



УДК 811.111'27

**THE CATEGORY OF EVALUATION AND ITS REPRESENTATION IN THE SEMANTICS OF METAPHOR****КАТЕГОРІЯ ОЦІНКИ ТА ЇЇ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦІЯ У СЕМАНТИЦІ МЕТАФОРИ****Kharkavtsiv I. / Харкавців І.Р.**

ORCID: 0000-0003-4143-3470

*Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University**Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка*

**Abstract.** *The article is aimed to research the category of evaluation and define its categorical status. Metaphors with rational and emotional evaluative components have been analyzed as well as the role of evaluation in the semantics of metaphors has been determined. The issue of the relationship of evaluativeness, emotivity, intensity, and stylistic component in the structure of word meaning has been also regarded. The evaluativeness of a metaphor has both structuralistic and activity-based characteristics. On the one hand, evaluativeness is a component of the metaphor's meaning structure. On the other hand, the metaphor acts as an axiological mechanism of human speech activity, characterized in pragmatic and socio-cultural aspects.*

**Keywords:** *evaluation, evaluativeness, metaphor, communication, evaluation criteria.*

**Problem statement.**

In the process of cognition of the surrounding reality a person, who is in the center of the process of cognition, determines his/her attitude to the world by evaluating events, phenomena, facts, etc. Concerning this and the fact that modern science has a pronounced anthropocentric character, linguistics, integrating into the general scientific paradigm, focus their attention on the speaking and thinking personality. Special attention is paid to a purely human type of activity – evaluation, one of the most important components of the cognition process. The results of general cognitive activity make up the linguistic picture of the world as a set of information that an “ordinary” native speaker has about life, society, the world, and the interrelationships of everything around him. The results of the evaluation are reflected in the statements and represent a valuable fragment of the picture of the world.

The problem of evaluation and evaluativeness with a broad approach intersects with the problems of the interaction of language and speech, subjective and objective in language, with the issues of typology and structure of lexical meaning, with the understanding of expressiveness, emotionality, imagery, stylistic coloring.

The current stage of linguistics development proves that the evaluation category determines the speaker's special attitude to what is being said, to the statement, and therefore is used as a means of the communication strategy of a communicator [3]. This gives us grounds to interpret the category of evaluation as a communicative category, which allows us to significantly enrich the research apparatus and increase the explanatory power of linguistic theory, which strives for a communicative interpretation of the language phenomena.

A review of the literature on evaluation problems shows that, as a rule, its structural, semantic and functional aspects were studied, while the definition of the categorical status of evaluation as well as its role in the semantics of metaphors,



remained out of the researchers' attention. Therefore, the article aims to research the evaluation category, determine its place in metaphor's semantics and systematize the evaluation criteria that underlie the evaluation category of metaphors.

Presentation of the main material. The problem of evaluation processes attracts the attention of researchers in the field of philosophy, logic, psychology, linguistics. The category of evaluation, researched in the works of linguists E. S. Aznaurova [1], N. D. Arutiunova [2], N. A. Lukianova [7], M. S. Retunskaja [9], E. M. Wolf [4], V. N. Telia [10], etc., has always occupied an important place in the semantic space of the language. Much attention in linguistics is paid to the semantic structure of the word, the identification of word meaning types and the criteria for their differentiation, ways of changing and developing the meanings of words.

The lexical meaning of a word reflects and fixes in our consciousness the idea of an object, property, process or phenomenon. The lexical meaning of a word is regarded as a system of elements of varying degrees of complexity that act in an inseparable unity and are determined by the semantics, pragmatics and syntactics of the word.

There are various verbal ways of expressing evaluation. Since any metaphor has an evaluative meaning, it is considered to be one of the elements of an individual's evaluation activity in his/her thesaurus.

Traditional statements in the theory of metaphor have become statements about the semantic ambiguity of a metaphor, its contextual environment and objective features: syntactic and morphological, abstraction, expressiveness, evaluativeness.

In metaphorical transfer, any image that is somehow associated in people's minds with the previous meaning of the word is defined as an internal form [2]. The internal form serves as a bridge connecting the denotative and connotative aspects of the meaning. Therefore, the internal form as an associative-figurative representation is a motive for the implementation of such connotative components as emotionality, evaluativeness, intensity and stylistic component.

The issue of the relationship of evaluativeness, emotivity, intensity and stylistic component in the structure of the meaning of a word has been a source of investigation for a long time. These components of meaning are integrated into the structure of the connotative aspect of the word meaning, but each of them has also a qualitative peculiarity.

Emotionality reflects the fact of the subject's emotional experience of a certain phenomenon, evaluativeness involves a positive or negative assessment of an object or phenomenon, intensity is regarded as the degree of manifestation of action or sign, and the stylistic component is associated with the referring of a word to a certain sphere of communication [8].

Perceiving the phenomena of reality, a person expresses his/her non-neutral attitude to it by evaluating good and bad, and visa versa. Expressed by linguistic means, the assessment is implemented in the component of the meaning of the word, which is called evaluativeness.

Following N. A. Lukianova, we distinguish between the two types of evaluativeness: rational (intellectual), which is an assessment of the surrounding reality (subjects, objects, qualities, phenomena), and emotional, conveyed through the



prism of the human psyche [7].

It has been proved that the emotional evaluativeness of the metaphor is the result of the actualization of the evaluative semes of the connotative aspect of the word meaning. Thus, the negative emotional evaluation of the metaphor *weed* (a skinny, lanky person) is the result of the actualization of the word *weed* original meaning connotative semes.

The rational evaluativeness of the metaphor is the result of the actualization of the word meaning of the evaluative semes denotative aspect. Thus, the rational evaluation of the metaphors *pill* and *doctor* is the result of the actualization of the differential denotative semes of the original meaning of the word *pill*.

Emotions are displayed in the structure of the word meaning through the component called emotivity. According to M. S. Retunskaja, emotivity is a linguistic representation of emotion through different levels of language, including lexical, which is not only associated with the expression of the emotional and evaluative attitude of the sender of speech but also aimed at creating an emotional resonance in the listener [9,10].

M. S. Retunskaja points out that the evaluative vocabulary contains in its meaning information about the emotional attitude to the designated object or phenomenon. Emotional-evaluative information is interpreted as an assessment of the surrounding reality, presented as a positive emotional assessment and its modifications (approval, affectionate attitude, admiration, etc.), and a negative emotional assessment and its modifications (disapproval, neglect, contempt, rude and soft ridicule) [9, 10].

Evaluativeness is a necessary element of emotivity. A person's assessment of an object or phenomenon is often based on emotional experiences. However, emotivity is not always an obligatory element of evaluativeness: the same word in different speech situations expresses either only an emotion or an emotion and an assessment at the same time.

Metaphor is a universal mechanism in the formation of emotional and evaluative units [6]. In the semantic structure of a metaphor, a positive or negative assessment always indicates the presence of emotion. A metaphor doesn't only involve various ideas about evaluation information, but also expresses emotions, for example, contempt, recklessness or vice versa, respect, admiration, etc., as well as possesses stylistic coloring. The integration of evaluativeness makes metaphor an expressive tool. The evaluativeness of a metaphor implements the evaluative attitude of the speech collective to the correlated metaphor for a concept or subject such as good/bad in the scale range from very good to very bad. In general, it can be argued that good is something that is favorable in terms of moral and physical and contributes to the satisfaction of the needs of an individual, a collective, and humanity (including aesthetic and moral needs); and bad is imperfect and false, which is unsatisfactory to the person and the team, and which conflicts with aesthetic and moral and ethical standards [6, 20-32].

In our opinion, expressiveness in the structure of the word meaning is a component of its pragmatic aspect, since it arises as a result of the selection and use of words only in the process of communication. Pragmatics includes both methods of



influence that cause emotional reactions in the addressee, who characterizes expressiveness, and all means of influence associated with goal-setting language activity.

The nature of evaluation processes is based on the juxtaposition of positive and negative qualities like *good/bad*. The nature of the evaluativeness focuses on a person's knowledge of the environmental reality since the evaluativeness determines the value of a particular object, action or feature in the world picture of a certain society. Evaluation features are separated by the norm line. In the positive aspect, there is the presence of some characteristics concerning the norm, which is considered as positive, and in the negative aspect, there are signs of a non-positive norm. The norm assumes the balance of features that are on the scale and correlates with stereotypical ideas about the average number of features that an object should possess [2, 3-11]. The norm as a specific act of evaluation reflects the complex interaction of the universal value system, the author's own value system, and value systems of those social groups (regional, age, religious, etc.) the author interacts with. Deviations from the norm affect negative signs ratings.

According to A. Aznaurova, rational evaluation is based on information about the properties objectively inherent in the object of evaluation as well as about their compliance with certain norms [1,115]. Rational evaluation, therefore, belongs to the norm zone and is neutral.

So, metaphors with a rational evaluative component of meaning include metaphors-terms or metaphors with a neutral meaning, e.g. characterizing a person's appearance or profession.

Following E. M. Wolf, we believe that rational evaluativeness is included in the denotative aspect of the word meaning, and emotional evaluativeness is included in the connotative aspect of the word meaning [4].

The level of evaluativeness in the structure of the evaluation act is determined by the contextual or situational actualization of the word evaluation features, which implies the interaction of the semantics of the word and the semantics of the utterance. In one case, evaluativeness is included in the semantics of the units that make up the structure of the act of evaluation, and in other cases, it can be considered its potential component, which is induced in a certain context [11].

The study of the structure of the evaluation act involves taking into account the human factor, since the subject of evaluation is always a person as a linguistic personality, and the object of evaluation is mainly a person. The designation of an attitude to a person and his physical and mental properties is more characteristic of human communication than the statement of an attitude to objects. The peculiarity of the evaluation is manifested in the form of anthropometrics. V. N. Telia defines anthropometrics as "the ability to think of one entity as if it were similar to another, which means to measure them in accordance with the actual human scale of knowledge and ideas, and at the same time with the system of national and cultural values and stereotypes", in other words, "a person's awareness of himself/herself as a measure of all things" [10, 40]. Thus, the anthropometric approach puts a person, characterized in social, emotional, pragmatic and other aspects, in the center of attention.



Human knowledge is constantly updating, providing cognitive processing of standard situations. Prior knowledge plays an important role in the perception, understanding, and memorization of a metaphor. When using a metaphor in a person's mind, the frame corresponding to the metaphor correlates with the structure of knowledge stored by human memory, which determines native speakers' ability to adequately perceive the meaning of the metaphor [10].

In general, all approaches to the study of metaphor can be characterized as either structuralist or activity-based.

At the heart of structuralist approaches, the most important object of metaphor research is its structural and semantic organization. Activity-based approaches are based on the understanding of metaphor as a mechanism of speech communication, while a person appears as the organizing center of this mechanism.

The evaluativeness of a metaphor has both structuralistic and activity-based characteristics. On the one hand, evaluativeness is a component of the metaphor's meaning structure. On the other hand, the metaphor acts as an axiological mechanism of human speech activity, characterized in pragmatic and socio-cultural aspects.

Metaphorization is based on the semantic ambiguity of the lexical unit [2], i.e. its ability to have lexico-semantic variants expressing its main (foreground) and figurative (second plan) meaning. Therefore, it is advisable to consider the semantic structure of a metaphor at the level of seminal units of the content plan.

Semes are a hierarchically ordered structure concerning some lexical and semantic variants. The method of component analysis allows us to divide the content side of a metaphor into its components and present its meanings in the form of semes.

In many modern linguistic studies, three types of semes are distinguished in the semantic structure of a word: an archiseme – a general seme of generic meaning, a differential seme of specific meaning and a potential seme that is actualized under certain conditions.

At the seminal level of analysis, the actualization of the evaluative seme in the semantics of the metaphor occurs as a result of the restructuring of the hierarchy of semes [5]. The evaluative seme is hypertrophied, and the archiseme, in its turn, is reduced. Thus, the specificity of the metaphor semantics lies in the actualization of the evaluative seme.

**Conclusions.** Considering the place and specificity of the evaluation category in the semantics of metaphor we have come to the following:

1. The formalization of the evaluation category in the semantics of metaphor is based on the fact that the evaluation is included in the semantic structure of the metaphor as a component of evaluativeness.

2. The evaluativeness of a metaphor can be attributed to both the denotative and connotative aspects of the metaphor meaning.

3. In the metaphor, the evaluative potential or differential semes of the original word meaning are actualized, replacing the archiseme or reducing it.

4. The evaluativeness of the metaphor implements the evaluative attitude of a person to the object of evaluation according to the type good / bad, in which the norm zone is placed in the center. The norm correlates with stereotypical ideas about the average number of features that the object of evaluation should possess. The norm



assumes a neutral assessment as a reference point of the evaluation quality. The semantics of the original word meaning and the context affect the level of evaluation of the metaphor.

5. The evaluation semantics of the metaphor is based on the anthropometric principle since a person is a necessary component of the structure of any evaluation act. All the concepts of metaphor reflect the structuralist or activity-based aspects of its research. In this context, the evaluative component of meaning in the semantics of a metaphor may be subject to variation.

### References:

1. Aznaurova E. S. Pragmatics of the artistic word. Tashkent: Fan, 1988. 121 p.
2. Arutiunova N. D. Types of linguistic meanings. Evaluation. Event. Fact. Moscow: Nauka, 1988. 339 p.
3. Bondarko A.V. Categorization in the grammar system. M.: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2011. 488 p.
4. Wolf E. M. Functional semantics of evaluation. M.: Nauka, 1985. 232 p.
5. Ivankova I. V. Metaphor as a means of expressing implicit evaluation in the language of philosophy. Philological sciences. Questions of theory and practice. Tambov: Diploma, 2016. No. 6(60): Part 3. C. 93-95.
6. Koshel G. G. Evaluative predicate nominations in modern English (based on the material of the person's prerogative names): abstract. thesis for the degree of Candidate of Philology: spec. 10.02.04. "Germanic languages" M., 1980. 27 p.
7. Lukyanova N. A. Expressive vocabulary of colloquial use (problems of semantics). M., 1986. pp. 12-36.
8. Prikhodko G.I. The ways of expressing evaluation in modern English: monograph. Zaporizhzhia. 2001. 362 p.
9. Retunskaa M. S. English axiological vocabulary: monograph. Nizhny Novgorod, 1996. 272 p.
10. Telia V. N. Mechanisms of the expressive coloring of linguistic units: The human factor in language: linguistic mechanisms of expressiveness. 1991. pp. 36-67.
11. Telia V. N. On the difference between rational and emotive (emotional) evaluation / V. N. Telia // Functional semantics: evaluation, expressiveness, modality. M., 1996. pp. 31-38.

***Анотація.** Метою статті є дослідження категорії оцінки та визначення її категоріального статусу. Проаналізовано метафори з раціональним та емоційно-оціночним компонентами, а також визначено роль оцінки в семантиці метафор. Також було розглянуто питання про співвідношення оцінності, емоційності, інтенсивності та стилістичної складової в структурі значення слова. Оціночність метафори володіє як структуралістськими, так і діяльними характеристиками. З одного боку, оціночність є компонентом смислової структури метафори. З іншого боку, метафора виступає як аксіологічний механізм людської мовної діяльності, що розглядається в прагматичному і соціокультурному аспектах.*

***Ключові слова:** оцінка, оціночність, метафора, комунікація, критерії оцінки.*

The article is sent on 19.01.2022.

© I. Kharkavtsiv