UO‘K: 811.1111: 811.512.1331

THE CONCEPT OF SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION AND CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF ITS LINGUISTIC MEANS OF EXPRESSION (based on the materials of English, Uzbek and other languages)

M.A. Abduvaliyev., D.A. Rustamov

Maqola subyektiv baho konseptini voqelantiruvchi lingvistik vositalarning chog‘ishtirma tadqiqiga bag‘ishlangan. Maqolada subyektiv baho konseptining ijobiy, salbiy, neytral, konseptual semantikasi, ular o‘rtasidagi dialektik munosabatlar, turli til sathlari birliklarining maydoniy tabiati, ingliz, o‘zbek va boshqa tillar materiallari asosida yoritib berilgan. Mavzu yuzasidan bildirilgan fikrlar so‘rovnoma natijalari yordamida dalillangan.

Kalit so‘zlar: *obyektiv baho, subyektiv baho, subyektiv baho konsepti, lingvistik vositalar, individual subyektiv baho, ijtimoiy subyektiv baho.*

Данная статья посвящена контрастивному изучению языковых средств, объективирующих концепт субъективная оценка. Позитивная, негативная и нейтральная концептуальная семантика концепта субъективной оценки, диалектические отношения между ними, полевая природа единиц, относящихся к разным языковым уровням, были изучены на материалах английского, узбекского и других языков. Ранее упомянутые нами характеристики концепта обоснованы результатами проведенного анкетирования.

Ключевые слова: *объективная оценка, субъективная оценка, концепт субъективной оценки, языковые средства, индивидуальная субъективная оценка, социальная субъективная оценка.*

The semantics of subjective evaluation and its linguistic means of expression have been studied to varying degrees by linguists such as R.Lakoff, Sh.Bally, V.V.Vinogradov, A.M.Peshkovsky, A.I.Smirnitsky, N.M.Shansky, O.A.Akhmanova, N.D.Arutyunova, Sh.Safarov, U.Tursunov, J.Mukhtarov, Sh.Rakhmatullayev, and A.Ikhtiyorov. However, we have decided to present our perspective on the cognitive-conceptual aspects of the issue, the scope of semantic possibilities of linguistic means of expression, the essence and classification of subjective evaluation, and its linguistic domain. Among living beings, humans stand out as intelligent and thoughtful, capable of influencing the surrounding reality and the events occurring within it, rather than remaining indifferent. Every individual, upon entering the world, lives within a social and natural environment, works, and engages in various relationships with their community members. The social and legal agreements, both formal and informal, or the national-cultural norms accepted by this community, regulate and refine their behaviour, actions, and verbal and nonverbal interactions. The worldview of a particular ethnos, along with its evaluations –whether positive, negative, or neutral – occupies a place in the socio-national consciousness, with many of these perceptions being passed down from generation to generation as a legacy. From this perspective, it is worth emphasizing that the consciousness of a specific ethnos reflects the nations’ or peoples’ wisdom and intellect in values, emotions, customs, and national ceremonies.

In reality, a person’s evaluation or attitude toward others, nature, and the surrounding objects is initially formed in the consciousness of an individual who represents a particular community or ethnos. Through the process of comparing the similarities and differences in the features and characteristics of the events and objects they see, hear, feel, or experience, an individual distinguishes, categorizes, and classifies them. When evaluating a specific event, phenomenon, or object, every person relies on the perceptions and images they have formed about it. Consequently, the perceptions, views, and images of individuals belonging to the same social group regarding a particular event, phenomenon, or object may differ from one another.

For example, concepts such as happiness/unhappiness can be interpreted differently even among individuals with the same social status or similar capabilities, as we often observe in daily life. The evaluations that an individual assigns to events and phenomena – whether positive, negative, or neutral – become evident during direct or indirect communication with others.

Let us refer to a table reflecting the results of a survey conducted among students and teachers (ASIFL) regarding the interpretation of the concepts of happiness/unhappiness.

#	Questions	Number of respondents	Social status	Gender	Age	Answers	Number	%
1	What is happiness?	159	Students: 149 Teachers: 10	Women: 143 Men: 16	17-20 30-40	1. Health, family, parents, children, peace, and tranquility	102	64
						2. Physical well-being	18	0.11
						3. Peace and tranquility	14	0.08
						4. Being loved	2	0.01
						5. Independence	1	0.006
						6. Faith	9	0.05
						7. Having friends	1	0.006
						8. Being born and living in this world	1	0.006
						9. Joining higher schools	3	0.02
						10. Money	8	0.05
2	What is unhappiness?	159	Students: 149 Teachers: 10	Women: 143 Men: 16	17-20 30-40	1. Ingratitude, lack of faith	26	0.16
						2. Loneliness, lack of family	25	0.15
						3. Hopelessness, absence of trust	11	0.07
						4. Losing loved ones	10	0.06
						5. Lack of purpose	18	0.11
						6. Lack of knowledge	16	0.10
						7. Falling into despair and absence of peace	7	0.04
						8. Misfortune	13	0.08
						9. Moral backwardness	12	0.07
						10. Health problems	4	0.02
						11. Living in an unstable country	14	0.08
						12. I don't know	3	0.02

Based on the analysis, it can be stated that 64% of respondents consider happiness to consist of health, family, parents, children, and peace of mind, while some define happiness as independence (0.06%) or simply being born and living (0.06%).

Among the respondents, 0.16% view unhappiness as being rooted in ingratitude and lack of faith, while 0.15% associate it with loneliness and the absence of family. A few respondents (0.02%) equate unhappiness with health problems. The system of evaluations (attitudes) embedded in the social consciousness and memory of a specific nation or ethnos possesses a structured nature. These evaluations play a critical role in shaping and developing the collective consciousness of a nation, people, or community, particularly in establishing proper moral norms and strategies and tactics for behaviour within society. Evaluations of events, phenomena, and objects in reality are categorized as beneficial/useless, harmful/harmless, or, in certain contexts, both beneficial and useless, both harmless and harmful, from the perspective of national welfare and interests. The scale of subjective and social evaluation is observed to differ across various nations and peoples, including in matters of religious values. For instance, in Islam and Christianity, acts such as murder, theft, lying, adultery, and deceit are equally considered sinful and prohibited. It is worth noting that for Muslims, altering religious principles, engaging in usury, and causing harm to others are deemed forbidden, while for Christians, idol worship, violence, gossip, and self-harm are prohibited. Similarly, in Islam, pork and products derived from it are considered haram, while in Buddhism (among Hindus), beef and foods containing it are regarded as forbidden.

The analysis of the provided examples suggests that the underlying similarity in the evaluation of events and objects across different cultures lies in the shared understanding that actions such as gossip, gambling, theft, and foul language bring no benefit to anyone. These actions are perceived as undermining the material and spiritual development of communities, societies, and citizens, based on collective life experiences and observations. In our view, the national-cultural differences in this regard stem from how significant, valuable, or necessary a particular event, phenomenon, or object is for a nation or ethnos. This alignment – or lack thereof – with

the nation's behaviour, lifestyle, and traditions plays a crucial role. Moreover, the neutrality in evaluating events and objects (assigning a moderate evaluation) also holds significant importance. Such evaluations recognize both the positive and negative, strong and weak aspects of the object or phenomenon in question, leading to a balanced, middle-ground perspective.

For example, dishes prepared in different cultures are described with lexemes such as sweet (shirin), tasty (mazali), savory (totli), appetizing (ishtahani qitiqlaydigan), delicious, tasty (mazali), and вкусный, which express a positive evaluation of taste. In contrast, words like bland (be'maza), tasteless (mazasiz), sour (achchiq), salty (sho'r), appetite-dulling (ishtahani bo'g'adigan), salty, saltless, overrated, and безвкусный reflect a negative evaluation of taste. A moderate evaluation of taste, such as *durust, tuzuk, o'rtacha, yesa bo'laveradi, yomon emas, chidasa bo'ladi, edible, not bad, терпимо, не плохо, можно есть*, reflects a neutral evaluation. It is important to emphasize the relativity of these evaluations, as the norms for taste established by different societies vary. This difference can be observed in how various cultures perceive taste. For instance, in the cuisines of the Indian, Korean, Japanese, and Chinese peoples, spicy and peppery dishes occupy a central role, while in Uzbek, English, Russian, and other cuisines, such dishes are either absent or very rare. For example, in the Valley, there is a dish called pepper soup. This dish is made from a mixture of boiling water from the rice being cooked, fried meat, oil, onions, chopped hot pepper, sour cream, and salt. The soup is usually served in porcelain dishes 30-40 minutes before the main meal. Those sitting at the table take turns tasting the pepper soup. This dish is typically considered an appetite-stimulating dish and is prepared in tea houses.

In China, spicy foods are very popular. According to some calculations, in China, there are over 30 different names for varying levels of spiciness. It should also be emphasized that people's attitudes towards taste are individual. In other words, each person has their own evaluations and relationships with taste. Some people may love garlic and heavily peppered salads, while others may not consider them part of their favorite dishes. From this, it can be concluded that subjective evaluation represents an ethnos' relationship with the world around it and itself, and two types of subjective evaluation can be distinguished: *individual subjective evaluation* and *social (collective) subjective evaluation*. The evaluation of events, objects, and their relational relationships within the world may be similar or different across various cultural contexts.

There is a systematic relationship and interdependence between individual subjective evaluation and social subjective evaluation, with each continuously complementing the other in meaning.

Nevertheless, individual subjective evaluation often contains occasionalisms in its content. Along with national norms, evaluations that fall outside of these norms can also be observed. In the works of English and Uzbek writers, the individual evaluation of certain events or phenomena by the authors is reflected. However, it must be emphasized that every literary work emerges through the collaboration of individual subjective and social subjective evaluations. In other words, social subjective evaluation influences the formation of individual subjective evaluation, and individual subjective evaluation affects the formation of social subjective evaluation. These evaluative relationships can manifest as real, unreal, hypothetical, or conditional based on their correspondence to reality. V. von Humboldt emphasized that humans subjectively perceive the world based on various individual ways of knowing and feeling the surrounding reality. He viewed the subjective aspect of the matter as a central factor and wrote, "Since perception and human activity are dependent on imagination, its relationship to objects is entirely conditioned by language" [1. P. 54].

It should be emphasized that the evaluation of a certain event, object, or phenomenon through individual and social subjective evaluations manifests in different forms based on factors such as age, gender, social status, and profession, such as the evaluation of women, the evaluation of the elderly, the evaluation of children, and the evaluation of thieves. These evaluations are dialectically interconnected, with an individual's subjective evaluation playing a foundational role in the formation of social subjective evaluations and vice versa. For instance, the evaluations of concepts like theft/honesty, hard work/laziness, kindness/evil among young children are shaped by the exemplary actions, advice, and guidance of parents, neighbors, relatives, educators, and teachers in the family and community. On the other hand, the academic work, literary works, speeches, and addresses of economists, poets, writers, and political leaders play a crucial role in the formation, improvement, and effectiveness of social and even international subjective evaluations. In short, the concept of evaluation refers to the subjective relationship of certain subjects to a specific object, expressed either orally, in writing, or nonverbally, and sometimes involving both.

The object being evaluated can be a concrete or abstract event, individual, nation, or any part of the material or immaterial world. In the evaluation relationship, the categories of generality and specifici-

ty in philosophy find their clear expression. In other words, social subjective evaluation is formed based on the subjective evaluations of individuals belonging to a specific nation or culture. For example, the Uzbek people's social subjective evaluations of a righteous person and righteous things are as follows: 1. Something that can be consumed, used, or enjoyed according to religious law (sharia) and is not forbidden (not haram): *Pulni olmadim, ming marta roziman, sizga ona sutiday halol bo'lsin* (A.Qahhor. "Qo'shchinor chiroqlari"); 2. A person who is self-reliant, earning through their own labor and hard work, free from betrayal, deceit, and similar vices. *To'g'ri tut ishqingni va halol yasha.* (Shuhrat); 3. figurative. *G'irromlikka o'rganmagan, qing'ir yo'lga bormaydigan, birovni aldamaydigan; to'g'ri sofdil: Bechora Oqila o'zi juda halol, mexnatkash bolalarga juda mehribon ayol.* (A.Qahhor. "Og'riq tishlar"); 4. Married, lawful (in relation to a wife): *Birovning halolini birov suyadigan zamon ekan-da, vodarig'*. (S.Siyoyev. "Otliq ayol"); 5. sport. *O'zbek kurashida sof g'alobaga beriladigan baho. Shunisi qiziqki, o'zbek kurashini xalqaro hamjamiyat tomonidan etirof etilishi kurashdagi sof g'alobaga beriladigan halol bahosi ham xalqarolashuviga olib keldi* [2. P. 494].

Subjective evaluation manifests in the process of speech activity. As Ferdinand de Saussure rightly emphasizes, "Speech activity (language) has two sides: individual and social, and one cannot be understood without the other." Language is the means that ensures the realization of speech activity. Ferdinand de Saussure writes about this: "Language is a treasure, manifested in the linguistic competence of all individuals belonging to a particular community. It is a grammatical system that exists virtually in the minds of each individual, because it never fully exists in any one person; language only exists fully in society" [3. P. 14]. Subjective evaluation, like components of the material and immaterial world, also has characteristics formed as a result of cognitive processes, which constitute the content of this concept. These are clustered around the archecognitive sign (semantics) and organize the conceptual space. This area can also be referred to as the cognitive field of subjective evaluation. The cognitive field of subjective evaluation consists of three microfields: the positive subjective evaluation microfield, the negative subjective evaluation microfield, and the neutral subjective evaluation microfield. These fields, according to their connection to the common conceptual sign in human memory, are arranged side by side to form "boxes" of knowledge. This can be compared to the Russian traditional toy matryoshka and its nested dolls.

In such "boxes," the knowledge related to the different characteristics of subjective evaluation holds a non-verbal status, and it is stored in memory as a reserve ready for verbalization in a specific communication context. It should be emphasized that not all characteristics of subjective evaluation manifest in a particular speech situation; rather, only the relevant portion of these characteristics for virtual communication and speech context takes on a linguistic landscape. Subjective evaluation (attitude) is verbalized within the internal order and norms accepted and agreed upon by the speakers of a particular nation's language. From this perspective, the language can be seen as an "Intermediate world" (V.von Humboldt calls it "Zwischen Welt") between the people and the objective world. This language actually has the status of a concept and includes knowledge related to the people's language. Such knowledge covers all levels of language and plays a fundamental role in generating speech chains (elements) according to established norms.

The meanings of subjective evaluation mentioned above take on a linguistic landscape through various linguistic signs (lexeme, phoneme, phraseme, syntacteme, texteme) in each language. These units are united into one field, i.e., the nominative-communicative field, based on the archetype of subjective evaluation. In this field, it is also possible to incorporate non-verbal means such as gestures and symbolic signs as alternative non-linguistic tools. I n the languages being compared, subjective evaluation is expressed through vowel elongation, strong pronunciation of vowel sounds, consonant doubling, and intonation (tone).

"*Kampir qizlarning kulishini eshtiganidan keyin mexmonlarning kimligini angladi. -Xa-a-a, Saltanadxonlardir? –dedi u*" [4. P. 32];

Yana bir necha marta boshini egib, Ho'h - ho'h - ho' deya takror qildi [4. P. 111];

A-v-v… - dedi Xadichaxon-koshki, ep degan narsa bo'lsa kuyovda … [4. P. 129];

Look here! Ouuuch! That hurts me, D-d-don't kill me please, V-v-v-ery good [5. P. 897].

In both languages, the lexical tools that express subjective evaluation are diverse, reflecting positive/negative evaluations of a person, their condition or mood, the taste and flavor of food, the joyful or unfortunate moments in a person's life, and family harmony, among others. For example, *shirin, achchiq, asal, asil, andishali, andishasiz, baquvvat, guras-guras, gulday, vafodor, vafosiz, vatanfurush, suyug'oyoq, himmatli, qo'zichoq, bo'taloq, burro, burro-burro, bot-bot, lazzat, lazzatli, lazzatsiz, laziz, mard, tanti, mardumxo'r, mol, anaconda, qo'y, marhamatli, marhamatlilik, maftun, maftunkor, ma'sum, bitter, sweet, bitterly, honey, sweetie, sweetly, pig, fox, ass.*

Yo'lchi, chirog'im, suvni tezlating! [5. P. 49]

Senga ishonaman, senga, yo‘lvorsim, yo‘lvorsim! [4. P. 113]

Expressions such as swear words, curses, or oaths (e.g., “so‘kish,” “qarg‘ish,” or “ont”) that convey negative evaluations are primarily used informally in problematic (conflictual) situations between people in the compared languages. For example: *Stupid old fool! We mutter, whats he knew about it* [6. P. 39]; *Pull your right - you, you idiot!* [6. P. 105]; *If I’m guilty, said the Earl, may this bread choke me when I eat it!* [6. P. 91]; *O‘lma, Alioxun, so‘zingda bitta xato bo‘lsa, Oppoqxo‘jam ursin! deb qichqirdi bir mardikor.* [5. P. 48]; *O‘hu, o‘hu yo‘tal qursin!* [5. P. 61]; *Ta’ma noniga qo‘l ochgandan o‘l och! Teringa somon tiqilgur* [5. P. 135]

Positive and negative subjective evaluations are also expressed through fixed expressions. For example: *Land of milk and honey* (a country where living conditions are good and people have the opportunity to make a lot of money); *I am neither sugar nor salt, dog sb’s steps*; *unbutton one’s soul, the sweet and the bitter life*, *The cat is out of the bag*, *yulduzi issiq*, *aravani quruq olib qochmoq*, *ilonning yog‘ini yalagan*,*podadan oldin chang chiqarmoq*, *qo‘li egri*, *qo‘li ochiq*. Bunday ma’nolar har ikki tilda paremiyalar tarzida ham verballashuvi aniqlandi: *He who would search for pearls must dive below.; Better be head of a dog than tail of a lion*, *every door may be shut,but death’s door.*; *Yaxshi bola to‘rga tortar yomon bola go‘rga*,*Vatan gadosi-kafan gadosi*, *haqiqat o‘tda ham kuymas*, *suvda ham cho‘kmas*, *Non ham non ushog‘i ham non*. Positive and negative subjective evaluations are also expressed through sentences that serve as explicators and implicators, which have different structures and meanings: *God help him!* [7. P. 70]; *Fake? No,sir* [7. P. 30]; *His spirits fell,however,when, upon reaching the park, he waited and waited and Carrie did not come* [8. P. 266]; *Free tickets? Sweet! I can’t tell you how sweet this victory is* [9. P. 1315]; *Have you seen my keys, honey?* [9. P. 623]; *No, silly, those aren’t your shoes!* [9. P. 325]; *Xafa bo‘lmang, jonim!* [5. P. 161]; *-Ha buni yaxshi qilgansiz, aylanay sizdan, do‘ndiqcham!* [5. P. 158]; *Yolchining opasini mehriban, ko‘ngilchang, g‘oyat samimiy bir qaynona kabi tasavvur qiladi* [5. P. 192]; *Oppoq qiz, nega yuzingni burasan?* [5. P. 193]; *Boyning uyi saroy bo‘lsin, baribir Gulnorga zindon bo‘ladi*. [5. P. 210];

Subjective evaluation can be explicated through two or more semantically related and complementary sentences (text), as shown in the following examples: *Xudo meni yer yuzida eng badbaxt qilib yaratgan ekan.Bu iflos yerga tushurgandan ko‘ra, jonimni olgani edi. Buzildim, odamgarchiligim qolmadi, suratim odam, boyvachcha aka, mendan xayvon yaxshi* [5. P. 161]; *Kundoshim badjahl, tanti xotin ekan. Uch kun o‘tmay,boshimda tosh chaqishga boshladi. Har bir ish uning buyrug‘i bilan bo‘ladi, hech nimaga meni biylatmaydi* [5. P. 158]. Subjective evaluation rules also include modal words. These words serve to express the speaker’s subjective attitude towards the sentence. In foreign linguistics, H.Sweet and E.Krenzinga have classified modal words under the category of adverbs. Such words, in the structure of a sentence, come as introductory parts or in dialogues, expressing the speaker’s certain belief, uncertainty, or assumption (hypothesis) regarding the occurrence of an event, action, or situation. For example: *Certainly,the early learning years are crucial to a childs educational development* [9. P. 120]; *May be he will come, may be he won’t*; *I can’t make it unfortunately* [9. P. 1417]; *Do you agree? Yes,indeed* [9. P. 659]; *Albatta,erta bilan kelib o‘zim to‘g‘irlayman* [4. P. 173]; *Afsuski, u oramizda yo‘q endi, haqiqatdan, darhaqiqat, chamasi, afsus* (modal words)*; ot, shubhasiz, shekilli, so‘zsiz; sifat, albatta, ayniqsa, avvalo* (adverb)*;balki, koshki, hatto* (auxiliary words).

Another modus for expressing subjective attitudes is emphasis. Emphatic expressions are related to the entire sentence and serve to reinforce, intensify, or limit its meaning, often indicating interrogative meanings. For example: *The queen nearly died* (Anthony), *I quite agree* (Powell), In English, such implicative words include “even,” “just,” “exactly,” “only,” “merely,” “scarcely,” and others. In Uzbek *-da, -u(-yu), -ku, hatto, axir* - particles of intensification and emphasis, *-mi, -chi, -a(-ya), nahotki*; particles of interrogation and amazement *faqat, faqatgina, -gina;* particles of separation and restriction, *xuddi* determination, *-dir* particles of doubt: *Chatoq bo‘layotibdi-da!* (A.Qahhor); *Marg‘ilonda shunday kelinimiz bor ekan-u , bilmay yurgan ekanmiz-da.* (A.Qodiriy) In the languages being compared, subjective evaluation is also expressed through the verbalizers of the volitional category of verbs. Here, the speaker’s attitude towards the fact or the state of being in the sentence is considered. The realization of an action, event, or state in the sentence is expressed through various grammatical representatives, which indicate its certainty, possibility, or unreality. The reality or unreality of such actions and states is manifested along with verb tenses. For example, in Uzbek, the speaker’s attitude towards the action, event, or relationship with a person is expressed through the present, past, and future tense forms, in addition to other words that relate to the predicate in the sentence, thus reflecting the degree of reality. For instance, *U kecha keldi*; *U ertaga keladi* va *U bugun keldi*.

In English, the subjective condition of the subjunctive mood is expressed through synthetic and analytic grammatical forms. This type of subjective condition is commonly used in simple and mainly compound sentences with subordinate clauses;

Real condition: *If it rains, I shall stay at home; Be he generous, wise or brave, he must only be a slave (Southey); God forbid!*; Unreal condition (present condition); *If were ill I should like to be nursed by you (Bennet), If you helped me I would finish the work shortly. (If I) had known about it I would not have gone there with you. She spoke as if she had known him for years*. What's interesting is that in conditional subordinate clauses, "should" can be used when there is a need to express a subjective evaluation or emotion regarding a real action or event. In such cases, "should" can be used for all persons equally: *Chrystal wondered why he should act as chairman when Brown himself was there*. (R.Snow)

In Uzbek, the conditional mood form that connects the subordinate clause to the main clause in a conditional sentence also expresses various types of evaluations (warning, admonition, oath, swearing) as follows: *Non ursin yolg'on bo'lsa*. (Said Ahmad); *Agar bir qadam nari bossang, quvib chiqaraman.* (P.Tursun); *Boshliq bizga shunaqa deb o'tirsa, boshqalardan nima deb o'pkalaymiz?* (A.Qahhor).

Idioms and proverbs also occupy a special place in the system of means expressing subjective evaluations. They are units designed to express the speaker's attitude towards various events, objects, in a concise yet impactful manner. For example: *ko'ziga sovuq ko'rinmoq* (to dislike, to evoke a feeling of disgust); *ko'ziga cho'p solmoq* (to deceive), *oq ko'ngil* (well-intentioned), *hamirdan qil sug'urganday* (easily), *follow sb's footsteps* (to follow someone's footsteps, to be a loyal follower), *A clean hand wants no washing* (Vijdonli odamga oqlov shart emas), *One fool makes many* (Tirraqi buzoq podani bulg'aydi).

The abundance and diversity of linguistic units expressing subjective evaluations indicate the importance of this concept in the conceptual spheres of both the English and Uzbek nations. The different meanings expressed by the linguistic units denoting subjective evaluations and their components possess various conceptual, proto-verbal, and verbal-logical natures. The proto-verbal components of the semantic structure of the linguistic sign are embedded in the consciousness and reflect the subject's attitude towards natural objects and phenomena in existence. In contrast, the verbal-logical components represent the subject's relationship with "objects" that are unnatural or not directly connected to humans.

From this perspective, it is appropriate to divide the semantic structure of linguistic signs expressing subjective evaluations into proto-verbal and verbal types. Based on the results of the analysis, it is also possible to distinguish between cognitive and pragmatic components depending on whether subjective evaluation is present in the semantic structure of the linguistic sign. The semantics of subjective evaluation verbalizers can encompass both intensional and extensional meanings. The verbalizers of subjective evaluations, when representing the content of a concept, somewhat reflect the collection of signs that represent the concept. Extensional units are those that directly relate to the subjective concept and encompass all images or denotations of objects and events. The intensional composition of subjective evaluations consists of intensional and implicational parts.

Intensional linguistic meaning forms the core of the content and serves to regularly understand and differentiate subjective evaluation semantic signs. In contrast, implicational subjective evaluation semantic signs, which have an optional status in the meaning of the linguistic sign, occupy a peripheral position within the field of subjective evaluation semantics. Thus, the concept of subjective evaluation is a collection (system) of knowledge accumulated in the national and individual consciousness about the world and its parts. These concepts arise from interpreting the signs and characteristics related to a specific part of the world as positive, negative, or neutral events, and they are verbalized through various levels of language semantics.

In conclusion, it can be said that the evaluation given to the world and its parts by a particular nation or its representatives leads to the correct selection and application of strategies and tactics based on social experience, which are grounded in the development of the society they live in and the efforts being made in this direction. As a result, any event, object, relationship, perception, and image acquires a sense of reality and naturalness, reflecting itself in human consciousness and language.

References:

1. Berezin, F.M. (1975) *Istoriya lingvisticheskih uchenij* [History of linguistic teachings]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.

2. Madvaliev, A. (ed.) (2020) *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati* [An explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language]. In 5 volumes. Vol. 5. Tashkent: "O'zbekiston Milliy entsiklopediyasi" Davlat ilmiy nashriyoti.

3. Sossyur, F.de. (2017) *Umumiy tilshunoslik kursi* [General linguistics course]. Tashkent: "Mumtoz so'z".

4. Chulpan, A. (2019*) Kecha va kunduz* [Night and Day]. Tashkent: Ilm-ziyo-zakovat.

5. Oybek. (1979) *Qutlug' qon* [Blood donation]. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.

6. Jerome, K.J. (1976) *Three men in a boat*. Moscow: “High school”.
7. Rockwell, K. (1973*) It’s me O lord*. Moscow: Higher school publishing House.
8. Dreiser, T. (1968) *Sister Carrie*. Moscow: Higher school publishing House.
9. (2000) *Oxford Advanced learners’ dictionary*. Sixth Edition. Oxford University Press.
10. Bondarenko, N. (2001) Analiz sub”ektivnyh ocenok normal’nogo dohoda i prozhitochnogo minimuma [Analysis of subjective assessments of normal income and subsistence minimum]. *Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya: ekonomicheskie i social’nye peremeny.* No 1(51). Pp. 46-50.
11. Gradosel’skaya,G.V. (2003) Sub”ektivnye i ob”ektivnye ocenki blagososto yaniya [Subjective and objective assessments of well-being]. Sociologicheskij jurnal. No 3. Pp. 86-98.
12. Ivanova, G.F. (2009) Mneniya “ob”ektivnye” i “sub”ektivnye” [Opinions are “objective” and “subjective”]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologiya. Iskusstvovedenie*. Vol. 29. No 5(143). Pp. 28-36.
13. Krupnova, N.A. (2019) Slova sub”ektivnoj ocenki i sposoby ee vyrazheniya v russkom i nemeckom yazykah [Words of subjective evaluation and ways of expressing it in Russian and German]. Vestnik MGLU. Gumanitarnye nauki. Vol. 1 (817). Pp. 219-230.
14. Lobyncev, N.A., Antipanova O.A. Sub”ektivnoe i ob”ektivnoe blagopoluchie studenta [Subjective and objective well-being of a student]. Pp. 376-381. [Online]. URL: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/53082685.pdf (Date of Access: 21.10.2024).
15. Tursunov, U., Muhtorov A., Rahmatullaev Sh. (1992) *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili* [The current Uzbek literary language]. Tashkent: O‘zbekiston.

SUBYEKTIV BAHO KONSEPTI VA UNI IFODALOVCHI LINGVISTIK VOSITALARNING CHOG‘ISHTIRMA TADQIQI

(ingliz, o‘zbek va boshqa tillar materiallari asosida)

Mahamatjon A.Abduvaliyev[1], Dilshodbek A.Rustamov[1]

Ilmiy xabarnoma. Seriya: Gumanitar tadqiqotlar – Scientific Bulletin. Series: Humanitarian Studies. 2025. 1(85). 79-86.

[1]Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Andijan, 170100, str. Baburshah 5 (Uzbekistan) E-mail: info@asifl.uz.

Kalit so‘zlar: *obyektiv baho, subyektiv baho, subyektiv baho konsepti, lingvistik vositalar, individual subyektiv baho, ijtimoiy subyektiv baho.*

Maqola subyektiv baho konseptini voqelantiruvchi lingvistik vositalarning chog‘ishtirma tadqiqiga bag‘ishlangan. Maqolada subyektiv baho konseptining ijobiy, salbiy, neytral, konseptual semantikasi, ular o‘rtasidagi dialektik munosabatlar, turli til sathlari birliklarining maydoniy tabiati, ingliz, o‘zbek va boshqa tillar materiallari asosida yoritib berilgan. Mavzu yuzasidan bildirilgan fikrlar so‘rovnoma natijalari yordamida dalillangan.

Muayyan millat yoki etnosning ijtimoiy ongi va xotirasidan o‘rin olgan baholar tizimli xususiyatga ega ekanligi, ularning barchasi millat, xalq yoki jamiyatning umumiy ongi shakllanishi, rivoji uchun, xususan jamiyatdagi axloq-odob me’yorlari, xatti-harakatlar strategiyasi va taktikasini to‘g‘ri belgilashda muhim o‘rin tutishi tahliliy materiallar orqali ko‘rsatib beriladi.

Individual subyektiv va ijtimoiy subyektiv baho munosabatlari haqiqatga moslik darajasiga ko‘ra real, noreal, taxminiy yoki shartlanganlik tarzida namoyon bo‘lishi, bunday munosabatlarning umumiy kognitiv modeli, uning turli til sathlari (fonetik, fonologik, morfologik, leksik, grammatik, frazeologik, paremiologik)ga mansub lisoniy, shuningdek, nolisoniy reprezentantlar yordamida voqelashuvi ingliz, o‘zbek tillari materiallari qiyosi orqali asoslab berilgan. Shu nuqtayi nazardan, subyektiv baho ifodalovchi lisoniy belgilar semantik mundarijasi komponentlarini protoverbal va verbal tiplari lisoniy belgi semantik strukturasida subyektiv baho mavjudligi/mavjud emasligiga ko‘ra kognitiv va pragmatik komponentlar farqlangan. Subyektiv baho

verbalizatorlari kontensional va ekstensional ma'nolarni o'z ichiga olishi, bunday birliklar ekstensionali subyektiv konseptga bevosita aloqador bo'lgan barcha predmet-hodisalar obrazlari (denotatlari) ekanligi, subyektiv baho kontensional, intensional va implikatsional qismlardan tarkib topishi dalillangan.

Tahlillarga asoslangan holda, "subyektiv baho" konseptiga quyidagicha mualliflik talqini asosli deb qaraladi: bu konsept insonning milliy va individual ongida shakllangan, olam hamda uning tarkibiy qismlari haqidagi bilimlar majmui asosida yuzaga kelgan murakkab semantik tizimdir. Ushbu tizim dunyodagi hodisalar, predmetlar va ularning xususiyatlarini subyekt tomonidan ijobiy, salbiy yoki neytral tarzda baholash asosida shakllanadi. Ya'ni, subyektiv baho konsepti bu – inson ongida mavjud bo'lgan, tajriba, madaniy muhit va ijtimoiy kontekst bilan boyigan baholovchi pozitsiyani ifoda etuvchi semantik struktura hisoblanadi.

Mazkur konsept til vositalari orqali – fonetik, leksik, grammatik va stilistik sathlardagi birliklar yordamida verballashadi. Bunda til o'zining baholovchanlik funksiyasini namoyon etadi va subyektning olamga nisbatan munosabati til sathida aniq semantik ifodasini topadi. Subyektiv baholash esa nafaqat tilshunoslik, balki madaniyatshunoslik, psixologiya va sotsiologiya kabi boshqa sohalar bilan ham uzviy bog'liq bo'lib, shaxsning ijtimoiy-madaniy muhitdagi o'rnini aniqlashda muhim rol o'ynaydi.

Xulosa qilib aytganda, subyektiv baho konsepti – bu til va tafakkur birligi asosida shakllangan, individning ongida dunyoni anglash va unga munosabat bildirish jarayonini ifodalovchi, ko'p qatlamli va dinamik semantik hodisadir. U tilshunoslikda semantik kategoriyalarni aniqlash, madaniy kodlarni o'rganish hamda kommunikativ aktlarda subyektivlikni tahlil qilishda muhim nazariy va amaliy ahamiyat kasb etadi.

Ababiyotlar:

1. *Березин Ф.М.* История лингвистических учений. – Москва: Высшая школа, 1975. – 304 с.
2. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. Беш жилдли. 5-жилд. Тузатилган 2-nashr. /Масъул муҳаррир А.Мадвалиев. – Тошкент: "O'zbekiston nashriyoti" давлат унитар корхонаси, 2020. – 608 б.
3. *Соссюр Ф.де.* Умумий тилшунослик курси /М.Шамшиева таржимаси. – Тошкент: "Mumtoz so'z", 2017. – 107 б.
4. *Cho'lpon A.* Kecha va kunduz. – Toshkent: Ilm-ziyo-zakovat, 2019. – 288 b.
5. *Ойбек*. Қутлуғ қон. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1979. – 369 б.
6. *Jerome K.J.* Three men in a boat. – Moscow: "High school", 1976. – 151 p.
7. *Rockwell K*. It's me O lord. – Moscow: Higher school publishing House. 1973. – 288 p.
8. *Dreiser T*. Sister Carrie. – Moscow: Higher school publishing House, 1968. – 596 p.
9. Oxford Advanced learners' dictionary. Sixth Edition. Oxford University Press., 2000. – 2006 p.
10. *Бондаренко Н.* Анализ субъективных оценок нормального дохода и прожиточного минимума // Мониторинг общественного мнения: экономические и социальные перемены. – 2001. – № 1 (51). – С. 46–50.
11. *Градосельская Г. В*. Субъективные и объективные оценки благосостояния // Социологический журнал. – 2003. – № 3. – С. 86–98.
12. *Иванова Г.Ф.* Мнения «объективные» и «субъективные». // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. Филология. Искусствоведение. Вып. 29. – 2009. – № 5 (143). – С. 28 –36.
13. *Крупнова Н.А*. Слова субъективной оценки и способы ее выражения в русском и немецком языках // Вестник МГЛУ. Гуманитарные науки. –2019. Вып. 1 (817). – С. 219–230.
14. Лобынцев Н.А., Антипанова О.А. Субъективное и объективное благополучие студента. – С. 376–381. [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/53082685.pdf (Дата обращения: 21.10.2024).
15. *Турсунов У, Мухторов А, Раҳматуллаев Ш*. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон, 1992. – 400 б.

Mualliflar haqida ma'lumot:

ABDUVALIYEV Mahamatjon Arabovich – Filologiya fanlari doktori (DSc). Andijon davlat chet tillar instituti Ingliz tilini o'qitishning integratsiyalashgan kursi kafedrasi mudiri. E-mail: muhammadjonabduvaliyev70@gmail.com.

RUSTAMOV Dilshodbek Abduvohidovich – Filologiya fanlari doktori (DSc). Andijon davlat chet tillar instituti Ingliz tili va adabiyoti kafedrasi professori. E-mail: dilshodbekrustamov01@gmail.com.