

## **EVALUATION AS A LINGUISTIC CATEGORY WITHIN AXIOLINGUISTICS**

**Saydalieva Mukhlisakhon Bakhtiyor kizi,**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences,  
Researcher at the Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore,  
Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan;  
e-mail: [saydalievamuxlisa@gmail.com](mailto:saydalievamuxlisa@gmail.com)

**Аннотация.** В данной статье анализируются взгляды лингвистов на реализацию категории оценки, являющейся одним из основных понятий в системе ценностей.

**Ключевые слова:** аксиология, ценность, оценка, оценочное суждение, оценка.

**Abstract.** In this study, attention is given to the manifestation of the category of evaluation – one of the core concepts of the value system – through the analysis of linguists' opinions.

**Keywords:** axiology, value, evaluation, evaluative judgment, assessment.

Today, in world linguistics, the axiological approach, which studies values, their nature, socio-cultural factors, and their connection with the notion of personality, is gaining increasing importance. Axiology is a separate branch of philosophy in which the concept of being is divided into two elements – reality and value. Axiolinguistics likewise has particular significance due to its anthropocentric character. Existing objects, events, and phenomena acquire value only within human consciousness.

In this regard, within the framework of the anthropocentric approach, one of the important tasks facing our linguistics is the study of the specifics of axiological evaluation in language units, the identification of its aspects related to worldview and consciousness, the thematic classification and analysis of axiological units, the determination of their significant features, the identification – based on the analysis of specific linguistic units – of the peculiarities of the axiolinguistic features of the Uzbek language, as well as the systematic description and analysis of values.

In axiolinguistics, the concepts of value and evaluation hold primary significance. When studying the category of evaluation, it is possible to rely on numerous works produced within Russian linguistics. In Uzbek linguistics, too, there exists a sufficient number of studies devoted to this subject.

The concept of axiological evaluation was originally formed as a philosophical category and later became a fundamental notion of axiology. The category of evaluation is considered a basic category of axiology, equally important as value. As a category, evaluation arises in the immediate process of people's relation to existing phenomena. Evaluation expresses people's aspirations, reflects their unacceptable rejections or neutral attitudes, and conveys the position of the subject within the system of social relations and culture. At the same time, it is implied that evaluation is also a product and choice of the human cognitive process, which serves as the source and measure of value.

In forming an understanding of value, one can rely on the following ideas of S.F. Anisimov: "The significance of value (namely, for people) is reflected in consciousness in the form of evaluation – in the form of ideas, concepts, and judgments. Evaluation may also be manifested in

the form of feelings, pleasure, aversion, and similar emotional reactions. Conscious evaluation always takes the form of an evaluative judgment, and in speech – the form of statements such as “This person is beautiful,” “These plants are useful,” “Violence is evil.” The main difference between an evaluative judgment and, for example, cognitive judgments, lies in the fact that in the predicate involves the concept of value.” [3: 85]. For example, let us analyze two judgments about bread. “Bread is a food product made from dough, baked in a tandir (national stove), oven, etc.” – this is a cognitive judgment, a scientific description. “Bread is precious” – this is an evaluative judgment, and in this case the predicate “precious” is a value concept expressing a positive meaning. In general, the formation of views on the role and significance of bread in the daily life and subsistence of members of the Uzbek linguo-cultural community, as a precious good, has led to a considerable increase in sources connected with it in the folklore and in traditions worthy of becoming objects of linguo-cultural studies: breaking bread (engagement), finding a whole loaf, finding bread; “The abundance of bread is the abundance of the people,” “Bread earned by labor is sugar, unworked bread is poison,” “Bread earned by labor is sweet,” and so on. From these examples one can see the value-based attitude of Uzbeks toward bread.

M.S. Andryukhina emphasizes that the system of evaluation is realized in two stages: “1) through human experience, which expresses everyday concepts; 2) through the understandings that are formed in the conceptual core of human existence.” [2: 54]. According to the scholar, the axiological significance of an object is determined by its evaluation, which, of course, may be positive, negative, or neutral. Values, as a category, include only those phenomena of social life that have positive content for the existence and development of society. It should be noted that values cannot exist as a separate world, outside of reality.

The linguist N.D. Arutyunova, who studied in depth the system of values in language, in particular the category of evaluation, emphasizes the social nature of evaluation and interprets it through the norms accepted in a given society. Worldview and the way of perceiving the world, social interests and fashion, prestige, influence or isolation – these are the factors that form or alter evaluation. The linguist regards evaluation as the most vivid example of pragmatic meaning and stresses that the category of evaluation links language with such notions as norm and the normative picture of the world, choice and alternative, practical thinking and decision-making. [4: 4]. According to the scholar, evaluation is relevant only at the moment of its application, that is, it is valid for the current period. [4:6]. For example, the notion of a “good automobile” at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century does not correspond to modern requirements. Similarly, the individual who gives the evaluation is of primary importance. This is explained by the fact that an evaluative judgment is multifaceted in its relation to its author. Through evaluation, the speaker expresses his or her personal opinion and taste.

In the “Dictionary of Linguistic Terms” by Sh. Safarov, the following definition is given: “The expression of the speaker’s subjective attitude toward the object or the information conveyed. Evaluative modality is regarded as a special type of subjective modality and is compared with deontic and epistemic modality. At present, issues related to the act of evaluation are interpreted as the subject of study in axiological linguistics.” [5: 100-101] It is clear that the scholar’s views are closer to the description of subjective evaluation than to the category of evaluation. In axiolinguistics, objective evaluation is considered more important than subjective evaluation. We will analyze this situation in more detail later on the example of types of evaluation.

In scientific works on axiolinguistics devoted to evaluation, we observe the predominant classification into general evaluation, objective and subjective evaluation, as well as positive and negative evaluation. Although these concepts constitute the main operative classification groups of evaluation, within this field a number of its types are distinguished. In the article “Basic

Concepts of Axiological Analysis,” Y.F. Serebrennikov, drawing on the ideas of Yakovleva, identifies the following types of evaluation: **general, collective** (objective), **individual** (subjective), **non-standard, rational, functional, emotional, standard, epistemic, a priori, a posteriori, explicit, and implicit evaluation**. [6:35-36]. We have summarized the types of evaluation presented in various studies and found it appropriate to distinguish the following types:

**General evaluation** is a positive or negative assessment related to the qualification of something, based on the premises of the evaluating subject or the phenomenology of the object.

**Objective, or collective**, evaluation is the type of evaluation that applies to all members of a particular linguistic community, and is based on common social, moral, cultural, or scientific norms. In this case, the evaluative judgment is founded not on individual, but on general standards. Objective evaluation contains content that is approved, permitted, or recommended by society. In objective evaluation, emotions do not play a primary role; it is regarded as a relatively stable form of evaluation and is grounded in concrete facts, social values, and strict norms established in society.

**Subjective, or individual**, evaluation is a form of assessment based on an independent point of view, inner feelings, intuition, worldview, knowledge, beliefs, tastes, and the personal experience of a particular individual. Subjective evaluation reflects the emotional and psychological state of the speaker. This type of evaluation pertains to the speaker himself/herself and expresses his or her personal position in the form of statements such as “I like it,” “It suits me,” “I don’t like it.” In subjective evaluation, the emotional and affective load is manifested more vividly. It is unstable, and changes in the situation or the state of the evaluated object also bring about changes in the evaluation.

**Epistemic evaluation** is related to the degree of reliability of interpretation/evaluation and reflects the speaker’s knowledge of the subject of discourse. Its means of expression are primarily the “epistemic articulators” of the utterance – modal parenthetical words that belong to the set of indicators of the reliability/unreliability of the evaluative content of the utterance (probably, apparently, undoubtedly, in my opinion, etc.). In this case, evaluation reflects the conditions under which the speaker perceives/understands the world. The notion of epistemic evaluation in axiology refers to the evaluation of knowledge and beliefs from the standpoint of value and is considered a broad concept. This notion lies at the intersection of epistemology (theory of knowledge) and axiology (theory of values) and implies the evaluation of a person’s beliefs or knowledge from an epistemic perspective, based on such criteria as their closeness to reality, justification, rationality, or reliability. For example, a person may believe in a certain concept of being and assume that this belief is founded on truth and relies upon these grounds. If these truths are systematically reliable, such a belief will have high epistemic value.

**A priori evaluation** (Lat. a priori – before all, from the very beginning; not based on experience, not derived from experience, preceding experience [1:124]) is a form of evaluation that has no empirical foundation but is formed on the basis of specific features of culture, mode of thinking, mentality, or the linguistic system. In this case, evaluation is shaped not by experience but appears in the form of semantic features grounded in pre-existing stereotypes and cultural patterns. For example, the word “homeland” is expressed as a sacred place, the land where a person was born and grew up, a beloved or dear place for people; the word “hero” is expressed as courageous, brave, valiant, fearless, the main participant in certain events who has distinguished himself; and the words “father” and “mother” as those who have children, show kindness, care, nurture, provide for, and protect them. Conversely, negative evaluation is inevitable in the semantics of such words as traitor, oppressor, haram, hypocrite, liar, anger.

**A posteriori evaluation** (Lat. a posteriori — from the later, from what occurred afterwards; based on experience, derived from experience [1:123]) is an evaluative attitude formed on the basis of experience, observations, and historical events of society or individual persons, acquired over a certain period of time. This type of evaluation is the complete opposite of a priori evaluation; that is, it is not the direct assimilation of a ready-made notion, but an evaluation shaped by lived experience. Thus, a posteriori evaluation is formed on the basis of real events, historical experience, and representations developed in social consciousness. It is not stable and permanent, but changeable, and over time the evaluation of a particular word or concept may shift. A vivid example of this can be seen in the attitude toward the pandemic. The coronavirus pandemic, which began in 2019, reached global proportions and profoundly affected the social, political, and economic life of countries, generating a serious negative attitude and evaluation among contemporary people. Before this, humanity had not experienced such a severe and instantaneous “collapse” for a long time. Therefore, living witnesses of the pandemic that began in 2019 will retain a negative attitude toward this word for many years. Another example of such a situation is the Japanese perception of the atomic bomb. The formation of negative attitudes and evaluations of events and processes such as system collapse, crisis, deflation, devaluation, famine, migration, etc., associated with the experience of economic and political crises in different countries, is an illustration of a posteriori evaluation.

**Non-standard evaluation** is, in fact, a form of subjective evaluation, characterized by non-standard judgments in the processes of assessment.

**Rational judgment** is a form of judgment that arises through logical reasoning.

**Functional evaluation** is defined by the coordinates of functional relevance, as opposed to evaluation determined by the coordinates of absolute significance. This type of evaluation is based on the social function of linguistic units. It arises in a more specific speech situation. Such evaluation is associated with practical and communicative values.

**Emotional evaluation** is manifested in the expression of assessment that arises as a result of experiencing such emotional states as joy, sadness, anger, fear, surprise, and perplexity.

**Normative evaluation** is established in the context of confirming the correspondence of the content of the evaluative judgment to the real situation.

In this case, **explicit** (expressive) and **implicit** (indirect) types of evaluation are distinguished. For example, in explicit evaluation, the evaluative judgment conveys a direct attitude (for example, hypocrisy, duplicity – as a bad vice), whereas in implicit evaluation the evaluative judgment is understood through context (“Yeti uxlab tushga kirmagan ishlar bo‘lyapti” (he has never predicted it) – a negative evaluation).

#### References:

1. Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language. Vol. 1. – Tashkent: Gafur Gulom National Publishing House, 2022.
2. Andryukhina, M.S. “Axiological Evaluation as One of the Basic Concepts of Linguoculturology and the Theory of Culture.” World of Science, Culture, Education, No. 3 (22). – Gorno-Altaysk, 2010.
3. Anisimov, S.F. Introduction to Axiology: A Textbook. – Moscow: Contemporary notebooks, 2001.
4. Arutyunova, N.D. Types of Linguistic Meanings. Evaluation. Event. Fact. – Moscow: Nauka, 1988.
5. Safarov, Sh. Dictionary of Linguistic Terms. – Tashkent: Lessons Press, 2023.