

**VALUE-BASED ASSESSMENT AS AN ANALYTICAL LINGUISTIC CATEGORY:  
STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FUNCTIONS IN THE LINGUISTIC WORLDVIEW**

**Salokhiddinov Manuchekhr**

PhD, Senior lecturer of  
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20478125>

**Abstract.** The present study offers a theoretical and scientific examination of axiological evaluation, framing it as a crucial category within linguistic analysis. It sheds light on the mechanisms underlying the formation of positive and negative evaluative meanings through various linguistic units, detailing their semantic, pragmatic, and cognitive characteristics. Additionally, the paper explores the contribution of value-based assessments to the construction of the linguistic worldview, highlighting their deep-rooted connections to national-cultural factors and their influence on the conceptual framework of language users. By analyzing concrete examples, the research investigates the manifestation of evaluative components across multiple linguistic tiers—specifically lexical, phraseological, and syntactic—and identifies their communicative and pragmatic roles. Ultimately, the findings substantiate the integral position of the axiological category within the language system and its vital function in shaping conceptual structures within the linguistic picture of the world.

**Keywords:** value-based assessment, linguistic category, linguistic picture of the world, evaluative components, semantics, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, conceptualization, socio-cultural traits, discourse.

**Introduction.** Assessing the linguistic worldview from an axiological standpoint serves as a methodological framework designed to uncover the underlying value systems encoded within a language. These systems mirror the spiritual, cultural, and ethnic dispositions of a specific demographic. Viewed through this lens, language operates both as an archive of shared historical experience and as an active mechanism for conceptualizing and transferring this experience into an individual's cognitive domain.

This evaluative approach treats language beyond its basic communicative utility, examining it as an intricate cultural and cognitive construct that encapsulates a nation's specific values, worldview, and assessment criteria. The primary objective of this paradigm is to extract the implicit value orientations embedded across various linguistic tiers, encompassing lexical items, metaphors, phraseology, and grammatical structures.

Over the course of its historical evolution, every speech community gathers a distinct collective memory. This communal knowledge is molded by societal structures, daily lifestyles, traditions, religious doctrines, and environmental engagements. As a result, these experiences are linguistically encoded and passed down across generations, cementing language's role as a "repository of collective experience" that preserves ancestral wisdom, core values, and societal stereotypes.

However, language transcends the mere passive storage of information; it acts as a dynamic agent of conceptualization. It fundamentally dictates how individuals perceive, categorize, and evaluate their reality. For example, a highly nuanced linguistic representation of specific concepts highlights their critical importance within a given culture, whereas a lack of specific terminology or limited expression points to their marginal relevance.

**Research methodology.** The axiological framework hones in on this exact dynamic: the complex correlation between language and societal values. Through the analysis of evaluative markers within speech, researchers can deduce a society's dominant moral, aesthetic, and socio-cultural principles. Expressions of commendation or critique, honorifics, and pejorative terms all provide vital clues regarding the ethical standards and social stratification of a community.

Ultimately, language functions as a sophisticated semiotic network that mirrors the cultural memory, spiritual domain, and axiological priorities of its speakers. Assessing the linguistic worldview from a value-based perspective offers a rigorous scientific methodology for deciphering this network, enabling scholars to investigate both individual and collective cognition through a linguistic lens.

The construction of a linguistic worldview is inextricably bound to a framework of axiological coordinates, observable across lexical-semantic configurations, grammatical systems, paremiological assets, and discourse patterns. Specific linguistic elements, including idioms, proverbs, and metaphorical constructs, expose a society's socio-cultural and normative-ethical orientations, ultimately establishing an enduring ethnic archetype for processing and interpreting reality.

The development of a linguistic worldview is neither an arbitrary nor an objective phenomenon; rather, it is intrinsically bound to the axiological framework of a given society, encompassing its core values, evaluative benchmarks, and normative paradigms. A language inherently encodes its speakers' conceptualizations of significance, moral judgments, and prescribed ways of life. Consequently, a holistic examination of language across multiple structural tiers is essential for decoding this cognitive-linguistic landscape.

At the forefront of this mechanism are lexical-semantic frameworks. A language's lexicon functions beyond mere nomenclature; it acts as a tool for assessment, establishing the socio-cultural weight of various phenomena. For example, the proliferation of synonyms for a specific concept - or the conspicuous lack thereof - highlights the cognitive priorities and focal points of a speech community. Furthermore, the inherent positive or negative valences attached to lexical items directly stem from this underlying value system.

Grammatical structures similarly participate in this axiological mapping. Elements such as honorific markers, forms of address, pronominal distinctions, and morphosyntactic variations in tense and modality serve as indices of social stratification, relational distance, and ethical conventions. To illustrate, the presence of dedicated grammatical honorifics in certain languages underscores the cultural premium placed on hierarchical reverence and social standing.

Furthermore, paremiological assets - comprising proverbs, maxims, and sayings - stand out as prominent indicators of the linguistic picture of the world. These expressions distill intergenerational wisdom into normative declarations, capturing a society's ethical orientations, existential philosophies, and behavioral protocols. By outlining acceptable and prohibited conduct and offering guidance on navigating life, proverbs transcend their linguistic boundaries to operate as vital mechanisms of social regulation.

In the realm of actualized speech, discursive practices further illuminate these axiological coordinates. The negotiation of permissible discourse, the observance of communicative taboos, and the selection of specific rhetorical strategies expose the profound cultural and moral dictates governing a community. Similarly, the calibration of politeness, as well as the preference for direct or indirect communication, is governed by this foundational matrix of values.

Finally, particular linguistic constructs - namely idioms, proverbs, and metaphors - warrant distinct scrutiny. Rather than passively reflecting objective reality, these elements construct a culturally specific interpretation of the world. Metaphorical mapping, in particular, enables speakers to process abstract domains through tangible imagery, thereby forging a unique

cognitive model of reality. Conceptualizing life as a “journey” or time as a “current,” for instance, underscores the deeply metaphorical architecture of human thought and cultural perception.

As a result, these linguistic mechanisms do more than merely highlight a society’s socio-cultural and ethical-normative frameworks; they actively generate a robust ethnic paradigm for perceiving reality. This paradigm acts as a comprehensive model of how a distinct demographic observes, understands, and judges the world - a framework that is solidified through linguistic practices and inherited across generations.

Therefore, investigating the linguistic picture of the world through an axiological lens fosters a deeper understanding of language, helps decipher underlying cultural codes, and clarifies the intricate relationship between human cognition and collective societal values.

**Results and discussion.** The value-laden dimensions of the linguistic worldview are particularly evident in the conceptualization of universal notions - such as “family”, “labor”, “freedom”, and “love” - which exhibit distinct semantic and pragmatic traits depending on the language. Infused with specific national and cultural histories, these concepts highlight the varying degrees to which different cultures assign and interpret value.

Cognitive linguistics views language as a mechanism for organizing reality and a vehicle for axiological awareness that molds a person’s individual worldview. From this standpoint, evaluating language through a value-based perspective becomes an essential methodology for examining the linguistic worldview, allowing researchers to uncover the cultural hierarchies embedded within the vocabulary.

Rather than treating language as a simple semiotic system or a basic communicative tool, cognitive linguistics regards it as a fundamental element of human thought and worldly perception. According to this discipline, language actively configures reality rather than merely reflecting it passively - it classifies, arranges, and assigns semantic meaning to the knowledge held in the human mind. Consequently, individuals rely on language to construct a distinct model of the world; this model operates not as a flawless mirror of objective reality, but as a subjective cognitive structure informed by personal, social, and cultural backgrounds. Viewed in this light, language serves as a primary mechanism in the development of an individual’s “axiological consciousness.” It allows speakers to do more than simply label phenomena; it enables them to appraise reality, designating elements as positive or negative, essential or marginal. This dynamic reveals an inherent evaluative layer - a stratum of value-oriented meaning - within linguistic components. Thus, linguistic units, particularly those within the lexical domain, function as semantic “codes” that encapsulate the dominant moral and cultural paradigms of a society.

Axiological analysis within cognitive linguistics is specifically designed to expose this evaluative dimension. It provides an indispensable methodological framework for studying the linguistic worldview by identifying the implicit assessment metrics operating within a language system. For example, a high frequency of lexical terms for a single concept, or highly nuanced semantic variations, signals the cultural centrality of that concept. Additionally, subtle differences among synonymic paradigms, along with emotional, expressive, and connotative layers of meaning, serve as vital resources for mapping a community’s axiological priorities.

Additionally, the realm of metaphor represents a crucial domain for axiological analysis. Within the paradigm of cognitive linguistics, metaphors are conceptualized not merely as rhetorical embellishments, but as foundational cognitive processes. They enable individuals to process and appraise abstract phenomena through the lens of tangible empirical and social experiences. Conceptual metaphors, such as “time is money” or “life is a journey,” do more than merely clarify reality; they actively construct specific, value-driven stances toward it.

The axiological framework is equally critical when examining phraseological constructs and paremiological data. Sayings, proverbs, and idioms serve as repositories of normative wisdom synthesized from a community's historical trajectory. Through these linguistic expressions, societies delineate ethical guidelines, addressing core existential inquiries regarding proper conduct and moral living. Thus, language operates beyond mere data transmission, functioning intrinsically as a prescriptive tool for social regulation.

Ultimately, integrating an axiological perspective within cognitive linguistics promotes a comprehensive and rigorous exploration of the linguistic worldview. By mapping the evaluative paradigms, cultural hierarchies, and priorities entrenched in linguistic structures, this approach clarifies the intricate nexus between human thought and societal norms. Consequently, language is revealed not just as a reflection of consciousness, but as a principal cognitive and cultural engine that actively molds and guides human perception.

Conducting comparative assessments of axiological focal points across diverse languages uncovers both ethnocentric particularities and ubiquitous human values within the broader global linguistic framework. This analytical paradigm is especially valuable in the realms of translation and intercultural discourse, where the accurate transmission and replication of cultural values is essential.

Operating at the intersection of multiple disciplines, axiological linguistics leverages methodologies from corpus lexicography, cognitive semantics, and discourse analysis to exhaustively probe how values are linguistically encoded. Such multi-faceted approaches not only isolate enduring semantic patterns but also trace the evolution of cultural values in response to shifting socio-cultural paradigms.

The axiological appraisal of the linguistic worldview represents a specialized branch of linguistic inquiry focused on decoding the evaluative semantics embedded within linguistic structures. Because language articulates the ideological frameworks, cultural preferences, and conceptual hierarchies central to a given demographic, it provides the essential groundwork for interpreting the linguistic worldview through a value-oriented lens.

A linguistic worldview emerges from the dynamic intersection of linguistic properties and extralinguistic contexts, incorporating the historical, cultural, religious, and socio-political environments that frame language use. Together, these variables dictate the cognitive categorization of reality, which subsequently materializes in linguistic forms and establishes a robust, formalized value framework.

These axiological compasses are systematically encoded throughout a language's grammatical, lexical, phraseological, and paremiological inventories. Idiomatic, proverbial, and metaphorical expressions capture the socio-cultural expectations, cognitive templates, and behavioral standards indigenous to a specific collective. To illustrate, the English adage "East or West, home is best" highlights the conceptual primacy of the domestic sphere, reflecting the deep-seated cultural reverence for the home within the Anglophone cognitive framework.

From a cognitive perspective, the axiological assessment of language is understood as the verbal articulation of values derived from shared communal experiences. Consequently, linguistic tokens serve as conduits for ethno-cultural ideals and significations, embodying both universally applicable and socio-culturally distinct axioms.

Functioning as the core structural element of the worldview, a concept is intrinsically augmented by evaluative dimensions that form the cultural cipher of a specific demographic. Thus, distinct linguistic cultures project varied axiological interpretations onto universal concepts - namely "liberty", "kinship" and "dignity" - which are deeply contingent upon their respective historical trajectories and cultural nuances.

Anthropocentric proverbs hold a prominent role within the value-driven linguistic worldview. They execute a regulatory function by delineating normative behavioral paradigms and dictating the parameters of acceptability, desirability, and deviance in accordance with prevailing socio-cultural frameworks.

Within linguistic discourse, a worldview is conceptualized as a compilation of verbally articulated conceptualizations of reality, mirroring the cognitive apprehension of native interlocutors. The term “worldview” itself was appropriated from the natural sciences to define the cognitive schemas manifested via linguistic expression.

The pioneer of modern theoretical physics, Albert Einstein, underscored the imperative of incorporating “worldview” into the lexicon of scientific investigation. He highlighted the intrinsic human drive to formulate a coherent and simplified model of the universe, intended to replace chaotic empirical reality and thereby afford individuals a sense of psychological tranquility and existential certainty.

The phenomenon of the “worldview” is investigated through a multidisciplinary lens, synthesizing methodologies from biology, psychology, and cultural studies. This composite approach allows for the analysis of the construct through both socio-cultural conditioning and the psychophysiological mechanisms of perception. From a cultural standpoint, a worldview is delineated as an accumulated body of environmental knowledge, organized into a distinct conceptual framework that typifies a particular national identity. Shaped by sociocultural variables, this construct acts as the cognitive manifestation of a culture, capturing its holistic, multifaceted nature. Moreover, rather than remaining static, this conceptual paradigm is continually modified and refined by emergent knowledge and lived experiences. Despite overarching cultural affinities, personal worldviews remain profoundly unique, echoing the subjective experiential realities of the individual. Variations across cross-cultural worldviews stem from contrasting paradigms of values, ideologies, and customs that are propagated through linguistic and traditional channels.

As posited by A. A. Leontiev, the worldview constitutes the psychological mirroring of objective reality, which is consciously mapped and mediated via standardized semantic structures and aligned cognitive frameworks.

Examined biologically, the worldview emerges within human cognition and is construed as an intricate network of mental representations. These configurations encapsulate a synthesized summation of experiences gathered through both immediate and vicarious engagements with the external milieu.

The paradigm of the “linguistic worldview” was initially conceptualized by the German philologist Wilhelm von Humboldt during his pioneering inquiries into the interface between linguistic structures and cognitive processes. He posited that language does not act as a passive mirror of objective reality; rather, it operates as an active mechanism for its interpretation. Consequently, individuals decode and reconstruct reality through a linguistic prism, thereby generating subjective, culturally mediated models of the universe.

Fundamentally, the linguistic worldview constitutes the specific domain of human conceptualization that is inextricably bound to and manifested through language. Language is deeply implicated in the formation of this worldview via a dual operational mechanism. Initially, the intrinsic structural and semantic architecture of a language molds the cognitive worldview of the individual. Conversely, language simultaneously functions as the primary conduit for externalizing and clarifying various facets of human consciousness. Throughout this dynamic interchange, distinct lexicon and concepts are absorbed into the linguistic system, embedding the unique cultural and individual traits of its speakers. Thus, personalized empirical insights are linguistically synthesized, evolving into the shared intellectual capital of a society.

In modern linguistic theory, the linguistic worldview is defined as the linguistically encoded fraction of an individual's conceptual matrix. It serves as a foundational theoretical construct for analyzing the intricate triad of cognition, culture, and linguistic expression. From this perspective, language transcends its conventional role as a mere communicative device, emerging as an essential cognitive apparatus used for the perception, categorization, and semantic interpretation of objective reality.

The integration of language and worldview is operationalized through two primary modalities. First, an individual's cognitive mapping of the world is structurally predetermined by the internal logic and grammatical properties of their native tongue. Through this mechanism, humans navigate their environment relying on pre-established linguistic categories, which dictate the classification and semantic evaluation of reality. Because every linguistic system offers a distinct epistemological lens, the cognitive apprehension of the world inherently varies across different linguocultural groups.

Second, language acts as the interpretative vehicle for articulating alternative conceptual paradigms, including scientific, theological, philosophical, and colloquial frameworks. As these paradigms are articulated, specialized phraseology, terminologies, and conceptual frameworks are integrated into the linguistic repertoire, thereby preserving the epistemic achievements of a specific socio-cultural group. Consequently, a language acts as an expansive repository, encapsulating not just isolated personal encounters, but sweeping historical and cultural continuities.

Ultimately, language serves as the crucible wherein individual empirical observations are amalgamated into a communal intellectual reservoir. It enables the intergenerational transmission of experiential knowledge, fostering the perpetual accumulation and refinement of collective wisdom. By functioning as a mechanism of social memory, language guarantees the unbroken progression of human cognitive evolution. In summary, the linguistic worldview represents a highly complex phenomenon illustrating the profound symbiosis of language, thought, and culture - a nexus that definitively shapes both the human perception of reality and its subsequent verbal articulation.

An ethnic worldview functions as an organized cognitive framework that captures the comprehensive apprehension of reality unique to a particular ethnic collective. It serves a dual purpose: facilitating environmental adaptation while encapsulating the axiological principles that represent the enduring cultural standards, core values, and collective ethos of a population.

This ethnic paradigm is forged not merely through direct sensory experience, but via the linguistic mediation and cultural interpretation of external phenomena. It integrates foundational epistemological frameworks, culturally specific stereotypes, and axiological constructs, which collectively form the cognitive and semantic architecture of the ethnic group.

As articulated by E. M. Volf, the axiological dimension of the ethnic worldview reflects the cognitive mapping of reality through binary oppositions, such as "benevolent-malevolent" or "beneficial-detrimental." This evaluative taxonomy is inherently secondary; it is socially engineered and subsequently codified both in lexicogrammatical units and the mental schemata governing human cognition.

The genesis of an "axiological worldview" stems from the cognitive engagements of both the individual and the broader ethnos. It constitutes a coherent matrix of enduring beliefs concerning the relevance and societal validity of diverse phenomena, thereby dictating evaluative paradigms and behavioral dispositions within a given ethno-linguistic community. Consequently, this phenomenon is deeply intertwined with theoretical discourse in contemporary cognitive linguistics and linguoculturology, which highlights the primacy of evaluative metrics in the human conceptualization and appraisal of the objective world.

In this vein, applying a linguoculturological perspective, V. A. Maslova underscores language's function as a cultural cipher that constructs and articulates the human axiological framework. Concurrently, N. D. Arutyunova's examination of evaluative semantics and pragmatic constructs validates the profound correlation between linguistically encoded value orientations and cognitive models. Additionally, within Yu. N. Karaulov's paradigm of the "linguistic persona," value systems are construed as enduring cognitive templates embedded within the individual's verbal-cognitive architecture, cultivated by the surrounding socio-cultural and ethnic milieu.

Consequently, the convergence of these theoretical frameworks corroborates the notion that the axiological worldview is a byproduct of human cognitive endeavor. It operates as a dynamic construct generated through the perpetual symbiosis of linguistic and cultural systems.

At the micro-level, an individual's conceptualization of the world is erected upon personal axiological orientations, which assign meaning to objective reality via subjective experiential filters. Evaluative appraisal remains a fundamental component of cognitive and affective processing; it does more than merely configure thought patterns, it also regulates the agent's behavioral responses during socio-material engagements.

The axiological apprehension of reality unfolds through the dichotomy of benevolence and malevolence, or the positive and the adverse, culminating in evaluative propositions that organize individual consciousness. This complex interplay of ethical and cultural dispositions is intrinsically oriented toward linguistic materialization.

Furthermore, as N. D. Arutyunova posits, the evaluative semantics entrenched within lexical units do not necessarily correspond to the empirical, physical attributes of an object. Rather, a substantial fraction of this semantic interpretation is dictated by the subjective parameters of perception and the individual's affective projections onto reality.

The formulation of an individual's value system is driven by a complex synthesis of cultural contexts, ethical principles, national archetypes, and personal social interactions. Far from being a static entity, this developmental process is in a state of perpetual flux, undergoing continuous modification in response to evolving historical circumstances, professional environments, familial configurations, and ongoing personal reflection.

According to V. I. Karasik, a rigorous investigation of the evaluative facets of the linguistic worldview requires an in-depth analysis of the axiological structures operating inherently within the language itself. He asserts that concepts holding profound cultural significance are characterized by highly detailed and versatile linguistic encoding, a phenomenon that mirrors their substantial cognitive prominence within a community's collective consciousness.

**Conclusion.** In outlining a systematic approach to analyzing this axiological worldview, Karasik establishes four core methodological postulates:

1. The internal architecture of value-based concepts relies on a combination of universal and culture-specific constituents. While the former represents broad, universally shared humanistic values, the latter denotes the unique cultural markers of linguistic categorization and assessment.
2. The linguo-axiological worldview functions as a hierarchically organized taxonomy of values, fundamentally interconnected with the moral, legal, and religious pillars of a society.
3. Evaluative judgments are structurally linked through associative intersections and hierarchical embeddings. These mechanisms allow researchers to map the development of culturally distinct paradigms within specific linguocultural communities.
4. The structural nucleus of this value hierarchy consists of axiological dominants - resilient semantic hubs representing crucial cultural categories. These core dominants are linguistically codified and iteratively transmitted across successive generations.

Drawing on Zverev's theoretical framework, the axiological structure of an ethnic group acts as a sophisticated governance mechanism designed to preserve socio-cultural cohesion. He highlights that foundational value dominants play a crucial integrative role, ultimately determining the developmental pathways of the ethnos. Having survived a stringent selection process across vast historical periods, these fundamental values secure the long-term viability of the community as a cohesive collective. Crucially, they establish vital cultural deterrents to aggression, functioning primarily to suppress innate, biologically motivated violence directed at members of the in-group.

**References:**

1. Lebedeva, N. Yu. (2022). Intercultural communication: Language and culture. Moscow: LIBROKOM Book House, 248 p.
2. Abdrakhmanova, G. F. (2020). Language and values: An axiological aspect. Moscow: LKI, 248 p.
3. Bocharnikova, T. I. (2021). Concepts in the mirror of national culture. Moscow: Infra-M, 156 p.
4. Zimnyaya, I. A. (2018). Linguistic conceptualization of the world. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 232 p.
5. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 248 p.
6. Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 248 p.
7. Apresyan, Yu. D. (1974). *Lexical semantics*. Moscow: Nauka, 248 p.
8. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 248 p.
9. Permyakov, G. L. (1988). *Fundamentals of structural paremiology*. Moscow: Nauka, 248 p.
10. Kartashova, V. A. (2022). Axiological parameters of translation. Moscow: Logos, 168 p.
11. Reznik, S. D. (2021). Discourse and values in the linguocultural space. Moscow: Logos, 200 p.
12. Sorokina, E. V. (2017). *Axiology and language: Correlation and interaction*. Kazan: Kazan University Press, 182 p.
13. Gudym, I. N. (2018). *Cognitive-discursive analysis of proverbs*. St. Petersburg: Lema, 210 p.
14. Leontiev, A. A. (1975). *Activity. Consciousness. Personality*. Moscow: Politizdat, 304 p.
15. Yartseva, K. V. (2012). The concept of the "worldview": The adaptive function of the worldview. Moscow: Logos, 180 p.
16. von Humboldt, W. (1836). *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts [On the diversity of human language construction and its influence on the mental development of the human species]*. Berlin: Königlich Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 500 p.
17. Selemeneva, O. A. (2012). Formation of the linguistic worldview concept in linguocognitology. Moscow: Infra-M, 190 p.
18. Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 190 p.
19. Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 190 p.
20. Maslova, V. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Moscow: Infra-M, 190 p.

21. Volf, E. M. (1985). Functional semantics of evaluation. Moscow: Nauka, 230 p.
22. Maslova, V. A. (2001). Linguoculturology. Moscow: Academia, 240 p.
23. Arutyunova, N. D. (1999). Language and the human world. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 896 p.
24. Karaulov, Yu. N. (1987). The Russian language and the linguistic persona. Moscow: Nauka, 264 p.
25. Savchenko, E. Yu. (2014). Linguistic representation of axiological parameters in discourse. Kazan: Kazan University Press, 190 p.
26. Shevchenko, N. A. (2019). Evaluative concepts in the linguistic worldview. Yekaterinburg: Ural Federal University (UrFU) Press, 186 p.
27. Karasik, V. I. (2004). The language circle: Personality, concepts, discourse. Moscow: Gnosis, 392 p.
28. Plotnikov, A. V. (2011). Value semantics of language: Theory and practice. Saratov: Saratov State University (SSU) Publishing House, 220 p.
29. Zorina, E. V. (2013). Evaluation in discourse: Cognitive and pragmatic aspects. Moscow: Logos, 220 p.
30. Zverev, Yu. I. (2018). Axiology and ethnic consciousness. St. Petersburg: Lan, 224 p.