



VALUES AS A FACTOR IN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

Evgeniya A. Smolii^{1}, Tatyana V. Satina², Larisa N. Aleshina³*

¹Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), Moscow, Russian Federation, Email: smoliia_e@list.ru

²Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russian Federation, Email: tv-satina@mail.ru

³Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russian Federation, Email: aleshina_l@list.ru

Evgeniya A. Smolii¹, Tatyana V. Satina, Larisa N. Aleshina. Values as a Factor in Language and Culture. - Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology 17(3) (2020), 1-20. ISSN 1567-214X. 20 pages + 13 figures, 3 tables + 4 frames.

Keywords: Values, Language, Culture.

ABSTRACT

Values are the main semantic determinant of human consciousness. Thanks to values, a person comprehends his being, but this comprehension occurs in language and through language. Thanks to language, meanings fall into human thinking, which are not always adequately understood by human. Accordingly, values make human life meaningful.

Key words:

INTRODUCTION

Values are a key category, a foundation for the process of comprehension of the world by a person. Values in their linguistic expression are social content that a person comprehends. Values serve as a guideline determining the direction of society. The form of expression of the value is language. A person comprehends the world around him based on the hierarchy of values developed by society, which is expressed in the linguistic units of the mother tongue. Values as an element of human consciousness are based on the deep value attitudes that are inherent in society.

HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF VALUES

Since the beginning of the 20th century, the problem of value, value relations, their role in human social life has become the object of attention of scientists of various fields: philosophers, philologists, psychologists, sociologists, linguists and cultural scientists are trying not only to define the concept of

value, but also to determine their place in life man, his being. However, the history of the study of values is a variety of conjectures, hypotheses, and teachings. All this diversity together constitutes the foundation of axiological theories.

Already in the most ancient philosophical investigations, concepts are used that were subsequently attributed to various manifestations of values, assessments of natural and social phenomena, human actions. The history of axiology can begin with ancient thinkers who talked about good, good, beauty, truth. Socrates already began to consider “good”, “justice”, “beauty” not as abstract concepts, but as values.

Until the end of the 19th – beginning of the 20th centuries, the doctrine of values was included in integral philosophical systems. However, there was no separate question about the nature of values, their hierarchy. Moreover, a comparative analysis of the values of different peoples and different eras was not carried out. The authors of axiological concepts proceeded from the fact that the people themselves, their social system are of the highest value.

The problem of the scientific development of the theory of values and value orientations becomes relevant only at the end of the 19th century, when the “philosophy of values” is formed in its systematic form, and axiological problems become the subject of science, turning to the analysis of the specifics of human activity, sociology, psychology, philosophy. At this time, axiology appears as a separate and youngest branch of philosophical science.

There is a theory of values, and with it a whole series of different schools. Value issues have become part of Western philosophical concepts. The most widespread problem of value is presented in the works of I. Kant, V. Windelband, G. Rickert, M. Scheler, R.B. Perry, J. Dewey and others. In Russian philosophy, the problem of values has long been ignored. Only in the 60s of the last century did Soviet axiologists tackle the problem of values. The most famous are the works of O.G. Drobnitsky, V.P. Tugarinov, M.S. Kagan, L.N. Stolovich., L. Chukhina, V. Yadov and others.

The development of the cognitive direction has again activated the interests in the study of values. At present, there is an understanding of value as a multidimensional concept, proceeding from the orientation to “cultural synthesis”, “convergence of cultures” among representatives of a certain ethnic group. The form of expression of value is language. Thanks to language, there is an external real human being, in the form of images, symbols of human consciousness. Through language, a person expresses the meaning of the situation, formulates motives and goals that motivate him and other members of society to work.

AXIOLOGICAL TRANSCENDENTALISM

In the late 19th – early 20th centuries, a reappraisal of traditional values was observed. A need arose for a new vision of the world, new forms of consciousness. The Neo-Kantians of the Freiburg School were the first to draw attention to the peculiarity of public cognition. First of all, Kant made an attempt to give a general idea of the definition of “value”. In his work, “Fundamentals of the Metaphysics of Morality”, the philosopher writes, “all objects of addition have only conditional value, because if there were no inclinations and needs based on them, then the subject would have no value. The inclinations themselves, as a source of needs, have so little absolute value for the sake of which they should be wished for themselves...” (Kant, 1965). Kant's value is inherent in man and in his human attitude to the world, determined by the laws of morality. The scientist believes that not all human value is true. Value can be illusory. He refers to such imaginary values the

judgments of people, generated by the “illusion of ambition”. For Kant, value is primarily moral value. A person must be aware of the need for certain actions. The philosopher argues that moral law lies at the foundation of moral value, and if moral requirements cannot be based on the laws and needs of this world, then they must come from some other world. Thus, Kant approaches the creation of the other world, the “realm of values”.

This direction was further developed in the neo-Kantian concept of values. Prominent representatives of the Freiburg (Baden School) V. Windelband and G. Rickert proceeded from the teachings of Kant. Philosophers tried to erect the concept of value as central to philosophy. Neo-Kantians associate the transcendence of value with independence from time and space. However, there are differences in their approaches to understanding the nature of value.

As writes V.V. Kryukov, according to V. Windelband, philosophy can exist “only as a doctrine of universally valid values, the task of philosophy is to rise above empirically perceived reality, study the field of universal principles, norms, ideals and express them in a certain system of values, without which neither individual nor social human existence is conceivable” (Kryukov, 2001). In his concept, the scientist widely uses the concept of “value”, replacing it with the concepts of “norm”, “absolute assessment”. V. Windelband is of the opinion that philosophy exists as a doctrine of the values of universally significant values and their explanation as a norm, not a fact. The highest value is truth. Truth, as well as good and beauty, has a temporal, non-historical principle.

G. Rickert further develops the neo-Kantian concept of values. But unlike W. Windelband, Rickert does not reduce the subject of philosophy to a “pure theory of values”. In his philosophical concept, value is universally valid, acting as an ideal, different from reality, not having an unambiguous normative character. The task of philosophy, according to the scientist, is to “find that third kingdom that would unite the world of reality with the world of transcendental values” (Rickert, 1998).

The scientist seeks to justify the objectivity of value, while he states that values “form a completely independent kingdom lying on the other side of the subject and object” (Rickert, 1998). Rickert's object is being, reality, and their understanding.

Rickert believes that there is a need to distinguish between three concepts: value, good and valuation. Values independent of reality are found in goods and valuations. The philosopher offers his hierarchy of values, highlighting in it 6 areas:

1. Logical values (they are implemented in science);
2. Aesthetic values (expressed in art);
3. Mystical values (expressed in religious cults that do not have a personal god);
4. Moral and social values (aesthetic benefits);
5. Personal values (love, kindness, friendship);
6. Religious values (faith in the “personal God”).

Rickert creates his own system of values, taking into account the division into “values, benefits (combining values with reality), the estimated relationship of the subject and the type of value worldview” in each area (Stolovich, 1994).

The main thing in the concept of G. Rickert is to overcome the contradiction between the spheres of “values” and “being”. Subject and object make up a single part of the world of reality. They are confronted by value.

In the first half of the 20th century, the content of values associated with the state and social groups is changing. At the same time, interest in the problem of values is growing, both in the ordinary and in the scientific consciousness. The most important indicator of an individual's cognitive processes is language.

It reflects “new axiological teachings that, to a greater extent than neo-Kantianism, corresponded to a changed historical reality” (Matveev, 2009).

In the phenomenological axiology of Max Scheler, man and the problem of his being occupy a central place. Scheler sets the task to reveal the nature of values, to justify their system and hierarchy and to prove that the phenomenological method is most effective for an adequate knowledge of values.

The philosopher distinguishes between values and their carriers, and defines the values themselves as “objective qualitative phenomena that are independent of the consciousness of the subject and of the objects in which they are” (Chukhina, 1966). Scheler considers values as objects independent of consciousness, acting on the subject through their carriers. The scientist considers values “objectively existing, emotionally colored facts” (Chukhina, 1966). Scheler rejects the interpretation of value with subjective - objective content, which is a dialectical unity of opposite parties.

It is important for the philosopher to defend the concept of “a priori” in relation to values, to affirm the a priori nature of the values themselves “as self-valuable in direct contemplation, not reducible to either sensory or rational cognition” (Matveev, 2009). Thus, in Scheler's value, objectivity is absolutized.

The scientist divides values into two classes - positive and negative. “All values (ethical, aesthetic, etc.) fall into positive and negative” (Scheler, 1994). A necessary condition for the formation of values and meanings is a person's mental activity, and language acts as a semantic field that enables a person and society to express in their depth structures the content of the process of understanding social and cultural phenomena of what values are.

Scheler recognized the existence of a certain hierarchy of values. He defined the hierarchy of values as “something absolutely unchanging” (ibid).

NATURALISTIC PSYCHOLOGISM

The basis of the psychological approach to the phenomenon of values is the reduction of value to certain spiritual manifestations that arise in the process of objective action. This direction was developed in the works of A. Meinong, K.I. Lewis, R.B. Perry, J. Dewey et al.

American philosopher R.B. Perry defines value as an object of interest, as a definition that expresses the position of a thing relative to interest. Any object, according to Perry, gains value when any interest, whatever it may be, extends to it. In his study of values, the scientist takes a “psychocentric” approach. Value is a “tertiary quality”, remote from the objectivity of the “primary” (figures, outlines of objects).

The scientist recognizes the division of values into “truth”, “beauty”, and “good” as a traditional axiological classification, while offering his own classification, according to which values can be divided into “functions of interest” and “institutional forms” (cognitive, moral, economic, political, aesthetic, religious).

THE PROBLEM OF VALUE IN DOMESTIC SCIENCE

In Marxist philosophy, the problem of value was addressed only in the second half of the 20th century, when special works on ethics, aesthetics, logic,

sociology began to appear, illuminating the theory of values by authors such as O.G. Drobnitsky, V.P. Tugarinov, B.A. Chagin, M.S. Kagan, V.A. Vasilenko, S.F. Anisimov, L. Stolovich, L. Chukhina, N. Rozov and others. In the Soviet literature, in the study of values, they often turned to the theory of value of K. Marx, which was considered as the theory of “economic valuation”.

B.A. Chagin wrote “the problem of value is to a large extent the problem of the relationship of the subject (person, class, nation, people) to the objective material and spiritual results of human labor, based on historically developed needs” (Chagin, 1966). Value is the unity of the objective and subjective, absolute and relative, past, present and future.

The greatest contribution to the development of Soviet axiology was made by V.P. Tugarinov who defines value as “objects, phenomena and their properties that are needed (necessary, useful, pleasant) for people of a certain society or class and individual person as means of satisfying their needs and interests, as well as ideas and motivations as a norm, goal or ideal” (Tugarinov, 1988). Value has an objective-subjective nature.

The position of another Soviet scientist O.G. Drobnitsky can be described as subjective-objective, since the philosopher put “subjectivity” in value in the first place. O.G. Drobnitsky gives the following definition of value: “... on the one hand, it is a characteristic of objects (phenomena) in which a person is somehow interested and which he evaluates positively or negatively, and on the other hand, these are forms of consciousness in which a normative-evaluative attitude is expressed man to the surrounding reality” (Drobnitsky, 1967). The scientist believed that values can be used widely only at the level of everyday consciousness, because they are closely related to subjective preferences.

It is worth noting that the point of view to the value approach of V.P. Tugarinov has become generally accepted in Russian philosophy. In the future, the study of value developed in the framework of objective-subjective or subjective-objective concepts.

Domestic scientist S.F. Anisimov built a classification of values based on their hierarchy:

- highest values (humanity and man);
- values of material life (natural resources, tools and products of labor necessary for human existence);
- values of social life (family, nation, state, various public entities);
- values of spiritual life and culture (scientific knowledge, philosophical, moral, aesthetic and other ideas, ideas, norms, ideals).

The Marxist concept of value, which was developed in the 20th century, was distinguished by the concept of the social essence of value, of historical and class nature. Values were considered as products of social life, as the subject's activities related to his needs and interests.

THE CONCEPT OF VALUE AND VALUE ORIENTATIONS

In the domestic literature devoted to the problems of axiology, the concept of “value”, its definition and content is given close attention. There are a variety of approaches to determining value. “Value is a philosophical and sociological concept denoting the positive or negative significance of an object, in contrast to its existential or qualitative characteristics (objective values); the normative prescriptive and evaluative side of the phenomena of public consciousness (subjective values)” (Philosophical Encyclopedia, 1970).

V. Sagatovsky formulated the definition of value as a guideline for the lifestyle of the subject. According to the scientist, values are a generalization of stable ideas about preferred goods and acceptable ways to obtain them, where the subject's previous experience is concentrated and on the basis of which decisions are made about his further behavior. However, it must be borne in mind that values belong not only to the individual, but also to the group, society, and humanity. The philosopher proposed his typology, in which the activity of man, oriented on value, was taken as a basis. In his opinion, value can be extracted when the achievement of the goal is dictated by external necessity, and intragenic when the goal is determined by the internal need of the subject. They are the necessary condition for the realization of cognitive functions in the language. Language in the development process reflects what is most valuable to society or its individual members. The process of understanding is formed on the basis of value categories that determine the direction of development of human society. Accordingly, the language is not only in organic connection with mental activity, but also carries axiological semantic content.

Language is a channel through which a person conveys not only the emotional state and the shades of emotions of feelings affect certain feelings of other people.

A significant contribution to the development of axiological problems was made by N. Rozov. In his work "Values in a troubled world" (1998), the scientist gives the following definition of value: "Value, like "truth", "man", "culture", apparently will never be determined by exhaustive images, but understanding this circumstance should not to impede the creation of working conceptual structures that meet the need to solve modern problems" (Rozov, 1998). Under the value refers to the "ultimate foundation of acts of consciousness and behavior of people" (ibid).

Moreover, in different cults, different peoples have their own individual value systems.

The axiological position of the St. Petersburg philosopher M.S. seems very remarkable. Kagan. According to the scientist, value is not a thing, not a property, but a specific relationship. The philosopher considers the specifics of a value relationship in human activity as a subject-object interaction. Value connects the object with the subject - the bearer of social and cultural qualities that determine the content of his spiritual activity. M.S. Kagan proposes to consider the value relationship from the external and internal sides.

The value relation from the inside is the evaluating subject and object (the bearer of value), and the external aspect considers the influence of the development of society and culture on the formation of value consciousness. Value consciousness and value attitude are important components of a person as a person.

The concept of "value" is characterized by a variety of facets, aspects and has many forms of existence. Values arise and function, ultimately, not at the level of the individual as such. Value is the product of the collective activity of people — groups, masses, society.

Reflection in the human mind of values recognized by them as strategic life goals and common worldviews are called value orientations (hereinafter - VO). The concept of "value" orientations was introduced in social psychology as an analogue of the philosophical concept of "value". Many scientists consider VO as a link between the motive and the goal of the activity. Sociologists, under the definition of VO, accept "motives, needs, interests and other determinants of activity considered in the value paradigm" (Sociological Dictionary, 1991).

V. Yadov believes that “from the point of view of the theory of relations, value orientations act as concrete guidelines for the manifestation of the personality relation in each particular case” (Yadov, 1975).

When determining value orientations, it is advisable to consider the latter within the framework of both approaches, since value orientations act as a kind of the most important “nodes” linking various types of activity into integral personality structures. These “nodes” are formed due to the inclusion of man in the system of social relations, and they form the core of the personality, its basis, ensuring the integrity of individual existence.

CONCLUSION

Each person lives in a certain system of values designed to satisfy his needs. We can say that values express the way a person exists, and different values have different meanings for her, and a hierarchy of values is associated with this: a person is able to sacrifice some values for the sake of others, and vary the order in which they are realized. Values are preserved and transmitted from generation to generation through language. That is, the language performs a social function, which is manifested in the storage of accumulated knowledge, skills and representation of achievements.

Like the values themselves, their hierarchical structure has a concrete historical character. The same objects and phenomena of the surrounding world for different people can be of varying importance, just as at different times for the same person value orientations can be very different. We can say that the whole life experience of a person and the totality of his preferences directly affect the nature of his value orientations and the value perception of reality. The formation of values is also influenced by such factors of human existence as biological, mental, etc., although they form only the background of objectification of sociality. In other words, there is not only historical, but also individual dynamics of values and their hierarchy.

Personality values form a system of its life orientations, by which we mean the totality of the most important qualities of a person's internal content, which are especially significant for him. These value orientations form the basis of the individual's behavior, and have a direct impact on his development. If we consider value orientations as target guidelines defining the boundaries of personal aspirations, the role of value-orientational activity in a person's life becomes obvious: the latter covers the entire content of his being in the field of “value attraction”.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publication was prepared with the support of the “RUDN University Program 5-100”

REFERENCES

- Adonina, L. V., Fisenko, O. S. (2015). *Linguistic personality as a value and carrier of universal, ethnic and individual values. Actual issues of socio-psychological research*. Collection of scientific and educational articles. Editors-compilers: Tyutchenko A.M., Fisenko O.S. - M.: Perot, 25-28
- Anisimov, S. F. (1970). *Values are real and imaginary*. - M.: Thought, –183 p.
- Chagin, B. A. (1966). The problem of value and evaluation in the light of the works of K. Marx, F. Engels, V.I. Lenin. *The problem of value in philosophy*. M.–L., 6-13

- Chukhina, L. A. (1966). Phenomenological axiology of Max Scheler. *The value problem in philosophy*. M.-L., 181–193
- Drobnitsky, O. G. (1967). *The world of living things*. The problem of value in Marxist philosophy. - M –351 p.
- Fisenko, O. S. (2015). *Universal values as sociocultural concepts. Sociocultural concepts in social work*. Collection of scientific and educational articles. Russian State Social University. - M.: Perot, P. 3-32
- Fisenko, O. S. (2015). *Values and linguistic consciousness. Social and humanitarian knowledge: traditions and innovations*. Collection of scientific and educational articles. - M.: Perot, 232-236
- Ilyin, V. V. (2005). *Axiology*. - M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 216 p.
- Kagan, M. S. (1974). *Human activities: Experience in systems analysis*. - M.: Politizdat, - 328 p.
- Kant, I. (1965). *Collected Works*. - T.4. - M.
- Kryukov, V. V. (2001). *Introduction to axiology*. Tutorial. - Novosibirsk, – 76 p.
- Matveev, P. E. (2009). *Value approach in ethics*. - Vladimir: Cathedral, 312 p.
- Philosophical Encyclopedia. - M., 5, P. 462
- Poisons, V. A. (1975). *About dispositional regulation of social behavior of a person*. Methodological problems of social psychology. M., 245 p.
- Rickert, G. (1998). *Natural sciences and cultural sciences*. - M.: Republic, – 413 p.
- Rozov, N. S. (1998). *Values in a problem world: philosophical foundations and social applications of constructive axiology*. Novosibirsk: Publishing House of the Novosibirsk University, 292 p.
- Rudelson, E. A. (1966). *Neo-Kantian doctrine of values* (Freiburg school). The value problem in philosophy. - M.-L., - P.128-144
- Scheler, M. (1994). *Selected Works*: Per. with him., ed. Denezhkina A.V. M.: Gnosim, – 490 p.
- Smoliy, E. A., & Fisenko, O. S. (2014). *Universal Values as a Component of Linguoculture*. Word and Text: Psycholinguistic Approach, 14, 93-97.
- Stolovich, L. N. (1994). *Beauty. Good. Truth: an essay on the history of esthetics*. Axiology. - M.: Republic, 464 p.
- The sociological dictionary*. (1991). Minsk, P.502
- Tugarinov, V. P. (1970). *Selected philosophical works*. L.: Leningrad University, 1988. –344 p.