



Received: February 25, 2026
Accepted: March 24, 2026
Available online: March 25, 2026

Madina Kholmurodova

Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in
Philological Sciences
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: kholmurodovamadina599@gmail.com
ORCID iD: 0009-0003-0752-7884

THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE AXIOLOGICAL STUDY OF LEXICAL MEANS EXPRESSING *SPIRITUAL ENLIGHTENMENT*

ABSTRACT

Values play a crucial role in shaping human consciousness, communication, and culture. In modern linguistics, the study of lexical units expressing spiritual enlightenment and moral values is particularly important for understanding the relationship between language, culture, and cognition. Language reflects not only objective reality but also ethical principles, cultural traditions, and socially accepted value systems through evaluative lexical means.

In this regard, the present research aims to analyze the theoretical foundations of the axiological study of lexical means expressing spiritual enlightenment and to investigate how evaluative meanings are represented in spiritually marked lexical units. The study explores the role of value components in the semantic structure of words related to morality, kindness, honesty, compassion, faith, and other spiritual concepts. Special attention is given to the interaction between semantic structure, cultural context, and evaluative meaning, as well as to the ways speakers express positive and negative moral attitudes through lexical choices in different communicative contexts.

To achieve these objectives, the research is based on theoretical, semantic, cognitive, and axiological analysis of linguistic data. Various scholarly sources related to lexicology, semantics, and axiology are reviewed and systematized to provide a comprehensive understanding of evaluative language connected with spirituality

Madina Xolmurodova

Filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa
doktori (PhD), dotsent
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti
Toshkent, O'zbekiston

MA'NAVIYAT MA'NOLARINI IFODALOVCHI LEKSIK BIRLIKLAR AKSIOLOGIK TADQIQINING NAZARIY ASOSLARI

ANNOTATSIYA

Qadriyatlar inson ongi, muloqoti hamda madaniyatini shakllantirishda muhim o'rin tutadi. Zamonaviy tilshunoslikda ma'naviyat va axloqiy qadriyatlarni ifodalovchi leksik birliklarni o'rganish til, madaniyat va tafakkur o'rtasidagi bog'liqlikni anglashda muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi. Til baholovchi leksik vositalar orqali nafaqat obyektiv borliqni, balki axloqiy tamoyillar, madaniy an'analar va ijtimoiy qadriyatlarni ham aks ettiradi. Ma'naviyat bilan bog'liq leksik birliklar xalqning dunyoqarashi, axloqiy me'yorlari va madaniy qadriyatlarini til orqali namoyon etadi. Shu sababli bunday birliklarning aksiologik xususiyatlarini o'rganish zamonaviy lingvistik tadqiqotlarda dolzarb masalalardan biri hisoblanadi.

Mazkur tadqiqotning asosiy maqsadi ma'naviyat ma'nolarini ifodalovchi leksik birliklarning aksiologik tadqiqi nazariy asoslarini tahlil qilish hamda baholovchi ma'nolarning ma'naviy mazmundagi leksik birliklarda qanday ifodalanishini aniqlashdan iborat. Tadqiqotda axloq, mehribonlik, halollik, rahm-shafqat, e'tiqod kabi ma'naviy tushunchalarni ifodalovchi so'zlarning semantik tuzilmasidagi qadriyat komponentlari o'rganiladi. Shuningdek, semantik tuzilma, madaniy kontekst va baholovchi ma'no o'rtasidagi o'zaro munosabat hamda turli kommunikativ vaziyatlarda ijobiy va salbiy axloqiy munosabatlarning leksik tanlov orqali ifodalanishiga alohida e'tibor qaratiladi.

Tadqiqot nazariy, semantik, kognitiv va

and moral values. The analysis demonstrates that lexical units expressing spiritual enlightenment contain both explicit and implicit evaluative elements reflecting speakers' attitudes as well as broader cultural and ethical values.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that the axiological approach to lexical means expressing spiritual enlightenment provides deeper insight into the semantic and cultural nature of language. The research reveals how language encodes moral and spiritual evaluations and emphasizes the importance of cultural context in shaping evaluative meaning. Consequently, the study contributes to the development of axiological linguistics and opens new perspectives for further research in lexicology, cultural linguistics, and discourse analysis.

Key words: axiology, evaluative meaning, semantic analysis, lexical level, value, evaluation, linguistic axiology, cognitive linguistics.

aksiologik tahlil metodlariga asoslanadi. Leksikologiya, semantika va aksiologiyaga oid ilmiy manbalar o'rganilib, tizimlashtiriladi hamda ma'naviyat va axloqiy qadriyatlar bilan bog'liq baholovchi til birliklari tahlil qilinadi. Tahlil natijalari ma'naviyatni ifodalovchi leksik birliklar nutq egasining munosabati bilan bir qatorda jamiyatdagi madaniy va axloqiy qadriyatlarni ham aks ettirishini ko'rsatadi.

Olingan natijalar ma'naviyat ma'nolarini ifodalovchi leksik birliklarni aksiologik yondashuv asosida o'rganish tilning semantik va madaniy tabiatini chuqurroq anglash imkonini berishini ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqot til orqali ma'naviy va axloqiy baholash qanday ifodalanishini yoritadi hamda baholovchi ma'nolar shakllanishida madaniy kontekstning muhimligini ta'kidlaydi. Natijada ushbu izlanish aksiologik tilshunoslik rivojiga hissa qo'shadi va leksikologiya, lingvomadaniyatshunoslik hamda diskurs tahlili yo'nalishlarida yangi ilmiy izlanishlar uchun asos yaratadi.

Kalit so'zlar: aksiologiya, baholovchi ma'no, semantik tahlil, leksik sath, qadriyat, baholash, aksiolingvistika, kognitiv lingvistika.

INTRODUCTION

Language is not only a system of communication but also a complex social and cultural phenomenon which is the reflection of social values, beliefs and evaluations of language users. Beyond its main function of transmitting information about the world, language encodes social and cultural norms, which makes it essential to preserve and transmit cultural identity of a nation. In other words, language functions as a way in which language users interpret reality and construct meaning of the surrounding world. In this sense, linguistic items carry implicit evaluative meanings, which shows how language users perceive and evaluate people, objects and phenomena. As N.Zerkina et al. stated that "every natural language reflects a definite way of perception and organization (conceptualization) of the world" [Zerkina et al., 2015]. This idea emphasizes the correlation between language and culture, which is particularly evident at the lexical level of language, in which lexical elements often embody socially accepted values and emotional connotations.

As being a reflection of social values and cultural norms, language makes the notion of "value" central in linguistic analysis. Values are considered as "the basic moral principles of a nation" [Nazarova, 2025], and "refer to what people hold important in life, such as freedom, wealth, or security. Values motivate what people do, influence their attitudes, and help them justify or explain their behaviour" [Schwartz & Cieciuch, 2016]. Values are socially shared principles which are the determination of what is considered as important, acceptable or desirable in a certain community. The

systematic study of values is known as axiology, which is “the science that studies how values are distributed and developed in society and it explains the content, essence and principles of values” [Khodjamkulov, 2024]. “The word “axiology” originates from two Greek roots, *axios* and *logos*, *axios* bearing the meaning of “worth” or “value” and *logos* the meaning of “logic” or “theory” [Biedenbach & Jacobsson, 2016]. According to Kh.K. Uzakova, axiology is “a set of knowledge about folk customs, traditions, attitudes, value, assessment, axiological landscape” [Uzakova, 2024]. Axiology, a branch of philosophy, examines the nature, function and classification of value judgments. In the last decades, the notion of axiology has been increasingly used in linguistic research. Axiological approach in linguistics examines how values are expressed and transmitted in the language.

Axiolinguistics is a direction of anthropocentric linguistics, which was formed on the bases of philosophy [Uzakova, 2024]. The content of axiology laid the foundation for the formation of axiolinguistics which is a subfield of linguistics, concerning with the axiological view of the surrounding world and the sign of value represented in language. In world linguistics, many researches have been done by A.Ivin, Y.Wolff, N.Arityunova, V.Karasik, S.Pavlov and Y.Serebryannikova, who made significant contribution to the development of axiolinguistics [Komilova, 2021]. Axiological linguistics deals with the system of language and its values. It explains the importance of cultural, moral and social values which are expressed through language.

Spiritual enlightenment as a system of moral and cultural values occupies an important place in axiological linguistics because language functions not only as a means of communication but also as a medium for transmitting ethical and spiritual concepts [Kholmurodova, 2020, 2021, 2023]. Lexical units expressing spirituality often reflect socially approved patterns of behaviour, moral ideals, and cultural traditions. Words such as *honesty*, *kindness*, *compassion*, *faith*, and *integrity* contain not only denotative meanings but also strong evaluative and emotional components. According to A.Wierzbicka, lexical meaning is closely connected with cultural values and collective human experience, since language encodes culturally significant concepts and moral evaluations [Wierzbicka, 1996]. Similarly, V.Karasik emphasizes that value-oriented lexical units reflect the axiological worldview of a speech community and reveal the cultural priorities of society [Karasik, 2002]. Therefore, the study of lexical means expressing spiritual enlightenment is essential for understanding the interaction between language, morality, and culture.

The system of language functions as a bridge between linguistics and anthropology, philosophy industry through the study of complex relationships between language and culture, language and moral values. As she mentions that linguistics determines the values which have been formed in the social environment based on the axiological aspect of language. Axiolinguistics allows to understand the complex relationship between language, culture and values existing in a specific culture. In this sense, it is important to analyze the lexical level of language, as axiological meanings are clearly realized. In order to linguistically express values, the lexical level occupies a central position. As it is clear that vocabulary is dynamic aspect g a language. Which

means that it is able to reflect social change, cultural and ideological shifts. Words and phrases in the lexical level directly encode evaluations and emotional attitudes. Such linguistic units of a language carry both denotative and connotative meanings, which reveal positive and negative attitudes of language users.

Axiological linguistics has been explored since the last decades and a large number of valuable researches have been already done in this field. However, the correlation between axiolinguistics and the lexical level of language remain insufficiently developed. There are many existing studies, which focus on single aspect of evaluation. as a result the relation between lexical units, such as words and phrases and axiolinguistics is usually overlooked. Therefore, there is a necessity to apply a more integrated approach, determining both the semantic aspect of vocabulary and its evaluative aspects. The present research is aimed at to explore the theoretical foundations of axiological approach to lexical level.

METHODS

The study uses a qualitative and theoretical research methods aimed at analyzing the axiological characteristics of the lexical level in language. The research is based on descriptive, analytical and interpretative methods, appropriate to explore linguistic meaning and evaluative structures. These approaches allow to comprehensively analyze how values are encoded and linguistically represented on the basis of lexical units of a language.

A qualitative approach is used in this research since axiological aspects of meaning is inherently abstract, context-based and culturally influenced. This approach enables for a deeper examination of the semantic aspects of lexical units from the axiological point of view. Furthermore, the theoretical function of the research allows to integrate existing linguistic theories with axiological perspectives, which contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of evaluative meaning in the language system.

The data used in the research involve a wide range of lexical items of the English language. The present study pays special attention to lexical units representing spiritual and moral values in the English language. The analysis includes words and expressions related to honesty, kindness, purity, compassion, morality, faith, and justice, as these concepts are widely recognized as core elements of spiritual enlightenment in many cultures. From an axiological perspective, such lexical units function as carriers of positive evaluation because they express socially approved ethical qualities. In contrast, lexical items such as *greed*, *hypocrisy*, *cruelty*, and *corruption* represent negative moral evaluation and reflect socially condemned behaviour. The evaluative potential of these lexical units demonstrates that spirituality is linguistically realized through both positive and negative semantic oppositions.

Examples are chosen from different part of speech, such as nouns, verbs and adjectives, which demonstrate implicit and explicit evaluative potential. The study considers different categories of lexical units expressing positive, negative and neutral connotations. It is worth-mentioning that neutral lexical units are also involved in the study to highlight how evaluative meaning emerges in different contexts. Additionally,

the study uses secondary sources, like dictionaries, thesauruses to identify denotative meanings of words and analyze their connotative and evaluative aspects.

Different analytical methods are also applied in the study. Firstly, semantic analysis is employed to examine the internal structure of lexical meaning. This process involves the differentiation between denotative and connotative meanings, the first one refers to the direct reference of a lexical item, while the other includes additional evaluative, expressive, stylistic and emotional associations of a word. Furthermore, axiological analysis is used as the main methodological approach in the research. This approach identifies the evaluative orientation of words and analyzes the way in which values and judgments are encoded within their meanings. It is revealed that words are classified base on their evaluative functions, involving positive, and negative evaluations.

An interdisciplinary perspective is also employed in this research, which brings together the insights from linguistics, philosophy and cultural studies. This approach is of utmost important as the concept of value is not limited to only language system itself, but it is deeply rooted in human cognition and social interaction. Combination of different theoretical perspectives provides more comprehensive understanding of the axiological aspects of the lexical level.

RESULTS

Identifying the lexical level form an axiological point of view highlights the idea that evaluation is an inherent aspect of lexical meaning of linguistic units. In other words, lexical units are not merely the representation of entities, objects or phenomena, rather they often carry evaluative meanings, which are considered as a reflection of speaker's attitudes and judgments. In this sense, it is essential to denote that “the two main types of meaning are the grammatical and lexical meanings of a word, the grammatical meaning of a word deals with the expressions in speech of relationship between words. The lexical meaning of the word is the realization of the notion by means of a definite language system” [Mamedova, 2018]. Lexical meaning is characterized by being multidimensional, which means that it encompasses not only objective referential aspect but also the subjective and cultural aspects of interpretation in language usage. Besides that, lexical meaning is fundamental to understand both semantics and pragmatics, since it forms the foundation upon which discourse and communication [Lyons, 1977; Palmer, 1981; Allan, 2001; Stubbs, 2001]. Lexical meaning is not a mere single phenomenon, rather it includes several interrelated components which contribute to the overall interpretation of a lexical item. Among these aspects, the difference between denotation and connotation plays a crucial role in linguistic analysis of lexical units.

Understanding different types of meanings is essential in the axiological analysis of the lexical level, since different aspects of meaning together reveal how words encode evaluative content. One of the main distinctions in lexical-semantics is the difference between denotative and connotative meanings. Denotative meaning is viewed “as the objective meaning related to the truth conditions of propositions, forming the basis

for truth-conditional semantics. This foundation is crucial for understanding how language conveys factual realities through words and sentences” [Putri & Djuharie, 2025]. Denotative meaning refers to “the explicit, direct, or literal meaning of a word. It is objective and does not depend on personal feelings or experiences. Dictionaries usually provide the denotative meaning of a word” [Shukurova, 2026]. Denotative meaning represents the fundamental and objective aspects of lexical meaning, which refers to the direct relation between a word and the entity or concept it denotes in the world. It is often referred as referential or literal meaning of a word, which is relatively stable on different contexts. The denotative meaning of a lexical item is generally consistent and can be found in dictionary definitions, which means that it is crucial to have a clear and unambiguous communication. It is also worth-mentioning that, denotative meaning provides the conceptual foundation of a word, which ensures that lexical items can function as reliable tools to linguistically represent reality. It would be difficult to analyze additional layers of meaning without the referential meaning of a word, as it establishes the basic semantic boundaries of the word.

Connotative meaning refers to “an association of a term” [Navruzova, 2021], which means that “it can be an emotional input attached to a word thus making it more figurative and suggestive” [Navruzova & Haydarov, 2022]. According to N. Navruzova, “the description of a word under the process of connotation takes a more complex approach than that of the aspect of word-meaning followed through denotation. In the process of giving meaning to a word through connotation, it is important that the one giving meaning does not use what is evident or what is specifically obvious about the matter. Instead, it deals more with the process of deciphering the inner meaning of a word” [Navruzova, 2022]. As connotation “is related to value of the sense of people who use language, whether they feel happy, sad, repugnant and angry” [Gee et al., 2022]. Connotative meaning relates to the additional semantic component which includes emotional, cultural and evaluative associations inherent to a lexical item. Unlike denotative meaning, connotation tends to be more dynamic and often varies depending on context, cultural and individual perception. It is relatively influenced by societal and individual factors, which means that to shape connotation of a word, societal, cultural factors play an important role. It represents how language users feel about and interpret the referent of a word. Connotation is essential in shaping the expressive, emotive and evaluative functions of a language, it enables language users to convey attitudes, judgments, emotions and values indirectly. Additionally, connotation is closely linked with cultural norms and social values, meaning that the same lexical unit may carry different evaluative meanings in different contexts.

The analysis demonstrates that lexical units expressing spiritual enlightenment possess a strong evaluative component. For instance, words such as *honesty*, *kindness*, *mercy*, and *integrity* are associated with positive moral assessment and cultural approval. These lexical units evoke ideas of ethical behaviour, inner purity, and social responsibility. In contrast, lexical items such as *dishonesty*, *greed*, *hypocrisy*, and *corruption* express negative evaluation and represent moral degradation. Such oppositional lexical pairs reveal that evaluative meaning is deeply embedded in the

semantic structure of spiritually marked vocabulary. As G.Leech notes, connotative meaning allows lexical units to convey emotional and value-related associations beyond their literal meanings [Leech, 1981]. Therefore, lexical items related to spirituality function not only as nominative units but also as indicators of moral and cultural values within discourse.

Connotation of a lexical unit can be mainly divided into three types: (1) positive connotation; (2) negative connotation; (3) neutral connotation.

Positive connotation involves the lexical elements which can evoke favourable associations and convey approval or desirability. “Positive connotation refers to a word that evokes a positive emotional response. For example, words such as *determined*, *inquisitive*, *dedicated*, and *spirited* all have positive connotations” (Study.com). On the other hand, negative connotation refers to words that evoke unfavorable associations and convey criticism, disapproval, or undesirable qualities. Such lexical items as *selfish*, *lazy*, *inefficient*, *nosy*, *stubborn* illustrate negative connotation. Another type of connotation is neutral connotation, which is considered more complex, since it involves words that do not inherently convey strong evaluative meaning. However, depending on the communicative situation, it can convey positive or negative evaluations. Differentiating the types of connotations plays a central role in the expressions of evaluation at the lexical level of language.

Axiological classification of lexical units expressing *spiritual enlightenment*

Lexical unit	Uzbek equivalent	Evaluative orientation	Spiritual / moral meaning	Connotative characteristic
honesty	halollik	positive	moral purity, truthfulness	social approval
kindness	mehribonlik	positive	compassion and humanity	emotional warmth
faith	e'tiqod	positive	spiritual belief and morality	cultural value
integrity	vijdonlilik	positive	ethical responsibility	respect and trust
compassion	rahm-shafqat	positive	sympathy toward others	moral sensitivity
greed	ochko'zlik	negative	excessive desire for wealth	social disapproval
hypocrisy	ikkiyuzlamachilik	negative	false morality	negative ethical judgment
cruelty	shafqatsizlik	negative	lack of mercy	emotional negativity
corruption	korrupsiya	negative	moral degradation	social condemnation

The above-mentioned table demonstrates that lexical units expressing spiritual enlightenment are strongly connected with evaluative meaning and cultural values. Positive lexical items such as *honesty*, *kindness*, and *faith* reflect socially approved moral qualities and express ethical ideals accepted within society. These lexical units possess positive connotative meanings associated with trust, morality, and spiritual purity. In contrast, negatively marked lexical units such as *greed*, *hypocrisy*, and *corruption* represent moral deviation and socially condemned behaviour. The comparison shows that both English and Uzbek lexical units preserve similar axiological oppositions, indicating the universal character of many spiritual and ethical values. At the same time, the connotative and cultural nuances of these lexical items reveal the close relationship between language, evaluation, and national worldview.

Connotative meaning provides the emotional, social, cultural and associative

layer of a word and these associations generate evaluation. In other words, evaluative meaning of a lexical item emerges on the basis of connotation. Words can acquire positive and negative value orientation through connotation. In this sense, it is essential to define the notion of evaluative meaning of a lexical item. Evaluative meaning “is frequently understood as a form of connotation, pertaining to a single lexical item. The evaluative part of meaning, perhaps the most elusive meaning component of all” [Jurko, 2015]. Evaluation is the component of meaning that conveys a positive or negative attitude, assessment, judgement towards actions, situations, objects or phenomena. As M.L. Drazdauskiene states that “in the framework of traditional descriptive semantics, evaluative meaning is defined as an aspect of affective meaning, by virtue of its general positive and negative evaluation, evaluative meaning finds its place in the compartment of interpersonal meaning in functional linguistics” [Drazdauskiene, 2008]. As it is stated that “evaluative meaning is considered to be an interaction between participants putting forward the feelings, attitudes of a speaker or writer to be perceived by a hearer or a reader” [Biber & Finegan, 1989].

It is essential to analyze different types of semantic mechanisms through which evaluation is structured and conveyed at the lexical level. Lexical units do not operate in isolation; rather, they function within a network of semantic relations that contribute to the formation of evaluative meaning. These relations include synonymy, antonymy, gradation, and intensification, each of which plays a significant role in shaping how values are linguistically represented. One of the primary mechanisms through which evaluation is expressed is synonym, where different lexical items share similar denotative meanings but differ in their connotative and evaluative nuances. For instance, words such as “*confident*”, “*self-assured*”, and “*assertive*” may denote similar qualities, yet they vary in their evaluative implications depending on context. While “*confident*” generally carries a positive connotation, “*assertive*” may be interpreted either positively or negatively, depending on cultural and situational factors. This demonstrates that synonymy is not merely a matter of semantic equivalence but also involves subtle distinctions in evaluative meaning.

Another important mechanism is antonymy, which directly reflects evaluative opposition within the lexical system. From a cross-cultural perspective, English and Uzbek languages demonstrate similar evaluative tendencies in lexical units expressing spirituality. For example, the English words *honesty*, *kindness*, and *faith* correspond to the Uzbek lexical units *halollik*, *mehribonlik*, and *e'tiqod*, all of which carry positive moral connotations. Likewise, negatively marked lexical items such as *greed* and *hypocrisy* correlate with the Uzbek words *ochko'zlik* and *ikkiyuzlamachilik*, expressing social disapproval and ethical negativity. These examples indicate that evaluative meanings connected with spirituality are shaped by both universal human values and culture-specific linguistic traditions.

Pairs such as “*honest*” and “*dishonest*”, “*effective*” and “*ineffective*”, or “*useful*” and “*useless*” clearly illustrate how language encodes contrasting value judgments. Antonymy plays a crucial role in structuring evaluative meaning because it establishes binary oppositions that reflect fundamental value distinctions in human

cognition. As a result, lexical items are often understood in relation to their opposites, reinforcing the evaluative dimension of meaning.

In addition to synonymy and antonymy, gradation and intensity contribute significantly to the expression of evaluation. Many lexical items can be modified by intensifiers such as “*very*” “*extremely*” or “*highly*” which amplify the evaluative force of a word. For example, the difference between “good” and “excellent” represents not only a variation in degree but also a shift in evaluative intensity. Similarly, negative evaluation can be intensified through expressions such as “*completely unacceptable*” or “*deeply flawed*”. These gradational distinctions highlight the scalar nature of evaluative meaning, where values are not fixed but exist along a continuum.

Another significant mechanism is metaphorical extension, through which abstract values are conceptualized in terms of concrete experiences. For example, positive evaluation is often associated with metaphors of height or light, as in expressions like “*high quality*” or “*bright idea*” whereas negative evaluation may be linked to darkness or depth, as in “*low standards*” or “*dark intentions*”. Such metaphorical patterns demonstrate how evaluative meaning is grounded in cognitive and cultural frameworks, reinforcing the connection between language and human perception [Wierzbicka, 1996; Ungerer & Schmid, 2006]. Furthermore, evaluative meaning is strongly influenced by contextual and discourse factors. Lexical items may shift their evaluative orientation depending on the communicative situation, the speaker’s intention, and the broader discourse context. For example, a word like “*ambitious*” may be perceived positively in a professional setting but negatively in a social context if it implies excessive competitiveness. This context-dependency highlights the dynamic nature of evaluation and underscores the importance of analyzing lexical meaning within real communicative environments [Fairclough, 1995].

Another important aspect of lexical evaluation is the formation of lexical semantic groups, which consist of sets of words that share similar evaluative properties. These groups reflect structured systems of values within language, allowing researchers to identify patterns in how evaluation is organized. For instance, lexical items expressing positive qualities such as “*efficient*”, “*productive*”, and “*reliable*” form a semantic cluster associated with desirable attributes, while words like “*inefficient*”, “*unproductive*”, and “*unreliable*” represent a contrasting cluster of negative evaluation. The existence of such groups demonstrates that evaluative meaning is not random but systematically structured within the lexical system.

In addition to the semantic mechanisms discussed above, it is important to consider the role of lexical variation and register in shaping evaluative meaning. Lexical items often differ not only in their denotative content but also in their stylistic and social associations, which significantly influence their evaluative interpretation. For instance, pairs such as “*child*” and “*kid*” or “*residence*” and “*home*” may refer to similar concepts, yet they differ in terms of formality, emotional tone, and social perception. These stylistic differences contribute to the evaluative dimension of language, as speakers consciously or unconsciously select lexical items that align with their communicative intentions and social context. As G. Leech notes, stylistic

variation is closely connected to the expressive function of language, allowing speakers to convey subtle nuances of meaning and attitude [Leech, 1981].

Another important factor in lexical evaluation is the role of collocation, or the tendency of words to co-occur with specific lexical items. Collocational patterns can reinforce or modify the evaluative meaning of a word. For example, the adjective “*strong*” may carry positive connotations in expressions such as “strong argument” or “*strong performance*,” but it may take on negative connotations in phrases like “*strong criticism*” or “*strong odor*”. This demonstrates that evaluative meaning is not inherent solely in individual lexical items but is also shaped by their interaction with other words. Collocation thus plays a crucial role in determining how lexical units function within discourse and how their evaluative potential is realized.

Furthermore, frequency and usage patterns influence the perception of evaluative meaning. Words that are frequently used in positive contexts may gradually acquire a positive evaluative bias, while those associated with negative contexts may develop unfavorable connotations over time. This process reflects the dynamic nature of language, where meaning evolves in response to social usage and communicative practices. For example, certain terms that were once neutral may become positively or negatively marked due to changes in cultural attitudes or social discourse. This highlights the importance of diachronic perspectives in understanding lexical evaluation.

Another dimension that deserves attention is the role of pragmatic intention in shaping evaluative meaning. Speakers often use lexical choices strategically to achieve specific communicative goals, such as persuading, criticizing, or expressing solidarity. In this context, evaluation becomes a pragmatic tool that allows speakers to influence the attitudes and perceptions of their audience. For instance, choosing the word “*affordable*” instead of “*cheap*” may create a more positive impression, even though both words relate to price. This demonstrates that evaluative meaning is not only a property of language but also a function of communicative strategy.

Additionally, the role of cultural and ideological factors cannot be overlooked in the analysis of lexical evaluation. Different cultures may assign different values to the same lexical items, resulting in variations in evaluative meaning across linguistic communities. For example, concepts such as “*individualism*” or “*authority*” may carry positive connotations in some cultural contexts and negative ones in others. This variability underscores the importance of considering cultural context in axiological research and highlights the connection between language, ideology, and social values.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that evaluative meaning contributes significantly to the formation of discourse and social reality. Through repeated use in specific contexts, lexical items can reinforce particular value systems and shape collective perceptions. Media discourse, political language, and everyday communication all rely heavily on evaluative vocabulary to frame issues and influence public opinion. Taken together, these findings indicate that evaluation at the lexical level is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, shaped by semantic relations, contextual factors, and cognitive processes. Lexical units function as carriers of both

meaning and value, enabling language to serve not only as a descriptive tool but also as a mechanism for expressing and shaping human judgments.

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study highlight the central role of the lexical level in the expression of evaluative meaning and the representation of value systems in language. By analyzing the interaction between denotative and connotative meaning, as well as the semantic mechanisms underlying evaluation, it becomes evident that language is inherently value-laden. Words do not merely reflect reality; they actively participate in constructing and interpreting it through evaluative frameworks.

One of the key implications of this study is that evaluative meaning is not an isolated linguistic feature but an integral part of lexical semantics [Geeraerts, 2010; Saeed, 2016]. The distinction between denotation and connotation provides a useful analytical framework, but it is their interaction that ultimately produces evaluation. Connotative meaning serves as the foundation for evaluative interpretation, while denotation ensures semantic stability and clarity [Traugott & Dasher, 2002]. This dual structure allows language to balance objectivity and subjectivity, enabling effective communication while also conveying attitudes and values.

Another important finding is the systematic nature of evaluative meaning. Through mechanisms such as synonymy, antonymy, and gradation, lexical units are organized into structured systems that reflect underlying value hierarchies. These structures are not arbitrary; they are shaped by cultural norms, social expectations, and cognitive patterns [Evans & Green, 2006]. As a result, the study of lexical evaluation provides valuable insights into how societies conceptualize and prioritize different values. The role of context further emphasizes the dynamic nature of evaluation in language. Since evaluative meaning can shift depending on usage, it is essential to consider not only the lexical item itself but also the discourse in which it appears. This has important implications for fields such as discourse analysis, translation, and intercultural communication, where the accurate interpretation of evaluative meaning is crucial.

Moreover, the findings support the view that axiolinguistics represents a significant and productive direction in modern linguistic research. By focusing on the relationship between language and values, this approach expands the scope of semantic analysis and contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of linguistic meaning. It also bridges the gap between linguistics and other disciplines, such as philosophy and cultural studies, highlighting the interdisciplinary nature of value-oriented research.

The findings indicate that lexical means expressing spiritual enlightenment form an important part of the axiological structure of language. Such lexical units reflect moral evaluation, cultural ideals, and socially accepted behavioural norms. Their semantic structure combines denotative meaning with evaluative and emotional components, allowing speakers to express attitudes toward ethical concepts and spiritual values. Consequently, the axiological analysis of spiritually marked vocabulary contributes

not only to lexical semantics but also to the broader understanding of the relationship between language, culture, and morality.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the axiological study of the lexical level provides a valuable framework for understanding how language encodes and expresses values. The analysis presented in this article demonstrates that lexical meaning is inherently complex, consisting of both denotative and connotative components that interact to produce evaluative meaning.

Connotation plays a particularly important role, as it serves as the primary source of value-related associations, which are then structured into evaluative judgments. The study also shows that evaluative meaning is systematically organized through semantic mechanisms such as synonymy, antonymy, gradation, and metaphorical extension. These mechanisms enable lexical units to function within broader semantic systems, reflecting structured patterns of evaluation. At the same time, the context-dependent nature of evaluation highlights the dynamic and flexible character of language, emphasizing the importance of discourse in shaping meaning.

From an axiological perspective, language can be seen as a tool for both reflecting and shaping value systems. Through lexical choices, speakers can express attitudes, influence perceptions, and construct social reality. Therefore, the study of lexical evaluation not only contributes to linguistic theory but also provides insights into cultural and social processes. Future research may further explore the cross-cultural aspects of lexical evaluation, as well as its applications in areas such as language teaching, translation, and discourse analysis. By continuing to investigate the relationship between language and values, scholars can deepen our understanding of how meaning is constructed and communicated in human interaction.

REFERENCES

1. Allan, K. (2001). *Natural language semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
2. Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 9(1), 93–124.
3. Biedenbach, T., & Jacobsson, M. (2016). The open secret of values: The roles of values and axiology in project research. *Project Management Journal*, 47(3), 139–155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875697281604700312>.
4. Drazdauskiene, M.L. (2008). Evaluative meaning and its cultural significance. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 44, 373–389.
5. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
6. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
7. Gee, R., Laiya, R.E., & Telaumbanua, T. (2022). An analysis of denotative and connotative meaning in selected Justin Bieber ft. Kid Laroi song lyrics. *Relation: Research on English Language Education*, 4(2).
8. Geeraerts, D. (2010). *Theories of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
9. Jurko, P. (2015). Evaluative meaning in translation. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 12(2), 193–209. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.12.2.193-209>

10. Karasik, V.I. (2002). *Language circle: Personality, concepts, discourse*. Volgograd: Change Publishing House.
11. Khodjamkulov, U.N. (2024). The role of the axiological approach in the development of education in modern pedagogy. *Web of Journals*, 2(12), 278–282.
12. Kholmurodova, M. (2020). Importance of showing colorful pictures and images in Abdulla Kadiri's Novel "The Days Gone By". *Philology Matters*, 33(3), 100–114. <https://doi.org/10.36078/987654451>.
13. Kholmurodova, M.A. (2021). Contextual analysis of the use of "spirituality" semantically marked expressions in the English translation of Abdulla Qodiriy's novel *Bygone Days*. *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, 1(36), 148–156. <https://doi.org/10.36078/1618989479>.
14. Kholmurodova, M.A. (2023). The English rendering of expressions representing the concept of "spirituality" in the prose of Abdulla Qodiriy. *PhD thes. philol. scien*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan State World Languages University.
15. Komilova, G. (2021). *Axiolinguistic analysis of Uzbek proverbs* (PhD dissertation). Tashkent.
16. Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics: The study of meaning* (2nd ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
17. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vols. 1–2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18. Mamedova, S.B. (2018). Lexical meaning and semantic structure of English words. *The Scientific Heritage*, 30(2), 48–51.
19. Nazarova, M.A. (2025). Cultural values and their linguistic verbalization. *Best Intellectual Research*, 44(3), 354–360. <https://scientific-jl.com/luch/article/view/12995>.
20. Navruzova, N. (2021). Approaches to lexical connotations. *ACADEMICIA*, 1721–1726. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2021.02308.9>.
21. Navruzova, N., & Haydarov, A. (2022). Connotative meanings related to phonetic changes. *Center of Scientific Publications*, 8(8).
22. Palmer, F.R. (1981). *Semantics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Putri, A.E., & Djuharie, O.S. (2025). Semantics analysis of denotative and connotative meaning. *Syntaxis*, 3(5), 100–114. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v3i5.2096>.
24. Saeed, J.I. (2016). *Semantics* (4th ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
25. Schwartz, S.H., & Ciecuch, J. (2016). Values. In H.L. Miller (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of theory in psychology* (pp. 950–951). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
26. Shukurova, M.A. (2026). Denotative and connotative meaning of words in English. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education*, 4(1), 12–14.
27. Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
28. Traugott, E.C., & Dasher, R.B. (2002). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
29. Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H.J. (2006). *An introduction to cognitive linguistics*. London: Pearson Education.
30. Uzakova, X.K. (2024). Axiolinguistics – Interpretation of values expressed in language. *European Journal of Innovation in Nonformal Education*, 4(2).
31. Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
32. Zerkina, N., Kostina, N., & Pesina, S. (2015). Axiological linguistics and foreign language teaching. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 254–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.514>