



## AN AXIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF KINSHIP TERMS IN VARIOUS SYSTEMATIC LANGUAGES

**Rahmatov Bekzod Uktam ugli**

Teacher of the Uzbek State University of World Languages

rakhmatovuz12@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17510086>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 29<sup>th</sup> October 2025

Accepted: 30<sup>th</sup> October 2025

Online: 31<sup>st</sup> October 2025

### KEYWORDS

*kinship terms, axiological approach, values, linguoculturology, referential function, performative function, social hierarchy, ideonymic approach, ontological unity, cultural memory.*

### ABSTRACT

*The article highlights the theoretical and methodological foundations of the axiological approach to the study of kinship terminology. Kinship terms are interpreted not only as linguistic units denoting biological relations but also as linguocultural phenomena encoding social norms, values, and traditions within society. The study examines the referential and performative functions of kinship terms, their role in shaping social hierarchy, and their axiological load. Drawing on Lévi-Strauss's concepts and Dzibel's semiotic interpretations, kinship terms are analyzed as both ontological and axiological entities. Furthermore, through the ideonymic approach, kinship terminology is shown to reflect gender, age, and generational principles that embody social expectations and moral obligations. The findings confirm that kinship terms play a crucial role in ensuring personal and collective identity, regulating social norms, and preserving and transmitting cultural values*

The Axiological Approach in the Study of Kinship Terms in Modern Linguistics. The axiological approach occupies a special place in modern linguistics in the study of kinship terms, as research oriented toward axiological analysis allows for examining the value-based dimension of language. This approach is especially significant for lexical units that reflect fundamental societal values, such as kinship terms, since these terms embody not only semantic meaning but also value-laden characteristics.

It is worth noting that the definition of the axiological approach is determined by the content of the discipline of "axiology." Axiology studies the nature of values, their foundations and sources, functions, types, and hierarchies. Within the framework of kinship terms, this definition implies the necessity of a systematic study of the value-based properties of these terms.

The advantage of axiological interpretation is that it focuses on perceiving language as an integral object situated at the intersection of human and world, prioritizing the expression of specific meanings in human and societal life. In our view, kinship terms hold a unique place within this triad—they should be regarded not only as units defining biological relationships but also as linguistic entities reflecting socially significant orientations, role expectations, and cultural meanings.

From the general framework of axiology, it is possible to isolate its linguistic component—“linguistic axiology.” This approach is aimed at perceiving language as an integral object at the crossroads of human–language–world (or worlds) epistemological relations and prioritizes expressing specific meanings in human and societal life. This framework provides a fundamental theoretical basis for studying kinship terms, as they lie at the intersection of anthropological, linguistic, and ontological dimensions.

From a methodological perspective, the main concepts forming the axiological analysis paradigm are interrelated: evaluation, value, valuable direction, and meaningful significance. Their internal connections require a dual approach to analyzing kinship terms. On one hand, axiological interpretation addresses deep semantic layers through concepts such as “valuable relation,” “valuable orientations,” “ideals,” and “symbols of belief.” On the other hand, at the expressive level, it studies the “functional evaluative semantics” through multi-level linguistic means. Thus, kinship terms carry both semantic and pragmatic axiological loads.

From a socio-communicative perspective, the social function of language and the domain of verbal communication are studied in terms of values, linked to role expectations imposed by society on the speaker. For example, terms like “father,” “mother,” “brother,” “sister” do not merely denote biological relationships; they also encode socially established expectations, responsibilities, and moral obligations. These terms mark the social roles of individuals within society and indicate the expected fulfillment of these roles.

The ontological nature of kinship terms is highlighted by Lévi-Strauss’s conceptual view: the kinship system is not only composed of objective blood relationships but also exists as a mental construct—a system of individual conceptions. This insight is crucial for understanding the axiological properties of kinship terms because if the kinship system is a mental construct, it directly reflects value-laden systems formed in cultural and social consciousness. Consequently, this approach separates kinship terms from biological determinism and explains their cultural and social conditionality.

From a semiotic perspective, it is important to emphasize the unity of the ontological and axiological aspects of kinship terms. As G.V. Dzibel notes, they represent the kinship cosmos in the cycle of birth, growth, and death, encompassing not merely biological or social oppositions but the unity of semiotics and ontology. This perspective provides a fundamental theoretical basis for the axiological study of kinship terms, as they embody the dialectical relationships between nature and culture, individual and community. Therefore, kinship terms are not limited to referential functions but also possess existential and ontological significance.

Kinship terms occupy a unique status in linguistics: they have a special place in the language and encapsulate ontological meanings. In this sense, their relationship to linguistics and semiotics is analogous to the relationship of genetics to biology. This analogy underscores the central role of kinship terms not only in the linguistic system but also in the socio-cultural value system, necessitating their treatment as primary objects of linguistic research.

Within the framework of idenetic terminology, the concept of the “idenotype” is particularly important in analyzing kinship terms. The idenotype is formed through the triad of relative gender–relative age–relative generation, which is crucial for understanding the axiological properties of kinship terms, as each component carries specific value-laden

content. Relative gender indicates gender hierarchy, relative age indicates respect and rank, and relative generation reflects traditional continuity and inheritance.

In analyzing the value-based components of kinship terms in socio-cultural contexts, it is necessary to identify the evolutionary continuity of societal values in anthropology and cultural studies. In this context, the family is considered a primary component, and its essence lies in forming, preserving, and transmitting value-based priorities reflecting historical and ethnic characteristics. Comparatively, kinship terms ensure the linguistic objectification of the family's value system.

The significance of axiological discourse lies not only in clarifying the content of the family as a value-based absolute and a primary form of social life organization but also in revealing the laws governing the development of moral and value-based orientations in family–society interactions. This multifunctional nature manifests the nominative, normative, and prescriptive characteristics of kinship terms.

The axiological indicators of the family as a social micro-system are expressed as follows: a self-sustaining integrity based on stable moral and kinship relationships; the hierarchical nature of intra-family relations, i.e., the generational hierarchy and their value-moral orientations. Notably, this hierarchical structure is reflected structurally in kinship terms, which linguistically encode intergenerational value relations. For example, the terms used by younger individuals to address elders automatically contain semantics of respect and subordination, implying that kinship terms perform not only identification but also socialization functions.

#### References:

1. Lévi-Strauss C. *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté*. — Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1949. — 592 p.
2. Lévi-Strauss C. *Structural Anthropology*. — New York: Basic Books, 1963. — 452 p.
3. Martin J. R., White P. R. R. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. — London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. — 256 p.
4. Schwartz S. H. *Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries // Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. — 1992. — Vol. 25. — P. 1–65.
5. Wierzbicka A. *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. — 496 p.
6. Арутюнова Н. Д. *Логический анализ языка: культурные концепты*. — Москва: Наука, 1999. — 345 с.
7. Джибелев А. В. Семантика и прагматика родственных терминов: семиотический аспект // *Вестник РУДН. Серия: Лингвистика*. — 2015. — № 4. — С. 45–52.
8. Кузина О. А., Ситко Ю. Л. *Лингвоаксиология: состояние и перспективы // Филологические науки*. — 2018. — № 7. — С. 14–20.
9. Маслова В. А. *Лингвокультурология*. — Москва: Академия, 2001. — 208 с.
10. Носирова М. *Лингвокультурологический анализ паремий, вербализующих концепт «труд–безделье» в пословицах // Академические исследования в современной науке*. — 2023. — Т. 2. — №. 16. — С. 188–197.

11. Носирова М. О. Пословичная картина мира как фрагмент языковой картины мира // Involta Scientific Journal. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. 5. – С. 168-174.
12. Носирова М. О. Репрезентативный аспект социальных ценностей в русской и узбекской пословичной картине мира // Образование и инновационные исследования международный научно-методический журнал. – 2023. – Т. 7. – С. 87-91.
13. Павлов С. Г. Лингвоаксиология как научное направление // Вопросы философии. — 2001. — № 5. — С. 33-41.

