

ISSN 1999-4214 (print)

ISSN 2957-5095 (online)

ЕУРАЗИЯ ГУМАНИТАРЛЫҚ ИНСТИТУТЫНЫҢ

ХАБАРШЫСЫ

ВЕСТНИК

ЕВРАЗИЙСКОГО
ГУМАНИТАРНОГО
ИНСТИТУТА

BULLETIN

OF THE EURASIAN
HUMANITIES
INSTITUTE

№3/2026

Жылына 4 рет шығады
2001 ж. шыға бастаған

Выходит 4 раза в год
Начал издаваться с 2001 г.

Published 4 times a year
Began to be published in 2001

Астана, 2026

Бас редактор **Дауренбекова Л.Н.**
А.Қ. Құсайынов атындағы Еуразия гуманитарлық институтының доценті,
филология ғылымдарының кандидаты
Жауапты редактор **Алимбаев А.Е.**
А.Қ. Құсайынов атындағы Еуразия гуманитарлық институтының доценті,
философия докторы (PhD)

Редакция алқасы

Аймұхамбет Ж.Ә.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ, Астана, Қазақстан
Ақтаева К.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, А. Мицкевич атындағы Польша университеті, Познань, Польша.
Әбсадық А.А.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, А. Байтұрсынов атындағы Қостанай өңірлік университеті, Қостанай, Қазақстан
Аасланд Е.	философия докторы (PhD), профессор
Бредихин С.Н.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Солтүстік Кавказ федералды университеті, Ставрополь, РФ
Гайнуллина Ф.А.	филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент Ә. Бөкейхан атындағы университеті, Семей, Қазақстан
Ермекова Т.Н.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан
Есиркепова К.Қ.	филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, А. Байтұрсынов атындағы Қостанай өңірлік университеті, Қостанай, Қазақстан
Жүсіпов Н.Қ.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Торайғыров университеті, Павлодар, Қазақстан
Каранфил Г.	философия докторы (PhD), профессор, Комрат мемлекеттік университеті, Кишинев, Молдова
Курбанова М.М.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Алишер Навои атындағы Ташкент мемлекеттік өзбек тілі мен әдебиеті университеті, Ташкент, Өзбекстан
Қамзабекұлы Д.	ҚР ҰҒА академигі, филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ, Астана, Қазақстан
Құрысжан Л.Ә.	филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Ханкук шетелтану университеті, Сеул, Оңтүстік Корея
Онер М.	философия докторы (PhD), профессор, Эгей университеті, Измир, Туркия
Олдфилд А.	Философия докторы (PhD), профессор, Каролина Университеті Каролина, АҚШ
Пименова М.В.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Шет ел тілдері институты, Санкт-Петербург, РФ
Сайфулина Ф.С.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Қазан федералды университеті, Қазан, Татарстан, РФ
Сенмез О.Ф.	философия докторы (PhD), профессор, Токат Газиосманпаша университеті, Токат, Түркия

Редакцияның мекенжайы: 010009, Астана қ., Жұмабаев даңғ., 4
Телефон/факс: (7172) 561 933; e-mail: eagi.vestnik@gmail.com, сайт: ojs.egi.kz

Еуразия гуманитарлық институтының Хабаршысы.
Меншіктенуші: «А.Қ. Құсайынов атындағы Еуразия гуманитарлық институты»
Қазақстан Республикасы Ақпарат және қоғамдық даму министрлігі Ақпарат комитетінде қайта есепке қойылды. Тіркеу № KZ92VPY00046970 17.03.2022
Басуға 25.09.2026 ж. қол қойылды. Пішімі 60*84 1\8. Қағаз офсеттік Көлемі. БТ.
Таралымы 200 дана. Бағасы келісім бойынша. Тапсырыс № 89
«Ақтаев У.Е.» баспасында басылып шықты

© А.Қ. Құсайынов атындағы Еуразия гуманитарлық институты

Главный редактор **Дауренбекова Л.Н.**
Кандидат филологических наук, доцент Евразийского гуманитарного института имени
А.К. Кусаинова
Ответственный редактор **Алимбаев А.Е.**
Доктор философии (PhD), доцент Евразийского гуманитарного института имени
А.К. Кусаинова

Редакционная коллегия

Аймухамбет Ж.А.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, ЕНУ имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан
Актаева К.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, университет имени Адама Мицкевича, Познань, Польша.
Абсадық А.А.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Костанайский региональный университет имени А.Байтурсынова, Костанай, Казахстан
Аасланд Е.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор
Бредихин С.Н.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет, Ставрополь, РФ
Гайнуллина Ф.А.	кандидат филологических наук, доцент университет имени А. Бокейхана, Семей, Казахстан
Ермекова Т.Н.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Алматы, Казахстан
Есиркепова К.К.	кандидат филологических наук, профессор, Костанайский региональный университет имени А. Байтурсынова, Костанай, Казахстан
Жусипов Н.К.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Торайгыров университет, Павлодар, Казахстан
Каранфил Г.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор, Комратский государственный университет, Кишинев, Молдова
Курбанова М.М.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Ташкентский государственный университет узбекского языка и литературы им. Алишера Навои, Ташкент, Узбекистан
Камзабекулы Д.	академик НАН РК, доктор филологических наук, профессор, ЕНУ имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан
Курысжан Л.А.	кандидат филологических наук, профессор, Университет иностранных языков Ханкук, Сеул, Южная Корея
Онер М.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор, Эгейский университет, Измир, Турция
Олдфилд А.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор, Университет Каролины Каролина, США
Пименова М.В.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Институт иностранных языков, Санкт-Петербург, РФ
Сайфулина Ф.С.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Казанский федеральный университет, Казань, Татарстан, РФ
Сенмез О.Ф.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор, Университет Токат Газиосманпаша, Токат, Турция

Адрес редакции: 010009, г. Астана., пр. Жумабаева, 4
Телефон/факс: (7172) 561 933; e-mail: eagi.vestnik@gmail.com, сайт: ojs.egi.kz

Вестник Евразийского гуманитарного института.
Собственник: «Евразийский гуманитарный институт имени А.К. Кусаинова».
Министерством информации и общественного развития Республики Казахстан Комитет информации постановлено на переучет № KZ92VPY00046970 17.03.2022
Подписано в печать 25.09.2026 г. Формат 60*84 1\8. Бум. типогр.
Тираж 200. Цена согласовано. Заказ № 89
Напечатано в издательстве «У.Е. Актаева»

©Евразийский гуманитарный институт имени А.К. Кусаинова

Chief Editor **Daurenbekova L.N.**
Candidate of Philological Science, Associate Professor of the A.K. Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities
Institute
Editor-in-Chief **Alimbayev A.E.**
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Associate Professor of the A.K. Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities
Institute

Editorial Board

Aimuhambet Zh.A.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, L.N. Gumilyov ENU, Astana, Kazakhstan
Aktayeva K.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Poznan Adam Mitskevich University, Poznan, Poland
Absadyk A.A.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kostanay Regional University named after A.Baitursynov, Kostanay, Kazakhstan
Aasland E.	
Bredikhin S.N.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, RF
Гайнуллина Ф.А.	Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Semey, Kazakhstan
Yermekova T.N.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kaz. National Women's Pedagogical University. Almaty, Kazakhstan
Yesirkepova K.K.	Candidate of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kostanay Regional University named after A.Baitursynov, Kostanay, Kazakhstan
Zhusipov N.K.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Toraighyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan
Karanfil G.	Doctor of Philological (PhD), Professor, Komrat Devlet Univerditesi, Kishinev, Moldova
Kurbanova M.M.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Tashkent State University of the Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoyi, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Kamzabekuly D.	Academician of NAS RK, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, L.N. Gumilyov ENU, Astana, Kazakhstan
Kuryszhn L.A.	Candidate of Philological Sciences, Professor, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Seoul Korea
Oner M.	Doctor of Philological (PhD), Professor, Aegean University, Izmir, Turkey
Oldfield A.	Doctor of Philological (PhD), Professor, Coastal Carolina University Carolina, USA
Pimenova M.V.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Foreign Languages Institute, St-Petersburg, RF
Seifullina F.S.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Tatarstan, RF
Senmez O.F.	(PhD), Professor, Tokat Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey

Editorial address: 010009, Astana., 4, Prospect Zhumabayev
Tel/Fax: (7172) 561 933: e-mail: eagi.vestnik@gmail.com, сайт: ojs.egi.kz

Bulletin of the Eurasian Humanities Institute.

Owner: «A.K. Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities Institute».

The Ministry of Information and Public Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan Information Committee decided to re-register No. KZ92VPY00046970 17.03.2022

Signed for printing 25.09.2026 Format 60 * 84 1 \ 8. Paper. Printing house

Circulation 200. Price agreed. Order No. 89

Printed in the publishing house of «U.E. Aktaev»

МАЗМҰНЫ / СОДЕРЖАНИЕ / CONTENTS

ТІЛ БІЛІМІ / ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ / LINGUISTICS		
БАҚЫТЗХАНОВА А.К.	The problem of Professional Language in Scientific Publications of the International Database Scopus	7
ЕРСҰЛТАНОВА Қ.Ж.	Қазақ тілінің цифрлық медиакөңістіктегі тіл тазалығы	23
ИМАНБЕРДІ С.Қ. ӘБДУӘЛИҰЛЫ Б.	Қазақ кісі есімдері: отбасы және демография	32
КЕСІКБАЕВА Ә. ЕСЕНОВА Қ.Ө. ИСМАИЛОВА Ф.К.	Қазақ очерктерінің типтік түрлері және жолсапар очерктерінің прагматикасы	42
МУСАЕВ Ә.С. АМАНГЕЛЬДИН Е.А. АЛКЕБАЕВА Д.А.	Адам мен жасанды интеллект коммуникациясы: тілдік имитация және иллюзия	54
НУРБАЕВА А.М. БАЙСЫДЫК И.Б. АҚЫБАЕВА Н.Н.	Генеративный искусственный интеллект в рекламном дискурсе: языковые сдвиги и трансформация голоса бренда	65
NURDAULET P. BIRAY N. MAULET A.	Theoretical Foundations of the Linguoculturological Study of Kui-anyz texts: Language and Culture, Linguocultural Unit, Concept, Symbol, and Cultural Code	78
ОРАЗБАЕВА Ф.Ш. РЫСҚҰЛОВА А.Д. ПЕРТАЕВА Ә.К.	Қазақ, орыс және ағылшын дискурсындағы генеративті семантика: салыстырмалы-типологиялық талдау	89
РАҚЫМҒАЛИЕВА А.О. ИСАКОВА С.С. МУХАМЕДЖАНОВА Г.Т.	Қазақ тіл білімінде когнитивтік терминтаңымның қалыптасуы мен дамуы	102
SAURBAYEV R.ZH. PASHAN D.M.	The Manifestation of Emotive and Evaluative Dimensions in Lexical Usage within the Context of Communication	111
СНАБЕКОВА М.М. НУРТАЕВА А.Б.	Қазақ және ағылшын тіліндегі жеке жұлдыздардың халықтық космоимдік атаулары жайында	124
ТҰЯҚБАЙ Т. ТҰЯҚБАЕВА Р. ТОЙБЕКОВА С.	Абай шығармаларындағы «е» көмекші етістігінің эволюциясы	133
ӘДЕБИЕТТАНУ / ЛИТЕРАТУРОВЕДЕНИЕ / LITERATURE STUDIES		
АЙМҰХАМБЕТ Ж.Ә. НУРДАУЛЕТОВА Б.И. БЕКЕЕВА Н.Ж.	Алтай оронимі мен Ертіс гидронимі: фольклорлық нұсқалар және этимологиялық талдау	146
АЛМАСХАНҚЫЗЫ А. СЕЙІТОВА Б.Б. МЕЛЬНИК С.	Асқар Алтай прозасындағы интермәтін және ұлттық семиосфера	158

ҚОРҒАНБЕКОВ Б.С. ДАУЛЕТ Л.	Мырзашөл өңірі қазақтарының фольклоры: жанрлық жүйесі мен мәдени-танымдық ерекшелігі	173
KARBOZOV E.K. NOGAIBEK KYZY L.	Semiotic and Symbolic Significance of Sacred Notions in Wedding Ritual Folklore	184
ДИЛЬДЕБАЕВА Ж.Ш. АХМЕТ К.С.	Әдебиеттегі кроссвер жанры және қазіргі қазақ прозасы	196
ЖОРАШОВА А.М. АЙТУГАНОВА С.Ш. ТАМАБАЕВА Қ.Ө.	Қазіргі қазақ прозасындағы метанарратив: Айгүл Кемелбаева шығармаларының құрылымдық ерекшеліктері	207
ЖУМАГЕЛДИН Ж.Ш. ЖАРЫЛҒАПОВ Ж.Ж. КЕНЖЕГАЛИЕВ С.А.	Қазақ анималистік прозасындағы баяндау формаларының құрылымы	218
ИСИНА Н.У. НУРМАНОВА Ж.К. ЖАПАНОВА М.Е.	Авторская стратегия в малой прозе Умит Тажкен	227
МИРАЗОВА М.Н. БОЛТАНОВА Ж.	Қазылық тауының көркем санадағы пішіні	243
ОРАЗХАН Н.Н. ДАРИБАЕВ С.Д. МАХАНБЕТҚЫЗЫ А.	*Қорқыт ата бейнесін медиакеңістікте жандандыру мәселесі	252
САДЫҚ А.С.	Қазақ ғашықтық ән өлеңдерінің поэтикалық типологиясы	262
САПАШ Ш.Б. ТАХАН С.Ш.	Методологические подходы к изучению казахской драматургии в отечественном литературоведении 1960–1980-х годов	273
СИРЯЧЕНКО В.В. БАЗЫЛОВА Б.К. СЕКЕЙ Ж.	Возможности и вызовы интеграции искусственного интеллекта и визуализации данных в изучение эволюции казахской литературы	284
ТОҚТАРБАЙ Е. Н. ӘУБӘКІРОВА Қ.А. ТОҚСАМБАЕВА А.О.	Шәкәрім поэзиясындағы «оян» мотиві	294
UTESHOVA A.A. MATBEK N.K.	Mystical Chronotope and Mythical Symbolism in Contemporary Kazakh Youth Prose	305
ТІЛ ЖӘНЕ ӘДЕБИЕТТІ ОҚЫТУ ӘДІСТЕМЕСІ / МЕТОДИКА ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ ЯЗЫКА И ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ / METHODOLOGY OF TEACHING LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE		
АСҚАРОВА Г.С. КАРИБЕКОВА А.Ж. АЙТОВА Ж.Ж.	Цифрлық гуманитаристика аясында ежелгі дәуір әдебиетін оқытудың жаңа парадигмасы	315
САТКЕНОВА Ш. ТЛЕУБАЕВ С. Б.	Мультимедиялық құралдар арқылы қазіргі қазақ әңгімелерін оқытудың ерекшелігі	328

*R.ZH. SAURBAYEV¹ 

D.M. PASHAN² 

Toraighyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan¹

Akhmet Baitursynov Institute of Linguistics, Almaty, Kazakhstan²

(e-mail: rishat_1062@mail.ru¹, pashan_dan@mail.ru²)

¹THE MANIFESTATION OF EMOTIVE AND EVALUATIVE DIMENSIONS IN LEXICAL USAGE WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF COMMUNICATION

Annotation. This paper seeks to analyze the complexity involved in the emotive and evaluative dimensions of lexemes in human communication. The object of the study is evaluative language in the process of communication. The problem of the study lies in identifying the mechanisms of formation and functioning of evaluative meanings and their role in expressing emotions and fulfilling pragmatic functions. The paper analyzes the functions of evaluative language not just conveying emotions but as part of the pragmatic functions of communication. The paper acknowledges the complex process involved in evaluation in language, which is influenced by various sociolinguistic and environmental factors, but also involves processes of semantics and syntax in language. With the help of appraisal, systemic functional linguistics, and cross-cultural theory, the paper will seek to understand how evaluative words become emotive in their meanings from their usage and stylistic perspectives. There is evidence that words denoting emotions and affective language influence the perception process and social evaluations, the syntax and semantics of evaluation used during communication acts. The research employs semantic and pragmatic analysis of evaluative lexemes, as well as the examination of their syntactic functioning in communicative contexts. The issue of sociolinguistics, culture, and language as the factors influencing the process of evaluation, as well as how speakers control the intensity of evaluation via intensification, mitigation, and synonymy, is explored in this paper. Some directions for further investigation include studying evaluative language in spoken language and cross-culturally. The results highlight the importance of evaluative and emotive meanings in lexical semantics and their central role in human communication. The study contributes to a better understanding of the interaction between language, culture, and evaluation, and suggests directions for further research, including the analysis of evaluative language in spoken discourse and cross-cultural contexts.

Keywords: evaluative language, emotive dimensions, lexical semantics, cross-cultural pragmatics, figurative language, metaphors, collocations, communication.

Introduction. Evaluation tools used in specific communicative acts embedded in speech have several functional characteristics. During the communication process, evaluation is not the ultimate goal, but rather an integral part of the descriptive aspect of a statement and organically connected to its descriptive components.

¹Мақала 2024-2026 жылдарға арналған ғылыми және (немесе) ғылыми техникалық бағдарлама бойынша бағдарламалық нысаналы қаржыландыруға арналған ЖТН BR24993111 «Қазақ тілінің орфоэпиялық нормасы негізінде сөз синтезі жүйесін әзірлеу» атты ғылыми жоба аясында әзірленді.

A pragmatic element is added to the propositional content of a statement, reflecting the speaker's unique perspective on the world. Therefore, words that do not intrinsically express evaluation can acquire an evaluative dimension.

On the one hand, each speaker in a speech event has a certain socially determined linguistic competence. They are members of a linguistic community, for which their thoughts, concepts, and standards are obligatory. On the other hand, the individual verbal responses of native speakers vary greatly and are influenced by various sociolinguistic variables. Therefore, the same expressive requirements of different speakers may correspond to different levels of vocabulary. There is a sociolinguistic conditioning of an individual's response to a situation.

If we consider the rating scale, which ranges from "contemptuous" to "approving" and "admiring", not in static terms, where the binary nature of evaluation principles is inherent, but rather in dynamic terms, we can see that movement along the scale is not straightforward. This is complicated by the interaction between the social and individual factors, as well as the combination of standardized, stereotypical information about value systems and the subjective attitudes of individuals towards the assessed object.

When viewed dynamically, assessments related to changes in historical periods, social tastes, and worldviews are not as flexible as those of individuals, which are shaped by numerous specific factors related to the practical aspects of communication.

Several factors influence how a word is evaluated. These include the rationality of the assessment, the motivation for it, the methods used to maintain a high standard of evaluation, the need to update and strengthen the assessment, and the potential for losing evaluative significance completely.

The contextual relevance of the evaluation words and the interaction between speakers in a specific speech situation are significant factors. The grammatical function of evaluation words in a sentence and the specific intonation patterns of evaluative statements also influence how they are assessed.

Methodology and research methods.

Research design

In this paper, the research will adopt an interdisciplinary approach to methodology through which both theoretical and empirical analysis of corpora of languages will be carried out, especially examining the potential usefulness of lexicon units in terms of evaluation and emotion within the communicative context.

Data Collection

1. Corpus Selection:

Discourse forms of various kinds including literary discourse, political discourse, media discourse, and conversations between people have been included in the creation of the corpus to bring in cultural diversity in the evaluation of evaluative language within the communicative context.

2. Sampling Strategy:

Samples were purposively selected to include texts rich in evaluative and emotive language, focusing on segments where speakers explicitly or implicitly express attitudes, opinions, or emotions. Both formal and informal registers were considered to capture the full spectrum of evaluative language usage.

Analytical Framework

1. Theoretical background:

The theoretical basis for the research was formed by systemic functional linguistics [1]; appraisal theory [2]; cross-cultural pragmatics; and provided an effective platform for finding, classifying, and analyzing evaluative constructions.

2. Lexical items identification:

The lexeme with possible affective and evaluative value was identified based on lexical analysis, specifically on adjectives, nouns, verbs, and adverbs related to evaluation.

3. Analysis of syntax and semantics:

With the help of linguistic methods and manual annotation, the syntactic placement of evaluative lexemes (subject, predicate, and modifier) was investigated. Moreover, semantic prosody and collocations were analyzed.

4. Stylistic and figurative devices:

Repetitions, synonymy, metaphor, metonymy, and collocations were found and analysed from the point of view of their impact on the evaluation.

Data Analysis

- The quantitative analysis included the use of frequency counts for evaluative vocabulary, their syntactic occurrences, and co-occurrences in various text types.

- The qualitative analysis involved the analysis of the context within which the evaluative and emotive vocabulary occurred and how that affected its meaning.

- Cross-cultural comparison analyses were carried out wherever appropriate, focusing on variations in the use of evaluative language among different cultures.

Validity and Reliability

In order to test the validity of the research, several coders coded parts of the corpus of data independently, and their differences were ironed out in order to ensure inter-coder reliability.

Limitations

Some limitations that have been considered in the current research include corpus representativeness, possible subjectivity of the interpretation process, and linguistic limitations of the chosen texts.

Discussion and observation. One topic of research in the fields of linguistics, psycholinguistics, and pragmatics has been the role of emotion and evaluation in language. There has been a longstanding fascination with not only factual information being conveyed via language, but also the emotions and attitudes taken by those speaking.

Evaluative Language and Its Functional Role

The application of evaluative language with respect to the theory of appraisal has been widely studied by scholars like Martin, White [2]. According to these scholars, the process of appraisal includes three categories, which are attitude, involvement, and graduation. Evaluation, according to Martin & White, refers to the evaluation and appreciation or condemnation of the speakers depending on their attitudes. Evaluation occurs according to the social values of Martin & White.

In the same vein, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) was proposed by Halliday [1]. The importance of linguistic selection in developing interpersonal meanings is highlighted by this theory. According to Halliday, language evaluation using the language itself may be achieved through the mood and modalities system.

Emotive Dimensions and Affective Lexicon

Emotions associated with the words have been investigated in relation to affective lexicon in terms of their valence and the degree of their intensity related to particular words. Experiments carried out by Izard [3] and Ekman [4]. provide useful data about universals related to the expression and naming of emotions. There is a wide variety of words for describing emotions in various languages, which is conditioned by special attitudes and evaluations towards the emotional conditions of people.

The use of emotion words during speech communication has been analyzed in the studies by Trillo. It should be noted that the use of emotion words is rarely independent since the impact of grammar on the perception of them positively or negatively has been demonstrated in intercultural studies of emotion words carried out by Wierzbicka [5].

Lexical Choice and Pragmatic Evaluation

Pragmatic utility of evaluative language is another topic under discussion within the scope of politeness theory studies [6], which proves that evaluative language can both threaten and save one's face. For instance, utilization of evaluative language as a means to accomplish certain communication aims is considered by Lakoff, Johnson [7] and Fraser [8].

Another way to study evaluative language concerns the role of context in shaping an evaluative meaning, which is analyzed through corpus linguistics investigations [9]. Specifically,

it was discovered that one linguistic element could acquire diverse evaluative connotations depending on contextual factors.

Syntactic and Semantic Manifestations of Evaluation

Where the evaluative words appear in syntactic structures as subjects, predicates, or modifiers can be regarded as having some impact on the interpretive power of those structures. As noted by Hopper, Thompson [10] when considering issues of transitivity and voice, the placing of metaphoric and evaluative adjectives in predicates shows how the interaction between lexical semantics and syntax works.

Collocation and semantic prosody have played important roles in computational discovery of evaluative constructs in recent corpus studies such as that undertaken by Taboada et al [11].

Metaphor, Metonymy, and Evaluation

Both metaphors and metonymies act as very efficient means for the use of evaluative language, wherein the evaluation takes place through figures of speech. This issue is discussed in more detail in the theories provided by Lakoff & Johnson [7], explaining how metaphorical maps affect the way we experience our feelings. For more details on this subject, refer to the work by Kövecses [12].

The transformation of metaphors from their evaluative function into a neutral one is addressed in your paper, and this theory is provided by Charteris-Black [13].

Repetition and Synonymy in Emotional Assessment

The use of repetition and synonymy to enhance or diminish evaluative terms was analyzed by Fraser [8], who later on had his findings confirmed by Hunston, Thomson [14] using corpus analysis [10]. Repetition and synonymy serve the purpose of either enhancing evaluation to avoid a monotonous style or varying evaluation.

Context and Sociocultural Factors

Sociolinguistic features which influence the evaluation process were studied extensively by such researchers as Labov [15] and Trillo [16]. It is especially important to mention that evaluation presupposes not only linguistic selection but also specific social and cultural features of an evaluator.

Gaps in Literature

In spite of the existing literature giving us a clear idea about the application of evaluative and emotive vocabulary, there are still some areas that require attention. The first question is about the necessity of conducting more research on the use of evaluative vocabulary in various contexts, particularly spoken language [17].

In addition, recent studies indexed in Scopus over the past decade and a half have increasingly focused on corpus-based, computational, and cross-linguistic approaches to evaluative and emotive language [18]. Contemporary research in corpus linguistics and discourse analysis has demonstrated the value of large-scale digital corpora and machine-assisted methods for identifying patterns of evaluation in both spoken and written discourse [19]. Furthermore, recent developments in computational linguistics and sentiment analysis have expanded the methodological toolkit for examining evaluative meaning in natural language processing contexts [11], allowing for more fine-grained detection of stance, polarity, and intensity [20]. However, despite these advances, there remains a research gap in integrating qualitative pragmatic analysis with large-scale quantitative corpus methods, particularly in cross-cultural spoken interaction. Therefore, further investigation is required to bridge traditional linguistic theories of evaluation with modern data-driven approaches in order to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of evaluative language in real communicative settings.

Recent studies have significantly expanded the investigation of evaluative and emotive language through corpus-based and computational approaches. In particular, research on appraisal theory has moved toward large-scale corpus annotation and automatic detection of evaluative meanings. For example, Zeng et al. explored challenges in annotating evaluative language within the Appraisal Theory framework and proposed methodological solutions for improving consistency in corpus-based analyses [21]. Similarly, Trnavac and Pöldvere examined evaluative

language in fake news corpora and demonstrated that evaluative meanings vary systematically according to genre and communicative context [22]. In parallel, advances in sentiment analysis and natural language processing have enabled more sophisticated identification of evaluative stance, emotional intensity, and polarity [23]. Recent reviews highlight the growing use of machine learning, deep learning, and large language models for detecting subjective meanings in texts and discourse [24]. Furthermore, studies on dialogic emotion analysis emphasize the importance of contextual and interactional factors in interpreting emotional and evaluative expressions in communication [25]. These developments indicate a growing convergence between traditional linguistic theories of evaluation and computational approaches, creating new opportunities for interdisciplinary research on evaluative language in authentic communicative settings.

Results. To describe the patterns of speech implementation of emotionally evaluative lexical items, it is essential to refer to the context of the text. The text, along with the communication situation it represents, enables us to identify the full emotional potential of a word and establish contextual variations in the use of evaluative vocabulary. These variations occur under the influence of the communicative and pragmatic focus of the utterance.

Evaluative connotations associated with lexical items define the range of communication situations in which they are appropriate. They restrict their syntactic functions, primarily being employed in addressing and appending as predicates. This syntactic limitation has been acknowledged in linguistic literature.

Traditionally, it has been thought that the presence of emotional evaluation, which accompanies mainly the figurative meaning of a word, in LSP (language for special purposes) inhibits the referential capabilities of a lexical unit.

N.D.Arutyunova observes that "identification and evaluation are founded on fundamentally different principles" [26, 54]. Evaluation can only be employed when the identification of an object has been accomplished through other means:

«Гриньку очень любили как-нибудь называть: «земледав», «быча», «телеграф», «морда»... (В. Шукшин)

Если необходимо одновременно и идентифицировать предмет, и эксплицировать мотив или основания оценки, то определенная дескрипция принимает на себя только первую – идентифицирующую функцию.

It is assumed by the use of demonstrative pronouns and definite articles:

«У Колумба опять грязные ноги! Что мне делать с этим ирландцем? (Е. Евтушенко). In this situation, the "Irishman" uses a derogatory term to describe the Irish people in English-speaking countries negatively.

In a general sense, the preliminary information may function as a substitute for the article or a demonstrative pronoun: *"Подлец и изверг рода человеческого оказался скромным белоглавым парнем"...* The use of an evaluative noun as the subject of a sentence is only appropriate after it has been previously used in the predicative position, where both its substantive and logical meanings are fully realized: *"Он, Васек, полупанк..." (Е. Евтушенко)* The use of a specific word or phrase within a given context can significantly impact our assessment of a particular matter: *"Ну, может, заходил к кому, скважина?" (В. Шукшин)*

«И вам, кровавая мелочь, хеопсы-провинциалы, которые лезли по трунам, лишь бы им быть наверху, сомосы и пиночеты, банановые генералы...» (Е. Евтушенко).

The pattern of using evaluative language in specific syntactic structures, such as predicates rather than subjects, is not absolute. Rather, we can only speak of a higher likelihood of this usage. Therefore, while acknowledging the predominant predicative usage of metaphors, which arise from secondary nomination in the formation of evaluative terms, it should also be noted that in the future, as these metaphors lose their evaluative significance, they will be able to function freely in any syntactical position occupied by these words.

Metaphorical meaning typically has a specific referential relationship to a single entity or group of entities known to the participants in a conversation. Metaphorical evaluative expressions are characterized by their prevalent use as subjects and modifiers: *"Вставай,*

шляпа!“. Metonymies, similar to metaphors, lack a clear preference for a specific syntactic position and are not utilized in the same manner as evaluative terms. When employed as the subject of a statement, an evaluative term can determine the subsequent content of the statement (the semantic connection between the predicate and expressed assessment), in which case, the description remains separate: *“Простофиля, глупец, он и не соображает, в какую историю его втянули...”*

If evaluative nouns are used in general statements without actualizing words (definite articles and demonstrative pronouns), they take on a generic meaning: *“Спекулянт – явление в наше время увы! не редкое...”*

Of the identifying features that are used to strengthen the evaluative meaning of a word in a subject position, demonstrative pronouns are the most efficient. If the individual being referred to is known to both the speaker and listener, and particularly if they are present, a specific article with a lower degree of definiteness is sufficient to identify the name compared to a pronoun. This is not true for Russian, which aids in preserving expressiveness:

«Но разве можно быть такой кислятиной?» (А. Чехов).

«А я не поехал, здесь просидел с этой стерлядью ... с чертовкой этой.» (А. Чехов)

«Наш идол предложил мне кольцевую рекогносцировочную партию...» (О. Кузавев)

Compare to English:

“There!” Willie roared. “There!” and he waved his right hand, the clutching the manuscript of his speech. “There is the Judas Iscariot, the lickspittle, the nose-wiper!... Look at him, Joe Harrison’s dummy!” (R.P. Warren)

“Oh, they told him and that hick swallowed it.” (ibid.)

One of the factors that contributes to the expressiveness of a text when using emotionally evaluative vocabulary is the use of repetitive naming. Expressiveness can be enhanced both through the repetitive use of identical names within the same text and through varied substitutions, primarily synonyms.

The emotional intensity of a communicative situation, within the context of an evaluative naming, generates the repetition of means and the formation of emotional assessment through the creation of contextual synonyms (different designations):

– Бессеменов: *«Что – может быть? Федька Досекин, слесарного цеха старшина, в головы метит... Мальчишка! Щенок! (М. Горький); «Золоторотцами будут, ...жуликами...» (там же).*

– Нил: *«В одном не вижу ничего приятного – в том, что мною и другими честными людьми командуют свиньи, дураки, воры...» «Он порча, он чума, он язва здешних мест!» (И.А. Крылов).*

“You pig”, she said. You low, rotten pimp. You murdering little- ‘she glared at me- ‘poince. Are you happy now, you bastard? Got rid of her nicely, didn’t you?” (J. Braine)

“Well, you are the goat,” she said. “You are the sacrificial goat. You are the ram in the bushes. You are the sap. For you let ‘em...” (R.P. Warren)

Various designations can be used in different contexts with different connotations. If multiple synonyms can be used to name something, the last one will take on its connotation based on the specific context. Various terms can also be used to assess the subject matter:

«Вот теперь я, например, – что такое? Босьяк, галах, пьяница и тронутый человек. Жизнь у меня без всякого оправдания...» (М. Горький),

In the strict sense of the term, the selected words are not exact synonyms, but rather members of a related semantic group. The evaluative impact increases when three or more evaluative units are used in conjunction.

Furthermore, apart from enhancing the individual evaluative capacity of lexical units through contextual synonymity, there are considerable opportunities in “smaller” syntactical units - primarily adjectival phrases that contain emotional and evaluative elements [6, 33]. The combination of emotionally powerful sememes within adjectives doubles and augments the evaluative significance inherent in the noun they modify:

“meddlesome hag”, “brainless ass”, “miserable Wap”, “dirty swine”.

Compare to Russian: *“подлые интриги”, “махровый реакционер”, “жалкий сброд”, “бандитское отребье”, “безмозглый осел”, “наглый хам” and etc.*

The exact opposite effect of emotional evaluation is created by transposition, in which the definition and the noun have opposite meanings. For example, "smart beast" and "bold bastard" are both rude compliments, but a strong negative connotation often prevents people from positively using them. Other examples include "glory scum" and "high-ranking scoundrels".

Another way in which evaluative potential can be strengthened is through the loosening of the usual norms for collocation, where phrases are intentionally detached from extra-linguistic reality:

"There is no mystery there. Jesse Crain is a simple, charming, home-made megalomaniac." (I. Shaw)
In addition to actual intensifiers and de-intensifiers of evaluation in speech, the operation of these elements is affected by several general characteristics of speech behaviour. Specifically, it is affected by the principles governing the development of evaluative reasoning. Naturally, one of the prerequisites for the presence of these elements in speech is the presence of a presupposition in prior statements:

– А, Максим... и котомка с ним! – скаламбурил Коновалов, увидав меня. – Ну-ка, книжник и фарисей, – тянни! (М. Горький).

The arguments of «книжник» and «фарисей» are discussed within the context of: ...»Я несколько раз читал ему «Бунт Стеньки Разина», «Тараса Бульбу» и «Бедных людей»... "Я с Коноваловым о многом переговаривал и много прочитал..."

After the presentation of an argument, it may be present in a text in various ways: within a single sentence, as part of a phrase, as a larger super-phrase unit, in a paragraph, or even as the entire body of text.

Влас: Погоди, сестра, – это я скажу... я знаю: вы – ряженые! Пока я жив, я буду всегда срывать с вас лохмотья, которыми вы прикрываете вашу ложь... вашу пошлость... нищету ваших чувств и разврат мыслей! (М. Горький)

Калерия: (взволнованно) Да, да! Вы тысячу раз правы... Это еще зверь, варвар! Его сознательное желание одно – быть сытым.

Шалимов: И носить сапога со скрипом.

In speech, evaluative language can be interspersed with arguments, particularly under conditions of time constraints, speed of delivery, and emotional tension:

– Да-ведь Трамб подлец! Это такой негодяй... такой бессовестный человек! Без всяких принципов! Урод нравственный! «Был у графа управляющим – нажился, теперь служит на железной дороге и ворует... Сестру ограбил... Негодяй и вор, одним словом. (А. Чехов)

...»you are the ram in the bushes. You are a sap. For you let 'em. You didn't get anything out of it. They'd have paid you to take the rap, but they didn't have to pay a sap like you. (Warren)

As previously mentioned, the justification for an assessment can go beyond a simple evaluative statement. In these cases, the main focus should be on the context, vertical context, and socio-cultural background in which the utterance takes place:

"Only mass action can stay the hand of butcher Reagan and stop his drive to war." (MS April)

Quasi-evaluative and undocumented statements provide a comic element to the text, while simultaneously reducing the practical effectiveness of the evaluation:

Это не народ, а какие-то химики свинячие, – пробормотал он, все еще думая о кухонном населении. (А. Чехов)

The impact of the categorical and accurate nature of assessment is also masked by unrealistic ratings, which arise from the inaccurate and illiterate use of terms, and a purely subjective interpretation of the evaluative capacity of a word:

– У-у-у... иезуит, магомет, мучитель мой! – замахнулась она на сына. (А. Чехов)

The limited vocabulary that a speaker may use when expressing their opinion can lead to contradictory statements:

– Эх, жизнь! Каторга ты великолепная! – шептал Гришка, не будучи в состоянии высказать то, что с болью чувствовал.» (М. Горький)

«... описывая плавные дуги, он съехал на лед Китама и завершил все это длинной сверхпихонской дугой на слитых воедино лыжах.

– Гвадалквивир! Силен! – с неприкрытым восхищением сказал Валька Карзубин. (О. Куваев)

In addition to the inappropriate choice of evaluation vocabulary, the severity of the assessment (as well as its practical impact) can be mitigated to some extent through the use of introductory phrases that underscore the subjective nature of the evaluation, such as “In my opinion”, “I believe”, “It appears to me that”, “Don’t you agree that” and “From my perspective, this is”. Similarly, understating the assessment can have a similar effect:

Калерия. Надо иметь мужество молчать...

Ольга Алексеевна. (Басову) Как она стала говорить, смело,... резко!

Басов. Да, заговорила Валаамова... (не кончив слова, испуганно закрывает себе рот рукой). (М. Горький) The unfinished sentence contains a fragment of the pejorative phrase “Valaam’s ass” (bookish). This phrase originates from the Biblical story of the ass of the Magi Valaam, who suddenly protested in human language against being beaten.

A decrease in the evaluative potential may also occur when there is an insufficiently strict selection of words. The negative connotations of one of the lexical units may violate the evaluation agreement expressed by the predicate.

Such a decrease in evaluative potential occurs due to careless use of words, and this can occur in situations where the words used carry negative connotations and, consequently, violate the agreement that exists due to the use of predicates in the sentence. This can be explained by an example like the one below: “The cutting-edge production of this ballet is a masterpiece of 20th-century choreography.” In this case, the term “cutting-edge” may evoke ironic associations, which means that the evaluative impact of the proposal will be negative, since it will not express the intended meaning.

Additionally, there exist some techniques which can weaken the evaluating potential of a statement to such an extent that, finally, the speaker may face the total absence of any evaluative effect. It should be noted that in such cases, there is a lack of evaluative potential of words, especially when the speaker expects to receive a positive estimation of his/her utterance, but receives its negative counterpart instead. In other words, the statement is pragmatically inverted and causes a negative pragmatic effect on the audience. Thus, some problems occur with creating proper statements.

Speaking about the evaluative potential of words in connection with specific speech acts, it is necessary to consider the socio-psychological peculiarities of people in communication as well as specific rules of evaluative behaviour. Evaluating third parties during conversation, the speaker must take into consideration the character of his/her relations with the addressee as well as the social status of all participants in the communicative process.

There are various strategies which can be utilized to handle potentially negative evaluations. This strategy proves particularly effective if the person under evaluation is expected to suffer not only from the evaluation itself, but also from its negative impact on another person who does not participate in the conversation personally. One of the possible ways to reduce the effect of an evaluation is to emphasize its subjective nature and, hence, to demonstrate to the listeners that what they hear is not an evaluation itself, but merely one’s point of view on the issue.

Additionally, the interaction of words which are used in the process of evaluation can result in an absolutely new interpretation of the same concept. Moreover, it should be mentioned that certain words which have an unchangeable emotional meaning according to the dictionary cannot be considered full linguistic units unless used together with other words. The emotional significance of such words is achieved through their combination with other words.

Conclusion. This study reveals the complexity of emotive and evaluative elements in lexemes used in communicative practice. It emphasizes that evaluation does not constitute an isolated feature of speech but is rather an essential component of any kind of communication reflecting attitudes and social or cultural peculiarities of speakers. In its turn, the dynamic combination of lexical choice, syntactical positioning of words and figurative language (metaphors, metonymies etc.) considerably affects the process of forming evaluative meanings.

Evaluation in lexical meaning occurs on various linguistic layers, ranging from lexical meaning to the pragmatic function of the expression. Thus, in addition to the transmission of factual information, evaluative language expresses certain emotions, attitudes and social opinions. The application of evaluative vocabulary depends on numerous social and linguistic criteria (situations, interlocutors' socio-cultural background and linguistic characteristics of expressions). Figurative language and stylistic devices, like e.g., repetition, synonymy and collocations, strengthen the meaning and colouration of evaluative expressions and thus enhance the evaluative power of vocabulary.

One should also note that evaluative language possesses high flexibility and is context dependent, thus making use of evaluative lexis in order to convince people, make an impact on them, be polite to others and criticize those who deserve that.

Nevertheless, in spite of all these studies which have been made in this direction up till now, some areas can be explored further. Firstly, one should pay special attention to spoken language since there that the process of evaluation and manifestation of emotions takes place spontaneously. Secondly, cross-cultural studies can play a key role since it is vital to know how evaluative language operates in different environments.

Thus, summing up the above-mentioned, it should be said that emotive and evaluative properties of lexical items are very important components of language because they allow to shape human perception of reality and evaluate events properly.

Literature

1. Halliday M.A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. – London: Edward Arnold, 1985. – 387 p.
2. Martin J.R., White, P. R. R. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. –London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 278 p.
3. Izard C.E. *Human Emotions*. – New York: Springer, 1977. – 496 p.
4. Ekman P. An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1992. – P. 169-200.
5. Wierzbicka A. *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. –Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. – 349 p.
6. Brown P., Levinson S.C. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 345 p.
7. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.
8. Fraser B. Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1990. – №14(2), – P. 155-176.
9. Baker P. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. – London: Continuum, 2006. – 194 p.
10. Hopper P.J., Thompson S.A. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language*, 1980. – №56(2). – P. 251-299.
11. Taboada M. Sentiment analysis: An overview from linguistics. *Annual Review of Linguistics*. 2016. – №2. – P. 325-347.
12. Kövecses Z. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 223 p.
13. Charteris-Black J. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. – 257 p.
14. Hunston S., Thompson, G. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. – 271 p.
15. Labov W. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. – Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966. – 655 p.
16. Trillo A. The pragmatics of evaluative language: An intercultural comparison. *Language & Culture*. – 2014. – №4(2), 123-139.
17. Bednarek M. *Corpus-assisted discourse studies. The Cambridge handbook of English corpus linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. 2015. – P. 204-224.

18. Hunston S. Corpus approaches to evaluation: Phraseology and evaluative language. Routledge. 2017. – 218 p.
19. Biber D., Egbert, J. Register variation online. Cambridge University Press. 2018. – 326 p.
20. Liu B. Sentiment analysis: Mining opinions, sentiments, and emotions. Cambridge University Press. 2020. – 493 p.
21. Zeng J., Dong, M., & Fang, A. C. Annotating Evaluative Language: Challenges and Solutions in Applying Appraisal Theory. Proceedings of the 20th Joint ACL-ISO Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation. – 2024. – P. 144-151.
22. Trnavac R., & Pöldvere, N. Investigating Appraisal and the Language of Evaluation in Fake News Corpora. Corpus Pragmatics. – 2024. – №8(2). – P. 107-130.
23. Jim J. R., Talukder, M. A. R., et al. Recent Advancements and Challenges of NLP-Based Sentiment Analysis: A State-of-the-Art Review. Natural Language Processing Journal. – 2024. – P. 6-10.
24. Zhang W., Deng, Y., Liu, B., Pan, S. J., & Bing, L. Sentiment Analysis in the Era of Large Language Models: A Reality Check. – 2023.
25. Gan C., Zheng, J., Zhu, Q., Cao, Y., & Zhu, Y. A Survey of Dialogic Emotion Analysis: Developments, Approaches and Perspectives. Pattern Recognition. – 2024. – P. 156-159.
26. Arutyunova N.D. Fundamentals of the theory of evaluation in language. – M.: Nauka. 2024. 1962. –198 p.

Р.Ж. САУРБАЕВ

Торайғыров университеті, Павлодар, Қазақстан

Д.М. ПАШАН

А. Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Тіл білімі институты, Алматы, Қазақстан

КОММУНИКАЦИЯ КОНТЕКСТІНДЕ ЛЕКСИКАЛЫҚ ҚОЛДАНЫСТАҒЫ ЭМОЦИЯЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ БАҒАЛАУ ӨЛШЕМДЕРІНІҢ КӨРІНІСІ

Аңдатпа. Мақалада адам коммуникациясындағы лексемалардың эмоциялық және бағалау қырларының күрделілігі талданады. Зерттеу нысаны – коммуникативтік үдерістергі бағалау тілі. Зерттеу мәселесі бағалау мағыналарының қалыптасу және қызмет ету ерекшеліктерін, сондай-ақ олардың эмоцияны білдіру мен прагматикалық функцияларды жүзеге асырудағы рөлін анықтаумен байланысты. Бағалау тілінің функциялары тек эмоцияны жеткізу құралы ретінде ғана емес, сонымен қатар коммуникацияның прагматикалық қызметтерінің құрамдас бөлігі ретінде қарастырылады. Бағалау тілі сөйлеушілердің пікірлерінің, сондай-ақ олардың коммуникативтік мінез-құлқындағы мәдениет, нормалар мен конвенциялардың көрсеткіші ретінде сипатталады. Зерттеуде тілдегі бағалау үдерісінің күрделі екендігі атап өтіледі, өйткені ол түрлі әлеуметтік лингвистикалық және қоршаған орта факторларымен қатар, тілдің семантикалық және синтаксистік деңгейлерімен де байланысты. Бағалау теориясы (appraisal), жүйелі-функционалдық лингвистика және кросс-мәдени тәсілге сүйене отырып, мақалада бағалау сөздерінің қолданылу және стильдік тұрғыдан қалай эмоциялық мәнге ие болатыны түсіндіріледі. Зерттеу әдістері ретінде бағалау лексемаларының семантикалық және прагматикалық талдауы, сондай-ақ олардың коммуникативтік контекстегі синтаксистік қызметін қарастыру қолданылады. Эмоцияны білдіретін сөздер мен аффективті лексика қабылдау үдерісіне және әлеуметтік бағалауға, сондай-ақ коммуникация актілеріндегі бағалаудың синтаксистік және семантикалық көріністеріне әсер ететіні көрсетіледі. Мақалада бағалау үдерісіне әсер ететін факторлар ретінде әлеуметтік лингвистика, мәдениет және тілдің рөлі қарастырылады, сондай-ақ сөйлеушілердің бағалау қарқындылығын күшейту, бәсеңдету және синонимия арқылы қалай реттейтіні талданады. Сонымен қатар, бағалау тілінің қолданылуында айтарлықтай вариативтілік пен контекстік тәуелділік бар екендігі атап өтіледі: сөйлеушілер оны сендіру, сын айту, сыпайылық және басқа да әлеуметтік бағалау мақсаттарында саналы түрде пайдалана алады. Болашақ зерттеулердің бағыттары ретінде ауызша сөйлеудегі және кросс-мәдени тұрғыдағы бағалау тілін зерттеу ұсынылады.

Зерттеу нәтижелері лексикалық семантикадағы эмоциялық және бағалау мағыналарының маңыздылығын және олардың адам коммуникациясындағы негізгі рөлін көрсетеді. Сонымен қатар, тіл, мәдениет және бағалау арасындағы өзара байланысты тереңірек түсінуге үлес қосады және болашақ зерттеулер үшін ауызша дискурс пен кросс-мәдени контекстегі бағалау тілін зерттеуді ұсынады.

Түйін сөздер: бағалау тілі, эмоциялық өлшемдер, лексикалық семантика, кросс-мәдени прагматика, бейнелі тіл, метафоралар, коллокациялар, коммуникация.

Р.Ж. САУРБАЕВ

Торайгыров университет, Павлодар, Казахстан

Д.М. ПАШАН

Институт языкознания имени А. Байтурсынулы, Алматы, Казахстан

ПРОЯВЛЕНИЕ ЭМОТИВНЫХ И ОЦЕНОЧНЫХ АСПЕКТОВ В ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОМ УПОТРЕБЛЕНИИ В КОНТЕКСТЕ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

Аннотация. В данной статье предпринимается попытка проанализировать сложность, связанную с эмотивными и оценочными аспектами лексем в человеческой коммуникации. Объектом исследования является оценочная лексика в коммуникативном процессе. Проблема исследования заключается в определении особенностей формирования и функционирования оценочных значений, а также их роли в выражении эмоций и реализации прагматических функций языка. Рассматриваются функции оценочного языка не только как средства передачи эмоций, но и как элемента прагматических функций общения. Оценочная лексика определяется как показатель мнений говорящих, а также культуры, норм и конвенций, присутствующих в их коммуникативном поведении. В работе признаётся сложный характер процесса оценки в языке, который обусловлен различными социолингвистическими и внешними факторами, а также включает семантические и синтаксические механизмы. С опорой на теорию оценивания (appraisal), системно-функциональную лингвистику и кросс-культурный подход в статье предпринимается попытка объяснить, каким образом оценочные слова приобретают эмотивное значение в процессе употребления и с точки зрения стилистики. В качестве методов исследования используются семантический и прагматический анализ оценочных лексем, а также анализ их синтаксического функционирования в коммуникативных контекстах. Показано, что слова, обозначающие эмоции, и аффективная лексика влияют на процессы восприятия и социального оценивания, а также на синтаксические и семантические особенности выражения оценки в коммуникативных актах. В статье рассматривается роль социолингвистики, культуры и языка как факторов, влияющих на процесс оценивания, а также способы, с помощью которых говорящие регулируют интенсивность оценки посредством усиления, смягчения и синонимии. Также подчёркивается вариативность и контекстуальная обусловленность использования оценочной лексики: говорящие могут сознательно манипулировать ею в целях убеждения, критики, вежливости и других форм социальной оценки. В числе перспектив дальнейших исследований обозначено изучение оценочной лексики в устной речи и в кросс-культурном аспекте. Полученные результаты подчеркивают значимость эмоциональных и оценочных значений в лексической семантике и их ключевую роль в процессах человеческой коммуникации. Исследование способствует более глубокому пониманию взаимосвязи языка, культуры и оценки, а также намечает перспективы дальнейших исследований, включая анализ оценочного языка в устной речи и кросс-культурном аспекте.

Ключевые слова: оценочная лексика, эмотивные аспекты, лексическая семантика, кросс-культурная прагматика, образный язык, метафоры, коллокации, коммуникация.

References

1. Halliday M.A. K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. – London: Edward Arnold, 1985. – 387 p.
2. Martin J.R., White, P. R. R. The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English. –London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 278 p.
3. Izard C.E. Human Emotions. – New York: Springer, 1977. – 496 p.
4. Ekman P. An argument for basic emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 1992. – P. 169-200.
5. Wierzbicka A. Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals. –Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. – 349 p.
6. Brown P., Levinson S.C. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 345 p.
7. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.
8. Fraser B. Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1990. – №14(2), – P. 155-176.
9. Baker P. Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis. – London: Continuum, 2006. – 194 p.
10. Hopper P.J., Thompson S.A. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language*, 1980. – №56(2). – P. 251-299.
11. Taboada M. Sentiment analysis: An overview from linguistics. *Annual Review of Linguistics*. 2016. – №2. – P. 325-347.
12. Kövecses Z. Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 223 p.
13. Charteris-Black J. Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. – 257 p.
14. Hunston S., Thompson, G. Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. – 271 p.
15. Labov W. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. – Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966. – 655 p.
16. Trillo A. The pragmatics of evaluative language: An intercultural comparison. *Language & Culture*. – 2014. – №4(2), 123-139.
17. Bednarek M. Corpus-assisted discourse studies. *The Cambridge handbook of English corpus linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. 2015. – P. 204-224.
18. Hunston S. Corpus approaches to evaluation: Phraseology and evaluative language. Routledge. 2017. – 218 p.
19. Biber D., Egbert, J. Register variation online. Cambridge University Press. 2018. – 326 p.
20. Liu B. Sentiment analysis: Mining opinions, sentiments, and emotions. Cambridge University Press. 2020. – 493 p.
21. Zeng J., Dong, M., & Fang, A. C. Annotating Evaluative Language: Challenges and Solutions in Applying Appraisal Theory. *Proceedings of the 20th Joint ACL-ISO Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation*. – 2024. – P. 144-151.
22. Trnavac R., & Pöldvere, N. Investigating Appraisal and the Language of Evaluation in Fake News Corpora. *Corpus Pragmatics*. – 2024. – №8(2). – P. 107-130.
23. Jim J. R., Talukder, M. A. R., et al. Recent Advancements and Challenges of NLP-Based Sentiment Analysis: A State-of-the-Art Review. *Natural Language Processing Journal*. – 2024. – P. 6-10.
24. Zhang W., Deng, Y., Liu, B., Pan, S. J., & Bing, L. Sentiment Analysis in the Era of Large Language Models: A Reality Check. – 2023.
25. Gan C., Zheng, J., Zhu, Q., Cao, Y., & Zhu, Y. A Survey of Dialogic Emotion Analysis: Developments, Approaches and Perspectives. *Pattern Recognition*. – 2024. – P. 156-159.
26. Arutyunova N.D. Fundamentals of the theory of evaluation in language. – M.: Nauka. 2024. 1962. –198 p.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Саурбаев Ришат Журкенович – филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, Торайғыров университетінің профессоры, Павлодар, Қазақстан.

Саурбаев Ришат Журкенович – кандидат филологических наук, профессор Торайгыровского университета, Павлодар, Казахстан

Saubayev Rishat Zhurkenovich – Candidate of Philological sciences, Professor of Toraigyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan

Пашан Дана Мұсабекқызы – филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, А.Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Тіл білімі институтының ғылыми қызметкері, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Пашан Дана Мусабеккызы – кандидат филологических наук, ассоциированный профессор, научный сотрудник Института языкознания имени А.Байтурсынулы, Алматы, Казахстан.

Pashan Dana Musabekqyzy – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Researcher A.Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics, Almaty, Kazakhstan.