

Axiological Dominants in Uzbek and Russian Paremiology: A Comparative Analysis of Human, Family, and Labour Values

FAKHRIDDIN BOKHODIROVICH YULBARSOV

*International Institute of Food Technology and Engineering,
Fergana, Uzbekistan*

ABSTRACT

The article examines axiological markedness in Uzbek and Russian paremiology through the three dominant value zones identified in the dissertation: Human, Family, and Labour. The qualitative analysis is supplemented by a transparent secondary count of all unique proverbs explicitly quoted and interpreted in Chapter 3 and its comparative tables. After duplicate removal, the analytical subcorpus contains 97 units (35 Russian and 62 Uzbek): 27 Human-related, 33 Family-related, and 37 Labour-related proverbs. The results show a shared ethical core but different profiling mechanisms. Russian examples more often test inner worth against appearance, emphasize family concord and parental attachment, and represent labour through deed, mastery, endurance, and deserved reward. Uzbek examples distribute human evaluation among odob, speech ethics, and social responsibility; model family as an extended relational structure; and connect mehnat with honesty, livelihood, social esteem, and well-being. Axiological markedness is therefore interpreted as a multilevel chain linking image, cultural association, evaluation, and behavioural prescription.

Keywords: Paremiology, linguoaxiology, linguoculture, Uzbek, Russian, axiological markedness, proverbs, value dominants

INTRODUCTION

Values enter language not only through explicit words such as good, honest, family, or labour, but also through habitual oppositions, images, pragmatic formulas, and culturally conventional scenarios. For this reason, linguoaxiology treats evaluation as part of the organization of linguistic meaning, while linguocultural analysis explains how a shared semantic category acquires culturally specific salience. Wierzbicka demonstrates that apparently universal domains are structured differently by cultural key words [1: 15-23], whereas Lakoff & Johnson show that recurrent metaphorical models participate in conceptual organization [2: 3-13]. Proverbs are especially informative in this respect because they condense a typical situation, its evaluation, and an implicit or explicit norm into a reproducible mini-text.

The degree of previous study is extensive but uneven across traditions. In international paremiology, Mieder systematizes the linguistic, folkloric, and social properties of proverbs [3: 1-18], and Krikmann examines their semantic generalization and contextual variability [4: 4-17]. Permyakov conceptualizes the proverb as a model of recurrent situations rather than merely a fixed phrase [15: 12-28]. These approaches prepared the ground for contemporary cognitive and linguocultural readings of proverbial meaning.

Russian scholarship supplies a developed theoretical basis for value, evaluation, linguistic world-view, phraseology, and paremiology. Arutyunova distinguishes major types of evaluative meaning [5: 5-21]; Teliya connects phraseological semantics with cultural connotation [6: 214-238]; Karasik describes values as components of linguistic-cultural conceptualization [7: 127-139]. Mokienko outlines the modern linguistic agenda of paremiology [8: 6-20], while Bredis, Dimoglo & Lomakina emphasize its text-forming and linguocultural potential [16: 265-284]. Recent value-oriented studies by Semenenko, Lomakina & Nelyubova further develop cognitive-discursive and axiological procedures for proverb analysis [17: 213-232; 18: 97-107; 9: 21-42].

Uzbek linguistics has simultaneously developed cognitive, linguocultural, and axiological interpretations of national

linguistic material. Safarov establishes key cognitive-linguistic principles [10: 7-16], Mamatov discusses modern anthropocentric directions [11: 18-31], and Komilova offers a focused axiological analysis of Uzbek proverbs [12: 5-17]. The collection *O'zbek xalq maqollari* provides an important paremiographic basis for the national proverb fund [13: 3-7]. Thus, both languages possess substantial research traditions; however, the dissertation correctly identifies a remaining gap: Uzbek and Russian paremias have rarely been compared through one unified model that combines axiological dominant, linguistic marking, figurative code, pragmatic function, cultural valency, and translation interpretability.

The present article addresses that gap by reanalysing the dissertation material in IMRAD form and by adding a controlled quantitative layer. Its aim is to determine how the three central dominants – Human, Family, and Labour – are distributed in the explicitly analysed examples and how common values are differently profiled in the two linguocultures. The central hypothesis is that national specificity lies less in the inventory of values than in the semantic links through which those values are made socially meaningful

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The source material is the dissertation's comparative analysis of Uzbek and Russian paremias, especially Chapter 3 and the associated tables. The dissertation uses descriptive analysis, continuous selection, thematic classification, componential and contextual-semantic analysis, linguoaxiological interpretation, linguocultural commentary, comparison, semantic modelling, and translation commentary. The present article preserves that methodological logic while making its quantitative component explicit.

The dissertation does not specify the numerical size of its complete working card index. Consequently, no total corpus size is reconstructed or assumed. Instead, every proverb explicitly quoted and interpreted in Chapter 3 or included in its

comparative tables was extracted; exact repetitions were removed. This produced a secondary analytical subcorpus of 97 unique units: 35 Russian and 62 Uzbek. Each unit was assigned to one of the three chapter dominants and then coded for a primary semantic profile. The resulting percentages therefore characterize the dissertation's explicit analytical examples, not the statistical prevalence of values in the entire Russian or Uzbek proverb funds.

Table 1. *Composition of the secondary analytical subcorpus*

Dominant	Russian n (%)	Uzbek n (%)	Total n (%)
Human	9 (25.7)	18 (29.0)	27 (27.8)
Family	13 (37.1)	20 (32.3)	33 (34.0)
Labour	13 (37.1)	24 (38.7)	37 (38.1)
Total	35 (100)	62 (100)	97 (100)

3. RESULTS

3.1. *General distribution and mechanisms of markedness*

Labour is the largest zone in the recoded examples (37 units; 38.1%), followed by Family (33; 34.0%) and Human (27; 27.8%). Russian material divides almost equally between Family and Labour (13 units each), while Uzbek material contains the largest number of Labour examples (24). These figures must not be read as frequencies for the languages as a whole; they measure the density of examples selected for interpretation in the dissertation. Their value is comparative: they show that the qualitative conclusions can be checked against a clearly delimited example set.

Across the three domains, axiological markedness is multilevel. Direct evaluative words interact with antithesis, parallelism, condition-result structures, metaphor, symbolic equivalence, rhyme, and imperative or aphoristic force. A proverb therefore does three things at once: it represents a recurrent situation, ranks its elements, and turns the ranking into socially reusable guidance. The cross-linguistic contrast concerns the preferred route from image to norm. Russian examples frequently correct a misleading surface criterion or formulate a

compact general law; Uzbek examples often extend evaluation into the person's relation with family, el, neighbour, livelihood, or social esteem.

3.2. Human: inner worth, *odob*, speech, and social responsibility

Table 2. Primary profiles within the Human dominant

Profile	Russian n (%)	Uzbek n (%)	Main contrast
Internal/moral-intellectual qualities	7 (77.8)	7 (38.9)	Russian concentration on mind, conscience, experience, and inner worth.
Speech ethics	0	5 (27.8)	Uzbek speech is explicitly evaluated as moral action.
Relational/social responsibility	1 (11.1)	5 (27.8)	Uzbek personhood is often evaluated through consequences for others and el.
Pride/negative traits	1 (11.1)	1 (5.6)	Both traditions strongly mark destructive self-evaluation.

The strongest Russian concentration occurs in the internal moral-intellectual profile: 7 of 9 examples (77.8%). The recurring semantic operation is correction of appearance by a more durable criterion. *Человека видим, а души (ума) его не видим* ("We see the person, but not the soul [mind]") warns against immediate judgement. *Не тот хорош, что лицом пригож, а тот хорош, кто на дело гож* ("Not the one handsome in face is good, but the one fit for a deed") explicitly moves evaluation from appearance to practical worth. *Ум не в бороде, а в голове* ("Wisdom is not in the beard but in the head") similarly separates age-sign from intelligence. In the nine Russian examples, forms of *ум* occur in four units (44.4%), confirming the prominence of intellectual judgement within this selected material.

The 18 Uzbek examples are more evenly distributed. *Odam bo'lish – oson, odamiy bo'lish – qiyin* ("It is easy to be a person; it is difficult to be humane") distinguishes biological personhood from achieved moral humanity. *Inson – odobi bilan, osmon – oftoobi bilan* ("A person is [adorned] by good manners, the sky by the sun") and *Odob – oltindan qimmat* ("Good manners are more precious than gold") make *odob* a culturally visible measure of

worth. The markers *yaxshi* and *yomon* occur in seven examples each (38.9%), while *so'z* occurs in four (22.2%) and *odob* in three (16.7%). The lexical centre is therefore not a single cognitive quality but a network joining moral education, good/bad conduct, and communication.

Speech forms a separate value profile in Uzbek. *Ariqni suv bezar, odamni – so'z* (“Water adorns an irrigation ditch; speech adorns a person”) transfers aesthetic visibility from water to ethically appropriate speech. *Yaxshi so'z – yurakka malham, yomon so'z – yurakka g'am* (“A good word is balm for the heart; a bad word is grief for the heart”) conceptualizes speech as treatment or injury. Such examples show why the dissertation treats language behaviour as part of axiology: saying something “good” is not merely polite wording but an action with social consequences. Russian material certainly contains a rich ethics of speech, but in the dissertation’s Human subsection the selected examples place the main quantitative emphasis on internal authenticity and intelligence.

3.3. *Family: concord, intergenerational attachment, and relational architecture*

Table 3. *Primary profiles within the Family dominant*

Profile	Russian n (%)	Uzbek n (%)	Main contrast
Parents/children/generations	7 (53.8)	5 (25.0)	Russian examples concentrate most strongly on parental attachment and upbringing.
Spouses/marriage	3 (23.1)	6 (30.0)	Both value marital stability; Uzbek imagery stresses complementary structure.
Household concord/order	1 (7.7)	5 (25.0)	Uzbek examples more often lexicalize order, house, blessing, and domestic organization.
Extended kin / community support	2 (15.4)	4 (20.0)	Uzbek family space more visibly extends toward affinal kin and neighbour support.

The Russian Family sample is dominated by intergenerational relations: 7 of 13 examples (53.8%). *При солнышке тепло, при*

матушке добро (“It is warm in sunshine and good with one’s mother”) establishes maternal care through a natural warmth metaphor. *Без отца – полсироты, а без матери – и вся сирота* (“Without a father one is half an orphan; without a mother, wholly an orphan”) constructs a graded model of loss. *Свое дитя и горбато, да мило* (“One’s own child may be hunchbacked, yet is dear”) makes attachment resistant to external imperfection. The Russian family is thus frequently represented as emotional protection and moral belonging. At the household level, *На что и клад, коли в семье лад* (“What use is treasure if there is concord in the family?”) places лад above wealth, making harmony a stronger resource than material possession.

The Uzbek Family sample is more evenly distributed among parents, spouses, household order, and near-community relations. *Oila tinch – yurt tinch* (“When the family is peaceful, the country is peaceful”) extends domestic stability into a wider civic scale. *Ona bilan bola – gul bilan lola* (“Mother and child are like flower and tulip”) uses paired beauty to express intimacy, whereas *Ota – aql, ona – idrok* (“Father is reason, mother is understanding”) assigns complementary cognitive-symbolic roles. In the 20 Uzbek examples, *ona* occurs in eight units (40.0%), *ota* in five (25.0%), *xotin* in five (25.0%), *uy* in four (20.0%), and *oila* in three (15.0%). These figures reveal that family evaluation is organized simultaneously around persons and domestic space.

Spousal imagery makes the structural profile especially visible. *Oila – qo’sh ustunli ayvon* (“The family is an aivan supported by two pillars”) and *Er-xotin – qo’shqanot* (“Husband and wife are two wings”) represent marriage through necessary complementarity. *Xotin – uyning chirog’i* (“The wife is the lamp of the home”) links a person with domestic vitality. Russian *Муж да жена – одна душа* (“Husband and wife are one soul”) expresses unity through fusion rather than architecture. Thus, both traditions value marital cohesion, but the preferred images differ: Russian examples foreground attachment and preservation, whereas Uzbek examples more often spatialize family as a functioning structure.

The Uzbek domain also reaches beyond the nuclear household. *Yaxshi qo'shni – ota-ona, yomon qo'shni – boshga balo* (“A good neighbour is like parents; a bad neighbour is a calamity”) moves a non-relative onto the parental value scale, while *Qo'shni keldi – ko'mak keldi* (“The neighbour came – help came”) defines proximity through assistance. *Qaynota ham – ota, qaynona ham – ona* (“A father-in-law is also a father; a mother-in-law is also a mother”) normatively absorbs affinal kin into the parent category. These examples support a relational interpretation of Uzbek family axiology: the home is a centre from which value expands to kin, neighbour, and yurt.

3.4. Labour: mastery, honest effort, and social worth

Table 4. *Primary profiles within the Labour dominant*

Profile	Russian n (%)	Uzbek n (%)	Main contrast
Effort/result/overcoming	4 (30.8)	10 (41.7)	Shared causal model; Uzbek examples more often extend effort to movement, livelihood, and success.
Mastery/practical competence	3 (23.1)	1 (4.2)	Russian <i>delo, rabota</i> , master and hands strongly profile skill.
Ethical legitimacy/reward	3 (23.1)	4 (16.7)	Russian reward is often deserved compensation; Uzbek <i>halol</i> moralizes earning itself.
Discipline vs. idleness	3 (23.1)	5 (20.8)	Both reject inactivity; Uzbek examples often name humiliation or self-harm as its result.
Explicit social-moral worth	0	4 (16.7)	Uzbek examples directly link labour with qadr, el, and human value.

Labour contains 37 units and is the largest domain in the secondary sample. Russian examples centre lexically on *труд* and *дело* (five of 13 units each; 38.5%) and *работа* (four; 30.8%). *Без труда не вытащишь и рыбки из пруда* (“Without labour you cannot pull even a fish from the pond”) encodes unavoidable effort; *Терпенье и труд все перетрут* (“Patience and labour will grind everything down”) joins work with

endurance. *Дело мастера боится* (“The task fears the master”) reverses ordinary agency and turns competence into power over difficulty. *Работа да руки – надежные в людях поруки* (“Work and hands are reliable guarantees among people”) converts practical capacity into evidence of reliability. Together these examples profile work as deed, mastery, and proof of character.

The Russian profile is not naïvely celebratory. *Дело учит, и мучит, и кормит* (“A task teaches, torments, and feeds”) combines education, burden, and sustenance. *Всякий труд мзды достоин* (“Every labour deserves reward”) and *Какова плата, такова и работа* (“As the pay, so the work”) preserve the ethical-economic relation between effort and compensation. Labour is valuable, but its legitimacy is connected to competence, endurance, and proportionate reward. This helps explain why the Russian sample devotes 23.1% of its labour examples primarily to mastery and another 23.1% to ethical reward.

Uzbek material is more concentrated on *mehnat*: the stem occurs in 13 of 24 examples (54.2%); *ish* occurs in seven (29.2%), *halol* in three (12.5%), and *yalqov* in three (12.5%). *Ish bor yerda osh bor* (“Where there is work, there is food”) uses the rhyme *ish/osh* to connect activity and subsistence. *Mehnat, mehnatning tagi – rohat* (“At the bottom of labour lies well-being”) conceptualizes comfort as a deferred result of effort. *Mehnatli non – shakar, mehnatsiz non – zahar* (“Bread earned by labour is sugar; bread without labour is poison”) makes the moral status of food depend on how it was obtained. *Halol ishla, halol tishla* (“Work honestly, eat honestly”) makes this relation explicit: labour is evaluated not only by productivity but also by ethical legitimacy.

Effort and overcoming account for 10 of 24 Uzbek Labour examples (41.7%). *Qimirlagan qir oshar* (“The one who moves will cross the hill”) turns movement into a condition of success; *Yer – xazina, mehnat – kaliti* (“The earth is a treasure-house; labour is its key”) represents potential wealth as locked until effort activates it; *Tirishgan tog’dan oshar, ter to’kkan baxtli yashar* (“The persistent one crosses the mountain; the one who sheds sweat lives happily”) links perseverance, bodily effort, overcoming, and well-being in one causal chain. The negative

pole is equally explicit: *Yalqovlik, oxiri xo'rlik* ("The end of laziness is humiliation") and *Yalqov – o'ziga yov* ("The lazy person is his own enemy") present idleness as self-destructive.

A distinctive feature of the Uzbek sample is the direct conversion of labour into social worth. *Daraxt yaprog'i bilan ko'rkam, odam – mehnati bilan* ("A tree is beautiful through its leaves; a person through labour") makes work part of visible dignity. *Daryo suvini bahor toshirar, odam qadrini mehnat oshirar* ("Spring raises the river's water; labour raises a person's worth") explicitly connects *mehnat* with *qadr*. *Ishsevarni el sevar* ("The people love the one who loves work") adds collective recognition. No Russian example in this small selected set was coded primarily under this category; this does not mean the relation is absent from Russian paremiology, only that it is not foregrounded in the dissertation's explicit Russian Labour examples.

3.5. Lexical concentration and contrastive indices

Table 5. *Selected recurrent lexical markers in the coded examples*

Domain / language	Marker	n/domain set	Share	Axiological function
Human/ Russian	ym	4/9	44.4%	Inner intellectual criterion that overrides age or appearance.
Human/ Uzbek	yaxshi/ yomon	7/18 each	38.9%	Direct lexicalization of positive and negative moral poles.
Human/ Uzbek	so'z	4/18	22.2%	Speech as ethical action and interpersonal influence.
Family/ Uzbek	ona	8/20	40.0%	Maternal figure as emotional and structural centre.
Family/ Uzbek	ota/xotin	5/20 each	25.0%	Parental and spousal roles within domestic organization.
Labour/ Russian	мпыѳ / ѳѳѳѳ	5/13 each	38.5%	Effort and competent deed as proof of worth.
Labour/ Russian	паѳѳѳѳ	4/13	30.8%	Work linked with time, burden, hands, and remuneration.
Labour / Uzbek	/ mehnat	13/24	54.2%	Central labour lexeme linking effort, result, dignity, and well-being.
Labour Uzbek	/ ish	7/24	29.2%	Practical activity linked to livelihood and movement.
Labour Uzbek	/ halol	3 / 24	12.5%	Ethical legitimacy of work, food, and income.

The lexical counts clarify where each value domain is most explicitly verbalized. The Russian Human sample has a strong single-marker concentration around *ym*: 44.4% of the nine examples contain this stem, which corresponds to the dominance of internal-intellectual evaluation. Uzbek Human examples are less centred on one lexeme: the balanced recurrence of *yaxshi* and *yomon*, together with *so'z* and *odob*, produces a broader moral-communicative field. In the Family domain, the high incidence of *ona* (40.0%) confirms the centrality of motherhood, while the simultaneous presence of *ota*, *xotin*, *uy*, *oila*, and *qo'shni* distributes family meaning across roles and spaces. The Labour domain shows the clearest lexical asymmetry: *mehnat* occurs in more than half of the Uzbek examples (54.2%), whereas Russian labour evaluation is divided between *труд*, *дело*, and *работа*. This supports the qualitative distinction between a comparatively unified Uzbek *mehnat*-centred field and a Russian field that differentiates effort, task/deed, and work activity.

Percentage-point contrasts make the semantic profiling more visible. Internal moral-intellectual qualities account for 77.8% of Russian Human examples but 38.9% of Uzbek ones, a difference of 38.9 percentage points. Conversely, speech ethics accounts for 27.8% of Uzbek Human material and is not primary in the selected Russian examples. In the Family domain, parents and children lead the Russian sample by 28.8 percentage points (53.8% versus 25.0%), while household concord/order is 17.3 points more prominent in Uzbek material (25.0% versus 7.7%). In Labour, Uzbek effort/result/overcoming exceeds the Russian share by 10.9 points (41.7% versus 30.8%), whereas Russian mastery/practical competence exceeds the Uzbek share by 18.9 points (23.1% versus 4.2%). These differences are not tests of population significance; rather, they are descriptive effect indicators for the explicit dissertation sample. Their importance lies in showing that the same general value domain is internally partitioned in systematically different ways.

4. DISCUSSION

The quantitative recoding strengthens rather than replaces the dissertation's qualitative argument. The same three values are

positive in both languages, so the contrast cannot be reduced to “different values.” National specificity appears in semantic profiling. Russian Human examples are highly concentrated on the contrast between outer signs and inner worth; Uzbek Human examples distribute evaluation across *odob*, speech, companionship, and responsibility. Russian Family examples concentrate on parental attachment and concord; Uzbek Family examples distribute value across generations, household organization, complementary spousal roles, affinal kin, neighbour support, and yurt. Russian Labour paremias foreground deed, mastery, endurance, and earned reward; Uzbek Labour paremias more visibly connect effort with *halol* conduct, food, social esteem, movement, and well-being.

These differences can be described through cultural valency: the capacity of a proverb’s central marker to activate neighbouring value domains. Uzbek *odob* connects personhood with education, social acceptability, speech, and beauty; *halol* connects work with morality, subsistence, and legitimate income; *oila* and *uy* connect kinship with order, neighbourliness, and public stability. Russian *ym* repeatedly functions as a criterion that corrects deceptive appearance, *лад* condenses household harmony, and *дело* links personal worth with demonstrable competence. The important point is not that one culture “has” a value lacking in the other, but that the value enters a different associative network.

The findings also clarify the mechanism of axiological markedness. It is rarely reducible to one positive or negative word. An image activates a culturally familiar association; the association establishes an evaluative contrast; grammar and rhythm make the contrast memorable; pragmatic use converts it into advice, warning, approval, reproach, or prescription. This image → association → evaluation → prescription sequence explains why translation must preserve more than dictionary meaning. Uzbek *el*, *yurt*, *odob*, *halol*, and *qadr* may require interpretive expansion in English or Russian, just as Russian *лад* and *дело* can lose part of their evaluative radius when rendered by a single neutral equivalent.

A cross-domain reading also reveals that the three dominants are not isolated thematic boxes. Human worth is repeatedly verified through family behaviour and labour; family stability is evaluated through responsibility, speech, order, and productive activity; labour becomes a criterion of personhood and, in Uzbek material especially, of social recognition. This interconnection is theoretically important because an axiological dominant should not be treated as a simple keyword field. It is better understood as a centre of semantic attraction whose boundaries overlap with neighbouring values. Such a view is compatible with contemporary descriptions of proverbial meaning as compressed and contextually expandable [16: 265-284; 18: 97-107]. It also explains why close formal equivalents may differ pragmatically. A translation can preserve the propositional lesson while weakening the source proverb's cultural valency: for example, rendering *el* merely as "people" may under represent its collective-social resonance, and translating *лад* only as "peace" may miss its sense of harmonious order within relations. Comparative paremiology therefore requires two levels of equivalence: equivalence of the explicit evaluative proposition and equivalence, as far as possible, of the culturally activated associative network. The latter is precisely where the contrastive model used in the dissertation is most productive, because it prevents national specificity from being reduced either to exotic vocabulary or to generalized cultural stereotypes.

The principal limitation is statistical. The 97-unit sample is a secondary reconstruction from examples explicitly analysed in the dissertation, not a balanced corpus sampled independently from equivalent dictionaries. The higher number of Uzbek items reflects the dissertation's example selection and should not be transformed into claims about greater value frequency in Uzbek. The counts are nonetheless useful because the procedure is reproducible, the denominator is explicit, and the numerical patterns correspond to textual mechanisms visible in the examples. A subsequent corpus study could test these profiles on balanced Russian and Uzbek paremiographic datasets and add inter-coder reliability for semantic categories.

5. CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis confirms that Uzbek and Russian paremiology share a stable ethical nucleus organized around worthy personhood, family cohesion, and productive labour, while differing in how these values are linguistically profiled. In the 97-unit secondary analytical sample, Labour constitutes 38.1%, Family 34.0%, and Human 27.8%. Russian Human examples predominantly test inner and intellectual worth; Uzbek examples more evenly integrate moral education, speech ethics, and relational responsibility. Russian Family paremias emphasize parental attachment and concord, whereas Uzbek examples more explicitly construct an extended relational architecture of household, kin, neighbour, and yurt. Russian Labour paremias privilege deed, competence, endurance, and deserved compensation; Uzbek examples link *mehnat* with *halol* conduct, livelihood, overcoming, social esteem, and well-being. The findings support the dissertation's central claim that axiological markedness is a multilevel cultural mechanism rather than a set of isolated evaluative words. Common values become nationally specific through their preferred images, lexical centres, pragmatic strategies, and associative connections.

REFERENCES

1. Wierzbicka, A. 1997. *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
3. Mieder, W. 2004. *Proverbs: A Handbook*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
4. Krikmann, A. 1974. Some Additional Aspects of Semantic Indefiniteness of Proverbs. Tallinn: Academy of Sciences of the Estonian SSR.
5. Arutyunova, N. D. 1988. *Tipy yazykovykh znacheniy: otsenka, sobytie, fakt* [Types of Linguistic Meaning: Evaluation, Event, Fact]. Moscow: Nauka.

6. Teliya, V. N. 1996. Russkaya frazeologiya: semanticheskiy, pragmaticheskiy i lingvokulturologicheskiy aspekty [Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic and Linguocultural Aspects]. Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kultury.
7. Karasik, V. I. 2004. *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs* [The Linguistic Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]. Moscow: Gnozis.
8. Mokienko, V. M. 2010. Sovremennaya paremiologiya (lingvisticheskie aspekty) [Contemporary Paremiology: Linguistic Aspects]. *Mir russkogo slova*, 3, 6-20.
9. Nelyubova, N. Yu. 2025. Aksiologicheskie dominanty lingvokultury i ikh markirovannost v paremiologii [Axiological Dominants of Linguoculture and their Markedness in Paremiology]. Doctoral dissertation, Moscow.
10. Safarov, Sh. 2006. *Kognitiv tilshunoslik* [Cognitive Linguistics]. Jizzakh: Sangzor.
11. Mamatov, A. E. 2019. *Zamonaviy lingvistika* [Modern Linguistics]. Tashkent: Noshir.
12. Komilova, G. R. 2023. *O'zbek tilidagi maqollarning aksiolingvistik tahlili* [Axiolinguistic Analysis of Uzbek Proverbs]. Tashkent: Bookmany Print.
13. Mirzayev, T., Musoqulov, A. & Sarimsoqov, B. 2005. *O'zbek xalq maqollari* [Uzbek Folk Proverbs]. Tashkent: Sharq.
14. Gibatova, G. F. 2011. *Aksiologiya v yazyke* [Axiology in Language]. Vestnik OGU, 2(121), 127–132.
15. Permyakov, G. L. 1988. *Osnovy strukturnoy paremiologii* [Foundations of Structural Paremiology]. Moscow: Nauka.
16. Bredis, M. A., Dimoglo, M. S. & Lomakina, O. V. 2020. Paremii v sovremennoy lingvistike: podkhody k izucheniyu, tekstoobrazuyushchiy i lingvokulturologicheskiy potentsial. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 11/2, 265-284.
17. Semenenko, N. N. 2020. Aksiologiya paremiy v fokuse problemy kognitivno-diskursivnogo modelirovaniya semantiki russkikh poslovits. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 11/2, 213-232.
18. Lomakina, O. V. 2021. Izuchenie poslovits v rusle tsennostnoy paradigm: metodologiya issledovaniya i kriterii vydeleniya otsenochnosti. *Scientific Notes of V. I. Vernadsky Crimean Federal University. Philological Sciences*, 7/1, 97-107.
19. Nelyubova, N. Yu., Dugalich, N. M. & Ershov, V. I. 2021. Semantic Condensations in French and Russian proverbs based on

- the thematic group family. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 12/4, 1051-1074.
20. Nelyubova, N. Yu. 2020. Reprezentatsiya kontsepta TRUD v russkikh i frantsuzskikh poslovitsakh: tsennostnyy aspekt. *Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka*, 3/42, 165-171.
21. Dal, V. I. 1989. *Poslovitsy russkogo naroda* [Proverbs of the Russian People], Vols. 1-2. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
22. Mokienko, V. M. & Nikitina, T. G. 2010. *Bolshoy slovar russkikh poslovits* [Large Dictionary of Russian Proverbs]. Moscow: Olma Media Group.

FAKHRIDDIN BOKHODIROVICH YULBARSOV
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FOOD
TECHNOLOGY AND ENGINEERING,
FERGANA, UZBEKISTAN.