EVALUATION CATEGORY AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH

Borysova N. V.

INTRODUCTION

A person, perceiving the environment, always evaluates it from certain perspectives, which depend on the environment, society, as well as on the level of education, nationality, upbringing, needs, aspirations, and all this helps to form an idea of good/bad; necessary/unnecessary; possible /impossible. The practical activity of a person, his or her cultural level, and spiritual and intellectual life are considered at the level of language as a complex set of relations. Universal linguistic categories aimed at analyzing linguistic elements establish the connection between language and the culture and mentality of the people.

The category of evaluation is a peculiar phenomenon that is manifested at different levels of language and the study of which proves that the choice of language means and their organization in texts of different functional styles, interpretation in the process of perception, as well as the verbalization of certain emotional states of recipients are becoming a problem for many scholars.
Evaluation is a multidirectional phenomenon that is realized through the subject's consciousness when perceiving and processing information about the external world and correlates with the inner world of a person through speech, reflecting the "world picture" represented by such categories as gradation, modality, state, negation, etc. that are related to evaluation.

It is important to express support or condemnation, which is related to the pragmatic orientation. The concepts that define evaluative meanings are based on the value picture of the world and the semantics of language units in their interaction.

A large number of linguists have studied various aspects of evaluation. In particular, J. Anderson (2011), N. Bigunova (2017), O. Byessonova (2021), I. Buiar (2009), V. Nagel (2007), A. Prykhodko (2018), P. White (2016) and others have considered all the subtleties of the relationship between expression, modality and evaluation; T. Ananko (2017), N. Borysova (2021),

T. Zabolotna (2021) and others studied the means of expressing evaluation; T. Myroniuk (2017) focused on the importance of the evaluation category in works of art; I. Heleta (2022), N. Zhmaieva (2022) paid attention to the category of evaluation in translation; I. Kharkavtsiv (2022) wrote about the categorization of evaluation in metaphor.

However, despite a significant number of scientific studies on the category of evaluation, at the present stage of development of linguistic science, it still needs to be studied more deeply.

The methodological basis of the study is the leading principles of the dialectic of scientific knowledge, general scientific provisions on the unity of the separate and the general, the part and the whole, the structure and the function. The study of the category of evaluation at the linguistic and stylistic levels in English was based on the provisions of cognitive science, where language is considered as a cognitive approach that allows us to analyze language as a means of influencing public consciousness.

1. The notion of "category of evaluation"

Every person is characterized by an evaluative approach to life facts, perceiving them through a system of their own or generally accepted values, norms and laws. That is why the category of evaluation has become the object of a significant number of scientific works in linguistics, philosophy, logic, psychology, and acmeology. This is due to the fact that evaluation is shown in many manifestations through the semantically polar pair of predicates "good/evil" or "good/bad", which help to explain the value of an object for a person at all language levels. In this regard, the category of evaluation requires a comprehensive study.

According to A. Prikhodko, language reflects the multidimensional interaction of objective reality and human beings, which is an important aspect that considers language not only as a means of cognition of the world, but also as a means of reflecting human feelings, emotions, intentions – this is the evaluative aspect. In this regard, every process of reflecting objective reality is evaluative, because the relation of the subject to the object of cognition is conditioned by the practical and spiritual needs of a person. The scientist notes that the evaluative attitude to the phenomena of objective reality is an inherent property of human cognition, which is positively or negatively reflected in language units[1].

P. White singles out evaluation and calls it "a human category in itself", noting that it is given by the physical and mental nature of man, his being

---

[1] Prihodko A. Category of evaluation as the object of linguistics: prospects of communication aspects of study. *Odessa linguistic journal*. № 11, 2018. P. 68.

and feeling, it determines his thinking and activity, his attitude to other people and objects of activity, his perception of art"[2].

Scholars such as J. Anderson, N. Bigunova, O. Byessonova, I. Buiar, V. Nagel, and A. Prikhodko explain evaluation as a logical and semantic category. In particular, T. Myroniuk notes that the structure of connotation in the concept is an emotional assessment; intensity of a feature that is real or given to the speaker, but which has deviations from the social measure or norm; imagery. A. Burchardt, V. Macketanz and others paid attention to syntactic constructions with evaluation semantics.

In linguistics, the category of evaluation is most often considered as an axiological component of lexical meaning, because it is lexemes (the main units of conveying the content of concrete and abstract entities of the external world) that not only nominate the actual evaluation features, but also convey information about the objects that a person subjects to linguistic evaluation[3].

The most important aspect of human communicative and cognitive activity, which can be recorded in the semantic structure of a word as a component of its meaning, or participate in the description of the conditions of word use, its pragmatics, is evaluation. Therefore, emotionally colored lexemes, contextual and stylistic features of its use are the result of the presence of an evaluative component in the semantics and pragmatics of the word. As a result, the evaluation has only semantic and pragmatic aspects and all aspects of its functioning reflect the merger of semantics (the intrinsic meaning of linguistic units together with the utterance as a whole) and pragmatics (the conditions for the realization of the communication process).

J. Anderson explains evaluation as one of the four "primary" functions of language, "around which the vocabulary of a language, its phraseological means and grammar are created"[4]. The term "subjective evaluation" was coined when a noun denotes that part of speech that evokes the idea of combining the basic full meaning representation with the grammatical categories of number, gender, case, and subjective evaluation[5].

A. Prikhodko also considers the category of evaluation in connection with the concept of the internal form of the word and the analysis of subjective-evaluative suffixes of nouns and qualitative adjectives, forms of

[2] White P. Evaluative contents in verbal communication. In A. Rocci & L. Saussure (Eds.), Verbal communication. Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton. 2016. P. 79.

[3] Myroniuk T. Evaluative Responses in Modem English Fiction. *Advanced Education*. 2017. Vol. 8. P. 106.

[4] Anderson J. M. Linguistic Representation (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and monographs). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2011. P. 156.

[5] Нагель В. В. Різновиди оцінки як лінгвістичної категорії. URL: htthp://www.nbuv. gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/dlgum/2007 (дата звернення: 3.02.2024).

degrees of comparison, the category of verb mood, modal words and particles in his work "Category of evaluation as the object of linguistics: prospects of communication aspects of study", where we find that the internal forms of the word express not only the "interpretation" of reality, but also its evaluation[6].

I. Kharkavtsiv studied the semantic composition of the word as a special form of reflection of the object of reality in the mind, its assessment, as "...the relation of the sound complex to the phenomena of reality"[7]. However, she noted that the expressive and stylistic colouring is not the colouring of the word as a sound complex, but the prism through which the meaning is perceived.

As for the linguistic evaluation in the linguistic and cultural dimension, O. Byessonova dealt with it. She noted: "The idealized model, which determines the positive or negative, reflects the ideas of a given society about good and evil based on its inherent national, social, cultural, religious and other standards of evaluation"[8]. The researcher emphasized the subjectivity of evaluation and its impact on behavioural stereotypes, which is essential for defining evaluation functions in the processes of ethno-cultural existence. It should be noted that the assessment of actions, behaviour, professionalism, and skill is dominated by determining the quality of performance of certain functions, i.e., the assessment is determined by the characteristics of the functional properties of objects. This kind of evaluation, which aims to identify the best among those performing the same type of functions, implies giving preference to those who subordinate their activities to the people and society, i.e., it is based on socio-cultural connotations. Ethical features of evaluation are determined by the principle of favourability/unfavorability; usefulness/unusability. The concepts of ethical/unethical are influenced by both human and ethnopsychological factors.

The importance of the cultural and semiotic aspect of the study of linguistic problems is also not ignored in scientific research, which considered the value orientations of native speakers as a relevant factor in the study of language as part of culture. They classified prescriptive linguistics as a kind of discourse. They argued that the choice of the grounds for the norm reveals

---

[6] Prihodko A. Category of evaluation as the object of linguistics: prospects of communication aspects of study. *Odessa linguistic journal*. № 11, 2018. P. 69. (To appear).

[7] Kharkavtsiv I. The category of evaluation and its representation in the semantics of metaphor. *SWorld Journal*, 2022. *5*(11-05). P. 137.

[8] Byessonova O. Evaluative Thesaurus as Instrument in Coding Values of the English Linguocultural Community. *The Ethical and Axiological Aspects in the Literature and the Culture of the 20th and 21st Centuries [Collective monograph]/edited by Maja Jakimovska-Toshikj, Katarína Žeňuchová.* Skopje: Institute of Macedonian Literature, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, 2021. P. 259-284.

an often hidden and not always realized system of value orientations, which ultimately determines the direction of normalization processes.

N. Borysova and T. Zabolotna argued that the system of different linguistic means of a functional-semantic category is able to interact to realize the communicator's goal. They speak of evaluation as a separate functional-semantic category with the semantic dominant of "approval/disapproval" of certain situations, phenomena, events, actions, persons, objects, etc. It should be noted that from the word to the text, all language units perform an evaluative function. In this regard, researchers explain evaluative meanings using the means of different language levels[9].

Speaking of the means of expressing evaluation, they can also be divided into a core and a periphery based on the frequency of use and the ability to adequately convey meaning, where the core is the main means and the periphery is those that represent meaning but are not the main ones. However, it should be noted that the centre and the periphery are not clearly delineated.

J. Anderson notes that evaluation is a component of the "semantic structure of the word as a unit of language, indicating a certain value of objects and phenomena in terms of compliance/inconsistency with the requirements, interests, tastes, preferences of the speaker. The heterogeneity of the evaluative component determines its different interaction with other components in the semantic structure of a linguistic sign. The evaluative component can be distinguished in both the denotative and connotative parts of the semantics"[10].

Using the functional approach, J. Anderson studies the category of evaluation, because it allows to characterize the regularities of functioning of language units in interaction with elements of different language levels. Thanks to this approach, the analysis is carried out from form to meaning and vice versa. According to the scientist, the core of evaluation is formed by evaluatively marked lexemes and evaluative phrases. She argued that the words that form the pericore space of the field of evaluation and that contain rational evaluation in their semantics, which is determined on the basis of objectively inherent properties of the denotation, belong to the conventionally fixed semantics of the word.

Units of lexical, word-formation, morphological and syntactic levels are peripheral. Means of clarifying evaluative values have been widely studied in axiology.

---

[9] Борисова Н.В., Заболотна Т.В. Вираження категорії оцінки у творі С. Кінга «11.22.63». *Львівський філологічний часопис*. № 9. 2021. С. 29.

[10] Anderson J. M. Linguistic Representation (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and monographs). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2011. P. 154. (To appear).

According to T. Ananko, the category of evaluation realizes the subjective assessment of objects and their features from the speaker's point of view, and therefore it is primarily a "category of nouns, adjectives and adverbs", that is, it is inherent in certain lexical categories of words within each of these parts of speech[11].

However, V. Nagel draws somewhat different conclusions, arguing that there is a dual nature of the category of evaluation: the semantics of quality, an evaluative feature (an opinion about the value of an object) and the semantics of attitude (to the object of evaluation). In particular, the semantics of quality is represented by adjectives as a form of expression of a feature (*He is decent*) or the degree of manifestation of a feature (*He is the most decent*); the semantics of attitude, in her opinion, is realized by verbs (*I appreciate his decency*)[12].

O. Selivanova argues that in evaluation the semantic and pragmatic aspects are inseparable, all aspects of its functioning reflect the merger of semantics (the intrinsic meaning of linguistic units, including the utterance in general) and pragmatics (the conditions for the realization of the communication process)[13]. In this regard, when analyzing the functional-semantic category of evaluation, one should pay special attention to the content of the sentence and, in particular, to the context.

However, there are scholars who emphasize the specificity of axiological texts, which is determined not so much by the content of a single evaluative word as by the content of the whole, taking into account the relations between the elements.

H. Bihunova, taking into account axiological evaluation, describes the specialization of constructions and notes that the construction of evaluative-subjective characteristic is a unique descriptor of social evaluation of a person, object or event, and in comparison with the evaluative-significant construction in describing moral, ethical and intellectual evaluation of a person, it is more expressive and expresses mainly negative character of evaluation. She calls this construction a unique expression of a "technical" assessment, which refers to the ability or skill of a person[14].

A. Prikhodko proposes to use a universal semantic language, which is devoid of subjective coloration and will allow describing the meaning of

[11] Ananko T. The Category of Evaluation in Political Discourse. *Advanced Education.* 2017. Vol. 8. P. 130.

[12] Нагель В. В. Різновиди оцінки як лінгвістичної категорії. URL: htth://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/dlgum/2007 (дата звернення: 3.02.2024).

[13] Селіванова О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2008. 156 с.

[14] Бігунова Н.О. Позитивна оцінка: від когнітивного судження до комунікативного висловлювання. Одеса : КП ОМД, 2017. 234 с.

lexical and grammatical units of different languages in unified objective categories.

Thus, the study of the evaluation category and its expression in the text, and, in particular, its pragmatic impact on the reader, is an urgent task of modern linguistics. The versatility and multifaceted nature of the evaluation category leads to a significant number of philosophical, logical and linguistic studies. Therefore, there are still discussions about the interpretation of the evaluation category.

2. Means of expressing the category of evaluation in works of fiction

Linguistic research is aimed at studying various aspects of evaluation, in particular, a significant part of it is devoted to the means of expressing evaluation, which are unequal and heterogeneous.

F. Batsevych notes that some are used regularly, occupying a central position, while others are used irregularly, clarifying, modifying evaluative relations, occupying a secondary position[15]. There are main and peripheral means of expressing evaluation, which the researcher writes about, and it is advisable to correlate them with the evaluation scale. At the same time, peripheral means are those that are associated with the final elements of the scale (“*What a miracle!*” – admiration, very good; “*What a day!*” – indignation, very bad).

It should be noted that linguistic evaluation is a specific subjective normatively or situationally mediated way of cognizing and expressing objectively expressed evaluative differences. Thus, the pragmatic features of evaluations in historical prose are determined by what is preferred over the norm in these types of communication strategies, in particular, the need to actualize the interpretive aspect of speech, that is, not the statement of facts, but the expression of the speaker’s attitude to these facts, his thoughts, imagination, dreams; intentions to direct the statement to an evaluative idea of the subject (subject) and unwillingness to clearly name it; appeal to the recipient’s knowledge fund. In this regard, linguistic evaluation should be considered comprehensively and exhaustively as a category of a high level of abstraction, which belongs to those categories that are set by the social, physical and mental nature of the individual, which encourages them to have a certain attitude towards other individuals and objects of the surrounding reality.

C. Hanzha and H. Onyschenko note that modern formal axiology consists of the logic of comparative evaluations and the logic of absolute evaluations. In the economic sciences, comparative evaluation is expressed by the concept of preference “A is better than B”, while absolute evaluations (“good”, “bad”, “indifferent”, “good”, “evil”, etc.) are considered in ethics

---

[15] Бацевич Ф. Вступ до лінгвістичної прагматики. Київ: Академія, 2011. С. 345.

and mathematics, as well as in linguistic philosophy, the subject of which is the functioning of language and its logical improvement. The linguistic equivalent of this category is the category of evaluation, which some scholars call the category of assessment "for the purpose of terminological unification and distinction" of these concepts[16].

O. Nazarchuk and O. Zaluzhna write in their work that linguistic evaluation has a specific structure and its main components are the subject, the object of evaluation, the evaluation predicate, the evaluation scale, the evaluation aspect and its basis. Accordingly, the following types of evaluations are distinguished:

1) positive / negative / neutral
2) general/private
3) objective / subjective;
4) emotional / rational / emotional-rational;
5) absolute / comparative[17].

Rational evaluation is associated with the intellectual sphere of human activity. Emotional evaluation, along with the expression of a rational judgment, conveys the speaker's emotions and is characterized by expressiveness and affectivity; it is this evaluation that is more often characterized by such an optional element of the evaluation structure as an intensifier. C. Hanzha and H. Onyschenko argue that axiological meanings are represented in the language by two main types: general evaluative and partial evaluative, where the first type expresses holistic evaluation and is realized by the adjectives good and bad and their synonyms with different stylistic and expressive shades, and the partial evaluative group includes lexemes that evaluate only one aspect of an object from a certain point of view.

However, the evaluative meaning is not always explicit at the linguistic level. Quite often, the recipient himself makes a certain explanation in connection with his logical conclusions. For example, the sentence "*I have a headache*" can be logically supplemented with "*I have a headache, and it's bad*". Sometimes, the expressed assessment sometimes needs to be specified, and in most cases, it is negative. That's why when we answer the question (*How are you?*) we hear: "*Not good*", it is natural to expect another question: "*What actually happened*?" However, if the first question is answered positively, further questioning is no longer appropriate and can be considered a sign of ill-manneredness.

---

[16] Ганжа С. А., Онищенко Г. А. Відображення категорії оцінки в сучасній фразеології. *Дослідження з лексикології і граматики української мови.* 2016. Вип. 17. С. 39.

[17] Назарчук О. О., Залужна О. О. Семантичні особливості оцінної лексики в сучасному англійськомовному інтернет дискурсі (на матеріалі відгуків на сучасні бренди одягу). 2021. С. 147.

Studies in logic, philosophy, and linguistics are devoted to the nature of evaluation and its classifications, which is explained by the importance of this logical and linguistic category in social and communication processes. I should be noted that the subjective-objective nature of evaluation plays a significant role in this, since any evaluative statement contains a subjective component (the subject's own attitude to the subject of evaluation), while the so-called objective or descriptive component (characterization of the properties of the object of evaluation) may be absent. As a result, the question of the truth/falsity of the valuation arises. Therefore, it is logical to assume that a certain assessment can be accepted as true by representatives of one social group or one society with a similar worldview and world understanding. But we should also take into account the personal factor, which often plays a significant role.

Evaluation is multifaceted and multidimensional, which explains its interpretation as a logical-semantic, linguistic and stylistic, cognitive, semantic-pragmatic, functional and grammatical category. Its manifestations are analyzed at all language levels: in literary, journalistic, scientific and colloquial styles.

Linguists consider various aspects of evaluation in language. In the study by A. Burchardt, V. Macketanz *et al.* examine the connotative component of the evaluative value, and investigate different types of evaluative phraseology, defining the nature of evaluation in the pragmalinguistic aspect. The work states that the core of the functional and semantic field of evaluation includes emotionally coloured lexemes and that the pericore space is made up of words of rational evaluation, and the periphery is mainly units of morphological, word-formation and syntactic levels[18].

The researchers worked on the disclosure of evaluative-figurative nomination in the process of generating and interpreting a literary text, on pragmatically relevant morphological, lexical and syntactic means of expressing evaluation on the example of an English-language advertising text, on functional and semantic classes of attributes, on the functional and semantic classes of attributes, predicates and relatives of evaluation as the main expressors of axiological categories in modern English, on the linguistic and stylistic means of expressing the category of evaluation in English at the lexical-semantic, morphological and syntactic levels on the example of verbs of axiological themes, the study of the evaluative component of an English-language advertising text in terms of its genre, speech-act and discourse characteristics, English-language emotive expressions of negative evaluation and their structural and semantic models, the work on the category of evaluation in the cognitive

---

[18] Burchardt A., Macketanz V. *et al*. A Linguistic Evaluation of Rule-Based, Phrase-Based, and Neural MT Engines. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics.* № 108. 2017. P. 160.

aspect on the example of gender stereotypes and investigated the semasiological characteristics of the lexical and semantic group of evaluative adjectives, as well as the syntagmatic and paradigmatic properties of the constituent elements of this group in English and German, respectively.

In the scientific researches, the adjectives are systematized, in which qualitative adjectives are divided according to their semantics into structural units of different levels, the adjectives are classified, where its inductive-deductive linguistic and psychological component is distinguished, in which, along with the semantic criterion of distribution, the psychological classification of R. Kettel was taken into account. As for the classification of nouns with an evaluative seme, their groups are presented in the work of A. Prikhodko.

Taking into account the nature of the criterion of evaluative classification carried out by the object, three semantic types of evaluation are distinguished:

1) rational evaluation, which is contained in the denotation and is associated with an attitude to objective reality based on logical judgments about the positive/negative properties inherent in the object of evaluation, and therefore such an evaluation has a descriptive value;

2) emotional evaluation, which expresses the speaker's feelings and attitudes towards the subject of evaluation and, accordingly, is a component of connotative meaning;

3) rational-emotional evaluation appears when the subject actualizes the attitudes of both logical and sensory-figurative perception, when judgment and experience are organically combined.

It should be noted that the concept of evaluation is closely related to the expression of a person's emotional attitude towards the object of expression, and when evaluating, the speaker conveys his or her positive or negative attitude on any grounds. Therefore, in the structure of the word meaning, evaluation is primarily associated with the emotional component of the connotation.

Evaluation occupies a significant place in the structure of word meaning, which can be a component of denotation or connotation, and can also appear in both aspects of the lexical meaning of a word. The study is based on the classification proposed by A. Prikhodko[19], which is based on the subject's attitude to the object of evaluation and the latter's qualifications. Given these classifications, which are based on the subject's attitude to the object of evaluation and the evaluation of the latter's qualifications, three types of evaluation are distinguished, in particular

---

[19] Приходько Г.І. Категорія оцінки в контексті зміни лінгвістичних парадигм. Запоріжжя, 2018. 200 с.

I. Rational evaluation (focused on logical judgments and determined on the basis of the denotation's inherent characteristics. For example, *recidivist, gangster*.

Rational evaluation has its own scale, which can be demonstrated by contrasts: "normal"/"abnormal", "appropriate"/"inappropriate", "true"/"false", "good"/"bad", etc. This evaluation (evaluation in the denotation) is expressed in the definition. The evaluation markers in it are divided into two categories: "good" and "bad", and the choice of words is based on the principle of having seven "good"/"bad" in the meaning of a word.

In this regard, two groups of words can be distinguished:

– directly evaluative words (the evaluation marker is in the definition itself, for example: a) *pig – domestic and wild animal*; б) *dirty, greedy or ill-mannered person*.

– derived evaluative words (further transformation of the definition is required to identify the evaluation, e.g.: *loafer – a lazy person, idler – idle, inactive, motionless, do-nothing*.

II. Evaluation that focuses on the speaker's emotional attitude to the subject of evaluation.

Due to the lack of a single definition of emotions, the emotional evaluation scale is generalized. It should be noted that the main opposition of the scale is the opposition "condemnation/approval", which results in a transformed "plus/minus" rating.

By classifying the emotional "+" rating, we can anticipate the following subtypes: 1) affection (in most cases, it refers to women and children, for example, *birdie*); 2) mischievousness *(rolypoly)*; 3) admiration (*virtuoso*); 4) approval, sympathy (*belle*); 5) joking (*lord*).

In contrast to positive evaluation, negative evaluation can be demonstrated as follows: 1) judgmental (*cad)*; 2) dismissive (*brat*); 3) destructive (*mummy*); 4) contemptuous (*sirrah*); 5) swearing (*witch*); 6) offensive (*darkey*).

It is worth noting that the compilers of dictionaries generalize different emotions, combining them in one comment (in particular, contempt and humiliation are denoted by *derogatory*). In this regard, the emotional evaluation scale presented in the dictionary is not entirely adequate, and it would be advisable to create a more extensive system of designations to capture different emotions.

III. Evaluation has different places in the structure of a word's meaning: it can be a component of a denotation *(beauty, criminal)* or connotation (*crumb-bum, pussy (voice)*), i.e., in certain areas of activity, the subject actualizes the attitudes of logical perception, in others – of sensory and figurative perception. However, when judgments and experiences are

in organic unity, then we are talking about the rational-emotional type of evaluation (*mug*).

Words can enter into antonymic relations according to the evaluative component: *beauty – ugliness*. However, antonymy is not always based on the juxtaposition of negative and positive evaluations; sometimes a "positive" evaluation is contrasted with the absence of a positive evaluation. For example: 1) *famous, experienced (actor, poet)*, 2) *young, beginner, inexperienced (actor, poet)* – the second row of words denies the reclamation assessment of the words of the first row, but does not introduce reclamation into the meaning, demonstrating only the absence of reclamation.

Evaluation can also refer to moral aspects. For example: *selfless, cruel*; social and procedural: *thief, criminal*; social class: *fascist, colonialist*.

The evaluative component is distinguished in the words of a specific evaluation (evaluation of a particular trait). This group includes the following evaluations: 1) by appearance: *handsome, nice, beautiful, ugly*; 2) by language features: *lisping, articulate*; 3) by mental activity: *capable, clever, dull, stupid, silly*; 4) by character: *active, quiet, placid, hot-tempered*; 5) by skills and abilities: *skillful, expert, experienced.*

It is worth emphasizing that the concept of evaluation is inextricably linked to the expression of a person's emotional attitude towards the object of expression. Therefore, when giving an opinion, the speaker expresses his or her positive or negative attitude on any grounds.

It should be noted that at the syntactic level, the means of conveying connotative information are phrases and sentences, namely, repetition and reprise, which, when translated into Ukrainian, are conveyed by alternative means, in particular, repetition is conveyed by means of repetition while preserving its structural and syntactic features. For example, *young tartar; (an) ugly tongue*. As for the reprise, it is also represented by a reprise, the components of which perform similar grammatical functions, structural and lexical means, and descriptive methods. For example*, There is no guts in him; That was nice. I got a big bang out of that.*

It is worth noting that three processes can occur in the structure of a phrase. Let's consider them.

1. The prevalence of evaluation semantics in the structure of the noun within the phrase (*king's weather, egregious ass, egregious fool*).

2. The predominance of evaluation semantics in the structure of an adjective (*evil eye, buttery kiss*).

3. Equality of components in terms of the degree of evaluation semantics (*job's comforter, signal villain*).

It should be noted that evaluative phrases more vividly and emotionally depict a person's inner world, behaviour, and everyday life. Evaluation is also conveyed by means of phraseological units at the syntactic level.

The work of I. Bekhta and O. Matviienkiv provides a classification of phraseological units, in particular:

1. Phraseological splices are completely unmotivated idiomatic groups of words. For example, *as an ass (or donkey) between two bundles of hay* (about a person who cannot choose one of two things), *bland as oil*.

2. Phraseological unities – metaphorically motivated idioms. For example, *(as) easy as A.B.C. (or as falling off a log, as lying, as punch, as talking, as winking, as damn it, as pie, as nothing), (as) simple as falling off a chair (or log), (as) simple as A.B.C.).*

3. Phraseological combinations (standard expressions) are groups of words with components whose combinational power is clearly limited. For example, *a little bit off the top, transpontine drama.*

4. Phraseological expressions – proverbs, sayings and aphorisms. For example, *laws are like cobwebs which may catch small flies, but let wasps and hornets break through; Bad custom is like a good cake, better broken than kept*[20].

It should be emphasized that the realization of evaluation at the lexical level is manifested in stylistic and figurative means. Taking into account their ontology, it is possible to distinguish stylistically coloured linguistic units into stylistic and figurative means. Stylistically marked elements of language already exist in the language system and therefore speakers only reproduce them in communication as ready-made means, while tropes need to be created.

Metaphors, oxymorons, periphrases, etc. are used to maximize the impact on the addressee's mind, and for this purpose, authors of literary works turn to the visual means of language. Secondary nominations make texts more imaginative, expressive, emotional, fresh, and original.

Scholars separate evaluation and metaphor and study the relationship between them. They focus on evaluative words that function in metaphor and how metaphorization affects the emergence of evaluative meaning, i.e., they study the relations "evaluation-metaphor" and "metaphor-evaluation".

I. Kharkavtsiv distinguishes between metaphors of ameliorative (positive) and paean (negative) evaluation, as well as expressive-evaluative and emotionally coloured metaphors. Researchers believe that evaluation is one of the main features of the pictorial and expressive means of literary texts, and

[20] Бехта І.А., Матвієнків О.С. Структурно-семантичні типи фразеологізмів в англійськомовному художньому прозовому тексті. *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія: Філологія. Соціальні комунікації.* Том 31 (70) № 2 Ч. 2 2020. С. 24.

therefore they are in dire need of expressive means. However, in journalistic texts, their expressiveness sometimes acquires a social character, because it is primarily purposeful, selective, and evaluative. In this regard, tropes in journalism are important not in themselves, as a decoration of style, a means of revitalizing the material, but primarily for the evaluative effect they have[21].

Periphrasis is one of the most effective evaluative devices. Their functioning is connected with genre features and communicative and pragmatic tasks. Most often, periphrases are found in such genres as essay, feuilleton, pamphlet, analytical information, commentary, etc.

The word-formation representatives of evaluative meaning are described through the typology of means of expressing the category of evaluation at the word-formation level in literary texts. In this regard, a significant number of words with an evaluative component in their meaning are formed through the use of word-formation means. Evaluative formations are both usual and occasional. The most frequently observed are the usual formations produced with the help of suffixes of negative evaluation.

It is worth noting that a small group includes meiurationally marked lexemes formed with the help of suffixes of diminutiveness, caress, and smallness (*raindrop, happiness, pretty*), which give literary and journalistic texts a special warmth, intimacy, and lyricism. Less frequently used are lexemes formed by prefixation (pseudo-intellectualism, anti-popular) and compounding (deregime, self-indulgence), which serve as a means of expressing negative evaluation in texts.

Nowadays, writers have begun to actively use occasional word formation, in which suffixation is most widely represented, while prefixation and compounding are less productive. Occasional formations are unusual, vivid and, due to their high impact, help to realize the author's communicative intentions, in particular, to give a negative assessment of certain processes, actions and deeds of their participants.

It should be noted that in fiction texts, evaluative phraseology prevails, characterized by high expressiveness and evaluation (*to make a fool of oneself; to wag one's tongue*). However, less frequent are non-evaluative phraseological units (*to the fullest*) and phraseological units containing evaluation in the denotation (*to give hope; to cause trouble*).

Thus, evaluation at different language levels has been studied by twentieth-century linguists. There are studies devoted to the means of expressing evaluation in fiction and journalistic texts.

Studies in logic, philosophy and linguistics are devoted to the nature of evaluation and its classifications, which is explained by the importance of

---

[21] Kharkavtsiv I. The category of evaluation and its representation in the semantics of metaphor. *SWorld Journal*, 2022. *5*(11-05). P. 136. (To appear).

this logical and linguistic category in social and communicative processes. Evaluative phrases more vividly and emotionally depict a person's inner world, behaviour, and everyday life. Evaluation is also conveyed with the help of phraseological units at the syntactic level.

It is important to note that in the structure of the word's meaning, evaluation is primarily associated with the emotional component of the connotation, which includes both rational and emotional evaluation, and therefore, a significant part of evaluative vocabulary is potentially associated with the emotional component and evokes an evaluative reaction in a person. At the syntactic level, positive and negative evaluations are conveyed by means of phrases and sentences, including repetition and reprise.

The category of evaluation is universal and common in every language; it can be a denotative or connotative component, but it can also permeate both aspects of the lexical meaning of a word. Evaluation is one of the main features of figurative and expressive means. Metaphors are relevant factors in the creation of linguistic discourse and carry an evaluative load. Most of the metaphors used in journalism have a pejorative assessment due to the negative attitude to the processes taking place in the state, etc.

It is worth emphasizing that figurative phraseology is a highly effective means of influencing the addressee in order to form an evaluative attitude to the events and phenomena depicted. They are characterized by varying degrees of intensification of the evaluative component of meanings, in particular, colloquial phraseology has a pronounced evaluative function.

3. Means of the evaluation category realization
(based on the novel "11.22.63" by S. King)

The category of evaluation has an extra-linguistic character and pragmatic potential and is an indispensable component of the communicative act and is realized in discourse as a multifunctional category. However, evaluation manifests itself differently in different linguistic environments because it has a certain set of pragmatically relevant means of explication and depends on the communicative goal of the speaker, which is achieved, as well as on the specifics of the author and the recipient, the semantic content of the discourse, its intentions, etc. Thus, the category of evaluation requires a comprehensive study taking into account the peculiarities of a particular speech situation in which it is present.

In order to study the lexical means of expressing evaluation in English, it is advisable to describe its functional and semantic meaning, involving all four nominal parts of speech. Adjectives are the main axiological unit, because their semantic feature is the ability to express the properties inherent in the subject of evaluation, as well as the qualitative characteristic of the

subject of evaluation. It should be noted that axiological adjectives can act as a source word in transposing word formation, forming lexical axiological units belonging to other parts of speech.

It should be noted that along with the evaluative meaning, there is an evaluative component of lexical meaning, which is defined as the expression of a positive or negative judgment by a lexeme about what the word denotes, i.e., "the expression of approval or disapproval", as "a positive or negative assessment contained in the meaning of a word", as a positive or negative characterization of a person, object, or phenomenon inherent in a word, as "a part of lexical meaning capable of expressing the speaker's attitude to the object or concept denoted by the word"[22].

We consider it appropriate to illustrate the realization of the category of evaluation through lexical means on the example of S. King's work "11.22.63". The author's idiosyncrasy, or individual style, is the main characteristic of a work of fiction that determines the style of writing, the use of stylistic devices and figures, which makes the style of each author unique. Therefore, researchers of S. King's works have focused on studying his idiom as a way of conveying national identity and cultural characteristics from his point of view.

Fiction usually contains a lot of neutral vocabulary. These are commonly used words, for example, "*man, week, weather, chair, table, to go, first, something, good, bad, enough*" etc. (***Hereinafter, examples from S. King's book "11.22.63" will be given***[23]). Such words form the lexical basis of all functional styles and are the main source of synonymy and polysemy. They easily create new meanings and stylistic variants.

However, in addition to neutral vocabulary, S. King uses literary vocabulary and colloquial vocabulary in his work. The former includes bookish words, terms, poetic and archaic words, barbarisms and neologisms. The second one includes bookish words, jargon, professionalisms, dialectisms, slang and vulgar words, because the author is a modern writer who tries to recreate the real language of his characters. In addition to the nominative function, neologisms also have a stylistic function, i.e., they convey irony, sarcasm, and serve as a means of humorous depiction of reality, realizing the author's individual ideas.

It should be noted that the author uses a lexical and thematic group of words and phrases with the meaning of "pain" in the novel, in particular, in different meanings. It has both physical and moral manifestations, and from

---

[22] Теглівець Ю. Роль оцінного компонента у семантичній структурі складених термінів із семою «Вода». URL: https://ena.lpnu.ua:8443/server/api/core/bitstreams/0daa74b8-04c2-4d42-9df7-6b0e751604bf/content

[23] King S. 11/22/63. New York : Scribner, 2011. URL: https:// booksfb2. com/?p=337419.

the very beginning the protagonist tells the reader that he is an indifferent person, but later denies it: *"Her bloodshot eyes regarded me sadly; I feel ... I do not know ... like a bottle of soda that's been shaken up; The pain had been temporarily buried in a surge of adrenaline; He screamed with pain and surprise"*.

In a few examples, the word "*pain"* is used and therefore it is clear that the character was really in a lot of pain, while in other cases this lexeme is verbalized with the help of words, phrases or even sentences*: tears, bloodshot eyes regarded me sadly, a bottle of soda that's been shaken up.* These examples provide examples of moral pain, first, and then physical pain.

However, the novel contains not only a lexical and thematic group of words with the meaning of "*pain*" that is marked by a negative assessment, but also another group with the meaning of "*love"*. Part of the work is full of positive vocabulary with this meaning because the protagonist meets his destiny, which prompted him to complete his mission: "*I'll love your face no matter what it looks like; She was laughing, her hair was flying, and her face was perfect; She threw back her head and let loose a beautiful full-throated laugh".* "*Love*" in the novel has a positive emotional assessment and, at times, it is verbalized through descriptions of the protagonist's beloved, which adds a romantic component to the novel "11.22.63".

Let's turn to the consideration of somatic vocabulary (somatisms), i.e. such lexical units that contain the names of body parts (from the Greek *soma* – body and its parts). S. King is characterized by the use of such vocabulary in tense moments of the narrative, in particular, different parts of the hero's body (hands, face, eyes) seem to gain independence, live their own lives and react instantly, impulsively, sometimes beyond the will and reason of the host: "*My heart is beating so hard it seems to shake my whole body; Her hands came up and tried – weakly – to fend me off; My face was shaking, but my abdomen was worse"*. In these examples, we can see the frequent use of the word "*heart*", which is an indicator of the protagonist's anxious state, because it is always "*beating hard*", which indicates the intense emotional state in which the protagonist is always in. In addition to "*heart"*, there are somatisms such as "*hands, face, abdomen",* which are also used to depict the same complex psychological state of the character as discussed above. In this regard, we can distinguish linguistic features that are used to create different feelings, such as worry, anxiety, vulnerability, surprise, confusion, etc. They are related to the subgenre of such works that deal with a certain "alternative history" or "parallel worlds".

The verbalization of "surprise" is created by introducing sharp, dynamic scenes (sometimes even scenes of violence) of one of the main characters of the work. To create emotional tension, the writer used phrases that describe

the brutal details of one of the characters' lives that influenced Jake Epping's decision to complete the mission in the past: "*he beat up my mom; he went to jail; there was blood all over the walls; white stuff on the couch... that was my mother's brains*". These horrific details encourage readers to negatively evaluate the events depicted in the work. When judgments and experiences are in organic unity, then we are talking about the rational-emotional type of assessment that can be given to such depictions of the events mentioned.

It should be noted that S. King's idiom is characterized by the use of such lexical means as realities, slang units, vulgarities, etc. The style of this novel is multilayered with the use of specific regional dialects and jargons, direct and hidden quotations.

We believe it is appropriate to consider the realities (this is the achievement of the people in whose language it appeared and continues to exist) that the author widely uses. Of course, they may enter another language, exist for a certain time or remain forever. For example: "*Because today I'm fifty-seven, buddy. Which makes me an official Heinz; ...and now he was just a guy in Carhartts that the kids called Hoptoad Harry because of the way he walked*". Thus, the use of realities in the work is a reflection of the concept of material culture inherent in the respective people. In the above examples, the realities are "*Heinz, Carhartts*", which are the names of brands that were popular in the second half of the twentieth century. The use of such words conveys the atmosphere of the period described, which is important for the reader's perception of the real details.

One of the characteristic features of S. King's novel "11.22.63" is the liveliness of the dialogues, which are close to colloquial speech depending on the situation. This is achieved through the use of slang: "*That's right, buddy. But I don't think it's ever gonna be, you know, completely right. And don't tell me that John screwed up again*".

The author uses youth slang in dialogues or descriptions of characters to enhance expression and thus draws a line between characters, indicating that they belong to a certain generation or social group. Consider the dialog from the novel "11.22.63": "*We used to say Coach, Coach, step on a roach. "Coach Borman looked puzzled. Really?" "Nah, just goofin witcha*". From this example, it is clear that the teacher is talking to the students and the last sentence is a vivid example of the use of youth slang: the interjection "*nah*" (expressing disagreement), the verb "*goofin*" (to joke, to make fun) and the word "*witcha*", which is a contraction of the pronoun with the preposition "*with you*".

Slang words are formed in different ways, including some that are formed by truncating commonly understood words. For example, let's take the word "*bookmaker*", which is a slang term for the abbreviated word

"*bookie*". For example, *"...make a few bets with a bookie he found in Lewiston.."*. The writer often uses informal vocabulary in his work, for example, "*But it's not my job to be anybody's whatchacallit – teachable moment*". In this sentence, the word "*whatchacallit*" is an eloquent example, the meaning of which is found in the Cambridge Dictionary: "used when you are talking about something or someone whose name you cannot remember, i.e. this lexeme is used when you cannot remember" [24], the name of an object or someone's name.

Thus, youth slang has become widespread in American literature. Many authors demonstrate a serious approach to the choice and use of youth slang vocabulary, which is determined by the peculiarities of situations and linguistic context and performs various stylistic functions: the function of emotional and expressive amplification, characterization, identification, and descriptive functions. Slang is used to express a positive or negative assessment of an object or phenomenon, or to characterize it. In the analyzed work, it is used in a negative sense, but it can be used to plunge into the described historical period and follow the speech of a certain circle of people of that time.

It should be emphasized that the concept of evaluation is inextricably linked to the expression of a person's emotional attitude towards the object of expression, and when giving an evaluation, one expresses one's own positive or negative attitude on any grounds, because in the structure of the word's meaning, evaluation is primarily associated with the emotional component of the connotation (rational and emotional evaluation). Thus, everything that surrounds a person evokes an evaluative reaction in him or her, because a significant part of the evaluative vocabulary is potentially Another type of stylistically coloured vocabulary is jargon. This type of language is mainly used in oral communication between communicators who are united by profession, interests, habits, occupation, social status or age. Here are examples of such lexical items: "*And that A-plus! Sheesh!, Yeah, but this is my last day, Nah, don't bother*". Thus, it is appropriate to note that the conscious use of such vocabulary is an expression, and the unconscious is a manifestation of low culture of speech.

Also, in S. King's novel "11.22.63", the use of vulgarisms is noticeable. The vocabulary of the lower case is used to impress the interlocutors with the brightness of the expression, the desire to show their disdain for the subject of the conversation. For example: "*Nine cases out of ten that's just sales-pitch bullshit, but this is the tenth case; My goddam rental Chevy threw a rod*". The above examples use samples of such swear words as "*bullshit,*

---

[24] Cambridge Dictionary. URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/ru/%D1%81%D0%BB%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%B9/whatchamacallit

goddam" that are lost in translation, although the author used them to characterize the low cultural level of the characters depicted in the novel.

Let's look at another example: *"<...> I caught the phrase three jigs stuck in an elevator and decided it wasn't one he'd have told to his Housedress Harem"*. In this example, the author uses the vulgarism "*jigs*", which refers to coarse, sweary vocabulary used to insult African-Americans and therefore is not used by polite people.

Throughout the work, the protagonist is constantly in emotional tension, accompanied by painful gestures, feelings of fear, despair, shock, trembling hands, body, numbness, inability to speak, think, and even breathe, for example: "*breathing through a tube, stopped breathing, trembling, fear, shock, loss, grief, anger*". This is a rational assessment associated with an attitude to objective reality based on logical judgments about the negative properties inherent in the object of assessment, and therefore such an assessment has a descriptive value: "*My eyes widened and I stopped breathing; The good side of her mouth began to tremble; I saw the fear in her eyes*". The use of lexical means to create an atmosphere of tension, pain, and mystery draws the reader's attention to the characters' experiences. What is important about such works is that their peculiarity is the interpretation of reality. This is the level where connotations arise that reflect the relationship between linguistic evaluative units and the existing extra-linguistic object, phenomenon, and user. Connotative information is a product of the speech process and arises as a result of activating the expressive potential of expressive and syntactic constructions. Therefore, it increases the impact on an individual and causes him/her to have an emotional and evaluative attitude towards a certain object, event or state.

Thus, figurative and evaluative expression reproduces the emotional sphere of the main native speakers, in particular, the author, characters, and readers. The semantic and cognitive features of evaluative lexemes in the novel reveal the emotional fund of modern English-language literary discourse and act as emotional signs that ensure cultural communication at the emotional level.

In addition to lexical means of expressing evaluation, it is worth considering its manifestations at the grammatical level, where connotations appear that reflect the relationship between linguistic evaluation units and a known extra-linguistic object, phenomenon, and user. So, let's move on to the syntactic manifestations of the evaluation category.

It is worth noting that S. King in his novel "11.22.63" widely uses narrative tense forms, i.e. past tenses used for storytelling. For example: "*She <u>did not appear</u> to be breathing; The good side of her mouth <u>began</u> to tremble; I <u>saw</u> the fear in her eyes*". These examples show sentences with

negative connotations that are related to events that have already happened or are taken from stories about past events. At the syntactic level, evaluation can also be conveyed with the help of idioms, which are expressive and emotionally coloured vocabulary, and therefore they are a means of expressing conceptual evaluation.

It should be noted that the emotional nature of idiomatic expressions expresses the evaluative attitude of the speaker to the object. For example: "*Keep your mouth shut as much as you can until you <u>pick up the lingo</u> and the <u>feel of the place</u>*". In this sentence, the author uses two idiomatic phrase unities: "*pick up the lingo*" and "*feel of the place*". The characters of the novel use such phrases in their everyday life, and therefore they express conceptual evaluation, and their character expresses an evaluative attitude. It should be noted that not only phrases but also sentences can be idioms.

The category of evaluation is also represented at the phraseological level, where we consider phraseological means of expressing evaluation and the specifics of their functioning in literary texts. There are phraseological units without evaluative meaning and phraseological units with evaluative meaning. Thus, evaluative phrases depict the inner world of the characters and their behaviour in everyday life more vividly, clearly, and emotionally.

We consider it appropriate to consider the types of sentences that are characteristic of conveying connotative information. In his novel "11.22.63", S. King often uses nominative one-part sentences. Here are examples of nominative sentences: *"Tearlessly"; "Two tumors"; "Advanced necrosis"; "Inoperable"; "Well, a pantry"*.

S. King also makes extensive use of uncommon sentences in the novel, for example: *"I froze"; "I'm flagellating myself"; "He laughed"; "He laughed wheezily"; "Life turns on a dime"*. Such sentences used by the writer contribute to the creation of tension and poignancy of the moment, which is typical for this type of literary work and is also a hallmark of S. King.

We consider it appropriate to consider the most commonly used evaluative expressive means at the syntactic level, which include inversion, which is used in the normalized syntactic structure of a sentence, adding a certain logical and semantic expressive shade to it. Inversion can be full or partial, which directly depends on the verb, i.e. whether it is the main or auxiliary verb. Here are some examples from the novel "11.22.63". First, here are examples of full and partial inversion: "*Take the money"; "Come this way"; "So I cried"; "On one occasion, at least"*.

Inversion is used in all interrogative sentences because they begin with an auxiliary verb, which is already a partial inversion, but there is an exception: a question to the subject. Let's look at a few examples with evaluative semantics: *"Who is this?"; "Will you listen?"; "Shock, isn't it?"*

These examples are examples of interrogative sentences, where the first is a special question, the second is a general question, and the last is a separating question. Thus, in his work, the writer uses this type of question in emotional situations, so here the evaluation has a connotative meaning

In S. King's novel "11.22.63" a large number of negative sentences are used. Negation is an important category of language because it is one of the main mental operations. The use of such sentences is due to a person's desire to differentiate the phenomena of reality, which, in turn, are reflected in the language. In English, negative sentences are constructed using suffixes, prefixes, negative pronouns, and particles. However, the most productive way of expressing negation is with the particle not, which is added to auxiliary or modal verbs and conveys the negative meaning of a verb, noun, adjective, and other parts of speech from the position of the predicate.

S. King often uses the indefinite adverb *never* in his work: *"I have been what you'd call a crying man"; "I have never seen you shed tears," she said, speaking in the flat tones people use when they are expressing the absolute final deal-breaker in a relationship".*

In addition to the adverb *never*, the author builds negative sentences with the particles no and not, which is common: "*I didn't cry when I went back inside the little house with the great big mortgage, either. The house where no baby had come, or now ever would; But I'm not emotionally blocked*". These examples present a rational and emotional assessment, because the protagonist actualizes the attitudes of both logical and sensual perception, where judgment and experience are organically combined.

We consider it appropriate to focus on a rhetorical question that is intended to evoke a certain expression, the illusion of a conversation, a dialog that seems to take place in the presence of the reader, as if with his or her participation. Such questions do not require an answer and are therefore used by writers in various literary genres. S. King also uses them in his novel "11.22.63". For example: "*Isn't that your pantry?" "Can I ask – ...Lewiston?" "Central Maine General?"*

Another syntactic means of expressing evaluative expressiveness in speech is the ellipsis, i.e. "omission" or "lack". It is based on the omission of a certain sentence member, usually a predicate. However, the omitted sentence member is easily reproduced in meaning. This technique is used when you need to make a short statement. In particular, the situational ellipsis in colloquial speech is fully normative in all languages. But in the colloquial style, the ellipsis characterizes the situation or the attitude towards it. S. King uses the ellipsis to influence the reader with the power of language. For example, "*Evoke a response?; From where?; Good for you*".

It is worth noting that in S. King's works there are various evaluative syntactic constructions. Let us consider some examples and peculiarities of the use of parenthetical contributions:

1) the category of reference is the words and syntactic constructions, sometimes very long, used by the speaker in speech to refer to any fact, literary or other source, to his previous statement, etc., e.g: *"hence, such, then, too, thenceforward, to my mind, as you say"*, etc. Such means of referencing are often accompanied by non-clichéd introductions, e.g.: "*I've been thinking about that foggy night when I had a headache and walked for air and passed all the lovely shadows without shape or substance. And I've been thinking about the trunk of my car-such an ugly word, trunk-and wondering why in the world I should be afraid to open it"*. In this example, the structure of the sentence is kept unchanged.

2) the category of explication, which includes words and syntactic constructions that are used to introduce examples, explanations, clarifications of what was said earlier, etc: "say, for example, suppose we take, for example", etc. For example: "*He disappeared around the corner and out of sight at 12.01, almost forty minutes ago. I listened closely for the diminishing scream as the crosswind got him, but it did not come"*. Here, the sentence structure is changed, the parenthetical is moved to the middle of the sentence.

3) the category of deliberateness includes words and syntactic constructions that express doubt, reflection, evaluation, etc: "*it seems, no doubt, no wonder, in a sense, at any rate, at best, at least, no wonder*", etc: "*You know, I rather like you, Mr. Norris. You're vulgar and you're a piker, but you seem to have heart. Marcia said you did. I rather doubted it. Her judgment of character is lax. But you do have a certain... verve. Which is why I've set things up the way I have. No doubt Marcia has told you that lam fond of wagering"*. The gig had started out feeling right and now it felt wrong. I could see it on my band's faces... on Miss Gibson's, too, for that matter"*. In this case, the parenthetical is placed at the beginning of the sentence.

It should be noted that S. King uses rhetorical questions in his work, which play an important role in a work of fiction. Let's look at examples from the text: "*He was an old man, and he'd had two heart attacks. Was I going to call him and tell about Katrina's letter so soon after we'd been in L.A.? To do that might very well have killed him"*. In this example, if we translate the rhetorical questions, the structure of the sentence will remain unchanged. This may be due to the fact that rhetorical questions play an important role in conveying the speaker's emotional state and enhance the expressiveness of the utterance.

As for punctuation, the writer uses dashes, brackets, and colons to enhance the expressive effect. Parenthetical contributions are often set off by

commas: "*As for me, I'm tolerated, although I have quite a reputation for eccentricity myself. After all, how many ex-astronauts regularly write to their elected Washington officials with the idea that space-exploration money could be better spent elsewhere?*"

The author also uses the colon to form parallel structures with enumeration: "*It was green with black markings, and stenciled on the front in white letters were the words: G. I. JOE VIETNAM FOOTLOCKER. Below that: 20 Infantrymen, 10 Helicopters, 2 BAR Men, 2 Bazooka Men, 2 Medics, 4 Jeeps. Below that: a flag decal. Below that, in the corner: Morris Toy Company, Miami, Fla*".

S. King uses elliptical sentences in his novel, for example: "*Escobar turned briefly to the woman on his right. Her face was very dark, her hair black with startling white streaks. It flowed back and up from her forehead as if blown by a gale-force wind. The look of her hair reminded Fletcher of Elsa Lanchester in Bride of Frankenstein*". In these lines, the ellipsis is preserved in both the first and second sentences.

In the work "11.22.63", an asyndeton is used. The author uses this elimination of conjunctions to emphasize and conciseness of expression. This lack of conjunctions enhances the expressiveness of the work's speech and emphasizes its dynamic aspect. For example: "*I looked back, feeling that fog of unreality thicken around me; I opened my mouth. No words came out; Al Templeton had been replaced by an elderly, ailing ghost; It's June. Seven months ago it was December*".

Thus, at the grammatical level, positive and negative evaluations are conveyed by phrases and sentences, including repetition and reprise. Evaluative phrases more vividly and emotionally depict a person's inner world, behaviour, and everyday life and are an important means of expressing evaluation. Thus, "the main function of evaluation is to express the speaker's attitude to objective reality in the course of the communication process".

CONCLUSIONS

Today, scholars interpret the category of evaluation in different ways, because it is a complex phenomenon for scientific research and interpretation. In particular, O. Selivanova considers evaluation "as a component of the connotative component of the semantic structure of a language unit, which represents the attitude of native speakers to the designated on the absolute scale "good – neutral (indifferent) – bad" and the relative scale "better – just as good – just as neutral – just as bad – worse".[25]

---

[25] Селіванова О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2008. С. 106. (To appear).

Evaluation is localized in the word due to its denotative meaning, when it acts as a concept, and words become evaluative signs because they have an evaluative meaning. Along with the evaluative value, there is an evaluative component of lexical meaning, which is defined as the expression by a word of a positive or negative judgment about what the word names, i.e., an expression of approval or disapproval, as a positive or negative assessment contained in the meaning of a word, as a positive or negative characteristic of a person, object, or phenomenon inherent in the word. It is important to note that in the structure of the word's meaning, evaluation is primarily associated with the emotional component of the connotation, which includes both rational and emotional evaluation, and therefore, a significant part of evaluative vocabulary is potentially associated with the emotional component and causes an evaluative reaction in a person.

Evaluative phrases more vividly and emotionally depict a person's inner world, behaviour, and everyday life. Evaluation is also reproduced with the help of phraseology. At the syntactic level, positive and negative evaluations are conveyed through phrases and sentences, including repetition and reprise. The notion of evaluation in S. King's novel "11.22.63" is inextricably linked to the expression of the characters' emotional attitude towards the objects of expression. In the process of evaluation, they express their positive or negative attitude on any grounds. The lexical means of evaluation are primarily related to the emotive component of the connotation, which includes both rational and emotional evaluation. A significant part of the evaluative vocabulary of S. King's work is associated with the emotive component. That is, everything that surrounds the characters evokes an evaluative reaction in them.

The work uses a variety of syntactic constructions that give the text brightness and expressiveness, because it is a kind of individual author's style. The writer uses evaluative expressive syntax, including punctuation. The author uses various syntactic means of expression: rhetorical questions, parenthetical introductions, elliptical sentences.

SUMMARY

An evaluative approach to the surrounding reality is important, as well as its perception through a certain system of norms and values that are inherent in each person. Therefore, evaluation is an indisputable and important component of the worldview of individuals, representatives of certain social groups and entire nations, since all events and facts of the world around us are perceived as positive, neutral or negative depending on the established norms, rules and personal beliefs. The centre of localization of evaluation in a word is its denotative meaning, when evaluation acts as a concept, and

words become evaluation signs because they have an evaluative meaning. The realization of the category of evaluation is manifested through morphological, lexical, syntactic, stylistic and pictorial means of its expression. Secondary nominations add imagery, expressiveness, emotionality, freshness, and originality to texts. It should be emphasized that the cognitive and semantic core of evaluation is the concept of "value" rather than "attitude", because the category of evaluation should be understood as the attitude of native speakers to an object caused by the recognition or non-recognition of its value in terms of compliance or non-compliance of its qualities with certain value criteria.

Bibliography

1. Prihodko A. Category of evaluation as the object of linguistics: prospects of communication aspects of study. *Odessa linguistic journal*. № 11, 2018. P. 64–70.

2. White P. Evaluative contents in verbal communication. In A. Rocci & L. Saussure (Eds.), Verbal communication. Berlin : De Gruyter Mouton. 2016. P. 77–96.

3. Myroniuk T. Evaluative Responses in Modem English Fiction. *Advanced Education*. 2017. Vol. 8. P. 103-108.

4. Anderson J. M. Linguistic Representation (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and monographs). Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 2011. 266 p.

5. Нагель В. В. Різновиди оцінки як лінгвістичної категорії. URL: htth://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/dlgum/2007 (Referred to on October 3, 2024).

6. Prihodko A. Category of evaluation as the object of linguistics: prospects of communication aspects of study. *Odessa linguistic journal*. № 11, 2018. P. 64–70. (To appear).

7. Kharkavtsiv I. The category of evaluation and its representation in the semantics of metaphor. *SWorld Journal*, 2022. *5*(11-05), 134–139. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30888/ 2663-5712.2022-11-05-038

8. Byessonova O. Evaluative Thesaurus as Instrument in Coding Values of the English Linguocultural Community. *The Ethical and Axiological Aspects in the Literature and the Culture of the 20th and 21st Centuries [Collective monograph]/edited by Maja Jakimovska-Toshikj, Katarína Žeňuchová*. Skopje : Institute of Macedonian Literature, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, 2021 P. 259-284. DOI: 10.1515/9783110255478-006

9. Борисова Н.В., Заболотна Т.В. Вираження категорії оцінки у творі С. Кінга «11.22.63». *Львівський філологічний часопис*. № 9. 2021. С. 27–35. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32447/2663-340X-2021-9.4

10. Anderson J. M. Linguistic Representation (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and monographs). Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 2011. 266 p. (To appear).

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

12. Нагель В. В. Різновиди оцінки як лінгвістичної категорії. URL: htth://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/dlgum/2007 (Referred to on October 3, 2024).

13. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми. Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2008. 712 с.

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

15. Бацевич Ф. Вступ до лінгвістичної прагматики. Київ : Академія, 2011. 304 с.

16. Ганжа С. А., Онищенко Г. А. Відображення категорії оцінки в сучасній фразеології. *Дослідження з лексикології і граматики української мови.* 2016. Вип. 17. С. 34–40.

17. Назарчук О. О., Залужна О. О. Семантичні особливості оцінної лексики в сучасному англійськомовному інтернет дискурсі (на матеріалі відгуків на сучасні бренди одягу). 2021. С. 146–149.

18. Burchardt A., Macketanz V. *et al*. A Linguistic Evaluation of Rule-Based, Phrase-Based, and Neural MT Engines. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics.* № 108. 2017. P. 159–170. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/pralin-2017-0017

19. Хачпанова І. В., Козуб Л. С. Специфіка значення емоційно-оцінної лексики. *Young Scientist.* № 10 (62). 2018. С. 555–557.

20. Приходько Г. І. Категорія оцінки в контексті зміни лінгвістичних парадигм. Запоріжжя, 2018. 200 с.

21. Бехта І. А., Матвієнків О. С. Структурно-семантичні типи фразеологізмів в англійськомовному художньому прозовому тексті. *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія: Філологія. Соціальні комунікації.* Том 31 (70) № 2 Ч. 2 2020. С. 22–28. DOI: https://doi.org/ 10.32838/2663-6069/2020.2-2/05

22. Kharkavtsiv I. The category of evaluation and its representation in the semantics of metaphor. *SWorld Journal*, 2022. 5(11-05). P. 136. (To appear).

23. Теглівець Ю. Роль оцінного компонента у семантичній структурі складених термінів із семою «Вода». URL: https://ena.lpnu.ua:8443/ server/api/core/bitstreams/0daa74b8-04c2-4d42-9df7-6b0e751604bf/content (Referred to on October 5, 2024).

24. King S. 11/22/63. New York: Scribner, 2011. URL: https:// booksfb2. com/?p=337419 (Referred to on October 4, 2024).

25. Cambridge Dictionary. URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/whatchamacallit (Referred to on October 4, 2024).

26. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2008. С. 106. (To appear).

Information about the authors:
Borysova Nataliia Vasylivna,
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology, Translation and Teaching Methods
Hryhorii Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav
30, Sukhomlynskyi str., Pereiaslav, Kyiv region, 08400, Ukraine