

**PRAGMATIC FILTERS SHAPING A COGNITIVE EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT
INTO AN EVALUATIVE UTTERANCE
(ON THE SAMPLES FROM ENGLISH LITERARY DISCOURSE)**

The article focuses on the pragmatic peculiarities of the formation of an evaluative cognitive judgment and its transformation into an evaluative communicative utterance. The material under analysis is represented by speech episodes taken from English literary discourse in which the characters express positive evaluation of certain objects. Literary discourse as a product of the author's cognitive and speech-productive activity necessarily implies the author's attitude: modality and evaluation. Both are manifested in all discourse segments, including reproduced dialogue. The dialogic speech of the fiction is seen as an imitation of oral conversation and is largely regulated by its formation and functional principles. Speech authenticity in fiction is achieved by imitating the main characteristics of oral speech: emotionality, spontaneity, its situational and contact-oriented character, etc. Evaluation expressed by literary discourse characters is always connected with peculiar connotations allowing the author to express his attitude to a certain object, and evaluation manifestation in a word is accompanied by an extension and deepening of a semantic meaning. A speaker's evaluative utterance does not necessarily equal his or her evaluative judgment as to its intensity and the plus-minus character. The article offers a number of variants of the correlation between an evaluative judgment and an evaluative utterance. Being shaped into an utterance, a mental judgment goes through pragmatic filters. The pragmatic filters that determine the transformation of an evaluative judgment into an evaluative utterance have been identified as the following: sticking to the speech etiquette and rituals, following "face-saving" tactics, mitigating refusal of criticism, manipulating the addressee. It has been found out that communicants tend to use evaluative utterances as a means of certain communicative tactics, such as "face-saving" tactics used to skirt a topic, as well as mitigation tactics, used to mitigate refusal or criticism. Thus, instead of expressing some negative evaluation, a communicant may opt to keep silent, or soften a negative evaluative statement, or even express an opposite positive evaluative statement. Genuine evaluative judgments become explicit to the reader of a literary discourse from the author's description of the characters' non-verbal behaviour and their thoughts.

Key words: evaluation, evaluative judgment, evaluative utterance, literary discourse, communicative tactics..

Бігунова Н. О. Прагматичні фільтри, що перетворюють когнітивне оцінне судження в оцінне висловлювання (на матеріалі англійського літературного дискурсу). Стаття спрямована на визначення прагматичних особливостей формування когнітивного оцінного судження та його перетворення в оцінне комунікативне висловлювання. Встановлено прагматичні фільтри, що визначають трансформацію оцінного судження в оцінне висловлювання: дотримання мовленнєвого етикету й ритуалів, використання тактики «збереження обличчя», пом'якшення відмови або критики, маніпулювання адресатом. Встановлено, що комуніканти схильні використовувати оцінні висловлювання як засоби реалізації певних комунікативних тактик, таких як тактика «збереження обличчя», яка дозволяє комунікантові уникнути небажаної теми, а також тактика мітгації, яку використовують для пом'якшення відмови або критики. Таким чином, замість вираження негативної оцінки комунікант швидше промовчить або пом'якшить негативне оцінне висловлювання або висловить протилежне позитивно-оцінне висловлювання. Читач літературного дискурсу дізнається про правдиві оцінні судження персонажу з авторського опису його невербальної поведінки і думок.

Ключові слова: оцінка, оцінне судження, оцінне висловлювання, літературний дискурс, комунікативна тактика.

As A. Prihodko wittily remarks, evaluation is realized by subject's consciousness in the perception and processing of information about the outside world and relates to internal (linguistic) world of man, reflecting his "view of the world". The essence of the category of evaluation is explained by the theory of value orientation of person's activity and consciousness, and the range of its characteristics embraces all that is given by the physical and mental nature of man, his being and feeling. Evaluation is as a kind of cognitive activity, as any cognitive act expresses the attitude of the speaker to the object described, that is contains an act of evaluation [Prihodko 2018, p. 64].

The **aim** of this study is to identify the pragmatic filters that determine evaluative speech production in English literary discourse.

The **object** of the research is the episodes of modern English literary discourse in which personages express positive evaluation.

The **subject** of the study is the correlation between an evaluative cognitive operation and an evaluative utterance in modern English Literary Discourse.

Any discourse, including literary, incorporates the textual area proper (verbal) and the supertextual area (i.e. implicit hints, connotations, evaluation), which can be revealed in the course

of the secondary cognition, i.e. in the course of the reader's or researcher's analysis of the author's conception [Буров 2001, p. 5].

Literary discourse as a product of the author's cognitive and speech-productive activity necessarily implies the author's attitude: modality and evaluation. Both are manifested in all discourse segments, including reproduced dialogue.

The dialogic speech of the fiction and drama is seen as an imitation of oral conversation and is largely regulated by its formation and functional principles. Speech authenticity in fiction is achieved by imitating the main characteristics of oral speech: emotionality, spontaneity, its situational and contact-oriented character, etc. [Кухаренко 2018].

Evaluation expressed by literary discourse characters is always connected with peculiar connotations allowing the author to express his attitude to a certain object, and evaluation manifestation in a word is accompanied by an extension and deepening of a semantic meaning.

It goes without saying that a crucial aspect of evaluative utterance production is its motivation. The very fact of evaluation presumes that the object of evaluation has become the focus of attention for a certain person. However, there sometimes occur communicative situations, in which the addresser's evaluation (predominantly, positive evaluation) is forced by the addressee. It happens when a person is asked to produce an evaluative utterance: people can ask what they look like, or how a person likes the food they have cooked or the things they have done – thus, an evaluative utterance is caused by the communicative situation. In such a case it is not the speaker's genuine purpose to express evaluation: he or she is forced to instantly assess the interlocutor's strong points to sound realistic. Thus, the recognized necessity of a positive evaluative utterance may precede the evaluative cognitive process.

The expression of evaluation is also determined by the communicative rituals: when a person receives a present, or is shown another person's house, or treated to dinner, the question arises: which goes first: the evaluative judgment formed in one's mind or the realized necessity of producing a positive evaluative utterance, demanded by the communicative situation? Probably the second option: the realized necessity of producing a positive evaluative utterance. The communicant has to produce positive evaluation, and the object of a required positive evaluation is obvious.

Moreover, it must be taken into account that positive evaluation often allows the addresser to skirt a topic, to soften refusal or criticism, thus serving as a tactics realizing certain communicative strategies. In such circumstances, the realized necessity of producing an evaluative utterance also comes first.

On the other hand, in real life communication not every evaluative judgment, formed in a person's mind, becomes transformed into an utterance. Moreover, if a person has opted for voicing his or her evaluation of a certain object, the evaluative utterance he/she produces will not necessarily equal his or her evaluative judgment as to its intensity and the plus-minus character. I have suggested the following variants of the correlation between an evaluative judgment (EJ) and an evaluative utterance (EU):

1. EJ = EU in terms both of "+ / -" character and the degree of intensity;
2. EJ \neq EU in terms of their "+ / -" character (EJ is negatively coloured ("- " icon), while EU is positively coloured ("+" icon), or vice versa);
3. EJ \neq EU as to the degree of intensity (EJ is a rational positive evaluation, EU is an exaggerated emotional evaluation);
4. EJ \rightarrow no EU;
5. no EJ \rightarrow EU as a ritual communicative act [Bigunova 2019, p.8].

Moreover, the meaning of an utterance, presupposed by a speaker, may be misinterpreted by an addressee. Thus, it is worth taking into consideration how the recipient of a positive evaluation takes the evaluative utterance – as sincere / insincere, relevant / irrelevant, etc.

Our own observations point to the fact that not every evaluation formed in a person's mind becomes transformed into an adequate utterance. Etiquette regulations prevent a communicant from

expressing his/her negative evaluation: a communicant may keep silent or express a diluted negative evaluative statement, or they may opt to express a counter positive evaluative statement. A positive evaluation does not usually get verbally or non-verbally explicit if the evaluation subject is jealous of the evaluation object or angry at them, or follows some peculiar pragmatic guidelines.

Consequently, being shaped into an utterance, a mental judgment goes through pragmatic filters. At this stage, the sincerity / insincerity factor becomes foregrounded, as well as the degree of evaluation intensity.

As it has been said, evaluation as a cognitive operation is based on a cognitive judgment, but is not necessarily transformed into an evaluative utterance. In real life communication, one communicant may be oblivious to the genuine evaluative attitude of another communicant. On the contrary, in reproduced discourse, the situation is different. The subject of an evaluative judgment may not voice it to his/her interlocutor, but the reader becomes informed about the former's attitude from other resources: from the author's comment and the character's inner speech.

Genuine evaluative judgments become explicit to the reader of a literary discourse from the author's description of the characters' non-verbal behaviour and their thoughts. For instance, in the following episode Fiona approves of Penelope's figure in her inner speech but does not voice it. The reader knows from the context that she is jealous of Penelope:

Penelope appeared from behind a screen. She was stark naked.

Definitely a 38D cup, thought Fiona. ***What a figure!*** [Beaton 2009, p. 75].

A positive evaluative utterance can get hyperbolic, especially if the communicant is involved in a speech ritual. Positive evaluation can serve as a communicative tactic, used by speakers to meet their own (but, in fact, designed by the author) aims. Here is an illustration of exaggerated positive evaluation, which is quite appropriate and acceptable in every day communicative rituals, such as tasting the food someone has cooked:

It's delicious! It's the most delicious curry I've ever tasted [Kinsella 2000, p. 106].

It is noteworthy that there are certain pragmatic filters that do not allow communicants to express their negative evaluation. Those are etiquette regulations, certain pragmatic intentions of the communicants, such as such as a wish to save "one's face". Thus, instead of expressing some negative evaluation, a communicant may opt to keep silent, or soften a negative evaluative statement, or even express an opposite evaluative statement. The mismatching of an evaluative judgment and an evaluative utterance is illustrated in the following episode, featuring Emma who is sitting next to her husband in his car. She is immersed in the thoughts about her lover who has suddenly disappeared. She is in despair but when asked about her state of mind says she is OK:

Alex's hand moved to her knee and she jumped. "You OK, Em?"

How many more times was he going to ask? "Yes. Yes, I'm fine" [Highmore 2009, p. 130].

As well as in real life communication, literary discourse often contains situations, where characters are forced to express evaluation. It especially refers to compliments. For example, Agatha has to assure Eileen (*with true Highland politeness*) that her hair looks good, though in fact it is not:

Then Eileen broke off singing and asked suddenly, "What do you think of my hair?"

"Very nice," said Ailsa *with true Highland politeness.*

"I hate it, hate it," said Eileen passionately. *"I hate being dumpy, and I hate having grey hair"* [Beaton 2009, p. 75].

In certain circumstances, communicants use evaluative utterances as a means of certain communicative tactics, such as "face-saving" tactics as skirting a topic, which is harmful to their "faces", or a means of mitigation tactics, used to mitigate refusal or criticism, thus saving the interlocutor's "face".

To illustrate a realized necessity of producing an evaluative utterance in order to skirt a topic, here is an episode depicting the protagonist's complimenting on her friend's looks because she dislikes the turn the conversation is taking:

"Can I read it?" And to my horror she starts coming towards me.

“No!” I exclaim. “I mean – it’s a work in progress. It’s ... sensitive material.” Hastily I close the document and stand up. “**You look really great, Suze. Fantastic!**” [Kinsella 2001, p. 95].

The next episode serves as an illustration of using a positive evaluative utterance to mitigate refusal:

“So, are you staying tonight? I have an extra bed in my room. You’re welcome to it.”

Lee shook her head quickly. “**Oh, I’d love to, Liza, but I’ve got to catch the last train**” [Cohen 2010, p. 37].

Thus, a character of literary discourse and film discourse can hide their evaluative judgment and fail to express it out loud, they might express it in a distorted, exaggerated, or embellished way. Nevertheless, the reader or the viewer becomes informed about the real state of affairs from the given implications and background situation as well as from the author's comment and the characters' inner speech (in literary discourse), or the characters' non-verbal behaviour (in film discourse).

Here is an example to illustrate the latter case: Merrion is furious with her boyfriend Guy for the previous night but she is well-bred and keen on maintaining their relationship; therefore, instead of rejecting his proposal, which is what she feels like doing (as her inner speech reveals, “*Don’t bother*”), she expresses a positive evaluation of his proposal. The discrepancy between the disapproving evaluative judgment and the opposing approving utterance as well as the effort she makes (*Only in the nick of time had she checked herself*) become obvious to the reader:

Guy had rung her that morning in the flat, as he always did, to say he would be on the usual train and that he would like to take her out to dinner to compensate for the night before. She had nearly said, “Don’t bother.” Only in the nick of time had she checked herself and said, “Lovely.” She hadn’t said it in quite the voice she would have wished, but at least she had said it [Trollope 2001, p. 244].

Having expressed a polite response, Merrion thinks that her voice has not been really convincing but she is glad she has managed a proper positive evaluative response. Thus, apart from her inner speech, the non-verbal means, such as her voice transformations, serve to tell the reader that the outspoken positive evaluation is not sincere.

The following speech episode illustrates a praising utterance, used by an elderly lady as a means of manipulation: she intends to make a young girl read books and develop her mental abilities:

One day, after ducking out for a brief reprieve on the High Street, she’d returned with renewed optimism and pressed a tattered library book into my hands.

*«Perhaps this will cheer you up», she’d said tentatively. «It’s for slightly older readers, I think, **but you’re a clever girl**; with a bit of effort I’m sure you’ll be fine. It’s rather long compared with what you’re used to, but do persevere»* [Morton 2010, p. 31].

Conclusions. Thus, an evaluation speech act production may be characterized by a certain gap between an evaluative cognitive judgement and an evaluative utterance.

The pragmatic filters that determine the transformation of an evaluative judgment into an evaluative utterance are the following: sticking to the speech etiquette and rituals, following “face-saving” tactics, mitigating refusal of criticism, manipulating the addressee, etc. All these pragmatic functions disable the communicants from expressing negative evaluation: they opt to keep silent or express a softened negative evaluative statement, or they may opt to express a counter positive evaluative statement. Genuine evaluative judgments become explicit to the reader of a literary discourse from the author's description of the characters' non-verbal behaviour and their thoughts.

Thus, a positive utterance may serve as a means of “face-saving” tactics or the tactics of mitigation in which case it will not correspond to the preceding evaluative judgement.

The **perspective** for further research is seen in investigating the regularities of speech production of negative evaluation in literary discourse.

References

- Буров А. А. Номинационно-синтаксический семиозис в современном русско-язычном дискурсе : новая реальность словаря. *Вестник ПГЛУ*. 2001. №4. С. 5 – 9.
- Кухаренко В. А. Текст и его структура : учебное пособие. М.: Флинта, 2018. 188 с.
- Beaton M. C. *Death of a scriptwriter*. London : C & R Crime, 2009. 304 p.
- Bigunova N. Cognitive pragmatic regularities in communicative manifestation of positive evaluation. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Trnava : University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, 2019. IV (1), June 2019. P. 2-46.
- Cohen J. *Getting away with it*. London : Headline Review, 2010. 599 p.
- Highmore J. *The birthday*. London : Headline Review, 2009. 407 p.
- Kinsella S. *Shopaholic abroad*. London : Black Swan, 2001. 350 p.
- Kinsella S. *The secret dreamworld of a shopaholic*. London : Black Swan, 2000. 320 p.
- Morton K. *The Distant Hours*. London : Pan Books, 2010. 677 p.
- Prihodko A. Category of evaluation as the object of linguistics: prospects of communication aspects of study. *Odessa Linguistic Journal*. №11. Odessa, 2018. P. 64 – 70.
- Trollope J. *Marrying the mistress*. London : Black Swan, 2001. 333 p.

(Матеріал надійшов до редакції 7.10.19. Прийнято до друку 2.11.19)

УДК: 811.111 : 81'42 : 070

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-1135/2019-78-02>

ВАНІНА Г. В.

(Запорізький національний університет)

АНТРОПОМОРФІЗМ ЯК ЗАСІБ МЕТАФОРИЧНОЇ ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЇ ПІАР-ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ У ГАЗЕТНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

У статті розглядаються особливості вербального вираження піар-діяльності за допомогою антропоморфної метафори. Антропоцентричність бачення навколишнього середовища пояснюється тим, що людина підсвідомо концептуалізує дійсність за своєю подібністю. На прикладах англійського, українського, російськомовного газетного дискурсу, виявлено, що піар-діяльність набуває таких антропоморфних ознак: тілесних, ментальних, психічних, емоційних, мовленнєвих та соціальних.

Ключові слова: піар-діяльність, вербалізація, метафора, концептосфера, антропоморфізм, метафорична модель перенесення, газетний дискурс.

Vanina H. V. Anthropomorphism as a mean of the metaphorical verbalization of PR-practice in newspaper discourse. The article is dedicated to the analysis of peculiarities of PR-activity verbal expression. In the center of research is using anthropomorphic metaphor to present PR in a newspaper discourse. Because social communication attracts the attention of not only political scientists, sociologists, psychologists, but also linguists. Mass media use certain sets of verbal instruments to influence and inform the audience. Such tools must be relevant, clear and bright. And metaphor is a such one. It suggests the idea of transferring features of one item to another one using elements of semantical relation.

Metaphor is the subject in linguistic research because of being the most productive creative way of enriching a language. In the process of metaphorisation signs of one conceptual sphere are used to nominate signs of another one. Cognitive mechanism of creating metaphors is interaction of the sphere-source and the sphere-aim.

Studying concept PR / ПІАР / ПИАР through the prism of metaphorical mechanisms and finding general consistent patterns of metaphorical models gives the opportunity to reveal key information that reflects understanding of PR-practice in studied languages.

The focus of this study is the conceptual sphere of figurative characteristics of PR-activity *Human*. It includes 3 domains of transference sources («Physiological features», «Activity», «Relations») and models of metaphorical transferences (metaphorical models) (e.g. («Parts of body», «Power/strength», «Fertility», «Illness» «Food», «Success», «Money», «Harvest», «Mechanism», «Building», «Object») that contain relevant information for the selected semantic type of the metaphor *Human*.

The anthropocentricity of the vision of the environment is explained by the fact that a man subconsciously conceptualizes the reality using similarities with his nature. Based on the examples of English-, Ukrainian-, Russian-language newspaper discourse, it is revealed that PR-activity acquires the following anthropomorphic features: physical, mental, emotional, speech and social.

The results of the study showed that techniques of anthropomorphisms used as a mean of verbal influence in three languages can coincide and differ. Further researches can be connected with studying other conceptual spheres of figurative characteristics of PR-practice verbalization in three suggested languages.

Keywords: PR-activity, verbalization, metaphor, conceptosphere, anthropomorphism, metaphorical model of transference, newspaper discourse.

Соціальна практика піар-діяльності пройшла тривалий шлях розвитку і має на меті певні дії, спрямовані на інформування й переконування будь-якої аудиторії. Вивчення