



## NORM OF AXIOLOGICAL SCALE IN ANTHROPOCENTRIC PROVERBS

**Ra'no Urishevna Madzidova**

Professor, Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc)

Uzbek State World Languages University

Email: r.madjidova@mail.ru

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3100-436X>

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19387145>

**Keywords:** *axiological category, anthropocentric proverbs, bipolarity, value, anti-value, axiological linguistics, anthropocentric approach, paremiological unit, norm, assessment scale, positive assessment, negative assessment.*

This article is devoted to an interesting and relevant problem of modern linguistics – the problem of the bipolarity of the assessment of the human image in the anthropocentric proverbs of the Russian and Uzbek languages on the basis of their national linguistic and cultural specifics. The article also identifies, analyzes and describes phraseological units marked according to the criterion of positivity/negativity of the assessment. It is emphasized that the concept of evaluation in the studied languages and cultures has common features. The estimated values of the anthropocentric proverbs of the studied diverse languages are bipolar. The proverb characterizes character, behavior, and action with either a plus or minus rating. It is also emphasized that a characteristic feature of the assessments presented in proverbs is their bipolarity, associated with the universal axiological categories “good” and “bad” that underlie evaluation activities.

The anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages contain a huge evaluative potential, the disclosure of which will make it possible to determine the system of values of the Uzbek and Russian peoples as different linguistic and cultural communities.

The evaluative potential of not only the anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages, but also the proverbial sayings of all existing languages of the world is predetermined by the fact that a proverb as a special paremiological unit, unlike a word, performs the function of not only nominating objects and phenomena of reality, but primarily a life situation, while the nomination of a situation also expresses an evaluative attitude to a given situation and specific instructions to act in accordance with generally accepted norms. It follows that proverbs, like all proverbs, are “special nominative units that exist in language to express a value relationship, which is realized through the categories “necessary”, “ought”, “good”, “bad”. Folk sayings are part of a system that depends entirely on a person, on his choice, value preferences, on what a person considers to be the norm” [3, p. 180]. Naturally, only a person’s value attitude to life situations and objective reality as a whole is formed under the influence of the value system of society.

Assessment as a cognitive activity of a person is carried out by correlating the characteristics of an object of study or description with its reference template, fixed in the consciousness of the individual and society as a whole. The basis of evaluation is always a comparison of an object with a standard. Comparison of the characteristics of an object with a standard is made through evaluative categories, which are represented by invariant oppositions good and bad.

Axiological categories stand out well or poorly against the background of the category neutrally and serve in anthropocentric proverbs to correlate the characteristics of a person with the value system of the national-ethnic culture of the people. Axiological category of



neutrality A.V. Beloborodova calls the category indifferent and defines it as an alternative to good and bad. According to the author, any object can be considered good, indifferent or bad. Exceptions are objects that are outside the scope of assessments [2, p. 264]. In other words, outside the sphere of evaluations there are such objects of real or imaginary reality that do not encourage the speaker or listener to express evaluative meaning.

The object of assessment in anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages is a person, his characteristics in various parameters, behavior and activity in general. A person's positive/negative assessment forms his axiological status.

The axiological status of the verbalized object in the anthropocentric proverbs of the analyzed languages can be: a) absolute; b) relative.

The absolute axiological status of any object is the status of the object that is expressed by the categories "good", "bad" and "indifferent", and the relative one – by the comparative categories "better", "worse" and "equal" [2, p. 268]. Anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages have both absolute and relative axiological status. For example, absolute axiological status is inherent in proverbs of the Uzbek language such as *"Ursa ham, el yaxshi, So'ksa ham, el yaxshi"*, *"Baxshi bor joyda yaxshi bor"*, *"Yomon xotin – dardsiz kasal"*, *"Yondashmagin yomonga, Ranging o'xshar somonga"*; Russian language type: *"Вместе хорошо и недруга бить"*, *"Хорошо тому жить, кому не о чем тужить"*, *"Плохой зевает, резвый на ходу хватает"*, *"У плохого мастера всегда инструмент виноват"*.

To achieve the goal of the study and solve the assigned problems, the following methods were used: the method of linguistic description (for the analysis and description of anthropocentric proverbs as an object of axiological research), the method of axiological analysis (for identifying, analyzing and describing the axiological properties of anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages), the semantic method (to analyze and determine the semantic characteristics of markers of the anthropomorphic cultural code in anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages), method of linguocultural analysis (to identify the national-cultural conditionality of the axiological characteristics of a person in the proverbs under study), the method of component analysis (to reveal the bipolarity of the assessment of the image of a person in anthropocentric proverbs), the contextual method (to identify and analyze the relativity of the assessment of a person in anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages), the method of oppositions (to establish the composition of axiological proverbial dyads of conventional values and anti-values).

In anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek language such as *"Qoloqdan cho'loq yaxshi"*, *"Gapirgandan gapirmagan yaxshiroq, Gapiruvdim tegdi boshimga tayoq"*, *"Ko'pning haqi yetimning haqidan yomon"*, *"G'araz marazdan yomon"* and in Russian proverbs like *"Нет лучше дружка, чем родимая матушка"*, *"Сердце матери лучше солнца греет"*, *"Недоученный хуже неученого"*, *"Ленивый сын хуже петли на шее"* their relative axiological status is manifested.

Anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages, from the point of view of the assessments of a person presented in them according to the criterion of positive/negative assessment of the described object, can be classified into three large groups:

1) anthropocentric proverbs with a positive assessment of a person. For example, in the Uzbek language: *"Odam odamning dardini olar"*, *"Intilganga tole' yor"*, *"To'g'ri so'zlagan odam"*



*tug'ishganingdan afzal*"; in Russian: "Покуда жив человек, голодную смертью помирать не станем", "Пока и мы человеки – счастье не пропало", "Русский человек хлеб-соль водит";

2) anthropocentric proverbs with a negative assessment of a person. For example, in the Uzbek language: "Bezorida hamma bezor", "Bekorchidan bezib qoch, chaqimchidan – ko'chib", "Beqo'nimga qo'nim yo'q, yomon odamga – o'lim", "Dili qoraning qilmishi – qiyiqlik"; in Russian: "Плохая арба – дороге беда, плохой человек – семье горе", "Трех сладок, человек падок", "Человек сам себе убийца", "От живого человека добра не жди, а от мёртвого подавно";

3) anthropocentric proverbs contrasting positive and negative assessments of a person. For example, in the Uzbek language: "Yomon farzand ota-onani yerga qaratay, yaxshi farzand ota-onani elga oralatay", "Yomon – o'z g'amida, yaxshi – el g'amida", "Yomonning yaxshisi bo'lguncha, yaxshining yomoni bo'l"; in Russian: "Старый друг лучше новых двух", "Лучше быть мертвым героем, чем живым трусом", "Лучше с умным в аду, чем с глупым в раю".

As we can see from the presented classification, the estimated meanings of Uzbek and Russian anthropocentric proverbs are bipolar in terms of *positivity/negativity*. A proverb may contain either a positive assessment of a person, his character, behavior and actions, or a negative assessment, or a positive assessment can be contrasted with a negative one.

Consequently, the *positive/negative* assessment of a person in anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages, which is made according to axiological categories of good or bad, form bipolarity of the evaluative meanings of proverbs.

In anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages, the characteristics of a person and the spheres of his life activity that have the most valuable significance are subject to positive or negative assessment. It is noteworthy that "the process of a person's assessment of himself, his actions, and the world around him is an integral element of human existence, the formation of a national linguistic picture of the world. The assessment not only mirrors the specific thinking and world modeling of speakers of a certain language and culture, but also demonstrates the universality of the vision of the world and oneself in this world" [12]. It follows that depending on which character traits of a person, his behavior, action and, in general, which aspect of a person's lifestyle and activity are the subject of evaluative comprehension in anthropocentric proverbs on the basis of *positivity* or *negativity*, it is possible to determine the corresponding value priorities of the linguocultural community, which can have both a universal and a specific character, characteristic only of a given ethnic group.

Evaluative understanding of a person in anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages can be carried out from different angles of his existence and being, and therefore different types of his assessment are formed.

When assessing a person, the studied proverbs take into account the ethical, aesthetic, mental-intellectual, pragmatic, valueological, emotional, and normative aspects of human life. Naturally, the person's assessment in this case is positive or negative.

The ethical assessment contained in linguistic units expresses the moral and ethical standards of behavior of members of society generally accepted in the linguistic and cultural community. Ethical assessment is also presented in the proverbial fund of the Uzbek and Russian languages.

Anthropocentric proverbs of the studied languages are characterized by bipolarity of evaluative meanings, which N.A. Arutyunova correlates with the concepts *moral – immoral, virtuous – vicious* [1].



E.D. Dorzhieva writes in this regard: "In the tradition of moral philosophy, the words "virtue" and "vice" have broad meanings of positive and negative qualities (moral qualities) of an individual. Honesty, generosity, generosity, compassion, etc. – virtues. Deceit, stinginess, pettiness, callousness, etc. – vices" [6]. As we see, a person's value understanding of reality occurs through the initially opposite ethical categories of virtue and vice, which predetermine the positive or negative assessment of the object of description.

Virtue is an individual's observance of moral and ethical standards in all spheres of his life. Only on condition that a person is guided in his actions by moral principles can he be considered virtuous, for "in ethical terms, the concept of "virtue" (and as its opposite, "vice") emphasizes an important aspect of morality, which is associated with forms of organization, or regulation, behavior" [6]. Otherwise, a person will be recognized as vicious in the society in which he is located.

Consequently, depravity is an individual's violation of public moral and ethical norms, his disregard of moral principles. As a result of deviation from such virtues as kindness, sincerity, honesty, justice, nobility, generosity, mercy, hospitality, moderation, etc., a person becomes evil, deceitful, greedy, stingy, coward, traitor, unjust, ungrateful, proud, envious, angry, lustful, etc. It should be noted that when ethically assessing a person in the anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek Russian languages, more attention is paid to kindness, fidelity, generosity, hospitality, etc.

The basis of the aesthetic assessment of a person is such a value as beauty [4]. Human beauty in a philosophical interpretation is the coincidence of an individual's objective and subjective perception of the manifestation of beauty in a person, which is a fusion of such human qualities as beauty, kindness and truthfulness.

Actually, this, in our opinion, justifies the position that E.V. Myakisheva points out in his dissertation. "The main feature of stereotypical ideas about beauty is the possibility of simultaneous functioning of stereotypes that are opposite to each other: *Быть худым – это красиво. – Быть худым – это некрасиво; Высокий рост – это красиво. – Высокий рост – это некрасиво; Красота – свойство молодости. – У каждого возраста своя красота*" [9, p. 14].

T.G. Orlova also points out the opposite meanings of the values of assessing the beauty of a person's appearance "Appearances are deceptive": "one cannot judge a person's inner qualities by a person's appearance", "a person is judged not by appearance, but by deeds and actions", "beauty is transitory", "the value of a person is not in beauty", "everyone understands beauty in their own way", and, conversely, "one can judge internal qualities by appearance", "the face reflects the inner world of a person", "appearance is a letter of recommendation", "behind an ugly appearance hides a beautiful inner world", "the most perfect creatures have flaws", "love a person with flaws", "happiness does not lie in beauty" [10, p. 59-60]. In this case, we are talking not so much about the opposite perception of the beauty of a person's appearance by different individuals, but about the representation of a contradictory assessment of it in the proverbs of people.

The opposite of aesthetic evaluation also manifests itself when characterizing human beauty from the point of view of its *naturalness/artificiality*. The natural beauty of nature is contrasted with the artificial, created by man himself. Divine beauty and earthly beauty are also contrasted.



It should be noted that the words beauty, beautiful and wonderful as terms of aesthetics have some semantic differences: the word beautiful is used when describing the appearance of an object, the word beauty, in addition to its aesthetic meaning, includes an ethical meaning, and the word beautiful is used when describing along with the appearance of an object and its other aspects, in addition to aesthetic evaluation, include ethical and utilitarian [7]. However, linguistically, all these three words can be present when assessing both the aesthetic, ethical and utilitarian characteristics of a person, as can be seen from the examples below.

The intellectual qualities of a person, or his human mind, distinguish him from the circle of other living beings living on Earth [5, p. 229-248]. A person has the gift of knowing himself and the world around him, to a certain extent to comprehend and analyze the structure of this world and through mental operations to identify what is hidden from view. "Mind and reason are the strength of man, his beauty, his weapon in the fight against evil, against deceit, a means of comprehending the truth and acquiring cultural values" [8, p. 169]. It is obvious that such a unique gift given to humanity cannot but be valuable for it and, accordingly, be subject to evaluative comprehension from the point of view of its development and perfection.

"Intelligence reflects the level of cognitive development of an individual achieved by a certain age, manifested in the formation of cognitive functions, the degree of assimilation of mental skills and knowledge, and serves for a person's successful mastery of various types of activities and successful adaptation to the environment" [8, p. 169]. The intellectual assessment of a person, contained in the wise sayings of peoples, is aimed at instilling in the individual the value of the mind and the development of intellectual abilities.

The intellectual assessment of a person is based on the opposition of the categories smart – stupid. A characteristic feature of the intellectual assessment of a person in paremiological units is that it reflects, along with admiration for reason and glorification of the mind, a condescending attitude towards unreason, forgiveness of stupidity [5, p. 239].

By pragmatic assessment of a person in anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages we understand the assessment of human activity to obtain a certain benefit. A person can achieve benefits in different ways. The objects of pragmatic evaluation in the proverbs under study are dexterity, skill, diligence, conscientiousness, cunning, and the ability to earn money.

In anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages, valeological assessment involves a positive or negative understanding of the physiological characteristics of a person, which represent some deviation from the accepted norm of health, and the deviation can be observed as higher, better than the norm – in this case the object receives a positive assessment, or lower, worse than the accepted norm – the assessment, accordingly, is negative in most cases.

Another type of assessment of a person in anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages is a normative assessment, which evaluates him in terms of the intensity [Beregovskaya] of his actions.

The normative assessment of human actions from the point of view of their intensity in the units we are studying contains a call, advice, and admonition to observe moderation in everything, adhere to the golden mean, not to overdo it and at the same time not to leave things unfinished.

Thus, in the anthropocentric proverbs of the Uzbek and Russian languages, ethical, aesthetic, intellectual, pragmatic, valeological, emotional, normative types of assessment of a



person are realized, which distinguished by the criterion of a person's qualities and the way of his life. A characteristic feature of the various types of human assessment contained in anthropocentric proverbs is their bipolarity, which is due to the fact that the basis of assessment activity is the universal axiological categories of good and bad.

### References:

1. Арутюнова Н. Д. Типы языковых значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт. – М.: Наука, 1988.
2. Белобородова А. В. Позиция безразличия на аксиологической шкале среди оценочных понятий хорошо/плохо. – Челябинск, 2010. – № 7.
3. Береговская Е. М. Очерки по экспрессивному синтаксису. – М., 2004.
4. Богуславский В. М. Типология значений образных средств выражения оценки внешности человека: Автореф. дисс. ... д-ра филол. наук. – М., 1995.
5. Динисламова О. Ю. Антропоцентризм языка и его отражение во фразеологии мансийского и русского языков. – Ханты-Мансийск, 2018.
6. Доржиева Е. Д. Этическая оценка в пословицах современного английского языка: Дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 2003.
7. Ли Хуа. Положительная эстетическая оценка в русском языке: Красота с позиции носителя китайского языка: Дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 2006.
8. Мирошников Ю. И., Шибeko Т. Ю. Эмоции и эмоциональные оценки в структуре ценностного сознания. – Челябинск, 2011. – № 2.
9. Мякишева Е. В. Эстетическая оценка человека в современном русском языке: лингвистический и лингвокультурный аспекты. – Омск, 2009.
10. Орлова Т. Г. Внутренний и внешний мир человека в английских и русских поговорках (опыт лингвистического анализа). – М., 2013. – № 3.