

Philological sciences

УДК 17.51

Rakhmatova M. M.

Teacher of the English language and literature department

Bukhara state university

CROSS-CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING OF VALUES IN LANGUAGE

Summary: Evaluation reflects real peculiarities of objects and includes in itself the needs and interests of subjects. Thus conveying cultural peculiarity of value is a matter of concept. The articles discusses the importance of value in cross-cultural understanding and its reflection in language.

Key words: value, evaluation, aesthetic judgement, reflection, concept.

Interests, tastes, preferences of speakers are reflected in evaluation as a component which forms semantic structure of the word. We cannot discuss issue of value in language without elucidating the role of evaluation in interrelation of value with language. Gurevich P.C [3.67] states that values are the reflection of evaluation made by man which I agree with because an object remains valueless until subject or evaluator attributes to it some value property. The image of 'lily' for example by English speaker becomes actual if speaker attributes to it features of aesthetic value and choses it as fair among many other flowers, and also Uzbek speaker attributes aesthetic value to the image of 'lily' and chooses the image of flower among other flowers as valuable but valuation degree is lower then that of English 'lily'. The values chosen are reflected in the proper names of girls of both cultures (western-lily: eastern-Nilufar) and in the imagery of mostly English language (as fair as lily). Hence, conception of values of specific type of objects are the main moments of evaluation criteria [2, 145]. For example, the idiomatic expressions "a face that would stop a clock, mutton dressed as lamb" are English specific idioms and images chosen by speaker

possess ethical or aesthetical negative values and the images used serve as criteria to evaluate object or feeling. While the same object, feeling or situation cannot be explained in Uzbek through the same image of *clock, mutton or lamb*. The images have totally different connotations and have nothing to do with explained above aesthetic displeasing situation.

Mesheryanikova explains the relation of value to evaluation and notes that evaluative judgement is subjective form of reflection of objective reality [4, 18]. To have the idea of values of particular type of objects are the main moments of evaluation criteria. Besides evaluation should reflect real peculiarities of objects and include in itself the needs and interests of subjects... Evaluation does not exist without subject as it presents representation of value property (essence). So evaluation carries information about that value property or reflects specific features of social being in it. Here emerges a question: are the matter of cognition and matter of evaluation identical? Mesheryanikov gives example to elucidate the matter by explaining that elements of being which have not become social are devoid of any valuable essence (mineral which is not used in social practice can be cognized, but can not be evaluated unless cognition realizes its features due to which it can be used in social practice) [4. 26]. Cognition is prerequisite of evaluation and evaluation stipulates for the process of cognition, stimulating activeness of cognition in the direction that counts preferable [4.45]. When evaluating some feature of a thing, feeling or action a speaker necessarily takes part in it. Academics refer to speaker as subject and to the thing, feeling and action as object. Subject of evaluation as Seleznova states whether it is explicit or implicit is a person or social stratum from whose point of view evaluation is carried out. Object of evaluation is a person, subject, events or situation of things to which evaluation is referred. The most important peculiarity of evaluation is the constant evidence of subject factor, which is in interrelation with objective. Evaluative utterance if even when subject of evaluation is not expressed directly in it, implies value relations between subject

of judgment and its object. I consider the above given statement being obvious in the example below.

He was very much the blue eyed boy in the office (Cambridge idioms Dictionary)

In the analysis of given example we are interested both in logical and linguistic aspect of evaluation. **A boy or man who is liked very much and is treated well by someone, especially someone in authority** [1] is evaluated through ethnic aesthetic values of *blue eyes* in source language which is sublime and give aesthetic pleasure found their representation in linguistic signs with connotation of favorite. Here we can assume that beautiful things are mostly valued as favorites for individuals and society. Being expressed by language means, evaluation becomes property of language elements. I propose following model of cognition for the above example. The first frame given below for the example above is cognized by subject who is unaware of linguacultural peculiarity of English language. The second model is the frame of above given example represented in the mind of native English speaker whose mind automatically comprehends and distinguishes between value and non-value.

Letters in the given below frame represent the following: A is subject, B is object, R is aesthetic value; H is favoring or favourite

1. A thinks that B is R . or A thinks B is H and it is unfair
2. A thinks B is H

The first frame means 'Subject A thinks object B is pleasing R' or subject thinks object is favourite but it is unfair. The misleading translation may occur when translator tries to find word for word equivalent for the image that represents idiom. 'Qora ko`z' or black eyes in Uzbek can not appropriately depict English situation.

The example in Uzbek language *black eyes* which represent aesthetic value expressed by the colour of eyes of Uzbek people may represent both neutral and aesthetic attitude too.

1. Aesthetic: Uning ko`zlari qora-Her eyes are black; aesthetic beauty: Qizning qora ko`zlari –Black eyes of a woman. Aesthetic pleasure is implied through peculiar cultural value implicitly: A thinks B is R

2. Neutral metonymy Qora ko`zlar-children or people, mostly people of younger age or weak ones: A thinks B is child or person, people not R and H.

As you see in the analysis above “blue eyes” valued in English culture facilitated creation of new idiom that expresses different negative value “having bias or favor” or “black eyes” valued in Uzbek culture became metonymy to express different valued notion. Hence, aesthetic evaluation represents rationally reflexed and emotionally experienced perception of understanding the world in the mode of admiration and aversion. In order to facilitate our discussion about reflection of values in evaluation and interrelation of language with values I decided to elucidate the matter via comparative analysis of aesthetic judgement in phraseology of Uzbek and English languages.

References:

1. Cambridge Idioms Dictionary. 2nd ed. (2006). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
2. Granin, Y. (1987). O gnoseologicheskom sodержaniye ponyatiya "Otsenka". *Voprosi Filosofii* #6, 59-72.
3. Gurevich, P. (1994). *Filosofiya kulturi*. Moskva: AO "Aspektpress".
4. Mesheryakova Y, V. (2004). *Konsept "krasota" v angliyskoy i russkoy lingvokulturax*. Volgograd.