# LINGUISTIC AXIOLOGY: ITS FEATURES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY RELATIONS

**Burxonova Mohira Omonilla qizi**
PhD student at Uzbekistan State World languages University

**Abstract**. Linguistic axiology, as a subfield of linguistics, explores the value-laden nature of language and its ability to encode ethical, cultural, and emotional meanings. Drawing upon global research from cognitive linguistics, translation theory, and ethnolinguistics, this article outlines the foundational features of linguistic axiology and its integration with other disciplines. The study synthesizes international perspectives to highlight how language operates as a medium for value transmission across diverse cultural and academic landscapes.

**Keywords**: linguistic axiology, values in language, interdisciplinary linguistics, axiological analysis, cognitive linguistics

**Introduction**

Language is not merely a vehicle for communication; it is also a powerful tool for expressing values, ideologies, and cultural norms. The field of linguistic axiology investigates how values—whether moral, aesthetic, or social—are embedded in and conveyed through language (Ullmann, 1962). This approach has since been expanded to investigate how language users assign positive or negative values to concepts, often unconsciously. As globalization intensifies interactions between cultures and languages, understanding the value systems reflected in linguistic expressions has gained critical importance, especially in multilingual and multicultural contexts. Given its intersection with cognitive science, translation studies, and sociolinguistics, linguistic axiology is inherently interdisciplinary. The present article aims to define its key characteristics, trace its historical development, and present insights from international scholarship on its application in modern linguistics.

Linguistic axiology is grounded in the semantic and pragmatic functions of language. It studies how words, phrases, and discourse carry value judgments—whether positive or negative. Ullmann (1962) distinguished between descriptive and emotive meanings, emphasizing that many lexical items imply approval or disapproval. Modern studies reinforce this view by examining axiological dominants—words or expressions that serve as carriers of core cultural values (Yergaliyeva et al., 2023).

Words are never entirely neutral. Many carry embedded evaluations that reflect collective experiences and societal beliefs. Terms like "freedom," "justice," or "corruption" do not merely refer to concepts—they imply approval or disapproval depending on context (Krzeszowski, 1997). Axiological meaning is often constructed through metaphors, evaluative markers semantic analysis and connotative layers of meaning. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) demonstrated

how metaphors shape moral reasoning (e.g., GOOD IS UP, BAD IS DOWN). These metaphors are culturally bound, affecting how speakers of different languages express similar values.

Certain expressions become dominant carriers of cultural identity. These axiological dominants reflect the core values of a speech community. Yergaliyeva et al. (2023), analyzing Kazakh linguoculture, identified dominant themes like hospitality and honor embedded in digital discourse. Such dominants are essential in identifying national conceptual frameworks.Moreover, culturally bound metaphors, idioms, and proverbs often encapsulate the worldview of a community. Neliubova (2022) observed that French, Russian, and Tuvan proverbs act as linguistic capsules of ethnocultural values, forming part of a society's moral memory. In her academic research, Madjidova has examined the axiological significance of proverbs in Uzbek and Russian, focusing on their practical application and the evaluative criteria used to express both positive and negative concept of value system.

Beyond vocabulary, evaluative meaning emerges through syntactic choices, tone, modality, and pragmatic framing. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) techniques are often employed to uncover implicit axiological judgments in political speeches, media language, and advertisements (Fairclough, 1995). Evaluative meaning in language is not confined to lexical choices alone; it is deeply embedded within syntactic structures and discourse organization. Syntax can be used to foreground or background value-laden information, as seen in the strategic placement of adjectives, adverbs, and modal verbs. For instance, evaluative adjectives such as remarkable, deplorable, or innovative often precede nouns to signal judgment before the proposition is fully processed (Thompson & Hunston, 2000). Moreover, discourse-level structures such as thematic progression, presupposition, and rhetorical questions contribute to the construction of value positions. In argumentative discourse, evaluative stances are marked through concessive constructions (e.g., "Although the method is limited, it remains effective") that manage conflicting values. The use of reported speech and hedging devices further reveals the speaker's orientation toward the values expressed. As Hunston (2011) notes, evaluative language in discourse serves not only to express opinion but also to align or distance the speaker from social norms, ideologies, and power structures. These features make evaluation a dynamic and context-sensitive phenomenon, tightly interwoven with both grammatical form and pragmatic intent.

Interdisciplinary Relations

Linguistic axiology, as a field concerned with the study of values encoded in language, naturally intersects with a range of other academic disciplines. One of its strongest connections lies with cognitive linguistics, where value systems are viewed through the prism of conceptual metaphors and embodied experience (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). These metaphors are not only linguistic devices but also cognitive tools that reflect the moral and cultural values of a speech

175

community. Another key interdisciplinary link is with translation studies, where axiological awareness is crucial for achieving semantic and pragmatic equivalence across languages. Translators must navigate not only denotative meaning but also culturally embedded value judgments, which may lack direct analogues in the target language (Rojo & Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2013). In language pedagogy, the integration of axiological components enhances intercultural competence, enabling learners to appreciate how values shape discourse across linguistic boundaries (Zerkina et al., 2015). Additionally, discourse analysis and critical linguistics rely heavily on axiological insights to uncover ideological underpinnings in media, political texts, and social communication. As such, linguistic axiology serves as a bridge connecting linguistic theory with social cognition, ethics, and cultural studies, contributing to a holistic understanding of language as a carrier of human values.

Values are often culture-specific, and their translation presents a challenge. Translators must grasp the axiological context behind idioms or metaphors to avoid semantic distortion. As Aydarova et al. (2024) note, neglecting axiological and cultural codes in machine or human translation can lead to miscommunication or loss of nuance. Modern approaches call for axiological equivalence, alongside lexical and syntactic fidelity.

Teaching a foreign language involves more than grammar and vocabulary—it includes introducing learners to a new value system. According to Zerkina et al. (2015), integrating axiological analysis into language instruction enhances intercultural awareness, which is key for effective communication in multicultural contexts. This pedagogical focus on values prepares learners not just to speak another language, but to think within its cultural framework.

Ethnolinguistics studies how language reflects the cultural and historical experiences of a community. In many Indigenous languages, certain grammatical forms or lexemes are tied to spiritual, environmental, or social values. This makes linguistic axiology a valuable lens for interpreting how culture and language co-evolve (Wierzbicka, 1999).

International Research and Emerging Directions

Recent international research in linguistic axiology reflects a growing recognition of the field's theoretical and applied importance across linguistic and cultural contexts. Studies in Europe, Central Asia, and East Asia have particularly emphasized the role of language in shaping national and cultural identities through value-laden expressions. For instance, comparative analyses of proverbs, idioms, and political discourse in Uzbek, Russian, English, and Chinese highlight how axiological markers differ cross-culturally, yet serve parallel functions in encoding moral and social norms (Madjidova, 2020; Neliubova, 2022). Western scholars have explored axiological markers in media, political discourse, and postcolonial narratives (Fairclough, 1995; Krzeszowski, 1997).In multilingual societies, researchers explore how competing value systems are negotiated within a single discourse, contributing to the understanding of value pluralism in

communication (Yergaliyeva et al., 2023). Moreover, linguistic axiology is increasingly intersecting with digital discourse analysis and AI language modeling, especially in the development of ethical algorithms and sentiment-aware technologies. In this context, axiological insights are instrumental for building culturally adaptive systems that recognize value-specific language use. Emerging trends also suggest a merging of axiological linguistics with neuroscience and cognitive psychology, where researchers aim to map emotional and value-based processing in the brain during language comprehension. These interdisciplinary and cross-national directions signal a promising expansion of linguistic axiology into new frontiers of science and global communication.

## Conclusion

Linguistic axiology plays a pivotal role in bridging language, thought, and value systems. Its interdisciplinary relevance is evident in cognitive linguistics, translation, pedagogy, and cultural studies. By uncovering the evaluative mechanisms in language, scholars can better understand the sociocultural dynamics that shape communication. Its focus on the evaluative potential of language reveals how societies articulate and preserve their values. By drawing on international research, it becomes evident that language is not merely shaped by thought but deeply influenced by what a society holds dear. . As technology, education, and intercultural dialogue evolve, so too will the methods and applications of linguistic axiology.Future research may focus on applying axiological frameworks in AI, international diplomacy, and global education.

## Reference

1.  Aydarova, A. M., Bilyalova, A. A., & Zelenina, T. I. (2024). Axiological and cultural codes of verbal semantics in the context of machine translation. Philology: Theory & Practice. https://philology-journal.ru/en/article/phil20240393/fulltext

2.  Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.

3.  Hunston, S. (2011). Corpus Approaches to Evaluation: Phraseology and Evaluative Language. Routledge.

4.  Krzeszowski, T. P. (1997). Angels and Devils in Hell: Elements of Axiological Linguistics. Warsaw: Energeia.

5.  Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press.

6.  Madjidova, R. (2020). Aksiologicheskoe issledovanie antropotsentricheskikh poslovits [Axiological study of anthropocentric proverbs] (Doctoral dissertation, The Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Fergana).

7.  Neliubova, N. Y. (2022). Axiological dominants of paremies as typological markers in Russian, Tuvan, and French ethnic cultures. New Research of Tuva, (1), 146–163.

8.  Rojo, A., & Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. (2013). Cognitive Linguistics and Translation Studies: Past, present and future. In Cognitive Linguistics and Translation (pp. 3–30). De Gruyter Mouton.

9.  Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: An Introduction. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse (pp. 1–27). Oxford University Press.

10. Ullmann, S. (1962). Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. Oxford: Blackwell. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and universals. Cambridge University Press.

11. Yergaliyeva, S. Z., Asanbayeva, Y. B., & Yergaliyev, K. S. (2023). Axiological dominants of the Kazakh linguoculture in the text generation of virtual communicants. Bulletin of the Karaganda University: Philology Series, (4), 130–136.

12. Zerkina, N., et al. (2015). Axiological Linguistics and Foreign Language Teaching. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199, 254–260.