

## Types of evaluative adjectives in English and Uzbek

*Bahromjonova Begoyim Bahromjon qizi*

*Bachelor's Degree Student*

*Chirchik State Pedogogical University of Tashkent region, Uzbekistan*

*Kenjayeva Muxlisa Baxodir qizi*

*Associated professor*

*Chirchik State Pedogogical University of Tashkent region, Uzbekistan*

**ABSTRACT:** This article is devoted to types 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.

### 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.

### Results and discussion

The subject of evaluation is an object or phenomenon whose value (or anti-value) is determined. This basis of evaluation is numerous classifications of ratings. The character of the evaluation is a recognition of the value (positive, negative or zero) of the object of evaluation. Depending on which characteristics are actualized in the evaluation act, the basis for the evaluation is taken to differentiate into external and internal. The inner expresses the emotional sphere of a person, his feelings, positive and negative emotions associated with the mental sphere of sympathy and antipathy. External oriented at the cognitive sphere of man, they reflect the knowledge of the subject, formed by the ratio of the mental and social nature of the surrounding person of reality. There are usually two types of evaluation - absolute and relative. In the first, terms such as "good / bad" are used, and the second one is "better / worse". In absolute assessment, as a rule, one object is evaluated, and in the case of a comparative one, at least two objects or two states of the same object. In absolute evaluative structures, the comparison is not directly expressed.

In the first group, the given adjectives pass an absolute mark. Expressions of this type always mean the stereotype and the scale on which the evaluation is oriented. Consequently, an absolute estimate is based on the general nature of social stereotypes. The adjectives of the second group represent a comparative estimate based on the matching of objects with each other.

Many terms are composed of both descriptive and evaluative information. Adjectives in English can be represented by two classes: empiric and rational. By the present stage of the English language development there defined several groups of empiric adjectives, that is, the ones "denoting signs perceived by the senses and realized by the person as a result of a single-stage mental comparison operation with "a standard". Empiric adjectives designate their own signs to specific subjects, their content is in full compliance with the logical and philosophical categories and rational adjectives, that is, indicating the category of signs that are not perceived by the senses, and are the result, comparison, conclusions. It should be noted that adjective attachment to a certain group is quite relative on its main meaning as for its derivative, metaphorical and redefining meaning they can be members of other groups. Rational adjectives indicate the category of features that are not perceived by the senses and they are the result, comparison, conclusions. Rational adjectives do not form a single class of words, and depending on the compatibility they are divided into four types: adjectives indicating the characteristics of a human, adjectives indicating the signs of animals, adjectives indicating features of objects, adjectives indicating the signs of the animal subjects estimated by a human.”

While we have taken beautiful and ugly to be aesthetic adjectives par excellence, it remains unclear whether there is a single, unified class of aesthetic adjectives: as noted earlier, it is plausible to think that one can express an aesthetic judgment using, so to speak, ordinary adjectives. To get started, it may help here to take a look at the adjectives that aestheticians themselves consider relevant. Famously, Frank Sibley proposed something like a list of what he called “aesthetic concepts”, among which we find the following: 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 not all of these (probably not even half of them) are exclusively aesthetic. For example, to say of a faded flower that it is lifeless is not necessarily to make an aesthetic judgment about it.

On the other end of the spectrum, to say that Picasso’s *Guernica* is one of the most beautiful paintings of 20th century is to attribute a (very) positive aesthetic value to *Guernica* and, quite controversially, to express an aesthetic judgment about that painting of Picasso's (as well as, derivatively, about other paintings of 20th century). The more interesting questions about aesthetic discourse arise with cases in which we do seem to apply an aesthetic concept without necessarily assigning any aesthetic value to a work of art, the way we do when we judge it to be one of the most beautiful paintings. Consider the followings:

- a. Picasso’s *Guernica* is dynamic.
- b. Picasso’s *Guernica* is somber.
- c. Picasso’s *Guernica* is moving

Evaluation is the second indicates the value of the first for a person. Although pearls and ruby in nature have their function and value, they are reborn in the human mind as an aesthetic value in society. Linguistic derived words of thinking such as eyes diamond (eyes like diamond), ruby lips (scarlet lips) in English, tishlaring sadafdek (teeth like pearls), lablaring yoqut (lips like rubies) in Uzbek, in are the result of national stereotypes of aesthetic axiological assessment. Having aesthetic value, the stone creates a panorama of the national picture of the Uzbek people - having formed as knowledge, it is expressed in the language through mental devices. Because the value factor plays an important role in the concept of culture. First of all, the individual

himself evaluates a social phenomenon and forms a national consciousness. In English, when connected to the adjective Beautiful, The answers the question “Who?” And means “The Beautiful” by beautiful people.

### **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.