

REFLECTION OF AESTHETIC VALUES IN THE LANGUAGE: UZBEK “GO`ZAL” AND ENGLISH “BEAUTIFUL”

M. M. Rakhmatova

Research Scholar Bukhara State University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Received: 16 May 2018

Accepted: 25 May 2018

Published: 02 Jun 2018

ABSTRACT

A present article which deals with comparative characteristics of the concept ‘beauty’ in Uzbek and English languages will pave the way to a more accurate and distinct imagination of the system of evaluative priorities which meanwhile will also assist in understanding Uzbek linguoculture and in accurate translation of phrases and proverbs in two different language societies.

KEYWORDS: *Concept, Aesthetics Judgment, Aesthetic Value, Culture, Linguoculture, Phraseology*

INTRODUCTION

Language and culture are an integral part of communication and can play a major role in understanding the values of a society. Krasnykh V. V. (2013) in the article “Correlation between language, culture and linguo-culture as subject of modern integrative studies” notices that anthropological approach and integrity of researchers consider language, culture and linguoculture as part and parcel of an indivisible unity “LANGUAGE – MIND – CULTURE – LINGUO-CULTURE – PERSONALITY – COMMUNITY – COMMUNICATION”.

On the other hand, values reflected in language demonstrate that the linguoculture which is understood as culture embodied and fixed in language signs, manifested in language and through language (ibid) is distinct from culture to culture. Linguacultural modeling of reality is one of the disciplines of linguistics with active and rapid development. Many investigations (Vorkachev, 2003; Vorobyov, 1997; Karasik, Slisshkin, 2001) have been carried out in a study of the interrelation of language and culture in Russia and in Uzbekistan. However linguacultural peculiarity of aesthetic judgement is not sufficiently studied in Uzbek linguistics.

The comprehension and translation of a foreign language is hardly accomplished only by the understanding of certain words and phrases or by knowing the syntax and morpheme system of a foreign language. There are parts of meaning in the concepts which are peculiar only to the culture and values of speakers of the certain language. Anna-Marie Taylor(2014) in the thesis “Investigations into facts and values: groundwork for a theory of moral conflict resolution” agrees, “A necessary condition for being able to speak a language is knowing under what circumstances to use terms and judgements”. In other words, a word only makes sense if used in the appropriate circumstance. She also states that knowing associations of judgments and terms is also a necessary condition. Connotations conveying additional meaning closely deal with values of a certain culture or I can say one value can have two or more value properties which are reflected in pun or synonyms. Krzeszowski (2012) in “Warsaw studies in English language and Literature, Volume7: Meaning and translation explains, “The crucial metalinguistic concept ‘valuation’ is consistent with the cognitive approach

to meaning. This approach involves the philosophical commitment that reality, even though it objectively exists as being independent of human cognition, can only be accessed and described thanks to human experience shared by groups of people making up a given community, a given nation, or perhaps, at least in some cases, by the whole human species.”. In other words, valuable objects existing in the world get their value property only through human actions and expertise in society. The experiences, actions, and objects that we judge on the bases of the certain specific foundation (through those bases we perceive the world) involve a system of values. These values get reflected in language or language absorbs values. I mean some sentences are impossible to translate because of the specific, peculiar way of the one language reflecting the values in proverbs. Adjusted specific structure of proverbs is due to the different value characteristics of one word or object, that makes the understanding of the world easier.

Krzeszowski (2012) affirms that the experience of values is “a necessary component of cognition, which means that axiology, as a study of values, cannot be ignored either in semantics or in pragmatics”. In other words, value reflected in evaluation enlivens the process of cognition through metaphors that individuals use in speech.

Values studied in “axiology” (from the Greek word ‘axia’ “value, worth” and ‘logia’ “study, science”) is a branch of philosophy dealing with values. Axiology is the essential grid in semantics which is the philosophical and scientific study of meaning in language closely dealing with what words, phrases, signs, symbols stand for and also pragmatics. Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning. Aesthetic and ethical norms are judged leaning on values and language necessarily reflects them in idioms and proverbs to convey meaning efficiently. That’s why translating such concise text units as proverbs or phrases calls in each case for a special strategy. Comprehending any proverb’s message as Sakayan, D explains “presupposes shared knowledge... cultural implications embedded in key-words must be commonly known to users of language”. In other words, shared knowledge of values unite people in one community making specific words clear in ethical or aesthetical messages.

Since values guide human behavior and language is an aspect of human behavior, basic values and national specific elements of basic values are surely reflected in the language. Interrelation of the two occurs only due to the evaluation made by the speaker during communication. How subject evidences values and how this is shown in language, and how subject’s native language, values interfere with comprehension of target language, values are described in the paper by the method of comparative analysis of ‘Beauty’ as aesthetic value in Uzbek and English 1

Values as Reflection of Culture and Social Being

Choosing the word that appropriately judges the object is the matter of conception of values in different cultures. According to Krzeszowski (2012) “Values must not be confused with objects of value (valuable objects), i.e. with things that are valued”. In other words, there are two types of values: valuable objects or things which are valued by its worth and the second is the bearer of value which means values are attributed in such things as ‘health’, ‘friendship’, ‘beauty’.

Rickert in his “Sciences about nature and sciences about culture” also claims that not every belief and object is considered as value. According to Rickert value is an object that is interrelated with a human being and they are basic characteristics of culture and the key point or guideline of human behavior (1995). In other words, the value is not just a thing, it is specific and peculiar social way of its existence. Whereas Seshadri, C. (1992) explains that “value refers to objects that human beings consider desirable and worthy of pursuit in their thoughts, feelings and actions. These objects may be material or abstract qualities and states of mind and heart like truthfulness, happiness, peace, justice. In any case,

they function as ideals and standards and govern human actions.” It means that value refers to objects as well as to abstract qualities and those things or feelings should satisfy man’s needs in order to become the value. No matter whether they are material or abstract they serve as a stereotype and guide our actions.

Rickert (1995) claims that science can distinguish cultural processes from natural ones basing only on the principles of value. And that we can always find the embodiment of some value recognized by the man in all phenomena of culture. For those values, these phenomena are created or if they existed before are fostered by man; and vice versa, everything that appeared and grew of itself can be regarded as of no relations with value (Rickert, 1995). Generally accepted view that the exactly values bear fundamental characteristics of culture, and are the highest guiding points of behavior are confirmed by the above statements. Kaushal, S.L., Janjhua, Y (2011) in the article “Meaning and Determinants of Values: Research Insights” also confirms that values “play a significant role in everyone’s life. The values possessed and practiced by the individual in their personal as well as worklife determine the decisions taken and the activities conducted by them. The behavior of an individual is based on the values held individually and collectively”. In other words, traditional, cultural and religious beliefs of people accumulated over the centuries form values and the values lead the whole life of one person, community and the whole nation.

Beauty ,as well as Truth and Goodness, are considered to be the basic values that guide human behavior. “Beauty” in general is an aesthetic pleasure valued universally and that’s why it is basic universal value. The elements or subvalues that make ‘beauty’ the whole are distinct from culture to culture. So, when people in different cultures talk about ‘beauty’ they consider different sub-values which are distinct and that’s why social behavior of different people also vary. Let’s take as an example the image of “beautiful woman” in Uzbek world picture which does not coincide with the image of “beautiful woman” in the English world picture. The image of blue-eyed woman, which is valued in English culture guides the behavior of people in that culture with positive effect towards the object that possesses this image and determines successful social existence as well as gets reflected not only in mere words but also in phrases, idioms, and proverbs of that language. While “blue eyes” in different culture perceived as non-value may not create positive effects in the behavior of people of that different culture and can be less reflected in language. Due to the values are chosen and reflected through images of different objects via association language enriches its vocabulary: positive images in English: *blue eyes- eyes as blue as the ocean*; a positive image in Uzbek: *qora ko`zlar (black eyes)-as black as night*. Or there are some other images describing the beauty of a woman are: *lily; swan, picture* in English; *gul(flower), lola(tulip), oy(moon)* in Uzbek.

The reflection of values in the language is important to investigate because the word that possesses only lexical and grammatical meaning cannot be contextually meaningful without expression of subjective evaluation or connotations assumed (Rakhmatova, M 2012). Sometimes those individual subjective and cultural peculiarities in meaning are omitted in the translation.

Many philosophers claim that norms of a value change and they develop or fade due to the dialectically developing experience of society, fex handlebar moustache valued as handsome by 17th-18th century western cultural aesthetic norms may sound ridiculous if evaluated by XXI century aesthetic western cultural norms. Karasik V.I, (1996) in his book “Cultural dominants in the language//Language identity: cultural concepts” distinguishes value of civilization type: values of medieval Christianity or values of modern industrial society among ethnic and universal values. Hence, while reading the description of a man with “a handlebar moustache” in a novel written in the 17th century the

image will indirectly imply about aesthetic pleasure received by that century aesthetic social norm, if even writer does not directly tell that the object was beautiful. Because “handlebar moustache” together with having neutral, meaning also possesses positive aesthetic connotation and so makes comprehension easier in a source language. But the translation of such pragmatic situation needs a special strategy in translation. As it is seen in the example above by the change of social aesthetic norms values also change. When values face change people also tend to use those words that reflect values less than before and it brings to effect that language also loses that connotation in words or phrases in its lexicon. For example, one of the elements of outer beauty valued in Uzbek linguaculture in middle ages “zulf” which means “hair used to decorate face and placed before ears of women” had specific aesthetic value and was considered beautiful or pleasing to senses. The word was frequently used in poetry to describe the beauty of women. Translation of such words which has no word-for-word equivalent in the target language culture may need some commentaries or clarifications in the process of translation. Now when contemporary aesthetic Uzbek values faced changes and women don’t anymore use ‘zulf’ as an element of beauty the object lost its value property and the meaning changed into just ‘hair’ when referred to the word by contemporary poets or became neutral in its every day use or gets old poetic and humoristic effect, translation needs special strategy because the word “zulf” may have two fold meaning functioning as pun in one context. Hence, when elements of values change over a period of time they acquire different other meanings and interplay of old connotation once valued with the new connotation can create pun or various other stylistic imagery in the text which makes translatability of the term challenging.

Mesheryakova Y. V. in her doctoral thesis “Concept “beauty” in English and Russian linguaculture” also confirms that the essence of value is changeable, it develops together with dialectically developing world experience, and can be cognized as any other objective relation, object or property. Evaluation in this process plays a big role being one of the means of realization of value. Our main point how values can be reflected in language is given in the analysis of evaluation further in this paper.

Evaluation as Reflection of Values

Interests, tastes, preferences of speakers are reflected in evaluation as a component which forms the semantic structure of the word. We cannot discuss issues of value in a language without elucidating the role of evaluation in the interrelation of value with language. Gurevich P.C (1994) 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 valuable property. The image of ‘lily’ for example by an 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 than 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, the conception of values of specific types of objects is the main moments of evaluation criteria (Granin, 1987). 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 the *clock, mutton or lamb*. The images have totally different connotations and have nothing to do with explained above aesthetic displeasing situation.

Mesheryanikova (2004) explains the relation of value to the evaluation and notes that evaluative judgement is subjective form of reflection of objective reality. To have the idea of values of a 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 a representation of the 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? Mesheryanikova (2004) gives example to elucidate the matter by explaining that elements of being which have not become social are devoid of any valuable essence (a mineral which is not used in social practice can be cognized, but cannot be evaluated unless cognition realizes its features due to which it can be used in social practice). Cognition is a prerequisite of evaluation and evaluation stipulates for the process of cognition, stimulating activeness of cognition in the direction that counts preferable (Mesheryanikova 2004). When evaluating some feature of a thing, feeling or action a speaker necessarily takes part in it. Academics refer to a speaker as subjects 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 the subject of evaluation is not expressed directly in it, implies value relations between the subject of judgment and its object.(1999). 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 the 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** (Cambridge idioms Dictionary) 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 a 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 the 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 a linguacultural peculiarity of the 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 an object, R is aesthetic value; H is favoring or favourite

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

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

- 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.
- 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 the new idiom that expresses different negative values “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 the perception of understanding the world in the modi of admiration and aversion. In order to facilitate our discussion about reflection of values in the 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.

Phraseology is the Main Evidence of Interrelation of Values with Language

For defining certain values in different cultures, it is necessary to carry out analysis of figurative, associative meaning of words present in idioms; interpretative analysis of value-marked expressions (proverbs in our case) for defining linguacultural peculiarity of aesthetic judgment.

Analysis of Phrase logical units in Uzbek language proves that beauty, first of all perceived by the eyes, and reflected in thinking that’s why language mind chooses the word ‘eye’ and depicts the situation. The image of “fire, light, ray” in explaining aesthetic pleasure valued as positive and bear positive connotation and expresses the beauty in the meaning of: to appear like a fire for the eyes, dazzle the eye (eng: dazzling beauty): “*кўзга ўтдай кўринмоқ*”, “*кўзни қамаштирмоқ*”, “*кўзга ташланмоқ*”, “*кўзга яқин бўлмоқ*”

The following expressions personify the aesthetic value attributing magical power to beauty in Uzbek linguaculture and expressions contain the meaning of bewitch, enchant, captivate: “*es hushini olib qo`ymoq*”, “*yuragidan urmoq*”, “*boshini aylantirmoq*”, “*jodu qilib qo`ymoq*”, “*asir etmoq*”, “*ofatijon bo`lmoq*”. The phrases assure that ‘beauty’ is a power of captivating those effects directly through emotions of people which is hard to regulate through reason.

The images of *nature, flower, peacock, bud, star, day* are evident in the following aesthetic phraseological expressions: “*gulday ochilmoq*”, “*toʻvushday yaltirab*”, “*g`uncha singari ochilmoq*”, “*yulduzi issiq*”, “*oy desa oydek, kun desa kundek*” imply that ‘beauty’ is seen firstly in nature and objects in nature serve as equivalent to evaluate beauty and specific value property of each object makes criterion of aesthetic evaluation in this case.

Women are mostly depicted through the image of the moon: *oyparcha, mohpora, mahvash, mahliqo, mahtob* or angels that are the heroes of folk tales: *farishta, parivash, sanam, malak*. These phrases are reflected on proper names of girls and imply intentions of people who desire to ascribe ‘Beauty’ to women as prior value for female.

Man is strong like heroes in the tales: *barvasta, bahodirlardek, Alpomishdek, Rustamnamo, davkar, pahlavonsifat, Yusufdek*, and reflected in the proper names of man implying masculine ‘beauty’. I can assume that concepts do not exist separately, they get the strength of delineation in interrelation. Concept “beauty” interrelated with the concept “strength” is implying the letter being valuable for comprehension masculine aesthetics and this value serves as a

stereotype for social existence of a man.

The following expressions confirm that concept “beauty” brings chaos and instability for the society and contain the meanings of captivate and kill: (smile that assassinates) *tabassumi jonga qasd qilguvchi*, (*beauty that captivates*) *husn asiri*.

Tenderness of a beautiful women is expressed through action verbs to eat and drink (as easy as to drink with one spoonful water; if eats carrot will be seen through her throat): “bir qoshiq suv bilan yutib yuborguday”; “*sabzi yesa tomog`idan ko`ringudek*”.

Phraseological expressions evaluating ugliness is expressed through unhealthy countenance, thin or thick proportion of people: “*rangi za`faron*”, “*eti suyagiga yopishgan*”, “*so`xtasi sovuq*”, “*beso`naqay gavda*”, “*qorindor semiz*”, “*ko`zga sovuq ko`rinmoq*”, “*istarasi sovuq*”, “*afti sovuq*”. It should be noted that the opposition *hot vs cold – Issiq/sovuq* is largely used to express the meaning of pretty, pleasant or familiar face – hot (*issiq*) and ugly, unpleasant, unfamiliar – cold (*sovuq*) in Uzbek linguaculture.

Let’s turn now to the analysis of aesthetic judgement in English phraseology. Phraseological dictionaries do not show a large number of expressions with aesthetic evaluation in English language. Beautiful outer appearance of people is valued and expressed through the following images in English: *lily, star, picture, paint, Greek god, and swan. Look like a million dollars, not a hair out of place; shining as star; graceful as swan; pretty as picture; as pure as lily/as fair as lily, a feast to the eye; a glamour girl, a slick chick, handsome as young Greek God, handsome as paint sweets to the sweet; out of this world; may queen; the fair sex; soft as dove; a dolly bird; beau ideal* are expressions that represent comparison standard or model.

The following phrase logical expressions prove that in evaluating beauty ‘eye’ and perception of seeing plays the great role in perceiving ‘beauty’ as well as in English culture: eye-appeal; feast one’s eyes on; have one’s eyes glued on; not to take one’s eyes from; easy on the eyes; easy to look at; collect eyes.

One more peculiarity of aesthetic English phrase logical units is it’s highly appreciation youth hood and health. Health and being young is considered to be key features of ones being beautiful. The following positive aesthetic evaluation – *as young Greek God; as fresh as a daisy; like a fly in amber*; and negative aesthetic evaluation – *lose ones roses, off color, without color* credit that being young and healthy is valuable property of ‘beauty’. Phraseological expressions like *as young Greek God, like an angel, out of this world* proves that beauty or beautiful are considered to be beyond our understanding and equivalents of which is not found on earth.

Prince charming, belle of the ball phrases of the kind is compared to fairy tale images which are also imaginary and perfect.

Outer appearance of not beautiful man is represented by the images: *toad, sin, scarecrow, dead monkey, bulldog* in the following expressions: *ugly as sin; ugly as a toad; ugly as a scarecrow; ugly as a dead monkey; vertically challenged; a face only a mother could love; a face that could stop a clock, look a sight, face like a bulldog chewing a wasp; skin and bone*.

From the analysis it is inferred that Uzbek people value *flower, peacock, bud, star, day, moon, angel, fire* as positive for perception of ‘beauty’ and they perceive ugliness through tactile perception considering ‘ugly’ to be ‘sovuq’

(cold) which compared to English “cold face” implying the ‘unemotional or low temperature’ but not ‘ugly’.

English world picture puts aesthetic positive emphasis on picture, paint, Greek God, swan, lily, star and a negative one on toad, sin, scarecrow, monkey, and bulldog. Comparisons of values in two different cultures more vividly express language mind of both cultures and comparative analysis eliminates a cultural gap that “could prevent English speaking people from understanding the translations” of proverbs (Sakayan,1997) and phrases.

In Uzbek and English linguaculture beauty is seen firstly in the nature and finds its objects to use as equivalent when comparing and express verbal utterances more distinctly. It can be easy to evaluate an object as beautiful and ugly, but it is difficult to answer the question what makes those things beautiful and ugly? Phrase logical expressions can show the reason of beauty, but all of them are subjective, culture specific and change over the period of time.

Axiology and the relation of it to linguistics or philosophical explanation of meaning through the prism of language is essential in the understanding cross-cultural peculiarity of aesthetic judgement. Comparative analysis of values of different culture’s level to better understanding among nations and comparative analysis of languages can pave the way to a better understanding of values. Knowledge about values in its turn eliminates a cultural gap that could prevent Uzbek or English speaking people from understanding translations of not only culture-specific phrases but also some glimpses of meaning in word-to-word equivalents that could express additional culture-specific connotations and associations.

REFERENCES

1. *British dictionary. (n.d.). www.dictionary.cambridge.org.*
2. *Cambridge Idioms Dictionary. 2nd ed. (2006). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.*
3. *Granin, Y. (1987). O gnoseologicheskoy sodержaniye ponyatiya "Otsenka". Voprosi Filosofii #6, 59-72.*
4. *Gurevich, P. (1994). Filosofiya kulturi. Moskva: AO "Aspektpress".*
5. *Karasik, V. (1996). Kulturniye dominanty v yazike. In Yazikovaya lichnost: kulturniye konsepty (pp. 1-16). Bolgograd: Arxangelsk.*
6. *Karasik, V., Slishkin, G. (2001). Linguokulturniy konsept kak yedinita issledovaniya. Metodologicheskiye problemi kognitivnoy lingvistiki, 75-80.*
7. *Kaushall S.I, P. H. (November 2011). Meaning and determinants of values: Research insights. International Journal of Research in Social Sciences <http://www.ijmra.us>, 113-116.*
8. *Krasnykh, V. (2013). Correlation between language, culture and linguo-culture as subject of modern integrative studies. Black sea-Чёрное море, 576-583.*
9. *Krzeszowski, T. P. (2012). Meaning and Translation. Volume1: Meaning. In e. b. Fisiak, Warsaw studies in English Language and Literature (pp. 3-28). Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang.*
10. *Kunin, A. (1967). Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar. Moskva.*
11. *Larin B, A. (1977). Istoriya russkogo yazika i obshee yazikoznaniye. Moskva: Moskva.*

12. Larin, B. (1977). *Ocherki po frazeologii (o sistematizatsii i metodax issledovaniya frazeologicheskix materialov). In Istoriya russkogo yazika i obshee yazikoznaniye (pp. 125-149). Moskva.*
13. Mesheryakova Y, V. (2004). *Konsept "krasota" v angliyskoy i russkoy lingvokulturax. Volgograd.*
14. Raxmatova, M. (2012/46). *Ingliz frazeologik iboralaridagi guzallik konseptining lingvomadaniy tahlili. Scientific reports of Bukhara State university, 95-97.*
15. Rickert, H. (1988). *Nauki o prirode i nauki o kulture. Moskva: Respublika.*
16. Sakayan, D. (1997). *On the translatability of some basic verbs and phrases in Armenian proverbs. Acta orientalia academiae scientiarum Hungaricae, 245-260.*
17. Selezneva, E. (1999). *O nekotorykh ossobennostyakh sredstv virajeniya modalnosti somnitelnoy otsenki (na materiale angliyskogo, fransuzskogo i russkogo yazikov). Teoreticheskaya i prikladnaya lingvistika. Vip.1. problemi filosofii yazika i sopostovitelnoy lingvistiki, Voronej, 74-80.*
18. Shomaqsudov, S., & SH, S. (1990). *Hikmatnoma. Toshkent: Uz.sov.ens.*
19. Taylor, A.-M. (1983/2014). *Moral Conflict Resolution. Victoria, Australia: Ondwelle Publications.*
20. Vorobyov, V. (1997). *Linguokulturologiya (teoriya i metodi). Moskva: Ros un-ta drujbi narodov.*
21. Vorkachev, S. (2001). *Linguokulturologiya, yazikovaya lichnost, konsept: stanovleniye antroposentricheskoy paradigmi v yazikoznaniye. Filologicheskiye nauki #1, 64-72.*

