УДК 801.8+811.111
DOI 10.12958/2227-2844-2024-2(361)-78-85

Udovichenko Hannah Mykhailivna,
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of Foreign Philology,
Ukrainian Studies and Social-Low Department of the
Mykhailo Tuhan-Baranovskyi Donetsk National
University of Economics and Trade,
Kryvyi Rih, Ukraine.
udovichenko@donnuet.edu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3731-0857

Sherstiuk Liudmila Valeriivna,
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Acting Head of the Department of English Philology and Translation of the
Black Sea National University named after Petro Mohyla,
Mykolaiv, Ukraine.
lvsherstiuk@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8467-8449

CORRELATION OF EVALUATIVENESS, EXPRESSIVENESS AND EMOTIONALITY

The category of evaluation is considered within the framework of axiology – the philosophical doctrine of value. The concept of value itself is defined as a philosophical and sociological concept denoting, firstly, the positive and negative significance of an object as opposed to its existential and qualitative characteristics (object values), and secondly, the normative value of an object, prescriptive-evaluative side of the phenomena of social consciousness (subjective values or values of the consciousness).

Evaluation is approval or condemnation of the phenomena of social reality, which are carried out with reliance on the ideal of advantageousness, quality, beauty, expediency, goodness, which exist in consciousness in the form of a certain totality, a complex with a hierarchical structure.

The philosophical category of evaluation is characterised by the following functions: worldview, methodological (gives a person a general orientation in the world), logical (participates in the thinking process), the function of formation of spiritual culture, practical.

In the sphere of linguistics, the category of evaluation raises a number of controversies.

The first one is of terminological nature and concerns the distinction between the notions of "evaluation" and "evaluativeness". In most cases these terms are regarded as synonyms: evaluativeness (or evaluation) can be defined as the transmission by lexical means of positive and negative attitudes to the named object, phenomenon.

However, attempts have been made to separate these concepts by assigning the term "evaluation" the status of the initial logical concept, and defining "evaluativeness" as a linguistic category.

Following this interpretation, evaluation is taken as an act of human consciousness (consisting in comparing the properties of objects, determining their place and role in one's own life activity) and its results, which are fixed in consciousness and language in the form of a positive, negative or neutral attitude, while evaluativeness is considered as the realisation of the universal logical category of evaluation in the semantic structure of linguistic units. The process of transition of evaluation into evaluativeness, thus, is the fixation of evaluation in the meaning of linguistic units, which is carried

out under the condition of the authority of the subject of evaluation and the wide usage of the evaluative expression.

Evaluativeness is the linguistic core of the category of evaluation. Evaluativeness has points of intersection with such linguistic phenomena as expressiveness, style fixation, emotionality, imagery. Certainly, all evaluative predicates can carry elements of the above phenomena, which, however, does not make evaluativeness identical to them. Let us consider each of the concepts separately.

Evaluation can be figurative. In linguistics, figurativeness is understood as a special component of meaning that reflects associations or perceptions associated with certain words, and through it with a particular word. The figurative evaluative predicate is certainly also expressive, since the artistic image is one of the means of creating expressiveness. The figurative way of expressing evaluation includes metaphor, metamorphosis (expressed by the possessive case), antonomasia, metonymy, figurative comparison and, of course, all allusive evaluative predicates.

The most heated controversy is the question of the correlation between evaluativeness, expressiveness and emotionality. According to some scholars, expressiveness differs from emotionality and evaluativeness in the same way as the phenomena of the plan of expression from the elements of content. Linguists define expressiveness as the ability of a linguistic sign to express the intensity of subject-logical or stylistic information of the linguistic sign (Onyshchenko, 2005). This category is connected with such a property of evaluation as graduality – quantitative expression of the quality of an object by means of its comparison with a certain norm, a standard, which reflects an objective idea of the neutral. Thus, evaluation can be neutral, stating the attitude of the object of evaluation to the subject as a fact, and it can be expressive, if the speaker wants to emphasise his attitude to the subject of evaluation. In this case, the evaluative component of the meaning fulfils an informative function, while the the expressive component, without changing the semantic meaning of the unit, has a pragmatic effect on the listener. In other words, expressiveness refers to everything that makes speech more vivid, strongly impactful, deeply impressive.

Expressiveness is represented by two forms: figurative, based on metaphorical transfer, and magnifying with the use of intensifier words (*all, ever, even, quite, really, absolutely, so*, etc.). Philologists also distinguish three types of expressiveness: ingherent, i.e. intrinsic to the language unit, adherent, i.e. potentially intrinsic to the unit, and contextual, realised in a certain speech context.

It is particularly difficult to distinguish between evaluativeness and emotionalism. The problem is complicated by the fact that many linguists equate emotionality and expressiveness, in light of which we consider it necessary to first outline the differences between these two categories.

Some linguists refer emotionality to the sphere of psychology, considering expressiveness as a linguistic means of expressing a given mental state. According to others, the expression of emotions in language is always expressive, but expression is not always emotional. In contrast to this point of view, it is argued that unmotivated use of emotives may not produce any pragmatic effect and, therefore, carry no expressive load. Thus, scientists allow the existence of non-expressive emotivity, identifying the expressive function with the pragmatic one: the expressive function is understood as a purposeful amplification of an utterance by expressives and emotives or other means, designed for a certain reaction of the addressee, i.e. for the desired effect of what is said (Boiko, 2005). It seems rational to recognise the existence of both purely emotive lexis, expressing emotions and not intended to influence the interlocutor, and purely expressive lexis, performing a pragmatic function.

As for the correlation between evaluativeness and emotionality, opinions differ in two directions. In psychology, it is generally recognised that emotions perform the function of evaluation. Scientists note the role of internal signals performed by emotions, reflecting the subject's evaluative personal attitude to emerging or possible situations, to his activity and to his manifestations in them. Emotions logically depend on evaluations, arise on their basis. Situations evaluated as good or bad, cause, respectively, positive or negative emotions. Such a close connection of these phenomena is consid-

ered by some researchers as a basis for combining the emotional and evaluative components into one They believe that emotionality is the most important feature underlying the evaluative attitude to the object.

However, emotionality and evaluativeness are not identical concepts. The philosopher David Hume believed that evaluation and emotion correlate in the same way as sensation and perception: emotions are equivalent to pleasant and unpleasant sensations and include an evaluative component, while evaluation, like perception, is the ability to draw conclusions about moral and aesthetic values on the basis of sensations. Developing this theory, Franz Brentano considered the adequacy of an evaluative judgement to moral norms as a distinctive feature of evaluation, since not always evaluation in the emotional structure and evaluation in the world picture coincide, a person may experience irrational emotional reactions.

Linguists relate these categories as part and whole: emotions in most cases imply evaluation, while evaluation can be purely rational. Emotional and rational in evaluation imply two different sides of the subject's relation to the object, the first is his feelings, the second is his opinion, but in natural language, there cannot be purely emotional evaluation, since language as such always presupposes a rational aspect. Emotionality can be added to rational evaluation and become a type of psychological evaluation. Linguists pointed out the blurred boundaries between the rational and the emotional: human thought oscillates between logical perception and emotion and more often than not thought is made up of a logical idea and a feeling. The close intertwining of logical and emotional in the process of evaluation is reflected in the following definition of evaluation: emotional-intellectual identification of value by the subject (Tatsenko, 2017).

Scientists distinguish two types of psychological evaluation related to the emotional sphere of a person: one of them describes feelings, and the other induces to experience some feeling-relationship about the signified by means of stimulating the recipient with an imaginative or equivalent representation of the signified.

Philosopher Max Scheler, in his turn, subdivided emotions into evaluative (feelings-functions), which are involved in cognition of the world, and non-evaluative (feelings-states), which are emotional reactions to what has already been evaluated (fear, anger, joy, etc.). The latter can also include non-specific denotations of emotional states (excitement, agitation, calmness). Speaking about the linguistic representation of emotional states, some researchers single out specific means of expressing emotions, such as emphases (special word order), intonation and interjections.

One of the distinguishing features of emotionality and evaluativeness is that the semantics of emotionality lies in the range of "approval-disapproval and is a reflection of subjective feelings, while evaluativeness is based on the opposition "good-bad", "significant-insignificant", i.e. it is based on the concept of pragmatic value for a person. Evaluation reflects the relationship between the objects of objective reality or their properties (their natural existence) and our needs. In this regard, consider emotionality as a communicative-semantic category, and evaluativeness as a communicative – logical – pragmatic. Another difference is that the evaluative component does not contribute to the facultativeness or weakening of syntactic links (Nepyivoda, 1997).

To summarize all above mentioned, the fundamental differences between the categories of expressiveness, emotionality and evaluativeness: expressiveness is revealed in a targeted impact on the listener by increasing the impressive power of the statement. Emotionality, in contrast to expressiveness, expresses the speaker's excited state, his own impressions, As for evaluativeness, this aspect of the statement is associated with reflecting the measure of compliance of an object with a standard for a certain quality / property. Emotionality, expressiveness and evaluativeness in language reflect different, irreducible to each other, although interrelated aspects of the sentence. All these three categories can accompany each other, or they can be implemented separately and in various combinations.

The generalized evaluative frame reflects the prototypical evaluative structure with the following elements: subject, object and basis for assessment. Some linguists complement this scheme the fourth element is the "means chosen for assessment" of the language. Based on pragmatic direction of assessments, the fourth element names the addressee. The structure of the evaluation expression may include intensifiers and deintensifiers as optional components, that is, elements that strengthen or weaken evaluative semantics and determine the gradation of the evaluative attribute, as well as arguments justifying the legitimacy of the evaluation. All of the above elements of the evaluation structure can be either explicit or implicit. The only necessarily expressed component of an evaluative statement is the evaluative predicate.

As a result of the evaluation process, an evaluative statement is formed that has an object-subject nature: the subject evaluates the object from a certain point of view. It should be noted here that not every construction containing a lexical unit of evaluative semantics is evaluative. A prerequisite is the position of the given lexical unit in the predicative position. Evaluative meaning is easily acquired by predicates of emotional states, appearing in the syntactic position of the modus in the modus-dictum structure. The evaluative meaning of emotional compounds comes to the fore in opposing constructions, where the union "a" contrasts evaluations with different signs.

All detailed evaluation proposals are built on the basis of things derivational transformations of three structural-semantic models: evaluative-attributive (with an evaluative adjective in the nominal part predicate), evaluative and classifying (with an *evaluative adjective +noun*, reducing the semantic volume of the subject, in the position nominal part of the predicate) and evaluative subject (with a noun evaluative semantics in the position of the nominal part of the predicate). The data elementary evaluation constructions can be extended by optional members to clarify and limit the evaluation, its scope actions, to indicate the subject or object of assessment.

From the point of view of the adequacy of the assessment to the objective qualities of the object, philologists single out three methods of assessment:

– the subject's reaction to the impact of the object, as a result of which an axiological conclusion is made, reflecting the subject's value attitudes (likes/dislikes);

– attribution of value to the object in accordance with general value judgments significant for the subject of assessment;

– three-stage assessment, including understanding the object, determining its place in its own area, determining its significance for humanity.

The first two methods of evaluation do not reflect the essence of the object, while the third can be called as close as possible to objective evaluation.

Scientists suggest using the so-called "ideal type" as a value criterion to achieve the most objective assessment: the ideal type is not an abstraction, but not a law, in some ways it coincides with reality, and in some ways it does not; it is useful as a means of orientation in it. Philologists consider assessment in a broad sense, which is the relationship of an object to the normative position of the latter in society, and assessment in a narrow sense, connected with the subjective opposition of good and bad.

With the universal structure of the evaluative frame, the ego is semantic filling and interpretation remain socially conditioned. In other words, every evaluative judgment is inevitable contains "cultural connotation", reflecting a nationally specific complex is presented, which should be taken into account when analyzing the evaluation statement. The truth of the evaluative part of the meaning of the evaluative sentence depends either on the subject of the evaluation, and in this sense the evaluative structure refers to the pragmatic in the logical sense of this word/ aspect of the statement, or from the idea of the "normative" position of things in this society.

A single person, a group of persons or a part of society can represent the subject of assessment. The subject is the source of the evaluative statement, which selects the object of evaluation and its basis, that is, the criterion by which the object is evaluated. In fiction, the source of all evaluative statements

is undoubtedly the author, who, however, can put certain evaluative judgments into the mouths of the characters or the narrator: the “speech producer” can only nominally be considered the “organizer” of evaluative structures. In fact, their creator is the author, who builds both the world surrounding the heroes and the system of their views. The author sometimes as if looks at the world through the eyes of the hero, but at the same time, superelements remain, lying only in the plane of the author’s consciousness, but inaccessible to the consciousness of the heroes. The author’s position itself is captured from the general context, follows from the entire course of the narrative and represents a kind of "internal" line of assessment. Axiological statements that do not coincide with the author of the narrator or the observer (as well as other characters of the work) constitute an “external” evaluation line.

It follows that for an adequate interpretation of the evaluations expressed, the reader must be at least in general familiar with the personality of the author, since, although the value picture of the world has some invariant part, represented by value universals common to all cultures, an evaluation is more than -or another meaning, depends on the speaking subject. The existence of an absolutely real objective assessment of this or that subject is impossible in principle. Therefore, the reader must take into account the value orientations of the evaluation subject. Taking into account his cultural, national, religious affiliation, as well as all known information about his life and worldview, the reader builds an axiological conclusion. Comprehension of the author’s concept, immersion in his worldview, his system of values remains the main criterion for the adequacy of the read.

The object can be evaluated according to various parameters and in a different form, therefore, several types of evaluations are distinguished: axiological (related to the definition of the meaning of any phenomenon, event, or relationship for the subject), which, in turn, are divided into, on the one hand , on absolute (qualifying an object as good or bad) and comparative and, on the other hand, on moral-ethical, intellectual, social, emotional, aesthetic, “technical” (relating to a person's abilities or skills), utilitarian, etc.; aletic modal assessments expressing necessity, obligation, opportunity, etc.; existential evaluations; temporary assessments; value estimates; spatial estimates.

Evaluation has its own forms of expression at all language levels, as well as in the field of paralinguistics in the form of gestures and facial expressions, but evaluation semantics is most fully revealed by means of lexical-phraseological and syntactic levels. The evaluative component of the meaning in most cases (unlike linguistic units, where it forms the basis of the nomination) is included in the connotation of the word along with emotionality, expressiveness, etc., while the connotation is considered by us in the traditional sense as additional content of the word, accompanying semantic nuances that are superimposed on its main meaning. Such units contain a description of a certain quality in the denotation and an assessment of the named quality in the connotative part. Similar predicates are considered private evaluative and in number far exceed general evaluative ones, whose semantics reflect only the relation of the object to “good” or “bad” without specifying the basis of the evaluation. Philologists call private evaluative predicates “nominative-characteristic”, since they perform both nominative and evaluative functions.

In addition to units with a fixed evaluative value in the denotative or connotative part, evaluation can also be carried out with the help of initially non-evaluative vocabulary (this often happens with allusions), which acquires evaluative semantics in the context. These are the so-called semantic-evaluative lexemes that express evaluation as a result of the actualization of connotative terms in certain verbal circumstances and receive transferable metaphorical meaning and the possibility of use in relation to new objects, actions, signs while simultaneously denotation extinguishment. On this basis, a number of authors distinguish verbal (contextual, situational, individual) evaluativeness, manifested in the author’s use, and linguistic evaluativeness, fixed in the linguistic meaning of a given lexeme.

The assessment can be given without reference to other objects (absolute) or in comparison with other objects (comparative).

Based on the presence/absence of motivations, evaluative judgments are divided into contextually argued and non-argumented ones.

Taking into account communicative and pragmatic factors scientists distinguish three types of representation of evaluations: evaluations-functions that express a general evaluation without its basis, evaluations-pragmas that simultaneously express both the object and its value, and do not depend on the context, and evaluations-connotations, completely dependent on the context, expressive and figurative (semantic evaluative predicates).

The linguistic category of evaluation is a reflection of the logical category of evaluation, which expresses the subject's attitude to some object or phenomenon. The category of evaluation has points of contact with such phenomena as comparison, as in the evaluative act there is always a correlation with a certain standard, and modality, which, like evaluation, contains such elements as objectivity, subjectivity, and attitude. The distinctive features of the two mentioned categories from the category of evaluation are the absence of an axiological conclusion in the comparison and the limitation of the expression of modality to the level of the sentence, while evaluation can be expressed by elements of all linguistic levels.

The obligatory elements of the evaluation frame are the subject, object and basis of evaluation. In literary texts, the source of all evaluative judgements is the author, who can put them into the mouth of the observer, narrator or characters. The object can be any element of reality, but most often people's actions and qualities are subject to evaluation. Depending on the basis, there are axiological, intellectual, emotional, etc. evaluations.

Although there is a notion of subjective and objective evaluation, we can only speak of relative objectivity. In connection with this criterion, we distinguish between evaluation in the narrow sense, associated with the subjective opposition between good and bad, and in the broad sense, where the object is correlated with the norms accepted in society.

References

1. Onyshchenko, I. V. (2005). Katehoriia otsinky ta zasoby yii vyrazhennia v publitsystychnykh ta informatsiinykh tekstakh [The category of evaluation and means of its expression in journalistic and informational texts]. *Candidate's thesis.* Kryvyi Rih [in Ukrainian].

2. Boiko, N. I. (2005). Ukrainska ekspresyvna leksyka: semantychnyi, leksykohrafichnyi i funktsionalnyi aspekty [Ukrainian expressive vocabulary: semantic, lexicographic and functional aspects]. Nizhyn: TOV Vydavnyztvo Aspekt–Poligraph [in Ukrainian].

3. Tatsenko, N. V. (2017). Realizatsiia empatii v suchasnomu anhlomovnomu dyskursi: kohnityvno-synerhetychnyi aspect [Realisation of empathy in modern English-language discourse: cognitive-synergetic aspect]. Sumy: Sumy State University [in Ukrainian].

4. Nepyivoda, N. F. (1997). Mova ukrainskoi naukovo-tekhnichnoi literatury (funktsionalno-stylistychnyi aspekt) [The language of Ukrainian scientific and technical literature (functional and stylistic aspect)]. Kyiv: TOV «MFA» [in Ukrainian].

Список використаної літератури

1. Онищенко І. В. Категорія оцінки та засоби її вираження публіцистичних та інформаційних текстах : дис. … канд. філ. наук :10.02.01. Кривий Ріг, 2005. 195 с.

2. Бойко Н. І. Українська експресивна лексика: семантичний лексикографічний і функціональний аспекти : монографія. Ніжин : Аспект-Поліграф, 2005.

3. Таценко Н. В. Реалізація емпатії в сучасному англомовному дискурсі: когнітивно-синергетичний аспект : монографія. Суми, 2017. 357 с.

4. Непийвода Н. Ф. Мова української науково-технічної літератури (функціонально-стилістичний аспект). Київ : МФА, 1997.

Udovichenko H., Sherstiuk L. Correlation of evaluativeness, expressiveness and emotionality

The linguistic category of evaluation is a reflection of the logical category of evaluation, which expresses the subject's attitude to some object or phenomenon. The category of evaluation has points of contact with such phenomena as comparison, as in the evaluative act there is always a correlation with a certain standard, and modality, which, like evaluation, contains such elements as objectivity, subjectivity, and attitude. The distinctive features of the two mentioned categories from the category of evaluation are the absence of an axiological conclusion in the comparison and the limitation of the expression of modality to the level of the sentence, while evaluation can be expressed by elements of all linguistic levels.

The obligatory elements of the evaluation frame are the subject, object and basis of evaluation. In literary texts, the source of all evaluative judgements is the author, who can put them into the mouth of the observer, narrator or characters. The object can be any element of reality, but most often people's actions and qualities are subject to evaluation. Depending on the basis, there are axiological, intellectual, emotional, etc. evaluations.

Although there is a notion of subjective and objective evaluation, we can only speak of relative objectivity. In connection with this criterion, we distinguish between evaluation in the narrow sense, associated with the subjective opposition between good and bad, and in the broad sense, where the object is correlated with the norms accepted in society.

The evaluative semantics is revealed most fully by means of lexical-phraseological and syntactic levels. Lexical evaluative predicates are divided into general evaluative predicates, in which the evaluative meaning constitutes the denotation, and particular evaluative predicates, where the evaluative component of the meaning is included in its connotation along with expressive and emotional components. In most cases, these three components are co-present in a word, on the basis of which many linguists do not distinguish between evaluativeness, emotionality and expressiveness. However, there are differences: expressivity consists in the purposeful influence on the listener by increasing the impressive power of the utterance without changing the semantics of the unit, emotionality expresses the subject's own impressions, while the evaluative component is associated with the reflection of the measure of conformity of the object to a standard in some quality.

Key words: evaluativeness, emotionality, expressiveness, subjective evaluation, objective evaluation.

Удовиченко Г. М., Шерстюк Л. В. Співвідношення оцінності, експресивності та емоційності

Лінгвістична категорія оцінки є відображенням логічної категорії судження, яка виражає ставлення суб'єкта до якогось предмета чи явища. Категорія оцінки має точки дотику з такими явищами, як порівняння, оскільки в оцінному акті завжди відбувається співвіднесення з певним еталоном, і модальність, яка, як і оцінка, містить такі елементи, як об'єктивність, суб'єктивність і ставлення. Відмінними рисами двох згаданих категорій від категорії оцінки є відсутність аксіологічного висновку в порівнянні та обмеження вираження модальності рівнем речення, тоді як оцінка може бути виражена елементами всіх мовних рівнів.

Обов'язковими елементами оцінного фрейму є суб'єкт, об'єкт і підстава оцінки. У художніх текстах джерелом усіх оцінних суджень є автор, який може вкладати їх в уста спостерігача, оповідача або персонажів. Об'єктом може бути будь-який елемент дійсності, але найчастіше оцінці підлягають вчинки та якості людей. Залежно від підстави розрізняють аксіологічні, інтелектуальні, емоційні тощо оцінки.

Хоча існує поняття суб'єктивної та об'єктивної оцінки, ми можемо говорити лише про відносну об'єктивність. У зв'язку із цим критерієм розрізняють оцінку у вузькому сенсі, пов'язану

із суб'єктивним протиставленням хорошого і поганого, і в широкому сенсі, де об'єкт співвідноситься з прийнятими в суспільстві нормами.

Найповніше оцінна семантика розкривається на лексико-фразеологічному та синтаксичному рівнях. Лексичні оцінні предикати поділяються на загальні оцінні предикати, у яких оцінне значення становить денотат, і часткові оцінні предикати, де оцінний компонент значення входить до конотації разом з експресивним та емоційним компонентами. Здебільшого ці три компоненти присутні у слові спільно, на основі чого багато лінгвістів не розрізняють оцінність, емоційність та експресивність. Однак відмінності є: експресивність полягає у цілеспрямованому впливі на слухача шляхом посилення переконливості висловлювання без зміни семантики одиниці, емоційність виражає власні враження суб'єкта, тоді як оцінний компонент пов'язаний із відображенням міри відповідності об'єкта еталону в якійсь якості.

Ключові слова: оцінність, емоційність, експресивність, суб'єктивна оцінка, об'єктивна оцінка.

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Стаття надійшла до редакції 22.05.2024 р.
Прийнято до друку 31.05.2024 р.