

INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE OF THE EVALUATION CATEGORY

Prihodko G. I.

INTRODUCTION

The essence of the category of evaluation is elucidated by the theory of value direction of person's activity and consciousness, and the scope of its features embraces all that is given by the physical and mental nature of individual, his being and feelings¹. The values' model of the world is arranged through the structure of the cultural universals, i.e. a set of interrelated universal concept, which can be expressed by different language means.

Evaluation is a crucial constituent of cognition, which is based on a value approach to the phenomena of environment and society². Individual's activity and life as of a human being having different needs, wishes, interests and aims is impossible without assessment. All objects of reality perceived by man have a certain value in our minds, that is, they may be estimated.

Many attempts have been made to investigate the quintessence of the evaluation category in present-day linguist studies. The functional semantics of evaluation has been thoroughly examined by Martin & White³, Volf⁴. Evaluation speech comprehension and its pragmatic significance have been analysed by Bigunova⁵, Myroniuk 2017⁶, Prihodko^{7,8}.

¹ Byessonova O. Reconstruction of Value Concepts in the Language Model of the World. Part I: *Linguistics, Translation and Cultural Studies*. 2012. Pp. 7–14.

² White P.R.R. Appraisal Theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. 2015. Pp. 1–8.

³ Martin J.R., White P.R.R.. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 278 p.

⁴ Вольф Е.М. Функциональная семантика оценки. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2009. 280 с.

⁵ Бігунова Н.О. Позитивна оцінка: Від когнітивного судження до комунікативного висловлювання. Одеса: КП ОМД, 2017. 580 с.

⁶ Myroniuk T. Evaluative Responses in Modern English Fiction. *Advanced Education*. 2017. Vol. 8. Pp. 103–108.

⁷ Prihodko A. Cognitive-communicative organization of the evaluative frame. *Lege Artis*. 2016. Vol. 1(1). Pp. 275–308.

Nevertheless, there are certain gaps in researching of the interdisciplinary character of evaluation. The importance of the present paper is determined by the fact that the evaluative cognitive process and evaluation speech realization require a further development. In the presented conception, the category of evaluation is interpreted as the chief cognitive and communicative category that shows a relationship with pragmatic social linguistic characteristics of the communicants and establishes their speech behavior, serving as the initial point of a speech act.

The **subject** of the discussion is the representation of the evaluation category as a universal linguistic phenomenon. The **purpose** of this piece of writing is to determine the position and functions of evaluation in the process of manifestation and perception of the objective reality.

The **material**, which is subjected to analysis, is a selection of approximately 550 utterances of the works by contemporary British, and American writers. The principle of the selection was the existence (direct or indirect) of evaluative seme in words of the utterance.

The **methodology** that is in use in the study is Appraisal theory, which presents a essential notions for the linguistic analysis. Concentrating chiefly on semantic peculiarities of evaluation, this theory expands the boundaries of the analysis with discourse semantics. It means that all components of communication (register, mood, participants with their communicative purposes and cognitive systems) become very significant for the study of creating and targeting assessment. In this respect, the theoretical standpoint important to the study is also the pragmatic approach to evaluation analysis^{9;10;11} focusing on the function of extralinguistic knowledge in utterance explanation and the principles that restrict its use as well as on the context types for appraisal.

This research involved a variety of methods. A descriptive method, by which we mean a set of research techniques that allow one to move from particular observations to generalizations and conclusions is widely used; methods of contextual and presuppositional analyzes, allowing to

⁸ Prihodko G. Specific Nature of Evaluative Speech Acts. *Advanced Education*. 2018. Vol. 9. Pp. 201–205.

⁹ Арутюнова Н.Д. Логический анализ языка. Адресация дискурса. Москва: Индрик, 2012. 511 с.

¹⁰ Приходько Г.І. Категорія оцінки в контексті зміни лінгвістичних парадигм. Запоріжжя: Кругозір, 2016. 200 с.

¹¹ Вольф Е. М. Функциональная семантика оценки. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2009. 280 с.

detect the influence of the role structure of the communication situation, social factors on the communicative semantics and functional features of utterances with evaluative words and phrases. Speech act analysis is used while studying the pragmatic characteristics of utterances containing evaluative concepts.

1. Assessment and Values

The category of evaluation is a rather popular point of linguistic analysis. It is known that the essence of the category of evaluation is clarified by the theory of value orientation of person's activity and awareness, and the set of its characteristics embraces all that is given by the physical and mental nature of the individual, his being, mood and feeling. Evaluation is defined as speaker's objective or subjective attitude to a certain object, which is explicitly or implicitly expressed by language means.¹²

Appraisal is as a type of cognitive activity, as in epistemological terms, any cognitive act expresses the attitude of the speaker to the thing described, that is, contains an act of evaluation.¹³ We can't but mention the problem of reasons of evaluation. From the viewpoint of Ananko, motives of assessment and assessment itself don't have a direct connection, though they are in a eternal empirical interrelation in the consciousness of individuals¹⁴.

Values are determined by certain needs in different periods of life. Thus, evaluation is seen as a cognitive process, which presupposes the use of two kinds of knowledge: the knowledge of the estimated object and the knowledge of the evaluator's own inner needs, desires and requirements.

Human being's activity is a pragmatic concept. It is appropriate only when it is aimed at those phenomena and things from which it is possible to get something useful, practical and valuable.

Evaluation by its nature is anthropocentric, it means that the contents of evaluation expose human nature and depend on the values and

¹² Приходько Г.І. Категорія оцінки в контексті зміни лінгвістичних парадигм .Запоріжжя: Кругозір, 2016. 200 с.

¹³ Breeze R., Olza I. Evaluation in media discourse. European perspectives. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2017. 286 p.

¹⁴ Ananko T. The Category of Evaluation in Political Discourse. *Advanced Education*. 2017. Vol. 8. Pp. 128–137.

axiological standards of the society and an individual.¹⁵ It should be noted that evaluation is characterized by selectivity. It means that it takes out and preserves the features that are essential from an evaluation individual's point of view.

One and the same thing can be of interest to one person and can leave another person uninterested. From a huge amount of various items, people assess those, which are important for them at a given moment and those that provoke their feelings. If an object does not influence the person's attention, no evaluation will be created: neither in the mind, nor in communication.

Evaluation is based on the logical notion of "value". Values are based on perceptions and observations of a definite object and phenomenon. Values can be considered as one of the means of categorization on the foundation of assessment, and the outer reality can be portrayed as a hierarchy of values.¹⁶

Origin of the notion of "value", if we resort to reconstructing it on the basis of the etymology of the words it is named, fixes in it at least three key elements. They are the following: the characterization of the external properties of objects and things as phenomena of evaluative attitude to them; psychological qualities of the human being as a subject of this attitude; relations between people, their communication, due to which values obtain a universal meaning.

Value is a positive or negative property of the objects of the surrounding world for the speaking community. This significance of these properties is determined not by the objects' characteristics as such, but by their function in the life of an individual language speaker and in the life of the speaking community in general.¹⁷

Each of the classes of values combines the basic meaning of value its material-objective, psychological and social significance. By recognizing the natural properties of objects and reproducing their value, a person reveals certain features of social relations, because the importance of a thing or phenomenon is determined primarily by the social attitude towards them.

¹⁵ White P.R.R. Appraisal Theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. 2015. Pp. 1–8.

¹⁶ Wang Y., Xu J. The interrelation between evaluative categories and evaluated items. *Linguistics and the Human sciences*. 2013. Vol. 8 (1). Pp. 29–61.

¹⁷ Partington A. Evaluative clash, evaluative cohesion and how we actually read evaluation in texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2017. Vol. 117. Pp. 190–203.

There exist universal values (common to all humanity, peculiar to individual communities) and individual ones. Being a concentrated expression of the vital activity' experience of a particular social community values form a certain scheme, which an individual as a member of this society adheres to in the course of self-evaluation.

Personal values are an individual manifestation of group or universal values. They are somewhat unlike in different people, due to the interpretation of their content and the shift of accents. The selection, appropriation and assimilation of social values by an individual are explained by his social identity and the values of the small contact groups referenced to him.

The subject of assessment acts in these cases as a mental or physical receptor, evaluating event, situation, thing and object from the point of view of different ranges: ethical evaluation (embarrassing, humiliating, sinful), emotional (boring), intellectual (foolish), utilitarian (meaningless, late) and psychological (difficult, easy, not easy, wise). This highlights the most important feature of evaluative phenomena i.e. the diffusion of their meanings, which is primarily conditioned by the ability to present appraisal in terms various reasons.

2. Cognitive and Pragmatic Nature of Evaluation

Evaluation is an essential component of a person's everyday life. We assess others and are evaluated in accordance with our actions and words. People evaluate their past and present, appearance and behavior of the individual, the shape and size of various subjects, things, duration and frequency of events, the degree of complexity of tasks, etc.¹⁸. Evaluative interpretation of circumstances, subjects is one of the most important types of mental-speech activity in everyday life of a human being. Evaluation is always cognitive in its nature, and hence logical-subject. Evaluative and epistemological functions of the language are closely interrelated and interconnected.¹⁹ In addition, at the same time, they are equal, as in the process of appraisal, cognition is transformed, and in the process of cognition, evaluation is always present.

¹⁸ Bednarek, M. Dimensions of evaluation: Cognitive and linguistic perspectives. *Pragmatics and Cognition*. 2009. Vol. 17(1). Pp. 146–175.

¹⁹ White P. Evaluative contents in verbal communication. *Verbal communication*. 2016. Pp. 77–96.

The correlation between cognition and evaluation is very complex. It belongs to the field of cognitive linguistics, the problems of which cover the nature of the procedures that control and structure the speech perception. As a result, the cognitive approach based on the interaction of language and thinking is the most appropriate for the examination of the evaluation category, because it studies it in the context of human cognitive activity.

Evaluation is a process that is characteristic of any science. This is confirmed by the fact that value orientation in many cases contributed to the progress of a whole range of directions not only in the linguistic field, but also in computer technology, genetic engineering, and many other areas.²⁰ It indicates stable incorporation of scientific knowledge within the cognitive paradigm that was formed as interdisciplinary (cognitive) science.

The cognitive process of assessment, including in the general program of human activity, is decision-making-oriented, and is the foundation of the choice of practical actions. A person as a subject of linguistic activity is an individual who perceives and comprehends the world, and is capable of evaluating speech facts in his day-to-day speech practice.

Human activity is a pragmatic concept. It is appropriate only when it is directed at those phenomena and properties from which it is possible to obtain something useful and valuable. As rightly remarks Arutyunova, the nature of the evaluation always corresponds to the nature of man, because we evaluate only “what is needed (physically and spiritually) to man and to Mankind”.²¹

The communicative aspect of linguistics is relatively young, but is actively developing. It puts the focus not only on the language in the inseparable unity of its form and substance, but also on higher unity, namely, the connection between language and person who acts in the real world, thinks and perceives the environment, communicates with other individuals.

It should be noted that when we talk about the communicative aspect of mastery of language or language skills, we mean, above all, the orientation to the interlocutor. Hence, communication is the optimal

²⁰ White P.R.R. Appraisal Theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. 2015. Pp. 1–8.

²¹ Арутюнова Н.Д. Логический анализ языка. Адресация дискурса. Москва: Индрик, 2012. 511 с.

influence on the interlocutor in the form of intercourse, exchange of thoughts, information, ideas, etc.

Therefore, it can be asserted that the notion of language began to be understood more widely than it was inherent in structural and generative linguistics. Triad form – meaning – function correlates language with extra lingual activities and with the conditions of its use in human activities.

Multidimensionality, of language system allows it to be simultaneously turned to the external reflected reality and to the sphere of human mentality. Achieving any pragmatic goals is impossible without communication, so the latter is perhaps the most important condition of person's activity and life itself. Verbal communication is carried out through a language, which is both a form and a means of communication.

The communicative purpose put forward by the speaker is to convey to the listener his point of view, to convince him of the possibility and legitimacy of precisely this, and not another vision of the word in the best possible way. The image of the word, which is stored in the linguistic consciousness of the individual, is revealed in emotional and aesthetic evaluations.

The close connection between the speaker's evaluation and his knowledge of the world is confirmed by the fact that in the utterance an evaluation can find its expression in the characterization of certain events, objects, phenomena that have a positive / negative evaluative significance for a particular social group or society as a whole.

Functional orientation of evaluative utterances is caused by the fact that the speaker uses language means as a device for his own intrusion into a speech act, as an expression of his thoughts, his attitude and his evaluation, the expression of relations he establishes between himself and the listener.

It is the evaluative-communicative function of the language, which is opposed to the representative (or conceptual) one. Modern linguists express similar opinion and emphasize on the necessity for a functional-cognitive approach to the study of the category of evaluation.

So, the notion of “function” is essential in the study of linguistic units: “this is ... the ability to perform a certain purpose, the potential of functioning (in a reduced form), and at the same time the realization of this ability, that is, the result, the purpose of functioning”²². Functional

²² Бондарко А.В. Основы функциональной грамматики: Языковая интерпретация идеи времени. СПб.: Изд-во С. – Петерб. ун-та, 1999. 260 с.

principle allows to see evaluative utterances in their “actions”, reflecting positive or negative values, attributed to the subject of the object of assessment.

The possibility of verbal communication is always realized in a particular situation, in a certain context, which is an internal characteristic of communication. The communicative aspect of the language means the existence of a unified structure of the linguistic units, bound by the connection of meaningful and formal sides.

It becomes apparent that the communicative approach involves interweaving with the cognitive approach. In this regard, the functioning of evaluative utterances acquires special significance, because the evaluation of various fragments of the world is one of the most important components of individual’s cognitive activity.

3. Biocognitive Dimensions of Evaluation

Modern stage of linguistics is characterized by coordination of various scientific opinions regarding its object – language. With all the differences in the interpretation of natural language dominant directions converge that this phenomenon can be understood and explained only by considering it as an integral part of the cognitive system, i.e. all of the structures and mechanisms that combine to provide cognitive and intellectual person’s activity.

Within the cognitive approach category of knowledge is considered the key one. It combines knowledge of the world and language system. This focus of linguistic research makes problems of solving linguistic semantics in terms of categorization and conceptualization of cognitive processes of surrounding reality particularly urgent.

The fundamental principles of cognitive field of the first generation were questioned and main principles of cognitive science of the second generation (as it is conventionally called by Lakoff and Johnson)²³ were worked out. Cognition is seen by scholars as the activities of the human body, carried out in the course of interaction with the environment in order to adapt to the environment for survival and reproduction.

It is very important to note that this thesis and other postulates formulated by Lakoff and Johnson were reflected in biocognitive theory

²³ Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. London: University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p.

developed by Chilean neurobiologists Maturana and Varela. Researches proposed an interesting conception of living systems, based on the principle of living systems are studying systems, and life is a process of cognition.

In other words, an attempt was made to find an explanation for the phenomenon of knowledge as an effective action, which enables a living organism to continue its existence in certain environment. In addition, scientists emphasize that the center of any knowledge is observer.²⁴

This complex representation is considered as a structural unit of the experience / memory, or concept. In other words, concept is a set of representations of interactions with the object or objects (non-linguistic and linguistic), characterized by the causal dependency and promotes effective adaptation of the organism to its environment.

During his development, a person, like human society as a whole, discovers the reality, receives new knowledge about the world, in a certain way organizes them and correlates with the already known. Processes of conceptualization and categorization are of particular importance for the systematization and updating of the received knowledge, for their successful application in different situations.

The specificity of conceptualization consists in comprehension of received information, the thoughtful construction of objects and phenomena, which leads to the formation of certain ideas about the world (concepts); while categorization is a mental act that organizes, systematizes and selects representations of interactions in human consciousness, which reduces the infinite variety of individual to an appreciable number of units. Together they represent a complex mental process, aiming at the effective incorporation of a human being into the surrounding environment.

Evaluative conceptualization is an appraisal of objects of the surrounding world and as a result the formation of evaluative concepts in our consciousness. Evaluative categorization is a grouping of objects and phenomena by the nature of their evaluation in accordance with the evaluative classes and categories, as well as the mental correlation of an object with a certain category.

Evaluative concepts define the content of the evaluative categories and serve as the cognitive basis for their formation. The nature and

²⁴ Maturana H., Varela F. *The Tree of Human Understanding*. Boston, 1987. 224 p.

structure of the evaluative categories are largely determined by the system of quantitative and individual values of an individual. The specific nature of the evaluative categorization and its main difference from natural categorization is in the fact that the basis of these two processes lies in different ways of perceiving the surrounding reality, natural and evaluative worldviews.

Each person has a unique experience of adaptation to the environment; hence, the set of representations and concepts of causal relations is also to some extent unique. In this connection, it is lawful to talk about the individual level in the structure of the concept.

However, a man lives in a certain society, which is a part of his niche. The existence of an individual directly depends on the interactions with other individuals, as they orientate him on his effective behavior in a specific situation. In this regard, it is possible to speak about social and national levels of concept.

Cognitive patterns that exist in the person's mind, are diverse according the channels of incoming information, or, in terms of the biological approach, they are formed because of different kinds of interactions with elements of the niche. Therefore, we can distinguish the concepts of sensory perception of the world and concepts of mediate knowledge.

From the angle of the biocognitive approach, the conceptual worldview can be defined as the totality of concepts or complex representations present in the person's mind. They reflect the collective experience of direct and indirect interaction with the environment²⁵. This conceptual system itself is the object of interaction.

The evaluation category is an important element of the conceptual worldview, since the notions of positive and negative, good and evil, beauty and ugliness, moral and immoral are inherent in any culture, any social system.

At the same time, in the minds of the possessor of each language, the image of the world is created by a combination of linguistic universals and the special functioning of linguistic signs, which reflect the national worldview. In the language worldview important fragments of reality which are important for people are recorded by means of different symbols.

²⁵ Кравченко А.В. Знак, значение, знание: очерк когнитивной философии языка. Иркутск: Иркутская областная типография № 1, 2001. 261 с.

It must be noted that the objective reality, judgments about it, its evaluative characteristics and the subjective attitude to it of the members of this society are represented in the interaction of different language means of expression.

Thus, we consider the evaluative concept as an independent mental formation characterized by cultural specificity. Verbalizing, this concept enters the conceptual and language worldview of a certain linguocultural community, and can be recognized as their structural and fundamental element. The reason for this is the thesis that the evaluation, being a feature inherent in any culture, participates in the formation of an evaluative worldview.

4. Interconnection of Context and Evaluative Utterance

One of the manifestations of the interdisciplinary nature of the evaluation category is its connection with the context. This fact is highlighted by many linguists^{26, 27} who emphasize the dynamic correlation between evaluative utterances and context. Our understanding of the context is based on its pragmatic interpretation, because “the notion of pragmatic context is a theoretical and cognitive abstraction of a variety of physical, biological, and other situations”²⁸.

The pragmatic context provides information on the conditions under which not only the utterance is perceived, but also gives rise to expectations regarding the probable objectives of the participants, and therefore, relatively possible speech acts that can be carried out in this situation.

In other words, the pragmatic context, which serves to express the meaning of the utterance in the speech, is formed by a set of subordinate contexts: linguistic, stylistic, paralinguistic, situational, cultural, and psychological. It is within the framework of the pragmatic context the transition in the usage and perception of the utterance from the level of meaning to the level of sense, in particular pragmatic, takes place. This approach to understanding the context is appropriate, as for the study of the realization of the evaluative potential, knowledge of all conditions under which it occurs is required.

²⁶ Fedoriv Ya. Speaking to the global audience: A case study into the message transformation. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. 2016. Vol. I (2). Pp. 1–36.

²⁷ Kecskes I. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013. 277 p.

²⁸ Dijk, T.A. van *Text and Context*. L.: Longman, 1977. 260 p.

Context gives an opportunity to expose their hidden potential. Linguistic units encode previous experience and former contexts of the use of a given phrase or expression. In the act of communication, the old collides with the actual one.

The genuine communicative meaning is generated because of a clash in the coded lexical units of the “old”, previous contexts and the actual situational context in which this utterance is used. The individual contexts of the speaker and hearer, encoded in the same terms based on personal experiences or in the same linguistic expressions, often differ.

All said above gave opportunity to establish three types of interconnection between the context and evaluative utterance:

- 1) the context influences the evaluative utterance, changing the character of the evaluation;
- 2) the evaluative utterance affects the context by adding the evaluative component to its structure;
- 3) the mutual influence of the evaluated utterance and context.

Consider the mechanism of mutual influence of the context and the evaluative utterance in detail.

In the first type of interdependence, two variants are possible – negative and positive.

In a negative context, an evaluative utterance (positive or negative) has a negative connotation. If, there are no semes with negative evaluation in the lexemes that are part of the utterance, they are added to the semantic structure of words under the influence of the context:

- (1) “*Poor little rich girl*”, *I said savagely*”²⁹.

In this utterance, the lexeme *little* is undoubtedly has evaluative seme, but the word *poor* is perceived more vividly, in contrast to the word *rich*, although it is not its antonym in this context. The negativity of the entire context is predetermined by the use of the word *savagely* (fiercely, roughly), which, in contrast to the word *little*, serves rather to express the intensity of the evaluation than to qualify its character. It also contributes to the appearance of negative-evaluative impulses in the semantic structure of the words that make up this utterance.

Here is another example that illustrates the impact of context on the mark of evaluation:

²⁹ Christie A. *Endless Night*. L.: Publ. by Collins, 1967. 224 p.

(2) “How nice to you, Cindy told him with pseudo-sweetness that it's not just dull old delegations who come to you with problems”³⁰.

The word *old* deprived of its nominative meaning, serves here to express the negative qualification of the subject of the utterance (disapproval, ridicule), which is revealed as a result of its use next to the lexeme *dull* (boring annoying), which expresses negative evaluation.

It is necessary to mention that the ironic use of *nice* is restrained in the same way, which is emphasized by the usage of the word *pseudo-sweetness* and the plural of noun *delegations* in the meaning of the singular.

In a positive context, an evaluative utterance with a neutral or negative evaluation acquires positive connotation, adding to its semantic structure semes of occasional positive evaluation under the influence of the context.

It takes place because some pejoratives in a certain context may express the opposite evaluation due to their ambivalence. In these cases, the descriptive semantic features of words do not agree with their evaluative trait:

(3) “Listen. Listen, you little fool! You deserve a hundred lashes. Are you going to ruin things now by mindless stupid jealousy? I'm here I love you, you are my wife”³¹.

In this utterance the negatively colored words *fool*, *stupid*, *jealousy* are used to enhance the pragmatic effect of the positive evaluation. This becomes possible due to the fact that the positive context indicates the unreasonableness of the addressee's disturbance.

In the second case, it is possible to distinguish two types of interaction between the context and the evaluative utterance:

1) the context (neutral or positive) combines in the utterance lexemes with negative-evaluative semes, under the influence of which the context becomes negative:

(4) “Opening it (the door), I beheld a handsomely ugly face, animal and engaging”³².

In this utterance, we observe a combination of an objective characteristic of a person, expressed with the help of the adjective *ugly*, and emotionally-subjective expressed by the adverb *handsomely*.

³⁰ Hailey A. Airport. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1968. 440 p.

³¹ Murdoch I. The Sacred and Profane Love Machine. N. Y.: Viking Press, 1974. 374 p.

³² McInnes C. City of Spades. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1958. 255 p.

The phrase of this type is not always an oxymoron in the conventional sense because the lexemes that make it up are not necessarily antonyms. Their peculiarity is precisely in the fact that a word, which usually expresses a positive characteristic of a phenomenon or object, is used here to convey a negative evaluation.

2) the context (neutral or negative) due to the words with positive meaning in its structure reflects the positive sense of the utterance:

(5) “*Old friend of my father's. Said it was good to have me abroad*”³³.

The change in the evaluative perspective occurs under the influence of the general-evaluative predicate *good* the semantic structure of which contains semes of positive evaluation. The change in the estimated perspective occurs under the influence of the general-estimated good predicate, which contains seven positive assessments.

It should be noted that the change in the speaker's opinion about the object of evaluation is influenced by the fact that integrated speech is incorporated into the direct speech as an evaluative element of the whole utterance.

In the third case, an interaction between the evaluative utterance and the context is observed.

The utterance contains appraisers with only positive semes in their semantic structure, and appraisers with only negative-evaluative semes. Interacting with the context, such utterance contributes to its transformation into a negative one (that is, the first two variants of the mutual influence of the evaluative utterance and the context seem to be combined here):

(6) “*I left them working, the car looking disgraced and empty with the engine open and parts spread on the work bench, and went in under the shed and looked at each of the cars. They were moderately clean, a few freshly washed, the others dusty ... I looked at the tires carefully, looking for cuts or stone bruises. Everything seemed in good condition. It evidently made no difference whether I was there to look after things or not*”³⁴.

Describing the state of military equipment, the author uses words (epithets) with both a negative evaluation (*disgraced, empty, dusty*) and positive one (*clean, freshly, good*), which, interacting within the

³³ Vonnegut K. jr. *Player Piano*. N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. 295 p.

³⁴ Hemingway E. *A Farewell to Arms*. M.: Progress Publishers, 1976. 320 p.

boundaries of the context, determine its negative perception. The negativity here is also emphasized by the last phrase of the utterance, which shows the hero's indifferent attitude to the phenomenon described.

It is impossible to overlook the fact that in this situation variants also are distinguished. If an utterance contains words with the positive evaluation, and the context conveys the negative one, then due to their interaction, the weakening of the negative evaluation of the context and the positive evaluation of the utterance takes place. Moreover, on the contrary, if the utterance includes words with the negative evaluation, and the context is positive (such cases are much less common than the previous ones), then the result of their interaction is the same – there is a weakening of both evaluative meanings.

CONCLUSIONS

The interpretation of the evaluation as a universal category of intellection and language reflects the multifaceted and contradictory nature of the evaluative semantics, which consists in generalizing reference of the evaluative function, “secondariness” of its nomination, the specificity of the communicative aim, which reproduces the objective properties of information simultaneously.

So we can understand the evaluation as an representation of the evaluative attitude of the speaker to the subject of speech, achievable at all levels of the language, which is the result of abstract work of the speaker's consciousness, logical analysis.

The concept of “evaluation” has become an integral and essential part of the conceptual apparatus of present-day linguistics, which clearly demonstrates the fact that it is impossible to study a language without resorting to its major purpose, its “creator”, carrier, consumer, specific linguistic personality, a person.

The evaluation, therefore, should be investigated comprehensively and profoundly as a category of high-level abstraction as one of the categories given by the social, physical and mental nature of a person, which determines his relation to other individuals and objects of the surrounding reality.

The evaluative conceptualization is the assessment of objects of the outer world and the formation of the evaluative concepts in our minds. The evaluative categorization is a grouping of objects and phenomena in accordance with the evaluative classes and categories.

To sum up, having focused the research on the field of the representation of the evaluation in different types of context, we have submitted results of interconnection of context and evaluative utterance in the area of Pragmatics, Evaluation theory, theory of Text, and theory of linguistic and stylistic Context. Often, units that are neutral at the language level become evaluative in context. Such context can be called evaluative, as only within its boundaries the expression acquires an evaluative meaning that is not inherent in its normative usage.

Our research shows that three types of interaction between the context and the evaluation utterance can be distinguished: the context affects the evaluative utterance, changing the mark of evaluation; the evaluative utterance influences the context, transforming the nature of its evaluation; the evaluative utterance and the context carry out organic mutual influence, and none of the parties prevails.

It is obvious that evaluation is created, realised and can be interpreted only within the context. The important role in this process belongs to various expressive means and stylistic devices.

In conclusion, this study points out the necessity of the investigation of the evaluation in different types of context taking into account national stereotypes.

SUMMARY

The paper examines the interdisciplinary character of the evaluation category, a very significant and attractive phenomenon in linguistics. Evaluation of different world's fragments is a considerable part of human cognitive activity. The essence of the category of evaluation is explained by the theory of value orientation of person's activity and consciousness, and the range of its characteristics embraces all that is given by the physical and mental nature of man, his being and feeling. The article proposes the communicative approach to the research of evaluative phenomena that exist in the reality and are reflected in language. It results in the interconnection of the context and the evaluative utterance. The piece of writing discusses the biocognitive foundations of evaluation category. Particular attention is paid to the structure of the evaluative concept. Three types of interrelation between the context and evaluative utterance can be established: 1) the context influences the evaluative utterance, changing the character of the evaluation; 2) the evaluative utterance affects the context by adding the evaluative component to its

structure; 3) the mutual influence of the evaluated utterance and context. The results obtained corroborate the idea that the evaluation should be studied comprehensively and profoundly as a category of high level abstraction as one of the categories given by the social, physical and mental nature of a person, which determines his relation to other individuals and objects of the surrounding reality.

REFERENCES

1. Ananko T. The Category of Evaluation in Political Discourse. *Advanced Education*. 2017. Vol. 8. Pp. 128–137.
2. Bednarek, M. Dimensions of evaluation: Cognitive and linguistic perspectives. *Pragmatics and Cognition*. 2009. Vol. 17(1). Pp. 146–175.
3. Breeze R., Olza I. Evaluation in media discourse. European perspectives. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2017. 286 p.
4. Byessonova O. Reconstruction of Value Concepts in the Language Model of the World. Part I: *Linguistics, Translation and Cultural Studies*. 2012. Pp. 7–14.
5. Christie A. *Endless Night*. L.: Publ. by Collins, 1967. 224 p.
6. Dijk T.A. *van Text and Context*. L.: Longman, 1977. 260 p.
7. Fedoriv Ya. Speaking to the global audience: A case study into the message transformation. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. 2016. Vol. I (2). Pp. 1–36.
8. Hailey A. *Airport*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1968. 440 p.
9. Hemingway E.A. *Farewell to Arms*. M.: Progress Publishers, 1976. 320 p.
10. Kecskes I. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013. 277 p.
11. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. London: University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p.
12. Martin J.R., White P.R.R.. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 278 p.
13. Maturana H., Varela F. *The Tree of Human Understanding*. Boston, 1987. 224 p.
14. McInnes C. *City of Spades*. N. Y.: Macmillan, 1958. 255 p.
15. Murdoch I. *The Sacred and Profane Love Machine*. N. Y.: Viking Press, 1974. 374 p.
16. Myroniuk T. Evaluative Responses in Modern English Fiction. *Advanced Education*. 2017. Vol. 8. Pp. 103–108.

17. Partington A. Evaluative clash, evaluative cohesion and how we actually read evaluation in texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2017. Vol. 117. Pp. 190–203.
18. Prihodko A.. Cognitive-communicative organization of the evaluative frame. *Lege Artis*. 2016. Vol. 1(1). Pp. 275–308.
19. Prihodko G. Specific Nature of Evaluative Speech Acts. *Advanced Education*. 2018. Vol. 9. Pp. 201–205.
20. Vonnegut K. jr. *Player Piano*. N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. 295 p.
21. Wang Y., Xu J. The interrelation between evaluative categories and evaluated items. *Linguistics and the Human sciences*. 2013. Vol. 8 (1). Pp. 29–61.
22. White P. Evaluative contents in verbal communication. *Verbal communication*. 2016. Pp. 77–96.
23. White P.R.R. Appraisal Theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. 2015. Pp. 1–8.
24. Арутюнова Н.Д. Логический анализ языка. Адресация дискурса. Москва: Индрик, 2012. 511 с.
25. Бігунова Н.О. Позитивна оцінка: Від когнітивного судження до комунікативного висловлювання. Одеса: КП ОМД, 2017. 580 с.
26. Бондарко А.В. Основы функциональной грамматики: Языковая интерпретация идеи времени. СПб.: Изд-во С. – Петерб. ун-та, 1999. 260 с.
27. Вольф Е.М. Функциональная семантика оценки. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2009. 280 с.
28. Кравченко А.В. Знак, значение, знание: очерк когнитивной философии языка. Иркутск: Иркутская областная типография № 1, 2001. 261 с.
29. Приходько Г.І. Категорія оцінки в контексті зміни лінгвістичних парадигм. Запоріжжя: Кругозір, 2016. 200 с.

Information about the author:

Prihodko G. I.

Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor at the Department of English Philology,
Zaporizhzhia National University
66, Zhukovsky str., Zaporizhzhia, 69600, Ukraine