

UDC 003

ON THE QUESTION OF DISTINCTION BETWEEN «EVALUATION» AND «EVALUATIVITY» IN AXIOLOGY

OLGA GLADKOVA, VICTORIA KLEIMENOVA
Pskov State University, Russia

The paper deals with the problem of distinguishing key terms of linguistic axiology – «evaluation» and «evaluativity». The article gives definitions of the terms and specifies particular differences that characterize them.

The problem of the relationship of a man and the world is largely due to the subjective perception of reality, which is determined by a system of human, cultural-specific and individual features. This perception of value-based world view comes through the prism of cultural-ethnic stereotypes belonging to one or another social stratum, personal experience and many other factors. The system of value coordinates that defines the relationship of a person with the world around is the basis of axiology. Axiology is a philosophical discipline that studies the characteristics, structures and hierarchies of the values, ways of their cognition, as well as the nature and specificity of value judgments. [7]. Terms related to axiology are increasingly found in linguistic research. In this regard, many scientists (A. A. Ivin, N. D. Arutyunova, E. M. Wolf, V. N. Telia et al.) distinguish linguistic axiology in their works.

Linguoaxiology considers the system of humanitarian values in the context of linguistic expression. "The nature of evaluation corresponds to human nature" [2]. So, on the basis of the axiosphere, a person evaluates a "subjective" reality as positive, negative or neutral. These axiological judgments are reflected in the language, in explicit or implicit forms of expression.

The key concept of linguistic axiology is "evaluation". Evaluation is a universal category: "there is hardly any language in which there is no idea of "good / bad" [4]. In the dictionary of linguistic terms, the concept of "evaluation" is defined as the speaker's judgment, "expressing his attitude to the subject of speech." [3]

Traditionally, the category of evaluation is considered in the logical and philosophical (N. D. Arutyunova, A. A. Ivin, M. M. Bakhtin), cultural (A. Wezhbitskaya, U. D. Apresyan) and linguistic plans (E. M. Wolf, V. N. Telia, V. I. Shakhovsky, T.V. Markelova, Z. K. Temirgazina et al.). In terms of language, the category of evaluation is presented as a complex system of evaluative means of content and expression. By the evaluation N. D. Arutyunova means the relationship, issued for a feature of the estimated object [1]. E. M. Wolf emphasizes that evaluation as a semantic concept implies the value aspect of the meaning of language expressions, which can be interpreted as "A (subject of evaluation) believes that B (object of evaluation) is good / bad" [4]. Markelova T.V. defines evaluation as "a functional-semantic category, implemented in speech activity by a system of multi-level language means", noting the value feature of evaluation in "the relation of society to surrounding objects, people, events ..." [5].

Foreign scientists also consider the category of evaluation as a language means of expressing assessment on the basis of value judgments. In English-language literature, the term "evaluation" is interpreted differently: "stance" (J. Du Bois, D. Biber), "metadiscourse" (K. Hyland), "appraisal" (J. Martin, P. White) and "attitude" (W. Vande Kopple). The American researcher J. Du Bois defines stance as an evaluative process, the actants of which are the subject and object (s) in a particular sociocultural context. [8]. English scientists J. Martin and P. White, relying in their work on the philosophical views of M.M. Bakhtin and V.N. Voloshinov, consider that all statements "are seen as in some way stanced or attitudinal." In their opinion, the subject of the appraisal "present itself as standing with, as standing against, as undecided, or as neutral with respect to other speakers and their value positions." [9]

From the above definitions, it can be concluded that the basis of the evaluation is subject-object relations, connected by an evaluative predicate base. These basic elements form an evaluation modal frame relating to the pragmatic aspect of the statement. The subject of evaluation, explicit or implicit - is a person or a society, which axiologically marks an object of evaluation - a person, object, situation. Besides, the modal frame often implicitly includes the rating scale or "reference point", on which the evaluation in the subject's social perception is based [4].

Thus, in linguistic terms, the evaluation is the speaker's or the subject's attitude to the object. The subject in this case evaluates the object in terms of compliance or non-compliance of its qualities with the basic value criteria/position, fixing this estimated attitude in the statement. In the interaction of the subject and the object of evaluation, one should single out a component that hides in itself an axiological judgment (good / bad). This component located directly in the semantic structure of the word is called evaluativity.

Linguistics, literature, philology

It should be noted that in the series of individual works the term "evaluativity" is identified with the term "emotivity". So Wolf E. M. in her study emphasizes that "emotivity" is used conditionally. This term "is not directly related to the concepts of emotions, emotionality or expressiveness, but may involve both emotional and rational evaluation" [4].

Markelova T.V. also assumes that the category of "actual" evaluation or emotiveness is presented in any evaluative statement. At the same time, "Emotional evaluation changes the interpretation of a statement, reflects the emotional state of the speaker" [5]. . Wed: *You treat her badly*. - interpretation of rational evaluation; *It kills me that you treat her like a slave* - it is an emotional assessment.

The same point of view is maintained by V.I. Shakhovsky, which describes the cause-effect relationship of emotivity and evaluation. "Evaluation is the subject's opinion about the value of the object for him in terms of his good or bad qualities, and emotion is the subject's experience of this opinion." [7]. Therefore, the emotional component, implicit or explicit, cannot appear in a word without evaluation.

Based on this, it can be assumed that emotivity is an integral feature of the evaluation mode. In this context, the rational aspect of evaluative judgments is primary, and the emotional component, that is, evaluativity, is secondary.

Consequently, the concepts of "evaluation" and "evaluativity" are in close relationship. However, we believe that these two terms are not equivalent. Evaluation is interpreted as a broader category. It can exist in a language without emotions, while evaluativity as an emotional component of axiological judgment that always depends on evaluation, is only its optional element.

REFERENCE

1. Арутюнова, Н.Д. Язык и мир человека / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1999. – 896 с.
2. Арутюнова, Н.Д. Типы языковых значений. Оценка. Событие. Факт / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – М. : Наука, 1988. – 341 с.
3. Ахманова, О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов / О.С. Ахманова. – М. : Сов. энциклопедия, 1969. – 607 с.
4. Вольф, Е.Н. Функциональная семантика оценки / Е.Н. Вольф. – М. : Эдиториал УРСС, 2002 . – 280 с.
5. Маркелова, Т.В. Прагматика и семантика средств выражения оценки в русском языке/ Т.В. Маркелова.– М. : МГУП им. Ивана Фёдорова, 2013. – 300 с.
6. Шаховский, В.И. Эмотивный компонент значения и методы его описания : учеб. пособие / В.И. Шаховский. – Волгоград, 1983. – 94 с.
7. Новейший философский словарь [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: https://www.gumer.info/bogoslov_Buks/Philos/fil_dict/19.php.
8. Du Bois, J. Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction. University of California, Santa Barbara. 2007. – Published online: <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.164.07du>.
9. Martin, J.R. The Language of Evaluation / J.R. Martin P.R. White // *Appraisal in English*. – 2005. – 274 p.