

COGNITIVE AND ONTOLOGICAL ESSENCE OF AXIOLOGICAL DOMINANTS AND PRINCIPLES OF THEIR TAXONOMY IN DIACHRONIC AND SYNCHRONIC REVIEW

Nataliia Stefanova

Dragomanov National Pedagogical University, Kyiv, Ukraine
stefanova.nataliya2017@gmail.com

The article provides a critical outline of elucidation of the cognitive and ontological essence of axiological dominants with the representatives of different cultures of language and a definition of the principles of their taxonomy in diachronic and synchronic review. The author makes a hypothesis that philosophical and axiological thoughts on this matter have not been homogeneous as in diachronic sense of its study (in particular, in the ancient world, the Middle Ages and Modern period etc.) so as in synchronic segment. It is proved that despite the ancient philosophers' efforts such major value concepts as "Truth", "Good", "Beauty", "Benefit" were left without clear understanding. Thus, they were not differentiated. The attempts of philosophical categorisation and conceptualisation remained to be undertaken by Renaissance scientists and thinkers. However, the notion "value" gets its philosophic status only in the Modern period, which was critical for the development of values taxonomy. The article argues that only after establishment of axiology as an independent philosophical doctrine it was possible to articulate four fundamental principles of the values structure: ontological, which makes it possible to explain scientifically the existential localisation of values and their correlation to human existence; gnoseological (or cognitive), with the help of which we experience values and necessity to study their correlation on the basis of both formalised principle, which is used for general rules of taxonomic hierarchy of values, and conceptual principle, which reveals the essence of values and determines their place in the defined hierarchy. The researcher introduces a new ethnosemiometric vector of axiological issues development directly within linguistics, which will enable to assess axiological dominants with the representatives of different cultures of language relying on the given values taxonomy and values hierarchy.

Keywords: axiological dominants; culture of language; ontological principle; cognitive principle; formalised principle; conceptual principle; ethnosemiometry; taxonomic hierarchy of values.

Introduction

Modern anthropologically focused linguistics grounds on the underlying concept perfectly defined in V. Iliin's study "Axiology" as follows: "Human world is the world of values that is crystallised out via the person's assessment of the Existence through binary parameters (oppositions) of real / desired, ontic / categorical, rational / irrational" (Iliin, 2005, p. 4). Such values are called cognitive because their essence is ontologically formed in the process of the concrete gnoseological practice of perception the environment and also due to introspective scientific activity in various areas of humanities (Luzondo & Ruiz de Mendoza, 2017), yet mainly in philosophy, and now in linguistics too (Kapranov, 2018; Korolyova, 2018 et al.). The latter are trying to demonstrate which cognitive mechanisms are used to express the values in the conscience of the representatives of certain ethnic cultures, and how each language interprets the results of such reflection grounding on its own evaluating resources. Generally, as shown by historical experience of the science development, especially history of scientific knowledge, the essence of cognitive values is dynamic and changeable, which is caused by the following factors: sociocultural conditions of cognitive activity, philosophical reflection on these values' essence, objects type of cognitive activity. However, the main factor is means and ways of their fixation (expression).

The given hypotheses about detecting cognitive nature of axiological dominants with the representatives of different ethnic cultures are behind the definition of axiology as the study of theory of values, which aim is to provide comprehensive analysis of features and properties of the objects, phenomena and processes that are able to satisfy people's needs, interests and desires. In this context, philosophers see the main function of axiology as elucidation of the values as "the sense-making principles of human Existence, which define the milestones and motivation of a personality's vital activity" (value-based orientations, or axiological dominants) (Andrushchenko, 2002, p. 26).

It is no coincidence that in general sense axiology involves the study of the whole scope of social, artistic and religious practice, human civilisation and culture at large. These ideas have always been of great interest to the researchers, but axiology started to develop only in the early XX century. The origins of the term "axiology" go back to the works of the French philosopher P. Lapi of 1902 (this term later pushed out its "competitor" – the term "tymology" introduced by J. Kreibig. In 1904 it was offered by E. von Hartmann as a name to define one of the major disciplines in the system of philosophical doctrine (Shokhin, 2010a).

Method

N. Hartmann started to develop the methodology of research of values, which resulted in finding and proving their cognitive and emotional essence. The researcher assumed that they were not subject to rational cognition but had subjective and emotional nature [...], which made a man intuitively prefer this or that way

of behaviour (Andrushchenko, 2002, p. 27). This view on the essence of cognitive nature of values was not homogeneous as in diachronic sense of its study (in particular, in the ancient world, the Middle Ages and Modern period etc.) so as in synchronic segment, which requires special methods of study, for instance: method of historic and cultural reconstruction, structural and systematic method, method of binary oppositions, comparative and parametric method. Using these methods, we offer critical analysis of a variety of scientific positions about structure and essence of cognitive values, their nature, kinds, factors of changeability, invariance, systematic nature aimed at creating the unified optimal classification that will reflect their dominants for each ethnic culture of language and compose their axiological sphere of concepts.

The **aim** of the article is to reveal cognitive and gnoseological essence of axiological dominants with the representatives of different cultures of language and define the principles of their taxonomy in diachronic and synchronic review.

1. Diachronic review of the philosophical epochs in studying the category of values

As Stolovych (1994) points out, the ancient philosophy was already axiologically oriented because it followed the classic principle that “Man is the measure of all things” (p. 25) and tried to set the level of subjective assessment while perceiving objective values. Actually, this principle was transferred into modern anthropocentric linguistics when it began its re-orientation from immanent purely structural study of languages to the analysis of connections between language and conscience, language and cognition, language and culture, language and ethnos, etc. The man and his/her values are in the centre of these studies. This caused the necessity to develop value taxonomy starting from the ancient times.

These issues are already discussed by Plato in “Laws” – he offered first attempts to classify values in two categories: 1) ordinary values (mental, physical, external) and 2) meta-values, the presence of which determines the asset.

Aristotle correlates the comparative value of the benefits with the category of a goal: that benefit is valuable which is closer to the goal [...], and the most valuable one – the one that can be experienced not just by one man but perceived as a general benefit for all (Shokhin, 2010b). Defining one of the most essential problems for axiology – correlation of subjective assessments and objective values – Ancient Greek philosopher emphasised the dependence of values on age and ethical features of people: “[...] it is absolutely clear that different things may not be same valuable for children and adults [...]”; yet “the good and virtuous man is the measure of value” (cit. by: Stolovych, 1994, p. 32). These Aristotle’s ideas cover the necessity of the time to have a classification. Modern philosopher Stolovych (1994) studies these thoughts and argues that in spite of all attempts and efforts of the philosopher of Ancient Greece, such major concepts as “Truth”, “Good”, “Beauty”, “Benefit” were left without clear understanding and, thus, without differentiation (p. 24).

Kagan (1997) assumes that the thinkers of the Middle Ages had no complete idea about the nature of values and their concrete modifications either because [...] theologians acknowledged only one real value, the God, while all the other values like moral, aesthetic, political, even the Truth itself, for religious consciousness are only emanations of Deity, manifestations of the otherworld, godly and spiritual energy. Despite that fact that axiology in that period, as the philosopher believes, blended into theology, it was the period when the philosophical categorisation of the triad “Truth, Good, Beauty” began (Kagan, 1997, p.10-11).

The next attempt of taxonomy of axiological dominant, according to Kagan (1997), takes place in Renaissance, which turned back to the ideas that started to form in the philosophy of the ancient polis. Renaissance period recreated, first of all, the insight into natural life, and not into mystical nature of moral, aesthetic, legal, political conscience. That is how it intended to discover the specific features of each form via man’s attitude to the world around. In those times there were tendencies to think deeply about moral values (L. Valla), beauty as an aesthetic value (L. B. Albert), while political values were acknowledging by Niccolo Machiavelli as such that were independent not only from religion but also from moral (ethical values) (Kagan, 1997, p. 11-12). However, the connection between these groups of values as first source of common axiological dominants formation had no scientific attention yet; neither the notion of ‘value’ became the philosophical category yet.

The first person to pursue the issue of emotional and axiological nature of values in cognitive sense was B. Pascal, who assumed that value was not abstract sentimentality and not just subjective fantasy but a special ability of assessment (that shows the cognitive nature of values). Pascal was particularly interested in moral values, with aesthetic, political and legal values as a second priority (Vysheslavtsev, 1955, p. 241). He puts religious values higher than moral ones and distinguishes the most important value – “holiness” (Vysheslavtsev, 1955, p. 243). Pascal claimed that hierarchy of values was finished with the recognition the biggest (in modern terms – dominant) value that is considered as Superior holiness, Superior perfection. The philosopher was confident in his idea – such hierarchy was already established by God and given in Christian

revelation (p. 244). Pascal's view became one of the determining factors in taxonomy of values as dominant reference cues for different people and cultures.

The Enlightenment, i.e. all European culture of XVII-XVIII centuries was led by cognitive pathos of cognition of the world – and not only nature, but also society, and a man, and culture (Kagan, 1997, p. 12). David Hume sees “a man as born for action; and as influenced in his measures by taste and sentiment; pursuing one object, and avoiding another, according to the value which these objects seem to possess, and according to the light in which they present themselves (Yum, 1995, p. 5). I. Kant builds his system of values within the cognitive, emotional, and evaluative framework. He distinguishes relative and absolute values (Kant, 1965, p. 269) and claims moral to be the top value of a man's character, which starts with the responsibility (p. 237).

2. Three segments in the development of the axiology theory as a science of values

Diachronic review of philosophical periods in studying the category of values when it becomes necessary to define their cognitive essence, develop taxonomy and determine hierarchical structure, which relates to defining the dominants for each culture, is that scientific background which made it possible to single out at least three main segments to select criteria of the further axiological taxonomy.

2.1. In the first segment (1860-1880), the category of values in its updated understanding was interpreted by R. Lotze. As the majority of philosophers after Kant, he considered “the major criterion for the value perception of the world “revelation”, which influences the sense of values and relations between them that are important for the value perception of the world in general. In axiological gnoseology Lotze differentiates notion (Begriff) and thought (Gedanke): the former is the objective side while the latter is its significance (Geltung), which is value. These criteria make a ground for almost all existing classifications of values: aesthetic, moral, religious” (Shokhin, 2010a).

Modern philosopher Shokhin (2006) in his monograph “Philosophy of values and early axiological thought” mentions the first classification of values offered by Hartmann in his work “Zur Geschichte und Begründung des Pessimismus” (1880). It grounds on such senses as pleasure, reasonability, beauty, moral as well as on the perception of the world connected with religious ideas. Shokhin (2006) notices here “inclination to their hierarchisation” with definition of dominants for each culture and period of social development (p. 55). He quotes H. Høffdin, who tried to present his vision of the classification of values according to certain criteria and connected them with feelings. He argued that every feeling has a corresponding value: vital – life-sustaining and its development, intellectual – the truth, aesthetic – beauty, ethical – the good. But above these empirical values the other ones are overbuilt, those that respond the religious feelings – a belief that previous values do not lose their importance when a man stops existing physically” (Shokhin, 2006, p. 57).

The most consistent insight into the principle of values hierarchisation in this historic segment of axiological development, according to Shokhin (2006), was done by M. Scheler. All the variety of values has a special order, according to which the values create hierarchy, and it comes out of the essence of these values. The philosopher offers five criteria for their *formalised* hierarchisation: 1) durability, 2) level of taxonomy, 3) coherence with other values, 4) depth of the pleasure received as a result of their implementation, 5) extent of relativity. *Conceptual* hierarchisation of value modalities is based on four binary rows: 1) value row of moral feelings: pleasant / unpleasant, which modes are sensual pleasure / pain, just / unjust; 2) value row of vital feelings: welfare, prosperity / shortage of funds, which modes are liveliness / frustration, health / illnesses, joy / sadness; 3) value row of aesthetic feelings: beautiful / ugly, which modes are pleasure / suffering; 4) the top value row of spiritual feelings: holy / ordinary, which modes are bliss / despair, belief / disbelief (Shokhin, 2006, p. 59).

2.2. The axiological range of problems within the second historic segment of the development of values theory (it is called classic period, which lasted from 1890 to 1920) became outstanding in the European research pursuits. Classic axiology is considered as the unity of the ‘formalised’ axiology – it studies general rules which regulate relations between values (i.e. their formalised hierarchy) – and the ‘conceptual’ axiology – it studies concepts in structure, or in the hierarchy of the set values. Besides, axiology studies both ontology of values – issues on their existential localisation and their correlation with human existence in general – and gnoseology – issues on correlation of values and their cognition. These four spheres compose, in fact, the fundamental theory of values, which was formed exactly during that period (Shokhin, 2010a).

We believe that these four fundamental principles of axiology should be taken as a major framework for the development of values taxonomy. Rickert (1998) suggested a classification of values that is rather close to this approach. In his philosophical studies he discusses six spheres of values: 1) scientific values, including Divine Truth; 2) aesthetic values, with Beauty as the dominant; 3) pantheistic values – dominant is

One God; 4) social and ethical or moral values realised in the idea of Weal; 5) values of love; 6) values of faith (pp. 374-387). We assume that the fifth category of values is one of components of the previous four depending on the conceptual and ontological principle of its interpretation. The same goes about the last category, which is, in our opinion, basic for the third category (and for each of the selected) because belief in values is already a value.

The fundamental principles of axiology – formalised, conceptual, ontological and gnoseological – enable us to define axiological dominants that are characteristic of every culture of language. The dominants define the spirit of the epoch and direction of society development at certain point. They are represented in consciousness of representatives of every culture as stereotypes and other sign formations. For instance, Kagan (1997) points out that eastern and western cultures have different axiological dominants in their spiritual background: East keeps the system of values of a conventional culture with its mythological genetics while West asserts individual freedom as the most important value, which masters all the rest, generating the idea of political freedom, principles of artistic freedom as the main artistic value and individual taste as the main aesthetic value. The researcher relates to the study of American sociologists K. S. Sitaram and R. T. Cogdell “Foundations of Intercultural Communication”, in which they provide a thorough analysis of the cultural and behavioural stereotypes of different cultures and demonstrate differences in their value priorities, which are offered in Table 1 given with specifications and modifications of terminology (see Table 1). In the study mentioned above, the authors found it necessary to range the values according to their significance for the culture into dominants (our term. – *N. S.*) of the first, second, and third order and external, which variants may be separately structured on scale positive / negative (Kagan, 1997, p. 144).

Table 1

Structure of axiological dominants with the representatives of different cultures of language

Western cultures of language	Eastern cultures of language	Muslim cultures of language
FIRST-ORDER DOMINANTS		
Individuality	Motherhood (femininity)	Hierarchy
Hierarchy		Courage
Courage	Hierarchy	Communal responsibility
Money (wealth)	Courage	
Punctuality	State power	Respect for the senior
Superiority	Peace	
Redemption, help	Modesty	Patriotism
Activity, perseverance	Karma	Religion
Respect for the young	Communal responsibility	Totalitarianism
Nationality	Respect for the senior	
Gender equality	Hospitality	
Human dignity	Environment protection	
Productivity, quality	Nationality	
Religion	Holiness of cropland	
Education	Patriotism	
Frankness	Totalitarianism	
SECOND-ORDER DOMINANTS		
Motherhood (femininity)	Respect for the young	Motherhood (femininity)
Patriotism	Gender equality	State power
Totalitarianism	Human dignity	Wealth (money)
	Education	Modesty
	Frankness	Redemption, help
	Religion (our assumption)	Activity, perseverance
		Respect for the young
		Nationality
		Human dignity
		Education
		Frankness

(continued)

Table 1

**Structure of axiological dominants with the representatives of different cultures of language
(continued)**

Western cultures of language	Eastern cultures of language	Muslim cultures of language
THIRD-ORDER DOMINANTS		
State power	Individuality	Punctuality
Peace	Wealth (money)	Productivity, quality
Environment protection	Punctuality	
	Activity, perseverance	
	Productivity, quality	
EXTERNAL		
Modesty	Redemption, help	Individuality
Responsibility	Superiority	Peace
Respect for the senior		Karma
Hospitality		Superiority
Holiness of cropland		Environment protection
		Holiness of cropland Gender equality

However, we assume that the borders of this hierarchy are rather moveable and dynamic. It depends on specific ethnos, social and economic development of the country in question, religious values, political order etc. as well as on world geopolitical tendencies. For example, at the moment, the axiological dominant PEACE as the first-order dominant for Eastern cultures of language also occupies the first position in the inner hierarchy of value priorities for Ukraine (as the culture of language of the Eastern Europe, i.e. western-eastern).

2.3. The third segment of development of modern fundamental axiology theory, also called post-classic, began in the 1930s and lasts up to now. When compared to the classic period, it has more applied nature rather than new theoretical discoveries and it develops in three main approaches: 1) *naturalistic* (R. Perri, Ch. Morris, John Dewey); 2) *phenomenological* (R. Ingarden) and 3) Anglo-American direction of analytical philosophy (A. Ambrose, M. Beaney). The representatives of each approach focus mainly on axiology promotion via developing practical (experimental) axiological studies (F. von Kuchera). And philosophy of modern research gives more and more importance to the axiological aspect of scientific cognition (Shokhin, 2010a).

Directly within linguistics, one of such research and experimental studies is the monograph “Linguistics and axiology: ethnosemiometry of value meanings” (2011) conducted under supervision of E. Serebrennikova. Taking into account the task of development of general theory of axiological sphere, set forth in modern anthropological knowledge, macrolinguistic issues become broader via developing the axiological approach to understand deep aspects in studying a man as anthropo-phenomenon and his language, in other words – methodological search of such ways and techniques of analysing the mechanisms of reflection “a man in language” – *homo lingualis* (Serebrennikova, 2011, p. 4, 6), which will contribute to axiological archeology of knowledge in general.

Professor E. Serebrennikova claims that axiological oriented linguistics, first of all, calls for applied studies of axiological dimension of language that do not stand in the way of considering language in other aspects with multidimensional study of language as the object of linguistics. At the same time this vector demonstrates linguistic and interdisciplinary focus on such study of the integral object that stands at the intersection of gnoseological research Man – Language – World (Worlds), stating necessity of complex analysis of ways and methods of expressing the value senses of human Existence and society in processes of their formation, social and personal diagnostics. The most important research task of this linguistic vector is unequivocally the elaboration of new methodology and technology to assess the content of the inner world of linguistic (discursive) personality, their value cues and such of the society in general according to linguistic data, to be more exact – a man – the language speaker who creates the discursive world in correlation with the Other and own self (Serebrennikova, 2011, p.18-19).

The applied linguistic axiological analysis is planned to have an aim to make a taxonomic contribution to the development of the theory of values connected in this case with the analysis of language structures and functions; a regulatory contribution that comes out of logical and rhetoric framework of the language and thinking; interpretative and classifying contribution that grounds on the achievements of philosophy,

semiology, culture studies or social psychology objectified by linguistic means with special connotative assessing semantics; and the most important, diagnostic ethnosemiometric contribution that will demonstrate the axiological state of a man and society in general in one of the moments of their existence or in their development (Serebrennikova, 2011, p.18-19), taking into consideration current taxonomies of values and presented hierarchy of axiological dominants of different cultures of language. That said, ethnosemiometry here is methodologically defined as a kind of semantic interpretation which is performed on the level of modelling the axiological spheres of concepts of the representatives of different cultures with further value assessment of the axiological concepts as the markers of ethnocultural constants and axiological dominants.

Conclusions

Summing up the critical review of the issue related to the study of cognitive and ontological essence of axiological dominants with the representatives of different cultures of language and to the definition of the principles of their taxonomy in diachronic and synchronic review, we can conclude that philosophical axiological thought on this matter has not been homogeneous as in diachronic sense of its study (in particular, in the ancient world, the Middle Ages and Modern period etc.) so as in synchronic segment. Despite the ancient philosophers' efforts such major value concepts as "Truth", "Good", "Beauty", "Benefit" were left without clear understanding and differentiation. The attempts of philosophical categorisation and conceptualisation remained to be undertaken by Renaissance scientists and thinkers. However, the notion "value" got its status of a philosophical category only in the Modern period, which was critical for the development of values taxonomy as dominant cues of the Existence for all peoples.

Only after establishment of axiology as an independent philosophical doctrine it was possible to articulate four fundamental principles of the values structure: ontological, which makes it possible to explain scientifically the existential localisation of values and their correlation to human existence; gnoseological (or cognitive), with the help of which we experience values and necessity to study their correlation on the basis of both formalised principle, which is used for general rules of taxonomic hierarchy of values, and conceptual principle, which reveals the essence of values and determines their place in the defined hierarchy. In linguistics, the axiological issues are represented by an ethnosemiometric vector of their development, which will enable to assess value state of different societies and their representatives.

Future studies may include specification of the ethnosemiometric principles and reconstruction of the value concepts within the scope of intercultural communication.

References:

- Andrushchenko, V.P. (Ed.) (2002). *Filosofskiy slovnyk sotsialnykh terminiv* (2002) [Philosophical Dictionary of Social Terms]. Kharkiv: Korvin.
- Ambrose, A. (1933) *A Controversy in the Logic of Mathematics. The Philosophical Review*, 42 (6), 594–611. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2180008>
- Iliin, V. V. (2005). *Aksiologiya* [Axiology]. Moscow: Izd-vo MGU.
- Kagan, M. S. (1997). *Filosofskaya teoriya tsennosti* [Philosophical theory of values]. Sankt-Peterburg: TOO TK Petropolis.
- Kant, I. (1965). *Sochineniya: V 6 T. (T.4)*. [Works in 6 volumes (Volume 4)]. Moscow: Izd-vo Mysl.
- Kapranov, Y. V. (2018). Hypothetical Versions on Antropogenesis Localization of the First Populations of the Homo. *Logos*, 94, 149-158. <https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2018.15>
- Korolyova, A. V. (2018). Reconstruction of Early Migration Routes of Homo Populations. *Logos*, 94, 159–166. <https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2018.16>
- Luzondo, A. & Ruiz de Mendoza, F. (2017). Argument-structure and implicational constructions in a knowledge base. *Onomazein*, 35, 25-48. <http://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.35.04>
- Rikkert, H. (1998). *Nauki o prirode, nauki o culture* [The sciences of nature and the science of culture]. Moscow: Respublica.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F. (2017). Conceptual complexes in cognitive modelling. *Spanish Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 297–322. <https://doi.org/10.1075/resla.30.1.12rui>
- Serebrennikova, E. (Ed.) (2011). *Lingvistika i aksiologiya: etnosemiometriya tsennostnykh smyslov* [Linguistics and axiology: ethnosemiometry of value meanings]. Moscow: Tezaurus.
- Shokhin, V.K. (2010 a). Aksiologiya. In V.S.Stepin (Ed.), *Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya: v 4t.* [New Philosophical Encyclopedia: in 4 vol.]. Moscow: Institut Filosofii. Retrieved May 15, 2018 from <https://iphlib.ru/greenstone3/library/collection/newphilenc/document/HASH0147b7e8f087b539ec51af47>
- Shokhin, V.K. (2010 b). Tsennost. In V.S.Stepin (Ed.), *Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya: v 4t.* [New Philosophical Encyclopedia: in 4 vol.]. Moscow: Institut Filosofii RAN. Retrieved May 15, 2018 from <https://iphlib.ru/greenstone3/library?el=&a=d&c=newphilenc&d=&rl=1&href=http:%2f%2f3342.html>
- Shokhin, V. K. (2006). *Filosofiya tsennostey i rannaya aksiologicheskaya mysl* [Philosophy of values and early axiological thought]. Moscow: Izd-vo RUDN.
- Sitaram, K. S., & Cogdell, R. T. (1976). *Foundations of intercultural communication*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Stolovich, L. N. (1994). *Krasota. Dobro. Istina: Ocherk istorii esteticheskoy aksiologii* [Beauty. Good. Truth: Essay on the history of aesthetic axiology]. Moscow: Respublica.
- Vysheslavtsev, B. P. (1955). *Vechnoye v rysskoy filosofii* [Eternal in Russian Philosophy]. N.-Y.: Izd-vo imeni Chekhova.

Received: May 20, 2018
Accepted: June 15, 2018