AESTHETIC TYPE OF EVALUATIVE ADJECTIVES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Kenjayeva Muxlisa Baxodir qizi
Master's Degree Student
Chirchik State Pedogogical University of Tashkent region, Uzbekistan
kenjayevamuxlisa8@gmail.com

Abstract.

This article is devoted to aesthetic type of evaluative adjectives by the levels of morphology in two different languages. Adjectives are seeing in especially dissimilar ways by Eastern and Western linguists. So, there are some comparable and different features of adjectives which we have attempted, illustrated in two languages.

Keywords.

English and Uzbek languages, comparative analysis, lexico-semantics, aesthetic adjectives; gradable, relative and absolute adjectives; context-sensitivity; the semantics-pragmatics interface.

Introduction

The evaluation is a universal category: there is no language in which there would be no idea of "good / bad". When evaluated it should be noted that evaluation is a subjective expression of the significance of objects and phenomena of the world for our lives and activities, that is, the evaluation is a mental act, which results in the relationship of the subject to the object being evaluated in order to determine its value for life and meaning of the subject. Evaluation is characterized by a special structure that includes a number of mandatory and optional elements. The following components of evaluation can be distinguished: subject, object, basis and character of evaluation. The object of evaluation is a person (or socium), that shows the value of a particular subject, by expressing an assessment. One aim of this paper is to make a contribution to understanding aesthetic communication — the process by which agents aim to convey thoughts and transmit knowledge about aesthetic matters to others. Our focus will be on the use of aesthetic adjectives in aesthetic communication. Although theorists working on the semantics of adjectives have developed sophisticated theories about gradable adjectives, they have tended to avoid studying aesthetic adjectives — the class of adjectives that play

a central role in expressing aesthetic evaluations (e.g., 'beautiful', 'ugly', 'elegant'). And despite the wealth of attention paid to aesthetic adjectives by philosophical aestheticians, they have paid little attention to contemporary semantic theories of adjectives. We take our work to be a first step in remedying these lacunae. In this paper, we present four experiments that examine one aspect of how aesthetic adjectives ordinarily function: the contextsensitivity of their application standards. Our results present a prima facie empirical challenge to a common distinction between relative and absolute gradable adjectives because aesthetic adjectives are found to behave differently from both. Our results thus also constitute a prima facie vindication of some philosophical aestheticians' contention that aesthetic adjectives constitute a particularly interesting segment of natural language, even if the boundaries of this segment turns out to be different from what they had in mind.

The term is derived from the ancient Greek term aishesis , which means sensation or perception, knowledge acquired through sensory experience. On the other hand, this particular use of language is much more evident in the field of literature. In poetry, for example, literary verbal structures are used intensively to convey a multiplicity of meanings. Among them, we can mention color, sound, emotions and images of the material and concrete world. Aesthetic function of language characteristics. To fulfill this function of language, a series of resources are used. Some of them are similes, assonances, dissonances, fantasy, puns, and metaphors. These are not for the exclusive use of literature. The range of possibilities where this aesthetic function of language develops includes films, television programs, and everyday language. Characteristics of the aesthetic function of language emphasis on expressive value the language has several functions. This can be used to convince (appellative function), communicate information about the concrete world (referential function), refer to aspects of the language (metalinguistic function), among others. In the case of the aesthetic function of language, this gives priority to the expressive value of language. That is, it refers to their ability to express feelings or affections that an object, an idea or a being awaken. This means that it does not neglect the significant value of language (its ability to refer to the outside world). When we read a novel or a poem, you are experiencing the aesthetic function of language. In all these types of expressions, the intended purpose is to give aesthetic pleasure. This is accomplished through the words themselves and through a conscious and deliberate arrangement that has a pleasant or enriching effect. For this reason, this aesthetic purpose gives preponderance to form, rather than content. In this way, it is common, especially in

literary contexts, that figurative, poetic, or playful language is used. As already mentioned, among the resources used for this purpose are similes, metaphors, irony, symbolism, and analogies. On the other hand, when using words for artistic purposes, certain words are often selected and re-used to ensure that the desired effect is achieved. The aesthetic function of language is related to the particular use of certain linguistic structures. However, it is cultural norms that ultimately determine the dominance of this function.

Results and discussion

Philosophical aestheticians are interested in a wide range of things having to do with the aesthetic domain, such as the production of art, the reception of art, our aesthetic responses to nature, and the nature of art itself. But communication is another key aspect of our aesthetic lives with which aestheticians have been and

In a pioneering set of studies, Liao & Meskin (2017) set out to examine how the aesthetic adjectives 'beautiful', 'ugly' and 'elegant' fit into the relative-absolute taxonomy. At first glance, 'beautiful' and 'ugly' pattern like relative adjectives: they are perfectly felicitous when combined with the modifier 'very', and sound marked, if not outright infelicitous, when combined with modifiers 'completely' or 'almost'.

The photography in The Wailing is very beautiful.

The photography in The Wailing is completely beautiful.

The photography in The Wailing is almost beautiful.

'Beautiful', 'ugly' and 'elegant' also seem to pattern like relative adjectives when it comes to entailment tests. Consider two objects, say buildings, such that you would not describe them as "beautiful" (though they needn't be ugly either). It will still make sense to compare them as to which one is "more beautiful", as in:

The Ryugyong Hotel in Pyonyang is more beautiful than the Elephant Building in Bangkok (even though neither of them is beautiful).

Although initial evidence suggests that 'beautiful' is a relative gradable adjective, Liao and Meskin (2017) seek to establish that 'beautiful', 'ugly' and 'elegant' also differ significantly from paradigmatic relative adjectives, such as 'tall' or 'expensive', but at the same time also differ from the paradigmatic absolute gradable adjectives, such as 'full' or 'bent'. They write: "Our results present a prima facie empirical challenge to a common distinction between relative and absolute gradable adjectives because aesthetic adjectives are found to behave differently from both." (2017). Liao and Meskin's motivation for this claim relies on a series of experiments designed to see how ordinary speakers understand those adjectives.

For their experiments, they took inspiration in those conducted by Kristen Syrett (Syrett 2007, and Syrett et al. 2010), who sought to show that the relative-absolute distinction was not just a theoretical distinction, but also had a psychological reality. Syrett and her colleagues presented the participants (both children and adults) with pairs of object that are comparable in terms of a given property – such as length, openness, fullness, etc. – and asked them to choose the object with that property. For example, they would present them with two lines of different lengths and would instruct them to pick out "the long one." Or they would present them with two lines that are bent to different degrees and would ask them to pick out "the straight one." The crucial observation that Syrett et al. (2010) established with their experiments is that there is a striking difference between relative and absolute adjectives when it comes to answering this sort of task. For relative adjectives, speakers will naturally choose as "the F" that object which has F to a higher degree: e.g., they will pick out as "the long line" that line which is longer than the other. In the case of absolute adjectives, on the other hand, speakers are not disposed to understand "the F" as referring to the object that is more F than the other: e.g., if neither of the lines is straight, even though one is straighter than the other, they will not pick the straighter line as "the straight one"; rather, they will refuse to make any selection. Liao and Meskin conducted four experiments, in which they applied Syrett's experimental paradigm to the aesthetic adjectives 'beautiful', 'ugly' and 'elegant'. In Study 1, they presented the participants with the following stimuli: disks that are spotted to different degrees, rods that are bent to different degrees, blocks that are long to different degrees, and faces that are beautiful to different degrees.

To demonstrate this properly, what is needed is some evidence from psycholinguistics on how people process evaluative content. In the following examples expression of connotation by using adjectives are demonstrated:

'And I like to marry her because she's got the longest, smoothest, straightest legs in the world'. Here the usage of the superlative degree of the adjective makes the fact more emotional. This case of expressing emotional colour is observed in the structure of the Uzbek language, too.

Bir Vatanning o'g'limankim,

Har taraf gullola bog',

Qalb ko'ziday eng qorong'u

Ko'chada porlar chirog' – In English it is translated as: "I am the son of the country full of flowers and gardens, even the darkest street shines like the eye of

the heart". In this Uzbek poem the author expresses strong emphasis by using the superlative degree of the adjective "eng qorong'u ko'cha" the darkest (street), showing the strong love of the hero towards his country.

Our hypothesis is that the former, but not the latter, have it built into their lexical meaning that their role is to assign a certain aesthetic value to the object or individual to which they are attributed. What distinguishes genuine evaluative adjectives (such as good and bad) from all sorts of adjectives that can be used evaluatively? Again, we suggest that they have it built into their meaning that their primary role is to transmit a value-judgement.

While we customarily talk of evaluative adjectives, taking good and bad as their paradigms, and of aesthetic adjectives, taking beautiful and ugly as their paradigm, it remains an open question whether any set of linguistic criteria actually makes it possible to delineate the class of evaluative adjectives (and then the subclass of aesthetic adjectives). In philosophical literature in aesthetics, the followings are considered as "aesthetic concepts": unified, balanced, integrated, lifeless, serene, somber, dynamic, powerful, vivid, delicate, moving, trite, sentimental, tragic, graceful, delicate, dainty, handsome, comely, elegant, garish, dumpy, and beautiful. However, it takes little to see that many among these adjectives have primary meanings that are not at all aesthetic. For example, to describe a pastry mix as "unified", or the gender ratio at a conference program as "balanced", amounts to making purely descriptive claims. Similar observations may be made for integrated, lifeless, dynamic, powerful, and so on. The crucial observation, then, is that many adjectives that are not by their very nature aesthetic may be used in order to make an aesthetic judgment. Similarly, many ordinary adjectives may be used to express a value-judgement: thus describing e.g. a project as "ambitious" will, in a suitable context, express a positive stance towards the project; but in another context, it may express a negative stance.

Conclusion

As a result, the Uzbek and language combine stylistic coloring and poetic character in complex words, and if the lexical semantic field "user (person)" has a synonymous feature, in the semantic field of national values they form an anonymity feature. The uniqueness of the adjective as a linguistic means of expressing the evaluative function also lies in the special position that they occupy among other characterizing signs. Adjectives are structurally and meaningfully closer to subject names such as morphological features, adjective-nominal,

nominative combinations of words and according to functions and degrees of abstraction of meaning, they refer to feature names.

REFERENCES:

1. Alefirenko N.F. Linguoculturology. Value-semantic space of language. Moscow: Flint, Science, 2010

2. Arutyunova N. D. Metaphor and Discourse // Metaphor Theory: Collection, ed. N.D. Arutyunova and M.A. Zhurinskaya. –M .: Progress, 1990. –S 5-15.

3. Ashurova D.U. Conceptual metaphor in the literary text // Filologik masalalar. Tashkent, 2018-No.1, p. 34

4. Humboldt V. von. Selected works on linguistics. - M; 1984. 400 p.

5. Karasik V.I. Cultural dominants in the language // Language personality: cultural concepts: Sat. scientific tr Volgograd - Arkhangelsk: Change, 1996. p-3-16.

Cites:

6.https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/adjective

7.https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/adjectives

Dictionaries:

8. Longman Dictionary of Language and Culture. Longman Group, UK, 1992 .--1528 p.

9. Webster's New World College Dictionary. 4th edition. - USA, Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 2001 .p-16-64

10. Nazarzoda, S. Sanginov A., R. Ҳoshim, H. Raufzoda. Фарҳанги тафсири забони тоҷикий. –D Ushanbe: Пажгихгохи забон ва адабиети Рудакий, 2008 –Т. 5-b.