore, the carrier of culture and its observer stand in different positions in the same process.

#### *Symbolism*

From the point of view of the carrier of culture, "the symbol is semantized in the text" [6, p. 334]. In European culture, the position of the observer is reflected in the category of symbols. In this case, the symbol represents the position of both the carrier of culture and the observer of this culture. In this case, it is necessary to speak from two types of observation positions. The first observer also expresses the position of the bearer of the same culture. The second observer is not the bearer of that culture, that is, he represents another culture. However, it comes from the research position of that culture. This observer is not a carrier of the culture under study, and the cultural and historical features of that culture are foreign to him. In this case, the characters act as semantic invariants of many texts and approach the concept. Namely this feature of the symbol is important in the study of modern cultures.

In many cultures, symbolism is not only not fully studied, but even not properly described. According to M. Mamardashvili and A. Pyatigorsky, within European culture, symbols become cultural symbols [14, p. 94-95]. Reality is sometimes perceived in a symbolic form. However, this perception of reality is associated with emotional and sometimes affective necessity. Unlike myth, the signs of the first cultural symbolism are to be

found in man's motivated, involuntary, and sometimes instinctive actions. In this case, it is necessary not to overlook the second symbolism formed on the basis of texts. In addition, the process of symbolization, which is formed in the human brain on the basis of texts and is the product of individual creativity of each person, should not be forgotten. According to P. Reeker, it is necessary to speak about the dual nature of the symbol: the perceived image and the verbal dialogue [16, p. 243-244]. Symbols have a sense of feeling and verbal unity and are part of the mental process. According to K. Aydukevich, symbols are non-articular judgments, they exist in the imagination of the carrier of culture [2, p. 309-312].

#### *Diachronic analysis of a symbol*

The separation of a symbol from the diffuse unity of time and life leads to its semantization and meaning. In the perception of the sense of the carrier of culture, the characters participate in the process of cultural functionalization. In this sense, a symbol is not an object, a sign, or a text - it is just a situation of hermeneutic events. One of the main functions of the symbol is its position in the history of human culture. The symbol serves as the organizer of human social life. Unlike signs and myths, which have a complex semiotic structure, symbols have a simpler structure and function only in the text. Symbols are not included in the communication sphere. All this allows clarifying the semiotic nature of the symbol, explaining its role in the process of semiosis and in comparison with the sign. Tracking the historical evolution of a symbol allows modeling its socio-cultural functions, semantics and typology. This determines people's social morals, forms of activity and value system.

Diachronic analysis of a symbol considers two aspects: 1. Symbol functionality should be seen as a communicative situation. The transmission of information, which is important for culture and performs the function of social organization through symbolism, facilitates the inclusion of the symbol in the text and its interpretation. 2. The functionality of the symbol can be considered as a hermeneutic situation. The change of the symbol in the system of socio-cultural communication creates conditions for understanding the special symbolism of culture. This is a culture that has its own special symbolism. The basis of the symbol is the function of cultural autoreflection.

Symbols can be understood, on the one hand, as part of the landscape of any period, and, on the other hand, as the embodiment of metaphysical forms of this worldview, as their points of intersection. This leads to dual research: the analysis of the structures of human consciousness and the study of specific sociocultural phenomenology. Symbols include the results of perceptual and value activities on the one hand, and conceptualization and verbalization on the other. The functionalization of meaning and values in the collective consciousness is an expression of the initial cultural reflection. Symbols - anthroposocioculture - is a concrete embodiment of the essence of value. Therefore, the process of symbol functionalization takes place in the "symbol — sign" process. Thus, the characters enter the sign system. Both cultures can be creators of characters. Only in European culture, there is the category of characters created by autoreflection.

As a method of self-awareness and self-expression of culture, the category of symbols acts as a transition from the traditional model to the level of functionalization, structuring, and categorization of culture. According to I.M. Kuznetsov, symbols are characterized by the function of interpretation, actualizing in the process of sociocultural communication. Symbols can be expressed in two types of discourse [11, p. 31-32]. Symbols form the basis of theoretical discourse (i.e., scientific, religious, philosophical, aesthetic, etc.) as well as artistic and domestic discourse.

The process of symbolization can go on several levels:

1. Explaining the state of affect and rituals through mythology in memory. Early it is archetypes, later - the

form of motivation at higher levels of development of consciousness.

2. Interpretation of affect and rituals through mythology.
3. The role of symbolism based on cultural tradition in the process of sacredization.
4. Origin of character terms and character categories. Thus, it can be concluded that symbols are characterized by their impact on the human mind and their axiological (value) nature.

Symbolism, on the other hand, involves a number of cognitive transitions. Symbols are a way of presenting meanings and values that are universal to culture. These meanings and values are formed in the process of practical and creative activity. Symbolization based on moral, religious, and aesthetic values includes political, legal, religious, aesthetic, and ethical symbols. The model, based on the scientific differentiation and modeling of the axiosphere, includes a typology of secondary symbolic structures. This understanding of symbol and value proves once again that the relationship between symbol and value is expressed by a concept. In this regard, it should be noted that the symbols, emblems express the values of allegorical figures.

#### *Communicative social organization functions of symbols*

During the real actualization of culture, symbols perform very important communicative social organization functions. The typology of symbols expressing values functionalizes culture and society. In this sense, the direction of symbol analysis is not semantics. The objectivity of the symbol is the object of symbolic activity. In addition to human values, symbols are closely related to the concept of meaning. Symbols should be based on models of the phenomenon of consciousness studied in terms of modern psychology, logic, semiotics. A. N. Leontyev notes that the meaning of the symbol becomes clear in the process of communication and when it is an element of the text [12, p. 21-23]. The typology of a symbol is modeled on the basis of its objectivity, because the symbol contains any object or event. Symbols are embodied in the human mind as a reality perceived through the senses. The typology of symbolic forms is the same as the typology of symbolic objects. Here the natural world, man, social events and so on are included. Such typology is expressed through natural language, as opposed to the initial categorization.

Any object or event can be an object of symbolism. From this point of view, the object of this symbolization must have its own special criteria, points of reference. The typology of different fields of culture is used as a reference point in the modeling of symbolic forms that concretize and complete the object division. There are political, religious, artistic, and other symbolization that can be included.

However, it should be noted that political and artistic symbols are of a secondary nature, they are characterized by text and superstition, they enter the system of socio-cultural communication and determine their addressee and address. Character typology is based on semantic typology. Not every character is fully understood in the human mind. From this point of view, it is necessary to speak not of the division of the semantics of the symbol, but of the clarification of its semantic features. In our opinion, this feature is related to the relationship between symbols and value. Therefore, the value typology should be the basis of the character typology.

The typology of symbolic forms is based on the values and meanings that are reflected in human culture and represent a phenomenon of consciousness. The structure of the symbol is whole, syncretic, characterized as a representation of the unity of human and social cosmic existence. In other words, from the point of view of the bearer of cultural traditions, a symbol cannot be a reflection of any value. L. M. Batkin notes that every form that is emotionally perceived by the carrier of culture and cannot be explained from the point of view of logic, which is the cause of certain reactions and psychological actions, is a symbol [3, p. 27-31].

Considering that man is a biological and social being, it is clear that the object of symbolism has both a natural and a social component. In this sense, the typology of the symbol is based on the physical and individual-social characteristics of man. Initially, the process of symbolization separates man from the natural world, that is, from the biological being to the social and cultural being. Thus, before it became a symbol of art or a motif for a mythological story, "animal", "water", "man", and so on images become the embodiment of spiritual value and are symbolized.

Due to the development of society and culture, the world of human values becomes more complex and differentiated. All this creates the conditions for the evolution of the process of symbolization. The main feature of the symbol is the reflection of human values and meanings in the material world, and then in words. In this regard, it should be noted that man is a historical and cultural phenomenon. The human body, as an object of symbolism, functions not only biologically and naturally, but also as a being characterized by social and cultural values. In other words, in the early stages of its development, symbols have anthropological features.

In addition to its connection with the human body, symbols also refer to concepts related to human life and activity, such as food, clothing, household items, and so on. Signs, emblems, and images appear in connection with the symbolism of this statement. The symbols of archaic cultures are associated with the perception of human value. In the beginning, only the human body was valued as a physical being, and in later times, as a spiritual being. The symbol of the human body is reflected in Christian culture with its spiritual, moral, and creative identity. Thus, the symbolism of the human body and personality can be expressed in two forms: the deification of the personality and the revival of its social functions. In archaic cultures, facts related to human practical activities, such as hunting, can be symbolized. The facts of animal symbolism can be found in the rock paintings of Gobustan and in the caves of bears discovered during excavations.

Russian scientist A. D. Stolyar made interesting remarks on the development of human artistic activity and abstract thinking on the basis of these symbolisms [19, p. 7-16]. The animal is formed in the human imagination as a symbol of desire and fear. It should be noted that totemism, which can be considered the value of social organization, is associated with animals. An example of this is the gray wolf, which the ancient Turks considered a totem. This totem symbolizes the ancestors of the ancient Turks. In the description of these totems, namely the signs and artistic images are expressed.

Fishermen, hunting, agriculture, and animal husbandry form the basis of the initial symbolism of the purpose and subject of these activities. During the semantization of this symbolism, mythological images and imaginations are formed. For example, in the imagination of the Siberian Komi-Zeryans and Komi-Permyaks, the crane and the water spirit inhabiting this fish are symbolized. For farmers, the cult of abundance, grain, bread becomes a symbol of myths. The symbolism of some natural objects is also of special interest.

The ancient Turks worshiped the tree. The tree was a symbol of strength, power, and productivity for them. The tree was considered a symbol of height and heroism for the heroes of the "Kitabi-Dada Gorgud" epic. In the history of human culture, the practical and value activity of man has been associated with symbols. In "Kitabi-Dada Gorgud", the word "white" is used as a symbol of height, grandeur, supremacy: "I have a root on the back of a white rock tiger. In the middle of nowhere, your deer will stop, I have a root in the lion of white music, to stop the gas flame, there is a root in the male of the white owl, Get a duck, don't blow black gas" [16]. Apparently, the ancient Oghuz used the word "white", a symbol of their height and grandeur, when referring to the idols and ongons and totems they worshiped. Thus, the word "white" symbolized "height", "supremacy", "height".

In Turkish mythology, Ulgen, the god of sun and light, was called "White Ulgen". Professor M. Seyidov's opinion on this is interesting: "An ancient Yakut legend says that God sits on the top of a white mountain. According to the legend of the Abagan Tatars, the legendary Great Khagan settled at the foot of the White Mountain on the shores of the White Sea and drank from the water of this sacred sea. We learn from medieval sources that Genghis Khan's private tent was always decorated with a white flag, which was a sign of distinction between the ruler and Genghis Khan. The erection of a white flag at the head of Khagan's tent was, of course, a symbol of his divinity and greatness. The city where the Kipchak khan lived was called the White Horde (i.e., the place belonging to the ruler). In the Karakalpak folk epic "Forty Girls", the palace where the khan's daughter Gulaim lived was called "White Land". White flags were always hung over the palaces of Azerbaijani khans. These examples given in Professor M. Seyidov's monograph "Thinking about the ancestral roots of the Azerbaijani people" once again prove that in the history of the Turkic peoples, "white" is a symbol of "height", "height", "supremacy" [18, p. 159-160].

The evolution of the archaic periods of socio-cultural symbolism proves that the point of reference here is the actualization of the symbols of life and death. In both archaic and modern cultures, symbolism retains its original nature and functions not as a system of symbols, but as a continuum containing different values and meanings in a diffuse form. The integrative nature of the values that make up the essence of the symbol proves the indivisible diffuse nature of their meanings. In essence, each symbol creates an axiom in the human mind and presents forms of high universal knowledge to the carrier of culture. Language is not only a system of signs, but also is multifunctional by nature. Language can also function as a sign model in semiotic research. There is a partial correspondence between the characters and the language. Symbolic structures have different functions from language structures and can partially complement each other. Extralinguistic visistic means — gestures, facial expressions, etc. - can perform the role of a sign that actualizes the connotative and factual functions. These tools can be presented as symbols of intensity or content, as well as references or main meanings. Symbols can complete language forms that provide information in the communication process; can have informative, "cognitive and metalinguistic functions" [9]. In sign structures, symbolic meanings in the text can have a sign function.

A symbol can sometimes be understood in two ways: 1. A symbol identified by a sign, because a symbol is represented only in texts and sign systems. 2. Characters and signs are completely different from each other. The symbol is a mystical image, it does not mean anything and its meaning cannot be clarified. These two aspects of the symbol have been studied by the Russian scientist M.Y. Lotman [13, p. 102-106]. Symbols are one of the components of culture and art as a concrete form of value. Symbols are not specifically related to material culture. However, in archaic culture, they contained the values of human activity. In the early days of cultural evolution, it created symbols in the human mind. However, the symbol of the development of higher mental goals and ideal goals began to separate it from practical activity. Symbols are related to human language activity, because a special function of reflexive consciousness is always present in the symbol. Theoretically, the relationship between language and culture remains unexplored. From W. von Humboldt's anthropological philosophy to modern cognition, the world in which man lives is largely perceived as the environment in which language exists. The structure of language, its syntax and logic are perceived as a presentation of the structure of human consciousness. This world of language forms the semantic space of culture [8, p. 203-205].

Culture, perceived as a conscious space, expresses its categorical forms in words. These words become symbols in the "keywords" function and express symbols. Thus, symbols and culture are divided into several components.

1. The relationship of symbols and reality — in the light of scientific ideas of the twentieth century, the concept of reality itself changes radically.
2. The relationship between symbols and signs — symbols are not signs, but cannot be understood without sign systems. The expression of reality in the text compares symbols and signs.
3. The relationship between symbols and consciousness: symbols are one of the structures of consciousness. From this point of view, it is necessary to talk about the structure of different levels of consciousness.

This problem was investigated in the works of Z. Freud [5, p. 104-107] and later V. Nalimov [15, p. 201-203]. In our opinion, the symbol does not belong to a specific level of consciousness, which proves that the symbol is of a quantum nature and contains the mechanism of cognitive transitions between levels of consciousness. Symbol is a form that functions in culture as a structure of consciousness and is presented in the process of communication in different languages.

#### *The functional relationships between symbols and images*

The structure of the symbol is fundamentally asymmetrical. Symbols have a special place in relation to aesthetic categories. Symbols, which are directly related to the formation and functioning of value, affect human activity through the senses, turning it into an aesthetic phenomenon. In addition, as a syncretic socio-cultural phenomenon, symbol expresses theoretical reflection and is defined as an aesthetic category. Symbols are a system of aesthetic ideas and categories, forms of cultural-historical evolution and express axiological syncretism. From this point of view, the aesthetics of a symbol is considered as one of the methods of its value differentiation. Thus, logically differentiated, syncretic characters become the subject of cognitive activity and find their expression in sign systems, including aesthetic categories and concepts [20, p. 28-42].

The origin of the symbol is mainly related to Greek culture. However, the theoretical formation of the symbol is associated with medieval Christian cultures. In this case, not only new characters are created, but also models of interpretation of old characters. While in ancient culture the symbol was perceived as a sign or allegory, in Christian culture the symbol is not interpreted in terms of a sign, but the sign is symbolized. As a result, the anthropological nature of the symbol changes, visual-verbal unity is formed, and the text in which the symbol is expressed is expressed in different forms. The comprehension of the text is symmetrical for the carriers of the new culture. The whole world becomes a "hypersymbol" and a "hypertext".

As a result, the functional relationships between symbols and images are strengthened. The symbolic structure of the sign includes art and imagery. The artistic image becomes the image of the symbol. The relationship between symbol and allegory is similar to the relationship between word and image in medieval culture, where symbol represents verbalism and allegory represents visuality. Descriptive motifs of images and genres are determined by the verbal texts of the Bible. The dependence of the image on the text is felt in the system of high iconostasis in the images and elements of the church in the Middle Ages.

The high iconostasis, formed in Russia in the 15th century, represented many genres of ancient Russian art. This great symbolic unity was an abstract form of the symbolic and psychological art of the fourteenth century. The positions of the carrier of culture and its external observer (observer representing another nation) are antonyms in the interpretation of the symbol. On the one hand, the symbol is associated with theology, and on the other hand, the difficulties in its interpretation include the transcendental meaning of the symbol.

In this regard, it should be noted that the concept of symbols is polysemous. This polysemy occurs as a result of the initial syncretism of the symbol. Heidegger notes that a new attitude to the symbol has been emerging since the 17th century. During this period, the dualism (two relations) in the interpretation of

matter and consciousness influenced the study of the theory of symbols. In the human mind, the surrounding world comes to life in the form of a worldview [7, p. 31-34]. Thus, this worldview comes to life in the form of an image, is interpreted in the form of a sign, and is published in the form of a concept. The process of creating symbols becomes the result of human creative activity. In this case, the symbol is reflected in discursive thinking as a symbolic image and becomes functional in the sign aspect.

Symbols have a dual nature that exists on the border of emotion and thought. As a result, the essence of symbolic forms, their verbalism and discursiveness change. Symbols become invariants of meaning in many texts and discourses. From this point of view, the types of discourses can be noted in a synchronous framework: scientific, philosophical, artistic, metaphorical, etc. At the diachronic level, the discourses are interchangeable. In the nineteenth century, symbols had traditional meanings, which are the archetypes of national consciousness.

The complex and multifaceted forms of culture are also reflected in the symbols. Examples of cognitive models of the middle and second half of the 19th century are metaphors in the poetry of the Russian poet F. I. Tyutchev. Cognitive analysis here does not consist of explaining the imagery that arises in the mind of any individual — the poet. Tyutchev's symbols include the development of metaphor on the one hand, and on the other hand, the ancient symbolism resembles a mythological allegorism.

#### **4 Conclusion**

The basis of symbolism in culture is the phenomenology and axiology of life. All this is the basis of conceptualization at the theoretical, philosophical, and artistic levels. Such forms of conceptualization are reflected in real and symbolic art. The dichotomy (dual essence) of art and life at the theoretical, conceptual, and artistic levels allows the symbol to function as a form of a category of aesthetic and philosophical discourse.

The complexity of the socio-political and socio-cultural processes characterizing the 20th -21st centuries has also been reflected in the symbolic forms. The complexity of the times, revolutions and wars caused great changes in the culture of the twentieth century.

Symbolism is the basis of the communicative space of culture, it creates values and meanings in the minds of culture carriers. Symbols are of special importance in the culture of the transition period. The study of symbolism is the basis of social forecasting, it includes the study of the impact on people's minds, the study of personality formation.

The role of sociocultural axiology in the understanding of the symbol is emphasized. In this case, the mechanisms of formation of values are explained through the methods of symbolization. Symbols are a form of formation and functioning of mass consciousness. Symbols express the concepts of meaning and value, perform the function of social organization, have an impact on mass movements and people's activities. The study of the symbol is of particular importance in the context of the study of international, intercultural, and interreligious relations that characterize modern culture. In addition to semiotics and sign components, cultural communications also include symbolic structures.

The study of the axiological features of the symbol prevents its perception in a narrow semiotic framework, creates conditions for the study of human mentality, socio-cultural development, the functioning of individual and social consciousness. Analysis of aesthetic phenomenology in historical dynamics and the evolution of symbolic forms is a mechanism of functionalization and formation of the axiosphere, as well as of creating conditions for the emergence and differentiation of aesthetic values. This serves to study the symbol in the context of artistic values.

Symbol theory is based on the interaction of historical, cultural, and theoretical research. Symbol theory includes the essence of the human mind and the mechanism of perception. This allows for a comparative analysis of the symbol with the language sign. The unity of the processes of symbolization and interpretation makes it important to analyze the cultural-historical phenomenology of symbolic forms.

#### Literature:

1. Averintsev, S. S. (1986). *Istoricheskaja podvizhnost' kategorii zhanra: opyt periodizacii. Istoricheskaja pojetika. Itogi i perspektivy izuchenija*. [Historical mobility of genre categories: experience of periodization. Historical poetics. Results and prospects of the study]. Moscow: Nauka.
2. Aydukevich, K. (1999). Jazyk i smysl [Language and meaning]. *Filosofija i logika l'vovsko-varshavskoj shkoly: Serija: "Nauchnoj filologii"* [Philosophy and logic of the Lviv-Warsaw school: Series "Scientific Philosophy"]. Moscow: ROSSPEN, pp. 309-312. (In Russ.).
3. Batkin, L. M. (1990). *Lichnoe chuvstvo i ego kul'turnoe oposredovanie* [Personal feeling and its cultural mediation]. *Chelovek i kul'tura* [Man and culture]. Leningrad: Nauka, pp. 27-31. (In Russ.).
4. Berzina, S. Ya. (1993). *K istorii titulatury v rannih politicheskikh strukturah* [To the history of titles in early political structures]. Moscow: Vostochnaja literatura. (In Russ.).
5. Freud, Z. (2019). *Psihologija mass i analiz chelovecheskogo "Ja"* [Mass psychology and analysis of human "Self"]. Moscow: Institute of Psychology. RAN. KSP Publishing House. (In Russ.).
6. Habibova, K. A. (2020). The Specificity of Everyday Discourses. First International Volga Region Conference on Economics, Humanities and Sports (FICEHS 19): In the book: *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*. Vol. 114, pp. 335-344. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebm.r.k.200114.079> (In Eng.).
7. Heidegger, M. (2012). *Vremja kartiny mira* [Time for peace pictures]. Moscow: Science. (In Russ.).
8. Humboldt, W. (2005). *Jazyk i filosofija kul'tury* [Language and philosophical culture]. Moscow: Progress. (In Russ.).
9. Jacobson, R. O. (1975). Lingvistika i pojetika [Linguistics and poetics]. *Strukturalizm "za" i "protiv"* [Structuralism "for" and "against"]. Moscow: Progress pp. 21-24. (In Russ.).
10. Kagan, M. S. (2010). *Vvedenie v istoriju mirovoj kul'tury* [Introduction to the history of world culture]. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russ.).
11. Kuznetsov, I. M. (1994) *Issledovanie simvolov v sisteme nacional'nogo samosoznaniya (k postanovke problemy)* [Study of symbols in the system of national self-consciousness (to staging problems)]. *Cennosti i simvol nacionalnogo samosoznaniya* [Values and symbols of national self-consciousness]. Moscow, pp. 31-32. (In Russ.).
12. Leontyev, A. N. (1972). *Dejatel'nost' i soznanie* [Activity and consciousness]. *Voprosy Filosofii* [Questions of Philosophy], 12, 21-24. (In Russ.).
13. Lotman, Yu. M. (1992). *Izbrannye stat'i v treh tomah*. [Favorite articles in three volumes]. *Stat'i po semiotike i tipologii kul'tury* [Articles on semiotics and typology of cultures]. Tallinn: Alexandra. Vol.1. (In Russ.).
14. Mamardashvili, M., & Pyatigorsky, A. (1997). *Simvol i soznanie* [Symbol and consciousness]. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. (In Russ.).
15. Nalimov, V. V. (1989). *Spontannost' soznaniya* [Consonance of consciousness]. Moscow: Prometej. (In Russ.).
16. Paksoy, H. B. & Phil, D. (1990). Introduction to DEDE KORKUT // *SOVIET ANTHROPOLOGY AND ARCHEOLOGY*. Vol. 29, No. 1. (In Russ.).
17. Reeker, P. (1996). *Germenevtika i psihoanaliz. Religija i vera* [Hermeneutics and psychoanalysis. Religion and faith]. Moscow: Iskusstvo. (In Russ.).
18. Seyidov, M. (1989). *Azarbajdzhan khalgynyn sojkokunu dushunarkan* [Thinking about the roots of the Azerbaijani people]. Baku: Elm. (In Azer.).
19. Stolyar, A. D. (2012). *Proishozhdenie izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva* [The origin of fine art]. Moscow: Iskusstvo. (In Russ.).

20. Sulimov, V. A., & Fadaeva, I. E. (2004). *Kommunikativnoe prostranstvo sovremennoj kul'tury: znaki i simvol* [Communicative space of modern culture: signs and symbols]. *Filosofskie nauki* [Philosophical Sciences], 4, 28-42. (In Russ.).

21. Uspensky, B. A. (2000). *Car' i imperator. Pomazanie na carstvo i semantika monarshego titula* [The king and emperor. Anointing for the kingdom and the semantics of the monarch's title]. Moscow: Iazyki russkoj kul'tury. Small Series. (In Russ.).

#### Primary Paper Section: A

#### Secondary Paper Section: AJ, AL