



## SEMANTIC CATEGORY OF VALUE AND TYPES OF VALUE IN LINGUISTICS

**Isakova Zilolakhon Zokirovna**

PhD of the English Language and Literature Department, Kokand State  
Pedagogical Institute named after Mukimi, Uzbekistan

e-mail: [isakovazilolakhon@gmail.com](mailto:isakovazilolakhon@gmail.com)

---

**Abstract.** In the modern Linguistics the relation of linguistics and other subjects is being studied with interest and one of the interdisciplinary concepts is the semantic category of value which is used in logics, philosophy and linguistics too. In the article the author studied developing the concept of value in Linguistics in comparison with other subjects like logics and psychology and types of values, value effecting factors, their expressing in speech in English and Uzbek languages in comparison.

**Key words:** Pragma linguistics, value relation, axiological value, positive value, negative value, axiological studies formed on the basis of relations between philosophy, logic, sociology and linguistics, axiological researches showing the relationship between psychology and linguistics, axiological investigations showing the interaction of cultural and linguistic sciences, value effecting factors.

---

### INTRODUCTION

Language is not only a means of exchanging information, but it is also technique of expressing emotions, thoughts, aim of speech participants through the appropriate and efficient use of linguistic means in the process of communication. Based on the above features of the language as well as axiological factors, communication between the participants in the speech is carried out, an objective or subjective approach to reality is taken, and this brings the assessment attitude to the surface.

The concept of Axiology is defined in English as axiology – value theory (value theory), in Russian as Axiology – оценка, цена (price, value), while in Uzbek the word Axiology is expressed by the word value, and Axiology (Greek axio – value, dignity and logy is a subject) - is a science of values. [1]

“What is value?” The question is defined in the National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan as follows: value is a concept used to show the universal, social-ethical, cultural-spiritual significance of certain events in reality. All things that are important for man and humanity, such as freedom, peace, justice, social equality, enlightenment, truth, goodness, beauty, material and spiritual wealth, tradition, customs, etc. are values. In any field of social science, value has been studied, and this concept has been sought to be defined in this way. [1]

It is worth noting that initially, during the development of humanity, values appeared on the basis of value concept. The values passed the test of time, became unchanged and formed the value system. Currently, the representative of the nation values reality based on national or social value. So, axiological value or value is a system of values that promotes the ideal developed in the mind of the representatives of the nation, and the value is the attitude expressed based on this system. Although the concepts of value and axiological value are not equal to each other, they are related and related concepts. Of course, the value is based on axiological value.

## METHODS AND DISCUSSION

In present-day linguistics, the cognitive direction and its related fields like pragma linguistics, are developing consistently. Categories such as space-time, causality, purpose-content, whole-piece, precision-abstraction, objectivity-subjectivity, generality-specificity, integrality-externality in pragma linguistics are widely discussed by linguists today. The concept that covers almost all of the above categories of pragma linguistics is certainly the concept of value.

It should be noted that in modern linguistics, based on interdisciplinarity, research of language and speech phenomena, in particular, research based on philosophy, logic, psychology and linguistic relations is developing. We can also include the study of axiological evaluation as a linguistic phenomenon among such researches. As mentioned in the previous section of the work, axiological assessment was first studied within the framework of philosophy and logic sciences, but since the middle of the last century, it has been widely studied as a linguistic phenomenon. As a continuation of these studies, in our research, we studied the axiological studies conducted in linguistics, divided into the following groups:

1. Axiological studies formed on the basis of relations between philosophy, logic, sociology and linguistics.

2. Axiological researches showing the relationship between psychology and linguistics.

3. Axiological investigations showing the interaction of cultural and linguistic sciences.

A number of linguists, in particular V.Von Humboldt, J.L.Lemke, A.A.Ivin, S.F.Anisimov, N.D.Arutyunova, M.S.Kagan, E.S.Yakovleva, Yu.G.Veshninsky, N.N.Kazidub, V.A.Maslov, A.A.Artemov, O.A.Dormidontova, E.V.Votintseva, F.G.Fatkullina, T.V.Evsyukova, E.F.Serebrennikova, L.K.Bayramova, O.N.Georgiva, E.Yu.Guaylar made their researches on the basis of relations between philosophy, logic, sociology and linguistics [2-13].

The occurrence of value based on the relationship between psychology and linguistics was searched by well-known linguists such as V.V.Vinogradov, V.I. Dodonov, E.M.Wolf. In the article by V.V.Kvashina, N.D.Arutyunova, E.M.Wolf, V.N.Teliya, L.A.Sergeeva, Z.K.Temirgazina, A.M.Peshkovsky [14-19].

It should be noted that human mentality, culture affects human intelligent, analysis of reality, in particular, the evaluation process. We can see this clearly when we cross-examine the axiological approaches of representatives of two languages, two nations and cultures. Although axiological research developed on the basis of cultural and linguistic sciences does not have a long history, a number of researches were carried out in this regard at the end of the twentieth century and the last decade of our century. In particular, the role of culture in the development of axiological theory studied by linguists such as N.O. Kushir, L.V. Kolijuk, O.V. Moshtak, L.N. Fedoseeva, A.R. Arakelova, E.A. Andreeva, E.I. Nazmieva, V.M. Nasrtinova, B. T. Gennadevna and S. Tsuen [20-25].

One of the researches devoted to linguistic axiology in Uzbek linguistics was conducted by G.Kambarov on the topic "Value attitude and its expression in Uzbek language". The linguist analyzed the expression of the evaluation relationship through language tools, especially the formation of evaluation forms through the lexical, morphological and syntactic tools, and researched the expression of subjective evaluation in the Uzbek language using formulas such as Negative+Negative=Positive [26].

A comparative research of personality evaluation nominations in English and Uzbek languages N.N. It was carried out by Panjjeva on the example of words such

as wop, working class, derog, petit, lad, elder, tirmizak, andi, pir, nobleman and their axiological features were studied [27].

The axiological study of the lexicon of the Uzbek language was carried out by E.Ibragimova. In the study, the relationship between linguistics and axiology, the types of expression of axiological meaning in words were divided into groups in the form of lexical tools denoting the meaning of subject, sign, action and state [28].

So, although the linguistic axiological research based on interdisciplinarity is linguistically new in modern linguistics, the concept of axiological value has a long history of development within disciplines such as philosophy and logic, and linguistics. All of the above-mentioned studies have their own place in elucidating the relation of axiological assessment in language and complement each other in terms of meaning. In addition to them, in our research, we aim to monographically study the expression of the evaluation relationship in English and Uzbek languages calculated from different system languages, evaluation elements, the relationship of evaluation with other semantic phenomena based on the cross-research of English and Uzbek languages.

## RESULTS

Reality can be assessed in two ways: objective value based on an objective view or subjective value based on a subjective view. Statements, information, news, and scientific works officially issued by mass media of the countries of the world have relative objectivity, subject to the norms of literary language. Subjectivity prevails in the relationship of certain individuals and groups' opinions about real life events. Undoubtedly, subjectivity is manifested in the personal value that is expressed by a person based on the society, nation, religion and age to which he belongs.

Positive and negative value which is expressed by language level units take the main place, and value is studied as a semantic category. Before analyzing the expression of the evaluation relationship, its specific features, it is necessary to dwell on expressiveness, it is necessary to remember that evaluation is a part of this expressiveness.

Expressiveness is studied mainly in two groups: expressive-emotional and expressive-subjective evaluation. Expressiveness has entered linguistics with a figurative meaning, and it means "the property of strong emotional imagery". Therefore, expressiveness means that expressive-emotional words, phonetic, lexical,

morphologic and syntactic levels' units express emotiveness in speech. Also, expressiveness (impressiveness) is formed on the basis of imagery, evaluation, emphasis and shows the levels of intensification/de-intensification.

It is known that 2 different forms of speech can be distinguished according to the speaker's attitude to reality: a) form of intellectual speech; b) form of intellectual-emotional speech. So, the psycho-physiological state of the speaker is reflected in his speech. Through the form of intellectual speech, a person expresses his relative objective value, and through the form of intellectual-emotional speech, personal feelings are added and "I" expresses an enhanced assessment. That is, intellectual and emotional forms of speech are combined, and evaluation is carried out based on the intention of the speaker.

The mental capacity of the speaker is demonstrated in the communicative function of the language, and the emotional state is manifested in the stylistic function. Although intellectuality and emotionality are opposed to each other as categories, they are inseparable phenomena that require each other.

If we consider the expression of emotionality in the speech, it is noticeable that along with the emotion, the expression of the relation of value which is expressed in the sentence. – *Hoo, bo'yiz etmagandan keyin puf sassiq qoldimi!* (O'.Hoshimov. *Dunyoning ishlari*).

It is worth to mention that emotionality is a phenomenon manifested through emotional words and language level units. The difference between emotionality and value expression is that emotionality and value expression differ semantically. Not all speech units expressing emotionality can express value relation. Some emotional words (for example, some exclamatory words: *allo, hosh, kisht*) do not have a value concept. For example: – *Xush...* – *dedi dadam salmoqlab.* – *Ishni do'ppidan boshlaymiz* (O'.Hoshimov. *Ikki eshik orasi*). At the same time, there are some words whose semantic structure is based on the concept of value, but is not included in the emotional lexicon: *Bilasizmi, arablar qahva ichishida nima deydilar? Ular der ekanlarki, birinchi qultum – ochchiq hayot kabi, ikkinchisi – zavqli ish kabini, uchunchisi – sirli olim kabi. Biz uchala kultumni ichib qoldik.* (T.Malik. *Shaytanat*, 2-kitob). The word *achchik* in the passage is considered to be an emotionally neutral word, and when used with the word *hayot*, it is equivalent to the phrase hard life, and the phrase *achchiq hayot* creates a negative value, that is, the neutral word is creating

a negative value in the context. As we mentioned above, the word *lazzatli* in the phrase *lazzatli hayot* reflects a positive evaluation based on the meaningful structure of the word, but the word *lazzatli* does not belong to the emotional lexicon. The word *sirli* in the phrase *sirli o'lim* has acquired a neutral meaning both out of context and within this context.

Levels of intensification/de-intensification are subjectively based on the concept of neutral value. For example: *Hamlet. What, the fair Ophelia? Queen. Sweets to the sweet: farewell!* (Scattering flowers) (W.Shakespeare. Hamlet) The phraseological combination *sweets to the sweet* in the passage has created intensity in relation to the word *beautiful*, which expresses a positive value.

Men bir gektar dalamga to'rt kilo qo'lansadan-qo'lansa zahar berdim. Achchiqdan-achchiq zahar berdim. (T.Murod. Otamdan qolgan dalalar) In the example phrases *qo'lansadan-qo'lansa*, *achchiqdan-achchiq* shows intensification in comparison phrases of neutral meaning of the words *sassiq*, *achchiq*.

Correspondingly, some language level units indicate intensity or de-intensity and the concept of value at the same time. For example, expressing intensity by lengthening the vowel: *wide – wi-ide room – ke-eng hona; low – low voice – low voice; Yes – ye-e-e-s – very true; good – go-o-o-d – very good; “Just a son of the ooold sod”, he went onmirthlessly, “with a tidy little private bank account of – what? Two, three million?”* But in some words with an intensive meaning, the relation of value is not expressed: *dark red, crimson-red*. Hence, the phenomena of intensification/de-intensification require a value relationship and they are interrelated.

Along with expressiveness, emotionality, and intensity, the following speech factors play an important role in the expression of subjective evaluation attitude:

1. The worldview of the addressee (the person expressing the linguistic reality) - the speaker and the addressee (the person receiving the linguistic reality) – the listener: ... *yosh oila yarim yil ichida buzilish jari yoqasiga kelib qoldi. Kuyov bola ajralishga asosiy sabab deb kelinning kiyinish madaniyatini ko'rsatadi. Kuyov: – Kelin shim kiyarkan, mening hijobga kirish haqidagi talabimni rad etdi. Bir qaraganda talab to'g'ri. Xotin er xohlaganday kiyinib yurishi kerak.... Kelin tomondan tayinlangan hakam ellik yoshlardagi gapga chechan ayol zamonaviy tarzda kiyingan. Yoshiga yarashmasa ham, shim kiygan, boshda ro'mol yo'q. U shubhasizki, o'z dunyoqarashi asosida kelinni himoya qiladi. Kuyov tomonni*

feodallikda ayblaydi. (T.Malik. Odamiylik mulki) The worldviews of the dialogue participants in the passage are completely different from each other, while the addressee - the groom makes a negative assessment of the bride's dressing culture, while the addressee - the bride's relative evaluates the bride's dress positively. As can be seen from the example, some concepts can be evaluated against each other based on the personal characteristics of the speech participants.

2. In the evaluation what is the purpose of communication between the addressee and the addressee is important factor. In communication knowing how important the intention of the participants of the communication is the next factor. Because a person can evaluate a concept both positively and negatively based on his purpose. After all, as Sh.Safarov pointed out [29], emotional intention is the logical basis of evaluation action. Thus, the speaker has 2 different goals for speaking: a) the speaker reveals his opinion and feelings about the thing being evaluated: *“You're the cutest thing here!” whispered Clyde, hugging her fondly* (Th. Dreiser. An American tragedy); b) the speaker encourages the listener to do something by evaluating: *“Oh, do look at that darling little coat there,”* she began, ecstatically, as though freshly arrested by the beauty of it, her whole manner suggesting a first and unspoiled impression. *“Oh, isn't that the dearest, sweetest, cutest little thing you ever saw?”* she went on, her histrionic powers growing with her desire for it (Th. Dreiser. An American tragedy).

3. The addressee and the addressee's thoughts about the person or situation with whom they are communicating.

4. The role of the speaker and the listener in the social society.

5. The situation of the speaker and the listener when the reality is happening.

We will consider the influence of 3-5 factors in the expression of the value relationship in the following example:

– Siz... siz... – dedi labi titrab. – Mayda odamsiz! Davlat manfaatini o‘ylamaysiz! Mana shu uyga ko‘chib kirishni o‘n yildan beri kutayotgan odamlar bor! Onalar, bolalar. Urush invalidlari... Topshiriqni bajaring!

Indamasang «siyosiy tomon»dan oladi!

– Yaxshi! – dedim. – Bitta iltimos, «A-1» armaturali panelni montaj qilish mumkin, deb yozib bering... O‘z qo‘lingiz bilan...

«Kobra» seskanib ketdi. Hatto ikki lunji shishib ketgandek bo‘ldi.

– Siz... – dedi vishillab. – Ilg‘or boshqarmamizning umum maqsadiga ataylab bolta uryapsiz. Ko‘ramiz, montajchilaringiz nosvoychining haqini olsa, nima deb sayrab qolarkansiz... Umuman... sizdaqa brigadirdan voz kechish masalasini o‘ylab ko‘ramiz... Dalillarimiz yetarli... (O‘.Hoshimov. Ikki eshik orasi). The content of the conversation between the director of the construction organization and the engineer given in the example is as follows: The construction manager looted the state property and sold the construction materials intended for construction. Now, the construction engineer is required to use a small reinforced panel instead of the size of the reinforced panel specified in the state standard. But the engineer correctly assesses the situation and does not agree to the construction of low-quality houses. In this debate, the people entering into contact have a negative opinion about each other. The construction manager is treating the employee with disdain because of his high position in the social society, and the engineer, although right, is trying to mitigate the strong emotional state of the boss and his own awkward position as an employee when the reality is happening.

## CONCLUSION

Thus, based on the above factors in speech in English and Uzbek languages, the category of semantic value is used in interpersonal relations, and it is characterized stylistically by acquiring diversity. In communication, through the effective use of axiological factors between the participants of the speech, the reality is assessed with a positive or negative perception. Although the concepts of value and axiological value are not mutually equal concepts, they are interrelated concepts, and axiological value plays an important role in the formation of value. Based on the axiological factors in the formation of the value, based on the worldviews, knowledge, psychology and emotional state of the participants of the dialogue, positive, neutral and negative coloring is reflected in the expression of the assessment attitude.

The problems of expressiveness in meaning as a component of connotation have been little studied. Studying value relation is one of them. There are two types of value about existence: descriptive and axiological. The first provides information about itself (objective), and the second is the value of the entity by a person (subjective). According to the semantic point of view there are 3 types of values: positive, neutral and negative.



If a person expresses his intellectual subjective evaluation through the form of intellectual speech, it is noticeable that the evaluation relationship is expressed together with emotion through the form of intellectual-emotional speech. Expressiveness is manifested in speech through levels of emotionality, imagery, evaluation, emphasis, intensification/de-intensification. The difference between emotionality and value expression is that emotionality and value expression differ semantically. Not all speech units expressing emotionality can express an value attitude. Some emotional words do not express the concept of value, but there are words that are based on the concept of value, but are not part of the emotional lexicon: good, bad, joy, anger, smart, stupid. Value has a special place in the formation of intensity, because the events of intensification/deintensification are carried out subjectively based on the evaluated neutral concept, and the evaluation relationship is also expressed in language level units that show some intensity/deintensification.

Participants of speech make attention to the following 5 main factors for evaluating reality:

1. The worldview of the addressee (the person expressing the linguistic reality) - the speaker and the addressee (the person receiving the linguistic reality) – the listener.
2. In the evaluation what is the purpose of communication between the addressee and the addressee.
3. The addressee and the addressee's thoughts about the person or situation with whom they are communicating.
4. The role of the speaker and the listener in the social society.
5. The situation of the speaker and the listener when the reality is happening.

## REFERENCES

1. National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan. – Toshkent: National encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2000. – 1. P. 181, 12. P. 58.

2. Humboldt V.F. Culture of language and philosophy. - Moscow: Progress, 1985. - 452 p.; Lemke J. L. // Semantics and social values, Word. - New York: Brooklyn College School of Education, 1989. - P. 234-238.
3. Ivin A.A. Osvaniya logiki otsenok.– Moscow: Izd-vo MGU, 1970. – 230 p.
4. Anisimov S. F. The real and imaginary values - Moscow: Thought, 1970 - P. 183.
5. Arutyunova N.D. Sravnitel'naya otsenka situatsional. Literary and literary series. - Moscow: Nauka, 1983. - P. 330.
6. Kagan M.S. Philosophical theory tsennosti. - SPb.: Petropolis, 1999. - 205 p.; Yakovleva E.S. Fragmenty russkoy yazykovoy kartiny mira (modeli prostranstva, vremeni i vospriyatiya) - Moscow: Gnozis, 1994. - 344 p.
7. Veshninsky Yu.G. Aksiologiya kulturnogo prostranstva-vremeni (v granitsakh postsovet'skogo kulturnogo prostranstva) // Mir psichologii, 2005. – S. 226-235.
8. Linguistics and axiology: ethnosemiometry tsennostnykh smyslov: collective monograph. - Moscow: Thesaurus, 2011. - 352 p.
9. Maslov V.A. Cognitive linguistics. - Minsk: Terta Systems, 2004. - 266 p.
10. Artemov A. A. Philosophical experience in building value hierarchy // Problems of modern economy. - Moscow. 2006. – P. 51-53.
11. Dormidontova O.A. Category otsenki i otsenoch'naya kategorizatsiya s pozitsiy sovremennoy lingvistiki // Almanakh sovremennoy nauki i obrazovaniya. - Tambov: Gramota, 2009. - S. 47-49.
12. Votintseva E.V., Fatkullina F.G. Aksiologicheskie problemy sovremennoy lingvistiki // Vestnik Bashkirskogo universiteta, 2015. – S. 1352-1354.
13. Evsyukova T.V., Agababyan S.R., Kotelnikova E.V., Germasheva T.M. Axiological World Picture of the Virtual Language Personality in Blog-Discourse Space // European Research Studies Journal Volume XX, Issue 3B, 2017. – P.

342-354; Linguistics and axiology: ethnosemiometry tsennostnykh smyslov: collective monograph. - Moscow: Thesaurus, 2011. - 352 p.

14. Vinogradov V. V. Русский язык: Grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove. - Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1972. - B. 31.

15. Dodonov V.I. Emotion kak tsennost. - Moscow: Politizdat, 1978. - B. 12.

16. Wolf E.M. Functional semantics is simple. - Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2002. - 280 p.; Wolf E.M. Otsenochnoe znachenie i sootnoshenie priznakov "horosho, ploxo" // Voprosy yazykoznaniiya, 1986. – S. 98-106.; Wolf E.M. Rol sub'ekta v otsenochnykh strukturax // Limba literatura moldovyanska. - Moscow: Nauka, 1979. - S. 21.

17. Kvashina V.V. Problemy aksiologii v sovremennom yazykoznanii // Vestnik Chelyabinskogo Gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. - Chelyabinsk, 2013. - S. 181–189.

18. Ironworks Z.K. Lingvisticheskaya axiology: Otsenochnye vyskazyvaniya v russkom yazyke. Monograph. - Moscow: Flinta, 2015. - 247 p.

19. Peshkovsky A.M. Linguistics. Poetics. Stylistics - Moscow: Flinta, 2018 - 712 p.

20. Kushnir O. N. Axiological basis of the typology of linguistic cultural concepts. Category of values and culture (axiology, literature, language) // Proceedings of scientific conference. – Vladikavkaz: Publishing House of the North Ossetian State University, 2010. – P. 165-174.

21. Fedoseeva L.N. Tsennosti i otsenki v sisteme aksiologii russkoi lingvokultury (na primere prostranstvennogo fragmenta kartiny mira) // Kultura i civilizatsiya. - Ryazan: Analitika rodiz, 2017. - S. 134-141.

22. Arakelova A.R. Lingvoaksiologicheskie kharakteristiki sovremennogo angloyazychnogo discursa mody: Diss. ... candy. Philol. science - Pyatigorsk, 2017. - 222 p.

23. Moshtak O.V. Linguistic aspect of evaluative category of pejorativeness. - Sir: Philology. 2015. – S. 37-39.

24. Andreyeva E., Nazmieva E., Nasrtdinova V. Taxonomy of Values and Anti-Values: the Material of the Russian and German Phraseology // Journal of History Culture and Art Research 6 (5) – Karabuk University, 2017. – P. 301 - 309.

25. Bochina T.G., Xiang Ts. Axiology in modern times and Russian paremike // Philology and culture. 2013. – P. 44-48.

26. Kambarov G'.S. Value relationship and its expression in Uzbek. Philol. science. name ... diss. - Tashkent: 2008. – p. 125.

27. Panjieva N.N. Cognitive aspect of otsenochnykh nominative litsa in English and Uzbek languages. Philol. science. name ... diss. - Tashkent, 2004. p. 149.

28. Ibragimova E. Axiological study of the lexicon of the Uzbek language. Instructional manual. - Fergana, 2018. – p. 84.

29. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. Monografiya. – Toshkent: Fan, 2008. – B. 203.