

REALIZATION OF EVALUATIVE UTTERANCE IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONTEXT

Ganna Prihodko

Professor, DSc, Zaporizhzhia National University,
e-mail: anna.prihodko.55@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0001-6220-5333, Ukraine

Oleksandra Prykhodchenko

PhD, Zaporizhzhia National University,
e-mail: sasha1712@rambler.ru, orcid.org/0000-0002-8468-2453, Ukraine

Andrii Galaidin

MA, Polonia University in Częstochowa,
e-mail: a.galaidin@live.ap.edu.pl, orcid.org/0000-0002-5236-1495, Poland

Abstract. The article is focused on the problem of the interconnection of the context and the evaluative utterance. Evaluation of different world's fragments is, of course, a considerable part of human cognitive activity. Special attention is paid to signals-indicators, which can be linguistic and extralinguistic in nature. The present paper highlights the actualization of evaluative utterance in microrcontext, and macrocontexts of the minimum, average and maximum size. In the process of realization of the evaluative utterance within the frame of microrcontext, the linguistic context is based on signals-indicators, while the structure of the stylistic context consists of various semasiological and syntactic expressive means and stylistic devices. While updating the evaluation in macrocontexts of the minimum and average size, the linguistic context is frequently mixed, and the configuration of the stylistic context in most cases includes different semasiological and syntactic expressive means and stylistic devices; but the macrocontext of the maximum size is linguistic, and the stylistic context is only its background part. The results obtained confirm the idea that the correlation between the evaluative utterance and context helps to understand encoded in the evaluative utterances presuppositions of the communication that is the speaker's communicative intentions associated with his epistemic state.

Keywords: evaluation; evaluative utterance; context; microrcontext; macrocontext; signals-indicators.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23856/3208>

Introduction

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 individual, his being and feelings (*Bednarek, 2009; Byessonova, 2012: 7*). Evaluation is a kind of cognitive activity, as in epistemological terms, any cognitive act expresses the attitude of the speaker to the object described, that is, contains an act of evaluation. The evaluative moment is nothing but a person's mental operation held on the subject of utterance (perception, understanding, synthesis, conclusion, etc.), which is an evaluation in its broadest sense (*Volf, 2009: 167*). All objects of reality perceived by man have a certain value in our minds, that is, they may be evaluated.

Evaluation is an essential component of cognition, which is based on a value approach to the phenomena of nature and society (*White, 2015*). So, person's activity and life as of a human being having different needs, interests and objectives is impossible without evaluation.

The study of the evaluative potential requires analysis of such important aspect as the influence of the context on the formation of the evaluation in the utterance. The fact that any utterance can be adequately interpreted only in a holistic context is of no doubt. The notion "context" has today several interpretations and classifications of its varieties. Scientists (*Fedoriv, 2016: 1-36; Kecskes, 2013; Saveliuk, 2015: 61-62*) speak about three main types of context: 1. Verbal context (linguistic means preceding the focal word and following it). 2. Situational context (set of cultural and psychological data common for the interlocutors). 3. Cognitive context (mental base, formed at the moment of assimilation of the meanings of the particular text).

Our conception 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" (*Dijk, 1977: 19*). 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 (*Bara, 2010; Toolan, 2013*). 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.

Within the verbal, or linguistic context scientists usually distinguish three types according to its size: microcontext, macrocontext and thematic, or megacontext (*Amosova, 1968; Kolshanskiy, 1980*). In our opinion, it would be better to speak not about megacontext, but about macrocontexts of various sizes: minimum, average and maximum, since, first, the words *macro* (gr. *μακρος*) and *mega* (gr. *μεγας*) are equal in meaning, but differ only in use, for example, the latter is used with respect to objects of the real world: (cf. *μεγας* – *megalopolis*), and secondly, the macrocontext can be of different amount: from a few sentences to the whole text.

Due to this, the **aim** of this paper is to examine the role of context in the process of expressing the potential of evaluation in the utterance.

It must be noted that for the analysis of the evaluative potential and its realization, it is very important to take into account the stylistic context, since very often various expressive means and stylistic devices take part in the formation of an evaluative utterance. They can express an evaluation that can be recognized only within the frames of a stylistic context. We share I. V. Arnold's point of view that stylistic context can be divided into microcontext and macrocontext (*Arnold, 1990: 281*).

In addition, signals-indicators are always required to identify an evaluation. Being elements of the context, they can be both linguistic in nature (a single word, a chain of words, a phrase, a sentence, a number of sentences), and extralinguistic, that is, they can be those extra-linguistic factors that help to reveal the meaning of the utterance (*Prihodko, 2016: 118*).

As for their position, signals-indicators can be situated before or directly behind the language unit that realizes evaluation, or they can be located distantly.

Data and methodology

The **material**, which is subjected to analysis, was a selection of approximately 350 utterances of the works by contemporary British and American writers. The criterion of the selection was the existence of evaluative words in the utterance. The **methodology** applied in the study is based on the essential points of Evaluation theory and theory of Context, which present basic ideas for the linguistic investigation (*Ananko, 2017; Arutyunova, 2012; Dijk, 2009; Kecskes, 2013; Myroniuk, 2017; Prihodko, 2016; Prihodko, 2018; Volf, 2009*). 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 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.

Realization of evaluation in microcontext

Analysis of language material shows, the evaluative utterance can be actualized both in the stylistic and linguistic microcontext:

- 1) the evaluative utterance realizes in a stylistic microcontext;
- 2) both types of microcontext – linguistic and stylistic – take part in the manifestation of the evaluative utterance.

When realizing the evaluative potential within the microcontext, the following signals-indicators are distinguished: a single word, a chain of words, and a part of a sentence. It must be noted that each of the named signal-indicators correlates with a certain type of microcontext: a single word correlates with a stylistic microcontext, the chain of words correlates with both stylistic and linguistic microcontext, the part of the sentence also correlates with both linguistic and stylistic microcontext.

Let us dwell on each of the cases mentioned here.

When implementing the evaluation within the stylistic microcontext, the signal-indicator is a single word:

(1) “*Such a crowd did not congregate too often but there were occasions when I did count four*” (*Mikes, 1955: 27*).

It is an example of the representation of irony in the microcontext. The signal-indicator *four* is positioned behind the unit being actualized. Irony is contained in the first part of the utterance (four people is not a crowd). This is the first type of irony: using negation to express an affirmation.

Stylistic context includes an evaluative statement in the general structure of the text. It can enrich the language unit expressing the evaluation with a new occasional connotation and additional meanings:

(2) “*He was eating salad – taking a whole lettuce leaf on his fork and absorbing it slowly, rabbit-wise – a fascinating process to watch*” (Jerome, 1976: 75).

The ironic evaluation is contained in the part of the sentence *a fascinating process to watch*, where negative-evaluative semes appear under the influence of the context, and this segment acquires the completely opposite meaning – *disgusting sight*. Signals-indicators *slowly, rabbit-wise* precede the language unit, which updates the irony.

At the simultaneous realization of an evaluation in the stylistic and linguistic microcontext, the signal- indicators is a chain of words.

Consider the following utterance:

(3) “*He had a sick, repulsive headache, piercing and ugly*” (Bellow, 1969: 121).

The hero's headache is depicted by two pairs of adjectives, one of which is descriptive (*sick, piercing*), and the second one is a subjective evaluation of the Herzog, which is negative due to the meanings of words *repulsive* and *ugly*. The simultaneous use of these words creates not only an expressive impression of the reaction to this pain, but also indicates that under the influence of negatively colored words, occasional negative connotation is also acquired by words to which it is not inherent in common usage. This is the accentuator of the negative meaning of the analyzed utterance.

The stylistic context is built on epithets, which are included in the first pair of adjectives, and the linguistic context is kept on the words-indicators *piercing, ugly*, the last of which is negative in its semantics.

When realizing an evaluation in a stylistic and linguistic microcontext, the signal-indicator can also be a part of a sentence, which, as a rule, includes words with a positive or negative evaluation, pointing to the fact that a deeper explanation of the meaning of the utterance is contained in the first part:

(4) “*Moses watches him recede in the mud of the lane, ... walking swiftly, with bad feet, bad feet, evil feet, Moses remembered*” (Bellow, 1969: 92).

Signal-indicator *with bad feet, bad feet, evil feet* contains words with negative-evaluative semes (*bad, evil*), the content of which is revealed in the previous part of the utterance.

To enhance the effect of negative evaluation in this utterance the emotional climax is used. It is based on emphatic repetition. The climax is characterized by a gradual increase of the level of emotionality and expressiveness of each subsequent part in comparison with the previous one. The greatest expressiveness is inherent to the final words of the utterance, which are the most important in their meanings, as they very convincingly convey feelings of hatred and hostility that the boy is experiencing, watching the person who has caused him evil.

So, it can be concluded that while updating the evaluation within the microcontext, the linguistic context is based on signals-indicators, while the composition of the stylistic context includes various semasiological and syntactic expressive means and stylistic devices. If the role of the signal-indicator is performed by a chain or part of a sentence, then they include evaluative words.

Realization of evaluation in macrocontexts of the minimum and average size

In the process of studying of the actualization of the evaluative utterance in the macrocontext, two types of interaction between the evaluative utterance and the macrocontext were established:

- 1) the evaluative utterance realizes only in the stylistic macrocontext;
- 2) the evaluative utterance realizes in both types of context – linguistic and stylistic.

Within the macrocontext, the following signals-indicators are distinguished: a sentence, several sentences. Each of these signals-indicators correlates with a specific kind of context: the entire sentence correlates with the stylistic macrocontext, and several sentences correlate with the linguistic and stylistic macrocontext.

1. Evaluative utterance realizes in a stylistic macrocontext. Signal-indicator is the entire sentence:

(5) “*She fancied that on the faces in front of her she saw critical expectation, boredom, ironic disapproval. Surely this was the height of bad form – to drop a guest unprepared into such a situation*” (Fitzgerald, 1989: 39).

In this utterance, the signal-indicator is the first sentence, containing in its structure epithets *ironic, critical*, which outline the negative evaluative characteristic of the described situation, which is revealed in the second sentence by means of the logical climax (*the height of bad form*).

So, in a stylistic context, an informational-saturated language unit containing semes of positive or negative evaluation, being combined in a group of stylistic devices covering a large segment of text, is included in its general structure.

2. Evaluation utterance realizes simultaneously in linguistic and stylistic macrocontexts. Signal-indicator is several sentences:

(6) “*It seemed to him that he had become light and ethereal, that it was he that was in motion; that he was being driven with inconceivable velocity through unending solidness. The wind was no longer air in motion. It had become substantial as water or quick-silver. He had a feeling that he could reach into it and tear it out in chunks as one might do with the meat in the carcass of steer; that he could seize hold of the wind and hang on it as a man hang on the face of a cliff*” (London, 1963: 157).

The first sentence in this utterance has words *light* and *ethereal* in its structure and performs the function of the signal-indicator. The information transmitted by this sentence requires further clarification, which the reader finds in the subsequent content of the statement. This requires an analysis of both stylistic and linguistic contexts.

First of all, it is necessary to remove the grammatical homonymy of the word *light*, which can be both a noun and an adjective. The syntactic context identifies it as an adjective, because it is used with the adjective *ethereal*. The meaning of the lexeme *might* is determined by the lexico-morphological context indicating that the seme “*force*”, “*power*” is actualized, as the verb cannot be used with a preposition. The considered lexical context is the context of the second degree (Amosova, 1968: 43), as the indicative minimum is in an indirect syntactic connection with the core.

The second sentence which can be considered a predicative one has the greatest semantic dependence. The lexeme *wind* becomes an actualized word of the entire utterance and significantly expands the boundaries of its meaning. The words *solidness, meat, cliff, substantial* correlate with its semantic structure as part to the whole and realize in it the semes of materiality, objectivity, density.

The stylistic context here is made up of the usage of parallel constructions, similes and metaphors, which carry additional information that eliminates the entropy of the word *wind* and, accordingly, makes explicit the sense of the whole utterance.

Thus, while realizing the evaluation within the macrocontext of the minimum and average size, the linguistic context is mostly mixed, and the structure of the stylistic context in

most cases includes various semasiological and syntactic expressive means and stylistic devices. In a number of cases, the signals-indicators are words that contain the evaluative semes. This circumstance, undoubtedly, helps an adequate perception of the sense of the entire utterance.

Realization of evaluation in macrocontext of the maximum size

Now let us study the actualization of evaluation potential in the macrocontexts of the maximum size. Such context may consist of several paragraphs united by a single sense; it can be a chapter, several chapters, or even a whole text.

An important role in the manifestation of evaluation in such contexts play paralinguistic conditions – knowledge of the surrounding reality, goals and attitudes of the addressee, which help to decode the content of the utterance adequately. Such context can be called pragmatic.

In macrocontexts of maximum size, the signal-indicator is of an extra-linguistic nature and may be situated at a considerable distance from the analyzed passage (*Arnold, 1990: 281*), for example, in the title of a chapter or title of a novel or even in another work for which an allusion is made.

It must be noted that the context and the text constitute an inseparable unity, because the construction of any text is directly dependent on the semantic content of any scale and a rather rigid system of continuous context in which the presentation of one or another topic is carried out (*Kolegaeva, 2017: 36-43*).

G. V. Kolshanskiy (*Kolshanskiy, 1980: 65-68*) identifies three main functions of the text, which play an important role in clarifying the meaning of utterances in the context. We think that these functions are of great importance for the analysis of the implementation of the evaluative utterance in the macrocontext of the maximum size, can rightly be attributed to the whole text.

The essence of these functions is as follows:

1. Explanation of the content of a word when it is unambiguously used in a sentence. Since evaluation can be expressed not only by a word, therefore this function should be interpreted more broadly: not only the explanation of the word, but also of the phrase s and the sentence, in other words, of the utterance as a whole.

This explanatory function is revealed by means of pre- and post-context, which creates the foundation for understanding not only a single utterance, but also the entire text.

Let us consider the following example. In chapter 14 K. Jerome depicts comical situations that happen to the heroes:

(7) “... Today he determined he would be beforehand. At the first sound the kettle made, he rose, growling, and advanced towards it in a threatening attitude. It was only a little kettle, but it was full of pluck, and it up and spit at him”. “Ah! would ye!” growled Monmorency, showing his teeth; “I’ll teach ye to cheek a hard-working respectable dog; ye miserable, long-nosed, dirty-looking scoundrel, ye. Come on!” And he rushed at the poor little kettle, and seized it by the spout” (*Jerome, 1976: 110*).

(8) “George has never learned to play the banjo to this day. He has had too much all-round discouragement to meet. he tried on two or three evenings, while we were up the river, to get a little practice, but it was never a success. Harris’s language used to be enough to unnerve any man, added to which, Monmorency would sit and have steadily, right through the performance. It was not giving the man a fair chance. “What’s he want to howl like that for

when I'm playing?" George would exclaim indignantly, while taking aim at him with a boot" (Jerome, 1976: 112).

Both fragments of the text are perceived with a certain degree of humor, being considered out of context, because they include words with negative-evaluative semes (*threatening, miserable, scoundrel, dirty-looking*), but they sound ironically only in the context of the whole chapter. The signal-indicator in excerpts (7, 8) has an extralinguistic character. It is the pre-context where the minor adversities of unlucky people are depicted. The context on the level of the whole text allows lexemes to implement certain meanings, as they are characterized by polysemy in the language system. In the definite context, only one of the meanings is actualized (*fair - good (chance); to advance - to attack*).

2. The revealing of not only the elliptical meanings of a word or phrase, but also its usual meanings, which form part of some complete text:

(9) "*Josefina, I do wish you would give us all little more warning when you're going to turn*", I said. "*Why?*" she inquired simply. "*Well, it helps you know. It gives us a chance to prepare to meet our master*".

"*But it is nice to say, no?*" she asked with satisfaction. "*And I've learned more; I know Blurry Barstard and...*" "*All right, all right*", I said hastily. "*I believe you. But for Heaven's sake don't use them in front of your mother, otherwise, she'll stop you driving for me*" (Durrell, 1969: 20-21).

In this passage, which could be continued, the first part requires further detailed explanation. Further, almost throughout the whole chapter, the author clearly reveals the meaning of the first sentence and, first of all, of the phrase *little more warning* - "a bit more warnings". The ironic tone is introduced in this passage because the author is explicitly presented here. As an impartial judge, he expresses his attitude towards the events described by using words with evaluative semes (*nice, satisfaction*). These lexemes, included in the general outline of the context of the whole chapter - the macrocontext - are the creators of its evaluative sense. The signal-indicator is of extralinguistic character - this is the knowledge of the manners and habits of the characters of the novel.

3. The general content of the text does not serve the purpose of removing ambiguity, but provides for an understanding of a word or expression (paragraph, chapter), the meaning of which is, as a rule, determined by the abstracted character of the text. It is necessary to note, that the volume of text essential for its understanding cannot be determined in advance:

(10) "... *Are you sure*", I said to him, "*that it ain't the hand that mixes the pancakes that you're after?*" "*Do you know how to make them pancakes, uncle Emsley?*" I asked. "*Well, I'm not as apprised in the anatomy of them as some*", said uncle Emsley" (Henry, 1977: 40-41).

To understand the symbolic meaning of the word *pancakes*, the context of the whole story is required, as any paragraph taken out of context has only a neutral meaning. Author's humor is understandable only from the content of the whole story. This is about a lighthearted young man who believed the justification of his girlfriend's fan that he needed only a recipe for wonderfully cooked pancakes. Due to this fiction, he loses his vigilance and his girl. It should be noted that the important role plays the fact that the whole story is united by a single semantic line - the recipe for cooking pancakes, which is just an excuse for an unlucky fan.

So, we can conclude that the macrocontext of the maximum volume, in which the evaluation is actualized, is linguistic, and the stylistic context is only its background part. At the level of the text, there is no lexical or grammatical polysemy, because the meaning of the text and context accumulates here simultaneously. One of the decisive factors for

understanding the evaluation within the macrocontext of the maximum volume is the extralinguistic context, because the signals-indicators, in most cases, are of an extralinguistic nature.

Conclusions

To sum up, having focused the research on the area of the actualization of the evaluation in different types of context, we have submitted results of interconnection of context and evaluative utterance in the field of Pragmatics, Evaluation theory, theory of Text, and theory of linguistic and stylistic Context.

The concept of "evaluation" has become an integral part of the conceptual apparatus of modern linguistics, which clearly demonstrates the fact that it is impossible to examine a language without resorting to its primary purpose, its "creator", carrier, user, specific linguistic personality, a person.

The contextual dependence of the potential of evaluation indicates that it can be updated in the micro-or macrocontext. The actualization of evaluation in micro and macrocontexts of different size (minimum, average and maximum) is carried out both explicitly and implicitly.

An important role in the realization of the evaluative utterance within the different types of context belongs to the signals-indicators which can be a single word, a chain of words, a part of the sentence. It should be noted that in many cases extralinguistic context is of great significance as signals-indicators mostly are of paralinguistic character.

It is apparent that evaluation is created, realized 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 that the evaluation, therefore, should be studied comprehensively and deeply 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 phenomena of the surrounding reality.

References

- Amosova, N. N. (1968). *English Contextology*. Leningrad: LGU Publishing House. [in English].
- Ananko, T. (2017). *The Category of Evaluation in Political Discourse*. *Advanced Education*, Vol. 8, 128–137. [in English].
- Arnold, I. V. (1990). *Stylistics of modern English language*. Moscow: Prosvesheniye. [in Russian].
- Arutyunova, N. D. (2012). *Logical analysis of the language. Discourse addressing*. Moscow: Indrik. [in Russian].
- Bara, B. G. (2010). *Cognitive pragmatics: The mental processes of communication*. USA: MIT Press. [in English].
- Bednarek, M. (2009). *Dimensions of evaluation: Cognitive and linguistic perspectives*. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, Vol. 17(1), 146–175. [in English].
- Bellow, S. (1969). *Herzog*. New York: Wicking Press. [in English].

- Byessonova, O. (2012). *Reconstruction of Value Concepts in the Language Model of the World. Language, Literature and Culture in a Changing Transatlantic World, Vol. II, Part I: Linguistics, Translation and Cultural Studies*, 7–14. [in English].
- Dijk, T. (1977). *Text and Context*. London: Longman. [in English].
- Dijk, T. (2009). *Society and Discourse. How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. New York: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Durrell, G. (1969). *The Whispering Land*. Leningrad: Prosvesheniye. [in Russian].
- Fedoriv, Ya. (2016). *Speaking to the global audience: A case study into the message transformation. Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow, Vol. I (2)*, 1–36. [in English].
- Fitzgerald, F. S. (1989). *Volume – One of the Last Uncollected Stories*. New York: Scribner. [in English].
- Henry, O. (1977). *Selected Stories*. Moscow: Progress Publishers. [in Russian].
- Jerome, K. (1976). *Three Men in a Boat*. Moscow: Higher School. [in Russian].
- Kecskes, I. (2013). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [in English].
- Kolegaeva, I. M. (2017). *Once again about the role of the first and the second signal systems in cognizing and naming the world, or why do we salivate on hearing the word lemon. Writings in Romance-Germanic Philology, Vol. 2 (39)*, 36–43. [in Russian].
- Kolshanskiy, G. V. (1980). *Contextual semantics*. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian].
- London, J. (1963). *Selected Stories*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House. [in English].
- Mikes, G. (1955). *The Little Cabbages*. London: A. Wingate. [in English].
- Myroniuk, T. (2017). *Evaluative Responses in Modern English Fiction. Advanced Education, Vol. 8*, 103–108. [in English].
- Prihodko, G. (2018). *Specific Nature of Evaluative Speech Acts. Advanced Education, Vol. 9*, 201–205. [in English].
- Prihodko, G. I. (2016). *The category of evaluation in the context of the change of linguistic paradigms. Zaporizhzhia: Kruhozir*. [in Ukrainian].
- Saveliuk, N. M. (2015). *Context as a systematic factor of comprehending discourse: philosophical, linguistic and psychological aspects. Kherson State University Herald, Vol. 1 (1)*, 61–65. [in Ukrainian].
- Toolan, M. (2013). *Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction*. London; New York: Routledge. [in English].
- Volf, E. M. (2009). *Functional semantics of evaluation. (3d ed.)*. Moscow: Editorial URSS. [in Russian].
- White, P. R. R. (2015). *Appraisal Theory*, in: Tracy, K. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. John Wiley & Sons. [in English].