



ORIENTAL JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

journal homepage:
<http://www.supportscience.uz/index.php/ojp/about>



MAIN ASPECTS OF STUDYING THE EVALUATIVE COMPONENT OF PAREMIOLOGICAL FUND IN THE RESEARCHED LANGUAGES

Zarina Kurbonova

Independent researcher

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

zarina_92k@icloud.com

Samarkand, Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: evaluation, evaluative semantics, linguistic axiology, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, proverbs, paremiology, informal discourse, value system, lexical connotation, cultural worldview, anthropocentrism, linguistic culture.

Received: 05.12.25

Accepted: 06.12.25

Published: 07.12.25

Abstract: This article examines the cognitive-semantic and axiological foundations of evaluation in language, with a particular focus on the evaluative potential of lexical units and proverbs within informal discourse. Drawing on the works of M.V. Nikitin, E.S. Aznurova, N.D. Arutyunova, V.N. Telia, A.A. Ivin, J. Searle, A. Wierzbicka, and other scholars, the study explores how evaluative meanings emerge as integral components of human cognition and linguistic activity. The paper argues that evaluation constitutes a fundamental mental operation that shapes an individual's worldview, cultural identity, and communicative behavior. Proverbs and paremiological units, due to their ethnospecific and metaphorical nature, serve as culturally marked carriers of positive, negative, and neutral evaluations. Their semantic structure reflects collective value systems and enables cross-cultural comparison of national linguocultures. The research highlights two major types of linguistic values—socially and culturally shaped evaluations and binary oppositional value scales (good/bad, pleasant/unpleasant, etc.). Theoretical perspectives from classical philosophy (Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Spinoza) and modern linguistic axiology illustrate the multidimensional nature of evaluation, encompassing psychological, emotional, pragmatic, and cognitive factors. Overall, the study demonstrates that evaluative semantics

plays a central role in understanding how language encodes cultural values, shapes communicative intentions, and contributes to constructing a nation's linguistic picture of the world.

MADANIYATLARARO MULOQOTDA MAQOLLARNING HISSIY VA BAHOLASH KOMPONENTLARI

Zarina Qurbonova

Samarqand Davlat Chet Tillari Institutining mustaqil tadqiqotchisi

zarina_92k@icloud.com

Samarqand, O'zbekiston

MAQOLA HAQIDA

Kalit so'zlar: baholash, baholovchi semantika, lingvistik aksiologiya, kognitiv lingvistika, pragmatika, maqollar, paremiologiya, norasmiy nutq, qadriyatlar tizimi, leksik konnotatsiya, madaniy dunyoqarash, antroposentrizm, lingvistik madaniyat.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqola tilda baholashning kognitiv-semantik va aksiologik asoslarini hamda norasmiy nutq doirasida leksik birliklar va maqollarning baholash salohiyatini tadqiq etgan. M.V. Nikitin, E.S. Aznurova, N.D. Arutyunova, V.N. Telia, A.A. Ivin, J. Searle, A. Wierzbicka va boshqa olimlarning asarlariga tayanib, tadqiqot baholash ma'nolarining inson bilishi va lingvistik faoliyatining ajralmas komponentlari sifatida qanday paydo bo'lishini o'rganadi. Maqolada baholash shaxsning dunyoqarashini, madaniy o'ziga xosligini va kommunikativ xatti-harakatlarini shakllantiradigan fundamental aqliy operatsiya ekanligi ta'kidlanadi. Maqol va paremiologik birliklar, o'zlarining etnospesifik va metaforik tabiati tufayli, ijobiy, salbiy va neytral baholashlarning madaniy jihatdan belgilangan tashuvchisi bo'lib xizmat qiladi. Ularning semantik tuzilishi jamoaviy qadriyatlar tizimlarini aks ettiradi va milliy lingvomadaniyatlarni madaniyatlararo taqqoslash imkonini beradi. Tadqiqotda lingvistik qadriyatlarning ikkita asosiy turi - ijtimoiy va madaniy jihatdan shakllangan baholashlar va ikkilik qarama-qarshilik qiymat shkalalari (yaxshi/yomon, yoqimli/yoqimsiz va boshqalar) ta'kidlangan. Klassik falsafa (Aristotel, Xobbs, Lokk, Spinoza) va zamonaviy lingvistik aksiologiyaning nazariy nuqtai nazarlari baholashning ko'p o'lchovli tabiatini ko'rsatadi, psixologik, hissiy, pragmatik va kognitiv omillarni qamrab oladi. Umuman olganda, tadqiqot baholash semantikasi tilning madaniy qadriyatlarni

qanday kodlashini, kommunikativ niyatlarini shakllantirishini va millatning dunyoning lingvistik manzarasini yaratishga hissa qo'shishini tushunishda markaziy rol o'ynashini ko'rsatadi.

ЭМОЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ И ОЦЕНОЧНЫЕ КОМПОНЕНТЫ ПОСЛОВИЦ В МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

Зарина Курбонова

Независимый исследователь

Самаркандского государственного института иностранных языков

zarina_92k@icloud.com

Самарканд, Узбекистан

О СТАТЬЕ

Ключевые слова: оценка; оценочная семантика; лингвистическая аксиология; когнитивная лингвистика; прагматика; пословицы; паремиология; неформальный дискурс; система ценностей; лексическая коннотация; культурное мировоззрение; антропоцентризм; лингвокультура.

Аннотация: В статье рассматриваются когнитивно-семантические и аксиологические основания оценочности в языке, особое внимание уделяется оценочному потенциалу лексических единиц и пословиц в неформальном дискурсе. Опираясь на труды М.В. Никитина, Е.С. Азнуровой, Н.Д. Арутюновой, В.Н. Телии, А.А. Ивина, Дж. Сёрла, А. Вежбицкой и других учёных, исследуется становление оценочных значений как неотъемлемых компонентов человеческого познания и языковой деятельности. В статье утверждается, что оценочность представляет собой фундаментальную мыслительную операцию, формирующую мировоззрение, культурную идентичность и коммуникативное поведение личности. Пословицы и паремиологические единицы, в силу своей этноспецифичности и метафоричности, служат культурно маркированными носителями позитивных, негативных и нейтральных оценок. Их семантическая структура отражает коллективные системы ценностей и позволяет проводить межкультурное сравнение национальных лингвокультур. В исследовании выделены два основных типа языковых ценностей: социально и культурно обусловленные оценки и бинарные оппозиционные шкалы ценностей (хорошо/плохо, приятно/неприятно и т. д.). Теоретические подходы классической философии

(Аристотель, Гоббс, Локк, Спиноза) и современной лингвистической аксиологии иллюстрируют многомерную природу оценки, охватывающую психологические, эмоциональные, прагматические и когнитивные факторы. В целом, исследование показывает, что оценочная семантика играет центральную роль в понимании того, как язык кодирует культурные ценности, формирует коммуникативные намерения и способствует построению языковой картины мира нации.

Introduction. Evaluation is one of the crucial aspects within the structure of reflective mental activity. According to researcher M.V. Nikitin, "In terms of cognitive method and character, our thinking is predominantly evaluative; that is, cognitive activity mostly occurs in the form and degree of evaluation. The ability to evaluate determines the organism's level of adaptation to its living environment. It can be said that the capacity for evaluation is inherent to the organism and integrates it organically into the universe" (Nikitin, 2000, p.7). Evaluation is intrinsically linked with language, which reflects the uniqueness of perceiving the world through values. Possibly the primary linguistic level representing all types of evaluations is the lexical level, as vocabulary effectively and promptly reflects the socio-cultural changes in human life and the lexical choices in speech primarily reveal the subject's attitude towards objects and phenomena.

In informal communication, proverbs and sayings (PUs) exhibit diverse stylistic features. Their use often reduces the formality of speech due to their spontaneous, oral nature and the absence of formal framing, thereby creating a tone of ease and relaxed communication. Consequently, informal discourse becomes enriched with lexemes marked by evaluative connotations. Following E.S. Aznurova, we interpret lexical-semantic evaluation as "a related meaning in the semantic structure of a word, reflecting the speaker's attitude towards a concept or object that is shared across a linguistic community, such as approval/disapproval, indifference/pride, etc." (Aznurova, 1984, p.44).

Literature review and methodology. The evaluation embedded in informal lexical and paremiological units allows us to perceive how real-world values shift semantically and to determine how this evaluative lexicon contributes to the cultural worldview of a given speech community. The rise of anthropocentrism in linguistics has led to the emergence of linguistic axiology—a scientific discipline studying a nation's value system and how it manifests in language and cultural continuum. In understanding the surrounding reality, a person evaluates events and

facts, thus shaping their perception of the world. The study of evaluative categories is reflected in the works of E.S. Aznurova, Y.D. Apresyan, I.V. Arnold, N.D. Arutyunova, O.S. Akhmanova, Y.M. Wolf, N.A. Lukyanova, N.N. Mironova, M.S. Retunskaya, V.N. Telia, Z.I. Fomina, V.I. Shakhovsky, and others. Contributions from Uzbek linguists should also be included.

Linguists' increasing interest in axiological aspects of paremiological fund across different languages evidences a growing focus on evaluation as a semantic component of word meaning.

Foreign scholars such as I.Y. Anichkova, E.F. Arsentyeva, A.Y. Beletskaya, A.N. Baranova, O.A. Vaskova, A. Wierzbicka, L. Wittgenstein, Y.A. Gvozdareva, O.A. Dmitrieva, D.O. Dobrovolskaya, L.B. Kokanina, V.T. Maligina, T.V. Pisanova, V.I. Sergeyeva, J. Searle, Y.E. Sorokin, A. Taylor, V.L. Tyomkina and others have explored axiological features of proverbs. Relevant works of Uzbek linguists and proper citations must also be integrated.

Research by scholars such as N.G. Bragina, A.S. Bukhonkina, Y.V. Vokhrisheva, Y.A. Dobridneva, O.G. Dubrovskaya, V.I. Postovalova, V.N. Telia, T.Z. Cherdansea, among others, analyze the evaluative nature of proverbs from a linguistic-cultural perspective. E.V. Ivanova, V.A. Maslova, M.V. Nikitin, and V.N. Tokareva approach it from a cognitive linguistic angle.

Axiological studies underscore the importance of analyzing proverbs as linguistic units that reflect national identity, aiming to understand ethnospecific traits and interethnic linguistic consciousness in intercultural communication. In linguistics, "evaluation" broadly refers to the value relationship between a speech subject and object, understood as human desires, needs, and aspirations expressed via linguistic means (Ivin, 1970, p.25).

From a formal standpoint, values expressed in language can be conditionally categorized into two types:

1. Culturally and socially formed evaluative representations: These describe object features in accordance with societal norms, cultural stereotypes, and historical frameworks.
2. Binary oppositional value systems: Concepts such as good/bad, right/wrong, desirable/undesirable, and so on, which are based on human emotions and needs. Examples of such comparisons include: pleasant – neutral – unpleasant; interesting – neutral – boring; beautiful – neutral – ugly; and others.

Discussion and results. According to Y.A. Dobridneva, such value systems form part of the emotive-evaluative plan of nominative feature content (Dobridneva, 2000, p.63). Retunskaya (1987, p.37) notes that in many modern European cultures, negative evaluations dominate, likely because the negative aspects of life are perceived more sharply compared to the emotionally neutral positives. To understand how evaluative categories function, structured axiological scales are often applied. These scales position object attributes relative to a normative midpoint (0-point),

enabling measurement and classification. These attributes are then compared to culturally stereotypical expectations.

Evaluation is both qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative aspect defines whether an evaluation is positive, neutral, or negative (Frenkel, 1982, p.5), while the quantitative aspect refers to the intensity of the evaluative feature. Some expressions cannot be captured through traditional scales, resulting in a flexible evaluative range.

N.D. Arutyunova argues that to create a clear contemporary model of axiology—a rapidly evolving linguistic field—scholars must draw upon centuries of accumulated knowledge. Human thought naturally began with value judgments such as good–bad, safe–dangerous, forming part of the evolutionary toolkit (Arutyunova, 1988, p.51).

The multifaceted nature of evaluative semantics invites a wide range of approaches. Scholars generally distinguish between two main types: communicative (pragmatic/illocutionary) and cognitive. The former is more established; the latter is still developing. Initially, only a few evaluation types were identified. Many authors separated good as a means versus good as a goal. New taxonomic systems no longer reflect the ontology of "good," but rather the ontology of meaning.

Classical axiology often equated “value” or “positive value” with “good.” Evaluation thus becomes a verbal expression of value. Consequently, good and bad are distinguished. Many linguistic, logical, and philosophical studies revolve around understanding evaluative predicates such as "good" and "bad." In explaining axiological problems, Aristotle's view on interest is crucial. He asserted that interest cannot be universal because it is defined across multiple categories—virtue, benefit, utility—thus making “good” a complex, subjective construct (Aristotle, 1984, pp.60–61).

Famous philosophers have explored the relationship between good/bad and language, emphasizing both the objective nature of values and their psychological basis. Good is something that satisfies material, spiritual, or moral needs of the individual or community; bad is the opposite (Frenkel, 1982, p.5).

The psychological foundation of evaluative concepts influences axiological interpretations. Emotions such as desire, satisfaction, reasoning, and intuition all shape evaluative judgments, which are inherently non-conventional and often contradictory.

Axiological concepts are shaped by psychological dominance, and this complexity deepens evaluative expressions.

By the 17th century, a new view emerged: humans as composite beings whose physical and social interactions shaped utilitarian perspectives on values. Spiritual aspects of environmental interactions also began to take form.

T. Hobbes explained "good" through emotions like desire, love, hatred, joy, and sorrow (Hobbes, 1964, p.88), suggesting that all desires are inherently good. Goodness was seen as a functional and theological concept: it satisfies life's essential needs.

J. Locke described good and evil hedonistically—as sources of pleasure and pain. B. Spinoza rejected mere emotional triggers and focused on the normative understanding of evaluation, arguing that good is whatever aligns with human nature and aids survival (Spinoza, 1957, p.544).

Von Wright offered a complex classification of evaluative terms in English such as "good," "useful," "pleasant," "healthy," etc. He proposed six types: instrumental, technical, convenience-related, utilitarian, medical/psychological, and hedonistic (von Wright, 1997, p.544).

Ethical evaluation is viewed as a secondary derivative of acceptability. Utilitarian and benefactive evaluations are not necessarily specialized—they rely on usefulness in achieving goals.

Hedonistic evaluation, tied to emotional response, serves as a base for ethnic evaluations.

The communicative approach, which gained traction post-classical period, analyzes words like "duty," "obligation," "will," and "satisfaction" for their evaluative functions. Its goal is to identify conditions under which evaluative predicates are used in speech acts. Over time, pragmatic theories began interpreting evaluative meaning through communicative goals.

Ch. Stevenson argued that value judgments aim not to convey facts, but to influence others. He identified two types of language use: 1) descriptive—to clarify and report views; and 2) evaluative-dynamic—to express emotions and prompt action (Stevenson, 1964, p.16). British philosopher A.J. Ayer emphasized the difficulty in justifying value judgments, noting that such statements inevitably appeal to cultural values, which can't serve as absolute proof but help understand a language's cultural-semantic framework (Ayer, 1963, p.244; Pisanova, 1997, p.16).

Russian linguists A.N. Baranov, Y.F. Wolf, and A.A. Ivin discussed how evaluative meanings emerge from descriptive ones, though Ivin notes that terms like "rude" inherently carry both description and evaluation (Ivin, 1973, p.39).

In classical axiology, evaluation is always filtered through human values: "Values derive from humans; they do not exist independently in the external world. Otherwise, they would cease to be values and merely become part of objective reality" (Searle, 1990, p.75).

Conclusion. Historical-philosophical perspectives—from Aristotle to Hobbes, Locke, Spinoza, and later linguistic philosophers—demonstrate that evaluation has long been viewed as an essential component of human reasoning and social regulation. Modern cognitive and communicative approaches continue to expand the theoretical understanding of evaluative structures by integrating psychological, cultural, and pragmatic dimensions.

In conclusion, evaluative semantics serves as a key domain of linguistic axiology, reflecting both the universal cognitive mechanisms of human thought and the ethnocultural uniqueness of individual speech communities. The study of evaluative meanings in proverbs and informal discourse not only deepens our understanding of national-cultural identity but also contributes to cross-cultural communication, linguistic anthropology, and modern cognitive linguistics.

References:

1. Arutyunova, N. D. (1988). *Logika, yazyk, kultura*. Moscow: Nauka.
2. Ayer, A. J. (1963). *Language, Truth and Logic*. London: Gollancz.
3. Aznurova, E. S. (1984). *Semantika otsenki v leksike*. Kazan University Press.
4. Baranov, A. N., Wolf, E. M. (2002). *Otsenochnye smysly v yazyke*. Moscow: Nauka.
5. Beletskaya, A. Y. (2000). *Paremiological axiological structures in modern languages*.
6. Bragina, N. G. (1996). *Otsenochnye sredstva v sovremennom yazyke*. Moscow.
7. Dobridneva, Y. A. (2000). *Otsenochnye kategorii v strukture nominativnykh edinit*.
8. Frenkel, V. A. (1982). *Otsenka i znachenie*. Leningrad University Press.
9. Locke, J. (1975). *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Oxford University Press.
10. Spinoza, B. (1957). *Ethics*. Moscow: Publishing House of Foreign Literature.
11. Stevenson, Ch. (1964). *Ethics and Language*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
12. Telia, V. N. (1996). *Russkaya frazeologiya: semantika, pragmatika, kultura*. Moscow: Nauka.
13. Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
14. Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.